

Durham E-Theses

Hurrell Froude and the development of his ideal of the church

Crowe, Eric Anthony

How to cite:

Crowe, Eric Anthony (1998). *Hurrell Froude and the development of his ideal of the church*, Durham e-Theses. <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/4741/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Eric Anthony Crowe: Hurrell Froude and the Development of his Ideal of the Church
MA 1998

Froude was born in 1803 into a Devon clerical family of social standing and High Church tradition. The godly Keble, his tutor at Oriel, affected him profoundly. In 1826 he became a Fellow of Oriel and there met Newman. Froude's ideas soon began to show a clear Catholic tendency which he expressed in his writing with outspoken vigour. New Government Acts, which allowed non-Anglicans to sit in Parliament and so influence the Church's life, were strongly opposed by Froude and his friends. Poor health led Froude to spend six months in the Mediterranean with his father and Newman. There, the Church of Rome both attracted and repelled them. Froude increasingly felt the necessity for the Church to be free from State interference. After Keble's Assize sermon, the incipient Oxford Movement came to life with the publication of the *Tracts for the Times* by Newman who emphasised the apostolic succession and the Church as the creation of God. Froude's ideas, meanwhile, continued in an ever more Catholic direction and with increasing rejection of the Reformers. His influence on Newman was substantial. At the end of 1833, he went to Barbados for 18 months for his health. He increasingly felt the necessity for holiness within the Church and the dangers of rationalism and liberalism. He believed that the Church possessed authority in the world. He frequently looked to the Nonjurors and increasingly towards Rome. While accepting the infallibility of the Apostolic Church, he rejected that of the Papacy and also transubstantiation which he understood as rationalistic. He believed deeply in the Real Presence and the centrality of the Eucharist in worship. After his death in 1836, Keble and Newman collected and published his *Remains*, which aroused anger and scorn, with some joyous agreement.

HURRELL FROUDE AND THE DEVELOPMENT
OF HIS IDEAL OF THE CHURCH

ERIC ANTHONY CROWE

The copyright of this thesis rests
with the author. No quotation
from it should be published
without the written consent of the
author and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

MA University of Durham

Department of Theology 1998



- 1 DEC 1998

CONTENTS

I	Early influences	2
II	To Oriel - and Keble	11
III	At Oriel - with Newman	18
IV	Home Thoughts Abroad	25
V	'Isaac, we must make a row in the world'	34
VI	Church and State	50
VII	Barbados	63
VIII	The Search for a Paradigm	72
IX	Church Discipline and Authority	90
X	Eucharist: Mystery and Miracle	96
XI	Rome	107
XII	The Ethos of Catholicism	118
XIII	References	130
XIV	Bibliography	139

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without their prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

I EARLY INFLUENCES

The tremors caused by the French Revolution reverberated throughout many countries of the world and still do to-day. In nineteenth-century England they brought a sense of unease to those whose lives were dependent on the old settled ways of life and thinking. They brought a tingle of excitement to those whose imaginations were fired with the possibility of a new order. But revolutions seldom bring just and permanent solutions to the problems of an unjust society. Post-Revolutionary France gave birth to Napoleon, military power and war.

The Napoleonic wars had little real effect on the lives of the majority of English people. Those who fought suffered; some who remained at home mourned. Daily life continued to be affected by nature. Good harvests towards the end of the war depressed the price of wheat and with it the farmers. Depression of a different kind was experienced by those who lived and worked in the squalid industrial towns of recent growth. Even so, England remained outwardly a green and pleasant land.

In the early part of the century England was ripe for a fresh awakening and renewal in many parts of its life. Hearts and imaginations were being stirred by the warmth and freedom of the spirit of romanticism. The novels of Sir Walter Scott brought delight and Wordsworth found many an echo with his new kind of appreciation of nature. There was also the stirring of many hearts by the Evangelical Revival. This concurrence of feelings and desires brought forth results. The obvious and immediate need was for political reform. The Church was also in desperate need of organisational and pastoral re-ordering.

It has long been assumed that the Church which the nineteenth century inherited should be dismissed as typifying idleness compounded with a cold and jaded rationalism. This has now been shown to be too depressing and shallow a judgement. It also ignores the very real fears felt by many within the Church. This is pointed out by J.C.D. Clark:

What was chiefly viewed with alarm in eighteenth-century England was the threat of the extension of a Papist monarchy's claims into the life of the individual, not the nature of the Hanoverian monarchy's title in a Protestant, Anglican, political theology.

The nature of the Church establishment was therefore of considerable importance, and the conventional caricature of it as somnolent, corrupt, and unthinkingly subservient to the civil power is particularly distorting. Even Low Churchmen of the eighteenth century sought, as their ideal, not a subordination of the sacred to the secular but a purposeful identity, a close connection between Church and State. (1)

In his study of the background to Tractarian thinking, Peter Nockles demonstrates with a wealth of contemporary material that the Tractarians themselves went too far in dismissing that century as being cold and empty of Church teaching and life. He shows too, the extent to which there was continuity of ideas throughout the period up to the Oxford Movement. 'In their church principles, sacramental teaching, spirituality and even political theology, they owed more than they usually acknowledged, not only to the Caroline phase of the High Church tradition but to the eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century witnesses to that tradition.' (2)

Among the clergy of this earlier century there is plenty of evidence of pluralism and non-residence, but these were inheritances of long standing reaching back through the Caroline period to the Middle Ages. Patronage was also a marked feature of much clerical life, although it could well claim not to be without some merit. In *The Passing of Barchester* Clive Dewey traces the use and effects of patronage within and stemming from the Lyall family in the earlier part of the nineteenth century. No doubt it was flourishing a hundred years before. What Dewey calls 'this dense web of personal contacts', although not commendable as a normal means of clerical appointments,

nevertheless did have the virtue of promoting a meritocracy and helping to preserve continuity of doctrine.

Bishops were not all given to idleness. 'There is considerable evidence that they were competent administrators, who discharged diligently the episcopal tasks of visitation, confirmation and ordination. In 1718 Archbishop Wake wrote that "the confirmations had never been so regular throughout this kingdom as within the last thirty years, nor the episcopal visitations and that by the bishops in person, so constant"'. (3) His view of episcopal duties was not over-demanding, but neither was it indifferent. Nor among the clergy were all in the mould of Parson Woodforde. Many were active in the way they best understood. 'It is likely that most eighteenth century clergy saw themselves first as foremost not as priestly mediators between God and man, dispensing the sacraments, but as pastoral educators, spiritual and moral teachers and guides'. (4)

Two surveys of Church life in different localities around the turn of the century reveal a surprising vitality. Peter Virgin's survey of rural north Norfolk in *The Church in an Age of Negligence* discounts the implication of his title. There was, he finds, 'a surprisingly vigorous spiritual revival. Services, especially services of Holy Communion, were becoming more frequent; congregations were growing; catechising was on the increase; and schools were springing up everywhere'. (5) In his survey of Canterbury Diocese, Jeremy Gregory finds a similar growth in the provision of education through charity schools and later through the Sunday School movement. He makes the general point that 'in speaking in terms of an "Evangelical revival" as the main leaven in the dough of the eighteenth century Church, historians have misjudged the significance of mainstream Anglican churchmanship and its ability to initiate pastoral developments'.

(6)

Contemporary assessments of the condition of the Church in the early part of the nineteenth century are varied. An optimistic, even cheerful, view is found in a letter from the poet Robert Southey to Bishop Jebb of Limerick in 1815: 'Unless I deceive

myself the state of religion in these kingdoms is better at this time than it has been at any other since the first fervour of the Reformation. Knowledge is reviving as well as zeal, and zeal is taking the best direction'. (7) This view was broadly supported by James Anthony Froude, the historian and Hurrell's youngest brother, in a less than fraternal comment: 'Before he and his friends undertook the process of reconstruction, the Church was perhaps in the healthiest condition which it had ever known . . .' (8) In contrast there is the oft-quoted footnote in Dean Church's classic account of the Oxford Movement with Thomas Arnold's depressing comment: 'The Church, as it now stands, no human power can save'.(9) One hundred years later, Canon Ollard, in *A Short History of the Oxford Movement*, affirmed with the Anglo-Catholic zeal and confidence of that time that 'never, in the whole of the tangled story, had the English Church as a whole sunk to the depth it had reached in 1833 . . . The English Church appeared to be nearly spiritually dead'. In his more recent study of Hurrell Froude, Piers Brendon writes in calmer tones of the 'parlous condition' of the Church at the beginning of the 1830s and of its 'sad inadequacies as an institution'.

It is certainly true that the Church of England was both blind and indolent in attempting to serve the needs of the newly industrialised towns. Most people still lived in rural areas and those with influence and authority still lived in the more rural parts of the south of the country. Bishops did not see the mills and factories which increasingly employed their flocks. Nor did parish boundaries in the mushrooming industrial areas reflect pastoral reality, but an earlier and still rural environment. Pastoral reorganisation was desperately needed.

Positive evidences of life within the Church of England are the founding of societies. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel had been founded as early as 1701 to help further the missionary work already started by the S.P.C.K. At the end of the eighteenth century the Church Missionary Society was founded and the first two decades of the nineteenth century saw the start of the National Society (1811) and the Church Building Society (1818) which received a vote of one million pounds from Parliament in 1818

and another half a million in 1824. On the individual level there were within the Evangelical Clapham Sect truly saintly men such as John Venn, Charles Simeon and William Wilberforce. The abolition of the slave trade, the extension of missionary work and the founding of the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1804 were products of their Christian beliefs and efforts. As a sort of High Church counterpart there were the Hutchinsonians and the Hackney Phalanx, both of which groups are not easy further to define apart from friendship and residence.

The great majority of churchpeople were no doubt unaware of belonging to any particular tradition. They were simply members of the Church in their village. They were as their fathers had been before them and as they expected their sons would be after them. Clergy would be more conscious of differing viewpoints within the wider Church, but to what extent they allied themselves with any of them depended largely on their own background and temperament

Groupings within the Church - 'parties' is too defining a word for this time - included those who had been affected by the Methodist revival and the preaching of George Whitefield. Many of these Evangelicals were saintly in their lives, if narrow in their theology. Their achievement was to produce saintly individuals rather than a communion of saints. Thus the godliness of an Evangelical household in Ireland made a deep impression on James Anthony Froude who was a guest there in 1842:

There was a quiet good sense, an intellectual breadth of feeling in this household, which to me, who had been bred up to despise Evangelicals as unreal and affected, was a startling surprise . . . More beautiful human characters than those of my Irish Evangelical friends I had never seen, and have never seen since.(10)

The Froude family were heirs to that school of thought loosely called 'High Church'. An even wider umbrella term was 'Orthodox'. During the first half of the eighteenth century High Churchmen were kept at a distance from the centre of both Church and State. With the accession of George III in 1760 they were brought into favour to the extent

that by 1790 most of the bishops were broadly High Church. This tradition was uniformly Tory and upheld the Divine Right of Kings, often with especial devotion to the memory of Charles I. Their theology was enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer, and thus they upheld the three-fold ministry of the Church and the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession. Their theological influence was not great, for what was best in this tradition was guarded by a quietness and reserve. At best, they were serious, learned and devout, disciples of Richard Hooker and Jeremy Taylor. At times, intellect outweighed their theology and Toryism their piety. Of their number were John Keble and Robert Hurrell Froude.

For those who inherited wealth, social position and good health, life was good, as in any generation. The agonies of toothache and the uncertainties of medical knowledge were the unavoidable lot of all men. Hurrell Froude was born on 25 March 1803 into a family of comfortable means and some social position. His father, Robert Hurrell, was Rector of Dartington in Devon and was later to become Archdeacon of Totnes. He was clearly a man of considerable ability and no little learning. James Anthony, the youngest of eight children, paints a picture of a secure, rural England at this time 'when the average English incumbent . . . was a man of private fortune . . . who farmed his own glebe . . . kept horses . . . shot and hunted moderately, and mixed in general society. He was generally a magistrate'.(11) He might well have been describing his own father.

Sir John Coleridge knew the Froude family. In his *Memoir of the Rev. John Keble* he records Keble's gently humorous description of the father after his first visit to the parsonage in Dartington. He found him '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'.(12)

Anthony Froude affords us a glimpse of his family life. Of the religious teaching they received, it 'did not instruct us in mysteries, it did not teach us to make religion a

special object of our thoughts'. They did not hear a single word about Church doctrine in church or out of it. (13)

The parish church itself only confirmed this rather drab and colourless approach to religion. 'The Royal Arms, flanked by the lamentable monuments of all the local gentry, dominated the chancel; the Squire's pew had its fat cushions, and a stove in the middle, and was walled away from any view of the ignored Communion-table chastely covered with green baize; plebeian hats were piled in the Font . . . ' (14) Such was the outward religious background of home and Church to Hurrell Froude's early life. There was little to awaken and nurture a lively faith in one so intelligent and sensitive. Yet there was an influence within the home which was to draw him towards holiness and the deeper things of God. This influence was quiet and gentle and came from his mother.

In the words of Sir John Coleridge, Margaret Froude was 'very beautiful in person, and delicate in constitution, with a highly expressive countenance, and gifted in intellect with the genius and imagination which his [Hurrell's] father failed in. Like the one he was clever, knowing, quick, and handy; like the other he was sensitive, intellectual, imaginative'. (15) In the opening pages of Froude's *Remains* there is a strange letter written by his mother. It was not addressed to any person by name nor was any name mentioned, but the whole letter clearly referred to her son, Hurrell. She told how he was causing her much anxiety, mainly on account of his lively insensitivity. Her health was poor and she would welcome advice. Hurrell would be about sixteen or seventeen years old when this letter was written. In spite of her poor health, he was indifferent to her desire and need for quiet 'without the slightest feeling, twenty times a day. At one time he kept one of his brothers screaming, from a sort of teasing play, for near an hour under my window. At another, he acted a wolf to his baby brother, whom he had promised never to frighten again'. She added a postscript: 'I have complained to him seriously of this day, and I thought he must have been hurt; but I am sorry to say that he

has whistled almost ever since'.(16) The baby brother was Anthony who would have been about two years old at the time.

Hurrell was the eldest of five brothers and three sisters. By the early 1840s only his brothers William and Anthony together with his sister Margaret survived. William, who was seven years younger than Hurrell, was sent to Westminster School, as was Anthony. Both were destined to make their mark in the world, William as a naval engineer and Anthony as an historian.

The difference in ages between the eldest and the youngest was too great for them to be close. Anthony was a gentle boy who suffered greatly from bullying at Westminster. 'Poor Att', Hurrell wrote in 1828, 'is such a very good-tempered little fellow that in spite of his sawneyess he is sure to be liked . . . I was an ill-natured sawney, and do not at all wish my time at School to come again.' (17) An insight into Hurrell's character is contained in an autobiographical fragment of Anthony Froude:

We adored Hurrell. He was sparkling brilliant, moved as a sort of king in the element which surrounded us. My father was infinitely proud of him, and let him do as he pleased. I worshipped him, but I cannot say that I think his educational experiments were always successful. He thought that I wanted manliness. A small stream ran along the fence which enclosed the garden, with newts, frogs, and other ugly things in it. I remember Hurrell once when I was very little taking me by the heels and stirring the mud at the bottom with my head. It had not the least effect which he desired. Another time I have a vivid recollection of being put overboard into deep water out of a boat in the river again to make me bold, which it didn't make me at all. (18)

Froude's lack of compassion towards his brother is evidence of a streak of hardness and insensitivity in his character. It became apparent at a later period in his life in his attitude to the negroes of Barbados, where his language about them is crudely offensive to the twentieth-century ear. On the other hand there was deep within his character a sensitivity which he tried desperately and successfully to hide. He accepted suffering for himself and other people as something to be accepted and borne.

About a year after his mother wrote her letter, she died. It was a loss which naturally affected the young Hurrell deeply. Some five years later he was to read her journal in which he learned afresh of her goodness and godliness. He was filled with remorse for his earlier spirited independence and thoughtlessness: 'I pray God the prayers she made for me may be effectual, and that her labours may not be in vain'.(19)

Just two months after her death, in April 1821, Froude went up to Oxford, to his father's old college, Oriel. This time must have been intensely difficult for him. By her death he had lost that background of gentleness and sensitivity of which he had probably been largely unaware until he felt its loss. The only mitigation of this loss was that his tutor was to be John Keble.

II TO ORIEL - AND KEBLE

Of Froude's undergraduate days virtually nothing is known. Letters to Keble tell of Dartington and his vacation reading. Yet this was the beginning of a second formative stage in his life. It was to give him a basis for all his future thinking about the Church.

In Keble, Froude found a man whom Isaac Williams famously described as 'wholly made up of love'. (1) He was a man whose whole being was shot through with a warmth and humility which he had not met before, except in his mother. Here was someone whom he could not but respect, trust and love wholeheartedly. Keble, for his part, soon developed an understanding of this unusual young man in his care and came to have a great affection for him. At first he would have felt compassion for one newly bereaved of his mother. In time there grew up before him someone who was remarkably intelligent, fundamentally in agreement with his tutor, yet given to exaggerated expressions of opinion. He was impetuous, causing occasional concern to Keble, and delighted in pricking any bubbles of pomposity around him. But Keble was able to recognise that behind this audacity and apparent impudence there was a deeply serious mind.

In order to understand Froude and his later development, it is essential to know Keble's own beliefs at this time, for these Froude accepted wholeheartedly. Like his father, Keble was staunchly High Church, but his religion was clothed with grace and reality.

A brilliant classical scholar, Keble had been elected to a Fellowship at Oriel when he was only nineteen years old. But his mind-set (and this is scarcely too strong a description) was one of acceptance and delight in the godly and High Church teaching which he had received from his father.

Geoffrey Faber, in his detached and sceptical survey, *Oxford Apostles*, turned to Keble with undisguised disdain. 'In his own home at Fairford he was his father's docile willing pupil; the ideas which he absorbed there as a boy sufficed him throughout his whole life. He passed them on to his pupil Hurrell Froude, and through Froude to Newman, but he did nothing himself to develop them . . . they remained simply the ideas which his father had taught him - devotion to the memory of King Charles the Martyr, belief in the principles of the Nonjurors, hatred of dissent, of Erastianism, of liberal thinking, loyalty to the ideas of a priestly Apostolic Church. His mind was passionately contented with the past'. (2) All these ideas Froude took from Keble with the exception of the passionate contentment. This was never to be his.

Keble's biographer, Walter Lock, offered a more sympathetic slant:

. . . There had been growing upon him an intense distrust of the Evangelicalism of the day, which seemed to depend entirely upon feeling, to neglect the sense of duty and the cultivation of character; it seemed to him so often unreal . . . On the other hand, he loathed even more strongly the cold Deism of the last century with its modern Erastianism, which would reduce the Church to a mere creation of the State, and would ultimately deny the supernatural . . . his mind craved for a religion which should affect the whole man, and keep both feelings and intellect under the control of the will. To enforce this he fell back upon the conception of the Church which he had inherited, as of a body independent of the State, founded by the Lord Himself, perpetuated by direct succession from the Apostles, one in continuous history and in doctrine with the Primitive Church, filled with a supernatural and sacramental life, witnessing to a high moral standard before the world. Such a conception . . . made him doubt the wisdom of much that the Reformers had done. In 1824 he wrote to Coleridge that he doubted Davison's application of the apostasy to the Church of Rome, and adds, "My impression for a long time has been that we have as much to do with it as they". (3)

John Davison, to whom he refers, was both Fellow and Tutor of Oriel at the time. Keble's letter to Coleridge reflects more his later thinking, but it did remain substantially the same. Lock's account of his beliefs contain so much of what Froude was to defend with such passion. To this should be added the deep attitude of reserve in treating and speaking of the things of God, an attitude so marked in Keble and which

was to be the cause of misunderstandings and accusations against the early leaders of the Oxford Movement.

By 1823 Keble had been a Tutor for almost five years. But he was never really at home in the Oriel Common Room where the Fellows displayed, for him, too critical an openness of mind towards the Church and its teaching. Keble, for all his renowned gentleness, was unbending in his fundamental beliefs. Tom Mozley recalled that he very soon lost his temper in discussion. 'There really was no getting on with Keble without entire agreement, that is submission.' (4) Anthony Froude observed that if a person did not agree with him, he considered that there was something morally wrong with him.

At heart Keble longed for the pastoral ministry of the Church. He decided to leave Oxford to take up a curacy in the Cotswold village of Southrop. During the Long Vacation of this year he invited Froude, Isaac Williams and Robert Wilberforce to join him for a reading party. Here the three young men were able to be with Keble daily and to see him in a home setting. It was here that they found, in Isaac Williams' words, 'religion a reality'. It was here that they began to 'follow conscience and to fear applause'. It proved to be a turning point for Froude and Isaac Williams.

Froude did not get the double First for which he had been working and hoping. Nevertheless he kept in touch with Keble by correspondence and visits. He told him that he was glad to know something of the Puritans after reading Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England* 'as it gives me a better right to hate Milton . . . Also, I adore King Charles and Bishop Laud'. (5) In a later letter, which like others of this time, reflects a very positive attitude to life, he told Keble: 'I am now officiating as ethical instructor to B., in which capacity I have been much humiliated at finding how little I know about the matter; but it makes me get them up . . . I would bet Bishop Butler against all the 'stotles in the world'. (6) Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics* were required reading at Oxford, but Froude, like others in the early Oxford Movement was strongly influenced by Butler's *Analogy of Religion* with its sacramental understanding

of nature and its advocacy of the principle of probability as a safe guide. In these sentiments he was also reflecting Keble's own firm views.

In the summer Froude stayed with Keble at Fairford. They visited Tintern Abbey and were both charmed by it. Somehow this encapsulated what was going on in Froude's mind at this time: a growing admiration for the medieval Church and a growing dislike of the Reformation. As Owen Chadwick points out, 'a sentiment for monastic ruins generates no love for a Reformation which ruined monasteries'. (7)

Keble's influence on Froude's thinking up to this period cannot be overestimated. Dean Church believed that Keble 'moulded' Froude who learned from Keble to be 'anti-Erastian, anti-methodistical, anti-sentimental - and as strong in his hatred of the world, as contemptuous of popular approval, as any Methodist'. (8) Froude himself acknowledged his debt. 'I expect before long to cease to have an opinion of my own on any subject where he has made up his mind'. (9) Yet there was a fundamental difference between the two which always remained. Religion was a warm and joyful reality to Keble; for Froude, it was always a struggle and often a bleak one. Nor could Froude ever be to Keble the 'docile willing pupil', which Geoffrey Faber claimed Keble had been to his father. Froude's mind was probing and outward looking. If in Keble he found an anchor, he was quite prepared to give it an occasional tug. The chain which held the anchor was considerably lengthened when Keble moved to the parish of Hursley in Hampshire at the end of 1825.

At the beginning of 1826 Froude attended a series of lectures given by Dr Charles Lloyd, the Regius Professor of Divinity who was to become the Bishop of Oxford in the following year. 'Lloyd's immense catalogue of books . . . has frightened me beyond measure', Froude told Keble. (10) The lectures were on the history and background of the *Book of Common Prayer*. Those words which were so familiar, so much a part of the English language and so central to the very being of the Church of England were examined and shown to be very often translations of medieval and primitive liturgies. It

was impossible to avoid seeing the connection between the Church as they knew it and the Church before the Reformation. In a country as anti-papal as England, it was a considerable surprise to find that much of their familiar Prayer Book could be found in a Latin form in the Roman Mass and the Breviary. At about the same time he went with Robert Wilberforce and Edward Pusey to learn more about the Breviary from Blanco White.

Born in Seville of Irish parents, Blanco White was to have a varied ecclesiastical career. While in Spain he became a Roman Catholic priest. He later became an Anglican and it was at this stage in his life that he became a member of the Oriel common room. He was intelligent and likeable and Froude came to know him quite well. His instructions on the Roman Breviary found a receptive listener in Froude for he later came to use it regularly. When Froude died, Newman chose his breviary as a keepsake.

Oriel's pre-eminence at this time was in large measure due to the basis on which its Fellows were elected. The criterion was not success in the Schools, but a candidate's possibilities. The dominant group in the Senior Common Room, nicknamed the Noetics - literally 'the intelligent ones' - were, according to Brilioth, 'an intellectual group of mildly liberal tendency who took up a critical attitude both towards the old High Church school and the more modern Evangelicalism'. (11) Mark Pattison wrote that 'they called everything in question; they appealed to first principles, and disallowed authority as a judge in intellectual matters'. (12) Of this group was Dr Richard Whately, a bluff, kindly man. He possessed a mind which was 'vigorous, sceptical, speculative within the widest bounds set by Christian formulas'. (13) The anonymous *Letters on the Church by an Episcopalian* published in 1826 was widely believed to be from his pen. In it, he held that the Church was a distinct body, founded by Christ, and possessing its own spiritual powers. In his classic account of the Oxford Movement, Dean Church tells how Froude and others took up and developed this concept:

But this idea had fallen dead, till Froude and his friends put new life into it. Froude accepted Whately's idea that the Church of England was the

one historic uninterrupted Church, than which there could be no other, locally in England; but into this Froude read a great deal that never was and never could be in Whately's thoughts. Whately had gone very far in viewing the Church from without as a great and sacred body. Casting aside the Erastian theory, he had claimed its right to exist, and if necessary, to govern itself, separate from the state. He had recognised excommunication as its natural and indefeasible instrument of government. But what the internal life of the Church was, what should be its teaching and organic system, and what was the standard and proof of these, Whately had left unsaid. And this outline Froude filled up. (14)

Newman paid tribute to Whately's influence: 'What he did for me in point of religious opinion, was first to teach me the existence of the Church, as a substantive body or corporation; next to fix in me those anti-Erastian views of Church polity, which were one of the most prominent features of the Tractarian Movement. On this point, and as far as I know, on this point alone, he and Hurrell Froude intimately sympathised, though Froude's development of opinion here was of a later date'. (15)

The Provost of Oriel at this time was Edward Copleston. It was he who had guided the College to its position of pre-eminence in Oxford. He was a man both of scholarship and business as well as 'a far-sighted reformer'. Like Whately, he held that the Church was a divine institution, but he saw no sacramental character belonging to the three-fold ministry. His influence on Newman was minimal, for they never established any personal rapport, largely because of Newman's shyness at that time.

In 1828 Copleston was succeeded as Provost by Edward Hawkins. Newman openly acknowledged his influence. 'As to doctrine, he was the means of great additions to my belief . . . He gave me the *Treatise on Apostolical Preaching* by Sumner, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, from which I learned to give up my remaining Calvinism, and to receive the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.' Hearing and reading Hawkins' sermon on Tradition 'made a most serious impression upon me'. Hawkins held that the Bible 'was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and that, if we would learn doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church; for instance to the Catechism, and to the Creeds. He considers, that, after learning from them the

doctrines of Christianity, the inquirer must verify them by Scripture. This view, most true in its outline, most fruitful in its consequences, opened upon me a large field of thought. Dr Whately held it too'. (16)

Newman acknowledged being taught the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession by William James, a Fellow of Oriel, in about 1823: 'I recollect being somewhat impatient on the subject at the time'. Froude's views were those of Keble, and in a sermon written in 1831, Froude set it out in the clearest possible way. For him there was no dispute 'that there exists in the world a set of men, and only one set of men, who derive their commission to teach religious truth, through an uninterrupted succession of persons themselves similarly commissioned, and deriving their first appointment from the Apostles themselves. Such a set of persons there are in the world, and everybody knows and admits that this set of persons consists of those who have been ordained by Christian Bishops as ministers of the Catholic Church.' (17)

By this time, Newman's earlier Calvinism was slowly beginning to give way to what he later feared was liberalism, but what proved to be an openness to a more Catholic direction. Froude had not the same need of change. All this was a preparation for that meeting of minds which was to have such consequences for the Oxford Movement.

John Keble had never been at ease in Oriel Common Room, but two of his pupils were now to join it. In March 1826 Froude and Robert Wilberforce were elected to Fellowships and it was as a result of this that Froude first began to come to know Newman. Anne Mozley described their coming together 'as bringing [Newman] into intimacy with the friend whose influence he ever felt powerful beyond all others to which he had been subject'. (18)

III AT ORIEL - WITH NEWMAN

Newman was a shy man and it was to be some time before he and Froude came to that intimacy which was to be so mutually effectual. Nevertheless he did take steps to get to know the new Fellow. 'We were in grave deliberation till near two this morning, and then went to bed', Newman wrote to his mother. 'Froude is one of the acutest and clearest and deepest men in the memory of man'. (1) Froude, for his part, told Keble that Newman 'is, to my mind, by far the greatest genius of the party, and I cannot help thinking that, sometime or other, I may get to be well acquainted with him'. (2)

Froude found in Newman a mind so very different from that of Keble, the orthodox High Churchman. His background was Evangelical. He was a converted man, although at this time and by his own admission, he was 'drifting in the direction of liberalism'.(3) In her biography of Newman, Meriol Trevor compares these two men:

Froude was utterly remote from the Protestant middle-class London in which Newman had grown up; he was never anywhere near Evangelicalism, which he laughed at, or Liberalism, which he hated. This background gave his ideas a coherence, accidental but solid, which Newman's never had; it also made it difficult for him to sympathise with people who held opinions he disliked. When he liked anyone, he would not believe in any difference of opinion, as Newman soon discovered. Both Newman's nature, and his background, helped him to understand people unlike himself and ideas the opposite of his own; it also forced him to think out his views with a thoroughness Froude never attempted. (4)

It would be premature at this time in Froude's life to seek anything more than pointers to what could be termed an ideal of the Church. His letters and Journal reveal an intense introspection and tiresome morbidity. He fasted and disciplined himself; he failed and castigated himself. 'I ought to bow before God in affrighted gratitude.' In July 1826 he wrote in his Journal: 'I feel hungry for some ideal thing, of which I have no definite

idea'. There is a deep pathos here. His whole being craved for the absolute and he could not find it. For Froude, God was a distant truth; for Newman, God was an ever present reality.

Catholic attitudes now begin to become evident. He thanked Keble in a letter dated 8 January 1827 for his advice about penance: 'Self-imposed, it seems to me quite different from when imposed by the Church; and even fasting itself, to weak minds, is not free from evil, when, however secretly it is done, one cannot avoid the consciousness of being singular'. The Editors of the *Remains*, commenting on Froude's thinking at this time, placed a footnote to an extract from his Journal for 1827:

If there was any deficiency in the author's views of religion at this time, it was that he did not recognize so fully as afterwards the doctrine of Christ's *presence* in His Church, e.g. the power of absolution, &c. It may be worth noticing that, how long and strict he had been in the duty of fasting, was not known to the friend most intimate with him, who read it in his Journal with extreme surprise. (5)

In the *Apologia*, Newman confirmed this with a simple observation: 'He embraced the principle of penance and mortification'. (6)

Both Newman and Froude came to the conclusion that they should live the single life. 'He had a high severe idea of the intrinsic excellence of virginity; and he considered the Blessed Virgin its greatest pattern', wrote Newman of Froude. (7) In a cancelled passage of the *Apologia*, he says that he 'was taught the Catholic belief of the moral superiority of the single life by Froude'. Geoffrey Faber, almost predictably, looked behind Froude's conflicts recorded in his Journal and saw sexual temptation and repressed homosexuality. 'Only a positive ideal could subdue the beast within him. The idea of virginity fulfilled this function as nothing else could'. (8) Yet Newman was surely right. Froude admired the complete dedication implied in celibacy. He cited St. Ignatius as an advocate for it and in his *Occasional Thoughts* he quoted from the Acts of the Martyrs with obvious approval: '[St. Ignatius] gave rules about virginity, and neglect of wealth, comfort, and what besides is pleasurable'. (9) Froude sought to live

out the whole of this. The dreariness of his prospects is reflected in one of his contributions to the *Lyra Apostolica*:

Son of sorrow, doom'd by fate
To a loss most desolate,
To joyless youth and childless age,
Last of thy father's lineage,
Blighted being! whence hast thou
That lofty mien and cloudless brow?

His own experience is reflected in a later verse:

Last of his father's lineage, he
Many a night on bended knee,
In hunger many a livelong day,
Hath striven to cast his slough away,
Yea, and that long prayer is granted;
Yea, his soul is disenchanted. (10)

In 1827 Froude wrestled with the ideas of absolution and excommunication. Some years later he was quite explicit about this latter. He was unafraid to wrestle with the problem of Biblical inspiration. 'We cannot be certain that the inspiration which dictated the Sacred Writings differed at all in kind, or very materially in degree, from that which suggested such a work as Bishop Butler's *Analogy*'. (11)

His concerns about the Church were soon to be exercised in a wider, political context. Acceptance of the establishment of the Church of England was part of his inheritance from his father and from Keble. Any tampering with the balance, any hint of Government interference could only be resisted. His developing ideas about the Church could not allow of any diminution of its freedom. The Elizabethan Settlement was based on the assumption that England was a Christian country and that its members belonged to one national Church. Parliament was regarded as the lay synod of the Church. Under the Test and Corporation Acts which were passed in 1673 and 1661 respectively, the reception of Holy Communion according to the rites of the Church of England was made a *sine qua non* for the holding of office under the Crown or for membership of municipal corporations. This exclusion of non-Anglicans was modified to a large extent by annual acts of indemnity which excused nonconformists from

incurring any penalties, but the Acts continued to symbolise the possession of both power and privilege by the Church of England.

The repeal of these Acts in 1828 and, in the following year, the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Bill which enabled Roman Catholics to sit in Parliament, made a nonsense of the constitutional settlement of the Established Church. The deep feelings aroused by Catholic Emancipation were evident from the opposition which faced Sir Robert Peel when he stood for re-election as candidate for the University. He had previously been against the Bill, but in 1828 changed his mind. It was this switch which so angered Keble, Newman and Froude and all three fought against his re-election. When Peel was defeated, Newman wrote to his mother: 'We have achieved a glorious victory . . . We have proved the independence of the Church and of Oxford'. (12) Their anger was certainly directed against Peel, but beneath their anger was a deep and underlying fear of the Roman Catholic Church. It was a fear which had ever been present in the subconscious mind of the nation since the Reformation. Newman voiced the conclusion which all three were in time to draw. He complained to his mother of 'indifferentism' in the Church, but 'I do believe it will ultimately be separated from the State, and at this prospect I look with apprehension'. (13) Froude was not to share his fear.

Edward Hawkins was elected to the Provostship of Oriel in 1828. At this time Isaac Williams noted Keble's influence on Newman:

But certainly their principles were then quite opposite. But at this time he was coming to look to Keble altogether as he received him second-hand through Froude. Newman had a peculiar power of seizing intellectually the $\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$ and principles of another, and making them his own, as it were on trial . . . It was in this manner that Newman was now imbibing John Keble, through Froude, when I came to reside in Oxford. Keble's name with us always cut short every argument, so instinctively did we look to his authority. But I always thought Froude an unfair exponent of Keble's opinions - they were stated by him in a manner so much his own, so startling and original, and put in so extreme a light, that I could hardly recognize them as the same - so different was his from Keble's manner of expressing himself. Things at Oxford at that time were very dead.(14)

In March 1828 Newman was instituted as Vicar of St. Mary's. At the end of the year, Froude was made Deacon by the Bishop of Oxford. He was invited by Newman to take a curacy and the same offer was made to Robert Wilberforce. Both declined. It is clear that parish work was not to Froude's liking. His mind was much more taken up with wider Church affairs as they related to the State. He was troubled by the spirit of reform and political unrest which was pervading not only his own country, but France. 'What a horrid affair this is in France', he wrote to Newman on hearing of the French revolution of July 1830. 'I admire the spirit of the King and Polignac, and wish them better success than I anticipate for them . . . As to English affairs the whiggs seem to[o] successful every where . . . ' (15) In the meantime Froude was intending to work on the ecclesiastical history of the Middle Ages. He read further about the Reformers in Strype and had not increased in admiration for them. But he did admit that the ethos of the Reformation was a *terra incognita* to him. His growing hostility towards the Reformers was shared by Keble who despised their wilful destruction, both physical and doctrinal, of what was sacred within the Church.

In August 1828 Froude wrote to Newman with family news. 'I have a brother now at home, who is coming to Oriel next term, and will make a very good hand at them [mathematics] unless he is very idle.' (16) William came to up Oriel in October with Hurrell as his tutor. He had little interest in the Classics, and four years later Froude was writing again to Newman about him: 'I am afraid poor Willy will make no hand of his second class - he has no interest, and can pick up none, for what he is about, and all his interleaves and margins are scribbled over with lugg sails.' (17) Later that same year William took a First in Mathematics and a Third in Classics. Of all his siblings, William was the one with whom Froude came to have the most mutually respectful relationship.

Froude was an ecclesiastical conservative to his very marrow. He abhorred any prospect of change in the settled inheritance which seemed to be his. Yet he was quite prepared to narrow down his conservatism to the preservation of the Church as he believed it

should be in the face of political interference. As John Rowlands points out, 'Froude was a true conservative and a true radical. Every page of the *Remains* reflected this dual nature of his personality'.(18) In facing up to the threat of disturbance, he looked backwards, as did Newman. But whereas Newman looked back to the early Fathers, Froude, although greatly drawn to the medieval Church, looked back for support and confirmation of his cherished beliefs to the Caroline Divines and the Nonjurors. He would gladly have wished to recreate a Nonjuring Church in England. He was looking for a pure Anglican ethos, and in the Nonjurors he saw a purity and clarity which was lacking in the Church of his day. He saw a Church willing to stand apart from the State for the truth's sake.

Both Froude and Newman believed that by looking back they could find the true Church. They were right in attempting to find that golden thread which must run through the history of the Church. But there was no perfection to be found. There was no period of Church history which could be said to show the ideal. At first, both of them were looking for what Brilioth calls the 'static Church'. Such a Church may be described, may be sought, but it remains an idea.

Froude continued to seek solutions. 'He thinks that the Church will eventually depend for its support, as it always did in its most influential time, on the very poorest classes of the country', wrote J.B.Mozley in 1832. (19) Here was the mind of Froude the romantic. It is doubtful if he ever exchanged many thoughts with the poorest of the land. Newman was more realistic. 'I am more and more convinced one ought to do every thing one can to avert a *civil* commotion - and now incline to the hope that the Whig $\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$ will keep in, and the Church be set adrift. If this were the case, we should be so very independent of things temporal - for we only, as individuals, should suffer'. (20)

By this time Froude's health was causing his family great concern. His prospects of becoming an 'ecclesiastical agitator', as he described himself to Newman, must have sounded a touch pathetic. His father, the Archdeacon, invited Newman to accompany

Hurrell and himself on a visit to the Mediterranean for the health of his son. Newman was, in his own words, 'easily persuaded'. They left Falmouth in December 1832 aboard a steamer. 'She is 800 tons and is called the "Hermes" ', wrote the Archdeacon.

IV HOME THOUGHTS ABROAD

Englishmen of the nineteenth century who went abroad considered their own country to be at the centre of intelligent and right thinking. Oxford dons could be more precise. But Froude and Newman were leaving England in low spirits. The Whig Government of Lord Grey had passed the great Reform Bill, the Irish Church Bill was in process of gestation and they had begun to contemplate the reform of the English Church's endowments and property.

Before setting out from Falmouth, Froude wrote to William with some brotherly advice. 'When you go to London you will be among a parcel of liberals in religion and politics, and ought to expect to find it infectious. Take care you don't get sucked in.' He suggested that he should continue with his Greek Testament and some Old Testament history. He clearly regarded the study of Divinity as a form of prophylactic. 'A *mere engineer* is sure to be a liberal at heart'. (1) He had earlier prepared two papers on Church architecture for the *British Magazine* as well as some chapters of his projected history of Becket. His health was failing. Newman, on the other hand, was not sick, but very tired. He had finished his book on the Arians and the prospect of visiting the classical sites, including Rome, with his well-loved friend, could not but appeal to him. But he was going with increasing conflict in his mind. His work on the Arian controversy had brought him face to face with what he felt bound to believe was a purer form of Church life and faith than he had found in his own Church of England. This disquiet about the Church was mutual.

Throughout their travels both men wrote long letters home. Froude's were mainly to friends. They were long and descriptive of people and places they had seen. Newman's more numerous and longer letters were chiefly to his mother and sisters. They displayed an emotion and intellectual curiosity which was missing from those of his friend. They

both marvelled at the scenery and visited the classical sites. But their deepest interest lay in the life of the Church around them. They observed it with deep interest and even, in Rome, with passion. They found much to criticise, much to admire, the presence of holiness and the lack of it.

At the beginning of their journey they put in to Cadiz. The sound of convent bells put Froude in mind 'that we are in a religious country: it sounded just like Oxford before morning chapel'. But he could not help adding that 'the day of apostasy seems at hand in Spain'. (2) He later heard the bells of the churches of Valetta on Christmas day, but dismissed Malta as 'that land of superstition'. (3) It is difficult to take such a sweeping observation too seriously.

In Corfu they experienced something of Orthodox worship. Froude found a Greek Mass 'very impressive'. He saw people praying in a church where the body of St Spiridion lies. 'They keep all the Saints' days by going to Church and playing cards afterwards; and on the fast days they fast fairly'. (4) Finally they came to Italy and were appalled by the dirt and poverty of Naples. Froude was even more appalled by the low state of the Church. On February 17 he wrote to 'k.1' (Keble ?) from Naples:

I remember you told me that I should come back a better Englishman than I went away; better satisfied not only that our Church is nearest in theory right, but also that practically, in spite of its abuses, it works better; and to own the truth, your prophecy is already nearly realised. Certainly I have as yet only seen the surface of things, but what I have seen does not come up to my notions of propriety. These Catholic countries seem in an especial manner *κατεχειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ*; and the priesthood are themselves so sensible of the hollow basis on which their power rests, that they dare not resist the most atrocious encroachments of the state upon their privileges . . . Monasticism is said to be going out of fashion fast . . . I have seen priests laughing when at the Confessional; and indeed it is plain, that unless they habitually made light of very gross immorality, three-fourths of the population would be excommunicated. I think people are injudicious who talk against Roman Catholics for worshipping Saints and honouring the Virgin and images,&c.; these things may perhaps be idolatrous, - I cannot make up my mind about it, - but to my mind it is the carnival which is real practical idolatry, as it is written, 'the people sat down to eat and drink,

and rose up to play.' The Church of England has fallen low, and will probably be worse before it is better; but let the Whigs do their worst, they cannot sink us so deep as these people have allowed themselves to fall while retaining all the superficials of a religious country. (5)

Froude was not attacking Catholicism, for these countries 'hold the truth in unrighteousness'. It was the lack of morality, the absence of holiness, which offended him. His concern was compounded by evidence of the encroachments of the State on the Church. He shared his gloom with Keble. 'The whole Christian system all over Europe "tendit visibiliter ad non esse". The same process which is going on in England and France is taking its course everywhere else; and the clergy in these Catholic countries seem as completely to have lost their influence, and to submit to the state, as ever we can do in England'. (6)

Here were contained the two deep convictions about the Church which Froude now wished to be a reality within his own Church of England. Firstly, the Church should be free from State interference. If this meant the severing of all ties, then he was prepared to suffer the consequences as he would later make quite plain. Secondly, the life of the Church must be founded on holiness. The ascetical practices which he inflicted upon himself in earlier years and which were to be the cause of much Protestant dismay and merriment when the *Remains* were published, were essentially the result of a thirst for holiness. Keble had probably advised him about them, but even he was unaware of the extent to which he had gone. Froude yearned for a complete self-dedication which accorded with his own psychological make-up, and which was evident also in his embracing of celibacy.

On arriving in Rome, Newman brought with him the surviving relics of his Evangelical and Calvinistic background. Froude had no such weight to carry. He was impressed by the city and felt wonder at the way in which the classical buildings and monuments had been 'taken up by Christianity'. Newman was impressed far more. He was captivated by 'this wonderful place'. Sensitive, as always, to the *genius loci*, he could not but

acknowledge to himself the grandeur and majesty of the Church of Rome. While in Palermo he expressed his feelings in words which were later printed in the *Lyra Apostolica*:

O that thy creed were sound !
For thou dost soothe the heart, Thou Church of Rome,
By thy unwearied watch and varied round
Of service, in thy Saviour's holy home.

He can not restrain his feelings towards a place and a creed with which he is beginning to fall in love:

There on a foreign shore
The homesick solitary finds a friend:
Thoughts, prisoned long for lack of speech, outpour
Their tears . . . (7)

Newman struggled to reconcile what he had read of the Church's early theological history and what he had read in the Fathers with what he had been taught in earlier years and was to find it impossible. Froude had no such internal battle. He betrayed no deep internal feelings such as Newman's, because he had none. His attitude was pragmatic. His own early background combined with his love of the medieval Church did not prevent him from acknowledging the Church of Rome as a great fact of history and a repository of truth, but he could not share Newman's agonising.

During their stay in Rome, Froude and Newman visited the future Cardinal Wiseman, who at that time was Rector of the English College. This visit (or visits - Newman recalls two in the *Apologia*) is puzzling, considering their views at the time. In a letter to his sister Jemima, Newman simply mentioned 'our conversations with Dr Wiseman'.(8) Froude gives an extended account in the course of a letter to J.F.Christie. It is noticeable for its openness and candour:

The only thing I can get my hand on as an acquisition is having formed an acquaintance with a man of some influence at Rome, Monsignor [Wiseman], the head of the [English] college, who has enlightened

[Newman] and me on the subject of our relations to the Church of Rome. We got introduced to him to find out whether they would take us in on any terms to which we could twist our consciences, and we found to our dismay that not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole. We made our approaches to the subject as delicately as we could. Our first notion was that the terms of communion were within certain limits under the control of the Pope, or that in case he could not dispense solely, yet at any rate the acts of one Council might be rescinded by another; indeed, that in Charles the First's time it had been intended to negotiate a reconciliation on the terms on which things stood before the Council of Trent. But we found to our horror that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church made the acts of each successive Council obligatory for ever, that what had been once decided could never be meddled with again; in fact, that they were committed finally and irrevocably, and could not advance one step to meet us, even though the Church of England should again become what it was in Laud's time, or indeed what it may have been up to the atrocious Council, for M. [Wiseman] admitted that many things, e.g. the doctrine of mass, which were fixed then, had been indeterminate before.

So much for the Council of Trent, for which Christendom has to thank Luther and the Reformers. [Newman] declares that ever since I heard this I have become a staunch Protestant, which is a most base calumny on his part, though I own it has altogether changed my notions of the Roman Catholics, and made me wish for the total overthrow of their system. I think that the only τόπος now is 'the ancient Church of England', and as an explanation of what one means, 'Charles the First and the Nonjurors'. When I come home I mean to read and write all sorts of things, for now that one is a Radical there is no use in being nice. (9)

Newman's footnote to this description in the *Remains* stated that the purpose of the meeting was 'to ascertain the ultimate points at issue between the churches'. Froude's language was less than cautious and Newman explained the account as being written in 'a jesting way'. This explanation had little effect on the learned William Palmer, who clearly had no sense of humour himself. In the Introduction to *A Narrative of Events connected with the Tracts for the Times* Palmer referred to this meeting with some coolness. He was not aware of it at the time and if he had been, 'I do not know whether I should have been able to co-operate cordially with [Newman]'. He was clearly surprised by this attempt 'to ascertain the terms upon which they could be admitted to communion by the Roman Church'. It was to him 'illustrative at once of the absence of elementary knowledge of the Roman Catholic system, and of the disposition to frame ingenious hypotheses upon the most important practical subjects'. (10) Palmer was quite right in

finding it strange that they could have so misunderstood the requirements of the Church of Rome, particularly in view of their friendship with Blanco White.

Dr Wiseman must have been intrigued by the, to him, embryonic state of their catholic understanding. Some twenty years later, as Cardinal, he wrote of this visit that 'it remains marked with gratitude in my mind as an epoch in my life. From that hour I watched with intense interest and love the Movement of which I then caught the first glimpse'. (11)

Newman's reactions to all that drew him while he was in the city, were expressed in his letter to Jemima, the same letter in which he briefly mentioned the meeting. He revealed a mixture of love, bitterness and frustration. 'Oh that Rome were not Rome; but I seem to see as clear as day that a union with her is *impossible*. She is the cruel Church - asking of us impossibilities, excommunicating us for disobedience, and now watching and exulting over our approaching overthrow'. (12)

Froude, for his part, betrayed none of Newman's anguish, for after the meeting with Wiseman he returned immediately to the concept he had held before and had been taught by Keble: the Church of the Nonjurors. His idea of the Church was essentially romantic at this time in that he was constantly looking back in history and avoiding the present. But it was one thing to look back to a golden time and learn from it. It was quite different from wishing to bring it back to the present. Newman could not but keep on searching and suffering. Froude, like many romantics, was also quite practical. He turned his attention back to Church and State.

During their absence from England the travellers had heard further news of the Irish Church Reform Bill and this angered them. They heard too of Thomas Arnold's plans for Church reform which called forth scorn and sarcasm from Newman. England was in their thoughts all the time. The State could not be trusted in its dealings with the Church; only separation would answer. Yet even in the evils of State interference,

Froude could see the hand of God. He sent a sonnet to Keble which had been written before leaving England. Rose would not accept it for the *British Magazine* 'because it was too fierce'. The lines could be seen as referring to Reformation times, but it is more likely that Froude directed them at the government of his own day, which is why Rose was not keen to print it.

Then grieve not at their high and palmy state,
Those proud bad men, whose unrelenting sway
Has shattered holiest things, and led astray
Christ's little ones: they are but tools of Fate . . . (13)

Whoever the 'proud bad men' were, it was another shake of the fist at Erastianism.

The voyage had now come to an end. Newman decided to visit Sicily alone and nearly died there from a severe illness. The Froudes set off for home, calling at Marseilles before travelling through France for about six weeks. Hurrell wanted to see some of the 'out-of-the-way things connected with Becket's history' which he was writing. He found himself charmed with the country, as Newman was to be later. 'This France is certainly a most delicious place', he told Christie. Whereas Newman would not even look at the tricolour in Algiers, Froude declared to his brother William that 'the French seem to me to have been grossly belied as a nation'. His letters to William at this time were addressed to him as an equal. He shared with him his thoughts about yacht design, problems of marine engineering, the book of Job and the French Church. In his letter of 23 May he made reference to a movement in that Church which, in some respects, paralleled his own thinking:

There is now in France a High Church Party, who are Republicans, and wish for universal suffrage, on the ground that in proportion as the franchise falls lower the influence of the Church makes itself more felt; at present its limits about coincide with those of the infidel faction. Don't be surprised if one of these days you find us turning Radicals on similar grounds. (14)

The 'High Church party' was that of Lamennais, a priest whose radical ideas challenged individual reason and demanded the separation of Church and State. Christopher Dawson observed that his 'attack on Gallicanism reached the very centre of the problem and rejected the whole system of Church establishment on the ground of first principles. Gallicanism had claimed to secure the freedom of the national Church, actually it meant something entirely different - the enslavement of the Church to the State.'⁽¹⁵⁾ Furthermore he believed that man could not discover religious truth by reason alone, but through faith. He attacked the Reformation which he believed had led to the Revolution in his country. It had brought anarchy in both Church and State and exalted the right of private judgement. The country was in need of a spiritual principle which could only be truly found in Catholicism.

It is possible that Froude had been made aware of the problems facing the French Church and even of some of Lamennais' ideas through the lectures of Dr Charles Lloyd. As W.G. Roe points out, Lloyd 'did not share in the insularity which is usually attributed to his contemporaries. He had had dealings with the French émigré clergy and claimed that he was tolerably well acquainted with the Gallican Church'.⁽¹⁶⁾ But whether Lloyd influenced him or not, Froude's real interest in Lamennais' ideas must be dated from his journey through France and his reading of the organ of Lamennais' party, *L'Avenir*.

Although Froude found much in Lamennais' ideas to support his own beliefs about the independence of the Church in relation to the State, his own ideas were far more insular. Roe compares Lamennais' wider and more practical vision of catholicity with Froude's narrower concept:

. . . Lamennais' purpose is social and therefore missionary: he envisages a mass revival of religion if his reforms are carried out. Froude, on the other hand, is a conservative, who is concerned primarily with preserving the purity of the Church of England. In this he is at one with the other Tractarians.⁽¹⁷⁾

In one of the undated Fragments in the *Remains*, Froude described this party as being:

. . . perhaps rather speculative than practical, and whose views seem to have been founded more upon an extended knowledge of Church History than an habitual attachment to the system under which they had themselves lived . . . The duty of the Clergy seemed clear and simple; to detach themselves from all parties, to dissolve their connexion with the State altogether, to reject its pay and to resist its interference, and quietly devoting themselves to spiritual concerns, gradually to undeceive a misguided people, who had been taught to regard the Church as a mere instrument of Regal oppression.

As for some of its other views, they 'illustrate but too evidently the sad unscrupulousness of the ill-fated Church of Rome'. He found that their observations on their own situation 'which but too probably awaits ourselves' . . . are 'not wholly unworthy of our attention . . .'. (18) But whereas Lamennais saw the catholicity of the Church as a world wide reality and the Pope as the preserver of that catholicity, Froude had to seek catholicity within the Church of England.

Froude and his father arrived back in England in the early summer; Newman a little later. Both were 'full of aspiration and anxieties which spurred them on'. On 14 July John Keble entered the pulpit of St. Mary's church to preach the Assize sermon. Newman, as he recorded in his *Apologia*, 'ever considered and kept the day as the start of the religious movement of 1833'. Froude had less than three years to live.

V 'ISAAC, WE MUST MAKE A ROW IN THE WORLD'

On their arrival back in England, both Froude and Newman were aware that the spirit of reform had strengthened yet further its, to them, malign power within both Church and State. The verbose, yet painfully honest William Palmer of Worcester painted a dire picture of the state of affairs as he saw it. He wrung his hands over the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828. He was especially lugubrious about Catholic Emancipation, 'a measure which scattered to the winds public principle, public morality, public confidence . . . The first sound of the tocsin of revolution at Paris in 1830, ought to have re-united the scattered friends of established order in England.' Most of the English press were favourable to the revolutionary party in France. 'The Tory Aristocracy which had forsaken the Church in yielding Emancipation, were now hurled from their political ascendancy; and the REFORM BILL of 1831, a just retribution for their offence, made for a time the democratic principle all-powerful in the State.' The Church itself was being assailed.

We were overwhelmed with pamphlets on Church Reform . . . Each sciolist presented his puny design for reconstructing this august temple built by no human hands. Such was the disorganisation of the public mind, that Dr Arnold of Rugby ventured to propose, that all sects should be united by Act of Parliament with the Church of England, on the principle of retaining all their distinctive errors and absurdities. Reports, apparently well founded, were prevalent, that some of the prelates . . . were favourable to alterations in the Liturgy. Pamphlets were in wide circulation, recommending the abolition of the Creeds (at least in public worship), and 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. In fact there was not a single stone of the sacred edifice of the Church, which was not examined, shaken, undermined, by a meddling and ignorant curiosity . . . And what was worst of all - *no principle 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. There was in all this enough to appal the stoutest hearts; and those who can recall the feelings of those

days, will at once remember the deep depression into which the Church had fallen, and the gloomy forebodings which were universally prevalent. (1)

Such was the state of England and its Church according to Palmer. His writing conveys a sense of deep foreboding, Goya-like in its intensity. He was not alone. The sense of affront and the feeling of urgency was shared by others. Their fears were compounded by the proposals in the Irish Church Temporalities Bill which became law in August. The provisions of this Bill were manifestly just and sensible. It went some way to putting right the absurdity and unfairness of a privileged minority Church being supported by an impoverished people who were almost entirely Roman Catholic. Certain taxes were abolished; there was a moderate redistribution of the Church's wealth to benefit poor benefices and to help with the building and repair of churches and parsonages; the number of archbishops and bishops was reduced from twenty-two to twelve. If the bishops of the Church had themselves proposed similar measures - although in fact, many did support the Government - the real objection to the Bill would not have existed. The problem lay in the fact that this reform was being carried out by a Government and Parliament which could, in theory, contain dissenters and Roman Catholics. It was seen as a trespass by the secular authority on that which belonged to the Church. The former ideal of the identity of Church and nation could no longer be upheld. That state of affairs which had been accepted since the days of Elizabeth now no longer existed. The very life and status of the Church was under threat. It was felt that 'the new governors of the country were preparing to invade the rights, and to alter the constitution, and even the public documents, of the Church'. (2) The time had come to protest, to set out the Church's beliefs, to rally the Church to its true colours.

Both Froude and Newman were disturbed and restless. But Froude was still a sick man. The Mediterranean journey had brought no improvement to his health. The cold weather and poor conditions they had experienced had probably made him worse. Nevertheless he felt a sense of urgency which he expressed in one of the poems he wrote for the *Lyra Apostolica*:

Heaven must be won, not dreamed; thy task is set,
Peace was not made for earth, nor rest for thee. (3)

Isaac Williams tells of a conversation he had with Froude at this time:

[Froude] returned full of energy and of a prospect of doing something for the Church, and we walked in the Trinity College Gardens and discussed the subject. He said in his manner, "Isaac, we must make a row in the world. Why should we not ? Only consider what the Peculiars, *i.e.* the Evangelicals have done with a few half truths to work upon! And with our principles, if we set resolutely to work, we can do the same".(4)

Christopher Dawson commented on this passage that 'poor Isaac Williams was no more capable of "making a row in the world" than a highly conscientious sheep'. (5)

At the beginning of the long vacation Froude was almost the only occupant of Oriel, according to Palmer. The two met frequently and together agreed that something should be done to defend the Church. It is impossible to imagine two more dissimilar men. William Palmer was, in the words of Dean Church, 'a man of exact and scholastic mind' with 'definite and well-arranged ideas about the nature and office of the Church'. (6) He was almost certainly the most learned of that early group, but he was 'the type that is born old'. (7) Yet Palmer found in Froude 'a friend with whom I could work with entire sympathy in Church questions. For never did I meet with a more cordial response to all that I felt upon these matters or a fuller sympathy. The only point on which I could not concur with him was the manner in which he spoke of the union of Church and State, which he esteemed unlawful *per se*, while I only objected to its abuses. His language as to the Reformation, too, I could not concur in . . . ' (8) The urgency of the times and their shared convictions were sufficient to overcome their personal incompatibility.

As early as February, Hugh James Rose, Rector of Hadleigh in Suffolk, had told Palmer 'that something is requisite is certain. The only thing is, that whatever is one ought to be *quickly* done: for the danger is immediate, and I should have little fear if I thought that

we could stand for ten or fifteen years as we are.' (9) Palmer now contacted Rose; Froude approached Keble and almost certainly, Newman. The upshot of this was an invitation to go to Hadleigh Rectory at the end of the month so that some form of concerted action might be planned.

Before this meeting took place, John Keble had already preached his Assize sermon. There was nothing apparently very exciting about the sermon itself although it certainly contained some plain speaking for those with ears to hear. But it was preached at a time when a number of ideas and events were all converging and only needed a spark to start a fire.

The sermon was deeply conservative in tone. The date on which it was preached was indeed 'a paradoxical date for an anti-revolutionary manifesto'. (10) But Keble determined to use the occasion to give calm, yet forceful expression to the deep sense of outrage which his fellow churchmen felt at the recent actions of the Whig Government. As a good disciple and student of Hooker, he identified the nation with the Church of England. He spoke of 'a nation having for centuries acknowledged, as an essential part of its theory of government, that, as a Christian nation, she is also part of Christ's Church, and bound, in all her legislation and policy, by the fundamental rules of that Church . . . ' If a government and people had disowned this principle, it was due to a lack of faith and growing indifference. 'Can we conceal it from ourselves, that every year the practice is becoming more and more common, of trusting men unreservedly in the most delicate and important matters, without one serious inquiry, whether they do not hold principles which make it impossible for them to be loyal to their Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier ?' He urged respect towards the successors of the Apostles, the duty of intercession and loyal submission to the State within its own sphere.

Among those who heard this sermon were Newman and Froude. Just over a week later, Froude wrote to his friend J.F.Christie. 'Keble has been preaching such a sermon on national apostasy before the Judges one of whom was a socinian. It is in the press now

and will be out in a day or two. He calls the Ministers Libertines and the Parliament Erastians, and implies that the Bishops are such a set that he hardly knows whether we ought to remain in communion with them: he does not say this last but only implies it so don't quote him for it.' (11) Froude, at least, had been stirred as the young J.B.Mozley observed:

I'm sorry I did not hear it myself . . . I am the more sorry I did not hear it, as I cannot help thinking it a kind of exordium of a great revolution - shall I call it? - coming on, whether rapidly or slowly we cannot tell, but at any rate most surely. It is the first regular remonstrance against the measures of the infidel party here, the first decided and pointed protest from a minister of the Church in his proper and peculiar station . . . This is a solemn ecclesiastical censure . . . Froude is now taking, not a walking but, a talking tour. (12)

The sermon was published one week later. It came out prefaced with an Advertisement by Keble in which he set out more directly his fundamental concerns:

Since the following pages were prepared for the press, the calamity in anticipation of which they were written, has actually overtaken this portion of the Church of God. The Legislature of England and Ireland (the members of which are not even bound to profess belief in the Atonement), this body has virtually usurped the commission of those whom our Saviour entrusted with *at least one voice* in making ecclesiastical laws, on matters wholly or partly spiritual. The same legislature has also ratified, to its full extent, this principle, - that the Apostolical Church in this realm is henceforth only to stand, in the eye of the State, as *one sect among many*, depending, for any pre-eminence she may still appear to retain, merely upon the accident of her having a strong party in the country . . .

How may they [i.e. members of the Church who still believe her authority divine] continue their communion with the Church established, (hitherto the pride and comfort of their lives) without any taint of those Erastian principles on which she is now assumed to be governed? What answer can we make henceforth to the partisans of the bishop of Rome, when they taunt us with being a mere Parliament Church? And how, consistently with our present relations to the State, can even the doctrinal purity and integrity of the MOST SACRED ORDER be preserved?

Both the sermon and the advertisement were cries from a gentle, but resolute heart. As Keble's biographer, Sir John Coleridge, noted, the Irish Church measure 'moved him very deeply'. But Keble had been troubled about Church / State relations for some time. In a letter to Coleridge in January 1833 he wrote: 'I look upon them [i.e. Church and

State relations] as virtually dissolved, and as soon as they are avowedly the better: as far as my poor wit can discern, anything almost is better for true Religion than going on in Union with a Whig State'. (13)

Such views were radical indeed for such a conservative churchman as Keble. He was a Tory, a 'King and Country' man. No doubt he felt Froude's influence here, but it would be truer to say that he had been driven to such a position by his own tenaciously held beliefs as to the nature of the Church. And it is with this concern that we come to the heart of the matter for the Movement-to-be at this time. For Keble, Newman, Froude and their allies, the Church - and for them, this meant the Church of England - was of the greatest importance in the lives of men and in the life of the country. It was the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the land. It was the bearer of the Gospel, the channel of God's grace through the sacraments. The freedom and authority of the Church was not simply a matter of life and death, but eternal life and eternal death. There was no point in attending to anything else if the Church of this realm were to be fettered or in any way prevented from exercising its divine commission. They all held to these principles; no doubt they all influenced each other; but it was Keble who was invited to preach the sermon and seized the opportunity.

It is this deep sense of the sacredness of the Church which impelled the early leaders of the Movement. It is this which explains why such deeply Christian men of such intelligence and learning could be so immersed in ecclesiastical affairs to the apparent exclusion of a wider concern for the poor and the many injustices which existed in the land. Yet Keble cared for the poor of his parish; Newman too was diligent and caring in his parochial work. Froude was unfitted for parochial work both on account of his health and his temperament, but at least his writings show a concern for the *pauperes Christi*. Even so, their concern for the Church never developed into a concern for wider social action.

Two weeks after the Assize sermon, Hugh James Rose played host at his Rectory to Palmer, Froude, A.P. Perceval and his own curate, R.C. Trench. Neither Newman nor Keble attended. They probably saw little purpose in doing so. Froude, who had been in close touch with Palmer during the month, no doubt felt in duty bound to go, although he was no committee man.

As with the Assize sermon, the meeting at Hadleigh was not important in itself, but it did result in the defining of certain statements of belief which they all shared. They were agreed about such principles as the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession and maintaining the integrity of the Prayer Book. Their disagreements - and they certainly surfaced at this gathering - were probably due more to clashes of personality than to any fundamental disagreements as regards principles. According to Newman, Palmer thought that both Froude and Perceval were 'very deficient in *learning* and *therefore* rash'. He also observed that Froude 'wishes to break with R.[Rose] which must not be, I think'. (14) Rose may have been cautious, and Froude certainly found him so, but he was a man of deep learning and held in the highest regard both in the University of Cambridge and among many clergy further afield. In *La Pensée Religieuse de Richard Hurrell Froude* Pierre Gauthier notes this temperamental difference between the cool-headed Rose and the impetuous Froude:

Il fallait sans doute connaître ce dernier de longue date, comme c'était le cas de Keble et de Newman, pour juger de la portée de ses paroles. Les lettres de Froude trahissent à la fois des incompatibilités personnelles et des différences de vues au sujet de l'oeuvre à accomplir. Rose voulait répondre aux dangers créés par les lois nouvelles et entreprendre des actions précises dans le cadre de l'Eglise établie, alors que Froude ne voyait là que des actions de détail n'allant pas à la racine du mal. (15)

At this time Froude's ideas were in a state of ferment. He wanted to act and he wanted others to be equally bold, but he was not clear as to what exactly they should do. His frustration shows in his letter to Newman the day after the meeting ended. 'They evidently think that no one will at present attend to any thing one says about the appointment of Bishops.' For Froude, this particular matter was of the greatest

importance and significance. The method of such appointments reflected, for him, the unholy stranglehold which the State had over the Church. He was not to let the matter drop. As for Rose, Froude felt that he was too conservative; he lacked fire and vision.

His notion is that the most important subject to which you can direct your reading at present is the meaning of Canonical obedience which we have all sworn to our Bishops - for that this is likely to be the only support of Church Government when the State refuses to support it. I myself have a most indistinct idea of what I am bound to: yet the oath must certainly contemplate something definite and sufficient to preserve practical subordination. (16)

Neither Rose nor Palmer were really able to understand Froude. Rose almost certainly did not recognise the deep seriousness which lay behind his often flippant and outrageous manner. Palmer was altogether too ponderous for his early alliance to last long. Froude could not suppress his impatience.

One of the chief results of the Hadleigh meeting was the attempt to form an Association of Friends of the Church. Palmer described its setting up in long and tedious detail in his *Narrative of Events*. Although some groups seem to have been formed in different towns, the project collapsed within a matter of months. Newman supported it through loyalty, but his heart was not in it. He wrote to Rose in the following year: 'As to the business of the Association, Keble, Froude, and myself were always against it'. (17)

In spite of such coolness, the terms of the Association are interesting as reflecting the theological views of its members. On 9 September Newman sent them to Froude. 'Criticism the whole very accurately in matter and style, and send it back by return of post.' Newman was anxious for Froude's imprimatur.

Keble's original draft which was printed after corrections made by others, included:

1. That the only way of salvation is the partaking of the Body and Blood of our sacrificed Redeemer;
2. That the mean expressly authorized by Him for that purpose is the

holy Sacrament of His Supper;

3. That the security, by Him no less expressly authorized, for the continuance and due application of that Sacrament, is the Apostolical commission of the Bishops, and, under them, the Presbyters of the Church;

[They wished to] circulate Books and Tracts . . .

To do what in us lies towards the reviving among Churchmen the practice of daily Common Prayer and more frequent participation of the Lord's Supper. (18)

The language and the ideas behind the statement are uncompromisingly and overtly Catholic. Yet Froude, in his reply to Newman, would have gone even further. 'I dont quite see the good of talking about "the continuance and due application" of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper instead [of], the making of the Body and Blood of Christ.' (19) Pierre Gauthier notes that this last expression may well have been inspired by the formula in the Breviary: 'Conficere corpus et sanguinem Domini' in the Declaratio intentionis ante Missam. (20) This points to the probability that at the time Froude was reading the Breviary.

Froude's thinking and language about the Eucharist were racing ahead. Newman was clearly surprised, even stunned, by such whole-hearted Catholic language. 'As to your correction for "the continuance and due application of the Sacrament," I differ from you in toto. I am rash enough, but you are furious.' (21)

The Association was doomed to failure. It was as if those at its heart were still searching and that its only appeal was that at least something was being done. 'Any thing that sets people agog is on our side; I deprecate a calm,' Froude wrote to Newman. (22) There followed two Addresses to the Archbishop of Canterbury: one from about 7000 clergy and the other from nearly a quarter of a million heads of families. The clergy acknowledged their 'devoted adherence to the apostolical doctrine and polity' of the Church of England together with their support for the Bishops and the Prayer Book. Likewise the laity expressed their support for the Church's 'apostolic form of

government'. What all this meant to the signatories is unclear, but at least they signed it, and it did no damage, if little good.

Both Froude and Newman had been involved in the wording of the Addresses, but again, they were simply responding to the feeling that 'something must be done'. 'Living movements do not come of committees, nor are great ideas worked out through the post,' wrote Newman. 'This principle deeply penetrated both Froude and myself from the first, and recommended to us the course which things took spontaneously, and without set purpose of our own'. (23) Froude was too bold, too incisive, to stay long with men such as Palmer and Rose. He was beginning to have a clearer vision of the Church which conflicted with the views of conservative, Establishment churchmen. He was increasingly passionate about the Church's freedom. He bemoaned the destruction of so much in the Church as a result of the Reformation, looking back to the medieval Church and that of the Nonjurors as a distant paradise. 'Froude had that strong hold of first principles, and that keen perception of their value, that he was comparatively indifferent to the revolutionary action which would attend on their application to a given state of things.' (24) As he was a bold rider to hounds, so he was bold and careless of consequences in his pursuit of the truth as he saw it. But the Church of England was a mighty and slow ship and could not be moved quickly.

At this time Froude was ahead of the more cautious Newman in his expression of anti-Erastianism. 'With Froude, Erastianism - that is, the union (so he viewed it) of church and state - was the parent, or if not the parent, the serviceable and sufficient tool, of liberalism. Till that union was snapped, Christian doctrine never could be safe . . . ' (25) His reading for his articles and his study of the life of St. Thomas Becket increased his delight in 'the notion of an hierarchical system, of sacerdotal power and of full ecclesiastical liberty'. (26)

Froude now began to throw out a number of ideas. He disliked increasingly the attitude within the Church which held that the clergy should be 'gentlemen' and able to mix in

good society. He despised the thought of 'prizes' to tempt men into the Church. 'We will have a vocabularium Apostolicum and I will start it with four words 'pampered Aristocrat', 'resident gentlemen' 'smug parsons' 'pauperes Christi'. I shall use the first on all occasions, it seems to me just to hit the thing.' (27)

Froude's concern for the *pauperes Christi* was further shown in a proposal he put forward for their evangelisation in a letter of 31 August to Newman:

It has lately come into my head that the present state of things in England makes an opening for reviving the monastic system. I think of putting the view forward under the title 'Project for reviving religion in the great Towns-' certainly Colleges of unmarried Priests (who might of course retire to a Living [if] they could and liked) would be the cheapest possible way of providing effectually for the Spiritual wants of a large population. (28)

Here was the idealism of Froude being converted into a practical idea. If his own experience of parish work was negligible, at least his thoughts showed concern for the growing, unchurched populations of the industrialised towns. In his study of the revival of the religious life in the Church of England, A.M.Allchin sees this 'as a means of reintroducing monasticism. And here we have a characteristic example of Froude's insight into the essentials of a situation; in his idea of the possibility of reviving the religious life under the cover of solving certain pressing nineteenth-century problems. But we also have here a typical nineteenth-century confusion which we shall meet again on a number of occasions'. (29) Froude's idea was far ahead of its time within the Church of England and certainly a little confused. It was similar in concept to the Oratory of St. Philip Neri which Newman was to join and to the Anglican Company of Mission Priests which was founded a hundred years later. Yet even to speak of 'reviving the monastic system' was to implant an idea which was ready to be nurtured. Two years later Newman wrote an article in the *British Magazine* of June 1835 on the subject of Monachism. Froude made reference to it as the 'efficacy of your opuscula in leading captive silly women'. (30) Newman admitted to 'some misgivings whether I have not been too bold' in the article. But he acknowledged Froude's support for his ideas. 'It is

only my confidence in this unseen Agitator which bears me up.' (31) Here, as so often, is evidence of a concurrence of ideas. If Froude was not the actual originator of the revival of the religious life in the Church of England, at least it could be claimed that he had sown some of its seeds.

A recurring refrain in Froude's writings is his intense dislike of the Reformation and the Reformers. It is not fair to describe his attitude as 'adolescent mockery', as Paul Avis does. He made efforts to read the history of the Reformation; his core reason for rejecting it was that his own concept of the Church was truly 'high', and he abhorred anything which belittled its sacredness. He hated its destructiveness, calling its legacy in the Church of England 'that odious Protestantism'. But perhaps the most persuasive rebuttal of the charge of adolescent mockery is to be found in his defence of the Puritans. 'I have been reading a good deal about the Reformation in Queen E's time - it is shocking indeed - what do you think of my contemplating "An Apology for the early Puritans"?', he wrote to Newman in September. 'I really think they deserve much commiseration. The Episcopalians did not claim "jus Divinum" indeed Queen E and her party considered her as the origin of Ecclesiastical Power - the Puritans thought it axiomatic that there must be a Church Government with "jus divinum", and, since they had been taught to despise history and tradition, looked for it in the Bible.' (32) He expressed similar views in a letter to Keble a week later. Froude's mind was so clear as to the freedom and independence of the Church. It is of divine institution, it is holy, and therefore can not, must not, be tampered with or manipulated. To do so is 'shocking indeed'. Only a few days earlier he had written to Newman about reviving Hammond's 'view of the infallibility of the Church which Palmer says was the old one - we must revive it. Surely the promise I am with you always means something'. (33) But Article XXI declares that General Councils 'may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God'. Ideas of Church infallibility found no place in the teaching of the Reformers.

It was also at this time that he returned to the idea of a Lay Synod which Rose had suggested at Hadleigh. Hooker's concept of Parliament as including the Lay Synod of the Church of England was now in tatters with the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts and the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act. He wrote positively to Keble. 'I think, if we manage well, we may make the idea of a Lay Synod popular. Its members should be elected by universal suffrage among the communicants, *more primitivo*. I find this view most effective in conversation.' (34) This matter was clearly on his mind, yet in a letter to Newman some two months later he dismissed 'old Hooker's notion of a lay synod: it is unecclesiastical and whig. We must only be popular in the choice of church officers'. (35) He had not thought out his ideas and was vague about the status and authority of such a synod, but it is noteworthy that, bearing in mind his views on authority within the Church, he did not rule out the idea, at least for the time being.

Throughout the summer Newman, Keble, Froude, Palmer and others were struggling to find a means of expression for their ideas. The Association was not going to set the Church ablaze. In September Newman issued the first of the *Tracts for the Times*.

The idea of writing tracts had been suggested earlier. Keble had mentioned them and reference was made to them in the statement of the Association. Tracts did not seem a persuasive manner of communication. Yet Newman's simple, direct style, full of the straightforward challenge of Church principles being clearly articulated, caused men to think. He was impatient of the Association and Palmer, even though as late as October he could write approvingly of 'our Society'. But individual action was needed. Newman could write, and so he did. Meanwhile Froude was in Dartington and thus separated from Newman. But his friend drew him into the writing of the Tracts. 'You must at once write a Tract on "the Project for shortening Services"', he wrote on 9 September. 'Your knowledge of the Breviary etc. points you out as the man. Give a succinct view of the origin of our Services, etc etc. . . . Keble is writing two tracts. I have written to Percival for another. I have written 4'. (36)

Thus Newman began to take over the leadership of the developing movement. It was no conscious bid to assume authority over others. Newman was only being true to himself. Froude's absence and continuing ill-health caused him no little concern, for he depended greatly on having Froude as a sounding-board and support for his ideas.

Froude's influence on Newman had grown since their first meeting. It was an influence which no one else was ever to have again. Newman was a much deeper thinker, but he admired and relied on his friend's clear and forthright views which coincided more and more with his own, as well as on his particular character and personality which he found both congenial and trustworthy. They first met at a time when Newman's Calvinism and abhorrence of things Catholic were beginning to crumble. Froude himself was reaching out towards a deeper sense of Catholicity from a firm basis of High Church doctrine. Warre Cornish gave an understanding assessment of their relationship: 'If we ask what was Froude's share in the movement, the answer is in the effect of his personality upon Keble and Newman, and especially Newman . . . He showed Newman the tendency of his own thought, gave him fresh principles and fresh points of view, to which he returned after his study of the Fathers; the very difference of their studies brought these two nearer to each other; Froude's fire brought out the latent heat in Newman.' (37) Newman himself acknowledged that 'his opinions arrested and influenced me, even when they did not gain my assent'. (38) Their friendship was very deep and would have been tested by the close confinement of the Mediterranean journey. The fact that Newman later left the Froudes to go to Sicily alone need not be understood as indicating any breach of friendship. It seems more probable that he simply wanted to go to Sicily. But whatever problems they may have had, when they arrived back in England their former relationship was as strong as before. They shared an earnest desire for holiness; they yearned for the Church of England to be renewed according to its Catholic heritage; they shared an attitude of frugality towards this world's goods. '[Froude's] influence over Newman will hardly bear analysis, for Newman and he were one: the gnomon and the disk of a dial, or the arrow and the bow

of some busy archer.' (39) Froude's ideas were both essentially conservative and deeply radical, and he challenged Newman to think what he would not dare to think alone.

Froude's relationship with Keble was naturally different. Sir John Coleridge knew both men.

. . . they were more like elder and younger brothers; reverence in some sort sanctified Froude's love for Keble, and moderated the sallies of his somewhat too quick and defiant temper, and imparted a special diffidence to his opposition in their occasional controversies with each other; while a sort of paternal fondness in Keble gave unusual tenderness to his friendship for Froude, and exaggerated perhaps his admiration for his undoubted gifts of head and heart. And these were greater than mere acquaintances would be aware of; for he did not present the best aspects of himself to common observation. (40)

Keble's affection for his former pupil and their shared basis of belief led him to be influenced by his boldness and persistence. Walter Lock believed that not only Froude, but also his other pupils, such as Isaac Williams and Robert Wilberforce, came to affect Keble. 'The influence was not wholly from him upon them; they too, and especially Froude, reacted upon him. His ecclesiastical principles became more clear cut.' (41) He felt sure of their fundamental agreement about the Church and the things of God; if it had been otherwise Keble would immediately have put up a barrier, for he could not accept disagreement. The combination of Froude's attractive personality, his quick intelligence and his desire for inner holiness combined to lead Keble to clarify and further develop his thinking.

The awareness of Froude's influence over others is instanced in a letter from Frederic Rogers to Newman and sent some five weeks before Froude's death. 'You ought to send Harrison down to him, to take lessons on the subject of the Reformers; for certainly he has a way of speaking, which carries conviction in a very extraordinary way, over and above the arguments he uses'. (42) Anne Mozley added a confirmatory footnote to this observation: 'Do not these words, as a definition of personal influence, throw a desired light on the weight and power attributed by all his friends to Froude's utterances ? Apart

from the language of eye, and smile, and voice, the reader feels and knows himself to be at a disadvantage'. (45)

An acknowledgement of the respect which others had for Froude's judgement comes towards the end of the first volume of Anne Mozley's *Letters and Correspondence of J.H. Newman*.

In this correspondence R.H. Froude appears more as a critic than originator or author. His more intimate friends required his criticisms and rested on his judgment. In his own person this faculty acted mainly as a check.....His critical faculty was too masterful to be practised upon himself, but when exercised for the benefit of friends to whom he looked up, he could give free licence to a pungent pen, and yet leave the reader to understand how anxious those friends might well be to secure his comments as long as they were attainable. Keble, in his own simple way, sends his papers to his old pupil to be overlooked by him, and Mr Newman was more at ease with Froude's imprimatur.....Of course, the state of Froude's health made criticism more possible than authorship, but also different intellectual powers and functions are called into play.

(44)

During the summer and autumn Froude had been wholeheartedly involved in the beginnings of the movement. He had kept up a lively correspondence with his friends. He also wrote a number of articles and Tract 59 on State interference in Church affairs. But his health was causing increasing concern. At the end of November he set sail for Barbados where he hoped he might find his health restored.

VI CHURCH AND STATE

According to James Anthony Froude, his father thought of the Church 'as part of the Constitution, and the Prayer-Book as an Act of Parliament which only folly or disloyalty could quarrel with'. (1) Such was the context of Hurrell's religious upbringing. With John Keble as his tutor these views would be broadly confirmed, but understood in a more spiritual sense. In his study of Becket he sets out this inherited background of an established Church and its place in society. We can detect more than a touch of irony here:

The alliance which has happily so long subsisted between Church and State, is now regarded as indispensable, at least to the well-being of the former; and the political relations, which have grown up under this state of things, are now so intricate, as almost to disable us from even conceiving the two societies as independent of one another. A modern high Churchman has been taught from his youth to identify the Church and the Establishment - to suppose that the respectability of the Clergy is the result of their connexion and intercourse with the higher classes, - and that in the event of any change which should render the clerical profession distasteful to the wealthy and well-connected, the Church must necessarily sink into insignificance . . . (2)

Froude himself drew the distinction between the Church of his own time with that of Becket. 'The high-church party of the twelfth century endeavoured as much as possible to make common cause with the poor and the defenceless. Becket always speaks of the poor as "Pauperes Christi" and the condescension which his party practised towards them, both before and after his time, appears to us incredible.' (3) His own background virtually ensured that he accepted, as Keble, Newman and others did, the stratification of society, which he accepted on grounds of social cohesion and order. There is more than a hint of his innermost feelings in his poem entitled 'The Exchange' with its romantic idealisation of the medieval world.

'Tis sad to watch Time's desolating hand
Doom noblest things to premature decay:
The Feudal court, the Patriarchal sway
Of kings, the cheerful homage of a land
Unskill'd in treason, every social band
That taught to rule with sweetness, and obey
With dignity, swept one by one away . . . (4)

His now growing uneasiness about Church/State relations was to find ever more critical expression. The union of Church and State was based both on idealism and nationalism. It could only make sense if the ideal took some real form and the nation was Christian within the Church of England. For Froude, the ideal was for ever shattered by Government legislation.

Talk of the separation of Church and State was rife in the country. The mood for reform could not be suppressed or bought off. Government reforms were the inevitable consequences of the genuine feeling that at least some inequalities should no longer be tolerated. Keble found all these changes most unwelcome, yet he could still write to his friend Perceval on 25 March 1829 that 'I am now, and have been for some time, convinced that the spiritual advantages enjoyed by ourselves and our charges at present are much greater than we have reason to expect, humanly speaking, if we were separated from the State'. Keble ever felt the greatest reluctance to change his opinion. But by the beginning of 1833 he acknowledged in a letter to Hugh James Rose that change was coming. 'I suppose there can be no doubt that the die for a separation is now cast. The most frightful thing to me is the apparent apathy of most of the Clergy even, both in Oxford and here in the country.' (5) Newman too, had accepted the relationship between Church and State, but as early as March 1829 he felt it would not last. He told his mother of his apprehension and gave his reasons which give an interesting insight into his mind at that time:

1. because all revolutions are awful things, and the effect of this revolution is unknown.
2. because the upper classes will be left almost religionless.
3. because there will not be that security for sound doctrine without change which is given by Act of Parliament.
4. because the

Clergy will be thrown on their Congregations for voluntary contributions.
(6)

Froude meanwhile was developing his own ideas and growing away from those he had been given at Dartington Rectory. By the end of 1830 he came to share his unease with his father in a careful and guarded letter in which he is far more sanguine about the future than Newman:

I am quite making up my mind to lose everything and to be thrown on my own resources before long, and I do not consider the prospect a gloomy one. I cannot but believe that the Church will surprise people a little when its latent spirit has been roused; and when the reasons for caution have been removed by disconnecting it with the State. And though I am not blind to the evils which must accompany such a convulsion, so that I would not for the world have a hand in bringing it about, I own it is not with unmixed apprehension that I anticipate its approach. (7)

It is significant that he could write thus to one whose views at this time had probably hardly changed since Hurrell was a child. But the child was now a man, his eldest son and a Fellow of Oriel. His father clearly listened to him with respect and with a pardonable pride in his intellect. He was to be supportive towards him throughout his short life.

The Church of England had incurred the wrath of many in the country by the opposition of a number of the bishops to the Reform Bill. The mood for reform found further fuel for its anger in the wealth of the bishops and some of the clergy. Mobs vented this anger, at times with violence, in a number of places. 'To abuse the Church of England was not new. What was new was the amount of vituperation and the number of people who listened'. (8)

Disturbances even reached the countryside. At the beginning of January 1831 Froude wrote to Keble with news of happenings in Dartington:

Things are still in a bad way down here. The labouring population, as well as the farmers, seem thoroughly indifferent to the welfare of the parsons and squires: and this does not seem at all to depend on their situation in respect to poverty, or on the way in which they have been treated . . . Two very great fires have taken place in our neighbourhood, and, for three or four nights, we expected that our thrashing machine would be set on fire . . . I have now made up my sage mind that the country is too bad to deserve an Established Church. (9)

The French Revolution was continuing to have its effect, further reinforced by the revolution of 1830.

Froude reveals little, if any, concern for social justice. His overriding interest lay in the Church, and a Church which was free. Behind the thinking of the Oxford Movement were such fundamental concepts as the authority of the Church, its holiness, its catholicity as well as its freedom. Deeper still lay a yet more fundamental question: 'What is the Church?' It was a definition of the Church that the Tractarians attempted and they found almost immediately that to define its identity was to assert its exclusiveness'. (10) Palmer had recognised that Froude had come to regard the union of Church and State as 'unlawful *per se*', but Froude's thinking was almost entirely confined to the Church of England which he, together with Newman, Keble and others regarded as the Catholic Church in the country. Any definition of the Church within such constraints was necessarily limited, yet it was within these limitations that Froude continued to develop his concept of the Church.

During the Mediterranean journey the Church in Italy had depressed Froude; the Irish Churches' Bill angered him; Dr Arnold's proposals for Church reform evoked his scorn; Lamennais stirred him. In the Preface to the second part of the *Remains* is a description of Froude's feelings as both Keble and Newman understood them to be:

At that crisis the writer of these Remains felt in common with not a few others, but with a vividness and keenness of perception almost peculiarly his own, that a call was given, and a time come, for asserting in their simplicity the principles of the only primitive and true Church - those essential rights and duties which seemed in danger of being surrendered, in mere ignorance, to preserve certain external trappings. He surrendered

himself to this feeling without reserve: he spoke, and wrote, and acted from it continually: he devoted to it what remained of life and health: and it seems to have been this more than anything else, excepting perhaps an unaffected mistrust concerning the sincerity and depth of his own repentance, which caused the sort of anxiety to recover, many times traceable in his correspondence. To use the words which Walton has reported of Hooker, "he could have wished to live longer, to do the Church more service." (11)

On his return home from the Mediterranean he was spoiling for a fight. The first weapon he used was a series of articles in the *British Magazine* in the summer and autumn of 1833. When Newman and Keble came to compile their friend's *Remains*, they brought together these articles with Tract 59 under the title 'Remarks on State Interference in Matters Spiritual' in the first volume of the second part. They form a closely argued case in favour of the separation of Church and State. The case is presented with a relentless logic and backed up with the clear evidence of history. Christopher Dawson saw these articles as Froude's greatest contribution to the literature of the Oxford Movement. (12)

Froude set the scene by outlining the root causes of the problems arising from Church/State relationships. Government Acts had destroyed the very basis which in previous years had allowed the civil authority to be identified with the ecclesiastical authority. He was aware that in escaping Parliamentary interference, the Church might also lose Parliamentary protection. But he pointed out the obvious fact that it was unreasonable for those who had no interest in, or who were hostile to, the welfare of the Church, to have the authority to make its laws. Was there some flaw in the Constitution which had now been revealed by the present situation? Did we have to 'lay our foundations afresh'? This prompted the editors to add a footnote: 'This passage may throw light on the Author's meaning in saying that "the Reformation was a limb badly set".'

Many proposals being aired at this time were a reflection of the resentment caused by inequalities and privileges within the Church. Yet he attacked them with a disdainful

irony, almost stumbling over his words in his eagerness to express himself. Proposals such as those of Dr Arnold were dismissed with righteous scorn. "A *union* between *excellent* men of *all parties* for the maintenance of peace and order!" *excellent* truly, and of *all parties*! parties who agree in nothing but a wish to maintain peace and good order! Such excellent men would include Independents, Socinians, Jews, unbelievers, latitudinarians. Many believed that it is now 'impossible for the Church of England to recover her lost ascendancy in the councils of this nation.' But 'if Churchmen must submit to a union with dissenters and latitudinarians, they should at least do so with their eyes open'. He put the question: 'Is it possible so to remodel our Church system as to propitiate the dissenting and latitudinarian parties ? and if so, have we a right to do this ?' The general assumption seemed to be that such a reconciliation would not be difficult and the Church would suffer nothing more than a rearrangement of Church property 'as should render the higher clergy less obnoxious to envy'.

But 'a great change has taken place already in the constitution of the Church of England'. There had been a 'downright Revolution' brought about by the Church of England losing her 'exclusive supremacy in the councils of this nation . . . As long as the governing power was restricted, either by law or in fact, to persons in communion with the Church, so long it was safe and proper to confide to that power the nominations of our ecclesiastical superiors. But now, that neither law secures to us such a government, nor does the existing state of things permit us ever again to hope for it, the question assumes a very altered aspect.'

He turned to the Church in France and to the ideas set out in the pages of Lamennais' short-lived newspaper, *L'Avenir*. Here he discovered congenial thinking, especially concerning his own special anxieties about the appointment of bishops. Lamennais too, sought independence from the State, but in its place he wanted a return to the authority of the Papacy. Froude quoted from *L'Avenir* from which either he or the printers took the greatest liberties with the French language:

"Quel sera en effet pour nous la garantie de leur choix ? Depuis que la religion Catholique n'est plus la religion de la Patrie, les Ministres d'état sont et *doivent être* dans une *indifférence légale* à notre égard: est-ce leur indifférence qui sera notre garantie ? Ils sont laïcs, ils *peuvent être* Protestants, Juifs, Athées: est-ce leur conscience qui sera notre garantie ? Ils sont choisis dans les rangs d'une société imbue d'un préjugé opiniâtre contre nous: est-ce leur préjugé qui sera notre garantie ?" . . . Nor need we fear, continues this able writer, to reassert our privileges; the power as well as the right is ours; let us know our strength and use it. QUE CRAIGNEZ VOUS ! N'ETES VOUS PAS EVEQUES ? Bishops of Christ's holy everlasting Church, who shall interfere with the free exercise of your indelible prerogative ?

Such expressions of feeling found a ready echo with Froude, nor is it unlikely that Newman had read them before writing his first Tract: 'C'est à vous de voir lequel vous préférez laisser sur vos sièges, en mourant, ou d'un Episcopat riche et corrompue, ou d'un Episcopat pauvre et digne de vous succéder.'

Froude appealed to 'good cautious people' to open their eyes. Surely they wanted to conserve within the Church that which rightly belonged there. 'By standing still you become a party to revolution'. So he brought to a close his passionate call for the preservation of the Church's independence as he saw it.

In the next section Froude outlined the principles of Richard Hooker regarding the relationship of Church and State. No doubt he had taken in a great deal of Hooker's thinking and ideas from his tutor, Keble, who was editing Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. According to Hooker, the origination of laws for the Church should rest with the bishops, but the general consent of all was needed to give them '*the vigour and form of laws*'. By 'consent of all' he meant 'the sanction of a General Synod, competent to represent the whole Church, Laity as well as Clergy'. In his time Parliament was held to be a true synod of the laity. In fact, the whole edifice of his thinking, the whole edifice of the Settlement of the Church, rested on the assumption that the whole body of the realm was but another name for the Church. 'Both Commonwealth and Church are collective bodies, made up of many into one; and both so near allied that the one, the Church, can never subsist but in the other, the Commonwealth; nay, so near, that the

same men, which in a temporal respect make the Commonwealth, do in a spiritual make the Church'. (13) So Archbishop Laud. The interference of Parliament in the affairs of the Church rested solely on the recognition that it was truly a lay synod of the Church; and to be English meant to be a member of the national Church. Laws passed in the reign of Elizabeth enforced attendance by all people over 16 years at Church of England services. Refusal to do so or attendance at any other kind of service made them subject to increasing penalties, leading to deportation. As Froude pointed out, this Act 'goes straight to the point, and empowers the magistrates and clergy to drive out dissenters, Roman Catholic or protestant alike, all who choose to withhold themselves from the worship of the Church of England: in short, if rigorously enforced, it ensures the identity of the CHURCH and the COMMONWEALTH . . . It does appear that, according to Hooker, our *civil* legislature is no longer qualified, as it formerly was, to be our *ecclesiastical* legislature'. The cause was to be found in the Acts which had been passed since 1828.

It is strange that such an idea should have been genuinely held as late as the nineteenth century. It is arguable that it was a paper theory at best for, as R.H. Tawney pointed out, 'by the end of the seventeenth century the secular State, separate from the Churches, which are subordinate to it, has emerged from the theory which had regarded both as dual aspects of a single society. The former pays a shadowy deference to religion; the latter do not meddle with the external fabric of the political and social system, which is the concern of the former.' (14) On the other hand, J.C.D. Clark argues that the England of the eighteenth century was still part of the *ancien régime*, consisting of the three pillars of monarchy, aristocracy and Church and that the real change came in the period 1828 - 1833, as Froude recognised

Froude now turned his attention to the Sovereign who stood at the apex of the English constitutional pyramid. He must be in communion with the Church of England and he is bound by the Coronation oath to uphold it. He is head both of the Civil Legislature and the Ecclesiastical Legislature. Yet the King has never been able to oppose 'the

resolute will of Parliament'. He may, indeed, be compelled to yield to it against his conscience. Here, Froude cited the King's opposition to and subsequent acceding to the Reform Bill of 1832, an act which, he claimed, was contrary to the Coronation oath.

Froude was scathing and returned to the language of Lamennais. ' "Voila les hommes de qui vous consentiriez à recevoir vos premiers Pasteurs." Such is the Supreme Head of the Church . . . To the Coronation Oath at least we cannot look with any reasonable confidence.' Thus had events changed the thinking of one who had been brought up to reverence both Church and King. Henceforth, for 'King' he would only wish to read 'Charles I'.

Both Parliament and King having been dismissed as having no right to interfere in Church affairs, his argument then surveyed the authority of the Church itself from an historical point of view. He examined the distinction between the civil power and that power which is 'independent and essentially superior, derived through the Successors of the Apostles from Christ Himself, - the power to remit and retain sins'. He quoted Gibbon in support of the early legitimacy of the distinction under Constantine. The power and authority of the Church was demonstrated in the censuring and excommunication of those in positions of power. He cited bishop Synesius, who urged his people to ostracise certain impenitent sinners, even 'to refuse them the common offices of life, and the decent rites of burial'. Froude was to return to the subject of excommunication later; in the meantime he gave every appearance of relishing the subject. 'Such was the independent power asserted by the church when its champions emerged from the bracing air of persecution, with their armour bright and their loins girded'. Nor did the bishops consider it to be their duty 'to consult their civil governors as to the manner in which they should administer [the gift given to them] . . . The sword of the Holy Spirit was in their hand, and they turned it against whomsoever that Spirit pleased'.

By the middle of the fourteenth century bishops were chosen by a small group of clergy who officiated round the Cathedral. Their choice was not a real one, for if they rejected the Pope's nominee, the Pope simply presented him. This was a regrettable departure from apostolic tradition. Froude then introduced sentiment to strengthen the justice of his case. 'The usurpations of the Roman Pontiffs were usurpations, not on the rights of Kings and Governors, but on the rights of the Church itself, of the congregation of Christ's little ones, the poor, the halt, the lame, and the blind.' He inveighed against the very idea of the Papacy as introducing into the Church an idea which was unknown in Catholic antiquity, that of a 'Supreme Head of the Church'. As he well knew, such a title was no stranger to the Church of England and it is to his own Church that he then turned. Attempts had been made to substitute interference by the Crown for interference by the Pope through the Statutes of Praemunire. He described the condition of the Church in what is, for him, a purple passage:

The inherent strength of the Church had been lost with its primitive constitution, and the great body of Christ's flock looked on as unconcerned spectators, amidst the selfish struggles of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers. The Clergy and People of the Holy Church were no longer knit together with those indissoluble ties which in former ages had compacted their system and rendered it proof against all the fiery darts of the wicked. The wealth of bishoprics and dignities, which was once regarded as the patrimony of the poor, had by degrees assumed the character of worldly property, was bestowed by patronage, and used for private gratification; while the lordly personages who possessed it, with the enjoyment of riches, had imbibed the dread of poverty, and shrunk from asserting their station as Successors of the Apostles, for fear of losing their station in society.

In this melancholy and fallen condition, that edifice against which the gates of Hell shall not finally prevail, became a ready prey to the rapacious Henry. It had been polluted, it fell; - shall it ever rise again ?

He then appealed to the laity of the Church. In the earliest times the laity had a real voice in the election of their bishops. 'How far our ancestors have fulfilled their duty in transferring to the King a right naturally their own, is a point on which men may differ in opinion.' In saying this, he appeared to be suggesting that such a right was willingly surrendered, a statement which could not be defended. But to-day the Crown's interference in the appointment of bishops was 'nothing more than a *substitute* for the

interference of the whole laity of the Church'. As our institutions had grown more popular, so the responsibility of sanctioning this substitution became greater. Silence implied consent. He set out at length sections of the Act of 1533 regarding the appointment of archbishops and bishops in order to show that all the rights of the whole Church of England have been surrendered to the Crown.

Most of the recent changes in the constitution had been a response to the feeling that the law should not interfere with freedom of conscience. It is strange that Froude should have been equivocal about the morality of such an attitude, but he could not suppress his hatred and fear of recent legislation. Nevertheless he appealed to the conscience of all people in England by setting out the law as it stood regarding the appointment of bishops together with its consequences. Again he quoted the law at length so that people might be aware of the severity of the penalties, such as the forfeiture of goods and imprisonment, which obtained under the Statutes of Provisions and Praemunire for failure to elect the Crown's nominee. Whether these penalties were real or nominal, they interfered with freedom of conscience.

He concluded his argument by appealing to the conscience of all - Presbyterian, Quaker, Independent, Socinian - 'to join in effecting the speedy removal of a grievance such as this, so much severer than any which they themselves have experienced'. So he made his case for the Church's freedom to appoint its own bishops, in great detail and at great length. The argument had been pursued relentlessly, and given his premisses, unanswerably.

The editors of the *Remains* felt it right to include here Tract 59 in which Froude dealt with the implications of the union of Church and State at that time. Dissenters might seek an end to this union, he admitted, but what they really wanted was 'a general confiscation of Church property, and a repeal of the few remaining laws which make the true Church the Church of England'. On the other hand, some supported the union, but for the wrong reasons.

The Church benefited from its union with the State by retaining what remained of its endowments; by being enabled to raise a tax on real property for the repair of churches; by allowing bishops to sit in the House of Lords; and by having the authority to give notice of a person's excommunication to the civil authorities so that he might be imprisoned until he be absolved. Froude acknowledged that this last 'is a bad useless law, which cannot be done away with too soon'.

Such benefits were to be set against State interference 'which encumbers us in ways too numerous to be catalogued . . . ' He deplored private patronage in respect of the presentation of clergy to livings as well as the method by which bishops are appointed. Such Patronage was vested in the hands of individuals who might be of any or no religion. As for the appointment of bishops, Froude's 'mare's nest', they were in fact appointed by the Prime Minister who, since the repeal of the Test Act, might be an atheist, and such a nomination, which in law is the nomination of the Crown, could not be refused.

Froude's arguments were intended to be morally, if not legally, watertight. If they suffered from over-repetition, this was hardly Froude's fault. But his argument did betray a fundamental lack of understanding of the nature of the Church of England. The Church did not admit of too close a definition, and the laws with which it was surrounded did not help in revealing its character. All the time he was searching for a purity and exclusivity in the Church which in his eyes was now sullied by its union with the State. Christopher Dawson has rightly pointed out that Froude 'would have been more at home in the clear air of Catholic Paris than among the misty half-lights and changing shadows of Anglican Oxford'. (15)

At this same time, Newman, as always, was thinking theologically, whereas Froude's approach was political and moral. Piers Brendon makes a perceptive observation in differentiating between their respective views:

It seems, though, that Froude's emphasis was slightly different from Newman's. It was Froude's political conviction that if they did finally eradicate Erastianism, 'give up a *national* Church and have a *real* one', the only authority left would be the Apostolical one. Newman's theological belief was that if they did not neglect 'the real ground on which our authority is built - OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT', State control would be superfluous. Froude anticipated ecclesiastical disestablishment; Newman looked towards doctrinal development. (16)

For all his appeals to conscience, Froude virtually unchurched all other Christians, looking back with longing to the medieval Church with its unity and authority, if ignoring papal claims, and to the Nonjurors with their sturdy independence. In these views, of course, he was not alone. But he failed to describe a 'real' Church, one which might be a reality in his own time as opposed to the 'national' one which he so despised. He was creating for himself a vacuum in his thinking which the Church of England, by its very nature, could never fill.

VII BARBADOS

It is difficult to imagine a greater contrast than between life in the University of Oxford at the end of 1833 and that in Barbados. Oxford meant friends with whom Froude shared a righteous indignation on behalf of the Church against the perceived encroachments of the State. Even more importantly, he shared with them the seeds of a vision, of an understanding, of the nature of the Church. They yearned for its purification and the recovery of an ideal. What was to become known as the Oxford Movement was at this time little more than a stirring of minds, a realisation that the Church of God should reflect its divine institution by Christ Himself. They believed that the Church of England was truly a part of that Church - One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic - but that it needed to be made aware of its true nature, of its divine calling. The Association of Friends of the Church, the Addresses to the Archbishop, the Tracts - all were but initial attempts to do *something* towards a realisation of the truth. But for its provenance, Luther's cry 'Become what you are' might well have become their own.

Froude left England in November 1833. 'I am', he wrote to Newman, 'like the man who "fled full soon on the first of June, but bade the rest keep fighting".' (1) In fact, he was to continue the battle from Barbados, his mind still teeming with ideas, both critical and positive. His bitterness towards the Reformation and the Reformers was constant as was his growth in acceptance of Catholic ideas.

One of the fortunate aspects of his stay in Barbados was that the Bishop was William Hart Coleridge. It was he who at one time had invited Keble to come out to him as Archdeacon. His brother, George, had been Master of the Free School at Ottery St. Mary in Devon which Froude had attended as a boy. The Froude and Coleridge families were acquainted with each other. Barbados must have been a clear choice.

Within a few weeks of his arrival, he accompanied the Bishop on a visitation of the other islands. Froude was fortunate in that he soon came to admire him. 'The Bishop stands very high in my estimation as a man of imperturbable equanimity among great trials to his temper, and the footing on which all his clergy are with him is a model . . . [His] library is capital - much better than I expected'. (2)

Throughout his stay of eighteen months on the island, Froude could never bring himself to accept the local population. He could only look upon them with a fastidious disdain. 'They are fat and merry and lazy; in a religious point of view, I should think they were for the most part either methodistical or brutish; morality seems to be as rare among women here as among men in England, and though ever so much encouraged to marry, each party seems equally reluctant.' (3) He found himself totally out of his depth among people so very different from himself in every way. His complete lack of empathy did not enable him to get beyond the colour of the skin, the dirt and the lack of education. But the vehemence of his feelings is inexcusable. This is the same Froude who, in his mind and on paper, championed the poor, the *pauperes Christi*, as being the guarantee of the Church's future. He was, of course, a man of his time and class, and neither reflected a mature Christian outlook. His sole experience of Church life, with the exception of the Mediterranean journey, was of dons and undergraduates together with some townspeople in Oxford and respectful villagers in Dartington. Towards the end of his stay in Barbados, he wrote to his friend, Robert Wilberforce. 'While out here I have stuck to my old prejudices as tight as I could; yet I fairly own that I think the niggers less incapable of being raised in the scale of being than I used.' (4)

It is strange that Froude appeared totally out of sympathy with the tremendous efforts in England to abolish the slave trade, and slavery itself in the previous year. Froude was a good friend of two of the sons of William Wilberforce, Robert and Henry. Those in favour of emancipation of the slaves he called 'Utopians'. 'It is curious to observe how every one out here, planters, parsons, and all, have eaten dirt, and give into the anti-slavery cant.' (5) As a justification for his views he cited a Major R. - 'the most sensible

person I have heard speak on the subject' - who believed that emancipation would bring about a state of semi-civilisation, desertion by the whites and a reduction in sugar production to about one-fifth. But he added with a naive honesty that 'they say that if the growth of sugar was discontinued, the island would produce sustenance enough for a very much larger population almost without any cultivation'. (6) In a letter to Newman in November 1834 he plumbed the depths. 'I have felt it a kind of duty to sustain in my mind a habitual hostility to the niggers, and to chuckle over the failure of the new system - as if these poor wretches concentrated in themselves all the whiggery dissent cant and abomination that have been ranged on their side.' (7) Sheridan Gilley, while deploring Froude's attitude, suggests that he 'was chiefly abusing the Barbados blacks because he loathed their Evangelical and liberal champions in England, and it should be added that in these as in Froude's other biting remarks can be seen the odd effects of galloping consumption'. (8) Froude himself admitted to Frederic Rogers that 'I am ashamed to say I cannot get over my prejudices against the niggers'. (9)

Although he could not help himself from finding the negro features 'so horribly ugly', yet he clearly applauded the refusal to accept colour prejudice within the local Church.

I have heard some facts which seems to show a good spirit among the clergy. The other day a Mr. --- refused the communion to three white people of consequence, and though they were excessively angry they were afraid to proceed against him . . . Also that Mr. --- , about whom you may remember the great row that took place some years since for admitting a black to the communion in company with whites, has now so completely broken down that feeling, that last Sunday, when I received the Sacrament at his church, at which near 200 people were present, all colours were mixed indiscriminately. In the Roman Catholic islands this was always insisted on and carried with a high hand. (10)

An editorial footnote in the *Remains* sought to explain his attitude without being quite convincing:

The reader must not confound the Author's view of the negro cause and the abstract negro with his feelings towards any he should actually meet. He has above said he received the communion with them; and it was impossible to know him well, and not be struck with his gentleness and

kindness towards men most removed in opinions or circumstances from himself, except they were the originators of error. (11)

In August 1834 Froude found himself in Codrington College where he was to teach mathematics. This College had been founded more than one hundred years earlier for 'a convenient number of Professors and Scholars to study and practise Physick and Chirurgery, as well as Divinity, that by the apparent usefulness of the former to all mankind, they might both endear themselves to the people, and have the better opportunity of doing good to men's souls, while they are taking care of their bodies'. His experience at the College allowed him to entertain more enlightened views about at least some of the local population:

If I was the Bishop, I should not make it a place for the exclusive education of gentlemen; but should let the respectable coloured people, who had time and inclination to study divinity, come here and prepare for orders, without insisting on Latin and Greek. These colonies are not ripe for supporting a learned clergy . . . I will not even insist on their giving up their trades; for if a parish priest can keep a school, I am sure he may make shoes without giving up more of his time: and if St. Paul could maintain himself by tent-making, while he discharged the duties of an Apostle, I don't see why other people should not be able to maintain themselves as well, while they do the duties of a parish priest. The notion that a priest must be a gentleman is a stupid exclusive protestant fancy, and ought to be exploded. (12)

For all the practical common sense which is evidenced here, Froude was not the sort of man who could ever have stepped into the bishop's shoes. Newman's suggestion that he 'ought to be a bishop in India' may have been no more than a *jeu d'esprit*, but its realisation would have been calamitous.

Strong feelings and a forthright expression of them were a constant feature of Froude's character. His mind worked with a relentless logic. In his concept of the Church there was little room for any softer half-tones which might have contributed to a truer picture. His views on the Reformation continued to become ever more antagonistic. His basic instincts recoiled from those who treated lightly or wantonly sacred things, the same people who were held by the majority of members of the Church of England as

champions of their cause. Shortly after his arrival in Barbados, Froude wrote to Keble and told him what he already well knew: 'You will be shocked at my avowal, that I am every day becoming a less and less loyal son of the Reformation.' (13) Later in the year he wrote with renewed emphasis: 'As to the Reformers, I think worse and worse of them. Jewell was what you would in these days call an irreverent dissenter . . . The Preface to the Thirty-nine Articles, was certainly intended to disconnect us from the Reformers.' (14) By the end of 1834 his rejection seemed absolute. 'Really I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more,' he wrote to Newman, 'and have almost made up my mind that the rationalist spirit they set afloat is the ψευδοπροφήτης of the Revelations.' (15) He complained to Newman 'for letting Pusey call the Reformers "the founders of our Church" in that excellent and much to be studied paper on fasting'. (16)

His earlier attitude to the Reformers is revealed in one of his *Sayings in Conversation*. The person of whom he is speaking is left a blank. Christopher Dawson believed it to be Newman; Piers Brendon opts for Keble.

I think as soon as I began to know --- , I felt they were the very kind of fellows he would most have hated and despised if he had known them. But I did not dare to sport my opinions, till I had read more and got him to agree with me. I believe I have a want of reverence, else I should not have got to hate them so soon as I did. --- used sometimes to give me such snubs for speaking disrespectfully of them, that I did not recover them for a week or fortnight. He was a long time giving up Cranmer. (17)

Froude's influence on both Keble and Newman is reflected in the Preface to the second volume of the *Remains* in which it is acknowledged that his attitude to the English Reformers 'more than any thing else in these Remains seems to have startled and displeased many, who in principle would agree with the writer'. They declared their own general support for his opinions 'that the persons chiefly instrumental in that great change were not, as a party, to be trusted on ecclesiastical and theological questions: nor yet to be imitated in their practical handling of the unspeakably awful matters with which they were concerned'. (18) Both Keble and Newman shared Froude's abhorrence of the way the Reformers treated sacred things.

Compare the sayings and manner of the two schools [the Reformers and the Fathers] on the subjects of Fasting, Celibacy, religious Vows, voluntary Retirement and Contemplation, the memory of the Saints, Rites and Ceremonies recommended by Antiquity, and involving any sort of self-denial, and especially on the great point of giving men divine knowledge, and introducing holy associations, not indiscriminately, but as men are able to bear it: there can be little doubt that generally speaking the tone of the fourth century is so unlike that of the sixteenth on each and all of these topics, that it is absolutely impossible for the same mind to sympathize with both. (19)

Throughout his stay in Barbados, Froude maintained the liveliest interest in Oxford affairs. 'Do you know I am hungry and thirsty to hear about you?' he told Newman. He complained that his friends did not write to him, but Newman explained in a letter of November 1834 that 'we expected you home with the Bishop of B.[Barbados] till the middle of May - and therefore did not send letters'. He added later: 'I miss you continually in advice'. (20) After only a month's absence he told Rose that 'as Froude is away, I have no one on the spot, whom I can get advice from, in spite of the many good friends I have around, for which I ought to be very grateful'. (21) His estimate of Froude was clearly of the highest. 'It is quite impossible that in some way or other you are not destined to be an instrument of God's purposes', he wrote to him. (22) Behind this rather sombre tribute there clearly lay the understanding that he was to lose him in this life.

Isaac Williams offered an interesting comparison of Froude and Newman. He knew both of them well and it indicated the sense of trustworthiness which Froude inspired in spite of the apparent recklessness which we might read into his letters:

I was greatly charmed and delighted with Newman, who was extremely kind to me, but did not altogether trust his opinions, and although Froude was in the habit of stating things in an extreme and paradoxical manner, yet one always felt conscious of a thorough foundation of truth and principle in him - a ground of entire confidence and agreement - but this was not so with Newman, even although one appeared more in unison with his more moderate statements. (23)

In spite of his illness which must often have drained him of energy and life, he did manage to do some writing. His 'Essay on Rationalism and Remarks on Church Discipline' belong to this time. His earlier articles on State interference had drawn none of the sting out of his vehemence against that Erastianism which he felt to be at the root of so much that was wrong with the Church of England. His father was an interested recipient of his thoughts as well as himself being a regular correspondent with his son. Although he was very firmly an Establishment man, yet he did become more sympathetic and understanding towards his son's views. Shortly after he had left England, the Archdeacon wrote to Newman. 'I have often told Hurrell that he was going too fast; he alarms people by his speculations, and is incautious in talking to persons, who cannot enter into the purity of his motives'. (24) But Hurrell could not check himself. It was his nature to pursue vigorously what he felt to be the truth and to reject with equal vigour that which he judged to be unworthy.

He continued to give forceful expression to his views on the appointment of bishops, his 'mare's nest'. He had no wish to hide his views from his father who understandably would see matters in a different light.

I wish you did not set your face so pertinaciously against any alteration in the mode of appointing Bishops; that is the real seat of the disorder of the Church: the more I think of it, the more sure I am that unless something is done about it, there must be a separation in the Church before long, and that I shall be one of the separatists. (25)

The fact that he could share with his father his thoughts of separation from the Church of England demonstrated his own depth of feeling and his confidence in his father. But being so far away from Oxford, there was little he could do except argue his case through writing and seek to persuade his friends in England to share his concern - which they already did. By February 1835 his stay in Barbados was drawing to a close. He sent an almost despairing letter to Keble:

The present Church system is an incubus upon the country. It spreads its arms in all directions, claiming the whole surface of the earth for its own, and refusing a place to any subsidiary system to spring upon. Would that

the waters would throw up some Acheloides, where some new Bishop might erect a see beyond the blighting influence of our upas tree. Yet I suppose that before he could step in an Act of Parliament would put its paw upon the κρησφύγετον, and include it within the limits of some adjacent diocese. I admire M.'s hit about our being united to the state as Israel was to Egypt. (26)

Such a sense of helplessness over the establishment of the Church together with his ever-growing aversion to the Reformers caused him constantly to turn to the Nonjurors. 'I begin to think that the Nonjurors were the last of the English divines, and that those since are twaddlers.' Yet he continued in an apparently contradictory way: 'The more I read the more I am reconciled to the present state of things in England and prospects of the Church. It seems to be only the fermentation of filth which has long been in existence and could not be got rid of otherwise . . . ' (27)

At this time Newman was immersed in the early Fathers. He was searching for that light, that truth, that golden thread, which would lead him to a truer understanding of the nature of the Church. Froude was not a theologian to the same degree as Newman. His mind was quick and his intelligence deep, but he was essentially a romantic. As Newman stated in the *Apologia*, Froude was greatly drawn to the medieval Church. He was captivated by its grandeur, its unity and its evidences of holiness. He looked in vain for signs of these within his own Church. The closest to his ideal were the Nonjurors, but he must have realised that they were history. They could not help him to look to the future nor to live the life of the Church in the present. 'Would that the nonjurors had kept up a succession! and then we might have been at peace - proselitisers instead of agitators', he sighed. (28)

Froude arrived back in England in May 1835. On Wednesday, 19 May Convocation met in the Sheldonian Theatre to vote on the proposal by the College Heads that only a declaration of conformity to the Church of England should be required of members of the University in place of subscription to the 39 Articles. It was overwhelmingly

rejected by 459 votes to 57. Anne Mozley wrote an eye-witness account of Froude who was in Oxford on this day:

It happened to the Editor, passing the coach office in company with Mrs. Newman, to see Froude as he alighted from the coach which brought him to Oxford, and was being greeted by his friends. He was terribly thin - his countenance dark and wasted, but with a brilliancy of expression and grace of outline which justified all that his friends had said of him. He was in the theatre next day, entering into all the enthusiasm of the scenes, and shouting *Non placet* with all his friends about him. While he lived at all he must *live* his life. (29)

Froude spent the latter part of May with his brother William, and they were joined by their brother Anthony who was just seventeen years old and had come up to Oriel with his private tutor. May turned into June. For Newman this was the beginning of the loss of his friend. He noted that Froude 'left Oxford never to return on June 4'.

VIII THE SEARCH FOR A PARADIGM

The declaration that the Church of England held the Apostolic Ministry and that it should be thankfully aware of it lay at the very heart of early Tractarian writing. As they surveyed the Church, the early members of the Oxford Movement felt that it had forgotten or at least neglected this pearl of great price. They now seized on the idea and proclaimed it repeatedly and with vigour. Never before had the bishops been so magnified in their office. It led one of them to confess to being unsure whether he believed in the Apostolic Succession or not. But Tractarian confidence was allied to frustration and fear of Government interference. Brilioth argued that it was political pressure which made the early Tractarians look to the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession as of the *esse* of the Church. Only so could they find 'a firm and unshakeable foundation for a theory of the Church which could defy the assaults of the age, something objective in the deepest sense to put as a breakwater against what was regarded as the inundation of liberal subjectivism'. (1) A similar view was taken by the Catholic Newman in his *Lectures on Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans*. In looking back to the beginnings of the Movement he claimed that its authors had affirmed the Apostolic Succession and its consequences 'not only because these things were true and right but in order to shake off the State'. (2)

But it would be untrue to suggest that the doctrine of the apostolic ministry had been forgotten at this time, which was the implication of much early Tractarian writing. Hugh James Rose wrote a courteous, if somewhat reproofing, letter to Newman in May 1836:

I wish that you had somewhat more represented the Apostolic Succession as a regular, undoubted doctrine, held undoubtedly by all true Churchmen, and only a little neglected, - than as a thing to which we

were to recur as a sort of ancient Novelty, - a truth now first recovered.
(3)

Rose was assuredly correct, for belief in the threefold order of ministry and an episcopal form of government within the Church was an integral part of the traditional doctrine of High Churchmen, however dormant at times. Evangelicals held a similar view, yet without the same doctrinal or sacramental implications. In the eighteenth century such men as Jones of Nayland and Bishop Horne were by no means alone in holding the doctrine, as were the Caroline divines and the Nonjurors of an earlier age. If the idea were dormant, unstated, it had certainly not been rejected or quite forgotten.

In *The Oxford Movement in Context*, Nockles points out that 'in traditional High Church ecclesiology the abandonment of episcopal government by most of the foreign reformed churches in the sixteenth century was deemed highly regrettable, but unavoidable in the circumstances of those times'. (4) Laud had accepted the validity of German Lutheran orders, but the Tractarians, sharing the views of earlier men such as Daubeny and Van Mildert, placed Lutherans with the Dissenters at home whom they regarded as cut off from the divinely appointed means of grace in the sacraments. Whereas both Nonjurors and Tractarians understood the doctrine to be of the *esse* of the Church, Keble had to acknowledge that his own great mentor, Richard Hooker 'had not drawn from the doctrine of the apostolical succession the inference that episcopacy was the sole divinely-appointed channel of sacramental grace, on which he himself insisted'. (5) They shared the belief of other High Churchmen of their time that 'catholicity did not imply a dogmatic centre of unity embodying the universal church as Roman Catholic controversialists asserted. Catholicity implied a federation of separate territorial entities that each upheld certain notes or "fundamentals" of catholic faith and apostolic order. The Church of England was not itself *the* Catholic or universal church, as the Church of Rome professed to be, but rather a branch of that universal church'. (6)

The so-called Branch theory of the Church was widely held by High Churchmen and persuasively set forth by William Palmer of Worcester in his *Treatise on the Church of*

Christ. Upholders of the theory did not seek to unchurch other 'branches' of the wider Church which possessed a similarly valid ministry, but it was implied that in England, the Church of England was the Catholic Church and all others were usurpers. If only the different Churches with a Catholic pedigree and common basic doctrine could acknowledge one another as the true Church within their own territorial sphere, then the Church of England would be content to see itself and others as branches of the same tree. The theory fell down in its insistence on the corruption of both the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches. The logic of this was to identify the Church of England as having doctrinal purity and being, in fact, the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

Froude never expressed agreement or otherwise with such a view. His thinking went far deeper as regards the nature of the Church, although he was remarkably narrow in some of the implications of his thinking. In both politics and religion, he was certainly a conservative, but such a description alone would be, in his own words, too 'milk and water'. He was never content to accept the *status quo* simply because it was there. He felt deeply the need to bring back what he perceived to be the lost, or rather, the neglected, Catholic heritage of his Church. His vision was radical in that he constantly looked for the *esse* of the Church. If his vision led him to dismiss some parts of what he saw and understood of contemporary Church life he would do it without restraint. In the Preface to the second volume of the *Remains* Keble hints at this individuality in describing the immediate background to the origins of the Movement:

The authority of Bishops was so slighted both in and out of parliament, as to make men apprehend that in no long time the whole functions of the Church would be usurped by the State. At that crisis the writer of these Remains felt in common with not a few others, but with a vividness and keenness of perception almost peculiarly his own, that a call was given, and a time come, for asserting in their simplicity the principles of the only primitive and true Church - those essential rights and duties which seemed in danger of being surrendered, in mere ignorance, to preserve certain external trappings. He surrendered himself to this feeling without reserve. (7)

He was among the first to realise the potential consequences of the Parliamentary Acts of 1828, 1829 and 1833. In fact, the consequences remained largely potential, but he and the other Tractarians objected to the principle of Church independence being lost, to the possibility that laws could be imposed on the Church by those outside it. He began to feel increasingly uncomfortable with so much within the Church, becoming a gad-fly towards both Newman and Keble. By 1833 Newman had emerged from his Evangelicalism, but some of it still lodged within his mind. It was many years, for example, before he could cease altogether to consider the Pope as the Anti-Christ. He needed both time and solid intellectual justification before he could accept any change from his former views. Keble, on the other hand, was quite different. Although he did change some of his attitudes and in particular towards the Reformers - a change which owed much to Froude - his outlook remained fundamentally the same throughout his life

Among Froude's contemporaries, his friend Isaac Williams described him as being 'considered a very odd fellow at College, but clever and original'. (8) He was on good terms with the Wilberforce brothers although, as David Newsome points out, 'Samuel never really understood Froude'. (9) Generally speaking, the impression is given of Froude as a man who did not fit into any particular group or category. He was ever an individual, even in his enthusiasm for the Movement. Newman, Keble and his father were among the few who really understood him and appreciated what lay behind his outrageous sallies and seeming affronts.

At the start of the Movement, Tractarian ecclesiology was expressed in limited and formal ways. The straightforward *credo* of Apostolic Succession, valid sacraments and creeds needed to be fleshed out and related to the Church. Dissatisfaction was ever present and especially since at the heart of the Movement lay a deep desire for holiness. Froude was greatly attracted by the 'austere beauty' of Catholicism and found a kind of sanctity there which he did not see in those who were regarded as saints within his own Church. His attraction to the asceticism of the Catholic saints was understandable for he

himself had tried to practise such asceticism, earnestly if somewhat waywardly. But he understood the mind of the ascetic, an understanding which was largely lacking within his own Church at that time.

The old High Church tradition had been inherited by Froude through his father, yet more deeply and spiritually through Keble. But his acceptance of it did not prevent him from challenging old assumptions. If he felt that the Reformers were destructive both of theology and buildings, then he would say so. If Rome were right where his own Church was wrong or weak, he would prove to be bold in saying that too. His attacks on the Reformers, published in the *Remains*, were unprecedented in the Church of his day. Yet it was this very directness which caused his friends to begin to re-examine the Church's inherited Reformation theology. Posthumous support came in the Preface to the second part of the *Remains*: 'Undoubtedly it appeared to him, - and his Editors . . . that the persons chiefly instrumental in that great change were not, as a party, to be trusted on ecclesiastical and theological questions: nor yet to be imitated in their practical handling of the unspeakably awful matters with which they were concerned'.(10) Froude 'would have complained of [the Reformers'] tone with regard to the Apostolical Succession . . . treating it as not better than a politic invention, to secure the influence of Church governors, in the absence of true doctrine, and visible spiritual gifts'. (11) But if the Reformers were found wanting on one side, the Tractarians had to be on their guard against the siren voice of Rome. Keble saw the need for his party to be prepared to give their followers grounds for continuing obedience. They had to 'show them that however ill they may in time come to think of the Reformers as a party, they need not be driven towards Rome: there is the ancient Church awaiting to receive them, and the Prayer-Book, and the Anglican divines of the 17th century, ready to cover their retreat towards it'. (12)

A recurring theme in much of Froude's writing about the Church is that of obedience. He recognised that if the State were to become too interfering, and if the Church were to be thrown upon its own resources, then the bishops could wield a truly apostolic

authority. He himself would have to face up to a more active obedience towards his bishop than the comfortable state of affairs which he had always experienced before. On the day after the the Hadleigh conference, Froude had shared some thoughts with Newman on the subject and he returned to the same theme with Keble a few days later. His letter referred to one of his own sermons which dealt with 'the principle of ecclesiastical subordination, so that when the law of the land ceases to enforce this, we may have a law within ourselves to supply its place'. (13)

But a problem even more serious and potentially more damaging than State interference faced the Movement: the spirit of rationalism and liberalism which they saw as gnawing at the very fabric of the faith. In this matter the editors of the *Remains* showed a deep understanding of Froude, who passionately wanted to believe the Catholic faith. His acceptance of it had not been without an inner struggle.

[He possessed] a mind of itself inclined to rationalism, but checked first in that process, and finally won from it, by resolute and implicit submission to the lessons and rules of the Church of England, and rewarded (if we may humbly judge) for such submission, by a more than ordinary insight into the true claims of the Universal Church, and the means of improving to the utmost our high privilege of being yet in her Communion. (14)

When Froude went to Barbados towards the end of 1833 he could not have seen it as anything but an exile. Oxford, or at least his circle there, was alight with ideas and challenges to the Church. As for himself, he was homesick, he fretted' and his health was poor. It is to his great credit that he did not retreat into himself and indulge in self-pity, but took up what weapons lay to hand to continue the battle he felt to have left. He used the opportunity of quiet and the Bishop's library to think and write. It was during this first year in Barbados that he wrote certain papers, later collected under the title *Essay on Rationalism*, in which he set out his understanding of the nature of the Church.

It is tempting for twentieth-century man to accuse Froude of credulity. Pierre Gauthier defends his manner of argument by pointing out his single-mindedness: 'On pourrait certes objecter à Froude que sa position manque de rigueur critique et qu'il paraît

incliner vers la superstition. Mais peut-être s'explique-t-elle par les nécessités de la polémique, qui ne s'embarrasse pas toujours de subtilités quand il s'agit de défendre une thèse.(15) In his *Essay* Froude set out 'to prove that certain views of religion, now generally discarded among Protestants, are, to say the least, *more probable than not*; and that, all things considered, it is our *safest course* to act on them'. This principle of the 'safest course' in setting out and justifying his ideas was also followed by Keble and in this both of them were disciples of Bishop Butler and William Law. Furthermore, 'on the subject of religion he is firmly convinced of the truth of the maxim that old ways are right ways; and he will think any of his views sufficiently refuted, if the charge can be substantiated against it, that it is *new*'. (16)

At the same time as Froude was thus upholding the 'old ways', Newman wrote to his friend Samuel Rickards and displayed the same attitude: 'Show me I am an innovator, and without question I will be silent'. (17) Both men were looking back to the early Church for the truth they were passionately seeking. The danger was that they were looking for something static. Newman, of course, was to free himself from this difficulty with his understanding of the development of doctrine. Had Froude lived longer, he would surely have shared in Newman's thinking - and contributed to it in a positive way. Reliance on human thought or experience for coming to a proper understanding of God and His Church was anathema to him. Absolute truth could only be apprehended through revelation; rationalism was no path to the truth. The same idea lay behind some rather sardonic words in a letter of Newman's to his sister Harriet: 'Rationalism is the attempt to know *how* things are about which you can know nothing'. Faith, not sight, is man's true and only guide, although God's revelation is confirmed by the consciences of holy men. Both Froude and Newman would have concurred with St. Anselm: *Credo ut intelligam*.

In his examination of the justification for the apostolic ministry, he rejected the Evangelicals' understanding of it as being of value simply for the idea of historical continuity or order and their believing that the Church was instituted simply for the

maintenance of 'decency, order and the propagation of true doctrine'. If this were the case, then there would be no need to argue about apostolical Church government and succession. Episcopacy, he believed, was of divine appointment. It was for episcopacy that both Archbishop Laud and Charles I died. They did not die simply for a form or point of discipline.

As they conceived Christ's coming in to the world, and death upon the Cross, to be mysterious parts of the Divine Economy for the salvation of sinners, so they regarded the institution of the Visible Church as a not less mysterious part of the same Economy towards the same end: and Episcopacy they considered as a Divine Mystery for perpetuating this Church. (18)

Jesus Christ gave the Holy Spirit to the Apostles and also 'the power of transmitting this precious gift to others by prayer and the imposition of hands . . . In this way it has been preserved in the world to the present day'. This gift empowers its possessors to admit or to exclude from the Kingdom of Heaven any they judge to be deserving of it; to bless and intercede for those within the Kingdom in a way which no others can do; 'to make the Eucharistic bread and wine the Body and Blood of Christ, in the sense in which our Lord made them so' and 'to enable delegates to perform this great miracle by ordaining them with imposition of hands . . . To be admitted within the mysterious precincts of the Kingdom of Heaven, to be miraculously blessed, and miraculously fed with the Bread that came down from Heaven, these are surely something more than forms and externals . . . To dispense with Episcopal Ordination is to be regarded not as a breach of order merely, or a deviation from Apostolical precedent, but as a surrender of the Christian Priesthood, a rejection of all the powers which Christ instituted Episcopacy to perpetuate: and the attempt to substitute any other form of ordination for it, or to seek communion with Christ through any non-episcopal Association, is to be regarded not as a schism merely, but as an impossibility'. (19)

The nature and logic of his mind led Froude to a ruthless and uncompromising exclusivity. This was particularly true in relation to Christians outside his own Church. His somewhat bleak assertion about the impossibility of finding 'communion with

Christ through any non-episcopal Association' moved the editors of the *Remains* to append a softening footnote: 'Not that the members of such an Association are certainly destitute of Communion with Christ, but that, if they have that privilege, it is not *through* the Association'. (20) No doubt Froude would not have dissented from this further elucidation, but he did not make it.

For Froude, it was a matter of simple honesty and logic that if the Apostolic Succession were of divine appointment, then the consequences of its being true must be followed. 'Episcopal Ordination conveys *real* though invisible power. This is the key-stone by which the whole system is held together.' Yet some, he claimed, would contend that 'what Ordination conveys to the person ordained is, not any *real* power, but only a *legal*, or rather a *formal* qualification for the discharge of certain offices in a decent and orderly manner'. In order to change their opinion they would wish to see clear evidence such as an increase in eloquence, wisdom or holiness after ordination. This was surely a false assumption, he argued, for it would mean 'that no power could possibly be real, the effects of which are not visible'. Most would grant that when Jesus gave the Holy Ghost to the Apostles, they received 'some real power as distinguished from a mere formal commission'. Yet it would be difficult to find visible evidence of this. Similarly the action of the Holy Ghost on 'all persons in covenant with God' is unseen. It is a false assumption 'that man's natural faculties are sufficient to show God's whole method of dealing with us; whereas we have no reason to suppose that they afford us more than the faintest and most partial glimpse into it. In fact, it would be just as rational for a blind man to deny the reality of light, or a deaf man the reality of music, as for our blind and deaf hearts to deny the reality of any operation of the Holy Spirit, however invisible'.(21)

Froude's honesty is reflected in the way in which he faced the charge of doubtfulness regarding the ecclesiastical system. He acknowledged that it was not clear in the New Testament, 'and were it not from the reflected light interpreted in the Primitive Church, probably we should have attained only to a partial knowledge of their drift'. (22) He

firmly rejected the idea that the whole of God's revelation is contained in the Bible. 'According to Bishop Butler, the Almighty, in revealing to us any part of His will in writing, has done more than we had any reason to expect; and consequently He may have left many parts of it unrevealed in writing.' (23) A cautious editorial note here adds: 'That is, He *may* have done so, as far as all *antecedent* reasoning tells us, though *in fact* He has not so left any doctrine necessary to salvation'. Froude would only have accepted this doctrine of *sola scriptura* with difficulty.

Doubtfulness, he argued, is part of the human condition. Our intellect can never make us certain about the things of God. If we would know the truth, we must be obedient and seek to catch those whispers of God's intentions in the history of His Church.

Doubtful evidence on the subject of religion, far from being a just cause of distress and perplexity, affords us the best opportunities for showing our real love towards God, and our desire to please Him: and that, such being the case, we should thankfully treasure up even the remotest hints that are afforded us respecting the Divine will, as loving children would the intimations of a departed parent: looking anxiously for them wherever they are to be found. (24)

If doubt persisted, there was an over-riding danger which must always be avoided: that of under-rating the sacredness of sacred things. For him, 'in all cases of doubt, where Scripture leaves the choice between two interpretations, the most reverential side is always the safe side'. (25)

If Froude had found any sort of a paradigm for the Church in the time of the Apostles, he then had to demonstrate how the Church of England was linked to that Church, not only through the apostolic succession, but through unity of doctrine. It is noticeable that he chose to limit his arguments to Scripture without reference to the early Fathers. As Newman observed: 'He had no appreciation of the writings of the Fathers, of the detail or development of doctrine, of the definite traditions of the Church viewed in their matter, of the teaching of the ecumenical councils, or of the controversies out of which they arose'. (26) Yet ultimately Froude sought for justification in the idea of tradition, an idea which was to be so influential in Newman's thinking. In 1818, when still an

undergraduate, Newman heard Dr Hawkins, then Provost of Oriel, preach a sermon on tradition.

He lays down a proposition, self-evident as soon as stated, to those who have at all examined the structure of Scripture, viz. that the sacred text was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and that, if we would learn doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church. (27)

But the value and necessity of tradition lay not simply in gathering it from ancient texts. As with the apostolic succession, it must form a real link with the Church of to-day and demonstrate a unity of doctrine. Owen Chadwick points out that for Keble, for example, 'the idea of primitive tradition is not only a preservative idea, but a quest for reform (Newman's "second reformation"), for the restoration of, or re-emphasis upon, those beliefs or practices approved or authorized by antiquity but wanting or fragmentary in the present age'. (28)

It was during Froude's absence in Barbados that Newman began his correspondence with the Abbé Jager on the relationship of Scripture to tradition. 'The war is to be on the whole Romish question', he told Froude. (29) But on his return home, Froude himself entered in to a spirited correspondence with Newman which justified Newman's later assessment that he (Froude) 'gloried in accepting tradition as a main instrument of religious teaching'. (30)

Froude was now quite clear about what he called 'Bible-Christianity and criticised Newman's 'trumpety principle about "Scripture being the sole rule of Faith in *fundamentals*" (I nauseate the word)'. (31) Newman tried to maintain the doctrine of *sola scriptura* in his debate with the Abbé, but Froude clearly felt under no such constraint in his own thinking. He sought to point out to Newman that if a doctrine were held as fundamental in the second and third centuries, then he, Newman, would accept it, although it was unprovable from Scripture, yet at the same time he was arguing the necessity of Scriptural proof. (32)

It was his controversy with the Abbé Jager which caused Newman to work out a doctrine of tradition in his articles on the Via Media and later published in his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church* in 1837. In these articles he sought to distinguish between what he called episcopal tradition and prophetical tradition. The former was what is contained in the creeds and derived from Scripture. The prophetical tradition was less precise:

Prophets or Doctors are the interpreters of the revelation . . . Their teaching is a vast system . . . pervading the Church like an atmosphere, irregular in its shape, from its very profusion and exuberance . . . This I call Prophetical Tradition, existing primarily in the bosom of the Church itself, and recorded in such measure as Providence has determined, in the writings of eminent men. (33)

In August 1835 Newman argued in his correspondence with Froude that, since, according to Roman theory, it is only the Church in council which can give authority to tradition, prophetical tradition without such sanction has no authority at all. He expressed his surprise 'more and more to see how the Fathers insist *on the Scriptures* as the rule of faith - even in proving the most subtle parts of the doctrine of the Incarnation'. (34) Later in the same month he told Froude that he was inclined 'to say the Creed is the faith necessary to salvation as well as to Church communion - and to maintain that Scripture, according to the Fathers, is the authentic record and document of this faith'. (35) Froude acknowledged that if the Fathers insisted that only what is deducible from Scripture ought to be required for terms of communion, then he would accept it. But he could not understand why, if tradition is allowed as an interpretative authority, such doctrines as the Priesthood and the Eucharist could not be insisted on as terms of communion. 'I dont mean of course that this will bear out the Romanists, which is perhaps your only point; but it certainly would bear out our party in excommunicating Protestants. Also you lug in the Apostles' Creed and talk about expansions - What is to be the end of expansions ? will not the Romanists say that their whole system is an expansion of "the H.C.C. [Holy Catholic Church] and the Communion of Saints" ? ' (36)

He continued to wrestle with the problem and shared his thoughts with his friend Frederic Rogers:

I have been thinking over and over again N.'s argument from the Fathers, that tradition, in order to be authoritative, must be in form interpretative, and can get no farther than that it is a convenient reason for [the Church's] tolerating that (I forget which) Article. No reason why the Apostles should have confined their oral teaching to comments on Scripture seems apparent, and why their other oral teaching should have been more likely to be corrupted *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*. (37)

He was unable to clarify in his own mind the role of tradition, and lack of clarity was always anathema to him. He came close to accepting Newman's concept of prophetic tradition, for example, in the respect, even reverence, he paid to Butler's *Analogy*. It was brave indeed, at that time, to compare such writings to Scripture in respect of inspiration.

Towards the end of 1835, when his health was deteriorating, Froude reviewed three books by Blanco White for the *British Critic*. The review appears in the *Remains* under the title *Remarks on the Grounds of Orthodox Belief* in which he sought to differentiate between an infallible judge in the present age, which he rejected, and an infallible judge in the early Church which he accepted.

We may persist as steadfastly as ever in denying what the Papist contends for, viz. a standing infallible judge of controversy, and yet still may be able to maintain that at least some, and those not unimportant portions of our formulae, *have* the sanction, which Mr. Blanco White demands, of an unerring authority, and may be applied, without contravening any one of his observations, to the interpretation of some of the most mysterious parts of Scripture. For it will hardly be contended, that the non-existence of an infallible judge, in the present age of Christianity, is a proof that none such ever existed in any preceding age. Undoubtedly, in the first age of all, when the Apostles yet lived, and governed the Churches and conversed familiarly with their disciples, it may be presumed that their judgments, wherever the rise of controversy rendered it necessary to deliver them, were infallible, as well when delivered orally to those among whom they resided, as when sent in writing to their most distant converts. So far cannot be denied, and therefore so far every one, even Mr. Blanco White, must admit that there resided at one time with the Church on earth an infallible judge of controversies on all subjects whatsoever; and consequently that any such judgments thus passed or interpretations thus sanctioned, even though it

should not have happened that they were committed to writing, must still, as long as the memory of them was believed to be faithfully preserved, have been as binding on men's consciences as the written word itself; and that, if any portion of them has been preserved faithfully to the present day, it is still binding, for the same reason and to the same extent. Now it will be found that such a portion of these doctrinal interpretations of Scripture was actually secured and recorded in primitive times, and has been transmitted to us, by means of history, as is sufficient to answer the purpose of an unerring guide, as far as the mysteries of religion are concerned; so that we have no need at all, as Mr. Blanco White would pretend, to rely upon the fallible judgment of expositors of modern times. (38)

The majority of bishops at the Council of Nicaea when faced with the Arian heresy, appealed to the traditional interpretation of Scripture as held in their Churches. The minority relied on private judgement. Thus, Froude claimed, the settlement of the Arian controversy 'attests to us the existence, in the year 325, of a certain systematic interpretation of mysterious texts, received at that time by every Church in Christendom, on the belief that it had been traditionary in each from the very first, and consequently derived ultimately from the Apostles. This is an admitted historical fact'. 'If the Nicene creed really does, as its framers believed, rest on a direct Apostolic tradition, its metaphors cannot be looked on as human and secondary, any more than those which occur in St. Paul's Epistles; nor can its authority be, in that case, consistently regarded as less than infallible.' Froude believed that we may 'without making one step towards the Popish doctrine of a standing infallible judge of controversies, place such reliance on the ancient Catholic formulae, as to find in them a protection against the various assaults of Latitudinarianism'. As for confessions of faith such as the 39 Articles, these 'have never been considered by our divines to be of more than secondary authority, nor to be portions, as such, of necessary faith; and that, while they are venerable as being professed by an ever-increasing number of pious and learned men, they are justified on the ground of a strong and imperative expediency . . . The articles of the Church are not of its essence, but an addition, of the nature of a preservative, necessary to its well-being and peace; but not to be put on a level with the ancient Creeds, as necessary to be believed in order to salvation.' (39)

Such words and arguments reveal a deep longing for certainty in faith. Froude never possessed Newman's luminous certitude nor Keble's deep and settled creed. His faith was more of an ardent struggle to reach out to an unseen goal of truth and perfection. Whereas in the *Essay on Rationalism* he counted on probability as the safest guide in matters of faith, in his later writing he emphasised far more the infallibility of the apostolic Church. There was no explicit mention of any development of doctrine, but it is impossible to avoid the thought that had he lived longer, he would have aligned himself with much of Newman's later thinking. In his review of Blanco White's books, much of what he wrote was essentially private judgement. If ever he had come to acknowledge this, he would have had to reject it on his own principles or seek for it an authority beyond himself.

In a sermon which he delivered in Winchester Cathedral in the autumn of 1836, Keble did not think of tradition as 'overriding the sole and paramount claim of Holy Scripture as a Rule of Faith, but as supplementing it. Such Tradition has its analogy in unwritten civil law; its existence is recognized in Scripture itself, and was constantly appealed to in the early centuries; it served even as a test for Apostolic writings until the Canon was formed, which in its turn served as a check upon tradition . . . The security that we still possess the Tradition is guaranteed by the Apostolical Succession'. (40) Keble was more measured, more cautious, than Froude, and his scholarship was far deeper. Whereas there was in Keble an inner stability of faith and temperament, Froude gives the impression of ever wanting to push the bounds of his doctrine further.

Throughout his life Froude never really faced up to the insularity of the English Church. His vision was Catholic but he was always constrained by his Englishness. When he sought to reach out beyond the confines of his own Church he quickly returned, if not to the Church of his day, at least to that of earlier, and, to him, more Catholic times. The cold douche which he experienced on his meeting with Dr Wiseman in Rome in 1833 had left him feeling that the only place for him was 'the ancient Church of England' by which he meant Charles I and the Nonjurors. The Nonjurors constantly became his

refuge, and in the year after the Rome visit he declared that he was becoming 'a more and more determined admirer of the Non-jurors'. (41) Froude's unrealistic dream was summed up by his friend Lord Blachford (formerly Frederic Rogers):

He would (as we see in the *Remains*) have wished Ken to have 'the courage of his convictions' by excommunicating the Jurors in William III's time, and setting up a little Catholic Church, like the Jansenists in Holland. He was not (as has been observed) a theologian, but he was as jealous for orthodoxy as if he were. (42)

None of the Tractarians was comfortable with the present and they looked to the past for their inspiration. But Froude was especially guilty of a form of romantic idealism. In the late summer of 1831 he told Newman of his 'serious wish and if I could presume to say so intention of working at the Ecclesiastical History of the middle ages'. (43) Newman was later to confirm that 'he was powerfully drawn to the medieval church, but not to the primitive'. (44) In the course of time it was to the medieval Church that he increasingly turned for inspiration and ideals.

The attraction of the Church of this age for Froude is evident, not from his letters which scarcely refer to it, but from his life of Becket:

In the first place then it must be observed, that in the time of Henry II, the Catholic Church was one compact machine, of which no individual part could move without giving an impulse to the rest. The Churches of Italy, France, Germany, and England, were cemented together by closer ties, than now unite any two dioceses in this country. Men of letters from all parts of civilized Europe talked a common language, intermingled with one another . . . (45)

It was in the Church of this age that he recognised the presence of holiness, which concept was at the very heart of the Oxford Movement. If Churchmen were not holy, how could they see God? And if they did not live in obedience to the Church and by the grace of the sacraments, how could they be made holy? His attraction to the medieval Church was instinctive. He delighted in thinking of the saints; he had a keen appreciation of the idea of sanctity, its possibility and its heights; and he was more than

inclined to believe a large amount of miraculous interference as occurring in the early and middle ages.' (46)

The pursuit of holiness and obedience towards God meant, for Froude himself, the acceptance of the celibate state. He owed nothing to Keble for such a choice and it was apparently very much a personal decision. There may have been something of romanticism, of a sense of chivalry in his decision, but his health may also have been seen as a pointer towards such a life. Whatever his reasons were he was fully aware of the sacrifice involved as his poem *Daniel in the Lyra Apostolica* revealed.

Dean Church summed up the attitude towards celibacy among many of the Tractarians:

The idea of celibacy, in those whom it affected at Oxford, was in the highest degree a religious and romantic one. The hold which it had on the leader of the movement made itself felt, though little was directly said. To shrink from it was a mark of want of strength or intelligence, of an unmanly preference for English home life, of insensibility to the generous devotion and purity of the saints. It cannot be doubted that at this period of the movement the power of this idea over imagination and conscience was one of the strongest forces in the direction of Rome. (47)

So far little mention has been made of the vast majority of the Church on earth - the laity. The truth is that Froude had not a great deal to say about them. In spite of what he had written about the voice of the laity in the nomination of a bishop in his *Remarks on State Interference*, he found little room for them in the life of the Church as other than an obedient flock under episcopal and clerical rule.

On the day after the Hadleigh conference Froude told Newman of a suggestion put forward by Rose. The idea was 'that we should proceed to elect a Lay Synod as *διάδοχος* of the Church of England Parliament which has apostasized - in order to regulate the things indifferent of Church Polity'. (48) The breakdown of the Anglican settlement whereby Parliament was seen as a lay synod had clearly called forth a desire to restore a lay voice in Church affairs. The idea remained in Froude's mind, for a fortnight later he told Keble: 'I think, if we manage well, we may make the idea of a Lay

Synod popular. Its members should be selected by universal suffrage among the communicants, *more primitivo*. I find this view most effective in conversation.' (49)
But the thought did not stay long. In November of the following year he found himself 'out of conceit with old Hooker's notion of a lay-synod: it is unecclesiastical and whig. We must only be popular in the choice of church officers'. (50)

Some two years later in response to a request from Newman for his thoughts about the power of the laity in the Church, he confessed to ignorance on the subject, but his answer revealed his true feelings about the governance of the Church:

As to the Laity having power in Synod's I dont know enough to have an opinion - but as far as I see I disagree with Hooker. Look at Bishop Hicke's little book on 'the constitution of the Christian Church' in which he maintains that each Diocese is a monarchy absolute except so far as the Bishop has been pledged by ordination oaths. Neither the Laity nor the Presbyters seem to me [to] have any part or lot in the government of the Church - tho of course since heresy is worse than schism, they must act for themselves if they think their governors heretical. (51)

Here we come close to an essential part of Froude's concept of the Church. Yet he never managed to fit all his ideas into a coherent whole. He admired so much of Rome, yet he could not accept Papal infallibility. For him, infallibility within the Church necessarily ceased after the break up of its unity. His whole instinct was for clarity and holiness in the context of a hierarchical Church order. For Newman the solution to his search for an ecclesiological paradigm came after spending many years in 'encircling gloom' until his reading and conscience and whole being led him to Rome. Keble never had anything remotely like such a problem. He was a Church of England man to his finger tips, and his criticisms and anxieties, although real enough at the time, amounted to little more in essence than the trimmming of his finger nails. Froude's life left many pointers to an understanding of the Church but the ultimate paradigm remained elusive.

IX CHURCH DISCIPLINE AND AUTHORITY

Writing from the vantage point of some fifty years distance, James Anthony Froude looked back on the early days of the Oxford Movement with some scorn. His own faith had evaporated, and he found the ideas of the early Tractarians quite indefensible.

They conceived that the secret of the Church's strength lay in the priesthood and the sacraments; and that the neglect of them was the explanation of its weakness. The Church of England so renovated would rise, they thought, like Achilles from his tent: clad in celestial armour, it would put to flight the armies of infidelity, and bring back in a modern shape, adapted to modern needs, the era of Hildebrand and Becket. They and only they stood on ground from which they could successfully encounter atheism. They and they only, as tracing their lineage through imposition of hands to the apostles, could meet and vanquish the pretensions of Rome. (1)

Whether the early Tractarians were so sanguine about their future is debatable, but Anthony Froude was accurate both about their intentions and their weapons. In another essay he put his finger with some cynicism on what they perceived to be the root problem within the Church: 'The bottom of the mischief was the modern notion of liberty, the supposed right of men to think for themselves and act for themselves. Their business was to submit to authority, and the seat of authority was the Church'. (2) Rationalism had led Renaissance man into innumerable errors of which the chief was pride. The Tracts called men back to holiness and the acknowledgement of God's revelation through his Church. It followed, therefore, for the Tractarians, that the Church would require a godly discipline to ensure that holiness was encouraged and sin punished. Newman, Froude and Keble were by no means reticent in setting out their thinking on this matter.

Between September and November 1833 Newman wrote five letters to the *Evangelical Record*. His style was appropriately Evangelical and he urged that the rules of God's

government should be visible to the world outside the Church, with the consequence of the final separation of sinners from God's elect. There was no problem in knowing who should be excommunicated: the heretical, the immoral and schismatics. He revealed some of the benefits which would come to the Church from these measures: 'It would be a bulwark against Popery, and by increasing the difficulties of the Episcopal office might lead to the appointment of more spiritually minded Bishops'. (3)

Tract XXXVII quoted from the tracts of the Nonjuror, Robert Nelson, who had encouraged the social ostracism of dissenters in village life. It also set before the clergy the recovery of ancient discipline as understood and practised by Bishop Thomas Wilson of the Isle of Man in the first part of the eighteenth century. As Bishop E.A. Knox observed with some relish: 'There is no question at all that the Oxford Movement without excommunication is a bee without its sting, that is, dead. (4)

Bishop Wilson had set out his ideas on discipline in his *Sacra Privata*. Such discipline involved 'first, to withhold from offenders the benefit of the Holy Sacrament, till they behave themselves so as to be worthy of so great a blessing; and secondly, if they continue obstinate (all proper methods being used to reclaim them), to excommunicate them, and to oblige all sober Christians not to have familiar converse with them'. (5) His penalties also had a very practical application, one of them being the dragging of a woman of loose morals behind a boat in the sea. He felt that the exercise of discipline had been entrusted to the governors of the Church by Christ:

Their duty is to receive into the Church such as are fit to be members of it, to sustain and tend those thus admitted, to offer to God the oblations of His people, and to administer those Sacraments without which, so he put it, we cannot hope to be saved. The clergy have also the power, after admonishing, rebuking, and withstanding the disobedient and profane, to cast them out of the Church - a power given to them for edification, not for mere love of authority; a power extending to the denial of the Sacraments to all such as render themselves unworthy to partake of them; a power to close the Church against offenders and to charge all other Christians not to company with them; a power which if rejected carries with it the rejection of Christ; a power which can loose as well as bind, which can receive back again as well as excommunicate. (6)

During his stay in Barbados Froude presented his own ideas on Church discipline, a subject which had been on his mind as early as 1827. In his *Occasional Thoughts* of July 1 of that year he wrote: 'It seems as if there was no necessity of attributing to Absolution a mystic efficacy, and sanctioning it with a revealed commission, *in order* to justify its exclusive appropriation to the Priesthood, and to render it a presumptuous intrusion in unauthorized persons to assume the office'. An editorial footnote gives Froude's later view as formulated in the *Essay on Rationalism*: 'He considered that Almighty God had put it *absolutely* into the power of the Church to deprive individuals of her *spiritual privileges*, as e.g. it evidently rests with her (though she is answerable for her discretionary power) to baptize or not to baptize individuals'. (7)

In his *Essay on Rationalism*, Froude offered a confident statement of his views. He acknowledged that it was a mystery how a blessing or a curse could affect a man, but the difficulty was to the imagination, not to reason. When a Christian bishop claimed the power of admitting to or excluding from the Kingdom of Heaven, he was not claiming any power which would determine a man's eternal salvation or otherwise. He claimed only 'to confer or deny that blessedness which Scripture assigns to the subjects of that kingdom, be it little or be it great'. This power was confirmed by our Lord's grant of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to St. Peter and the other apostles. If a sentence were to be unjustly given, then that is part of life's unfairness, but God would take it into consideration in the final judgement. He added with a dogmatic assurance that 'it is certain that persons within the kingdom of Heaven may, and that many of them unhappily will, perish everlastingly'. (8)

The neglect of discipline within the Church he attributed to its being endowed, established and national, unlike the primitive Church. In its early days, when the Church was small in number, it was the highest privilege to be in communion with it. With its growth, this sense disappeared. The present established position of the Church of England caused him great misgivings. 'If a national Church means a Church without

discipline, every argument for discipline is an argument against a national Church; and the best thing we can do is to unnationalize ours as soon as possible.' (9) Yet it was possible to maintain standards in a national Church. Among the problems had been the clergy who thought more of numbers than of the sincerity of their converts.

The true cause of the decay of Church discipline is not that nations have become Christian, but that the clergy have wished to make them appear Christian, either before they were so or after they have ceased to be so. And if at the present day it is difficult to enforce Church Discipline in England, it is not because we have a national Church, but because the clergy are too anxious to keep up the show of one. The body of the English nation either are sincere Christians or they are not: if they are, they will submit to Discipline as readily as the primitive Christians did. If not, let us tell the truth and shame the devil: let us give up a *national* Church and have a *real* one. (10)

It would be wrong to compare excommunication and absolution with membership or otherwise of ordinary societies. Nor should the fact that the Church had lost its former ascendancy in society be a reason for its not exercising its power of excommunication at the present time. Such restraint might be an interruption of God's plan for our salvation. Such views were generally shared by Keble who expressed them in a contribution to the *Lyra Apostolica*, which Froude quoted:

"Behold your Armoury! - sword and lightning shaft,
Culled from the stores of God's all-judging ire,
And in your wielding left! The words that waft
Power to your voice Absolving, point with fire
Your awful Curse. O grief! should Heaven's dread Sire
Have stayed, for you, the mercy dews of old
Vouchsafed when pastors' arms in deep desire
Were spread on high to bless the kneeling fold!
IF CENSURE SLEEP WILL ABSOLUTION HOLD?
Will the great KING affirm their acts of grace
Who thankless leave to cankering rust and mould
The flaming sword that should the unworthy chase
From His pure Eden? O beware lest vain
Their sentence to *remit* who never dare *retain*. (11)

Opposed to this strict and sombre view was the layman, Alexander Knox, sometimes regarded as a precursor of Tractarian ideas, although not at all in this instance. He

believed that the very want of discipline within the Church was one of its happier features. In this way religion could be presented without any human interference. He favoured an established Church because it provided a diffused religion. Those of higher intellect, he suggested, could frame their own religion; others would benefit from membership of sects and societies. Such ideas appalled Froude, for Knox was, in effect, denying the apostolic priesthood who had Christ's own authority 'to act as his vice-regents on earth'. Christ had given to men the true Church; it was not for Knox to suggest another.

Froude believed that the reason why excommunication was not used was due, not to the Church, but to the fact that 'our Spiritual Governors are prevented from executing this part of their divine commission by tyrannical laws'. (12) If they were to excommunicate 'except under certain imposed restrictions, that amount in almost all cases to a prohibition, they would forthwith come under a law enacted by Edward III.; confiscating all their goods, whether ecclesiastical or personal, and subjecting themselves, their aiders and abettors, to perpetual imprisonment'. (13) It is difficult to imagine the Government of that time imprisoning a bishop for this reason. It is even more difficult to imagine a bishop of that time wishing so to act.

Support for Froude came in the Preface to the second volume of the *Remains*. Christians should separate themselves from sinners and heretics in contrast to 'the liberal and unscrupulous intercourse, which respectable persons now practise, for peace, and quietness, and good nature's sake; it is a conviction which cannot but widely influence both his judgment of other times, and his conduct towards his contemporaries; it will lead to many a sentence that will sound harsh, and many a step that will be counted austere; it will cause him often to shock those by whom he would greatly wish to be approved; and yet, thus he must judge and act, if he will be true to his own principle, and conform himself throughout to that will of God, which the consent of those purer ages indicates'. (14)

Most of Froude's thoughts on the subject were written down during the last two years of his life. Within this period his uncertainty about the authority of the English Church increased. He told Keble of his difficulties in a letter dated 25 February 1835: 'And first, I shall attack you for the expression, "The Church teaches so and so", which I observe is in the Tract equivalent to "the Prayer-Book, &c. teach us so and so" '. He felt obliged to query the very authority of the Prayer Book which was the 'gold standard' of the Church of England. Whence came its authority? From Parliament? From Convocation? Or from the assent of the majority of the clergy? 'Why is the opinion of the English Clergy, since the enactment of the Prayer Book, entitled to be called the teaching of the Church, more than that of the Clergy of the sixteen previous centuries; or, again, than the Clergy of France, Italy, Spain, Russia, &c. &c.?' At this time he was using the Roman Breviary, and he added: 'I can see no other claim which the Prayer Book has on a Layman's deference, as the teaching of the Church, which the Breviary and Missal have not in a far greater degree'. (15)

Froude never reached any final resolution of the problems either of discipline or authority. He probably felt that the exercise of either, so far as it went in the Church of his own time, was often social rather than ecclesiastical. But it was the intention of the Tractarians to recall the Church to what they believed was its divine commission. He understood this in a negative, almost mechanical way, betraying an uncomfortable enthusiasm for discipline, 'matters on which his mind fastened itself with enthusiasm'. (16) His contact with 'ordinary' people was extremely limited throughout his life and although he was not alone in seeing the laity mainly as people who should be obedient, passive, the balance of his thinking reflects a side of his character which, it has to be acknowledged, was singularly unattractive.

X THE EUCHARIST: MYSTERY AND MIRACLE

'How many Clergymen of the Church of England are there who administer the Eucharist in their Parish Church more at any rate than twelve, or even than eight or four times in the same period' (i.e. one year) ? (1) Thus Hurrell Froude bemoaned the state of Eucharistic practice in the Church of his day. In his survey of English Church life in the eighteenth century, Wickham Legg attempted to present a fair picture of the Church of England at prayer during that period. Since there were no registers of services at that time other than for baptisms, weddings and funerals, he had to rely on the scattered comments of a variety of writers. But the overall picture was clear. The Eucharist was not the Church's central act of worship; weekly, and even monthly, celebration was very limited. He concluded sadly that 'throughout our period the laity received communion with melancholy infrequency'. (2)

Peter Virgin paints a similar picture of eighteenth century eucharistic life in the diocese of Hereford. He quotes the results of the Bishop's own enquiry concerning communicants in his diocese at the great festivals. 'Communicants in the year 1747 appear to have been many more, so many more, than those reported in the year 1789, that I am unwilling to recite the numbers.' (3) His reticence was not encouraging.

The Rector of the parish of Dartington, who was of the High Church school, might have been expected to have offered his parishioners a more sacramental Church life than was the usual standard. But such was not the case. As late as August, 1834 - that is to say, a year after Keble's Assize sermon and the beginning of the Tracts, and a longer period since his cherished elder son had committed himself to Catholic teaching - the Eucharist was celebrated at Dartington, at the most, quarterly, including no doubt, the major

festivals. It was in this same month that Froude wrote an earnest letter to his father from Barbados.

I believe it to be the most indispensable of all the duties of external religion, that every one should receive the communion as often as he has opportunity; and that if he has such opportunity every day of the week, it is his duty to take advantage of it every day of the week . . .

Now at [Dartington], if you had the communion every Sunday you might make sure of a sufficient number of communicants . . . or at any rate you might have it every month without the slightest difficulty, and need assign no reason for the change; indeed, people would not find out at first that there was any change . . . I dare say you will think my view overstrained, and very likely it may be a little. Yet the more I think of it, the less doubtful it seems to me. I know that neither N. nor K., when I left England, saw the thing in the light in which it now strikes me; they thought that it was desirable to have the communion as often as possible, but still that the customs of particular places ought not to be changed without particular reason. But it really does seem to me that the Church of England has gone so very wrong in this matter, that it is not right to keep things smooth any longer. (4)

The Mediterranean journey with his father and Newman gave, probably to them all, what was almost certainly their first experience of non-Anglican Eucharistic worship. Froude was offended by the lack of holiness and even the immorality he found, he could not help himself being impressed. He later compared the attitude of the people in the countries he visited with that of his own countrymen. He bewailed the fact that what 'should be a signal for the general assemblage of Christ's flock' was, in his own country, a signal 'for their dispersion':

The ignorant and superstitious Churches of Greece and Rome, in this respect at least, present a spectacle fraught with instructive lessons to the serious member of our own enlightened communion. Among them he sees, in the outward part of religion at least, an exhibition of that deference of sight to Faith in which we are externally so deficient. The opening of the Eucharistic Service, which among ourselves is a signal for three-fourths of the congregation to withdraw, operates there like the voice of the good shepherd which the sheep hear and obey. (5)

Although Froude had only minimal experience of parish life beyond Dartington, yet he felt so deeply that the Eucharist should be at the centre of local Church life. 'The

Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, professing as it does to feed us with the Bread of life, and to make us spiritual partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ, ought, one would think, in all reason to form the most prominent feature in the worship of the faithful.' (6) Such views as these, Härdelin observed, added up to 'nothing less than a manifesto the execution of which would entirely change the pattern of contemporary Anglican parish worship'. (7)

The Tractarians' understanding of the Eucharist has commonly been seen as owing little to earlier teaching within the Church of England. Further, the later Tractarians had developed a distinctive theology of the Eucharist which was read back into the early years of the Movement. The first was untrue; the second, mistaken. George Murray, Bishop of Bangor, criticised the Tractarians in his Visitation Charge of 1843 'for implying that the High Church doctrines of the Real Presence and the eucharistic sacrifice had been jettisoned over the preceding century'. (8)

Belief in the Real Presence was held by Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester in the early part of the seventeenth century. 'Christ is to Andrewes present in the Sacrament, just as at the Incarnation He was present in the manger'. (9) Furthermore, it is interesting to note the high sacramental views of Charles Wesley, a constant member of the Church of England, whose life spanned most of the eighteenth century:

We need not now go up to Heaven
To bring the long-sought Saviour down;
Thou art to all already given,
Thou dost e'en now Thy Banquet crown:
To every faithful soul appear,
And shew Thy real Presence here.

Now on the Sacred Table laid
Thy Flesh becomes our Food,
Thy life is to our souls conveyed
In Sacramental Blood. (10)

Such views on the Eucharist necessarily only reflect the views of those particular writers and their adherents. The vast majority of church people would never have even heard of the names of, for example, Richard Hooker, Daniel Waterland or Alexander Knox. Their beliefs were absorbed from their parents, their local Church, the Prayer Book. It might be arguable, indeed, how far such writers represented the thinking of the clergy. Understanding of the Eucharist is greatly affected in the common mind by received practices and appeals to the senses. The inheritance of the Reformation had left churches, for the most part, devoid of colour, the clergy with a variety of theological understanding, and Prayer Book services which appealed to the head rather than to the heart. It is to Froude's credit that he understood the necessity of frequent communion and the centrality of the Eucharist in Church life.

During the early days of the Movement, the greatest emphasis, even the sole emphasis, was being placed upon the relationship between Church and State and the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession. But the consequences of the latter doctrine led to an increasing awareness of Catholic doctrine in a way which ultimately began to separate the Tractarians from their earlier inheritance. They believed they could justify their beliefs from the Prayer Book. They were not inventing new doctrine; it was earlier and present Churchmen who neglected what had always been there.

The Real Presence and the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist were increasingly proclaimed as time went on. In 1833 Froude had taken Keble to task for his resolutions for the projected Association of Friends of the Church. He failed to understand why Keble could not be straightforward and write that 'the power of making the Body and Blood of Christ is vested in the Successors of the Apostles'. (11) Newman had disagreed with such a view expressed in a separate letter to him and condemned him for being 'furious'. Even so, in a letter to his friend, Samuel Rickards, Newman seemed to have changed a little after only two months. 'I do think we have most of us dreadfully low notions of the Blessed Sacrament. I expect to be called a Papist when my opinions are known', he wrote. (12) There is surely something of Froude behind this change.

Among the variety of understandings of the Eucharist to be found in the Church of England at this time was receptionism, the belief that the reception of Christ in the sacrament was dependent upon the worthiness of the communicant. It had been held by Daniel Waterland, one-time Archdeacon of Middlesex in the early part of the eighteenth century, and in Froude's own day, by Charles Lloyd who became Bishop of Oxford, and by Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter. Their views did not deny the Real Presence, but they did not admit that there was any change in the bread and wine.

Shortly after he arrived in Barbados, Froude had been discussing the interpretation of the Prayer Book Articles with the Bishop and particularly in relation to the Eucharist. On 25 January 1834 he wrote to Newman to tell him that he had been 'floored' by the Bishop 'who has proved to me that the expression in Art. XXVIII "and the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith" is intended to contradict the notion that the unfaithful may possibly receive it'. Froude could not reconcile this with his own passionate belief in the Real Presence.

Now I certainly cannot take on myself to say what the unfaithful receive or do not receive; so if the Article means to dogmatise where I doubt, he [the Bishop] says I cannot subscribe it. Laud used to say that subscribing the Articles meant nothing more than declaring that you would not preach [or] teach against them. must we come to this? I wish they were [all] swept away and nothing but the creeds left . . . I think I am clear that the Articles are as Laud maintained a formula of submission - not a profession of opinion - vid King James' preface. (13)

The King's Declaration which prefaces the Articles in the Prayer Book states that they 'do contain the true Doctrine of the Church of England agreeable to God's Word' and are to be understood 'in the literal and grammatical sense'. Froude was relieved in being able to interpret them in a way which accorded to his own understanding: 'I have got over my scruple about the Articles', he wrote to both Keble and Newman, ' - from considering the preface to them in which it is said that we are to understand them in their grammatical sense, which I interpret into a permission to think nothing of the

opinion of their framers.' (14) This view came to be shared by Newman and enabled him to write Tract XC.

But if the Bishop of Barbados could cause him such heart-searching, how much more would Keble, his former tutor and spiritual guide. Early in 1835 he wrote to Keble and took him to task for a verse in *The Christian Year*. In the poem for the fifth of November, Keble had written:

O come to our Communion Feast !
There present in the heart,
Not in the hands, the eternal Priest
Will his true self impart.

Froude remonstrated with Keble: 'How can we possibly know that it is true to say "not in the hands"? Also, on the Communion . . . you seem cramped by Protestantism'.(15) Keble's biographer, Walter Lock, explained that 'probably he would not himself have written this line in later life, for he stated in 1845 that when he wrote the *Christian Year* he did not fully understand the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, but he frequently refused to alter it'. (16) In fact, it was altered after his death and according to his own wishes to read: 'There present in the heart / As in the hands . . . ' There is almost a pugnacity in Froude's attitude. He was beginning to prompt and to scold both Keble and Newman.

For Froude, any form of receptionism implied a denial of the Real Presence. Either the Lord was present or not. Newman wrote of the Real Absence as being the only alternative to the Real Presence. But of course, the worthy reception of the sacrament was of the greatest importance. 'Is not baptism, unless followed by an attempt at a Christian life, as great a curse as receiving the Lord's Body unworthily?', Froude asked Keble. (17)

At the beginning of his stay in Barbados Froude expressed his horror at the views of Jewel, the sixteenth century Bishop of Salisbury. He had been reading the controversy



of Jewel with the Roman Catholic, Thomas Harding, and his sympathies were clearly with the latter. He was appalled at Jewel's subjective and rationalistic approach as he made clear to Newman:

[Jewel] calls the mass 'your cursed, paltrier service' . . . He most distinctly denies the Sacrament of the Lord's supper to be a *means* of grace as distinguished from a pledge; calling it a 'phantasy of M. Harding's' . . . [He] justifies Calvin for saying that the Sacrament of the Lord's supper 'were superfluous' if we remembered Christ's death enough without it. Ridicules the consecration of the elements, and indirectly explains that the way the Body and Blood are verily received is that they are *received into our remembrance* . . . Certainly the Council of Trent had no fair chance of getting at the Truth if they saw no alternative between transubstantiation and Jewelism. I do not hesitate to say that his Doctrine ought to be denied under pain of damnation. (18)

It is doubtful if the Council of Trent was much concerned with the views of Bishop Jewel, but he was a bishop of Froude's own Church. Härdelin wondered whether it was not Froude's study of Jewel and especially of his controversy with Harding, which came to determine his eucharistic belief. He believed this to be Keble's opinion.(19) In the Preface to the second volume of the *Remains*, Keble explained that Froude began to study the theology of the Reformers 'with the general and natural impression, that he should find on the whole a treasure of sound Anglican doctrine, and a tone of thought in unison with the Ancient Church. He found himself greatly disappointed . . .'(20)

Froude's language now became ever more Catholic. In a letter to Newman at the beginning of 1835 he roundly declared: 'I shall never call the holy Eucharist "the Lord's supper", nor God's Priests "ministers of the word", or the altar "the Lord's table" - etc, etc innocent as such phrases are in themselves, they have be[en] dirted - a fact of which you seem oblivious on many occasions.' (21)

Newman acknowledged Froude's influence on his own thinking about the Eucharist in the *Apologia*. Froude's 'deep devotion to the Real Presence, in which he had a firm faith' clearly affected him profoundly, for 'he led me gradually to believe in the Real Presence'. (22) Newman's used the word 'gradually', for he was to think long and hard

before he came to accept any change in his beliefs. Froude, on the other hand, was far more instinctive and immediate in his thinking. He was also more outspoken and uninhibited in expressing it. 'My Tracts were abused as Popish, as for other things so especially for expressions about the Eucharist', Newman told him. 'Here as you well know, it was you who were apt to be unguarded, not I'. (23)

Froude's considered views on the Eucharist were set out in his *Essay on Rationalism*. His opening chapter contains a fierce attack on the rationalism of Benjamin Hoadly, the Bishop of Bangor whose famous controversy with the Nonjuror, William Law, he had been reading. He was shocked to find 'a Prelate of the Church of England . . . disavowing his belief in any efficacy of prayer, intercession, and the Sacraments, except such as is inseparable from the right performance of these services, and belongs to them through their natural tendency'. (24) He then proceeded to state and justify his own, or, as he would have preferred, the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist.

The miracle of the Eucharist is, in fact, a double miracle. It is 'the [making] of the Body and Blood of Christ for our spiritual food, and the preservation of the sensible bread and wine to exercise our faith'. (25) As a mystery it is beyond reason; its guarantee is the Scriptural Apostolic Succession. Elsewhere he criticised Protestants who 'have ingeniously converted the words, "This is my body", i.e. "the mysterious gift of which I spoke", (John vi) into "my body is [only] this". Of course the words are an economy - they make it a metaphor.' (26) Such poverty of understanding he condemned, believing that 'the principle on which it is founded is as proud irreverent and foolish as that of any heresy - even Socinianism'. (27)

He found himself constantly unable to say enough about the mystery of the Eucharist. In a letter to Newman early in 1835 he quoted Pascal the better to express his thoughts:

'Il a demeuré caché sous le voile de la nature, qui nous le couvre, jusq'à l'incarnation; et quand il a fallu qu'il ait paru, il s'est encore plus cache, en se couvrant de l'humanite . . . Enfin, quand il a voulu accomplir la promesse qu'il fit à ses Apôtres de demeurer avec les hommes jusq'à son

dernier avènement, il a choisi de demeurer dans le plus étrange et le plus obscur secret de tous, savoir, sous les espèces de l'Eucharistie'.

He continued with Pascal to say that 'Deists penetrate the veil of nature, heretics that of the incarnation, mais pour nous, nous devons nous estimer heureux de ce que Dieu nous éclaire jusqu'à le reconnaître sous les espèces du pain et du vin. I believe you will agree with me that this is orthodox, indeed you say as much in your sermon on the resurrection of the Body'. (28)

Froude's thinking and the language he used went far beyond any of his fellow Tractarians at this time. He struggled to find words to express a sublime wonder, so unlike most of his writing which can be harsh, even arid. Thus he described the Eucharist in the life of the Church of Corinth as 'the principal agent in effecting the mystic absorption of individual Christians into the Body of Christ'. (29) This is a remarkable expression of Eucharistic theology. It was no mere romanticism, but a deep insight into the mystical union of Christ with his people. Perhaps he spoke more than he knew; perhaps he was unconsciously interpreting the words of the Prayer of Humble Access in the Prayer Book: 'that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us'. Something of an echo of his thinking here was to be found later in a book by his friend, Robert Wilberforce. In 1853, the year before he was received into the Church of Rome, Wilberforce defined the Blessed Sacrament in *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, as 'the extension of the incarnation', and declared that 'through the Eucharist that recreation which began in Christ is extended to men'. (30) Froude would not have dissented.

So much of what Froude writes could easily be interpreted as an upholding of transubstantiation. He criticised Newman for issuing a translation of Bishop Cosin's attack on the doctrine in the form of two Tracts. 'Surely no member of the Church of England is in any danger of overrating the miracle of the Eucharist'. But Newman's purpose was to emphasise the rejection of transubstantiation by the Tractarians and their

anti-Roman stance and he appended a note to this letter: 'Froude would not believe that I was in earnest, *as I was*, in shrinking from the views which he boldly followed out. I *was* against Transubstantiation.' (31) This comment certainly suggests that Froude held a view at least close to transubstantiation. His language was bold and clear. Indeed, he could not express himself more clearly about the presence of Christ in the Sacrament. Bishops and priests had the power 'to make the eucharistic bread and wine the Body and Blood of Christ'. (32) Also, 'when at the conclusion of the Last Supper our Lord took bread and blessed it and gave it to His Apostles, saying, "This is My Body", we may [be sure] He stated that which was more near the literal truth than could be expressed in any other language whatsoever'. (33) Such words from the pen of a Roman Catholic would naturally be interpreted in terms of transubstantiation. Yet Froude expressly rejected this doctrine which he believed to be based on rationalism. 'By explaining wherein the miracle consisted, and how it was brought about, it aims . . . at relieving us from a confession of ignorance, and so far must be regarded as a contrivance of human scepticism, to elude the claims of faith, and to withdraw from the hidden mysteries of religion the indistinctness in which God has thought to envelop them.' (34) It was, in effect, an attempt 'to make that plainer, which, doubtless, God has made as plain as it admits of being made.' (34)

Newman's poem in the *Lyra Apostolica* reflects the same view:

Whene'er I seek the Holy Altar's rail,
And kneel to take the grace there offered me,
It is no time to task my reason frail,
To try Christ's words, and search how they may be;
Enough, I eat His Flesh and drink His blood,
More is not told - to ask it is not good. (36)

Less than four weeks before Froude's death, Newman wrote to him: 'So far I have *not* changed my mind, viz in thinking Transubstantiation, as held by Rome, involves *in matter of fact* profane ideas. If the union of the exalted Nature of Christ with the qualities of bread be the doctrine of antiquity, I yield; else, it does seem to me a substitution of something earthly for a heavenly mystery'. (36) The subject of

transubstantiation was exercising both men. Newman solved his problems with the theory of development and his joining the Church of Rome. Froude's belief in the Real Presence could not have been more explicit. But up to the time of his death, and so far as his own writings reveal, he could not accept what he perceived to be the rationalism of Aristotelian metaphysics. But the authority for his judgement lay in himself. How far he would ever have accepted an authority outside and above himself can never be known.

XI ROME

At the beginning of the nineteenth century Roman Catholics in England were quietly proud and confident of their spiritual heritage. They were a very small minority and wanted nothing more than to be left alone. But fear and distrust of the Church of Rome had burned itself deep into the English psyche. 'The Englishman knew himself to be Protestant. The memories or legends of his history, from fires of Smithfield to glorious revolution of 1688, were vague but powerful in his feeling that popery was un-English and ought legally to be discouraged.' (1) Memories of Tyburn were also preserved by this small and partly aristocratic set of people, but with quiet and reserve. 'To the English at large they seemed not part of a vast organisation and a universal body, but an obscure half-foreign and negligible sect.' (2) The insularity of the English, both physical and metaphorical, encouraged the view that the Church of Rome should be seen as an alien religious body, even a potential political threat. It was better kept at a distance; best of all, forgotten.

Within the Church of England an abhorrence of the Roman Catholic Church was assumed to be right. Apart from its 'foreignness', the Roman Church was corrupt in its teachings with its unacceptable accretions to the Christian faith. There was, too, that residual fear of Papal tyranny and although members of the Church of England felt secure, they were ready to take up cudgels against the slightest whiff of popery.

Thinking High Churchmen justified their continued separation from Rome largely on the foregoing grounds and claimed their part in the Church Universal with some form of the Branch theory. Rome was acknowledged as a branch, but gnarled and distorted. There was also another viewpoint. For pre-Tractarian High Churchmen the Anglican theory represented a *via media* between rival theories of unity represented by Rome and Geneva.' (3) Thus they could accept the title of Protestant as indicating their rejection of Rome and accept too the title of Catholic as describing their membership of the wider

Church. Essential to their Protestantism was an acceptance of the heritage of the Reformation. They could thank God for belonging to a Church which had washed its face.

Such was Froude's inheritance as he grew up in Dartington Rectory. It is unlikely that he ever heard a good word spoken about the Church of Rome, and when he went up to Oriel and met Keble, the influence would be broadly similar in this respect. Keble was in love with the Church of England, so following his own father. He deepened Froude's understanding of its background by showing him its roots, especially in the early Church and that of the Nonjurors.

Froude's first opportunity of getting a foundation for an objective view of Rome came in 1827 with the lectures of Charles Lloyd, who pointed out the debt owed by the Prayer Book to the early liturgies. At the same time, together with Pusey and Robert Wilberforce, he learned about the Roman Breviary from Blanco White. For Froude this was the beginning of a lifelong appreciation of the Breviary and leading to its regular use.

There is very little evidence of Froude's stated views on Rome at this time. On St. Peter's day in 1831 he preached a sermon in which he described Peter as 'the rock on whom the Universal Church is built, the appointed shepherd of Christ's sheep'. (4) But whatever Froude or his friends believed about Rome, it is highly unlikely that any of them had any actual contact with its worship or anything more than an occasional meeting with a priest. The only known exception was Blanco White, formerly a Roman Catholic priest. The journey of Froude together with his father and Newman to the Mediterranean at the end of 1832 was, in effect, a first encounter with the Church of Rome for both of them.

Newman was profoundly affected by the visit, especially to the city of Rome where his ingrained prejudices were challenged. 'Is it possible that so serene and lofty a place is

the cage of unclean creatures?' he wrote to his sister Harriet. 'I will not believe it until I have evidence of it.' (5) Froude was impressed, yet by no means so deeply and intimately as Newman. But he was distressed by the behaviour of some of the priests in Naples, a city which Cardinal Wiseman acknowledged as 'not generally reputed the most edifying in its conduct'. (6)

Their seeking out of the then Dr. Wiseman at the English College is most difficult to understand. Newman's anti-papal views remained strong and deep in spite of his fascination with Rome as a city and Catholicism as a system. Froude, on the other hand, brought no such deep antagonism with him. Both appeared to have an incomprehensible lack of understanding of the Roman Church and what Froude took as their rejection by Wiseman, both surprised and hurt him. His flirtation with Rome, if that is what it was, had come to nothing. Keble's hold remained secure.

Wiseman's own description of that meeting shows that he was clearly impressed by his two unlikely visitors. He saw in them the potential first fruits of the Catholic revival within the Church of England, leading to conversion to Rome. 'From the day of Newman and Froude's visit to me, never for an instant did I waver in my conviction that a new era had commenced in England.' (7)

On his arrival back back in England, Froude's earlier discouragement turned to an eager desire to bring about change in the Church. The motto from Homer which he and Newman had chosen for the *Lyra Apostolica* reflected their intention: 'You shall know the difference, now that I am back again'. (8) A flurry of activity and discussion took place in that summer of 1833. The Movement had begun. The call to members of the Church of England, especially the clergy, to awareness of the apostolic succession and the divine commission of the Church, laid stress on its Catholic nature. As Dean Church observed, 'whatever the Church of Rome was abroad, it was here an intruder and a disturber'. (9)

On 22 August 1833 Newman sent Froude some papers later published in the *British Magazine* under the title *Home Thoughts Abroad* and containing the beginning of his ideas of the Via Media. His attitude to Rome was uncompromisingly hostile, but it called forth a spirited reply from Froude in defence of 'the poor Romanists':

You have first set them down as demoniacally possess'd by the evil genius of Pagan Rome, but notwithstanding are able to find some thing to admire in their spirit particularly because they apply ornament to its proper purposes - and then talk of the Churches - and all that is very well and one hopes one has heard the end of the name-calling when all [at] once you relapse into your protestantism and deal in what I take leave to call slang - I envy the mind which can kiss St Peter's foot with devotion, and do not believe that any Roman Catholic of education would tell you that he identified penitence and penance - in fact I know that they often preach against this very error as warmly as you could do. (10)

Froude was not able to dismiss what was becoming a growing unease. Shortly before he left for Barbados, he wrote to Newman and quoted Keble who admitted that 'if the Roman Catholics would revoke their anathemas we might reckon all the points of difference as Theological opinions'. (11) He was still clinging to the thought that the Church of Rome could waive those doctrines which caused difficulties to Catholic-minded outsiders like himself, in the interests of inter-communion. He needed more time to learn and to clarify his own beliefs. The eighteen months he spent in Barbados provided him with the opportunity. It was during this time that his attitude to Rome began to develop.

As for the Reformers, his attitude towards them had been growing ever more disdainful, until he came to lack all respect for them. They were in his eyes negative, denying and destructive both of doctrine and institutions. He began to seek to justify his developing idea of the Church, mainly in Scripture, in the medieval Church and in that of the Nonjurors. His letters began to contain references to Rome which revealed a growing appreciation of the claims of that Church and a consequent dissatisfaction with his own. The development was by no means constant and was mixed up with declarations of faith in the Church of England. But the idea of Rome would not go away.

It was shortly after his arrival in Barbados that he wrote openly and boldly to Keble:

It appears to me plain that in all matters that seem to us indifferent or even doubtful, we should conform our practices to those of the Church which has preserved its traditionary practices unbroken. We cannot know about any seemingly indifferent practice of the Church of Rome that it is not a development of the apostolic $\hat{\eta}\theta\omicron\varsigma$; and it is to no purpose to say that we can find no proof of it in the writings of the first six centuries; they must find a *disproof* if they would do any thing. (12)

Keble must have sensed what lay behind such words - in particular, the word 'development' - and cannot have been cheered. Yet there remained conflict in Froude's mind, for later in the same month, in a letter to Newman, he sought to uphold the authority of Canterbury and deny that claimed by the Pope.

Does not the Archbishop of Cant. [Canterbury] claim Patriarchal authority (qualem qualem) over as large a portion of the Globe as ever the Bishop of Rome did ? and are not the Colonial Bishops just as much exonerated from their oath of canonical obedience, by proving that there is no universal Bishop recognised in Scripture, as ever Cranmer was ?
(13)

This mood of defensiveness turned to a condemnation of the Whigs in England for having 'taken up all the froth that has been secreted in the fermentation of human thought. Puritanism, Latitudinarianism, Popery, Infidelity; they have it all now, and good luck to them'. (14)

His main problem with Rome lay in the papal claims. Other parts of the Roman faith seemed to cause him no trouble, with the exception of transubstantiation. In May 1834 he asked Keble to send him some Tracts together with a copy of *The Christian Year* and 'also the parts *autumnalis* and *hyemalis* of my Breviary' - a clear indication that he was using it for his own devotions.(15) His obvious appreciation of the Breviary contrasted with his views on the Prayer Book which all High Churchmen regarded as the jewel in the crown of their Church. He quoted with evident sympathy Newman's view 'about regarding our present Communion Service etc as a judgement on the Church and taking it and the crumbs from the Apostles table . . . If I was a Roman Catholic Priest I should

look on the administration of the communion in one kind in the same light'. (16) Keble had some sympathy with this attitude but expressed himself more positively in the Preface to the second volume of the *Remains*: 'The regret we feel in some particulars is a price which must be paid for the unspeakable consciousness of the blessing yet vouchsafed to us in those which are most essential'. (17)

Lloyd's lectures had sown seeds, but some of the resulting shoots would have been unwelcome to him. In a letter to his friend J.F.Christie at the end of 1834, Froude wrote: 'I verily believe that he [Perceval] would now gladly consent to see our Communion Service replaced by a good translation of the liturgy of St. Peter; a name which I advise you to substitute in your notes to --- for the obnoxious phrase "Mass Book" '. (18)

In the early part of 1835 Froude wrote Tract 63, *The Antiquity of the Existing Liturgies*. Using William Palmer's *Origines Liturgicae*, which was itself a development of Lloyd's work, he sought to point out the deficiencies of the Prayer Book in comparison with the ancient liturgies.

While Palmer's ambition in his *Origines* was to demonstrate the continuity between the ancient rites of the Church and that of the Prayer Book, Froude was only interested in the ancient rites. His point is that these all unanimously teach the eucharistic presence and sacrifice, or as he expressed it more freely in a letter, that they 'are a death-blow to Protestantism'. It is the ancient anaphoras, and not the English rite that, according to Froude, 'next to the Holy Scriptures . . . possess the greatest claims on our veneration and study'. (19)

The Reformers had cut the Church off from many of the early traditions which the Prayer Book still reflected in part. He sought to query the authority of the Prayer Book as a source of Church teaching, since the basis for such authority was nothing more than an Act of Parliament and the assent of the clergy. But even though he felt that the Breviary and the Missal had more authority than the Prayer Book he could still tell Keble that 'we are Catholics without the Popery, and Church-of-England men without the Protestantism'. (20)

While Froude was thus displaying a remarkably sympathetic attitude towards the Church of Rome, yet clinging to his own Church, Newman's mind was entering its deep turmoil. How was he to understand Rome? As 'Light of the wide West, or heinous error seat'? (21) He was increasingly disillusioned with his own Church, yet his attitude to Rome remained deeply suspicious. In August 1835 he met 'a Mr. Maguire, a Roman Catholic priest of the College of St. Edmund's, near Ware . . . I see in him the very same spirit I saw in Dr. Wiseman, the spirit of the cruel Church. I believe he would willingly annihilate the English Church. Keble and I puzzled him; whether we enlightened him, I doubt'. (22) In contrast, Froude was openly positive. While condemning the Roman Catholics for 'excommunicating us', he told Newman that 'if they would give up this I think they are indefinitely the purest Church of the two'. (23)

Both Froude and Newman were attracted to Rome and at the same time repelled - Newman more than Froude. It was the latter who was the first of the Tractarians to look at Rome with any real approval or understanding. His 'keen and deep sense of shortcomings at home disposed him to claim equity and candour in judging of the alleged faults and corruptions of the Church abroad', wrote Dean Church. 'It did more, it disposed him - naturally enough, but still unfairly, and certainly without adequate knowledge - to treat Roman shortcomings with an indulgence which he refused to the English.' (24)

His West Indian isolation encouraged Froude in becoming ever more and more independent of his mentor, Keble, and ever more forthright in his correspondence with Newman. Both he and Newman found the Thirty Nine Articles troublesome. In March 1835 Froude made one of the most startling suggestions in all his correspondence: a direct appeal to the Pope.

It occurred to me the other day that one might send a Latin petition to the Pope confessing one's interpretation of the 39 Articles (Which by the by the Jesuit Francis Santa Clara showed to be 'patient if not ambitious of a Catholic meaning' and apparently Laud did not think the interpretation over strained vid Heylin) and opinions on divers subjects, and praying that one might be allowed to communicate in their Churches. (25)

It may be unfair to read too much into this. It was only something which 'occurred' to him, yet he was sufficiently intrigued by the thought to put pen to paper and send it to Newman. It also shows his continuing desire to be accepted to communion in Rome. His reference to 'the Jesuit Francis Santa Clara' (who was in fact a Franciscan as he might have guessed from his name) was the name in religion of Dr. Christopher Davenport, a seventeenth century convert from the Church of England who maintained good relationships with a number of his former co-religionists.

There was, for Froude, one perceptible difference between the two Churches which was not doctrinal, yet lay at the heart of true religion: the presence of holiness. Writing from Barbados, he showed himself ill at ease with what he perceived to be its particular nature within his own Church. 'Must it not be owned that the Church of England Saints, however good in essentials, are with a few rare exceptions deficient in the austere beauty of the Catholic ἡθός? K. will be severe on me for this . . .' (26)

Less than six months before his death, he could not but correct his friend Newman, and seek to draw him to a fuller and kindlier understanding of Rome:

Before I finish I must enter another protest against your cursing and swearing at the end of the first via media as you do - What good can it do? and I call it uncharitable to an excess. How mistaken we may ourselves be on many points that are only gradually opening on us. Surely one should reserve 'blasphemous' 'impious' etc for denials of the Articles of Faith. (27)

Froude's early death left his friends - and his enemies - with a question which was impossible to answer, yet equally impossible to resist: Would he, like Newman and many others, have joined the Church of Rome ? Or would he, like Keble, have remained in the Church of his birth ? In the Preface to the first volume of the *Remains* published in 1838 the editors pre-empted the expected accusations of Romanism:

. . . these Remains, it will be found, bear a peculiarly strong testimony against the actual system of Rome; strong, as coming from one who was disposed to make every fair allowance in that Church's favour; who was

looking and longing for some fuller development of Catholic principles than he could easily find, but who was soon obliged to confess, with undissembled mortification and disappointment, that such development was not to be looked for in Rome. (28)

Froude's father naturally defended his son's adherence to the Church of England. But it seems more than possible that the son had not confided his innermost thoughts and feelings to his father as he did to his friends, especially Keble and Newman. In a letter to Sir John Coleridge, the Archdeacon declared himself to be ignorant of his son's ever holding up the Church of Rome to approbation:

A departure from some of the practices of the early Christians observed by the Roman Church, and the neglect of ordinances prescribed by our own ritual, I have often heard him condemn in strong terms; but neither abroad nor at home did I ever know him to be the apologist of the Papal Church, much less hold it up to approbation, except for its zeal and unity. His professed aim was to follow, as closely as authorities could guide him, the practice of the early Christian Church. In our own, Bishop Bull and the Non-jurors were, I think, the patterns he proposed to himself for everything that was noble and disinterested in temporal, and sound in doctrinal, matters: but I feel I am quite unable to explain or defend the notions he had formed on these important subjects. (29)

In his *Autobiography* his good and faithful friend Isaac Williams dissociated himself from those who believed that Froude would have joined the Church of Rome, had he lived. 'But this I do not at all think. There was a seriousness and steadfastness at the bottom in Froude, so that I had always confidence in him.' A footnote to this comment was added in 1859. 'I find that John Keble and others quite agree with me that there was that in Hurrell Froude that he could not have joined the Church of Rome.' (30)

A later estimate from the calm and judicious mind of Dean Church put a very Anglican slant on Froude's views. While dismissing out of hand the thought that he had any intention of joining the Church of Rome, he concluded by suggesting that he was, in fact - very much like Dean Church.

[Froude] was accused, as was most natural, of Romanising; of wishing to bring back Popery. It is perfectly certain that this is not what he meant, though he did not care for the imputation of it. He was, perhaps, the first Englishman who attempted to do justice to Rome, and to use friendly language of it, without the intention of joining it. But what he fought for

was not Rome, not even a restoration of unity, but a Church of England such as it was conceived of by the Caroline divines and the Non-jurors. (31)

Such was a comforting view, but it did not take into account all that Froude himself wrote. The Nonjurors were really a 'fall back' position for him. His reading of history led him to seek for a Church in past times, but he had to live in the present. His understanding of Rome was certainly flawed and incomplete, as witness his expectations during his visit to Wiseman in Rome. But it is impossible to deny the constant Romeward trend in what he wrote towards the end of his life. Yet even in these same years, there was apparent contradiction. In September 1834 Froude wrote to Arthur Perceval:

If I was to assign my reason for belonging to the Church of England in preference to any other religious community, it would be simply this, that she has retained an apostolical clergy, and exacts no sinful terms of communion; whereas, on the one hand, the Romanists, though retaining an apostolical clergy, do exact sinful terms of communion; and on the other, no other religious community has retained such a clergy. (32)

A similar view is expressed in one of his undated *Sayings in Conversation*:

Of course no one could join the Church of Rome, while it retains its anathemas. Only consider what it comes to as regards friends departed. I never could be a Romanist; I never could think all those things in Pope Pius' Creed necessary to salvation. But I do not see what harm an ordinary Romanist gets from thinking so. (33)

His opposition to Rome as seen in these two statements, is based on a rejection of the Council of Trent and the unyielding nature of the Roman terms of communion. The question of authority was never settled by Froude to his satisfaction, but a recognition of his distancing himself from the Church of England was offered in later years by his younger and sceptical brother, Anthony:

This I am sure of, that . . . when it became clear to him that if his conception of the Church, and if its rights and position, was true at all, it was not true of the Church of England in which he was born, and that he must renounce his theory as visionary or join another communion, he would not have 'minimised' the Roman doctrines that they might be more

easy for him to swallow, or have explained away plain propositions till they meant anything or nothing. Whether he would have swallowed them or not I cannot say; I was not eighteen when he died, and I do not so much as form an opinion about it; but his course, whatever it was, would have been direct and straightforward; he was a man far more than a theologian; and if he had gone, he would have gone with his whole heart and conscience, unassisted by subtleties and nice distinctions. It is, however, at least equally possible that he would not have gone at all. (34)

Newman was converted to the Church of Rome nine years after Froude's death in 1836. It had cost him a great deal of anguish and soul searching. But Froude was a different sort of man. Newman tells us that 'he had no turn for theology as such', that 'he had no appreciation of the writings of the Fathers' nor of the development of doctrine, nor even of the 'definite traditions of the Church'. Had he lived, Froude could not have maintained the fluid, yet increasingly sympathetic, attitude towards the Church of Rome which he held at the time of his death. He might even have been the cause of an earlier secession to Rome by Newman. A restless Froude remaining with Canterbury at the same time as a Newman finally reconciled to Rome is difficult to envisage. We can but guess at a future which never happened.

XII THE ETHOS OF CATHOLICISM

Less than fifty years after Froude's death, Dean Church was beginning his account of the Oxford Movement. He had known Newman quite well, but Froude was to him a distant figure, yet one whose importance he clearly recognised. Lord Blachford had been Froude's pupil, and Church asked him for the account which appears in his book. 'It seems to me that so memorable a person ought to be duly had in remembrance', he told him, 'and people now hardly recognise how much he had to do with the first stir'. (1)

At the time of his death, his friends were profoundly affected, not only by the cutting short of so young a life - for this had long been expected - but for the realisation that his particular character and mind would no longer be with them. On the day he heard of Froude's death, Newman wrote to Samuel Rickards: 'I never can have such a loss, for no one is there else in the whole world but he whom I could look forward to as a *contubernalis* for my whole life'. (2) In Froude he had found a complementary mind and a stimulant as well as a security which was more influential than Keble. He wrote to his friend, John Bowden: 'It is very mysterious that anyone so remarkably and variously gifted, and with talents so fitted for these times, should be removed. I never on the whole fell in with so gifted a person - in variety and perfection of gifts I think he far exceeded even Keble - for myself, I cannot describe what I owe to him as regards the intellectual principles of religion and morals . . . every thing was so bright and beautiful about him, that to think of him must always be a comfort'. (3)

On the Sunday after hearing of Froude's death, Keble broke down at the altar in Hursley church. Tom Mozley described the atmosphere at Oriel as being 'not a gloom, but a calm sadness'. 'I dare say there is no one who has said more severe and cutting things to me', he wrote to his sister Maria, 'yet the constant impression Froude has always left on my mind is that of kindness and *sweetness*'.

Many years later Anne Mozley was moved to pay a fulsome tribute:

Little as his pen did, short as his life was, those who can recall the time feel the influence of his mere presence to have been essential to the original impulse which set all going. They cannot imagine the start without his forwarding, impelling look and voice. His presence impressed persons as a *spiritual*, though living, influence. He stands distinct, apart in the memory of those who can recall it, the more that years did not dim the brightness and fire which became him so well in his office as inspirer. (5)

Hurrell Froude had inherited from his father's side a lack of sympathy towards the feelings of others, that 'severe and cutting side' which Tom Mozley had experienced. But there was also within him a sensitivity which he struggled to conceal. He once confessed to Keble that 'I am, and always have been, childishly alive to the pain of being despised'. (6)

Throughout his life he was driven by a remorseless sense of logic within the context of a Christian faith. He never gave any indication in his writings that he entertained any doubts about the basic truths of Christianity. In his *Occasional Thoughts* of 1826 he wrote: 'That a Being exists endued with power and wisdom, the limits of which we cannot reach to, is, I think, more certain than that we have fellow creatures'. (7) His understanding of the nature of God betrayed an aridity of concept and an overwhelming sense of the might of God rather than of his love. It is significant that he rarely mentioned the name of Jesus Christ.

Some thirty years after Froude's death, Frederick Oakeley, then a Roman Catholic, wrote that '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 that of a Christian living in the full sunshine of Gospel privileges'. (8) Froude's own approach to religion was too purely intellectual to represent the wholeness of truth. He always sought for an authority beyond himself, being all too aware of the limits of private judgement. His own vehement attacks on rationalism in religion could be interpreted as betraying a mind which was itself prey to

rationalistic thoughts. Newman certainly believed this to be the case as he told Keble while Froude's papers were being prepared for publication:

These 'Thoughts' present a remarkable instance of the temptation to Rationalism, self-speculation, &c., subdued. We see his mind only breaking out into more original and beautiful discoveries, from that very repression which at first sight seemed likely to be the utter prohibition to exercise his special powers. He used playfully to say that 'his highest ambition was to be a humdrum,' and by relinquishing the prospect of originality he has but become more original. (9)

There was ever within Froude a deep and sincere desire for holiness and this revealed itself in a number of ways apart from his early attempts at asceticism. As both he and Newman came to have more influence within the Oriel Common Room, so the atmosphere there changed. It was the Apostolicals (Froude's word) who changed the former liberality of wine and thought to a greater frugality in the consumption of the former and more caution in the latter. They were deeply concerned with the ethos of the place and, according to Tom Mozley, discussed the subject continually. They feared the destructiveness of liberalism and the manner in which old beliefs were criticised. Truth, they believed, could only flourish in an atmosphere of holiness and respect for the ways of the early Christian Church.

Another aspect of Froude's thirst for holiness was an eternal dissatisfaction within himself which he communicated unwittingly to others. Isaac Williams recalled Samuel Wilberforce saying that 'they talk of Froude's fun, but somehow I cannot be in a room with him alone for ten minutes without feeling so intensely melancholy, that I do not know what to do with myself. At Brightstone, in my Eden days, he was with me, and I was overwhelmed with the deep sense which possessed him of yearning which nothing could satisfy and of the unsatisfying nature of all things'. (10)

But Froude was part of a unique concurrence of ideas and people in Oxford during the early years of the 1830s. Of those whom we understand as initiators of the Oxford Movement, the learned William Palmer of Worcester and the judicious Hugh James

Rose were not without influence, but the focal point of it all was the three Fellows of Oriel: Keble, Newman and Froude. They all approved the social order, yet could not but resist when that very order so changed Parliament that there was the possibility of the Church being governed by those who were not members of the Established Church. Their opposition was both political and ecclesiastical. Furthermore, they were becoming increasingly conscious of new stirrings which they believed, on the one hand, could lead to an abhorred liberalism of thought with the consequent destruction of the Church's faith, or, on the other hand, to the recovery of what was true because given to mankind by God. In his *Nineteenth-Century Studies*, Basil Willey set the incipient movement in context:

The movement was, in fact, a part of that great deepening of seriousness, that impulse to come to grips with history, with the unseen, and with the fundamentals of the general human plight, which showed itself also as the French Revolution, as Romanticism, and as Evangelicalism. That other and older Oxford Movement, the Methodist, had begun with the same glow and warming of the heart, but occurring in the eighteenth century it had other tasks to perform, and could melt the spiritual ice-pack by reaffirming the old Protestant certainties. Tractarianism, if only because it followed the revolutionary and romantic upheavals, was bound to be more scholastic, dogmatic, and ecclesiastical - in a word, more 'Catholic'. (11)

One of the consequences of Froude's death which spread his views abroad was the publication of his papers in the *Remains*. His father had handed them to Newman and did not object to their publication. Although both Keble and Newman who were joint editors must have been aware of the explosive nature of the opinions expressed, yet they felt it right to proceed with publication. Sheridan Gilley judges it to have been 'an event which was to be a disaster for their party, but was a long and deeply meditated one . . . To Newman, Froude's every word was alive with the sound of his voice and the delight of his presence, but the public merely had the bald print before them, and the "biting epigrams caused foe to exult and friend to shrink" '. (12) In the Preface to the second part of the *Remains*, Newman and Keble could only write that 'it was a publication of some importance for good or for evil'. (13)

When the *Remains* appeared in two parts in 1838 and 1839 there arose an uproar compounded of anger and merriment, of disgust and delight. W.G. Ward was overjoyed to read Froude's views, for in them he found a kindred spirit. Lord Blachford described Ward's reaction at that time: 'He found in Froude's *Remains* a good deal of his own Radicalism (though nothing at all of his own Utilitarianism or Liberalism) and it seemed *literally* to make him jump for joy'. Ward himself wrote to Pusey: 'Out came Froude of which it is little to say that it delighted me more than any book of the kind I ever read'. (14)

Other readers found no cause for joy; for them it called forth anger and scornful laughter at Froude's early and earnest attempts at asceticism. They discovered in the *Remains* views which had never before been expressed in print. He spurned and castigated the English Reformers whom the Church of England saw as the pillars of their Church. He saw them as having been destructive of so much which was good and true within the life of the Church, especially regarding the Eucharist. He displayed increasing admiration for the old enemy, the Church of Rome. Dr Faussett, Margaret Professor of Divinity, roundly condemned these views in a sermon which was immediately answered by a pamphlet from Newman. Yet it is interesting that those who regarded Froude as a traitor to his own Church did not accuse Keble of any share in such treachery. Newman wrote of 'that early venerated long-loved friend together with whom I edited a work which, more perhaps than any other, caused disturbance and annoyance in the Anglican world, Froude's *Remains*; yet, however judgment might run as to the prudence of publishing it, I never heard any one impute to Mr. Keble the very shadow of dishonesty or treachery towards his church in so acting'. (15)

Froude's thinking was profoundly affected by what can only be described as his insularity. His very character was individualistic in spite of sharing common ideals with his fellow Tractarians. His isolation was increased by his lack of relationships with others outside his immediate circle of family and friends. Both Newman and Keble had their parish work and thus had contact with a wider, if less intellectual, world. Froude's

insularity was further increased by his continuing poor health, and more literally by the eighteen months he spent on the island of Barbados. W.G. Roe levels the accusation of insularity against both Newman and Keble. Even Newman 'often gave the impression in his correspondence that the world extended no further than London, and Keble, who exercised such great influence over others, remained to the end of his life largely self-contained. The *Tracts for the Times* dealt almost exclusively with matters of doctrine and practice relevant only to English churchmen'. (16) As for Keble, it was said that he had never travelled further than Bournemouth.

Newman was generous in his acknowledgement of Froude's influence upon him in the *Apologia* where we also see a reflection of Froude himself:

His opinions arrested and influenced me, even when they did not gain my assent . . . It is difficult to enumerate the precise additions to my theological creed which I derived from a friend to whom I owe so much. He made me look with admiration towards the Church of Rome, and in the same degree to dislike the Reformation. He fixed deep in me the idea of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and he led me gradually to believe in the Real Presence. (17)

Newman's personal dependence on Froude was immense. He needed people whom he both liked and trusted to support him. In Mary Church's *Life and Letters of Dean Church*, she recalled that at a much later period there was 'on Cardinal Newman's side . . . still the frank confidence and reliance on sympathy and counsel which had belonged to the old Oxford days'. (18) It was a great trial to Newman when Froude went to Barbados. His importance to Newman, and through Newman to the future of the movement, is instanced in their exchange of letters just before Froude set sail in November 1833. The Tracts had been arousing opposition which had depressed Newman. He expected it from his foreseen opponents, but not from his supposed supporters. 'I am in the midst of trouble', he told Froude. 'Palmer musters the 2s in great force against the Tracts, and some Evangelicals . . . (He) wishes us to stop them . . . I want advice sadly. I have no confidence in any one. If I could be sure of 5 or 6 vigorous co-operators in various parts, I would laugh at opposition . . . Do give me some advice

and encouragement . . . My dear F. - I so fear I may be self willed in this matter of the Tracts - pray do advise me according to your light.' (19)

Newman's letter was a genuine signal of distress. With Keble no longer in Oxford, his isolation from support was more than he felt he could bear. Froude's reply was swift and vigorous: 'If old Palmer is determined to be carried away by Z dissimulations we must cut him loose . . . As to giving up the tracts the notion is odious'. (20) Froude set sail and the Tracts continued. Piers Brendon sees this as a crisis point in the movement. Froude's strengthening of Newman's resolve rescued the Tracts from possible oblivion and with them, the movement itself.

The battle which had emerged over the previous six months was not so much a battle against the establishment of the Church of England, but rather against its distortion. The Tractarians were supportive of such an arrangement, but only in so far as the Church was free from outside interference. Froude's eighteen months in Barbados gave him time to think and write, but it also necessarily isolated him from critical minds. Even so, he realised, as did the other Tractarians, that the Church meant far more than the possession of a valid ministry and sacraments. It must possess that holiness which he had met in Keble and perhaps in his memories of his mother. But he could not find the heroic sanctity and asceticism in his own Church which he believed he recognised within the saints of the Church of Rome. The Church was a living and organic unity and its life was more than technical validity.

As their view of the Church developed into the conception of a living spirit-bearing body, so their interest also moved from the formal notes of the Church to its actual spiritual state. Their growing dissatisfaction with the English Church in its actual state may be seen as a result of their perception of the 'discrepancy between their spiritual conception of Catholicity and its institutional embodiment in Anglicanism'. Concerned as they were for the spiritual welfare of the people and for the Church's saving task among their contemporaries, a mere formal catholicity was clearly insufficient. (21)

Froude realised something of the impossibility of 'a mere formal catholicity'. But his response lay partly in recommending the reintroduction of a form of discipline which had largely been allowed to atrophy. Yet he had often strained against the leash of the Establishment and he knew that if ever that link were to be broken, the Church would be responsible for a form of discipline which had been blunted through the Church's connection with the State. But as his brother Anthony observed, 'he belonged himself to the class whose business was to order rather than obey. If his own bishop had interfered with him, his theory of episcopal authority would have been found inapplicable in that particular instance'. (22)

It is too easy to dismiss Froude's views on the obedience of the laity as absurd. They were unrealistic and they reflected his often impractical attitude to Church affairs, but they also reflected a very serious understanding which he had of obedience within religion. He saw obedience as a necessary way to God, just as he saw belief as the only real path to true understanding of God and the things of God. W.G. Ward expressed what was surely Froude's own view in a sermon preached in about 1839:

Obedience comes first, knowledge afterwards. It is by being pure in heart that we see God, not by seeing God that we first become pure in heart . . . Obedience is the very air in which religious faith lives; without obedience it languishes and dies . . . He who learns the truth from argument or mere trust in men may lose it again by argument or by trust in men; but he who learns it by obedience can lose it only by disobedience. (23)

But obedience would have been no guard against the most fundamental fear which possessed all the Tractarians. They saw private judgement and rationalism as destructive of God's truth. It was man's duty to seek and recognise the truth which God had given to his Church. But members of the Church of England had no defining authority apart from the *Book of Common Prayer* and the Thirty Nine Articles. The problem, especially with the latter, was that each man had his own interpretation. A Protestant-minded man may accept the Articles and yet Froude was willing to petition the Pope with Dr Christopher Davenport's interpretation of them in a Catholic sense.

Newman's attempt to give them a Catholic interpretation in *Tract XC* only confirmed the lack of definition in the Anglican formularies. Froude was clearly one of those who saw such lack of definition as a papering over of fundamental disagreements, and therefore essentially dishonest.

Froude's mind was such that he saw truth in sharply delineated terms. Although he lived at the start of the idea of human progress which had originated with the Enlightenment, but which was made more clear in England with the results of the Industrial Revolution and the advancement of science, he would not have supported such an interpretation of history. For him, as for all the Tractarians, the correct understanding of history was an apocalyptic one. With his view of mankind he could never have accepted the idea of any form of moral progress. History was a story of the battle between good and evil. It was a part of the cosmic drama between God and all that was opposed to God. The history of mankind had a centre point in the Incarnation. It was this wondrous intervention by God which also had as a consequence, the foundation of the Church with its message of truth and its sacraments for the salvation of all men. The teachings of the Church could never be jettisoned in the face of scientific progress and discovery.

For Froude, rationalism meant the rejection of truths which God had given to mankind. Man was made for God and even if rationalistic arguments convinced him of the truth of the Gospel, the deeper and surer reason for its acceptance was that it answered man's deepest needs. In this he was at one with W.G. Ward who enthusiastically welcomed Froude's thinking. Both would have agreed that the majority of mankind would not be affected by arguments about the Apostolic Succession or the validity of the sacraments. The Church's features had to be, in Ward's words, 'very simple, obvious and intelligible'. But Froude never managed so to express himself. In a sense he was the prisoner of his insularity and the expression of his thinking was all too often theoretical.

An exception to this last statement is to be found in his eucharistic theology and its application. His language about the Eucharist took wings and he was emphatic about its

centrality within Christian worship. His forceful emphasis on this was most unusual, if not unique, within the Church of his time. His reading of Jewel and Hoadly among others had convinced him of the poverty of the Protestant understanding of the Eucharist. The more he contemplated the Eucharistic gift, so much the more he emphasised its necessity.

His ecclesiological ideas had been deeply affected by his reading for his life of Becket. The medieval Church attracted him as being an ideal form. More and more did he come to think of the Church as being a self-contained kingdom within the world. For him its teaching and authority knew no national bounds, and at the heart of its life was the Eucharist. Thus he came to express himself in ways which went far beyond any traditional thinking within the Church of England.

An universal rule had been laid down by our Lord, unlimited in its application either as to time, persons, or circumstances, in virtue of which the Church was erected into an independent court of judicature, supreme as far as Christians were concerned, in all causes and over all persons, civil as well as ecclesiastical. (24)

In his biography of his father, Wilfrid Ward described Froude's picture of the medieval Church which was also a realisation of his own beliefs and realisations:

[It] was that of an absolute, independent spiritual authority, direct, uncompromising, explicit in its decrees, in contrast with the uncertain voice of the English Church with its hundred shades of opinions differing from and even opposed to each other. Instead of groping with the feeble light of human reason amid texts of uncertain signification, he interpreted Scripture by the aid of constant tradition, and of the Church's divine illumination. The stand for moral goodness against vice and worldliness was witnessed in the highest and most ideal types of sanctity in Church history. The personal struggle of the ordinary Christian against his evil inclinations was systematised and brought to perfection in Catholic ascetic works. The doctrine of a supernatural world and supernatural influences was not minimised, as though one feared to tax human powers of belief; it was put forth in the fullest and most fearless manner. Angels and saints, as ministers of supernatural help, were recognised, and their various offices in aiding and protecting us and listening to our prayers on all occasions forced on the attention constantly, in the Catholic system. There was no mistiness or haze or

hesitation. All was clear, complete, definite, carried out to its logical consequences. (25)

Such a description never came from Froude's pen, yet it is but the obvious deduction from so many of his beliefs and from the way in which his thinking was tending, especially towards the end of his life. This being so, it is strange that he never embraced the Church of Rome. His admiration for that Church was clear in spite of Newman's serious reservations. There is no evidence of any sentimental attachment to Rome, either as a city or to its practices such as Newman came to have. But if his thinking did not admit sentiment, he became increasingly persuaded that the Church of Rome was heir to a true tradition of belief and holiness. He readily accepted the idea of the infallibility of the Church of the Apostles and of the early Fathers, as did Newman. But he could never accept the infallibility of the Pope. He did not see the Pope as the anti-Christ, as did Newman for many years. Rather was he a distant figure of authority whose position within the Church of Rome he could never accept as consonant with his understanding of Catholicism.

Froude's concept of the Church was never fully developed within his own mind, nor was it always coherent. As a High Churchman he would surely, if pressed to do so, have professed some form of the branch theory. Yet he would never have dismissed the Church of Rome as simply an impostor in England, at least towards the end of his life. Nor would he have been able to accept Newman's concept of the *Via Media* which saw the Church of England as holding the truth in a sort of tension between Protestantism and the Church of Rome.

Froude had never had any sympathy with a policy of moderation and compromise. His way was not a *Via Media*, but a *Via Ultima*, a steep and narrow way which went straight ahead to its goal without turning aside for any obstacle. And this Froudean extremism was really more characteristic of the original spirit of the Oxford Movement, as shown in the *Lyra Apostolica* and the first *Tracts for the Times*, than the *Via Media* itself. (26)

Froude's contribution to the Oxford Movement is all too often overshadowed by the stature of Newman. Yet without Froude the Movement might never have developed. It was Froude's personality and incisiveness which upheld Newman against opposition and which challenged him to expand his ecclesiological horizons. If he was not as deep a thinker as Newman, he was able to challenge his friend to new and deeper thoughts. This is not to dismiss Froude's own thinking as of little consequence. If he had but lived as long as Newman, the consequences of his mature thinking and more rounded concepts could not have been anything but yet more influential.

Froude seemed to find in Catholic teaching almost an echo of what was already within him. It only needed developing; the seed was already there. He possessed almost an instinct regarding the recognition of Catholicism. His thought, as Gauthier points out, was less a continuing evolution than the development and enrichment of an initial intuition.

It is difficult to resist the conclusion that, had he lived, he would have gone over to Rome. But such speculation is of little consequence, however tempting. It was the ethos of Catholicism which drew him. That he did not find it embodied within any Church might well be taken as evidence of the private judgement which he so abhorred, rather than the exercise of obedient acceptance of God's revelation which he constantly sought.

REFERENCES

I EARLY INFLUENCES

1. J.C.D.Clark, *English Society 1688 - 1832* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1985), p.136.
2. Peter B.Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1994), p.307.
3. J.Walsh, C.Haydon and S.Taylor (eds.), *The Church of England, c.1689 - c.1833* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1993), pp.4f.
4. *Ibid.*, p.14.
5. Peter Virgin, *The Church in an Age of Negligence* (James Clarke & Co.: Cambridge, 1989), p.155.
6. Walsh, Haydon and Taylor, p.78.
7. J.H.Overton, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, p.8.
(quoted in Y. Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival* (Longmans: London,1933), p.9.).
8. J.A.Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, vol.iv (Longmans: London,1893), p.237.
9. R.W.Church, *The Oxford Movement* (Macmillan: London,1909), p.1 (footnote).
10. J.A.Froude, *Short Studies*, vol. iv, pp.295, 302.
11. *Ibid.*, p.240f.
12. J.T.Coleridge, *A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble M.A.* (James Parker: Oxford, 1870), p.111.
13. J.A.Froude, *Short Studies*, vol. iv, p.242.
14. Louise I.Guiney, *Hurrell Froude* (Methuen: London, 1904), p.11.
15. Coleridge, p.111.
16. R.H.Froude, *Remains of the late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude, M.A.* 2 parts in 4 vols. (Rivington: London, 1838 and 1839), vol.i. p.4f.
17. Guiney, p.6.
18. W.H.Dunn, *James Anthony Froude* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1961), p.18.
19. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.8.

II TO ORIEL - AND KEBLE

1. G.Prevoist (ed.), *The Autobiography of Isaac Williams B.D.* (Longmans, Green, & Co: London,1893), p.18.
2. G.Faber, *Oxford Apostles* (Faber & Faber: London, 1936), p.88.
3. W.Lock, *John Keble*, (Methuen: London, 1893), p.19.
4. Tom Mozley, *Reminiscences chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement* 2 vols. (Longmans: London, 1882), vol.i, p.220.
5. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.177.
6. *Ibid.*, p.179.
7. O.Chadwick, *The Victorian Church* Part 1 (A.&C. Black: London,1971), p.174.
8. Church, p.31.
9. Froude Papers at the Birmingham Oratory, 30 October 1826 (quoted in P.Brendon, *Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement* (Paul Elek: London, 1974), p.69)
10. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.197.

11. Y. Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival* (Longmans: London, 1933), p.77.
12. Mark Pattison, *Memoirs* (London, 1885), p.78f. (quoted in Brilioth, p.78).
13. Faber, p.102.
14. Church, p.71.
15. J.H.Newman, *Apologia pro vita sua* (J.M.Dent & Sons: London, 1912), p.37.
16. *Ibid.*, p.35.
17. Froude, *Remains*, II. p.237.
18. Anne Mozley (ed.), *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman* 2 vols. (Longmans: London, 1891), vol.i, p.130.

III AT ORIEL - WITH NEWMAN

1. Anne Mozley, I. p.131.
2. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.199.
3. Newman, *Apologia*, p.39.
4. Meriol Trevor, *Newman The Pillar of the Cloud* (Macmillan: London, 1962), p.79.
5. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.69.
6. Newman, *Apologia*, p.47.
7. *Ibid.*, p.47.
8. Faber, p.222.
9. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.101.
10. *Lyra Apostolica*, xxxv.
11. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.126.
12. J.H.Newman, *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman* (edd. Ker and Gornall) (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1979 - 1981), II. p.125.
13. *Ibid.*, p.130.
14. Prevost, pp.49ff.
15. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, II. p.260.
16. *Ibid.*, p.89.
17. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, III. p.92.
18. J.H.L. Rowlands, *Church, State and Society* (Churchman: Worthing, 1989), p.120.
19. J.B. Mozley, *Essays Historical and Theological*, vol.i. p.xvii. (quoted in Brendon, p.112).
20. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, III. pp.99f.

IV HOME THOUGHTS ABROAD

1. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.258f.
2. *Ibid.*, p.266.
3. *Ibid.*, p.282.
4. *Ibid.*, p.287.
5. *Ibid.*, p.293f.
6. *Ibid.*, p.296.
7. *Lyra Apostolica*, clxxiv.
8. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, III. p.284.
9. Froude, *Remains*, I. pp.306ff.
10. W.Palmer, *A Narrative of Events connected with the publication of the Tracts for the Times* (Rivington: London, 1883), p.40.

11. N. Wiseman, *Essays on Various Subjects*, II. p.93 (quoted in C. Dawson, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement* (Sheed and Ward: London, 1945), p.50).
12. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, III. p.284.
13. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.303.
14. *Ibid.*, p.312.
15. Dawson, p.61.
16. W.G.Roe, *Lamennais and England* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1966), p.94.
17. *Ibid.*, p.99.
18. Froude, *Remains*, III. pp.403ff.

V 'ISAAC, WE MUST MAKE A ROW IN THE WORLD'

1. Palmer, pp.97ff.
2. Church, p.92.
3. *Lyra Apostolica*, lxxix.
4. Prevost, p.63.
5. Dawson, p.70.
6. Church, p.98.
7. Dawson, p.72.
8. Palmer, pp.39f.
9. *Ibid.*, p.101(footnote).
10. S.C.Carpenter, *Church and People, 1789 - 1889*, p.113.
11. Letter of R.H. Froude to J.F. Christie, 22 July 1833. Birmingham Oratory ms. 41 (quoted in Pierre Gauthier, *La Pensée Religieuse de Richard Hurrell Froude* (Editions Beauchesne: Paris, 1977), p.67).
12. J.B.Mozley, pp.xxiiff.
13. Letter of Keble to Sir John Coleridge, January 1833. Bodleian, ms. Eng. Lett. d.134, f. 238 (quoted in Brendon, p.95).
14. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. pp.20f.
15. Gauthier, p.68.
16. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.16.
17. *Ibid.*, p.224.
18. *Ibid.*, p.42.
19. *Ibid.*, p.50.
20. Gauthier, p.74.
21. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.52.
22. *Ibid.*, p.51.
23. Newman, *Apologia*, p.59.
24. *Ibid.*, p.59.
25. *Ibid.*, p.59.
26. *Ibid.*, p.47.
27. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.82.
28. *Ibid.*, p.38.
29. A.M.Allchin, *The Silent Rebellion* (S.C.M: London, 1958), p.58.
30. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.98.
31. *Ibid.*, p.99.
32. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.46.
33. *Ibid.*, p.38.
34. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.328.
35. *Ibid.*, p.333.

36. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.48.
37. *Ibid.*, p.101.
38. *Ibid.*, p.112.
39. F.Warre Cornish, *A History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century* Part 1 (Macmillan: London, 1933), p.218.
40. Newman, *Apologia*, p.47.
41. Guiney, p.123.
42. Coleridge, p.252.
43. Lock, p.19.
44. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.203.
45. Anne Mozley, II. p.153.
46. Anne Mozley, I. pp. 480f.

VI CHURCH AND STATE

1. J.A. Froude, *Short Studies*, vol. iv, p.254.
2. Froude, *Remains*, IV. p.30.
3. *Ibid.*, p.30f.
4. *Lyra Apostolica*, clix.
5. Letter of J. Keble to H.J. Rose, 21 February 1833 (quoted in Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, vol.i, p.147).
6. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, II. p.130.
7. Letter of R.H. Froude to his father, 28 November 1830. Birmingham Oratory ms. (quoted in Brendon, p.105).
8. Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, p.32.
9. Froude, *Remains*, I. pp.245f.
10. J.N.Figgis - H.J. Laski, *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty* (Newhaven, 1917), p.89 (quoted in Brilioth, p.203).
11. Froude, *Remains*, III. pp.vi f.
12. Dawson, p.62.
13. *The Works of William Laud, D.D.* (ed.Wm.Scott), vol.i,1847, p.6 (quoted in R.H Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (Penguin: Harmondsworth 1938), p.175).
14. Tawney, p.20.
15. Dawson, p.68.
16. Brendon, p.145.

VII BARBADOS

1. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.82.
2. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.342.
3. *Ibid.*, p.334.
4. *Ibid.*, p.398.
5. *Ibid.*, p.348.
6. *Ibid.*, p.343.
7. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.8.
8. S.W.Gilley, *Newman and his Age* (Darton, Longman and Todd: London, 1990), p.135.
9. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.377.

10. *Ibid.*, pp.334f.
11. *Ibid.*, p.382 (footnote).
12. *Ibid.*, pp.373f.
13. *Ibid.*, p.336.
14. *Ibid.*, pp.379f.
15. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.12.
16. *Ibid.*, p.18.
17. Froude, *Remains*, I. pp.434f.
18. Froude, *Remains*, III. p.xix.
19. *Ibid.*, pp.xxviii f.
20. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. pp.359ff.
21. *Ibid.*, p.142.
22. *Ibid.*, p.362.
23. Prevost, p.48.
24. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.144.
25. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.370.
26. *Ibid.*, p.405.
27. *Ibid.*, pp.355f.
28. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.19.
29. Anne Mozley, II. pp.106f. (footnote).

VIII THE SEARCH FOR A PARADIGM

1. Brilioth, p.183.
2. J.H.Newman, *Lectures on Certain Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol.i, p.102 (quoted in Brilioth, p.183).
3. J.W.Burgon, *Lives of Twelve Good Men* (John Murray: London, 1888), vol.i, p.211.
4. Nockles, p.156.
5. *Ibid.*, p.151 (footnote).
6. *Ibid.*, p.153.
7. Froude, *Remains*, III. pp.vi f.
8. Prevost, p.23.
9. David Newsome, *The Parting of Friends* (John Murray: London, 1966), p.102.
10. Froude, *Remains*, III. p.xix.
11. *Ibid.*, p.xxvii.
12. *Ibid.*, pp.xxxiv f.
13. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.323.
14. Froude, *Remains*, III. p.x.
15. Gauthier, p.121.
16. Froude, *Remains*, III. pp.16f.
17. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.315.
18. Froude, *Remains*, III. p.41.
19. *Ibid.*, pp.41ff.
20. *Ibid.*, p.41.
21. *Ibid.*, pp.44ff.
22. *Ibid.*, p.73.
23. *Ibid.*, p.76.
24. *Ibid.*, pp.86f.
25. *Ibid.*, p.97.
26. Newman, *Apologia*, p.47.

27. *Ibid.*, p.35.
28. Chadwick, *The Mind of the Oxford Movement* (A.&C. Black: London, 1963), p.39.
29. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.360.
30. Newman, *Apologia*, p.47.
31. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.98.
32. *Ibid.*, p.101.
33. J.H.Newman, *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, pp.305f.
(quoted in Chadwick, *The Mind of the Oxford Movement*, p.41).
34. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.119.
35. *Ibid.* p.126.
36. *Ibid.*, p.128.
37. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.423.
38. Froude, *Remains*, III. pp.347ff.
39. *Ibid.* pp.349ff.
40. Lock, p.93.
41. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.254.
42. Church, p.63.
43. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, II. p.349.
44. Newman, *Apologia*, p.47.
45. Froude, *Remains*, IV. pp.49f.
46. Newman, *Apologia*, p.47.
47. Church, p.370.
48. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.17.
49. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.328.
50. *Ibid.*, p.333.
51. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.98.

IX CHURCH DISCIPLINE AND AUTHORITY

1. J.A.Froude, *Short Studies*, vol. iii, p.171.
2. J.A.Froude, *Short Studies*, vol. iv, pp.246f.
3. E.A.Knox, *The Tractarian Movement 1833 - 1845* (Putnam: London, 1934). p.125.
4. *Ibid.*, p.365.
5. J.H. Overton and F. Relton, *The English Church from the Accession of George I to the end of the Eighteenth Century* (Macmillan: London, 1906), p.131.
6. *Ibid.*, pp.131f.
7. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.112.
8. Froude, *Remains*, III. pp.288f.
9. *Ibid.*, p.272.
10. *Ibid.*, pp.273f.
11. *Ibid.*, p.279 (*Lyra Apostolica* clxv).
12. *Ibid.*, p.291.
13. *Ibid.*, p.298.
14. *Ibid.*, p.xiv.
15. Froude, *Remains*, I. pp.401ff.
16. Church, p.64.

X THE EUCHARIST: MYSTERY AND MIRACLE

1. Froude, *Remains*, III. p.13.
2. J. Wickham Legg, *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement* (Longmans, Green and Co.: London, 1914), p.37.
3. *Virgin*, p.5.
4. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.370f.
5. Froude, *Remains*, III. p.12.
6. *Ibid.*, p.10f.
7. Alf Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist* (Uppsala, 1965), p.273.
8. Nockles, p.235.
9. *Brilioth*, p.315.
10. Charles Wesley (quoted in Overton and Relton, p.84).
11. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.326.
12. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.118.
13. *Ibid.*, pp.215f.
14. *Ibid.*, p.254.
15. Froude, *Remains*, I. pp.403f.
16. Lock, p.56.
17. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.368.
18. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. pp.214f.
19. Härdelin, p.177.
20. Froude, *Remains*, III. p.xxi.
21. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.18.
22. Newman, *Apologia*, pp.47f.
23. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.271.
24. Froude, *Remains*, III. p.6.
25. *Ibid.*, p.65.
26. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.438 (31).
27. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.18.
28. *Ibid.*, p.18.
29. Froude, *Remains*, III. p.134.
30. R.I. Wilberforce, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (quoted in Härdelin p.163).
31. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.18.
32. Froude, *Remains*, III. p.42.
33. *Ibid.*, p.146.
34. *Ibid.*, p.146.
35. *Ibid.*, p.144.
36. *Lyra Apostolica*, xxxiii.
37. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. pp.225f.

XI ROME

1. Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, Part 1. p.7.
2. F. Warre Cornish, Part 1. p.338.
3. Nockles, p.154.
4. Froude, *Remains*, II. p.125
5. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, III. pp.230f.
6. Guiney, p.340.

7. Wilfrid Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* vol.i. (London 1897) p.123 (quoted in Fothergill, *Nicholas Wiseman* p.63).
8. Newman, *Apologia*, p.55.
9. Church, p.207.
10. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. p.37.
11. *Ibid.*, p.83.
12. Froude, *Remains*, I., p.336.
13. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.*, IV. p.215.
14. *Ibid.*, p.215.
15. Froude, *Remains*. I, p.365.
16. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.78.
17. Froude, *Remains*, III. p.xxv.
18. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.387.
19. Härdelin, p.263.
20. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.404.
21. *Lyra Apostolica*, clxxii.
22. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.132.
23. *Ibid.*, p.18.
24. Church, p.204.
25. Newman, *Letters and Diaries.*, V. p.68.
26. *Ibid.*, p.19.
27. *Ibid.*, p.156.
28. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.x.
29. Coleridge, p.255.
30. Prevost, p.84.
31. Church, pp.50f.
32. A.P.Perceval, *A Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833* (Rivington: London, 1842), p.16.
33. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.434.
34. J.A.Froude, *Short Studies*, vol.iv, pp.249f.

XII THE ETHOS OF CATHOLICISM

1. Mary C. Church (ed.), *Life and Letters of Dean Church* (Macmillan: London, 1895), p.315.
2. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, V. p.247.
3. *Ibid.*, p.249.
4. Anne Mozley, II. p.172.
5. *Ibid.*, p.173.
6. Froude, *Remains*, I. p.221.
7. *Ibid.*, p.88.
8. Guiney, p.305.
9. Anne Mozley, II. p.236.
10. Church, p.56.
11. Basil Willey, *Nineteenth-Century Studies* (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1964), p.83f.
12. Gilley, p.164.
13. Froude, *Remains*, III. p.iii.
14. Wilfrid Ward, *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, 2nd ed. (Macmillan: London, 1890), p.84.
15. Newman, *Apologia*, p.88.

16. Roe, p.94.
17. Newman, *Apologia*, p.47f.
18. Mary C. Church, p.345.
19. Newman, *Letters and Diaries*, IV. pp.99ff.
20. *Ibid.*, p.112.
21. Härdelin, p.340.
22. J.A.Froude, *Short Studies*, vol.iv, p.251.
23. Ward, *W.G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p.77.
24. Froude, *Remains*, IV. p.12.
25. Ward, *W.G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p.85.
26. Dawson, p.100f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allchin, A.M., *The Silent Rebellion* (S.C.M: London, 1958).
- Brendon, Piers, *Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement* (Paul Elek: London, 1974).
- Brilioth, Yngve, *The Anglican Revival* (Longmans: London, 1933).
- Burgon, John W., *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, 2 vols., 4th ed.
(John Murray: London, 1888).
- Chadwick, Owen, *The Mind of the Oxford Movement* (A. & C. Black: London, 1963).
The Victorian Church, Pt 1, 3rd ed. (A. & C. Black: London, 1971).
- Church, Mary C. (ed.), *Life and Letters of Dean Church*, (Macmillan: London, 1895).
- Church, Richard W., *The Oxford Movement*, 3rd ed. (Macmillan: London, 1909).
- Clark, J.C.D., *English Society 1688 - 1832* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1985).
- Coleridge, John T., *A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble M.A.*, 3rd ed.
(James Parker: Oxford, 1870).
- Dawson, Christopher, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement*
(Sheed and Ward: London, 1933).
- Dewey, Clive, *The Passing of Barchester* (The Hambledon Press: London, 1991).
- Dunn, Waldo Hilary, *James Anthony Froude* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1961).
- Faber, Geoffrey, *Oxford Apostles*, 2nd ed. (Faber & Faber: London, 1936).
- ffinch, Michael, *Cardinal Newman The Second Spring*
(Weidenfeld and Nicholson: London, 1991).
- Fothergill, Brian, *Nicholas Wiseman* (Faber and Faber: London, 1963).
- Froude, James Anthony, *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, 4 vols.
(Longmans: London, 1893).
- Froude, R. Hurrell, *Remains of the late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude, M.A.*,
2 vols. (Rivington: London, 1838 and 1839).
- Gauthier, Pierre, *La Pensée Religieuse de Richard Hurrell Froude*
(Editions Beauchesne: Paris, 1977).

- Gilley, Sheridan W., *Newman and his Age* (Darton, Longman and Todd: London, 1990).
- Guiney, Louise I., *Hurrell Froude* (Methuen: London, 1904).
- Härdelin, Alf, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist* (Uppsala, 1965).
- Ker, Ian, *John Henry Newman* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1988).
- Knox, Edmund A., *The Tractarian Movement 1833 - 1845*, 2nd ed. (Putnam: London, 1934).
- Lock, Walter, *John Keble*, 3rd ed. (Methuen: London, 1893).
- Lyra Apostolica*, 3rd ed. (Henry Mozley and Sons: Derby, 1838).
- Mozley, Anne (ed.), *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman*, 2 vols. (Longmans: London, 1891).
- Mozley, James B., *Essays Historical and Theological*, 2 vols. 3rd ed. (Longmans, Green and Co: London, 1892).
- Mozley, Tom, *Reminiscences chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement*, 2 vols. (Longmans: London, 1882).
- Newman, John H., *Apologia pro vita sua* (J.M. Dent & Sons: London, 1912).
- The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, vols. ii - iv (edd. Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall S.J.), vol. v (ed. Thomas Gornall S.J.) (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1979 - 1981).
- Newsome, David H., *The Parting of Friends* (John Murray: London, 1966).
- The Convert Cardinals* (John Murray: London, 1993).
- Nockles, Peter B., *The Oxford Movement in Context*, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1994).
- Ollard, S.L., *A Short History of the Oxford Movement*, 2nd ed. (Mowbray: London, 1932).
- Overton, John H., *The Anglican Revival* (Blackie & Son: London, 1897).
- Overton, John H and Relton, Frederic, *The English Church from the Accession of George I to the end of the Eighteenth Century (1714 - 1800)* (Macmillan: London, 1906).
- Palmer, William, *A Narrative of Events connected with the publication of the Tracts for the Times* (Rivington: London, 1883).

- Perceval, Arthur P., *A Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833* (Rivington: London, 1842).
- Prevost, George (ed.), *The Autobiography of Isaac Williams B.D.*, 3rd ed. (Longmans, Green, & Co: London, 1893).
- Roe, W.G., *Lamennais and England* (Oxford University Press: London, 1966).
- Rowlands, John H.L., *Church, State and Society* (Churchman: Worthing, 1989).
- Tavard, George H., *The Quest for Catholicity* (Burns & Oates: London, 1963).
- Tawney, Richard H., *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, 2nd ed. (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1938).
- Trevor, Meriol, *Newman The Pillar of the Cloud* (Macmillan: London, 1962).
- Tuckwell, W., *Reminiscences of Oxford*, 2nd ed. (Smith, Elder, & Co: London, 1907).
- Tulloch, John, *Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the Nineteenth Century* (reprint of 1885 ed.) (Leicester University Press: Leicester, 1971).
- Vaiss, Paul (ed.), *From Oxford to the People* (Gracewing: Leominster, 1996).
- Vidler, Alec R., *The Church in an Age of Revolution* (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1961).
- Virgin, Peter, *The Church in an Age of Negligence* (James Clarke & Co.: Cambridge, 1989).
- Walsh, J. and Haydon, C. and Taylor, S. (eds.), *The Church of England, c. 1689 - c. 1833* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1993).
- Ward, Wilfrid, *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, 2nd ed. (Macmillan: London, 1890).
- Warre Cornish, F., *A History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, Pt. 1. (Macmillan: London, 1933).
- Webb, C.C.J., *Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement* (S.P.C.K: London, 1928).
- Wickham Legg, J., *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement* (Longmans, Green and Co: London, 1914).
- Willey, Basil, *Nineteenth-Century Studies* (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1964).