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PREFACE

I have selected the life of Richard Hurrell Froude and his relation to the Oxford Movement as the topic for my dissertation for three reasons: first, because I believe this study is a contribution to literature in that it gives a better understanding of a man who was not only an instrumental factor in initiating a movement which resulted in a flood of literature during the last and present century, but a man who was also an important influence in the life and on the thoughts of one of the greatest literary figures of the nineteenth century.

Literature, according to Newman, is the expression of thought in language. The page of the great writer is the "lucid mirror of his mind and life." Richard Hurrell Froude helped to energize the mind of John Henry Newman by helping to clarify the view of what man and the Church should be; through his own exemplary life and through his personal research, Froude helped Newman to see the gap between the ideal and the actual, and to ascertain a plan of life by which to attain the ideal.

The great writer, says Newman, "writes passionately, because he feels keenly; forcibly, because he conceives vividly; he sees too clearly to be vague; he is too serious to be otiose; he can analyze his subject, and therefore he is rich; he embraces it as a whole and in its parts, and therefore he is consistent; he has a firm hold of it, and therefore he is luminous." Richard Hurrell Froude helped to make Newman a great writer, not technically, but materially; he assisted him in attaining the truth, the depth, the clarity of view, and the personal conviction which are necessary elements in a great writer.
Froude introduced Newman to a broader view of life. Together, Froude and Newman explored this view. They voiced their approval and defense of it, and their literature encouraged others to pronounce upon their views, favorably or unfavorably, initiating a torrent of literature whose greatness varied according to the earnestness and sublimity of thought and according to the power of expression. None, however, superseded the voice of the Movement, John Henry Newman; and the sound philosophical basis from which the voice emanated was erected through the assistance of Richard Hurrell Froude.

Literature is also a record of man's experience; and as such a record, it is beneficial in promulgating a better understanding of other people, other religions, and other movements. The second reason why I chose the life of Richard Hurrell Froude for my dissertation is that, in presenting the literature revolving around this figure—the record of this one man's experience—I hope in some small way to create a better understanding of a Roman Catholic's obligation, in face of the approaching ecumenical council, to develop a spirit of charity and humility toward our separated brethren.

This record of one man's experience is an impressive reflection of the genuine sincerity and earnestness with which a man gradually arrives at the truth. It illustrates the exemplary religious life which a man, outside the true Faith, may be practicing while the scandalous living of some of those who profess the true Faith becomes an impediment, at least temporary, for such a seeker of truth.

It is my hope that, through an understanding of Richard Hurrell
Froude, I may in a small way propagate an attitude of charity—charity which recognizes the earnestness and sincerity of separated brethren; charity which does not mistake a clouded view for a stubbornness of will; charity which recognizes that we, not alone the separated brethren, will be benefited from their gift of Faith; charity which attempts to discover a key to the removal of obstacles which may impede Faith. Henry St. John, one of the many writers interested in the ecumenical movement, stated recently: "From the ecumenical point of view one may hope that among the subjects chosen will be at least this dogmatic one: the relationship of the Pope to the episcopate and of his infallibility to that of the Church. This was never fully defined at the Vatican Council and is of the greatest importance in our dealings with the Greek Orthodoxy and immediately with our Anglican brethren." Blackfriars (April 1960), p.131.

Surely, constructive statements, like this one above, make one realize that the Church through a clarification of dogma, and the individuals in the Church through good example and a charitable attitude can help men like Hurrell Froude to experience the path that leads to Truth.

The third reason why I selected the life of Richard Hurrell Froude as the topic of my dissertation is that he is one of the most attractive personalities about whom I have ever read, a judgment shared by most of the writers on the Oxford Movement. In spite of his attractive personality, however, and in spite of his importance in a significant movement, few persons have attempted to write about him at any length.

Louise Imogene Guiney has the only full-length biography of Froude.
It was published in 1904, and of this scholarly work the American Ecclesiastical Review of 1945 said: "Hurrell Froude has not been done properly yet. The Life of Louise Imogene Guiney, although showing great research, is rather cumbersome. I feel that she did not get at the heart of her subject."

The unpublished theses of John H. Hoff and Sister Mary Xavier Graham, from the University of Chicago and the University of Illinois respectively, do not pretend to make an extensive study of Froude, nor do they use the unpublished materials on Newman and Froude. George Huntington Harper has a scholarly unpublished dissertation on The Froude Family in the Oxford Movement. He makes use of the unpublished materials from the Birmingham Oratory, but he does not concentrate on the spiritual and personal life of Froude adequately, which one must understand in order to derive a clear knowledge of the man behind a great spiritual movement. Too, Harper's indictment of the Oxford Movement--that "it attempted to solve immediate problems of a complicated nature by the simple rules of an essentially different age"--indicates a lack of sympathetic understanding.

Several books dealing with the Oxford Movement treat of Froude, among which R. W. Church's The Oxford Movement is notable. It presents a sympathetic picture of Froude and a true appreciation of his works. It lacks extensiveness, however, and its view is not entirely correct when it states: "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." A book like The Oxford Apostles
makes a more thorough study of Froude's personality, but its extensiveness is of little value when a man like Geoffrey Faber starts with the premise that intensive holiness and the practice of celibacy must be related to a schizoid personality. Christopher Dawson's *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement* gives one of the best treatments of Froude. He overemphasizes, however, Froude's indebtedness to Lamennais while he disregards the importance of Froude's Becket papers through which Froude announced the direction the Oxford Movement was to take.

In my dissertation, I have tried to make a study of all available works on Richard Hurrell Froude. Through the courtesy of the University of Illinois, I was permitted to use the unpublished letters of Newman and Froude. Through these letters, fragments of which are contained in *Letters and Correspondence* and in the *Remains*, plus the published materials on Newman and Froude, I have tried to draw an exact and detailed picture of Froude. As a Roman Catholic who realizes that Faith is a great gift, I have tried to draw an unprejudiced picture of Froude.

Originally, I had hoped to secure a microfilmed copy of Froude's private diary or that of his mother. I also hoped to obtain more of Froude's correspondence with Keble. Correspondence with research students at Birmingham Oratory, inquiries directed to various libraries in England, a letter to the *Times Literary Supplement*, and requests made to Froude's descendants and descendants of Froude's friends have all proved fruitless, however; no one could help me. Finally, I had to begin writing the dissertation, with a promise from the director of the Newman materials at Birmingham, that he would advise me whenever anything
new on Froude was called to his attention. At present, nothing has been added to the Froude collection. What is greatly desired is further information on his youth, especially his years at Eton. More information on the personal and religious life of his mother is also desired, for she was a great source of inspiration to Hurrell. The exact influence of Lamennais could be determined better if one knew whom Froude met in France and with whom he stayed. If one had the Keble-Froude correspondence during the Oxford Movement, one could give Keble more credit for his part in the Movement. Finally, if one had, from the papers of Wiseman or from papers at the Vatican Library, evidence that Froude had written to the Pope or evidence of what occurred at the time Froude first consulted Wiseman, one could write a more conclusive statement of his endeavors to attain unity.

I am very grateful to Professor Martin Svaglic for his patience, kindness, and assistance while I was writing this dissertation. I also appreciate the helpful suggestions offered by members of the board who read the dissertation.
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CHAPTER I

FROUDE: HIS CHARACTER

Hurrell Froude was, as he termed himself, the poker of the Oxford Movement. His vibrant personality, coupled with deep religious convictions which he fearlessly affirmed, high ideals which he relentlessly pursued, and intense longings for truth which he impatiently yet persistently labored to satiate, made him an indispensable figure in the cause which gave impetus to the Oxford Movement. Many people who delve into his Remains will agree with C.F. Harrold that "had he not died early—in 1836—he no doubt would have been among the first Oxford converts."¹ It is an incontestable fact that the Movement took the direction it did because of Froude's influence.

Who was Froude? The answer to this question is difficult to ascertain, for he was somewhat of an enigma. Not even his most intimate friends detected his depths of spirituality. Isaac Williams, the poet of the Oxford Movement and one of Froude's close friends, aptly stated the case in his autobiography: "Poor Froude! he was peculiarly vir paucorum hominum. I thought that, knowing him, I better understood

Shakespeare's Hamlet. Froude was a person most natural, but so original as to be unlike anyone else, hiding depth of delicate thought in apparent extravagancies. . . . One constantly trembled for him in mixed society—both in Common Rooms and in other places—feeling that he would not be understood.  

Williams admitted, however, that "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."  

R. W. Church, a fellow of Oriel and later dean of St. Paul's, was attracted to Froude through the enthusiasm of Frederick Rogers; he delineated Froude's character at length and discovered "a side of the most genuine warmth of affection, an awful reality of devoutness, which it was his great and habitual effort to keep hidden, a high simplicity of worldliness and generosity, and in spite of his daring mockeries of what was commonplace or showy, the most sincere and deeply felt humility with himself."  

Rogers himself stated the intricacy of his teacher's character in a letter to Newman in 1868:

---

3 Ibid., 48.
With all his disgust at coxcombing and his merciless use of the best powers of his mind to put it down, there was a warm genial mode of placing himself (in a sense) in an equality with anyone whom he did not think a coxcomb which was wonderfully fascinating. And though you felt his strength, it was as if you felt the strength of a playmate excited in the warmth and pleasure of the game—not as a master. It was really curious that his efforts to avoid people (efforts at being a humdrum I think he calls it somewhere) did really prevent undergraduates and such like from observing his talent. He really did disguise his own excellence. It is true as you say, he did not altogether enter into the minds of others. . . . But he had a very keen appreciation of others—even though commonplace people, and love for them—lofty and playful—interest in what they did and thought—a readiness to play with you (at skating, math, and aesthetics) and yet always with occasional upward tendencies if you chose to understand his parable.5

In his journal, Rogers provided another insight into the character of the man whom he so greatly admired:

He was anything but learned. In lecture he gave you the idea of not being in knowledge so very much in advance of those he taught; but he had a fine taste; a quick and piercing precision of thought, a fertility and depth of reasoning, which stimulated a mind which had any quickness and activity. He had an interest in everything; he could draw with you, sail on the river with you, talk philosophy or politics with you, ride over fences with you, skate with you—all with a kind of joyous enjoyment. Mischief seems to have been his share as a boy, and a controlled delight in what was on the edge of mischief gave a kind of verve to his character as man. This made him charming to those whom he liked. But then he did not choose to like any whom he did not respect; and he could be as hard and sharp as you please on what he thought bad, profane, vicious, or coxcombical.

Enlarging upon the picture of Froude, Thomas Mozley further stressed the diversity of his nature: "Tall, erect, very thin, never resting or sparing himself, investigating and explaining with unwearied energy,


incisive in his language, and with a certain fiery force of look and tone he seemed a sort of angelic presence to weaker natures. He slashed at the shams, phrases, and disguises in which the lazy or the pretentious veil their real ignorance or folly. His features readily expressed every varying mood of playfulness, sadness, and awe. There were those about him who would rather writhe under his most cutting sarcasms than miss their part in the workings of his sympathy and genius."

In an article in The British Critic in which he reviewed the Remains, Thomas Mozley made another attempt to vindicate Froude's paradoxical nature. He wrote:

We will venture a remark or two with regard to that ironical turn which certainly does appear in various shapes in the first part of these Remains. Unpleasant, as irony may sometimes be, there need not go with it, and in this instance there did not go with it, the smallest real asperity of temper... His irony arose from that peculiar mode in which he viewed all earthly things, himself and all that was dear to him not excepted. It was his poetry. Irony is, indeed, the natural way in which men of high views and keen intellect view the world: they cannot find middle terms of controversy with men of ordinary views; they feel a gulf between them and the world: they cannot descend to the level of lower views, or raise others from that level to their own. As therefore there is no common ground which they can seriously or really assume with inferior or worldly minds, they fall into a way of pretending to assume common notions, and reasoning on them with unreal seriousness, in order to expose them.

Samuel Wilberforce agreed with Thomas Mozley in regard to the keen intellect and original powers of mind, but J. B. Mozley, who also knew

---

Froude and edited the latter's "Life of Becket," gave a critique of his brother's article in a letter to their sister Anne: "Of course you have read half through The British Critic by this time. I have only read the Froude article. It gives too much the impression of Froude as a philosopher simply, instead of one who was constantly bringing his general maxims to bear most forcibly and pointedly on the present state of things; on particular classes, sects, and parties. It does not bring out Froude's great practical and almost lawyer-like penetration."10

Arthur Perceval, also a pupil of Froude who was privileged to work closely with him at Hadleigh, gave an inconsistent view of Froude as a man who always carefully weighed facts and refused to take things for granted, yet a man who expressed himself hastily without adequate information. It is evident that Perceval, too, found Froude puzzling and had difficulty in reconciling diverse tendencies in him. Speaking of the Remains, Perceval said:

These volumes contain the expression of the workings of a young and ardent mind, seeking after truth with a singleness of purpose, and a noble disregard of all sublunary and temporary consequences, rarely to be met with; doing that which most men are blamed for not doing, that is to say, refusing to take things for granted to be true, because they are told him, but striving to weigh all things in the balances of the sanctuary, and prepared to embrace truth wherever he could find it, at any and whatever cost. . . . That fervent zeal and highminded enthusiasm which shone from his eagle eye, and formed the charm of his conversation, and left so deep an impression of affection to his memory in the minds of all who had the privilege of his friendship, while they prompted him to a noble course of great exertion, at the same time led him frequently to express himself, as is apparent from his letters, hastily, upon imperfect information

and without the consideration of all the bearings of the point before him. But he was open to conviction, and ever ready to embrace that modification or alteration of any view he might previously have entertained, which, after due examination, he was persuaded approached nearer to the truth.\(^{11}\)

Frederick Oakeley, another acquaintance who knew and respected Froude but who differed with him on religious beliefs, observed the apparent dichotomy between Froude's exterior conduct and inner life:

Mr. Froude was a college contemporary of my own, and I enjoyed at one time the privilege of constant intercourse and familiar acquaintance with him. Those who have formed their impression of him from his published Remains will scarcely, perhaps, be prepared to hear how little there appeared in his external department, while he was at Oxford of that remarkable austerity of life which he is now known to have habitually practiced even then. To a form of singular elegance, and a countenance of that peculiar and highest kind of beauty which flows from purity of heart and mind, he added manners the most refined and engaging. That air of sunny cheerfulness which is best expressed by the French word "riant" never forsook him at the time when I knew him best, and diffused itself, as is its wont, over every circle in which he moved. I have seen him in spheres so different as the commonrooms of Oxford and the after-dinner company of the high aristocratic society of the West of England; and I well remember how he mingled even with the last in a way so easy yet so dignified as at once to conciliate its sympathies and direct its tone. He was one of the few who seemed to have extracted good out of an English public school education, while uninfected by its manifold vices.\(^{12}\) Popular among his companions from his skill in all athletic exercises, as well as for his humility, forbearance, and indomitable good temper, he had the rare gift of changing the course of dangerous conversation without uncouth abruptness or unbecoming dictation, and almost seemed, as is recorded of St. Bernardine of Siena, to check by his mere presence the profane gibe or unseemly "equivoque."\(^{13}\)


\(^{12}\) Oakeley was not cognizant of the fact that the public school vices did have their consequences in the adolescent Froude as is shown in one of the suppressed passages in a letter from his mother to which reference is made later on page ten.

\(^{13}\) Frederick Oakeley, "Historical Notes of the Tractarian Movement," Dublin Review, i, 1863, 173-174.
All these vindications of Froude's integrity by his friends show cognizance of the complexity of his character and defend him against the seemingly schizoid nature which persons who did not know him intimately deduced from their perusal of the *Remains*. These latter mistook his rigorous self-control for either apathy or perversity; they made his struggles with temptation a warrant for subjection to a Freudian psycho-analysis. E.A. Abbott, for example, thought Froude was "by nature, without any deep feeling of human-hearted sociality, without love of man as a fellow man; by ecclesiasticism, led rather to hate than to love—loving indeed a few, but only as a Spartan might love his companions in arms, loving those select spirits by whose side he could battle for the interests of the church;"14 Geoffrey Faber believed that Froude despised or feared comfort and was indifferent to beauty in his surroundings;15 he concluded that "in his private mind Christ seems to have had no place at all."16 Lytton Strachey's flippant judgment gave Froude credit for only an idealistic concern with God: "The sort of ardour which impels more normal youths to haunt music halls and fall in love with actresses took the form, in Froude's case, of a romantic devotion to the Deity and an intense interest in the state of his own soul. He was obsessed by the

16 Ibid., 215.
ideals of saintliness, and convinced of the supreme importance of not
eating too much."\textsuperscript{17} Most noteworthy, however, is the erroneous viewpoint
of Wiseman, who "missed from his pages those cheerful views of religion
which result from confidence and love" and found that "fasting seems to
have been considered as an end and not as a means, and practiced for its
own sake."\textsuperscript{18}

Perhaps the most adequate and competent analysis of Froude's early
character comes to us in the form of a letter written to him indirectly
by his mother when he was about seventeen years of age but which he never
read until after his mother's death. Mrs. Froude was a brilliant woman,
self-sacrificing and deeply religious. She instilled sound moral prin-
ciples in her son, and after her death, her diary of spiritual progress
served as an inspiration and model for him. He said: "She seems to have
had the same annoyances as myself, without the same advantages, and to
have written her thoughts down, instead of conversation."\textsuperscript{19}

This letter reveals a wholesome teen-aged boy with a pleasing person-
ality but a dominant will balancing precariously between sanctity and
iniquity, having great propensities toward both without the danger of
mediocrity. Already at that time Hurrell was a champion of truth and a


\textsuperscript{18} Cardinal Wiseman, "Remains of Richard Hurrell Froude," \textit{Dublin
Review}, VI, 1839, 421-423.

\textsuperscript{19} Richard Hurrell Froude, \textit{The Remains of the Reverend Richard
rebel against sham and compromise. One sees the apparent playfulness and exuberance to the point of sinfulness alternating with periods of interior gravity. Mrs. Froude wrote:

Sir,

I have a son who is giving me a good deal of uneasiness at this time, from causes which I persuade myself are not altogether common; and having used my best judgment about him for seventeen years, I at last begin to think it incompetent to the case, and apply to you for advice.

From his very birth his temper has been peculiar; pleasing, intelligent, and attaching, when his mind was undisturbed, and he was in the company of people who treated him reasonably and kindly; but exceedingly impatient under vexatious circumstances: very much disposed to find his own amusement in teasing and vexing others; and almost entirely incorrigible when it was necessary to reprove him. I never could find a successful mode of treating him. Harshness made him obstinate and gloomy; calm and long displeasure made him stupid and sullen; and kind patience had not sufficient power over his feeling to force him to govern himself. His disposition to worry made his appearance the perpetual signal for noise and disturbance among his brothers and sisters; and this it was impossible to stop, though a taste for quiet, and constant weak health, made it to me almost insupportable. After a statement of such great faults, it may seem an inconsistency to say that he nevertheless still bore about him strong marks of a promising character. In all points of substantial principle his feelings were just and high. He had (for his age) an unusually deep feeling of admiration for every thing which was good and noble; his relish was lively, and his taste good, for all the pleasures of the imagination; and he was also quite conscious of his own faults, and (untempted) had a just dislike of them.

On these grounds I built my hope that his reason would gradually correct his temper, and do that for him which his friends could not accomplish. Such a hope was necessary to my peace of mind; for I will not say that he was dearer to me than my other children, but he was my first child, and certainly could not be dearer. This expectation has been realized, gradually, though very slowly. The education his father chose for him agreed with him; his mind expanded and sweetened; and even some more material faults (which had grown out of circumstances uniting with his temper) entirely disappeared. His promising virtues became my most delightful hopes, and his company my greatest pleasure. At this time he had a dangerous illness, which he bore most admirably. The consequences of it obliged him to leave his school, submit for many months to the most troublesome restraints, and to be debarred from all the amusements and pleasures of his age, though he felt, at the same time, quite
competent to them. All this he bore not only with patience and
compliance, but with a cheerful sweetness which endeared him to all
around him. He returned home for the confirmation of his health,
and he appeared to me all I could desire. His manners were tender
and kind, his conversation highly pleasing, and his occupations
manly and rational. The promising parts of his character, like
Aaron's rod, appeared to have swallowed up all the rest, and to have
left us nothing but his health to wish for.

After such an account, imagine the pain I must feel on being
forced to acknowledge that the ease and indulgence of home is bring­
ing on a relapse into his former habits. I view it with sincere alarm
as well as grief, as he must remain here many, many months, and a
strong return to ill-conduct; at his age, I do not think would ever
be recovered.

I will mention some facts, to show that my fears are not too
forward. He has a near relation, who has attended him through his
illness with extraordinary tenderness, and who never made a differ­
ence between night and day, if she could give him the smallest com­
fort; to whom he is very troublesome, and not always respectful. He
told her in an argument the other day that "she lied, and knew she
did," without (I am ashamed to say) the smallest apology. I am in a
very wretched state of health, and quiet is important to my recovery,
and quite essential to my comfort; yet he disturbs it, for what he
calls funny tormenting, without the slightest feeling, twenty times
a day. [I have not had a single meal to-day in peace, nor been long
quiet even in my own room without being obliged to rouse myself to
quell some disturbance made by him.] 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. [And at another, he
revived a dirty practice of his first school which I am ashamed to
mention and made his brother submit to a disgusting result which all
the servants knew and talked of.] All this worry has been kept up
upon a day when I have been particularly unwell, [which I have
pleaded many times in vain. He cannot think it pretense for I am to
look at best a spectre whose days (whether passed in pain or peace)
anyone would say were not likely to be many. Light as my body is
become he sees many times that I have hardly strength to drag it
about.] He also knows at the same time very well, that if his head
does but ache, it is not only my occupation, but that of the whole
family, to put an end to every thing which can annoy him.

You will readily see, dear sir, that our situation is very dif­
ficult, and very distressing. He is too old for any correction but
that of his own reason; and how to influence that, I know not. Your
advice will greatly oblige,

A very anxious parent,
M.F.

P.S. 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. [If he cannot be induced to keep peace around me I must leave the house—but what a distress will that be from such a cause!—So unfeeling and from such a quarter!] 20

A letter written by Rogers to Newman sixteen years later shows that Froude still presented the same playful yet tantalizing personality which by this time, however, camouflaged his true ascetical nature, for he had then discovered the secret of being both joyful and serious at the same time. Rogers wrote: "I am excessively amused at the alternations of treatment Miss Froude is subject to from Hurrell and Mr. B. In fact, I can hardly help being in a constant half-laughter when anything is going on between Froude and his sister." 21

Newman added this note to the letter: "Mary Froude was one of the sweetest girls I ever saw. She was at this time engaged to Mr. B. He used to come with a great consciousness of his situation, much gravity, and great reverence for her. Hurrell, on the other hand, treated his sister in a good-humored way as a little child, calling her Poll, and sending her about on messages, etc. to Mr. B's seeming scandal and distress. Mary Froude all the while was the very picture of naturalness and simplicity, receiving with equal readiness and equability the homage of the one and the playful rudeness of the other."

20 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection. Fragments within brackets were omitted in the Remains.

Even shortly before Froude's death, Anne Mozley noticed the fire still enkindled in the spirited crusader: "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."22 "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."23

R.F. Wilson testified to the continued role of enthusiast which Froude played: "It was a great pleasure to me to meet poor Froude. . . . To me he was a more interesting person than ever, because I find that his peculiar way of thinking and manner of expressing himself, which I thought might only belong to him in health and strength, continue just the same."24

The exuberant personality of Richard Hurrell Froude was never dimmed as friends and contemporaries attest; neither was the spiritual vigor of Richard Hurrell Froude diminished, as indicated by his journal, letters,

22 Ibid., 95.
23 Ibid., 155.
24 Ibid., 130.
and deeds. J.F. Christie justly remarked to Newman after Froude's death: "The zeal of His House hath ever eaten him up." 25

It is only when we sympathetically examine all of Froude's correspondence and the facts ascertained from the *Remains*, four volumes comprised of a journal, sermons, essays, letters, and a life of Thomas of Becket, published after Froude's death by Newman and Keble, that we can justly attempt a picture of Froude. From them we discern his insatiable zeal for spiritual perfection, his disregard for human appraisal, and his vigorous attempt to seek only the good pleasure of God and live a life conformable not only to His precepts but also to His counsels. These virtues, unsuspectedly embedded in an impetuous and volatile nature, drove Froude to a relentless and ruthless war on self to which no earthly person had a clue. Even John Keble, his spiritual guide and dearest friend, alleged: "His Journal has taught me things concerning him, which I never suspected myself, as to the degree of self-denial which he was practicing when I was most intimate with him." 26

From the sermons of Richard Hurrell Froude, we can glean the general plan for attaining perfection which he outlined for his parishioners; from his diary and correspondence, we can ascertain the degree in which he participated in the rule of life which he advocated.

Examining Froude's sermons, one finds that, negatively, his greatest

---

25 Unpublished Letters, Reel 19, Miscellaneous Papers.
concern was with the indifference of people toward religion, the fact that the majority of people seem not to respond to the fact that there is a God present within the universe. He found that "the multitude of men are scarcely in any material respects different from what they would have been had they known nothing of Jesus Christ and the Gospel. There is little even in their external conduct and intercourse with each other, that might not just as well be discharged by a deist or a heathen. Mere natural religion might teach them a far higher standard of honesty, sobriety, and benevolence, than almost any man acts up to in his daily conduct" (Remains II.1.203).

Froude observed that even if people do admit that they believe in God, their conduct belies their assertion:

It is the melancholy duty of most of us to confess at each pause of serious reflection, the unhappy discrepancy between our faith and conduct. To acknowledge that in the cares of our worldly occupation we lose sight of the only object that renders any occupation reasonable; that we pursue as ends valuable in themselves what we know to be the mere instruments of remoter good; and are so absorbed in the present system of things, and regulate our lives so entirely with reference to it, that there are very few things in which we should act differently if we were without God in the world (Remains II.1.71).

In a sermon in which Froude contrasted the aims of the Rechabites with those of the Israelites, Froude showed the perversity of people who, although they have an acquaintance with spiritual values, persist in erecting material goals:

The point in this narrative which is most surprising is the perseverance of one set of men in pursuit of an object, the value of which we cannot understand, and the complete indifference of another set, to an object quite as easily within their reach, and the value of which we perceive to be inestimable. Now if any one will be at the pains to look around him, or to examine his own heart, he will
find that he himself, and almost every one, are in themselves an example of this surprising inconsistency. He will detect himself and his neighbors in dedicating as much time and pains to the pursuit of things, which even themselves own to be comparatively insignificant, as would, if directed to higher objects, secure to them an inheritance in heaven (Remains II.i.5).

Not only do people direct as much time and energy toward material gains as toward spiritual, but often it is a disproportionate effort, in favor of the material welfare:

Let us turn our thoughts to the pains and sacrifices which we make every day, without even ever thinking of them, for the sake of getting on in our businesses. And then let us own with shame, how very little indeed the wish to serve God enters into the motives which make us useful and respectable—how little our diligence in business arises from fervency of spirit, or is likely to render us acceptable with God.

We shall have to acknowledge that, did we make one half or one quarter the sacrifices in obedience to our Heavenly Father which we make without the slightest scruple or hesitation in the pursuit of ends which we acknowledge to be comparatively of no value at all, we should be very much better people than we are (Remains II.i.12).

A choice must be made—God or Mammon. The first stage in the spiritual life is a turning away from the world and all that opposes God; the second stage is a surrender to God.

If we lead negligent lives, and allow ourselves to be swallowed up in the business and pleasures of the world around us, it is quite impossible that we can form any idea of those invisible things with which we are no less, really, though less obviously conversant. If we do not ourselves feel deep sorrow and contrition at our sins, we can feel no great thankfulness for the kindness which so tenderly consoles and reclaims us. . . . There is but one way as well to know as to serve God; and that, the only means of remedying our want of faith, is perseverance in Holy Living (Remains II.i.215-216).

In a sermon on one's duty in life, Froude indicated his grasp of the theological truth that, once man has turned away from material gains, two important means to perfection for him are a Knowledge of God acquired through the practice of living in His Presence and a conformity to His
Divine Will. Froude saw the latter, not as a kind of void of personality which repudiates all ambition and all ideals and all interests, but as an acceptance of God as the Director and End of all ambitions, ideals, and interests, thereby enriching every thought and action of life rather than diminishing it. This sermon may also provide the key to Froude's habit of living joyfully and seriously at the same time, the habit of seeming to enjoy all the temporal gifts of God to the fullest while actually being mindful ever of the next life, a habit which perplexed so many of his acquaintances when they read his diary.

The notion which most unthinking people annex to a serious life is that of constant weariness and constraint; that they suppose it impossible to enjoy pleasure seriously; and that they connect the idea of religion with moroseness and melancholy. To have God uppermost in their thoughts seems to such persons impossible, without destroying all that freedom of mind which makes life intolerable. And yet those who have tried to live serious and holy lives, will be found to give a very different account of the effect which is produced in them by the thought of God. To them, it seems, the oftener they can think of Him, the more nearly they approach to living in His Presence; and that living in His Presence seems like living in the presence of the greatest and kindest of benefactors, who has done most for their good and who delights in seeing them happy as long as happiness is consistent with their interests. They find it no more impossible to be joyful when thinking of their unseen Father, than our Lord's disciples did when they were blessed by His actual presence. And the reason of this is that they know Him. Careless people feel restraint and uneasiness at the thought of God's presence, because to them He is a stranger. His ways are not their ways; and they feel towards Him as they do toward a stranger, who does not enter into their pursuits and way of living. And it is only by trying to know Him, as people try to know their earthly acquaintance, that they can possibly attain to a different notion of Him. Our earthly friends have not become our friends all at once; we have not come to know and esteem them by a sudden determination, or by talking to others about their character. It is by living with the thought of Him present to us, and by constantly endeavoring to do His Will, that we can train ourselves to know and to love Him; and it is not possible to do so in any other way. In proportion as we endeavor to live in this way, we shall find it possible to be serious and joyful at once (Remains II.i.102).
Just as, negatively, Froude's greatest concern was with man's indifference to religion, so, positively, this habit of living in the presence of God and integrating all interests in God was the point he stressed. That the formation of this habit was of paramount importance to him is evidenced by his constant reiteration of this theme:

In all our daily conduct and conversation we are to act as if we saw God; as if we observed His Eye looking down upon us from Heaven; and we are to harbour no thought, indulge no inclination, which we should fear to harbour or indulge in if we stood in the presence of our Father Who is in heaven (Remains II.i.93).

Writing with the same idea in mind, Froude later said:

He is at this day as truly God with us, as at the time when He showed Himself among us in the Person of our Lord. At this moment He is not far from any one of us, for "in Him we live and move and have our being." Everything that is going on around us proves that we live in His presence. When we see a tree growing, we may be just as certain that God is at hand to nourish it, as we could have been if we had witnessed the creation of the world. And as often as we offer up our prayers before Him, we may feel as confident that He looks upon us, as if we were conversing with Him face to face (Remains II.i.278).

The practice of living in the presence of God leads to knowledge of God which, in turn, leads directly to love of Him because of His infinite goodness. A knowledge of self is also important, for it leads indirectly to love of God; it helps one to conform to His Will and it discloses the need of His assistance. Froude called this knowledge of self "taking root in self." It consists in breaking the barriers of pride, inspecting the motives of action, preparing defenses against temptation, and determining to live and act solely for love of God.

In one of his sermons, Froude outlined a plan by which one "gets root in himself." He spoke of the need to "connect religion with the ordinary affairs of life" and acquire a knowledge of one's particular temptation and the means to resist it:
Everyone who has paid any attention whatever to his way of living, and has endeavored to repress the encroachments of any single vicious feeling, will have been aware how much more liable he is to be led away when temptation takes him on a sudden, and of what great assistance it is to think over beforehand the full difficulty to be encountered, in order to summon his resolution, and direct his efforts to the exact point where they will be wanted. Yet it is quite clear that this sort of foresight can only be attained by frequent observation; . . . observe, in each successive struggle, some of the causes why his last efforts had been ineffectual . . . what were the points in which he failed most, and to what defects in himself the failure was attributable . . . what was the particular shape in which the temptation presented itself . . . the sort of excuses he had made to himself for indulging it . . . These, or a thousand other little things, any man would be sure to gather up and profit by, in the course of a long continual effort to overcome his bad dispositions. But to one who is first beginning the practice of self-government, such knowledge must be entirely strange, and in consequence, he must lose much of the advantage which is to be gained by meeting temptation prepared. . . . He might generally be aware that he was wicked, and that God required of him to be good; but until he had done more than this, until he had done his best to act on this general knowledge, the impression would be very indistinct, and would soon pass away from his mind (Remains II.i.104).

Because man is by nature a social being, his advance in self-knowledge is derived from his associations with other men. If he has "root in himself," his actions will not be motivated by human respect, nor will he engage his progress in virtue by his transactions with his friends. "If we would wish to know how far our heart is right with God, how far our benevolence is like that of Jesus Christ, we should consider in what manner we act toward the ill-disposed, the malicious, and the ungrateful"(Remains II.i.297-298). To be charitable alike to friend, foe, and stranger calls for a life of discipline. A search for perfection, or the integration of all one's interests in God, must necessarily include a plan of purgation. It is the formation of the just man.

Voluntarily endured privation is one means of discipline. It strengthens the will power and creates a reserve of strength for the times
of spiritual struggle when man is called upon to act quickly and courageously. This is what Froude advocated "if we would give Jesus Christ that place in our affections which He promised to supply for those who seek Him earnestly" (Remains II.1.56). It is part of the process of becoming theocentric instead of egocentric.

Besides voluntary mortification, Froude endorsed suffering as another means of discipline and an essential element in growth to perfection. Froude recognized that suffering can be the means of causing man to turn away from God entirely; or, suffering can be a means to only natural virtue which, negatively, forces man to restrain from evil: "Persons, who from their way of life are forced often into contact with pain and danger, feel it absolutely necessary to steel and brace their character, and from the immediate evils that attend on effeminate self-indulgence, are, even in spite of themselves, driven to keep their armour bright and their loins girded" (Remains II.1.249); but, Froude realized that suffering can also be supernaturalized. Next to dying for another, suffering is the surest sign of love, and so suffering is often the vehicle by which man, consumed with love for God, speeds to God. Then, "a kind of quiet pleasure will be found to attend even on suffering itself, when endured for the sake of God, and considered as a token of His regard; a pleasure of which we can form no idea, while living on in comfort and indulgence, than people could of the look of starlight, who had never seen night, but lived constantly in sunshine" (Remains II.1.115).

Man gets "root in himself" through a disciplined life of mortification and suffering. Yet man must be constantly aware less he glorify
penance and suffering, forgetting that they are only means to an end, else his endeavors are meaningless:

Some people imagine that all their duty requires of them is to check any disposition to repining or presumption. As to manly firmness, and that sort of conduct which gives to pain an elevated character, this is supposed to be due, rather to our own dignity and public opinion, than to the will of our heavenly Father. How great and how sad this mistake is, requires rather to be noticed than proved. For it is obvious how great a difference it must make in the whole feeling with which we summon our resolution. To struggle with our natural disposition for the sake of our dignity, is but a bleak and cheerless contest; while, on the contrary, we can scarce conceive any topic of consolation more soothing and elevating than the knowledge that though we are set forward unto death, yet that it is under the banner of the Lord, and that the rough paths in which we are treading resemble those in which the Martyrs trod before us (Remains II.1.256).

Froude cannot justly be accused of proposing penance as an end in itself, as this sermon testified. His poem, "Lord, I Have Fasted," bears additional testimony of his orthodox view of self-denial in its last line "It must be rooted in charity."

Granted that one is struggling for perfection—living with the thought of God present before him and therefore trying to "get root in himself," his next pitfall is pharisaical pride. To avoid this, Froude recommended living an unostentatious life, as far as personal aggrandizement was concerned. He advocated a dedicated life which did not call attention to itself by any eccentricities. A letter to his brother William partially explains what the life of a "humdrum" entails, since Hurrell showed solicitude lest his brother could not differentiate between living the life of a "humdrum" and compromising on principles. To avert the danger of the latter, Hurrell himself endorsed the right to unleash his fury with vituperative scorn rather than sacrifice principles.
On October 27, 1827, he wrote to William:

I am very sorry to find that you are not on good terms with the other fellows in College, and though it is very possible, and indeed likely that the majority may in a case of that sort be in the wrong, still if it is only about amusements it is not worth while to set up one's self on such trifles. There are quite enough serious matters on which a fellow may have opportunity to show his steadiness and how little he is influenced by the silly notions of others, and one ought to be glad of any trifling occasion of giving way, if it was only to show one's firmness on other matters was not obstinacy. I am giving you advice which I never used to follow myself, but now I try to do so as much as I can, having experienced the evil effects of a contrary conduct. If I were you I would try as much as I could to fall in with the general games, and even if it is a bore to be shinn'd at football, it is better than being disliked for shirking it. Besides, it is no bad thing to be forced to bear pain now and then. 27

Complete disinterestedness in regard to one's own material success coupled with complete devotion and the use of all one's talents and ability to further the cause of Christ is the goal Froude set before his parishioners and clients. His choice of Saint John the Baptist further demonstrates this goal of becoming a "humdrum." Saint John never forgot that he was not the Light, nor did he allow others to forget it; he was but the precursor who prepared the way for the Light, drawing all men to the Light. "He must increase, I must decrease." John's self-effacement, however, was not that of a man who would not boldly bear testimony to the Light, a man who refused to acknowledge his gifts and talents, or a man who was magnetized by his neighbor's opinions. Saint John was a man of power who, through the talent and personality which he recognized as fine gifts of God, drew crowds of people; he was a fearless man who would not compromise on principles, even though a king challenged him, for he knew

the Source of his power as well as his own limitation; he was an unambitious man who cared not for the futile praise or blame of his fellowmen, but looked only for the opportunity of pleasing God. Saint John the Baptist was a humble man—a "humdrum"—one who knew the truth and gave testimony to the Truth. Froude emphasized: "It is this feature in Saint John's history which seems in an especial manner to demand the contemplation of serious persons. This single-hearted disinterested zeal in a cause, the success of which he was not to witness, or materially to promote" (Remains II.1.222).

These ideals which Froude alleged in his sermons and instructions give meaning to Froude's own life. His diary is a witness to his own habit of living in the presence of God. His one concern in life was to please God. The diary witnesses his superhuman efforts to acquire knowledge of himself and, in turn, to correct his shortcomings. His striving for perfection, however imprudent at times, was certainly not unmotivated nor wrongly motivated. Neither was his struggle a manifestation of a presumptuous confidence in his own strength. "I have read over my journal because I intend to receive the Sacrament next Sunday, and want to have some settled notion what particular weaknesses I must pray for support against, and what sins and omissions I have to be forgiven" (Remains I.1.19).

The following passages from his diary are typical and show his determination to "take root" in himself, to know himself in order that he might correct himself and purify his motives. Each minute deflection from his high goal was noted and vigilantly guarded against. The diary
exemplifies the kind of religious examen Froude recommended to his parishioners for use to prepare themselves in self-knowledge and thereby attain indirectly to a life of closer union with God.

October 1, 1826
I felt a wish cross my mind to show off abstinence before P, of which I am thoroughly ashamed.

October 2, 1826
Was impatient for supper, though not hungry; and deceived myself with the notion that it was wrong to fast on Sundays. I am not sure that I should have eaten anything if P had been in the room. (Evening) I have been tolerably abstemious to-day, but have caught myself once or twice, as well in other matters as in this, thinking what P would think of me.

October 8, 1826
Felt so disinclined to come to evening Church that I wished it would rain for an excuse, but was thoroughly ashamed of myself, and went in spite of a storm.

October 21, 1826
Gave P my Greek Testament for a memorial. We had slept in the same room; and I felt how little root I had in myself, as it came into my head whether he would think my prayers long enough.

Conscious of the fact that ease and satiety may be the gateway to sin, Froude sought assistance from God in maintaining a straight course:

March 4, 1827
O God, keep up in me now, while I am in the sunshine, that consciousness of my wretchedness which the day of darkness forced on me. Or if by no other means I can be preserved from arrogance, bow me down again, O Lord, and let Thy storms pass over me. O may it please Thee, of Thy goodness, to render its accomplishment unnecessary. . . . Let me find the narrow course between Pharisaical scrupulosity in things to which I as yet annex no meaning, and using this as a pretext for real negligence.

A life of penance without ostentation so that he "might be literally hid in the presence of the Lord" was his goal.

October 21, 1826
I have been coming to a resolution that, as soon as I am out of reach of observation, I will begin a sort of monastic austere life, and do my best to chastise myself before the Lord. That I will
attend chapel regularly, eat little and plainly, drink as little wine as I can consistently with the forms of society: keep the fasts of the Church as much as I can without ostentation: . . . give all the money I can save in charity for the adorning of religion. That I will submit myself to the wishes of the *** as to one set over me by the Lord, but never give in to the will or opinion of any one from idleness, or false shame, or want of spirit. That I will avoid society as much as I can, except those I can do good to, or from whom I may expect real advantage; and that I will, in all my actions endeavor to justify that high notion of my capacities of which I cannot divest myself. That I will avoid all conversations on serious subjects, except with those whose opinions I revere, and content myself with exercising dominion over my own mind, without trying to influence others.

Froude's aim to sanctify his social actions is evident throughout his journal:

February 1, 1826
All my associations here are bad, and I can hardly shake them off. All the old feelings I have been trying to get rid of, seemed revived: particularly vanity and wandering of mind. I do not really care for any of their opinions; and I will try to act as if "I had root in myself." I will try to do steadily what I ought to do; and, as far as I can control the impulse of the moment, will never let a desire to obtain their good opinion be the motive of any of my slightest actions.

This same zeal for purity of intention later caused Froude to admonish Newman when the latter was willing to compromise rather than alienate some followers from the cause: "I cannot see the harm of losing influence with people when you can only retain it by sinking the points on which you differ with them. What is the good of influence except to influence people?" Froude would tolerate no compromise on principles. Knowing that God alone can deify the soul, and realizing his own weaknesses, he asked God to judge his intentions and forgive his falls:

July 25, 1826
O Lord, consider it not a mockery in me, that day after day I present myself before Thee, professing penitence for sins, which I
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continue to commit, and asking Thy grace to assist me in subduing them while my negligence renders it ineffectual. O Lord, if I must judge of the future from the past, and if the prayers which I am now about to offer up to Thee will prove equally ineffectual with those which have preceded them, then indeed it is a fearful thing to come before Thee with professions, whose fruitlessness seems a proof of their insincerity. But Thine eye trieth my inward parts, and knoweth my thoughts, independently of the actions which proceed from them.

Froude's journal is a testimony of his life of austerity; the pages are filled with notations of imprudent deprivations of food and drink, sleeping on the bare floor, voluntary inflictions of pain which, in all probability, hastened him to an early consumptive death at the age of thirty-three. Throughout the journal, however, is proof, too, that Froude was never a prey to deception; he realized that penance was not an end in itself—-that it could easily be the means of greater pride. "It is curious to see how by denying one affection we gratify another, and how hard it is to keep a pure motive for anything." Froude was striving for humility; he wanted to efface himself so he could give testimony to the Truth.

The ideals which Froude held up for his parishioners in his sermons and which were evidenced in practice in his own early life by accounts in his journals were not attenuated by his vigorous life as leader of the Oxford Movement; they were developed, instead, by his contacts with men and books advocating the same high goals.
CHAPTER II

FROUDE: THE BACKGROUND AND INFLUENCES IN HIS LIFE

Richard Hurrell Froude was born at Dartington in Devonshire in 1803, on the twenty-fifth of March--the feast of the Annunciation--of a wealthy landowning family. His father, the Reverend Robert Froude, Rector of Dartington and later Archdeacon of Totnes in Exeter, was, according to Keble, "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."¹ From him Hurrell inherited a love of riding, talent in drawing, and an attraction for outdoor life. As far as can be determined, Archdeacon Froude seemed contented with the Church and the role he played in it until the fire of his son's zeal awakened him to the fact that not only was danger to its spiritual structure imminent, but a slow decomposition was already warping its very foundation.

Froude's mother, Margaret Spedding Froude, was a deeply religious, intelligent, and gifted woman for whom Hurrell's admiration deepened the more he became acquainted with the spiritual life she lived.

¹Keble, Memoir, p. 111.
Hurrell was the eldest of eight children. Both Robert and John, next in age to Hurrell, died early in life, as well as his two sisters, Phillis Jane and Mary Isabella. William, an engineer and naval architect, seemed to be closer to Hurrell than any of his other brothers. He and Hurrell shared a love for the out-of-doors, and Hurrell spent long hours coaching William in his studies, as well as advising him in spiritual matters. William became a close friend of Newman, although he never maintained the same religious convictions which Newman came to hold.

James Anthony, the historian and defender of the Reformation, was fifteen years younger than Hurrell. A fellow of Exeter College, he associated first with Newman and helped publish *The Lives of the English Saints*, but later, sealing his dissatisfaction with the Tractarian Party by his *Nemesis of Faith*, he turned to Carlyle. His biographer, Herbert Paul, gives an unfavorable picture of Hurrell, to which one can give little credence. It may be true, as stated, that Hurrell's "dominating personality" was not beneficial to a sensitive and nervous child like James Anthony, but it is scarcely tenable that Hurrell took James Anthony "by the heels and stirred with his head the mud at the bottom of a stream."2 Either we must doubt the veracity of James Anthony's later statement about Hurrell that "I have never seen any person,—not one! in whom, as I now think of him, the excellences of intellect and character

---

were combined in fuller measure," or credit him with a poor memory, if the previous assertion of Paul is true. Just as it is difficult to approximate the relationship between Hurrell and James Anthony, so it is equally difficult to ascertain the latter's relationship with his father. When James Anthony published a semiautobiographical novel called Shadows of the Clouds in 1847, his father bought and destroyed as many of the available copies as he could procure. The book depicts a strict, unfeeling man known as Canon Fowler, who unjustly ruins the love affair, and consequently the youth, of his son Edward. It was published under the pen name Zeta.

Hurrell attended Ottery Free School in Devonshire, during which time he lived with the family of the Reverend George Coleridge, master of the school and nephew of the famous poet. In 1816, just five years before he matriculated at Oriel as Commoner, Hurrell became an Etonian. Little is said of his life at Eton, but he must have been sufficiently impressed with its program of classical study, for Thomas Mozley reported that "he very consistently urged that the expenses of Eton should be kept down so low as to enable every ordinary incumbent to send his sons there to be trained for the ministry."4 Hurrell was very spirited, impetuous, and vexatious at home during his Etonian years, compelling his mother to devise, unsuccessfully, numerous means of discipline.

---

3James Anthony Froude, "A Few Words on Mr. Freeman," Nineteenth Century, III (April 1878), 621.

After the death of his mother in 1821, Hurrell went to Oxford and passed to a new apprenticeship in his yet unformed apostolate; he met John Keble. The latter, eleven years older than Hurrell, was the son of a High Church clergyman and the descendant of a family of non-jurors. John Keble and his brother Thomas obtained scholarships at Corpus Christi College after both an extensive and intensive education by their father. In 1810, as a result of the father's diligent tutelage and his own application, John achieved the distinction of a double first class honors in Classics and Mathematics at Oriel, the center of learning at this time. As a fellow and tutor at Oriel, Keble was noted for his literary ability but, far more, it was his principled life, his profound piety, and his sincerity which inspired awe in his friends and colleagues. It was natural that such a model of perfection should have attracted the attention of a perfectionist like Hurrell Froude.

Next to Mrs. Froude, John Keble was one of the greatest influences which molded Hurrell Froude's character. His saintly simplicity and wise practicality restrained Froude's youthful exuberances and depressions. Not many years elapsed before Froude was satisfied to let his spiritual life be directed entirely by Keble. He often preached Keble's sermons, and, even in regard to the acceptance of a parish with Newman, Froude was willing to subscribe to whatever answer Keble would volunteer for him. Their correspondence, beginning in 1823, reveals a fatherly understanding and concern for a spiritual son with an excessive idealistic nature which forgot that perfection was not achieved in one day.

On October 14, 1826, Hurrell appealed to Keble: "I wish you would
say anything to me that you think would do me good. However severe it may be. You must have observed many things very contemptible in me, but I know worse of myself, and shall be prepared for anything. I cannot help being afraid that I am still deceiving myself about my motives and feelings, and shall be glad of anything in which to steady myself" (Remains I.i.204-206). In turn, Keble warned Hurrell about excessive introspection which engenders despair; he urged cheerfulness and positive acts of charity to his neighbor. Again and again, during these early years of acquaintance, Froude found himself in a state of melancholy and came to Keble "to be prosed and put in a better way."

Froude's friendship with Keble had in it a warmth of feeling and tone of intimacy which was seldom allowed to Keble's other acquaintances. The jocular complimentary close to a letter of March 23, 1825, "Yours half grateful, quarter resentful, and the rest hopeful" discloses an amity which by October 12, 1826 had grown into a confidence which willed to make a father confessor out of Keble. Froude confessed his lapses in the spiritual life, especially his lack of humility, and asked advice against a relapse.

Although limitation was put upon the time Froude was allowed to spend with Keble, for the latter was unfortunately much engaged, Froude confided to Wilberforce, early in 1827, that even that little time sufficed to bring before him "the immeasurable interval which separates him from his fellow-wanderers on earth. There is a sort of deep richness in his observations which gives a resting-place to one's dreary feelings,
and helps one to see things through an enchanted atmosphere."^5

As the acquaintance of the two men grew, Hurrell imbibed more and more of the spirit and attitude of his teacher. The practices he observed in Keble became for him a way of life; the ideas and attitudes of Keble crystallized into a view of life. Walter Lock, in his biography of John Keble, aptly stated the point: "It was like a high-bred horse responding at once to a master's touch."^6

Keble commanded a great power of fasting; for many years, he took no food on Friday until evening, and even after he had reached his seventieth birthday, he took scarcely more on fast-days than a light meal in the evening. Froude's diary manifests a parallel growth in the spirit of penance and fasting; evidence of denial of food, restriction of sleep, and similar restraints becomes more prevalent during the early years of Keble's tutorship.

From observing and listening to Keble, Froude probably formulated his own ideal of being a "humdrum," for, to Keble, a life that would draw attention to itself either by an unnecessary appearance of austerity or

---

^5 Ashwell, The Life of Wilberforce, I, 35; (cf. Letter of R. H. Froude to Wilberforce on March 20, 1827.)


^7 John Keble, Supplement to Memoir, Tractarian Pamphlets, II, 47.

by an ambitious originality⁹ was equally repugnant. Keble himself was a retreating man; he shunned the company of men like Blanco White, who would draw him into useless controversies. It is related that he would not enter the home which sheltered a Liberal.¹⁰ In 1827, he quietly withdrew from the competition for the provostship of Oriel. Although desirous of the Poetry Professorship, Keble made no attempt to attain it for himself. In spite of the fact that he had received the highest honors of Oriel, which only one man previous to that time had received, Keble left Oxford in 1823, when his mother died, and took charge of three small parishes which netted him little financial remuneration, and which withdrew him from the public eye until a defense of religious principles forced him at different times to take a public stand, a position which he was reluctant to take unless absolutely necessary.

It was during the Vacation of 1823, when Keble left Oriel for his curacy at Southrop, and Froude went with Keble to read for his degree, that Froude entered into a closer relationship with Keble. His respect and admiration for Keble developed him into an ardent disciple, alert to

⁹ John Keble, Occasional Papers and Reviews (London, 1877), p. xii. Isaac Williams related of Keble: "It was to me quite strange and wonderful that one so distinguished should always ask one's opinion as if he was younger than myself." Autobiography, p. 18.

¹⁰ James Anthony Froude, Short Studies on Great Subjects (London, 1886), p. 269. I use the term "Liberal" to denote, according to Newman, "false liberty of thought, or the exercise of thought upon matters, in which, from the constitution of the human mind, thought cannot be brought to any successful issue, and therefore is out of place. Among such matters are first principles of whatever kind; and of these the most sacred and momentous are especially to be reckoned the truths of Revelation."
interpret and quick to accept the ideas and views of his teacher. Isaac Williams and Robert Wilberforce, fellow students at Oriel, accompanied Froude to Southrop.

Besides penance and humility, another practice of John Keble must have influenced Hurrell Froude. The beautiful poem, "Mother Out of Sight," and various poems published in The Christian Year give proof of another trait of John Keble—his tender devotion to Our Lady, which he probably inherited from Laud and Hickes. In a poem written on the feast of the Annunciation, Keble attested to the esteem in which he held Mary:

"thou whose name/ all but adoring love claim" (The Christian Year).

John Henry Newman best expressed the exalted position in which Keble placed the Mother of God:

If there be one writer in the Anglican Church who has discovered a deep, tender, loyal devotion to the Blessed Virgin, it is the author of the Christian Year. The image of the Virgin and Child seems to be the one vision upon which both his heart and intellect have been formed; and those who knew Oxford twenty or thirty years ago, say that, while other college rooms were ornamented with pictures of Napoleon on horseback, or Apollo and the Graces, or Heads of Houses placed in easy chairs, there were the rooms of one man, a young and rising one, in which might be seen the Madonna di Sisto or Domenichino's Saint John—fit augury of him who was in the event to do so much for the revival of Catholicism.

In spite of the manifestation by Keble of such an ardent affection for Mary, there is a complete lack of evidence in the writings of Froude that Keble instilled this love for Our Lady in his pupil. Froude scarcely alluded to the Mother of God. One is, however, justified in be-

---

lieving that Froude was a sharer in his teacher's veneration for Mary, because Newman said of Froude: "He fixed deep in me the idea of devotion to the Blessed Virgin."  

Besides, Hurrell's love of virginity, of which he considered the Blessed Virgin the great Pattern, his attraction to the Medieval Church, and his faith in the Real Presence are so involved in Mariology that it would be a strange indictment to accuse him of a lack of love for her, on whose feast he entered the world.

Through Keble, Froude also developed an interest in religious poetry although he found the Sternhold-Hopkinsy element in Keble's poems unpalatable. Milton, Froude evicted from the rank of religious poets altogether. Sharing his teacher's dislike of Puritanism, Froude lacked, however, his teacher's discernment; he did not see that a man's writings could be appreciated apart from the man himself. In the October issue of the Quarterly Review of 1825, Froude read an article on sacred poetry in which, he confided to Keble, he "looked greedily for a final demolisher to his [Milton's] fame." Instead, he found Milton praised as a religious poet. In a grieved tone, Froude informed Keble that it was rumored that


13 Marot of France introduced a new method of hymnology which consisted of setting the verses of Scripture to popular airs, a practice which appealed to the lower classes of people. Calvin assimilated it into his ecclesiastical system instead of hymns from the Breviary and Missal. Forbidden by the Roman Catholic Church, it was primarily associated with Calvinism. Thomas Sternhold and John Hopkins introduced Marot's system into England in the sixteenth century.
Keble, as was true, was the author of the article. To Froude, this was quite incomprehensible. 14

It was from Keble also that Froude derived his love for Catholic tradition. It awakened in him a concern for the Church as a receptacle of cherished truth which devoted non-jurors and other Anglican divines defended with their lives. The sacramental system, which the Puritans endeavored to extirpate at various times, began to form an integral part of the spiritual edifice of Froude’s ideal Church. Like Keble, Froude soon realized that religion was meant to be more than Sunday attire or an emotional catharsis; religion was a form of justice, whereby man offered God the worship due to Him.

The manner of Froude’s growth in knowledge and respect for tradition was very typical of him. It was first initiated by the respect and love for the man who taught the doctrine. In the spring of 1825, he confessed to Keble that he “venerated Clarendon,” and “adored King Charles and Bishop Laud,” supporters of Catholic tradition in England. Soon after, he added a glowing account of his admiration for Hammond. During the

14 By 1833, Froude changed his attitude toward the Puritans. In fact, he sympathized with them. He told Newman on September 8, 1833: “I have been reading a good deal about the Reformation in Queen Elizabeth’s time— it is shocking indeed. What do you think of my contemplating An Apology for Early Puritans? I really think they deserve much commiseration. The Episcopalians did not claim ‘jus Divinum’ and indeed Queen Elizabeth 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.” Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection.

Froude wrote to Keble in more detail about “your friends the Puritans” on September 16, 1833.
following year, he read more books which helped him to appreciate the ethos of Catholic tradition: Taylor's *Holy Living and Dying* and Law's *Serious Call* and Bishop Wilson's *Sermons*. Love for tradition became so deeply engrained in Froude that he waxed strong in enthusiasm whenever he spoke of defenders of this tradition, especially Thomas a Becket, Cardinal Pole, and King Charles I; Gregory VII ranked first on this list.

Writings, such as these on tradition, were part of a directed reading program, instigated by Keble, to develop the great spiritual potentialities he recognized in his pupil. These readings influenced the final position Froude held in respect to Catholic doctrine probably more than any other single influence. The books, however, which John Keble proposed led Hurrell to paths which often bore fruit of a riper nature than Keble anticipated; Hurrell was "not afraid of inferences" and he was free from prejudices against Roman Catholic doctrine, many of which John Keble maintained. Newman said of Froude: "He taught me to look with admiration towards the Church of Rome." 

This sympathetic attitude toward Roman Catholicism was partly the re-

---


16 Newman wrote to Rose on May 23, 1856: "As to dear Froude, he was a furious Church and King Man--I do believe reading mainly opened his eyes. " *Unpublished Letters*, Reel 81, Copied Letters.

sult of his studies under Lloyd, Divinity Professor at Oxford and later Bishop of London. Lloyd did not permit his students to abuse Roman Catholicism. He himself, after association with the French clergy, grew in an understanding and respect for the Roman Catholic Church. In his lecture series, he devoted much of his time to the study of the history and structure of the Anglican prayerbook. Naturally, its sources—the Missal and the Breviary—gained emphasis. Roman Missals and Breviaries were secured through a Roman Catholic bookseller.

Already on February 1, 1826, Froude reported to Keble the catalogue of books which Lloyd recommended; although Froude spoke of Lloyd's lectures a few months later, it was not until a letter on October 23, 1827, that Froude actually stated his attendance at these lectures. At that time, he concluded that his "time and spirits" would be so much overdrawn in another quarter that he would not have much left. "Otherwise an historical account of the Liturgy, tracing all the prayers, through the Roman missals and breviaries, up to their original source, for one lecture, and the Epistle to the Romans and first of the Corinthians for the other, would be a very eligible subject to spend a good deal of time on" (Remains I.1.221).

Froude changed his mind. Lloyd, the man who later vindicated Roman Catholic doctrines against Protestant misrepresentations before George IV

---

at the time of the Catholic Emancipation problem, impressed Froude and inculcated in him such a love for the Breviary that it became his constant companion. Frederick Oakeley recalled:

There was not one of the class upon whom these lectures appeared to make so deep an impression, as the late Richard Hurrell Froude. . . . In him, Dr. Lloyd's teaching on the subject of liturgies found a mind ripe, at the age of one and twenty, for receiving impressions favourable even to the Roman Church, and strongly adverse to the Reformation. . . . What in Dr. Lloyd was a "view," in Mr. Froude settled into a motive; and what with many of Dr. Lloyd's pupils would probably have lived and died away as a mere fashion, took extensive root under Mr. Froude's influence, and eventually germinated into something intensely and powerfully practical.

Besides Lloyd, another influence may have helped Froude to look without prejudice upon the Roman Catholic Church. This influence was Richard Hooker (1554-1600), whose Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity Froude told Keble he was reading already on November 5, 1826. Keble's own regard for Hooker is evidenced in the fact that he spent from 1830 to 1836 preparing an edition of Hooker's works.

Hooker drew up a via media between Protestantism and Catholicism. He

---

19 Frederick Oakeley, "Historical Notes of the Tractarian Movement," Dublin Review (July 1863), 179. Lloyd's influence upon Newman was considerably different. In regard to the formation of religious principles, Newman said: "I am not aware I owed anything to Dr. Lloyd. I left his lecture room in 1824, as I entered it in 1822, a Calvinist (Unpublished Letters, Reel 81, Copied Letters; an N.B. attached to the letter Newman wrote to Harriet on June 4, 1829). Newman attended only the Bible lectures of Lloyd; not the Prayer Book lectures which Froude attended. Also, Newman was under the influence of Lloyd's severest critic--Whately.

20 Frederick Oakeley, "Personal Reminiscences of the Oxford Movement," Tracts for the Times: Pamphlets, II (London, 1855), 6. The "one and twenty" was probably a conjecture in age; there is no evidence that Froude attended Lloyd's lectures before 1826.
held a two-church theory as Luther and Calvin did—the Church Invisible, consisting of the elect as they are in the eyes of God; and the Church Visible, consisting of professed believers organized according to the precepts of the Bible. The former was the essence of Religion; it was a private, individual, subjective affair, sensibly indiscernible. The latter, not directly under God as the Church Invisible but rather under the State, was erected for the safeguard of the Elect. The Church Visible contained the elect and non-elect.

Hooker differed from Luther in that he did not accept the total depravity of man. Although he accepted Luther's doctrine of Justification through faith, the imputation of the merits of Christ, Hooker believed man could better himself through his own natural power; he called this "sanctification."

Hooker followed Bellarmine and Aquinas in his philosophy of the state. Law is a product of reason; the state arises out of the very nature of man. Because man is a rational social being, he partakes of the Eternal Law; he regulates his manner of living with others. The consent of all men invests sovereignty in one authority who will exercise his power in accordance with the natural law.

Hooker carried this philosophy into the ecclesiastical field. Since the Invisible Church alone was the true church, and the function of the Visible Church was not that of supernaturalization, there was no need for a specific government determined by God. According to Hooker, the Visible Church had the same origin as the state; it arose out of the necessity of
human nature—the human desires of man for religious association. Like other societies, it was an imperfect society. It could be identified with the state—if the people acted politically, they acted as the state; if they acted religiously, they acted as the Church.

The power of the Visible Church originated just as that of the state—ultimately from God; directly from the consent of the governed. Originally, the consent of the governed was directed to the Pope of Rome; now, the consent of the governed in England was directed to the Crown. In Italy, it was still the Pope. 21

Hurrell Froude could find in Hooker, whom he was studying, a benevolent attitude toward the Pope of Rome and all Roman Catholics as long as they adhered to the branch theory, which assumed that all were members of the Same Invisible Catholic Church, but, because of the differences in time, place, and social conditions, one was a member of the particular branch of the Church in England while the other was a member of the particular branch of the Church in Rome.

21Cletus Dirksen, A Critical Analysis of Richard Hooker's Theory of the Relation of Church and State (June 1947), pp. 73-126. Hurrell Froude modified his views of Hooker's Polity; as the Church became more and more influenced by liberal measures, Froude investigated Church polity.

In 1835, when Keble was completing his edition of Hooker, he wrote to Froude: "Newman says I must give a view of Hooker's views. But this will go terribly against the grain. . . . I am more and more satisfied that Richard was in most things a middle term between Laud and Cranmer, but nearer the former; and also that he was in a transition state when he was taken from us; and there is no saying how much nearer he might have got to Laud, if he had lived twenty years longer. His notion of Regal, or rather State, power would rather have stood in the way, and so perhaps would his dislike to anything approaching to Justification by inherent grace." J.T. Coleridge, A Memoir of the Reverend John Keble (Oxford, 1874), p. 201.
Hooker did not derogate the power of the bishops and clergy in his system of ecclesiastical polity; he maintained a hierarchy of power. Each bishop was authorized to the jurisdiction of a certain territory, with, however, a universal power having supreme authority over all. This universal power was the Crown.

The bishops were given power to administer the Sacraments, to teach, and to preach; these powers they had in common with the presbyters. Besides this, the bishops were given the power to ordain ecclesiastical persons.

Since the power of the Visible Church resided in the people, it was only with the consent of the people--and above all, with the consent of the Crown--that the bishops could make ecclesiastical laws.

In matters purely spiritual, the bishops through the power of ordination, were directly responsible to God. Since purely spiritual matters entail only internal acts, for any external act is under the jurisdiction of the Crown, it is difficult to see the limitation of the Crown's power. One, baptized and reared in the Anglican Church is not too likely to see this limitation of episcopal power, however, unless the encroachment upon that power were of a positive nature.

Froude need have no prejudiced feelings toward Rome as long as he accepted the fact that he was a member of the same invisible Church as Rome was; he need have no violent reactions to an ecclesiastical society which chose the Pope as its head while his own church chose the Crown, as long as both societies held the same doctrines, in general. There is no
evidence that Froude entertained any animosity, as a youth, toward Rome.
Keble's exhortation in *The Christian Year*, "Speak gently of the sister's fall," was more than graciously adhered to by Froude.

Toward the end of 1826, Froude was also reading the early Fathers, according to Keble's direction. He had completed nearly four books of Eusebius (*Remains I.i.206-209*). Although he witnessed difficulty in procuring the books of the Church Fathers, and perplexity in determining the order in which they were to be read, Froude's letters indicate that he persevered in the task. In 1827, he read Ignatius (*Remains I.i.101*), and it was Froude who, in 1833, suggested the printing and distributing of the works of Clement and Ignatius.

Hooker's theory, the writings of the Fathers, the works on tradition, and Lloyd's instructions seemed to clarify, broaden, and strengthen each other in their general principles rather than to point up controversial issues before 1830. The writers stressed the spiritual and sacramental nature of the church with which his studies in church liturgy under Lloyd had familiarized him. It was the sacramental system revered by Keble, upheld by Charles I, defended by Laud, justified by Hooker, and originated by Christ as described by the Church Fathers.

All held one baptism, although it is difficult to explain the supernatural aspect of the sacramental system in a natural church such as Hooker's Visible Church. The same is true of Confirmation. Anglican Divines like Laud and Wilson, and to a greater extent Jeremy Taylor, acknowledged the doctrine of the Real Presence, which the Church Fathers proclaimed, even though they differed from one another in the meaning...
attached to the words. As to the necessity of Sacramental Confession, the Church Fathers were explicit on this requirement; certainly, Froude must have repeatedly heard Keble's own desire for a revival of the rule of systematic confession. Keble believed that, without it, clergy in parishes were "like people whose lantern has blown out, and are feeling their way, and continually stepping in puddles and splotches of mud, which they think are dry stones." Many Anglican Divines, like Taylor and Cosin, held a more conservative view on confession, admitting its beneficial effect but disallowing its sacramental nature. Devotion to Our Lady, promulgated by all the Church Fathers, especially Ambrose, was heartily approved by Keble, Laud, Lloyd, and many other Anglicans.

Froude's love for the Church and for tradition grew the more he read

22 John Keble, Letters of Spiritual Counsel, p. 39.

23 Newman expressed in a "Letter to Jelf" what must have passed through Froude's mind as he read the different Divines. Being a man of deep faith, he must have accepted the most reverential of the doctrines of each Divine as Newman did: "But I desire that it may not be supposed as utterly unlawful . . . to allow a compreension with the Saints as Bramhall does, or to hold with Andrews that, taking away the doctrine of Transubstantiation from the Mass, we shall have no dispute about the Sacrifice; or with Hooker to treat even Transubstantiation as an opinion which by itself need not cause separation; or to hold with Hammond that no General Council, truly such, ever did, or shall err in any matter of faith; or with Bull, that man was in a supernatural state of grace before the fall, by which he could attain to immortality, and that he has recovered it in Christ, or with Thorndike, that works of humiliation and penance are requisite to render God again propitious to those who fall from the grace of Baptism; or with Pearson that the Name of Jesus is not otherwise given under Heaven than in the Catholic Church."

in church history. Monasticism, which appealed to him early in youth, unfolded itself as a plan of life and a practical means of attaining sanctity. In Saint Ignatius, Froude found an advocate of celibacy. In 1827, while reading the works of Ignatius with admiration, Froude jotted in his diary about St. Ignatius: "He gave rules about virginity, and neglect of wealth, comfort, and what besides is pleasurable" (Remains I.i. 101). This view coincided with Hooker's judgment that "Single life is a thing more Angelical and Divine."

Proportionately, as his readings increased and the vigor of his spiritual life mounted, Froude looked for a fulfillment of the ideal Church. This he found in the medieval church of Hildebrand. One man who attracted his attention as the embodiment of all his personal ideals, and as a martyr defended the church from political domination, was Thomas of Becket. Froude did intensive research in the original manuscripts of the period, and he clarified many erroneous ideas which, for centuries, were annexed to the martyr's name.

Although Becket was not the "humdrum" which Froude set as a goal for himself, still he had another quality which was being enkindled in Froude now, and which was soon to be his distinguishing mark in his apostolate. Of Becket, Froude wrote:

It is not indeed to be pretended, that the ardour with which he devoted himself to this noble enterprise, was altogether such as to consist with the very highest frame of mind: there was an eagerness about it; a fiery zeal; a spirit of chivalry which excluded that calm unruffled quiescence which is the prerogative of faith, -- that entire indifference to consequences which reason points out as the proper frame of mind for those who fight under the banner of the Invincible, who know that whether their efforts succeed or fail, His will is alike done. And yet, in his very imperfections, there is a
kind of splendor, to which its own praise is due: if short of the very highest character, they are at least an approach to it, which few are capable of making. An excess of zeal in the cause of God, is indefinitely less culpable than lukewarmness (Remains II.ii.24).

Froude produced evidence to show that Becket lived a life of mortification hidden from even his nearest friends. On his deathbed, he wore a hairshirt which his confessor admitted had been his custom to wear. Likewise, Becket slept on bare boards and fasted rigorously.

Froude felt compelled to add: "England must have retrograded sadly if such characters were ever common in her annals . . ." (Remains II.ii.10).

Hildebrand, especially, warranted Froude's admiration. This eleventh century Pope had been able to establish the supremacy of Church over State, going so far as to excommunicate foreign power which interfered in spiritual matters. He lived for some time the life of a monk, and, as a Pope, he enforced the life of celibacy among his clergy. Froude saw the Church in the time of Hildebrand as a living, vital stronghold of the Faith. The accent was upon spiritual reform during this time, and Hildebrand inaugurated stringent measures of reform for both clergy and lay members.

Froude, who teemed with measures of attaining personal sanctification and whose idealistic nature lent itself most generously to all that was spiritual, accepted readily the whole positive scheme of church doctrine which was unfolding itself to him. Scepticism in matters of doctrine was foreign to his nature. Like Keble, his love for God strengthened his faith and enabled him to concur wholeheartedly in doctrines.
which the Age of Rationalism held up for sceptical viewing. It was natural then, in 1826 when he became a Fellow at Oriel, for Froude, who believed in taking "the safest course"—that of faith, to look askance at his new companions who wanted a reasonable certitude before accepting any matters as true. Polemics was their favorite pastime, and the only facts worth retaining were those wrested from the coals of a continual and heated debate, according to them.

The "Oriel Noetics" initiated Froude into a field of controversy which groomed him for later years when he would have to extricate the strand of truth from a much more entangled web. They were a group of distinguished intellectuals who reacted against the emotional religion of their day. Neither High Churchmen bound by Tradition nor Low Churchmen bound by enthusiasm, they advocated the subjection of all doctrine to Reason. Unconsciously, they left no room for Faith.

Edward Copleston was sometimes looked upon as the head of this liberal party, but only because he was provost of Oriel at the time of its rise in significance, and he remained in that position until the time of his preferment, when he was appointed to the See of Llandaff. He had succeeded John Eveleigh, whose first endeavor at university reform he brought to fruition.

Thomas Arnold, who desired to admit to the Church of England Dissenters of all kinds except Unitarians, and Edward Hawkins, who followed Copleston as provost, were members of this liberal party. Most notable among the "Oriel Noetics," however, were Richard Whately and Joseph Blanco White.
The latter, a Roman Catholic priest who became a violent anti-Romanist, scorned the idea of virginity, scoffed at fasting and penance, spoke invidiously about the veneration of Mary and the Saints, rendered ludicrous the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and attempted evidence to prove the evil effects of the use of the Breviary. A Spaniard by birth, White had attended the Dominican convent of San Pablo and the University of Seville. He studied Aristotle under the Dominicans, and he was the only man at Oxford well acquainted with scholastic philosophy. Chancellor Jenkyns conferred an M.A. on White at Oriel for exemplary conduct and "more especially on account of those able and well-timed publications by which he has powerfully exposed the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome." White had just completed writing Practical and Internal Evidence Against Catholicism.

The Memoir of a fellow student at Oxford gives an insight into the life of Blanco White: "I am a little set at my pendulum work by Blanco White who has been studiously working to persuade me of Keble's mysticism and Newman's asceticism, that truth is subjective only, that law is practically the will of the people, that the Church is not of divine institu-

---


tion, that the Fathers as a body are fools, yea, knaves." 26

White fitted with the "Oriel Noetics" even though he was far their senior in age, being fifty-one years of age at the time his M.A. was conferred, for his chief exultation was his "unconquerable ... love of rational conviction." 27

Richard Whately published in 1830 The Errors of Romanism Traced to Their Origin in Human Nature. In the preface to the book, he made a gracious acknowledgment to Joseph Blanco White, to whom he dedicated the work, "I am indebted to you for such an insight into the peculiarities of the Church of Rome." Whately quoted from both White's Letter to Converts From Romanism and from his Evidence Against Catholicism. His dependence upon White's statements is shown in his view on Transubstantiation: "For the Roman doctrine is, as Mr. Blanco White has plainly shown, not, as they themselves declare, that bread is transformed into the body of Christ, but that Christ is transformed into bread, in the sense which the words according to invariable usage convey." 28

Unlike Newman, who credited Whately for his views on "the existence of the Church as a substantive body or corporation" and also for "those


anti-Erasrian views of Church polity," Froude arrived at these ideas independent of Whately. Froude expressed his precise idea of Whately to Acland:

Aldrich has all that has been, and all that can be said on Logic—as for the Bear [Whately] he is acknowledged to know Logic, and known to know nothing else. So he does these two things, swears
1. that Logic is very difficult and 2. that it is a science to be pursued to any length, and carried further by him than by any man yet. A, this involves the subject in great mystery. B, this makes it sound grand to those who know nothing of it.

As for Thomas Arnold, Froude hated his broad church views, and his proposals of compromise. Arnold did not hold Apostolical Succession, either.

Although Froude spoke of Blanco White generally with the epithet "poor," he could scarcely have admired a man so vehement in his denunciations of the things which were dear to Froude. A tolerant note toward White seemed to arise when the friendship between Newman and Froude formed.

The diary of Froude leads one to conjecture that the Liberals were a source of great annoyance to Froude. A keen and profound appreciation of ritual and dogma to which he was led by Keble, put Froude in an opposite camp from the "Oriel Noetics," who denied the dogmatic principle in religion and asserted that religious truth was relative.

In a precautionary letter to his brother William some years later, Hurrell advised from experience:

---

29 Acland, Memoirs, p. 26. Lloyd said that Whately "had sagacitía and nothing more."—Mark Pattison, Memoirs (London, 1885), p. 203. *Sagacitía* is translated "plainness" or "clearness" or "distinctness." Could Froude be echoing Lloyd?
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. Don't get intimate with people of that sort. Let your intercourse with them be only a matter of business, and take as few kind offices from them as you can, where you have not got it in your power to give a quid pro quo. Also, don't get absorbed in your pursuit, but make some divinity part of your day's work. Go on getting up the Greek Testament history, Newton on the Prophecies, or something of that sort; I don't care how little, but let it be something every day. A parson is the only person whose studies should be only professional. A MERE ENGINEER is sure to be a liberal at heart (Remains I.i.258-259).

The first clue to Froude's reaction against the Liberal Party was in a letter to Keble in 1824. Froude said he "predicated with confidence" who wrote the article in the Quarterly on Buckland, notwithstanding that he could nowhere find "the most perfect specimen of inductive reasoning"; he said the article smelt of "Schola Philosophiae Speculative," meaning "Noetic" influence.

The article was a review of William Buckland's Reliquiae Diluvianae, a book in which a scientist and geologist of Oxford gave the import of his discoveries of the remains of extinct animals on the Biblical account of the Deluge. The reviewer told of the service this book offered in an "age of free inquiry." He concluded: "The charge then that is committed even to the professors of physical science is precious and sacred; and happy is that age and country in which it is placed side by side with the interests of religion, in the hands of men whose education is enlightened

---

30 The Edinburgh Review, XXXVI (October 1821), 254, equated the "Criel Noetics" with this School. It spoke of them as "a distinguished society, which, besides its other merits, is at present the school of Speculative Philosophy in England."
and liberal, and who unite, as may surely always be done, the character of the scholar and the Christian with that of the philosopher, in their investigations of the frame and constitution of the material world."

Unlike Keble, Froude had a great interest in science, provided it was founded upon truth. Unlike the "Noetics," Froude knew the danger of science "placed side by side with the interests of religion" particularly, "in the hands of men whose education is enlightened and liberal."

It was Keble's policy to avoid people who would entice him into arguments. Froude, however, was of a different temperament; he seemed to invite disputes. During the school years of 1826 and 1827, Froude was constantly involved in controversies with the Liberals as his letter to Wilberforce, as well as his diary, attest. To Wilberforce, he confided:

I have had nothing to do in the shape of an argument since I left Oxford; and, as I am getting decidedly (puzzle-headed), I hope I shall keep clear for the future, if it was only for the credit of my cause. But, as we have a liberal -- staying here at present, I dread my inability to keep quiet. He would fully acquiesce with your friends in the praises of that good fellow Voltaire (Remains I.1.218).

Typical of the annotations which recur in Froude's diary about his controversies with the Liberals is that of October 7, 1826: "On looking over a part of Bp. Butler, that reminded me of the argument I had with --, felt provoked at not having set him down better, and if he had been there should have attacked him for victory. I will endeavor never to

---

argue on a serious subject again, except with those to whose opinions I look up; at least till I have good grounds to be more sure of myself" (Remains I.1.19).

Blanco White, evidently, was one of the antagonists: "I was a good deal annoyed that I could not arrange my thoughts for an argument with H. and Mr. B.W. At tea I felt a great inclination to make remarks, with a view to show how much I had thought on serious subjects . . . . An uncomfortable absurdity keeps hold of me, that my own opinions become false, when I allow contrary ones to be sported in my presence with impunity" (Remains I.1.32).

By 1828, Froude still seemed to be troubled by his associations. Unlike Keble, who had his parishes to keep him busy, Froude lived in close proximity to these men, and innocent conversations often grew into a battle of contention. Although, as Oakeley recalled, 32 Froude "used to appeal to this great moral teacher of antiquity ('Old Stottle,' as he used playfully to call him,) against the shallow principles of the day," he was no match for his opponents with their dialectic approach to matters of Faith. He was but a catechumen in the spiritual life, just a novice learning the beauties of the dogmatic principles of the Catholic Faith, principles in which his opponents did not even believe.

Froude’s continual polemics with the Liberals was a source of concern to Keble, who was older, more aware of the snares of false logic, and cognizant of the futility of arguing with men who lacked an appreciation for the Faith. Evidently, he reproved his pupil, for Froude replied:

---
32 Oakeley, Historical Notes, p. 180.
I have often been doleful since I saw you last, at the way in which you seemed to assume that I should differ from you in all sorts of points; and I want to consult you as a doctor, as to what symptoms you have seen in me that indicate such a malady. Please then in charity to send me an explanation of my case, and prescribe as nasty physic as you please. I believe that in consequence of my work being less disagreeable, I have become very fat-minded of late, and that I want a rubbing up on most points; but as to a general change of sentiments, and a dereliction of the views . . . have instilled in me, it is a charge to which my conscience pleads not guilty (Remains I.i.234).

Froude did realize the futility of the arguments with the "Noetics."

His "Essay on Rationalism" germinated at this time, but it was not completed until several years later by the editors of the Remains, who had to fill in some parts for which Froude left a broad outline. Froude resolved the argument by maintaining that the issue at stake was not "Reason vs. Faith" but "Which is more reasonable--Faith or Disbelief?"

That some doctrines and precepts are received by some, against which others think there is a balance of probabilities, is indeed perfectly true; but that, if these men were to argue together, the question would turn on, which ought to be trusted, Reason or Faith, is absurd; the real question being, which is the most reasonable, Faith or Disbelief. I believe in the miraculous conception of our Blessed Lord, another person disbelieves it; and then my belief is not founded on a submission of Reason to Faith, nor again, is his belief a triumph of Reason over Faith. His notions of the laws of evidence are different from mine: whether or not he be right and I wrong, the question between us is not, which ought to be most trusted, Faith or Reason, but whose notions of evidence are most reasonable, his or mine. He attributes more weight than I do, to the presumption drawn from experience, that the course of nature is uniform, and therefore cannot have been deviated from in this particular instance; I attribute more weight than he does to the testimony, which proves Scripture authentic, and the text, in which this miracle is stated, genuine. His reason teaches him to think it more probable that the parts of the Bible are a forgery, or at least couched in vague and random language than that the order of nature which we see around us should have been so wonderfully set aside; mine teaches me the reverse. Thus it is not his Reason and my Faith that are opposed, but his reliance on experience and my reliance on the genuineness and authenticity of Scripture; each of us being equally ready to appeal to Reason as the arbiter (Remains I.ii.22).
Froude was justified in seeking out the company of one of the liberals, Blanco White. Although the opinions and beliefs of these two men were diametrically divergent, White did have something to offer Froude. In the fall of 1827, Froude, Robert Wilberforce, and E.B. Pusey, studied the order of the Roman Catholic Service of the Breviary with White.\(^3\) White was able, more than any other acquaintance at Oxford, to explain the Breviary. Many controversies must have occurred during the periods of exposition, considering the differences in approach to the Book. As far as Keble's fears of Froude's deflection toward the view of the Liberals, they were groundless in this case; Froude was not taken in by White. Another associate of the "Oriel Noetics" offered a much greater attraction to Froude—John Henry Newman.

\(^3\)White, *Life*, I, 439. The three men were enrolled in Lloyd's lectures on the *Prayerbook*. Robert Wilberforce, afterwards Archdeacon, was a Fellow and Tutor of Oriel at the same time Froude was. Edward Pusey, later Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, had been a Fellow at Oriel in 1822 already. He formed a close friendship with Newman, with whom he lodged in 1823. Pusey and Newman, at that time, attended the Bible lectures of Lloyd.
CHAPTER III
FROUDE: THE BEGINNING OF HIS FRIENDSHIP WITH NEWMAN

In spite of the dissimilarities in family background, in tempera-
ment, and in social background, Newman and Froude were attracted to each
other from the beginning of their acquaintance in 1826. In May of that
year, Froude remarked, "Newman is to my mind far the greatest genius of
the party, and I cannot help think that, some time or other, I may get to
be well acquainted with him; but he is very shy, and dining with a person
now and then does not break the ice so quickly as might be wished"
(Remains I.1.1197).

Already, Newman had written to his mother in March of the same year,
"Froude is one of the acutest and clearest and deepest men in the memory
of man." ¹

John Henry Newman was two years older than Hurrell Froude. Like
Froude, he was the eldest child in the family. His father, being suc-
cessively a banker in London and then the manager of a brewery in Alton,
provided a somewhat different background for his son than Archdeacon
Froude did. Financial difficulties were foreign to the eight children in
the Froude household, but the Newmans had periods of anxiety occasioned

¹Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 115.
in 1816 by banking difficulties, and three years later by Mr. Newman’s severance from the brewery. Perforce, their eldest son did not know the serenity of the seventeen years of undisturbed peace which the Froudes enjoyed in their quiet and beautiful country site at Dartington. The Newmans moved from their Southampton Street residence, where John Henry was born, to various houses in London, changes which even involved a temporary separation of the family.

These financial crises, and the worries they entailed, forced Newman to assume towards his parents, three brothers, and three sisters, a responsibility entirely alien to the adolescent Froude. The solicitude young Newman evidenced about the health of his mother and the education of his brothers and sisters, as well as notations like "8 1/3 per cent is taken off" the wine, was utterly unlike the thoughtlessness of the teen-aged Froude, so indifferent even to the pleas of his ailing mother.

Financial problems did not deter the Newmans, however, from providing their children with educational opportunities. John did not attend a public school, as Froude did, but began at Great Ealing, a private school near London. Here he stayed from the age of seven until eight years later, when he entered Trinity College. At Ealing, one of the masters—Mr. Walter Mayers, took an interest in Newman’s personal life, just as Keble did in Froude’s at Oriel. Through his guidance and example, Newman’s whole spiritual life was revitalized. In consequence, though, a problem arose in the Newman household.

Mayers, being an Evangelical, caused Newman’s parents to be apprehensive that their sons would become enthusiasts. Both John and
Frank showed signs of being too "ultra" for their parents' peace of mind: the boys even refused to copy a letter on Sunday, alleging it would infringe on the Sabbath rest. As a result, Newman's father thought it imperative to give his sons frequent admonitions on conservatism. These delicacies of conscience and concerns about sinfulness were uncommon in the Froude home. Archdeacon Froude himself was "orthodox without being spiritual"—a high and dry Churchman, and controversies over religious issues seldom arose in that household when Hurrell was young.²

Both fathers bequeathed their sons cultural interests as well as means for intellectual pursuits. Mr. Newman and John shared a love for music, especially the violin. One is not astonished, knowing the latter's keen appreciation of harmony and knowing the general run of small church choirs, that Newman dispensed with his singers at St. Clement's after a dispute with them; congregational singing offered a solution.

Music was not one of Hurrell's accomplishments. He verified this statement when he wrote to Newman on August 12, 1829: "I have done nothing except getting my equatorial put up and adjusted in our garden, and trying provoking experiments on the insensibility of my hearing organs. I find the summit of perfection to which I can attain is to observe that a note harmonizes better with its octave 12th and 5th then with their next door neighbors; I can also acknowledge a discord in a deuce and a seventh. But as for knowing one from the other unless they come very close on each

²Herbert Paul, The Life of Froude, p. 2.
other, it passes my comprehensions how man can do it."³

The talent of Archdeacon Froude and his son lay in an adjacent field—art. From his father, skilful in the use of crayon and water color, Hurrell inherited a love for drawing. He had a great knowledge and appreciation of Gothic architecture, and he wrote a paper on its significance which was read at one of the meetings of the Oxford Ashmolean Society and published in the British Magazine. One of the last things he did before he died was to design an altar for his father's church at Dartington, modeled on the high altar in Cologne Cathedral.

In temperament, the shy and retiring Newman contrasted sharply with the social iconoclast Froude. Not even seventeen years of age when he entered Trinity College, where he later won a scholarship, Newman had an air of gravity unusual in boys his age. His fellow students soon discovered that he provided a wonderful target for their practical jokes. Rushing into his room, taunting him with overstudy, and pressuring him to take wine became a real lark.⁴ Most of their escapades resembled the "funny tormenting" which the sixteen-year-old Froude found so irresistible. Even in the more culpable amusements, the conspirators would probably have had an ally in the venturesome Froude. Newman, on the contrary, could not comprehend their "ungentlemanly conduct"; such annoyances gave him only great discomfiture.

³Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter in Remains I.1.228-229.

Newman's natural reserve and his ability to be a good listener marked him with a maturity few would claim for the impetuous Froude. The verve and speed with which the latter avowed a conclusion to an issue showed a decided difference in temperament from Newman. Newman was more deliberate by nature; moreover, indebted to Hawkins for a discipline in precision, he mentally jotted down the possibilities and explored the pitfalls of an issue. He exhibited a cautiousness which proceeded from "fear of turning out wrong." Froude had no such inhibition as a child, and as a young man it certainly was not one of his greatest assets. He was always quick and more than willing to challenge the logic of any Common Room disputer, only to brood afterwards that he "hadn't set him down better."

Whereas older men who could not command Froude's sympathy were prone to interpret his candidness merely as pertness, they could seldom take offense at Newman for incivility. He was able to enter into the feelings of another and respect his sensitivities. The depth of his thought was accented by his seriousness and courtesy and consideration for others. In Froude, the converse was true. First of all, his fear of compromise affected his manner of dealing with those whom he did not respect. Secondly, the interior gravity, occasioned by the death of Mrs. Froude and by the efficacious instruction and example of Keble, did not diminish his buoyancy and zest for life. Although his love for sports, his brimful, mischievous delight in fun, his exchange of banter were certainly

5Ibid., 170.
not incompatible with his interior zeal for spiritual things, yet they were, to a degree, a liability. They gave strangers and mere acquaintances an impression of boyishness and immaturity which belied the spiritual richness which arose from his depth of thought.

No wonder Whately compared Froude and Robert Wilberforce, as tutors, "to the bigger girls of a poor family, who before their strength was come, have to nurse and carry about their little brothers, and lose their shape in consequence." Hawkins, too, was probably justified in believing Froude too immature to act as tutor. Contrariwise, Hawkins and Whately viewed Newman in an entirely different light; they respected him highly and placed great confidence in him.

Joined to Newman's mature way of deliberating an issue was his attention to detail. Carefully pigeon-holed, annotated letters were typical of Newman's meticulosity. Opposed to this virtue was Froude's "let's-get-on" attitude—his fevered haste, which seemed to foretell that he had but thirty-three years to live his lifetime. His advice, when Newman was writing on the Arians, was to stop "fiddling with your introduction."

Already as a student, he complained to Keble, who had to prod him on to finish writing his essays, that too much time was expended in writing things down. Contrary to his usual prudent judgment, Keble must have

---

6Keble hoped that Froude would take a parish so he "would get more calm and less young in his notions, or rather in his way of putting them, which makes people who do not know him think him not a practical man." Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 37.

7Newman, Autobiographical Writings, p. 102.
Froude to be proofreader for his *The Christian Year* -- and regretfully.

In a letter of January 16, 1828, Froude confided to Hawkins that he would urge Keble to place one of his hymns in a later season "when this melancholy edition, into which I have admitted such gross errata, is sold of If I had a conscience I should reckon myself bound to buy up the rest of the copies and dispose of them how I could. I think printer's devils, and proofsheets, and false prints will long be an object of instinctive horror to me, and rank with spiders and toads in the catalogue of my antipathies."  

Newman must often have found this difference in temperament trying.

In another man who did not register Froude's ebulliency, well-meaning, and charm, it would have been scarcely excusable. A letter, such as the following one written on April 28, 1829, must naturally have solicited from Newman both pique for Froude's carelessness and loving tolerance because of the captivating boyishness which effaced his guilt:

> I grieve in the extreme that I should so ill have requited your benevolence to me, yet when I bethink me of the source of your annoyance I fear I may by solving the difficulty only get out of the frying pan into the fire.

> The fact is that I have not been in the habit of locking up your book and I believe you will find it in the place under the longest of my book cases.

> Should it not be there, it will be found in the right hand drawer of my sofa table. Which you are quite at liberty to open by any means which most readily present themselves -- a poker or anything else.

Socially, Newman traveled in a different circle from Froude. The

---


circle from which arose the source of most of Froude's contentions was the very one which included Newman among its friends. When Newman was initiated into the Oriel Common Room, Whately, Hawkins, and White became his close and respected associates. Whately, whose vice-principal he became at St. Alban Hall and whom he assisted in the publication of a logic book, befriended the diffident scholar: he drew him out of his retirement, bolstered his self-confidence, and made him think for himself.

Newman paid great deference to Edward Hawkins, the man who was to become his provost at Oriel. Hawkins taught him to be cautious in speech and circumspect in thought, a task not too difficult for the reserved young man. Hawkins' interest in Newman's early St. Clement sermons may have had their share in the formation of the later renowned preacher at St. Mary's.

Still another of the "Noetics" who won Newman's approbation and friendship was Blanco White. Music seems to have been the bond associating him with White, a man whose age, temperament, and ideals were so divergent from his own. Of equal import, however, may have been the stamp of Whately's approval which White bore. Newman jotted in his Private Journal in February, 1826: "Blanco White has joined our common room party. He is very well-read, ardent, ingenious, warm hearted, simple minded, pious man. I like him much." ¹⁰

This social circle, from whose bounds Froude was generally deterred by Keble's abhorrence of liberalism, acquainted Newman with a new world of ideas which had a twofold influence as far as Newman's friendship with Froude was concerned: some of the ideas drew him closer in thought to Froude; others formed a barrier to unity.

Whately caused Newman to view the Church as a substantive body independent of the State, while Hawkins unloosed the grasps of Calvinism which still clutched Newman. He converted him to the dogma of Baptismal Regeneration by giving him John Sumner's *Treatise on Apostolical Preaching*. Hawkins also impressed upon him the rôle of Tradition.

As well as beneficial influence, for which Newman was always grateful and indebted, the "Noetics" were likewise responsible for other views less salutary.

Two of the "Noetics," besides tainting Newman with their secular outlook on life, helped to nourish some ideas about Roman Catholicism which were implanted during Newman's boyhood. The anti-Roman Catholic propaganda of both White and Whately undoubtedly corroborated ideas centering around the theory of the Pope as Anti-Christ, a conception Newman derived in youth from reading Newton's *Dissertations on the Prophecies*. It was in harmony with the sneering irony of Gibbon, whom he read with so much pleasure in 1818 and 1819. It blended with the ideas

---

¹¹One of Froude's "Occasional Thoughts" clearly emphasized the impact wrong associations produce. He compared people who unconsciously assimilate the customs and accents of the group with whom they live, to those who associate with heretics and soon, unconsciously, expound heretical opinions (*Remains*, II, i, 109)
he and John Bowden, his close associate whose friendship began when they were students together at Trinity College, incorporated into their poems about the Saint Bartholomew Massacre.

Newman confirmed that White "was certainly most bitter-minded and prejudiced against everything in and connected with the Catholic Church; it was nearly the only subject on which he could not brook opposition"; Newman summed up his own position in regard to White when he added: "But this did not interfere with the confidence I placed in his honour and truth; for though he might give expression to a host of opinions in which it was impossible to acquiesce, and was most precipitate and unfair in his inferences and inductions, and might be credulous in the case of alleged facts for which others were the authority, yet, as to his personal testimony, viewed as distinct from his judgments and suspicions, it never for an instant came into my mind to doubt it."

The anti-Roman Catholic tirades in the books of White, echoed in those of Whately, seemed to confirm the general impression Newman carried during his early Oxford years that infidelity and Romanism were compatible. In White's books he read of Spanish Catholics who conformed exteriorly to the laws of the Church; interiorly, they paid little heed to its maxims. In England Newman saw the cause of the Roman Catholics championed by O'Connell, who allied himself with the Whig or liberal wing of the government. According to Newman, it seemed that, for

---


13 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 181.
Roman Catholics, the end justified the means.

There was no one in Newman's early life to act as advocate for the Roman Catholic cause until Richard Hurrell Froude began to slash at his prejudices; even then, many observations made while he and Newman were on their Mediterranean Voyage tended only to give a conclusiveness to those prejudices so deeply intrenched in Newman's mind, instead of balancing the scales in favor of Froude's views.

Another Oriel Fellow who moved as freely in and out of the social circle of "Noetics" as Newman did was Edward Pusey. He attracted Newman for much the same reason Froude did -- he was imbued with a deep religious faith. Although associated with the "Noetics," Pusey was not one of their followers. In a way, he counteracted some of the radical influence of their group.

Pusey was a Liberal, in so far as being content to vote for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts and to endorse Roman Catholic Emancipation. His view was a tolerant one -- he wanted nothing that would "keep alive the bitterness of party spirit among Christians, agreeing in the same essentials of Faith, in England."14 He was particularly indulgent to the Calvinistic and Evangelical tendencies. A minor point like the Sternhold-Hopkins element in Keble's poems, which found such disfavor with Froude, would never have been rejected by Pusey:

"Edward Pusey's sympathies . . . were warmly enlisted on the side of Sternhold and Hopkins."\(^{15}\) Frequently, during the Tractarian Movement, Pusey chided Newman for his intolerance of the Evangelicals. In a letter to Pusey, December 5, 1832, Newman had to warn Pusey that Calvin was not a Saint but a Schismatic.\(^{16}\)

Contrary to the "Noetics," Pusey extended his tolerant view to Roman Catholics; he approached them much in the same light as did Lloyd, with whom he had lived, been instructed, and who had sent him to Germany to study the German critics of the New Testament. Pusey probably owed his benevolent attitude in dealing with the Roman Catholics to Lloyd. Under him, he had begun a translation of the Roman Catholic Hug's Introduction to the New Testament, and in November, 1845, he expressed his still tolerant view of Roman Catholicism to J. Spencer Northcote: "I began to hope that the actual decrees to which the Roman Church is bound might be so explained, e.g., by another General Council, that they could be accepted by us, and that the Churches were not hopelessly at variance."\(^{17}\)

Like the "Noetics" Pusey offered Newman great potentialities for friendship: intellectual acumen, stimulating conversation, and a vital interest in the problems of the day. He could offer more, however, for Newman's edification than the correct life the "Noetics" led; Pusey lived by faith.

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 298.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., 234.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., 11,502.
It was Pusey's personal life, lived in consonance with deep religious faith and high ideals, that influenced Newman and helped to cement his own pious practices, which had been revitalized by Mayers. Pusey's "deep views of the Pastoral office, his high ideals of the spiritual rest of the Sabbath, his devotional spirit, his love of the Scripture, his firmness and zeal" attracted Newman when they met in 1822 as Fellows of Oriel; he became even more edified when they lodged together in 1823. Both men regretted the luxury of Oxford and the excess of drink. Both knew the meaning and reason for the self-denial they exercised. Pusey's example helped Newman keep alive the sparks of spirituality which tended to be smothered at Oriel by the natural outlook on life, as opposed to the supernatural. Although the emphasis was not on the dogma of the Church, yet both held indispensable an inward life. Pusey bridged the gap in Newman's life between Mayers, who quickened the life of spirituality in Newman, and Froude, who forced it into new channels.

If it were not for the great length of time Pusey spent abroad, Newman's friendship with him might have precluded the friendship with Froude. First, Newman was so attracted by the earnestness with which Pusey pursued spiritual ideals, especially in his personal life, that the two men would have witnessed the fulfillment of a friendship which Pusey's fre-

18 Pusey was not High Church at this time. In a letter to Rose in March, 1838, Pusey regretted that, previous to 1830, he did not sufficiently realize the blessings of the Church of England. Liddon, Life, I,177.
quent trips abroad impeded; secondly, if Pusey had remained at Oriel and accepted the tutorship offered to him in 1826, when Tyler and Jelf left, possibly Froude would not have been offered the tutorship, for the claim of R.W. Wilberforce and Froude were considered only in view of the fact that Pusey was not to be had. 19

Newman, who was ordained in 1824, became curate at St. Clement's Church in Oxford through Pusey's influence; he gave up his curacy two years later, however, to replace James Jelf as tutor of Oriel. It was in the following year, 1827, that Hurrell Froude, while still a layman, joined Newman as tutor. Robert Wilberforce, a disciple of Keble, followed. Together with their senior tutor -- Joseph Dornford, they ushered into Oriel College a new era of thought. Froude was not made a deacon by Lloyd until December, 1828; it was not until a year later, at the urgency of Keble, that Froude presented himself to Dr. Bagot for ordination.

In Froude, Newman detected a religious zeal and intellectual acuteness akin to Pusey's; in Froude, Newman found a fearless and straight-
forward manner analogous to the approach of the "Noetics"; from him, Newman welcomed the homey and affectionate exchange of banter, which put him at his ease and drew from him humorous quips similar to those directed at his sisters; in Froude, Newman discovered a companion who, though only a youth like himself, had already witnessed the grief of having lost persons near and dear to him, just as Newman himself had. All these discoveries came gradually, though.

On May 10, 1828, Newman invited Froude to a dinner club he had founded for the purpose of bringing members of the different colleges together. It is almost certain that the suspicion with which Froude and Keble regarded Newman had not at this period been entirely obliterated. Newman was still on very good terms with the "Noetics"; he was a close friend of Pusey, in whose works Keble had detected a note of rationalism on which he had commented unfavorably. Newman, in a letter of July 31, 1828, expressed to Keble his sincere pleasure upon the appointment of

---

20 Pusey had worked with Biblical critics in Germany. The end he had in view was to acquire knowledge sufficient to refute ideas of atheists, such as Dupuis, with whom he had been carrying on an argument. At one period of his research, associates thought he fell a victim to the very evils of rationalism he was combating.

On July 16, 1839, Pusey wrote to Newman: "It is very shocking about poor Blanco White and more so to me because I made my first book on Germany a stepping-stone in his downward course." Unpublished Letters, Reel 70. Although Newman reassured Pusey that he was not at fault in regard to White's loss of faith, Pusey had trod on dangerous grounds. In his first book, Pusey disallowed that historical passages in Scripture, in which no religious truth was contained, were equally inspired with the rest of Scripture. He stated the problem not too clearly and drew criticism from Rose, Newman, and Keble. Blanco White, alone, praised him and said, "You appear to me to have developed my own crude thoughts."

Rose felt that Pusey was unsettling the faith of others, but Pusey's aim was to face doubts which were prevalent and to set people at rest about these doubts.
of John Sumner as Bishop of Chester. Sumner was noted for his Evangelical views. Above all, in spite of the urgings of Froude, Newman had preferred Edward Hawkins as provost of Oriel to Keble, when Copleston left the post for a see at Llandaff. Newman had confessed that Hawkins' general views so agreed with his own "practical notions, religious opinions, and habits of thinking," that he believed Hawkins was the man under whom he could pursue the ideals of tutoring which he found difficult to pursue under Copleston.

The Oriel College which Copleston left was the scene of indulgence for many undergraduates. The rowdiness of Gentlemen-Commoners, obsessed with a desire for fine clothes and easy living, was matched by the hilarity which resulted from the drinking parties, for which Oriel was gaining notoriety. This was not the worst.

It was no less than a question of sacrilege. As ecclesiastical foundations, with their roots in the Middle Ages, all the colleges maintained religious observances which were rather more full than the taste of the age required. At Oriel, for example, there was morning and evening chapel and communion at the end of the term, and as participation in all these services was expected, the sacred objects were thereby exposed to indifference and even contempt. The occasion of the Sacrament, especially, coming as it did just at the end of classes, was often ushered in and out with a champagne feast; and although the liturgy said expressly that it was dangerous to partake unworthily, some who did partake were so obviously unworthy that they could hardly stand.\(^2\)

There was great need for moral improvement at Oriel. Newman was

\(^2\) Culler, *The Imperial Intellect*, pp. 56-57.
frequently shocked at the lack of ethical principles among the students; moreover, he despaired of his own ability to effect a change under Copleston.

Froude, whose temperament was so different from Newman's, certainly did not take offense at the noise and pranks of the students; but he was appalled at the moral indifference—the vanity and worldliness, and above all, the sacrilegious abuses.

When Copleston was appointed Bishop, both Froude and Newman had hopes of reform. Keble was the man to effect the reform, Froude concluded. If anyone could impart a love for the Classics, Keble could; above all, he could imbue the student with an appreciation for moral excellence. Froude spoke from experience. Enthusiastically, he campaigned for Keble as provost.

Newman and Pusey had had little opportunity to know Keble intimately; he had resided at Oxford for only a few months after they became Fellows there. On the other hand, Edward Hawkins was an associate of both men. Along with the senior tutor Dornford, Newman and Pusey favored Hawkins. Robert Wilberforce, who spent much of the fall of 1827 with Newman, felt obligated to Keble, his former tutor; yet he looked with favor upon Hawkins, too. He may have been influenced by Newman. The other person considered for the position, but less popular, was James Tyler. Newman and Pusey took the view that Hawkins could not compete with Keble as far as "personal excellence, high talents, a pure and beautiful mind" were concerned; they felt, however, that Keble lacked a needed practicality and a moderate view. They made their opinions, coupled with apologies,
known to Keble. Keble withdrew from the competition.

Newman and Pusey were not conscious that Keble maintained, just as Lloyd had previously and they themselves at present held, that the tutorship was a pastoral office; that the office consisted of moral guidance as well as mere classroom lecturing. In fact, Newman assumed the position of tutor with the idea that it was merely another form of missionary endeavor like his curacy at St. Clement.

Hawkins was elected provost on January 31, 1828. Froude wrote to Hawkins on January 16, 1828, when it was apparent that Hawkins remained uncontested. In this letter he sent his approbation for "the strong measure" which Hawkins was anticipating—"lengthening the vacation." He gave his "most unqualified acquiescence in the arrangements" adopted concerning this measure.

Froude added, in his letter to Hawkins, in regard to the Hawkins-Keble competition that since Keble so resolved about the Provostship, he must make up his mind to the alternative under which he trusted his philosophy to support him—"Therefore I do not consider excellence worthwhile unless it be the highest excellence." Froude let it be known he was making no compromise. His philosophy was the same, even

22 Liddon, Life, I, 137.

23 About three weeks since Keble wrote me his resolution about the Provostship, which I believe you had from him at the same time. So I suppose I must make up my mind to the alternative, under which I trust my philosophy may support me. 'Quo praestantias duxi nihil, nisi ad quod praestantissimum est.' Unpublished Letters, Reel 2203, Bodleian Library.
though it must be employed under a second-choice man.

Problems at Oriel College were not solved by the election of Hawkins. For one thing, he lost the confidence of some of his staunch supporters by his pretentious manners and by allying himself, not with his own Fellows, but with the Hebdomadal Board of which he became a member.\(^\text{24}\) For another, Hawkins considered the tutorship as merely a secular office.

The tutors could look to Hawkins for support in some of the disciplinary problems, but as long as the fundamental principles upon which the school was run were at variance, little hope for improvement could ensue. Many of the moral problems, Hawkins refused to face; for example, the scandalous way in which some students approached the Sacrament. When Newman asked him whether men were "expected" to take the Sacrament, Hawkins evaded the issue. He maintained that if men were not worthy to receive the Sacrament, they were not worthy to be on the roll call of a Christian college. Yet, neither he nor anyone else seemed particularly anxious to expel the unworthy.\(^\text{25}\)

Froude experienced a discouragement in proportion to his eager nature. First, he had been unable to convince the Oriel Fellows they were erroneous in their choice of provost; now, the overnight reforms, which his idealistic nature had led him to anticipate, seemed frustrated. He himself assumed much of the blame at this time, however, as recorded in


\(^{25}\)Culler, *The Imperial Intellect*, p. 57.
his Journal on November 10, 1828:

When I began the tuition, I could not help indulging in some faint degree the fancy that I might give a tone to things. I knew the fancy was most unreasonable, and that from all the experience I had had of myself I could never be a person of influence. Yet the delusion would come, and I allowed myself to mistake the smoothness with which things first went on for personal respect, and smacked my lips in secret over C's Copleston saying, that "he thought me a catch for the College." And now, after so short a time, as soon as things have begun to go the least wrong, I have been pusillanimes and impatient, and let fancies about insults, and dislike, and sulkiness take hold of me; I am distrustful of God's guardian hand, and concern myself about the event of my ineffectual undertakings . . . (Remains I.1.458).

Newman's dreams too were being shattered, but he never rode the tide so high as Froude did. He had confidence in his experiment which involved a new college set-up, and he still maintained confidence in his provost. He wrote to Samuel Rickards, another Fellow of Oriel, in February of 1829, and he warned Rickards not to rely on the testimony of a certain Mr. X, who was dissatisfied. The Mr. X sounds suspiciously like Froude, who was neither patient with partial reformation nor willing to compromise even lesser gains; it was "natural he should say something" especially in regard to the indifference of the Provost concerning the students' reception of the Sacrament. Newman cautioned:

You have heard of our proceedings at Oriel, I presume, from X but I do not account him a fair judge. Not, indeed, that I know what he said, or even that he said anything; but it is natural he should say something, and it's almost certain he would say wrong. He annoys me by his way of railing against the Provost, and I shall tell him so some day. If he has railed to you, don't believe him. We have gone through the year famously. 26

Newman was more optimistic than Froude, for he was in the process of

26 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 173.
adopting measures for reform. Not yet disillusioned by the ineffectiveness of the new provost's regard for duty, he assumed that since Hawkins did not proceed with reforms, he himself with tacit permission could undertake them; and he did.

Previously, there had been little personal relation between pupil and tutor, and the pupil was instructed by all the tutors, regardless under whose particular charge he had been placed. Teacher and pupil rarely met outside the class period, so that the teacher's influence was at a minimum. Newman and Froude were at cross purposes with this established system. Newman had Mayers, and Froude had Keble to look back upon as the beau-ideal for tutor. How could they effect an influence such as they themselves had felt from their teachers—an influence which affected their whole lives, not merely their intellectual lives and this often by accident?

Newman, after consultation with the other tutors, formulated a plan:

... his plan as actually formulated provided for grouping men in small private classes under their own tutor, "quite familiarly and chatantly," while throwing the others into larger public classes which would be distributed among all the tutors according to the established system. The plan also provided for distinguishing between those subjects in the teaching of which an intimate, personal relation was especially desirable and those in which it was less desirable or not worth the trouble. Only in the former were private classes to be formed even for the better men, and these classes were defined by Newman as "either 1. in Moral subjects—e.g. Divinity-Ethics, or 2. in books continued term after term; e.g. history or 3. in order to prepare pupils for the public lectures—e.g. algebraical arithmetic, Euclid, Latin Composition, etc." The subjects in which it was not worth the trouble to form small classes were those "which are necessarily read, (Euclid, Articles, Logic), or generally, (Greek plays, Greek and Latin authors)—or often (Mathematics, Rhetoric.)" This system could also be modified, if the tutors agreed to do so, by exchanging pupils even in their private classes. On the other hand, the final principle of the system was that every tutor had the ultimate disposition of his own men and
could, if he so desired, keep all of them (even the bad ones) exclusively for himself.\textsuperscript{27}

Embodied in the plan were other measures to develop the potentialities of the Oriel undergraduates. Froude and Newman, both very interested and skilled in Mathematics, encouraged this branch of knowledge in their college. It had been very neglected there. Froude wrote and published a pamphlet entitled "Considerations Respecting the Most Effectual Means of Encouraging Mathematics in Oxford."\textsuperscript{28}

Another alteration the tutors made was the introduction of modern books to read alongside the ancient classics for comparison and illustration; for example, Butler's \textit{Analogy} to be read with Lucretius.\textsuperscript{29} To both Newman and Froude, the relation to the moral life of the intellectual life was of vital importance.

All during youth Froude had been preoccupied with the ancient poets and philosophers. Plato's \textit{Apology}, his \textit{Critæ}, and his \textit{Phædo}, which deal with the highest thoughts of Socrates, intoxicated him. They offered him

\textsuperscript{27}Culler, \textit{The Imperial Intellect}, pp. 67-68.

\textsuperscript{28}Froude advised: Go back to the system of 1801 and regard Mathematics as a branch of "Literæ Humaniores" and acknowledge it as a constituent subject of the General Examination; open scholarships in Mathematics to all undergraduates, for encouragement. Froude wanted the first six books of Euclid to be considered indispensable to a first class. He wanted the philosophy of Mathematics to be considered in the same light as that of logic or history.

Because of the disconnection between Mathematics and Classics, Froude felt that it was necessary to examine in both fields to give Mathematics its proper place again.

\textsuperscript{29}Mosley, \textit{Reminiscences}, I, 229.
a danger, however: he spent hours in fruitless contemplation and reverie, which consequently drew Keble's rebuke. Keble, a learned and religious man, realized the value of the Classics, but he also knew that Froude's idealistic nature became so engrossed in the cold and inaccessible ideal which the pagan philosophers intimated, that he had to remind Froude that Christianity had realized its Ideal. Far from inaccessible, it could be realized in the love of God. Man, unlike the angel, was not made to spend his life in sublime thought but to practice virtue. Keble advocated acts of kindness.

As a student, when Keble's lessons were fructifying, Froude had reported to him that he was reading Lucretius with intense admiration. "In the end of the book, about the mortality of the soul, there are some magnificent reflections, on our longings for something indescribable, and beyond our reach; on our having affections, which have no adequate object and which we long to forget and smother, because we cannot gratify them; which make a striking preface to Bishop Butler's Sermons on the Love of God" (Remains I.i.198-199).

After his brother Bob died in 1828, Hurrell again wrote to Keble on the same theme. He told how Bob had edified him by studying the Ethics and discovering its relevance to actual conduct. In the study, Bob had used Butler for comparison.

From experience, Froude knew the value of reading the Christian authors in conjunction with the pagan idealists to help bridge the gap between the ideal and the practical, a conviction ever dear to Newman, too.
In a measure, the plan of Newman lessened one of Froude's great concerns—Gentlemen Commoners. They would fall into the large general class of students, justifying the tutor in merely tolerating them in lecture class and then washing his hands of them. Of course, compromise was a hard word to Froude. He much preferred to have the college refuse them entrance. Their privilege of dining with the Fellows was particularly obnoxious.

Newman, who shared Froude's views about the seeming futility of influencing most of the Gentlemen Commoners, was not so adamant in his demands. In a letter of August 15, 1829, he said to Froude: "I have also entered for you one of two brothers by name De Sales. They are frank youths. They are to be gentlemen commoners, which I could not help, and to tell the truth, if we can get gentlemen commoners to our taste, I do not know why they should be sent elsewhere where they will want the sound instruction and paternal care of Adam de Brome. They will not, I am sure, do us discredit—they come with a very high character from Eton."  

In the letter, Newman reminded Froude that it was a great responsibility to enter so many youths, and therefore he must not grumble "if they are bad ones. I allow not one is striking."

A correspondence between Froude and Hawkins in 1832, when the long drawn out contention about the tutorship was nearly abated, with a victory for Hawkins, illustrates the tenacity with which Froude still

clung to his convictions about the Gentlemen Commoners. Even the pers-
suasion of Keble did not cause him to relinquish the idea. Hawkins wrote:

May we have the pleasure of your company on Friday at dinner to meet Mr. Davis Gilbert?

And let me take this opportunity of thanking you for having, as I understand from Keble you have, given up your desire of separating the G.C's from the High Table. I give you full credit indeed, and I trust you also give me for taking no step of this kind without having the good of the Society at heart. But I suspect you have here scarcely altered your views but have abandoned your own wishes in consideration of mine. And on this account I feel personally obliged to you, and had it not been for the bustle of this week, I should have told you so before.

Could you indeed place yourself thoroughly in my situation and feel the great anxiety I entertain for the safety of our old institutions when they seem deserving of being maintained, you would understand the extent of my obligations to you. 31

Hawkins little knew Froude if he expected him to "have abandoned" his "wishes" for someone who did not claim his respect. Froude's answer was prompt and precise: "I am much obliged for your kind invitation, but am unable to avail myself of it, as I have promised to dine next Friday with Mrs. Newman. I am sorry that Keble should have conveyed to you a mistaken impression about my feelings respecting the high Table, though I certainly have expressed to him my willingness to be influenced by his judgment." 32

When, in 1829, Hawkins accidentally learned of the program the tutors had initiated, he was taken aback and insisted it be altered.

One can certainly appreciate Hawkins' dilemma when he realized that the tutors had grasped the reins. In the altercations which followed, he


continually maintained a calm, dignified exterior although he was insis-
tent upon his rights. Neither he nor the tutors would give in. Hawkins
could not believe that Newman's opposition was an actuality. As for the
other two tutors--Froude and Wilberforce, neither he nor Whately had
placed much confidence in them from the beginning. Hawkins later wrote to
Newman: "Wilberforce and Froude I knew were not likely to hold their
offices long in any case, and I could not but feel that a little matter
might possibly induce them to desert their posts somewhat earlier than if
everything were precisely according to their wishes." 33

In May of 1830, the Provost offered Froude a pupil in the usual way,
and Froude replied that he could not examine him unless it was with the
understanding that he was to be his pupil in the University sense, i.e.,
the pupil was his charge, his responsibility, and he was answerable only
to the Vice-Chancellor.

Hawkins replied immediately: "There has been so much misunderstanding
on the Tuition system already that in order to prevent anymore I meant to
put down my views of it on paper as soon as I could find sufficient time.
In the meantime I have begged the Dean to examine Mr. Hicks." 34

Hawkins declared to Newman that there was, strictly speaking, only
one tutor in the University sense, and that was the senior tutor. This
eliminated the grounds for Newman's whole plan of reform, for he had

33 Unpublished Letters, Reel 93, Oriel Tutorship.

34 Ibid.
appealed to the discretionary clauses of the University Statute, which allowed the tutor special powers. Hawkins' interpretations of the tutorship reduced Newman, Froude, and Wilberforce to mere lecturers, holding their office under Hawkins—not under the Vice-Chancellor, as they supposed. Newman said: "I should on this ground . . . have tendered my voluntary resignation without further discussion, had not Froude (on talking it over with me) convinced me I should insist on a pledge of this fact more formal than his mere statement in conversation." So the correspondence became even more extensive. Hawkins finally came upon the only solution which would save face for himself—to give the three tutors no more pupils.

In the meantime, however, Oriel College witnessed the beginning of a spiritual rejuvenation foreign to its day. The Chapel sermon was revived. A notation was made in Newman's Journal for October 4, 1830: "Began college Chapel--only five of us--Froude, I, H. Wilberforce, Ryder, and Wood." He added in parenthesis: "This was one of Froude's reforms." Ryder, mentioned as one of their group, was an early pupil of both Froude and Newman. The nature of the supervision which Froude and Newman believed compatible with their office as tutors is well exemplified in a correspondence they had with Ryder when he was determined to accompany them on their Mediterranean trip.

35 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
37 Unpublished Letters, Reel 4, Miscellaneous Papers.
The letters reveal the moral concern, the intellectual concern, a sort of "parental control," and an intimate relationship with the tutors exercised in regard to their students.

Froude wrote to Ryder on November 5, 1832, when he and Newman were receiving no students but held themselves responsible for the ones whom they had launched on their college studies and who were out of lecture but had, as yet, not completed their work:

Since you went, Newman and I have been thinking a great deal about you, and we are most seriously of opinion that under all circumstances you ought not to go abroad. If on going over in your mind what has happened between us, you think that we have before now talked to you in a way that makes our present advice inconsistent---do tell us so. I don't think we have. If I did I shouldn't feel entitled to speak so strongly now. But we really do think that as things now stand you have no right to take your pleasure. That by doing so you are likely to deteriorate yourself permanently. I really am serious when I say that I should feel a sort of weight on my mind if I was to be party to your idling away any more time at present---and I think you would feel the same yourself before long. I am quite clear that resolution would enable you to do a good deal in spite of your illness. You cannot say that reading brought it on in the first instance. It came on when you were idle, and I do not see how you can count on idleness to remove it. I really feel myself a good deal implicated in this business. I think that if I had done my duty when I was a tutor, you would have got your degree over a year ago. As it is you are slipping into a sort of do nothing imbecility and I'd sooner you rouse yourself or are roused the better. The discredit that you have just now got into ought to be a help to rouse you and if it does not act in this way it will make you callous. Strike the nail when it is hot.

With the added force of Newman's letter, Ryder certainly must have abandoned any idea of going anywhere, except back to his studies. Newman bluntly advised:

---

38 Unpublished Letters, Reel 81, Copied Letters.
I have just returned from London, or you would have heard from me
or Froude before this. My feeling on your letter is this. I cannot
divest myself of the notion that going abroad is not necessary for
your health, in any sense of the word—and I cannot promise that, if
any one asks me any opinion about you, that I will not tell it. And
if I have said anything to you lately or formerly which makes this
seem hard, tell me and I will not fail to take a share in the blame
myself. On the other hand, I cannot deny your right to judge for
yourself, and if you tell me that it is necessary for you to go
abroad, I do not see on what grounds I can oblige myself to the
self-denial of not going in your company. Froude, I believe, thinks
as I do.\textsuperscript{39}

What weight could Ryder add to his case when both his tutors were allied
against him, but he could, at least, give vent to his anger and let Froude
know just how he felt about the matter. Characteristically, Froude never
realized the harshness of his own letter; all he knew was that he had
Ryder's welfare at heart. On November 26, 1832, he explained:

\begin{quote}
You are a capital fellow—partly for owning what I had not
found out, that you were in a rage at my first letter, and partly for
determining to go up next time, and lastly for forgiving us the sus-
picion that you are not so unwell as you suppose . . . .
\end{quote}

Poor Ryder—not only did Newman and Froude give him a dressing down
for contemplating a trip which they supposed would be conducive to further
idleness, but Newman had just a few months previously insinuated that love
had deprived him of his self-command. The letter indicates the extent to
which, by their position as tutor, they felt obligated to direct even the
personal life of their subject.

On July 22, 1832, Newman imparted these words of counsel to Ryder:

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{39}Ibid.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{40}Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection.
\end{quote}
It is quite absurd to suppose you are not at liberty both to marry and to go into the church—indeed I think that country parsons ought as a general rule to be married—and I am sure the generality of men ought whether parsons or not. The celibate is a high state of life, to which the multitude of men cannot aspire. I do not say that they who adopt it are necessarily better than others, tho the noblest (ethos) is situated in that state. While I allow you full liberty to marry, yet, if you ask my opinion, I certainly think you are too young to marry. Since I do not know who it is your heart is set upon, I may say without seeming to cut at individuals that I think most likely that you will make a bad choice. What can you know of others at your age? How likely are you to be captivated by outside show, tho not show in the common vulgar meaning of the word. Depend upon it, many a man would repent of his marriage, if he did not think it right (as it is) to repress the rising sigh. It is a fearful thing to tie yourself to one person for life. Again I am not at all satisfied with your want of self command. You gave up the notion of taking a degree, before you had this impulse. If it has been the cause of your changing your mind back, then you have just swayed by two too and fro, indolence and love—you yourself, the proper you, having no power or will of your own. Do you know yourself enough? Have you not talked a good deal of politics even without feeling what you said? Are you sure you will not sink into a Conservative after all?

Such an intimate relation between tutor and pupil was the outgrowth of the pastoral view of the tutorship; it harmonized perfectly with the office of clergyman.

On August 1, 1830, Froude again wrote to Newman concerning the tutorship. He reported that, before he left Oxford, he had had an interview with the Provost, who begged for a reconsideration of the whole question. Froude said: "I endeavoured to make him see that it was an extremely simple one and resolved itself into two parts—one whether our system was better than his of which I said I entertained no doubt, and concerning which humanly speaking I could anticipate no change of opinion. The other

41 Unpublished Letters, Reel 81, Copied Letters.
how far the statute authorised us to oppose him which I said I was willing to reconsider and give him the benefit of the result. He went to the old point that by acting as he wished we should do much good though not perhaps in our opinion as much as possible. I suggested that this held no weight unless it could be shown that we could not do more good by attending to other matters. Froude also gave his father's and Keble's ideas on the situation. In regard to the statute, Froude reported: "Since I have been home I have gone it over with my Father who thinks that it authorises us to go any lengths if we feel strongly the importance of our position." Froude went on to say that "Keble is very angry to find the College calumniated in all quarters as rapidly on the decline. He thinks that this notion has been set about by old Cop's [Copland] party, and that with what Hawkins is at is to brush us up and set the college on its old ground. My Father too feels certain that something of this sort is at the bottom of it."

By the time the Provost had decided to give Newman, Froude, and Wilberforce no more pupils, and the Bishop of Llandaff had received an answer to his inquiry, "Do the three malcontents mean to continue their own pupils . . . ?" an incident had occurred which further alienated Newman from Hawkins and allied him more closely with Froude: in 1829, the Peel Question arose. Peel had resigned his seat in Parliament, where he repre-

---

42 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter published in Remains, I.i.243-244.

presented Oxford, and offered himself for re-election because, whereas he was now advocating Roman Catholic Emancipation, he previously had taken an opposite stand. Hawkins, without the knowledge of most of the members of Oriel, pledged the support of the college to Peel. Newman was appalled at Peel's turn-about-face and felt him unworthy to represent Oxford; he vigorously opposed Hawkins' endorsement of him and backed the conservatives, who elected Robert Inglis to represent Oxford.

The anomaly of O'Connell's being elected to Parliament to represent the County of Clare and being prevented by law from accepting the seat could be viewed from several angles: Roman Catholics saw in it an unjust deprivation of representation, and so they fought for reform legislation; many Dissenters, although they considered Catholicism superstitious, believed they could not deny the Catholics the benefits of religious freedom, and so they, especially the Unitarians, began campaigns to emancipate the Roman Catholics; Tory leaders like Peel and Wellington were against reform, but threatened with Civil War in Ireland and overruled in their own House of Commons, they were forced to compromise; conservative Oxford men questioned the intervention of Oxford in politics.

To active High Church Anglicans like Froude and Keble, the Catholic Emancipation question was just another in a series of religious liberalizing methods which tended to dilute the spiritual element in the Church in England. Fewer and Fewer hands were raised in opposition to the

---

intrusion of the nonconformists upon the Church; many of the conformists
themselves cared little about the spirit within the Church. There was no
longer the union of Church and State as a form which approached, however,
feeble, a theocracy—an ideal Froude cherished; now there was a union of
a very different nature:

"A union between excellent men of all parties for the mainte­
ance of peace and order! excellent truly, and of all parties!
parties who agree in nothing but a wish to maintain peace and good
order! who differ in opinion respecting all man's higher interests
and duties, respecting all those points about which to differ is to
disapprove; who will unite on no other basis than that of selfish
worldly convenience; and yet who are to recognize each other as
excellent men! How can one protest too earnestly against such
mawkishness as this (Remains I.ii.189).

To Keble and Froude, the impending disaster was tremendous; religious
principles were being undermined. They knew that to stand still was to
acquiesce. Like the non-nurors, whom they revered, they felt the time had
come to fight for the traditions they held precious. They knew they could
count on another person to work with them to preserve the spiritual edi­
fice of the Church—John Henry Newman. Early in life Newman had learned
the principle upon which they were now to act—"Holiness rather than
peace."45

The proceedings of the Peel Controversy seemed to remove all the
final reservations to a complete and harmonious friendship among Froude,
Newman, and Keble.

45 Newman speaks of Thomas Scott as the man "to whom (humanly
speaking) I almost owe my soul." His "bold unworldliness" and "vigorous
independence of mind" left a deep impression upon Newman, and for years,
he says, he used the expressions "Holiness rather than peace," and
"Growth the only evidence of life," as proverbs summing up Scott's
Despite the fact that Froude, not too long before the Peel incident, would have given "a few odd pence if he [Newman] were not a heretic," he recognized in Newman a man who, like himself, was intent upon living a virtuous life. The religious ideals of Newman, in spite of his different formal religious training, coincided with those of Hurrell Froude. From childhood, but especially since his fifteenth year, New was intensely conscious of the presence of God—a sense of "God and myself." Also, like Froude, he had dedicated himself to a virginal life.

For both men, Law's Serious Call, as well as the sermons of Bishop Wilson, nourished their spiritual life. Both owed their basic philosophy of religion to Aristotle's Ethics and to Butler's Analogy of Religion. Newman read the latter in 1825, and it was Keble's Christian Year which gave him a new insight into it. Of the Christian Year, which appeared in 1827, Newman said:

The two main intellectual truths which it brought home to me, were the same two, which I had learned from Butler, though recast in the creative mind of my new master. The first of these was what may be called, in a large sense of the word, the Sacramental system, that is, the doctrine that material phenomena are both the types and the instruments of real things unseen—a doctrine, which embraces in its fulness, not only what Anglicans, as well as Catholics, believe about Sacraments properly so called; but also the article of 'the communion of saints'; and likewise the Mysteries of the Faith... On the second intellectual principle... Butler teaches us that probability is the guide of life. The danger of this doctrine, in the case of many minds, is its tendency to destroy in them absolute certainty... Mr. Keble met this difficulty by ascribing the firmness of assent which we give to religious doctrine, not to the probabilities which introduced it, but to the living power of faith and love which accepted it.

46Ibid., 18-19. Newman and Wilberforce had spent many evenings studying Keble's G.Y. in 1827. In 1829, Newman advised S. Pope to study the book: "It is not a drawing-room book to languidly gaze over, but requires thought, time, and a pure heart to understand—and I am sure no one will study it rightly, without being holier and better." Reel 70.
Keble's approach to probability, to which Newman was converted by the Christian Year, was more in keeping with Newman's natural inclination to faith and to his great reverence for the Providence of God, than the skeptical approach to which the "Noetica" had accustomed him. Later, Newman himself was to take the test one step further—to show how one could attain certitude itself.

Just as the Christian Year gave Newman a new approach to a doctrine previously held, so Hurrell Froude awakened another doctrine and gave it immediacy. In a letter to Keble on November 21, 1844, Newman recalled this debt: "When I was first taught the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration by Hawkins on my getting into Oriel, of 'the Church' by Whately in 1825, and of Apostolical Succession by Hurrell seven years later in 1829 (after James on 'Episcopacy' in 1823), I began to profess them and commit myself by definite acts to the profession. . . ." 47

Newman's early sermons show a remarkable affinity to those of Froude; both men stress the same spiritual requisites. In a sermon "Secret Faults" preached in 1825, Newman emphasized the necessity of self-knowledge attained through an habitual self-examination. 48 Like Froude, he drew his sermon material from practical life, as his Journals confirm. Froude's thesis that a knowledge of self is a prelude to knowledge of God and to a practice of humility was likewise stressed by Newman, 49 although Newman's

49 Ibid., VIII.8.
system of attaining humility was not so clearly defined. The necessity of self-denial was a readily-acknowledged precept, but Newman did not emphasize nor practice the rigorous asceticism of Froude. A main and fundamental requisite for the spiritual life both held in common was the practice of the presence of God—"to see everywhere the marks of God's holiness" and "to feel himself always in His Presence." "Holiness, or inward separation from the world, is necessary to our admission into heaven."  

The years of tutoring and the Peel Question not only verified Newman's first impressions of Froude and inspired a deep friendship for this man with aspirations so like his own; they clarified and vindicated Froude's original preference of a provost. If any trait and tendency was characteristic of Froude, it was magnanimity; and the greatest earthly treasure which Froude had to give, he gave to his friend—the confidence of John Keble. Years later, in 1843, when Froude was no longer on earth as part of the triumvirate, troubled Newman could still say to Keble: "To whom can I go, (for surely I may so speak without irreverence) but to you who have been an instrument of good to so many, myself inclusive? To whom is it natural for me to go but to you whom I have tried to follow so long and on so many occasions? To whom would Hurrell go, or wish me to go but to you?  

---

50 Ibid., VII.2.  
51 Ibid., VII.2; I.1; VII.3.  
52 Newman, Correspondence with John Keble, p. 225.
Froude made the friendship between Newman and Keble a reality. Together this little band formed a citadel of defense for religious truths in the Church in England. Their main foe was Liberalism. During the next two or three years they were to use their time and talent to muster their forces in preparation for the fight. Frequently, they were to differ on questions of method, on systems of thought, and even on matters of dogma. Never were they to swerve from the power which gave them their impetus and their unanimity—the desire for holiness.

Nothing so well illustrates the private life they and their adherents led as the picture Keble drew in a letter written to Newman on the latter's birthday in 1845:

I have nothing to say to you, dearest Newman, that is at all to the purpose, and yet I want to say a word to you just to say that I remember your birthday, and long to be able to keep it as I ought; but it is to be hoped there are others who will make up for one's deficiencies in that way.

One thing I should like today would be to choose out some one of the old days, when we most enjoyed ourselves together, either with dear H.F., or in thought and talk of him, and live over it again for an hour or two—if such indulgences are not unfit for this season: and to me they ought not to be altogether unfit, for surely they would bring with them bitter recollections of thoughts and fancies very unfit to have been where I was allowed to be. But I am not going to talk of myself.

I was going to say that, if I might choose a pleasant day to think of, perhaps the day of the first stone at Littlemore might be it. Many places and times, it seems to me, may well have taken a sort of coloring from that day, and surely it brings with it sweet and hopeful thoughts, and many of them, and the past and the future, and the living and the departed, and times of faith and times of decay, seem blended, as one thinks of it, in a way which must (by His blessing, may we not forfeit it!) issue in comfort at last.

I remember too another day, when we walked up with old Christie (J.F.C.) and there was talk of how each word of our Lord's is, as it were, a sort of Church Canon, and Christie said the talk ought to be printed, this was long after the other, but I cannot exactly
remember when. 53

These three men—Froude, Keble, and Newman, alerted to the danger of liberalism, which was bringing the Anglo-Catholic Church to the brink of dissolution, took index of the vitality of the Church to determine why the Church had so little efficacy in their time, where the fault lay, and how it could be remedied. Before long, they began to realize that these questions were only the partial considerations of a much greater question: "What is the Church of England?"

53 Ibid., 371-372.
CHAPTER IV

FROUDE: HIS VIEWS ON THE CHURCH

Between 1829 and 1932, as the tutorial responsibility of Newman and Froude diminished, the two clergymen engaged in other Church matters: Newman, besides his pastoral work at St. Mary’s, devoted himself to a study of the Council of Nicaea; Froude declined the invitation Newman offered him in 1829 to join him at St. Mary’s and Littlemore, nor did he share St. Ebbe’s Parish with Thomas Mozley, as the latter anticipated. Instead, he occupied himself extensively with reading which led him, in 1831, to the determination to write an Ecclesiastical History of the Middle Ages. It did more: it opened up a whole new vista of thought on the Tudor settlement. He concentrated all his attention on the "ethos of the Reformation," which was "terra incognita" and "unexplored by anyone." Voraciously, he dug into Strype, Lingard, Burnet, and Froissart "to get a clue to Cranmer and the rest" or to find a reference for the history of Lutheranism. The discovery that "Edward VI and his court were on the whole a poor set" and that "there was a great deterioration in the Church after Edward III’s death" spurred Froude on to seek more information. At first, he was "pained" to be such a sceptic about the Reformers, especially Latimer and Cranmer, and he felt "one must not speak lightly of a martyr," but his boldness grew as he gained assurance that popular opinion had deceived him in regard to the Reformers.

Meanwhile, the bond of friendship between Newman and Froude
tightened. Newman spent the vacation of 1831 at Dartington. A lover of nature, he was enthralled with the beauty of Froude's homeland. Newman was accepted readily as a member of the noisy household, which missed the gentle firmness of a woman's guiding hand. He found a friend in Archdeacon Froude and laid claim to the companionship of William and James Anthony. The link of friendship between Newman and the Froude family was further cemented on January 13, 1832, when Hurrell was ill and could not personally bring his favorite brother, whom he had spent long hours in coaching, up to Oxford. Newman promptly suggested: "Why not trust your brother to come up by himself? . . . I will promise to keep him in order and will make him write his fingers off -- and when I come here to sleep, he shall come regularly to me and receive periodical rowings as good as you could administer." This act definitely endeared Newman to the Froude household, and Hurrell frequently relayed his father's appreciation to Newman.

Newman also shared his family with Froude. In fact, at one time Froude's winning ways caused him to take precedence with one of the

1 While Newman was at Dartington, he composed the poem, "There stray'd awhile, amid the woods of Dart," to which Bremond gave an added significance. Cf. Louis Bouyer, Newman (New York, 1958), pp. 124-127, for one resolution of the problem which Bremond raised about the incapability of Newman to love others. Also cf. the Preface to Christopher Dawson's The Spirit of the Oxford Movement for a repudiation of the psychological conclusions of Geoffrey Faber's book Oxford Apostles, in the treatment given to the friendship between Newman and Froude.

members of the Newman family. When Frank Newman left Oxford, he gave some of his books to Froude. On May 7, 1830, Newman expressed his pique to his sister Jemima: "Frank has offered Froud some of his books as not needing them any more. He has made no such offer to me. One would think I had a prior claim." At another time, Newman's sister must have made a watch chain for Hurrell. When he broke it in November, 1834, he told Newman that he had tried to get Poll, his pet name for Mary Froude, to fix it, but "she made clumsy work of it."

The correspondence between Newman and Froude from 1829 until the time when they departed for their Mediterranean trip manifested a growing alarm for the Church of England. The Whigs, or Liberals, seemed to be successful everywhere. Froude termed the situation "gloomy." "Think of that rascal Brougham being retained as he will for York," he wrote to Newman on August 1, 1830. Brougham, an independent member backed by no party, had taken precedence over the proud families of York principally because he favored parliamentary reform, which, of course, included a liberalizing Church reform. In the letter, Froude revealed that the Whig victory had struck much nearer home: "Think with horror of the Devonshire Yeomanry -- last hold of Toryism -- being almost all for Lord

---

3 Unpublished Letters, Reel 120, Miscellaneous Letters.
4 Ibid., Reel 40, Personal Collection.
Ebrington." Froude asked Newman whether he would accept a living from
Brougham as one of their friends had done; he also deeply regretted that
Greswell could not have afforded to refuse a benefit from Thomas Arnold.
The former had received a mastership at Rugby. Froude wanted no favors
from Whigs; favors meant concessions. Newman agreed wholeheartedly with
Froude's views. He wrote to Bowden on January 16, 1830, that he was
"confirmed as a dull staid Tory."  

By January of 1832, the prospect of a Tory or conservative victory
had all but dissolved as the struggle for parliamentary reform continued.
Froude informed Newman that Brougham and Stanley were "willing to rat
to any amount." At Oxford, too, troubles were brewing: Newman urged
Froude to use his eloquence and write, for a Mr. Wilson was put forward
as Hebrew Professor. "We only know he is a Sanscrit Scholar; that he is
a gentleman, a man of fixed principles, or of morals, we know not. And
we know he is not a clergyman, or a University man, or a classical
scholar, or a theologian, or a man of general requirements." Newman saw
that "Sanscrit Literature, being religious, a professor will be forced
into Theology. Fancy a Hebrew Professor not a divine; look at Germany."  

---

5 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of
letter published in Remains I.1.243 and a small part in Letters and
Correspondence I.205.

6 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 195.

7 Newman, Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of
letter published in Remains I.1.251-252. "To rat" was a favorite ex-
pression of Froude; it meant "to desert the cause."

8 Ibid., Reel 51, Miscellaneous Papers.
A spirit of indifferentism seemed to invade all of England. Froude and Newman sensed it with alarm as it crept stealthily into politics, into the university, and into the Church itself. They watched the majority of their fellow clergymen who, unperturbed by the crisis, continued to stifle any criticism which would disrupt the compromising peace of the day.

A zealous pastor like Keble, a spiritually ambitious ascetic like Froude, and an earnest preacher concerned with the significance of religious beliefs, as Newman was, were exceptional clergymen in the first part of the nineteenth century in England. Pluralities, non-residence, and neglect of services were flagrant among the incumbents in this era; people associated riding and hunting with their clergy instead of administration of the sacraments. The anonymous Extraordinary Black Book, notorious for its hostile attack on the ministers of the Church, gave an exaggerated picture of the state of the Church in England, but its claim that there was no Church in Europe with more abuses and less piety than this one, seemed indisputable.

Newman depicted the lethargy of the clergy themselves when he wrote of the spiritual barrenness of the Anglican system of his day:

The author of the Christian Year found the Anglican system all but destitute of this divine element, which is an essential property of Catholicism; -- a ritual dashed upon the ground, trodden on, and broken piecemeal; -- prayers, clipped, pieced, torn, shuffled about at pleasure, until the meaning of the composition perished, and offices which had been poetry were no longer even good prose; -- scripture lessons turned into chapters; -- heaviness, feebleness, unwieldiness, where Catholic rites had had the lightness and airiness of a spirit; -- vestments chucked off, lights quenched, a dreariness which could be felt, and which seemed the token of an incipient Socinianism, forcing itself upon the eye, the ear, and the nostrils of the worshipper; a smell of dust and damp, not of incense; droning out Catholic canticles; the royal arms for the crucifix; huge ugly boxes of wood, sacred to preachers, frowning on the congregation in
the place of the mysterious altar; and long cathedral aisles unused, railed off, like the tombs (as they were) of what had been and was not; and for orthodoxy, a frigid, unelastic, inconsistent, dull, helpless dogmatic, which could give no just account of itself, yet was intolerant of all teaching which contained a doctrine more or a doctrine less, and resented every attempt to give it a meaning. . . .

Francis Cornish, in his history of the English Church, gives a similar picture of the spiritual state of the Church at this time:

There was little to distinguish them [clergy] from the laity. They were not a separate order, but shared the opinions and sentiments of the ruling class. They visited the sick and ministered to the poor; but many of them did little spiritual work, neglected Church observances, were careless about education, lived throughout the week much as the squires and lesser gentry to whom they preached on Sunday mornings, and administered the Sacrament once or at most three or four times a year. Pluralism, non-residence, and the abuses of translation and patronage were at their height.

Such was the state of England's clergymen and her Church in which utilitarianism and liberalism were quietly suffocating the spiritual life. The deterioration was even more basic. Froude himself best summed up the situation as it unfolded itself between the years 1828 and 1832, when the traditional Church-State relationship in England underwent a fundamental change which involved the whole system of belief.

In a series of articles written for the British Magazine in 1833, Froude reviewed the historical background of the Anglican establishment,


which had become the prey of liberalism. Froude noted that the Elizabethan settlement had established the Anglican service as the only legal service in England, and the Act of Supremacy with supporting statutes had secured this arrangement. The legislature protected and governed the Church; for, since the whole body of the realm was identical with the Church, Parliament was a synod of the laity of the Church, while convocation was a synod of the clergy. Various Elizabethan laws against religious meetings and private religious services ensured the continuance of the identity of the Church and State, and they authorized the expulsion of all Dissenters.

Froude showed how the first wedge pried into this compact was the Toleration Act of 1688. By it, Dissenters were exempted from the penalties for refusing to conform to the Established Church; thus the nation ceased to be identified with the Church. There now began the distinction between Established Church and non-established churches. The Established Church came to be synonymous with the idea of privilege instead of obligation.

11 These articles, published in the British Magazine under the titles "Project of Henry II for Uniting Church and State" and "Hooker's Views of State Interference in Matters Spiritual," appeared from September, 1833 until June, 1834. In the Remains, they form segments of a longer article "Remarks on State Interference in Matters Spiritual" (Remains I.ii.184-269). These articles are a continuation of the articles on Thomas of Becket, most of which Froude finished before he left for his Mediterranean trip. In the first article on "The Project of Henry II," Froude made continual reference to the Becket documents and said he would now continue "this curious history" here (British Magazine, IV, September, 1833, 256). The continuation of "this curious history" blends the history of Becket with ideas which were germinating before Froude's trip to Rome and which gained clarity during his trip to France. They finally took form at the time of the suppression of the Irish Sees; Froude repeatedly advocated the reform of the method for nominating and electing bishops—he asked for the repeal of the Praemunire.
Parliament, however, continued to represent the Established Church because the Test and Corporation Acts kept non-Anglicans out of municipal offices at least.

"At length, in 1828, men had so completely forgotten the principles on which the Church and State were anciently united," Froude decided, that even the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed; Dissenters were admitted into Parliament. By 1829, Roman Catholics, previously prohibited from Parliament by the Oath of Supremacy and subscription against Transubstantiation, were likewise admitted. Parliament, supposedly the lay synod of the Church of England, was now composed not only of Anglicans, but also of the people who represented opposing doctrines of faith and even those of no faith at all. Froude objected:

It seems at first sight something short of reasonable that persons, not necessarily interested in the welfare of the Church, should deliberate for its good; and still less so, that they should be allowed to dictate laws to it, without the consent of those who are necessarily interested; and least reasonable of all, when we add the consideration, that many of the persons so dictating, are, as a fact its avowed enemies, and that their dictates are deeply reprobated by the great body of its attached members (Remains I.ii.187).

Froude doubted the soundness of a system which allowed such a state of affairs to arise, and he wondered "whether, after all that has been said and felt about the excellence of the English Constitution, there may not still be something wrong about it; some hollowness or flaw which has hitherto escaped notice only because circumstances have kept it hidden: in short, whether we may not even now have to revert to first principles, and lay our foundation afresh."

To Froude, the Hooker theory, with which he had become so well-acquainted, now seemed impractical—a limb badly set, impervious to healthy growth. He questioned whether the Church-State relationship was
an efficacious union from the beginning. Protection from the State diminished; interference increased. After the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, the Established Church was no longer recognized even as the privileged church, according to Froude, for the seats in Parliament were no longer reserved for Anglicans. He boldly claimed that the events of 1828 and 1829 eradicated the basis upon which Hooker had allowed state interference in matters spiritual. This assertion he followed by an even more blunt and bold:

I have already shown on the principles of the great Hooker that our Civil Legislature is no longer competent to act as our Ecclesiastical Legislature. I now throw out for inquiry, whether the same principles may not affect the competence of the Head of Civil Legislature? (Remains I.i.213).

Froude went on to show how the Reform Bill of 1832 shifted the balance of power from the nobles, who had exercised it since 1688, into the hands of the middle class, who were mostly Dissenters and agitators for reform. This transfer of power lessened considerably the prestige of the Anglican bishops, members of the House of Lords. Froude further explained how Wellington attested that the Ministers offered advice to the King in regard to the Reform Bill—they threatened to create a sufficient number of Peers to force the Bill through the House of Lords, and they compelled the King to submit to the Bill in spite of his religious obligations.

Significantly, Froude concluded: "Such is the Supreme Head of the Church. I shall not myself presume to decide whether it is safe or wise for us to trust our most valued interests in such hands, relying on the difference which subsists between his Majesty's own religious opinions and those of his Parliament." (Remains I.i.213).
A liberal Parliament and a weak King were no safeguards for the spiritual welfare of the Church of England, in Froude's estimation, and a continued infiltration of liberal ideas would tend to dilute the doctrine of the Church of England until it held no formal doctrine. Men like Thomas Arnold assumed that the only certainty for a continuance of Christianity at all was to overlook the differences between the various sects and merge into one Christian body; on the other hand, F.D.Maurice and Gladstone, too, were concerned about the State-Church relationship, but their fears were directed to the interests of the State, for they felt that the relation between the two was only a secondary matter for the Church, whose foundation was elsewhere, while it was the duty of the State, for her own good, not to reject the Church.  

Froude, to whom Newman admitted his indebtedness for reviving in 1829 the doctrine of Apostolical Succession with which William James had first acquainted him, knew there was another Power to which he could turn besides that of the King and Parliament. Although "the Powers that be are ordained of God," Froude vigorously denied that these were the only Powers on earth; nor were they the highest. There were two Powers, he claimed; one was "a Power quite distinct from the sword of the Civil Governor, and that too ordained of God." It was the Episcopal Power.  


13 Keble, in his edition of _Ecclesiastical Polity_, checked Hooker for "one fallacious proposition." Hooker's notion "implies that coordinate authorities are incompatible; that the sovereign is not a sovereign if the church is independent." Keble maintained that this position was untenable. Hooker, _Ecclesiastical Polity_, I, cviii.
Unfortunately, many of the Bishops themselves did not realize their power; some neglected to assert it while others denied it. 14

What caused this Episcopal Power to be overshadowed by the Civil Power in the first place, and what instigated the state aggression on the Church? Froude laid the major part of the blame in the lap of the Roman Catholic system. He held:

The selfish policy of the See of Rome, which was more or less successful to the middle of the 14th century, had nevertheless tended gradually to undermine the foundations on which it had built its power; and to smooth the way for that course of systematic aggression which has from that time been pursued by the "kings of the earth," not merely against the offending See itself, but against the whole Church, "against the Lord and against His Anointed." In particular it had introduced one idea unknown to Catholic antiquity, but which in its subsequent development has occupied a very prominent place in English ecclesiastical history, that of a "Supreme Head of the Church:" and at the same time had associated this idea with so much of what was worldly and intriguing, that, as far as appeared in practice, this upstart authority might as well be wielded by Lay hands as by Clerical; might be consigned to the King of England as to the Pope of Rome (Remains 11.224-225).

14 Froude had a low estimation of Charles James Blomfield, the Bishop of London, who maintained that belief in the Apostolical Succession had gone out with the Nonjurors. Blomfield was too utilitarian for Froude. Newman, on the other hand, eagerly conveyed to Froude on January 9, 1830, that the Bishop of London "maintains the propriety and expedience of the Athanasian Creed," and he was "glad to see the Bishop firm and notice it to you so you'll have better thoughts of him." Newman's own views were later reassessed; in the Apologia, Newman spoke of him as having "for years engaged in diluting the high orthodoxy of the Church by the introduction of the Evangelical body into places of influence and trust." Newman, Apologia, in Works, XXXIII, 30.
How does one reconcile this vehement opposition to the assumption of power by the See of Rome with the known admiration and love with which Froude looked upon Gregory VII, one of the most potent rulers of Christendom?

Although Hildebrand's idealism and enthusiasm, his revival of Monasticism, his enforcement of clerical celibacy, his forceful subjection of the temporal to the spiritual by means of excommunication, and his care for the poor must have endeared him to Froude, they are insufficient to justify completely the reason why Hildebrand was chosen as the beau ideal.

Did Gregory VII infringe on worldly possessions less than other Pontiffs, according to Froude, and was this fact his defense? Froude's answer to this question was:

Vain is it then to pretend that the loftiest of the Roman Pontiffs, either Gregory or Innocent, exalted themselves unwarrantably above the proud Potentates of Europe. Unjust they may have been in the infliction of their censures, unchristian in the spirit with which they wielded them; but that the circumstance of their directing them against princes was in itself unchristian, is what the history of the early Church most unequivocally denies. . . . They in no degree extended the limits "of that Kingdom under the whole heaven which shall be given to the people of the Saints of the most High. . . . Indeed, if we compare the claims of Gregory VII and his austere successors, with those which Gibbon allows to have been conceded by Constantine and other Emperors to the Patriarchs of the primitive Church, it may be thought on the whole that their policy, with respect to Civil Governments, was directed rather to recovering losses than extending conquests. (Remains I.i1.224)

Froude's complaint was that the independent rights of each separate Church were absorbed into one by the Patriarch of Rome. The Patriarch of Rome was first, Froude admitted, but he had no right to encroach upon the rights of the other Churches nor to suppress the right of a
voice in their elections. He held that in the middle of the fourteenth century, two features of Ecclesiastical Polity changed: first, in the election of Bishops, the voice of the people and all the clergy dwindled down to a selection of a narrow circle of Ecclesiastics, and "the electors had no course open to them but either to second the nomination of the Pope, or, by a refusal, to forfeit, pro hac voce, all apparent share in the government." Froude gave the example of Grandison being chosen Bishop of Exeter by the Pope in 1327 when the Canons of Exeter wanted John Godley 16 (Remains I.ii.222).

The second change in Ecclesiastical Polity was the situation whereby the power of the episcopate was minimized by papal jurisdiction.

15 In Tract 15, "On Apostolical Succession in the English Church," Newman and Palmer trace a similar history of the Papacy: "But though the Bishops of Rome were often called the Successors of Saint Peter in the early Church, yet every other Bishop had the same title. And though it be true, that Saint Peter was the foremost of the Apostles, that does not prove he had any dominion over them." Like an elder brother, he had privileges but no power, according to the Tractarians. They claimed the Bishop of Rome was the first Patriarch in dignity; he had the right to intervene if Alexandria and Antioch had a dispute, or if the bishops of those churches were deprived of their sees; but he had no right to appoint bishops to the sees.

Although this idea is similar to that of Froude, yet Froude disagreed vehemently with other ideas in this tract, as will be seen later.

16 Cletus Dirksen, in his preface to Hooker, gives two cautions to Roman Catholics, which are worthy of frequent repetition: Whereas the average Catholic learned from infancy that the Pope, as Vicar endowed with special grace of the Holy Ghost, is the infallible Voice in matters of faith and morals, this doctrine was not defined dogmatically until the Vatican Council in 1870; the Conciliar Theory, even though condemned by the Council of Florence in 1439, was not entirely dead, and the whole matter of the Councils was greatly debated and misunderstood among non-Catholics, who relied upon Justinian and the Roman law. Hooker repeatedly says "that the whole body of the Church is properly the subject in which power resides." Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity, I, cxi.
Froude opined that in 1349 the Pope denied the monks of Canterbury the right of electing their own Archbishop, thus making the Archbishop completely subordinate to himself. In consequence, Edward III began a system of counter aggressions "injurious to the liberty of the Church as a whole, though it might seem in some degree favourable to the liberty of the English branch of it." His Act of 1350 restricted Papal interference in English elections, but at the same time it gave the King the right to interfere. By "Free Elections" was meant "an Election licensed and confirmed by the King." The Act of 1350 was ineffective, and in 1392 Richard II made another attempt "to substitute Regal for Papal interference" by the famous statute of Praemunire. By it, the penal clauses of the former act were extended to all who in any way tried to touch the Crown or the realm by a sentence of excommunication. This act, too, was only partly successful.

With the close of the Middle Ages, as the sense of corporateness dissolved and the Renaissance ushered in the spirit of secularization, the Civil and Ecclesiastical conflict continued in the thirst for temporal power, according to Froude.

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 the 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 gratifications; 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 Successor of the Apostles, for fear of losing their station in
The conflict ended to the detriment of the Church. "It is well known that in the earliest ages of the Church, it was considered the right, and therefore the duty, of lay Churchmen, to interpose their voice in the election of their spiritual rulers." Froude analyzed the Act of Henry VIII in 1533, by which the Praemunire became fully effective and "all rights were surrendered unconditionally to the king."

Froude showed that where originally the people had the right of nomination, the clergy the right of election, and the Archbishop the right of confirmation -- the Praemunire constituted the King as representative of the laity, giving him the right of nomination. Besides, it forced the clergy, under penalty of the Statutes of Provision and Praemunire, to enforce this nomination. Moreover, if the penalties were insufficient means of coercion, the Act gave the King liberty to supersede both election and confirmation. It even gave him means to consecrate. 17

How did Gregory VII differ in his policies in order to merit an exemption from these indictments? When he became Pope, the nations of Europe were in theory, if not in fact, committed to a policy of Erastianism. Besides, the demoralization in the episcopal ranks brought about a state of ineffectiveness and disorder among the clergy. Lay investiture, which was rampant, kept introducing more unworthy church

---

17 The Seventh Book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity allowed ordination without a bishop "sometimes for just and sufficient reason." Keble excused this error because the Remains of Ignatius were not available at this time, and so Hooker did not insist on Apostolical Succession, as Saravia, Laud, and Hammond later insisted on it.
church dignitaries. Hildebrand, an idealist and an enthusiast, had the force of his convictions and determined, with the grace of office, to bring about a spiritual reform. William I of England and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lanfranc, carried out Hildebrand's reforms in England, and they received his commendations. Although they patronized monasticism, provided for the separation of the secular and ecclesiastical courts, enforced priestly celibacy, and had separate courts for trials of the clergy, William I and Lanfranc retained control of appointment to church benefices and almost total jurisdiction of the Church in England. With William I supporting him, Lanfranc was Pope in England. English bishops could not appeal to Rome, nor could the Pope publish bulls in England without permission. Previous to Gregory VII's election, Lanfranc had obtained permission from Alexander II to have his dispute with the archbishop-elect of York settled by the council of the English Church -- not the council of Rome. Gregory VII, who never intervened in purely secular affairs, and who brought kings to their knees not to humiliate them but to restore proper Church-State relations, tacitly allowed powers to the Archbishop of Canterbury which were greater than any previously or since allowed by the Pope. 18 Froude probably viewed these tacit permissions

18 Sister Agnes Cavanagh, Pope Gregory VII and the Theocratic State (Washington, 1934), pp. 14-35. Also cf. Dublin Review (May 1839), p. 318: "The King of England, William the Conqueror, had received considerable succours from Gregory, while deacon of the Roman Catholic Church, in his expedition against England; and their amicable relations continued after Gregory had ascended the papal chair; and he glories in the fact that William was the only prince who had not been guilty of simony, and had obliged others to abandon this vice. On this account, the pope was more indulgent to the king when he infringed on the jurisdiction of the Church, by preventing the free intercourse of his bishops with the see of Rome."
as Gregory's recognition of equality between himself and the Archbishop of Canterbury, as far as English jurisdiction was concerned.

In Froude's estimation, the church in Hildebrand's time was the ideal church on earth, the full blossoming of the primitive Church of the Apostles. Froude seemed intuitively to seize upon the crux of the whole Church situation in the beginning of the eleventh century and to applaud the remedy Hildebrand applied. Unlike the sixteenth-century Reformers, who became more involved in politics, Hildebrand separated himself and the Church entirely from politics, and politics from the Church, except as they necessarily involved one another. Hildebrand saw that Reformation must come from within the Church -- not from without. Too, he saw that reformation must start with individuals who themselves conformed to the precepts of the Gospel.

Froude was partially right in attributing a policy of greed and selfishness to the Church of Rome between the sixth and eleventh centuries. Roman Catholics sadly acknowledge the increasing control which lay princes secured over the papacy, bishoprics, and even parish churches. Secular power attempted to strangle the Church during these years. With the conversion of the Merovingian and Carolingian barbaric kings, who were accustomed to complete control of all within their kingdom, the Church found it more and more difficult to extricate herself from their grasp. Although the traditional method of choosing a bishop in the first five centuries was by popular election, or the voice of the people and the clergy of the city; in the next four or five centuries, the power of the people declined while that of the clergy increased. Now the clergy, bound to aristocrats and kings, easily lost their voice in election to
those who dominated them. In the tenth century, in spite of Church objections, the Bishop received, as a trust from the temporal ruler, his bishopric -- the territory over which he was to govern. In return, he often had to take an oath of fealty to the ruler, and many bishops were considered as vassals to their ruler. Out of this situation grew more evils, such as simony and nicolaitanism.

Unlike Hildebrand, many previous popes were weak and succumbed to the influence of wealth and power instead of fighting against it; others, such as John XII, whose private greed for the pleasures of the senses scandalised the world, encouraged the temporal domination of the Church. In fact, the worldliness of the papacy, especially during the tenth century, infiltrated dioceses, parishes, and lay people. Only because Christ fulfills His promise, "I will be with you all days, even to the consummation of the world," the Church, in spite of unworthy and even sinful leaders, can never be prevailed upon.

Froude certainly, as his own suggestions for reform attest, saw that the principal evil which gripped the Church and caused so many other irregular practices to arise in the period before Gregory VII was that of lay investiture. Froude studied the kind of man who combated this evil, and the kind of weapons he used to eradicate it. Froude dwelt with admiration upon the life of this reformer who, previous to becoming a Pope, had been secluded in a monastery and had lived an exemplary life. Hildebrand, himself a model to the other clergy, could insist upon their celibacy, their poverty, and their obedience. Truly representing the Church, Hildebrand could use the weapons of the Church, the most powerful of which is excommunication.
An idealistic temperament like Froude's certainly must have received inspiration and encouragement from studying the pontificate of Gregory VII. It was no wonder that "the times of Hildebrand" became a familiar phrase as both Newman and Froude sought a cure for their own times.

Froude and Newman saw that the liberal spirit which was slowly paralyzing the Church of England had already culminated in a revolution in France. Newman called it "the triumph of irreligion." They watched the French Revolution resolve itself, and the idea of the secular State, a state which officially acknowledged relations neither with God nor His Church evolve. They saw Charles I, adamant in his refusal to concede further to the wishes of the anti-royalist and anti-clerical parties, bent toward defeat. Froude commiserated: "I admire the spirit of the King and Polignac and wish them better success than I anticipate for them." He was quick to add: "If I were King, I'd rather lose my head than retract a step" (Remains I.i.245). He deplored "the fate of the poor king of France, whose only fault seems to have been his ignorance of how far his people were demoralised" (Remains I.i.244). In 1831, after the bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe assumed power in France, Froude again wrote to Newman about the French situation: "They almost persecute the Roman Catholics at Paris. The Archbishop seems a spirited person" (Remains I.i.248).

19"And so again, the most recent martyr, as he may be called, of the French Church, the late Archbishop of Paris; he, indeed, had in every way adorned and sustained his high dignity, by holiness of conversation and a reputation beyond reproach: and the last glorious act of his life was but in keeping with all which had gone before it." Newman, The Present Position of Catholics in England in Works, XXXII, 398-399.
At first, Newman seemed to imbibe some of Froude's rashness. He advocated "an immediate rumpus" to set the country aright, and he agreed with Froude that "the Church can never right itself without a blow up." By October, 1832, he had a more calm approach: he wanted to "avert any civil commotion." His hope lay in having the Whig spirit continue until it set the Church adrift. Seeing the glint of daring in Froude's eyes, he cautioned further: "Let us make broad comprehensions." He did not want to split on trifles.

Froude "went by no theory, he was bent on defending no system, he was no advocate, laughed at economies, merely investigated," as Newman observed, and his investigations brought him an entirely new outlook on Church matters. He was discovering that the conditions no longer existed under which the Hooker theory was practicable; that popular opinion about the Reformers was biased; that the majority of the members of the Church of England were unconcerned about the spiritual welfare of the Church. On the other hand, he was being drawn irresistibly to the Church of the Middle Ages. An idealist and enthusiast, Froude found there his theoretical solution -- simply restore the Apostolic system; return to the Church of Hildebrand. The practical aspect of this solution he was slowly working out. Obviously, the first necessity was

---

20 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 243.

to enlighten fellow Anglicans, just as he was enlightened through his
studies, where the Church of England had erred and to what she must re-
turn. To publicize was an idea which had dogged Froude for some time
already. On June 13, 1831, he had written to Keble his expectations of
becoming an editor of a newspaper. He told Keble he was "embarked on a
speculation which will make everybody else laugh and myself cry," and
"feeling that these were not times in which people who thought their own
principles right had any business to be shilly-shally," he had consented
to become editor of a newspaper. He confided in the letter that his
preparation for the work was not complete: "I know so little of my future
business that for a long time I must do literally nothing except analyze
debates and collect news. But I hope for the best, and that at the last
last I may have a suck at the account where there is the most sweet-
ness." Froude further advised Keble to "get up a history of Brougham's
life ab ovo. I shall set to work on the same point directly."

Nothing came of this editorship project, as far as can be ascer-
tained, but Froude did not abandon the idea of a publication. By
February 17, 1832, when his investigations definitely forced him to turn
his back on the Reformation, his desire to undermine existing prejudices
reasserted itself. He suggested to Newman:

It struck me the other day that we might be able out of the
embryo Tory Club to get up contributions for a quarterly magazine
on a very unpretending scale; to be at first only historical and
matter of fact, so that writing for it would be the reverse of a

---

22 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40; Personal Collection; parts of
letter published in Remains I.i.246-247. "But I hope for the best,
and that at last I may have a suck at
waste of time even if it failed entirely, which I really hardly think possible, considering the ridiculous unfounded notions most people have got, and the vast quantity of unexplored ground. A thing of that sort might sneak into circulation as a book of antiquarian research, and yet, if managed, might undermine many prejudices. I am willing to think that I could contribute two articles per annum to such a work without losing a moment of time; indeed getting through more than I should else. I should think too that Mozley and Christie might be induced to help and that we could screw some criticisms out of Blencowe. Memoirs of Hampden would be a subject Keble would take to with zest, as he hates that worthy with as much zeal and much more knowledge than your humble servant. However, this is a scheme formed at a distance, which, as Johnson remarks, makes rivers look narrow and prejudice smooth.

Froude readily availed himself of the opportunity for publication which soon presented itself. In 1832, Hugh James Rose, a Cambridge divine and future Tractarian, founded the British Magazine, a periodical established to defend the Church of England. Its antiquarian research items, its old rites, and its histories of the churches in England must certainly have met with Froude's approval, for they all pointed to the Church of the Middle Ages.

On September 9, 1832, Froude wrote to Newman that he was busy with a project but was becoming "sawney," and "not to relish the dreary prospects which you and I have proposed to ourselves. But this is only a feeling; depend on it I will not shrink, if I buy my constancy at the expense of a permanent separation from home. I think this journey will set me up, and then I shall try my new style of preaching. We must indulge ourselves and other people with a little excitement on such matters, or else the indifferentists will run away with everything."

In the letter, Froude also said he would "not go into details, for all

---

is at last as well as possible; but you were right in saying it would be a slow job; perhaps much pain is yet to come, but all must go right."  

On September 27, 1832, Froude reported to Newman that he had the first five articles on Thomas à Becket ready to send to Rose. It is more than coincidental that, in the same letter, Froude conveyed to Newman that he was afflicted again with "sawney feelings" which could be attributed to various causes but "more to the prospect of becoming an Ecclesiastical agitator."  

These are the articles to which Newman referred when he told John Bowden in a letter on November 17, 1833: "If you had read the dissertation on Becket in the British Magazine, you would be somewhat prepared for the kind of system we suppose Hildebrand to have set up. Now our notion is that things are returning so fast to a state of dissolution, that we ought to be prepared, and to prepare the public mind, for a restoration to the old Apostolic system."  

24 Part of the letter is published in the *Remains* I.i.258 and the other part in *Letters and Correspondence* I.240.  

25 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter published in *Remains* I.i.258. In *The Difficulties of Anglicans*, Newman wrote: "It was this same conviction that the Church had rights which the State could not touch, and was prone to ignore, and which in consequence were the occasion of great troubles between the two, that led Mr. Froude at the beginning of the movement to translate the letters of St. Thomas Becket, and Mr. Bowden to write the Life of Hildebrand." *Works*, XXXI, 199.  

26 Newman, *Letters and Correspondence*, I,425. Besides the five articles Froude sent Rose before he left for Rome, he sent an additional one on Becket when he returned; Cf. Newman's letter to Rose on August 16, 1833, in Newman's *Unpublished Letters*, Reel 72; on September 15,1833, Froude told Newman he would "get on with Sanctus Thomas though there is not need at present since Rose has left more than half of my last for the next account." Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection.
Newman was concerned when he published the *Remains*; evidently Froude wrote an accompanying Preface which did not find its way into print: "The Preface to Becket Papers might frighten people considerably on Church and State, and, as far as I am concerned, I would consent to its being unpublished," Newman wrote to Keble on September 13, 1838. 27 A notation accompanied the letter: "it never has been."

One cannot read the Becket articles without being aware of the striking similarity which the incidents recorded from the twelfth century in England bore to Froude’s own day. One wonders if Froude did not make use of the opportunity at times, as translator, to heighten the resemblance between the two periods of history; for he said he could not always give a literal translation of his manuscripts because of passages of "barbarous Latin," or because the desire "to retain the spirit" necessitated a deviation from a literal translation, or because some passages did not lend themselves to translation at all, causing him to "despair of translating this section." What one is certain of is that, as commentator, he availed himself fully of the opportunity to emphasize issues which were at stake both in his own day and Becket's day. He also took great pains to vindicate the Church's right in face of State aggression. Two of these incidents are especially noteworthy:

Since the Reformation a notion has prevailed among protestants that the concessions which Henry required from Becket, and which, on his endeavoring to extort them, were the occasion and ostensible

---

27 *Unpublished Letters*, Reel 45, Personal Collection.

cause of the whole dispute, ought, on all principles of law and
reason, to have been granted unhesitatingly.

1. It has been generally assumed, that when the Church claimed
exemption from secular jurisdiction in all cases which concerned its
own privileges, it was guilty of one of those preposterous usurpations
which in after times were so frequent in the Church of Rome.

This point, however, is set at rest by Mr. Turner, who shews
that the claims of the Church were, in this instance, founded not
merely in prescriptive usage, but on a formal grant of William the
Conqueror. Wilkins Concil. I.363.

2. The cases in which Becket insisted on this exemption, and
which brought the dispute to a crisis, have usually been so stated
as to create an unfair impression to his disadvantage.

Protestant historians seem to have written under a feeling that
Becket could have been influenced by no motive but a wish to secure
impunity to offending Clergymen; and while they dwelt upon the crimes
which the civil Magistrates were not allowed to punish, they seem
never to have inquired how the criminals fared in the hands of the
Church. We have been told over and over again of the Clergyman who
had seduced a Yeoman's daughter and murdered the Father. But it is
not so generally understood, that "the Chief Priest (Archipraesul),
however, being consulted, ordered, that, being deprived of all
ecclesiastical benefice, he should be discharged, and that he should
be perpetually confined in a Monastery to perform the perpetual
penance of a solitary life."

Froude showed throughout his Becket articles that the Church had
rights which, as liberalism progressed, became less and less recognized
until finally the employment of these rights began to be regarded as a
usurpation of authority. The Church, however, was not free from abuses
either. Taking advantage of the opportunity to point out these abuses of
his own day, Froude quoted a letter from Nicholas of Rouen to Becket, in
which Rouen mentioned "the ordination of him who has no title to a church,
that it is void, to the injury of him who ordained him"; "four or seven
churches or prebends are given to one clergyman, although sacred canons

28. Hurrell Froude, "Thomas a Becket," British Magazine, III (February
1833), 155.
everywhere plainly forbid a clergyman from being appointed to two churches"; and "controversies arise from the gift and presentation of churches." 29

In the Becket drama, Froude delineated the different parties: 30 first, the higher order of clergy "who followed the King out of cowardice" because they had much at stake. These Bishops counseled Beckett: "that by sacrificing the liberty of the church they in no way compromised the church itself. 'Indeed,' they said, 'such a course would rather tend to strengthen it. An obstinate resistance on our part can end in nothing but our own ruin; whereas, by giving way to the King in this point we may retain our inheritance in God's sanctuary, and repose in the peaceable possession of our churches. We are placed in difficult circumstances, and the temper of the times requires of us large concessions.'" 31

Who can doubt that Froude's fire mingled with Becket's as he answered the first party:

"I see, my Lords, that you disguise to yourselves your cowardice under the name of patience, and that on this pretext of concession the spouse of Christ is to be given up to slavery. And who hath bewitched you, ye insensate prelates? Why would ye mask palpable iniquity under this virtuous name, concession? Why do ye call that concession, which is, in fact, abandonment of the church of Christ? Words, my Lords, should be the signs of things, not their disguises.

'But,' say your lordships, 'we must make concessions to the temper of the times.' Granted; but not vicious concessions to vicious temper.

29 Ibid., 156.
30 Ibid., 142.
31 Ibid., III (April 1833), 400. This is one of the sections which Froude footnoted: "I despair of translating this,"
My Lords, the cause of God is not so ill supported, as to require your tall that it may stand. Nor is the Most High at a loss for means to uphold his church, though unaided by the truckling policy of its governors. . . .

Know, my Lords, that this temper of the times is the very thing which constitutes your trial . . . . Remember, therefore, that when the Church is troubled, then it is that the shepherd of the church must expose himself. Think not, that if the bishops of old times were called on to found the church of Christ on their blood, we in these times are less called on to shed ours in its defence.

I, for my part, (God is my witness) do not dare to recede from that form of government which has been handed down to us from those Holy Fathers."32

The second party consisted of the higher order of the laity. They sided with the King against the Church so that, when they had removed this obstacle to their ambition, they might fight the King single-handed.

The third party, a more significant one, was made up of the lower orders. They were attached to the Church and made "a broad base of passive support." Froude interjected:

It will doubtless be surprising to find the party who, in the twelfth century, advocated what are now called high church principles, maintaining their ground on the affections of the common people, against a united aristocracy. 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 from 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.

Such, however, was certainly not the case in the times I speak of. The high church party of the twelfth century endeavored as much as possible to make common cause with the poor as

32 Ibid., 401.
"Pauperes Christi": and the condescension which his party practiced toward them, both before and after his times, appears to us almost incredible. One of Becket's practices, which is now most insisted on as a proof of his ostentatious sanctity, viz., that he was accustomed daily to wash the feet of "thirteen pauperes," seems to have been nothing more than was then expected from persons in his station indeed, so little was it noticed among his contemporaries, that it did not exempt him from the imputation of over attachment to worldly splendor.33

Special emphasis was placed on the first party of Bishops who followed the King in terror, fearing the confiscation of their goods, and "so readily did they yield to his request, that their consent seemed to have been given even before it was asked."34

In spite of the fact that the Bishops exhibited unwarranted cowardice and that the power of the Kings and nobles was awesome, "Becket and his pauperes Christi were too strong for them."35

33 Ibid., (February 1833), 142-143.

34 Ibid., (April 1833), 402.

35 Ibid., (February 1833), 148. "Servus Pauperum Christi" became a common signature for Froude, and anti-aristocratic became a slogan for the "Ecclesiastical agitator." The young aristocrat wrote to Keble: "We have one sermon for All Saints on Paupers Christi; which was a watch-word of the Church in Ambrose's time as well as Becket's. I don't see how we can make too much fuss about it" (Remains I.1.323-325). The sermon was published in the "Letters on the Church Fathers," in the British Magazine, IV (November 1833), 540-545.

On September 8, 1833, Newman wrote to J.F.Wilson in virtually the same words Froude used to Keble, telling Wilson that the people were the fulcrum of the Church in Ambrose and Becket's time, and the aim of the Radicals was to reestablish this situation. Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 399.
Froude then analyzed the situation to account for the victory. In his analysis, the key words--"peasantry" "one compact machine" "strict system of subordination"--advance his own platform for the revitalization of the Church.

It is difficult for us to conceive any system of warfare which could enable a set of defenceless churchmen, backed by the good wishes of a half-enslaved peasantry, to make head against the chivalry of England, and the ablest as well as the most powerful of her kings. . . .

I would observe, 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. . . .

There was a strict system of subordination, which secured a union of action even where there did not exist a union of opinion. Inferiors were subjected to superiors by well defined laws, through which they seldom dared to break, however audacious might be their attempts at evasion. 36

Froude went into detail about the "system of subordination"; and said "the machinery of this system was so arranged as to afford especial facilities for what in these days we call 'agitation.'" It "affected large masses of people" and caused "general commotion." It served two purposes at once--the faithful were united more closely by acting against aliens. 37

---

36 Ibid., 149.

37 Ibid., 150. On July 30, 1833, Froude suggested to Newman that a paper on Excommunication by Keble be substituted for the Lyra of the month; on August 8, 1833, Keble wrote to Newman to say he would like to write the paper but needed "more knowledge" on the subject. By January 25, 1834, the paper must not have been forthcoming from Keble, for Froude wrote to Newman that he would write the paper, and he also remarked that the Bishop was wrong in neglecting excommunication. Unpublished Letters, Reel 40.
Froude gave innumerable examples of the effectiveness of excommunication. As an "Ecclesiastical agitator" Froude took great interest in this powerful weapon of the Church which brought both the Monarchy of Germany and the Monarch of England to realize that "the emperor is within the Church but not over the Church." 38

Although Froude could not persuade Keble "to leave off index making and press correcting" to devote himself entirely to a better cause, Froude and Newman were much involved in doing their part to stem the tide of Liberalism in the Church of England. Froude had already handed in his five Becket articles, one of which appeared, 39 when Newman unfolded a new plan of defense for the Church: he wrote to Rose on November 26, 1832:

We propose, if you will let us, on our return to systematize a poetry department for you—which I am sanguine will be above the ordinary run of such exhibitions, and may be useful. We shall ask for two pages in each number—and shall insert in that space four brief compositions, each bringing out forcibly one idea. You may smile at our planning such details, before you have a word about it, but if it interferes with plans of yours, of course we shall take a negative from you very lightly. Our object is, to bring out certain truths and facts, moral, ecclesiastical, and religious, simply and forcibly, with greater freedom and clearness than in the Christian...

38 The meaningful phrase is attributed to Saint Ambrose in the sermon preached on All Saints' Day. This is the sermon referred to in "Letters of the Church Fathers," in the British Magazine, IV (November 1833), 540-545. The "Church of the Fathers" series began in the October, 1833, issue, but Newman referred to them already in August, 1833, in a letter to Rogers. Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 396.

In the Apologia, Newman said of this series: "The Church of the Fathers is one of the earliest products of the Movement." He said its aim was to introduce religious sentiments, views, and customs of the first ages of the Church into the modern Church of England. Apologia, in Works, XXXIII, 73.

Year. I will not go on to say, with greater poetry. If it answered on trial, we should be content to carry it on ad infinitum. It might be called Lyra Apostolica. 40

The "Apostolicals" had commenced; articles and sermons and letters from 1832 on were centered around ideas of "a compact machine" "pauperes Christi" "gentlemen clergy" "excommunication" and "Reformers"; having in mind Froude's Church of Hildebrand and a Becket which was mirrored in Newman's Church of Ambrose and Augustine, the triumvirate began their movement. 41 Only one requirement was demanded to become a bone fide member of the group—be an Apostolical! 42

Just as the second article on Thomas à Becket appeared in the British Magazine 43 and plans for the Lyra were materializing, Archdeacon Froude, Hurrell, and Newman left on the Hermes for a trip to the Continent. Archdeacon Froude arranged the trip for Hurrell, in an effort

40 Unpublished Letters, Reel 81, Copied Letters.

41 Keble was hesitant to enter fully into any plans which did not have the explicit sanction of the Bishops, although he felt as keenly as did Newman and Froude the necessity of arising to the defense of the Church.

42 Newman's book (the Arians) may be considered as part of the foundation for the Oxford Movement. When he had turned it in to Rose, he observed of Rose: "I suspect that Rose thinks it scarcely safe, and Rivington thinks it dull. However, I am quite satisfied with Rose; he is in ecstacies with parts of it, and, I sincerely believe it delays it under the wish to make it as good as possible. He seems to like the first chapter least, which is now in Lyell's hands. Rose is a very energetic, well-principled fellow; I have seen a good deal of him; whether he is firm remains to be seen. I will believe no one till he has committed himself." Newman, Unpublished Letters, Reel 40; parts of letter in Letters and Correspondence, I, 242. Froude never accepted Rose as an "Apostolical" even though he liked him.

43 This second article appeared in the British Magazine, II (December 1832), 453-459.
to arrest a persistent cough. Newman had been persuaded, without much difficulty, to accompany them.

For Froude, the trip had disheartening consequences: it did little to build his health; in fact, it may have speeded his death. Above all, it punctured his dreams of a speedy Church reform, for "the whole Christian system all over Europe 'tendit visibiliter ad non esse,'" according to Froude, and, besides, he had to modify his ideas of the Church of Rome considerably. 44

44 Newman spoke in a similar vein: "They have infidelity and profaneness as if the whole world (Western) were tending towards some dreadful crisis." Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 310.
"The French Revolution and Empire seem to have generated a plague which is slowly working its way everywhere." Ibid., 311.
The Hermes left Falmouth about midnight on the eighth of December, 1832. Momentarily, Froude and Newman forgot the tensions which had engrossed them in England, for the beauties of nature captivated them, making them oblivious of the stress and strain of the land which was quickly vanishing from sight. As the boat nosed its way to Malta, Froude indulged in one of his favorite pastimes -- observing the stars. As a youth in Dartington, Froude had arisen at half past two o'clock in the morning to walk a mile with his sister and brother to see Mercury rise. Now, on the Mediterranean, he renewed his acquaintance with the heavens. In the log of his trip, which he sent to Keble, he described "the sea a perfect sheet of glass, showing the reflections of the stars, particularly Sirius, which is most splendid." And on the Polestar’s sinking perceptibly: "I am sure the Great Bear's tail must have had a dip as he went his rounds" (Remains I.i.260).

Froude, as well as his father, had time to devote to another hobby--drawing. At Gibraltar, he selected a "Moorish Jew" for study. The model was "dressed so picturesquely, and looked so exotic" that Froude tried to draw him. At first, the man "hallowed out, 'You no paint me!" but when Froude persisted, he bolted as fast as he could.

On the first Sunday aboard ship, Froude conducted services for all the crew members who could be dispensed from duty. Before the services, the commander found it necessary to give the crew members "a practical
discourse on good behaviour."

Froude recorded how a boat with the Vice-Consul approached the Hermes for letters. Its crew members looked "like puffed red leather," and if anyone touched them, he would have received one hundred days quarantine, Froude conjectured; yet, "the wretches had the impudence to insist on our slitting all the letters to let out the cholera," Froude wrote. ¹

Newman was not the seaman that Froude was, and he kept to his cabin much of the earlier part of the voyage. Newman seemed to prefer land, but Froude was very much at home on the water. The Froude family and the Champernownses ² used to rent a large house at the mouth of the Dart during the summer. All day was spent sailing, and the house was occupied only at night. When Froude had written to Newman in 1829 about the exploits of his cruise on the Dart, Newman had replied: "Much as you boast of your situation in the water, and justly, yet I doubt after all whether it is finer than the land . . . . I have discovered Shotover is

¹The cholera ravaged central Europe in 1830 and spread to England in the winter of 1831. When Froude went home from Oxford in July of 1832, he and Newman parted as if they were never to see each other again.

²The Champernownses were close friends of the Froudes, and Caroline Champernownse married one of Froude's associates, Isaac Williams. In the letter of August 12, 1829, in which Froude related to Newman the events of his boating trip, he wrote with admiration of Mrs. Champernownse, who made the children read their psalms and lessons each day before taking part in any amusement, even though it was vacation. Froude himself enjoyed the vacation and the children, although he was frequently the target of their jokes. In speaking of the situation one particular evening, he said: "Add to this there are four young Champernownses of our party who were unusually silent being out of spirits at a fruitless evening's fishing -- but who when in a state of excitement were almost like fellows that have taken laughing gas." Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection.
wilderness; . . . now what sea-view can compare to it." The Froude family, especially Hurrell and William, loved boats and sailing, so it was with relief that Hurrell reported on December 27 to Isaac Williams that Newman was over most of his seasickness and was devoting a great deal of his time to the Lyra.

This period was the most productive time in Newman's life as a poet. Every letter to his mother or sister seemed to carry a new poem which eventually became part of the Lyra, and one can be sure they received the "imprimatur" of his seafaring companion.

Newman and Froude undertook the Lyra with a view of "catching people unguarded." Newman further explained to Rogers: "Ten thousand obvious ideas become impressive when put into a metrical shape; and many of them we should not dare to utter except metrically, for thus the responsibility (as it were) is shoved off of oneself, and one speaks , though serious."  

Under this guise, Newman could tell England: "He who scanned Sodom for His righteous men, / Still spares thee for they ten"; or tell the

---

3 Ibid., part of Letter is published in Letters and Correspondence, I, 186.  
5 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 425.  
6 Ibid., 321.  
7 Newman et al., Lyra Apostolica (London, 1836), p. 174
Church of England: "When thrones are trembling, and earth’s fat ones quail, / True Seed! thou shalt prevail!" 8 and "Wake Mother dear, the foes are near, / A spoiler claims thy child." 9

In spite of the guise, Froude’s candor was too prohibitive for Rose, and the only poem which Froude submitted for the Lyra on the voyage to Rome was rejected until a later date because it was "too fierce." Based on Rom.xiii.1-8, the poem dwelt on obedience to civil authority, while reflecting on the nature of the people to whom this obedience was due: "Those proud bad men, whose unrelenting sway / Has shattered holiest things, and led astray / Christ’s little ones." 10

This objection and the consequent delay in printing Froude’s poem were the first in the series of reactions which was soon to form a pattern as far as Froude’s writings were concerned. Froude found it very trying to adjust to a world where the signposts read: "Caution" or "Wait." He respected all laws of restraint which dealt with the ordering of the passions, but this was a different restraint for which he knew no reason; he saw an abuse of sacred rights which surely called for an immediate remedy. Time and time again, to his amazement and frustration, Froude discovered that he was regarded as too violent, and that his suggestions, articles, and even his cooperation were spurned.

---

8 Ibid., 210.
9 Ibid., 210.
10 Ibid., 163. The poem was published in the British Magazine, September, 1833.
As the packet sailed on its route, Froude glimpsed an occasional convent among the foliage on the hillside, and the sight of it drew from him this observation: "The Roman Catholics are queer fellows; they are determined to be admired and not envied: we, unhappily are envied and not admired" (Remains I.i.263).

The Hermes made two stops at Malta: the first time the ship was held up because of quarantine restrictions, and the group spent Christmas there; when they returned on the second visit a month later, Sir John Stodart, Chief Justice, acquainted Newman and Froude with what Newman termed "the admirable system of the Papacy as an instrument of power" in Malta. The English, in an attempt to introduce trial by jury in a Catholic country where the clergy were independent of the State, were meeting great difficulties, for a country where the clergy "were tried in courts of their own (as in Becket's time) and irresponsible to the civil power" did not easily change systems.

By the time the trio were ready to enter Rome, however, Froude not only changed his mind about the power of the Papacy, but he was slowly changing his mind about Roman Catholics in general. As to the former, he found in Sicily that the Church "conceded one-third of the Church revenues for the payment of state pensions" and did not dare to resist "the most atrocious encroachments of the state upon their privileges" (Remains I.i.294). He sadly confessed to Keble: "The same process which is going on in England and France is taking its course everywhere else; and the clergy in these Catholic countries seems as completely to have lost their influence, and to submit as tamely to the state, as ever we can do in England" (Remains I.i.296).
This lessening of ecclesiastical power was not in itself the greatest disillusionment Froude suffered: unfortunately, Froude witnessed the carnival days in Italy. He said he could not concur with the idea that Roman Catholics worship Saints; he thought people injudicious who spoke against Roman Catholics for honoring the Virgin and images. There might be an element of idolatry in it, he felt, but he could not make up his mind on this question. One thing, he did make up his mind about—"it is carnival which is real practical idolatry, as it is written, 'the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.'" Evidently, Froude witnessed the heights of Bacchanalian revelry, the bane against which many Popes and bishops directed their censures. To make it worse, he interpreted the attitude of the clergy toward this intemperate merriment as one of indifference: "I have seen priests laughing when at the Confessional; and indeed it is plain, that unless they habitually make light of very gross immorality, three-fourths of the population would be excommunicated" (Remains I.i.294).

In a letter to Ryder on February 28, 1833, Froude spoke again of idolatry: "By the by since I have been out here, I have got a worse notion of the Roman Catholics than I had. I really do think them idolaters, though I cannot feel quite confident of my information as it affects the character often." Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection.

In another part of the letter, Froude defined "idolater": "What I mean by calling the people Idolaters is that I believe they look on the Saints and Virgin as good natured people that will try to get them let off punishment that the Bible declares and that as they don't intend to comply with the conditions on which God promises to answer prayers, they pray to these as a come off. But this is a generality on which I have not sufficient data." Unpublished Letters, Reel 76, Personal Collection.
The poverty of the common people appalled Froude also. He had read of the Catholic Church as the Church of the poor. To him the Church seemed utterly indifferent toward her poor.

Neither the life of the people nor that of the clergy in the Sicilian countryside fulfilled the high expectations of the idealistic Froude. Equally disheartening was his belief that monasticism was going out of fashion: "Hardly any one goes into the convents, and those who are in already are subjected to no discipline; at least, 0's friend, Mr. --, who went into a Benedictine convent at Monreale, is now in Naples without permission, leading a gay life, and the Church has not proceeded to any severe measures against him" (Remains I.i.294).12

Before Froude reached Rome, he concluded: "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" (Remains I.i.294). Not all hope was lost, for he added: "I hope when I get to know something of the language, and to see more of the people, that I shall see reason to retract my present views." The continental life, so foreign to the Anglo-Saxon mind; the carnival days, so disgusting to the habitual restraints of an ascetic; and the seeming devitalization of spiritual life, so disillusioning to an

---

12 Monasticism attracted Froude from youth, and it was to be an important plank in Froude's reform program for the Church. In 1829, he visited Glendalough, his mother's homeland, and he was particularly attracted to one of the most striking monuments of monasticism in Ireland -- St. Kevin's (Remains I.i.240-242).
idealistic nature such as Froude's all contributed towards quenching the hopes and the ardent desires for the union with Rome, which Froude

Newman denied that the reason he and Froude went to see Monsignor Wiseman in Rome was an effort to effect a union with the Roman Catholic Church. He added a note to the letter which Froude wrote to Christie which intimated this idea, and he said Froude's remarks about "union with Rome must not be taken literally" (Remains I.i.307). In later life Newman even more vehemently denied any intention of union with Rome at that time. In a letter to Canon MacColl on May 3, 1883, he said: "To suppose that H. Froude and I had contemplated even the bare idea of being admitted to communion at Rome is monstrous, too monstrous to gain credit." Unpublished Letters, Reel 46, Personal Collection.

The crux of the problem lies in the interpretation of the phrase "union with Rome," which will be clarified later in this chapter. Here, on the negative side, it is sufficient to state that Newman's frequent renunciations of a union with Rome, which began at the time of his Mediterranean voyage, are one indication that such a union must have been contemplated—or at least spoken of. On April 6, 1833, he wrote to Christie: "As to my view of the Romanist system, it remains, I believe, unchanged. A union with Rome, while it is what it is, is impossible. It is a dream." Unpublished Letters, Reel 81, Copied Letters.

A letter to Henry Jenkyns dated the next day was written in a similar vein: "As to Rome, a union with her on our part is impossible and ever will be." Unpublished Letters, Reel 2, Miscellaneous Papers. Part of letter in Letters and Correspondence, I, 334.

A few days later, on April 11, 1833, he wrote to Jemima: "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." Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 338.

Newman spoke of the matter again to Jemima in the following year, October 2, 1834: "To become a Romanist seems more and more impossible; to unite with Rome, (If they would let us) not impossible—but she would not, without ceasing to be Rome." Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 59.

All these letters were written after Newman and Froude talked with Wiseman. Before this talk, Newman had written to R.F. Wilson: "Rome... desirable refuge, did evil days drive one from England." Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 329.

In his Apologia, Newman wrote: "Thus we had a real wish to cooperate with Rome in all lawful things, if she would let us, and if the rules of our own Church let us; and we thought there was not better way towards the restoration of doctrinal purity and unity. And we thought that Rome was not committed by her formal decrees to all that she actually taught: and again, if her disputants had been unfair to us, or her rulers tyrannical, we bore in mind that on our side too there had been rancour and slander in our controversial attacks upon her, and violence in our political measures." Newman, Apologia, Works, XXXIII, 71. Newman added, in regard to the Branch theory and aspect of it just quoted: "I have no intention whatever of implying that... I took it up myself except by degrees in the course of ten years." Ibid.
intended when he set out on his trip. When he finally reached Rome on the evening of the second of March, his dwindling hopes were reenkindled. The next day, according to Newman's Private Diary, 14 the trio went to Saint Peter's; and, on the eighth of the month, they repeated their visit in order to hear Vespers. On the fifteenth of the same month, they went to the Jesuits' Church, according to Newman, and then "hence to Saint Peter's to see the pope."

Whether Froude anticipated a call on Monsignor Wiseman before he left for Rome or whether he was directed to the English College after he arrived in Rome is uncertain. Newman recorded in his Private Diary that they missed Dr. Wiseman on the afternoon of the tenth, but on the twenty-fourth, they went to hear him speak. On April 3, the Froudes called on Mr. Severn 15 and he accompanied them to Dr. Wiseman's; Newman did not go with the group. Two days later, however, Newman was with Froude when he called on Dr. Wiseman for the second time, but, unfortunately, Dr. Wiseman was out. On the following day, April 6, they were more successful: Newman reported that he and Froude had a long talk with Dr. Wiseman.

This "long talk" was probably the antecedent of the controversial letter Froude wrote to Christie on April 13, 1833, and which was published in Froude's Remains after his death. It made the Tractarians,

---

14 Unpublished Letters, Reel 1, Private Diary.

15 Mr. Severn, according to L.I. Guiney, was Joseph Severn, the English painter and friend of Keats. He was in Rome between 1820 and 1841 working on his paintings. It was through Severn that Froude met Frederick Overbeck, a Roman Catholic convert who interested Froude. Overbeck, a German painter, studied Raphael in Rome. Louise I. Guiney, Hurrell Froude, pp. 96-97.
especially Newman, the target of much criticism. People who suspected
the Tractarians of Roman Catholic tendencies used this letter as proof
that such was the aim of the party from the beginning.

From the letter, one can detect a note of utter amazement—a pro­
found disillusionment. One can ascertain the fact that Froude did desire
union with Rome—but on his own terms. Indoctrinated with the branch
theory; illuminated by his readings in Church History on the weakening
influence which the Reformation had on the dogma of the Anglican Church;
and witnessing in his readings in the Middle Ages the effectiveness of
a unified Church as a spiritual force against evil, Froude felt the only
solution for the apathetic Church of his day lay in a return to the
Apostolic Church, which reached its greatest vigor in the times of
Hildebrand. Froude did not contemplate becoming a Roman Catholic; he
would have agreed very probably with an explanation which the converted
Newman set down in a letter to a friend who was contemplating a change
somewhat similar: "To leave it [the Church of England] merely as a
branch of the Catholic Church for another which I liked better, would
have been to desert without reason the post where Providence put me." 16

Froude must have had in mind a series of negotiations whereby both
the Church of Rome and the Church of England could draw up a program of
reform which would purify BOTH Churches and reduce them to the Church
of the Apostolic times—a Church with the pursuance of a virtuous life as
a normal procedure, with the tender regard for its poor as an obligation

in charity, with a vibrant love for God as a unifying power, and with the

effective weapon of excommunication as a threat to unwholesome members

who resisted a cure; above all, a Church free from the tyranny of the

State. Froude's idealistic nature obscured from his view the breadth

such a plan would encompass and the innumerable impediments that would

present themselves. As the letter suggests, Froude probably expected

Wiseman to assume the role of another Charles Davenport, who would

In the letter of September 27, 1832, Froude told Newman that the
First Eclogue was running through his head, and he attributed it to the
prospect of becoming an Ecclesiastical Agitator. Besides the Becket
articles bearing a relation to Froude's becoming an Ecclesiastical Agi-
tator, there is a possibility that his trip to Rome bore some relation
to this same idea. When he wrote the letter, he already anticipated the
trip, and the First Eclogue of Virgil concerns Tityrus, a shepherd "who
has saved his farm from seizure, and incidentally purchased his freedom
by a timely journey to Rome and application to the highest authorities."

Charles Davenport was a Franciscan whose religious name was Santa
Clara. He lived in the seventeenth century and conversed frequently with
Laud, Cosin, and Taylor. He was Chaplain at the Court of Charles I to
the Roman Catholic Queen Henrietta Maria. He was noted for his efforts
to procure a union between Anglicans and Roman Catholics. At various
times, he received the censure of Roman Catholic authorities for what
they thought were liberal interpretations of dogma. Cf. Ernest C.
Messenger, The Reformation, the Mass, and the Priesthood (London, 1937),

Froude knew of Davenport, as is evident from his reference to him
in a letter of March 4, 1835, to Newman. Besides indicating Froude's
acquaintance with Davenport's efforts at union, the letter shows that
Froude's own desire for union continued through the years. The terms
of the union changed, however, as Froude gradually accepted more and more
of the Roman Catholic doctrines. The letter read: "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." Newman, Unpublished Letters,
Reel 40, Personal Collection.

Newman, in a letter to Dr. Russell on Easter, 1841, quoted Davenport
as the writer whom he followed in "exonerating our Articles from what is
traditionally imputed to them." He also quoted him in a letter to Lord
Shrewsbury. He showed his use of the Decrees of the Council of Trent as
a rule to interpret the 39 Articles. The quotation is in Certain Diffi-
culties Felt by Anglicans, in Works, XXXI, 14.
work out such a union with them. Froude's controversial letter to Christie read:

It is really melancholy to think how little one has got for one's time and money. The only thing I can put 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 I'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 doctrines 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 Monsignor 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 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 (Remains I.1.306-308).

Newman's reaction to Wiseman's explanation can be gleaned from a passage in his Apologia where he referred to the wish to co-operate with Rome in order to restore doctrinal purity: "As to ourselves being direct instruments in improving her belief or practice, I used to say, 'Look at Rome; let us first, (or at least let us the while,) supply our own short
In a letter to R. F. Wilson, September 8, 1833, Newman told Wilson the new program of Ecclesiastical reform, and he reiterated two ideas of Froude, as expressed in the latter's letter to Christie: they were now Radicals, and they intended to hand down the "principles of Laud till the time comes..." The last phrase "till the time comes" seems significant; relating it to the above-quoted passage of the Apologia, one could add "before we attempt to be physicians to any one else."

At Rome, Froude discarded his Toryism and became a Radical, for previously he believed that to be an "Apostolical" did not necessitate a rejection of the role of Tory. His new conviction was reinforced when he visited France. Conditions there seemed to verify his judgment that the only position compatible with an "Apostolical" was that of a Radical. In a poem in the Lyra, he bade farewell to Toryism.

In the meantime, the crucial aspect of Froude's trip did not consume all his time in Rome: he used every opportunity to visit and examine the beautiful buildings and historic sites there.

Froude found Rome "the place after all where there is most to as-

---

19 Newman, Apologia, in Works, XXXIII, 71.
20 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 399. Newman had previously written to Rogers that he was a Tory theoretically and historically, but a Radical practically. Ibid., 395.
21 In the poem, Froude addressed to Christians this message:
Thou hast a treasure and an armoury / Locked to the spoiler yet: /
Thy shafts are bright: / Fain not: Heaven's Keys are more than sceptred might; /
Their Guardians more than king or sire to thee.
The poem is entitled "Farewell to Toryism" in the Remains; it bears the title "The Exchange" in the British Magazine for May, 1835, and it is entitled "Farewell to Feudalism" in Guiney's Hurrell Froude, p. lll.
tonish one, and of all ages, even the present." He absorbed all the splendors of Rome, especially those which pertained to art or Catholicism. Concerning the former, Mr. Severn must have been an able guide. Froude wrote to Keble in glowing terms about the effect colored stone produced in architecture and the marvelous use which Michaelangelo made of it. He gave his brother William a detailed account of the impressiveness of the mosaics, too. The vastness and the beauty of Rome made a deep impression upon him as he investigated with eagerness all her works of art. Francisco Francia's works, especially, engaged his attention, and one can be sure Froude displayed a sincere appreciation of Francia's Madonnas.

Newman also was enthralled by the works of art in Rome, especially the Fountains and the mosaics. He himself had a keen appreciation of beauty; even if he had lacked this appreciation, he certainly would have found the enthusiasm of his friend difficult to withstand. Not only the works of art drew Newman's attention, but also the beautiful chant of the various services they attended. After his return to England, Newman mentioned the Gregorian Chant, "a modification of the Ambrosian Chant," in his "Church of the Fathers" and he also suggested Froude write a paper on Gregorian Chant.

Froude carried away from Saint Peter's a much different impression than Newman did, as is seen from his letters and articles. For Newman, Rome was "a very difficult place to speak of, from the mixture of good and evil in it." Although he said, "The Miserere at Rome, my going up to St. Peter's, and the Easter illumination, our conversations with Doctor Wiseman, and with Mr. Bunsen, our search for the Church of Saint
Thomas of Canterbury, my pilgrimage to the place of Saint Paul's martyrdom, the Catacombs, and all the other sights... have stolen away half my heart," he also believed Rome to be possessed by an evil spirit, which manifested itself in its "crafty, relentless, inflexible, and undeviating" policy. To his mother, he spoke of the "abundance of mummery" and to Christie, he wrote about "the solemn reception" of superstitions as "an essential part of Christianity"; Newman told Christie of the famous churches of Rome "built (in part) by the sale of indulgences." In Jemima's letter, he mentioned the Roman "inventions" of the Mass and Purgatory. 22

The difference between the impressions carried away by Newman and those carried away by Froude are very apparent in the correspondence regarding "Home Thoughts Abroad," a series of articles which first appeared in the British Magazine in January and February of 1834. Newman wrote these articles shortly after his return from the continent, and he sent them to Froude for perusal before giving them to Rose for publication. The articles contain Newman's impressions of Rome. Many of his anti-Roman Catholic prejudices, which he retained from youth, are apparent. Froude's comment, in part, on the articles was contained in a letter of September 2, 1833:

Owing to the abominable delay of the Bath Coach, I only got your paper yesterday. As a proof that it is not destitute of interest I got it about half past ten or eleven at night, and read it through without yawning--also I think it not unlikely to do some pittance of good in the way of infusing sentiments. I only

22 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 325-341.
except from the general approbation your second and most superfluous hit at the poor Romanists. You have set them down as demoniacally possessed by the evil genius of Pagan Rome, but notwithstanding are able to find something 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 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 feet with devotion and I do not believe that any Roman Catholic of education would tell you that he identified penitence and penance—in fact, know that they often preach against this very error as warmly as you could do.23

Newman's sentiments in "Home Thoughts Abroad" were mixed, and in part showed the softening effects of Froude's influence. In the January article, he maintained: "It cannot be denied Rome is one of the four monsters of Daniel's vision." In the February article, Newman was more concerned with the problem "How to avoid papery without giving up the Church." Although he retained, in spite of Froude's criticism, the scorn for those who kissed the feet of St. Peter and he indicted the Roman Catholic Church for perverting the doctrine of celibacy and destroying personal religion, yet he suggested a change in the manner of speaking about the Roman Catholic Church, "Our Mother, to whom we owe the blessing of Christianity." He, however, summed up his stand by speaking of "her intense hatred of us, and the iron temper with which she resists all proposals of ever so little concession. She multiplies her requisitions of belief upon us in matters great and little, till we are forced to

23 Unpublished Works, Reel 40, Personal Collection. This letter was an answer to Newman's letter of August 22, 1833, in which Newman enclosed the articles.
dissent from her, as robbing us of our Christian liberty; and then she
denies the Sacraments, which are the means of future life, except on the
terms of our admitting all she chooses to impose." He concluded his
article: "Happily for us, we had the apostolical succession within our
own country, and so could consecrate the bread and wine without her; but
can any measure be more atrociously cruel than that of placing the
Germans and others to the alternative of being hypocrites, or losing the
Sacraments?"  

Froude was a non-Roman Catholic but not an anti-Roman Catholic. He
admired the exhibition of faith which he witnessed in the churches of
Rome. Writing of that experience in his "Essay on Rationalism," he
contrasted it with the spirit of disbelief prevalent in his own country:

Among them [the Churches of Rome and Greece] 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-quarters of the congregation to withdraw, operates
there like the voice of the good shepherd which the sheep hear and
obey. The areas of the Churches, which we fill with seats to ac­
comodate the gazing audience of a popular preacher, so arranged for
the most part as to make kneeling almost impossible, are adapted
only to the use of devotees who come to humble themselves before
their God (Remains I.ii.12).

Froude seldom joined Newman in the latter's criticism of excessive
devotion in the Roman Catholic Church, which Newman likened to "a
beautiful flower run to seed." Froude, on the contrary, believed it was
infinitely better to err on the side of belief than on the side of dis­
belief. Before coming to Rome, the two travelers were initiated into

24 Newman, "Home Thoughts Abroad," British Magazine, V (January
February 1834), 2, 125-126, 131.
scenes anticipatory to those at Rome: they had visited several Greek Churches, some Uniate and some Orthodox. Froude depicted two scenes at Saint Spiridion in Corfu, where the body of the patron saint is deposited for veneration: "In the chapel, where the body lies, lamps are always kept dimly burning, and the people go in and kiss the shrine. The feet are stained with tears, and there are many splendid offerings there of precious stones."

Newman reported the same scene, but with an element of reserve and scepticism: "On Saturday we saw the church and body of St. Spiridion, who was one of the Nicene Fathers, though doubtless it is not his body... People were ever coming in, weeping and bowing and kissing the pictures."

Another scene Froude described in this same letter:

The altar is behind a screen, with three doors in it. The middle one has a picture of our Saviour on it, and on the others there is generally the Virgin, and some other Saints. The rest of the screen is a number of compartments, with pictures of Saints in each. When the Bread and Wine is consecrated, the doors are shut, and the priest behind the screen chants just loud enough for the people to respond to him. I was present at this service once; and in spite of the nasal twang, in which the chant was conducted, and the unintelligibility of the pronunciation, it was altogether very impressive" (Remains I.i.286-288).

Both Froude and Newman had mixed feelings towards Rome, but, whereas anti-Romanism was an active and fundamental point in Newman's program, it was seldom tolerated by Froude. Newman felt it a duty to protest against the Church of Rome; Froude attacked him repeatedly for doing it. The theory of Rome's connection with Antichrist was such an ingrained idea in Newman that even the protestations of his dearest friend were often ineff-

fective. Not until 1843 was the idea completely eradicated. "From the time that I knew Froude, I got less and less bitter on the subject," Newman wrote in his *Apologia*. 26

One more event in Rome was significant, as far as the Oxford Movement was concerned. The *Lyra*, for which Newman wrote copiously, was officially christened. Newman and Froude borrowed a copy of the *Iliad* from Mr. Bunsen, the Prussian minister who offered hospitality to them in Rome. Froude selected the words of Achilles as a motto: "You shall know the difference, now that I am back again." It is interesting to note that Achilles, on re-entering the fight, realized that he was to perish before the fight was completed. Froude, too, began to realize that he would leave before the "fight" was completed.

Newman parted company with the Froudes in Rome; he went home by way of Sicily, where he had a severe attack of fever and was confined until June 13, 1833.

The Froudes headed toward France. While in France, Hurrell wrote to Christie that he felt like a fool, for he was unable to speak French. As a student, he had learned French by reading Fenelon's *Telemaque* with some one standing by to prompt him with the words he did not know (Remains I.1.190). Like many English speaking people, he probably had a good reading knowledge of the French language but little ability to converse in it.

France held a particular attraction for Froude: it was the scene of many incidents connected with the life of Thomas à Becket. Mr. Bunsen

had assisted Froude in Rome in securing permission to have access to the
original letters of St. Thomas in the Vatican Library; in France, Froude
hoped to glean additional information from the abbeys connected with
Saint Thomas's exile. His general route was from Marseilles to Lyons
to Paris. He certainly must have stopped in the vicinity of Burgundy,
at the monastery of Pontigny, where St. Thomas lived for some time,
during which he attempted to bring Henry II under complete submission
to the Church.

While in France, another incident quickened the spirits of the
young Radical, and information about this new interest was written to
his brother on May 23, 1833:

What I have seen since my last letter ends, has been more
interesting than anything else except Rome. . . . France seems
governed by a small despotic oligarchy,—the aristocrats of wealth,
who by their agitating spirit have contrived to get the franchise
so restricted as to secure to themselves a majority in the Chamber,
and the command of the military, by which they keep France under a
strong hand. All the towns we passed are full of soldiers; in Lyons
alone there are 15,000: and, with the mass of the people, this
government is so unpopular, that on Louis Philippe's birthday only
one house in all Lyons was illuminated. I have since heard what
we observed confirmed in a curious way. 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 (Remains 1.1.312).²⁷

²⁷Before coming to France, Froude and Newman, keenly observant of
the religious problem in France, may have heard of Lamennais and Lacordaire,
two contemporary Roman Catholics who were promoting papal au-
thority in France, but I have found no evidence of it. The "since" which
I italicised in the above quotation points to the opposite conclusion.
Their difference in attitude towards Charles X; the fact that Lamennais
was working for a theocracy headed by a Pope, an idea not entirely conso-
nant with Froude's desire for a renewal of Episcopal power; and the fact
that, by 1833, L'Avenir, their newspaper, had ceased publication must all
be considered before attributing too much to the influence of Lamennais on
Froude's ideas previous to his trip to France.
After Froude had been disillusioned by Wiseman, he had written that he intended to be a Radical from then on. 28 Then, in France, a month later, he found similar grounds which justified one in becoming a Radical. Froude's analysis of the situation in France may enlighten and enable one to interpret the similarity between the situation in France and the situation in England which warranted a Tory's becoming a Radical.

In a fragmentary article entitled "On the Present State of the French Church," which was published in his Remains (I.II.402-406), Froude examined the tenets of the parties in France. He maintained that there were two parties prior to the Revolution of 1830; the Royalists and the Conservatives. These two parties, unconvinced that the Revolution altered the position of the Church, maintained the same allegiances as previously held, according to Froude. The Royalists recalled the sacrifices of Charles and hoped for a restoration. "Forgetting that the usurping government was now among 'the powers that be' in France, Royalism and Catholicism were the joint subject of their discourses, and the cross was blended with the fleur-de-lis in the badge of the party."

The Conservatives "adhered to such relics of the ancient system as appeared to have survived convulsion. It seemed to them the safer course to maintain even the outward form of things as they were: nor did they perceive that in order thus to preserve appearances, they sometimes sacrificed realities; as indeed was especially the case with those

28 Letter to Christie, April 13, 1833; cf. page 135.
relations between Church and State, which, for the very reason that they had been beneficial under a Catholic dynasty, must be pernicious under a Latitudinarian."

The dilemma, according to Froude, which faced the active Churchmen of France, who were not prepared to surrender the rights of the Church, was resolved by the formation of a third group. This group was "perhaps rather more speculative than practical," and their "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." Whereas the other two parties supposed the identity of monarchical and Catholic principles, this group realized that the identity was unknown before the sixteenth century, and that now circumstances warranting this identity did not exist. It felt that "to mix up the cause of religion with that of any merely political party, whether that of the King de jure or of the King de facto, was in fact to confuse two questions essentially independent."

According to Froude, "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." This third party looked with alarm at the appointment of bishops by a government no longer constituted on Episcopal principles, even Christian principles, and at the payment of clergy from funds not belonging to them.
Froude found that the indifferentism with which this third party, the Radicals, had to contend was similar to the struggle in which he himself was involved. This party of Lamennais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and de Guérin had passed its flourishing stage by the time Froude visited France, but it is certain that the furor they stimulated had not died down. In 1832, the encyclical Mirari Vos had condemned their policy of ultramontanism, and had consequently silenced the organ of the party, L'Avenir, which had carried on the campaign against State control of the Church and aspired to connect the Church with the democracy instead of with the State. 29 The Agence Générale, for defense of religious liberty, was likewise enervated by the encyclical. 30

Froude had much in common with Lamennais. Both were clergymen who were zealous for the welfare of the Church; both opposed State domination of the Church; both believed that a renaissance of Catholicism was possible only if the Church was free; both pressed principles to their logical conclusion with a boldness that startled their acquaintances; both opposed Protestantism, especially its chief doctrine of the right of private judgment. 31 Both men were mathematically inclined, and both


30 This association was founded in December, 1830, and headed by Lamennais. Its prospectus was published in L’Avenir. It, too, advocated alliance between the people and the Church; because many Bishops were State appointed and acted as servants of the State, the Bishops opposed it.

31 Both Lamennais and Froude affirmed that private judgment led to atheism. In 1835, Froude illustrated this view from the life of Blanco White, when he reviewed White’s autobiography, as will be discussed later. Lamennais denounced the principle of private judgment forcefully in his "Essai sur L’Indifférence."
taught mathematics during their life.

Whereas Lamennais had no sympathy for Charles X, though, Froude readily sympathized with the French King and believed him to be concerned with religious issues (Remains I.ii.243-244). Lamennais felt that Charles X and his ministers governed on atheistic principles (meaning indifferent principles). 32

Whereas Lamennais was against the supremacy of the General Councils because he thought such a situation provided no center of unity unless the Council was in session and because it required the consent of princes, 33 Froude seemed inclined to favor the Councils.

As far as the influence of the Lamennais party on Froude can be traced, this influence seems to be limited more to the encouragement and corroboration of views at which Froude arrived quite independently. Several ideas which had been germinating in Froude's mind as a result of his readings and research grew into definite shape after Froude returned to England from his continental trip. Lamennais' writings seemed to encourage Froude and give him methods and means of carrying on his reform program.

The belief of the Lamennais party—that the common people were the


33 Ibid., 111.
stronghold of the Church—was an idea Froude also cherished. There seems no proof that Froude derived the idea from the French group, however. In his Becket readings, Froude saw the King, the aristocrats, and many of the worldly-minded Bishops working in opposition to the interests of the Church and in pursuance of their own selfish ambitions.

Newman wrote to Matthew Arnold on December 3, 1871: "It was one of Hurrell Froude's main views that the Church must alter her position in the political world—and when he heard of la Mennais, he took up his views with great eagerness. . . . Froude had seized upon it from the intuitive apprehension he had of what was coming, and of what was fitting." Unpublished Letters of Matthew Arnold, ed. Arnold Whitridge (New Haven, 1923), pp. 60-61.

Newman, too, took the anti-aristocratical view which Froude proposed, but by November 7, 1833, he "left off being anti-aristocratical" for he did not feel the time was ripe. Unpublished Letters, Reel 40.

Previously, on August 31, 1833, he had written to Rogers that he thought the most natural state of things was for the aristocratical power to uphold the Church, yet history proved that the Church was upheld by a popular power. Letters and Correspondence, I, 395.

To Froude, Newman had said about the same time: "Of late months the idea has broke on me, as it did a little before on yourself, that the Church is essentially a popular institution, and the past English union of it with the State has been a happy anomaly." Unpublished Letters, Reel 40.

In his "Church of the Fathers," published in the British Magazine for October, 1833, Newman said that hitherto he had depended on the State, but now he would "look to the people." (The phrase "Look to the people" and "Apostolical Body" were printed in solid capital letters. p. 422). Newman said it was not he who deserted the aristocracy, but they deserted him. The Church, he added, was purest when it was dependent upon its popularity for its influence, and he referred to an illustration of this fact in the Becket articles: "I own your correspondent's papers upon Becket's history have struck me not a little; but of course I now refer not to the dark ages, but to the primitive church, --the church of St. Athanasius and St. Ambrose."

Newman spoke of the latter as "eminently a popular prelate," who was chosen by the people and worked for the people: "I confess I have stipendiaries; they are Pauperes Christi, the poor of Christ's flock." p. 541.
while the poor and common people were allied with the Church.

The idea of State interference was one which was not necessarily derived from Lamennais either, for Froude witnessed in his readings in Medieval Church history the constant attempt by the State to usurp the right to voice preferences in church elections, and the demand to try cases in the civil courts instead of ecclesiastical courts. In his own day, he had but to look about him to see a continuation of this interference, especially the Althorp Irish Church Bill, which was pending.\footnote{Lord Althorp, Chancellor of the Exchequer, initiated a bill in February, 1833, to lessen the grievances of Ireland. The bill "abolished first-fruits and Church cess, and imposed instead of them a graduated tax" on ecclesiastical incomes. It also "diminished the number of archbishops and bishops from twenty-two to twelve" to save money for other uses. "Strictly speaking, no bishopric was suppressed, but dioceses were united." Francis Warre Cornish, \textit{The English Church in the Nineteenth Century}, I (London, 1910), 143.}

The Lamennais party did furnish Froude with ammunition to fight State interference, however. Lamennais and Lacordaire had raised the issue repeatedly. In \textit{L'Avenir} of November, 1830, Lacordaire had written a highly provocative article, which had effectively checked the policy of Louis Philippe in nominating questionable bishops\footnote{Vidler, \textit{Prophecy and Papacy}, pp. 170-172.} even though it resulted in the confiscation of the paper by the police and a court session for both Lacordaire and Lamennais. Froude quoted parts of this article in a letter he wrote to the \textit{British Magazine} on July 1, 1833.\footnote{Froude, "Conservative Principles," \textit{British Magazine}, IV (July 1833), 51-54.}

He entitled his letter "Conservative Principles" and he signed it "F."
He wrote:

His Majesty's Ministers, in future must be, and ought to be at least in their public capacity, DETACHED FROM RELIGIOUS PARTIES,--DANS UNE INDIFFERENCE LEGALE A notre egard; with us, as with the Catholics of France,--est-ce leur indifférence 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'êtes vous pas Évêques? Bishops of Christ's holy everlasting Church, who shall interfere with the free exercise of your indelible prerogative? Consecrate or refuse to consecrate: who shall reverse your decree? You can bind and who shall loose? UNE SEULE CHOSE LEUR EST POSSIBLE: LE REA TRANCHAIENT DE NOTRE BUDGET. Évêques de France! nous de vous en disons pas d'avantage: c'est a vous de voir lequel vous preferez laisser sur vos sieges, en mourant, ou d'un Épiscopat riche et corrupteur, ou d'un Épiscopat pauvre et digne de vous succeeder.

Froude's quotation from Lacordaire echoed many of the ideas for reform which Froude drew up from the Becket articles previously: the power of the Church if it but claim it; the need for Bishops to renounce riches; the need and right of the Church to assert itself.

The above letter, published in the British Magazine in July, 1833, closed with a note of caution against indifferentists: "Look fairly at the question before you; make up your mind, not whether you will 'go these lengths' or remain where you are, but whether you will go these lengths or other lengths. ... By standing still you become a party to Revolution."38

Another letter to the British Magazine followed in September, urging people to agitate for the repeal of those laws which required the

38 In Tract I, Newman closed on a similar note: "CHOOSE YOUR SIDE. To remain neuter much longer will be itself to take a part."
dean and chapter to elect the person nominated by the King. In the same issue, he saw the continuation of his Becket articles, now under the title, "The Project of Henry II for Uniting Church and State." Like Lamennais, Froude began his fight in opposition to State interference in spiritual matters. Unlike Lamennais, Froude was using a foreign doctrine when he called upon Bishops to assert their authority. Many Bishops in England did not recognize their authority independent of the State; many were not sure of it; most Bishops feared to claim it. The doctrine of Apostolical Succession had been little heard of since the time of the Non-jurors.

Another measure of Lamennais' program for reform which certainly must have met with Froude's approval, if he became acquainted with it, was the foundation of the Congregation of Saint Peter, organized in 1828 by the priests and laymen of Lamennais' party. The members engaged in parish, missionary, and educational work. They recited the Roman Breviary, a novel thing in France at that time.39 In view of Froude's love for monastic life and celibacy, plus his disappointment at the lack of monastic observance in Sicily, he would have whole-heartedly welcomed news of the erection of this monastery. It may, although evidence is wanting, have influenced his ideas for reviving monastic life in large cities in England, a plan which he discussed with Newman in September,

39Vidler, Prophecy and Papacy, p. 145.
In one other matter, Froude and Lamennais bore a resemblance—in the manner in which they approached the problem of belief and scepticism. Lamennais, in his *Essai sur L'Indifférence*, dealt with the reasonableness of belief. In a reaction against Cartesianism or individual certainty, he said no one could be individually positive of anything. Although no one can be individually justified in being certain about anything, however, one can be, in fact, certain about many things. In other words, belief and individual reason (experience or the fact of knowing truth) do not necessarily have to coincide in the individual. Lamennais said there are two senses of reason: apart from the fact of knowing truth, there is ratiocination, or the power of the discursive understanding in which one passes from premises to conclusions. The things of which one can be certain, according to Lamennais, are the things about which everyone agrees.

---

40 In a letter to Newman dated September 2, 1833, in the *Unpublished Letters*, Reel 40; dated August 31, 1833, *Remains*, p.322; and a letter dated August 22, 1833, in *Letters and Correspondence*, I, 390, Froude suggested: "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 of PROJECT FOR REVIVING RELIGION IN GREAT TOWNS. Certainly colleges of unmarried priests, (who might, of course, retire to a living, when they could and liked) would be the cheapest possible way of providing effectively for the spiritual wants of a large population."


42 Vidler, *Prophecy and Papacy*, p. 86.
in the general reason of mankind—the sensus communis, or the reason of society as a whole, expressed in the tradition organized by the Church. This general reason rests upon universality, perpetuity, and sanctity—or the testimony of the ages.

In a similar vein, Froude developed his theory of "the safest course." In his "Essay on Rationalism" (Remains i.ii.1-165), Froude, too, implied that belief and individual reason (experience) do not necessarily have to coincide in the individual. He said: "I believe in the miraculous conception of our Blessed Lord, another person disbelieves it; and then my belief is not founded on a submission of Reason to Faith, nor again, is his belief a triumph of Reason over Faith."

Froude said: "The question . . . which ought to be trusted, Reason or Faith, is absurd." He maintained that "the question between us is not, which ought to be most trusted, Faith or Reason, but whose notions of evidence are most reasonable, his or mine. He attributes more weight than I do, to the presumption drawn from experience, that the course of nature is uniform, and therefore cannot have been deviated from in this particular instance; I attribute more weight than he does to the testimony, which proves Scripture authentic, and the text, in which this miracle is stated, genuine. His reason teaches him to think it more

---

45 Froude was indebted to Butler's Analogy, but he was also acquainted with Pascal, to whom Lamennais owed a great deal. He quoted Pascal in his "Essay on Rationalism" and the implication of his "safest course" is Pascal's assertion that belief in God is a wager on which one can lose nothing.
probable that the parts of the Bible are a forgery, or at least couched in vague and random language, than that the order of nature which we see around us should have been so wonderfully set aside; mine teaches me the reverse" (Remains I.ii.22). For Froude, the question did not hinge upon the degree or kind of mystery to which Reason was subjected, but the basic question was the reasonableness of believing at all. Like Lamennais, he abhorred private judgment, or the attempt to derive certitude from individual reason, and somewhat like Lamennais, Froude grounded his certitude in authority (tradition, Scripture, text). Both rejected Reason as an Arbiter for Faith, and then both came back and gave, as a ground for Faith, its reasonableness.

For the believing man, Froude advised the "safest course" principle but: "The points fixed by the Creeds are the only ones on which there is not a safest course" (Remains I.ii.318). The Creeds were to be accepted without question on their Authority. In regard to other religious prac-

---

46 Newman's Oxford University Sermons of 1831, 1832, and especially 1839, treat of the problem of belief. (They form the basis of the Grammar of Assent.) In Sermon X, Newman reproved the error "that a process of Reason is the sine qua non for true religious Faith. When the Gospel is said to require a rational Faith, this need not mean more than that Faith is accordant to right Reason in the abstract, not that it results from it in the particular case." (p. 184) He concluded: "Faith certainly does seem, in matter of fact, to exist and operate quite independently of Reason."

In Sermon XI, Newman continued: Faith is the exercise of Reason if Reason is the faculty of proceeding from things perceived to things not perceived. It is the acceptance of things as real which the senses do not convey, upon certain previous grounds. Newman said that, whereas we are given absolute certainty in nothing, we must choose between One Who gives us less evidence when He could give us the greater evidence. Faith is the reasoning of a religious mind which acts upon presumptions rather than evidence. (pp. 202-215) Oxford University Sermons, in Works, X.
tices, not explicitly considered in the Creeds, Froude believed, "The most reverential side is always the safe side" (Remains I.ii.97), and the burden of disproof lay with the objector. Froude claimed that "rites are so interwoven and interdependent that we cannot safely discard one without injury to the faith."

Froude's whole object in his "Essay on Rationalism" was "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" (Remains I.ii.16).

Expanding on a passage from Pascal, Froude said:

In the affairs of this life, men know well enough what is meant by the safest course. In religion, a difficulty arises from the dread of superstition. When you must necessarily act on one or two views of a subject, it does not follow that the most probable of the two is the safest to act upon; one may be indefinitely improbable, and the other next to certain, and yet it may be safest to act as if the first was true, and the second false. On the contrary, in matters of mere speculation, when two views can be taken of a subject, that which has a preponderance of probability in its favour is that which we must suppose true. (Remains I.ii.380).

After the Oxford Movement officially opened, Froude prompted Keble: "Do ply the people with tracts on the 'safest course' principle; the more I think of it the more important it seems as the intellectual basis

47In Tract 11, Newman wrote about the Visible Church and showed that there was evidence of its existence. It was intended to continue. "The onus probandi lies with those who deny this position." In Tract 85, Newman asked, "Why should not the Church be divine? The burden of proof surely is on the other side. I will accept her doctrine, and her rites, and her Bible,—not, one and not the other, but all,—till I have clear proof that she is mistaken."
of Church authority" (Remains I.1.351). Froude had reference to "Adherence to the Apostolic Succession the Safest Course," Keble's Tract IV. It was the "safest course" principle which led Froude to conclude: "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 ethos; 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 anything" (Remains I.1.336).

Basically, Lamennais and Froude had the same ardent zeal for religious truth, and devotion to the Church. When Froude was in France, "Paroles d'un Croyant" was not yet forthcoming, and Lamennais had not yet taken his fatal step which severed him from the company of loyal believers of the Church. Froude must have left France enriched and encouraged in his apostolate, ready to bear testimony to the Truth. He arrived home before Newman did; and when the latter returned to his beloved England, which he hoped never to leave again, he found it seething with disquietude. Besides the pending Althorp Bill, the Church was being flooded with pamphlets on reform, desires to alter the Liturgy,

---

48 Froude wrote to Newman on March 4, 1835: "Rome puts La Mennais into my head. What a rage the Quarterly are in with him. I have only just seen the November number and had not heard of Paroles d'un Croyant before."
abolish Creeds, and even remove the mere mention of doctrines such as Baptismal Regeneration and 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."49

Newman and Froude would again join forces, however, and the skeptics and liberals "would know the difference" once they were back. "Should the hand of Satan press us sore, our Athanasius and Basil will be given us in their destined season, to break the bonds of the Oppressor, and let the captives go free."50 England's Athanasius and Basil were ready for action.


50 Newman, The Arians of the Fourth Century, in Works, XXIV, 393-394. Froude censored the Ariana as well as the other works of the Apostolics when the moment was opportune. On November 14, 1833, he alluded to this work when he wrote: "I see already that I shall find in your book sentences which I am sure stood when they were first written after some other sentence than that which affects to introduce them now, and seem conscious of being in the neighborhood of a stranger—'buts' where should have been 'ands' etc. of which I shall make a catalogue and pay you off for all the workings you have given me before now. However, it looks very pretty; and when I puff it, and people turn over the pages, they have a very imposing effect. People will say, 'Ah! I dare say a very interesting work.'"

Froude referred to the book again on January, 1835: "In your Ariana, I have marked some 'buts' and 'ands' and 'yets' which are gross Ferresianisms; also I think you do not account satisfactorily for the Eusebian party. . . . To my mind you are especially strong in the chapter on the Variation of Ante-Nicene Statements."
CHAPTER VI

PROUDE THE APOSTOLICAL

As soon as Froude returned from Europe, he contacted Isaac Williams, who was curate at St. Mary's Church during Newman's absence. They discussed the condition of the Church in England, and Williams briefed his friend on the happenings within the past months. For Williams, the conversation was "the first commencement of 'the Tracts for the Times.'"\(^1\)

It is not difficult to picture the zealous and impetuous Apostolical trying to convince the mild curate: "Isaac, we must make a row in the world." Already, Froude and Newman had been quietly working on plans which Froude now invited Isaac to consider: "We must have short tracts, and letters in the *British Magazine*, and verses, and these you can do for us--and get people to preach sermons on the Apostolical Succession and the like. And let us come and see old Palmer and get him to do something."\(^2\)

"Old Palmer" was William Palmer of Worcester College, who during the previous year, with the assistance of papers of Bishop Lloyd, had

\(^1\) Isaac Williams, *Autobiography*, p. 62.

\(^2\) Ibid., 64.
published *Origines Liturgicae*. Palmer was more prominent in the launching of the Oxford Movement than Isaac Williams, who contributed his share to the Movement quite unobtrusively until his fatal Tract 80 gave him unsolicited prominence.

In his *Narrative of Events*, Palmer recalled that Froude was the only occupant of Oriel at the beginning of the Long Vacation. They immediately began conferences. Through correspondence, Palmer kept Rose informed of happenings and plans while Froude relayed to Keble the same matter. It must have been very trying to both men to agree on a method of action. Palmer, a very learned man, was well acquainted with controversies on Roman Catholic ideas and did not share any of Froude's enthusiasm for a union with the Roman Catholic Church. On the contrary, Palmer's sympathies lay with the Reformers: "I cannot but think that Froude's influence, which was very great, was on many occasions exerted

Palmer said he published *Origines Liturgicae* to vindicate the Church of England on what are sometimes called High Church Principles. And he argued against the Non-jurors and sustained the harmony of Church and State, ... and vindicated the Reformation." *A Narrative of Events Connected with "Tracts for the Times"* (London, 1885), pp. 24-27.

On May 2, 1834, Froude wrote to Keble: "I wish Palmer would publish a Supplement to the *Origines Liturgicae*, with the anaphora of the primitive liturgies in Greek. Have you read Brett's translation of them? They are a death-blow to Protestantism, if Palmer is right about their antiquity and independence" (*Remains* I.1.366). In Tract 63, Froude used Palmer and Brett to give the "death-blow to Protestantism." Palmer, however, was believed to repudiate Brett in *Origines Liturgicae II*.

Williams' Tract 80 on "Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge" made him suspect. After a controversy about his qualifications to be Poetry Professor in Keble's place, for the latter was retiring, Williams withdrew from the contest since his religious views would have insured his defeat anyway.

In Tract 86, Williams tried to counteract Froude's remarks in the *Remains* which seemed to disparage the Prayerbook. *Autobiography*, pp. 92-93.
in a direction contrary to mine," Palmer at one time said. "Mr. Froude occasionally expressed sentiments on the latter subject which seemed unjust to the Reformers and injurious to the Church; but as his conversation generally was of a very startling and paradoxical character, and his sentiments were evidently only in the course of formation, I trusted that more knowledge and thought would bring him to juster views."  

After his visit with Wiseman, Froude had determined to make Charles I and the Nonjurors the practical basis for Church principles until he could advance further. Palmer had little use for the Nonjurors:

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

---

6 Ibid., 24.
The meetings during June in 1833, between Palmer and Froude, were but the beginning of a series of differences between the two men. To Froude, Palmer was much too conservative; to Palmer, Froude was much too rash. Besides a difference in temperament, the vast difference of their views caused each to continuously veto the work of the other. Palmer was very learned; he thought Froude the opposite. He did not know that Froude had spent a considerable amount of time on a study of the Reformation. Froude's attitude toward the "myth of the Reformation" was not a result of rash conclusions, but one of an unprejudiced, deeply-explored study.

On the feast of Saint John the Baptist, during that June when Froude was meeting Palmer, Froude delivered a sermon which gave the keynote of his own place in the Oxford Movement:

Let us look only to what God requires of us, leaving the success and the reward to Him. Meanwhile, in the midst of our seemingly unsuccessful labours, let us look for consolation to the happier efforts of our more favoured fellow labourers; let us rejoice over their great powers, and more extended influence, that, when we see them employed successfully, in the cause for which we toil in vain, our joy too may be fulfilled (Remains II.i.229).

In spite of his dynamic personality, Froude was destined to be "the unseen agitator," as Newman termed him, during the Oxford Movement. He was satisfied to be the "humdrum" as long as He and His Cause would increase.

Newman returned to England on Tuesday, July 9, 1833; Froude had been anxiously awaiting his arrival. On the following Sunday, the first public action of the Oxford Movement was taken by John Keble when he preached his Assize Sermon in the University Pulpit.

Keble had for a long time "left off index-making." Early in March,
Froude had invited him to write for the *Lyra* (*Remains I.i.303*), and he had quickly responded. Only a few days after the invitation, Newman had written to his sister: "We find Keble at length aroused, and (if once up) he will prove a second St. Ambrose."7 Keble verified Newman's prediction at least on July 14, 1833.

Characteristically calling a spade a spade, Froude wrote about the sermon to Christie on July 23, 1833: "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 [heretical] and the Parliament [traitors], 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."8

Upon invitation, Froude and Palmer visited Rose at his rectory at Hadleigh during the following week. Conferences were held from July 25 until July 29 for about three hours each day. Each attendant spoke in succession and then all expressed their opinions on the matters which were introduced. One of the topics submitted was the publication of Tracts.

Newman and Keble were both invited, but they did not come. Keble expressed his regret at not being able to be present; his father was

---

7 *Newman, Letters and Correspondence*, I.351.

8 *Unpublished Letters*, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter published in *Remains* I.i.318-319. Keble had spoken of 'Israel as a nation which, through its indifference, had apostatized; it replaced sacerdotal authority by civil authority. England was another Israel.
aged and ill at the time and required him to remain at home. Besides Froude, Rose, and Palmer, Arthur Perceval was present. He was the rector of East Horsley in Surrey, and also a royal chaplain. Previously, he had consulted Rose about a revision of the Catechism of Church Principles, and Rose had directed him to Palmer and Hook.

The four men at Hadleigh were united in one goal—to do something about the spiritual needs of the Church. This was perhaps the extent of their unity, however. In spite of their obvious good intentions, the difference in their backgrounds, temperaments, and views prevented them from accomplishing much at Hadleigh, but at least they initiated action. Probably the presence of Keble and Newman would have effected more of a cohesive power; as it was, Newman sadly confided to Keble that the Hadleigh meeting had not fared so well.

Each of the Hadleighs had his own idea of the business to be accomplished. Perceval, a former pupil of Keble, was concerned with his Churchman's Manual, which he considered the first Tract. This Churchman's Manual was a supplementary Catechism which defined the position of the Church of England, and especially her relations to Rome and to Protestant Dissenters. Froude's contribution to this project was "the insertion of the Questions and Answers embodying the rule de Concionsatoribus, put forth by the Reformers of the Church of 1571."10

---


10 Ibid., 44.
Rose, whom Froude and Newman had met through Palmer the previous June, was interested in his British Magazine, as the voice for the group. He must have discussed the Lyra at the meeting, for Froude felt that Rose was diffident about publishing it in his magazine. Froude suggested to Newman that, with the assistance of others, they might start "a pure religious periodical of prose as well as verse, with Keble's name, 'Excubiae Apostolicae.'" Rose thought there was a danger that people would consider the periodical "a mere party publication," a danger Froude recognized.

In the main, Rose was inclined to favor reading which was directed to the meaning of the Canonical Obedience which they had sworn to their bishops, and Keble concurred in this idea. Rose, however, also suggested that a lay Synod of the Church be elected to replace the apostatized Parliament. Keble was unimpressed with this suggestion. "He did not see what could be gained by a Synod as long "as the ruling members of that Synod are nominated by an infidel Government." On the contrary, Froude seized upon the notion at first, but soon he relinquished the idea. "I am myself out of conceit with old Hooker's notion of a lay synod: it is uneclesiastical and whig. We must only be popular in the choice of church officers" (Remains I.i.333).

Of course, Froude's foremost idea was the repeal of the Praemunire (Cf. Chapter IV); this action, to Froude, would strike at the heart of the matter. Keble agreed with him wholeheartedly, but Keble was not present at Hadleigh and could not save him from Palmer's indictment of being rash. Dejectedly, Froude complained to Newman in his report of the
meeting at Hadleigh: "They think no one will attend at present to anything one says about the appointment of bishops. I see that Rose has not abandoned Conservative hopes himself, and is in suspense. His notion is that the next few years will either plant us safely in a republic—which will settle the question without our saying anything—or else that if things are kept quiet, the power of the people will go to sleep and what he calls 'a repetition of the Rotten Borough System' grow up and things return to what they were. I told him this was what I thought the worst calamity we could dread—but he does not entertain our views seriously; if he does not, others hardly will."

Froude wanted to break with Rose and Palmer. Although he did not believe they were "mere conservatives," they were decidedly not true "Apostolics." Newman and Keble both persuaded him to have patience. He remarked to a friend that he was "floored." "It seems to be agreed, among the wise, that we must begin by laying a foundation. . . . This is a humiliating conclusion to me, and I think a flat one to all, I believe" (Remains I.1.321). In regard to Palmer, Newman and Keble were to discover what a severe trial he could be to their plans; as for Rose, Newman realized his conservatism and Keble soon began to realize

11 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40; parts of letter published in Remains I.1.319, and parts in Letters and Correspondence, I. 384-385.
it, but Newman and Keble had a patience quite foreign to Froude. The latter seemed conscious that his period of activity in this world was very limited, and therefore there was no time for less consequential business, nor for a delay of important business. With an unusual submission, however, Froude put aside his Praemunire ideas temporarily and entered into the plans of the other Hadleigh members. "What I have learned is not to be sanguine; not to expect to bring people into my views, in a shorter time than I have been in coming to them myself" (Remains I.1.320). Froude should have said "am learning" instead of "learned," for it took almost his whole lifetime to realize that his own

---

12 On April 1, 1834, Keble wrote to Newman: "Rose . . . ought not to waste himself on that Magazine any longer. It is quite plain that he in some measure forgets from month to month what he wrote the number before; and no wonder. But it proves he has too much to do. . . . Why can't he take a partner? When shall we give up expecting one another to be consistent? Letters and Correspondence, II, 29.

Newman responded: "I cannot recollect whether Rose has committed himself to our view as regards the Irish Sees. Indeed I never thought he had a view. I never have reckoned him as in his opinions one of ourselves so to say. I have thought him a man of high and ardent mind, keen perceptions and ready eloquence but deficient in the power of taking an accurate and firm view of any subject which was clouded by political interests and the influences of friends and superiors. Our view, whether right or wrong, he has not seemed to me to grasp or to be likely to grasp. Doubtless, if he was a good deal with Froude or you, he would ex animo take your side; then, when he got to London he would shift. I perfectly coincide in what you say about his inconsistency or forgetfulness; only I have ever taken it for granted. Several years ago, And now he seems utterly unconscious that he wrote to me for an answer to the Bishop of Ferns. Besides, he quite forgot that he was the person who recommended the address to the Archbishop." Unpublished Letters, Reel 45, Personal Collection; parts of letter published in Letters and Correspondence, II, 30-31. (Palmer said he recommended the Address--Narrative, p. 50.)
views were startling in comparison to those of the majority in England.

One of the programs of action which arose from the Hadleigh meeting was the "Association of Friends of the Church." Its prime mover was Palmer. Originally, it was never intended by the "Apostolicals" to be a concerted public action group. Keble objected to such action if it did not have the sanction of the Bishop, and Froude disliked such a program because it diluted the ideas of its original members. In March, 1834, when the Association was clearly sinking into oblivion, Newman told Rose:

As to the matter of the Association, Keble, Froude, and myself were always against it. There is as much association now as ever there was on our plan—nay it is increasing. I mean, I know and correspond with strangers far more than I did. We never contemplated more than an Association founded on common views; i.e., just as much as exists between you and me at this moment. So we began—Palmer went to Mr. Hood—and H and P and others framed the famous Association, and Palmer came back and talked me over—and I was willingly talked over by any one like him. So I suspended the Tracts sorely against my will and joined in bringing out that Prospectus of an Association which I never liked, and never accepted, till Ogilvie gave his assent and corrected it. This lasted six weeks—Froude and Keble being disgusted the whole time. At the end of that time, directly your letter came to me, I abjured the Association, and went on with Tracts.13

Although Newman said that they intended only an Association founded on common views, this precise intention instigated further action, for the parties could not agree on common views. Keble proposed "the doctrine of apostolic succession as a basis, together with the exclusive validity of the Eucharist administered by a ministry preserving that succession; unlawfulness of the interference of persons or bodies external to the Church in matters spiritual, and other points," according to Palmer; but Palmer thought this was too narrow—too great a margin for discord.14

The object of the Association was "to maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services, and the discipline of the Church" and also "to afford Churchmen an opportunity of exchanging their sentiments, and cooperating together on a large scale."

Six points were drawn up for advancement by the committee of the Association, Froude wrote to Perceval on August 14, 1833. Three of these points were agreeable to everyone:

First, the doctrine of apostolic succession as a rule of practice:
1. That the participation of the Body and Blood of Christ is essential to the maintenance of Christian life and hope in each individual.
2. That it is conveyed to individual Christians only by the heads of the successors of the Apostles and their delegates.
3. That the successors of the Apostles are those who are descended in a direct line from them by the imposition of hands, and that the delegates of these are the respective presbyters whom each had commissioned.

Second, that it is sinful voluntarily to allow the interference of persons, or bodies, not members of the Church, in matters spiritual.

Third, we hold it to be the duty of every clergyman to stir up his brother clergy to the consideration of these and similar subjects, and if possible, to induce them to do the same.\footnote{Perceval, \textit{Collection of Papers}, p. 12.}

Three points were disputed:

First, we protest against all the efforts directed to the subversion of existing institutions, or to the separation of church and state.

Second, we think it a duty steadily to provide for the contingency of such a separation.

Third, that it is desirable to make the Church more popular, as far as is consistent with the maintenance of its apostolical character.

Keble demurred to all three of the last points; the first two, because "he thinks the union of Church and State, as it is now understood,
actually sinful,"\(^{16}\) to which Froude, of course, agreed.

In regard to the third point, it is interesting to note that even the "Apostolicals" were not agreed upon making the Church more popular. In the letter to Perceval, Froude noted that this point was added by Newman and another person whom he does not name, very probably himself for this was one of his main planks in his program of reform for the Church. It was a point about which Newman wavered.\(^{17}\)

Perceval received Froude's letter with the above points of the Association, but it was followed within ten days by another letter from "one of them," which stated: "With respect to your observations, it seems to me that Froude has made a mistake in sending you some articles which, on further discussion, we thought it better not to introduce. The two principles of the society would be—-a firm maintenance of the apostolical succession, and a resolution to preserve the integrity of Christian doc-

\[^{16}\]Tbid. Newman did not think the time ripe for the repeal of the Praemunire. He also told Bowden on August 31, 1833, that he would not advocate a separation of Church and State "unless the nation does more tyrannical things against us."

\[^{17}\]Although Newman told R. F. Wilson on September 8, 1833, that the people were the fulcrum of the Church, and he spoke to Froude about the idea with enthusiasm on September 18, 1833, he said very little publicly about the idea by November of the same year. On November 7, 1833, he told Froude that he had left off being anti-aristocratical, for the time was not ripe. After Froude's death, however, on April 10, 1836, he wrote to Rose: "I wish to encourage Churchmen to look boldly at the possibility of the Church's being made to dwell in the affections of the people at large. At present it is too much a Church of the aristocracy and for the poor—mainly THROUGH the aristocracy—with few attractions for the middle classes."
trine in our Prayer Book, that is, not to allow it to be watered down to Socinianism."

By September 6, Perceval received another account of the principles of the society from Newman. This account was drawn up by Keble, and Perceval termed it a "matured" one. It read:

Considering, 1. That the only way of salvation is the partaking of the body and blood of our sacrificed Redeemer.
2. That the means 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.
4. That, under the present circumstances of the Church in England, there is peculiar danger of these matters being slighted and practically disavowed, and of numbers of Christians being left or tempted to precarious and unauthorized ways of communion, which must terminate often in virtual apostasy.

We desire to pledge ourselves one to another, reserving our canonical obedience, as follows:

1. To be on the watch for all opportunities of inculcating on all committed to our charge, a due sense of the inestimable privilege of communion with our Lord through the successors of the Apostles; and of leading them to the resolution to transmit it, by his blessing, unimpaired to their children.
2. To provide and circulate books and tracts which may tend to familiarize the imaginations of men to the idea of an apostolical commission, to represent to them the feelings and principles resulting from that doctrine in the purest and earliest Churches, and especially to point out its fruits as exemplified in the practice of the primitive Christians; their communion with each other, however widely separated, and their resolute sufferings for the truth's sake.
3. To do what lies in us towards reviving among Churchmen the practice of daily common prayer, and more frequent participation of the Lord's Supper. And whereas there seems great danger at present of attempts at unauthorized and inconsiderate innovation, as in other matters so especially in the service of our Church, we pledge ourselves;

18 Perceval, Collection of Papers, p. 13. The "one of them" was probably Palmer, as evidenced in the conservatism of the principles he offered.
4. To resist any attempt that may be made to alter the liturgy on insufficient authority; i.e. without the exercise of the free and deliberate judgment of the Church on the alterations proposed.

5. It will also be one of our objects to place within the reach of all men sound and true accounts of those points in our discipline and worship, which may appear from time to time most likely to be misunderstood or undervalued, and to suggest such measures as may promise to be most successful in preserving them. 19

On September 9, Froude received Keble’s account from Newman. The latter charged him to “criticize the whole very accurately in matter of style and send it back by return of post.” He also informed Froude that Keble had appointed Palmer and himself as Secretaries: “I wanted you, but he said you were going abroad—on which understanding I consented.” 20

Froude was not at home when the letter arrived, so his criticism went out too late. He objected to only one point, about which he wrote in a letter to Newman on September 15: “I don’t 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.’” 21

To Keble, he wrote at greater length: “Newman sent me your resolutions for our association, which I think excellent, only I should like to know why you flinch from saying that the power of making the Body and Blood of Christ is vested in the Successors of the Apostles; it seems so

19 Ibid., 13–14. Note in the fourth point of the consideration that Keble used the phrase “Church in England.” It was a phrase he insisted upon. (Cf. Tract 12.) This program which Keble mapped out for the Association is really the program carried out by the Tracts.

20 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letters published in Letters and Correspondence, I, 401.

21 Ibid., 402.
much simpler, and less open to cavil, than 'continuance and due application of the Sacrament.' I suppose all dissenters think they have positive evidence that their own ways are best calculated for the 'continuance and due application, etc.' They cannot think this about the other since, in the nature of things, it admits of no evidence except the Bible and Tradition" (Remains I.i.326).

Newman's answer was speedy and decisive: "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. If my Tract marches beyond the age, what does your phrase?"22

Froude need not have worried about the phrase, for the final draft of the principles for the society did not contain even Keble's conservative phrase; it was drawn up chiefly by Palmer and contained nothing that would offend the most conservative of the Church of England.

The membership in the Association was growing. Palmer had many friends among the high-and-dry school who were willing to become members, but both Newman and Froude had decided that it was of the utmost importance that they did not enlarge the basis of their Association, even in the case of admitting Bishops. Froude objected to anyone "whose ear we have not secured, so that our opinions may be the creed of the Association." When Palmer's influence became apparent, Newman had to reassure Froude that he was not departing from this policy of selection. "We must not be impatient. Never mind, though our creed is not stamped on

22Ibid., 403.
the body; we may single out from them those who agree with us, and form a second society out of the first."  

Froude spent from October 5 to October 26 with Newman at Oxford. Together they must have discussed all the pro's and con's of the Association. On October 24, Newman gave Palmer all his reasons against forming the Association. It is not difficult to see the influence of Froude, especially in the last reason. Newman argued that it was awkward without the sanction of the Bishop to promote independent public action; that an Association was dangerous and could be made ridiculous as well as incite jealousy and suspicion; and that an Association might bring in men who would dilute the opinions of the Apostolicals.

On November 7, Newman was delighted to announce to Froude that "Palmer has completely come over to us on the matter of the Association and I am busily employed all day in disclaiming the notion, declaring my abhorrence of it, and saddling it upon "friends in the country." The agreement was short-lived; by November 13, Palmer was again advocating the Association.

In the meantime, besides working on the platform for the Association, the group were engaged in drawing up an Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury for the purpose of unifying the clergy with their spiritual leader. The Address was to give the Archbishop an assurance of the clergy's "devoted adherence to the apostolical doctrine and polity" of the

23 Ibid.
24 Ibid., 419.
Church of England, and an expression of confidence that the episcopate would take necessary action to revive discipline and promote the welfare of the Church.

Froude left Newman on October 26. On the next day, Palmer asked that the Address be sent to him [Palmer] for perusal.25 Evidently, Froude must have taken a copy of the Address with him, for, in reply to a letter from Newman, Froude wrote on November 4: "You have rowed me for nothing. I never undertook to return Rose's address. However as you are bent on it, I send you a production of my own" (Remains I.1.330).

Froude left the "more experienced to supply the etiquette at the beginning about the undersigned clergy, etc."

They assure your --- that they continue to regard the Liturgy of the Church of England with satisfaction and attachment; and that they do not conceive any such change of circumstances to have arisen since its arrangement, as to have interfered with its application to the present conditions of Christians.

At the same time they do not conceal from themselves the misapplication to which some of its services are exposed by the practical disuse of the Rubrics prefixed to them; and the inefficiency of attempting to act on these Rubrics, without first completing the Ecclesiastical system they pre-suppose. They venture therefore to express their wish for the speedy completion of this system, and their readiness to co-operate in any measures by which your--- may think fit to carry it into effect.

Lastly, they take this opportunity of declaring their conviction that measures such as these, affecting the spiritual welfare of the Church, ought to originate only with its Spiritual Rulers; and that in such matters they deprecate every kind of extra-ecclesiastical interference (Remains I.1.330).

It helped little to send his own production, for, when it returned

---

25Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 412. Newman inserted after "Address to the Archbishop" the phrase "by Froude and me."
from London, Froude was most disgusted with "the milk and water" edition which Palmer drew up. Newman said of it, "Such a composition I never saw. We have re-written each others' (London and Oxford) three times--but now we here have made a few alterations nostro periculo and have pointed it off." He further remarked: "This, in itself too moderate, since I wrote under the fear of Palmer's thinking me ultra, was further weakened by Palmer in London, who struck out all notion of "extra-ecclesiastical interference.""

"I would not have had a hand in printing that Address," was Froude's pronouncement; "Don't spend any of your money on such stuff as this address again. Say 'Settle it among yourselves gentlemen.'"

By cutting Froude's notion of "extra-ecclesiastical interference," Palmer again silenced the issue of the separation of Church and State; but one other matter of even greater importance was deleted. Froude was fighting for the "system presupposed in the Rubrics." Scores of people, many of them Palmer's London friends, were fighting for the Rubrics; most of them were mere Conservatives satisfied to have Rubrics because they were traditional. This was meaningless to Froude. He wanted the Church of the Apostles, as he saw it in the Middle Ages; the Church which was unfafraid to say it started with Christ and it gave Christ in the form of Bread and Wine to its people. Froude severely admonished

---

26 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection.


28 Unpublished Letters, Reels 40 and 51; parts of letter in Remains L.1.331-332.
Newman to cut Palmer loose. "You should not have admitted that our system is in any respect defective now in which it was ever anything but defective."\(^{29}\) Froude was determined to go back to the pre-Reformation days. Palmer and Rose's re-wording of the Address to say "renewal and correction" instead of "restoration and completion" frustrated Froude's entire program of reform.\(^{30}\)

The "milk and water" petition was presented to the Archbishop with about seven thousand signatures in February of 1834. A similar Address followed from the laity signed with over two hundred thousand signatures of the heads of families. Froude, however, was dejected. Newman related the fact to Keble: "He is full of disappointment at the Address, but then, say I, it effects two things—first, it addresses the Archbishop as the head of the Administration and it addresses not King or Parliament which has a doctrinal meaning and is a good precedent. However, Froude calls me names, and bids me stir you up into a fury if I can."\(^{31}\)

The Association and the Address to the Archbishop were both a severe disappointment to Froude; not so the Tracts. During August, when

\(^{29}\) Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection. The lengthy letter of November 17, 1833, quoted in part in Remains I.1.331-332.

\(^{30}\) Rose was at first afraid the address opened the door too much; it was, indeed, far more lax than we sent it to London. Indeed, so much altered that we may safely say it was not ours. All illusion to the iniquity of extra-ecclesiastical interference was cut out; and our words "the restoration and completion" of the Church system were changed into "renewal and correction." Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 23.

\(^{31}\) Unpublished Letters, Reel 45, Personal Collection. The letter is undated in Letters and Correspondence, I, 418.
Froude and Newman were alone at Oxford, they decided "to get Keble and the Tracts rolling instead of the Association." By September 9, only two months after his return from the Continent, Newman had three of his Tracts in circulation.

Newman and Keble figure most prominently in the Tracts, according to most writers on the Oxford Movement. Froude is credited with only Tract 9 on "Shortening the Church Services"; Tract 59 on "Church and State"; and Tract 63 on "The Antiquity of Existing Liturgies." Tract 75 rightfully belongs to Froude, too. It is the Tract on "The Roman Breviary as Embodying the Substance of the Devotional Services of the Church Catholic." Newman said "the idea and groundwork" of the Tract were Froude's, but his manuscripts were in "too imperfect a state" for publication (Remains II.i.379). Even four Tracts seem almost inconsequential when one considers that there were ninety Tracts in all.

There are numerous reasons, however, why Froude did not have more Tracts to his credit, among which was his illness. Just as soon as the Oxford Movement had a good start, he had to go to the West Indies because his consumptive condition required it. Other reasons were his inability to have his "flaming papers" accepted, his dislike of having to write things out, and his desire to be a "humdrum."

Froude, however, deserves more credit than is usually given to him. There were countless times when Froude was asked for his "imprimatur" both by Keble and Newman. Just a few instances in the fall of 1833 when the Tracts were started will illustrate the confidence which they placed in his judgment: on August 5, Newman--"I have written one or two papers on St. Ambrose, but am diffident about them till Froude casts his eyes
on them"; on August 22, Newman--"Read the enclosed nonsense [Home Thoughts Abroad] and send it back forthwith as I want to send it to Tyler, if you give your imprimatur"; September 8, Newman--"Criticize the whole Basis of the Association very accurately in matter and style and send it back by return of post"; September 18, Newman--"I doubt whether you will like the way we are going on. I myself am disappointed, and wished for your presence here"; November 5, Keble--"Now as to my memorial paper, I was rather daunted about it by Froude's criticism, which I fancied convicted me of bad logic in it; so I have not yet revised it, but will try as soon as I have finished the Latin"; November 13, Newman--"What will be done I know not; but I want advice sadly; I have no confidence in any one. . . . My dear Froude, I do so fear I may be self-willed in this matter of the Tracts. Pray do advise me according to your light."

There were no letters during October because Froude was with Newman in Oxford at that time. Throughout the remaining years of Froude's life, however, Newman continually turned to him for his "imprimatur," or sent others to be "prosed" by him, like Golightly and Rogers. It was not a case of an incompetent Newman turning to a competent Froude; most frequently, it was the case of Newman's presentation of his views so that Froude could detect fallacies, if there were any; or to oppose his own views so that between them they could "strike out the truth." It was a wonderful asset for Newman to have Froude's knowledge of the Medieval Church to draw upon and to compare with his own knowledge of the Primitive Church.

Froude also helped finance the Tracts. Several letters to Newman
contain reminders that Froude sent money or expected to send money. One of the most pathetic letters in the Froude-Newman correspondence is one written a little over a year before his death, dealing with this aspect of Froude's contribution to the Tracts. On December 26, 1834, he wrote to Newman:

There was a passage in a letter I have just received from my Father that made me feel so infinitely dismal that I must write to you about it. He says you have written to him to learn something about me and to ask what to do with my money. It really made me feel as if I was dead and you were sweeping up my remains. And by the by if I was dead why should I be cut off from the privilege of helping on the good cause? I don't know what money I left, little enough, I suspect, but whatever it was, I am superstitious enough to think that any good it could do in honorem Deo and sacrosantae Matris Ecclesiae would have something too "in salutem animae meae." And now I find you would have cut me off from all part or lot in the matter. 32

Another reference in one of Froude's letters which pertains to the financial assistance he contributed to the Tracts is that in a letter of January 27, 1836, to Newman:

You have not told me how much you and Rose found in my drawers; Rose thinks it was £40. Also you say nothing about this year's fellowship. I should like you to have what comes to me except £100 to be placed in my name at Parson's for convenience sake. I think I have about £30 there now so if 70 is paid out of my last year's fellowship, you may have all the rest. I have no chance of wanting it as my Father owes me about £300 and besides his accession of fortune in consequence of my Grandmother's death has been so considerable that I have no anxiety to avoid making further demands on him. So spend away, my boy, and make a great fuss, as if your money flowed in from a variety of sources. 33

33 Ibid., 142; 425.
The last phrase is that characteristic of a "humdrum." After death, Froude's contribution did not stop. On March 7, 1836, his father told Newman: "With regard to dear Hurrell's worldly concerns, my desire is to realize every wish that I think he would himself have dictated. The sum devoted to the Tract, you will of course consider as pledged to the furtherance of that or any other purpose of that sort, to which you will see fit to apply it." 34

Early in the Movement, November, 1833, Froude had anticipated a large sum of money from an invention by his brother William. "My Brother's steam engine is going to be patented directly; every one feels sure of its success. If he gets lots of money, I shall reckon it a Godsend to the Apostolics; we will do things in style. Keble, you and I will cut the rest unless they submit," Froude assured Newman, but ten days later, his news was less optimistic: "I shall send some money soon. My brother thinks he will lose all profits from his engine." The project failed.

Froude was also the "agitator" behind the Tracts as well as behind the other Apostolical projects. One can be sure that Keble's first public pronouncement was at least somewhat influenced by Froude's constant prodding, just as Newman's observation to Bowden in August, 1833, derived some of its spirit from Froude's persistent urgings, when he wrote: "I am sure the Apostles did not sit still, and agitation is the order of the day."

34 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection.
To an unidentified writer, probably Thomas Keble, Froude suggested:

"By the by, I am writing to you all this while as if you were your brother, and had all the proses with me that he had. . . . I have long been trying to bother you through your brother to do something for the --------. What do you say to a life of Bishop Butler?" (Remains I.i.321).

Froude also influenced the views which were promulgated in the Tracts. Newman readily acknowledged this fact to Wood in September, 1840.

Your sketch was very satisfactory. Pusey much approved it. He has marked two passages, I think, for correction—which perhaps you had better look to yourself. I hardly agree with him. In one you speak of Froude's views as influencing the writers of the Tracts. Now Pusey, of course, ought to be excluded—but as to the anonymous writers it is quite true—and I could not consent to it not being said. The other is where you prophesy that the English clergy will fall back again upon the Rubrics. I should think it a great pity to omit that passage. But since Pusey thinks it is not sanguine enough perhaps you could put in a sentence or a clause saying we hope otherwise."

Many of Froude's views were incorporated into the Tracts, as those on the use of Excommunication, use of the Breviary, preference for the First Prayer Book rather than the Cranmer Revision, the propriety of facing the congregation, and the error in supposing the Reformers

35 Newman, Correspondence with Keble and others, p. 67.
36 Tracts 3, 37, 41, 55, 62, 67, and 74 are some of the Tracts in which the idea of Excommunication is brought out. Tract 37 gives Bishop Wilson's "Form of Excommunication."
37 Tracts 75 and 80 emphasize the place of the Breviary in the life of an Apostolic. Newman used the Breviary for his group at Littlemore, and Pusey drew up a book of devotions from the Breviary for the "sisterhood which he established in 1844. Isaac Williams published the Breviary.
38 Tracts 34, 38, 75, 81.
39 Tracts 86, 87.
to have been beneficial to the Church. The Tracts emphasizing the
efficacy of fasting and mortification had Froude's whole-hearted ap-
proval. Of course, the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession was dinned
into the readers in tract after tract. The doctrine of the Holy Eucharist
gained emphasis and clarification as the Tracts progressed.

All these points were ones which concerned Froude. That they were
in the Tracts precisely because he was concerned with them is, of course
untenable. On the other hand, his encouragement and criticism influenced
the Tract writers to do research on unfamiliar areas of Church doctrine
and to ferret out the truth in areas where the Divines differed. His
paradoxical manner of dealing with many facets of ecclesiastical history
sent them scurrying to strengthen their arguments.

Because of Froude's encouragement, and Keble's and Rose's to some
extent, Newman finally arrived at a Tract numbered XC, which brought
him to a decisive corner and crossroad in his religious life; if it had
not been for the encouragement, he would have permitted himself to be
dominated by Palmer and would have stopped the Tracts already in 1833.
The latter kept insisting that he continue them. On November 13, 1833,
Newman consulted Froude: "I want advice sadly." He admitted:

40 Tracts 31, 77, 81, 78.

41 Tracts 14, 18, 21, 48, 56, 75, 88.

42 Froude's ideas on Transubstantiation will be discussed in the
next chapter.
I am in the midst of troubles . . . . Palmer musters the Z's in great force against the Tracts and some Evangelicals. He presses and I am ready to admit, a disclaimer (in the shape of a circular) of the Tracts. But he goes further and wishes to stop them. In these cases success is the test of sagacity or rashness. The said Tracts give offense, I know, but they also do good, and I maintain will strengthen his association, by enabling it to take high ground, yet seem in the mean.

I suggested to him that we were only doing here, what Rose is doing elsewhere and who nevertheless is a member of the grand scheme. He said, Rose is known as the editor of the Magazine. And so, I replied, I suppose, Keble would have no objection to give his name to the Tracts.

What will be done I know not; but I want advice sadly. I have no confidence in any one. If I could be sure of five or six vigorous co-operators in various parts I would laugh at opposition; but I fear being beaten from the field. Keble says we must be read unless we grow stupid, but I am not ever certain about our fertility even.

The Tracts are certainly liked in many places, among other persons, by the Bishop of Winchester. Oh, that he would take us up. I would go to the length of my tether to melt him . . . .

Do give me some advice and encouragement . . . .

I do think our Tracts, if we persist, will catch all the enthusiastic spirit among the Associated; which will be wretched for the Z's.

One proposition is that we should cease the issue of the Tracts till the Address is happily got over; but I say "Palmer, you delayed us five weeks with your scruples, which you yourself got over at last; and now you are playing the same game again." Yet I should shrink from spoiling the address, and I do not know what to do.

Newman concluded his letter by saying he compromised: "I have written to Palmer today, to say I will join his open Association if he wishes it, in spite of my dislike for it, but I will not cease my issue of Tracts." 44

Froude did not hesitate to advise:

---

43 The Z's were the high-and-dry Churchmen; it was Froude's pet name, and adopted by the rest of the Tractarians to designate those who advocated the Establishment.

44 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, I, 421.
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. . . .

Old Norris wrote to my Father to announce that the "tract system was (he was happy to say) abandoned." We must throw the Z's overboard; they are a small and, as my Father says, daily diminishing party. He is much inclined to them himself but will take trouble to circulate the tracts, and if every month you will send him down twenty or thirty copies of what comes out in the interval, he will be much obliged. He put some very strong stuff into his sermon at Exeter about "the Church of the People" which touched up Sir Tallard and others; they have got him to publish it and it will be out on Saturday. The Z's down here look on him as so cautious that I dare say it will stir them a little. But as for these Z's you and I are not the people to get at them. Stick as you propose to the Tracts and . . . do keep writing to Keble and stirring his rage; he is my fire, but I may be his poker. 43

Again in his letter of December 15, to Froude, Newman's theme was same—his controversy with Palmer:

If you knew the trouble I have had with Palmer, you would pity me. He is the best-tempered, kindest fellow in the world, but we well-nigh quarrelled for a while. He made a most vehement set at them the Tracts and not once alone (at our proceedings), but even now, I regret to say, has not got over it. The fact is, he promised Mr. Norris 'there would be no tracts.' . . . I wrote to him to say that, though I would not give up my tracts, I would waive my objections to an Association, strong as they were. In a short time Harrison and others bothered me to keep to my promise of disclaiming an Association. On the other hand, Dean of Derby and others were so far advanced in the formation of one that I did not like to damp them, so I excogitated a paper condemning one great Association, but advocating small local ones, which I thought would reconcile all parties, and went to Palmer about it. 46

In the letter, Newman disclosed that Rose also ranted at Palmer about the Address—its imbecility, and about his opposition to the Tracts.

---

43 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter published in Remains I.1.331, and parts in Letters and Correspondence, I, 426.

46 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 5-6.
Perceval was not too pleased with the early Tracts either. He thought that many of them "wanted a careful consideration, and the pruning knife." His objections were not so vigorous, however, as those of Palmer.

Froude was with Newman during August and October of 1833, when most of the early Tracts were written or formulated. When the first ones were published in September, Froude immediately sent his encouragement. Newman invited him to write the Tract on "The Project for Shortening the Services." "Your knowledge of the Breviary, etc., points you out as the man. Give a succinct view of the origin of our Services, etc., and send it up and I will get it printed." Froude was hesitant: "You know the extent of my ignorance and that I have no books here on the subject, so I suppose you have some meaning that I don't see; I have no conception of writing on the Liturgy without some facts to go on." He did write it, however, and even added a pat on the back for himself when he wrote to Newman on November 14, 1833: "Your last batch of pamphlets is capital, especially the one on shortening the services."

In his Tract, Froude told how the Church Services were compressed and curtailed more and more during the centuries after the Reformation. He said the practice now was that of weekly services. "Are they not in a fair way to become monthly?" The Roman Catholics, he pointed out,

47 Ibid., 39.

48 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection.

49 Ibid., parts of letter published in Letters and Correspondence, I, 422, and Remains I.1.331.
still used the Breviary, and their services averages, in length, three
hours each day.

Froude also had a comment for Newman on the previous Tract 3, in
which Newman opined that, before the blessing of a Millenium, the whole
Christian world would have much to confess in its various branches. He
went on to show the different corruptions—Rome, papal corruption and
cruelty to those who refuse to accept these corruptions; Holland and
Scotland, neglect of Apostolic Succession; Greece, saint worship and
want of zeal; Asia, heresy. 50 Froude observed: "One of the Tracts for
the Times speaks of the Millenium being ushered in by mutual confession
on the part of all branches of the Church. If so, we would cut the
worst figure, after the way we've blasphemed Tradition and the
Sacraments" (Remains I.i.438).

For Keble, Froude had more than a comment; it was a criticism. In
Tract 4, "Adherence to the Apostolical Succession the Safest Course,"
Keble certainly pleased Froude with the theme he presented: "Why should
we talk so much of an Establishment, and so little of an Apostolical
Succession?" Another aspect of the Tract made him dubious. Keble had
written in it: "We, in England cannot communicate with Presbyterians,
as neither can we with Roman Catholics, but we do not therefore exclude
either from salvation. Necessary to Salvation and Necessary to Church
Communion are not used as convertible terms."

50 Guiney, Froude, p. 124, holds that Tract 8 is probably Froude's,
but her evidence does not seem convincing enough. "Cruel Rome" was one
of Newman's frequent expressions.
Froude questioned: "Is it expedient to put forth any Tracts on 'the doctrine necessary to salvation?'" First of all, Froude hated the Protestant doctrine of "fundamentals and non-fundamentals"; secondly, he was not ready for "refining" at this time. He was thinking of the relation of the Thirty-nine Articles to the "doctrine necessary to salvation."

I am led to question whether justification by Faith is an integral part of this doctrine. I have not breathed this to a soul but you, and express myself hard. Is the denial of it anathematical directly or by implication? May one not broadly maintain that no one has any right to call any opinion necessary unless he believes its necessity (as distinct from its truth) to be revealed (I mean in Scripture or Tradition)? If so how liberal and how bigotted one may be at the same time without refining. I could be content to throw overboard the Articles keeping the Creeds, and so forth as I think the spirit of the times an instrument towards this, I am reconciled to it.

After Newman called upon the clergy in Tract I to "choose sides" for "to remain neuter much longer will be itself to take a part," he received responses, especially on Tract 10. Beginning with this Tract, many criticisms were directed toward Newman for "papistical leanings." Newman told Froude that the "transubstantiation passages . . . have brought us to all sort of trouble." This Tract contained two ideas which were very dear to Froude—one a reference to the Holy Eucharist, and the other an attack on

51 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection. In his Apologia, Newman wrote: "I wrote my Essay on Justification in 1837; it was aimed at the Lutheran dictum that justification by faith only was the cardinal doctrine of Christianity. I considered this doctrine was either a paradox or a truism,—a paradox in Luther a mouth, a truism in Melancthon's."

In 1844, Keble wrote: "The tradition which goes by the name of Justification by Faith, and which in reality means that one who has sinned, and is sorry for it, is as if he had not sinned, blights and benumbs one in every limb, in trying to make people aware of their real state. . . . I so deprecate the word and idea of Protestantism, because it seems inseparable to me from "every man is his own absolver."
"gentlemen clergy." 52 Rickards, among others, protested in a letter on November 20, 1833, against the latter term; he also deplored the language Newman used in reference to the Holy Eucharist. 53 Newman had used the phrase "entrusted with the awful and mysterious gift of making the Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of Christ" which he later changed to "the awful and mysterious privilege of dispensing Christ's Body and Blood."

Newman replied to Rickards: "In confidence to a friend, I can only admit it was imprudent, for 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." 54

During the period between his return from the Continent and his departure for Barbados, Froude was not only a contributor to the formation of the Society of Friends of the Church, to the draft of an Address to the Archbishop, and to the launching of the Tracts, but he also had various articles published in the British Magazine. All of them forced his "return to the Apostolic Church" program to the attention of the readers.

52 Froude accused both Rose and Palmer of being "gentlemen clergy" (Remains I.1.320); too concerned about secular, social, and political affairs, and not enough concerned with their apostolic duty and love for God. Froude believed that a clergyman need not be a man of wealth nor of lands. He himself was wealthy, but he knew the proper use for money. He was unattached to any temporal possession. T. Mozley said of him: "I suppose Froude never got a book or anything else in his life merely for the sake of having it. His absolute indifference to possession was something marvelous." Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 154.

53 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 427.

54 Ibid., 431.
In July and September, he saw in print his two letters to the editor. The first, "Conservative Principles," influenced greatly by L'Avenir, directed the clergy to rally to the defense of their Bishops. Its theme was similar to Newman's Tract I. The second, "The Appointment of Bishops by the State," dealt with the Praemunire. If the clergy were to look to their Bishops, the Bishops certainly had to be men of the Church. Froude counselled that it was the duty of lay churchmen to interpose their voices in the election of their spiritual rulers. Their ancestors had, rightly or wrongly, transferred this right. The whole transaction was based on an Act of Parliament, and, if the Statute under which Bishops were nominated by the Crown was evil, it was an evil which could be resisted.

By the meantime, Froude was showing how this "evil" came about; above all, he was showing how Becket and his "pauperes Christi" withstood the evil during their times. In September, October, and December, Froude saw, with satisfaction, the publication of his series on "The Project of Henry II for the Union of Church and State." It was a continuation of his Becket articles under a new title with a more pronounced aim, and it served as a "companion" article to Newman's "Letters on the Church of the Fathers."

Both series emphasized "pauperes Christi" as the stronghold of the Church; both emphasized the effectiveness with which the Church (through

55 British Magazine, IV (July 1833), 51-54.
56 Ibid., (September 1833), 290-299.
57 Ibid., 290-291.
Ambrose and Becket) wielded the sword of excommunication in its encounter with a relentless emperor; both showed the spirit of charity exercised in the encounter.

Froude quoted the letter of Nicholas of Rouan to the Archbishop of Canterbury, wherein he spoke of the charges of the Archbishop:

The Church of Christ's little ones, whom your Lordship has, in your condescension, claimed as sons, and to whom you have commended yourself as your patrons before God, turns toward you with entire affection, praying day and night for prosperous issue to your labour it asks in faith, nothing wavering.

Froude footnoted "Christ's little ones": "Pauperes Christi"—a name which, in the mouth of the Archbishop's party, was associated with the noblest and most inspiring thoughts."

Newman quoted Ambrose: "I confess I have stipendiaries; they are Pauperes Christi, the poor of Christ's flock."

Newman's series on "The Church of the Fathers" and Froude's series on the "Project of Henry II" both emphasized the place of the Church in relation to the State:

"Though we are bound to obey our civil rulers, the welfare of the


"If you look into history, whether in the age of the Apostles, St. Ambrose's, or St. Becket's, still the people were the fulorum of the Church's power. So they may be again." Newman to Wilson, September 8, 1833.
Church has a prior claim upon our obedience," stated Ambrose.

Froude quoted Becket:

Since, craving your Majesty's pardon, it is certain that the power of the kings is given them through the church, but not that of the church through kings; your Majesty can have no pretense for compelling the Bishops either to absolve or excommunicate; for summoning the clergy before secular courts; for interfering with tithes or presentations; for prohibiting the trial of perjury in the Bishop's court; and many other things of like nature contained among the usages which you are pleased to call traditional.

Both series in the December British Magazine had the theme: "Whom ye bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." Ambrose and Becket confronted their temporal rulers with the only alternative left to them--the ban of excommunication. "He pronounced a decree by which all such offenders became ipso facto excommunicate. This an archbishop might do with the pope's sanction." 62

In his "Church of the Fathers," for November, Newman spoke with admiration of the Ambrosian Chants, of which the Gregorian Chants are a modification. A lover of music, Newman keenly appreciated the solemn Church music he had heard in Rome. He asked Froude to write an account of Gregorian Chant for "Home Thoughts Abroad," but Froude never complied.

Although Froude sent "Hooker's View of State Interference in Matters Spiritual" to Rose before September 8, it did not appear in the British

60 Ibid., 540.


62 Ibid., 610.
Magazine until November. When it did appear, it represented Froude's sole contribution for the month; his "Project of Henry II" was omitted in that issue. From Barbados he wrote to Newman: "Is not the last British Magazine odiously twaddling? Rose must take a line—also it should be six pence cheaper and the print omitted. You can't think how the prints disgust some people. I say this of course because my (best) Saint Thomas was left out, to make room for what?"

A "W.F.H." wrote articles for the British Magazine during this period, and the themes he stressed, his bits of irony, and his vehemence in certain places sound suspiciously like Froude. In September, he reviewed Waddington's Ecclesiastical History. He called attention to the fact that there was a great need for an Ecclesiastical History, just as Froude mentioned many times. He paid special attention to the chapter on the Pontificate of Gregory VIII, Froude's 'beau ideal.' In October, W.F.H. treated another subject which was a favorite of Froude—"On the Pulpit and the Reading Desk." Like Froude, the author spoke of the "senseless change" made by Bucer, through the direction of Calvin, in the rubrics. He advised a return to directions previously observed—when the clergyman


64 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection. The "Best" St. Thomas was the one on excommunication of the King, published the following month. The "prints" were pictures of Churches and scenes.

65 British Magazine, IV (September 1833), 299-308.

66 British Magazine, IV (October 1833), 434-440.
prays, he should kneel and face God; when he preaches, he should stand and face the people. If desks must be used, they should at least be removed from the middle of the Church, and placed on the side unconspicuously. The same author also had an article in the December British Magazine on "The Reformed Catholic Church in America." In a letter of November 17, 1833, Froude told Newman, "I conclude in the emphatic words of Martinius Scriblerus—'Ye gods, annihilate both space and time and bring me back with copious noted in my pockets on State of Religion in the United States.'"  

Froude even had time to contribute to the Lyra. In August, he saw one of his own poems in print, "O Lord, I Hear," and one of Keble's poems for which he had suggested the theme and given the text, "Fear Not."  

Froude's poem, No. XVI in the Lyra, forms a part of three poems under the title "The Three Absolutions," which are the absolusions of the Daily Service, in the Communion, and in the visitation of the sick. Keble's poems deal with the first and last topics; Froude's with Holy Communion. The poem is not great poetry, but it does have weight, sincerity, elevation, and a rhythmical flow.

He used the text: "And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And who

---


68 On June 26, 1833, Froude suggested that Keble write a poem based on the text: "He which testifieth these things saith, 'surely I come quickly.'"
sower will, let him take of the waters of life freely." In the first stanza, he developed the idea of "But can it be/ The gracious word was meant for me?" Accepting the word for himself, he determined in the second stanza that he would go and answer the invitation, "But I am chained to earth." The problem was resolved in the third stanza—man is helpless without God's assistance:

The Golden Keys each eve and morn
I see them with a heart forlorn
Lest they should iron prove to me—
O set my heart at liberty.
May I seize what Thou dost give
Seize tremblingly and live.

In the September issue, Rose published the poem Froude wrote during his Mediterranean trip and which he previously hesitated to publish; its theme was "The Powers that be are ordained of God." In it, Froude indicted "those proud bad men, whose unrelenting sway/ Has shattered holiest things, and led astray Christ's little ones."

Both of Froude's poems printed in the December Magazine were written in the same mood. The first, entitled "Daniel," was a dialogue poem: the poet asked the Prophet—"Whence has thou/ That lofty mien and cloudless brow?" The Prophet answered: "Bitter is the cup I trow; A cup of weary well-spent years, / A cup of sorrows, fasts, and tears, / A cup whose virtue can impart / Such calmness to the troubled heart." Froude, himself an ascetic, hoped that like Daniel he in his "lot" might stand with him.

The second poem, without a title, took its source from the Gospel text: "Be strong, and He shall comfort thine heart." It was composed of two stanzas, the first of which was addressed to God; the second was His answer:
"Lord, I have fasted, I have prayed,
And sackcloth has my girdle been,
To purge my soul I have essayed
With hunger blank and vigil keen.
O God of mercy! why am I
Still haunted by the self I fly?"

Sackcloth is a girdle good,
O bind it round thee still;
Fasting, it is Angels' food,
And Jesus loved the night-air chill;
Yet think not prayer and fast were given
To make one step 'twixt earth and heaven.

One questions "blank hunger" and whether "Fasting, it is Angels' Food," but one cannot question the philosophical basis of the poem—penance and fasting are only a means, in themselves valueless. The poem, as published, lacks a resolution, or a positive assessment of penance and fasting. Froude intended, as indicated in Remains I.1.431, to have a third stanza, the thought of which would be—"Penance, if rooted in charity, is a great asset in the spiritual life."

Froude used all his talents; he gave most generously of himself for the cause of the Faith. "He would have been the last person to classify Hurrell Froude among the poets of the nineteenth century, but he must have believed with John Keble that poets were of two kinds—primary poets, who wrote because their creativity demanded an outlet; and secondary poets, who composed from less impulsive motives. 69 Froude did not even aspire to become a secondary poet, but he did have a motive for

69 In the British Critic, 1838, in "The Life and Writings of Sir Walter Scott," John Keble elucidated his views on poetry. They were more fully developed in two volumes of Praelectiones Academicae. Keble classified Homer, Lucretius, Burns, and Scott as Primary Poets; Milton and Dryden, who wrote with mixed motives, were Secondary Poets. Cf. also M.H.Abrams, The Mirror and the Lamp (New York, 1953), pp. 144-149.
writing and therefore usurped the office of poet, at times. At other times,\(^7^0\) he could justly claim the right to be considered a fair secondary poet, whether he cared to claim it or not.

Possibly Mr. Turrill, the publisher of the *British Magazine*, considered Froude no poet at all; at least, he failed to pay Froude for his poems, as well as his other articles. Newman called this to Rose's attention on November 23, 1833: "It has struck me that Turrill should pay us for what we do. When the thought first occurred to me, I checked it—but then I thought, that we were as likely to spend money as well as Turrill and were under no necessity of enriching him—and that I was the best person to hint it, as having contributed so little."\(^7^1\)

Rose agreed: "I am thoroughly provoked with Turrill. He has according to the entry book paid Palmer. Will you ascertain if this is correct. He only returned the said book today after my sending it in October, and has thus let Froude go a second time without being paid. ... I am perfectly ashamed when I look at the *Lyra* that such contributions should be gratis, as they are worth all the *Magazine* put together."\(^7^2\)

Froude accomplished one more important feat before he left for Barbados—he aroused his father, a typical high-and-dry Tory, and began

---

\(^7^0\) Froude's poem "Dialogue between the Old Self and New Self," is generally considered one of his better productions. H.C. Be thing, editor of the *Lyra*, opined that, in this poem, Froude was an apt pupil of Andrew Marvell. Guiney, *Hurrell Froude*, 404.

\(^7^1\) *Unpublished Letters*, Reel 72, Personal Collection.

\(^7^2\) *Ibid.*
to convert him into an ardent Churchman.

On September 2, Froude told Newman that "even my Father" is a "propagandist" for a new Church basis. Archdeacon Froude helped to disseminate many of the Tractarians' ideas, but he was principally interested in the "Pauperes Christi" idea at first. Froude related, "I am astonished to see how much impression the march of events has made upon him." Archdeacon Froude was ready to enter into their plans, with some qualification, however:

He [Archdeacon] Froude says that he is afraid to recommend Associations in his Archdeanry till something is started in higher quarters that shall give people their keynote. I don't mean that he would wait for Bishops; but for any individual who could get the ear of the Evangelicals and keep them straight. At present he says they would be all pulling different ways with mare's nests of their own. The High Church he thinks generally speaking too apathetic to be worked on. If we could get any good addresses to the poor written, licking the parsons over their backs, he says he is sure he could circulate them among all the clergy of his Archdeanry and that he could get the Archdeacon of Exeter to do the same.

He has to preach a Sermon for the National Schools at the Cathedral the middle of next month, and intends to speak in very plain terms about the Apostasy moral as well as Religious of the higher Orders in true Church Principles—for that we must look to them (the Poor) for our support. I wish, if any ideas occur to you on the subject, that you would send me word soon. The opportunity seems a good one and not to be lost. What I should like most would be that you should write something flash, i.e. acrimonious—upon it, and I would try and get my Father to put it in. I shall make a similar attempt myself.

What would be the effect of Philpotts bringing forward the Praemunire? My Father thinks it might take.\footnote{Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter are published in Letters and Correspondence, I, 400, and Remains I.i.325.}
Ten days later, on September 18, Newman replied that he was not familiar enough yet with the idea of the Church as "essentially a popular institution." For the time being, it was "out of his depth," so he could not discuss it further.74

Froude's father was converted to more ideas than that of "Pauperes Christi," for Archdeacon Froude also agreed with Hurrell that the Address was a "milk and water" edition:

My father says it will not be liked so well in these parts without some such additions "extra-ecclesiastical interference" and "completing the system presupposed in the Rubrics"75. He much wishes that he may be allowed to tack them on. He has written to the Archdeacon Barnes about it and will call three meetings in his own Archdeanry on the subject—one at Totnes, one at Plymouth, one at Tavistock. He is annoyed at its being such milk and water; do make a row about it.76

After Hurrell left home, however, the Archdeacon reconciled himself to the Lambeth Address. He admitted to Newman that a full disclosure of their views might cause the clergy to draw back.76 He also had to admit, on December 15, 1833: "I have often told Hurrell he is 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. I dare say he laid himself completely open on his visit to Archdeacon Lyell."77

74 Ibid., 403, not in Remains.

75 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter published in Remains I:1.331 and in Letters and Correspondence, I, 426.


77 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 8.
On the last day of October, Froude left Oxford for Barbados, but he remained in England until the end of November, when his packet sailed. While waiting for departure, he lived with Canon Rogers and tried his level best to make an "Apostolical" out of him. "I have left the Canon with a full impression on his mind that state interference has become by recent changes an insufferable evil if we could but devise a remedy. I have given him a set of tracts and hope he will write to Keble; ... he is soft and has fiddle faddle reforms in his head which I said Rose would look upon like plasters on a big toe of which the leg ought to be cut off. He thinks me a visionary (and thereby you will say shows his judgment)."\(^78\)

Just a few days before leaving, Froude had selected a "vocabulary apostolicum"; "pampered aristocrat," "Resident gentlemen," "Smug parson," and "Pauperes Christi." He considered himself one of the latter group. He told Newman what a "nuisance" it was to leave the "Apostolicals" and "Sub-Apostolicals" but he thought he was "doing the right in going." He felt, he said, like the man who "fled full soon on the first of June, but bade the rest keep fighting."

He showed evidence that thoughts of union with Rome had not been forgotten, nor would he let others forget. He wrote to Newman just two before his departure: "I ought to say that Keble has derived great relief from the distinction between Catholic verities and theological opinions. ... he admits if the Roman Catholics would revoke their

\(^78\) Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter published in Remains I.1.329.
anathemas, we might reckon all the points of difference as theological opinions. This... is a good one."

During the interval before he left the British Isles, Froude finished his work on Thomas a Becket, and he said he was ready to go to Anselm, after which he contemplated the beginning of an ecclesiastical history on "The Gregorian Era," taking in from Gregory to Innocent III. Through Newman, Froude had secured a promise from Bowden that the latter would do a book on Gregory VII, and Froude kept reminding Newman to hold his friend to his promise. A return to the Apostolic Church seemed almost always foremost in Froude's mind. He was glad to learn from Newman that his article on the Praemunire had been somewhat effective in promoting this cause. "Palmer brought word from town that your articles effectually stopped the probability of certain promotions; in fact, that the Archbishop would be afraid to consecrate obnoxious persons; and at least you have given him a good pretense for refusing, now it was known that there was a party in the Church and they not weak in talent, etc.,

79 Ibid., Newman, however, was convinced that "Our business is with ourselves—to make ourselves more holy, more self-denying, more primitive, more worthy of our high calling. Let the Church of Rome do the same."

80 John Bowden wrote The Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII and also an article on Gothic Architecture in 1837, two subjects dear to Froude. Newman reviewed Bowden's biography and noted the aversion Gregory manifested for the married priesthood, and how the multitude shared this aversion. Newman commended Bowden for handling the Pontificate of Gregory so well, "the history of the commencement of that great reformation of the Church in the middle ages, which Providence conducted through the instrumentality, partly divine, partly human, of the Papal Monarchy." Newman, "Reformation of the Eleventh Century," in Works, XX, 249-317.
who would go all the length rather than submit to State tyranny."  

At times, Froude grew very concerned with the reticence Newman displayed, and he did not seem to comprehend the need for prudence. Newman must have advised him to be cautious in speech, or people would doubt his seriousness. Froude quickly retorted: "When you say faith loves much and talks little, how do you defend certain printed tracts ascribed to a certain individual? Do let me know the sequel."

Froude himself admitted that, in his conversations with Canon Rogers and the Archdeacon who accompanied him, he had rushed so headlong into controversial issues that in the end, "they thought [the ideas he presented] so wild that I lost all ground I had made good."

He could not believe that other serious-minded individuals did not see things in the same light as the "Apostolics." For example, he had hoped that Keble could have made contact with George Cornish, a man of whom Froude had great expectations. Suddenly, in the last week of October, Cornish published a visitation sermon at Philpott's request; it had for a theme the past uselessness and the present efficiency of our excellent establishment." Froude commented: "Under the former head he reminds the hearers that even before the development of protestantism, we had our Wickliffs, our Cranmers, etc. Ought we not to cram our good friends with a wiser slang?" Uncomprehendingly, Froude sadly asked: "How is it that we are so much in advance of our generation?"

---

81 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40 and 51; parts of letter published in Letters and Correspondence, I, 419.

Froude spent over a year at Barbados, during which time he became "A less and less loyal son of the Reformation." It appeared to him "plain that in all indifferent or doubtful matters, they should conform their practices "to those of the Church which has preserved its traditionary practices unbroken." He believed that one could not know about "any seemingly indifferent practice of the Church of Rome that it was not a development of the apostolic ethos." He was determined to use "the safest course," so he concluded: "It is to no purpose to say that we can find no proof of it in the writings of the six first centuries; they must find a disproof if they would do any thing" (Remains I.i.336).

In consequence, he was "pulled on in anti-Protestantism," and he became a more and more determined admirer of that small group of Apostolical Divines, the "genus of which seems to me to have come to existence about the beginning of James I and to have become extinct with the Nonjurors."

The Bishop's library was "a great piece of luck" to Froude. "I begin to think that the Nonjurors were the last of the English divines, and that those since were twaddlers. The more I read the more I am reconciled to the present state of things in England and the 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" (Remains I.i.355-356). Froude envisioned the Church of England once more a living, spiritual power, truly dedicated to the work of God. He sent home "flaming papers" which engulfed plans to hurry this "second Reformation," but no one else was so presumptuous—or was it optimistic—to suppose
that a handful of men could change the Church of England over night. His "flaming papers" were either returned to him, \(^{83}\) or they rested in Rose's portfolio. \(^{84}\)

Although most of Froude's "flaming papers" which he wrote at Barbados never saw print, yet he did send home effective criticisms and suggestions. Above all, while he was at Barbados, Froude spent the major portion of his time reading, thinking, and discussing the greatest doctrine of the Catholic Church—the Holy Eucharist. Providence "took him apart, away from the crowds" that he could come to the knowledge of the most sublime doctrine of the Faith.

\(^{83}\)"You send home flaming papers (which I will insert)—(one I have just received from your Father), but after all I fall back to what I said last year on your articles about the Praemunire. Not that it is not right (very right) to accustom men's imaginations to the prospect of changes; but they cannot realize the arguments, they are quite beyond them. I see in the case of the tracts compared with others; and (I am sure) recalling the memory of my own feelings in past years, I can quite understand it." Unpublished Letters, Reel 40.

\(^{84}\)On November 12, 1834, Newman wrote to Froude: "What do you mean by saying to Rogers I will not take your Tracts? I sent them all to Rose—who has published same—but I suppose he fears the others." Six days later, Newman added: "Rose has your papers, put one in, and has all the rest at present in his portfolio." Newman, Unpublished Letters, Reel 40.
Froude's Retreat

Froude found it very difficult to adjust to conditions in Barbados. "There is nothing to interest one out of doors,—horribly ugly faces, most uninteresting scenery, an extremely shabby town, the population of which may, in the point of morals, be called almost the sink of humanity, and then the vulgar names of all the places (I forget them as fast as I hear them), and money-making associations, which intrude into everything one sees and hears, offer a sad contrast to last winter's work." Froude lacked a sympathetic insight into the problems of the Negro inhabitants, who were still bound by the rules of slavery. It was a new experience for him, and his reaction was similar to that which he displayed when he witnessed the effects of the carnival on the Continent—severe disgust.

The utter poverty, coupled with the air of indifference and sloth, are not uncommon to enslaved people, but it took some time for Froude to understand the situation. Above all, the immorality—indifference to the marriage vows, even the marriage ceremony itself, neglect of children, dishonesty—appalled him. He thought the solution lay in educating and admitting into Orders the lower classes of men who desired an apostolic life and showed they had the potentialities of fervent clergymen, especially the natives themselves. Froude was eager to formulate such plans. He advocated the eradication of the "gentlemen heresy,"
which permitted only the upper classes to enter into the ministry and resulted in fewer and fewer applicants, and those ineffective in dealing with the lower classes of people. He even suggested that the clergyman be allowed to pursue his trade as well as perform his apostolic duties.

Froude's severe indictments of the inhabitants of the Barbados cannot be taken for racial prejudice; they are rather the result of a lack of insight into the situation which prompted the Negro to shun moral responsibility. If it had been racial prejudice, Froude would never have advocated a native clergy; nor would he have spoken of integration with as much good will as he did to Keble:

I have heard some facts which seem to show a good spirit among the clergy. The other day, a Mr. -- refused 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 two hundred people were present, all colors were mixed indiscriminately. In the Roman Catholic Islands, this always was insisted on and carried with a high hand (Remains I.i.335).

Keble must have been very interested in the state of affairs in the Barbados, outside of the fact that his friend was residing there; in 1824, he had been offered the Archdeaconry of the Barbados, but he had declined the offer, due to family circumstances.

Although the "out-of-doors" situation claimed little of Froude's enthusiasm, indoors there was much to absorb his attention. He had access to the Bishop's library, and he delved into the history and policies of the High Churchmen of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Many facts which he discovered startled him, and he hastily informed
his conferees of his disillusionments and findings, at the same time
calling attention to noteworthy publications which they should them-
selves read.

One of Froude's great surprises was the fact that the first Lati-
tudinarians were Tories -- Hales, Chillingworth, Tillotson, and Hoadly
(Remains I. i. 406-410), and that the High Church Party in the seventeenth
century underwent a severe change. Froude was studying the history of
the High Churchmen of that period, and it is necessary to investigate
that history to understand his allusions to men of that period and to
understand what Froude meant when he said, "I begin to think that the
Nonjurors were the last of the English divines, and that those since
were twaddlers," as he said when he first began the study in 1834; and
when he defined the Apostolical Divines of the Church of England as
"a genus which seems to have come into existence about the beginning of
James I and to have become extinct with the Nonjurors," as he did toward
the end of 1834.

In the seventeenth century, "High Church" was a term applied to the
party who held "strong" or "advanced" views; those who traced their
descent back to Laud and the Laudians of the Restoration.¹ Laud, harsh
in his demands for strict conformity in many things, was liberal enough,
however, to recognize bishops who were not in any episcopal succession.
On the other hand, he stressed order and reverence in liturgical ser-
VICES and placed a great emphasis on matters in which the Roman Catholics

¹For the history of the Nonjurors, the High Church Party, and the
and the Anglicans agreed.  

Up to the middle of the century, the Laudians and the Latitudinarians were more allies than enemies, for they opposed a common foe -- the Puritans. By the second half of the century, the Latitudinarians were willing to accommodate the Puritan nonconformists, and this compromise started a cleavage in the party. It did more: it initiated a controversy on the questions of what was "necessary doctrine," and on questions of apostolical succession, excommunication, the sacramental system, and other religious issues.


In 1688, when James II ordered the second declaration of Indulgences to be read, the Archbishop of Canterbury -- William Sancroft, and men like Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and others sought accommodations between the Anglicans and the Presbyterians who preferred comprehension to sharing Indulgences with Roman Catholics under a Catholic King. While Sancroft and his Bishops were imprisoned, ten nonconformist ministers

---

2. "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 ethos. Keble will be severe with me for this, but I cannot deny that Laud's architecture seems to me typical." Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 75. Froude wrote the above statement in January, 1835.

Rogers told Newman in a letter on November 27, 1837, that Froude said of Laud, "all that he saw in him was that he was a brave man with some good views."
visited them and negotiated with them. Sancroft was by no means a Latitudinarian, though he advocated Church discipline, especially excommunication; he was vexed with pluralism; and he decreed that State interference should be kept at a minimum.

When James II was forced to flee and William came to the throne, strong Jacobite sentiment arose. Many of the High Churchmen had placed their hopes in James III, and refused, in spite of the objections they had to the policies of James II, to recognize William and Mary. When the House of Lords concurred with Commons and finally declared the throne vacant and offered it to William and Mary, Sancroft and seven Bishops, two of whom died not long afterwards, refused the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. They were known as the Nonjuring Bishops. After six months of suspension, the Bishops were deprived. High Churchmen like Beveridge and Scot refused to occupy their sees. Tillotson, who had been acting dean of the chapter of Canterbury, accepted the position of Archbishop. He was looked upon by the Nonjurors as the head of a schism. Evidence points to the fact that, if he had not accepted, the position would not have been filled until the deaths of the Nonjurors. With Tillotson began the flow of Latitudinarian Bishops.

Previous to Tillotson's appointment, members of the High Church were

---

\(^3\) Froude wrote to Newman in January, 1835: "The High Church party had cut the ground from under their feet by acknowledging Tillotson. Would that the nonjurors had kept up a succession and then we might have been at peace -- proselytisers (sic) instead of agitators." Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter published in Letters and Correspondence, II, 73-74, and in Remains I.i.390-397.
in a quandary: no convocation could be called without the Archbishop, and the Archbishop would not respond to a summons from a King whom he did not recognize. A commission was chosen. Still, there was bewilderment. They questioned whether the work Sancroft had started on accommodation should be proceeded with. Of course, the Presbyterians now had no need to work for accommodation, for under the new King toleration was guaranteed for them. The Commission started to revise the Prayer Book, making the weekday services not obligatory and making verbal alterations such as "presbyter" for priest and "Lord's Day" for Sunday. Bishop Burnet proposed a redraft of the form of ordination in accord with ideas of Jean Morin, an antiquary and convert of the French Roman Catholic Church, a man whose controversial works offended Catholics and Protestants alike. Many High Churchmen joined the party of Nonjurors as a consequence. The latter numbered about five hundred.

With Tillotson as Archbishop, the High Churchmen were in an even greater dilemma: they felt bound to follow their rightful Archbishop -- the nonjuring Sancroft, and to separate from the Latitudinarian Bishops; yet they also felt the necessity of unity. On the one hand, they felt that if the civil magistrate could depose Bishops, he could overthrow the Church, and so they felt their obligation to withstand State action; on the other hand, if they departed with the deposed Bishops and their flock, they made up such a minority that they wondered "Where is the Church?"

Too, Sancroft commissioned Bishop Lloyd to exercise his metropolitan authority, and the latter consecrated Hickes. Hickes was only a suffragan bishop, however, and could not act for the whole Church; furthermore, he
was in schism. Were Orders given by him valid? Were Orders by Nonjurors valid? These questions led to a broader question -- How dependent upon the State was the Church?

The rift between the two groups grew. By the end of the first decade of the eighteenth century, Lutherans were admitted to the fold because they were said to "retain a considerable share in the Divinely appointed Form" of the sacramental life. Gibson and other High Churchmen attempted to reestablish the Church as a spiritual power; controversial questions regarding the use of church discipline, especially excommunication, Church-State powers, and other matters were brought up.

Benjamin Hoadly objected vigorously to the intimation of a revival of discipline. Too, he was opposed to the whole idea of passive resistance by the Nonjurors. As Bishop of Bangor, Hoadly published a *Preservative Against the Principles and Practices of Nonjurors in Church and State*, followed by the sermon *Kingdom of Christ*, which he published at the Royal command. The two works attacked both the divine right of kings and the authority of the clergy. The Bangorian Controversy resulted: Hoadly was deluged with pamphlets, among which were the letters of

---

"If you have not yet got Law's letters to Hoadly, do with all speed. I read them through at the Bishop's, and only wonder I had not done so before; they are the most brilliant as well as argumentative overthrow of liberalism that I ever saw. Also try to get Law's answer to Hoadly's *Plain Account of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (Remains 1.1,355-360)."

On January 25, 1834, Froude wrote to Newman about Hoadly; on March 24, Newman wrote to Keble: "Next, I should like a tract against Hoadly, giving and refuting his view, showing it had influenced the 'Companion to the AItar ' etc." *Letters and Correspondence*, II, 28. Newman also speaks in a disparaging way about Hoadly in both of the *Via Media's*. 
William Law, an able opponent who, with Brett, had joined the Nonjurors. 4

More important than the pamphlets was the fact that his opponents who attempted to rebuke him in a convocation were prevented from doing so because the King prorogued the assembly. This intervention of the State in Convocation was the precedent for the formal Convocations that became a principle in the following century. 5

Froude sympathetically studied this history of the Nonjurors and inquired into the questions which, for them, resulted in controversies. At times he was amazed to find that even men whose doctrines he regarded highly were connected with the Latitudinarian party in some way. One of these men was Bull. He asked Newman, "How came Bull to be with the Tillotsonians?"

Froude was disgusted with the political overture in so many religious issues. There were two avenues of reform in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; these two avenues were still the direction to take, as far as Froude could see.

5 Already on September 10, 1830, Newman had written to Froude about the meeting he attended in St. Mary’s of the Deaneries of Oxford and Cuddenden to elect Proctors to represent the Clergy in Convocation. Newman had added: "Vident (sic) videor illum diem, cum a Convocation actually meets for business."

On May 2, 1834, Froude told Keble: "Before long I shall send you a superficial account of putting down of Convocation, which I think I can make effective."

On August 10, 1834, Newman told Bowden that "last week" he took up the subject of Anglican Convocation. Newman’s article appeared in the November and December issue of the 1834 edition of the British Magazine under the title "The Convocation to the Province of Canterbury." The essay is a legalistic inquiry into the question of the supremacy and jurisdiction of the king as head of the Church. It deals with the question of the Praemunire also. (British Magazine, VI, 517-524; 637-647) Froude’s influence is quite evident.
First, Froude continued to urge a repeal of the Praemunire. He wrote to his father on August 22, 1834:

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. It will not do to say that you see evils in any proposed new plan; that is a very good argument when the present state of things is good; but when a man is dying, it is poor wisdom in him to object that the plans the surgeons propose for his relief are painful and dangerous.

In the same letter, Froude indicated the second immediate step which should be followed: it was a resolution strongly insisted upon by the Nonjurors, too:

Everyone 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. I know that neither Newman nor Keble, 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 seems 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. The administration of the Communion is one of the very few religious duties now performed by the clergy for which Ordination has ever been considered necessary. Preaching and reading the Scriptures is what a layman can do as well as a clergyman. And it is no wonder that people should forget the difference between ordained and unordained persons, when those who are ordained do nothing for them, but what they could have done just as well without Ordination. (Remains I.i.370-374).

At Barbados, Froude's doctrinal research centered largely on the Holy Eucharist. In January, 1834, Froude discovered that "Keble's friend, Jewell" propagated a very dangerous doctrine in regard to the Eucharist: "He calls the mass 'your cursed, paltrie service,'" laughs at the apostolical succession both in principle and as a fact . . . . He most distinctly denies the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be a means
of grace as distinguished from a pledge, . . . 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."

Froude added that he would give Newman the chapter and verse for the above statements, but he also added the following questionable statement:

"Certainly the Council of Trent had no fair chance of getting at the truth if they saw no alternative between Transubstantiation and Jewellism" (Remains I.1.339). 6

Although Froude further maintained that Jewell's doctrine "ought to be denied under pain of damnation," he intimated that he would not accept Transubstantiation either. He did the same in his "Essay on Rationalism" which, Newman believed, Froude wrote at the same time. He said: "Opposed to these errors [the errors of the rationalists who subject all matters to reason], but erroneous for much the same reason, is the Roman Catholic

6 Jewell, Bishop of Salisbury in the middle of the sixteenth century, defended the Anglican position in relation to that of the Roman Catholic one in Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae. Thomas Harding published an Answer to which Jewell, in turn, gave a Reply. Then Harding's Confutation was followed by Jewell's Defence. These arguments covered almost the whole field of the Roman Catholic-Anglican controversy. Jewell's Defence became an authority in every Anglican parish Church.

Froude said of the Defence: "His Defence of his Apology disgusted me more than almost any work I have read. Bishop Hickey and Dr. Brett I see go all lengths with me in this respect, and I believe Laud did" (Remains I.1.379).

Keble excused Jewell's lack of insistence on apostolical principles in the former's edition of Hooker's Works. Jewell was a patron of Hooker, and Keble said that neither had access to the epistles of St. Ignatius, which in Hooker's time were still considered dubious. St. Ignatius, according to Keble, is the single writer most decisive in apostolic principles. Hooker, Works, I, lxi.
dogma about Transubstantiation. Unlike the Protestant glosses, this does not attempt to explain away everything miraculous in the history of the Last Supper; but, by explaining precisely wherein the miracle consisted, and how it was brought about, it aims, like them, 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 it fit to envelop them" (Remains I.ii.144).

Both statements indicate that Froude did not accept the doctrine of Transubstantiation; on the contrary, they seem to indicate that he accepted the Anglican "receptional theory"—"Think more of what we have than the manner how it is achieved." "The real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament." 7

This viewpoint on the Holy Eucharist seems at variance with the one previously expressed when the Tractarians were drawing up the resolutions for the Associations, and Froude had insisted that "continuance and due application of the Sacrament" be changed in wording to "the power of making the Body and Blood of Christ." Then, he seemed to believe that bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ by the power of the ordained successor of the Apostles. He seemed to place the emphasis not on the receiver but on the Sacrament and the Priesthood. He

argued for the power of the Priesthood in his "Essay on Rationalism":

"The Apostolic Eucharist was miraculous; therefore, if ours be the Apostolic, it is miraculous; but miracles imply persons gifted with power to work them; our Eucharist, therefore, is not miraculous, unless there has been an appointment of consecrating persons—in other words, a Priesthood" (Remains I.i.157). He went on to show there was such an appointment.

What brought about the change in Froude's view of the Holy Eucharist within just a few months?

Evidently, Froude had thought the Thirty-nine Articles compatible with the Creeds and traditionary Catholic doctrines. Although in November of 1833, he was "content to throw overboard the Articles, keeping the Creeds," Froude had not found the Articles at direct variance with his beliefs until he was at Barbados. On January 25, 1834, he wrote to Newman: "I have just been floored by the Bishop of Barbados, who has proved to me that the expression in Article 28 'and the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper' is intended to contradict the notion that the unfaithful may possibly receive it. Now I certainly cannot take it on myself to say what the unfaithful do receive or do not receive, so if the Article means to dogmatize where I doubt, he says I cannot subscribe it." 8


Newman's Tract 90: "It is often urged, and sometimes felt and granted, that there are in the Articles propositions or terms inconsistent with the Catholic Faith." In regard to Transubstantiation, Newman said the "Article 28" was not against a Real Presence, and he said Andrewes held a doctrine which approached the Roman Catholic definition quite closely.
Obviously, he had believed that both faithful and "unfaithful" had received the Body and Blood of Christ; he had not believed that the Change of the bread and wine was in any way dependent upon the recipient. The interpretation of the Article seemed to bring serious doubts to the mind of Froude. If he were not a man of integrity, he could have a way out, for "Laud used to say that subscribing to the Articles was nothing more than declaring that you would not preach against them."

Froude sadly questioned: "Must we come to this?" Now he had more reason to exclaim than he had had in November of the previous year: "I wish they were swept away and nothing but the Creeds left."9

By April of the same year, Froude resolved his doubts: "I have got over my scruples about the Articles--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. By the by see Bull's Works, Vol. II, p. 255: "We are not ignorant that the Ancient Fathers generally teach that the bread and wine in the Eucharist, by or upon the Consecration of them do become and are made the Body and Blood of Christ."10

---

9Ibid.

10Unpublished Works, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter published in Remains 1:11.406-410. On January 27, 1836, Froude wrote to Newman: "As to the cleftstick which you hold up in terror, in case I don't admit the expediency of the Articles, I see no difficulty for myself. I never professed to be for a subscription to Articles except as involving the Creeds, and would gladly have the latter stand alone."
Later, Hurrell wrote to his father about the new altar which the latter anticipated in his church: "Whatever you do, pray don't let it [the pulpit] stand in the light of the Altar, which, if there is any truth in my notions of Ordination, is more sacred than the Holy of Holies was in the Jewish Temple" (Remains I.i.372).

From the time Froude was in Barbados until his death, it seemed as though he followed "the safest course," accepting, what he thought were the most reverential and most probable teachings on the Holy Eucharist; he left the burden of disproof on his objectors. He criticized Keble on February 25, 1835, for not following the same course. Keble, in a poem on the Eucharist, had stated in the Christian Year: "There present in the heart, not in the hands." Froude objected: "How can we possibly know that it is true to say 'not in the hands'; Also, on the Communion ... you seem cramped by Protestantism" (Remains I.i.401-402).

Froude objected vigorously to the Protestant teachings on the Holy Eucharist. To those who held that It was merely a Sign or Symbol, he responded: "No doubt, if the words 'Sign of My Body,' had been a more accurate expression of Our Lord's meaning, He would Himself have used them, and not perplexed a plain matter with language unnecessarily figurative." (Remains I.ii.144).

---

11 Keble made a few corrections in his poems which he later regretted. On September 19, 1863, he wrote to Newman in regard to the Lyra: "It would please me, if in a new Edition you would be so good as to make two or three verbal corrections on the lines. Several of these are in matter of fact restorations to the original reading as they ran either in the Manuscript or in the British Critic. Two I altered at Hurrell's wish, but at a distance of thirty years, I prefer my own words." Unpublished Letters, Reel 45.
In January, 1835, Froude wrote to Newman: "I am more and more indignant at the Protestant doctrine on the subject of the Eucharist, and think that the principle on which it is founded is as proud, irreverent, and foolish as that of any heresy, even Socinianism."

Froude pointed out to Newman the words of Pascal when he was speaking on the text of Isaiah XLV.15—"The God Who concealed Himself:

Il a demuré caché sous la voile de la nature, qui nous le couvre, jusqu'à L'incarnation; et quand il a fallu qu'il ait paru, il s'est encore plus caché, en se couvrant de L'humanité... Enfin, quand il a voulu accomplir la promesse qu'il fit à ses Apôtres de demeurer avec les hommes jusqu'à son dernier avenement, il a choisi demeurer dans le plus étrange et le plus obscur secret de tous, savoir, sous les espèces de l'Eucharistie.

Froude continued: "and then he [Pascal] goes on 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," Froude asserted to Newman.

He also told Newman a resolution he had made in regard to the terms connected with this holy doctrine: "Pour moi, I never mean, if I can help it, to use any phrases even, which can connect me with such a set. 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 been dirtied; a fact of which you seem oblivious on many occasions. Nor shall I even abuse the Roman Catholics As a Church for any thing except excommunicating us. If they would give up this I think they are infinitely the
purest Church of the two."

Froude was alert to criticize Newman's attitude toward the Holy Eucharist as portrayed in the Tracts. The latter published two Tracts--Numbers 27 and 28, on "The History of Popish Transubstantiation," by John Cosin, Bishop of Durham in the seventeenth century. The Essay was lengthy, seven chapters. Cosin's thesis was that Transubstantiation was "invented" in the twelfth century, and "we have no reason to embrace it, until it shall be demonstrated, that, except the substance of the Bread be changed into the very body of Christ, His words cannot possibly be true, nor His Body present, which will never be done."

The last of two Tracts was dated "The Feast of the Annunciation"; Froude did not welcome the Tracts as a birthday commemoration. He told Newman, "Why publish poor Bishop Cosin's Tract on Transubstantiation? Surely no member of the Church of England is in any danger at overrating the miracle of the Eucharist." Newman noted in parenthesis: "Froude could not believe I was in earnest in shrinking from views which he

---


Keble wrote an essay on "The Proper Meaning of the Term 'The Lord's Supper,'" in which he vindicated the use of the term. He added, however, that it "will be well to remember that this Sacrament has other names, as Scriptural at least, and with more sanction from antiquity; to which, if we would ever come to adequate notions of it, we must direct some serious attention. And perhaps there may be some of them, such as Eucharist and Communion in particular, with which not the clergy only, but every considerate Christian, should be familiar." Keble, Occasional Papers and Reviews (Oxford, 1877, p. 391.)
boldly followed out. I was against Transubstantiation."  

Evidently, Froude tried to convince Newman that the latter had an erroneous idea about Transubstantiation, for on November 17, 1835, Newman conceded to Froude: "As much as this I allowed, that I ought to have put in 'Transubstantiation, as popularly held, etc.' Really, would not this satisfy you? Some famous Romanist controversialist actually says that if a priest were to use the words, he could turn all the bread in the market into Christ's Body. Now all this, and such as this, seems very shocking—when you take it for a substantial change."  

Even a month before Froude's death, Newman still differed with Froude on the doctrine of Transubstantiation. He said he would "willingly alter all revilings" in his Tracts, as well as "all serious charges" about which he may have changed his mind. "But, so far, I have not

---

13 Ibid. Newman's views on the Holy Eucharist were clearly expressed at this time to Mrs. Wilberforce, who was anticipating becoming a Roman Catholic: "It seems so very irreverent and profane a thing to say that our Saviour's own Body is carnally present on the Altar. That He is in some mysterious incomprehensible way present I fully believe, but I do not know the way—and since the way is not told us in Scriptures and the Ancient Fathers I dare pronounce nothing. Much less dare I be so irreverent as to determine that His Flesh and Blood are there as they were on Calvary. Surely He who came into the apartment the door being shut, has ways of being there innumerable, such as we know not—we believe that now He has a 'spiritual body' and a spiritual body may be present, the bread and wine still remaining. Therefore it seems safe and according to Scripture to say He is present in the bread and wine—but unnecessary to insist on our saying that the bread and wine are changed into that same Flesh and Blood which was on the cross." Letter of November 17, 1834, Unpublished Letters, Reel 120, Miscellaneous Letters.

changed my mind, namely, in thinking that 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 by the doctrine of antiquity, I yield; else, it does seem to me a substitution of something earthly for a heavenly mystery. If I am wrong, I wish to be set right, but till then I cannot but say what I say, though I admit I ought to say it temperately."

Froude had many other thought-provoking questions to ask Newman, besides those on Transubstantiation, while he was studying at Barbados. In a letter to Newman on January 25, 1834, he inquired: "Does not the Bishop of Canterbury claim Patriarchal authority 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 recognized in Scripture, as ever Cranmer was? You cannot think how this question has puzzled my poor friend the Bishop of Barbados who is a most staunch Protestant." Again on May 2, 1834, came another inquiry: "Is not baptism, unless followed by an attempt at a Christian life, as great a curse as receiving the Lord's Body unworthily? The primitive Church seems to have thought so" (Remains I.i.368).

15 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 147.
16 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter published in Letters and Correspondence, II, 19-20. In a letter to Newman and Keble on April 8, 1834, Froude said, "The Bishop is a thorough Z, and I can make no impression on him, though I think I have frightened him. If he had not been as kind to me as one man can be to another, I should be terribly provoked with him sometimes."
While at Barbados, Froude read with avidity any news from the Apostolics or about them. Eagerly, he urged them to consider new angles of a problem, encouraged them to continue Catholic doctrines in spite of opposition, and slashed the weak points in their arguments or compromises in their policies. Rose generally was the object of his criticism. Probably, Froude saw the excellent opportunities the former had to push their apostolical program without making use of them. "Rose is turning a Z again. What business has he to put Whewell in the British Magazine, and to talk so much of Church rates?"

Newman accused Rose of "sudden conservatism," at which Rose was very incensed. To Froude, Newman exclaimed, "Oh, that you were well enough to assist him [Rose] in London! You are not fit to move of yourself, but you would act through Rose as spirit acts on external matter through a body."

Again, Froude's papers were not being published. He even questioned William whether he neglected to deliver the papers. "I do not see in the last British Magazine an article of mine that I expected. Did you deliver to Turrill that little parcel I sent by you? If not, look for it in your great coat pockets, and deliver it with all speed," Froude admonished him. Neither were the papers of "W.F.H." being published.

17William Whewell was Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. He wrote Astronomy and General Physics, considered with Reference to Natural Theology. Whewell, in 1834, wrote an article defending himself against a critical review printed in the Edinburgh Review. Froude, in all probability, decided the space allowed to Whewell could have been used for a more beneficial purpose.
They were acknowledged upon receipt, but not printed. 18

The fifth volume of the British Magazine continued Froude's article on "The Project of Henry II for the Union of Church and State,"19 while it also devoted considerable space to Newman's "Letters on the Church of the Fathers." In the "Letters," Newman developed the history of Gregory and Basil, which is interesting for several reasons: first, as portraying the ethos of the primitive Church; secondly, as an argument giving both sides of the "Marriage vs. Celibacy" question; 20 and lastly, as a depiction of Newman and Froude themselves. One can surely see Newman portrayed in Gregory—"the affectionate, tender-hearted, the sensitive companion, . . . accomplished, eloquent preacher"; and in Basil, there was a similarity to Froude—"the man of hard deeds, the high-minded ruler of Christ's flock, the ascetic champion of the truth . . . utter disregard of mere human feelings when the interests of religion were concerned." Basil, dedicated to the life of chastity, advocated it to Gregory, just as Newman said Froude had done to him. Although "they differed, both were devoted champions of the orthodox creed."

In the sixth volume of the British Magazine, Froude was more fortunate than in the previous volume: one of his letters was printed. The

---

18 In Volume V, 1834, p. 396, the British Magazine acknowledged papers from "W.F.H." and "B". The latter was Froude's signature for the Lyra, and the former was either Froude or someone who held similar views to Froude's.

19 British Magazine, V (January and June 1834), 11-15; 655-658.

20 British Magazine, VI (August 1834), 157-158.
July issue bears the signature "F" under a letter entitled "Private Ex-
communication." The letter expressed the regret that, although there
was class distinction, distinction between heretics and believers was
disavowed. Excommunication was no longer countenanced. If Bishops did
attempt to excommunicate, they would come under the law of Edward III,
by which their goods would be confiscated, and their persons, their
aiders, and their abettors, would be subjected to perpetual imprisonment.

Although Froude deplored the fact that his own articles were shelved
and replaced by many others much too conservative, and some even detri-
mental to the Apostolical cause, he was jubilant whenever he found that
the British Magazine published views with which he could wholeheartedly
agree. One such article appeared in the Correspondence section of the
November, 1834, issue; it was entitled "Catholic" and explained the term.

In a letter of January, 1835, Froude referred to this article, and
he told Newman the "hit" at the end could have emanated from only one
pen. He said the article was "quite strong" and that the simile of the
"hero of romance" was equivalent to a signature.

The article used the term "Catholic" as a contrast to "Protestant." It
stated that in the ante-Reformation times Catholics and Papists were
identical. Even today, the author stated, it was fair to apply the term
to Papists:

They are the great united body of the western church Catholic,

21 British Magazine, VI (July 1834), 49-53; published in Remains
I.ii.290-298.

22 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 73-73.
or Latins, and our Church is unhappily cut off from it, not through our fault, but theirs; yet as truly cut off as a son who is sent from home by his father in disgrace, though his father may be in the wrong. And it may be useful for us, of the English Church, instead of vaunting about our famous Reformation and railing at popish superstitions, and talking of our purity, etc., to bear in mind that, even though we are in the right, we are in a deplorable condition, in banishment, under a stigma, and bound, by all feelings of piety and Christian love, to walk in sackcloth, and to afflict our souls with fasting, as the two witnesses mentioned in prophecy, or David beyond the Jordan. . . . Nothing would tend more to alleviate such a state of things (though, of course, it would not touch the seat of evil itself), than if it had been possible for us to enter into communion with other branches of the church catholic, which, like ourselves, the papal section of Christendom has cast off . . . . an advance could be made towards restoring us to an actual Catholicism; till then, we must be content to be called what we are content to remain, an isolated fragment of a spiritual empire of the apostles.

It would seem as if the state were not the nursing father, but (to use a fashionable figure) the upas-tree of the apostolic church, or, at best, the jailor of her in a splendid captivity, keeping her, as some hero of romance, from her high destinies in the gardens of luxurious security. The latest accounts from the West Indies state that our settlements there have begun to give that branch of our church "notice to quit." 24

Many ideas in the article were ones upon which Froude looked with favor—"our Church unhappily cut off, not through our fault, but theirs," "vaunting about our famous Reformation," "we are in a deplorable condition," "advance towards restoring us to an actual Catholicism," and the "hit" at the end about the state. Many of these same views are expressed

---

23 Froude used this figure "upas tree" in a letter to Keble a few months later—February 25, 1835: "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." Remains i.i.402.

24 The article is unsigned in British Magazine, VI (November 1834), 543-545, and it certainly reflects the thoughts of Froude even more than Newman, whose authorship is very probable.
in the "Home Thoughts Abroad" article in the British Magazine in 1836, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Another small item of interest to Froude in the British Magazine during 1834 must have been the Note to Correspondents in the March issue. The Editor replied to a complainant about the Becket documents that the articles on Becket "have reference to no controversy of the day; they are selected simply as authentic documents which throw light on an historical matter." 25

Froude eagerly awaited each issue of the British Magazine as it was sent to Barbados. He told Newman it was "sort of a letter from you, quoad 'Lyra' and 'Letters on the Church of the Fathers'" (Remains I.1.380).

Froude was very dismayed at many of the Tracts which were making their appearance. Besides the one on Cosin's idea of Transubstantiation, he particularly regretted two Tracts which Perceval sent him, probably Tract 16 and Tract 17. "Is not 'the ministration of the word' a sheer Protestantism?" he asked Newman; "Also it said the Church of England taught 'the whole truth.' If so, why do we wish to reform it?"

Pusey, Newman's Oxford friend who had shared lodgings with him and spiritually resuscitated him during the first years at Oriel, entered the Tractarian Movement shortly after Froude left for Barbados. His first Tract, initialled E.B.P., allied him much more closely to the Movement than he desired. It was entitled "Thoughts on the Benefits of the System of Fasting," and, unlike the previous Tracts, it was long and in-

structive, while the former were "short stirring appeals." Froude appreciated the subject of Pusey's Tract, but he "grumbled" at Newman "for letting Pusey call the Reformer 'the founders of our Church.'"

Froude protested again and again about "Protestant" doctrines promulgated in the Tracts, and he repeatedly wrote to Newman about the attitude taken toward the Reformers. "Why do you praise Ridley? Do you know sufficient good about him to counterbalance the fact that he was the associate of Cranmer, Peter Martyr, and Bucer? ... Also you seem to speak of the denial of communion to little children as an ordinance of God. Was it not one of the Rationalist innovations of those fellows?"

The one Tract which appeared just after Froude left for Barbados but which, significantly, he did not read until 1836, when "accident" put it in his way, was Palmer and Newman's Tract 15 "On the Apostolical succession in the English Church." Froude wondered how Newman could have consented to be a party to it; "it really does seem so very unfair."

In the Tract, Palmer and Newman asserted that:

The English Church did not revolt from those who in that day had authority by succession from the Apostles. On the contrary, it is certain that the Bishops and Clergy in England and Ireland remained the same as before the separation, and that it was these, with the aid of the civil power, who delivered the Church of those kingdoms from the yoke of Papal tyranny and usurpation, while at the same time they gradually removed from the minds of the people various superstitious opinions and practices which had grown up during the middle ages. ... The Church then by its proper rulers and officers reformed itself.

The Tractarians then related how, in 1534, the Bishops and Clergy, in Convocations, signed a declaration that the Pope no longer had jurisdiction in their country. "The people of England, then, in casting off the Pope, but obeyed and concurred in the acts of their own spiritual
Superiors, and committed no schism," they maintained. For a period, Queen Mary, by force, rendered the Church once more submissive to the Pope, but "on the succession of Queen Elizabeth, the true Successors of the Apostles in the English Church were reinstated in their ancient rights."

In Tract 15, the Tractarians denied that the Bishops were bound to the Pope and had no right to revolt. They said that "in early times... all Christians thought substantially alike, and formed one great body all over the world, called the Church Catholic or Universal." This body, consisting of a vast number of separate Churches superintended by a Bishop, was divided into bishoprics; these, in turn, were grouped into provinces. The provinces were partitioned into Patriarchates, but, according to the Tract writers, some portions were not included in any Patriarchates; instead, they were governed by themselves, as Cyprus, Ireland, and Britain.

In the beginning, there were four or five Patriarchates, among which the Patriarch of Rome was honorary Primate. The latter tried to get "control of the Churches of Britain," and later forbade them to reform their doctrine and usages," which "he had no right at all to do... because the English and Irish Churches, though in the West, being exterior to his Patriarchate," were "altogether independent of him."

For a parallel example of one Church usurping authority over another—as the two Tractarians believed Rome did over England—they cited the case of the Patriarch of Antioch attempting measures to dominate the Cyprian Churches. The dispute, settled by the Council of Ephesus, de-
It is my creed that "no Bishop shall interfere in another province, which has not from the very first been under himself and his predecessors."

Newman and Palmer concluded: "Our Bishops, at the time of the Reformation, did but vindicate their ancient rights; . . . if England and Ireland had a plea for asserting their freedom under any circumstances, much more so, when the corruptions imposed on them by Rome even made it a duty to do so."

Froude would not accept this theory. He certainly acquiesced in the fact that a reformation was necessary, as Roman Catholics themselves do; but, to Froude, unity was a question of paramount importance. From the time he wrote his first chapters on Thomas à Becket and stated there: "A wounded limb may recover as long as it is united with the body; when cut off, its situation is desperate," Froude became concerned with the problem of unity. To him, the Reformation was "a limb badly set" and it needed to "be broken again to be righted." In regard to Tract 15, Froude quickly issued his verdict as to its logicality: "The Patriarchate of Constantinople, as every one knows, was not one 'from the first,' but neighboring churches voluntarily submitted to it in the first instance, and then by virtue of their oaths remained its ecclesiastical subjects; and the same argument by which you justify England and Ireland would justify all those churches in setting up any day for themselves. The obvious meaning of the canon (of Ephesus) is that patriarchs might not begin to exercise authority in churches hitherto independent, without
Froude instantly put his mark of approbation upon Tract 34, "Rites and Customs of the Church," and it is not difficult to see why he did. Its theme was: "He who is duly strengthened in faith, does not go so far as to require argument and reason for what is enjoined, but is satisfied with the tradition alone." Newman developed the idea, in the Tract, that many rituals and observances in the Church, not noted in Scripture, were handed down by the Apostles and meant to be observed. He ended his Tract with a passage particularly appealing to Froude:

The conclusion to be drawn from all that has been said in these pages is this: -- That rites and ordinances, far from being unmeaning, are in their nature capable of impressing our memories and imaginations with the great revealed verities; far from being superstitious, are expressly sanctioned in Scripture as to their principle, and delivered to the Church in their form by tradition... Lastly, that, although the details of the early ritual varied in importance, and corrupt additions were made in the middle ages, yet that, as a whole, the Catholic ritual was a precious possession; and if we, who have rid ourselves of those corruptions, have lost not only the possession, but the sense of its value, it is a serious question whether we are not like men who recover from some grievous illness with the loss or injury of their sight or hearing;--whether we are not like the Jews returned from captivity, who could never find the rod of Aaron or the Ark of the Covenant, which, indeed, had ever been hid from the world, but then was removed from the Temple itself.

26 The See of Constantinople, originally a suffragan of Heraclea, obtained by usurpation the jurisdiction over the Metropolitans of Thrace, Pontus, and Asia. Even though unjustly acquired, "time respected and held inviolable" the right of jurisdiction which the See of Constantinople employed. It was at length approved by the General Council of Chalcedon. Although the Pope (Leo) refused to sanction some of the canons of that synod, yet he did sanction the jurisdiction of the See of Constantinople. Ephesus was independent because it was the see of St. John and was as old as the Church.

Confir the Dublin Review, V (October 1838), 285-309, for a discussion of this problem and arguments that England was considered part of the Roman or Western Patriarchate.
Besides doing research in the Bishop's library and acting as critic, Froude worked on projects of his own at Barbados. In May, 1834, he told Keble he was making "a rough draft" for an Opusculum which he intended to call "A Companion to the Prayer Book." Because it would take too much time to describe it, he promised to send a specimen.

Froude also taught at Codrington College in Barbados "where the next generation of West Indian clergy are now in embryo." He offered himself as mathematical instructor "on condition of having a room given me and being allowed to battell; and in that capacity shall endeavor to instill some good notions into the youth" (Remains I.1.364). Froude used every means to further his apostolate. As soon as arrangements were completed for his assignment at the College, he sent to Keble and Newman for material "to poison the minds of the natives out here."

Will your worships have the goodness to get together a few sets of the Oxford tracts; also three or four copies of a work which I see much praised in the British Magazine (Arians) as coming from the pen of "a scholar, a man of refined taste, and above all a Christian" also a copy of an anonymous work called The Christian Year, which I forgot to bring with me; also the parts autumnalis and hymnalis of my Breviary; also any newspapers or reviews, or anything else which will throw light on your worships' proceedings; send the package to my father; let it be a good big one; and mind to send lots of tracts (Remains I.1.365).

Meanwhile, Newman at home missed Froude. He wrote to his mother that it was "very distressing to be alone," with "no one, apparently to encourage"him. He told Froude that Keble and Pusey took his part, "else I am solus."

Above all, Newman felt he was "abused beyond measure by high and low--threatening with a pelting and a prosecution--having anonymous letters--discountenanced by high church and low church."
litany of abuses, Newman apprised his friend in Barbados: "It should be you." 27

The last remark is more fully explained in a letter Newman wrote to Froude the previous month:

Was it not a strange mishap that, much as you abused me for making you a cat's paw, yet when the time of danger came, you should get out of the way, and leave innocent me to trouble?28 So it was; only think how mildly I have always spoken of Arnold, and how bitterly you; never did I use a harsh word against him, I think, except that once, and then at Rome, and with but one or two friends. Yet even from Rome those few words are dragged forth, and I have to answer for them, in spite of my very great moderation and charity as touching him. In the next place, my tracts were abused as Popish—as for other things, so especially for expressions about the Eucharist. Here, as you well know, it was you who were apt to be unguarded—not I.29

Newman sent his "unseen agitator" the box of materials he requested. Besides the books and Tracts, Newman sent pamphlets which he bought for Froude, and "a commonplace book containing some extracts which made me laugh most heartily so I stuck them in." Although the box was sent in the early part of July, 1834, Froude did not receive it until Christmas time. Not only did he spend month after month awaiting the box, but also awaiting letters from the Apostolicals. "Do you know I am hungry to hear about you?" he wrote to Newman in November.

The lack of correspondence made Froude suspicious. He told Keble he

27 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection. (Letter of July 13, 1834 to Froude.)

28 Newman was with a few friends in Rome who were discussing whether a certain interpretation of Scripture was Christian. Someone said Dr. Arnold accepted it. Newman queried: "But is he a Christian?" Later, Newman was asked for an explanation.

29 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 42.
feared that both he and Newman were going to back out of the "conspiracy" and leave Perceval and himself to their "fate." Froude also asked Keble for Horace's receipt "for giving the sound of a swan to mute fishes" so he could administer him a dose. "Concerning your worship's self, I have been able to collect that you were in existence on or about the twelfth of June last."

In November, two letters from Newman reached Froude in quick succession. In the first, written on the twelfth of the month, Newman explained that the box was sent with "news of Oxford up to the minute of its leaving," and he expected it had arrived some time previously; he excused the tardiness in writing by the fact that they expected Froude home in May when the Bishop of Barbados came to England. As soon as the Bishop arrived alone, they began to write.

Newman briefed Froude on the contemporary events--his attack by Whately and their ensuing letters, the addition of talent to their party, and a commentary on Dr. Hampden's article in which the latter stated all

---

30 Perceval said he was the person to whom Froude alluded in the phrase "leave me and---to our fate." This is quite probable because Froude was corresponding with Perceval at this time and dejected because he had not heard from Newman and Keble in months.

31 In telling Froude that Sewell, Pusey, and Harrison were active and "with us," Newman added: "You see we now have the talent on our side, in spite of the deadweight of Keble and Williams." Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection. The letter was written on November 12, 1854. Isaac Williams, at that time, was unwell. Keble's father likewise was ill and needed his son's attention. Besides, Keble was busily engaged in editing the works of Hooker; he had little time to write for the British Magazine, for one thing--a fact Rose deplored.
Creeds (except the Apostles Creed) were theological statements and pious opinions.

Newman closed the first letter with: "My dear Froude, be comforted, be sure that I, and I doubt not others, think of you twice a day." That, too, was little comfort to Froude, for he did not receive that letter nor Newman's other letters nor his box of books and pamphlets for many months.

On the eighteenth of the month, Newman wrote again:

I have just heard from your Father that up to September 29 you had not one box—how very provoking. It is as hard to bear for us as for you. I find too that you have been writing to Perceval. I suppose you are quite angry with us. Why will you not have faith? . . . . I am so angry with you, I cannot say. Have we not sent you a full box? I was week after week saying, "Now the time's nearly come for the box to arrive, etc." . . . My views on Romanism are much clearer than when you were here. How I long to see you again if it be. I wish you knew how very angry I was, but I suppose all this is for your good. You want a taming in various ways. It is to wean you from your over-interest in politics. You are certainly , and I miss you continually in advice; but of course one is fond of what one does well; so you see you are being taught to unlearn the world—the ecclesiastical as well as the worldly world.

Newman's second letter was interesting for another reason. During the previous month, he had written to Jemima about a Mr. Tucker, who gave him an account of the Church in India. Newman told Jemima: "At this moment, could I choose, and have all circumstances and providences at my disposal, I would go as an independent Bishop to his part of India, and found a Church there."{32} Newman made the same proposal to Froude:

---

{32} Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 60.
A strange thought came across me about you some six weeks ago, when I saw a letter from Tucker of CCC giving an account of his prospects in India. He is not at all an imaginative or enthusiastic man; but he seemed to show that the fields were ready for harvest. Really a religious spirit has sprung up among military men in our stations; and having no angel to direct them to Joppa, they have turned Peculiars. The various sects there have a leaning towards the Church, and wait for Aaron's serpent to swallow them up, and the men of colour answering to the proselytes at the gates are forming centers of operation. My thought was, if your health would not let you come home, you ought to be a bishop in India. There you might be a Catholic and no one would know the difference. It quite amused me for a while, and made me think how many posts there are in His kingdom, how many offices, who says to one, "Do this, and he doeth it, etc. It is quite impossible that, some way or other, you are not destined to be the instrument of God's purposes. Tho I saw the earth cleave, and you fall in, or Heaven open and a chariot appear, I should say just the same. God has ten thousand posts of service. You might be of use in the central elemental fire; you might be of use in the depths of the sea."

Froude had said that, when he received Newman's letter, he would "expect a rowing for Roman Catholic sentiments," so he must have been quite nonplussed at Newman's suggestion. In regards to the post he was to fill, Froude was sceptical: "The pertinacity of my trifling ailment has sometimes seemed to me like a warning that fate has put its hand on me for the next world."

It was probably thoughts of "the next world" that changed Froude's attitude to a great extent. "I have left off writing radicalism, which did myself harm, and no one else any good; for I see neither Newman nor-(Rose?) will take any of it" (Remains I.i.374).

---

33 The manuscript letter has an R before "Catholic" with two neat lines drawn through it.

If Froude admitted defeat in relation to the Praemunire question, Perceval and Keble did not. Newman told Froude that the former was "vehement" and the latter "excited" about it still in 1835. He advised that articles on Praemunire were "useful as keeping up a protest and as gradually enlightening people, but they do not tend immediately to practice." Keble immediately took him to task for the statement, about which he somehow learned: "I can hardly enter into your view of keeping it up as a grievance which it is convenient to have to complain of."

Newman explained: "I said nothing about keeping the Praemunire in order to have a grievance, but that Perceval's new scheme would be one which, being our own, we could not complain of, though it worked as ill as the Praemunire, whereas of the Praemunire we had a right to complain, for it was a tyrannical measure imposed on the Church against our will."35

Froude no longer sent his "flaming papers" home for publication, but he still clung tenaciously to the idea of union with the Roman Catholic Church. Not long before he was ready to leave Barbados to return to England, Froude wrote the letter to Newman suggesting that "one might send a Latin petition to the Pope confessing one's interpretation of the 39 Articles ... and opinions on divers subjects and praying that one might be allowed to communicate in their churches."36 Newman had previously written to Froude on January 18, 1835: "My dear Froude, come back to us

35 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 79.
36 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter published in Letters and Correspondence, II, 83-84 and Remains I.i.408.
as soon as you safely can, and then next winter (please God) you shall go to Rome, and tempt Isaac (who is very willing) to go with you. But, wherever you are (so be it), you cannot be divided from us.”

In Froude's letter, there was a reference to Newman's suggestion; Froude said "the notion of going to Rome with Isaac is very gratifying."

Newman missed his "unseen agitator," whom he continually chided for going too fast. He himself was a true apostolical, but he was also a patient and practical man. Whereas Froude's thoughts tended toward union with Rome to form "one compact machine" and thereby work for the purification of the Church and return it to "the Church of Hildebrand," Newman was satisfied to labor for the spiritual revival of the Catholic doctrine in the Church of England. Just prior to the time that Froude suggested the Latin petition to the Pope, Newman wrote to Wilson:

The Church is certainly in a wretched state; but not a gloomy one to those who regard every symptom of dissolution as a ground of hope. Not that I would do anything towards the undoing, or will fail both tooth and nail to resist every change and degradation to which it is subjected. But, after all, I see a system behind the existing one, a system indeed which will take time and suffering to bring us to adopt, but still a firm foundation. Those who live by the breath of State patronage, who think the clergy must be gentlemen, and the Church must rest on the great, not on the multitude, of course are desponding.

Newman eagerly looked forward to Froude's return, although he had severe doubts whether he would ever see him again. Every letter Newman wrote while Froude was away contained regrets at their separation. "I

---

37 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 76-77.
38 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 31-32.
could say much, were it of use, of my own solitariness now that you are away. Not that I would undervalue that great blessing, which is what I do not deserve, of so many friends about me . . . yet, after all, as is obvious, no one can enter into one's mind except a person who has lived with one. I seem to write things to no purpose as wanting your imprimatur. Perhaps it is well to cultivate the habit of writing as if for unseen companions, but I have felt it much, so that I am getting quite dry and hard."

God willed that the two Apostolicals work together for another year, after which Froude was to leave with a feeling of a failure to accomplish his mission. Newman certainly must have had his friend in mind when he wrote in his essay on Gregory VII:

Gregory thought he had failed: so it is; often a cause seems to decline as its champion grows in years, and to die in his death; but this is to judge hastily; others are destined to complete what he began. No man is given to see his work through. "Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labours until the evening," but the evening falls before it is done. There was One alone who began and finished and died.

---

39 Ibid., 77-78.
Froude was eager to get back "into the midst of things" again. His retreat had allowed him time to think out many problems about which he had previously been dubious. Taken away from the feverish heat of the arguments, Froude could weigh things in a calmer state of mind; he could, although reluctantly, put aside items of secondary importance and apply the remaining strength he had to the items of ultimate importance. Anxiously, he looked forward to his return.
CHAPTER VIII

FROUDE: HIS LAST MONTHS

Richard Hurrell Froude returned to England in time to add his "Non placet" to that of Newman and Christie on the question of subscription to a Declaration of Conformity to the Church of England instead of subscription to the Articles. The proposal was rejected by a vote of 459 to 57, and Froude's extra vote did little to decide the victory; but, while he lived, Froude entered into everything connected with the cause of religion—and entered wholeheartedly. Newman's biographer, Anne Mozley, saw Froude as he arrived for the convocation that May, less than a year before his death:

He was terribly thin then—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.

During his remaining months, Froude's intellectual pursuits and vital interests in the Apostolical life were not arrested, but they could not keep pace with the feverish activity of the consumptive disease which was reaching advanced stages. Newman tried to

---

1 Newman and Froude considered the measure a liberalizing one intended to benefit the Dissenters.

2 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 95.
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"drink out his thought" while there was still time; but frequently, in spite of energetic attempts to be victor in his wrestle with weakness and fatigue, Froude had to succumb. "I don't know whether you know the sensation of a pulse over a hundred," he told Newman; "If you do, I think you will admit it not to be favourable to mental exertion." Yet, Wilson corroborated the view of Froude which Anne Mozley expressed: "While he lived at all, he must live his life." Wilson found Froude "a more interesting person than ever" because, in spite of his illness, "his peculiar way of thinking and manner of expressing himself... continued just the same."

All that was left of Froude's vigor and zeal was channeled into one climactic inquiry as he served as the devil's advocate in Newman's formulation of an answer to the one searching question which was the culmination of all other ecclesiastical inquiries which the two had made up to that time—what is the seat of religious authority? From the seed which germinated in his correspondence with the Abbe Jager, to its development

__3__Benjamin Harrison, a Student of Christ Church, met in Paris a learned priest, Abbe Jager. They began a private discussion about religious topics which, by agreement, continued as a publication in the columns of the _Univers_; Harrison informed Newman of the controversy and asked his assistance. He finally turned the whole matter over to Newman. Father Henry Tristram has written a thorough review of the whole controversy in an article entitled "In the Lists with the Abbe Jager" in _John Henry Newman: Centenary Essays_ (London, 1945), 201-222.

When Harrison discovered Newman's attitude toward the Reformers in the answers he made to the Abbe, he expressed his dismay to Golightly and Fusey. Rogers, who learned of Harrison's attitude, suggested to Newman that "You ought to send Harrison down to him [Froude] 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, even and above the arguments he uses."
in his "Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church," to its systematization in the *Via Media*, Newman pursued his search for an understanding of religious authority.

One avenue of approach—the popular idea of private judgment, was a closed road to both Newman and Froude. Both eliminated this means as an answer to their question "What is the seat of religious authority?"

Newman devoted two of his chapters of the *Via Media* to the problem of the abuse of private judgment. For him, the question posed was not, however, "Private Judgment or Infallibility?" Both, according to him, proceeded from a rationalistic tendency to define too clearly and definitely doctrines which were within the confines of mystery and miracle and which ought to be accepted upon Faith. "To know all that is revealed with equal clearness, implies that there is nothing not revealed." Froude shared this idea to a certain degree when he spoke of Transubstantiation: "By explaining precisely wherein the miracle consists and how it is brought about, it aims like them the rationalists 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

---

4 Newman gave public lectures in Oxford, in Adam de Brome's Chapel, St. Mary's, on "The Prophetical Office of the Church." He traced the Via Media of the English Church, which had neither added to her doctrine as Rome had, nor subtracted from her doctrine, as Protestantism had. These lectures were incorporated into Newman's *Via Media*.

indistinctness in which God has thought fit to envelope them." The view is understandable when one understands the temper of the age these men lived in—an age which attempted to divest religion of every mystery and all of its awe, subjecting divine truth to human reason. Newman took a middle course between what he designated as Protestantism and Romish errors in regard to private judgment: The Church of England, he said, "considers that on certain definite subjects private judgment upon the text of Scripture has been superseded, not by the mere authoritative sentence of the Church, but by its historical testimony delivered down from the Apostles. To these definite subjects nothing more can be added, unless, indeed, new records of primitive Christianity or new uninterrupted traditions of its teaching were discoverable." In his Via Media, Newman had a definite place for private judgment in the investigation of the truths of revelation, but it was under the guidance of the Church's authority; it was conducted in an attitude of faith and reverence, accepting as infallible the system in which one found himself and acting upon it in a confiding spirit "till he finds a better, or in a course of time has cause to suspect it."

Although many of Froude's ideas in his Essay on Nationalism resembled ideas contained in Newman's Via Media, Froude was not too ready to take a middle course in his stand on private judgment. He continually equated it with Protestantism and hated both vehemently. He struck his last blow at it by means of a review of the life and works
of Blanco White in an article in the January, 1836, British Critic. 6

The critique was on White's two books, Second Travels of an Irish Gentlemen in Search of a Religion, published in 1834, and Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy, published in 1835. Newman briefed Froude on what was expected in the article:

Pray be very candid—and, while you bring out strongly and boldly the Socinianism of Sabellianism, (for this will take), suggest with some modesty, as by way of answer to an objection the Catholic view to be taken of Professor Norton, etc.'s remarks, and as to Blanco White's Preface to the Second Travels, (where existence of the English Church is denied) and kindred subjects, do not commit yourself to an opinion, only state them fully, doing justice to the expression of them. This seems to me your line. I trust I shall receive the manuscript from you at once—for, though Boone declines it, it shall not fall to the ground. And since it may be a little while before you receive your books, you cannot be better employed than in getting this off your hands. 7

Froude found mental exertion very trying and exhausting at this time, but with his characteristic disdain for "economy" he quickly informed Newman of his own plans for the review:

6 In a series of letters during January, Newman told Froude about the controversy between the British Magazine and the British Critic. The letters throw light on the fact that Froude still cherished the thought of having their own theological journal.

Newman told Froude: "Rose is jealous of the Critic; J. Watson of the Magazine. Rose wanted the Critic to die and he hinted Boone was unmanageable. He says that as far as reviews, his Magazine was open to receive them and he should be glad of them (to which the plain answer is that for nine months he has not had room for 'Home Thoughts'). Then I began to expose my plan, that friends of mine at Oxford were disposed to spend three hundred to four hundred pounds a year on a Theological Journal—that I had suggested that it was better to throw ourselves into an existing publication, etc. That we intended to be learned though without giving up reviews—and Rivington had said if we supplied quarterly four sheets out of the fifteen gratis, it would about cover the loss of one hundred dollars" which Rivington and the British Critic lost every year in spite of the 1100 copies sold.

7 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection.
By dawdling over Blanco White's books, I think I have got more insight into his state of mind and views than I had at first, and shall be able to make great allowance for much that he says without any affectation of candour. Poor fellow, he is only a consistent Protestant. As to Sabellianism and facts, I fear you have been unable to cram me with your views. Your *Arians* shows in a few lines (what Blanco White declares) that Sabellianism is only Crypto- Socinianism, but how to say more about it, I know not. What I hope to make play about is a reductio ad absurdum of the Protestant Rule of Faith, which I think Blanco furnished me with so completely that I can give it as his view without committing myself to it.  

I mean after praising his talent and amiable qualities and alluding to his "interesting history" to give an analysis of his arguments in which to the best of my ability I shall strengthen his arguments and soften his conclusions so as to make the whole appear and indeed be a legitimate development of Protestantism. I shall then say that the instructed Protestant who has recognized the authority of "the united Church of Great Britain and Ireland as by law established" will readily supply the refutation by himself, and accordingly shall leave him to do so. But for the sake of less thoroughly instructed persons, I shall endeavor to show that even without the recognition of such authority, whatever becomes of the Articles, still something may be said for the Creeds. 

Because the task of correcting proofs was such a "bother" to Froude, Newman offered to take the article through the Press "if you will trust me," and he cautioned: "Do not fuss yourself." Froude, however, was not concerned about the labor entailed in the article; "as to the review on Blanco White, it is an amusement to me, for which I am very grateful to you." The debate of the "Oriel Noetic" days was resumed.

On December 10, 1835, Froude sent Newman sixty-three sheets, forty of which he completed within five days. He hoped to finish the rest "in a
jiffy" "if the humor lasts." Newman thought the article "capital, well-written, well thought out, and irresistible except when people think otherwise." He must have thought people would think otherwise, for he made alterations "which have spoiled your style," and Newman chided: "You are lucky in not having more."

In the article, Froude did what he set out to do--reduced the practice of private judgment as a rule of Faith to an absurdity. What is more interesting about the article is the fact that Newman finished the article himself, and the second part of the article never appeared in the periodical. It was published in Froude's Remains with the annotation that it was written in November or December, 1835, and intended for publication. Entitled "Remarks upon the Principles to be Observed in Interpreting Scripture," the article fulfilled Froude's ambition

10 On January 3, 1836, Newman told Froude, in regard to the White article: "You would be reasonably disgusted at my alterations which have spoiled your style. You are lucky in not having more. . . . I put a flourishing ending full of antithesis about Blanco White's not knowing the Divines of the seventeenth century."

Newman had told Froude earlier that he would ask Boone to give Froude more space for his article; Froude found the allotted eighteen pages insufficient. He now, in this letter, told Froude that Boone replied: "Time and space, I regret to say, are both opposed to the prolongation of Mr. Froude's article at present, although he can take up some other work for a prefix, e.g. Mr. Madge's Sermons, or something of Channing's or Norton, and continue or renew the subject."

Froude replied: "If you can give me a subject that can be brought to bear against Protestantism, I shall be very glad to think it over, but I have no notion of writing a merely judicious article to appear among such stuff as the last number of the British Critic."

11 The unpublished article, Remains I.i1.357-383, was probably not sent to the press because it was, in many ways, repetitious of the argument in the preceding article, and it also was bound to stir the fires of a cause Newman was content to let rest for a while.
Froude had his answer for the three opponents of his oriel school-days; he answered them individually and collectively. He dissected the phrase "utmost pains" in Arnold's declaration that, if a man took the utmost pains to find the truth of Scripture but found some doctrines fairly disputable, he was entitled to be indifferent and obliged to be tolerant of another's view; each man was allowed his own opinion. Froude compared the results Arnold achieved by using "utmost pains" with those achieved by Taylor and Hooker who also used "utmost pains."

To White, who found it inconsequential to anyone whether the sense in which he understood the Sacred Mysteries was true or false, Froude explained that doubts concerning religious truths imposed some moral obligation.

Froude answered Whately with Pascal. Whately said: "A good man will indeed wish to find the evidence of the Christian religion satisfactory, but a wise man will not for that reason think it unsatisfactory, but will weight the evidence the more carefully, on account of the importance of the question." Concerning the truths of religion, Pascal remarked that even if the evidence is so inconclusive as to leave doubts, still on the principle of prudence it is better to take for granted their truth and to regulate one's conduct as if they were certain. One hazards little to attain all.

Froude concluded his article by showing that an atheist and a believer both have the same proof. The atheist thinks that any defect
of evidence is a refutation; the believer, that any evidence is enough. The believer "feels justified in affirming till his proof has been altogether destroyed," and the atheist "in denying till it has been completed." White maintained that God could not want resources to produce in man the highest degree of certainty if He wanted us to be certain. Froude's reply was based on the testimony of Scripture: "Yet Almighty God's miraculous displays at Sinai were not sufficient to hinder the Israelites worshipping the golden calf."

Both Froude and Newman directed much attention in their writings to steer others from the view that the popular doctrine of private judgment was the answer to the question, "Where is the seat of religious authority?" Froude's whole life was literally spent in combating religious liberalism. Like Newman, he tried to find the correct relation between religious authority and religious liberty; like Keble, he was unprepared to yield much to the latter. The other two avenues of approach to the problem of religious authority—Scripture and the Church, were the source of more perplexity to Froude and Newman.

The idea of Scripture and the Church as a living whole, mutually inclusive, was lost during the Middle Ages. At that time, men were faced with the fact that actual teaching and life in the Church presented more than the letter of Scripture. They did not understand the real nature of development, and so they ascribed the difference to the unwritten apostolic tradition or the revelation of the Holy Ghost. In place of an organic unity of Scripture and Church, the tendency arose to separate them. With the separation, the question simultaneously followed: "Which
is superior?" The Reformers, especially Calvin, started from this false position. To his credit, he wanted to restore Scripture—God's word, to its proper position, but he went to the other extreme. Even Bellarmine held that doctrine was partly in Scripture and partly in the unwritten apostolical tradition. 12

Understandably, because of the "high and dry" reputation the Church of England had in the nineteenth century, Froude minimized the role of the Church of England as an authoritative and competent guide. In February, 1835, he attacked Keble for using the expression in his Tracts "the Church teaches." In the Tracts, it was equivalent to "the Prayer Book teaches." Knowing Froude's indictments against the Prayer Book of his day for its elimination of so many vital parts of the Catholic service, one realizes his bewilderment and exasperation at the phrase "the Church teaches," even apart from the general problem of Church versus Scripture:

Now suppose a conscientious layman to inquire on what grounds the Prayer Book, etc., are called the teaching of the Church, how shall we answer him? Shall we tell him that they are embodied in an Act of Parliament? So is the Spoliation Bill. Shall we tell him that they were formerly enacted by Convocation in the reign of Charles II? But what especial claim had this Convocation, etc., to monopolize the name and authority of the Church? Shall we tell him that all the Clergy assented to them ever since their enactment?


Newman credited Bellarmine for having "written my lectures on Justification."
But to what interpretation of them have all, or even the major part of the clergy assented? For if it is the assent of the Clergy that makes the Prayer Book, etc. the teaching of the Church, the Church teaches only that interpretation of them to which all, or at least the majority of the Clergy, have assented; and, in order to ascertain this, it will be necessary to inquire, not for what may seem to the inquirer to be their real meaning, but for the meaning which the majority of the Clergy have in fact attached to them. It will be necessary to poll the Hoadleians, Puritans, Laudians, and to be determined by the most votes. Again, supposing him to have ascertained these, another question occurs: 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, etc. I 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. I know you will snub me for this, and put in lots of "and," some of which I could anticipate and answer, but it would take too much room, and I dare say you can augur the answers as well as I can the objections.

Next, the Tracts talk a great deal about the Clergy "teaching authoritatively." Do you think that, on any fair principles of interpretation, the texts which claim authority for the teaching of inspired persons, and those in immediate communication with them, can be applied to the teaching of those who have no access to any source of information which is not equally open to all mankind? Surely, no teaching now-a-days is authoritative in the sense in which the Apostles was, except that of the Bible; nor any in the sense in which Timothy's was except that of primitive tradition. To find a sense in which the teaching of the modern clergy is authoritative, I confess baffles me. (Remains 1.i.401-402).

Newman systematized his ideas on the question of the Apostolic Catholic Church as a witness of the deposit of faith and as to its relation to Scripture in his *Via Media*. He held Antiquity as the oracle of truth. His hypothesis—that the Apostolic deposit of faith was static and did not allow developments,
preluded the necessity of an infallible guide. Instead, he proposed Vincent of Lerins' principle of "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus" (that which is believed always, everywhere, and by all) as arbiter of doctrinal disputes. If a doctrine was believed always, everywhere, and by all, it was to be accepted as a deposit of faith and the object of the Church's doctrinal authority; if it was found wanting, it was an innovation or corruption.

Newman upheld the Canon of Ancient Consent, but denied that "the Church of the present age may speak authoritatively except as regard those things already fixed in Antiquity," for the Church no longer had the unity which could give universal sanction. Whereas the Roman Catholic Church asserted that certitude could be secured upon: first, a God revealing; second, a Church infallible in conveying revelation, Newman held that the first was sufficient. The role of the Church, for Newman, was that of witness.

---


14 On August 23, 1835, Newman wrote to Froude: "The Fathers are a witness only as one voice, not in individual instances, or, much less, isolated passages."

Newman, in Lectures on the Prophetic Office, II, characterized Ancient Consent: "That whatever doctrine the primitive ages unanimously attest, whether by consent of Fathers, or by Councils, or by the events of history, or by controversies, or in whatever way, whatever may fairly and reasonably be considered to be the universal belief of those ages, is to be received as coming from the Apostles."
For Froude, this whole area was one of uncertainty. He was not sure if development were possible or not. "We cannot know about any seemingly indifferent practice of the Church of "one that it is not a development of the apostolic ethos; and it is to no purpose to say that we can find no proof of it in the writings of the six first centuries; they the objectors must find a disproof if they would do any thing" (Remains I.i.336). Accordingly, in his article on Blanco White, he conceded there might have been an infallible guide in the preceding ages of the Church, for certainly the apostles had written judgments and oral judgments; the council of Nicaea, in its historical and authoritative judgment, gave proof of a system handed down. Its creed rested upon a direct Apostolic tradition, infallible; the Athanasian Creed paralleled it.

Froude was not too willing to admit a static deposit, for this led him into the channel of "fundamentals" and "non-fundamentals." He, for once, was hesitant about expressing a view: "How mistaken we ourselves may be on many points that are only gradually opening for us." He interpreted Newman's principle--"though Tradition may teach many things profitable, yet the test of a doctrine being necessary to salvation is its being in Scripture," as a form of "Bible Christianity."

The phenomena of the heavens are repugnant to Newman, just in the same way as the letter of Scripture to the Church, i.e. on the assumption that they contradict every notion which they do not make self-evident--which is the basis of "Bible Christianity" and also of Protestantism; and of which your trumpery principle about "Scripture being the sole rule of Faith in fundamentals" (I nauseate the word) is but a mutilated edition without the breadth and axio-
matic character of the original (Remains I.i.412-415).\textsuperscript{15}

In a similar strain, he spoke of the same subject later:

What would these good people Bible Christians say to a sky astronomer? The sky is the fountain-head of all astronomical knowledge; nothing can be known about astronomy except what is seen there. There it shines in gold and azure, every syllable of the system of Newton is there, and it is only because there that it is true. When these good people can read the system of Newton in the sky, and think a man's knowledge of astronomy better and more complete because he is a sky astronomer, and has read and heard nothing else on the subject except the book of the heavens, then they may with more consistency talk about Bible Christians. (Remains I.ii.90).

Froude tried to shake Newman's stand on the Bible's being the sole rule of Faith in fundamentals. To clarify Newman's position, Froude drew up a supposed argument between Newman and the Abbe, placing Newman in the position where he would face a discrepancy between Scripture and the early Christians:

Abbe: I maintain that the doctrine of the Eucharist is a fundamental.
You: I deny it.
Abbe: Why?
You: Because it cannot be proved from Scripture.
Abbe: Supposing it granted, do you think that no doctrine is fundamental which cannot be proved from Scripture?
You: Yes.

\textsuperscript{15} The retort was made by Froude to Newman during the argument about the Abbe Jager controversy. On July 17, 1835, Froude wrote up a supposed dialogue between the Abbe and Newman, in an attempt to show the latter how ridiculous his stand on fundamentals was. Newman found it difficult to follow Froude's argument and wrote: "Please keep this letter that I may think it over; and help me out of a puzzle I may have got into. I cannot help think you have perverted my meaning in turning a prima facie argument into a (supposed) conclusive one."
Abbe: Supposing I can show that the early Christians (say of the second and third centuries) regarded the doctrine of the Eucharist as fundamental, should you still say that it was not so, because it cannot be proved from Scripture?

You: No, in that case I should admit that it was fundamental; but you cannot show it.

Abbe: Then you admit your real reason for denying that this doctrine is fundamental is, not that it is not proved from Scripture, but that it was not held such by the early Christians.

Froude went on from here, in his discussion, to show that Newman's test of fundamentality was insufficient. Newman, however, although he admitted he was puzzled, told Froude that in the last point attributed to him in the argument, he would not have said, "No, in that case I should admit it was fundamental," but "If so, Tradition would not be what by nature it is."

Newman bolstered his argument on Scripture's being the ultimate source of faith in fundamentals by distinguishing between "Episcopal" or "Apostolical" Tradition on the one hand, and "Prophetic" Tradition on the other. By the latter he meant "the voice of the body of the Church, the received system in the Church, the spirit circulating through it and poured out through the cannels of its doctors and writers;"

In Tract 85, Newman elucidated: "Doubtless, Scripture contains all things necessary to be believed; but there may be things contained in it, which are not on the surface, and things which belong to the ritual and not to the belief. Points of faith may lie under the surface, points of observance need not be in Scripture at all." Works, XVIII, 166.

In a footnote added after Newman became a Catholic, he wrote of himself in the third person: "He was hampered by his belief in the Protestant tenet that all revealed doctrine is in Scripture, and, since he could not maintain that it was on the surface of the inspired Word, he was forced upon the (not untrue, but unpractical) theory of the implicit sense, history developing it." Works, XVIII, 141.
"the system taught, interpretative, supplementary, applicative illustration of the Scriptural doctrine." Newman maintained that this Tradition did not "carry with it any witness of its reception being necessary for Church Communion;" "it is clear that Scripture does absolutely declare belief in its doctrines necessary to salvation, but Prophetic Tradition does not say so of its own." "Scripture and Prophetic Tradition, taken per se, come to us in a different aspect, the one with a demand upon one's faith, the other not." Strict Tradition, or Episcopal Tradition, which Newman defined as the Tradition "from one hand to another, from definite person to definite person, official and exact," carries with it its own sanction, according to Newman, and is not at variance with Scripture. Although the Apostles Creed comes from strict Tradition, it is also in Scripture. 17

In his letter to Froude on August 23, 1835, Newman reaffirmed his position in relation to Tradition and Scripture:

The more I read of Athanasius, Theodoret, etc. the more I see that the ancients did make the Scriptures the basis of their belief. . . . I incline 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. . . . I am surprised more and more to see how entirely they fall into Hawkins's theory even in set words, that Scripture proves and the Church teaches. I believe it would be extremely difficult to show that tradition is ever considered by them (in matters of faith) more than interpretative of Scripture. 18

Again Froude was hesitant; he felt that Newman had narrowed the discussion too much by distinguishing Prophetic Tradition and Strict

17 Letter from Newman to Froude, July 20, 1835; Unpublished Letters, Reel 40.
18 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 113.
Tradition; then, too, he no longer saw what Newman wanted to prove:

Of course, if the Fathers maintain that "nothing not deducible from Scripture ought to be insisted upon as terms of Communion," I have nothing to say. But again, if you allow Tradition an interpretative authority, I cannot see what is gained. For surely the doctrines of the Priesthood and the Eucharist may be proved from Scripture interpreted by tradition; and if so, what is to hinder our insisting on them as terms of communion? I don't 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 Romans say that their whole system is an expansion of "the Holy Catholic Church and the Communion of Saints?" Also, what are the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds but expansions? Also, to which class of Tradition do you refer the Athanasian Creed? For I suppose you will admit that it carries in its form the assertion of its fundamentality. In short, why treat a subject of great perplexity and deep and general interest on a narrow and insufficient ground which may avail in one or two controversies with the Romans (supposing that you can prove what you think you can from the Fathers) but which in no way serves to meet the general question or to guide our practice? I cannot see what we owe to our Protestant predecessors that should make us so very anxious to screw a sense out of all their dogmata. 19

In his Via Media, Newman showed "what is to be the end of expansions," "how the line is to be drawn." He divided the Roman Catholic doctrine into three categories: in the first, Newman placed the Catho-

19 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter in Remains I.1.419-420. In regard to the Athanasian Creed, when Newman, in 1830, had told Froude that "there are parts of the Creed I would willingly see omitted, if it could be done silently, and could not defend if attacked," Froude asked him how he could entertain such sentiments as those which he ventured to utter.

If one notes in Letters and Correspondence, II, 114, the excerpt selected from the above passage, (the one enclosed in brackets here), one sees what an untrue picture is inadvertently depicted of Froude. The excerpt quoted in Letters and Correspondence gives the impression that Froude did not recognize developments when in reality he did.
lic teaching of the early Church; this, he affirmed, was the inde-
fectedible doctrine. It was the doctrine of Scripture interpreted by
Tradition, Tradition verified by Scripture. In the second category,
he placed the formal dogmas of Rome; some, he believed, were to be
accepted and some were not; those which were valid and were to be ac-
cepted conformed to the rule of Vincent of Lerins. Newman objected to
the doctrines of the later Councils, not because the doctrines were false,
but because the Roman Catholic Church enforced doctrines de fide which
they had not authority to declare. Many of these doctrines, according
to Newman, came from Prophetical Tradition. Whereas "Apostles rule
and preach, Prophets expound." Although in its very first origin, this
Prophetical Tradition was equally Apostolical and even at present, viewed
as a whole, claimed pious attention; yet, because of its vastness and
indefiniteness, this body of doctrine was exposed to corruption:

It may easily happen that this Prophetical Tradition has been
corrupted in its details, in spite of its general accuracy and its
agreement with Episcopal; and if so, there will be lesser points of
document as well as greater points, whatever be their number and
limit, from which a person may possibly dissent, as doubting their
Apostolical origin, without incurring any anathema or public cen-
sure. And this is supposed on the Anglo-Catholic theory actually to
be the case; that, though the Prophetical Tradition come from God,
and ought to have been religiously preserved, and was so in great
measure and for a long time, yet that no such especial means
were taken for its preservation as those which have secured to
us the Creed.20

Even after Froude worked with Newman for almost a month on the

Froude still confessed to Rogers about a month after Newman's departure: "I have been thinking over and over again Newman'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 the (I forget which) Article. No reason why the Apostles should have confined their oral teaching to comments on Scripture seems apparent, and why their oral teaching should have been more likely to be corrupted semper, ubique, et ab omnibus."

The third category of Roman Catholic doctrines, according to Newman, was popular beliefs and usages. These, he designated as "Popery," and

21 On September 10, 1835, Newman wrote to Froude: "I propose coming to you next week. Besides looking over sermons, I want to read you what I have written to the Abbe, and to get up the controversy between Bossuet and Wake, and to write an essay against Erskine, Chalmers, Knox, Blanco White, etc., on the subject of Objective Religion."

In August, when he first anticipated the trip, he had written to Froude: "I shall bring with me a lot of sermons to try to put together a third volume, and shall get you to help me."

On August 30, 1835, he had written to Rogers: "Perhaps it would be as well to go down to Froude, were it only to adjust my notions to his. Dear fellow, long as I have anticipated what I suppose must come, I feel quite raw and unprepared. I suppose one ought to get as much as one can from him, dum licet." Newman stayed with Froude until October 11.

22 The sixth Article reads: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

23 Newman added the footnote to this letter in the Remains: "It is not in form interpretative,--nor even in matter, except as regards Fundamentals" (Remains I.i.422-423).
"dominant errors." Even here, Froude was indulgent; he was willing to attribute many of the "errors" to pious practices which developed from the religious temper of the Church.

Froude had no conclusive idea, as far as can be ascertained, on the Rule of Faith before he died. As far as his personal belief was concerned, Froude knew what the "safest course" was; questioning what the Article meant by "doctrine necessary to salvation," Froude concluded: "No doctrine is necessary to salvation to those who have not rejected it wilfully; and every true doctrine is necessary to salvation to those who, if they reject it, must reject wilfully. . . . I think no doctrine necessary except under circumstances which will make every religious truth necessary, i.e. circumstances which would make its rejection an act of wilful sin."²⁴ Froude never stinted in his dealings with his fellowmen; above all, in his dealings with God. "He was a man who did nothing by halves," as Newman said of him in a footnote to his letter to Godfrey Faussett, who was incensed with Froude's views on the Holy Eucharist.

In the controversy over Scripture and Tradition, Froude never let Newman forget the importance of Tradition, per se. It is interesting to note that Newman, in his Apologia, wrote:

²⁴ Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection; parts of letter in Letters and Correspondence, II, 104-105 and Remains I.i.419.

In 1844, Newman wrote: "Thus I am in the condition that I must either believe all or none. And so it really is. I see no resting place for the sole of my foot between all and none." Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and others, p. 22.
He [Hurrell Froude] felt the scorn of the maxim, "The Bible
and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants"; and he gloried
in accepting tradition as a main instrument of religious teaching. 25

When Newman sent this section of his Apologia to Rogers, Froude's
close friend, for his approbation, Rogers questioned "Tradition... the
chief instrument." He said "I should not myself have put this quite so
strongly, but probably you know best." 26 It must have escaped his no-
tice that Newman said "a chief instrument" not "the chief" one. Froude
seemed willing to accept Tradition and the Bible. He avoided any dis-
cussion which favored "the Bible only" or ensuing discussions on funda-
mentals. Newman had a peculiar phrase about Froude in his Apologia
which one may scrutinize at this point:

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 ecu-
menical councils, or of the controversies out of which they arose.

This is a "hard" statement about his friend. Knowing Froude's
anxiety to get the works of the Fathers printed and distributed among
Tractarians, knowing his reliance upon the authority of the Fa-
thers--"Of course, if the Fathers maintain that 'nothing not deducible
from Scripture ought to be insisted upon as terms of Communion,' I
have nothing to say," and knowing Froude's love for Catholic doctrine,
one finds the above statement difficult to understand.

Could the answer lie in Froude's refusal to recognize the "funda-

26 Unpublished Letters, Reel 36, Personal Collection. (Letter is
dated April 19, 1868.)
mental" and "non-fundamental" distinctions Newman kept making; the latter saw also "Romish corruptions" which were in the present Roman Catholic Church and not in Antiquity. Newman looked upon these "corruptions" as additions or developments, and he did not recognize developments as possible in a static deposit of faith. Froude, in the meantime, was more concerned with the Medieval Church, his ideal. Unlike the Church of Antiquity, the Church of Hildebrand was a "developed" Church which was blossoming fruitfully. Doctrines concerning the Eucharist, Baptism, and the sacerdotal power were definite and clear, not a matter of discussion and differences among the Bishops and clergy as they were among the Fathers and early writers. Froude did not witness the difficulty Newman experienced in having to explain the "additions" he saw in the present-day Church. "Additions" or "developments" were not the obstacle nor the concern to Froude that they were to Newman. Could this be the meaning behind Newman's statement? It is difficult to see how Newman could say that Froude had no appreciation of development of doctrine when he himself did not recognize true development of doctrine while Froude was living. It was Froude, not Newman, who left the door open for true development of doctrine.

Although Froude and Keble introduced Newman to Catholic principles---"since I am conscious I have got all my best things from Keble and you, I feel only something of an awkward guilt when I am lauded for my discoveries"27---it was Froude who kept bringing these principles to bear

27 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 137-139.
upon the arguments and writings of Newman. Keble had withdraw into the background again, possibly because married life now claimed a portion of his time; more probably because he saw Newman and Froude moving farther from the circle of episcopal approbation. Froude, on the contrary, in his own desire for the truth, kept suggesting, denying, encouraging, and assisting Newman while he sought to unravel the strands of truth. In speaking of Froude's letters, Newman said to Keble: "There are so many clever things in those he sent to me, the first hints of principles which I and others have pursued and of which he ought to have the credit. Moreover, we have often said that the Movement, if anything comes of it, must be enthusiastic. Now then here is a man fitted above all others to enkindle enthusiasm." 28 Isaac Williams reported: "The person to whom Newman most deferred had been Froude, though younger than himself." 29

In spite of progressing illness, Froude entered into many of the cherished plans for the revitalization of religion. The monastic life, which Froude had always looked upon wistfully, still drew his attention. When Newman, in his "Letters on the Church of the Fathers" in the June issue of the British Magazine, 30 wrote on Saint Augustine, the founder

28 Unpublished Letters, Reel 45, Personal Collection. (Letter of July 16, 1837.)
29 Williams, Autobiography, p. 115.
30 British Magazine, VII (June 1835), 662-668.
of the Monastic system in Africa, he gave a long extract from Augustine's work on Holy Virginity. Newman expressed regrets that the Non-jurors had not kept up monastic life to oppose Hoadley and his group—pushed religious issues, and not political ones. He spoke of the Monastery as a refuge for Christian piety and holiness when secularism predominated. Newman was criticized; he told Froude: "Shuttleworth has pronounced there is an active Popish party in Oxford and has pointed to someone who has been praising Monachism in the British Magazine."  

Newman quickly asked advice: "I have, at present, some misgivings whether I have not been too bold in the June Magazine on the subject of Monachism. You saw it, and it is only my confidence in this unseen agitator which bears me up. I doubt whether I am not burdening my well-wishers with too heavy a load when I oblige them to take up and defend these opinions too."  

Froude's reply showed he had lost not the slightest degree of the bold, courageous, unselfish way of viewing things: "I cannot see the harm of losing influence with people when you can only retain it by sinking the points on which you differ with them. Surely that would be propter vitam vivendi, etc. What is the good of influence, except to influence people."  

---

31 Unpublished Letters, Reels 51 and 40; parts of letter in Letters and Correspondence, II, 98-99.  
32 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 100.  
33 Ibid., 104-105.
Although Froude had put aside his political wars on the Praemunire, he still waxed strong in his invectives against the Reformation. When Benjamin Harrison saw the attitude Newman was taking towards the Reformers and questioned it, Rogers suggested they send Harrison down to Froude to take lessons on the Reformers. Rogers himself had been an apt pupil; he spent quite a bit of time with Froude in January of 1836. Froude was delighted with him and spoke of him in superlative terms: "Rogers leaves on Thursday, having been the greatest of acquisitions in the age of everyone."

Newman had many projects in view for Froude, hoping against hope that he would be able to accomplish just a few more pieces of work. First, Froude had anticipated a visit to the United States while he was in Barbados, but he found it impossible. He had followed the ecclesiastical movement in the United States, and, although he felt that the accent was on preaching rather than on the sacramental life in the Church, he hoped to be able to accomplish some good in the young Church.

In 1835, December 9, Newman wrote to Hook. He spoke of the American Church, how it was ready to split into two divisions on Baptismal Regeneration. The Western part, according to Newman, took the Protestant view; the New York group, the Catholic view. Newman described the present Bishop as "ultra Protestant" and undesirable. He had a plan:

I have for some time thought that a greater service could not be done to the Church, than for two of those men who agree with us to go over to New York and make it their headquarters for several years. But where will you get men unemployed? One man, especially
fitted for that work, and year by year more so, is in that precarious state that we do not know what to expect, Froude.  

Newman also had hoped that either Keble or Froude would write a review of the life of Laud for the British Critic; "The review... should get into good hands. I know no one could do it but you and Froude," he wrote to Keble on February 2, 1836.  

There is evidence that Newman and Froude had another project in mind, but it is difficult to ascertain its exact nature; it concerned the novel. In June, 1835, Froude told Newman: "My ideas about the novel are but cloudy, as I have no books of reference to get details out of." At the end of the next months, Froude suggested that, if Newman came to Dartington, he "might get on with the controversy and be inspired for the novel." They may have reference to "Home Thoughts Abroad," which was initiated about this time, and to which reference is made later.  

Froude's view of the Tract situation was not as optimistic as that of a year previous to this time. He asked Newman to alter some of the tracts. Even some of Newman's own Tracts merited Froude's disapproval, especially a recent one on the Via Media; "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? I call it uncharitable to an excess. How mistaken we may ourselves be on many points that are only  

34 Unpublished Letters, Reel 120, Miscellaneous Letters.  

35 Unpublished Letters, Reel 45, Personal Collection; part of letter published in Letters and Correspondence, II, 146.
gradually opening on us! Surely we should reserve 'blasphemous' and 'impious' for denial of the articles of faith," he wrote to Newman on November 1, 1835 (Remains I.i.421). 36

During the summer of 1835, Newman told Froude: "The tracts are defunct, or in extremis. . . . I am not sorry, as I am tired of being editor." Newman, probably at Froude's prompting, asked Keble to be editor. Keble, in turn, suggested to Newman, "Why should not Pusey be editor?" It was left to Newman to continue.

Froude had not given up the Tracts entirely, even though he was less optimistic. In June, 1835, he told Newman he was sending a Tract, a "rather flowery" one, but he promised he would not be offended if it was rejected. Evidently, it was. The next month, he admitted: "I have myself put some thoughts on the stocks for Tracts, but I find myself so ignorant of the way to get at people, that I never know what to assume, what to prove" (Remains I.i.415-417). His lament was but an echo of one previously made, in January of the same year: "I am getting more and more to feel what you tell me about the impracticability of making sensible people enter into our Ecclesiastical views—and what is most discouraging I hardly see how to set about leading them towards us."

36 The Tract, in later publication, thanks to Froude, came to an abrupt stop after the statement: "In a few words then, before we separate, I will state some of my irreconcilable differences with Rome."

In Newman's last letter to Froude, he promised: "I will willingly alter all revilings." He kept his word.
If he lacked the ability to "enter into the minds of others," he was willing to admit this deficiency and use other means to enlighten people. Although he was ill, with less than three months to live, at a time when Newman confided to Rogers "it would seem as if he were kept alive by the uplifted hands of Moses, which is an encouragement to persevere," Froude requested Tracts which he could circulate. This means of continuing his apostolate was likewise fruitless: "You and Rose have used me very ill about the Oxford Tracts," he wrote to Newman on December 21, 1835; "When I came to unpack them I found I could make up none of the sets that I wanted to dispense, and heaps of some that I did not care two pence for."

Did Froude fare any better with the British Magazine than with the Tracts? His last article, as seen, was published in the British Critic, a periodical Newman edited from 1838 to 1841. Little snatches of conversation imply that Rose's conservatism was still incomprehensible to Froude. "I see Rose has jilted you again; he really is too bad," Froude told his friend. Newman, however, who frequently had to defend Froude's injudicious remarks, was more tolerant of Rose's refusal to take a bolder stand. He advised Froude:

37 In Rogers commentary on Newman's eulogy of Hurrell Froude in the Apologia, he remarked on the above passage: "It is true as you say he did not altogether enter into the minds of others. . . . But he had a very keen appreciation of others—even though commonplace people, and love for them—lofty and playful—interest in what they did and thought—a readiness to play with you at skating, math, and aesthetics, and yet always with occasional upward tendencies if you chose to understand his parable." Letter of Rogers to Newman on April 19, 1868. Unpublished Letters, Reel 36.
Rose has inquired most kindly after you and wishes to hear of or from you. It would be well to write to Rose; he has so much to do; depend upon it; he has forgotten all about it. At a fit opportunity, you may ask for them back. He has suspended my first part of No. 2 Home Thoughts till he has seen the rest. Certainly I think I should pause, were I he. 38

Newman himself, though, expressed the wish that "Rose were unshackled," especially in regard to "Home Thoughts" which Rose kept putting off from month to month until, in January, 1836, Newman contemplated taking the "Home Thoughts" out of the group of articles awaiting publication in the British Magazine and making it a Tract instead. 39

It seems as though, from Newman's comments to Froude, that Froude was acquainted with the first part of the "Home Thoughts" to be published, for Newman merely told Froude it was to be suspended until Rose saw the second part; he gave no description or explanation of the work, as he customarily did to Froude when he spoke of a new project. Froude did not, however, see the second part of "Home Thoughts." On September 10, 1835, Newman informed Froude: "If you saw my 'Home Thoughts' No. 2 (not that there is much in it), you would understand my line very completely. The great principle is this, that one cannot go across the country and make short cuts; you must go along the road." 40

38 Unpublished Letters, Reel 51 and 40; parts of letter in Letters and Correspondence, II, 98-99. Rose later wrote to Newman: "As I presume you will be about this time at Dartington and will have an opportunity to talk the matter over with Froude, I trouble you again about Church History. Remember me most kindly to Froude and say how glad I should be to hear from him officially or non-officially."

39 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 137-139.

40 Ibid., 121.
"Home Thoughts Abroad" made its appearance in the British Magazine, after almost a year's delay, in 1836; it was reprinted under the title, "How to Accomplish It." 

The article was written in the first person. Newman told of his experience in Rome, meeting an English acquaintance there, and getting into a discussion with him. In a note to the article, Newman explained: "The discussion in this Paper is carried on by two speculative Anglicans, who aim at giving vitality to their Church, the one by uniting it to the Roman See, the other by developing a nineteenth-century Anglo-Catholicism." He added: "The narrator sides on the whole with the latter of these."

The description of the former disputor, the "friend", fits Froude well—"pleasant, as rather engaging companion, and his talent no one could question"; "unsettled or at least very uncommon" in opinion; "ingenious"; "always entertaining, and could bear a set-down or a laugh easily, from the sweetness and amiableness of his nature"; "his theories lay in the different direction from those now in fashion, and

---


Christopher Dawson, in his appreciative evaluation of Froude, The Spirit of the Oxford Movement, placed great emphasis upon this article and believed the "friend" was Froude: "Whether Newman intended it or not, it is impossible not to recognize the views of Froude, and sometimes his very voice and personality, in the anonymous friend of the author who puts the case for Rome against Newman's ideal of the Anglican Via Media." Christopher Dawson, The Spirit of the Oxford Movement (New York, 1933), p.52.
were all based upon the principle of 'bigotry,' (as he, whether seriously or paradoxically, avowed)."

Newman said: "We were thrown together at Rome, as we had never been before; and, getting familiar with him, I began to have some insight into his meaning. I soon found him to be quite serious in his opinions. . . . Indeed, if the truth must be spoken, I believe, in some degree, he began to poison my mind with his extravagances."

Newman narrated the visit to the Prussian Minister's residence, and, upon leaving, how the two friends lingered at one of the windows overlooking Rome. The "friend" observed, recalling a previous conversation in which the author predicted and anticipated that Rome, as a city, was still destined to bear the manifestation of divine judgments: "If Rome itself, as you say, is not to last, why should the daughter who has severed herself from Rome? The amputated limb dies sooner than the wounded and enfeebled trunk which loses it."

The ensuing discussion is quoted in part under the two initials, "A" for Author and "F" for Friend. It summarizes and clarifies the attitude and arguments of Newman and Froude more succinctly and more forcefully than anyone, except the two men themselves, can do; it emphasizes the two stands taken—Newman, on truth; Froude, on unity:

F: "We, in England, are severed from the center of unity, and therefore no wonder our Church does not flourish. You may say to me, if you please, that the Church of Rome is corrupt. I know it; but what then? If (to use the common saying) there are remedies even worse than the disease they practice on, much more are the remedies conceivable which are only not as bad, or but a little better. To cut off a limb is anyhow a strange mode of saving it from the influence of some constitutional ailment. Indigestion may cause cramps in the extremities, yet we spare
our hands or feet, notwithstanding. I do not wish to press analogies; yet, surely there is such a religious fact as the existence of a great Catholic body, union with which is a Christian privilege and duty. Now, we English are separate from it."

A: "I will grant you thus much,—that the present is an unsatisfactory, miserable state of things; that there is a defect, an evil in existing circumstances, which we should pray and labour to remove; yet I can grant no more. The Church is founded on a doctrine—the gospel of Truth; it is a means to an end. Perish the Church Catholic itself, (though, blessed be the promise, this cannot be,) yet let it perish rather than the Truth should fail. Purity of faith is more precious to the Christian than unity itself. If Rome has erred grievously in doctrine (and in so thinking we are both of one mind), then is it a duty to separate even from Rome."

F: "You allow much more than most of us; yet even you, as it seems to me, have not a deep sense enough of the seriousness of our position. Recollect, at the Reformation we did that which is a sin, unless we prove it to be a duty. It was, and is, a very solemn protest. Would the seraph Abdiel have made his resistance a triumph and a boast,—spoken of the glorious stand he had made,—or made it a pleasant era in his history? Would he have gone on to praise himself, and say, 'Certainly, I am one among a thousand; all of them went wrong but I, and they are now in hell, but I am pure and uncorrupt, in consequence of my noble separation from those rebels'? Now, certainly, I have heard you glory in an event which at best was but an escape as by fire, an escape at a great risk and loss, and at the price of a melancholy separation."

(A. conceded)

F: "Do you recollect the notion entertained by the primitive Christians concerning Catholicity? The Church was, in their view, one vast body, founded by the Apostles, and spreading its branches out into all lands,—the channel through which the streams of grace flowed, the mystical vine through which that sap of life circulated, which was the possession of those and those only who were grafted on it. In this Church there can be no division. Pass the axe through it, and one part or the other is cut off from the Apostles. There cannot be two distinct bodies, each claiming descent from the original stem. Indeed, the very word Catholic witnesses to this. Two Apostolic bodies there may be without actual contradiction of terms; but there is necessarily but one body Catholic."
(The author here noted that his friend cited passages from Cyril and Augustine in illustration of his view, which, the author said: "I suspect he had picked up from some Romanist friend at the English College," meaning Wiseman, probably. The author cited these passages. The author let his friend continue and saved his own view for the end.)

F: "I am only contending for the fact that the communion of Rome constitutes the main body of the Church Catholic, and what we are split off from it, and in the condition of the Donatists; so that every word of Augustine’s argument to them, could be applied to us. This, I say, is a fact; and if it be a grave fact, to account for it by saying that they are corrupt is only bringing in a second grave fact. Two such serious facts—that we are separated from the great body of the Church, and that it is corrupt—should, one would think, make us serious; whereas, we behave as if they were plus and minus, and destroying each other. Or rather, we triumph in the Romanists being corrupt, and we deny they are the great body of Christians, unfairly merging their myriad of churches under the poor title of 'the Church of Rome;' as if unanimity destroyed the argument from numbers."

A: "Stay! not so fast! After all, they are but a part, though a large part, of the Christian world. Is the Greek communion to go for nothing, extending from St. Petersburg to Corinth and Antioch? or the Armenian churches? and the English communion which has branched off to India, Australia, the West Indies, the United States, Canada, and Nova Scotia? The true state of the case is this: the condition of the early Church, as Augustine and Cyril describe it, exists no more; it is to be found nowhere. You may apply, indeed, the terms which they used of it to the present time, and call the Romanists Catholics, as they claim to be; but this is a fiction and a theory, not the expression of a visible fact. . . . Where is the Catholic Bishop of Winchester or Lincoln? Where the Catholic Church in England as a visible institution? No more is it such in Scotland; not to go on to speak of parts of Germany or the new world. . . ."

F: "That is the point; they maintain that, such as they are, such they ever have been. They have been from the first 'the Catholics.' The schismatical Greeks, the Nestorians, the Monophysites, and the Protestants have grown up at different times, and on a novel doctrine or foundation."

A: "I was observing that the state of things is certainly altered since Augustine's time—that is, in matter of fact, divisions, cross divisions, and complicated disarrangements have taken
place in these latter centuries which were unknown in the
fifth; . . . another reason for caution in applying the
language of the Fathers concerning schism to our own times,
since they did not in their writings curiously separate the
Church's intrinsic and permanent authority as divine, from her
temporary office of bearing witness to the Apostolic doctrine
as to an historical fact."

F: "I must take time to think of this; meanwhile, you at least
grant me that the Latin communion is the main portion of
Christendom—that participation with it is especially our
natural position—and that our present separation from it is
a grievous calamity as such, and, under the circumstances,
nothing short of a solemn protest against corruptions in it,
of which we dare not partake."

A: "I grant it."

F: "And, in consequence, you discard, henceforth and forever, the
following phrases, and the like—'our glorious emancipation
from Rome,' 'the noble stand we made against a corrupt church,'
'our enlightened times,' 'the blind and formal Papists,' etc.,
etc."

A: "We shall see; we shall see."

"However, I still must hold that we have no right to judge of
others Jews at this day, as we should have judged of them,
had all of us lived a thousand years earlier. I do really
think, for instance, that in the presbyterianism of Scotland
we see a providential phenomenon, the growth of a secondary
system unknown to St. Austin—begun, indeed, not without sin,
but continued, as regards the man, ignorantly, and compatibly
with some portions of true faith; I cannot at once apply to
its upholders his language concerning schismatics."

F: "Well, perhaps I may grant you this, under explanations, if
you will grant that we, on our part, should deviate in practice
from primitive rules as little as we can help—only so much as
the sheer necessity of our circumstances obliges us."

(The author said: "I assented to him, and was glad to have
gained a clearer view on this point than I had ever obtained
before.")

F: "After all, there is no reason why the ancient unity of Chris-
tendom should not be revived among us, and Rome be again
ecclesiastical head of the whole Church."
A: "You will be much better employed, surely, in speculating upon the means of building up our existing English Church, the Church of Andrewes and Laud, Ken and Butler, than attempting what, even in your own judgment, is an inconsistency. Tell me, can you tolerate the practical idolatry, the virtual worship, of the Virgin and Saints, which is the offense of the Latin Church, and the degradation of moral truth and duty which follows from these?"

F: "These are corruptions of the Greek Church also."

A: "Which only shows that we are in the position of Abdiel—one against a many, to take your own comparison. However, this is nothing to the purpose. It is plain, to speak soberly and unpractically, we never can unite with Rome; for, even were we disposed to tolerate in its adherents what we could not allow in ourselves, they would not listen to our overtures for a moment, unless we began by agreeing to accept all the doctrinal decrees of Trent, and that about images in the number. No; surely, the one and only policy remaining for us to pursue is, not to look towards Rome, but to build up upon Laud's principles."

F: "Here you are theorizing, not I. What is the ground of Andrewes and Laud, Stillingfleet and the rest, but a theory which has never been realized? I grant that the position they take in argument is most admirable, nearer much than the Romanist's to that of primitive Church, and that they defend and develop their peculiar view most originally and satisfactorily; still, after all, it is a theory—a fine-drawn theory, which has never been owned by any body of churchmen, never witnessed in operation in any system. The question is not, how to draw it out, but how to do it. Laud's attempt was so unsuccessful as to prove he was working upon a mere theory. The actual English Church has never adopted it; in spite of the learning of her divines, she has ranked herself among the Protestants, and the doctrine of the Via Media has slept in libraries. Nay, not only is Anglicanism a theory; it represents, after all, but an imperfect system; it implies a return to that inchoate state, in which the Church existed before the era of Constantine. It is a substitution of infancy for manhood. Of course it took some time, after its first starting, to get the Ark of Religion into her due course, which was at first somewhat vacillating and indeterminate. The language of theology was confessedly unformed, and we at this day actually adopt the creeds and the canons of the fourth century; why not, then, the rites and customs also?"
A: "I suppose no follower of Laud would object to the rites and customs then received."

F: "Why, then, do we not pay to the See of Rome the deference shown by the Fathers and Councils of that age?"

A: "Rome is corrupt. When she reforms, it will be time enough to think about the share of honour and power belonging to her in the universal Church. At present, her prerogative is, at least, suspended, and that most justly."

F: "However, what I was showing was that the Anglican principle is scarcely fair, as fastening the Christian upon the very first age of the Gospel for evidence of all those necessary developments of the elements of Gospel truth, which could not be introduced throughout the Church except gradually. On the other hand, the Anglican system itself is not found complete in those early centuries; so that the principle is self-destructive."

A: "Now listen to me, for I have it in purpose to turn your own words against yourself, to show that you are the theorist, and I the man of practical sense; and at the same time to cheer you with the hope, that the Anglican principle, though the true one, yet may perchance be destined, even yet, in the designs of Providence, to be expanded and realized in us, the unworthy sons of the great Archbishop."

In the second part of "Home Thoughts," the author had his other friend, Basil, bolster the arguments for Anglicanism, or the Via Media. The first friend, presumably Froude, objected to their acceptance of the union of Church and State as it was found in England—an acceptance which the author and his second friend felt to be justified because they were "not allowed to disenthral themselves without an intimation of God's permission"; the first friend was happy, however, about one part of their plan: "I have been watching with some interest how near, with all your protestations against Popery, you would advance towards it in the course of your speculations. I am now happy to see you will go the full length of what you yourselves seem to admit is
considered one of its most remarkable characteristics--monachism."

Froude was not allotted the time for a complete refutation of Newman's sincere and well-thought-out arguments; he himself was uncertain in many areas. One area alone was devoid of any uncertainty--his desire for the truth.

Cardinal Wiseman, whom Froude may have visited shortly before his death, said of Froude:

The hope which an Ambrose expressed for a Valentinian, who died yet a Catechumen, we willingly will hold of him. His ardent desires were with the truth; his heart was not a stranger to its love. He was one, we firmly believe, whom no sordid views, or fear of men's tongues, would have deterred from avowing his full convictions, and embracing their consequences, had time and opportunity been vouchsafed him for a longer and closer search. He is another instance of that same mysterious Providence, which guided a Grotius and a Leibnitz to the threshold of truth, but allowed them not the time to step within it, into the hallowed precincts of God's visible Church."

By February 21, 1836, Newman penned a letter to Jemima and predicted that the time was fast approaching when he would "lose dear Froude," a loss which he estimated to her as "the greatest loss I could have. I shall be truly widowed."

---

42 Wiseman wrote to Newman on July 28, 1835: "Your kind offers, when I had the pleasure of seeing you in Rome, emboldened me to present to you my friend, the Reverend T. Maguire, who is desirous of visiting Oxford and whom I hope before long to follow on the same interesting errand." Reel 76. Newman recorded the visit of Father Maguire, but he said Dr. Wiseman did not come; he, however, sent messages to Newman and Froude. Thureau-Dangin, in The English Catholic Revival in the 19th Century, says, however, that Froude visited Wiseman, and the latter would not divulge what occurred, but Louise Imogene Guiney contests his remarks in Hurrell Froude, p. 179.

Archdeacon Froude kept in touch with Newman, sending messages from his son which Hurrell himself was too weak to write. On February 28, 1836, he wrote from Dartington: "My dear son died this day."

An old friend and pupil, Reverend Anthony Buller read the burial service on March 3,

"I have just had one of the greatest losses I can have in this world--the lost of my dear friend Froude," Newman told his friend S. L. Pope.

In like words, he informed his friend Bowden:

Yesterday morning brought me the news of Froude's death; and if I could collect my thoughts at this moment, I would say something to you about him, but I scarcely can. He has been so very dear to me, that it is an effort to reflect on my own thoughts about him. I can never have a greater loss, looking on for the whole of my life. ... 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. ... It is useless to go on to speak of him, yet it has pleased God to take him, in mercy to him, but by a very heavy visitation to all who were intimate with him. Yet everything was so bright and beautiful about him, that to think of him must always be a comfort.

Newman told Miss Gilberne:

As to dear Froude, I cannot speak of him consistently with my own deep feelings about him though they are all bright and pleasant. It is a loss such as I never can have again. I love to think and muse upon one who had the most angelic mind of any person I ever fell in with—the most unearthly, the most gifted. I have no painful thoughts in speaking of him though I cannot trust myself to speak of him to many but I feel the longer I live, the more I shall miss him. You will do me a most exceeding kindness in giving me your sketch of him.

44 Unpublished Letters, Reel 70, Personal Collection.
45 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 155.
46 Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection.
Froude was gone, but he was still to act as the "devil's advocate" for Newman, as his words would echo and re-echo as friend and foe quoted his daring passages published in his Remains. He was with Newman in another way, as Newman wrote to Manning in 1837, after the loss of both his friend and his mother, who died in the same year as Hurrell Froude did:

For those we love are not nearest to us when in the flesh, but they come into our very hearts as being spiritual beings, when they are removed from us. Alas, it is hard to persuade oneself of this, when we have the presence and are without experience of the absence of those we love; yet the absence is often more than the presence, even were this all, that our treasure being removed hence, leads us to think more of Heaven and less of earth. 47

Newman's words to Manning were but an explication of the lives of "David and Jonathan," a poem Newman wrote earlier and dedicated to Froude: "He bides with us who dies, / He is but lost who lives."

47 Unpublished Letters, Reel 81, Copied Letters.
CHAPTER IX

FROUDE: PUBLICATION OF HIS REMAINS

Although Hurrell Froude's death had been anticipated for a long time, it was still a shock to all his friends, especially his father, when it occurred. The latter had grown to be very intimate with his son, sharing many of his views and pursuing many of the same goals. He grew closer to his son, particularly during the last months when they spent so much time in each other's company. Moments before death, Hurrell listened to his father read the Liturgy and a sermon. Archdeacon Froude told Newman that he could never mention his son's name after death without an emotion which prevented him from talking about him; his only consolation was to listen to Froude's friends speak of the rare qualities and great gifts his son possessed. The death of Hurrell's sister, within a few months, caused additional grief.

Archdeacon Froude wrote to Newman frequently during this time, and Newman's Journal recorded a visit from William, Hurrell's brother, on March 6, 1836. William probably brought some of Hurrell's manuscripts with him, for Newman had received a letter from the father just a day previously, promising to send the papers with William. Not all were sent at this time, however; Henry Champernowne delivered some of Froude's work in October, and the father himself brought Keble's letters and his son's private journal the next year.
Shortly after his son's death, the Archdeacon told Newman: "With regard to dear Hurrell's worldly concerns, my desire is to realize every wish that I think he would himself have dictated. The sum devoted to the Tracts, you will of course consider as pledged to the furtherance of that or any other purpose of the sort, to which you will see fit to apply it."\(^1\)

Hurrell's father also invited Newman to accept a keepsake: "Will you, my dear Newman, select any things you please as a token of remembrance from your departed friend?"

Newman wanted Butler's *Analogy*, a book that had meant so much to both Froude and himself in formulating a basic philosophy, but it had already been chosen; instead, at the suggestion of an intimate friend, he selected Froude's Breviary, which the latter had been using habitually and with which Newman was not too familiar. In the *Apologia*, Newman said: "Accordingly I took it, studied it, wrote my tract from it, and have it on my table in constant use till this day." When Newman listed March, 1836, as the most critical month in his life and enumerated the cardinal points of importance connected with this month, he noted: "My knowing and using the Breviary."

In May of the same year, Newman asked Rose, "Why not claim the Breviary as ours?" Rose replied that he had no objection to the use of

\(^1\)Unpublished Letters, Reel 40, Personal Collection (letter of March 7, 1836).
the Breviary.  

The Tract on the Breviary was well under way by June 26, 1836. Newman told Christie: "As much as one hundred and fifty pages of the Breviary are coming out July 1. Were it not that dear Froude wished it, I should not have liked merely on my own judgment to print so much of the mere text of the Psalms and Bible; it seems like a frittering away of his legacy, but yet I trust it may tell."  

In January of the next year, Newman again wrote to Christie--this time in a different attitude of mind in regard to the publication of the Breviary: "The Tract on the Breviary, which I published not supposing it would answer, but because dear Froude wished it--which was a dear one, and published at a dead time of year--has in six months run out the whole edition. This is the most promising event that has happened since the Tracts began. Rivington says they have suddenly begun to sell, and is in haste getting reprints of some of them. He proposes to double all editions in the future; viz., to make them 1500."  

On March 2, 1844, Newman wrote to Keble: "Perhaps I ought to add,  

---

2Rose died in January, 1839. Newman wrote to Mrs. Rose at the time: "The recollection of the last seven years is full of sad yet soothing thoughts to me. How wonderfully things are carried on; each has his part in the great work. Mr. Rose was favored to begin, what he has not been given to finish. I associate him in memory with a dear and intimate friend, whom he knew and valued, and who in like manner had his part assigned him, did it, and was taken away."

3Unpublished Letters, Reel 37.

4Ibid.
though it will pain you, that for myself I have no difficulty in the Breviary in toto, though you are the first person to whom I say so."

Previously, Newman and his small group of disciples in their retreat at Littlemore, living a monastic life, used the Breviary daily, but they omitted some sections with invocations to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints.

When Pusey, with the approbation of Newman, revived religious community life, so dear to Froude, in England, he gave the Sisterhood he established a rule drawn from that of Saint Augustine, and a book of devotions taken from the Breviary. They recited the Little Office in common daily.

On the feast of the Annunciation, in 1836, Newman noted in his Journal that he "read one of dear Hurrell Froude's sermons (on his birthday) being the first not my own I ever read in my life."

Already at that time, he was making plans for the publication of "some useful documents of dear Froude's--one article on the Praemunire and his Hooker papers." He felt that Froude's death was a kind of

---

5 Newman, Correspondence with Keble, p. 306

6 Francis Cornish, The English Church, II, 67-87. "Newman and I have separately come to think it necessary to have some Soeurs de Charite in the Anglo-Catholic Church."

Out of these community establishments of Sisterhoods grew other practices--auricular confession, absolution, vows of celibacy, poverty, and obedience.

In November, 1838, Pusey was thinking about a college of young unmarried priests for a large town. By August 3, 1841, Newman told Pusey: "I have given up the notion of a monastic body at present, lest a talk should be made."
call to publish his works, but he also maintained fears about publication: "all parties but me are for the immediate publication." Keble, who for a long time had not been doing much writing, except on Hooker, was eager for the publication of the Remains:

I am sanguine that the first volume will take with the University men. I have transcribed the Private Thoughts and am deeply impressed with their attractive character. They are full of instruction and interest, as I think all will feel. I have transcribed them for your imprimatur. If you say "yes" and send them to me I propose to go to press almost immediately.

These Thoughts present a remarkable instance of the temptation to Rationalism, self-speculation, etc. 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 rather 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 the more original.7

Newman, like Keble, hoped the publication of the Remains would effect a good; he thought that by publishing Froude's letters and conversations plus the record of his most intimate thoughts he could show the spirit of a truly ascetical life. He wanted to illustrate how Froude's life of strict penance, a secret between God and himself, never dimmed the brightness of his exterior life nor diminished his playfulness and spirit of youthful exuberance.

Early in 1835, Newman had written to Pusey: "Gloom as connected with the monastic rule came in with the Goth ethos; certainly Saint Anthony is bright and cheerful, and Athanasius particularly insists upon this... Early asceticism had more of a striving after per-

7Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 211.
fection in it, than a penance." Newman must have been delighted to find evidence of rigorous penitential practices concealed beneath the effervescent light-heartedness of his friend Hurrell. He told Rogers that Froude had a delicate way of implying, not expressing, sacred thoughts. He added: "I have much to say on the danger which (I think) at present besets the Apostolical movement of getting Peculiar in externals, i.e. formal, manneristic, etc. Now, Froude disdained all show of religion. In losing him, we may have lost an important correction. I fear fasting, etc. may get obstentatious. His letters are a second-best preventive."  

By September, 1837, Archdeacon Froude added to the material already gathered for the first volume of the Remains. Newman expressed his delight with the papers "more interesting than any ever seen." Palmer must have been one of the men consulted at this time by the editors, Newman and Keble. Palmer felt that, although there were passages which he "should have been glad had they been omitted," he thought sensible people would recognize Froude's mind was one of uncommon candor, not fixed in principles yet.  

As the months drew near for a final draft of the Remains, Newman once more had misgivings about the publication. He wrote to Keble on August 27, 1837, much in Froude's manner when he used to attempt to clarify a position for Newman:  

I do wish you would seriously consider the objection which will be made to dear Hurrell's paper. I will put it as an

---

8 Unpublished Letters, Reel 70, Personal Collection.

9 Newman, Letters and Correspondence, II, 212.
objector might.

In those Papers there is much to interest and improve the reader, but the most instructive point of view is the light cast by them on a certain school of theology which is now rising. Here we see ten years ago, the workings of the minds which have since developed themselves. They are accused of Popery; they deny it. What do we see here? Here is a young man, deeply oppressed with the feeling of his own imperfections, coming to God for forgiveness yet not a hint is there in his most intimate thoughts that he recollected we had a Saviour. His name is not even mentioned; on the contrary, whom does he speak of? "the holy and great people" "the saints" "the righteous men whom he would imitate." He expresses his belief in the presence of spirits, of the departed and of Angels. How does he approach God? by fasting, austerities. We do not hesitate to say here is Dr. Pusey's system complete; and why so we notice it? to point out to the reader that it is founded on a practical neglect of our Saviour. We most fully believe the deceased writer to be entirely orthodox, to believe firmly the great doctrine of the Atonement, but there is no apprehension in him of that great truth, no practical adherence to it. Who can wonder that in his later papers he actually expresses his leaning to Popery, nay, his bitter hatred of our Reformers. Both then by what he omits and by what he maintains he shows us what is in the mind of such as Dr. Pusey.10

By the end of December, the manuscripts were compiled into two books, ready for the press. Newman predicted that they would give rise to much criticism. He stated that "unless I was pretty well used to it by this time, I should have enough to annoy me."

He was right.

The Remains supplied ammunition to the previous critics of the Tractarians by verifying their suspicions of "Popery" and "Conspiracy"; it also initiated doubts among the more earnest believers about whether Froude's arguments against Erastianism might not be valid and whether Froude's opposers might not be living proof of the lack of spirituality in the Church of England.

10 Unpublished Letters, Reel 45, Personal Collection.
The first two parts of the *Remains*, dated on the feast of the Purification in 1838, were prefaced by a brief biography of Froude. The editors met the anticipated charge of Romanism by advancing all the anti-Roman passages in the text and by defending Froude's "unshrinking openness." In spite of all the efforts of the editors, the *Remains* startled people.

To the majority of people who read the "Private Journal" in the first part of the *Remains*, an examen like "I broke my fast at tea. In the morning I held up vigorously enough, but having been made wretched by a cold walk, I was quite subdued," was little short of ridiculous. To others, the humble admission "In the evening I felt an impulse often to fish for admiration, by allusions to the Oriel election" was a painful insight into conscience matters.

The "Occasional Thoughts" in the same volume were a source of considerable concern, too, especially the reflection on celibacy. Even the "Sayings in Conversation" alarmed the moderate man of England who read them: "I cannot fancy a more magnificent position than Ken's... if he had boldly excommunicated all who acknowledged the state bishops." Here was evidence of a radical thinker, to be sure.

Froude's "Letters to Friends" were, however, the cause of most of the indictments. A bold report of a visit with a Roman Catholic cleric plus an avowal that he inquired upon terms of communion triggered off the flood of accusations of Romanism. The shocking revelation that he was a "less and less loyal son of the Reformation" and was "being pulled on in anti-Protestantism" multiplied the attacks not only on Froude but
also on his companions in the Oxford Movement.

Even those adherents of "the gentlemen tradition" who had never taken too much time to inquire into the doctrines of the Divines were antagonized by witnessing a fellow clergyman calling the English divines "twaddlers," and suggesting that it were better for one to have Orders from a Scotch bishop for "the stream is purer."

Every eye that had watched the Tracts being distributed and had surreptitiously searched for evidence to convict the Tractarians of a conspiracy was rewarded when the Remains were published. Not once, but repeatedly, the author of these Remains mentioned "a conspiracy." Feeling justified now for their private indictments, they hurriedly composed letters and essays in which they objected to the whole Movement and warned others of its insidiousness.

Although the Sermons, of which the second part of the first volume was largely composed, added little fuel to the fire already conflagrated; yet the essay on the "Antiquity of Existing Liturgies" was not without further evidence of Romanizing tendencies, especially because of the fact that it plainly proved that the English Reformers had not followed any of the original liturgies. Froude also boldly stated that in all the original liturgies "the Eucharist is regarded as a Mystery and a Sacrifice," obviously indicating the inadequacy of their own Liturgy.

So much criticism was engendered by the first volume of the Remains that Rivington declined to publish any more of it. In his Apologia, Newman judged that this work, "more perhaps than any other, caused
disturbance and annoyance in the Anglican world." Sadly, Newman ob-
served, "I declare, ever since Froude went, I have been in scrapes," and added to Keble, "No one has encouraged me but you."

Edward Churton was one of the most excited members of the group who wrote repeatedly to Keble and Newman. He wanted them to explain themselves—to state their agreements and disagreements with the re-
marks in Froude's Remains. "Your friends are perplexed, and some who were neuters have declared against you . . . . Indeed, I have not found one who defends that publication except Dr. Pusey." Churton concluded that "friendship for an extraordinary young man has misled you."

A certain A. Simpson, among many others, wrote to Newman in a vein similar to Churton's: "Can't something be done to erase the impression which the Remains have made—at least show where the editors agree and disagree." Like many other Oxford Movement sympathizers, he believed the Remains detrimental to the cause.

To many people, the Preface to each volume seemed merely a chal-
lenge to prove the conclusions of the editors wrong. Nearly all the newspapers and periodicals which commented on the Remains highpointed Froude's Roman Catholic tendencies. The Christian Observer noted that Dr. Spencer went over to Rome and "Mr. Froude was rapidly tending the same way, when his early death cut short his career. Like our Wakefield 'Sacerdos,' he seemed to think his discreeter Oxford Tract friends 'rather too much opposed to the Catholic Church of Rome,' and 'would willingly have made nearer approaches to her' than they 'appear desirous of doing'—a very modest phrase, as if indicating that the desire may
be in advance of the appearance."

If commentators did not emphasize Froude's sympathy toward the Roman Catholic Church, they at least emphasized his lack of zeal for the established Church of England. George A. Poole, "On the Present State of Parties in the Church of England," designated Froude's Remains as a work, "more than any other work," which gave form and substance to a certain spirit of criticism which he deprecated. "In Froude was embodied all that we have yet seen of the habit of looking upon the Church of England from without:--of taking or endeavoring to take a station upon Catholic tradition, or primitive antiquity, as if it were a habit of observation, and then looking down upon our Church."

Isaac Taylor, in "Ancient Christianity and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts," noted that one would gladly avoid making any allusion to a book so thoroughly disgraceful to its editors as the Remains. Nearly every book, magazine, and newspaper, did, however, allude to the Remains; it was even referred to in the House of Commons.

The avalanche of criticism which descended upon Newman from

---

11 Christian Observer, XLI (January 1841), 21.
14 Louise I. Guiney, Hurrell Froude, p. 210
friends and enemies, newspapers and reviews, religious leaders and political leaders, pulverized the Via Media, as far as most people were concerned. The Remains tended to divide people into two camps--conservatives and extremists, opposed to Froude's principles or defenders of them.

Newman was, of course, one of Froude's staunchest defenders against both groups. He found it difficult to conceive the cause of the severity of the criticism. Perhaps he did not realize that to people not intimately acquainted with Froude's personality--so brimful of eagerness and delight, the asceticism they read about seemed morbid; to people not charged with energy and dedicated to a search for Truth, Froude's intemperate charges seemed uncharitable; and to people unaccustomed to a diligent striving for perfection, especially for a pure motive for acting, Froude's self-depreciation seemed unmanly. Newman told a certain Mr. Hornby: "I feel hurt at your speaking of Mr. Froude as one about whose opinions you are comparatively indifferent and that you attach a very different value to his opinions and authority from what you attribute to mine. You would not say so if you had personally known one of the most fascinating as well as most gifted of minds."15

That was the difficulty--they had not personally known Froude; they could not ascertain his earnestness and sincerity in his extravagant expressions; they could not see the wholesomeness and naturalness upon which the supernatural built when they read of his denial of the

15 Unpublished Letters, Reel 121, Miscellaneous Letters.
legitimate pleasures of the world—all they could fathom was a personality devoid of love.

Dr. Godfrey Faussett, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, who preached a sermon at the University on the "Revival of Popery," made the Remains his target. This harangue on Froude's "offensive publication" drew some of Newman's most lengthy replies and defense.

Besides Newman, Perceval also went to Froude's defense: "I would request all, whether they approve or disapprove of publishing it Remains, whether they admire or condemn the theological opinions contained in it, to bear this in mind; namely, that those volumes contain the expression of the workings of a young and ardent mind, seeking after the truth with a singleness of purpose, and a noble disregard of all sublunary and temporary consequences, rarely to be met with." 16

Frederick Rogers had, however, one of the best vindications and appreciations of Froude. In an article in the British Critic, he attempted to clarify Froude's position. 17 He classified Froude as a member "not of the peculiar Church of England character, but of that cast which we are somewhat apt to depreciate, or to look upon as a romantic unreality." Rogers said: "Ours is the Church of Walton and Herbert, not of Athanasius and Ambrose. . . . Our fathers have bequeathed to us the appreciation of a kindly and a holy spirit; a spirit of affectionate unobtrusive meekness, of considerate friendliness, of calm cheerfulness."

16 Arthur Perceval, A Collection of Papers, p. 15.
17 British Critic, XXIII (January 1838), 200.
Rogers showed how a man who followed not only the precepts but the counsels, especially the one "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast and come follow me," was bound to be an anomaly among men who considered the highest goal merely "to be frank and amiable, to marry and bring up a family, to be neighbourly to his equals, and active in relieving want."

The one thing in the Remains, more than any other, which took the members of the Church of England by surprise, was Froude's avowed hatred for the Reformation. Many people, knowing Newman's responsibility for the publication of the Remains and his agreement, to a large extent, with its ideas, deluged him with criticism. What is most surprising is that Pusey, who supported and worked so energetically with Newman in spreading the idea of the Via Media, was not cognizant, in spite of all the criticism, that Newman shared Froude's ideas about the Reformers. He told Newman he had not read the Preface to the Remains. Newman gave him countless clues by which he could have discovered Newman's attitude. He told him on August 13, 1841: "It quite took me by surprise to find that you did not know my views about the Reformers." With almost Froudian bluntness, he concluded: "I fear I must express a persuasion that it requires no deep reading to dislike the Reformation."

The "tested-tried-and-true" followers of the Reformation decided in 1838 that the time had come to end the anti-Reformation attitude.

---

18 Henry Wilberforce told his brother amazedly: "He Froude seems to hate the Reformers." Ashwell, Life of Wilberforce, I, 113.
created by the *Remains*. Golightly and several of his friends initiated a program whereby a memorial was to be erected to the three "martyrs"--Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer. All members of the Church of England were asked to contribute.

Pusey at first was willing to do so, but, when the situation resolved itself into a question of the Fathers versus the Reformers, Pusey declined. Both Newman and Keble were gratified for the opportunity to manifest their belief that the Reformers were not the founders of the Church of England. They abstained from contributing to the memorial in any way. The gulf between Protestant elements and Catholic elements in the Church of England was further deepened by this action of Golightly and his party.

---


An Arnold memorial in 1842 and 1843 provided similar difficulties. On September 12, 1842, Newman told Keble:

"Certainly my own impression was, supposing the object of the Memorial to be confined to Arnold's merits in his school, that, if called on, I might join it; and therefore much more you. It strikes me that such as we may do things now, which we could not do ten years ago, because now we are so well-known that no one can mistake our meaning. I recollect Froude and I keeping off in 1832 from the meeting in Oxford about the Walter Scott Testimonial because it was taken up by the Liberals; but then our opinions were unknown, and to have joined it would have seemed adopting Liberal notions."

Newman went on to say he had not spoken against Arnold. "I believe the only controversial piece we have put out against him is Froude's Fragment."

Newman told Keble that Pusey embarrassed him by depending upon his subscription. "What is uncomfortable, he adds that if I subscribe, he certainly will."

During October, and even in January, 1843, Newman was still writing to Keble about the Arnold Memorial, to which Keble told him to abstain from subscribing.
Newman and Keble were undaunted by the avalanche of criticism; they published another volume, in two parts, of Froude's *Remains* the following year, 1839. Froude's essays and his work on Thomas a Becket comprised the volume.

Even though Froude had been dead for several years already, his clarion call to resist state interference again trumpeted; and the vivid contrast he depicted between what the relation of Church to State should be and what it was degenerating into, again focused a responsibility for both ecclesiastical and civil officials into the foreground. Froude clearly enunciated Christ's command—"Give to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."

On reverting to the primitive ages of Christianity it would appear, that the respective limits of Ecclesiastical and Civil authority were than determined on principles which afforded little scope for difference of opinion among Churchmen: indeed, that as long as the letter of the New Testament was considered of paramount authority on this subject, it was impossible for sincere persons ever to be at a loss, respecting the path of duty it marked out for them. Two rules had been laid down by our Lord and his Apostles for the guidance of the early Christians, so broad, and at the same time so easy of application, as to leave no room to doubt how far allegiance was due from them to their spiritual and temporal governors respectively; even when, as might sometimes be the case, the commands laid on them by each were directly at variance.

... From these two rules it appears, that the respective jurisdictions assigned in Scripture to the Church and State were such as to exclude all room for cavil. A question could never arise whether any given cause came more properly under the cognizance of the one or the other; as they were distinct from one another, not in respect of the causes of which each might take cognizance, but in respect of the sanctions by which their decisions might be upheld. The jurisdiction of the State extended to all causes and over all persons ecclesiastical as well as civil; the jurisdiction of the Church to all causes and over all persons civil as well as ecclesiastical. But the sanctions, by which these jurisdictions were respectively upheld, differed in kind and never could interfere. No Churchman could ever by any possibility be placed in circum-
stances such as to prevent his conforming to both the foregoing rules at one and the same time. It must always have been in his power at once to serve the Church and submit to the state, to obey and be persecuted (Remains II.i.12-14).

The Remains influenced the personal lives of men like Frederick Oakeley, William Ward, James Robert Hope-Scott, Frederick Faber, and William Lockhart. In general, it stirred many men toward a yearning for greater perfection. Above all, the Remains forced Church leaders to define their doctrines, particularly Anglicans. The latter, of necessity, had to defend Anglican doctrines from the extravagances of Froude's assertions—or they had to defend Froude's Catholic principles by showing their accordance with the basic doctrines of the Church of England. It caused men to think in terms of religious doctrine and practices.

Newman was one of the men most forced to define. From the outset of the Oxford Movement, Newman was striving patiently yet earnestly

20 Christopher Dawson, The Spirit of the Oxford Movement, pp. 120-126, devotes much space to a comparison between Ward and Froude. Ward saw the Remains, and he said, "From that time began my inclination to see Truth where I trust it is." Ward found in the Remains, according to Rogers, a good deal of his own Radicalism. Dawson shows how Ward's antagonism toward Arnold, and Oakeley's toward Jewel sprung from the influence of Froude.

21 Wilberforce wrote in his Diary in 1838: "Read some of Jeremy Taylor and Froude's Remains in Review. I shrink from the severe countenance of perfect devotion to God despicably. Lord, have pity on my miserable weakness; and yet Lord, while I so pray I am scarce sincere, for I fear being scourged into devotedness. Lord, give me a will for thee. I wish earnestly that I more wished to be as a flame of fire in Thy service, passionless for earth, and impassioned for Thee." A. R. Ashwell, The Life of the Right Reverend Samuel Wilberforce (London, 1880), I, 113.
to ferret out the Catholic basis of the Church of England. He never let Froude's feverish drive for a conclusion cause him to take any shortcuts. By the time of Froude's death, he was in a somewhat settled state; in his writings, particularly "Home Thoughts," he professed a solemn belief that he was obliged to stay in the Church of England because she, more than any other Church, had held to the teaching of the Apostles. No longer at that time did he hold the ultra-Protestant theory of the Pope being Anti-Christ, a theory which simplified the explanation for an estrangement from Rome; he allowed Rome her claims to be a Church, but with this allowance, Newman had the greater difficulty of justifying a separation from her.  

Newman held that, although the Roman Catholic Church could claim she was the successor of the Church of Antiquity and although she could claim many doctrines of the Church of the Apostles, yet she corrupted her doctrine by adding to the deposit of faith. Truth, according to Newman, was more important than unity; this fact justified separation.  

Newman held that the Church of England was complete in one bishopric; "it was essentially complete without Rome and naturally independent of it."  

According to Newman, the English Church was the Catholic Church in England in his day, or else there was no Catholic Church in England.

---

22 Newman, "The Catholicity of the Anglican Church," in Essays Critical and Historical, in Works, XX.

23 Newman, "Discourse on the Unity of the Church," in Essays Critical and Historical, in Works, XX.
There had been one there from the first; the sees remained; they were filled; the Catholic Church still existed. If it were schismatical, then there was no true branch of the Catholic Church in England. Did Cranmer single-handed destroy the work of Ages? This was a monstrous probability! Besides, according to Bellarmine, heresies took a name from their authors, as Donatists, Lutherans, Calvinists; the Church of England had no human title.

John Henry Newman was convinced he was part of the true Catholic Church. The more men criticized the Catholic principles and practices in the Remains, the more forcefully he felt called upon to defend them and define them. On the other hand, the more men doubted and wavered about the question whether it was safe to remain in the Church of England or whether it was not safer to go to Rome, the more Newman pointed out that the Church of England taught the true doctrine of the Apostles. Not only did she do that, she evaded the corruptions of Rome also.  

Criticism mounted. Newman continued to uphold Catholic doctrine. Many persons felt the incongruity between accepting and professing Catholic doctrine, and subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles. To

---

24 On July 29, 1840, Newman told Pusey: "Williams is stationary." A month later, he wrote: "How sick this makes one," when he learned Lockhart anticipated becoming a Roman Catholic. The following year Newman wrote: "Do not believe any absurd reports; they talk in the papers of successions from among us to Rome. Do not believe it. No one will go." By 1843, Newman felt he ought to give up St. Mary's. He told Keble of all the people going to Rome, and he felt responsible.
retain persons within the Church of England and yet grant them peace of conscience, Newman wrote Tract 90, in which he showed the "catholic sense" of the Articles. Contrary to traditional public opinion, Newman claimed the Articles were mere terms of comprehension, allowing divergent opinions, and not authoritative doctrine in themselves, just as Froude opined in his review of Blanco White. In the Tract, Newman further proved how the Articles did not pass judgment on the decrees of Trent, for the Council of Trent had not formulated decrees when the Articles were written. In main, Newman illustrated how the Church of England was Catholic in doctrine, not Protestant.

The criticism which attended upon the publication of the Remains was vastly enlarged in vehemence and extent; the Bishops declared against the interpretations of Newman; four tutors, representing four colleges, drew up a formal protest which, through the energetic activity of Geiky, brought the Heads of Houses to condemn Tract 90, in 1841.

In the same year, a friend of Arnold who had the same liberalizing tendencies as he had, inaugurated a plan whereby the Anglicans and Lutherans in the Holy Land would join together and form one branch of episcopal Protestantism. They were to get orders from the Church of England, yet subscribe to the Augsburg Confession.

Samuel Wilberforce, and even Pusey, approved of the move. Newman looked upon the movement as one of the blows that finally shattered his faith in the Church of England. The Church of England not only objected to his view of the Church of Rome and prohibited concurrence
with that Church; it even went to the other extreme and communicated with the Protestant Church.

In 1843, even conservative Pusey was punished: he was suspended for two years from preaching because of his teaching on the Holy Eucharist.

By this time, Newman realized that his work was of little value in the Church of England; people had gradually lost their confidence in him. He turned to Keble and asked advice. On May 14, 1843, Keble answered; he advised Newman to retain the English ministry, for a withdrawal would be perilous in bringing him closer to Rome. "The latter would indeed be a grievous event, considering that for what is wrong without our fault in the place where God's Providence has set us, we are not ourselves answerable; but we are for what may be wrong in the position we choose for ourselves." Keble concluded his Letter:

And now, my dearest Newman, I have one most earnest request to make of you, that you will not in the smallest degree depend on my advice or opinion in this matter, for you do not, you cannot . . . in every respect but true love (I believe) towards you. It frightens me to think how rashly and with how small preparation I have been dealing with these great matters of imaginations as to how my defects may have helped to unsettle people, and in particular to hinder you from finding peace. Yet do not suppose I would stop you from writing to me, if it is the least relief to you to do so. On the contrary, not to hear from you would be a sad loss. All I want is that you should put no sort of implicit faith in me, but take up with what I say when you see anything in it that is reasonable and right, not otherwise. I still cling to the hope you taught me to entertain, that, in the present distress, where the Succession and the Creeds are, there is the Covenant, even without visible inter-communion.25

---

25 Newman, Correspondence with Keble, p. 224.
By September of the same year, Newman "after much sorrowful lingering and hesitation" resigned his living of St. Mary's and retired to Littlemore for quiet contemplation and prayer. There he pondered the problem of the development of doctrine.

Even though Newman, by this time, saw the position of the Anglican Church comparable to that of the Monophysites and Donatists, against which "the whole world judges right," and even though the reception of Tract 90 by the bishops and clergy proved that the majority of the Church of England did not believe in a Catholic interpretation of the Articles, and even though Jerusalem bishopric affair gave evidence that the Church of England did not value sufficiently its Catholic basis, Newman still had doubts.

It was not until October 8, 1845, that Newman publicly pronounced his Credo to Father Dominic, the Passionist.

Three days after Newman's reception by Father Dominic, Keble wrote to him:

My dearest Newman, you have been a kind and helpful friend to me in a way in which scarce anyone else could have been; and you are so mixed up in my mind with old and dear sacred thoughts, that I cannot well bear to part with you, most unworthy as I know myself to be, yet I cannot go along with you. I must cling to the belief that we are not really parted. You have taught me so, and I scarce think you can unteach me. And having relieved my mind with this little word, I will only say God bless you and reward you a thousand fold all your help in every way to me unworthy and to so many others. May you have peace when you are gone, and help us in some way to get peace; but somehow I scarce think it will be in the way of controversy. And so, with somewhat of a feeling as if the Spring had been taken out of my year, I am always, yours affectionately and grateful. 26

26 Ibid., 386.
Newman’s answer came on November 14, 1845:

May the Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Spirit, return to you sevenfold, my dear Keble, all the good, of which you have been the instrument towards me, since I first knew you. To you I owe it, humanly speaking, that I am what and where I am. Others have helped me in various ways, but no one can I name but you, among those I ever knew, except one who is gone, who has had any part in setting my foot in that special direction which has led me to my present inestimable gain. Do not let me pain you, my dear Keble, by saying this. Let me not seem rude. Let it be your comfort, when you are troubled, to think that there is one who feels that he owes all to you, and who, though, alas, now cut off from you, is a faithful and assiduous friend unseen. 27

Newman entered the Roman Catholic Church; he acknowledged the influence of both Froude and Keble as important in directing his steps toward that Church. John Keble remained in the Church of England, one of its strong supporters and, with men like R. W. Church, emphatic contenders against the intervention of the State in matters spiritual. 28

And Froude—had he lived? In a beautiful tribute to him, Monsignor R. Knox said:

It is doubtful whether a man so exact in his loyalties, so retentive of his traditions as Newman could have found the courage (humanly speaking) to throw in his lot with the despised Catholic minority, if the influence of friends had not helped him.

27 Unpublished Letters, Reel 45, Personal Collection.

28 In 1850, George Gorham, having been refused a living by Bishop Philpotts because Gorham did not profess belief in Baptismal Regeneration, was vindicated by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, of which Archbishop Sumner, Archbishop Musgrave, and Bishop Blomfield, became advisers. The Court decided that the Articles gave enough latitude for an acceptance of Gorham’s interpretation.

The High Church members, especially Pusey, Keble, Church were alarmed. Keble wrote “Church Matters in 1850” and R. W. Church wrote “On the Relation between Church and State,” two papers which echo decidedly Froude’s papers on the Praemunire.

Men like Manning, and Hope-Scott, as a result of the outcome of the Gorham controversy, re-investigated the claims of the Anglican Church
And here, I think, the first credit belongs to one who never lived to become a Catholic, I mean Hurrell Froude. To me he is the most attractive figure, personally, in the whole Tractarian group; a man full of earnestness and devotion, yet with a sense of humour, not far removed from flippancy, well in advance of his time; a reckless counsellor, never shrinking from the logic of his own conclusions; eager, restless, optimistic, perhaps with the eagerness, the restlessness, the optimism of the consumptive; a born conspirator, possessed clearly, of a magnetic personal charm, something of a saint. It was he who forced Newman away from his old alliances, not by dominating this thought, but by showing him where his own thought led. If he had lived, I feel certain he would have become a Catholic; quite probably, he would have brought Newman with him, perhaps as early as 1841. 29

Whether Froude, who "followed the long course of controversy, with a large sympathy for those engaged in it, and a deep sense of the responsibilities of religious inquiry, and the sacredness of religious Truth," 30 would have followed Newman, preceded him, or remained with his friend Keble can only be a conjecture. "Faith is a gift of God."

"No man can come to Me, except the Father, who hath sent Me, draw him."

---


30 The words are taken from the tribute Newman paid to Hurrell in the dedication to the first volume of his Essays Critical and Historical.
CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

As attested by his writings and confirmed by those of both his friends and enemies, Richard Hurrell Froude was imbued with a vigorous religious zeal which was indispensable in the enkindlement of the Oxford Movement. This vibrant, pulsating determination to return the Church of England to a spiritual basis and free it from state interference, spurred leaders like Keble and Newman to plan with confidence a program of reform; at the same time, it shook the clergy out of their apathy to defend, if nothing else, their challenged position as "gentlemen."

Without Froude, the Oxford Movement is inconceivable, just as it is equally unimaginable without Newman or without Keble. Each man had his part to play in the movement, and each man made his own individual contribution. None could give to a spiritual movement what he himself lacked; therefore, it is of prime importance to realize that all three men were ardent Christians, possessed with great love for God which manifested itself in faith, a prayful and temperate life, and a sincere desire to retain spiritual values against onslaught of liberalism and utilitarianism.

John Keble was the heart of the Movement, in that he was the source from which Hurrell Froude drew the inspiration, the learning,
and the desire for truth and goodness which attracted Newman and cemented their friendship. Without Keble, Froude's high ideals, rich imagination, and unbounded enthusiasm would very probably never have been channeled into use in God's service. Without Keble, Froude's idealistic and generous nature would probably never have been made so intensely aware that God is the only Source at which one can be completely satiated. It required the wonderful example of a learned and dedicated man who was content to be a "humdrum" to inspire Froude with a similar zeal.

Keble needed Froude, too, for his work in the Apostolic cause. Although Froude, probably through Keble's example and tutoring, desired to be a "humdrum," yet his humility was coupled with a magnanimous spirit that yearned to do great things for God and the Church, without fear and with an utter disregard for self. Unlike Keble, Froude was not satisfied to live his own life in conformity with God's law; Froude felt the need to set the world on fire—to shake people out of their lethargy, to call upon all true Christians to unite and stand up and be counted, and to use the force of excommunication, if necessary, to form a dividing line between believers and unbelievers and thus coral the middle groups by making them face facts. Froude vitalized the principles Keble instilled within him—in his own life and in his teachings. Unmindful of criticism, accusations, personal inconvenience, Froude forcefully brought these principles to bear upon the issues of the day, regardless of the consequences. His apostolic zeal made him the expounder and developer of these lofty principles which
Keble's reticent nature propagated, prior to the Oxford Movement, only among his close friends and in the mild maxims of his poetry. Whereas Keble imbued these doctrines of the Non-jurors from his parents in youth and was accustomed to see the average churchmen of his day indifferent toward these teachings, Froude's life underwent a slow change as his religious life developed under Keble. Immediately, he had to defend these religious ideas and dogmas against the Oriel "Noetics." In this way, they were strengthened. With the courage of his convictions, Froude was ready to dictate even to the clergy. Silence, according to Froude, was compromise; and Froude would never compromise on principles.

Newman was the head and voice of the Movement. Without Newman, Froude's excited, often alarming, condemnations as well as his lofty ascetical program of spiritual revivification would have been relegated to the quarters allotted to the plans of most visionaries in an age which is dedicated to materialism. Froude's ardent, impetuous enunciations, so responsive to the promptings of grace, would not have been heeded within the confines of the gentlemanly tradition of the Church of England had not a man who was respected for his maturity, prudence, and learning voiced them as part of his own convictions. Newman, whose mind was attuned to that of Froude's through a basic attitude of faith and humility common to both men, assimilated, digested, and developed systematically Froude's thoughts that jostled and pushed so furiously in their demand to secure truth. Without Keble, Froude perhaps would never have felt the urgency to dedicate himself wholeheartedly to God; without Newman, many others would probably never have experienced the
rationality of belief which Froude was so eager for them to realize.

Newman repeatedly acknowledged his indebtedness to Froude. It was Froude who, through diligent research, gave the lie to the legend that the Church of England underwent a spiritual reformation in the sixteenth century; he blazed the trail, by his Becket articles, for the re-establishment of the Church of England on a firm and apostolic basis. It was through Froude that an affirmative plan of reform was initiated—the use of the Breviary, the practice of celibacy and monastic austerity, a renewal of emphasis on the doctrine of the Eucharist. It was Froude who curbed Newman's prejudices toward Rome and led him to two great essentials of the Roman Catholic Church—the doctrine of transubstantiation and the devotion to Mary. In this regard, Christopher Dawson stated:

It may well be doubted if Newman would ever have freed himself from the deep-seated influence of these ideas prejudices against Rome if it had not been for the constant pressure of Froude's objections and criticism. He could not dismiss the ideas of his beloved Froude with the moral indignation or the intellectual contempt with which he would have treated them if they had come from a stranger. And so the barbed darts of Froude's paradoxes and questionings penetrated the surface of his consciousness and prevented him from resting secure, like other men, in the shelter of his inherited prejudices, even when Froude's living voice was silenced by death.¹

Without Froude's bold directives and critical attacks, which emerged from an obvious sincerity and love, Newman's early diffidence would probably never have blossomed into the vigorous faith he later affirmed and practiced.

¹Dawson, Spirit of the Oxford Movement, p. 144.
Above all, it was Froude who never allowed Newman, or Keble, to remain complacent in the half-truths they discovered, but, as a devil's advocate, darted questions and drew conclusions which continually upset his friends' peace of mind and prodded them on to the ultimate conclusion of their arguments, conclusions for which time was not allowed him in his brief thirty-three years.

Newman needed Keble in the Oxford Movement. Together they commanded the respect, trust, and admiration of the people who did not agree with them as well as the enthusiastic support of their followers. It was Froude who brought Keble and Newman to this close spiritual rejuvenation. Froude said that he, like the murderer who did one good deed before he died, introduced Newman and Keble. The influence of Keble and Froude together was often brought to bear upon Newman efficaciously, especially at the time when Newman was considering the idea of giving up the Tracts. At other times, Newman showed that he was a man of great practicality who would not be influenced in spite of the urgings, demands, and noble stand of his friends; he proved his tenacity in his own convictions when he withstood Froude and Keble on the Praemunire question, for which Newman thought the time was not ripe, even though he was as much opposed to the Erastianism of his day as were his two friends.

While Keble was the heart of the movement and Newman the head and voice, Froude was everywhere the spirit of the movement, as Christopher Dawson so aptly characterizes him. Newman and Keble both looked for his imprimatur; he stamped every article and program with his spirit—
unflinching, uncompromising demand for a vital Catholic view of life. He urged, contested, criticized, encouraged--and he certainly must have prayed for the apostolic Church. He was the "poker" of the Oxford Movement, as he termed himself. No member of the Movement labored with more ardor to attain the truth than Froude did, and no member of the Movement was closer to the truth at the time of Froude's premature death than he himself. One can without difficulty assert that, without Froude, Newman's *Via Media* would not have so speedily become a *Via Ultima*.

The High Church of England in the first quarter of the nineteenth century is characterized by its complacency, its gentlemenly tradition, its Erastian tendencies, its pride and security in its Protestant basis; by the middle of the century, its complacency is shattered. Clergymen are held to the ministrations of their office and the State cannot unopposedly infringe upon the rights of the Church. Surely, it is quite apparent that the Oxford Movement has been effective within the Church of England itself as well as it has helped to swell the Roman Catholic fold. If one visits the Anglo-Catholic Church today, one witnesses the influence of the Oxford Movement--its great outward similarity to the Roman Catholic Church in its altar, sanctuary lamp, communion rail, baptismal font, confessional and confession formula, and vested clergy. Catholic doctrines and ideas, especially the Sacramental life, are more frequently emphasized than Protestant teachings. Many times in the twentieth century, when Catholic doctrines taught in the Anglican Church are challenged and denied by fellow Anglicans, the result has been conversions to Roman Catholicism. In the face of the fact that
the Anglican High Church has drawn nearer to Catholicism and has placed little emphasis on the Reformers as founders of their Church, for which Froude certainly can claim some credit; in view of the fact that Newman confirmed his indebtedness to Froude for many of the principles and doctrines which he came to hold and to propagate; in view of the fact that the Oxford Movement effected beneficial changes in both the Anglican and Roman Catholic Church, and that Froude was an indispensable factor in that Movement—it is difficult to agree with the most recent article written on Hurrell Froude in a learned journal in which the author sums up Froude's life metaphorically as follows:

The glow faded too soon, and the brilliance vanished into oblivion, a lightning flash which left nothing of itself behind, except, in the minds of those who chanced to see it, a memory of swift brightness.  

Froude is characterized in terms of light more than in any other way because of his vitality, enthusiasm, and impressiveness; but his light was not that of a flare nor a lightning flash. It was that only in so far as Froude personally was concerned; in that way, he achieved

---

2"The Third Man," The Times Literary Supplement (April 15, 1960), i. Only a superficial study of Froude would include remarks like the following: "Froude is a man in love with the idea of religion; he does not burn with the love of God. We do not know if in the end the one thing led to the other, for the last entry in the Journal is dated 1828." "Somewhere in his nature was a streak of cruelty which showed itself in his really brutal treatment of the little brother who adored him, and again in his callous attitude towards the West Indian 'niggers.'" "Imagination pictures him up at Oxford to-day driving the fastest and most dangerous type of sports car." "Who but Hurrell Froude would have regarded fox-hunting as an opportunity for self-denial?"
his desire to be a "humdrum." As far as the fruits of his work and prayer are concerned, Richard Hurrell Froude is more aptly compared to the "star flashing across the deep night sky, but leaving behind it a fiery cicatrice that never fades."\(^3\)

It is my hope that this dissertation has given evidence not only of the fact that a comparison of Froude to light and brightness is apt in that Froude was a vibrant personality who enkindled the sparks of life in those with whom he came in contact; but also of the fact that the comparison must bear reference to the unfading aura which the light created, for the principles Froude discovered and promulgated lived and fructified after his death in those men in whose minds he instilled the principles and in the pages of his writings where even today man draws inspiration.

\(^3\) Bouyer, *Newman*, p. 127
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