In what different ways did the Tractarians respond to their political context on the question of the relationship between Church and State?

Introduction.

The term 'Tractarian' first emerged to refer to the Anglican clergymen who contributed to the ninety tracts in the *Tracts for the Times*, published between 1833 and 1841. The earlier, self-chosen name, 'Apostolicals', reveals much of their shared purpose. As John Henry Newman, who wrote twenty-four of these tracts, summarised in *Tract 1*, "I fear we have neglected our real grounds on which our authority is built – OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT."[1] It is for this reminder that the movement is so often remembered for precipitating the spiritual revival of the Anglican Church. Richard Hurrell Froude, ever the scathing rhetorician and dissentient student of John Keble at Oriel College, wrote to Newman in 1835 that the Church was "under the blighting influence of the Upas tree."[2] Referring to the myth of the poisonous Upas tree, for Froude, as with Keble and Newman, the Anglican Church had fallen asleep under it and forgotten its Catholic and Apostolic nature.

The first section of this essay will consider the 'poison' that Froude refers to. That is, the perceived threat of the context in which the Church found itself in 1828-1832. A number of significant political changes occurred in this period including the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts (1828), Catholic Emancipation (1829), the Irish Church Bill (1832), and the rise of anticlericalism and dissenterism (the view that the Church and State must separate). By referring to the private letters, published works, and sermons of these three Tractarians, I will argue that they formed an engaged critique of their contemporary politics and had a shared conception of the forces they were fighting against: Erastianism, Latitudinarianism, and the liberal and rational spirit of the enlightenment.

The argument that the Tractarians were responding to their political context is itself an objectionable view to many scholars. Not only did early historical accounts like Richard Church's *The Oxford Movement* (1891) neglect the political dimensions of the movement, focussing instead on its theological and ecclesiological legacy, but the historiography on the Tractarians that followed is primarily dominated by the view that its members were solely academic, abstract, and apolitical. For Nigel Yates, the operation of the Tractarians was "exclusively academic"[3]; for John Reed, "confined

[1] John Henry Newman, "Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission", *Tracts for the Times* (London: J. H. Parker, 1840), 1:2.
[2] Richard Hurrell Froude, *Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude* (London: Gilbert & Rivington, 1839), 1:405.
[3] Nigel Yates, *The Oxford Movement and Anglican Ritualism* (London: Historical Association, 1983), 15.

to the Oxford Common rooms"[4], and Desmond Bowen argued that "the early Tractarians showed little or no interest in secular affairs."[5] Throughout this essay, I will seek to redress this view. Indeed, this argument contradicts Newman's own characterisation of the movement in 1833:

> Strictly speaking, the Christian Church, as being a visible society, is necessarily a political power or party … since there is a popular misconception, that Christians, and especially the clergy, as such, have no concern in temporal affairs, it is expedient to take every opportunity of formally denying the position … In truth, the Church was framed for the express purpose of interfering, or, (as irreligious men will say) meddling with the world.[6]

In agreement with Simon Skinner's more recent book on the social thought of the Tractarians, this essay will take every opportunity to deny the position that the Tractarians had little interest in political questions. Newman insisted in *Tract 1* that abstinence from "worldly politics" was "impossible in troublous times" and that "to remain neuter much longer will be itself to take a part."[7] The political changes that had occurred were, for these three Tractarians, nothing short of revolution[8] and a direct attack on the Church. As Froude howled at his readers of the *British Magazine* in 1833, "open your eyes to the fearful change which has so noiselessly effected; and acknowledge that BY STANDING STILL YOU BECOME A PARTY TO REVOLUTION."[9]

However, despite a shared view that the Church was under attack and its Apostolic authority forgotten, Keble, Froude, and Newman varied significantly in their responses and on the question of what the relationship between the Church and State should now be. While after Froude's death in 1836 and Newman's conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1845, the movement rallied under Keble's defence of establishment and Royal Supremacy, I agree with Josef Altholz's suggestion that the appropriate methodology is to "get rid of all hindsight"[10] and allow their arguments to speak for themselves. I propose that a number of historians, including Skinner and Harold Laski, have overlooked the variation between their views and the change and uncertainty within their arguments in what is often characterised as the first stage of the movement (1833-1845). It is this variation that I will consider in the second section of this essay, seeking to demonstrate that there is little evidence that the early Tractarians shared a theological ideal for the relationship between Church and State.

---

[4] John Shelton Reed, *Glorious Battle: The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996), 15.
[5] Desmond Bowen, *The Idea of the Victorian Church: A Study of the Church of England, 1833-1889* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1968), 142.
[6] John Henry Newman, *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, 4th ed. (London: Pickering, 1876), 257-258.
[7] Newman, *Tracts*, 1:4.
[8] Froude, *Remains*, 3:192.
[9] Richard Hurrell Froude, "Conservative Principles", *British Magazine* 4 (July 1833): 54.
[10] Josef Altholz, "The Tractarian Moment: The Incidental Origins of the Oxford Movement", *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 26, no. 2 (1994), 274.

Section 1 – Political Context

i) Political Changes 1828-32.

Whatever the self-perceptions or aims of Keble, Froude, and Newman, the origins of their movement were undeniably political; they were responding to immediate political changes that they saw as threatening the spiritual independence of the Church. The period of 1828-32 saw several radical acts pass. The first of these was the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, which admitted Protestant Dissenters, and later, Roman Catholics (1829) to Parliament. In one stroke, these acts undermined the delicate balance of the Elizabethan Settlement which had defined the relationship between the Anglican Church and the State. In Richard Hooker's defence of the settlement in *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1594), which Keble saw a "providential gift to the Church"[11], he argued that, on the terms of the settlement, Parliament must function as a "Lay Synod" whereby "there is not any man of the Church of England, but the same man is also a member of the commonwealth (the State), nor any man a member of the commonwealth who is not also of the Church of England … but the selfsame people … under one Chief Governor [God]."[12] It was on these terms that Parliament was permitted to interfere with the Church. As Froude summarised, the changes of 1828-9 meant that "it does appear that according to Hooker, our *civil* legislature is no longer qualified, as it formerly was, to be our *ecclesiastical* legislature; the *conditions* on which the Parliament has been allowed to interfere in matters spiritual are *cancelled.*"[13] For Newman, the "time-honoured instrument" of the Church-State relationship was broken.[14] Hooker's model had been overturned, and as Keble lamented in the *British Critic*, this rendered Parliament "a body of laymen, any number of whom may be heretics."[15] Not only does their direct engagement attest to the political origins of the movement, but, as Nockles notes, it was in opposition to the Prime Minister Robert Peel's support of Catholic Emancipation that they first gathered together in Oxford.[16]

Tensions heightened further after the passing of the Irish Church Temporalities Act (1832), often seen by historians as the direct trigger for Keble's 'Apostasy Sermon' and the *Tracts.* Here, under Lord Grey's Whig government (1830-34), radical reforms were introduced including the parliamentary suppression of two archbishropics and eight bishropics, and a number of economic reforms: the revenue of the two wealthiest sees, Derry, and Armagh, were drastically reduced, church

[11] Richard Hooker, *Selections from the Fifth Book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, ed. John Keble (Oxford: J. H. Parker,1839), xv.
[12] Richard Hooker, *The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine: Mr. Richard Hooker*, ed. John Keble (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1836), 3:340.
[13] Froude, *Remains*, 3:207.
[14] John Griffin, "Radical Phase of the Oxford Movement", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27, no. 1, (1976): 47.
[15] John Keble, *The State in its Relations with the Church: A Paper Reprinted from the "British Critic," October 1839* (Oxford: James Parker, 1869), 42.
[16] Peter Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 69.

cess abolished, and the first-fruits payments removed and replaced with raised income tax.[17] Further, the 'Ecclesiastical Commission' was set up to manage this acquired money, the purpose of which "parliament shall hereafter decide" (clause 147). Many historians have argued that Keble's sermon, 'National Apostasy', directly responded to these interferences. While there is no direct reference to the Irish Church Act, there is little doubt of the context he is criticising, particularly in its 'Advertisement': "how may they continue their communion with the Church *established* … without any taint of those Erastian principles on which she is now avowedly to be governed?"[18] The Church had become a mere slave of a civil legislature that no longer conformed to Hooker's model. Keble summarised the significance of the changes that had taken place, describing the current conditions of the Church by 1833 as subject to the "profane intrusion" and "tyranny"[19] of an "infidel government"[20].

ii) Erastianism, Liberalism, and the Decline of Dogma.

Many historians, including Desmond Bowen[21] and T. L. Harris[22], argued that the Tractarians responded specifically to the threat of Erastianism, that is, the meddling of the State in Church affairs. Indeed, there is much evidence to support this. Not only does Newman argue that "the *Tracts for the Times* were founded on a deadly antagonism to… Erastianism"[23], but Keble's 'Apostasy' sermon, often considered the starting point of the movement, implicitly critiqued the Irish Church Act, and Froude's *Tract 59* directly addressed the infringements of State interference. All three Tractarians were continuously refuting Erastianism and its proponents. William Paley had argued that "there is nothing in the nature of religion as such which exempts it from the authority of the legislation when the safety or welfare of the community requires his interposition"[24], and William Warburton that the Church abandons its independence in accepting the protection of the State.[25] Keble anathematised both Paley[26] and Warburton[27] in successive articles in the *Critic.* Further, Bishop Hoadly's crudely Erastian argument that the Church has no moral authority and thus must submit itself under the

---

[17] Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, pt. 1 (London: A. & C. Black, 1966), 56-7.
[18] John Keble, *Sermons, Academical and Occasional*, 2nd ed (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1848), 128.
[19] Keble, 128.
[20] John Henry Newman, *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, *Vol. 2-8: The Oxford Movement: 1827-1842,* ed. Ian Ker, Thomas Gornall, and Gerard Tracey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 4:23; hereafter *L&D.*
[21] Bowen, *Victorian*, 44.
[22] T. L Harris, "The Conception of Authority in the Oxford Movement", *Church History* 3, no. 2 (June 1934), 119.
[23] Griffin, *Oxford,* 28.
[24] William Paley, *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy* (London: Edinburgh, 1811) 2:325
[25] William Warburton, *The Alliance Between Church and State,* 4th ed (London: Printed for A. Millar, 1766), 47: "the Church's exercise of its power can never possibly clash with the State".
[26] Keble, *State*, 7.
[27] John Keble, "Papers of Bishop Warburton", *British Critic* 29 (December 1841): 411-440.

auspices of the State[28] was, for Newman, a "denial of the Church" and a "heresy"[29], and for Froude, a Whig conspiracy[30]. In summary, it was the rise of Erastianism in the Hanoverian period that the Tractarians so vehemently opposed, and the blatancy of State interference in 1832 that triggered their reaction. Opposition to Erastianism was a central concern of the movement and goes far to undermine the view that the Tractarians were abstract and apolitical.

However, viewing Erastianism as an isolated problem for these three Tractarians would be misleading. Instead, it is often presented alongside a more general critique of modernity. When Newman recounted the origins of the movement in his *Apologia pro vita sua*, he argued that the first principle of his "battle" was not with Erastianism but "with liberalism", which he defines the "anti-dogmatic principle"[31], that is, the replacement of faith and tradition with reason. In Newman's *Apologia*, we find a sustained aversion to what he called this "false liberty of thought"[32] that "virtue is the child of knowledge, and vice of ignorance."[33] For Newman, the view that virtuous action came from knowledge alone, or that political action should be determined solely by reason was a profound arrogance. Newman characterised rationalism as "the mistake of subjecting to *human judgement* those revealed doctrines which are in a nature beyond and independent of it."[34] Thus, it was not just the meddling of the State in Church matters that Newman objected to but that the State had procured a new "Chief governor" of reason. That ecclesiastical matters were governed by these principles and not by faith and tradition (as in Hooker's model of the Lay Synod) was anathema. To view Newman's main concern with modern politics as an objection to Erastianism is to ignore the essential for the superficial. Erastianism was but a symptom of the disease of enlightenment rationality and liberalism that had entered politics; it was the empirical arrogance *behind* Erastianism that Newman opposed.

Similarly, Keble argued that modern politics had lost its spiritual and moral temper. Coupled with his Hookerian view that both the Church and State should exist "under one Chief governor", he criticised the "inveterate political sectarianism" of the "political man"[35] who relied solely on reason. For Keble, Erastianism was not a sui generis problem, but rather the subjection of the Church to a "*liberalistic* … tyranny."[36] As he explains in 1833, the task of the movement was to "[strengthen] the hand of the Catholic Apostolic Church at a moment when the Rationalisation powers … fancy

---

[28] Benjamin Hoadly, "The Nature of the Kingdom", in *Sixteen Sermons* (London: John and Paul Knapton, 1754). Hoadly criticised the Church's claim to "erect Tribunals over the Consciences of Men" arguing that Christ alone is the "sole Law-giver to his Subjects … in the Affairs of Conscience and Eternal Salvation" (14, 11).
[29] *L&D,* 7:38.
[30] *L&D,* 4:215.
[31] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931), 150
[32] Newman, *Apologia*, 493.
[33] Newman, 501.
[34] Newman, *Apologia*, 493.
[35] Keble, *State,* 13.
[36] Griffin, *Oxford*, 7.

themselves more than usually triumphant."[37] Further, Froude bid his "Farewell to Toryism" because of the "proud empirics" in politics that "doom the noblest things to premature decay."[38] Froude called this empiricism "Whiggery", something he describes as a disease that "has by degrees taken up all the filth that has been secreted in the fermentation of human thought!"[39] For Froude, the rise the "proud empirics" was not an isolated contemporary problem but spread from "the Reformation and the Reformers … and the rationalist spirit they set afloat in the *ψευδοπροφήτης* [false prophet] of the Revelations.[40] Even if Froude is unique in his contempt for the Protestant Reformation, it is rationalism, rearing its head as "Whiggery" that he sees as the contagion of the modern world.

Therefore, these three Tractarians had a shared idea of the worldly forces they were fighting against. Newman's "liberalism", Keble's "inveterate political sectarianism", and Froude's "Whiggery" function as somewhat interchangeable terms. All three Tractarians rejected Kant's indictment, "Sapere Aude! [dare to know"], and the perceived arrogance of his motto that characterised enlightenment rationalism: "have courage to use your own understanding!"[41] Only when we see Erastianism as a product of this broader challenge to faith by reason and empiricism do we understand how these three Tractarians understood their position. Their sustained critiques of modern Toryism, Peelite conservatism, and the actions of the Whig party were not simply aversions to the meddling of the State in Church matters but a more general rejection of the mantra that utility and reason alone were the guides for State interference. Thus, any later defences of establishment between these three thinkers involved not only the call for a change in the *terms* of the Church-State relationship but a more general spiritual revival in politics and a rejection of the notion that the State is religiously and morally neutral.

iii) The Threat of Disestablishment.

The political changes that occurred in this period not only led to the growing concern over whether the *civil* legislature could still function as the *ecclesiastical* legislature but were accompanied by the looming threat of disestablishment. Anticlericalism was rife in Britain. Publications like John Wade's *The Extraordinary Black Book* (1831), which sold over 50,000 copies over the next four years[42], wrote scathingly against the Anglican Church. The book was essentially a sustained diatribe against

[37] *Keble College Archives,* no. 57.
[38] Froude, *Remains*, 1:429.
[39] Froude, 1:340.
[40] Froude, 1:389.
[41] Immanuel Kant, "An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment", in *Kant's Practical Philosophy*, trans. M. J. Gregor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 1.
[42] Stewart Brown, *The National Churches of England, Ireland, and Scotland 1801-46* (Oxford: Oxford Academic, 2001), 171.

establishment, exposing cases of corruption, nepotism, the abuses of patronage, and the inequalities of clerical incomes.[43] Robert Beverley, a Congregational layman, wrote a tirading letter to the Archbishop of York on the "present corrupt state of the Church of England" (1831) which was similarly popular, selling 30,000 copies over the following four years, and echoing much of the radical critique of the reformers: that the Anglican Church had been corrupted by the wealth and status afforded to it by the State.[44] There was widespread antagonism in England against the established Church; Anticlerical pamphlets circulated the country, and many objected to what was seen as the exorbitant burden of paying tithes. By December 1833, the liberal politician and Congregationalist George Hadfield expressed the growing demands of Dissenters in the *Baptist Magazine*: "A total disconnection between Church and State."[45]

Rising anticlericalism boiled over into violence when bishops in the House of Lords blocked the 1831 Reform Bill. This bill promised increased enfranchisement to the middle classes (that is, every householder rated at £10)[46] and was rejected by a majority of 41 votes, 21 of whom had been bishops. Middle-class frustration was primarily directed against Anglican clergymen: the 'Bristol Riots' of 1831 saw the looting and burning of the bishop's palace; 'Judas Iscariot. Bishop of Worcester' was chalked onto the walls of the city's cathedral; a mob of 8,000 in Carlisle burnt an effigy of their bishop, and many of the fires burning on Guy Fawkes Day in 1831 had replaced the effigies of Guy Fawkes or the Pope with those of local bishops.[47] For the bishop of Peterborough, Herbert Marsh, it was not since the Civil War of the 1640s that the clergy had been "assailed with so much calumny and violence."[48] When the Great Reform Act finally passed in 1832, the expanded electorate demanded Erastian reform or even disestablishment. It is no wonder that Geoffrey Best describes this act as a "Constitutional Revolution"[49] and J.C.D. Clark as the destruction of the vestiges of the *ancien regime* in England.[50] With Lord Grey's Whig party in power, coupled with the new possibility of non-Anglicans residing in Parliament, disestablishment appeared imminent. As Wade forewarned the bishops in the House of Lords: "your days are assuredly numbered; your lease is expired … a terrible storm is impending over the Church."[51] Not only does this context explain the radical reforms between 1828-32 (to placate the rise of anticlericalism), but it further makes the

[43] John Wade, *The Extraordinary Black Book* (England: Effingham Wilson, 1832), see 4-6, 19-33, 64, 189, 283.
[44] Brown, *National*, 173.
[45] George Hadfield, *Baptist Magazine* 25 (December 1833), 597-600, 599.
[46] Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church,* Pt. 1 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 25.
[47] Chadwick, *Victorian*, 26-28.
[48] Brown, *National*, 176.
[49] Geoffrey Best, "The Constitutional Revolution, 1828-32, and its Consequences for the Established Church", *Theology* 52 (1959).
[50] Clark, J. C. D. *English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice During the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
[51] Wade, *Extraordinary*, 95.

arguments appealing to 'utility' that I will discuss below more comprehensible; the very continuance of establishment was threatened.

v) Utilitarian Justifications for Union.

For the Presbyterian minister, Thomas Chalmers, establishment and the preservation of Church endowments could be defended solely on utilitarian grounds. Chalmers first argued in 1827 that the State should provide endowments because of the "natural want or weakness of spiritual appetite"[52], where, as Chalmers explains in his later 1838 lecture, the Anglican clergy serve as "dealers in those things which are necessary to godliness", supplying religion at a "market-price."[53] The language was one of mechanism, utility, and expediency. Given the threat of disestablishment, it is unsurprising that Anglican clergymen would muster any forces they could to defend their institution. Thus, as Skinner argued, the early reception of Chalmers' work in the *Critic* was overwhelmingly positive. Under the editorship of the Anglican 'Hackney Phalanx' group, successive reviewers endorsed Chalmers' arguments. One review in 1832 pronounced that Chalmer's 1827 book "ought, unquestionably, to be in the hands of every clergyman", and another that Chalmer's defence was "unanswerable" and had "completely settled the question." A later reviewer in 1833 further argued that the established Church formed "one of the surest bulwarks to the general rights of property" and that the Church "does more for the peace, the good order, the public and private virtue … than all its civil enactments and its municipal police."[54] It appears that many Anglican clergymen, even the notoriously High Church 'Hackney Phalanx' group, scurried down from the *iure divino* ideal and began to defend establishment on the grounds of the Church's functional utility to society: the provision of religion, the protection of property and the maintenance of civility and order.

While the Tractarians were highly critical of the Dissenters (although, as I will later argue, their views on the outcome of disestablishment were nuanced and varied), they were equally disdainful of how the Church was being defended. Henry Wilberforce was the first Tractarian to review Chalmers' book. Writing scathingly in 1838 under the editorship of Newman, Wilberforce argued that Chalmers' defence constituted "a most revolting blasphemy."[55] For Wilberforce, "on the principles of Dr Chalmers, we are at a loss to frame any valid argument against the establishment of Methodism in any country or city where it may chance to outnumber the Church."[56] Truth was being exchanged by calculations of expediency; tradition for utility. Newman was similarly dismayed by the

[52] Thomas Chalmers, *On the Use and Abuse of Literary and Ecclesiastical Endowments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 63.
[53] Henry Wilberforce, "Dr Chalmers' *Lectures on Establishments*", *British Critic* 26 (July 1839): 229.
[54] Simon Skinner, *Tractarians and the 'Condition of England: The Social and Political Thought of the Oxford Movement*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 95, 98, 98, 97.
[55] Wilberforce, "Chalmers", 244.
[56] Wilberforce, 238.

'Friends of the Church'[57] group, who he argued were "far more disposed to look out for secular and unauthorised ways of defending her [the Church]."[58] The defence of establishment by appealing to the preservation of property was perhaps the most vexing: "I had rather the Church were levelled to the ground than that it should be upheld on the mere ground of maintaining property, for I think this a much greater sin." Newman despised the 'conservative man' who "defends religion, not for religion's sake, but for the sake of its accidents and externals"[59]; establishment could *only* be defended on account of the Church's Apostolic and Catholic nature.

Froude shared Newman's concern. In his *Tract 59*, Froude notes that "many people seem to join us in this crisis [against the Dissenters]" but "[their arguments are] in some points almost as great an evil."[60] Further, Froude questioned in his *Remains* "whether such supporters are not worse enemies than the Dissenters themselves."[61] Froude was particularly critical of those who defended the Anglican clergy on the grounds that they preserved order and stability for the nation. Terming this view the "gentlemen heresy"[62], Froude argued that "the notion that a priest must be a gentleman is a stupid exclusive protestant fancy and ought to be exploded."[63] In a more even-handed tone, Newman similarly argued that "the Christian Church is thought invaluable as a promoter of good order and sobriety but is regarded as nothing more". The world had forgotten that clergymen were representatives of Christ. Instead, Newman argued, "at present the beau ideal of a clergyman in the eyes of many is a "reverend gentleman" whose "sovereign object" is to "hush it up."[64] Finally, while Keble defended establishment far more resolutely than Froude and Newman ever did (as I argue in the next section of this essay), he was never willing to do so by appealing to the Church's utility. In *Tract 4*, Keble questioned, "why should we talk so much of *establishment* and so little of *Apostolic Succession?*"[65] The answer to Newman's question in *Tract 1*, "*on what* are we to rest the authority when the state deserts us"[66] was clear for Keble: the Church's spiritual independence could only be defended because of its Apostolic authority. What united the 'Apostolicals' was the view, as the name suggests, that the Church was an instrument of God and not of England; the clergy were not agents of the State but of Christ and could only be defended on this basis.

---

[57] A group set up by the Anglican deacon William Palmer, of which all three Tractarians were fleeting, dissentient members.
[58] Griffin, *Oxford*, 32**.**
[59] Griffin, 32**, 32.**
[60] Richard Hurrell Froude, "Church and State", *Tracts for the Times* (London: J. H. Parker, 1840), 2:1.
[61] Froude, *Remains,* 2:269**.**
[62] Froude, *Remains,* 1:404**.**
[63] Froude, 1:374**.**
[64] Griffin, *Oxford,* 30**.**
[65] John Keble, "Adherence to the Apostolic Succession the Safest Course", *Tracts for the Times* (London: J. H. Parker, 1840) 1:5**.**
[66] Newman, *Tracts*, 1:2**.**

The reception of Chalmer's arguments, preserved in microcosm in the *Critic,* clearly demonstrates the differences between the Tractarians and their fellow Anglicans. That Wilberforce wrote his review in 1838 under the editorship of Newman and that these earlier reviews were written under the direction of the 'Hackney Phalanx' group in 1832 is significant. We can presume that this Anglican group endorsed the view that Chalmers's arguments were "unanswerable". Whereas, under Newman, who used the *Critic* as a mouthpiece for Tractarian views, Chalmer's utilitarian defences constituted "a most revolting blasphemy". This noticeable change supports the Tractarian historian William Copeland's argument that the movement was not simply "the old Tory church party cry of 'the Church in danger'" but a "movement from within."[67] They criticised not just the poison of the Upas tree but the fact that the Anglican Church slept willingly under it. The Tractarians were responding not only to the external political circumstances of Erastianism, liberalism, dissenterism, and Whig politics but against their fellow Anglicans as well; the chalice was poisoned from within.[68]

So far, the historical narrative I have argued for is one of relative unity. The Tractarians shared many of the same ideas and concerns. Indeed, what brought them together was a shared conception of the forces they were fighting against and their belief in the Apostolic and Catholic nature of the Anglican Church. However, in the next section of this essay, I will argue that they varied significantly between one another on what the relationship between Church and State should now be.

Section 2 – Variation in Political Thought.

i) Keble's Defence of Establishment.

In Keble's review of William Gladstone's *The State and Relations with the Church* (1838), published in the *Critic*, he simultaneously critiques the book and presents his own theological ideal for Church-State relations. Writing to Newman in 1839, he thought that the book was "excellently well-meant … but wants a little reconciling with Froude's views"[69]. It is worth noting that Keble agreed with Gladstone's critique of Paleyite and Warburtonian conceptions of the Church-State relationship[70] and defended his book against the searing review of the Whig politician Thomas Macaulay, who Keble called an "infidel" for his criticism of Gladstone's central premise that the State ought to profess a religion.[71] Despite agreeing with Gladstone's defence of establishment, Keble's review expressed a

[67] Peter Nockles, "Pusey and the Question of Church and State", *Pusey Rediscovered* (London: SPCK, 1983), 261.
[68] For discussion on the Tractarian portrayal of the High Church, see Nockles, *Oxford*, 25-43; Skinner, *Tractarian*s, 93-96; Clark, *English Society,* 349-359.
[69] Skinner, *Tractarians*, 101.
[70] Keble, *State,* 7.
[71] John Griffin, *The Oxford Movement: A Revision* (Edinburgh: The Pentland Press, 1984), 15.

particular disagreement with Gladstone's proposed Church-State relationship. For Keble, the required reconciliation was with his own, and purportedly Froude's, view that the ideal conception of establishment was one not of alliance but Church supremacy:

> To us, we confess, the word Incorporation, though Mr Gladstone at once discards it, would have appeared in the abstract far preferable to Marriage, Alliance, Union, or any other like them: provided always that we understand it as the meaning of the terms requires … *reserving the superiority, according to the idea of a Corporation, to the body adopting, for the benefit of the member adopted.*[72]

For Keble, the very notion of 'alliance' or 'union' is misguided since it implies the equal status of both participants. While Gladstone defended the Church from State interference, Keble could not accept the view that the Church and State were equal partners.

To clarify Keble's position further, it is helpful to place his views in relation to Hooker's *Laws*. Hooker argued against both the Puritans calling for disestablishment and the threat of the Church being subsumed under Papal authority, defending the *via media* of the Elizabethan Settlement. In book eight of Hooker's expansive work, he defines the relationship between Church and State as one of "two societies independent"[73]:

> Bishops may not meddle with the affairs of the commonwealth [the State], because they are governors of another corporation, which is the Church; nor kings with making laws for the Church, because they have government not of this corporation, but of another divided from it, the commonwealth.[74]

It is important to note that Keble edited a number of Hooker's works and was thoroughly acquainted with his ideas, so it is almost certain that he was aware of Hooker's ideal of two *independent* corporations. Moreover, as I discussed in the last section, it was a because of a shared agreement with Hooker's rejection of Erastianism and ideal of the Lay Synod that the Tractarians argued that the terms of the Elizabethan Settlement had changed. Given Keble's knowledge of and deference to Hooker[75], it is striking that he chooses not to restate a model of two independent corporations. Instead, he poses 'Incorporation': the unassailable claim of the superiority of the Church over the State. While Hooker's two corporations exist albeit under the "one Chief Governor"[76] (God), who is, of course, for

---

[72] Keble, *State*, 6-7.
[73] Hooker, *Works,* 3:340.
[74] Hooker, *Works*, 3:330.
[75] Richard Hooker, *Selections from the Fifth Book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, ed. John Keble, (Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1839). In Keble's preface, he praises Hooker's *Laws* as a "providential gift to this Church" (xv) and "His instrument for preserving us in that good and middle way" (viii).
[76] Hooker, *Works*, 3:340.

Keble, also the authority of the Anglican Church, his tone is decidedly loftier; the Church-State relationship is not one on equal terms.

The principle of 'Incorporation' is for Keble, "divinely sanctioned."[77] To demonstrate this, both in his review of Gladstone and his sermon in 1835, his text was Isaiah 49:23: "kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy mothers."[78] His review describes the "well-known texts of Isaiah" as "virtually containing the terms of the union in question" … "a divine intimation of the duty of the State to the Church"[79], a duty which Keble argued in his earlier sermon is as "nurses *under* her."[80] For Keble, 'Incorporation' is grounded in scripture, and crucially, therefore, the principle of establishment is itself divinely sanctioned. It is on this point that Keble seeks to clarify his position:

> Mr Gladstone is mistaken if he thinks, as some of his expressions appear to imply, that anything which has happened in the way of wrong done to the Church … has caused such religionists to doubt or deny the duty of the State to connect itself with the Church … all the scruples and demurs that we have met with in such persons have had reference, not to the *principle* of incorporation, but to the *terms.*[81]

In essence, while Keble and, as he claims, his fellow Tractarians, dispute present *terms* of the Church-State union, they do not reject the *principle* of establishment. To do so would constitute rebellion against God's divine instrument.

Adding to Skinner's rejection of Griffin's view that Keble was "sentimentally disestablishmentarian"[82], he argued, alongside Nockles[83], that Keble insisted on the duty of obedience and the horror of rebellion. For Keble, obedience was a duty since all things come from God. As he argued in a sermon in 1843: "for they see plainly, that as the weather and the seasons are of God's own sending, so is the Master whom we serve". Thus, he argued that "to rebel against it … is the same kind of impiety … as rebelling against God"[84]; we must accept the authority we inherit. Further, Keble reminds his audience in 1835 to refer to 1 Peter 2:13: "submit yourself to every ordinance of man", and, in accordance with the prayer book, the service included a "Collect of Thanksgiving" where people pray for "the grace to obey [the king] cheerfully and willingly for conscience sake."[85] Even in Keble's famous 'National Apostasy' sermon in 1833, often seen as a "Tractarian call to

---

[77] Keble, *State,* 15.
[78] Keble, *Sermons,* 149.
[79] Keble, *State*, 15.
[80] Keble, *Sermons*, 154 (emphasis added).
[81] Keble, *State*, 14, 15.
[82] Skinner, *Tractarians*, 106; see Griffin, "Keble", 171-173.
[83] Nockles, *Oxford*, 71.
[84] Isaac Williams, *Plain Sermons by Contributors to the 'Tracts for the Times'*, vol. 4 (London: Francis & John Rivington, 1844), 213.
[85] Keble, *Sermons*, 149.

arms"[86], Keble is careful to mention that "the powers that be ordained of God, whether they foster the true church or not. Submission and order are still duties."[87] It was for these reasons that Keble (and as I will later argue, Newman) saw rebellion against the Oath of Obedience as a rebellion against God. Therefore, despite the swagger of 'Incorporation', Keble was, at least by the time he wrote his review in 1839, an antidisestablishmentarian; he saw the Church-State relationship as "divinely sanctioned" and rebellion against it as blasphemy.

So far, I have sought to clarify Keble's position in his essay-review of Gladstone's book by placing it, as Keble did, in relation to Anglican history and scripture and alongside his theology of obedience and inheritance. The view that the State must be preserved, but the "terms" resisted is expressed assuredly in Keble's review and intimated in his surrounding sermons. It is this view that Skinner regards as the *"echt* Tractarian position"[88], that is, the typical view held by Tractarians. Indeed, this view ultimately won out after Froude's death in 1836 and Newman's conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1845. However, in the earlier stages of the movement, this portrayal is too neat. While we might call this Keble's typical position (although even this I will question), it is the suggestion of consensus in this earlier period that I argue we must reject.

ii) Froude: Giving up the National Church.

Including Froude in this essay on the Tractarians may appear to be an odd choice. Indeed, he is often overlooked in historical accounts of the Oxford Movement. Considering the abundance of literature on Keble, Newman, Dr Pusey, Thomas Mozley, and many others, his comparative neglect is surprising. This may be because of his early death in 1836 of tuberculosis and his retreat from the movement in 1833 to Barbados or because he contributed less, in volume, to the revival. However, the weight of Froude's influence on Keble and Newman in this early stage is significant.

His early influence can be gleaned from the sheer quantity of letters exchanged between Froude and the other Tractarians in this period, as well as Newman's claim that Keble and Froude were the "philosophers" of the revival.[89] More tangibly however, I argue that without Froude, it is uncertain that the Tracts would ever have been written. As Rowlands points out, Palmer (arguably the head of the 'Friends of the Church', or as Froude called them, the Z's) strongly opposed the Tracts.[90] At first, Palmer criticised the view that individuals should publish them. Fearing Latitudinarianism, he

---

[86] Skinner, *Tractarians*, 130.
[87] John Keble, *National Apostasy Considered* (England: J.H. Parker, 1833), 24.
[88] Skinner, *Tractarians,* 117.
[89] Griffin, *Oxford*, 40.
[90] Rowlands, John, *Church, State and Society: The Attitudes of John Keble, Richard Hurrell Froude and John Henry Newman, 1827-1845* (Durham theses: Durham University, 1986), 126-129.

proposed an Association amongst the Anglican clergymen to publish under unanimous agreement. Writing on the 13th of November 1833 to John Bowden, the author of *Tract 5*, Newman describes the mounting tensions:

> Palmer, backed by Mr Norris etc. etc. is afraid of the Tracts and wishes them stopped, and is aiming at an Association … I say let everyone employ his talent in his own way – Let there be an Association … tho' I confess I do not like joining in anything the bishops have not publicly sanctioned.[91]

On the same day, Newman writes to Froude:

> Palmer musters the Z's in great force against the Tracts … and wished to stop them. The said Tracts give offence, I know – but they are also good … What will be done, I know not but want advice sadly. I have no confidence in anyone … I am half out of spirits … do give me some advice and encouragement.[92]

From these two letters, I argue alongside Rowlands that Newman's resolute position one month later that he was "impersuadable" over publishing the Tracts was not inevitable. His uncertainty in doing "anything the Bishops have not publicly sanctioned" reveals the impact of his shared belief with Keble that "rebellion is a sin". As Rowland's argued, "Newman might well have succumbed to Palmer's threats", and indeed, let there be an Association. Froude's reply appears to have had a significant impact: "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 … We must throw the Z's overboard."[93] While Newman appears to be an unwilling radical, Froude does not. His reply is confident and uncompromising. Not only does this exchange of letters reveal the significant influence of Froude on Newman as an agitator and catalyst, but that without Froude, the Tracts may never have been written.

Having defended Froude's relevance, I will now consider his theological position: that the Church must regrettably prepare for its separation from the State. In *Tract 59*, Froude weighs up both the advantages and disadvantages of establishment. The benefits, listed under the heading "State Protection", are scarce: church endowments, protection of Church property, the right for thirty bishops to sit and vote in the House of Lords and the right of excommunication. The last of these two are relatively trivial, but Froude notes that it is on these first two that establishment is so often defended, something that, as I have argued, Froude calls "in some points almost as great an evil"[94]. The "Z's", William Palmer and Hugh Rose had both defended establishment since they saw

---

[91] *L&D*, 4:98.
[92] Rowlands, *Church*, 128.
[93] Rowlands, 128-129, 128.
[94] Froude, *Tracts,* 2:1.

endowments as the basis "on which our whole parochial system depended"[95], and it was because of this exact argument that Froude collected them under his contemptuous epithet. In contrast, Froude expressed a sustained willingness to sacrifice endowments for the powers of self-legislation. In a letter to his father in 1830, Froude writes: "I am quite making up my mind to lose everything and to be thrown on my own resources before long, and I do not consider the prospect a gloomy one."[96] Newman displays a similar sentiment in *Tract 10*, writing that "the day may come, even in this generation, when the Representatives of Christ are spoiled of their sacred possessions … then you will look to us, not as gentlemen, not as your superiors in worldly station."[97] Froude and Newman, far from Keble's theological defence of establishment, appear here to welcome separation as an opportunity for spiritual revival.

Among the cases of "State Interference" that Froude lists, the first and seemingly most distressing is the interference with the appointment of bishops, which, since the Test Acts, came from a "godless ministry."[98] For Froude, the passing of the Statute of Praemunire (an act which forced bishops to consecrate even those they disapproved of) was a blatant attack on the Church. Thus, he argued that "if a national Church means a Church without discipline, every argument for discipline is an argument against a national Church … the best thing we can do is to unnationalise ours as soon as possible"[99]. Restoring the purity of the Church could only be achieved by its separation. As Froude argued in perhaps his most famous remark: "let us tell the truth and shame the Devil. Let us give up the national Church and have a *real* one."[100] Froude reiterated this uncompromising view: "the more I think of it, the more I am sure 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."[101] It was this sort of radical thinking that compelled Newman to write to Froude in 1833: "I think Keble and I quite agree in thinking that your agitation will not do good yet. Would not the Oath of Obedience be turned against us?"[102] While Froude did heed Newman's warning, accepting to 'lay off writing radicalism'[103], his arguments at this earlier stage are undoubtedly distinct from Keble's uncompromising defence of the *principle* of establishment by 1839.

---

[95] Griffin, "Radical Phase", 52.
[96] Hervé Picton, "Hurrell Froude and Disestablishment", *Cahiers Victoriens et Édouardians* 76 (April 2012), 4-5.
[97] John Henry Newman, "Heads of a Week-Day Lecture", *Tracts for the Times* (London: J. H. Parker, 1840), 2:5.
[98] Froude, *Tracts,* 2:10.
[99] Froude, *Remains,* 1:319; cited in Picton, "Froude", 7.
[100] Griffin, "Radical Phase", 44.
[101] Froude, *Remains,* 1:370.
[102] Griffin, "Radical Phase", 50.
[103] Froude, *Remains,* 1:374.

Skinner repudiates Griffin's argument that Froude was "sentimentally disestablishmentarian" because we cannot characterise the Tractarians in their "moments of rhetorical brinkmanship."[104] Skinner is not alone in this view, and the accounts that do consider Froude rarely take him seriously. Church writes that the "fierce and scornful passages" in Froude's posthumously published *Remains* (1388-9) "really did not go beyond the liberty and frank speaking which most people give themselves in the abandon and understood exaggeration of intimate correspondence and talk."[105] In other words, we should dismiss Froude's radical views as nothing more than excitable rhetoric. Piers Brendon's more recent work, while rediscovering the significance of Froude's impact, nevertheless characterises him as little more than an "ecclesiastical agitator"[106], and Nockles argued that Tractarian threats of disestablishment were nothing but "devious strategies" or "mere rhetorical device."[107] But it would be wrong to think that Froude's separatism only emerged when he was spoiling for a fight, when his anger boiled over into superficial rhetoric. On the contrary, he often makes the argument calmly and in private letters, such as this one already cited to his father:

> I cannot but believe that the Church will surprise people a little when its latent spirit has been roused … and though I am not blind to the evils which must accompany such a convulsion, so that I would not for the world have a hand in bringing it about, I own it is not with unmixed apprehension that I anticipate its approach.

This letter is far more even-handed. Unlike Froude's grandiose claim that "I shall be one of the separatists", he refuses to bring the disconnection about. Nevertheless, his position remains notably distinct from Keble's in 1839. Establishment is not defended, but its dissolution anticipated. This is Froude at his most genial and collected, and yet still, he does not conform to Skinner's model.

Newman himself discourages readers from not taking Froude seriously. In his preface to the first volume of *Remains*, he writes that Froude's words: "may in general be taken more literally than those of most men … he was not in the habit of speaking at random on such matters … he was continuously employing the same illustrations and arguments."[108] Indeed, the consistency of Froude's arguments gives weight to his sincerity. Furthermore, his arguments were not isolated to excitable letters but can be uncovered in his views of history, particularly his celebration of Thomas Becket (1120-1170). Froude's essays on Becket have similarly been dismissed. For Brendon, Froude's lionising history of Becket was nothing but an "expression of [his] romanticised medievalism."[109] Instead, I suggest that Becket had a tangible and practical influence on Froude's response. Froude was

---

[104] Skinner, *Tractarians*, 90.
[105] Church, *Oxford Movement*, 42.
[106] Piers Brendon, *Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement* (London: Elek, 1974), 127.
[107] Nockles, *Oxford Movement*, 3.
[108] Froude, *Remains*, 1:xix-xx; cited in Griffin, *Oxford*, 42.
[109] Brendon, *Froude,* 50.

aware of the problems of venerating "the achievements of great men in distant ages"[110] and quickly considered how Becket's actions could influence his own. For Froude, Becket's heroism was his stand against State interference. But Becket's stand was not akin to Keble's grumbling of the *terms* in 1839, but active rebellion against the King; Becket's cry for "Libertas Ecclesiae" was not one of passive resistance and obedience, but defiance: "*never* will I covenant with mortal men as to forget my covenant with God and my order."[111] I argue that Froude's choice of Becket as an object of adoration should not be dismissed as idealised romanticism, but, as the historian, J. A. Froude, (Hurrell Froude's younger brother) argued, a "tacit confession of [his] intention … to liberate the church from bondage to the state."[112] Accompanied by Froude's consistency, both publicly and privately, we have no reason to doubt his sincerity.

Keble was perhaps the first to censor Froude's radical ideas in his apologetic preface to the second volume of *Remains*. While Froude is positively enthusiastic about the prospect of separation in his letter to his father, Keble writes that he considered disestablishment a "not necessarily fatal alternative."[113] Elsewhere, Keble describes Froude's views on the differences between the Apostolicals and the Z's as "subordinate", obscuring Froude's more direct call to "throw the Z's overboard."[114] I agree with Griffin that the effect is to "reduce sharp, consistent, and repeated comments into a sort of irreverent raillery."[115] Keble's advice to the reader, as almost an inverse of Newman's, are that his views were often "school-boy words" and "like proverbial modes of speech, they were of course not always to be taken literally."[116]

However, we should be sceptical of histories such as those of Church and Keble that brush Froude aside. Both were English Anglican clergymen, and it is clear how Froude presents problems for the Anglican historian; there is an incentive to dissociate from Froude's rabid attacks on Protestantism, 'The Friends of the Church', and the State, all of which were ultimately accepted. Sidney Ollard views Froude's sharp sayings as the "Achilles' tendon"[117] of the movement, and Brendon that publishing Froude's *Remains* was a mistake.[118] Indeed, publishing Froude's *Remains* may have been a mistake in that he muddied the waters of the Tractarian position. Nevertheless, it is exactly because of this variation that Froude's ideas must be included if we are to present an accurate

[110] Froude, *Remains,* 2:137.
[111] Rowlands, *Church*, 119 (emphasis added).
[112] Griffin, *Oxford*, 50.
[113] Froude, *Remains*, pt. 2, 1:viii-ix.
[114] Griffin, *Oxford,* 45.
[115] Griffin, 46.
[116] Froude, *Remains*, pt. 2, 1:xxxi.
[117] Griffin, *Oxford*, 37.
[118] Brendon, *Froude*, 127.

picture and more nuanced view of Tractarian thought and not fall to the temptation that might also encourage secular historians to brush Froude aside for the sake of easy categories.

iii) Newman: Preparing the Lifeboat.

Newman's position on Church establishment was in many ways closely aligned with Keble's. As Newman wrote in his *Apologia*, he shared with Keble an instinctive hatred of rebellion.[119] Analysing 1 Thessalonians 5:1, Newman argued: "St Paul says 'let everyone remain in the place where he finds himself … it is our duty to submit to what we are born under … I only assert that we find the Church and State united and must therefore maintain that Union."[120] He further argued explicitly in a review in the *Critic* in 1837 that "rebellion is a sin."[121] This review was responding to the French Catholic, Félicité Lamennais' and his radical and controversial *Essai Sur L'indifférence En Matière De Religion* (1817), where he called for the separation of Church and State and the ultimate authority of the Pope over the King (ultramontanism), who was nothing but a secular prince.[122] Indeed, it was Froude's admiration for Lamennais' defence of the Church, and his suggestion that the Tractarians should follow suit that directly prompted Newman to write "would not the Oath of Obedience be turned against us?". Obedience, reserve, patience, and inheritance were his precepts and, in many ways, characterised Newman's response to his present political context. Despite his critique of union as a "house of bondage"[123], he frequently refused to rebel since, as he argued in 1829, "all revolutions are awful things."[124] In a letter to Froude in 1833, Newman writes that even though "the State has abandoned us … you must not think, however that I myself mean to hasten the downfall of the Monarchy by word or deed. Whigs and Radicals will reap their proper glory, and we but enjoy their fruits without committing ourselves."[125] Clerical agitation was alien to Newman's ethos. Even if separation bore fruits and liberation, Newman concluded his 1836 essay that "[we] who are in captivity, must *bide our time.*"[126]

That is not to say that Newman 'stood still' on the question of establishment. Instead, as he explains to Froude, he was "preparing [him]self" for the contingency of its seemingly imminent separation. That is, by preparing a lifeboat for the sinking ship of the Church of England. For Newman, the Church had "hitherto depended on the State", but now it "must look to the people."[127] However, this was not an unwelcome outcome. As I have argued, Newman presented the Church's

[119] Newman, *Apologia,* 495.
[120] John Henry Newman, "Home Thoughts Abroad", *British Magazine*, 9 (April 1836): 363.
[121] John Henry Newman, "Affairs of Rome", *British Critic* 22 (October 1837): 44.
[122] Lamennais, Félicité, *Essai Sur L'indifférence En Matière De Religion* (Paris: Tournachon-Molin, 1817), 344.
[123] Newman, "Home Thoughts", 363.
[124] *L&D*, 2:130.
[125] *L&D*, 4:35; Newman to Froude, August 31st, 1833.
[126] Newman, "Home Thoughts", 363.
[127] Griffin, *Oxford*, 30.

separation in *Tract 10* as an opportunity for spiritual revival and for the clergy to be considered "Representatives of Christ" and not as "gentlemen" or "superiors in worldly station."[128] Like Froude, Newman appears to anticipate separation with a degree of excitement. As Newman writes in 1834, "the Church is certainly in a wretched state; but not a gloomy one to those who regard every symptom of dissolution as a ground for hope … after all I see a system behind the existing one."[129] Far from Keble's defence of establishment, Newman's early response is essentially a defence of the view that disestablishment *need not be fatal*; their Catholic, Apostolic Church need not go down with the ship. Indeed, it is highly significant that Newman summarises the first volume of the *Tracts* (*1-20*) as intending "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"[130], and further that he argued that a Church based on popular power was itself traditional and existed "in its rise, in the days of Ambrose and in the days of Becket."[131] While Newman later argued that separation would be fatal for the Church[132], his earlier response is in some ways a *via media* between Keble and Froude's positions thus far presented. Like Froude, Newman does little to defend the Church-State relationship but instead anticipates its separation, and yet, like Keble, Newman is unwilling to bring this change about. In summary, Newman's early response was to prepare a lifeboat for the Church in the event of disestablishment, even if he refused to board first.

However, it would be misleading to suggest that the main point of difference between Keble and Newman was simply that Newman was more optimistic about disestablishment than Keble. Instead, I suggest they disagreed fundamentally on the nature of the Church-State relationship. In Newman's *Tract 90*, the final and perhaps most widely known Tract (where he argued controversially that the 39 Articles admitted a Catholic reading), he wrote specifically on the 37th Article, 'On Civil Magistrates', that the Church-State alliance was:

> … altogether an ecclesiastical arrangement; not a point *de fide*, but of expedience, custom, or piety, which cannot be claimed as if the Pope ought to have it, any more than, on the other hand, the King could claim it of Divine Right.[133]

Newman's argument directly contradicted Keble's defence of establishment in the *Critic*. Far from the Church-State relationship being a divine instrument, for Newman, alliance was but an "ecclesiastical arrangement". Thus, Newman's shared defence of establishment (although, of course, he did

---

[128] Newman, *Tracts,* 2:5.
[129] *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, ed. Anne Mosley (London: Longmans, Green, 1903) 2: 31; hereafter *L&C*.
[130] *L&C*, 2:166; Newman to Rose, April 10th, 1836.
[131] *L&D*, 4:35.
[132] Griffin, *Oxford*, 55.
[133] John Henry Newman, *Tract 90: On Certain Passages in the 39 Articles*, (London: Oxford, 1866), 82.

ultimately convert to Roman Catholicism) should be seen on different grounds than Keble's. For Keble, it was not just that rebellion was a sin or that establishment should be defended since it is "what we are born under" but that the State was itself of divine appointment.

iv) Royal Supremacy.

Royal Supremacy is essentially the view that the monarch is appointed by God into a sacral office that bears the power of jurisdiction in both temporal and spiritual matters. That is, as the supreme head of both the Church and State, largely conceived according to the apotheosis of Hooker's godly prince. As Nockles notes, the Tractarians were heirs to this Orthodox political tradition.[134] For Keble and Newman in particular, Royal Supremacy offered a refuge for maintaining the spiritual independence of the Church as a bulwark against Whig interference. As Newman argued, "the Coronation Oath has secured the Church its liberties to the utter annulment of all former precedents of tyranny."[135] As such, Newman appealed to the King, William IV, to protect the Church under the aegis of his divine appointment.[136] However, the present reality was far from this theological ideal; the theoretical model of Royal Supremacy was under acute practical strain. Despite a number of appeals from bishops to the Crown to veto Whig legislation by recourse to Royal Supremacy[137], Lord Grey had convinced the King that his position was solely legislative and not executive.[138] The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Catholic Emancipation, and the Irish Church Act had all passed under the submissive assent of the King. By April 1833, an article in the *British Magazine* summarised the question posed by present circumstances: "how will the King's Coronation Oath stand up to the Irish Bill, including the spoilation of Church property?". It appeared that Royal Supremacy and the covenant of the Coronation Oath were rendered utterly vain, and as the article concluded, that in practice, "oaths are not to bear that literal sense the words infer."[139]

However, Keble never abandoned his faith in Royal Supremacy. Skinner makes a vital distinction between "circumstantial problems" and the "ideal relationship between Church and State"[140], which applies well here. Despite the political circumstances Keble found himself in, this never obstructed his faith in the monarch's sacral office. As he argued in a sermon in 1835, Kings were "anointed of the Lord … a living type of the supreme dominion of Jesus Christ"[141], and later in his 1839 review in the *Critic* that "Kings as well as bishops are in a manner representatives of Jesus Christ on earth."[142] Even

[134] Nockles, *Oxford,* 72.
[135] *L&D*, 4:164.
[136] Nockles, *Oxford,* 76.
[137] Nockles, 76; see Bishop Phillpots speech in the House of Lord, June 1833.
[138] Froude, *Remains*, 3:212-213.
[139] Rowlands, *Church*, 134, 133.
[140] Skinner, *Tractarians*, 90.
[141] Nockles, *Oxford*, 72.
[142] Keble, *State*, 15.

if his interpretation of Isaiah 49:23 (that the monarch ought to serve as a nursing father *under* the Church) offered an implicit and nudging critique of the present circumstances, he never abandoned his Hookerian ideal. For Keble, the monarch was divinely appointed and, according to the Coronation Oath, protector of the Church's spiritual independence. Thus, he rebuked what he saw as the growing tendency to "speak evil of rulers" as itself "reviling God through His chosen ministers"[143] and concluded in his 1835 sermon: "far from furnishing an excitement to impatience and rebellion, there is no such security for quiet and Christian submission even to abused authority as a sense of that *authority proceeding from God.*"[144] Once again, his maxims were patience, obedience and submissive political allegiance, even under what he described as the "monarchical tyranny"[145] of the present circumstances.

Both Nockles[146] and Rowlands[147] make the important observation that there was a crucial difference between Keble and Froude regarding their understanding of Royal Supremacy. While Keble sought refuge against Church interference in Hooker's notion of the "godly prince", for Froude, the only supremacy was the House of Commons[148]; the King had been unable to prevent political change and was now at the mercy of a chance government.[149] As Froude wrote to Newman in 1834, "what is the good of influence except to influence people?"[150] Keble may well have agreed with Froude's portrayal of the present circumstances (although he rarely said anything against the King), but what differentiated Froude further was his disregard of Royal Supremacy as Erastian and secular *at its root*. Froude could not accept Hooker's argument that Kings ought to have "supreme authority in Ecclesiastical affairs."[151] He argued fervently that no bishop could be consecrated without the consent of its members[152] writing in 1833 that the "Royal License" to do so, "according to the Statutes and *Ecclesiastical Laws*" must be exposed as a "nakedly" "persecuting law."[153] Thus, the Statute of Praemunire (1392), which had vested the right to appoint bishops on the Crown, was for Froude, the pernicious and Erastian substitution of Papal interference for Regal interference.[154] It is no wonder that he venerated Becket; like Becket, he was willing to rebel against the King to protect the Church. Not only had the Coronation Oath proved ineffectual, but the very principle of Royal Supremacy was itself Erastian and secular; the Church must abandon the King.

---

[143] Keble, *Sermons*, 161, 160.
[144] Keble, 162.
[145] Griffin, *Oxford*, 7.
[146] Nockles, *Oxford*, 72-79.
[147] Rowlands, *Church*, 132.
[148] Rowlands, 134.
[149] Froude, *Tracts,* 2:6.
[150] *L&D,* 5:20.
[151] Hooker, *Works,* 3:139.
[152] Froude, *Remains,* 3:217.
[153] Froude, 3:255-257.
[154] Froude, *Tracts,* 2:6.

Newman's views on Royal Supremacy changed significantly. His early royalism was expressed passionately in his appeal to William IV to veto the Irish Church Act, and he displayed a resolute confidence in the Coronation Oath in 1834. For these reasons, Skinner portrays Newman's thought as aligned with Keble's notion of the monarch as the nursing father. However, Skinner's argument overlooks Newman's changing views on Royal Supremacy. Even by 1835, Newman had joined those who "speak evil" of their rulers, lamenting in successive articles in the *British Magazine* the extent of the King's power over the Church, particularly on the prerogative of appointing bishops. It seems likely that Newman's change of heart was in some way directed by Froude. Indeed, Newman did not escape the vitriol of Froude's pen[155], who consistently challenged Newman's defence of Royal Supremacy.[156] By 1835, Newman wrote that Henry VIII had "tie[d] up the hands of the clergy"[157] and that William III had completed the Erastianism that Henry had begun.[158] Froude's influence should not be understated, but I argue that Newman's abandonment of his earlier royalism was primarily a direct response to changing political circumstances. As Newman writes in 1836, externals were vital:

> Now suppose one had been born 30 years sooner, I think one should have kept quiet. But the times will not allow this … outward circumstances are changing … men like Hooker … acted in the system they found themselves. The single difference between their views and those I seem to follow is this – they had a divine right King – we in matter of fact do not.[159]

Even if Newman was, as he insisted to Froude, a Tory "theoretically and historically", his political circumstances forced him "to be a Radical practically."[160] The above quotation reveals a consistent theme in Newman's response to his political context: that of an unwilling radical, forced into action by circumstances in which one could no longer "have kept quiet".

For Newman, Peel's formation of the Ecclesiastical Commission in 1835 under royal assent was "a new precedent in the Church" that directly challenged the notion of Royal Supremacy. The King had sanctioned reform and become "but a creature of an infidel Parliament."[161] And yet it was not until 1836 that Newman expressed his rebellion. As Rowlands argued, the appointment of an Ecclesiastical Commission was only "a mild storm compared with the whirlwind that was unleashed when Hampden was appointed Regius Professor."[162] Bishops Hampden argued against an objective reading of Trinitarian doctrine in his "Bampton Lectures" (1832). He suggested that the doctrine had

---

[155] Rowlands, *Church*, 136.
[156] *L&D,* 5:7; Froude to Newman, November 23rd, 1834: "Are you getting stupid?"
[157] Newman, "The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury", *British Magazine* 7 (February 1835), 151; cited in Rowlands, *Church*, 137.
[158] Newman, "Convocation", 154.
[159] *L&D*, 5:304; cited in Nockles, 78.
[160] *L&D*, cited in Nockles, 77. LC. 1833 to Rogers.
[161] *L&D,* 3:293.
[162] Rowlands, *Church*, 138.

emerged in "the mists of human speculation" and an "atmosphere of repulsion" which had created the "pretended exactness of thought on which our technical language is based."[163] All three Tractarians had responded in united outrage[164], and particularly Keble who compared Hampden to Arius and anathematised his substitution of Tradition and Orthodoxy with the Rationalism of the age.[165] Thus, Hampden's later appointment to the Regius Divinity Chair in 1836 under the direct assent of the King provided the final death blow to Newman's waning royalism. Shortly after, Newman wrote that "the very title 'Church of England' is an offence for it implies that it holds, not of the Church Catholic but of the State",[166] and by 1841, as I discussed in the previous section, Newman's *Tract 90* suggested that the King had no more rights than the Pope to interfere in Church matters.

Both Skinner's portrayal of Newman's royalism[167] and Harold Laski's totalising suggestion that Royal Supremacy was a point of "central attack"[168] for *all* Tractarians sacrifice nuance for easy categories. The issue of Royal Supremacy displays in microcosm the nature of the early Tractarian response to their political context. Despite a shared notion of the external problems, they display not only change and uncertainty but significant variation on how to preserve the Church's Apostolic and Catholic identity.

v) The Radical Keble and the Role of Genre.

So far, for the sake of comparison, I have presented Keble's typical position as a monolithic defence of establishment, Royal Supremacy, and the principles of obedience and reserve. However, once more, the reality is more complex. Griffin has done much to recover the earlier, often overlooked, radical stage in Keble's political thought, which Keble calls a "parenthesis" in his life.[169] Froude provides striking reference to this in a letter to Arthur Perceval (a fellow contributor to the *Tracts*). He writes that Keble "demurs" the agreement at the Hadleigh meetings (where Palmer proposed an Association) that they stand "against all efforts directed to ... the separation of Church and State… because he thinks the Union of Church and State as it is now understood, actually sinful."[170] Indeed, there is much evidence to support Froude's portrayal of Keble at this stage. Keble had written a month earlier that "all Churchmen who are not Erastians ... will separate"[171], and to Coleridge in May 1832 that "I am more and more inclined to think that the sooner we come to an open separation … the

[163] Rowlands, 76.
[164] For Tractarian objections to Hampden, see Owen, *Victorian Church*, 1:112-121.
[165] Rowlands *Church*, 77.
[166] *L&D*, 5:301
[167] Skinner, *Tractarians*, 113.
[168] Harold Laski, *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty* (Kitechener, Ont: Batoche, 1999), 48.
[169] Altholz, "Tractarian Moment", 279.
[170] *Keble College Archives*, no. 62: Froude to Perceval, August 18th, 1833.
[171] *Archives,* no. 57: Keble to Holmes, July 10th, 1833.

better for ourselves and our flocks."[172] So how can we make sense of these radically opposed portrayals of Keble's political thought? It is possible that Keble simply changed his mind, that this earlier radicalism was just a "parenthesis" in his life, and that our portrait of Keble would be benefitted by viewing him as a theologian in progress, uncertain of how to respond to a constantly changing political context. This approach is certainly helpful, but I suggest, alongside Ellison[173], that a greater awareness of genre goes far to explain Keble's shifting politics.

The problem is that Keble's arguments appear to shift back and forth. Indeed, despite the politically conservative message of his 'Apostasy' sermon, where he reminds his audience that "submission and order are still duties", his private letter to Newman, only three weeks later, completely contradicts this. In perhaps his most radical letter, Keble writes:

> I cannot take the Oath of Supremacy in the sense which the Legislature clearly now puts it … I think we ought to be prepared to sacrifice any of our endowments sooner than sanction it. Take every pound, shilling, and penny … only let us make our own bishops and be governed by our laws.[174]

From apparent contradictions such as these, Griffin concludes that "it is impossible to make any coherent sense of Keble's theory."[175] However, the shift in genre between these two arguments, that is, between a sermon and a private letter, is significant. Indeed, Keble displays an acute awareness of the role of the sermon in public life. After the passing of the Gorham Judgement in 1851[176], Keble refused to discuss this in a sermon since such matters were "not in all respects fit for the House of God."[177] Similarly, Newman, while defending the Church's right to "meddle with the world", argued in his *Apologia* against "introduc[ing] the exciting topics of the day into the Pulpit."[178] It appears that politics, and rebellion in particular, were not suitable topics for the Pulpit for both Keble and Newman, even if they privately held more radical views. Therefore, I suggest that it is unlikely that Keble completely changed his mind between his 'Apostasy' sermon and his letter to Newman or that his reminder to his audience in his sermon to avoid "public concerns"[179] was altogether hypocritical but that his arguments were tailored to different audiences. Similarly, while Keble's sermon only

---

[172] John Griffin, "John Keble: Radical", *Anglican Theological Review* 53, no.3 (July 1971): 170.
[173] Robert Ellison, "The Tractarians' Political Rhetoric", *Anglican and Episcopal* History 77, no. 3 (September 2008): 225.
[174] *L&D*, 4:22: Keble to Newman, August 8th, 1833.
[175] Griffin, *Oxford*, 15.
[176] The controversial Gorham Judgement saw the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council reverse the Anglican Court of Arches refusal to institute the Evangelical, George Gorham, in the Exeter diocese.
[177] John Keble, *Occasional Papers and Reviews* (England: J. Parker, 1877), 238.
[178] Newman, *Apologia*, 250.
[179] Keble, *Sermons,* 147.

makes brief allusions to State interference, and always in hypothetical language[180], the 'Advertisement', which for Perry Butler constituted "Tract 0" of the movement[181], states in no uncertain terms the "tyranny" and "profane intrusion" of the State on Church matters.[182] Creating a picture of Keble's political position at the start of the movement is undoubtedly complex, but I agree with Ellison that it is made far more coherent by an awareness that Keble's arguments were subjected to the confines of genre.

Conclusion.

The aim of this essay in drawing out the views of Keble, Froude, and Newman on the question of the Church-State relationship has been twofold: firstly, to redress the historical view that the Tractarians had little concern for political questions, and secondly, to critique the attempts of several historians to characterise a static and typical Tractarian position. Indeed, the early stage of the movement was far from static; it was *of the moment*, improvising and responding in several different ways to a changing political context. Despite this variation, the Tractarians frequently argued that they must "pull together and preach the same thing"[183]:

> For if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for battle? (1 Corinthians 14:8)

The above quotation is printed on the cover page of the first publication of the *Tracts* (1840), and it begs the question: how certain was the trumpet sound of the movement? In some ways, the battle cry was clear, unfaltering, and unanimous. As I have argued in this essay, these three Tractarians had a shared notion of the forces they were fighting against. Keble, Froude, and Newman all launched a sustained diatribe against the changes of 1828-32, the spread of Erastianism, Liberalism, Dissenterism, and the "unauthorised" utilitarian defences of the Church's establishment. In other words, they had a shared enemy. Reading their letters, sermons, and contributions to the *Critic* and the *British Magazine* shows a clear sense of urgency. As Keble writes in 1833, "at this particular moment, we come to a critical point in our Church history"[184]. The changes in this period were nothing short of revolution and national apostasy. They all agreed that they could no longer afford to stand still. Further, they had a united purpose: to remind the nation that the clergy were stationed as representatives of Christ and members of a Catholic and Apostolic Church.

---

[180] Keble, 140, 142.
[181] Altholz, "Tractarian Moment", 277.
[182] Keble, *Sermons*, 128.
[183] *Archives,* no. 62.
[184] *Archives,* no. 57.

However, as I have sought to demonstrate, Keble, Froude, and Newman had not yet decided in which direction to charge. Newman argued that the Church must be a political party, but there is little sense of a shared policy in this early stage. They were not only uncertain about how to respond but disagreed significantly with one another on what the relationship between the Church and State should be. The challenges of their context brought into acute focus the question of what it means to be an Anglican, a clergyman, and a member of a Church that must render its duty unto both Caesar and God. To answer this, they returned to what Keble called the "hints and examples"[185] of the past, but they varied in the histories they chose. While Froude and Newman sought guidance in the life of Becket, Keble had a particular deference to Hooker and the Elizabethan Settlement. Moreover, while Keble defended establishment through his reading of Isaiah, Newman came to view the Church-State relationship as nothing but an ecclesiastical arrangement.

The movement later retreated from political questions and grew to defend the sacredness of alliance under the guidance of Keble. However, these later developments should not obscure how we view the early stage of the movement. Grand narratives that attempt to characterise a typical Tractarian position on the ideal relationship between Church and State do little to capture the nuance of their disagreements and the improvisations and uncertainties of Keble, Froude, and Newman in their first responses.

[185] *Archives*, no. 57.

Bibliography.

Primary Sources.

Beverly, Robert. *A Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of York on the Present Corrupt State of the Church of England*. London: W. B. Johnson, 1831.

Chalmers, Thomas. *On the Use and Abuse of Literary and Ecclesiastical Endowments.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Froude, Richard Hurrell. "Conservative Principles." *British Magazine* 4 (July 1833)

Froude, Richard Hurrell. *Keble College Archives.* A1, no. 62.

Froude, Richard Hurrell. "Church and State". In *Tracts for the Times.* London: J. H. Parker, 1840.

Froude, Richard Hurrell. *Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*. 3 vols. London: Gilbert & Rivington, 1839.

Hadfield, George. *Baptist Magazine* 25 (December 1833)

Hoadly, Benjamin. "The Nature of the Kingdom". In *Sixteen Sermons*. London: Printed for John and Paul Knapton, 1754. Eighteenth Century Collections Online.

Hooker, Richard. *Selections from the Fifth Book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*. Edited by John Keble. Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1839.

Hooker, Richard. *The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine: Mr Richard Hooker*. 3 vols. Edited by John Keble. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1836.

Kant, Immanuel. "An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment." In *Kant's Practical Philosophy*, trans. M. J. Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Keble, John. "Adherence to the Apostolic Succession the Safest Course". In *Tracts for the Times.* London: J. H. Parker, 1840.

Keble, John. *Keble College Archives.* A1, no. 57.

Keble, John. *National Apostasy Considered*. Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1833.

Keble, John. "Papers of Bishops Warburton." *British Critic* 29 (December 1841)

Keble, John. *Occasional Papers and Reviews*. Oxford: J. H Parker, 1877.

Keble, John. *Sermons, Academical and Occasional*. 2nd ed. Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1848.

Keble, John. *The State in its Relations with the Church: A Paper Reprinted from the "British Critic," October 1839*. Oxford: James Parker, 1869.

Lamennais, Félicité. *Essai Sur L'indifférence En Matière De Religion*. Paris: Tournachon-Molin, 1817.

Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman. 2 vols. Edited by Anne Mosley. London: Longmans, Green, 1903.

Newman, John Henry. "Affairs of Rome." *British Critic* 22 (October 1837)

Newman, John Henry. *Apologia Pro Vita Sua.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931.

Newman, John Henry. *The Arians of the Fourth Century*. 4th ed. London: Pickering, 1876.

Newman, John Henry. "The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury." *British Magazine* 7 (February 1835)

Newman, John Henry. "Heads of a Week Lecture." In *Tracts for the Times*, London: J. H. Parker, 1840)

Newman, John Henry. "Home Thoughts Abroad." *British Magazine* 9 (April 1836)

Newman, John Henry. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, *Vol. 2-8: The Oxford Movement: 1827-1842.* Edited by Ian Ker, Thomas Gornall, and Gerard Tracey. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Oxford Scholarly Editions Online.

Newman, John Henry. "Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission**.**" In *Tracts for the Times*. London: J. H. Parker, 1840.

Newman, John Henry. *Tract 90: On Certain Passages in the 39 Articles.* London: Oxford, 1866.

Paley, William. *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*. Vol. 2. London: Edinburgh, 1811.

Wade, John. *The Extraordinary Black Book*. England: Effingham Wilson, 1832.

Warburton, William. *The Alliance Between Church and State.* 4th ed. London: Printed for A. Millar, 1766. Eighteenth Century Collections Online.

Wilberforce, Henry. "Dr Chalmers' *Lectures on Establishments*." *British Critic* 26 (July 1839) Internet Archive.

Williams, Isaac. *Plain Sermons by Contributors to the 'Tracts for the Times.'* Vol. 4. London: Francis & John Rivington, 1844.

Secondary Sources**.**

Altholz, Josef. “The Tractarian Movement: The Incidental Origins of the Oxford Movement.” *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 26, no. 2 (Summer 1994)

Best, Geoffrey “The Constitutional Revolution, 1828-32, and its Consequences for the Established Church.” *Theology* 52 (1959)

Bowen, Desmond. *The Idea of the Victorian Church: A Study of the Church of England, 1833-1889.* Montreal: McGill University Press, 1968.

Brendon, Piers. *Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement*. London: Elek, 1974.

Brown, Stewart. *The National Churches of England, Ireland, and Scotland 1801-46*. Oxford: Oxford Academic, 2001.

Chadwick, Owen. *The Victorian Church.* Pt. 1. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Church, Richard. *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years, 1833-1845*. England: Macmillan, 1892.

Clark, J. C. D. *English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice During the Ancien Regime*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Ellison, Robert. “The Tractarians’ Political Rhetoric.” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 77, no. 3 (September 2008)

Griffin, John. “John Keble: Radical.” *Anglican Theological Review* 53, no. 3 (July 1971)

Griffin, John. “Radical Phase of the Oxford Movement.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27, no. 1 (1976)

Griffin, John. *The Oxford Movement: A Revision*. Edinburgh: Pentland Press, 1984.

Harris, T. L. “The Conception of Authority in the Oxford Movement.” *Church History* 3, no. 2, (June 1934)

Laski, Harold. *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty.* Kitechener, Ont: Batoche, 1999.

Nockles, Peter. *The Oxford Movement in Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Nockles, Peter. “Pusey and the Question of Church and State”. In *Pusey Rediscovered*. Edited by Perry Butler. London: SPCK, 1983.

Picton, Hervé. “Hurrell Froude and Disestablishment.” *Cahiers Victoriens et Édouardians* 76 (April 2012)

Reed, John Shelton. *Glorious Battle: The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996.

Rowlands, John. *Church, State and Society: The Attitudes of John Keble, Richard Hurrell Froude and John Henry Newman, 1827-1845*. Durham: Durham University, 1986.

Skinner, Simon. *Tractarians and the ‘Condition of England’: The Social and Political Thought of the Oxford Movement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Yates, Nigel. *The Oxford Movement and Anglican Ritualism*. London: Historical Association, 1983.