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The purpose of this study was to investigate the various reactions to the Oxford Movement among the Evangelicals of England; and to determine whether those Evangelicals who did not react by becoming Low Churchmen attempted to define a new and unique position for the Anglican Church. A certain group of Evangelicals, some of whom referred to themselves as Evangelical High Churchmen, did not simply reject the High and Low Church extremes, but attempted to define a moderate position which embraced aspects of both Low Church Evangelicalism and Tractarianism. This group helped prepare the way for the Anglican Church to emerge, in the 1850s, as a broad and moderate body.
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CHAPTER I

COOPERATION

Introduction

Since 1934, when Yngve Brilioth published his lectures on Evangelicalism and the Oxford Movement, it has hardly been disputed that the Evangelicals in some ways cooperated with the Tractarians. Yet most historians continue to treat 'Evangelicalism' as a term necessarily opposed to 'High Churchmanship.' Dietrich Voll's view of the Evangelical response to Tractarianism is typical: "The course of events irritated the Evangelical camp. In this situation an alliance was formed with the Low Church wing."\(^1\) While it is certainly true that most Evangelicals reacted to the Oxford Movement by becoming Low Churchmen, it is hardly accurate to classify all Evangelicals as Low Church.

Initially, most Evangelicals seem to have welcomed the Oxford Movement, and Tractarians like Newman and William Palmer confidently expected the Evangelicals to rally to their banner and join the proposed associations formed to strengthen the Church of England. Very soon, however, most Evangelicals rejected the Oxford Movement and with it the authority of the Church. Many, however, remained firm in their conviction that the original intentions of the Tractarians were

both timely and necessary. These Evangelicals played an important role in the shaping of the Church of England between 1833 and the late 1840s.

The various responses within the Evangelical party raise many questions. Why did the majority of Evangelicals at first accept, and then later firmly reject, the Oxford Movement? What was the position of those Evangelicals who did not totally reject the objectives of the Tractarians, and what effect did they have on the Church of England itself? For answers to these and other questions, one must turn first to the beginnings of the Oxford Movement and see the relationship of the Evangelicals to it.

The Evangelicals and the Oxford Movement

In 1833 it seemed likely that the Tractarians would find a ready ally in the Evangelicals. William Palmer, looking back on the original intent of the Tractarians, specifically mentions the Evangelicals:

I can sincerely say, that if there was one object more than another which we should have been happy to realize, it was the union of the Church. . . . I know the kind and charitable feelings which existed in others toward the party called 'Evangelical,' and am sure that no different sentiment has ever existed in my own mind. The controversies which have since arisen . . . are a source of

Palmer (1811-1878) was one of the original Tractarians and helped formulate the original goals of the Oxford Movement at the Hadleigh conference in 1833. He later complained, in his Narrative of Events Connected With the Publication of the Tracts for the Times (1843), that the Tractarians had abandoned those objectives. He is known as William Palmer of Worcester (Oxford) to distinguish him from a contemporary scholar of the same name (Palmer of Worcester).
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grief and disappointment. It is not too much to say that John Wesley was himself a forerunner of the Tractarians. Raised a High Churchman, his sacramentarian views and belief in the Apostolic succession were a source of irritation to many of his contemporaries; so much so, in fact, that it was Bishop Lavington's opinion that the activities of the Methodists "must end at Rome." Wesley's own love of the Church and her liturgy in some ways foreshadowed the emphases of the Oxford Movement, and he was instrumental in keeping the Methodists within the Church during his lifetime. Even after the Methodists broke with the Church a strong Evangelical group remained behind.

The Evangelical party, then, was one which transcended the boundaries of the Church of England. Both within and without the Church the Evangelicals emphasized preaching, a warm, somewhat emotional religion, and frequent celebration of the Lord's Supper. In addition, those within the Church stressed the use of the Prayer Book and deference to the Church hierarchy. The point is an important one because the Evangelicals within the Church are largely assumed to have been dissenters at heart and Churchmen only outwardly. Their dilemma is imagined to have been much like Mr. Jerome's when he explained to

---


his new curate, "I'm a Dissenter, Mr. Tryan; I've been a Dissenter ever sin' I was fifteen 'ear old; but show me good i' the Church, an' I'm a Churchman too." In fact, the Church Evangelicals were staunchly loyal to the Church of England, particularly before 1840. Charles Simeon, for instance, was exceptional in his willingness to cooperate with dissenters in spreading the Gospel, but even his loyalty to the Church was never in doubt. In a series of sermons entitled, The Excellency of the Liturgy, Simeon outlined his own view of the two bodies:

What might not be hoped for, if all who have undertaken the sacred office of the ministry fulfilled their engagements in the way we have described? . . . If there were such exertions made in every parish, we should hear no more complaints about the increase of dissenters. . . . Let me not be misunderstood, as though I meant to suggest anything disrespectful of the dissenters; for I honour all that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, of whatever Church they be. . . . But whilst I see such abundant means of edification in the Church of England, I cannot but regret that any occasion should be given to men to seek for that in other places which is so richly provided for them in their own Church.  

Joseph Milner's attacks on Dissent were more typical of the Church Evangelicals. In his History of the Church of Christ Milner refers to separation from the Church as that "extreme licentiousness of modern ecclesiastical polity" and compares modern dissenters to the Waldenses in the following manner:

---


We have seen how obedient they [the Waldenses] were to established governments; and that separation from a church so corrupt as that of Rome was with them only a matter of necessity. The best and wisest in all ages have acted in the same manner, and have dreaded the evils of schism more than those of a defect in discipline.

There were, then, two distinct branches of Evangelicalism at the time of Keble's Assize Sermon in 1833. It was the Church Evangelicals, rather than their Dissenting counterparts, who were potentially the allies of the Tractarians in the first years of the movement. The Anglican Evangelicals carried on the traditions of Wesley, Simeon, and Gilberforce, and many saw in the Oxford Movement a variation on the main themes of their own party. The Tractarians were proposing the formation of associations to propagate their ideas, and this as much as anything was calculated to interest the Evangelicals. In addition, the plea for holiness, a renewed emphasis on the Prayer Book, and a desire for more frequent celebrations of the Lord's Supper were familiar ideas to the Evangelicals.

An emphasis on holiness characterized the teachings of Newman, and other Tractarians, throughout his career. His first sermon as rector of St. Mary's, Oxford (1826) was Holiness Necessary for Future Blessedness, and nearly a decade later he declared to Samuel Wilberforce that "the whole of Scripture speaks of holiness being indispensible" for salvation. Later still he wrote in Via Media:

It is sanctity of heart and conduct which commends us to

---


9 Thomas Gornall, ed., The Letters and Diaries of John Henry
God. If we be holy all will go well with us. External things are comparatively nothing; whatever be a religious body's relation to the State—whatever its regimen—whatever its doctrines—whatever its worship—if it has but the life of holiness within it, this inward gift will, if I may so speak, take care of itself.

The Church Evangelicals likewise placed great emphasis on sanctity of heart and conduct—indeed, the charity and discipline of the Victorian Evangelicals is legendary. Their charitable works extended far beyond their famous struggle to abolish the slave trade; they were active promoters of legislation to improve conditions in prisons and factories, and early advocates of child labor and education laws. The sanctity of their hearts was expressed in the strictness of their homes—part of a concerted effort to inculcate holiness in themselves and their offspring. Whatever may be said of Evangelical theology, "the strength of the Movement in its early days lay in its renunciation of the world."^11

Wesley saw the pursuit of holiness as a return to Apostolic Christianity,^12 and this indicates yet another area of agreement between the two parties: the Evangelicals were keenly interested in

---

Newman, vol. 5: Liberalism in Oxford, January 1835-December 1836 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1981), p. 15. This series will hereafter be referred to as Newman's Letters and Diaries. Because each volume is edited separately, however, the initial citation of each volume will repeat the complete bibliographical information.

^10 Via Media, cited by Davies, 3:248-49.


the early Church. The ecclesiastical histories of Newton, Haweis, Taylor, and many others further attest to this interest, and it is no coincidence that Newman's own interest in the church Fathers was awakened as he read the famous Evangelical Church history of Joseph and Isaac Milner. In fact, while the Tractarians undoubtedly revered Church Tradition more highly than did the Evangelicals, it was the latter who produced, in William Goode and George Stanley Faber, the most learned and accurate Victorian scholars of Church history.

The Tractarian and Evangelical views of the Eucharist were also similar, and the Evangelicals focused attention on the sacrament well before the Oxford Movement began. "The Evangelicals," writes Davies, "can rightly be claimed as pioneers in restoring the Sacrament of Holy Communion to its central place in the Anglican cultus." Typical is a hymn by John Wesley which compares the Eucharist to fasting, hearing the Word, and prayer, all of which are merely "Good vessels all to draw the Grace/Out of Salvation's well." None compare to "this mysterious Rite:"

This is the richest Legacy
Thou hast on Man bestow'd:
Here chiefly, LORD, we feed on Thee,
And drink thy precious Blood.

The influence of the Church Evangelicals in recalling Anglicans to the communion table cannot be overestimated. Shortly before his

---

13Walsh, pp. 174-87, passim.

14Davies, 3:223.

death in 1836, Simeon wrote to Archdeacon Hodson recalling the days before he came to the living at Trinity Church, Cambridge. In those days he had visited Trinity on several occasions and had once been one of only three communicants at the Eucharist. After 54 years of ministry he could write:

Yesterday I . . . partook of the Lord's Supper in concert with a larger number than has been convened together on such an occasion in any church in Cambridge since the place existed on earth. . . . So greatly has the Church of England been injured by myself and my associates.  

The Tractarians, then, found the ground well prepared in this area and may be said to have taken up an Evangelical theme. There is an echo of the Wesleys in Pusey's sermon, *Holy Communion—Privileges*, when he says, "other gifts of God are means of grace; prayer, fasting, . . . reading God's word . . . but the Sacraments are more."  

Newman would have found the Evangelicals in full agreement when he exulted at Littlemore: "How great is our privilege, my brethren! every one of us enjoys the great privileges of daily worship and weekly communion."  

In several less significant ways the two movements found common cause. Both parties, for instance, laid greater emphasis on preaching than was usual in the Anglican Church. The extemporaneous preaching of the Evangelicals was not adopted by the Tractarians, but they often

16 Moule, p. 165.  
18 Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, cited by Dearing, p. 16.  
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used sermons to convey important messages. The emphasis the Oxonians placed on preaching is attested to by the quality and sheer volume of sermons they produced, including Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons* and Keble's eleven volume *Sermons for the Christian Year*.

In addition, the fact that the Tractarians emphasized the Cross in their preaching was due in large part to the Evangelicals. As Pusey wrote, it was from Evangelicalism that "a vivid and energetic ... preaching of the corruption of human nature, and of the Cross ... by the Providence of God broke in upon an age of torpor and smooth easy ways in religion."  

Brilioth notes several other similarities between the two parties including fundamental agreement in their reverence for the Scriptures and in their emphasis on the Old Testament. He even notices that both moved beyond metrical psalmody—the Evangelicals by producing original hymns, the Tractarians (especially John Mason Neale) by translating ancient hymns.

It should come as no surprise then that the Tractarians expected, and at first received, support from the Evangelicals within the Church of England. The initial aims of the Oxford Movement were not abhorrent to Evangelicals. The statement resulting from the Hadleigh

---

19 Cited by Davies, 3:110. R. W. Church, in *The Oxford Movement, Twelve Years, 1833-45*, goes so far as to say that Newman's preaching alone was more important to the Oxford Movement than all the Tracts combined.


21 Yngve Brilioth, *Three Lectures on Evangelicalism and the Oxford*
Conference called for associations to "maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services, and the discipline of the Church;" and the Evangelicals were as fond of Church discipline as they were of associations. It was no coincidence that Newman appealed to the readers of the Evangelical Record by emphasizing their mutual desire for more Church discipline.\footnote{Palmer, p. 105.}

It was the Tracts that began to alienate the Evangelicals, although many continued to support the movement itself. Newman noted in his diary that the Record had denounced the Tracts but had "taken up 'the movement begun at Oxford' and the Association."\footnote{Five letters published between 21 October and 14 November, 1833, reprinted in Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall, The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman, vol. 4: The Oxford Movement, July 1833–December 1834 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1980), pp. 63–65, 76–78, 87–88, 94–96, 101–103.} Newman evidently tried to counteract the effect on several occasions. Brilioth suspects that at least two Tracts, "Law of Liberty" (no. VIII) and "Sin of the Church" (no. VI), were directed at the Evangelicals, and Newman himself claimed that Tract no. XI, "The Visible Church," was "for the Evangelicals."\footnote{Ibid., p. 2. Newman refers here to the associations (noted above) which the Tractarians proposed at the Hadleigh conference.} At the same time, Newman wrote a letter to the Record in which he emphasized their mutual dislike for liberalism, their shared orthodoxy on the Movement (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), pp. 45, 47.\footnote{Brilioth, Lectures, p. 29; Newman's Letters and Diaries, 4:91.}
the Trinity and the Incarnation, and their belief in the Atonement. The Record did not exactly endorse this attempt to find common ground but wrote that it would continue to regard the Tractarians as its "friends at Oxford."27

As late as 1835 Newman could write to Samuel Wilberforce that he still hoped for cooperation from the Evangelicals. Indeed, only the year before they had joined forces to forestall the appointment of Professor Hampden as Regius Professor of Divinity. But, even as Newman wrote his letter, it must have been obvious to him that the Evangelicals would never cooperate with the Tractarians in any significant way.28

For most Evangelicals the direction the movement was taking was already alarming. The thirty-first Tract, for example, had signaled the Tractarian's growing dissatisfaction with the Reformation. Here Newman declared that "the Christian Church was, in the beginning, set up in unity," and lamented that the unity had long-since dissolved. "We are reformed;" he wrote, "we have come out of Babylon, and have rebuilt our Church; but it is Ichabod; 'the glory is departed from

27 Ibid., p. 151.
28 The Hampden controversy provides further evidence that the Evangelicals were not entirely enamored of the Dissenters. One of the chief complaints against Hampden during the controversy in 1836 was that he had betrayed Church principles some years earlier by leading the campaign at Oxford to allow Dissenters to take degrees at the University. See Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church: An Ecclesiastical History of England, 2 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966-1970), 1:112ff. For Newman's letter to Wilberforce see Newman's Letters and Diaries, 5:21.
By 1837 the Tractarians were expounding the view that "the doctrine of the early Church was this; that 'in the Eucharist, an oblation or sacrifice was made by the Church to God, under the form of His creatures of bread and wine, . . .'" This was a far cry from the Tract three years earlier which had argued nothing more controversial than that "the Bread and Wine . . . are neither changed as to their substance, nor vanished, nor reduced to nothing, but are solemnly consecrated by the words of Christ, . . ." In fact, the radical interpretation placed on the Eucharist by the Tracts was as disturbing to the Evangelicals as any other thing promulgated by the Oxfordians. One modern author, speaking of the retreat of dissenters into Ultra-Protestantism argues that much of this decay is to be explained by over-reaction to the Tractarian movement in the 30s and 40s. Even the decline of the Church idea, the Puritan concept of the congregation as a sacerdotal society, a kingdom of priests, may be explained in this way. The Tractarians' exaltation of the sacraments led dissenters either to neglect them altogether, to tack them on to the end of the preaching service, or to insist on lay administration as a counter to priestly claims.

The same might easily be said about the reaction of most Church Evangelicals.

---


31Ibid., 1(27):1.

But the most important blow fell in 1838 when Hurrell Froude's *Remains* were published. The Evangelical outcry was instantaneous and nearly universal. Many Evangelicals probably found nothing alarming in Froude's penitence—Wesley and Simeon, after all, were rigorous in their own private confessions. What alarmed most Evangelicals was Froude's attack on the Reformation. Lines like "odious Protestantism sticks in people's gizzards" and "really I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more" seemed to reveal some heretofore hidden motive of the Tractarians. From this point, more than any other, can be marked the alienation of the Church Evangelicals from the Oxford Movement. No longer did the two parties seem to share a common goal. The Evangelicals would not be party to the undoing of the Reformation.

Froude's *Remains* alienated many who were not Evangelicals. Within the High Church party were many who found this startling. William Palmer refers to "the material differences" between Froude's view of the Reformers and his own. The result was that by the time the movement had completed its first decade a serious split had occurred. On the one hand, as Palmer aptly demonstrated, were those who showed a marked tendency toward "Romish" practices. Opposite them stood those Evangelicals within the Church who had reacted to that tendency by rejecting entirely the outward symbols of the Church and who could now be considered truly Low Church. Between these two stood a large group of moderates who displayed characteristics of both

33 Chadwick, 2:172-75.
34 Palmer, pp. 123, 152.
groups. Although this group’s boundaries were sometimes ill-defined, there stood within it a small group of men who consciously identified themselves with both High Church principles and the Evangelical movement. These sought to carry on the original ideals of the Tractarians by infusing the outward privileges of the Church with the inner warmth of Evangelicalism. Indeed, they were Evangelical High Churchmen.
CHAPTER II

CONFLICT

Introduction

In a letter to C. P. Golightly, on 6 March 1841, the scholar George Stanley Faber wrote about his recent association with a group of men who hoped to hold "a just medium between Tractarianism and what for want of a better name I have been wont to call Ultra-Protestantism. If I wished to designate our principle," he said, "perhaps I could not do better than by the name of Evangelical High Churchmanship; . . ."\(^1\)

The term was coined the year before by Henry Christmas, librarian of Sion College (London) and editor of The Church of England Quarterly Review, to identify those Evangelicals who specifically combatted the extremes of Tractarianism and Ultra-Protestantism by looking to old High Church principles—namely: Scripture, the Fathers, and Tradition. While these moderates never became a recognized Church party, the men who composed it shared certain specific characteristics, among which were:

1) a conscious and sustained attempt to find a moderate position between the Low Church and the Church of Rome as evidenced in their

---

\(^1\)Cited by Peter Toon, Evangelical Theology, 1833-1856: A Response to Tractarianism (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), p. 42. Faber (1773-1854) was the uncle of the Tractarian (and, later, Catholic), F. W. Faber. George Stanley Faber attended Durham University and later taught at first University and then Lincoln College, Oxford. He became one of the leading spokesmen against the Oxford Movement.
writings. Emphasis here is on the word conscious. No doubt, the majority of Englishmen fell somewhere between the two extremes, but these men attempted to demonstrate that the historical position of the Church generally, and the English Church particularly, was centrally located between the two. Most importantly, these men attempted to determine the boundaries of this centrist position and agreed substantially as to where those boundaries fell.

2) a consistent avowal of "church principles" (i.e. the importance of the sacraments as more than symbols, the necessity of the Apostolic Succession as legitimizing church authority, and the general condemnation of dissent).

3) some enthusiasm for what was known to the Victorians as "vital religion" (i.e. although these men emphasized the necessity of the sacraments and church authority, they generally encouraged personal and individual conversions, etc.). As Knox wrote, "to be evangelical is to feel that the Gospel is the POWER of God unto Salvation."

It should be noted that, very often, the best indication of an Evangelical High Churchman is his relation to others who so-qualify. Only rarely does one find Faber's name mentioned without finding also mentioned the names of Coode, Scholefield, Pearson, or the Churchman and the Christian Observer. These men, through the instruments of these journals (and others) and their own writings, attempted to define specifically the boundaries of the Church of England as it although he sympathized with its early objectives, and, indeed, was often criticized by Low Churchmen for his close identification with the High Churchmen.
stood between Romanism and Ultra-Protestantism and, in fact, achieved a consensus as to where those limits fell.

In order to see more clearly this attempt at moderation it will be necessary to first investigate the direction in which Tractarian theology seemed to be leading, then to discover the "Ultra-Protestant" reaction, and finally to see how Faber and other moderates attempted to find a proper balance between the two. Although there were many questions debated during this time, we will concentrate on just three: 1) the importance of the established Church, 2) tradition and the Church Divines, and 3) the process of justification.

The Importance of the Established Church

The spark that lit the fire of the Oxford Movement was the introduction in the House of Commons of the church temporalities bill on 12 February 1833. To Churchmen, this seemed the first of what they imagined would be many such attacks on the prerogatives of the Church. The year before had witnessed the passage of the Reform Act, and the Duke of Wellington expressed what must have been the attitude of many High Churchmen when he wrote:

The revolution is made, that is to say, that power is transferred from one class of society, the gentlemen of England, professing the faith of the Church of England, to another class of society, the shopkeepers, being Dissenters from the Church, many of them Socinians, others atheists.²

To High Churchmen, the church temporalities (or Irish Church) bill seemed the opening volley of a war that non-churchmen must now

wage against the Church. Many were alarmed that even so-Tory a prime minister as Lord Grey seemed intoxicated by the mood for reform. In fact, Grey realized that any attempt to appease the Irish must be radical. His radicalism startled even O'Connell. Among other things, the Irish Church bill abolished two of the four Irish archbishoprics and eight of the bishoprics; it reduced the revenues of the two wealthiest sees and abolished the cess (tax) paid by parishioners for the upkeep of the parish church. There were suggestions that the money thus saved might go to build Catholic churches or even to pay Roman Catholic priests. 3

There was little doubt in the minds of many Churchmen that the reformers would turn their attentions to the Church in England next. Keble wrote bitterly of the "ruffian band come to reform, where ne'er they came to pray," and concluded that

the Apostolic Church in this realm is henceforth only to stand, in the eye of the state, as one sect among many, depending, for any preeminence she may still appear to retain, merely upon the accident of her having a strong party in the country. 4

Newman summarized this point of view in his second Tract, The Catholic Church:

Are we content to be accounted the mere creation of the state? Did the state make us? can it unmake us? can it send out missionaries? can it arrange dioceses? Surely these are all spiritual functions; ... No one can say the British Legislature is in our communion, or that its members are necessarily even Christians. What pretence then has it

3 Chadwick, Victorian Church, 1:55-57.
for not merely advising, but superseding the Ecclesiastical power?

The Oxford Movement grew out of this threat. As Keble and Newman and many others saw the Church's base of authority suddenly crumbling, they attempted to redefine the prerogatives of the Church in terms that went beyond the power of the state. They appealed to the Church's spiritual and historical foundations.

To most, the establishment of the Church of England as the official Church was still of utmost importance. Only Keble seems able to have believed that "Establishment is not on the whole as great a benefit to men's spiritual interest as one has been led to think." For the rest, the Church of England was God's instrument. It alone was responsible for the moral tone of the state. It alone kept England from lapsing into barbarism. Destroy it and "you pull down the political structure on your own head," said Newman.

But in 1833 the immediate task seemed to be to answer Newman's question: would the Church allow herself to be considered a creation of the state to be made and unmade at will? If not, to whom was she to appeal for authority? The Tractarians found their answer in the doctrine of the apostolic succession. "We are those," said Newman, "who [adhere] to that one Body Catholic which alone was founded by the Apostle."

---

I fear it must be owned [he wrote] that much of the evil is owing to the comparatively low ground which we ourselves, the Ministers of God, have chosen to occupy in defence of our commission. For many years, we have been much in the habit of resting our claim on the general duties of submission to authority, of decency and order, of respecting precedents long established; instead of appealing to that warrant, which marks us exclusively, for God's Ambassadors. . . . Why should we talk so much of an Establishment, and so little of an Apostolical Succession? Why should we not seriously endeavour to impress our people with this plain truth;—that by separating themselves from our communion, they separate themselves not only from a decent, orderly, useful society, but from the only church in this realm which has a right to be quite sure that she has the Lord's Body to give to His people?

Unfortunately, the Tractarians alienated many potential supporters among the Evangelicals by exaggerating this doctrine and becoming narrow in their interpretation of it. The Evangelicals believed that the Church on earth existed in both a visible and an invisible form. The invisible Church encompassed all of those, including dissenters and Roman Catholics, who had believed on Christ and been justified by faith. The Church of England, then, constituted the visible Church whose individual members might or might not be members if the invisible, or true, Church. In contrast to this, Newman declared that the word Church, applied to the body of Christians, means but one thing in Scripture, a visible body invested with invisible privileges. Scripture does not speak of two bodies, one visible, the other invisible, such that it is possible to be a member of one and not a member of the other.

But Newman went even further and elaborated on the "invisible privileges" with which the Church of England had been invested. The

sacraments, as a means of regeneration," he said, are "the peculiar
and invisible gift of the Church." Salvation itself must come
through the Church.

Dissent, then, very naturally became the object of concentrated
attack by the Tractarians. "There is a necessity of believing the
Catholic Church, because except a man be of that he can be of none;" true Churchmen ought to "pray to God . . . that he may be pleased so
to turn [dissenters] hearts, and fetch them home to his flock, that
they may be saved together with His true servants." As usual,
Newman seems to have summarized the Tractarian position best:

As we believe it [the Church] to be a Divine ordinance, so we
must ever protest against separation from it as sin. There
is not a dissenter living but, in as much, and so far as he
dissents, is in a sin . . . . If he is saved, he will be
saved, not through it, but in spite of it.

Statements like these embittered many Evangelicals who placed primary
emphasis on personal conversion and who saw the dissenters as equals
in the invisible church.

The Tractarians, then, began by asserting the independent and
self-sustaining authority of the Church against the encroachment of
the state. As they expressed the doctrine of the apostolic

10 Ibid., 3:251. One of the difficulties in dealing with the Oxford
Movement is the fact that, like any such movement, its adherents were far
from unanimous in their approach to any given doctrine. But Newman seems
to have spoken for the main body of Tractarians at any given time. He
was doubtless the most charismatic of the leaders of the Oxford Movement,
and many who never abandoned the Church of England must have followed the
evolution of his thinking right up to the time of his conversion (at
which time, in the words of Chadwick, "the Tractarians lost the single
bold and original mind which they then possessed").


13 Newman, Parochial and Plain Sermons, 3:220.
succession, however, they became increasingly strident about the prerogatives of the Church and increasingly critical of those who did not share their convictions. The result was to drive most Evangelicals into a Low Church position where they allied with Dissent and very often attacked the privileges of the established Church.

That the Church Evangelicals should have allied with the dissenters is not as natural as it may at first appear. Indeed, there was a natural tendency in the opposite direction—a tendency which the attacks of the Tractarians did much to overcome. The early Evangelicals had distrusted the dissenters. Wilberforce, writing in 1789, expressed the apparently typical view that "its individual benefits are no compensation for the general evils of dissent." He complained that "the increase of dissenters, which always follows from the institution of unsteeped places of worship, is highly injurious to the interests of religion in the long run." Among the things they disliked were prayer meetings (Simeon always regarded extemporaneous prayer as dangerous because it made people dissatisfied with the Prayer Book) and lay preaching. One prominent Evangelical considered lay preaching "a manifest irregularity" which "would not be endured in any Christian society." The problem became especially acute when itinerate dissenting preachers invaded Evangelical parishes.

But by the 1830s the Church Evangelicals had found new reasons to ally themselves with dissenters and fight attempts, such as the Oxford Movement, to heighten the importance of the Church of England. The

---

14 Cited by Elliott-Binns, p. 211.
very secession of the Methodists had served to bring the two parties
closer by blurring the distinction between the Church and dissent.
Methodism became a means of transition from the one to the other. The
Methodists became either "the High Churchmen of Nonconformity" or the
"Low Churchmen of the Anglican Communion," depending on one's point of
view.16 In addition, the early nineteenth century saw the political
union of the two groups. The Evangelicals found many allies among the
dissenters in the fight to abolish slavery as well as in the quest for
strict sabbatarian laws and more humane labor laws.

The dogmatism of the Tractarians also helped push the Evangelicals and dissenters together. As the Tractarians became more engrossed in the rituals and prerogatives of the Church, most Evangelicals became alarmed. Perhaps the tendency for the movement to overemphasize the importance of the Church was a natural one for, as Palmer says,

It was impossible, when certain truths or principles had to be retrieved, that they should not apparently, and in some cases really assume an undue degree of prominence. Principles relating to the Church, the Sacraments, etc., were to be dwelt on continually and earnestly, if the public attention was to be arrested: and yet it was impossible to prevent many of those who became convinced of the truth of those principles, from investing them with undue importance; from supposing that the essence of religion consisted in their reception and advocacy.17

But, natural or not, the Evangelicals became disturbed.

To all Evangelicals, the Church in its invisible form had always

17 Palmer, p. 185.
taken precedent over the Church in its visible form although the two had always seemed perfectly compatible. Now the Tractarians asserted that dissenters might not be saved and the Evangelicals saw a clear choice. They could support the visible Church, with her increasingly-inflated authority, or they could minimize the prerogatives of the Church and insist that the true Church transcended the boundaries of the Church of England.

The latter position was a natural one for most Evangelicals to take. Their Calvinistic heritage placed emphasis on individual judgment, individual conversion, and individual assurance of salvation. This same heritage, derived as it was from the Continental Reformation, minimized ceremony and visible embellishments of worship. Add to these a natural English fear of anything even remotely resembling Popery—inflamed by Froude's Remains—and it is little wonder that most Evangelicals radically distanced themselves from anything put forth by the Tractarians. Most assumed a Low Church stance and joined the growing chorus of dissenters and radicals who were downplaying the importance of the Sacraments and the Church hierarchy.

It was an Evangelical, however, who was among the first to sound the alarm that the Church prerogatives were in danger. As reform fever engulfed the country, and evidence mounted that the Radicals and dissenters would unite to disestablish the Church, James Scholefield, once a curate to Charles Simeon, preached a sermon entitled, *An Argument for a Church Established*. "The immediate result [of
"disestablishment]," he said, "must be that our villages would be at once abandoned to heathenism."\(^\text{18}\)

Scholefield was Regius Professor of Greek at Trinity College, Cambridge and, as such, represented a more intellectual strain of Evangelicalism—one that was firmly committed to the established Church. He and his fellow-Evangelicals, G. S. Faber and William Goode,\(^\text{19}\) took up a moderate position half-way between the increasingly high Church Tractarians and the ever-lower Church Evangelicals. While the latter clamored to disparage the importance of the apostolic succession, Faber reiterated his "full historical conviction [in] the aboriginal appointment of Episcopal Ecclesiastical Polity," all the while condemning the former for rejecting "every Reformed church which from its local infelicity was organized unepiscopally."\(^\text{20}\)

William Goode, a fellow-scholar of Scholefield's at Trinity and perhaps the most learned Evangelical of his day, defined his own position in his inaugural editorial in the *Christian Observer*. Goode


\(^{19}\) Goode (1801-1868) was raised in one of the leading Evangelical families in England. His father (also named William) served as a curate at Blackfriars, London under the famous Evangelical, William Romaine, and succeeded Romaine as vicar in 1795. He sent his son to Trinity College, Cambridge (c. 1821) almost certainly because of the presence there of Charles Simeon. There the younger William became especially learned in historical theology, ecclesiastical history, and law. He later became an editor for the Parker Society.

\(^{20}\) Cited by Toon, p. 42.
saw three parties prevailing in the Church: the Evangelicals, the High Church, and the Tractarians. "Men may repudiate, as much as they please, all connexion with any of these bodies, but if the general character of their views is accordant with that of one of these, they are justly classed under one or other of these appellations." Under his guidance, he wrote, the journal would adhere to what had traditionally been the Evangelical views. But Goode's views were not those of contemporary Low Church Evangelicals; for one thing, he would not countenance Dissent. Although he did not believe that all dissenters were necessarily damned, neither did he think it "a matter of indifference to which body a man belongs." Goode's editorial points up the tension that characterized the moderate position. Because their position was more easily defined in reference to what they were against than in terms of what they were for, the writings of the Evangelical High Churchmen are often characterized by a certain ambiguity. They knew what they were attacking: Romanism and the Romanist tendencies of the Tractarians on the one hand and the narrow bigotry of the Ultra-Protestants on the other; but they were often vague about what they were defending. Typical is the 1833 editorial by Goode's predecessor at the Christian Observer, Samuel Charles Wilkes:

We lament to hear the ominous notes of preparation for a party-spirited collision, the effects of which, unless wiser counsels prevail to check the evil, may be most injurious to our National Church. . . . On the one side we see ranged a new and active sect, composed chiefly of Dissenters who agree with the Church of England in her leading doctrinal tenets, but avowing themselves her enemies as an Established

---

Church, and combining with Infidels, Radicals, and Socinians, to raze her foundations. On the other side we see a society formed at Oxford, the members of which, professing themselves to be the most orthodox upholders of the Church, have begun to scatter throughout the land publications which, for bigotry, Popery, and intolerance, surpass the writings even of Laud and Sacheverell.

In contrast to this very definite statement about the enemies of the Church, Wilkes vaguely claimed for his own party that they stood "upon Scriptural and Church of England principles" and that they upheld "the powerful claims of our National Church Establishment." 

So the moderates found themselves squarely, if somewhat obscurely, in the center of the Oxford tempest. On the one hand they believed that the Church of England had an historic right to be the official Church of the nation. And they defended this right, like the Tractarians, on the basis of the apostolic succession. The Anglican Church, in their view, was that which had originated with the Apostles of Christ, and which—unlike the Roman Church—still guarded the true doctrines of the faith. On the other hand they yielded to no Evangelical in their defense of "vital religion" and justification by faith. On almost every issue their writings reveal an uncomfortable balance between the two extremes. Take, for example, this question of Church authority and private judgment. The subject arose in the pages of the Churchman, a journal whose editor claimed, "in a word, our views are those of Evangelical High Churchman." A reader had noticed the ambiguity of their position and wrote asking the editors

---

22Ibid., 33 (1833): iii-iv.
23Ibid., 34 (1834): v.
24Ibid.
25Cited by Toon, p. 43.
to declare plainly whether Church authority took precedence over individual judgment. The Churchman equivocated:

On the occasion to which our correspondent refers we were vindicating . . . the right of private judgment in opposition to the infallibility of the Church, which totally subverts and destroys it . . . . In later numbers of our paper we have had occasion to insist strongly on the authority of the Church, and we have urged the promise of our Lord to be ever with her as proof that the doctrines in which the Church Catholic has always consented, and does now consent, are the genuine truths of the word of God. In these cases, our aim has been to check the wanton exercise of private judgment, without subverting the right; to show that Scripture, as interpreted by Catholic tradition, is a safe reasonable and satisfactory rule for private Christians, without, however, urging them to believe any doctrine simply because the Church declares it, but because the Church, being the appointed vehicle for transmitting the knowledge of God, may be reasonably and firmly believed to deliver her faith on scriptural grounds. 26

This same tendency to vacillate characterized the Churchman's view of ceremony within the Church. While railing against "Romish rites and superstitions" on the one hand, they castigated those Protestants "that out of too much zeale . . . will quite demolish all, they will admit of no ceremonies at all, no fasting dayes, no cross in baptism, kneeling at communion, no church musick, etc. no bishop's courts, no church government, raile at all our Church discipline. . . ." 27

If the Evangelical High Churchmen could be said to have had a definite program it was the propagation of what William Palmer called "primitive Tractarianism." That is, they believed, with the early Tractarians, that certain principles relating to the Church—her

26Churchman, 10, no. 17 (1840): 66.
27Ibid., 9, no. 3 (1839): 1. The spelling of the original is retained. The author is imitating an earlier style.
authority and sacraments—were in danger of being completely forgotten. And, long after the Tractarians had invested those principles with "undue importance," the moderates sought a particular balance between Church authority and individual judgment; between the Sacraments and faith. In short, they attempted to define the Anglican Church as a moderate one resting between the extremes of Ritualism and Calvinistic Protestantism.

It was this attempt to resist the attraction of either extreme that led inevitably to the ambiguity of their position. That they recognized the difficulty of their task is evident in the tone of the Churchman seven years after Keble's landmark sermon:

Let none deceive themselves with the idea of an approximation and union in sentiment between the high and Low Churchmen. The time was when we hoped and thought there was a tendency to this; that the one was coming down and the other going up, so that they would unite in a happy union, and both be improved,—the Churchmanship of the one and the spirituality of the other; but we have long since lost all such hope. . . . We content ourselves, therefore, with laboring to deserve the title of . . . a consistent Christian, leaving our brethren to choose for themselves such appellations as they prefer.

Throughout the debates that raged between Tractarianism and Ultra-Protestantism, the Evangelical High Churchmen set for themselves the task of improving upon the spirituality of the former and the churchmanship of the latter. That they saw themselves as defenders of the traditionally moderate position of the Church of England is evident from their writings on the role of tradition and the Church Divines.

28Ibid., 9, no. 7 (1839): 27.
Tradition and the Church Divines

In no way did the Evangelical High Churchmen more closely resemble the early Tractarians than in their view of the Reformation and the early Church. That many Tractarians eventually embraced Rome should not obscure the fact that their early pronouncements were distinctly anti-Roman. The presence of Froude among the Oxonians indicates that the seeds of their later involvement with Rome were present from the beginning, but if we take the Tractarians at their word this was far from their original intent.

The early Tractarians believed that the English Reformation had delivered England from "the yoke of Papal tyranny and usurpation" and from "superstitious opinions and practices which had grown up during the middle ages." Newman's view was that the Roman Church was "infected with heterodoxy." "We are bound," he said, "to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth." Pusey believed that the Church of England, "alone of all the Reformed Churches, was purified in the fire and purged by the blood of martyrs, and had the evidence of affliction that she was a beloved child."30

But the Tractarian defense of the English Reformation lasted only a short time. William Palmer indicates that their shift in attitude took place about 1840, although he offers no explanation as to its

29 *Tracts for the Times*, cited by Palmer, p. 144.
30 Pusey's sermon of 5 November 1833, cited by Palmer, p. 146.
31 Ibid., p. 149.
likely cause. No doubt as the leading Tractarians became more disposed toward the Roman Church their enthusiasm for the English Reformation waned proportionately. But the event which undoubtedly brought their growing opposition to the fore was the proposal of the Jerusalem Bishopric.

At the bottom of this proposal was Prussia's and Britain's attempt to gain influence in the weakening Turkish empire. Russia and France had long manipulated that empire by claiming to be the protectors of the Orthodox and Catholic Christians in that region. In 1841 Prussian and England decided jointly to create a bishopric in Jerusalem to "protect" Protestants in the area. (At the time there were six living in the entire region.)\textsuperscript{32} The Low Church Evangelicals campaigned for the bishopric and openly urged the subjugation of foreign territories so as to facilitate the missionary activities of the Church.

The Tractarians publicly and bitterly opposed any cooperation with the German Church. "Lutheranism and Calvinism," wrote Newman, "are heresies, repugnant to Scripture . . . and anathemised by east as well as west."\textsuperscript{33} Tractarian writings on the subject demonstrate their antipathy toward the Continental Reformation in particular. Even at their most Catholic the Oxonians were usually able to admit to their pantheon of Church Fathers the post-Reformation English divines (particularly, of course, the non-jurors), but the absence from their

\textsuperscript{32}Chadwick, \textit{Victorian Church}, 1:189-90.

writings of the Continental divines is conspicuous. In fact, their adoration of the arch-Arminian Laud precluded any real affinity for the Calvinistic continental Reformers. The *British Critic* on more than one occasion attacked the English Reformation for being "in spirit Calvinistic," and praised the "noble episcopate that reclaimed us from Calvinism."  

The Low Church Evangelicals, on the other hand, shared the heritage of the Lutheran Church. These were the heirs of Luther and Calvin, of the Continental Reformation and its major tenets. Their very opposition to Rome and the Romanizing tendencies of the Tractarians found its roots in their fervent Calvinism. Nothing could have been more calculated to drive the wedge still further between the Tractarians and the Low Church than the Jerusalem Bishopric. Here were the Evangelicals willing to cooperate with a church that stood for everything the Tractarians abhorred—willing to cooperate with the champions of private judgment over Church paternalism; of stark, unadorned services rather than elaborate, symbol-filled worship; of Calvinism and personal election as opposed to free will exercised through the instrument of the Church. Certainly the Jerusalem Bishopric controversy marks an important point in the relationship of the two parties.

Once again the Evangelical High Churchmen showed characteristics of both the Evangelical Low Church and the Tractarians. By and large the moderates were quite willing to cooperate with the Lutheran Church. For the most part they indicated that they were generally

---

favorable, if not ecstatic, toward the proposal. The Churchman, for example, celebrated the occasion of the proposal by printing without comment the letters that passed between the Prussian Church and the Archbishop of Canterbury outlining the venture. In addition, they devoted a large portion of the same issue to articles about such things as travel in Palestine indicating that their readers were interested if not enthusiastic.\textsuperscript{35} The reaction was predictable for, as we have seen, the moderates were not averse to "every church which . . . was organized unepiscopally."

But the High Church Evangelicals tended to part company with their lower Church counterparts over the Continental Reformation. The moderates were Protestants to be sure, but they were heirs to the English Reformation. The Churchman published a long sermon on this subject by Dr. Hook whose High Church views and friendship with Evangelical causes were well known. Dr. Hook drew a sharp distinction between the Protestants (moderates) and the Ultra-Protestants (low churchmen).

Some Englishmen in the sixteenth century, he wrote, were not content with the English Reformation and so went to Geneva and "embraced the model of Reformation settled by Calvin" and "became fond of these foreign novelties." These men, led by Knox and Goodman,\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{35}Churchman, 11, no. 28 (1842): 108-112, passim.

\textsuperscript{36}Christopher Goodman (1520?–1603) was a political theorist and Lady Margaret professor of divinity at Oxford. He was denounced during the reign of Queen Mary and fled to Geneva. While there, he joined with John Knox and several other men who were resolved to eradicate what they perceived to be the unscriptural elements of the English Prayer Book. In 1557 they produced a Reformed edition of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
"rejected the whole frame and fabric of the Reformation made in King Edward's time and conformed themselves wholly to the fashions of the Church of Geneva." The continental reformers, said Hook, rejected the English reformers because the English were, in Calvin's words, "resolved to remit nothing of their ancient customs." The foolish Calvinists (Hook's words) saw ceremonies and ancient liturgies as "trifles" which the English Reformation had failed to expunge. 37

Hence, continued Hook, arose the English Protestants and the Continental Ultra-Protestants. From the latter "descended the whole body of Ultra-Protestants, who reject all church authority, and put forth, on every occasion, the maxim that 'the Bible only forms the religion of the Protestants.'" In 1562, the dispute between these two sects reached its zenith. At stake, said Hook, was "a principle— that principle being whether the Church of England should 'conform to the government of the ancient church, or to that of the Genevan sect.'"

Hook continues:

These [the Protestants] had a great deference for the reformation of religion, as it was settled under King Edward; and so were for a strict and unaltered observation of the liturgy and orders of it as it then stood. But those who were for alterations, and stripping the English Church of her usages [the Ultra-Protestants], were such as had lately lived abroad in the reformed Churches of Geneva, Switzerland, and Germany. 38

Hook concluded that two parties of very different views had resulted from this confrontation: the Protestants (or, as he interchangeably calls them, the High Churchmen) who supported the principle which they hoped would foster a "truly scriptural religion."

37Ibid., 11, no. 8 (1842): 29. 38Ibid.
pies of the English Reformation, and the Ultra-Protestants who supported those of the Continental Reformation. Present-day critics of the High Churchmen, said Hook, were charging, in effect, that the English Reformation had not gone far enough, for in fact, "the English Reformers were distinguished from the foreign Reformers by being high Churchmen." Hook concludes with this application:

Whatever charges may be brought against those, against whom, under the name of high Churchmen, an attempt is now made to raise a moral persecution, they cannot, with propriety be accused of deviating from the principles of the English Reformation. Of the English Reformers they are, in fact, the representatives, and it is precisely on the principles of the English Reformers that they oppose the errors both of Romanists and Ultragrotestants, and uphold 'THE CHURCH OF THE TRADITIONERS.'

Here one sees clearly the characteristic moderation of the Evangelical High Church. And here too they carry on the original intentions of the Tractarians. To the moderates, the original goals of the Oxford Movement were above reproach; but as one wrote about the time of the Jerusalem Bishopric controversy, "this movement has for some time gone so far beyond its ostensible object, as to alarm not a few even of those who looked upon it at first with approbation and hope." Among those things the moderates feared most in the Oxford Movement was its tendency, as time went on, to "unprotestantize the Church" and lead her "further and further from the principles of the

---

39 Ibid., 9, no. 8 (1839): 29.
The various debates over the Reformation—and the use of quotations from divines of that period—proved to be the greatest source of conflict between the Tractarians and the Evangelical High Churchmen. On the one hand stood the Oxonians defending themselves against the charge of Popery by asserting that "in the seventeenth century, the theology of the body of the English Church was substantially the same" as that of the Tracts. Against them stood the moderates who charged that "if we go back to the works of the great Divines of our Church, not of the school of Calvin, we shall find that the very views now advocated by the Tractarians are stigmatized as of the essence of Popery."

The favorite technique of the moderates in dealing with Tractarian literature was to quote at length some passage which the Tractarian had quoted in part, and thereby to demonstrate that the passage in question actually contradicted, rather than supported, the Tractarian position. One example is the way in which William Goode dealt with a defender of Tract XC.

Tract XC was probably Newman's last attempt to remain in the Anglican Church. In it he attempted to demonstrate that even Roman Catholics could subscribe to the thirty-nine articles in some sense, to which Goode replied that "a more painful misstatement, and one, I will add, more obviously untrue and absurd to any one who is acquainted with the documents and history of that period, could not be

---

41Ibid., p. 120.  
42Newman, Tracts, 2(38):11.  
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He went on to say that, in Tract XC, sentiments and statements, absolutely unprecedented in the whole history of our reformed church, have been put forth with equal confidence as if they were indisputable truths. Matters which have been ruled points in it during the whole period of its existence, as for instance its anti-Romish character, have been brought into question, and determined contrary to the testimony of every writer of its communion.

The particular subject of Goode's attack, however, was a pamphlet by the Reverend Oakeley entitled, *The Subject of Tract XC Historically Examined*. It is here that his typical method is amply demonstrated. Oakeley had quoted the following passage from Bishop Fuller in defense of Newman's thesis which stated that at the time of the English Reformation Anglicans were indistinguishable from Catholics:

> Hitherto, Papists generally without regret repaired to the places of divine service, and were present at our prayers, sermons, and sacraments. . . . (sic) In which sense, one may say, the whole land was of one language and one speech.

Oakeley concluded that the Articles, as Newman had written, were formulated with Catholics, as well as Anglicans, in mind. Goode replied simply by quoting the entire passage as Fuller had originally written it:

> Hitherto Papists generally without regret repaired to the public places of divine service, and were present at our prayers, sermons, and sacraments. What they thought in their hearts, He knew who knoweth hearts; but in OUTWARD CONFORMITY, they kept communion with the Church of England. In which sense, one may say, that the whole land was of one language and one speech. But now began the tower of Babel to be built, and Popery to increase; . . . THEY WENT OUT

---


45 Ibid., p. 3.
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FROM US, BECAUSE THEY WERE NOT OF US...\textsuperscript{47} (emphasis his)

A few years after Goode and others began this method they had become so successful that, according to one moderate, "of all the authorities which they [the Tractarians] so confidently claimed, upon all their distinctive points, scarcely one has been left them of any real weight or importance."\textsuperscript{48} This same writer went on, however, to complain that the Tractarians continue to speak, not merely as if they still retained all these Divines, but as if they had been left in undisputed possession of them; not merely as if their opponents had not succeeded in wresting any of their boasted Compur|ators from them, but as if they had never made the attempt!\textsuperscript{49}

The \textit{British Critic}, long a voice of Tractarianism, replied to this charge by stating that even if the anti-Tractarians could demonstrate that ALL of our standard writers, since the Reformation, were of this [i.e. the anti-Tractarian] way of thinking this would still be irrelevant as regards the Oxford opinions, not merely to the question of their truth, but even of their consistency with the formularies we have described: WE ARE IN NO WAY CALLED, THEN, TO DISCUSS THE SUBJECT."\textsuperscript{50} (emphasis theirs)

As the attacks of the moderates became more effective, however, the Tractarians centered their attention less on the Reformation and more on the primitive Church.

As we have seen, Newman's introduction to the early Church Fathers came by way of Milner's \textit{History of the Church of Christ}, but the Tractarian estimation of the Father's importance soon left the Evangelicals far behind. The oral tradition, bequeathed to the early Christians by the apostles, was equal in importance, in the Tractarian

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., p. 13. \textsuperscript{48}Bricknell, p. 175. \textsuperscript{49}Ibid., p. 176. \textsuperscript{50}British \textit{Critic}, cited by Bricknell, p. 176.
scheme, to Scripture itself. Keble expressed the attitude succinctly:

Do not they (Tertullian, etc.) employ Church Tradition as parallel to Scripture, not as derived from it? and consequently as fixing the interpretation of disputed texts, not simply by the judgment of the Church, but by authority of that Holy Spirit which inspired the oral teaching itself, of which such Tradition is the record? ... If we will be impartial, we cannot hide it from ourselves, that His unwritten word, if it can be any how authenticated, must necessarily demand the same reverence from us [as Scripture].

This reverence for tradition included a reverence for the divines of nearly every age. The quotations in the Catena Patrum no. IV of Tract LXXXI alone draw from nearly seventy English divines. The Church in each new age, according to Newman, provides a new body in which to house the spirit of religion. Thus the divines in each age (at least up to the English Reformation) speak with authority—this, despite the fact that the divines of one age may contradict those of another.

The Low Church attitude toward the early Church is not nearly so complex. Although the Evangelicals may be credited with having resurrected an interest in the early Fathers, they very soon abandoned the study of them. Before long they were denouncing the Oxford movement for its "specious pretence or deference for primitive models." 52 Without a doubt Bishop Wilson reflected his Calvinistic upbringing, and spoke for all Low Church Evangelicals when he asserted that "Scripture alone is the sole and adequate Rule of Faith." 53

The Evangelical High Church view of tradition was, for the most

52 J. D. Sumner, cited by Toon, p. 29.
part, closer to that of the Low Church Evangelicals. But the moder­
ates showed a readiness to reason that their Low Church counterparts
lacked. Consequently, they defended the role of Scripture as the Rule
of Faith while appealing constantly to the Church Fathers. The
writings of Faber and Goode especially were characterized by an
objective approach to tradition—an approach which did not overlook
the faults of the early Church writers in an attempt to elevate their
importance. "The moment a Doctrine is offered to us," wrote Faber,

which cannot be found written in Scripture, and which stands
upon a foundation distinct from, and independent of Scrip­
ture, even though it may boldly claim to be part and parcel
of a body of truth and duty, contained, not indeed in
Scripture, but in [e.g.] St. Paul's good deposit with
Timothy; a deposit which, if not, as is most likely, suffi­
ciently committed to writing in the later Canonical books of
the New Testament, must now, I fear, be sought in that Lunar
region of the great Italian poet, where all things lost upon
earth may assuredly be found: the moment a Doctrine thus
circumstanced is offered to us, that Doctrine, whatever show
of evidence in its favour may be adduced from certain of the
Fathers, we are by our truly sound and Apostolic Church,
called upon to reject, as a mere fond agitation, fabricated
at a later period, by fallible mortals.

Dean Pearson summed up the difference between the Tractarians and the
moderates as one of degree rather than of kind:

It is one thing thus, confidently and thankfully, to appeal
to the support of Christian Antiquity for the general
identity of our principles and our practices with the
Primitive Church, and quite another to elevate either the
decisions of Councils, or the opinions of Fathers, into a
standard of authority almost equal to, or divinely interpre­
tive of, Scriptural Doctrines or Apostolic Ordinances.

In fact, once again, the moderates, by appealing to the Church

54Faber's Treatise on Justification, cited by Bricknell, p. 184.

55Bricknell, p. 197. Hugh Nicholas Pearson (1776-1856), a
moderate and learned Evangelical, was a scholar at St. John's College,
Fathers, carried on an original tenet of the Oxford Movement which was abandoned by its originators. For, while the Tractarians at first appealed with sincerity to the ancient Church, their appeals must soon have sounded hollow to many; for Newman's theory of development, as Palmer pointed out, "teaches us so far to set aside the testimony of Catholic antiquity, on pretence, that religion was then but imperfectly understood."56

Nevertheless, the leading Tractarians continued to express outwardly their confidence in the ancient Fathers, and each party quoted freely those passages from early writings which seemed to support its position on any issue. Such was the case in the controversy over the issue of Justification.

Justification

The Meaning

The debate over justification was twofold: what is justification? and through what medium does justification come to man? Among all Christians it was generally agreed that for a man to be saved he must, in some way, lose the guilt which all men have shared since the fall of Adam. The process whereby this regeneration took place was called justification. Generally, this was believed to be accompanied, in

---
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some manner, by a change of personality characterized by holiness. The second process was often termed sanctification.

For the Tractarians, sanctification and justification were inseparable. It was their belief that at the moment of justification Christ imparted to the soul of the believer his own righteousness. Henceforth the Christian actually possessed the mind and desires of Christ himself.

While truth and righteousness are not of us [i.e. in our natural state], it is quite certain that they are also in us if we be Christ's; not merely nominally given to us and imputed to us, but really implanted in us by the operation of the Blessed Spirit.

The importance of this belief was that justification became an act of obedience rather than an act of belief. Newman described it as "a state of holiness; not one in which we may be pardoned, but in which we are obedient;" and in another place he wrote, "[Whoever] 'has the mind of the Spirit'. . . has holiness and righteousness within him. Henceforth all his thoughts, words, and works, as done in the Spirit, are acceptable, pleasing, just before God." Newman suggests here is that man's works will not only seem pleasing to God, not only be counted pleasing by God, but that they will be actually pleasing to God. From the time a man's spirit is infused with God's righteousness that man's subsequent life will be holy, and this holiness—this constant obedience to God's law—will ultimately make that man acceptable to God. Since Christ infuses the believer with the ability to be holy, it is the believer's own perfection which
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ultimately renders a believer suitable for heaven. In his sermon, The State of Salvation, Newman outlines the belief in imparted righteousness:

Christ is present in that heart which He visits with His grace. So that to be in His kingdom is to be in righteousness, to live in obedience, to breathe, as it were, an atmosphere of truth and love.

Now it is necessary to insist upon this also: for here again some men go wrong; and while they go so far as to acknowledge that there is a new state, or kingdom, into which souls must be brought, in order to salvation, yet consider it as a state, not of holiness and righteousness, but merely or mainly of acceptance with God. It has been maintained by some persons, that human nature, even when regenerate, is not, and cannot be, really holy; nay, that it is idle to suppose that, even with the aid of the Holy Spirit, it can do anything really good in any degree; that our best actions are sins; and that we are always sinning, not only in slighter matters, but so as to need pardon, in all we do, in the same sense in which we needed it when we were as yet unregenerate; and consequently, that it is vain to try to be holy and righteous, or, rather, that it is presumptuous.

On the contrary, says Newman, once one has achieved a state of grace one must live a life of perfect holiness.

If we do sin, we cease to be in that state of salvation; we fall back into a state resembling our original state of wrath, and must pass back again from wrath to grace (if he so), as we best may, in such ways as God has appointed; whereas it is not an uncommon notion, at this time, that a man may be an habitual sinner, and yet be in a state of salvation, and in the kingdom of grace.

Newman is castigating here the doctrine of justification by faith as it appeared to be held by many Christians. He criticizes those who seem to believe that they may continue to sin in distinct acts so long as they request forgiveness for each one "by faith." Rather than define the state of salvation as a state in which the believer exer-
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cises substantial holiness, these define it as a state in which existing sins are forgiven—simply overlooked by God.

Persons who hold these opinions consider that the great difference between a state of nature and a state of salvation is, that, in a state of nature, when we sin, we are not forgiven (which is true); but that, in a state of salvation, when we sin, our sins are forgiven us because we are in that state. On the other hand, I maintain from Scripture, that a state of salvation is so far from being a state in which sins of every kind are forgiven, that it is a state in which there are not sins of every kind to forgive; and that, if a man commit them, so far from being forgiven by his state, he falls at once from his state by committing them; so far from being justified by faith, he, for that very reason, has not faith whereby to justify him.

In fact, in this passage, Newman is comparing the belief of the Tractarians with that of the Low Church. The traditional Reformation, or 'forensic', view stated that man was justified by faith alone. In this view, Christ's perfect obedience toward God's law is imputed, rather than imparted, to the believer. The emphasis is on being accounted righteous rather than on being made righteous. Despite the fact that Ultra-Protestants might strive for holiness, the entire question of individual justification could be settled without reference to whether the person thus accounted righteous actually became righteous. The issue hinged on whether the believer had moved, through faith in Christ's righteousness, into a state of acceptance by God. The Tractarians made this doctrine the object of intense attack. In one instance they had this to say about the low Protestant view of justification:

The very first aggression, then, of those who labour to revive some degree at least of vital Christianity . . . must
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be upon that strange congeries of notions and practices of which the Lutheran Doctrine of Justification is the origin and representative. Whether any heresy has ever infested the Church, so hateful and unchristian as this doctrine, it is perhaps not necessary to determine: none certainly has ever prevailed so subtle and extensively poisonous.

A corollary to justification by faith alone was the belief that no human works could be considered righteous. To the Calvinistic Low Churchmen the practice of good works might indicate that the person who did them was in a state of grace, but no work, either prior or subsequent to salvation, could be considered good in itself. This was in sharp contrast to the Tractarian belief that a Christian's infused righteousness rendered all of his subsequent works meritorious. 63

The two beliefs evoked different emphases. The Ultra-Protestants placed great emphasis on personal conversion. In their view—in practice at least—it was more important for the believer to recall the moment at which he passed from a "state of death" to a "state of life" than to show definite signs of having done so. The Tractarians minimized the conversion experience and stressed instead the subsequent change in a believer's life. As Pusey said, "In whatever way a change may be wrought, a change there must be." 64 It did not so much matter when the change took place so long as there was a change.

The High Church Evangelicals wrote at great length on the subject of justification because they believed the doctrine to be the key to

all right doctrine. George Stanley Faber's *Treatise on Justification* set the tone for much of their thinking. In it Faber reasoned:

If the end of the Gospel be the reconciliation of man with God, and if it be therefore of prime importance to ascertain how that reconciliation is effected: then the doctrine of Justification may claim to itself a sort of precedence over all other doctrines; then one of the greatest fathers of the reformation [Luther] did not err, when he pronounced it to be the badge of a standing or of a falling Church according as it was held soundly or unsoundly.

At first glance the Evangelical High Church belief may seem to support the Low Church view entirely. Certainly the moderates believed that justification was primarily imputed to the believer rather than imparted to him. Thus, Faber in a comment on Romans 8:33-34 says that Paul is using the term justification in the forensic sense. The believers are on trial and God justifies them. The words "who is he that condemneth?" are answered by: "it is God that justifieth," thus indicating that the theological sense of the word "justified" must be "acquitted." But the problem becomes more complex when one realizes that the believer is, in some sense, acquitted unjustly, for, in fact, the accusations are just. Thus the term "justification" expands to include pardon as well as acquittal. Faber concludes that God can only be the "acquitting pardoner" because of the righteousness of Christ which he imputes to the believer:

St. Paul repeatedly declares, that our justification is solely by faith in the merits of Christ. . . . Our Church rightly determines, that we are accounted righteous before God (accounted only, not actually made righteous), only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith.

In this passage Faber sounds very much like a Low Church Evangelist.
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ical. Yet Faber believed, too, that "without holiness it is impossible in the very nature of things to enter into the kingdom of heaven."  

Here again one senses the ambiguity of the moderate position. On the one hand salvation is through faith alone; on the other, it is holiness that secures one's place in heaven. To reconcile these seemingly incompatible views, the High Church Evangelicals brought forth a doctrine which made sanctification equal in status to justification but not necessarily simultaneous in process.

Just as a man wishing to take control of a parcel of land must gain both title (deed) and possession (physical control) of the land, so too, a man wishing to enter heaven must gain both title (justification) and possession (sanctification) of Christ. Justification gives one "the right to be called a son of God" but cannot do more than bestow upon one the title. Sanctification is the process (or event) whereby a believer becomes holy. It is sanctification that qualifies the justified to enter heaven.

And again [Faber wrote], by his Holy Spirit changing and renewing our hearts, making us altogether different creatures from what we were by nature, and gradually maturing us in every disposition pleasing to God, he renders us fit subjects for spiritual happiness; so that thus our qualification for the kingdom of heaven is restored to us, no less than our right and title to it: this is our Sanctification.

The Churchman reflects Faber's view:

Gospel justification is a change of state and condition in the eye of the law, and of the lawgiver; whereas Gospel sanctification is a blessed conformity of heart and life to
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the law, or will of the law-giver. The first is a relative change, from being guilty to be righteous; the other is a real change, from being filthy to be holy; by the one we are made near to God; by the other we are made like him. By being justified, of aliens we are made children; by being sanctified, the enmity of the heart is slain, and the sinner made not only a faithful loyal subject, but a loving dutiful child. This may be set in the clearest light by the following simile: Our children, the day they are born, are as much our children as they are ever after: but they are many years growing up into a state of manhood; their likeness to us, as it respects the mind, as well as the body, is daily increasing; thus a king's first born son is heir apparent to the crown while lying in the cradle; after growth adds nothing to his title; but it does to his fitness to govern, and to succeed his father. Our right to heaven comes not in at the door of our sanctification, but at that of our justification; but our meetness for heaven does. By Christ's righteousness, it being upon us, we have a right to the inheritance; and by Christ's image, it being drawn upon us, we have our meetness.

In many ways the High Church Evangelical doctrine of sanctification was very similar to that of the Tractarian doctrine of justification. In both doctrines Christ is imparting holiness to the believer and altering his nature so as to render him fit for heaven. The Churchman elaborated on the nature of this change and on the moderate view of sanctification:

The union of God and man in Christ is the foundation of our union with God. In Christ the Spirit was present in its infinite plenitude; not by derivation from another, but by origination in Himself; for he was not only 'with God,' but 'was God.' In us the same Spirit is present, not in fulness, but in degrees; not by origination in our nature, but by procession from the Father and the Son. In proportion as we are governed by this Spirit, we are like Christ; and in proportion as we are like Christ, we are with Him united to God; . . .

Is it possible to be changed in NATURE?! Not only possible, but necessary. Those awful and unfathomable words--new creation and regeneration--what less can they mean than the total change of our nature--the transnaturing
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of humanity—from sinful to holy, from mortal to immortal, from abject to glorified? . . .

This new nature, this regenerated humanity, Christ bestows on believers; . . . The union, therefore, between Christ and believers, consists not in identity of persons, but in community of nature. The nature which man derives from Adam—the sinful soul and the corruptible body—the believer loses in Christ, and receives in the place of it the new, Spiritual, or regenerated nature, the holy and obedient soul, and the incorruptible body.

The emphasis of their position was that a believer must have both the title to heaven and the fitness to occupy it. Justification must become reality through sanctification, and the former was of little consequence without the latter. The Churchman made this plain in a reply to one of their readers who had written that "the doctrine of imputation of Christ's righteousness, though generally considered fundamental and even vital, is as I humbly conceive, not warranted by Scripture, nor supported by any the least evidence." The Churchman agreed that there was little authority for the doctrine of justification by imputation of righteousness,

but we see no objection to the [belief] that 'the righteousness of Christ becomes the believer's, and is imparted to him as such;' i.e. is his as to all its saving benefits. This imputation, however, is a conditional one. The language "of the Gospel and the Church plainly require of the believer, not his consent but repentance or the forsaking of sin, the earnest resolution to lead a new life and actual obedience also."

It is not, then, by means of faith of any sort, but by means of such a faith as leads to a compliance with the terms of the Gospel that sinners are brought into a justified

71 Ibid., 9, no. 48 (1840): 190.
72 Ibid., 10, no. 10 (1840): 38. 73 Ibid.
state. . . . And after men are thus justified, it is not every sort of faith that indicates the mental or spiritual state in which the possessing of the promises is continued to them. It is a lively faith, i.e. a faith working by love and producing obedience to the commandments of God; a faith which will stand every test by which God may be pleased to try it, and obtain for us, unto the end, victory over the world, the flesh, and the devil.  

The Evangelical High Churchmen, then, believed with Newman that justification was not by faith alone, but by a certain kind of faith. Faith must produce holiness. Yet the two beliefs were not entirely similar. The moderates insisted that the necessary holiness was produced only in a believer who had first been justified by faith, while the Tractarians argued that actual holiness alone justified the believer. Dean Pearson compared the Evangelical view with that of the Tractarians in more detail:

If we inquire of St. Paul, on this, as on every other point, from the very nature of a common inspiration, in perfect accordance with his fellow Apostle, St. James, rightly understood; or if we consult the 11th Article, and the corresponding Homily of our Church, we receive a definite and intelligible reply—that 'man is justified by Faith, without the deeds of the law,'—that 'we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own works or deserves.'

If we ask the same question of the disciples of the School upon which I am animadverting [the Tractarians], we are told in accordance virtually with the Romanists, though ingeniously but ineffectually distinguished from them, that 'Justification is an imparting of righteousness, a work of the Holy Ghost, a spiritual gift or presence in the heart.'

The Doctrine of Justification by an inherent righteousness infused by the Spirit of God, is here plainly expressed; and I need only point out the contrast which it exhibits to that of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, and of the Reformers of the English Church. The righteousness of Sanctification, which is interior and our own, is thus,
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as the profoundly-learned Hooker has elaborately shewn, confounded with that of Justification, which is exterior and not our own, but imputed to us by faith in Jesus Christ. It cannot be necessary for me to remind you, of what every well-instructed Divine is fully aware, that wherever one of these blessings is bestowed, the other is simultaneously imparted—that he who is justified, is also sanctified, the Spirit of Christ dwelling in him; and that while peace with God is, according to the declaration of St. Paul, the result of faith in Him, who is 'the Lord our righteousness,' the faith which obtains it, and which marks the justified man, must be, according to that of St. James, and in point of fact, as the 12th Article asserts, necessarily is, productive of good works.

As this passage clearly shows, the moderates took great pains to distinguish their beliefs from those of the Tractarians, but the two parties had no quarrel over whether holiness was in fact necessary in order to obtain heaven. On this matter, as with so many others, the moderates tended to be ambiguous. They seem to deny vehemently that the believer is regenerated on account of his righteousness while insisting that without righteousness no believer is regenerated. Charles Heurtley, speaking as the 1845 Bampton lecturer, demonstrated this tension when he argued that

our justification consists not, as the Church of Rome teaches, in our being made righteous, though this also we must be if ever we would reach heaven, but as our own Church teaches [Article XI], in our being accounted righteous . . . because our guilt in transgressing the law has been laid upon Christ.  


76 Charles Abel Heurtley, Justification. Eight Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, in the year MDCCCXLV, at the lecture founded by the late Canon Bampton, (London: Rivingtons, 1846), p.86. Heurtley (1806-1895) was a leading Evangelical. In addition to his lectures on Justification, which enjoyed a wide popularity during his lifetime, he published a series of translations of the early Church fathers. He served as one of the original editors of The Library of the Fathers, a series planned and published by the Tractarians.
How were the moderates to reconcile this discrepancy? If salvation were truly by faith alone, how could holiness be necessary for salvation? The answer lay in the moderates' separation of the justification and sanctification processes. Believers, they argued, could only be initially justified by faith in Christ's righteousness. If justification was not followed by sanctification, however, the believer's faith was in vain. If, within an unspecified period of time, the believer had not begun to demonstrate the characteristics of holiness, the justification itself was removed by God. Heurtley summarized the doctrine in the following manner:

Every Christian, who is, what his name imports, a living member of Christ's mystical body, has a true inherent righteousness infused into him by that Spirit of holiness which flows to him from Christ, and connects him with Christ. He is not merely accounted righteous, but he really is righteous; and he is so in exact proportion to the measure in which the Holy Spirit dwells within him. He may grieve the blessed Being who has vouchsafed to take up His abode within him, and provoke him first to withhold His influence, and eventually, to withdraw it altogether.

But if the Christian remains faithful and attempts to conform his attitudes and actions to the example set by Christ his nature slowly changes. He advances toward perfect holiness until his righteousness ceases to be accounted to him and becomes actual within him.

But, on the other hand, this inherent righteousness, whatsoever measure of it we may have attained, well-pleasing though it be to God in Christ, and indispensable to our admission into heaven, is not sufficient to stand the severity of God's righteous judgment, and cannot be our justification in His sight. If we must claim heaven on the ground of merit—the reward being infinite the merit must be infinite; and where shall we find an infinite merit, but in His righteousness, whose sufferings provided for our sins an
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In one sense this view echoes that of Newman in that it posits the possibility of a believer losing his justification. But, whereas Newman's scenario, in *The State of Salvation*, is that of the Christian continually moving in and out of a state of grace, Heurtley's view is slightly more hopeful in that it assumes that, once begun on the road to holiness, the believer normally will make continual and steady progress. The danger exists only if sanctification does not immediately follow justification.

The differing emphasis each party placed on righteousness and its role in sanctification was rooted in the relative importance assigned by each to the Incarnation and the Atonement. Brilioth points out that Tract LXXX (*Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge*) was a direct assault on the Evangelicals in that its author, Isaac Williams, used the tract to criticize that party's practice of always bringing forward the doctrine of the Atonement. The Atonement represented to all Evangelicals, that act through which Christ sacrificed himself for man. It was the Atonement that made it possible for man to be justified by faith. Christ's death satisfied the demands of God, and believers became justified by claiming, through faith, that very satisfaction.

The Tractarians, on the other hand, stressed the Resurrection rather than the death of Christ, since they believed that regenerate men must experience the power to become holy. It was upon his resurrection that Christ was exalted "from the state of mortal weakness
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which, during his life on earth, he shared with all other individual men, to the state of immortal power, in which it is able to become the principle of spiritual life within those who are mystically united to him." This, too, was why the Tractarians rarely treated the Atonement in isolation from the Incarnation. They exalted the latter "as involving an actual objective entry of the divine life into humanity." Consequently, "it was an essential feature of the Oxford Movement that it made the Incarnation rather than the Atonement the central dogma of Christianity."  

The importance, to the Tractarians, of "the entry of the divine life into humanity" through the Incarnation, and of the transformation of Christ "from mortal weakness to the state of mortal power" through the resurrection, lay in the fact that now Christ could impart to "those mystically united to him" his own ability to live in perfect holiness.

Just how that mystical union (justification) took place led to yet another struggle between the Tractarians and the Evangelicals. The dispute centered around the importance of the Sacraments, particularly concentrating on the role of baptism in the justification process.

**The Means**

Newman, comparing the Tractarian doctrine of justification with
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that held by the Ultra-Protestants noted that

They seem to speak as if the great gift of Christ were His favourable account of us, and the means of it faith; whereas we seem to speak of it as an inward renewal in us, and the means of it being an union with the Church.

We have already noted the emphasis the Tractarians placed on this internal change, but here we see that the believer's duty "is to come to Christ in faith, through the Church."\(^8\)

It is not surprising that the Tractarians emphasized the role of the Church in justification. Indeed, the movement began with the very intention of restoring the dignity and spiritual authority of the Church. It has already been seen that the Tractarians regarded the means of regeneration as "the peculiar and invisible gift of the Church."\(^8\) And the means whereby individuals were united with the Church and received justification at her hand were the Sacraments.

The Church of England officially recognized three Sacraments: Marriage, the Eucharist, and Baptism. It was the last which marked the occasion of a believer's passage from an unregenerated state to a state of grace. To what degree the ceremony itself played an active role in that passage was a matter of great debate among the various parties.

As with so many of their beliefs, the Tractarian doctrine of baptism seems to have evolved, progressing rapidly from a moderate view to a very ritualistic one. And, as was also frequently the case,
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the early Tractarian belief was that which was later carried on by the High Church Evangelicals.

Newman initially believed that "faith is the title (deed) for justification, but baptism gives us the possession." He cited the case of Philip and the Eunuch (Acts VIII) where the act of baptism followed the verbal profession of faith (as, indeed, it does in the Anglican liturgy in the case of adult baptism). Had Philip been removed before the baptism, but after the profession of faith, the Eunuch, said Newman, "would still have had the title, the claim to baptism," but he would have been without the possession. Philip remained, however, to finish the work, and God "justified the believing soul through water." 84

Such a concept assumes a certain degree of accountability on the part of the believer at the time of baptism. The early Tractarians, therefore, were hard-pressed to explain the efficacy of infant baptism. Newman's early sermons speak of infant baptism as "a second birth, in which original sin is washed away." At the same time, he describes the sacrament as a "means and pledge of grace," failing, however, to distinguish a "pledge" from a "means." The most he can conclude is that the infant is assured of "the certainty of God's present favour." The problem remains as to how long that favor lasts. Presumably, any willful act of disobedience--occurring, of course, once the child has reached an age of accountability--negates the efficacy of the sacrament entirely.

The most mature Tractarian belief about infant baptism seems to
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have been that at the moment of baptism there could be present in the infant's soul no willful spirit of disobedience. In the absence of any such deliberate sin, the sacrament was always efficacious for justification.

This view demonstrates at least one immediate conflict with the belief held by the Low Churchmen. Whereas the Ultra-Protestants saw justification as a process dependent upon the presence of something in the believer (namely: faith), the Tractarians saw it as dependent upon the absence of something in the believer (namely: sin). The former relegated the sacrament of baptism to a mere symbol and came to look upon it as a public confession of an inward transaction; thus, the Churchman complained of those who believe that "it is not a matter of vital importance, provided they have faith." The Tractarians, meanwhile—led once again by Newman—came to regard baptism as that moment when Christ imparts to the believer the ability to live a holy life. Indeed, the conflict between these views eventually caused an unprecedented crisis for the Church when Bishop Phillpotts refused to institute the Evangelical, George Cornelius Gorham, because he denied the Tractarian doctrine of baptism (1848).

The Tractarians admitted that the infant thus regenerated might in later life, through willful acts of disobedience, lose his justification. This view was meant to account for those persons who, though baptized as infants, were held by the Church to be unregenerate in later life. But here again the Low Churchmen found room for argument. The Ultra-Protestants, steeped as they were in the tradi-
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tions of the Continental Reformation, were overwhelmingly Calvinists. Consequently, they could endorse no view of justification or baptism which included the possibility that a true believer might later lose his salvation. Since the Calvinists could not believe that unregenerate persons had ever been truly regenerated, they had to conclude that the baptism of infants did not truly regenerate those who later overtly demonstrated that they were unregenerate.

As the Ultra-Protestants and Tractarians receded into opposite extremes, the Evangelical High Church sought a position somewhere between the two. Charles Heurtley cautioned believers neither to demean nor to unduly elevate the place of baptism in the process of regeneration.

The office of faith in reference to justification has at times been allowed so exclusively to fill the whole field of vision, that men have forgotten, that though in its own province it stands alone, there are other graces to be exercised, and other duties to be performed, and none of them without an important place in the economy of our salvation. 'It is a branch of belief, as Hooker says, 'that sacraments are in their place no less required than belief itself.' And yet it has been a common thing for men so exclusively to fix their minds on the known and acknowledged necessity of faith, that they have almost or altogether lost sight of the office which the sacraments have assigned to them. And then, in turn, another generation has arisen, which has dwelt so exclusively on the sacraments and their efficacy, that men have been in danger of resting in a form of godliness, taking little care, while regard is paid to the externals of religion and to outward propriety of conduct, to cultivate that inward life of faith, without which neither religious observances nor outward propriety are of any avail.

The truth is, it is alike impossible to have a right view of the office of faith in reference to our justification, without taking into account the office of the sacraments, as to have a right view of the office of the sacraments without taking into account the office of faith. And he will be the safest expounder of the one, and the best maintainer of its just rights, who has the truest sense of
the other's claims, and of their mutual relationship. 86

In fact, the moderates defined the mutual relationship in terms very similar to Newman's early belief. Indeed, Newman seems to have borrowed Faber's exact words to describe baptism. But while Newman agreed that baptism was a "means and a pledge," Faber argued that "we do not find Baptism is a mean and a pledge of grace to all who receive it." 87 Certainly Faber believed that baptism played an important role in the regeneration of man, for he wrote that "the due administration of the former [baptism] is a mean whereby we may receive the latter [regeneration] and a pledge or earnest on the part of God to assure us of it." 88 But the question of the day, at least as most perceived it, was whether the full baptismal blessing is, in the case of infants, under all circumstances, invariably and universally bestowed; whether, in fact, God has pledged himself, whenever an infant is baptized, apart from all consideration of every other circumstance except the mere act of baptism, to give that child, in the act, the full blessing of spiritual regeneration.

The moderates firmly rejected this belief, Goode himself going so far as to speculate that, were this the case, Christians might, by stealth, baptize and thus regenerate the children of the heathen. But this is not to say that the moderates rejected infant baptism altogether. The Churchman asserted that early tradition substantiates the fact that the infants of
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believers were baptized; that in no period of the Church to which tradition reaches back were they not baptized; and this, to say the least, is a most striking collateral proof that the interpretation of scripture which includes infants is a correct one.

The argument was not with the baptism of infants but with the change that the Tractarians seemed to suppose took place in the infant's life at the moment of baptism. That some change surely took place was evident from the liturgy itself, for immediately following the anointing of the child the priest was made to say: "seeing now that this child is regenerate..." But that change, argued the moderates, was not the imparting of righteousness to the infant.

In writing about the change that took place at baptism, the moderates distinguished between a 'federal', or contractual, change in man's state before God, and a moral change in man's nature. Whereas the Tractarians regarded baptism as the sacrament whereby both a 'federal' as well as a moral change took place within the infant, Faber defined baptism as primarily a 'federal' change and only secondarily a moral one. The sacrament altered the relative condition of man's state before God. Heurtley described it as "the solemn ratification" of the covenant between God and man; "the instrument by which we are incorporated into Christ." To him it was a ceremony to mark the Christian's "first formal grant of the remission of sins, the first formal investiture in perfect righteousness."
This explains why Faber said that "we do not find Baptism is a
mean and a pledge of grace to all who receive it."

It is a mean of God's grace, only so far as we avail our­selves of the privileges to which it entitles us: it is a
pledge of our receiving it, only so far as we take those
intermediate steps upon which God has suspended its com­mu­nication.

And what were those "intermediate steps"? They included at least two
things: faith and holiness.

We have seen that the moderates believed the process of justi­fication to include both an active faith and a positive, willful
holiness. And the Evangelical High Church doctrine of infant baptism
cannot be understood apart from that doctrine of justification. For,
obviously, infants cannot be expected to exercise an active (that is,
a knowledgeable) faith and holiness; and without the exercise of free
will no moral change can take place.

This is why there can be no moral regeneration in the infant
during baptism. Instead, a federal change occurs—the infant becomes
entitled to certain privileges which he must later appropriate by
faith. William Goode suggests that

the child, in passing from an infantine state to a state of
responsibility, goes through a complete change of condi­tion.  

The baptism of infants, then, places God's covenant upon them so that
when, in later life, they trust to Christ's righteousness their faith
will justify them.

The fact that they believed that faith was later necessary for
the completion of regeneration does not imply that the moderates
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considered baptism to be a mere formality. Just as the believer would be incomplete without both justification and sanctification, so too would he be incomplete without both baptism (the formal entrance) and faith (the actual entrance into God's covenant). Nor was the formal entry merely symbolic. Heurtley believed that the Holy Spirit is infallibly present in the sacrament to make good God's part of the covenant, and to incorporate those [who are being baptized] as living members into Christ's body, . . .

Baptism, whenever available, was just as necessary as faith to salvation. Heurtley says that

Where both the subject is capable of faith, and baptism can be had, the sacrament is of no avail without faith, and faith will not suffice without baptism; but where either of these is wanting through unavoidable necessity, there we may not doubt, but that the grace of the sacrament is given, either without the sacrament, as in the case of such catechumens as are cut off, whether by martyrdom or otherwise, before they have obtained their desire of baptism, or without faith, as in the case of infants.95

Once it was admitted that baptism, whenever available, was as necessary to salvation as faith, it was not difficult to demand yet one thing more: to most Anglicans, the Eucharist was equated with baptism. The Low Church, not surprisingly, tended to treat the bread and wine as symbols, while the Tractarians assigned to it an efficacy similar to that of baptism. It is not surprising that the moderates saw the Eucharist as very similar to baptism. The Churchman wrote:

Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration, and the Eucharist, of growth in new life, and the Church declared them necessary to salvation; i.e., necessary for us in order to our reception by faith of the benefits which they signify. If the Church is right, then they who possess the word

95 Heurtley, p. 253. 96 Ibid., p. 276.
of God ought to be guided thereby to the sacraments; and they who neglect, despise or reject the sacraments, hoping to receive the benefits otherwise than God has appointed, are led astray by their own carnal will and frailness.

It has ever been the doctrine of the universal Church, that, as when we worthily receive baptism, we obtain through Christ remission of all sins, (Acts 2:28; 22:16) so when we worthily communicate God's almsg, we obtain remission of all sins committed since baptism.

To the moderates, the Eucharist actually contained the presence of Christ in the same sense as "where two or three are gathered together" there, also, is Christ. And, in the same way as baptism was necessary to salvation, so too did Christ, through the Eucharist, become "incorporated into our nature to strengthen and refresh it." Through the elements, they believed, "all that belongs to His sacred humanity are made over to us."

Interestingly enough, the importance assigned the sacraments by the High Church Evangelicals reveals why they were more wary of Dissent than their Low Church counterparts. If, indeed, the sacraments were necessary for salvation, then it was vital that the sacraments emanate from a valid episcopacy. It was not enough that an infant be baptized—he must be baptized by a priest whose orders were authentic.

But from whom was the priest to derive his authority? Was it from the state? After 1833, Parliament seemed to be saying that the Church's authority (and, hence, the priest's) was derived from that

97Churchman, 10, no.3 (1840): 10.
98Ibid., 9, no.9 (1839): 33.
99Ibid., 9, no.48 (1840): 190.
very source. First, by disestablishing the Church in Ireland (1833) and later, by asserting its own right to decide questions of Church doctrine (1849, in the Gorham case) and to appoint missionary bishops (1853), the state seemed to be setting itself up as the final arbiter of Church authority. Or was the priest's authority laid upon him as the Bishop laid his hands upon him to ordain him? Had the Bishop's authority been passed from generation to generation, through the apostolic succession, since the time of Christ? The question of the sacraments was, ultimately, the question of the Oxford Movement itself: "Did the state make us? Can it unmake us?"
CHAPTER III

Conclusion

The response which Newman's question evoked was a new form of Anglicanism. The Church which emerged after the debate of his question was neither Wesleyan Evangelical nor Old High Church but a synthesis of the two. In this transformation the Evangelical High Churchmen played a crucial role. Their significance lay in the fact that they remained true to the original Tractarian ideal of defining the Anglican Church as a via media between Rome and Dissent.

It is important firstly to realize that the Evangelical High Church movement was a recognizable one. The events of the thirties created a very real chasm between the Tractarians and the Low Church Evangelicals. The reaction of the majority of Evangelicals, who minimized the prestige of the Church Fathers, denigrated the importance of the Sacraments, and reasserted the principle of private judgment at the expense of the Church, drove many thinking Evangelicals into the High Church party. Contemporaries, such as a writer in the Churchman's Monthly Review, looked back on the 1830s and noticed that during that decade the Evangelical party had divided, "some continuing to adhere to the original principles of such men as Cecil and Scott; while a large number were drawn away from these and assumed the very anomalous character of 'High Church Evangelicals.'" \(^1\)

\(^1\)Cited by Toon, p. 75.
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The writer was uncertain as to when it had occurred, but he sensed that somewhere along the way the Evangelicals had divided into two distinct camps, the one Low, the other High.

At the outset of the Oxford Movement the High Church Evangelicals did not differ substantially from the Tractarians themselves. Indeed, they could not yet have been said to form a distinct party; they were simply those Evangelicals who agreed with the aims of the Oxford Movement. They shared with Newman and others a very high regard for the Anglican Church:

We are to our inmost hearts [wrote the editor of the Christian Observer] friends of the Church of England: we believe her to be the most Scriptural Church in all Christendom, and the chief instrument in the hands of God for the spiritual welfare of our land.\(^2\)

At first, too, it was both the Tractarians and the Evangelical High Churchmen who expounded the doctrine of the apostolic succession as the only true foundation of the Church of England. It was this succession which gave the Anglican Church her spiritual authority.

The Churchman wrote of the Roman Church:

You may take to yourselves the name of Catholic, but you have no right to such a distinction; [we assert] that this title is only applicable to the Universal Church, and indeed, without the slightest reserve, to the Church of England.\(^3\)

And on another occasion, the same journal warned its readers:

It is the doctrine of apostolic succession which forms all the difference between Catholic Episcopalians and Methodist superintendency. Let Episcopalians, then beware how they indulge themselves, or countenance in others a levity or


\(^3\)Churchman, 9, no. 4 (1839): 1.
looseness on a subject which imparts stability to the Church, infuses life and warmth into her sacraments, and "settles" the faith of her members.\

But if the two groups were at first indistinguishable, the Tractarians very soon abandoned their original principles. In their thinking the Church very quickly became infallible, and it was only a matter of time before they began to look toward a Church that spoke as if it actually possessed the authority they had hypothesized. The Evangelical High Churchmen were left to demonstrate those traits which had marked the early Oxford Movement: enthusiasm—tempered by circumspection—for the revitalization of the Church, and moderation in doctrinal expressions.

What these moderates were doing, in fact, was exploring the Anglican theology as a via media between two extremes. In that sense they did truly carry on the program of "primitive Tractarianism" which had set out to define the Anglican Church as something distinct from both the Roman and Ultra-Protestant extremes.

The question over which the two groups parted company was the Tractarian attitude toward the English Reformation. William Palmer, of course, saw this as the central issue of the Oxford Movement. The moment at which the Tractarians lost their respect for the English Reformation they strayed from the principles for which they had been fighting all along:

It was never their design [Palmer wrote of the early Tractarians] to compromise one particle of religious truth; to diminish in any degree the attachment of our people to the National Church; to sacrifice any of its rights, lib-

---

4 Ibid., 9, no. 2 (1839): 7.
erties, or laws; to give countenance to superstitious or idolatrous practices; or to subvert the principles of the English Reformation. . . .

Within the last two or three years, however, a new School has made its appearance. The Church has unhappily had reason to feel the existence of a spirit of dissatisfaction with her principles, of enmity to her Reformers, of recklessness for her interests. . . . The blame of separation, of schism, is openly and unscrupulously laid on the English Church! Her reformers are denounced in the most vehement terms. . . .

This open avowal [Palmer concludes] of a determination to agitate with a view to alter the character of the Church of England, and to recede from the principles of the Reformation, proves the existence of designs to which every Churchman is bound to offer his strenuous opposition.

Bishop O'Brien, who initially saw in the Oxford Movement a force to revitalize the Church, echoed Palmer when he charged that his attitude toward the Tractarians was changed as he realized that they were "resolved to recede more and more from the principles of the English Reformation." O'Brien, too, declared that "this attempt to unprotestantize our Church will unite us all in defence of the principles of the English Reformation."6

It was this same question that divided the High and Low Church Evangelicals, for while the Higher party was willing to cooperate with the Reformed Churches of Europe, it was only because, as Goode wrote,

our early divines made common cause with the Continental Reformers, particularly (and indeed in Queen Elizabeth's time, exclusively) with those of the "Reformed" (that is,

---

5 Palmer, pp. 141, 149, 158.

6 Bricknell, p. 121. James Thomas O'Brien (1792-1874), Bishop of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, attended, and afterward taught at, Trinity College in Dublin (1810-1830). He became well-known in Ireland for his attempts to moderate the passions aroused by the disestablishment of the Church there. After the disestablishment, O'Brien used his influence to dissuade his Evangelical friends from
more or less, Calvinistic) Churches.  

Unlike the Low Church, the Higher Evangelicals regarded the Continental Reformation as something foreign—radical even. The High Church writings reflect the knowledge that the English Reformation was unique. William Goode, for example, opposed all attempts by the Low Church to alter the liturgy so that it could be interpreted only in a "Protestant manner." To him, the liturgy was a unique document, neither Protestant nor Roman Catholic.

There is some indication that the Evangelical High Church attitude toward the two Reformations was the result of an Arminian (that is, Wesleyan or anti-Calvinistic) theology. Apparently they regarded the English Reformation as exceptional because it was not Calvinistic. Their references to the Continental Reformation, as in Goode's statement just quoted, draw attention specifically to its Calvinistic aspects.

Faber indicated his own Arminian beliefs in his writings on predestination. In these sermons he argued that the doctrine of predestination was an Augustinian innovation which had not existed in the primitive Church; and he believed that Article XVII could not refer to predestination since the reformers had followed Melancthon and the Augsburg Confession rather than the Calvinistic confession. 

Even the writer for the Churchman's Monthly Review, who noted the revising the Prayer Book in a manner which would have excluded all but Evangelical interpretations.

---

8 See Toon, p.94.  
9 Faber, Primitive Doctrine of Election, cited by Hunt, p. 43.
division in the Evangelical party (see above), believed that the High Church Evangelicals had abandoned the Calvinistic beliefs held by the Low Church group.

It is difficult to determine from the writings of other moderates just how they viewed the question of predestination and election, but if, indeed, the moderates were largely Arminian it would help explain the initial attraction of these particular Evangelicals to the Oxford Movement, for the early movement bore a marked resemblance to the Wesleyan-Arminian movement. The Tractarians, too, regarded the Calvinistic doctrine of election with suspicion and were not averse to the Arminian interpretation of the Articles, as indicated by their reverence for Laud.

It was not their attitude toward the Reformation alone that set these men apart from both the Tractarians and the Low Church. Throughout the thirties and forties the High Church Evangelicals maintained a central position on nearly every issue that threatened to divide the Church. Like their forerunner Simeon, they neither verged towards the great error of over-magnifying the ecclesiastical polity of the Church and placing it in the stead of Christ and salvation, nor towards the opposite mistake of undervaluing the Sacraments and the authority of an Apostolic Episcopacy.

This moderation is evident in all of their writings. Their appeals to tradition and the Church Fathers, for example, display none of the blind trust which one finds so often in Tractarian writings. Rather than assert that tradition must be afforded the same reverence

---

10 Memoirs of Simeon (Carus), cited by Elliott-Binns, p. 391.
as Scripture itself (as Keble had asserted), the Evangelical High Churchmen charged that "it is vain to look upon them [the Church Fathers] as certain guides in Theology." Rather, they must be looked upon as "invaluable witnesses [to] the principal facts of the Gospel" and must be considered in light of the ancient creeds and confessions, and, above all, in light of Scripture itself. 11

Their beliefs, too, were characterized by boundaries set as close to either extreme as possible without actually compromising the integrity of the doctrines in question. Heurtley's discussion of justification borrows language from the party on either side of his own and demonstrates the typical moderation of the High Church Evangelicals:

Every Christian, who is, what his name imports, a living member of Christ's mystical body, has a true inherent righteousness infused into him by that Spirit of holiness which flows to him from Christ, and connects him with Christ. He is not merely accounted righteous, but he really is righteous; . . . But, on the other hand, this inherent righteousness, whatsoever measure of it we may have attained, well-pleasing though it be to God in Christ, and indispensable to our admission into heaven, is not sufficient to stand the severity of God's righteous judgment, and cannot be our justification in His sight. 12

The moderates argued that they found precedent for their flexibility in the history of the Church. Goode, for instance, believed that the English Reformers had not dictated the doctrines of the Church for all time:

I believe that they [the Reformers] have not tied us to one precise view of the subject we are now about to discuss [baptism] and the parties who are the loudest in clamouring for the establishment of their view as the exclusive doc-

trine of our Church, are probably the farthest from the doctrine of our Reformers.\textsuperscript{13}

The moderates saw a certain latitude within orthodoxy as another unique characteristic of the Church of England.

If the High Church Evangelicals saw the Anglican Church as something unique, they saw themselves as something equally unique: they were, they believed, "truly enlightened Protestants." The Churchman, while publishing extracts from the Tracts for the Times argued that

the weak Protestant, whose principles float on the surface of the shallow waters of the mere upbraiding and evil-speaking in which many delight to show their anti-popery, will fear the effect of the publication among us of the Oxford Tracts. No such fear is felt by the truly enlightened Protestant.\textsuperscript{14}

And they retorted to complaints that the Tracts were enjoying great popularity:

Do you fear that the Tracts will bring in the errors of Popery, or bring out the errors of the 'evangelical' school?\textsuperscript{15}

The fact is, that in setting out to explore the errors of both Popery and the Evangelical school, the Evangelical High Churchmen were recalling Anglicans to the tradition of the English Reformation—a reform that had abandoned Rome without embracing Geneva. The moderates charted a course for the Church of England that was truly a via media between the two extremes.

Ironically, though, despite all of their exertions—despite the

\textsuperscript{13}Goode, Effects of Baptism, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{14}Churchman, 9, no. 7 (1839): 26.  \textsuperscript{15}Ibid.
fact that they articulated what must certainly have been the beliefs of most Anglicans who abhorred the excesses of Ritualists and Low Churchmen alike—the thinking of the High Church Evangelicals might never have entered the mainstream of Anglican theology but for one man. For, in the thirties and forties no single charismatic individual emerged to lead the moderates; and by 1854 both Faber and Scholefield, two men who might have filled that vacuum, were dead. But then, in the mid-1850s, Samuel Wilberforce "became the first figurehead which high churchmen found since Archbishop Howley tottered to his grave."  

It was extremely fortunate that Wilberforce emerged when he did. The decade of the fifties was a critical time for the Church of England. The Low Church Evangelicals stood arrayed against the Ritualists, and the alternating decisions in the Gorham case threatened to send the two parties into the arms, variously, of Dissent or Rome. In the fifties it appeared likely that all moderation, including that of the Evangelical High Church, would disappear in a cloud of controversy. Then, "by a strange providence the son of the evangelical slave-emancipator gathered to himself . . . the leadership . . . of English high churchmen."  

The Bishop of Oxford stood for High Churchmanship, but certainly not for the Churchmanship of the old 'high and dry' school of Hook. Rather, his was the moderate Churchmanship of the High Church Evan-

---

16 Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, 1:505.  
17 See Toon, p.204.  
18 Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, 1:501.
gelicals. In a Church rent by the extremism of both her high and low parties, Wilberforce stood for a degree of doctrinal latitude and tolerance that would promote unity, and for a degree of episcopal authority that would keep that tolerance from becoming license—in short, he stood for Church authority as the Tractarians had once envisioned it.

In large part, it was he who assimilated the moderate doctrines of these men into the Anglican Church. Indeed, given his Evangelical upbringing and subsequent High Church views, and his position in the Church, Wilberforce was uniquely situated to bring together in himself the formal Church hierarchy and the theology of the Evangelical High Churchmen. According to Brilioth, he "managed to bring together primitive Tractarianism and the Evangelical heritage into a new and living synthesis." In fact, Wilberforce did not produce this synthesis, he only animated it. The synthesis itself was the work of the Evangelical High Churchmen. In light of their endeavors it is not surprising that "the new type of High Churchmanship which [Wilberforce] inaugurated is decidedly indebted both to the Oxford Movement and Evangelicalism."  

19 Brilioth, Lectures, p. 38.  
20 Ibid.
APPENDIX A

Hugh Nicholas Pearson was a scholarly Evangelical whose 1839 Charge contained the following passage which is a typical moderate response to the Tractarians' use of tradition and the Church Fathers.

FROM THE CHARGE OF PEARSON, DEAN OF SALISBURY, 1839

The origin and source of what I consider to be the erroneous views alluded to, is an undue and excessive reverence for Catholic Antiquity. Upon this fundamental and interesting point, I am anxious that my sentiments should be distinctly understood. No one can be more inclined than myself, both by natural disposition and taste, and by the grateful recollection of early and of later studies, to admire the excellences, and to revere the character and the legitimate authority of the ancient Fathers of the Church. I reverence their devout and spiritual minds, their deadness to the world, their pastoral and charitable labours, their constance amidst persecution, their faithfulness, in some instances, even unto death. In all these divine and holy qualities they are deserving of high admiration, and worthy to be had in everlasting remembrance.

But truth compels me to add, that their piety was too often alloyed by superstition, and that, with some exceptions, their learning was neither accurate nor extensive;—that their reasonings were often weak and inconclusive, their interpretations of Scripture fanciful and unsatisfactory, and their judgments incorrect and erroneous; and, consequently, that it is vain to look up to them as certain guides in Theology, or as judicious and safe expounders of Holy Writ.

As witnesses, together with the ancient Creeds and Confessions of the Church, to the principal facts of the Gospel, and to the outline of Doctrine comprised in the great 'mystery of godliness,' to the inspired Canon of Sacred Scripture, to the use of prescribed Liturgies, to the threefold order of the Christian Priesthood, to the Episcopal form of Ecclesiastical Government, and, generally, to the nature, offices, and authority of the Church,—the testimony of the primitive Fathers, continued in unbroken succession from the Apostolic times, and uniform and harmonious, is invaluable and conclusive against the errors of all who, whether in ancient or in modern times, had separated from the great body of the Catholic Church.

I am persuaded, also, that the celebrated challenge of Bishop Jewel, with respect to the absence of any plain and unequivocal evidence in favour of the peculiar errors and observances of the Church of Rome, in the Ecclesiastical writers of the first six centuries, and to their substantial agreement and consent with the Doctrines and Discipline of the Church of England, may be fully and successfully maintained.
But it is one thing thus, confidently and thankfully, to appeal to the support of Christian Antiquity for the general identity of our principles and our practices with the primitive Church, and quite another to elevate either the decisions of Councils, or the opinions of Fathers, into a standard of authority almost equal to, or divinely interpretative of, Scriptural Doctrines or Apostolic ordinances.

It was this which, amidst the darkening and downward progress of the middle ages, gradually and imperceptibly led to the errors and corruptions of the Romish Church. Nor must it be concealed, that, with the growing disuse of the devout study of the Holy Scriptures, and the nearly exclusive regard to human writings, the incautious, ambiguous, figurative, and illustrative expressions, which abound in the works of the Christian Fathers, little versed, in general, in critical accuracy, and, except when contending with Pagan or heretical opponents, chiefly intent on devotional or pastoral instruction, were easily diverted from their original and sounder meaning, and wrested to the countenance and support of the grossest errors and abuses, both of the Eastern and Western Churches—to the undue exaltation of Apostolic Tradition, falsely so called—to Monasticism, and the compulsory celibacy of the Clergy—to the efficacy of the Sacraments ex opere operato—to Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Mass—to Justification by Works, or by infused Grace—to the Doctrine of Penance and Purgatory—to uncommanded and excessive austerities—to the Adoration of Saints and Angels, and the Worship of Images, and to the tyranny and usurped dominion of the See of Rome.

Taken from Bricknell, pp. 196-97.
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