

V. N. Baryshnikov, V. N. Borisenko, M. S. Stetkevich

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT AND THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

The article examines the attitude of the leading figures of the initial stage (1833–1845) of the Oxford (Tractarian) movement — J. H. Newman, J. Keble, R. H. Froude, E. B. Pusey, W. Ward, F. Oakeley towards English Reformation, and the estimation of their opinion by religious and secular circles of English society. The article demonstrates that tractarians have departed to a great extent from tradition of benevolent assessment of the Reformation that prevailed in the Church of England. It was the logical result of their aspirations to present the Church of England not as the Protestant Church, but as a branch of Ancient undivided Catholic Church. The controversy that started after the publication of R. H. Froude's "Remains" (1838–1839), the first tractarian treatise in which a negative assessment of the Reformation was made clear, and of J. H. Newman's "Tract 90" demonstrated that the position of members of the Oxford movement had no support in the Church of England as well as in the society. Rejection of the heritage of the English Reformation was perceived as a rejection of Anglican identity. After the "apostasy" of Newman, Ward and Oakeley in 1845, those tractarians, who stayed in the Church of England and their descendants, Anglo-Catholics, significantly reduced the degree of their rejection of English Reformation, or preferred not to pronounce their opinion about the subject. At last by the end of the 19th century the compulsory characterization of the Church of England as "Protestant" had gradually faded making way for a more critical look at the Reformation. In the Anglican theology of the 20th century the view, according to which the Church of England is both "Catholic" and "Reformed", became predominant. Refs 53.

Keywords: the Oxford movement, the Reformation, English Reformation, history of England, tractarians, J. H. Newman, The Church Of England.

For citation: Baryshnikov V.N., Borisenko V.N., Stetkevich M.S. The Oxford movement and the English reformation. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2017, vol. 62, issue 4, pp. 826–838. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2017.410>

V. N. Барышников, В. Н. Борисенко, М. С. Стецкевич

ОКСФОРДСКОЕ ДВИЖЕНИЕ И АНГЛИЙСКАЯ РЕФОРМАЦИЯ

В статье рассматривается вопрос об отношении ведущих фигур начального этапа (1833–1845) Оксфордского (Трактарианского) движения Дж. Г. Ньюмена, Дж. Кибла, Р. Фруда, Е. Пьюзи, У. Уорда, Ф. Оукли к английской Реформации, а также оценка их позиции в церковных и светских кругах английского общества. В статье показывается, что трактарианцы в значительной степени отошли от сложившейся в церкви Англии традиции благожелательной оценки Реформации. Это логически вытекало из стремления участников Оксфордского движения представить церковь Англии не как протестантскую церковь, а как ветвь древней неразделен-

Baryshnikov Vladimir Nikolaevich — Doctor in History, Professor, St. Petersburg State University, 7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; v.baryshnikov@spbu.ru

Borisenko Victor Nikolaevich — PhD in History, Associate Professor, St. Petersburg State University, 7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; v.borisenko@spbu.ru

Stetkevich Mikhail Stanislavovich — PhD in History, Associate Professor, St. Petersburg State University, 7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; m.stetkevich@spbu.ru

Барышников Владимир Николаевич — доктор исторических наук, профессор, Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; v.baryshnikov@spbu.ru

Борисенко Виктор Николаевич — кандидат исторических наук, доцент, Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; v.borisenko@spbu.ru

Стецкевич Михаил Станиславович — кандидат исторических наук, доцент, Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; m.stetkevich@spbu.ru

© Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, 2017

ной Католической церкви (a branch of Ancient undivided Catholic Church). Полемика, вначале завязавшаяся в связи с изданием “Remains” Р. Фруда (1838–1839) — первой трактарианской публикации, в которой негативное отношение к Реформации было высказано ясно и недвусмысленно, а затем и в связи с Трактатом 90, написанным Дж. Г. Ньюменом, ясно показала, что позиция участников Оксфордского движения не находит поддержки ни в церкви Англии, ни в обществе. Отказ от наследия английской Реформации воспринимался как отказ от англиканской идентичности. После перехода в Римско-католическую церковь в 1845 г. Ньюмена, Уорда и Оукли, трактарианцы, оставшиеся в лоне церкви Англии, и их наследники англо-католики или значительно смягчили степень своего неприятия английской Реформации, или предпочитали не высказываться на эту тему. В конечном счете к концу XIX в. характеристика церкви Англии как «протестантской» постепенно утрачивает свою обязательность, становится допустимым более критичный взгляд на Реформацию. В англиканской теологии XX в. преобладающей становится точка зрения, согласно которой церковь Англии является одновременно и “Catholic”, и “Reformed”. Библиогр. 53 назв.

Ключевые слова: Оксфордское движение, Реформация, английская Реформация, история Англии, трактарианцы, Дж. Г. Ньюмен, церковь Англии.

The attitude of the participants of Oxford (Tractarian) movement to the English Reformation has been recurrently mentioned in general works devoted to its history, but for a long time this problem did not attract special attention of researchers. The dissertation of W. Baker and his analytical publication concerning R. H. Froude’s views of the Reformation, as well as the article of P. Nockles can be mentioned among the few exceptions [Baker 1966; Baker 1970; Nockles 2001].

Only in 2014 did a number of informative publications, covering various aspects of this problem appear in a special issue of the “Bulletin of the John Rylands Library”, called “Reinventing the Reformation in the Nineteenth Century” [Nockles 2014; Skinner 2014; Wolffe 2014].

Meanwhile, the English Reformation was a historical event that attracted intense attention of the participants of the Oxford movement and held an important place in the public debate that accompanied the whole process of its development and lasted at least until the mid-nineteenth century. This circumstance was not accidental. Since the Church of England broke ties with Rome in the 16th century, the view that dominated Anglican theology almost without exception was that the Church of England was “reformed” and “protestant” at the same time. If we talk about society as a whole, in the 17th and 18th centuries, Protestantism, understood as anti-catholicism, as it was convincingly demonstrated by L. Colley, became the basis “which made the invention of great Britain possible.” [Colley 1994, p.54]. The Tractarian movement quite resolutely broke away from previous tradition, denying the Protestant character of the Church of England and a positive assessment of the English Reformation. Afterwards, the famous historian J. A. Froude, younger brother of R. H. Froude, called it “the Oxford counter-reformation” (1881). [Froude J. A. 1909, pp. 231–360]. The purpose of the present article is an analysis of views of the most prominent figures of the initial stage (1833–1845) of the Oxford movement (J. H. Newman, J. Keble, R. H. Froude, E. B. Pusey, W. Ward, F. Oakeley) in relation to the English Reformation as well as of the controversy that emerged in this context, and the determination of the extent of influence of the Tractarian position on further development of the Church of England.

Since the final legalization of the Church of England as independent from the Roman Catholic Church in the second half of the 16th century, Anglican theologians of all major directions — High, Latitudinarian and Evangelical — considered the Reformation

as a momentous event that allowed to break with “corrupt” Rome and preserve the purity of Christian doctrine. High churchman C. Daubeny (1745–1827) argued that in the 16th century, the Church of England has done away with “usurped supremacy of the bishop of Rome and those dangerous tenets, which are incompatible with some of the most important articles of the Christian faith”, but at the same time did not seek “to create a Church for themselves upon any new plan of her own.” [Daubeny 1804, p. 149].

Positions of the various Anglican theological schools varied in nuances. For example, evangelicals, in contrast to high churchmen, were more positive towards the continental Reformation and its leaders — M. Luther, U. Zwingli, and J. Calvin, attaching less attention to the preservation of ancient Christian tradition in the Church of England. Significantly, the debate, that took place in the early 19th century between C. Daubeny and J. Overton on the question of permissibility of reading the main doctrinal document of the Church of England in the Calvinist spirit of the “Thirty-Nine Articles” (1571) was accompanied by constant references to the statements of T. Cranmer, H. Latimer and other English Reformers of the 16th century. Each party in these debates insisted on compliance of its point of view with the spirit and principles of the Reformation [Daubeny 1803; Overton 1802].

In general, the characteristics of the English Reformation as a “glorious period” of English history, given by the famous leader of the Evangelical wing of the Church of England, William Wilberforce, has long been generally accepted as standard [Wilberforce 1835, p. XLI]. In 1826 Tory magazine “The Quarterly Review” wrote that the Reformers may have been not completely free from “barbarous opinions and prejudices of their times”, but we owe them “the establishment of that religion whence we derive all our consolations on earth and our hopes for heaven.” (The Quarterly Review 1826, p. 3).

The situation began to change only in the early 19th century, and this correction took place almost exclusively in secular but not religious literature. Between 1824 and 1826 the radical publicist William Cobbett published “A History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland.” Cobbett was not an original researcher and actually introduced the popular arrangement of the work of English Catholic historian J. Lingard’s “The History of England”. Cobbett actively defended the Catholic religion, which, as he reminded the readers, for nine hundred years was “the only Christian religion known to our forefathers” [Cobbett 1857, p. 2]. But Cobbett’s defence of Roman Catholicism was carried out without any resort to theological arguments. According to him before the Reformation, England was more free, moral, and wealthy. Reformation “was an alteration greatly for the worse.” [Cobbett 1857, p. 3]. All the modern social disasters emerged from Reformation, it led to the state that “poor and rich hate each other instead of binding them together, as the Catholic mode did.” [Cobbett 1857, p. 72].

Conservative romantic poet and essayist R. Southey in the novel “Sir Thomas More: or Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society”, published in 1829, wrote that Reformation, on the one hand, “brought back a corrupted faith to its primitive purity”, but “lessened the influence of religion ... among all classes”, on the other [Southey 1848, vol. 1, p. 154]. Interestingly, despite his negative attitude to Roman Catholicism, Southey proposed to make use of elements of its tradition — the revival of certain rituals, monasteries, the cult of saints — to remedy the situation [Southey 1848, vol. 1, pp. 154–158, vol. 2, p. 34].

The appearance of Southey’s and Cobbett’s works gave evidence to the spread of a more tolerant attitude to Roman Catholicism. Much more patent evidence came from the fact that the so called Catholic emancipation, granting voting rights to adherents of Ca-

tholicism, passed in 1829 without any serious public disturbance or riot. This weakening of traditional anti-Catholic sentiment, without which the very appearance and development of Tractarianism would have been impossible, created some preconditions for the correction of the attitude toward the Reformation.

Starting in 1833, the Oxford movement put the revival of the Church of England as a sacred institution as a major goal, in contrast to a long prevailing concept that its primary function was to maintain social hierarchy and order. In 1831–1832, during the struggle for the first Parliamentary reform, the vast majority of Anglican clergy acted as its opponents, which led to a sharp decline in the authority of the Church of England and widespread anticlerical sentiments. The fears appeared that the Church of England would repeat the fate of the Catholic Church of France during the Great French revolution, and lose its privileged position. The first “Tracts of the Times”, the author of the majority of which was the undisputed leader of the movement—J. H. Newman, were passionate texts in defence of the “truth” and “catholicity” of the Church of England, and the authority of its clergy, based solely on Apostolic succession, not on secular institutions. The strong assertion of the spiritual independence of the Church of England, right up to the recognition of the possibility of its separation from the state, gives grounds to J. Griffin to talk about the first years of Tractarian movement as its “radical phase”. [Griffin 1976, pp. 47–56]. Meanwhile, in theological terms the initial period of the Oxford movement was quite moderate, and main ideas developed in “Tracts for the Times” did not go beyond the High Church tradition. This trend in the Church of England was characterized by the emphasis on the authority of the “visible Church,” underlining of the significance of the Episcopal arrangement, the desire to rely on the authority of the catechisms, articles of faith, “Fathers of the Church” in interpreting the Holy Scripture.

The “Tracts”, published between 1833 and 1837 addressed such issues as the inadmissibility of any change in the Liturgy and the reduction of the Church service (tracts 3, 9), the Apostolic succession as the source of ecclesiastic authority (tracts 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 12, 15, 19), defence of the necessity of faith in “one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church” (tract 2), the “clean” branch of which was the Church of England (tract 5). In the tract 15, perhaps for the first time in the history of the Tractarian movement, the idea was clearly formulated that during the English Reformation “no new Church founded among us, but the rights and the true doctrines of the Ancient existing Church were declared and established.” [tract 15]. It is the “patristic fundamentalism” (the wording of J. Pereiro [Pereiro 2008, p. 234]), the desire to consider the Ancient undivided Church as the model for the modern Church that will be one of the cornerstone provisions of the Oxford movement.

Although tractarians from the very beginning clearly distinguished between the concepts “Catholic” and “Roman Catholic”, placing a sign of equality between the first and Ancient Church, and criticizing the second for the distortion of the “antiquity”, accusations of hidden and even overt sympathy for “popery” were inevitable. Initially, up to 1837, they came mostly from the supporters of the Evangelical party in the Church of England. Critics of the Oxford tracts wrote about the scornful attitude of their authors to the Bible, their desire to restore the “remarkable fabric of Romish superstition,” but the question of Tractarian attitude to Reformation was not practically touched upon. (The Record 1833; The Christian Observer 1833, p. iii-iv).

The theme of the Reformation appeared from time to time in the tracts of the movement’s initial years, as well as in other publications of Oxford group, although it did not

occupy a central place. The authors of the tracts spoke about the English reformers, with sufficient reverence: E. B. Pusey in the tract 18 called them “the fathers of our Church” and J. H. Newman in tract 38 used the phrase “our Martyrs at the Reformation” [tract 18; tract 38]. At the same time, a marked difference from the conventional Anglican tradition was already present. The idea that the English Reformation was not quite perfect was clearly pronounced in a number of tracts. For example, Newman expressed the need for a “second Reformation” which will allow to fully restore the “glory of the English Church” being “the middle way” (*Via Media*) “between the (so called) Reformers and the Romanists” [tract 38].

The term ‘Reformers’ meant not only radical Protestants, like the English Puritans, but also the continental Reformers. They, especially Zwingli and Calvin, were exposed to severe criticism and accused of establishing the system of “self-will” (tract 45), rationalism and the expulsion of supernatural element from sacraments (tract 18). In fact, there was nothing radically new in this demarcation with the continental Reformation. However, earlier “divines”, who belonged to the High Church school, were not afraid to call The Church of England a Protestant Church, criticizing not Protestantism as such, but only its radical manifestations. Tractarians, and especially J. H. Newman, focusing on the fact that the Church of England has been a “true branch of the Church Universal... Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Papistical” [tract 20], refused with increasing determination to name it Protestant. So, in a tract 71 (1836) the blame for the schism of Western Christianity in the 16th century was assigned equally to the Reformation and The Council of Trent (1545–1563), which elaborated the program of the Counter-reformation, and the Church of England was called “merely Reformed, not Protestant” [tract 71].

By the mid-1830s, all the leaders of the Oxford movement, though not to the same extent, revised their initial attitude to the English Reformation, although this revision did not find public expression up to the point. J. H. Newman, in one of the sermons, read in 1825, noticed: due to the Reformation “Whole states, among which (God be ever praised), was England, threw off the yoke of superstition and ungodliness — the Kingdom of Christ again began to flourish “. [Newman 1991, p. 284]. In his private correspondence (March, 1833) Newman condemned some aspects of the activities of T. Cranmer (1489–1556), one of the creators of the English Reformation, burned on the charge of treason and heresy during the restoration of Roman Catholicism at the reign of Mary Tudor. However, Newman made the reservation that Cranmer’s death “must ever make him an object of reverence”. [Newman 1979, p. 270].

Finally in May 1836, when the prominent traditional high churchman H. J. Rose, alarmed by Tractarian absolutization of the authority of the Ancient Church, tried to convince Newman that, unlike the Reformers, who had been in the situation of finding the “Truth”, “we know exactly what the Truth is” [Nockles 1994, p. 117]. He however ran into quite a strong objection. “I do not like the Church of the Reformation,” answered Newman, mentioning that he loved the Church of England first and foremost as “a portion and a realizing of a Catholic Church among us”. [Newman 1981, p. 301].

There is evidence that in 1832 J. Keble considered the English Reformers “as the only guide to religious doctrine”. [Griffin 1987, p.9]. But in January 1839, his opinion has already changed to the opposite: “anything which separates the present Church from the Reformers I should hail as a great good”. [Liddon 1894, p. 71]. Among the Tractarians, Pusey continued to maintain the greatest respect for the Reformers. In 1839 he stated: “whatever

faults there were we... owe our peculiar position of Adherents of Primitive Antiquity to them". [Liddon 1894, p. 76].

A change in the attitude of the majority of Tractarians to the English Reformation occurred partly because of the very logic of the development of the Oxford movement, dissatisfaction of its participants with the character of the "purification" of the 16th century, but mainly under the influence of R. H. Froude. Being the youngest of the Tractarian leaders, Froude stood out for the sharpness and irreconcilability of his judgments, the desire to assert the spiritual independence of the Church of England up to the rupture of relations with the state. Froude's contribution to the "Tracts for the Times" was not too large (he wrote only 3 of the tracts, while Newman about 30), but his role in the development of the Oxford movement and its gradual radicalization was significant. In his famous autobiography, "*Apologia Pro Vita Sua*" (1864) Newman directly claimed that Froude "taught me to look with admiration towards the Church of Rome, and in the same degree to dislike the Reformation." [Newman 1908, p. 25].

In 1836 Froude died of tuberculosis. He did not live to even 33 years. His demise was not unexpected, but made a huge impression on his closest friends Keble and Newman. They had prepared for publishing and edited under the title "Remains" Froude's private letters, diaries and works both previously published and unpublished. The first two volumes appeared in 1838, the third and fourth volumes followed a year later.

The goal of publication was clear: to present a portrait of a Tractarian "saint" as Newman called Froude in private correspondence. According to J. Griffin there is almost nothing in the "Remains" that cannot be found in the early "Tracts", with the exception of attacks on the Reformation and the reformers. [Griffin 1980, p. 41]. Even if this is an exaggeration, it is Froude's harsh criticism of the English Reformation that has caused the greatest public response.

Froude had claimed that Reformation had two main shortcomings: the introduction of the "rationalist spirit" to Christianity, the rejection of ancient tradition [Froude R. H. 1838, p. 336, 389; Froude R. H. 1839, p. 6] and the development of a system that "reduced the Church to a mere creation of the State." [Froude R. H. 1839, p. 387]. The only protestants between the 16th and 17th centuries, whom he praised on the pages of the "Remains", were Jean Calvin and the English Puritans, and that precisely because of their rejection of the idea of subordination of Church to State [Froude R. H. 1838, p. 325]. This fact suggests that the reasons for Froude's rejection of Reformation lie not only in the field of theology.

In general, the discourse about the Reformation occupied a very small place in the four-volume edition. Mostly it was not an analysis, but the mere emotional evaluation resulting from reading the works of G. Burnet and J. Strype, historians of the 17th and 18th centuries, not from the personal exploration of primary sources. "I am every day becoming a less and less loyal son of the Reformation"; "Really I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more"; "The Reformation was a limb badly set — it must be broken again in order to be righted". [Froude R. H. 1838, pp. 336, 389, 433]. Such sharp attacks against the Reformation had never been heard from an Anglican priest. The leaders of English Reformation: Latimer, Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel received extremely unflattering characterizations [Froude R. H. 1838, pp. 252, 339, 393–394].

If critical remarks about the Roman Catholic Church [Froude R. H. 1838, pp. 293–294, 434] are combined with a highly complementary assessment of its teachings, right

up to claims that its doctrine is “a development of the Apostolic ἥθος” [Froude R. H. 1838, p. 336], Froude’s “anti — Protestantism” [Froude R. H. 1838, p.347] looks rather obvious, despite any clarifying comments of Keble and Newman that his view was “quite distinct from Romanism” [Froude R. H. 1838, p.347]. An impression that the “Remains” dealt a blow to the fundamental conception of the Church of England as Protestant and Reformed, was strengthened by Keble and Newman’s observations that Froude was a priest “not of any human establishment, but of the one Holy Church Catholic” [Froude R. H. 1838, p. XIV], and especially by their assessment of the English Reformation contained in the Preface to the third volume of “Remains”. It was mentioned there that although some Reformers deserve “praise” and “admiration”, the “principles” and “tone” of Reformation “were materially opposed to those of the early Church” [Froude R. H., 1839, p. XXVII]. Noting the impossibility “to sympathize with both,” Newman and Keble strongly stated: “you must choose between two lines: they are not only diverging, but contrary” [Froude R. H. 1839, p. XXIX].

The reaction to the publication of “Remains” was immediate and stormy. The position of the evangelical periodicals “The Record”, and “The Christian Observer” was quite predictable. The latter even allowed itself the statement: “the battle of the Reformation must be fought once more”. (The Christian Observer 1838, p. 507). But also in High Church circles “Remains” received a rather negative assessment, the main reason were Froude’s statements concerning the Reformation. A heavy blow was struck directly at Oxford at May 20, 1838 when a University Professor and the priest G. Faussett delivered a sermon in which he sharply criticized Tractarians. Noting their “zealous efforts to revive a due respect for Ecclesiastical and properly Catholic principles,” he noted with consolation the movement in the direction of “Popish error and superstition”. [Faussett 1838, p. 12–13]. One of the most important was the charge in the quest to “depreciate the principles of Protestantism and the character and conduct of the Reformers,” [Faussett 1838, p.15] The works of the Tractarians, Faussett noted, contained “insidious cavils against the wisdom, and even in some measure, necessity of Reformation” [Faussett 1838, p. 13].

High Churchman W. Hook, rather close to the Tractarians, delivered a sermon, characteristically entitled “A Call to Union on the Principles of the English Reformation.” He took the Oxford tracts and their authors under protection and accused G. Faussett of breaking the peace in the Church [Hook 1838, p. 168]. But, considering that the Reformers sought only “to correct abuses in the existing Catholic Church” and highly appreciating Tractarian activities, he stressed that “Remains” include both “flowers” and “weeds”, and clearly dissociated himself from many of Froude’s views and statements [Hook 1838, p. 167].

Publication of the “Remains” attracted the attention of the major literary and political journals of the time: “The Edinburgh Review” and “The Quarterly Review”. The Whiggish and liberal “Edinburgh Review”, adhering to the so-called “broad” point of view, according to which various shades of Protestantism could co-exist in the framework of the Church of England, defending the “irresistible power of the doctrines of Reformation”, ridiculed Froude’s texts instead of providing a detailed analysis, completing their consideration by the ironic comment: “hitherto at least Oxford has not given birth to a new race of giants, by whom the Evangelical founders... of the Church of England will be expelled from their ancient dominion.” (The Edinburgh Review 1838, p. 534).

Much more sympathetic was the article in the Tory-oriented “The Quarterly Review”. Overlooking the entire body of Tractarian literature, publishers highly appreciated the

activity of Newman and his friends, seeing in it not only the protection of “the cause of a Church” (The Quarterly Review 1839, p.546), but also the opposition to prevailing state of “spiritual destitution” and “expediency” (The Quarterly Review 1839, p.549–550). Denying the allegations against the Tractarians of “Popery”, the magazine nevertheless regretted the fact of the publication of the “Remains” (The Quarterly Review 1839, p.551). Speaking about the reasons for this regret, the magazine noted not only the lack of preparedness of the public, accustomed to see everywhere the confrontation of two systems “Catholicism” and “Protestantism” (The Quarterly Review 1839, p.553), but also the unacceptability of some of Froude’s judgments. Assuming that one can speak “with mixed feelings of gratitude and sorrow” about the English Reformation (The Quarterly Review 1839, p.564), and that its leaders should be regarded only as “purifiers”, but not as “founders” of the Church of England (The Quarterly Review 1839, p.561), “The Quarterly Review” at the same time, felt right to treat Reformers with “reverence and gratitude” (The Quarterly Review 1839, p.562). Strongly objecting to Froude’s “hatred for the Reformation,” the magazine called to remember those “blessings” that “were restored to us” owing to it (The Quarterly Review 1839, p.562).

The question about “Remains” had been raised even in the Parliament. On July 30, 1838 the Whig speaker Lord Morphet anxiously cited the passages, most critical of the Reformation, from Froude’s writings, and called Newman the leader of “the new school” which was becoming increasingly widespread in Oxford. (The Mirror of Parliament 1838, pp. 5950–5951).

Thus, the reaction to the publication of “Remains” clearly demonstrated that some Tractarian ideas could count on definite support in the Church of England, and in society as well, only if focusing on a return to the traditions of the Ancient Church would not be accompanied by attempts to disavow the significance of the English Reformation.

In October 1838 the priest C. Golightly created a committee to build a monument to “Oxford martyrs”, the Archbishop T. Cranmer, Bishops H. Latimer and N. Ridley. They were burned in Oxford in 1555–1556, during the reign of Queen Mary Tudor, who sought to restore the country to Roman Catholicism. The modern British researcher A. Atherstone has shown that the Martyrs memorial was planned long before and originally had a primarily Anti-Catholic orientation. [Atherstone 2003, p.278–285]. At the same time, in the specific circumstances of the late 1830s, the initiators of the construction, of course, pursued another goal: “to test the Tractarians loyalty to the Reformation” [Gilley 1990, p.179]. Pusey, learning about the plans of raising funds for the construction of the monument, saw it as “nothing but a cut at us” [Liddon 1894, p.64]. Newman’s reaction was similar [Newman 1995, p.28]. The Bishop of Oxford R. Bagot, through Pusey, made his and the Archbishop of Canterbury W. Howley’s request to Tractarians if not to support the memorial directly, then at least to make a declaration of support of the Reformation and its principles, stressing that “it would be invaluable... to the Church at this moment.” [Liddon 1894, p.69–72]. Faced with the uncompromising position of Keble and especially Newman, who had announced that “to subscribe to this trumpety concern would be clean against my conscience” [Newman 1995, p.64], Pusey also refused to support the memorial in any form. Ultimately, none of the leaders of the Oxford movement put his name in the list of donors for its construction. And the “Letter to the Bishop of Oxford” published by Pusey was absolutely not enough to stop, as hoped Bagot, “the accusations of your being to some extent hostile to the Reformation” [Liddon 1894, p.72].

At the end of the 1830's the Oxford movement experienced serious changes. New persons appeared. The most prominent among them were W. Ward and F. Oakeley. Newman later would write about the rising of "a new school of thought" which "was sweeping the original party of the Movement aside, and was taking its place" [Newman, 1908, p. 163]. A peculiar feature of this school was the increasing interest in the Roman Catholic Church. Newman, who was an absolute authority to new participants of the movement, had lost at this time, as he had later recalled, the desire to write anything against the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church, and began to dream about the Union of the Church of England with Rome [Newman 1908, p. 112].

However, a few years remained up to Newman's decision to join the Roman Catholic Church, and in the meanwhile the leader of Tractarians had made a determined effort not to lose faith in "truth" and "catholicity" of the Church of England, and tried to strengthen his new friends in this faith. Along with the desire to keep them from moving towards Rome, Newman sought to remove obstacles to the understanding of Anglican teaching as Catholic and Apostolic in order "to assert the right of all who chose, to say in the face of day, 'Our Church teaches the Primitive Ancient faith'" [Newman 1908, p. 131].

The result was the publication, in February 1841, of "Tract 90", at once the last and the most famous of the "Tracts for the Times" series. In this tract Newman tried to prove that the main doctrinal document of the Church of England, the "Thirty-Nine Articles", being the "offspring of an uncatholic age", however, can be taken as a sign "catholic in heart and doctrine" [tract 90-1]. He argued that the articles condemned only the "Romish practice", that was, in essence, popular Catholicism, but not the teaching of the Council of Trent [tract 90-2].

This meant that Newman now has not already restricted the limits of "catholicity" by "antiquity", and has expanded them up to the actual recognition of the decisions of the Council of Trent. Starting from this point it was easy to conclude that dogmatic differences between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church were not as fundamental as it was generally considered. Analyzing the tract, the liberal newspaper "The Morning Chronicle" noted sarcastically that "we are all good Papists without knowing it" (The Morning Chronicle 1841).

A violent reaction to the "Tract 90" was accompanied, not only on the part of Evangelicals, by direct and indirect accusations of Newman's and the Oxford movement as pure "popery". On March 16, 1841 "Tract 90" was condemned by the Hebdomadal Council, the governing body of the University of Oxford. "The Edinburgh Review" had not found anything positive in the activity of the Tractarians, mentioning that no one in England after the Reformation had been so consistently inclined towards Catholicism as they (The Edinburgh Review 1841, p. 272). "The Quarterly Review", even in these circumstances, pronounced much a softer opinion about the Oxford movement. Nevertheless it declared full support to Reformation and the Protestant character of the Church of England (The Quarterly Review 1841, pp. 519-532), expressing that "in a short period nothing will survive of this Tractarian agitation, but a renewed confirmation of the soundness of the Anglican doctrine as enshrined...on our Articles" (The Quarterly Review 1843, p. 238).

Anglican bishops also found it necessary to express their opinion. In 1841-1842. the question of Tractarians and "Tract 90" was raised in almost 20 Episcopal Charges. No other internal Church problem, at least for the previous 100 years, had attracted such unanimous attention of bishops. All of them condemned the "Tract 90" directly or indi-

rectly, and the vast majority presented a sufficiently detailed critique of Tractarianism. The question of the Reformation and the attitude towards it was raised constantly, and the approach of Tractarians was called out as unacceptable. Detailed arguments were presented by Bishop of Oxford R. Bagot. He condemned the combination of “unjustifiable manner” in which the Tractarians allowed themselves to talk about the Reformers, with underestimation of the “intolerable evils and errors of the Romish system.” [Newman 2006, p. 609]. J. Kaye, the Bishop of Lincoln, had raised the question more acutely, noting that if Newman’s thesis about the doctrinal proximity of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church would be accepted, the reason for their separation remains unclear, as well as the assessment of the English Reformers: were they “martyrs in the cause of true faith” or “schismatics” [Newman 2006, p. 640]?

Thus, the Anglican prelates had identified very accurately the main point of vulnerability of the Oxford movement and especially its “Romanizing” party: the equivalence of the rejection of the Reformation’s heritage to the loss of Anglican identity.

This was clearly revealed by the discussion of the “Tract 90”. Keble and Pusey expressed their support to Newman and his interpretation of the “Thirty-Nine Articles”, though not unequivocally. Both theologians thought it necessary to emphasize their loyalty to the Church of England, stressing the importance of following the principles of Anglicanism [Pusey 1841, p.183; Keble 1841, p.21]. Oakeley put the accents differently. Assurances of loyalty, contained in his pamphlet, were dedicated not to the Church of England as an institution, but only to the “Catholic element” in it. The sharp criticism of “imperfections” of the Established Church was accompanied by the highest praise of the Roman Catholic Church [Oakeley 1845, p.57]

Oakeley’s large article, devoted to the analysis of views of J. Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury (1522–1571), one of the main apologists of the compromising “Elizabethan settlement” of the Church of England, received considerable public response. Oakeley did not deny some positive consequences of the Reformation, but he noted that they all belonged to the sphere of “incidental effects”, whereas “leading principles” contained “far too much of intrinsic evil, to be a legitimate subject of triumph” [Oakeley 1841, pp. 1–2]. Oakeley deeply regretted the loss of bonds with the Roman Catholic Church, calling it “our Mother” [Oakeley 1841, p. 2]. Jewel was disparagingly characterized as “Apostate” [Oakeley 1841, p. 13], who did not even deserve the title of “Reformer”. To Oakeley the true Reformers were the prophet Elijah, John the Baptist and some of the medieval popes, but not leaders of the Reformation of the 16th century [Oakeley 1841, p. 15]. In conclusion Oakeley mentioned the necessity for “unprotestantizing... the national Church,” following the principles of the English Reformation (with the typical caveat “if any such there be” p. 45) only if one could prove their catholicity. [Oakeley 1841, p. 45]. Otherwise, the author strongly stated, “they must be abandoned” [Oakeley 1841, p. 46].

Pusey found it necessary to tell Newman that Oakeley’s article appeared “very painful” to him, pointing to a significant difference between the discussion on catholicity of the Reformation and its baseless criticism [Newman 1999, p.233]. In the ensuing dialogue about the Reformation two Oxford theologians outlined their positions quite clearly: Pusey insisted that the English version of Reformation, in contrast to continental, was “intrinsically Catholic” [Newman 1999, p.240], while Newman admitted: “in my heart I dislike the Reformers as much as any one” [Newman 1999, p.234]. Countering Pusey’s reproach of insufficient knowledge of the historical reality of the 16th century, Newman

mentioned: “it requires no deep reading to dislike the Reformation... Whence all this schism and heresy... but for it?” [Newman 1999, pp.242–243].

As for Ward, one of the most important ideas of his book “The Ideal of a Christian Church”, published in 1844 (it was censured by Oxford University and its author was deprived from his degrees) was that from the Roman religious system “we may really hope to derive remedies for our present need” [Ward 1844, p.81]. The English Reformation, by contrast, is “wholly destitute of all claims to our sympathy and regard” [Ward 1844, p.45].

It is obvious, that the question of Reformation was the touchstone which tested the loyalty of Tractarians to the Church of England. Those, who became increasingly disappointed in it, were ready to acknowledge its inadequacy to the Ancient Church, and ultimately they made their way to Rome. During 1845, within the interval of few weeks, the transition to the Roman Catholic Church has carried out by Ward, Newman and Oakeley.

Keble’s attitude to the Reformation remained critical, but he kept to the end the belief, gradually lost by his friend Newman, that the Church of England was “still the Church, the true mystical body of Jesus Christ...from whom it is unlawful to separate” [Keble 1869, p.50]. Pusey even in 1851 continued to assert that “principles upon which the Church of England claimed to act in the Reformation” had been “principles maintained by the body of Primitive teachers” [Pusey 1851, pp. 61–62]. Considering it permissible in theory to discuss the possibility of restoring Christian unity, he, as well as Keble, remained an Anglican.

Nowadays, thanks to the efforts of a number of researchers, primarily G.Herring [Herring 2002; Herring 2016], a longtime idea that Newman’s departure from the Church of England in 1845, was both the end of the Oxford movement, is reconsidered. Although the transitions of the Anglican priests to the Roman Catholic Church happened afterwards, the younger Tractarians, or the Puseyites, as they often were called, continued to fight for the return of the Church of England to the ideals of the Ancient Church. The middle and the second half of the 19th century was the time of a sharp aggravation of discussions between various wings in the Church of England.

Exposed to constant attacks from the Evangelicals and a significant part of English public opinion, Puseyites, who had often been seen as secret “papists,” managed to survive as an influential Church party, called Anglo-Catholics. But they managed to do it only thanks to the rejection of the nihilistic attitude towards the Reformation which was characteristic of Froude, Newman, Ward and Oakley. In the 1840’s the pamphlets of Tractarian by W.Gresley contained not only the condemnation of “Romanizers who have left us” [Gresley 1846, p.5], but also a generally positive assessment of the Reformation: “It is not pretended that every act of the Reformers was right, but that it was necessary for them to correct the abuses of the Church, and that, in the main, they were guided by a Divine Providence, to follow Scripture and Primitive Antiquity” [Gresley 1845, p. 35].

At the same time, it should be underlined that under the influence of Anglo-Catholicism the characteristic of the Church of England as “Protestant” was gradually losing its binding. In Anglican theology more critical look at the Reformation became valid, though this does not justify any claims about the necessity of complete rejection of its heritage. At the end of the 19th century Bishop C. Gore presented “a classic expression of the Anglo-Catholic view of the Church of England” [MacCulloch 1991, p.7]. Objecting against the “idolatrous” treatment of the Reformation [Gore 1889, p.164], he nevertheless noted that it was a “time of reaction rather than of settlement”, but it did not interrupt

“the continuity of our Church in any essential matter with the Church of the past” [Gore 1889, p. 17].

The official website of the Church of England stresses that it is both “Catholic” and “Reformed”, that it has received during Elizabethan settlement “the distinctive identity that it has retained to this day”. The Church of England is characterized as “the comprehensive Church” in which three broad traditions — Evangelical, Catholic and Liberal — coexist. (The Church of England detailed history). This language of compromise reflects modern realities, but resembles only to a small extent those acute verbal battles around the Reformation, which shook England during the 1830s and 1840s.

References

- Atherstone A. The Martyrs Memorial at Oxford. *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 2003, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 278–301.
- Baker W. J. The Attitudes of English Churchmen, 1800–1850, toward the Reformation. PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 1966.
- Baker W. J. Hurrell Froude and the Reformers. *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 1970, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 243–259.
- Cobbett W. A History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland. London, Published by A. Cobbett, 1857, 526 p.
- Colley L. Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837. London, Pimlico, 1994, 429 p.
- Daubeny C. *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae*: in which the false reasoning, incorrect statements and palpable misrepresentations, in a Publication entitled “The true churchman ascertained”, John Overton, A. B., are pointed out. London, F. C. and J. Rivington, 1803, 471 p.
- Daubeny C. A Guide to the Church. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1804, 455 p.
- Faussett G. The Revival of Popery. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1838, 52 p.
- Froude J. A. The Oxford Counter-Reformation. *Short Studies on Great Subjects*. London, Longmans, 1909, 572 p.
- Froude R. H. Remains of the late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude. London, Printed for J. G. and F. Rivington, 1838, vol. 1, 497 p.
- Froude R. H. Remains of the late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude, vol. 3. Derby, Printed by Henry Mozley and Sons, 1839, 410 p.
- Gilley S. Newman and his Age. London, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1990, 485 p.
- Gore C. Roman Catholic claims. London, Rivingtons, 1889, 175 p.
- Gresley W. A Short Treatise on the Theory of the English Church. London, James Burns, 1845, 106 p.
- Gresley W. The Real Danger of the Church of England. London, James Burns, 1846, 75 p.
- Griffin J. R. The Radical Phase of Oxford Movement. *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 1976, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 47–56.
- Griffin J. R. The Oxford Movement: A Revision. Christendom Publications, 1980, 148 p.
- Griffin J. R. John Keble, Saint of Anglicanism. Macon, Mercer University Press, 1987, 122 p.
- Herring G. What was The Oxford Movement? London, Bloomsbury Publishing, 2002, 160 p.
- Herring G. The Oxford Movement in Practice. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016, 368 p.
- Hook W. F. Call to Union on the Principles of the English Reformation. London, J. G. and F. Rivington, 1838, 176 p.
- Keble J. The Case of Catholic Subscription to 39 Articles. London, Gilbert and Rivington, 1841, 56 p.
- Keble, J. “The State in its Relations with the Church.” Oxford and London, James Parker and Co., 1869, 63 p.
- Liddon H. P. Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey, vol. 2. London, Longmans, Green and Co, 1894, 530 p.
- MacCulloch D. The Myth of the English Reformation. *The Journal of British Studies*, 1991, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 1–19.
- Newman J. H. *Apologia pro Vita Sua*. London, Longmans, Green and Co, 1908, 398 p.
- Newman J. H. *Sermons 1824–1843*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1991, vol. 1, 384 p.
- Newman J. H. *The Letters and Diaries of J. H. Newman*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1979, vol. 3, 344 p.
- Newman J. H. *The Letters and Diaries of J. H. Newman*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1981, vol. 5, 423 p.
- Newman J. H. *The Letters and Diaries of J. H. Newman*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995, vol. 7, 550 p.
- Newman J. H. *The Letters and Diaries of J. H. Newman*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1999, vol. 8, 644 p.

- Newman J. H. *The Letters and Diaries of J. H. Newman*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2006, vol. 9. 833p.
- Nockles P. B. *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760–1857*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994, 342 p.
- Nockles P. B. A disputed legacy: Anglican historiographies of the Reformation from the era of the Caroline divines to that of the Oxford Movement. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 2001, vol. 83, no. 1, pp. 121–167.
- Nockles P. B. The Reformation Revised? The Contested Reception of the English Reformation in Nineteenth-Century Protestantism. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 2014, vol. 90, no. 1, pp. 231–256.
- [Oakeley F.] Bishop Jewel; His Character, Correspondence and Apologetic Treaties. *The British Critic*, 1841, vol. 30, pp. 1–46.
- Oakeley F. The Subject of Tract 90 Historically Examined. London, James Toovey, 1845, 87 p.
- Overton J. The true Churchman ascertained: or an Apology for those of the regular clergy of the Establishment who are sometimes called Evangelical Ministers. York, Printed by T. Wilson, 1802, 424 p.
- Pereiro J. 'Ethos' and the Oxford Movement: At the Heart of Tractarianism. Oxford, University Press, 2008, 279 p.
- Pusey E. B. The Articles Treated in Tract 90 Reconsidered and their Interpretation Vindicated. Oxford, John Henry Parker, 1841, 217 p.
- Pusey E. B. The Rule of Faith, as maintained by the Fathers, and the Church of England. Oxford, John Henry Parker, 1851, 69 p.
- Skinner S. 'A Triumph of the Rich': Tractarians and the Reformation. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 2014, vol. 90, no. 1, pp. 69–91.
- Southey R. *Sir Thomas More: or Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society*: 2 vols. London, John Murray, 1848, vol. 1, 372 p.; vol. 2, 448 p.
- Tract 15. *On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church*. Available at: <http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/tract15.html> (accessed 10.05.2017).
- Tract 18. *Thoughts on the Benefits of the System of Fasting Enjoyed by Our Church*. Available at: <http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/tract18.html> (accessed 10.05.2017).
- Tract 20. *The Visible Church, Letter III*. Available at: <http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/tract20.html> (accessed 10.05.2017).
- Tract 38. *Via Media, no. I*. Available at: <http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/tract38.html> (accessed 10.05.2017).
- Tract 71. *Against Romanism, no. I*. On the Controversy with the Romanists. Available at: <http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/tract71.html> (accessed 10.05.2017).
- Tract 90–1. *Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-Nine Articles. Introduction*. Available at: <http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/tract90/introduction.html> (accessed 10.05.2017).
- Tract 90–2. *Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-Nine Articles. Purgatory, Pardons, Images, Relics, Invocation of Saints*. Available at: <http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/tract90/section6.html> (accessed 10.05.2017).
- Ward W. R. *The Ideal of a Christian Church*. London, James Toovey, 1844, 601 p.
- Wilberforce W. A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians, Philadelphia, Key and Biddle, 1835, 385 p.
- Wolffe J. The Commemoration of the Reformation and Mid-Nineteenth-Century Evangelical Identity. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 2014, vol. 90, no. 1, pp. 49–68.

Received: 25.05.2017

Accepted: 20.11.2017