The Oxford Architectural and Historical Society and the Oxford Movement

By S. L. Ollard

(*Read before the Society*, 31 *May*, 1939)

BY the Oxford Movement I understand the religious revival which began with John Keble's sermon on National Apostasy preached in St. Mary's on 14 July, 1833. The strictly Oxford stage of that Movement, its first chapter, ended in 1845 with the degradation of W. G. Ward in February and the secession to Rome of Mr. Newman and his friends at Littlemore in the following October. I am not very much concerned in this paper with the story after that date, though I have pursued it in the printed reports and other sources up to 1852.

The Oxford Movement was at base a moral movement. The effect of 18th century speculation and of the French Revolution had been to force men's minds back to first principles. Reform had begun. In England it had shaken the foundations of the existing parliamentary system, and the Church itself seemed in danger of being reformed away. Some of its supposed safeguards, *e.g.*, the penal laws against Nonconformists and Roman Catholics, had been removed, yet abuses, pluralism and non-residence for instance, remained obvious weaknesses. Meanwhile, most of its official defenders were not armed with particularly spiritual weapons. The men of the Oxford Movement were convinced of a great truth, namely that the English Church was a living part of the one Holy Catholic Church : that it was no state-created body, but part of the Society founded by the Lord Himself with supernatural powers and supernatural claims. That truth had been very largely forgotten or slurred over during the preceding century ; though not entirely. It was the work of the Oxford Movement to revive it, with all that it implied ; morally, theologically, socially.

There was nothing new in this. It was, speaking broadly, the position held by Bishop Stephen Gardiner and his conservative colleagues during the latter part of Henry VIII's reign, after the repudiation of the papal jurisdiction. It was the position of Bishop Andrewes and his fellows under Queen Elizabeth and James I, defined succinctly by Dr. Brightman as ' the Catholic Faith . . .

neither pared away on the one hand, nor embellished with questionable deductions on the other.'[1] It was the position for which Archbishop Laud lived and died. It was stated with the greatest clarity by William Law in his remarkable *Letters to the Bishop of Bangor* (Hoadly), 1717–19.[2] More than that, it was being taught in the first quarter of the 19th century by the famous Irish churchmen Bishop Jebb and Alexander Knox, by Bishop Hobart of New York, by the bishops of the Church in Scotland, and by the distinguished Hugh James Rose in the University pulpit at Cambridge. Indeed these facts have induced scholars like Dean Burgon to believe that the Oxford Movement really began at Cambridge or alternatively that it had its spring in Ireland.[3] The truth is that this teaching had never died out: it was imbedded, I should claim, as the founders of the Oxford Movement claimed, in the Prayer Book. But to the mass of men in 1833 it seemed new because it had been neglected: a prominent bishop of the day, Dr. Blomfield of London, roundly asserted of the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession that 'it had gone out with the non-jurors.' The light was burning dim until a group of able and earnestly religious priests set to work to teach it in Oxford. In their hands it spread like wild fire.

As soon as that fire touched a parish it kindled inevitably a desire to make the worship offered to God more worthy and more beautiful. Therefore it quickened those arts which serve worship: architecture and music particularly. I am concerned here and now with architecture. The revival kindled a desire to build new churches and to 'restore,' as it was called, old ones. That in such restorations much that was lamentable was done is without question, but it should be remembered that the neglect of the fabrics of both the cathedral and parish churches of England had reached its lowest depth when the Oxford Movement began. In poetry and in prose English writers had not been slow to praise the witness of the parish church with its heavenward pointing spire or tower and its silent call to a higher life and a brighter world. In fact, in 1833, that appeal could have had little force, when those churches were monuments of neglect and decay, and their witness was, apparently, to a creed outworn. The evidence for this condition of things is abundant. William Butterfield was born in 1814. Having served his articles he spent a considerable time in what he calls laboriously visiting old buildings and specially churches throughout many parts of England. He records their 'neglected condition' and adds, 'few living persons can at all realise the appearance they then everywhere presented.'[4]

[1] *The Preces Privatae of Lancelot Andrewes* (1903), Introduction, p. xxxv.

[2] Reprinted by J. O. Nash and Charles Gore as *Defence of Church Principles* (1893).

[3] For Cambridge see Dean Burgon's essay on Hugh James Rose in his *Lives of Twelve Good Men*; for Ireland see the *Guardian*, 7, 14, 21 and 28 September, 1887.

[4] *Journal of the R.I.B.A.*, 3 ser., VII, no. 10, 241.

For the East Riding of Yorkshire there is an official return made to the archdeacon in 1843 of the churches in one deanery. One, Ellerton, was formerly the church of a Gilbertine priory, founded for canons only in 1212. The return for it says : ' Exterior of church all very bad and much dilapidated. Floor bad. Window casements, doors bad. Windows much defaced by plaster. Open seats and a few pews, very old and bad. . . . Two bells, one cracked. . . . Some brasses have been removed. . . . A fine old font on pedestals, but mutilated and defaced by brickwork and colouring. The church is the ruin of what has doubtless been a very fine fabric. It has suffered grievously by time and neglect. . . . There are some scanty remains of a handsome old screen.'[1] It would be easy to add to such evidence. The Movement of 1833 with its recall to a nobler ideal of worship came in such cases just in time. For it must be remembered that the method of obtaining money for the repair of the parish church was by a church rate, levied on all parishioners. Rates were no more popular then than now. Church rates, soon to be abolished, were the most unpopular of all. And as yet there was little enthusiasm to rouse private generosity. In fact the spirit which had inspired the building of the older churches was lacking : it had been dormant for centuries. Not until that same spirit of devotion was roused again would the stream of almsgiving flow. It was in part the work of the Oxford Movement to arouse it.

Meanwhile there had already arisen in England what has been named ' The Gothic Revival.' Sir Kenneth Clark attributes it primarily to literary influences and especially to Thomas Gray (1716–1771), who was an archaeologist as well as a poet. Thomas Warton (1728–1790), Fellow of Trinity, was both a man of letters and a learned archaeologist, with a passionate love of Gothic architecture. But Horace Walpole, 4th Earl of Orford (1717–1797), was its chief promoter. It grew and prospered as a mode of taste : persons of education were expected to be acquainted with it. But there was as yet no deep mediaeval learning on which it could stand, and there was no breath of spiritual zeal to give it life. It was a fashion. But it was taken seriously ; antiquaries, of course, were interested in it and the Waverley novels in their turn aided it. The followers of the Oxford Movement became its enthusiastic supporters. Here was a style of building which was entirely and undeniably Christian and Catholic.

The first direct contact I can discover between the Oxford Movement and the Gothic Revival was made by one of the most important of the early leaders of the Movement, more than two years, if it be not anachronistic to say so, before the Movement formally began. On 22 April, 1831, the Revd. Richard Hurrell Froude, Fellow of Oriel, read a paper on Church Architecture[2] at a

[1] M. C. F. Morris, *Yorkshire Reminiscences* (1922), p. 25 f.

[2] The paper is printed as a whole in Froude's *Remains* (Part I, 1838), II, 335–374. It appeared first in three parts in the *British Magazine*, I (August, 1832), 546–552 ; II (September, 1832) 14–20, and III (January, 1833), 22–28.

meeting of the Oxford Ashmolean Society. The writer had paid considerable attention to existing examples of vaulting and mouldings, and he illustrated his paper with sketches from Iffley, St. Peter's-in-the-East, St. Giles's, and Christ Church in Oxford, as well as from Canterbury Cathedral and elsewhere. The special point of interest in that paper is that he speaks of ' the Gothic, or rather Catholic, style.' There for the first time, I believe, sounds the note which was often to be heard later on. As a matter of fact this paper of Hurrell Froude's explains a story of Thomas Mozley, a brother Fellow of Oriel, who tells how Froude and he spent three days taking measurements, tracings, mouldings, and sketches of St. Giles's church.[1] Froude did not live to see the beginning of this Society, for he died of phthisis on 28 February, 1836, when he was nearly 33.

This is not the occasion upon which to re-tell the story of the beginnings of the Oxford Movement. But it may be permissible to say that Hurrell Froude came up from Eton to Oriel, became the pupil of Mr. Keble, and later on, as Fellow and Tutor of Oriel, came to know well his brother Fellow John Henry Newman and brought him and Keble together. From that friendship the Oxford Movement of 1833 began. It is tempting to linger on the name of Richard Hurrell Froude and to try to describe his charm, his courage, his brilliance and his devotion, for he was of the fibre of which the Saints are made. He spoke and wrote to his friends with the same *abandon* with which he sailed his boat in rough weather in the Channel or rode across country, yet there was about him ' an awful reality of devoutness.' I name him now especially because he had a considerable knowledge of architecture, and particularly knew much of Gothic architecture 'when' as I think Cardinal Newman says ' such knowledge was rare in England.' At any rate Hurrell Froude was the first of the Tractarians (as the members of the Oxford Movement came to be called) to identify himself with the study of Gothic architecture. But other men had caught the flame, consequently this Society, under the title of *The Oxford Society for the Study of Gothic Architecture*, was formed. Its first printed *Proceedings*, those for 1840, begin with a statement which makes clear its connexion with the Oxford Movement and with the Gothic Revival. It says : ' Gothic Architecture . . . has of late years excited a considerable degree of public interest, and the labours of many eminent individuals have been directed to the recovery of its Principles. . . . The number of Churches now rising in every part of the country renders it of the highest importance to provide for the cultivation of correct architectural taste : the circumstances of this place seem to point it out as peculiarly well-suited for the purpose ; because many of its residents are or soon will be, Clergymen, the constituted guardians of our Ecclesiastical Edifices.'

So on Friday, 1 February, 1839, a meeting was held in Wyatt's Rooms, and

[1] T. Mozley, *Reminiscences* (1882), 1, 216.

the Rev. W. J. Copeland, Fellow of Trinity, proposed, and his brother Fellow the Rev. Isaac Williams seconded, that the Society be formed. Both men were at the centre of the Oxford Movement. To take Isaac Williams first. He came up to Trinity from Harrow, a very good cricketer and a finished Latin scholar. Almost by accident he became known to Mr. Keble at Oriel and he went with Hurrell Froude and Robert Wilberforce to read with him at Southrop in the Long Vacation of 1823. That experience was the turning point of his life.[1] In due course he was ordained and elected Fellow of his college in 1831, becoming Tutor next year. He also became curate to Newman at St. Mary's. He wrote in the series of *Tracts for the Times*: one of his Tracts, No. 80, *On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge*, published in 1839, produced a result 'like the explosion of a mine.' Actually it is a beautiful and suggestive essay, urging that most sacred words should not be flung about at random, especially in declamatory appeals about the Atonement; but its title caused the trouble—the word 'Reserve' was taken to show a love of crooked and secret ways and fanned the suspicions which had been roused by the publication of the *Remains* of R. H. Froude a year before. Williams was also a poet, and ought to have been elected Professor of Poetry in 1842. But the title of Tract No. 80 had roused such deep suspicion that it was clear he had no chance of election and he withdrew. He married and left Oxford in 1842 and after a serious illness in 1846 lived a retired and studious life until he died in 1865. Newman had been visiting him just before and Williams had insisted on driving with him to the station and so caught the chill which caused his death. 'He has died' Newman wrote 'of his old love for me.'

William John Copeland, who proposed the resolution and to that extent may be reckoned the founder of the Society, is one of the most interesting of the Tractarians, though too little known because no Life of him has been written. He was nearly two years younger than Williams. He came up to Trinity as a scholar from St. Paul's School and like Williams was a brilliant Latinist. He returned to Trinity as Fellow in 1832 and was made Tutor with Williams. He too became curate to Newman, working chiefly at Littlemore, then a hamlet of St. Mary's. Copeland did not write in the series of *Tracts for the Times*, but he edited for a time the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology* and with Isaac Williams he began in this year, 1839, a useful series of *Plain Sermons by Contributors to the Tracts for the Times*. He was steeped in the older Anglican divinity, and knew more than most men about the Non-jurors. He was a link between the representatives of the old High Churchmen and the Oxford School. Copeland left Oxford in 1849 for the small college living of Farnham near Bishop's Stortford, and there he left a tangible witness to his interest in Gothic

[1] *The Autobiography of Isaac Williams* (3rd ed., 1893), p. 16.

architecture, for in 1850 the old Farnham church was pulled down and rebuilt, partly at Copeland's expense. He took most careful interest in every detail of the work, not least in the stone carving, and, as Dean Church says, all was done ' with more than ordinary excellence of design and execution.'[1] Copeland, with Newman's consent, edited and republished the excellent edition of the Cardinal's Anglican *Sermons* and, irrelevant as it may be to relate it here, he helped to educate Cecil Rhodes, who was son of a neighbouring incumbent.

Isaac Williams and Copeland working together at Trinity left a mark on the Trinity scholars of their day and it is notable that some of the keenest officers of this Society in its early years were drawn from that company; but that is to anticipate. Such were the two beginners of this Society, Tractarians heart and soul. At that first meeting Copeland proposed and C. L. Cornish, Fellow of Exeter, seconded a vote of thanks to the President of Magdalen for consenting to act as president of the Society. That president was Dr. M. J. Routh, then in his 85th year, who was justly illustrious as a patristic scholar and a man of much learning besides. Dr. Routh was not a Tractarian, but he was sympathetic with the Movement,[2] and two years before this had accepted the beautiful dedication of Newman's *Via Media* which describes him as having been ' reserved to Report to a Forgetful Generation what was the Theology of their Fathers.'[3] Three other dignitaries were proposed as vice-presidents: the President of Trinity, Dr. Ingram, an Anglo-Saxon scholar and an antiquary of distinction, whose *Memorials of Oxford* is still well known; the Rector of Exeter, Dr. Richards, who was to some extent in sympathy with the Movement and, like Dr. Routh, refused to join the other Heads of Houses in their condemnation of it later on. The third vice-president was Dr. Buckland, Canon of Christ Church, six years later to become Dean of Westminster, who was already distinguished as a geologist. Dr. Buckland had no connexion that I can trace with the Oxford Movement, but his son Frank, the famous naturalist, became later on in London one of its keen supporters. These great folk were certainly not Tractarians, though they were free from prejudice against the Movement, and it is worth noticing that their election, proposed by T. Weare of Christ Church, was seconded by F. W. Faber, Fellow of University, then a deacon, who was ordained priest in this year. Frederick Faber is best known for his hymns and for his poems. He played no great part in the work of this Society; indeed he was not much resident in Oxford after it began for he accepted a college living, Elton, Hunts., in 1842 and became a Roman Catholic

[1] See Dean Church's memoir of him reprinted from the *Guardian* in J. G. Geare, *Farnham, Essex, Past and Present* (1909), p. 81 f.

[2] Dr. Routh's ecclesiastical position and his liking for the Tractarians are excellently described in R. D. Middleton's *Dr. Routh* (1938).

[3] Dedication to *The Prophetical Office of the Church* (1837).

in 1845. He was well known from 1849 till his death in 1863 as Superior of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri in London.

When it comes to the original committee of the Society the connexion between the Society and the Movement is very marked indeed. There were 16 members on the committee and of these 11 were Tractarians. There were some remarkable men among them. Copeland, Williams and Faber I have named. Another was John Rouse Bloxam, who returned to reside as Fellow of Magdalen in 1836 and became next year (like Williams and Copeland) a curate to Newman. Dr. Bloxam was a really learned antiquary and was the beginner, so far as the Oxford men went, of the ceremonial revival. 'The Father of all Ritualistics,' Lord Blachford called him. His arrangement of the altar at Littlemore was so much admired that Frederick Oakeley copied it when he went to the Margaret Street Chapel, London, in this year. Bloxam was one of six brothers whose father was Dr. R. R. Bloxam, undermaster of Rugby School, and their mother the sister of Sir Thomas Lawrence. An elder brother Matthew, by profession a solicitor, had already become distinguished as a writer on Gothic architecture. He had published a small book on it in 1829, which Mr. Paul Waterhouse points out was several years ahead of those by Pugin and was twenty years before the well-known book of Mr. J. H. Parker. Edition followed edition. By the 10th edition of 1859, 17,000 copies had been sold and it had been translated into German in 1845. Thus Dr. Bloxam was well acquainted, to say the least, with the principles of the Gothic Revival. At Magdalen he was one of the intimate friends of the President, Dr. Routh, and the link between Routh and Newman. Bloxam was one of the two men whom Newman pressed to become a Roman Catholic, but he resisted the pressure and died, as he had lived, an English Churchman and a devoted friend of Newman. He left Oxford in 1862 for the college living of Upper Beeding, Sussex, where he died in 1891. Bloxam's learning and diligence must have meant much to this Society in the early days.[1]

Next to Bloxam comes James Bowling Mozley, then of Oriel but to be elected in 1840, thanks to Bloxam's activity and the President's sympathy, Fellow of Magdalen. Mozley was one of the two B.A.s—Mark Pattison was the other—who lived in the hostel for research provided by Dr. Pusey. Mozley's *Essays* show his powers and are still most valuable, and his was one of the most powerful minds on the Tractarian side. He differed from the Tractarians to some extent after 1855, but he remained substantially one with them. In 1856 he became vicar of Old Shoreham, Sussex, but returned to Oxford in 1871 as Regius Professor of Divinity. He died in 1878 and is buried here in Oxford in St. Sepulchre's cemetery in Walton Street.

[1] For a most interesting account of Dr. Bloxam see R. D. Middleton, *Magdalen Studies* (1936), pp. 31–79.

Next on the list is C. L. Cornish, Fellow of Exeter, a college which, like Oriel and Trinity, was then much affected by the Movement. Cornish was an able and attractive man who got a first in Greats in 1831, at the same time as Mr. Gladstone. He was whole-heartedly Tractarian and from 1847 to 1854 edited the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*. He left Oxford for a curacy in Somerset (Baltonsborough) and died in 1870 without receiving any official recognition for his life of loyal service.

With Cornish goes R. J. Spranger, a younger Fellow of Exeter, who won his first in Greats in 1834. He, too, was a Tractarian, and helped later on at the Margaret Street Chapel after Frederick Oakeley's secession. Like his brother Fellow, Cornish, he cuts no great figure in the story; for he left Oxford to live for a time at Hursley, presumably for the sake of helping Mr. Keble. He wrote later some books on patristic theology and died at Southampton in 1888.

Then come three Oriel men, the most distinguished of whom was Frederick, later Sir Frederick, Rogers, afterwards Lord Blachford. Rogers, like Hurrell Froude whose pupil and friend he was, came up to Oriel from Eton, and presumably Froude had taught him to care for Gothic architecture. He was Craven Scholar in 1829, gained a double first in the Schools in 1832 and was elected Fellow of Oriel next year. Rogers was a devoted friend of Newman. 'No one was a closer friend than Rogers,' Dean Church writes, 'there was no one in whom Newman had such trust; no one in whose companionship he so delighted.' But when a new party sprang up in the Movement and captured Newman, Rogers withdrew to London in 1842 (he was at the Bar). By an odd coincidence he and Newman resigned their Fellowships on the same day in 1845. Rogers had a distinguished career in the Civil Service and in 1871 was created a peer. He was one of the group, with Church, J. B. Mozley and others, who founded the *Guardian* newspaper in 1846. He died in 1889 a firm believer in the English Church and a devoted friend of Newman.

The second Oriel name is that of Charles Page Eden, who won a first in Greats in 1829 and was elected Fellow in 1832. He wrote a *Tract for the Times* (No. 32) and succeeded Newman as Vicar of St. Mary's in 1843. In 1850 he accepted the college living of Aberford, Yorks., and held it till he died in 1885. Dean Burgon has immortalized him in his *Twelve Good Men*.

The third Oriel man, Thomas Dudley Ryder, was a young B.A. who had taken his degree in 1837. Son of the evangelical Bishop of Lichfield, he became like others of his family a keen follower of the Movement and had a share in translating (with Mark Pattison) the *Catena Aurea*. Ryder was at this time a factory inspector in Lancashire; later he became registrar of the diocese of Manchester, an office he held till his death in 1886.

The eleventh Tractarian on the committee was an unusually learned man—Nicholas Pocock, Scholar and then Fellow of Queen's College, said to have been the best mathematical teacher of his time. Ordained deacon in 1838, he remained in that office till 1855. He left Oxford and married in 1852 but held no church preferment. He became a great authority on the English Reformation in the 16th century and Professor Pollard has recorded the debt subsequent writers owe to him for the masses of new material he brought to light. Mr. Pocock must have been the last survivor of the first committee for he lived till 1897.

The other five members of the committee, Dr. Bliss of St. John's, Mr. Biggs of Merton, Mr. Hawkins of Pembroke, Mr. Edwards of Magdalen, and Mr. Weare of Christ Church, were not, so far as I know, identified with the Movement.

But the two secretaries were emphatically its followers : they were Mr. J. H. Parker, publisher both of the *Library of the Fathers* and of the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, whose *Glossary of Terms used in Architecture* had begun its career as a best-seller in 1836. Mr. Parker was a staunch adherent, as was his co-secretary Thomas Combe, whose career as printer and manager of the Clarendon Press began in 1837. Mr. Combe built at his own charges a chapel for the Radcliffe Infirmary and then he and his wife built and endowed the church of St. Barnabas. He was a regular attendant at Newman's afternoon sermons at St. Mary's, and Newman officiated at his wedding at St. Ebbe's church in 1840. Mr. Combe was an early friend of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood and the pictures which he and his wife collected were given by her bequest to the University.

Enough has been said to show how at its beginning this Society was stiffened by the backing of the followers of the Oxford Movement. That stiffening continued. At a meeting of the committee on 3 May, 1839, the first gifts of books to the library of the Society were made. The first donor was the Rev. J. H. Newman, who gave Carter's *Ancient Sculpture* and Bishop Hopkins's *Essay on Gothic Architecture*. But Newman never joined the Society. It may have been, as Thomas Mozley says, that he was not interested in architecture : more probably, I think he felt he had already more than enough calls on his time. In some memories of its early years which in after years he contributed to the Society, Mr. J. H. Parker has recorded that Newman used to say that the meetings of this Society were the ' only neutral ground in Oxford ' where Tractarians and their opponents were able to meet and that he valued them for that reason. He must have attended them as a guest, for members could bring a guest, and I presume that he came with Church or Dr. Bloxam. At that committee of 3 May, there were present Copeland, in the chair, Eden, Bloxam,

Rogers, Mozley, and Weare, all but one keen Tractarians, which shows how much the direction of the Society was in their hands. In 1839 the Movement was at its peak in Oxford and that period of success extended to 1840. Not that there was not opposition: Dr. Arnold had made a furious attack on the Oxford Malignants, as he called them, in 1836; the publication of Froude's *Remains* in 1838 had roused a storm, Isaac Williams's Tract in 1839 had increased it; but there was worse to come. Archbishop Wiseman's article in the *Dublin Review* had in the summer of this year, 1839, raised a grave doubt in Newman's mind, and a body of new and distinguished recruits had joined the Movement, some of whom had previously been its opponents. That group, brilliant, able, devout, lacked the solid Anglican foundation of the original Tractarians whose names I have mentioned. 'Their direction,' says Dean Church, who knew them well 'was definitely Romewards almost from the beginning of their connection with the Movement.' . . . 'Rome . . . so far as they knew it, had attractions for them which nothing else had.' Few of them belonged to this Society; F. W. Faber came to sympathise with them. Partly to satisfy their doubts Newman published Tract 90 on 27 February, 1841, and what had previously been a storm became a hurricane. Party feeling in Oxford was lashed to fury and, in the event, Newman resigned St. Mary's in September, 1843, and retired into what was virtually lay communion (though he did very occasionally officiate afterwards) and finally was received into the Roman Catholic Church on 9 October, 1845.

The minute-books of this Society reveal little of that bitter, and to many devout souls agonizing, time. The stream of the Movement in Oxford was still running strong in 1840 and, when half the original committee retired in that year, among those elected to replace them were two men whose names belong to the Movement for all time. One was R. W. Church, Fellow of Oriel, the other Manuel Johnson, the Radcliffe Observer. Church seems to me the most attractive figure of all. 'There was such a moral beauty about Church,' said an outside observer, when he was elected Fellow of Oriel from Wadham in 1838, 'that they could not help taking him.' At Oriel he became the close friend of Newman and of Sir F. Rogers and their friendship lasted till death. In this connexion I observe how keen his interest in this Society was. He attended its committees most faithfully and on 26 February he gave to the library the *History of the Cathedral Church of Trèves*. Manuel Johnson was a distinguished astronomer and a most convinced follower of the Movement to the day of his death. At the Radcliffe Observatory he entertained his friends on Sunday evenings: it will be remembered that when Newman left Oxford in 1846 it was at the Observatory that he slept and said goodbye to his most intimate friends. Manuel Johnson died on 28 February, 1859, aged 53. Another

Tractarian elected to the committee was Mark Pattison, Fellow of Lincoln. This brilliant young man had a keen interest in the affairs of the Society and on 17 November of this year read a paper to it on the symbolism of Gothic architecture ' communicated by a friend in Germany.' After the break up of 1845 Mr. Pattison became one of the most scornful critics of the Movement, but at this time he was an eager disciple of Newman : ' my reason seemed entirely in abeyance in the years 1840, 1841, 1842 ' he wrote on p. 185 of his *Memoirs*. Probably he would not have included under that phrase his interest in this Society. Very evidently the Society in 1840 was becoming popular and great names were added to its list of patrons and members. Among those known in Tractarian story are Charles Marriott, Fellow of Oriel, then Principal of Chichester Theological College, who was one of the leaders in Oxford after 1845, Edward Bellasis, the famous Serjeant-at-law, who left the English for the Roman Church in 1851, Albany Christie, Fellow of Oriel, who did the like in 1845, Robert Gregory, later to become Dean of St. Paul's, R. G. Macmullen, Fellow of Corpus, who later went to Rome. Enthusiasm was keen among undergraduates : nine Exeter men presented a copy of Pugin's *Examples of Gothic Architecture*, among them being F. S. Bowles, who later was one of Newman's community at Littlemore, and E. E. Estcourt of the same college (who was a B.A.), both of whom were ' out in '45,' Estcourt becoming later a Canon of Birmingham and author of a book attacking Anglican Orders. The Exeter members included W. Lockhart, who read a paper on Anglican Church Architecture in 1841 and later went to Littlemore and then to Rome in 1843, and J. B. Dalgairns, also one of the Littlemore community who also was ' out in '45.' The Trinity group too, was a strong one and included some who later served the Society well : E. A. Freeman, afterwards Regius Professor of Modern History, and J. L. Patterson, who later left the English Church and became an assistant bishop to Cardinal Manning with the title of Bishop of Emmaus. At the end of 1844 Patterson was elected treasurer of the Society and Freeman succeeded Thomas Combe as one of the secretaries. Freeman played a great part in the direction of the Society for years to come. An interesting point in these early years is the fact that Heads of Houses, aloof and remote as they were as a rule, not only joined the Society but took a share in its work. I have noticed already the President of Magdalen, the Rector of Exeter, and the President of Trinity, but they were not alone. The Master of University, Dr. Plumptre, presided at meetings of the Society three times in 1839 and at the annual meeting in 1840, reading then an excellent paper on ' the Neglected and Desolate State of many of our ancient Churches.' A little later the Principal of Brasenose, Dr. Harington, took a like active interest. Other Heads, notably the President of S. John's, Dr.

Wynter, who as Vice-Chancellor was chiefly responsible for Dr. Pusey's suspension from preaching in 1843, and the President of Corpus, Dr. Bridges, were early members. Even during the fiercest years of controversy Heads of Houses like the Master of University or the Principal of B.N.C. were presiding over committee meetings composed chiefly of their Tractarian opponents.

It is fair to say that the Tractarians never used the Society for party purposes. Naturally controversial questions came up : the Memorandum-Book begun on 12 February, 1845, contains questions asked by members about such matters as the position of the celebrant at the altar and prayers for the dead. In 1848 an Exeter man asked for information about the proper sequence of colours for altar-cloths. An answer referred him to Pugin's *Glossary*, the *Ecclesiologist*, and similar authorities, while another member wrote ' A Catholic Directory will furnish the information for every day of the year.' To which another hand added ' What can an Architectural Society have to do with Altar Cloths ? '

Inevitably, however, since the advice of the Society was asked about the building and restoration of churches, questions about their ornaments arose and among the interesting muniments of the Society is a letter of 24 March, 1842, from a Mr. G. F. French to Manuel Johnson asking leave to present to the Society specimens of altar- and communion-cloths. A month later (27 April) specimens of such cloths were accepted and again on 1 November, 1843. In the possession of the Society are two cloths of white linen damask, the larger one 39 inches by 39 inches, the smaller one 38 inches by 38 inches. In the centre of the larger one in a circle is a pelican in its piety surmounted by an inscription on a scroll ' Christ so loved us.' Round the border are four inscriptions :

My Flesh is meat indeed
Eat of My Body
My Blood is drink indeed
Drink ye all of it

The field is covered by a diaper in which the quatrefoil with cross within alternates with a circle enclosing the sacred monogram. The smaller cloth has a plain centre, a conventional border with a mitre in each corner : within are 8 mitres with crossed croziers alternating with 8 sacred monograms. It seems probable that these cloths were meant to be used as corporals, but from their size they may have been intended for chalice veils. They must, I suppose, be unique.

I note three further points. Newman, as I have said, never joined the Society nor did Mr. Keble. But Dr. Pusey became a member in May, 1842, together with his brother canon, Dr. Jelf. Benjamin Jowett, Fellow of Balliol,

was admitted in the same month and was a member of the committee from 1844 to 1845. It is strange that A. P. Stanley, then Fellow of University, and J. A. Froude, then Fellow of Exeter, were not also attracted to the Society.

After the secessions of 1845 it was proposed that membership of the Society be confined to members of the Church of England or Churches in communion therewith. The committee did not agree with the proposal. After the next wave of secessions to Rome, following the Gorham judgment of 1850, the names of those who had left the English Church were omitted from the printed list of members, apparently without authority. The committee discussed this action at two successive meetings and it was agreed that the president (the Principal of B.N.C.) should write and ask the members involved to remove their names. In January, 1852, the answers were reported: R. A. Coffin, Student of Christ Church and later Roman Catholic Bishop of Southwark, and R. G. Macmullen, Fellow of Corpus, asked that their names should be removed; but nine others, including T. W. Allies, Albany Christie, F. S. Bowles, J. L. Patterson, Serjeant Bellasis and J. M. Capes declined. The answers of four others, including F. W. Faber, Sir G. Bowyer and Thos. Meyrick, were undecided. A month later H. E. Manning (the future cardinal), W. H. Anderdon (his nephew), and Faber removed their names.

A resolution that any member joining the Church of Rome should be asked whether he wished his name to be removed was carried at the January meeting. But at the next meeting Mr. Wayte, Fellow and later President of Trinity, proposed the reconsideration of the resolution, adding that the committee had no intention of dictating to the members referred to. It is not recorded what happened in the end to the resolution, for the minutes were not then kept in a very businesslike way. Presumably by being recorded it was passed. This is confirmed by an entry in the diary of J. H. Pollen, then Fellow of Merton, which records how the secretary, named only as 'M.' got 'well dusted' for removing the names 'and eventually we got off triumphant.' Pollen, later a Roman Catholic, was then a Tractarian: see *John Hungerford Pollen* (1912), p. 221. In the next month T. Meyrick and George (later Sir George) Bowyer desired their names to be retained.

One further subject needs notice. The Cambridge Camden Society came into existence three months after this Society, in May, 1839, though it was the child of a smaller, chiefly undergraduate, society which had been begun by two Trinity men, J. M. Neale and E. J. Boyce, in 1837. The Camden Society leapt into immediate success: chiefly because it had as its moving spirits three young men of unusual gifts, John Mason Neale, Benjamin Webb and A. J. Beresford Hope. Its president was a strong and able man, the Ven. Thomas Thorpe, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity, Archdeacon and Chancellor of Bristol.

The objects of the Camden Society were more ambitious than those of this Society, for it aimed very definitely at the study of ecclesiology and at the restoration of mutilated architectural remains.

Very quickly it came into contact with this Society which Mr. Beresford Hope had indeed joined at its beginning. The Camden Society was very definitely Anglo-Catholic and it began to publish a magazine, the *Ecclesiologist*, in November, 1841, whose controversial tone was most marked. This tone became so strongly emphasised that early in 1845 various of its influential patrons, *e.g.*, the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor, withdrew, and ultimately the Society was reconstituted as the Ecclesiological Society and dissociated from the University. But its influence continued. Our Society resolved in May, 1845, but not till then, to take in the *Ecclesiologist*, and on 25 February, 1846, the secretary, the Rev. Benjamin Webb, sent £10 from the Camden Society towards the restoration of Dorchester Abbey, upon which this Society was then engaged. On 3 February, 1841, members of the Camden Society were granted the right of attending meetings of this Society and of buying its publications on the same terms as our own members. The Cambridge Society made a similar friendly gesture on the following 12 May.

While the crisis in the Camden Society was at its height in 1845 the Committee of this Society recorded that they had long been anxiously watching the course of the Camden Society and, while yielding all merited admiration to the energy displayed by its directors, they could not but feel alarmed lest the decidedly controversial tone of its publications should hinder the cause which both Societies equally desired to promote. They add 'that they have only further to hope that the Society in its renewed existence will profit by the experience of the past, and learn while diminishing nothing of its vigour to beware lest its good be evil spoken of through lack of discretion.'

Whether this very patronizing resolution was communicated to the Ecclesiological Society there is nothing to tell. Probably not, for at the next annual meeting of this Society, on 23 June, 1846, the Cambridge group were its honoured guests. Archdeacon Thorpe, J. M. Neale, and Benjamin Webb came, and Mr. Beresford Hope read an exceedingly strong and outspoken paper which emphasised and underlined the Church principles held in common by the Tractarians and the Cambridge Anglo-Catholics, a paper which must have been very strong meat to those who did not share that position. E. A. Freeman entertained the party at dinner on one day of their visit, when Sir Stephen Glynn, Dr. Mill, Professor of Hebrew, and Philip Freeman, then Principal of the Theological College at Chichester, were also present. After it E. A. Freeman wrote: 'With Archdeacon Thorpe I am delighted, and also with Webb. Neale is the gravest

and most reserved man I ever saw, quite different from what I should have expected from his books.'[1]

It is pleasant to remember that that very great man had at least this contact with this Society, for though he and his friends were not Tractarians and were rather critical of the Oxford school and its doings, as became Cambridge men, yet Dr. Neale in his short life did more to popularize the principles of the Church revival than any other one man, and his eminence as a scholar and a theologian, too often forgotten, was finally attested by an Oxford scholar, the late Dr. Cuthbert Turner, when he dedicated his *Studies in Early Church History* to the memory of ' the Cambridge historians of Christianity—Neale, Lightfoot and Benson.'

So I end this attempt to give some idea of the connexion between the Oxford Architectural and Historical Society and the Oxford Movement, strictly so called. If it has seemed to be chiefly a catalogue of names, some of them forgotten or half-forgotten, I can only reply that that is how the subject presented itself to me. Sometimes in some circles it becomes a fashion to sneer at the Tractarians of a century ago. I hold that the judgment of Dean Church is right when he wrote ' that for their time and opportunities the men of the Movement, with all their imperfect equipment and their mistakes, still seem to me the salt of their generation.'[2] ' Poor Tractarians,' he wrote a year before he died, ' one man attacks them for want of literature, another for deficiency in Biblical exegesis, another man for want of German philosophy and ignorance of Kant. It seems that they were expected to exhaust all important subjects in the few years when they were mostly fighting for their lives. It is odd that such a poor lot should have been able to leave such a mark behind them.'[3] And it is good to remember that they set their mark on this Society and that at its beginning and throughout its early years it owed if not its origin at any rate much of its vigorous life to these men of the Oxford Movement.[4]

[1] W. J. W. Stephens, *Life of Freeman*, I, 180.

[2] Dean Church, *The Oxford Movement* (1892), p. vi.

[3] *Life and Letters of Dean Church*, p. 334.

[4] This lecture was one of three specially arranged during Trinity Term, 1939, in celebration of the Centenary of the Society.