

The Tractarian Critique of the Evangelical Church Invisible: Tracts 2, 11, 20 and 47 in Historical Context

Kenneth J. Stewart

1. The *Tracts for the Times* Mark the Launch of a Movement

By the method of reckoning which he popularized in his *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* of 1864, John Henry Newman understood the movement—variously termed the Oxford or Tractarian—to have commenced on the occasion of John Keble’s sermon “On National Apostasy”, delivered 14 July, 1833.¹ However, as it met the public eye, this movement can have been reckoned as commencing on 9 September of the same year. For on the latter date, there came from the press the first of forty-six that year, and eventually ninety in all *Tracts for the Times*—pungent pamphlets of between four and thirty pages in length. Distributed at first by Newman and associates who travelled about the country for the purpose—and then, eventually in bookshops, the pamphlets sold so briskly that by year end one could buy the first forty-six tracts in a bound volume. While eighteen authors would contribute, by the time the series came to an end in 1840, one third of this total were the work of Newman himself.²

In these tracts, what might be called the programme of this movement was set out. But before proceeding to examine this programme, it is crucial to grasp the important point highlighted by the recent Newman biographer, Frank Turner. He has observed a great enigma about these polemical missives: Newman’s re-telling of his life story in the *Apologia* of 1864 avoids any discussion of their contents.³ This is very *odd*, to say the least.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to examine a sampling of these early writings of Newman—as a gauge of his thought at that critical time. The sampling will have entirely to do with his conception of the church considered both as visible and invisible. We will go on to observe reactions to this Tractarian teaching about the church from among Newman’s fellow Anglicans, among English Nonconformists, and Scottish Presbyterians. Finally,

we will address the question of why Newman passed over this material at the time of his writing the *Apologia* in 1864.

II. John Henry Newman in Summer 1833

Only two months before launching the *Tracts*, Newman had been near death in a foreign land. A Mediterranean cruise, undertaken in the company of his acquaintance, J. H. Froude⁴ from December 1832 onward, had seemed to go awry in its final stages. While Froude had returned home to England directly from Rome, Newman—certainly the healthier of the two at their departure from England—lingered behind to tour Italy further. In Sicily he fell prey to a serious fever which meant that for a time his life had hung in the balance.⁵ He had no sooner recovered from this than he speedily made his way across France in order to cross the Channel for home.

As the familiar tale of the *Apologia* has it, Newman had presentiments while still in the Mediterranean that he had important work to do in England;⁶ such news of the English government's actions as reached him (such as the Bill for the Suppression of several Irish Episcopal Sees) filled him with grave apprehension. At his mother's home on 11 July, he sensed the reverberations of John Keble's July 14 Oxford Assize sermon, "On National Apostasy".⁷ Newman allowed that, although the Keble sermon seemed to him to mark a special milestone, high church Anglican reaction against the invasive measures of the liberal government toward the national Church had in fact *pre-dated* Keble's sermon of 14 July. Under the leadership of the Cambridge-educated clergyman, H. J. Rose, an attempt had been made to rally support among Anglican clergy across the country.⁸ However, what Rose and his supporters aimed to accomplish by publishing a periodical "The British Magazine" and gathering up petitions of concern across the country, Newman meant to accomplish otherwise. 'I on the other hand, out of my own head began the Tracts.'⁹ Newman reckoned them to embody an 'antagonist' principle. Nineteenth century chronicler of the Oxford movement, R. W. Church has written that 'The early tracts were intended to startle the world; they succeeded in doing so'.¹⁰

III. The Tenor of the Tracts of 1833-34¹¹

The thrust of the early tracts released following 9 September 1833 was that the national Church of England stood endangered—endangered by the elected House of Commons, which since the Reform Act of 1832 had represented

voters who were religious dissenters and those of no religion in *addition* to those who were members of the Church of England. It becomes quite clear, however, as one peruses the early tracts that Newman *also* views the national Church as endangered by the non-established and dissenting religious denominations which—through elected members of parliament—are now finding a voice in national life. Prior to the Reform Act, earlier governments had given to the national Church the preferential treatment which its established character warranted. Newman’s aim in the early tracts, therefore, will be to ‘outflank’ both the government’s growing willingness to intervene into the Church’s internal affairs by legislative action and the sentiments of religious dissenters which would favour the stripping away of the privileges of the national Church. Newman will aim to achieve this by an emphasis upon the Church of England’s ‘catholic’ and ‘apostolic’ character.

On the Catholic Church: Tract 2

This emphasis is present already in *Tract 2*, entitled *The Catholic Church*. Arguing from the phrase in the Apostles Creed, ‘I Believe in the Holy Catholic Church’, and in face of impending government action, Newman insists that the meaning of the credal phrase was ‘That there is on earth an existing society, Apostolic as founded by the Apostles, Catholic because it spreads its branches in every place i.e. the Church visible with its Bishops, priests and deacons’.¹² Quoting the late Bishop John Pearson (1613-1686) who had written an *Exposition of the Creed* (1659), Newman urged, ‘There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved and that name is no otherwise given under heaven than in the Church’.¹³

Now all this argument was a mere means to an end, with that end being a question posed as, ‘How can we with a safe conscience countenance the interference of the Nation in its (i.e. the Church’s) concerns? Does not such interference tend to destroy it?’¹⁴

As if his motivation in exalting the national Church as *the* expression of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church was not clear enough, he added—

Is it not plain that by showing a bold front and defending the rights of the Church, we are taking the only course which can make us respected? Yielding will not persuade our enemies to desist from their efforts to destroy

us root and branch. We cannot hope that by giving something, to keep the rest... But by resisting strenuously, and contemplating and providing against the worst, we may actually prevent the very evils we fear.¹⁵

This theme, sounded already in Tract 2 in September, 1833 must have struck a considerable number of sparks, for later that autumn, Newman was to revisit these subjects. Reflecting that comment and correspondence regarding what he had already written in Tract 2, Newman revisited the theme of the ‘visible Church’ in three tracts—11, 20, and 47.¹⁶

On the Visible Church: Tracts 11, 20 & 47

Tract 11

Someone known to Newman has written to him in the aftermath of the September, 1833 publication of the preceding tract, *The Catholic Church*. This individual has been left unconvinced of the validity of Newman’s strategy of stressing the continuity of the Church of England with the ‘one holy and Apostolic Church’ of antiquity; this correspondent accepts instead that ‘true doctrine is the important matter for which we must contend and a right state of affections is the test of vital religion in the heart’. He presses Newman for an answer to the question, ‘Why may I not be satisfied if my Creed is correct and my affections spiritual?’¹⁷ I trust that it is apparent that any contemporary evangelical Christian could as easily have posed this question to Newman as did his original correspondent, who is likely an Anglican evangelical.¹⁸

Newman, in replying to these sentiments is civil, but curt: ‘I believe them to be mere fallacies’, he writes, and goes on to show that the warmest of stated expressions of devotion to Christ are frequently belied by Christian leaders who are privately immoral. Thus, ‘it seems that true doctrine and warm feelings are not enough’.¹⁹ Newman would thus have his correspondent *add* to his existing convictions the Scriptural doctrine of ‘the Church’. At this point, however, the correspondent demurs—and demands to know whether it was the Church as ‘visible’ or as ‘invisible’ for which Newman contends so vigorously? Newman, for his part, does not deny the utility of such a distinction between the church as visible and invisible. He himself admits that those who will ultimately be saved are not necessarily the ‘same company that are under the means of grace here’.²⁰ But farther than this, he will not go—for, he insists that ‘Scripture makes the existence of a Visible Church a condition of the existence

of the Invisible'.²¹ Newman believes that the salvation of individuals presupposes the activity and existence of a Visible Church, which serves as a means to that end: 'The Sacraments are in the hands of the Clergy; What then shall be thought of any attempts to weaken or exterminate that Community or that Ministry, which is an appointed condition of the salvation of the elect?' This Visible Church is a 'standing body'.²²

Now, for Newman, inasmuch as he identifies the national Church of England with the 'one body, and one Spirit' spoken of by the Apostle Paul in Ephesians 4:5, 6, he feels entitled to demand to know how anyone—especially a religious Dissenter—can justify separation from the 'Existing Church'. Do they not make 'many bodies' whereas the Apostle spoke of one only? Is not the church which the same apostle described as 'the pillar and ground of the truth' (1 Tim. 3:5) the visible, national Church of England?²³

In a second letter,²⁴ Newman pointed out what he believed to be the common evangelical folly of being ready to credit this or that 'distinguished preacher' as exercising a mighty influence on one's spiritual development, while denying that the same gratitude ought to be recorded towards the Church. Comparing the visible Church to a hospital or dispensary, he urged his correspondent to see the visible Church as the dispenser of Christ's gifts.²⁵ The chief of these gifts are Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and these are committed not to the Church as a whole, but into the hands of 'certain definite, selected persons'.²⁶

Tract 20

To this point in the early progress of the Tractarian movement, Newman had taken no position that cut him off from other High Church Anglicans. However, this could not be said about Newman's posture *vis-à-vis* Anglican evangelicalism, for from the same correspondent as before now came the suggestion that the positions which Newman had just endorsed in Tract 11 (the visible church being given priority over the invisible, the means of salvation being entrusted to clergy, and the Church as the 'pillar and ground of the truth') were those that 'should lead to Popery'.²⁷ It was December, 1833 and this insinuation that the tendency of the Tractarian movement was towards Rome would thereafter be raised with regularity. Newman seems to have been poised to deal with the charge, as though he had anticipated that it was bound to come.

According to Newman, these emphases pertaining to the visible church are to be reckoned with because they are taught in Scripture. That they happen also to be upheld within Roman Catholicism is simply an illustration that Catholicism (a branch of the Christian religion he is still willing to characterize as full of ‘Papistical corruptions’ and ‘unscriptural’)²⁸ still faithfully retains *some* doctrines of Scripture. Christ had set up a Visible Church ‘to witness for Him, to be a matter of fact, as undeniable as the shining of the sun, that there was such a principle of conscience in the world, as faith, as fear of God’.²⁹ ‘Christ set up a visible Society, His Church, to be as a light upon a hill, to all the ends of the earth, while time endures. It is a witness of the unseen world, a pledge of it; and a prefiguration of what hereafter will take place.’³⁰

While Rome was to be commended for upholding this biblical teaching regarding the Visible Church, this could not disguise her other errors. ‘Their communion is infected with heterodoxy....They have established a lie in the place of God’s truth; and by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed; it cannot be reformed.’³¹ Yet England has been signally blessed; at the time of the Reformation when godly persons in most lands were obliged to leave the Visible Church on account of erroneous teaching, ‘Christians in England in the evil day escaped...God has wonderfully preserved our church as a true branch of the Church Universal, yet withal preserved it free from doctrinal error. It is Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Papistical.’³²

Two consequences seem obvious to Newman. First, as for those who value the Visible Church, is it not folly to propose as some have³³ that the Church of England ‘attempt unions with those who have separated from the Church?’ Further, is it not the case that anything which erodes the Church of England’s claim to be the Visible Church of Christ in England does also ‘prepare the way for Popery in our land?’³⁴ No doubt Newman felt quite unassailable in his conviction in December 1833.

Tract 47

In 1834, there were additional apprehensive readers of the tracts who took exception to their tendency to exclusiveness. In the 47th tract, also on the theme of the Church Visible, it was necessary to respond to a complaint the thrust of which was that ‘in his zeal in advocating the doctrine of the Church

Catholic and Apostolic, he (the author) uses expressions...which imply that the Dissenters are without the pale of salvation'. Newman's readers had caught his drift, or at least nearly so.

He had maintained that England had a visible Church furnished to it by the Church's divine head; that this Church of England had continued through the upheavals of the Reformation with its Apostolic identity intact, and that her bishops and clergy were the divinely-appointed dispensers of the rites of salvation within that nation. It was no wild surmise then, when some of Newman's readers understood his intended meaning to be that a religious dissenter was, in effect, cut off from this house of salvation.³⁵ Newman's meaning was very close to this.

He allowed that Presbyterians—especially of the Scottish variety—had spurned the kind of continuity with the pre-Reformation era still enjoyed by the Church of England; they had ended Episcopacy and settled for a lesser form of ministry. As for English dissenters, he was ready to say that such 'sects' while not beyond salvation, were not '*in Christ* in the same fullness that we are'. The position of such dissenters was somewhere 'between the Church of England and heathenism'; he allowed that the position of Roman Catholics in England was comparable.³⁶

IV. Contemporary Reactions to Newman's Stress on the Church as Catholic and Visible

(a) Thomas Arnold, Master of Rugby School and eventual Oxford Professor of Modern History

In the same season of 1833 as witnessed the release of the first *Tracts for the Times* came also from the press the controversial pamphlet of Thomas Arnold, *Principles of Church Reform*. Like the *Tracts*, written with the Reform Act of the preceding year still in the background, Arnold's pamphlet called for the restructuring of the national Church in a manner so broad and comprehensive as to exclude only Quakers, Unitarians, and Roman Catholics.³⁷ While therefore *not* written in reaction to the stance reflected in the *Tracts* penned by Newman, Arnold's approach taken in *Principles of Church Reform* could hardly have been more different from the *Tracts*. Whereas Newman's tracts had urged dissenters and others to *submit* themselves to the one true visible church—the national church claiming descent from the Apostles, Arnold

proposed a kind of amnesty in which all Protestant and Trinitarian bodies in England would have been welcomed back to a common home.

In due course, Arnold would level his own criticisms against the *Tracts for the Times* and the views of the Church and ministry advocated within them. Seeing in these views an essentially sacerdotal understanding of the Church and ministry, he protested strongly—

Mr. Newman and his friends have preached as their peculiar doctrine, not Christ, but the Church. We must go even farther and say, not the Church, but themselves. What they teach has no moral or spiritual excellence in itself; but it tends greatly to their own exaltation... Doubtless, if apostolical succession be God's will, it is our duty to receive it and to teach it; but a number of clergymen, claiming themselves to have this succession, and insisting that without it, neither Christ nor Christ's sacraments will save us do, beyond all contradiction, preach themselves, and magnify their own importance... 'We preach,' said St. Paul, 'not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake.' It is certain that the enforcing of apostolical succession as the great object of our teaching is precisely the very thing which St. Paul was commissioned not to do. This, to my mind, affords a very great presumption that the peculiar doctrines of Mr. Newman and his friends...are not of God.³⁸

Arnold maintained that the historical repercussions of the advocacy of these doctrines had consistently been harmful. The 'triumphant maintenance and full development' of them had been 'coincident, to say the least with the corruption alike of Christ's religion and Christ's church'.³⁹ The notion that 'the sacraments derive their efficacy from the apostolical succession of the minister is so extremely unchristian that it actually deserves to be called antichristian'.⁴⁰ Now these were the criticisms of one who Newman himself would have unhesitatingly termed a 'liberal'. What of those whose theological stance lay in what was the evangelicalism of his own adolescence and early manhood?

(b) William Goode (1801-1868) and E. A. Litton (1813-1897)

In the years of Tractarian controversy, William Goode was the editor of the evangelical Anglican periodical, *The Christian Observer*. His own eventual

written response to Tractarianism in book form, *The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice*⁴¹ pursued diligently both the reasons for which the Tractarian agitation had arisen and its general tendency. The latter maintained that the Tractarian movement's insistence on the pre-eminence of the visible church and a ministry standing in succession to the Apostles was an example of—

Surrendering to Rome the *principles* upon which that vast system of religious fraud and imposition is built, and while they gave themselves out to be the opponents, nay the best opponents, of Romanism...they are in fact paving the way for her by upholding those *first principles* of Popery upon which her dominion over the minds of men principally rests.⁴²

Litton, a fellow and later Dean of Oriel College, then subsequently Vice-Principal of St. Edmund Hall⁴³ wrote extensively on these themes as a person who had proceeded through Oxford and Oriel just as the Tractarian era was dawning. Both in his *The Church of Christ: Its Idea, Attributes and Ministry*,⁴⁴ and his later *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology*, the crisis opened for evangelical Anglicanism by the Tractarian teaching on the church is much in evidence. Though by the time of Litton's writing *The Church of Christ*, Newman had been in the Roman communion for more than a decade, it is plain that Litton still found Oxford abuzz with continuing advocacy of what were being called 'Church principles'. Litton did not conceal his belief that the kind of advocacy earlier undertaken by Newman on behalf of the Church of England as the church catholic, apostolic, and visible had been the means by which 'Our younger clergy especially...were seduced in numbers by the attractive, and to them novel, guise in which the reasonings of Bellarmine and Bossuet were re-produced and imbibed Romish principles without suspecting the source whence the poison was derived'.⁴⁵

Litton was endorsing a judgement as old as 1833 that Newman's ecclesiology had been essentially Roman Catholic even as he (Newman) had been urging the defence of the Church of England. Litton's position, in contrast to Newman's, was that 'the invisible Church, as Protestants call it, precedes the visible'.⁴⁶ Further, it was his position that—

The Romanist regards that which is visible in the Church as the antecedent; the Protestant as the consequent of the life within; the former

attributes a positive and independent value to the outward characteristics of the body; the latter values them chiefly as the evidences of the unseen work of the spirit.⁴⁷

(c) From within English Nonconformity: John Stoughton (1807-97)

Stoughton, best known for his extended history of *Religion in England*⁴⁸ was almost an exact contemporary of Newman. Educated in a Nonconformist academy at Highbury because Cambridge and Oxford were closed to Nonconformists until 1834, Stoughton was nevertheless an acute observer of Tractarian developments in general and Newman in particular.⁴⁹ Stoughton's major criticism of Newman's tract writing (a good part of which was his championing of the Church of England as the catholic, apostolic and visible church) was that he was 'not far-seeing'; Newman was under the influence of tendencies which 'brought him where he at first did not mean to go'.⁵⁰

(d) From a Scottish Presbyterian: James Bannerman (1807-69)

Like Litton, Bannerman wrote on the biblical doctrine of the Church in the aftermath of Newman's re-affiliation to Rome. Reacting as much to the Roman Catholic emphasis of Newman's 1833 tracts as to Newman himself, he took pains in his *The Church of Christ* (1869) to contend against the Roman tendency to exalt the visible Church at the expense of the invisible. 'The Romanist...is prepared to deny altogether, or if not to deny absolutely, yet practically to set aside the idea of an invisible church as the primary and fundamental one and to substitute that of the visible Church in its stead.'

In sum, these theologians—contemporaries all of Newman—reacted instinctively and uniformly against Tractarianism's effort to shore up the authority and place of the national Church of England in the nineteenth century by making pronounced claims to its apostolicity, catholicity and visibility. As all besides Stoughton had served in established national Churches,⁵¹ these will have been alive to the dangers posed to established churches in that era of political reform. That they worked to oppose the Tractarian emphasis is an indicator that they esteemed some thing or things much higher than the authority and reputation of the Church in society. Among such things that they esteemed higher were the church's *purity* (something only persuasible if the church as visible would be considered as logically distinguishable from the church as invisible) and the spiritual unity of

true Christian believers—across denominational lines. Here were themes of importance to evangelical Christians then, as now.

VI. The Enigma: Why Did the *Apologia* of 1864 pass over the Contents of the Tracts, almost without Notice?

Newman, penning his *Apologia* in 1864, took puckish delight in telling about the *launch* of the tract publication; he would also describe in detail how the final tract, no. 90, proved to be such an aggravation to Anglican authorities that it brought a demand for an end to further tract publication.⁵² Why were the tracts under consideration here, which were highly controversial in the eyes of contemporary readers, passed over in the *Apologia* without mention?

There is this fundamental difference between the early and final tracts. Tract 90 represented Newman's attempt in 1840 to demonstrate that one of his own advanced Anglo-Catholic views could hold to Catholic theological conviction while still subscribing to the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. It was an argument which cost him dearly. When he had been censured for circulating such views, he found himself several steps nearer to the eventual conversion to Catholicism, the rightness of which the 1864 *Apologia* had been written to defend. By contrast, the early tracts surveyed in this paper—2, 11, 20, 47 had in common an argument that not the Roman Catholic communion (Newman's eventual ecclesiastical home) but the Church of England was the actual catholic, apostolic, and visible Church of Jesus Christ in the nation. In those early tracts he had, from the premise that the Church of England was the visible, apostolic church, ranked the Roman Catholic communion in England, along with Dissenters of all kinds, as being 'between the Church of England and heathenism'.⁵³

It goes without saying therefore, that in 1864, Newman could not draw attention to the contents and argumentation of these tracts of 1833–1834 without also drawing attention to his volte-face on the question of *which* Church was catholic, apostolic and visible. Newman's position in 1864 was *precisely* the one he had condemned thirty years earlier as sectarian and spiritually dangerous.

KENNETH J. STEWART is Professor of Theological Studies in Covenant College, Lookout Mountain, Georgia, USA.

ENDNOTES

1. John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (1864), (London: Longmans, 1934), p. 35. R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years 1833-45* (1891, reprinted Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 68.
2. Frank M. Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion* (Cambridge, Mass., Yale University Press, 2002), p. 165.
3. Turner, *Newman*, p. 7.
4. It was of J. H. Froude that Newman would recall in the *Apologia* of 1864, 'He taught me to look with admiration towards the Church of Rome and in the same degree to dislike the Reformation. He fixed deep in me the idea of devotion to the Blessed Virgin and he led me gradually to believe in the Real Presence.' p. 25.
5. Newman, *Apologia pro vita sua*, pp. 32, 34.
6. *Apologia*, p. 35.
7. The sermon has been consulted as printed in Eugene R. Fairweather (ed.), *The Oxford Movement* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 37-49.
8. Newman, *Apologia*, p. 39.
9. *Apologia*, p. 40.
10. R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years 1835-1845* (1891) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 85.
11. I have been assisted in the preparation of this section through consulting Stephen Thomas, *Newman and Heresy: The Anglican Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 50-9.
12. John Henry Newman, "The Catholic Church" (1833), Tract II, in *Tracts for the Times* Vol. 1, (London: Rivington 1834) p. 2.
13. 'The Catholic Church' p. 3.
14. 'The Catholic Church' p. 3.
15. 'The Catholic Church' p. 4.
16. Tract 11 formed two parts; 20 and 47 one each. I have utilized the tracts as reprinted in *Tracts for the Times* Vols. I and II (London: Rivingtons, 1834 and 1836).
17. Newman, (ed.), *Tracts for the Times*, Vol. 1, Tract 11, p. 1.
18. Such an estimate of Newman's correspondent is further warranted when Newman goes on to admit that this correspondent 'perhaps attributes less efficacy to the Sacrament of Baptism than I; brings out into greater system and prominence the history of an individual's warfare with his spiritual enemies; fixes more precisely and abruptly the date of his actual conversion from darkness to light', 'The Catholic Church' p. 2.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 2.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
24. Tract 20 consisted of Letters 1 & 2.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
27. Newman, Tract 20, in *Tracts for the Times* Vol. 1, p. 1.
28. Tract 20 p. 1.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
33. A reference to the scheme of broad Christian comprehension advocated by Thomas Arnold. Arnold's response to Tractarianism is discussed below.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
35. Tract 47 in *Tracts for the Times* Vol. 2 (London: Rivingtons, 1836), p. 2.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
37. I am indebted to Marvin R. O'Connell's *The Oxford Conspirators: A History of the Oxford Movement 1833-45* (NY: Macmillan, 1969), pp. 75-9 for this.
38. Thomas Arnold, "Tracts for the Times" in *Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold D.D.*, (New York: Appleton, 1845), pp. 246, 7.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 247.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 257.
41. 2 volumes, 1842.
42. William Goode, *The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice* (1842) in Elizabeth Jay, (ed.), *The Evangelical and Oxford Movements* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 81.
43. E. A. Litton, *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology* (1882, reprinted London: James Clarke, 1960), p. ix.
44. (Philadelphia: Smith & English, 1856). The work bore the sub-title 'With a Particular Reference to the Controversy on the Subject Between Romanists and Protestants'.
45. *The Church of Christ*, pp. v,vi.
46. Litton, *Dogmatic Theology*, p. 372.
47. *Dogmatic Theology*, p. 71.

48. For the preparation of this essay, I have relied on Stoughton's *Religion in England:1800-1850* Vol. I, (London: Hodder and Stoughton 1884). Stoughton's volume on the Tractarian controversy, *Lectures on Tractarian Theology* (London 1843) has to date proved impossible to obtain.
49. s.v. "Stoughton, John" in the Donald M. Lewis, (ed.), *Blackwell Dictionary of Evangelical Biography*, Vol. 2 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), p. 1062.
50. *Religion in England*, p. 175.
51. Bannerman's ministry had begun in the Church of Scotland in 1833; he departed for the non-established Free Church in 1843. cf. the intro. to Bannerman's *The Church of Christ*, Vol. I (1869, reprint London: Banner, 1960), pp. xv-xvii.
52. *Apologia* pp. 39, 139ff.
53. Note the discussion above at p. 355. The quotations here are from Tract 47, pp. 2, 4.