

# Development or Destruction? E.A. Freeman and the Debate on Church Restoration, 1839–51

JONATHAN CONLIN

## SUMMARY

*In the 1840s Edward Augustus Freeman was a pillar of the Oxford Architectural Society (which became the Oxford Architectural and Historical Society in 1860), then known as the Oxford Society for Promoting the Study of Gothic Architecture. A young fellow of Trinity College, Freeman was vacillating between pursuing a career as an architect and becoming a medieval historian, the field in which he would establish his reputation. A study of Freeman's correspondence, society transactions and Freeman's architectural publications from the 1840s reveals a sophisticated, 'eclectic' concept of architectural style. Though his interest in architecture has been generally overlooked, his ideas led the Cambridge Camden Society and others to change the way they restored historic churches as well as their vision of architectural history.*

'In what style should we build?' This was a question which confronted architects and many others in the nineteenth century. And not just in Germany, where Heinrich Hübsch published a book entitled *In welchem Style sollen wir bauen?* (1828), but also in Britain. For centuries it had been possible to describe structures as good or bad architecture, but not as good or bad examples of this or that style. 'Romanesque', 'Gothic', and other style labels were coined several centuries after the buildings they sought to classify were built. 'Gothick' began as a pejorative label in the eighteenth century. 'Romanesque' was coined by William Gunn in 1819.<sup>1</sup> An early Victorian architect worked in Greek, Roman, Gothic and in some cases Egyptian Revival. Though some revelled in it, for most, then as now, choice induced anxiety, and A.W.N. Pugin's *Contrasts* of 1836 gave his fellow architects a stern dressing down for dressing their buildings up in a series of interchangeable, indiscriminately cheap (to his mind) costumes.

Writing in the *Architectural Record* towards the close of the century, the historian Edward Augustus Freeman observed that

The architect of our age finds himself in a position in which no architect of any other age ever found himself. He has to choose his style. Nothing like this has ever happened before. There have been periods of transition in which an architect has had to choose between two styles; but he has never had any choice wider than that. But the architect of the nineteenth century can choose among all the styles that have been in use since men began to build... We talk of the style of this or that century; the nineteenth century stands distinguished from all earlier centuries by having no style of its own, but imitating the styles of all earlier centuries.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> C. Yanni, 'On Nature and Nomenclature: William Whewell and the Production of Architectural Knowledge', *Architectural History*, 40 (1997), p. 206.

<sup>2</sup> E.A. Freeman, 'Choice in Architectural Styles', *Architectural Record*, 1.4 (April–June 1892), p. 391.

In a cruel irony the nineteenth century was the first century with sufficient self-awareness to speak of itself as ‘the nineteenth century’, but it struggled to find a style to call its own. It seemed condemned to an architecture of revetment.

It may seem odd to suggest that Edward Augustus Freeman found a way out of this Victorian predicament, or even that he thought much about architecture. Though the importance of Freeman’s *History of the Norman Conquest* (1865–76) to the emergence of medieval studies as an academic discipline has been acknowledged, Freeman’s interest in architecture and architectural history has been overlooked until recently. Freeman came up to Trinity College, Oxford in Michaelmas term 1841; the following March he joined the Oxford Society for Promoting the Study of Gothic Architecture. Better known as the OAS, this Society had been formed in 1839. Freeman soon became a pillar of the Society, serving as its secretary twice (1845 and 1846–7) and collaborating with its sister organization, the Cambridge Camden Society (CCS), also founded in 1839.

In the early 1840s Freeman toyed with becoming an architect himself. He spent the long vacations touring country churches and published a number of pamphlets on Gothic art and architecture. Although he does not enjoy the profile of leading CCS members such as John Mason Neale, Benjamin Webb and Alexander James Beresford Hope, Freeman is an important figure in the history of the OAS and of Victorian architectural history more generally.<sup>3</sup> In 1849 Freeman’s *A History of Architecture* appeared: his first book, and, more remarkably, the first history of world architecture to appear in the English language. In it Freeman advanced a highly sophisticated, racialized concept of architectural style and architectural history, one Alex Bremner and I have discussed elsewhere.<sup>4</sup>

This essay turns to an earlier publication, Freeman’s 1846 pamphlet *Principles of Church Restoration*. As James White and Chris Miele have shown, Freeman’s *Principles* marked a step-change in writing on church restoration.<sup>5</sup> Admittedly, James Wyatt’s alterations at Salisbury Cathedral in 1789 had sparked a debate half a century earlier. Wyatt provoked Revd John Milner to prepare a paper on restoration for the Society of Antiquaries in 1798. But the Antiquaries refused to hear it, and Milner’s *Dissertation on the Merits of the Modern Style of Altering Ancient Cathedrals* would only appear in print in 1811. Apart from an 1823 book by John Chessel Buckler, therefore, the question remained dormant until the 1840s. Along with the 1841 *Remarks on Church Architecture* by fellow OAS member Revd John Louis Petit, Freeman’s *Principles* was also important for its role in leading the CCS to address church restoration – a question the CCS had claimed lay within its purview, but which it had been slow to tackle.<sup>6</sup> Church restoration not only provided a deceptively easy way for those interested in architecture to put theory into practice, at Iffley (in the OAS’s case) and the Round Church (in the CCS’s), it also raised deeper questions about the nature of stylistic change that threatened to divide the sister societies of Oxford and Cambridge.

Freeman’s pamphlet also needs to be set in the context of the Oxford Movement. Newman’s

<sup>3</sup> For the early history of the OAS see C. Dade-Robertson, ‘Edward Augustus Freeman and the University Architectural Societies,’ *Oxoniensia*, 71 (2006), pp. 151–73; P. Howell, ‘The Founders of the Oxford Architectural Society,’ *Oxoniensia*, 75 (2010), pp. 61–6; S.L. Ollard, ‘The Oxford Architectural and Historical Society and the Oxford Movement,’ *Oxoniensia*, 5 (1940), pp. 146–60; W.A. Pantin, ‘The Oxford Architectural and Historical Society, 1839–1939,’ *Oxoniensia*, 4 (1939), pp. 162–94. For the CCS see J.F. White, *The Cambridge Movement: The Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival* (Cambridge, 1979); C. Webster and J. Elliott (eds.), ‘A Church as it should be’: *the Cambridge Camden Society and its Influence* (Stamford, 2000).

<sup>4</sup> G.A. Bremner and J. Conlin, ‘History as Form: Architecture and Liberal Anglican Thought in the Writings of E.A. Freeman,’ *Modern Intellectual History*, 8.2 (2011), pp. 299–326.

<sup>5</sup> White, *Cambridge Movement*, ch. 6; C. Miele, ‘The Gothic Revival and Gothic Architecture: The Restoration of Medieval Churches in Victorian Britain,’ New York University PhD thesis (1992); idem, ‘Re-Presenting the Church Militant: The Camden Society, Church Restoration and the Gothic Sign,’ in Webster and Elliott (eds.), ‘A Church as it should be’, pp. 257–94.

<sup>6</sup> White, *Cambridge Movement*, p. 164.

1845 conversion to Roman Catholicism had been anything but an exercise in church restoration, shaking the Church of England to its foundation. David Brownlee and Michael Hall have both suggested that Newman's concept of the 'development of doctrine' may have influenced Freeman's thinking on architecture, a suggestion this essay supports with new evidence drawn from Freeman's papers, held at the John Rylands Library, University of Manchester.<sup>7</sup> This correspondence enables us to appreciate how the *Principles* reflected Freeman's relationship with High Anglicans, with the CCS and with the architect George Gilbert Scott, whose 1850 *Plea for the Faithful Restoration of Churches* lent heavily on Freeman's *Principles*. Freeman's discussion of restoration, it is proposed, was more heuristic than that advanced by John Ruskin in his *Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1849), the approach later championed by William Morris's Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), established in 1877.<sup>8</sup>

Rocked as it frequently was by internal feuding, it must be conceded that the world of the OAS and the CCS in the 1840s was a small one. At times the world of the young Freeman can seem as narrowly defined as the space separating OAS's home in the Music Room in Holywell Street from J.H. Parker's bookshop and publishing house in Turl Street, from which so many guides, glossaries and companions to Gothic tumbled in the 1830s. The industry and energy with which Freeman and his friends and rivals pursued their church-bagging tours of the surrounding counties is nonetheless astonishing. Travelling for weeks on end, often on foot, these 'church tourists' clocked up hundreds of measurements, sketches and notes.

This was the raw data of the 'science of Ecclesiology', which the CCS's house organ *The Ecclesiologist* defined as embracing

Church Building at home and in the Colonies; Church Restoration in England and abroad; the theory and practice of ecclesiological architecture; the investigation of Church Antiquities; the connection of Architecture with Ritual; the science of Symbolism; the principles of Church Arrangement; Church Musick and all the Decorative Arts.<sup>9</sup>

Although it borrowed terminology from an earlier generation, from Thomas Rickman and William Whewell in particular, ecclesiology was about much more than the taxonomy which drew distinctions between 'Early Pointed', 'Middle Pointed' and 'Third Pointed', which filled out the scientific 'Church Scheme' forms distributed in their thousands by the CCS.<sup>10</sup> In the years after the debate the number of church restoration starts in England boomed, rising from just over thirty in the period 1851–5 to more than eighty in 1856–60. Once there, they remained at that level until at least 1874.<sup>11</sup> Ecclesiology helped Victorians decide what to destroy, what to preserve and what to build.

#### RAILWAY ARCHITECTURE: THE VIEW FROM CASTLE ASHBY

For church tourists in the 1840s railways, which were just beginning to spread across the country, represented something of a mixed blessing. On the one hand they made it easier to

<sup>7</sup> D.B. Brownlee, 'The First High Victorian: British Architectural Theory in the 1840s', *Architectura*, 15.1 (1985), pp. 35–7; M. Hall, "'Our Own": Thomas Hope, A.J. Beresford Hope and the Creation of the High Victorian Style', in R. Hill and M. Hall (eds.), *The 1840s*, Studies in Victorian Architecture and Design, 1 (2008), p. 64.

<sup>8</sup> J. Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (London, 1849), pp. 179–80.

<sup>9</sup> *Ecclesiologist*, 1 (1845), p. 1.

<sup>10</sup> Thomas Rickman's *An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of English Architecture* appeared in 1817; William Whewell's *Architectural Notes on German Churches* (anonymously) in 1830. See Yanni, 'On Nature and Nomenclature'. A CCS 'Church Scheme' is illustrated and discussed in Miele, 'Re-Presenting the Church Militant', p. 288.

<sup>11</sup> C. Miele, "'Their Interest and Habit": Professionalism and the Restoration of Medieval Churches, 1837–77', in C. Brooks and A. Saint (eds.), *The Victorian Church: Architecture and Society* (Manchester, 1995), p. 158.

extend their researches beyond the counties immediately surrounding Oxford and Cambridge. On the other they reflected the ruthless pursuit of profit and speed, forces threatening the isolated yet charming villages where, it seemed, the finest churches lay waiting to be discovered. 'How lamentably unromantic is every thing and every one becoming!', bemoans 'Catholicus', one of the characters in Neale's *Hierologus; or, the Church Tourists* (1843), as he and his fellow 'pilgrims' await their train at Weedon Beck. 'What a completely nineteenth-century look have these stations!' If this was a compliment, it was unintended. For Neale's tourists these 'lath and plaster things' are just one symptom of 'the immense moral mischief that railroads have caused and will cause to England... cutting up by the root hearty old English associations, superstitions, attachments'.<sup>12</sup>

For Freeman, however, there were insights to be gained from viewing churches by train. In his *Principles of Church Restoration* Freeman invites us to stand on a platform at what sounds like Castle Ashby Station, a station on the Northampton and Peterborough Railway which had only opened the previous year. Here we receive a lesson in historical triangulation:

On one of the stations on the Peterborough railway, we can descry on the right hand the stern Romanesque tower of Earls Barton: its lofty yet massive proportion, the barbarick richness of its rude arcade and heavy balusters, carry us back to the wild freedom and isolated greatness of England's early days; to the right reposes the last building of ancient times, the fairy Church of Whiston, its graceful tower with its rich panelling, and battlement, and pinnacle, kindled into beauty by the last expiring rays of northern skill and faith. By a mere calculation of years, the latter would be comparatively one of our own day, and in outward appearance it has all the freshness of a newly consecrated temple; while Earls Barton bears upon it all the stamp of ages. Yet who does not feel the seven centuries between the two as nothing compared with the three that divide himself from Whiston? Both we feel are ancient, both belong to a class from which we are separated: the years that separate them are like a stream winding gradually away from its source, changing, developing, or corrupting, but all gently and gradually without any sudden perceptible break or jar. We on the other hand are separated from both of them as it were by a single yawning gulf, at a smaller but more impassable distance.

Though the chronological distance separating the two churches in front of us is far larger than that which separates our nineteenth-century railway station from the Perpendicular church of Whiston, in fact 'a complete revulsion of feeling separates us alike from both'. There is a tradition that bridges the Saxon/Perpendicular divide, one we are not part of. To us Whiston is a 'relic of departed times', a final example of the 'ancient' way of building, whereas to those who built Whiston the 'old Saxon pile' of Earls Barton was not.<sup>13</sup>

To put it in simple terms, Castle Ashby Station is not to Whiston as Whiston is to Earls Barton. The passage is an early example of Freeman's love of historical analogies that collapse 'a mere space of time', that fold up past and present in startling ways, forcing us to imagine not only how we might view a Saxon architect, but how he might view us as well as the fifteenth-century architect 'between' us (chronologically speaking, at least). It also serves to set the scene for the contrast Freeman seeks to draw between the 'ancient' architect and the 'modern' architect, as well as between the ways that they approach church restoration. 'Ancient' architects practiced 'a *living* art, an instrument which as it were grew into their hands', Freeman claims. They destroyed older work without a second thought, secure in the knowledge that their style

<sup>12</sup> J.M. Neale, *Hierologus; or, the Church Tourists* (London, 1843), p. 90.

<sup>13</sup> E.A. Freeman, *Principles of Church Restoration* (London, 1846), p. 9.

was best and without any interest in 'historical associations.' 'Each successive style rose only on the ashes of its predecessor.' A modern architect was condemned by his very situation to be a nervous imitator rather than an inventor. As with 'a writer composing in a dead language,' in his case originality was neither sought nor desired.<sup>14</sup>

Unfortunately, Freeman wrote, 'nothing is more common now than bad restorations,' in which restorers acted without 'professional aid' or regard to a *genius loci*, guided instead by their own predilections for this or that period of architecture.<sup>15</sup> It was a regular complaint of Freeman, Scott and other ecclesiologists<sup>16</sup> that such individuals lifted designs for windows or other details straight out of works such as Matthew Bloxam's *Principles of Gothic Ecclesiastical Architecture* (1829, ten editions by 1859), without regard to the individual character of 'their' church.<sup>17</sup> It is hard not to note a certain irony here. The ecclesiologists were victims of their own success in diffusing examples of 'correct' detail. Bloxam was a member of the OAS and a honorary member of the CCS. There was something patronizing about ecclesiologists condemning their followers for following them too closely, particularly when there seemed no clear agreement on what constituted the 'character' of any given church.

Members of both societies had their first taste of restoration work in 1841. OAS members were set loose on the church of Great Haseley, where they restored a steeply pitched roof to the chancel, and at the same time debated J.C. Buckler's proposal to replace the Perpendicular window in the west front of Iffley church with a round Norman window to Buckler's design, which would supposedly be more in keeping with the rest of the building. In 1844 they turned their attentions to Dorchester abbey. Meanwhile in 1841 CCS members got stuck into St Sepulchre's (the Round Church) in Cambridge. Both would represent major commitments, in time and in reputational terms. Once implicated at Dorchester the OAS did not extract itself until George Gilbert Scott finished the project in 1858.<sup>18</sup> At the Round Church the CCS's installation of a stone altar table led to a furore which nearly destroyed the society in 1845.<sup>19</sup>

In their review of J.L. Petit's aforementioned *Remarks on Church Architecture* (1841) the CCS defined restoration as being 'to recover the original appearance, which has been lost by decay, accident, or ill-judged alteration.'<sup>20</sup> At Iffley, they would have supported Buckler. Freeman disagreed. When Iffley was debated by the OAS in 1841 Freeman and J.H. Parker both supported H.G. Liddell of Christ Church in his opposition to the imposition of stylistic purity and a preference for one style over all others.<sup>21</sup> Such restoration projects and debates informed Freeman's *Principles*. There Freeman noted that returning the church to its original condition was not as easy as at first appeared. 'For what are we to understand by "its ancient condition"?' What should one do where the nave was the 'perfect example' of one style, and the chancel of

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. pp. 4–5.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. p. 10.

<sup>16</sup> In this essay I use 'Ecclesiologists' when referring specifically to the leaders of the CCS and 'ecclesiologist' when referring more generally to church tourists and others who made a particular study of church architecture.

<sup>17</sup> As Scott wrote to Freeman on 9 Oct. 1849, 'every [window] which does not conform to the canons of the ecclesiologist or which is not the pet window of the "restorer" is to be removed to make way for a fancy specimen from Bloxham [sic.] or the [J.H. Parker's] Glossary [the *Glossary of Terms* of 1836]': John Rylands Library, Manchester (JRL), FA1/1/94a. See also G.G. Scott, *A Plea for the Faithful Restoration of our Ancient Churches* (London, 1850), pp. 5, 31.

<sup>18</sup> Although an 1844 survey by the architect James Cranstoun estimated the cost of a general restoration at £3,970, the OAS only managed to raise £500 by 1846. The north (Jesse) and south chancel windows were repaired along with the sedilia. Further work was carried out subsequently under the direction of Butterfield and, after 1858, by Scott.

<sup>19</sup> This episode is discussed further below. See White, *Cambridge Movement*, ch. 5; E. Rose, 'The Stone Table in the Round Church and the Crisis of the Cambridge Camden Society', *Victorian Studies*, 10.2 (December 1966), pp. 119–44; C. Miele, 'Gothic Sign, Protestant Realia: Templars, Ecclesiologists and the Round Churches at Cambridge and London', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain*, 53 (2010), pp. 191–215.

<sup>20</sup> *Ecclesiologist*, 1 (1841), p. 70.

<sup>21</sup> Miele, 'Gothic Revival and Gothic Architecture', pp. 105–6.



another? 'Where perhaps a vista of Romanesque arches is terminated by a Lancet triplet or a gorgeous Flowing east window, and itself supports a Perpendicular clerestory, what is here to be done?' The earliest style present in a church might not be the 'predominant' one.<sup>22</sup> Freeman's advice was to restore the church to how it looked after the 'last alteration of a tolerable character', although he then went on to note several exceptions to this rule.<sup>23</sup>

Freeman's *Principles of Church Restoration* mingled general advice with critique of recent restorations. But it was primarily a philosophical exploration of the process of restoration and of historical agency. The work was welcomed by Neale and Webb personally as a useful stimulus, and the *Ecclesiologist's* May 1847 review also noted that Freeman had raised a 'great question' which had yet to receive a 'satisfactory and philosophical answer'.<sup>24</sup> Rather than following Freeman's thoughtful approach, however, the reviewer (who may have been Neale or Webb) took a schematic line: 'There are but three systems of conducting a restoration, which we may respectively name the Destructive, the Conservative, and the Eclectic.'<sup>25</sup>

As noted by Freeman himself, by G.G. Scott and others since, this was a caricature of Freeman's argument. This unhelpful nomenclature nonetheless dominated discussion of restoration until the 1860s.<sup>26</sup> The reviewer claimed that the 'Destructive' and 'Conservative' were equivalent to the 'ancient' and 'modern' attitudes described by Freeman, when Freeman had been quite clear that we could not recover the 'ancient' mindset. This did not stop the *Ecclesiologist* noting the advantages of the 'Destructive':

it is the only system which offers the logical possibility of working a building into a state of abstract perfection; for, of course, it logically follows upon the theory of architectural development that there can be only one perfect period of architecture, all others tending to or declining from it.<sup>27</sup>

Though the reviewer granted that a gulf separated us from past ages of faith in terms of 'external matters', he argued that our powers of 'association' (of a structure with the holy men martyred or buried there, for example) and sensitivity to 'romantic scenery' meant that there was no gulf at all in terms of 'internal reality'.

For the *Ecclesiologist* the Church that built Whiston was the same Church that now restored it: 'the only separation between us and the architects of the middle ages was a separation of time, and therefore in this respect merely we have no more reason to preserve their buildings than they had to preserve those of their predecessors.'<sup>28</sup> Though the 'Conservative' had the advantage of 'safety', that was its only claim to our favour. There was little point in holding 'one style of Christian art to be superior to others, if nevertheless we are not to employ it because it happens to have been removed to make way for another'. Hence all later additions should probably be removed. The reviewer clearly preferred the 'Destructive' to the third or 'Eclectic' approach as well. The latter was described as 'a middle course between the others; in certain cases it would simply restore, in others it would re-model'. The reviewer felt it was nearly impossible to identify any principles for this 'system', but was nonetheless convinced that it existed.

The *Ecclesiologist* claimed that one could not be an advocate of 'development' in architecture without believing in 'abstract perfection' and without constructing history in terms of rise and fall. Fragments of 'perfection' were to be extracted from the historical matrix, lovingly dusted off and carefully reproduced throughout the structure. Everything dating from later phases of

<sup>22</sup> Freeman, *Church Restoration*, pp. 12–13.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* p. 14.

<sup>24</sup> *Ecclesiologist*, 7 (1847), p. 161. See also Webb to Freeman, 30 Nov. 1846: JRL, FA1/1/196.

<sup>25</sup> *Ecclesiologist*, 7 (1847), p. 161.

<sup>26</sup> E.A. Freeman, *On the Preservation and Restoration of Ancient Monuments* (London, 1852), pp. 7–10; Scott, *A Plea*, p. 22; White, *Cambridge Movement*, pp. 166–8; Miele, 'Re-Presenting the Church Militant', p. 290.

<sup>27</sup> *Ecclesiologist*, 7 (1847), p. 163.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 164–5.

building was to be thrown away. Though it would take a few years and the publication of his *History of Architecture* to get the message across, Freeman had already shown that 'development' did *not* imply a golden age and isolation of 'pure' style. The church restorer was confronted, not with a collage, but with a battlefield. Rather than the building being a matrix filled with specimens of distinct styles (some 'pure', most 'debased'), it was a 'scene of mingled destruction and creation', a dynamic rather than a static entity.<sup>29</sup> Freeman derived this much more sophisticated, evolutionary model of development from a surprising source.

#### THE FABRIC OF DOCTRINE: NEWMAN AND 'DEVELOPMENT' IN LITTLEMORE

In 1845 Freeman married Eleanor Gutch, daughter of his former tutor, necessitating the resignation of his Trinity fellowship. After a honeymoon spent touring Gothic churches, the pair set up house two miles outside Oxford, in the rambling village of Littlemore. Here Freeman wrote his *Principles of Church Restoration* as well as his entry for the Chancellor's English essay prize, 'On the effects of the Conquest of England by the Normans'. Though it did not win, it was Freeman's first attempt to grapple with a topic that would fascinate him for many years to come. In December the publisher James Burns commissioned him to write a 400-page 'manual of architecture' – what became his *History of Architecture*.<sup>30</sup>

During their courtship Freeman had composed bad poetry for Eleanor's birthday, along with bad poetry celebrating the medieval age of faith and bemoaning the destruction and latter-day disdain of its most sacred relics, Gothic churches.

Men say the ages when our Gothick sires  
For Salem drew the consecrated glaive,  
Were dark and lifeless as the very grave:  
Yet when I look up on the Heaven: bound spires  
Those ages bade arise, my heart aspires  
At Anselm's side to tread the hallowed nave.  
If less of light to them its radiance gave,  
The light they had was lit at warmer fires.<sup>31</sup>

Freeman and like-minded friends such as Samuel Wayte vanished for weeks on end, measuring country churches, sketching towers, rubbing brasses and peering through lychscopes. Like any faithful 'church tourist' they probed the wounds left by the Reformation's assault on stained glass, rood screens, stone crosses, frescoes and sculpted tombs, and homilized against latter-day additions such as galleries, whitewash, plaster ceilings and box pews to any churchwarden or rector foolish enough to get in their way.

F.A. Paley's *Church Restorers* nicely captures such Oxonians' somewhat smug sense of difference from their hearty peers.<sup>32</sup> Yet Eleanor feared that church touring was throwing Edward among men with 'a leaning towards Rome'.<sup>33</sup> Back at Trinity Freeman and his friends had organized a small lay brotherhood and abstained from dinner on Wednesdays and Fridays. Wayte at this point compared Freeman's views on architecture and the Church to the Tractarian

<sup>29</sup> Freeman, *Church Restoration*, p. 4.

<sup>30</sup> Burns to Freeman, 7 Dec. 1846: JRL, FA1/1/8. The book was published by Joseph Masters, Burns (a Roman Catholic) objecting to certain 'Anglo-Catholic' observations on Freeman's part. See Bremner and Conlin, 'History as Form', p. 300, n. 5.

<sup>31</sup> Freeman, 'The Ages of Faith': JRL, FA3/3/2.

<sup>32</sup> Paley, *The Church Restorers*, p. 32.

<sup>33</sup> Freeman to Eleanor Gutch, 1 Feb. 1846: W.R.W. Stephens, *Life and Letters of Edward Augustus Freeman*, 2 vols. (London, 1895), vol. 1, p. 87.

Richard Hurrell Froude (1803–36), whose memoirs (the *Remains of R.H. Froude*, published by Newman in 1839) were notorious, damned as ‘papistical’ by Low Churchmen.<sup>34</sup> The *Remains* included a paper on church architecture Froude had read to the Oxford Ashmolean Society in 1831.<sup>35</sup> Freeman’s admiration for Richard Hurrell may lie behind Freeman’s later feud with his brother, the historian G.A. Froude.<sup>36</sup>

Conversions and rumours of conversions rippled around Oxford and Cambridge. In the course of 1844–5 the CCS was in crisis after the vicar of Cheltenham, Francis Close, delivered a sermon (later published) asserting that *The Restoration of Churches is the Restoration of Popery*. Close had jumped on the Evangelical bandwagon behind the incumbent of the Round Church, a certain Faulkner, who had brought the infamous stone altar installed in his church by the CCS before the consistory court. Various Church dignitaries who had been happy to be co-opted as patrons of the CCS were inspired to find out more about what ‘their’ organization had been doing, and took fright at the stridency and Tractarian sympathies they discovered. Several members converted; Paley in 1846, after a scandal in which the Master of St John’s Cambridge evicted him from his fellow’s set for having allegedly encouraged a pupil to convert.<sup>37</sup> After a stormy meeting held in Cambridge town hall on 8 May 1845 the CCS cut its ties with the university and moved to London, where it was reborn as ‘the Ecclesiological late Cambridge Camden Society’.<sup>38</sup> After 1845 the CCS drew its new recruits from Oxford, not Cambridge.<sup>39</sup>

Though its activities were far less ‘suspect’, in 1845 the OAS considered (but rejected) a motion to exclude non-Anglicans from membership. The original motion to found the Society back in 1839 had been proposed and seconded by two Tractarians, both fellows of Trinity: Isaac Williams (author of Tract 80, *On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge*) and W.J. Copeland. Although meetings continued to see heads of houses and Tractarians mingle, several members were ‘out in ‘45’.<sup>40</sup> Wayte crossed to Rome, albeit much later.

While Eleanor could keep a closer eye on Freeman outside Trinity (Newman’s old college), if she was worried about ‘a leaning towards Rome’ then moving to Littlemore in 1845 can hardly have reassured her. Littlemore was part of the parish of St Mary’s, Oxford, and very much a neglected part in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. When John Henry Newman became vicar of St Mary’s in 1828, however, he quickly set about addressing that neglect, paying regular visits to the village and successfully petitioning the patron of the living, Oriel College, to grant land for a chapel of ease. Designed by H.J. Underwood, the church of St Mary and St Nicholas (1835–6) began as a simple Middle Pointed Gothic structure, with clear glass in its windows, a modest belfry rather than a tower and without a chancel.

Though Newman had not joined the OAS, he had attended meetings. In a classic act of Ecclesiologist translation, he ‘dug up’ a thirteenth-century font from St Mary’s, Oxford and installed it in his new church at Littlemore. A feature that had been hacked by Cromwell’s ‘bad men’ in the Civil War only to be cruelly thrust aside in Thomas Plowman’s 1828 reordering of the University Church (an exercise in ‘neatness’) now gave Newman a handy illustration for a Littlemore sermon.<sup>41</sup> Under the guidance of J.R. Bloxam, Newman’s curate, St Mary and St

<sup>34</sup> Stephens, *Life of Freeman*, vol. 1, p. 72. Wayte may have been noting the similarity between Freeman’s poetry and earlier work by Froude, the ‘Lyra Apostolica’, published in the *British Magazine* under a pseudonym.

<sup>35</sup> R.H. Froude, *Remains of R.H. Froude*, 2 vols. (Part 1, 1838), vol. 2, pp. 335–74.

<sup>36</sup> Ian Hesketh, personal communication, 2011.

<sup>37</sup> C. Collard, ‘Frederick Apthorp Paley’, *ODNB*, online edition (accessed June 2011); White, *The Cambridge Movement*, p. 27.

<sup>38</sup> Other Evangelical pamphlets opposing the installation had been published before Close went into print, notably those penned by J.J. Smith, a former CCS member and Revd Faulkner himself. See Rose, ‘Stone Table’, pp. 128–39; Miele, ‘Gothic Sign, Protestant Realia’, pp. 209–12.

<sup>39</sup> G.K. Brandwood, ‘“Fond of Church Architecture”: The Establishment of the Society and a Short History of its Membership’ in Webster and Elliott (eds.), ‘*A Church as it should be*’, p. 59.

<sup>40</sup> Ollard, ‘The Oxford Architectural and Historical Society’, p. 9.

<sup>41</sup> F.J. McGrath (ed.), *John Henry Newman. Sermons 1824–1843*, 5 vols. (Oxford, 2011–2), vol. 4, pp. 241–2.



Nicholas was gradually enriched, and by 1845 it was being hailed by the CCS as 'the first building for many a long year erected, showing itself to be not so much a sermon-house, as a temple of the MOST HIGH'.<sup>42</sup> Stained glass, a chancel and tower were all subsequently added.<sup>43</sup>

In April 1842 Newman had retreated from Oxford, although he did not resign the living until 1843. At Littlemore he and several disciples lived a quasi-monastic life in a range of hastily converted farm buildings. Here Newman remained until February 1846. In Littlemore in 1845, therefore, while Freeman worked on *The Principles of Church Restoration* Newman turned his last sermon as vicar of St Mary's, Oxford, entitled 'The theory of developments in religious doctrine' into a book, the *Essay on the Development of Doctrine*. Newman had set himself the project as a test, determined to convert if writing the *Essay* did not change his resolve. It did not, and the essay remained incomplete, though it was published late that year. Before then, on the 9 October 1845 Newman became a Roman Catholic, an event which rocked the Anglican Church. While Freeman had been working out how to restore a church, Newman had done his best to destroy it, at least in the eyes of many Anglicans in that time of ferment.

For several years Newman had struggled to locate a coherent body of doctrine within the weighty tomes that lay unread on the shelves of Anglican divines, something necessary if the Church of England was to uphold her claim to embody 'the primitive church'. From 1839 onwards he began having serious doubts as to whether this was possible. Though doctrine was in one sense a 'large fabric of divinity...irregular in structure', in another sense doctrine was 'evolved', constantly throwing out 'fresh forms', developing in the minds of the faithful.<sup>44</sup> Instead of seeking to retain its hold on 'primitive revelation' and resist any innovation, the Church needed to recognize that doctrine changed over time. Owen Chadwick has constructed one pedigree for 'development' via W.G. Ward and German Liberal Catholics.<sup>45</sup> But contemporary natural history may have also been in Newman's mind. Whether by accident or design, Newman's hypothesis of development coincided with the 'development hypothesis', the theory of transmutation advanced in Robert Chambers's anonymous 1844 bestseller, *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*. Indeed, in using the verb 'evolve' it went further, in so far as the word only came into currency in discussion of transmutation after 1850, thanks to the work of Herbert Spencer. The word would appear only once in Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859).

Newman's doctrines developed in interaction with their environment, that is with the minds and communities which enshrined them. True doctrine is true if it 'retains one and the same type, the same principles, the same organization; if its beginnings anticipate its subsequent phases, and its later phenomena protect and subserve its earlier; if it has a power of assimilation and revival, and a vigorous action from first to last'.<sup>46</sup>

Evidence of Freeman's response to the Oxford Movement and to Newman specifically is thin. Freeman seems to have lost interest in Church affairs after 1850, which compounds the difficulty.<sup>47</sup> We do know, however, that Freeman and his childhood mentor, the Somerset curate Henry Thompson (1797–1878) corresponded about *Tracts for the Times* and Newman's

<sup>42</sup> *Ecclesiologist*, 4 (1845), pp. 32–3. A.J. Beresford Hope and the CCS took Bloxam's arrangement of the altar as the model for William Butterfield's All Saints, Margaret Street, the *Ecclesiologist's* model church: Ollard, 'The Oxford Architectural and Historical Society', p. 6.

<sup>43</sup> J. Rothenstein, 'Newman and Littlemore', *Architectural Review*, 98 (1945), pp. 176–7; P. Howell, 'Newman's Church at Littlemore', *Oxford Art Journal*, 6 (1983), pp. 51–6.

<sup>44</sup> J.H. Newman, *Fifteen Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford, between A. D. 1826 and 1843* (London, 1872), p. 317.

<sup>45</sup> O. Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman: the Idea of Doctrinal Development* (Cambridge, 1957), pp. 116, 119.

<sup>46</sup> J.H. Newman, *Essay on Development* (London, 1845), p. 170.

<sup>47</sup> Correspondence with Stephen Glynne does indicate that in 1870 Freeman lobbied unsuccessfully for Gladstone (Glynne's brother in law) to appoint his old Trinity friend and fellow OAS committee member Basil Jones to the see of St Asaph, and may have shared Glynne's dislike for the 'low' clergy appointed by Palmerston. Disraeli appointed Jones to the see of St David's in 1874. See Glynne to Freeman, 10 March 1870 and 30 March 18[57?]: JRL, FA1/7/250 and /255.

'development' between 1839 and 1845. Unfortunately only Thompson's side of this correspondence survives, although we can gain an impression of Freeman's views from it. Thompson's views on the seventeenth-century non-jurors, the sacral role of the king as well as on the W.G. Ward case show him to be a High Churchman of the old school.<sup>48</sup> Thompson applauded the Tractarian William Gresley's Evangelical- and liberal-baiting fables and bemoaned the mainstream press's attacks on John Keble as 'malignity'. He also stated that he 'quite approve[d]' of Freeman's 'observation about the approximation of ultra protestantism to Popery'.<sup>49</sup>

When Freeman first broached the *Tracts* controversy in September 1839 Thompson was relaxed, insisting that there was nothing in them that could not be found in the 'soundest of old divines' (such as the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century theologians Richard Hooker and John Jewel). Far from threatening the Anglican Church's integrity the Tractarians afforded a salutary and timely reminder to the evangelical wing of the Anglican Church.<sup>50</sup> When Newman's *Essay* appeared in late 1845 Thompson wrote to Freeman that he

quite agree[d] with your views respecting Catholick doctrine. We or the Romanists are schismatics – if we have decided in our minds that they are right, no doubt we ought to join them at once...But consistency seems to have fled to the stars. It is my great comfort that Newman and his followers have not 'developed' Church principles into Romanism, but have been obliged to abandon Church principles in order to be Romanists. The Development Theory places Romanism in bold and avowed opposition to Catholicism, and 'quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus' ['That which {has been believed} always, everywhere, and by all; a quote from Vincent de Lérins] is to yield to 'quod nunc, quod Roma, quod a nobis' ['That which {is believed} now, in Rome, and by us'] Rome cannot stand upon antiquity.

Thompson insisted that the 'principles of the Tracts for the Times' had not led to 'apostasy'.<sup>51</sup>

In March 1843 – a month after Newman's key sermon on 'development' (2 February) – Freeman delivered a paper 'On the progressive development of the several styles of architecture and their connexion with the spirit of the times in which they severally arose' to the OAS. Though hesitant, this paper presumed that 'each style is, if I may so speak, the material expression of the spirit of the age to which it belongs.' Freeman was not in fact arguing that styles changed in response to 'the times', but nor did he view the history of architecture in terms of the rise and decadence of one 'pure' style.<sup>52</sup> This was a daring statement for the time. In the early 1840s the leading members of the CCS had reached consensus on which variety of Gothic was the 'purest': Middle Pointed, from the early thirteenth century. In declaring his preference for fifteenth-century Perpendicular Freeman was casting himself into the outer darkness. The CCS associated Perpendicular with the decline of Gothic, damning it by association with the Erastianism they believed had strangled pure 'Catholick' faith in fifteenth-century England. Meanwhile the Romanesque style was damned for being too crude and barbaric. Where it stood in the way of 'pure' Gothic it was to give way to Middle Pointed. 'We need not say', the *Ecclesiologist* opined, 'that we should have advised the adoption of Middle-Pointed in the rebuilding of this [St Andrew's, Bradfield], as of every other church, from a

<sup>48</sup> For a useful discussion see P.B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760–1857* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 130–3.

<sup>49</sup> Henry Thompson to Freeman, 21 May 1840: JRL, FA1/7/737.

<sup>50</sup> Thompson to Freeman, 2 Sept. 1839: JRL, FA1/7/733. For a partial transcript: Stephens, *Life*, vol. 1, p. 24.

<sup>51</sup> Thompson to Freeman, 26 Dec. 1846: JRL, FA1/7/749.

<sup>52</sup> JRL, FA3/3/17.

preference found, we believe, on reason and propriety.<sup>53</sup> The 1850–1 restoration of St Peter's Northampton provides a further opportunity to see how such views were expressed (and defied) in practice.

#### RESTORATION PRACTICE: G.G. SCOTT AT ST PETER'S NORTHAMPTON

George Gilbert Scott restored more of Britain's cathedrals than any other Victorian architect. Having been lambasted as a latter-day William Dowsing, Scott's restorations are no longer viewed in such lurid terms.<sup>54</sup> Scott's memoirs nonetheless show the scars of what he, in his somewhat paranoid fashion, considered ill-treatment at the hand of the CCS in the years after his conversion to the cause by Benjamin Webb.<sup>55</sup> Perhaps sensing that Freeman was similarly placed with regard to the CCS 'vanguard', Scott befriended him at some point in 1846.<sup>56</sup> He drew heavily on Freeman's *Principles of Church Restoration* in a paper on church restoration that he delivered to the Buckinghamshire Architectural and Archaeological Society in July 1848, and which he subsequently published with additional notes as *A Plea for the Faithful Restoration of our Ancient Churches* (1850).<sup>57</sup> When Scott found himself 'nailed' (as he put it) for restoring St Peter's Northampton in Romanesque, therefore, he knew he would find a friendly ear in Freeman.<sup>58</sup>

No longer in use as a church, St Peter's had been built around 1140 by Simon II de Senlis, fourth earl of Northumberland with a nave, a chancel (of the same width) and aisles. Scott re-roofed the nave, restored the clerestory, lowered the floor one foot and, most importantly, rebuilt the east end. The original chancel had been removed at some point in the seventeenth century, and so there was little for Scott to go on. He therefore based his design on the east end of St Cross Church, Winchester (also c.1140). To a Neale or Webb the church was already objectionable on the grounds of its style and chancel, which was not narrower than the nave. By lowering the floor Scott was able to insert steps up into the chancel, which at least went some way to appeasing ecclesiological sensitivities by marking the separation of clergy and laity. The main issue was probably Scott's use of Romanesque in the east end.

In his earlier 1841–2 restoration of St Mary's, Stafford, Scott had replaced a Perpendicular east end he saw as 'debased' with Early Decorated lancets. This provoked a dispute with Petit, who felt Scott had compromised the church's picturesque effect. Scott and Petit agreed to let a combined OAS/CCS committee adjudicate. This group found in the former's favour, firmly opposed to the criterion of picturesque effect. As the *Ecclesiologist* noted, they 'decidedly' preferred to 'recover the original scheme as conceived by the first builder' rather than retain 'the additions or alterations of subsequent ages.'<sup>59</sup> One can presume, therefore, that they hoped Scott would again adopt a 'Destructive' approach at Northampton. Certainly it had been hoped he would alter the tower, part of which had collapsed in 1607 and been rebuilt in a very dilute, if picturesque, Gothic.

<sup>53</sup> Cited in G. Stamp, 'George Gilbert Scott and the Cambridge Camden Society', in Webster and Elliott (eds.), *A Church as it should be*, p. 178.

<sup>54</sup> C. Marx, 'The Restoration of Cathedrals and Major Churches in England during the Nineteenth Century and after', Cambridge University PhD thesis (2009).

<sup>55</sup> G.G. Scott, *Personal and Professional Reflections* [1879], ed. G. Stamp (Stamford, 1995), p. 104.

<sup>56</sup> As Chris Brooks notes 'Freeman was uncomfortably positioned from the standpoint of the *Ecclesiologist* — a part-ally but also a rival authority... [the Ecclesiologists] disputed many of his conclusions about the history of Gothic, his views on restoration, and his architectural nomenclature.' C. Brooks, "'The Stuff of a Heresiarch: William Butterfield, Beresford Hope, and the Ecclesiological Vanguard', in Webster and Elliott (eds.), *A Church as it should be*, p. 135.

<sup>57</sup> Scott, *Reflections*, pp. 149–50.

<sup>58</sup> Scott to Freeman, 3 Oct. 1849: JRL, FA1/1/93a.

<sup>59</sup> *Ecclesiologist*, 1 (1841), pp. 60–2.

Freeman discussed St Peter's in his *Principles of Church Restoration*, where he supported Scott:

Where one style is decidedly predominant, especially if the Church be a rich or remarkable example of that style, and the later alterations few and poor, no one would probably hesitate in restoring exclusively in the older style. In St Peter's, Northampton, no one can doubt that the whole – except of course the upper stage of the tower – should be purely Romanesque. But did that Church terminate, instead of its present miserable east window, in such a specimen of Geometrical or Flowing tracery as Wellingborough or Ringstead, or even its own neighbour St Giles, it would surely be the merest architectural pedantry to replace it by a conjectural Romanesque triplet.<sup>60</sup>

Neale wrote to Freeman politely thanking him for his *Principles*, claiming that he was for the most part in agreement with them, 'though inclined, perhaps, myself, to go a little further in the work of demolition than you there recommend.'<sup>61</sup> Freeman would be frustrated by Neale's statement in May 1847 advocating the demolition of the Romanesque Peterborough cathedral and its reconstruction in Middle Pointed.<sup>62</sup>

Though Neale may not have meant this to be taken seriously, it clearly rankled with Scott, who could be thin-skinned at times. Scott believed that Freeman was too hard on the clergy for carrying out poor restorations. Given their other duties it was unreasonable to expect them to be 'perfect antiquaries or practical architects', or

to have arrived at absolute conclusions on questions of so much difficulty arising from Church restoration – questions in which those who have given the greatest attention to the subject not only differ but take diametrically opposite sides. As for instance Mr Neale who would pull down Peterborough cathedral because it is Romanesque (!) and yourself who would in the case of St Peter's [Northampton] take down all which is not Romanesque<sup>63</sup>...I have in my opposition to the 'destructive' theory of some of the Ecclesiologist people been very 'conservative' in my views. You seem to be at the antipodes from them but go perhaps a little for conservation in the opposite direction.<sup>64</sup>

Whereas Freeman (perhaps because of Neale's flippant remark) believed that the 'Destructive' existed 'only on paper', Scott argued that

There is in fact not the smallest danger of a blind conservatism being the principle of action – it is never brought practically to bear – it exists only on paper [-] destructiveness is the principle of action – by it, in its modified form, we are positively threatened with the loss of genuine examples of half of the humble remains of Gothic architecture...Blind though conservatism may be if it is to [be] rigidly followed, we have nothing to fear on that side – everything on the other...<sup>65</sup>

If the CCS's approach to restoration seemed doctrinaire, that was because for them 'correct' architecture was also 'correct' doctrine. Encouraged by reading and translating the thirteenth-

<sup>60</sup> Freeman, *Church Restoration*, p. 13.

<sup>61</sup> J.M. Neale to Freeman, 1 Dec. 1846: JRL, FA1/1/74.

<sup>62</sup> *Ecclesiologist*, 7 (1847), p. 238.

<sup>63</sup> As the previous quote indicates, this is not in fact what Freeman had advocated.

<sup>64</sup> Scott to Freeman, 3 Oct. 1849: JRL, FA1/1/93a.

<sup>65</sup> Scott to Freeman, 9 Oct. 1849: JRL, FA1/1/94a.

century cleric William Durandus' *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum* Neale and Webb eagerly compiled other scraps of evidence supporting their belief that the physical structures of Gothic church were so many symbolic references to Church doctrine.<sup>66</sup> 'Everything material is symbolical of some mental process, of which it is indeed only the development', Neale and Webb wrote in the long introduction to their 1843 Durandus edition.<sup>67</sup> A 'correct' church was one that could support detailed readings: the chevrons of Norman doorways thus referred to martyrdom by 'exposure to the teeth of wild beasts'.<sup>68</sup> It was not 'correct' to have three lancet windows in the west end of the nave, for example, only two, because two windows represented a door, and therefore Christ (whereas a triplet represented the Trinity).<sup>69</sup> Indeed, doctrine and architecture were so closely intertwined for them that it can seem unclear whether Neale and Webb considered Perpendicular decayed because of its form, or because of the Church policies adopted at the time Perpendicular buildings were being built. Although Freeman was happy to admit 'proto-symbolism' of the sort which contrasted the sacred 'verticality' of Gothic with the earthly 'horizontal' of classicism, otherwise he felt Neale and Webb got too bogged down in what they called 'the mysterious symbolism of those fair shrines of Catholic worship'.<sup>70</sup> Durandus was nothing new to OAS members like him; they had heard a paper on the subject in 1841.<sup>71</sup>

Though Freeman faced much criticism from the CCS in the early 1840s, by 1850 his views were gaining acceptance, and we find strong echoes of them in post-1850 writings by James Fergusson, Beresford Hope, Scott, G.E. Street and others.<sup>72</sup> Freeman's correspondence from 1846 shows Webb and Beresford Hope determined to draw a line under the fiery statements of the early 1840s, which they now sought to excuse as the arrogance of youth.<sup>73</sup> Hope's address on 'The Present State of Ecclesiological Art in England', delivered to the 1846 annual meeting of the OAS proclaimed that the 'first age of ecclesiological science, the Anglo-parochial age' was over. What had appeared a somewhat introverted and involuted science now had to turn to archival sources and foreign examples as well as to new technologies.<sup>74</sup> In this age of ecclesiology Freeman's more sophisticated system of development would prevail, particularly its focus on assimilation.

Freeman's racialist architectural history also found its imitators. James Fergusson's *History of the Modern Styles of Architecture* (1862) echoes Freeman's *Principles of Church Restoration* in positing a sharp moral distinction between post-Reformation 'imitative styles' and the 'true styles' which preceded it. Whereas the latter-day development of architecture was driven by mere circumstance – individual genius and fads – in the prelapsarian age architecture had developed naturally, intuitively, without design.<sup>75</sup> Buildings from this happy age were 'fossil

<sup>66</sup> See J. Mordaunt Crook, 'Benjamin Webb (1819–85) and Victorian Ecclesiology', in R.N. Swanson (ed.), *The Church Retrospective* (Melton, 1997), pp. 423–55; Michael Hall, 'What do Victorian Churches Mean? Symbolism and Sacramentalism in Anglican Church Architecture, 1850–1870', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 59.1 (March 2000), pp. 78–95.

<sup>67</sup> Cited in White, *Cambridge Movement*, p. 74.

<sup>68</sup> Cited in Miele, 'Re-Presenting the Church Militant', p. 262.

<sup>69</sup> It was possible to make an exception, however, if there was 'more than a triplet at the east end': *Ecclesiologist*, 2 (1842), pp. 67–8.

<sup>70</sup> The quote is from a characteristically patronizing review of J.L. Petit's *Remarks on Architectural Character* (1846): *Ecclesiologist*, 6 (1846), p. 133. Neale's 'Catholicus' may have Freeman in mind when he defends that symbolism against which 'the arguments of some, and the sneers of more, are directed': *Hierologus*, pp. 193–4.

<sup>71</sup> Miele, 'Re-Presenting the Church Militant', p. 280.

<sup>72</sup> G.E. Street, 'The True Principles of Architecture and the Possibility of Development', *Ecclesiologist*, 10 (1852), pp. 247–62. For an earlier example, see A.J.B. Beresford Hope, 'Past and Future Developments of Architecture', *Ecclesiologist*, 5 (1846), pp. 52–8. See also 'Progressive Eclecticism: The Case of Beresford Hope', in J. Mordaunt Crook, *The Architect's Secret: Victorian Critics and the Image of Gravity* (London, 2003), pp. 85–120.

<sup>73</sup> See Beresford Hope to Freeman, 31 March and 1 Dec. 1846: JRL, FA1/1/38a and /39a.

<sup>74</sup> A.J. Beresford Hope, 'The Present State of Ecclesiological Art in England', *Rules and Proceedings of the Oxford Society for Promoting the Study of Gothic Architecture* (1846), p. 26.

<sup>75</sup> J. Fergusson, *A History of the Modern Styles of Architecture* (London, 1862), p. 1.



remains, the 'petrified thoughts and feelings' of this or that race. They could be studied as 'scientifically' as dinosaur bones could be. Architectural history was natural history.<sup>76</sup>

At least, it *had* been. Having lost its 'aesthetic form, and been relegated to 'the purely Technic art of building' (in other words, engineering) by the rise of iron and steel, architecture for Fergusson was stranded in an eternal present, unable to move forward or back.<sup>77</sup> It was this dilemma that Freeman escaped. It was, Freeman insisted, possible for us to go back and pick up where we left off. Though Scott agreed, he saw it as a long-term project. 'I think we shall have to plod on a long time before we arrive at any development of our own', he wrote to Freeman in November 1846, 'really the new churches one sees are not such as to hold out much hopes of our learning to copy much less to originate legitimate developments of our own – but we must press on.'<sup>78</sup> To Victorians, there would have been something manly about this. And Freeman's racialism gave comfort. For Freeman the Gothic style had achieved such heights of glory because the hand that shaped its forms was 'the plastic hand of the Northman'.<sup>79</sup> What might seem impossible to a less-favoured race was not impossible for a Teutonic one.

Ruskin played a curiously minor role in this discussion. Although the ecclesiologists and Ruskin alike avowed truth to materials and had a shared dislike of classical tradition and Victorian progress, Freeman's approach to restoration was very different from that advanced in *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1849).<sup>80</sup> As guidance to restorers, Ruskin's railing against any alteration of historic fabric as tantamount to constructing falsehoods was useless.<sup>81</sup> Not that that was a problem: as Miele has noted, 'The very unworkability of Ruskin's passage has given it the aura of prophecy.'<sup>82</sup> Although he confessed to Freeman in April 1850 that he had not read more than 'detached passages' and found Ruskin 'to full of crotchets' [sic.], Scott concluded that *Seven Lamps* was 'a book we all ought to read and ought to get a great deal of good out of without believing all, much less admiring all.'<sup>83</sup> A year later Benjamin Webb was writing to Freeman, expressing an urge to lay past disputes to rest and urging Freeman to write something against Ruskin for the *Ecclesiologist*. 'We abandon him now – as a whole – however much we may think him right in particular points. It will be delightful to us to see him castigated.'<sup>84</sup>

Unlike Ruskin and SPAB, Freeman had no interest in or appreciation of patina. An accurate copy was, for him, preferable to the timeworn original. As his remarks on Castle Ashby station already indicate, Freeman's vision of past and present was oddly 'flat', with very little sense of what we might call historical recession or chronological perspective. If, as Freeman famously put it, 'history is past politics, politics present history', then all the elements of a church were in a sense coterminous. Indeed, this is precisely what made restoration so difficult. If there was any precedence to a building's phases of construction, it was stylistic, not historical.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>76</sup> Fergusson, *Modern Styles*, p. 494. See especially the appendix, 'Ethnology from an Architectural Point of View', pp. 493–528.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.* p. 21.

<sup>78</sup> Scott to Freeman, 26 Nov. 1846: JRL, FA1/1/90.

<sup>79</sup> Freeman, *A History of Architecture*, p. 150.

<sup>80</sup> For Ruskin and the Ecclesiologists, see D. Dishon, 'Three Men in a Gondola: Ruskin, Webb and Street', in Webster and Elliott (eds.), *A Church as it should be*, pp. 190–210.

<sup>81</sup> Ruskin, *Seven Lamps*, pp. 179–80.

<sup>82</sup> Miele, 'Gothic Revival and Gothic Architecture', p. 125. On this point, see also Miele, 'Re-Presenting the Church Militant', pp. 292–3.

<sup>83</sup> Scott to Freeman, 2 April 1850: JRL, FA/1/98a.

<sup>84</sup> Webb to Freeman, 12 April 1851: JRL, FA1/1/199.

<sup>85</sup> Freeman's expanded and revised version of the *Principles*, his 1852 *On the Preservation and Restoration of Ancient Monuments*, seems to see him change his mind on the status of the copy versus the original. As Miele has observed, however, this only held for a distinct class of monument, one which could no longer be made to serve any purpose other than poetic contemplation on the transitory nature of man-made structures: Miele, 'Gothic Revival and Gothic Architecture', pp. 116–17.

But style was not expressed in a finished, perfect construction or a golden moment of time, but in the activity of building and rebuilding (the two are, one senses, the same for Freeman). A building was enriched rather than impoverished as a result of having been extended, altered or even partly destroyed. Though Freeman was not above picking the odd ecclesiological spat over nomenclature, the taxonomy by which ecclesiologists classified windows, towers and doors quickly came to seem an antiquarian distraction to him. 'Style' in its deeper, idealist sense had little to do with such things. Like Newman's doctrine, so Freeman's perfect style – Gothic – has the power of assimilation, having appropriated the pointed arch from the 'Saracens',<sup>86</sup> Its beginnings held the 'germ' of subsequent development latent within it, while its 'pervading principles' (based on the structural element of the arch) remained the same. Like Newman's true doctrine it was always 'in a state of flux', in 'transition', and this itself formed part of its perfection. 'In a higher world it is otherwise', Newman observed in his *Essay*, 'but here below to live is to change, to be perfect is to have changed often.'<sup>87</sup> If Freeman's *Principles* speaks to us today, it is surely because it acknowledges that a building's life does not end when we intervene, but simply enters a new chapter. For a 'philosophick architecturalist', that is no mean achievement.<sup>88</sup>

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to Alex Bremner, Kate Heard and in particular Chris Miele for their assistance and their comments on earlier drafts of this essay, based on a paper presented at 'Time! Time! Time!: The Pace of Change in Victorian Britain, c.1780–c.1870', a conference held at Trinity College, Cambridge in July 2011, in honour of Boyd Hilton.

The Society would like to express its gratitude to the Greening Lamborn Trust for a grant towards publication of this article.

<sup>86</sup> Freeman, *History of Architecture*, p. 27.

<sup>87</sup> Newman, *Essay on Development*, p. 41.

<sup>88</sup> Beresford Hope applies this label to Freeman in Beresford Hope to Freeman, 17 Feb. 1853: JRL, FA1/1/50a.

