THE UNITARIAN MOVEMENT

I

McLACHLAN

To THE REV. HARRY MARVIN, B.Sc.

THIS IS A SMALL (BUT WITH DISPROPORTIONATE) TRIBUTE FROM FORMER COLLEAGUES FOR YOUR ALMOST SINGLE-HANDED EFFORTS TO KEEP OUR BRANCH ALIVE DURING ITS MOST DIFFICULT TIMES.

WE WISH YOU LONG LIFE AND GOOD HEALTH TO CONTINUE YOUR PUBLIC SERVICE ELSEWHERE.

On behalf of the Committee,

E K Spencer
Mary Edmunds
John W. Gracey.

Ditchling & Westmeston Parish,
League of Nations Union.

April 1920

THE UNITARIAN MOVEMENT IN THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF ENGLAND

I. ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THOUGHT AND LEARNING 1700–1900

by

H. McLACHLAN
M.A., D.D., F.R.HIST.S.

Principal, Unitarian College, Manchester; and Lecturer in Hellenistic Greek in the Victoria University of Manchester

LONDON
GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
MUSEUM STREET

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1933

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
UNWIN BROTHERS LTD., WOKING

PREFACE

It was by invitation of The Hibbert Trustees, to whom all interested in "Christianity in its most simple and intelligible form" have long been indebted, that what follows was written. For the opinions expressed the writer alone is responsible. His aim has been to give some account of the work during two centuries of a small group of religious thinkers, who, for the most part, have been overlooked in the records of English religious life, and so rescue from obscurity a few names that deserve to be remembered amongst pioneers and pathfinders in more fields than one.

Obligations are gratefully acknowledged to the Rev. V. D. Davis, B.A., and the Rev. W. H. Burgess, M.A., for a few fruitful suggestions, and to the Rev. W. Whitaker, M.A., for his labours in correcting proofs.

H. McLACHLAN

MANCHESTER
October 14, 1933

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP

SPEAKING of the origin of Unitarian Christianity in this country, James Martineau said:[1] "There is one unorthodox influence so powerful and so extensively diffused as almost to supersede inquiry into the personal pedigree of English Unitarianism—I mean, the English Bible," and, again, "The earlier Unitarians, notwithstanding their repute of rationalism, drew their doctrines out of the Scriptures, much to their own surprise, and did not import it into them."

Historically beyond cavil, these statements evoke the question, Why, then, did Unitarian opinions not sweep over the country like a mighty torrent instead of being represented only by isolated rivulets, once the English version of the Scriptures became the priceless possession of the masses of the people in the century after the Reformation? The answer is to be found in the character of that great movement. It did not abolish, but only qualified, the character of the creeds and catechisms of the Church, subscription to which was required of clergy and laymen alike, and these formulae not only professed to embody the doctrine of the Scriptures as interpreted by patristic and ecclesiastical tradition, but also provided the limits within which alone the application of reason to Scripture was tolerated.

Unitarian doctrine could only be discovered in the Bible by men who, in Martineau's phrase, had "the repute of rationalism"; in other words, by a few men of independent mind like John Bidle (1616–62), sometimes called the "father of English Unitarianism," who, as he said, "experienced

[1] Bonet-Maury, *Early Sources of English Unitarian Christianity*, Introduction, p. xii, 1884.

his first doubts respecting the Trinity in reading the Bible."

These thinkers, refusing to be fettered in their inquiries by the decisions of councils and synods, formulated for themselves what afterwards was more widely recognised as the principle of "the sufficiency of Scripture." This principle, after much controversy amongst Dissenters in the West of England, was adopted in 1719 by a small majority of the Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists at the Salters' Hall Synod, when an acrimonious debate resulted in a decision announced by a spectator, Sir Joseph Jekyll, in the words: "The Bible has it by four."

It was not mere hap or chance that the doctrine giving rise to the dispute, whose settlement was the occasion of the Synod, had first arisen in the Exeter Academy (1690?–1722). In the Nonconformist academies, or, more accurately, in the more liberal of them during the eighteenth century, the principle of "the sufficiency of Scripture" was implicitly or overtly accepted by tutors in their elucidation of Christian doctrine. Calvinist tutors, or tutors supported by a fund with a dogmatic basis, in their examination of Scripture naturally adopted as at once a guiding and restraining standard of judgment one or other of the current "schemes" or "bodies" of Divinity, which differed in important detail but not in principle from the articles and catechisms of the Established Church or of the Westminster Assembly. The most famous of these "schemes," however, that of Philip Doddridge, published posthumously in 1775 and used even in manuscript in many academies, by its numerous references to authors of differing opinions, easily lent itself to a somewhat free interpretation of Scripture.

The more candid principle of free inquiry was first clearly enunciated by John Taylor, D.D., Tutor at Warrington Academy, 1757–61, who had "discovered that many points of theological doctrine, which were universally accepted,

were not to be found in Scripture." In the Preface to his *Scheme of Scripture Divinity*, printed for the use of his students, he adjured his readers "to attend to evidence as it lies in the holy scriptures, or in the nature of things and the dictates of reason, to assent to nothing taught by him except as it appeared to be supported and justified by proper evidence from Revelation or the reason in things; to suspect or reject any principle or sentiment advanced by him which afterwards upon careful examination should appear doubtful or false; and finally to keep their minds always open to fresh truth, to banish prejudice, and steadily to assert and fully allow to others the inalienable right of judgment and conscience." Later, Charles Wellbeloved, at Manchester College, York (1805–40), "carefully read over with his students the whole of the Old and New Testaments, and from these pure sources encouraged them, each for himself, to form his own views of the important doctrines of revelation." He never referred to commentators except for the purpose of criticism, and taught Hebrew without points, not merely to facilitate the study, but "under the reasonable conviction that the Massoretic pointing when it pronounces upon a matter otherwise doubtful is only an element of interpretation." "At the beginning of their Biblical studies he was accustomed to read to each new class of students Dr. John Taylor's solemn charge, already quoted, formerly given at Warrington."

Earlier anticipations of the same attitude towards Scripture may be met with at Taunton (1670?–1758), Hoxton (1701–85), Kendal (1733–55), Findern (1710?–14) and elsewhere.[1]

Unintelligent reading of the Bible by men of little or no education has frequently given rise to singular and even wild opinions, alike political and doctrinal, as in the period of the Commonwealth in England and hardly less in the America

[1] McLachlan, *Education Under the Test Acts*, p. 27.

of the nineteenth century. Nonconformist tutors, however, were men of sober judgment and wide culture, and the non-subscribers at Salters' Hall, by no means heretical in theology, included some of the leading dissenting divines. The verdict of the Synod in favour of the Bible as the supreme authority was primarily one on the side of liberty as against uniformity.

The students and ministers at Exeter, whose actions had led to that verdict, had come under the influence of *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, published in 1712 by Dr. Samuel Clarke (1675–1729), the philosopher and scholarly clergyman who had himself been much affected by the method and temper of John Locke, though he was by no means his disciple in philosophy. Clarke's book consists of a collection of texts bearing upon the Trinity, and a statement of the doctrine, together with a discussion of certain passages in the Anglican liturgy. In the Church of England it created a school of theologians called Clarkeans, which lasted until the end of the eighteenth century. Amongst Dissenters, especially those of liberal views, it was even more popular. It was read with avidity in their academies, and turned the attention of students from scholastic definitions to the Biblical data on which the doctrine of the Trinity was founded. Implicitly, at least, it constituted a recognition of the principle of "the sufficiency of Scripture."

For those who adopted that principle the way was open to move in the direction of modern Biblical criticism. This movement was stimulated by the influence of Socinianism, which slowly penetrating the circle of "Rational Dissenters," ultimately ensured for Unitarians an honourable place amongst the pioneers of Biblical criticism in England.

Of the treatise by Faustus Socinus (1559–1604), *De Auctoritate S. Scripturae* (1570), it has been said: "Of the whole modern literature of rational credence in Scripture, this is the fountain head. What Spinoza is to the school of

rationalistic criticism, that Sozzini is to the school of rational credence; with this difference, that, while the positions of criticism are indefinitely variable, the principles of credence remain substantially unaffected by the course of time."[1] Socinus had no doctrine of Biblical inspiration. "Christ, just before He entered upon His ministry, was taken up into heaven, and there instructed in the divine message. Our conviction that the report is authentic depends entirely upon our persuasion of the messenger's veracity. And, so, in their measure of other revealers."[2]

This is, indeed, far from the scientific view of Scripture, but it is equally far from the traditional doctrine of inspiration. It made the person and precepts of the Man of Nazareth central to the interpretation of Scripture, and constituted, in its way, an anticipation of the nineteenth-century movement of "Back to Jesus." More than that, the interpretation of Scripture was vitally affected since it was held that a revelation by God must of necessity be rational in its nature. This doctrine Radical Dissenters, as they were called, accepted, even when they rejected the *Deus ex machina* expedient of a divinely instructed but human Christ, and preferred the Arian doctrine of the person and work of Christ. Socinus allowed reason a critical as well as an interpretative faculty; he allowed that the essentials of salvation should be believed not only because God has revealed them but because the truth shines with its own light, and admitted that Scripture sometimes relates physical impossibilities which sensible men gloss in another sense.

A single illustration will suffice to show the contribution of the Socinian school to "Higher Criticism." George Enyedi (*d.* 1597), a contemporary and correspondent of Socinus and Superintendent of the Unitarian Churches in Transylvania, in his *Explicationes Locorum Veteris et Novi*

[1] Alx. Gordon, art. *The Sozzini and Their School*, *Theological Review*, 1879, p. 542.

[2] Ibid., p. 544.

Testamenti, published posthumously without date or place of publication *c.* 1600, which ran to four editions, the last in 1670, set forth six arguments against the apostolic authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The second edition is known to have circulated in England. The same critical view, now generally accepted, was argued at length by John Crell (1590–1633), a German scholar who became Rector of the Socinian College at Rakow, Poland. His works form part of the nine folio volumes of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum quos Unitarios vocant*, 1665. The commentary on Hebrews in this collection was written by Jonas Schlichting, but in his Preface he acknowledges that Crell was associated with him in such a way that he is bound to ascribe the chief merit to him. We may therefore attribute to Crell the views set forth in the Prolegomena. Therein are contrasted the style, form, and doctrine of the letter with those of the Pauline Epistles, the absence of ascription to Paul in the manuscripts is noted, and the arguments for apostolic authorship controverted, and, finally, the theory that Hebrews was written in Hebrew by Paul and translated by Luke is examined and rejected.

So great was the influence of Socinian exegesis in England during the Commonwealth period that its historian, Dr. S. R. Gardiner, remarked: "The term Socinianism was applied not as later to a certain doctrine on the Second Person of the Trinity, but rather to a habit of applying reason to questions of revelation, which led up to that doctrine as its most startling result."[1] It was the method of investigating Scripture adopted by Socinus, rather than his specific doctrine of Christ's person, or even—his most noteworthy contribution to Christian theology—his doctrine of the Atonement, which was most commonly adopted by the eighteenth-century Dissenters in England who accepted the principle of "the sufficiency of Scripture."

[1] *Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. *Falkland*.

Apart, however, from a few men like John Bidle, once he had read Socinian writings, and Paul Best, who had travelled in Hungary and Poland, both Independents, it was, paradoxically enough, within the pale of the Established Church that the first attempt was made to employ Socinian methods of Scriptural study, and, anticipating the Modernists of the twentieth century, to find room within Anglicanism for rational and even frankly Unitarian theology.

Before the dawn of the eighteenth century, a number of Anglicans, clergymen for the most part, writing anonymously and calling themselves Unitarians, a term only recently introduced into England,[1] in defiance of the law subjected to severe criticism the current doctrines of the Trinity, pointed to Unitarianism as the way out of the Trinitarian controversy then raging, and incidentally adopted methods and principles of Biblical criticism, derived in the main from Socinian writings, without subscribing to Socinian doctrines in their entirety. The works of Socinus and his school had made their way in the seventeenth century into England from Holland, where heterodox opinions enjoyed a considerable measure of toleration.

In six collections of tracts, bearing dates from 1691 to 1713, these Anglican scholars not obscurely set forth the reasons for their faith, winning an encomium from Archbishop Tillotson for their ability and moderation of speech. "They are a pattern," he said,[2] "of the fair way of disputing and of debating matters of religion. They generally argue matters with that temper and gravity, and with that freedom from passion and transport which becomes a serious and weighty argument."

Scripture interpreted by reason was the basis of this early Unitarian movement. "To prove all things, to try the

[1] 1672, by Hy. Hedworth.

[2] *Second Sermon on the Divinity of the Saviour*, *Tillotson's Sermons*, Folio, p. 71, London, 1728.

spirits, to search the Scriptures is our wisdom as men, is our duty as Christians, our principle and profession as Protestants." But the English version of the Bible, highly as they esteemed it, was not for them the last word in scholarship. In their use of the available materials for textual criticism, their interpretation of Old Testament prophecy, and their exegesis of disputed texts, they pointed the way which later generations of scholars have travelled. Stephen Nye, Rector of Little Hormead, Herts (1648?–1719), who interpreted the formularies of the Prayer Book in a Sabellian sense,[1] was the leading clergyman of the group. He declared that "Any doctrine that plainly appears to be absurd and contradictory ought to be rejected. . . . We are to interpret Scripture, not by the sound of words but the nature of things,"[2] and he complained that in the English version "wherever there is an ambiguity in the original Hebrew or Greek, the translators have always so translated as to confirm their own doctrines," whilst they have "omitted those other readings of the manuscript copies and other translations of famous critics which would have enabled even the common people to perfect the Reformation beyond the standard intended by the translators."[3] What is meant by this statement may be learnt from a comparison of the renderings of theological terms in the Authorised Version with those in the Revised Version, the American Revised Version, and in the modern versions of the Bible. Again, the misuse of the Old Testament, due to its interpretation down to our own day in the light of the Christian revelation regarded as its fulfilment, is censured, and the practice of New Testament writers explained: "Nothing is more usual with the writers of the New Testament than to apply to the Lord Christ, in a mystical or allegorical sense,

[1] Sabellius (*c.* A.D. 250) regarded the different Persons of the Trinity as modes or manifestations of the One God.

[2] *Fourth Letter*, p. 44; *Unitarian Tracts*, i.

[3] *An Accurate Examination*, p. 23; *Unitarian Tracts*, ii, 1692.

what has been said by the writers of the Old Testament of God, or any others, in the literal and primary sense of the words." An illustration given is Hos. xi. 1, referring to the call of Israel out of Egypt, which is used by the first evangelist (ii. 15) with reference to the sojourn of Jesus with his parents in Egypt. In his rejection, as an interpolation, of the threefold formula of baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19), Nye quotes the omission of it by Eusebius as modern scholars like Conybeare and Lake have done. Scattered throughout the tracts are quotations from critics and scholars like Grotius and especially from the writings of the Polish brethren.

The tract writers were wholly unconscious of being in a false position as members of the Established Church. They protested that they were "no hypocrites," and though not enthusiastic for the acceptance of formulae and creeds, were willing to use them (the Athanasian Creed excepted) for the sake of peace, interpreting them, of course, in their own way. The general opinion of Churchmen, however, was decidedly averse to the recognition of their honesty or their Churchmanship, and, fiercely as Anglican theologians attacked one another's attempts to explain the Trinity, they agreed in a common detestation of the Unitarian scheme and regarded with marked disfavour their methods of Scriptural interpretation. In consequence, the leaven of Liberalism did not work in the Church, and the attempt to establish Unitarian societies or fraternities within the establishment failed as completely as did Wesley's effort half a century later to set up Methodist societies therein. But whilst the logic of events led to the foundation of the great Wesleyan connection as a dissenting movement, the Unitarians, largely clerics who clung to their livings, quietly ceased their propaganda and the movement died away. The tracts played a part in the conversion of Theophilus Lindsey (1723–1808) from Episcopalian to Unitarian Christianity, but their chief influence, by no means widespread, was exercised

in the ranks of Dissenters, who drew for their guidance in Scriptural interpretation upon the writings of a contemporary of the tract writers, often regarded as one of their number—John Locke. It was not for nothing that tradition erroneously assigned one of the tracts to John Locke, and another, though less unanimously, to Sir Isaac Newton. The sixth tract in the Third Collection, a closely reasoned defence of Locke's *Reasonableness of Christianity*, was attributed to Locke by Bishop Law in his Preface to *Locke's Works*, 1777, by John Disney, D.D., in 1793, and by Charles Wellbeloved in his controversy with Francis Wrangham in 1822. The suspicion of Locke's Antitrinitarianism thus preceded the publication of his *Commonplace Book* in 1829, which confirmed it. The long series of paraphrases and translations of Scripture by Unitarian scholars begins with Locke's posthumous *Paraphrases of St. Paul*, 1707. The historian of *The Arian Movement in England* observes:[1] "Grotius as a commentator was much esteemed in England, but in the matter of method Locke's influence was paramount. He and his followers treated the New Testament in such a way that the halo of verbal inspiration began to disappear, and by the middle of the eighteenth century the Socinian method of dealing with the Scriptures was universally adopted." "The Presbyterian theology of this period," said J. J. Tayler,[2] may indeed be described as the offspring of an alliance between the new philosophy of Locke and the Scripturalism of the old Puritans. Scripture was accepted as a Divine record, but upon that record reason was to be exercised with the greatest freedom and impartiality, not only in eliciting its contents, but also in establishing their coincidence with those natural truths which the same reason as clearly affirmed. For the prosecution of such studies the academies of the Dissenters were well adapted."

[1] J. H. Colligan, p. 151.
[2] *Retrospect of Religious Life in England*, p. 372.

John Locke (1632–1704), "the Socinus of his age," as he has been called, prefaced his paraphrases with an essay entitled, *An Essay for the Understanding of St. Paul's Epistles by Consulting St. Paul Himself*. The sting is in the tail. His purpose was, as he explained, to set aside all the meanings men had read into St. Paul's words in order to harmonise his doctrine with their orthodoxy, and explain the Epistles by the light of history, archaeology, considerations of style, and the comparative study of other Scriptural writings; in other words, by the methods commonly employed to ascertain the sense of ancient books.

At the outset, Locke gives as his reason for discarding the division of the Epistles into chapters and verses, that "they are thereby so chopped and minced, and, as they are now printed, stand so broken and divided, that not only the common people take the verses usually for distinct aphorisms, but even men of more advanced knowledge, in reading them, lose very much of the strength and force of the coherence, and the light that depends on it." The same judgment was expressed by Dr. W. G. Rutherford in his translation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, 1900: "Deliberately to break the current of an argument at every turn, especially an argument so rapid and impetuous as St. Paul's, was an act of unwisdom which ought not to have been tolerated."[1]

Punctuation, again, as Dr. J. H. Moulton reminded us,[2] "is simply in essence a form of commentary . . . it does not depend on the autographs, and may be no more than guesses by those not by any means better qualified than ourselves."

In Romans ix. 5, where no fewer than seven punctuations are possible, one of which declares Christ to be God, Locke takes the last clause to be a doxology and is followed by the Revised Version margin, by Dr. Moffatt and other modern scholars.

[1] P. 10.
[2] *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, ii, p. 48.

In 1690 Sir Isaac Newton sent to John Locke his *Historical Account of Two Notable Corruptions of the Scripture*, dealing with 1 John v. 7: "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost," and 1 Timothy iii. 16: "Great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh," as it is read in our Authorised Version. Locke, instead of taking the letters with him to Holland for publication, sent them to Le Clerc, a Divinity Professor amongst the Remonstrants, who undertook to translate and publish them. Newton, however, intervened and prevented their appearance. Le Clerc then deposited the manuscript in the library of the Remonstrants, where it remained until a copy was published, wanting both beginning and end, in 1754. A complete edition was afterwards included in Newton's works by his editor, Bishop Horsley. "The Heavenly Witnesses" passage is now generally admitted to be an interpolation. In his discussion of the second text, Newton is at one with modern scholars in rejecting the word "God."

It has been disputed whether it is just to count Newton a Unitarian. Thus, in his life of Newton in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Glazebrook says: "The views expressed in the two letters do not prove him to be an Antitrinitarian but are rather the strong expression of his hostility to the unfair manner in which, in his opinion, certain texts had been treated with a view to the support of the Trinitarian doctrine." The evidence for Newton's Unitarianism is threefold. There is the investigation of these texts and his evident satisfaction with the conclusions reached. Moreover, Newton nowhere in his writings on religion or Scripture has once expressed his belief in the Trinity or in the deity of Jesus. Then we have, finally, the witness of Hopton Haynes (1672–1749) and William Whiston (1667–1752), two men long associated with him; the former as his fellow-servant in the Mint, and the latter as his deputy and successor in the

Mathematical Chair at Cambridge, who attest his Unitarian opinions.

Newton was not the first Unitarian scholar to challenge the authenticity of the three witnesses' text.[1] Christopher Sandius, in an Appendix to *Interpretations of the Paradoxes of the Four Gospels* (1670), discusses the passage. Erasmus had not included it in the first edition of his Greek Testament (1516), but, yielding to clamour, inserted it in his third edition (1522) on the authority of a single manuscript then in England. Sandius quotes manuscripts, versions, Fathers and editors against the retention of the verse nineteen years before the more critical discussion of Father Simon, who is usually mentioned in this connection. Socinus himself had marked the meagre evidence for the verse, and accepted a suggestion thrown out by Erasmus in controversy that its presence in the Vulgate was due to interpolation by Jerome! —an unjust aspersion on that scholar.

Eight years after the publication of *Locke's Paraphrases*, Thomas Emlyn (1663–1741), "the first minister who publicly took the Unitarian name," and suffered imprisonment for his opinions, published *A Full Inquiry into the Original Authority of 1 John v. 7*. It consists of a review of the evidence for and against the passage offered by John Mill, the father of English textual criticism, in his great posthumous edition of the New Testament, 1707. Emlyn has little difficulty in showing that Mill's conclusion cannot be drawn from his own premises, and subscribes to a remark of Le Clerc: "If Dr. Mill hath not concluded here like a judicious critic, yet certainly he hath shown himself to be a candid and ingenuous man, in producing the arguments which effectually overturn his own opinions." A controversy into which Emlyn was drawn on his treatise had this result, that the great Richard Bentley (1662–1742), when appointed to the Chair of Theology at

[1] = John v.

Cambridge, publicly announced his abandonment of the text.

James Peirce (1674–1726), who played so prominent a part in the proceedings which led up to the Salters' Hall controversy, already mentioned, which gave Unitarians "the charter of their liberties," published in 1725 *Paraphrases and Notes of Paul's Epistles*, avowedly inspired by Locke. In 1747 Professor Michaelis, the German scholar, published the section on "Hebrews" in Latin. If not a Unitarian, as Whiston thought, Peirce was certainly heterodox on the subject of the Trinity, and declined, we are told, to subscribe to any proposition not in Scripture (not even that three and two make five).

Closely associated with Peirce in the Exeter controversy was Joseph Hallett, tutor of the Exeter Academy, whose son of the same name published in 1729 the first volume of *A Free and Impartial Study of the Holy Scriptures Recommended, being Notes on Some Peculiar Texts*. Two more volumes followed in 1732 and 1736. Amongst many excellent contributions to Biblical scholarship which they contain is one on the translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek, showing that all the books were not translated by the same hands and contrasting the Pentateuch translation with that of the later books. Several essays provide ingenious emendations of the Hebrew text based on the Samaritan, Greek, Latin, and other versions. One seeks to prove that the Doxology to the Lord's Prayer is not as old as the Prayer itself, "but was added from the liturgies of the Church," a view now commonly held; whilst in his estimate of Codex Bezae,[1] the judgment of Hort, the great nineteenth-century Cambridge scholar, is anticipated. "The testimony of the Cambridge manuscript is the more to be regarded in this case, because the general character is that 'tis full of

[1] The much-discussed Graeco-Latin MS. of the sixth century, containing the Gospels and Acts now in the Cambridge University Library.

interpolations. Its testimony then in favour of an addition cannot be of great weight, whereas its testimony against an addition cannot but be considerable."[1] In notes on the Old Testament, Hallett displays a knowledge of the Syriac and other versions as well as of ancient and modern commentators and a close acquaintance with the Apocrypha. "There is scarcely a conjectural emendation of the Hebrew text proposed which was not afterwards found by Dr. Kennicott, in some manuscripts, to have been an ancient reading."[2] Hallett's work met with the approbation of John David Michaelis (1717–91), "one of the originators of the science of Biblical Criticism in Germany," who had some thought of translating it.

Another scholar, who published *Paraphrases and Notes, Attempted in Imitation of Mr. Locke's Manner*, was Dr. George Benson (1699–1762), of whom Dr. Grosart says:[3] "He was undoubtedly a Socinian, a fact which explains the neglect that attended his works after his death." He was certainly Socinian in his view of the Atonement, but not otherwise, though a well-grounded suspicion of his heterodoxy doubtless led to the result mentioned by his biographer. Professor Michaelis thought so highly of the "Paraphrases" that he undertook to translate them into Latin, and part of the work was published in 1746 with an Introduction by Professor Baumgarten.

To the value of the Paraphrases mentioned, testimony is borne by Dr. Doddridge: "Locke, Peirce, and Benson make up a complete commentary on the Epistles, and are indeed all in the number of the most ingenious commentators I have ever read."

In 1745 John Taylor, of Norwich, afterwards tutor at Warrington, published *A Paraphrase with Notes on the*

[1] Hallett, *A Free and Impartial Study*, i, p. 155.

[2] J. Murch, *History of the Presbyterian and General Baptist Churches in the West of England*, p. 402, n.

[3] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Benson, George*.

Epistle to the Romans, which he dedicated to "the Society of Christians in the city of Norwich whom he served." To the Notes was prefaced *A Key to the Apostolic Writings*, which Doddridge described as a key broken in the lock. Taylor's indebtedness to Locke is freely acknowledged, though his conclusions are not infrequently rejected. The Authorised Version is printed in the margin opposite the paraphrase, and notes are added at the end of the book. The Greek is printed without accents and the Hebrew without points. It may be safely surmised that not all those to whom the work is dedicated would profit by the philological learning displayed. Taylor's dedication expresses the general attitude of liberal Christians at this time. "The Apostles were inspired and infallible writers, but we are none of us either inspired or infallible interpreters. None of us have dominion over the faith of our fellow-Christians and Servants; nor must anyone pretend to set up for Master in Christ's school, Christ alone is our Master and Lord; and we ought not, as indeed, justly, we cannot, substitute any supposed infallible Guide in his place." In his interpretation of the Epistle, Taylor defines his view of the Atonement, on which he afterwards wrote a treatise. Incidentally, he anticipates Dr. Moffatt and other scholars by recognising the quotation by Paul in his letters of the words of his opponents. He illustrates "the love and obedience of Christ as a just foundation of the Divine Grace" rather quaintly. "There have been Masters, willing now and then, to grant a relaxation from study, or even to remit deserved punishment, in case any one boy, in behalf of the whole school, or of the offenders, would compose a distich or copy of Latin verse. This at once showed the Master's love and lenity, and was a very proper expedient for promoting learning and benevolence in the society of little men training up for future usefulness . . . and one may say that the kind verse-maker purchased the favour, or that his goodness and compliance with the governor's will and pleasure was a just ground or foundation of the pardon." The poverty of the attempts to rationalise Paul at any cost is seen in the interpretation of the difficult passage in 1 Cor. xi. 10: "Women ought to have power upon their heads because of the angels." "Power" is interpreted, as commonly, as a veil, "the sign of man's authority," and "the angels" as "messengers"—a possible meaning of the Greek word. Taylor then argues that women, who were not allowed to speak in church, held meetings in private houses, and that when their husbands wanted them at home, they sent "messengers" for them. "Access to messengers was one of the conditions upon which the ladies held these religious assemblies: And these messengers, coming in the name of their husbands, brought, in a sense, their authority along with them. On which account the women ought to observe a just decorum, as if their husbands were present, seeing they were, in effect, still under their eye." It is an explanation more ingenious than convincing, and possibly throws more light upon Taylor's view of the relations of man and wife than upon the words of the Apostle Paul.

In 1734 John Taylor published his *Hebrew Concordance* (2 vols., folio), subscribed for, amongst others, by twenty-two English and fifteen Irish bishops. "Based on Buxtorf and Noldius, the concordance is arranged to serve the purpose of a Hebrew-English and English-Hebrew lexicon. He employs no amanuensis, as his accuracy is equal to his industry. As a lexicographer, he deserves praise for the first serious attempt to fix the primitive meaning of Hebrew roots, and deduce thence the various uses of terms."[1]

Lawrence Holden (1710–78), who had been trained for the ministry by Charles Owen, D.D., at Warrington and became Unitarian minister at Malden, published in 1763 *A Paraphrase on Job, Psalms, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes*, and in

[1] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Taylor, John.*

1766 *A Paraphrase on Isaiah*. He had been an unsuccessful candidate for the charge of the English Presbyterian congregation at Rotterdam, and "his visit to Holland had introduced him to the works of foreign divines of which he made use in his critical commentaries."[1]

It was not, however, the meaning of the Scriptures alone, whether in the English versions or in the original tongues, that interested Unitarian scholars. They were anxious to construct the best critical text, especially in passages where the authorities were numerous and conflicting, in order to secure the surest foundation for their structure of translation and interpretation.

Two Arian divines of the eighteenth century, Daniel Mace and Edward Harwood, have not always received the honour that is their due as pioneers in the science of New Testament Textual Criticism. Dr. Souter describes them as "Nonconformists who did pioneer work which availed little in their own generation but to arouse mulish obstinacy against their efforts."[2] But it was not only eighteenth-century scholars who flouted their work. Tregelles in 1854 said Mace "boldly and arbitrarily changed passages with evidence or without it, in accordance with his own subjective notions," and describes him as "a man apparently of some ingenuity, of no real or accurate scholarship and possessed of but little principle."[3] Thirty years later Scrivener could write:[4] "The anonymous text and version of William Mace, said to have been a Presbyterian minister (*The New Testament in Greek and English*, 2 vols., 1729) are alike unworthy of serious notice, and have long since been forgotten." Harwood he does not even mention. Both are passed over in silence by Sir Frederick Kenyon and Dr. Conybeare. "William" Mace, in Scrivener's contemptuous

[1] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Holden, Lawrence*, by Alx. Gordon.
[2] *Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p. 99, London, 1913.
[3] *An Account of the Printed Text of the New Testament*, pp. 63–6.
[4] *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, ii, p. 210.

notice, is an error due to identification of the author with a Gresham lecturer who died early in 1767. Edward Miller, the editor of the last edition (1894) of Scrivener's *Introduction*, apparently knew less of Mace than his chief, for he is content to quote in a footnote a remark of Gregory that "Mace's edition had no accents or soft breathings; he anticipates most of the changes accepted by some critics of the present day." The second half of this statement is more accurate than the first. Mace employed the hard breathing and the circumflex accent, but nothing more. Most contemporaries condemned the text for exhibiting capricious changes and mutilations, designed to help the Arian hypothesis. One, wiser than the rest, the German J. J. Wolff, treats with respect the readings of the anonymous Englishman. Mace's chief opponent, Leonard Twells, who published an answer to him in 1732, was an out-and-out defender of the received text. Much later, critics of the standing of Reuss, Gregory, and Abbot recognised the value of Mace's text of the New Testament.

Daniel Mace (*d.* 1753), from 1727 until his death minister of the Meeting House (now Unitarian) at Newbury, Berks, was a friend of William Whiston and James Peirce. He included in his edition critical and historical notes. It was dedicated to Peter, Lord King, formerly a student at Exeter Academy and the author of a critical history of the Apostles' Creed, whose mother was a cousin of John Locke, and he may have assisted in financing its production. The book, copies of which are very rare, was "Printed for James Roberts," an eminent printer who was Master of the Stationers' Company, 1729–31, and, as appears from the name in the tail-piece at the end of St. Mark's Gospel, the ornaments were designed by P. (presumably Francis) Hoffman, an engraver resident in England at this date.[1] The

[1] For information relating to James Roberts and Francis Hoffman I am indebted to Dr. Henry Guppy of the John Rylands Library.

Greek type, an antique form, is peculiarly clear and pleasing. The notes on the Epistles and Apocalypse in Volume II are much fuller than those, mostly textual, in Volume I on the Gospels and Acts. Amongst the numerous authors quoted by Mace are Grotius and Locke. He rejects the Petrine authorship of 2 Peter and the Pauline authorship of Hebrews. In the discussion of the latter he exhibits his humour. "A very learned author of our own time thinks Hebrews iii. 23 a sufficient proof that Paul was the original author, as if nobody could be acquainted with Timothy but Paul; which shows that in order to understand the doctrine of Moral Evidence, that is, the doctrine of Chances, some other discipline is necessary besides that of bearly (sic) chewing a few Hebrew roots." The theory that the Epistle is a translation he controverts thus: "The Greek has all the air of an original; there's nothing of that constraint observable in a translation, nor such Hebraisms as occur frequently in the version of the Septuagint, and that of Ecclesiasticus."

Friedrich Bleek (1793–1859), in his lectures on the Apocalypse, edited in English by Samuel Davidson (1875),[1] refers to this work "by an unknown writer" as containing the first of the modern attacks upon the apostolic authorship of the Revelation of St. John.

An Index of Matters contained in the New Testament reveals the Arianism of the author. In his translation Mace uses some odd words, e.g. "grumes"; "raparees," explained as "Kidnappers, who stole men to sell them for slaves"; "carruways"; "adry"; "mountebank."[2]

The version throughout is anti-ecclesiastical but scholarly. The Greek text constructed by Mace is one of real value. Eduard Reuss, in 1872, was the first to recognise the remarkable sagacity of Mace's choice of readings, and the

[1] P. 55.
[2] Revised Version: "great drops"; "extortioners"; "husks"; "thirst not"; "babbler."

multitude of places in which his text anticipates modern results. After giving detailed proofs, he says: "It will be quite clear from these examples that Mace was a true pioneer (antesignanum) of present-day critics in his preference for certain most ancient readings, a man whom his contemporaries undeservedly persecuted and more recent writers, with even less reason, have buried in oblivion."[1] Reuss was followed by Gregory and Abbot in the Prolegomena to Tischendorf's Greek Testament, 1884. They describe him as "Guilelmus (*alias* Daniel) ecclesiae Presbyterianae minister, collegii Greshami Londini socius," speak of his "remarkable edition of the New Testament," and add: "He so emended the text that in a remarkable way it often agrees in a marvellous fashion with texts constructed by the critics of our time." They rank him indeed with Mill and Bentley.

Later, Gregory observed:[2] "In many cases he has the readings that the modern critics with their vastly enlarged apparatus have chosen. It was a most excellent work, and was, as a matter of course, violently denounced."

Edward Harwood (1729–94) was a Lancashire man, who numbered among his friends John Taylor and Joseph Priestley. A semi-Arian in the early part of his life, he inclined more towards Socinianism towards its close. He published an *Introduction to the Study and Knowledge of the New Testament* (2 vols., 1767, 1771), which won for him the degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh. In the Preface to the first edition he paid tribute to the "learning in the academies" in London, Daventry, Warrington, Exeter, and Carmarthen," and in the Preface to the second edition spoke of the sufferings of his predecessors, "Pearce (*sic*), Hallet, and Emlyn" "from the bigots and enthusiasts in their day." He himself suffered ostracism, as he observed: "I remember when I published *Proposals for my Liberal*

[1] Prolegomena to Tischendorf's eighth edition, p. 241, 1884.
[2] *Canon and Text of the New Testament*, pp. 416–7, London, 1907 [illegible]

Translation, or Concise Paraphrase of the New Testament, in which I had advanced some free sentiments, that I was instantly shunned by the multitude like an infected person; and especially about the time that I wrote a little tract entitled *The Melancholy Doctrine of Predestination Exposed*, that for many months I could hardly walk the streets of Bristol without being insulted." His studies were more encouraged by Anglicans than by orthodox Dissenters. Continental scholars recognised the value of his work, and the first volume of the *Introduction* was translated into German by Professor Schultz, of Göttingen, soon after its publication.

In it he corrects the English translation of Acts iv. 13, where Peter and John are described as "ignorant and unlearned men," remarking that "the first term in the original only denotes that they had not enjoyed a liberal education and been trained up in the schools of the rabbis—and the second expresses their not being in a public, but a private station of life," interpretations quite in accord with the modern view of the phrase in question. He explains the use of prophecy by New Testament writers thus: "They borrowed their language to adorn and dignify their subject—when there was a correspondence and parity of circumstances between the events and transactions they were recording and those which the antient sacred authors had recorded, not intending that a particular passage in one of the sacred books was ever designed to be a real prediction of what they were then relating." The second volume of the *Introduction* is occupied with the Customs and Usages of New Testament Times, and for its date is remarkably informing and accurate.

In 1768 he published *A Liberal Translation of the New Testament*, which, though not without merit, met with little favour owing to its affected style. His "precedent and pattern" was Castellio's rendering into Latin of the Greek

Testament. It was an unhappy "attempt to translate the sacred writers with the same freedom, spirit, and elegance with which other English translations from the Greek classics have lately been executed." The familiar Parable of the Prodigal Son begins thus: "A gentleman of a splendid family and opulent fortune had two sons. One day the younger approached his father, and begged him in the most importune and soothing terms to make a partition of his effects betwixt himself and his elder brother. The indulgent father, overcome by his blandishments, immediately divided all his fortunes between them."

In 1776 he published his edition of the Greek Testament in two volumes, including in it "A View of the Principal Editions of the Greek Testament and of the Principal Critics of it." It was a work as original in plan as it was admirable in execution. Harwood was the first to set aside altogether the traditional "received" text, and build up, direct from manuscript authorities, the text of his edition.

It was rather overshadowed by the simultaneous appearance of Griesbach's edition. Reuss, however, confessed its worth, and Gregory speaks of it in high terms. "He knew nothing of the future *Codex Sinaiticus*, and there were no scholars to tell him how valuable the *Codex Vaticanus* was, and his keen discernment led him to turn to the *Codex Bezae* for the Gospels and for Acts, and to the *Codex Claromontanus* for the Pauline Epistles." "Reuss counted Harwood's new readings, and did not name as new the ones which Griesbach at about the same time had preferred, and yet he found two hundred and three readings, many of which are approved by modern critics. That was a very good showing for the year 1776." "If Scrivener and Burgon had appreciated and commended what Mace and Harwood did in those times that were so perilous for daring scientific work, their names would be better known, and would attain at least to such greatness as various other names which

Scrivener counted fit for approving notice."[1] Von Soden says of Harwood's edition of the Greek Testament:[2] "He brought into the field for the first time *Codex D.*, seconded by Itala. In this 'Western' recension he saw the text as it was before the formation of the Canon. Errors in detail like the reckoning of the 'Western' text a recension, or the false position of individual codices amongst the witnesses of one of the three recensions, cannot decrease the service of this great scholar, which he accomplished in the attempt to carry through to the end the ideas of Bengel and Semler." It may be added that Harwood made good use of Wetstein's edition of the New Testament (1751–52), a practice followed for a century by New Testament scholars, and also enriched his work by numerous classical illustrations.

Of the men whose writings have been briefly noticed, Emlyn, Hallett, Benson, Taylor, and Harwood were students at Nonconformist academies, and the presumption is that Mace also was a pupil at one of these seminaries. The direct and indirect influence of Socinian methods in these academies is undoubted. At Manchester (1699–1713) it was not the tutors but Chetham's Library to which the students resorted that introduced them to the writings of the Polish Brethren. One of them quaintly observed: "Mr. Chorlton read lectures to us in the forenoon in Divinity, and in the afternoon some of us read in the public library. It was there I first met with the works of Episcopius, Socinus, Crellius, etc. The writings of Socinus and his followers made little impression on me, only I could never after be entirely reconciled to the common doctrines of the Trinity." At Whitehaven (1717–83), where George Benson was a pupil, the tutor, Thomas Dixon, M.D., was an advanced disciple of the Baxterian school; whilst at Hoxton, where Edward Harwood studied, Dr. S. M. Savage "encouraged free

[1] *Canon and Text of the New Testament*, pp. 449–50.
[2] *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, Bd. I, 2 a. Berlin, 1902.

inquiry, and threw no difficulties in the way of those who honestly pursued their inquiries, though they embraced views different from his own." His constant advice to his students was "Judge for yourselves," whilst one of his colleagues was an Arian and the other a Socinian. At Kendal (1733–52) Dr. Caleb Rotheram, "an impartial lover of truth," "encouraged the most free and unbounded inquiry after it," and in his library had the folio volumes of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum quos Unitarios vocant*. By students at Northampton under Doddridge "the transition of Lancashire to Unitarianism" is said to have been "greatly assisted."[1] The influence of Daventry, Warrington, Exeter, Hackney College and Manchester College in the spread of a rational interpretation of the Scriptures need not here be laboured. It may be discerned in what follows, and in the growing influence of Socinianism upon their pupils.

William Whiston (1667–1752), divine, mathematician, and eccentric scholar, stood however outside the main stream of Nonconformity, though he was a correspondent of Joseph Hallett, Jr., then a student at Exeter Academy. In 1710 he lost his Chair in Mathematics through Arianism.

In 1745 he published *The Primitive New Testament in English*. It is in four parts, the first containing the Gospels following *Codex Bezae*, with some help from the Vulgate where this manuscript is deficient; the second containing the Pauline Epistles according to the Clermont manuscript; and the remaining parts following *Codex Alexandrinus*. Like many other productions of Whiston, it is more curious than critical. A Baptist and an Arian, Whiston described himself as an "Eusebian."

John Worsley (*d.* 1767), a Hereford schoolmaster of Arian opinions, made a translation of the New Testament, published posthumously (1770) by subscription, edited by his son Samuel and Matthew Bradshaw. The object of the

[1] J. H. Colligan *The Arian Movement*, p. 50.

translation was "to bring it nearer to the original, either in the text or notes, than the common version, and to make the form of expression more suitable to our present language." In both respects the translator met with a large measure of success. His editors called attention to his rendering of "small particles," which "will be found on an accurate inspection to distinguish this from the old translation more than almost any other circumstance." Worsley was not afraid, as were the revisers of our New Testament, to translate one Greek word by more than one English word, when the sense of the context required it. Unlike them, again, he does not associate the Epistle to the Hebrews with the Apostle Paul. He had, as he said, "no design to countenance any particular opinions or sentiments," and his version, apparently made from the *textus receptus*, is an honest and workmanlike, if not a brilliant, performance.

Gilbert Wakefield (1756–1801), whilst Tutor at Warrington Academy, published a translation of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians (1781), of St. Matthew's Gospel (1782), and ten years later, after he had resigned his Chair at Hackney College, a translation of the entire New Testament. Wakefield was an admirable classical scholar and a fearless advocate of unpopular theological and political opinions. In his translation of 1 Thessalonians he "followed no particular edition of the Greek Testament, and, in various readings, and especially those of controverted texts, paid respect to the number and authority of the manuscripts, not altogether disregarding the scope and exigencies of the passage," which, he concludes, "in the case of trivial variations, and when the design of the writer is extremely clear, is a more satisfactory and decisive rule." Wakefield's first translation attracted little attention, though some anonymous writers took him severely to task for his freedom of thought. Three years before the translation of the New Testament came *A New Translation of Those Parts Only of the New Testament which are Wrongly Translated in Our Common Version.* Some "exceptionable" passages he left untouched, where any alteration would expose him "to any imputation of prejudiced attachment to a particular system of Divinity." But in one or two places he "yielded to the cloud of witnesses, and sacrificed the timidity of his scruples to the truth." In the Fourth Gospel he suggested one or two transpositions to improve the sense, a proceeding which commends itself to many modern scholars of different schools. Like Edward Harwood, he made use of Wetstein's edition, but only occasionally refers to "the manuscripts," or "some manuscripts," without specifying the codices. He drew largely upon the versions—Syriac, Aethiopian, Coptic, and Arabic—sometimes without much judgment, as when he followed them in retaining the interpolated passage (1 John v. 7) without considering that no Greek manuscript before the fourteenth century contains the words in question. Wakefield's translations are interesting examples of brilliant individual renderings, but here and there it is clear that the author was not less distinguished as controversialist than as philologist.

In 1790 Michael Dodson (1732–99), a distinguished lawyer, published under the title of *A Layman* a new translation of Isaiah with notes, which won the commendation of Bishop Lowth, whose lectures on Hebrew poetry (1753) laid the foundations of the study of it. Dodson, who was a member of Essex Street Chapel and a friend of Joseph Priestley, published his translation originally in a volume of *Commentaries and Essays* sent forth by the Society for Promoting the Knowledge of the Scriptures (est. 1783), which had been promoted by Lindsey and his friends.

Charles Bulkley (1719–97), an old student at Northampton Academy under Philip Doddridge, who afterwards became a General Baptist minister, amongst other writings, was the

author of *Notes on the Bible*, published posthumously in three volumes, 1802, with a memoir by Joshua Toulmin.

As the editor indicates, the *Notes* were "borrowed from a great variety of authors," and reveal a wide range of reading in "classical, rabbinical, patristic, and later writers."

Thomas Belsham (1754–1829), tutor at Daventry Academy, 1771–89, and, after his conversion to Unitarianism, at Hackney College, 1790–96, was the principal editor of *The Improved Version of the New Testament* (1808), and the author of an annotated translation of St. Paul's Epistles (1822). *The Improved Version* was based upon Archbishop Newcome's New Testament translation. The editors had desired to use Wakefield's as a basis, but this "being found impracticable," they fixed their choice upon the one named. "To this choice they were induced, not only by the merits of the translation, but principally because it followed the text of Griesbach's edition." Where the editors differed from it, Newcome's translation was placed at the foot of the page. The Preface presents an admirable summary of the history of the canon and text, the versions and editions of the New Testament, and discusses briefly such questions as the value of patristic quotations, the use of critical conjecture and the like. This discussion was characterised by a contemporary reviewer as "the best compend of criticism which has yet been presented to the English reader."

Though not without faults and violently attacked and even ridiculed by orthodox controversialists, *The Improved Version* merits great respect, and in very many passages the readings anticipate the judgment of the last revisers of the New Testament. The version was never adopted, as its assailants maintained that it was, as the recognised "Unitarian Bible," and was indeed rather severely handled by men like Lant Carpenter. "In later editions," as Dr. Estlin Carpenter observed,[1] "many defects were corrected; the

[1] *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 64. London, 1903.

text was conformed to that of Griesbach's second edition; all variations from the "received" text were duly recorded; and in cases of divergence from Newcome's revision, his renderings were appended also." As stated in the Introduction, "the work was a sincere attempt to supply the English reader with a more correct text of the New Testament than has yet appeared in the English language, and to give him an opportunity of comparing it with the text in common use. Also, by divesting the sacred volume of the technical phrases of a systematic theology which has no foundation in the Scriptures themselves, to render the New Testament more generally intelligible, or at least to preclude many sources of error."

"Imperfect as is its freedom from sectional bias in particular cases, it is a fine piece of good workmanship on the whole; and the number of instances in which *The Improved Version* has anticipated the judgment of the revisers of 1881 is very remarkable."[1]

Belsham's *Exposition of St. Paul's Epistles* was based upon pulpit utterances at Hackney. The translation takes account of the work of his predecessors; in his own words, it may be called "an Eclectic, or Select version, rather than a new one." He candidly confesses in the Paraphrase a Unitarian bias, and finds in others Trinitarian or Arian prepossessions. He adopts, as he tells us, the theory of interpretation first suggested by Locke and amplified by John Taylor.

It was a Unitarian minister, the Rev. Samuel Wood, who contributed to *The Monthly Repository* of 1829 what has escaped the notice of most if not all the writers on Textual Criticism. In *The Journal of a Tour on the Continent* he relates how he recently visited the Vatican Library. "On requesting the priest, who was in attendance as Librarian, to show me the celebrated manuscript of the New Testament which is

[1] Alex. Gordon, *Christian Doctrine in the Light of New Testament Research*, p. 47.

here preserved, he immediately sent one of his attendants to fetch it, and I had the very great pleasure of examining this most precious relic for the space of an hour." He then proceeds to describe the contents of the manuscript, remarks on two readings (1 John v. 7 and Acts xx. 28), and gives a facsimile of the lettering. It is the first published facsimile of any portion of this important manuscript, which still retains its pre-eminence amongst the primary sources for the construction of the purest text of the New Testament. The narrative is also interesting for another reason. In 1809 Napoleon carried off this treasure from its home in the Vatican Library to Paris, where Hug first examined it and made known its age and value. After the fall of Napoleon it was taken back to Rome.

Historians of Textual Criticism generally observe that at this point the manuscript was altogether withdrawn from the use of foreign scholars. A little later, as critics like Tischendorf and Tregelles discovered, it was most jealously guarded, but the narrative of Samuel Wood disproves the common statement that its withdrawal dates from its return to Rome.

In 1825 was published the first volume (containing the Pentateuch) of *The Holy Bible: A New Translation with Introductory Remarks, Notes and Explanatory and Critical and Practical Reflections Designed for the Use of Families*, by Charles Wellbeloved. Projected, March 1814, by David Eaton, the bookseller (*d.* 1829), to be issued in two quarto volumes, the prospectus, May 1814, announced it in three, and elicited six hundred and twenty-one subscribers. It came out in nine parts, the first (Genesis) published by Eaton in 1819, and the last, completing Volume II, published at Wellbeloved's expense, in 1839. The second volume included Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon. Wellbeloved died in 1840 and left unpublished Joshua, Judges, Ruth, and the Minor Prophets.

His work was revised by John Kenrick and the translation republished by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, together with translations of the remaining books of the Old Testament by George Vance Smith and John Scott Porter, in three volumes, 1859–62. From this edition Wellbeloved's Introductions, Notes, and Critical Remarks were omitted.

Wellbeloved acknowledged in 1825 "the valuable assistance of two learned and judicious friends, the Rev. J. Kentish, of Birmingham, and the Rev. John Kenrick, of York." In his translation he "adhered to the common version as closely as was consistent with giving a faithful and intelligible representation of the original. Yet, as in many instances he felt himself obliged, on sound principles of criticism, to abandon the Hebrew text, the basis of the authorised version, and also to give to many Hebrew words a sense very different from that given by King James's translation, he thought himself bound to render some account of his reasons for so doing. Hence the introduction of the Critical Remarks. . . ."

A laborious work, executed amidst the pressure of ministerial and tutorial duties and interrupted by ill-health, it attracted no attention from the literary journals of the day. It constituted, however, in Kenrick's opinion, "the chief literary labour of Wellbeloved's life." Though the Introductions and Critical Remarks are now, of course, quite out of date, they contain much curious learning, and the work as a whole was not only well abreast of contemporary scholarship at home and abroad but also exhibits the independence, modesty, candour, and sound judgment of its author.

In 1840 appeared the posthumous translation of the New Testament by Edgar Taylor (1793–1839), a great-grandson of John Taylor. It was announced on the title-page as "Revised from the Authorised Version with the aid of

other translations and made conformable to the Greek Text of J. J. Griesbach. By a Layman." It was edited by William Hincks, Professor at Manchester College (1827–39) and Editor of the *Inquirer* (1842–49). In revising the Gospels, Taylor "attends to the principle of rendering the same words in the same way, and thus of marking the adoption of some common narrative or the fact of mutual borrowing." Elsewhere he "has not been very anxious about preserving uniformity by always rendering the same words alike; an object in itself not always desirable." We may contrast the plan adopted by the revisers of 1880, which carried the principle referred to throughout the New Testament, and met with much criticism. In the Epistles Taylor aimed at simplicity. Scrupulous to avoid anything like the interpretation of passages, in one or two places he indicates how the foundation of different interpretations arises out of the Greek. The rendering of a few terms is specially discussed in the Preface, whilst variant readings are given at the end of the book. The translation is one of considerable value, and may still be consulted with profit.

In the same year as Taylor, Samuel Sharpe (1799–1881), the Unitarian Egyptologist, revised the Authorised Version upon the basis of Griesbach's Greek text. It is curious that Edgar Taylor and Samuel Sharpe, two laymen in habitual intercourse with each other, should have been engaged, in mutual ignorance of the fact, upon the task of translating the New Testament—a work neither remunerative nor calculated to win much appreciation. Sharpe seldom changed the Common Version except when the Greek seemed in his judgment to require it. Not all his changes are defensible, and, in especial, his assimilation of the idioms of Greek and English in the use of the article. Speeches, poetry, and quotations were distinguished by inverted commas, a smaller type, and italics. Sharpe made little claim to originality, but on the whole his judgment was excellent. In the

second edition he made a free use of Taylor's translation. Later (1861) Sharpe published a *Revised Translation of the Bible* as a whole. The Old Testament, translated from Van der Hooght's Hebrew text, printed in Amsterdam in 1705, ran to seven editions. One of the last advocates of unpointed Hebrew, Sharpe never felt bound by the vowel points of the Massoretes. The books were divided into paragraphs, poetical passages arranged into short verses, and speeches marked with inverted commas.

It will be seen that several of the scholars used the Greek text of Griesbach. For this they were assailed by the champions of orthodoxy and the old theory of verbal infallibility. Thus Thomas Burgess, Bishop of St. David's, in his *Vindication of 1 John V. 7 from the Objections of M. Griesbach*, says of Unitarians, "They trust to their auxiliar, M. Griesbach. He is the rock of their infidelity, and the pope of their system. His single authority is sufficient for mutilating the received text of the New Testament." The reason for the early Unitarian choice of Griesbach's text of the New Testament was simply that it was the best produced in their time, and, as Sharpe observed, the "standard text to which most scholars appealed." In the words of Sir Frederick Kenyon,[1] the name of Griesbach "ranks with the highest in the history of textual criticism."

As an orthodox critic of Griesbach and the Unitarians said,[2] "The Unitarians not only applauded and patronised his undertaking, but exerted every means in their power to carry the work with credit through the press, and to give it publicity in this country." It was a Unitarian (the Duke of Grafton) who promoted the publication of Griesbach's second edition (1796), a handsome acknowledgment of which is included in its Preface, and a Unitarian printer and

[1] *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, p. 259, London, 1901.

[2] R. Lawrence, *Remarks upon the Classification of MSS. by Griesbach*, pp. 2, 3, London, 1814.

corrector was concerned in the first English reprint of it (1809–10). Edgar Taylor, whose translation has been already noticed, for the purpose of settling the disputed reading of Acts xx. 28, procured from the custodian of the Vatican Library a tracing of rather more than three lines in this passage, and it appeared in the editorial Monitum prefixed to the second London reprint of Griesbach's Greek Testament in 1818.

John Scott Porter (1801–80), Irish Unitarian minister, was a pioneer in British Textual Criticism. In 1848 he published *Principles of Textual Criticism with Their Application to the Old and New Testaments*. "I gratefully own," he said, "Griesbach and Hug as my masters in the art of criticism, and, in dissenting occasionally from their views, would wish to express my own with deference." Howbeit, Porter's work was a real contribution to the subject. "A useful feature of the work was its series of coloured plates, draughted by Porter himself, exhibiting specimens of codices in facsimile." The book was recognised by Gregory and Abbot[1] as the indication of an important era in British textual criticism."

The discovery by Tischendorf of the *Codex Sinaiticus* (1858) in a basket of old parchment destined to feed the fires of the monastery on Mount Sinai helped to depose the text of Griesbach from its position of eminence. Tischendorf's eighth edition of the New Testament (1865) first took account of this discovery, and Unitarian scholars promptly translated it into English. Robert Ainslie (1809–76), a Unitarian minister, straightway broke away from the tradition of the Griesbach text in his translation of 1869. The order of the books follows that of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, and the titles, paragraphs, numbering of chapters and verses are those of Tischendorf. The Preface gives an account of the discovery of the famous manuscript and of previous English translations, and notes some of the principal changes

[1] *Prolegomena to Tischendorf's New Testament*, eighth edition, p. 189.

in this version as compared with the Authorised. Many of the renderings are extremely quaint. James iii. 6 says of the tongue, it "setteth on fire the wheel of nature" (R.V.). Ainslie renders it: "it setteth on fire the circle of our family," adding, "I believe it to be an accurate translation; it is common sense—it is a matter of fact, and of universal experience, and presents to us a truth, whose power is witnessed in daily life." Again, in Titus ii. 3 the aged women are bidden "be reverent in demeanour, not slanderers" (R.V.). Ainslie has it "be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not devils." The translation enjoyed little vogue, but it is by no means worthless. "As a translator," said Ainslie, "I know nothing of theology; I have no theological system to uphold." It is a statement which many New Testament translators and commentators could not make, and it cannot be disproved from his translation. The year after the publication of the translation of Tischendorf's text by Ainslie, action was taken by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury which resulted in the Revised Version of the New Testament (1881).

George Vance Smith (1817–1902) was a member of the New Testament Revision Committee. He was Principal of Manchester College, 1850–53, and of Carmarthen College, 1876–88. Together with Charles Wellbeloved and John Scott Porter, he took part as we have seen in a translation of the Old Testament (1859–62). His appointment as one of the New Testament Revision Committee raised a storm in certain orthodox quarters, and a resolution condemning it was passed by the Upper House of Convocation. It may fairly be claimed that the revision of 1881 justified the attempts of the Unitarian translators to produce an English version nearer than that of 1611 to the original of the oldest manuscripts, and that the recent modern translations have included many of the features that marked those early versions. It is further safe to prophesy that any future

revision will more closely resemble many of those individual efforts in their modern idiomatic speech than does the Revised Version of the New Testament.

In higher criticism, as in textual criticism and in translation, Unitarian scholars were among the first in this country to point the way which modern scholarship has travelled.

Nathaniel Lardner (1684–1768) was a conservative in Biblical criticism, but a rationalist in his treatment of such a problem as "demoniacal possession." And it was his letter on the "Logos," addressed to Viscount Barrington, published 1758, that converted Joseph Priestley from Arianism to Socinianism, though it was inspired, not by Socinian writers, but by the study of the Scriptures and the Early Fathers. As a Biblical and patristic scholar, he takes a high place. "Of greatest value is his vast and careful collection of critically appraised materials for determining the date and authorship of New Testament books. Here he remains unrivalled. He may justly be regarded as the founder of the modern school of critical research in the field of early Christian literature, and he is still the leading authority on the conservative side."[1]

Joseph Priestley (1733–1804), Unitarian minister in Leeds, Birmingham, and London, was a "way-maker" in Biblical as in scientific studies. His opinions have been thus summarised by the greatest authority on his theological writings. "He rejected the doctrine of the Virgin Birth as without historical basis. He expressed the conviction that the place of Christ's nativity was Nazareth. He reached the position that our Lord was neither naturally impeccable nor intellectually infallible, had been under illusion respecting demoniacal possession, had misconceived the import of certain of the prophecies, and had sometimes recommended indisputable truths by halting arguments. As for the doctrine that Christ made the world, he saw no good proof

[1] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Lardner, Nathaniel.*

of its apostolic origin; but, if otherwise, inasmuch as it was certainly no part of Christ's own gospel, he did not think we should be 'under any obligation to believe it, merely because it was an opinion held by an Apostle.' Save in his tenacious adhesion to the literal verity, and evidential value, of the miraculous element in the Biblical narratives, and in his conservative estimate of the dates and authorship of Biblical books, there is scarcely a point on which the most independent of modern scholars can pride himself on having advanced beyond the outposts of Priestley."[1]

Dr. Estlin Carpenter has noted that "the first serious criticism in this country" of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, now rejected by Modernists in the Church of England and by many outside it, "proceeded from Priestley."[2]

A Unitarian, with whom Priestley crossed swords more than once, did, however, go further than Priestley in New Testament criticism. Edward Evanson (1731–1805), an Anglican clergyman who resigned his living after publishing Unitarian opinions, published in 1792 *The Dissonance of the Four Generally Received Evangelists, and the Evidence of Their Respective Authenticity Examined.* His attack upon the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel in this work was the first to be made since those of the so-called Alogi in the second century, anticipating by twenty-eight years the abler and more complete exposition of it by Bretschneider in 1820. Evanson also gave evidence of the dissonance between the gospels, and between different parts of the same gospel. He attached a singular importance to the prophetic elements in the New Testament, and estimated very highly the trustworthiness of Luke, "though even his writings did not escape untouched by the hands of the interpolators after the second century." Thus the first two chapters of the Third Gospel are not by Luke, but written after his

[1] A. Gordon, *Heads of English Unitarian History*, pp. 117–18.

[2] *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 482, n. 1.

style. Evanson's criticism led him to reject the First, Second, and Fourth Gospels, the Epistles to the Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, and Hebrews, and those of James, John, and Jude. The New Testament published in accordance with his plan in 1807, two years after Evanson's death, is a mere torso. Evanson's views, almost entirely subjective, though disinterred by F. C. Conybeare[1] to serve the purposes of "Rationalist" propaganda, are merely critical curiosities. As a pioneer in the comparative study of the Gospels, however, this fearless Unitarian investigator has secured a place for himself in the history of New Testament criticism.

Timothy Kenrick (1759–1804), Unitarian divine, tutor at Daventry, 1779–84, and at the third Exeter Academy, 1799–1804, exhibits some traces of the influence of Evanson in his *Exposition of the Historical Writings of the New Testament*, published posthumously in 1807. He does not notice the birth stories of Matthew and Luke because, as his editor remarks, "with the exception of the preface to Luke's Gospel, he did not look upon the chapters in question as the production of those Evangelists, but as fabrications by an unknown, though early, hand." The Temptation is treated, in the manner of modern scholars, as a symbolic narrative, and demoniacal possession described as an "absurd notion" which the New Testament writers and Christ did not combat. Miraculous elements in the Gospels are not denied and, in general, the exegetical position is that of the older Unitarian school.

Thomas Belsham as a translator has been already noticed. A sympathetic student of Astruc, Geddes, and Eichhorn, the founders of Old Testament criticism, he drew attention in 1807 to the composite character of the Pentateuch. Fourteen years later, at the advanced age of seventy-one, in a sermon preached at Warrington, he rejected the history of the creation in the Book of Genesis as incredible, and irreconcilable

[1] *History of New Testament Criticism*, pp. 87–93, London, 1910.

with science. "If the history of the creation in the first chapter of Genesis be inspired, then all the discoveries of Kepler and Galileo, of Copernicus and Newton, are false, and all their demonstrations must be erroneous, which is impossible." He rejected the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and bade "the humble and sincere inquirer after truth, discarding every prejudice," to sit down and "read the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments with the same thirst after knowledge, and with the same liberal and candid spirit with which he would read any other ancient volume." Observe, this was said nearly forty years before Benjamin Jowett, in *Essays and Reviews*, pleaded that the Bible should "be interpreted like any other book, by the same rules of evidence and the same canons of criticism."

Naturally, a man so open of mind and bold of speech as Belsham was not lagging behind the times in his attitude towards the New Testament. In a letter to a young friend, then studying in Germany, he wrote, "I love German criticism as much as I dislike German theology, and would give a great deal to be able to read or to hear Eichhorn's lectures upon the Old and New Testaments." It may be added that a good deal of Eichhorn was translated in early volumes of *The Monthly Repository* (1821–22), the Unitarian journal edited by Robert Aspland. Belsham doubted if the four Gospels existed in their present form in the time of Justin Martyr (A.D. 150), since he does not quote them by name, and is "inclined to think that more than that number were in general circulation, and some, perhaps, e.g. the Gospel of the Hebrews, nearly as valuable as those which we at present possess." Before our canonical Gospels were universally known and acknowledged, Belsham believed "those who were in possession of early copies made additions of narratives which they believed to be authentic, which accounts for the interpolations which they now contain. And it seems that Matthew has been more corrupted

than any of the rest; and Mark, perhaps, the least, because of its brevity."

It is not too much to say that these conjectures of Belsham are nearer the conclusions of liberal scholars in England and Germany to-day than anything that was written in this country in the early part of the nineteenth century.

Charles Christian Hennell (1809–50), a Unitarian layman who had been educated by his uncle, the Rev. Edward Higginson, of Derby, published in 1838 an *Inquiry Concerning the Origin of Christianity*. It represented a departure from the school of Scripture rationalism in which he had been reared, which stressed the miracles as proof of the Messianic character of Jesus, and he justified his repudiation of miracle by the example of his teachers who rejected the stories of the Virgin Birth. What was more important, Hennell laid down in his Preface principles to be employed in the investigation of the Gospels which have been accepted as fundamental by most scholars during the last quarter of a century. "It is necessary to form an opinion as to the date of each writing, the general character of each author, and his peculiarities as a writer; to institute continual comparisons between the events or discourses which he relates and the opinions and controversies which arose subsequently to his own time; to weigh the probability in favour of the real occurrence of a fact, considered in reference to the ascertained history of the time, with that in favour of its invention by the author or some intermediate narrator; to consider what greater degree of weight is due to the testimony from the accordance of all, or of several of the writers; and to ascertain whether they wrote independently or copied from each other." Strauss had the book translated into German, and wrote for it a preface, in which he said: "Those excellent views which the learned German of our time appropriates to himself as the fruit of the

religious development of his nation, this Englishman, to whom the greater part of our means was wanting, has been able to evolve by his own efforts."

John Hamilton Thom reviewed the book in 1843 with some severity, whereas Dr. Estlin Carpenter in 1903 gave it a most sympathetic notice, a difference of treatment marking the advance during the intervening half-century towards the position of Hennell.[1]

John Kenrick (1788–1877), classical scholar and historian, was first student then professor at Manchester College. Articles contributed by him to various quarterlies included some on New Testament criticism. In discussing the narratives of the Crucifixion (*Christian Reformer*, 1845), he exhibits a candour that was uncommon before the middle of last century. "To maintain the credibility of the New Testament," he says, "and find a firm basis for faith in its narratives, after we have abandoned the doctrine of verbal inspiration, we must be prepared to show that when treated according to the acknowledged rules of philology and historical criticism, they furnish a result of unquestionable truth. Nothing must be allowed to pass in the school of Theology, which would be rejected in the interpretation of other histories." Five years later he contributed to *The Prospective Review* a remarkable article on "The Relation of the Third to the First Two Gospels." In his preference for Mark's Gospel as the earliest, Kenrick anticipated later investigation, as in his recognition of the accretions which the fuller Gospels of Matthew and Luke acquired.

An uncommon work by a layman, which in its day excited much attention, was *The Creed of Christendom*, by William Rathbone Greg, published in 1851. Its subject was the foundation and superstructure of the Creed. It had occupied its author for four years, and was kept for two years

[1] *The Prospective Review*, i, pp. 19–48, 1845. *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 283–6.

before being given "to the world with much diffidence and with some misgiving." The three conclusions which he sought to establish were "that the tenet of Inspiration of the Scriptures is baseless and untenable under any form or modification which leaves to it a dogmatic value—that the Gospels are not textually faithful records of the sayings and actions of Jesus, but ascribe to him words which he never uttered, and deeds which he never did—and that the Apostles only partially comprehended, and imperfectly transmitted, the teaching of their Great Master."

The book was not without its defects, many of which were promptly pointed out in the pages of *The Prospective Review*, but its influence was wide, and, in the existing state of belief, most salutary. John Morley has left on record an account of its influence. "The present writer was at Oxford in the last three years of the decade in which it appeared, and can well recall the share that it had, along with Mansel's *Bampton Lectures* and other books on both sides, in shaking the fabric of early beliefs in some of the most active minds then in the University. The landmarks have so shifted within the last twenty years that *The Creed of Christendom* is now comparatively orthodox. But in those days it was a remarkable proof of intellectual courage and independence to venture on introducing to the English public the best results of German theological criticism, with fresh applications from an original mind."[1]

In 1855 Edward Higginson (1807–50), Unitarian minister at Wakefield and brother-in-law of James Martineau, published *The Spirit of the Bible, or The Nature and Value of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures Discriminated* (2 vols.), in which the documentary theory of the composition of Genesis was recognised, though the basis of the Pentateuch is "admitted to have been put into writing by Moses, or under his direction." Isaiah xl–lxvi. is assigned to the

[1] *Critical Miscellanies*, iii, pp. 222–3.

Captivity, Daniel to the Maccabean Age, and the Song of Songs regarded as "nothing more than a specimen of Hebrew amatory poetry—a marriage song or a collection of detached poems," theories in advance of those of contemporary English scholars. Mark's Gospel he reckons "the earliest," which "may have been seen by the other evangelists." What Matthew wrote "must have been derived from different sources," and stories like those of "Herod and the Wise Men and the Flight into Egypt have an apocryphal air"; whilst "there are no proper predictions of the facts of Christ's life or personality discovered in the Hebrew prophets." Hebrews is not by Paul and 2 Peter and Jude are "of very doubtful authenticity."

In 1857 George Vance Smith published *The Prophecies Relating to Nineveh and the Assyrians: Translated from the Hebrew with Historical Introductions and Notes*, a scholarly work inspired by the writings of Gesenius, Ewald, Knobel, and Hitzig. It discusses in some detail Isaiah i–xxxvii, transposing chapters to recover the chronological sequence, Nahum, Jonah, and passages from Zephaniah and Ezekiel. The critical notes are both exegetical and linguistic, and throughout there is a distinct approach to the modern views of the problem discussed.

In 1855 James Heywood, M.P., F.R.S., a Unitarian layman, translated Peter von Bohlen's *Introduction to Genesis* (2 vols.), originally published in German in an extended form. Though ill-received at the time, it was a pioneer piece of work, based on critical principles, and had been welcomed in Germany by such scholars as Gesenius and De Wette.

In 1867 John James Tayler, Principal of Manchester College, published *An Attempt to Ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel*. "For years," he wrote, "I clung to the opinion that the most spiritual of the Gospels must be of Apostolic origin." Closer study of the evidence, with the

help of German scholarship, led him to a contrary opinion. It was an unfounded "apprehension of spiritual loss," which kept him for a long time from "accepting the plain dictate of unbiassed scholarship." Even so, Tayler was the first Englishman to plead a case for the non-Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel. As early as 1694, indeed, Stephen Nye, in one of the Unitarian tracts,[1] had laid stress on the fact that the early Unitarians, called the "Alogi," rejected the Johannine authorship, but there was nothing like a full statement of the case in English against the Apostolic authorship before John James Tayler. In the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (vol. ii, 1901) Schmiedel, in a note to his article on John, observes that the English literature on the subject is mainly conservative. The critical view is represented by a short list of names in which John James Tayler comes first. To-day the wheel has come full circle, and the death of Professor A. S. Peake in 1929 removed the one great English scholar who clung tenaciously to the traditional opinion. Again, Tayler suspected the author was the Presbyter John in whose name the Second and Third Epistles of John are written. It is a view which, from the time of Harnack, has gained increasing recognition by scholars of the front rank at home and abroad.

The traditional theory, however, was strictly defended by many Unitarians. Thomas Madge, the minister of Essex Street Chapel, published a reply to Tayler in 1868, and in 1876, under the title of *The Fourth Gospel is the Gospel according to St. John*, John Scott Porter issued a discourse with copious notes on the same side. It was unfortunate that Dr. Lightfoot, the great Cambridge scholar, in his essay on *The External Evidence for the Authorship and Genuineness of St. John's Gospel* (1867–72), should have written: "The assailants are of two kinds: (1) Rationalists; (2) those who deny the distinctive character of Christian doctrine—

[1] See pp. 19 ff.

Unitarians. The Gospel confronts both. It relates the most stupendous miracle in the history of our Lord (short of the Incarnation and the Resurrection), the raising of Lazarus. Again, it enunciates in the most express terms the Divinity, the Deity of our Lord. . . . If therefore the claim of this Gospel to be the work of John the son of Zebedee be true, if, in other words, the Fourth Gospel is genuine, the most formidable, not to say an insuperable, obstacle stands in the way of *both* classes of antagonists."

Upon two questions of fact in this statement a word must be said in passing. The Deity of our Lord is not enunciated in the most express terms by the Evangelist; it is only one of several interpretations of his doctrine. The Gospel, again, does not claim to be the work of John, the son of Zebedee; the sentence or two which are said to suggest this may be otherwise interpreted, and in any case fall very far short of any such claim. For the rest, "The whirligig of time brings in his revenges." One of the most distinguished defenders of the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel in the nineteenth century was a Unitarian, Dr. James Drummond (1835–1918), Principal of Manchester College (1885–1906).

In the Preface to his work, which was warmly welcomed by orthodox scholars, Dr. Drummond admits that his "two principal teachers in theology," Rev. J. J. Tayler and Dr. Martineau, "rejected with equal confidence the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel." Published in 1903, Drummond's masterly treatise had appeared in great part in *The Theological Review* (1875, 1877). Drummond rested his case on the external far more than on the internal evidence. At the same time, though of apostolic origin, the Gospel is regarded as largely unhistorical in its record of the ministry of Jesus. It is "a deliberate construction of narrative as a pictorial embodiment of spiritual truth." He therefore did not feel driven to accept as historical "the most stupendous

miracle"—the raising of Lazarus. The underlying assumption of Lightfoot's remarks may best be met by the statement of an evangelical biographer of Drummond,[1] "*The anima naturaliter Christiana* was eminently exemplified in Drummond." None the less, it may be frankly admitted that the theory of Drummond is difficult to hold, despite his skilful exposition of it. Something *more* or *less* appears to be required according as the evidence, external or internal, inclines us for or against the Apostolic authorship. In his *Johannine Thoughts: A Series of Meditations in Prose and Verse* (1909), Drummond is seen to even more advantage as an interpreter of "one of the world's great masterpieces of spiritual genius." In it he relates his own deep spiritual experience to that of the evangelist, and provides a profound yet rational exposition of the abiding significance of Johannine thought. Exegetical notes on particular passages (e.g. i. 15) awaken the regret that he did not attempt a commentary on the Gospel.

To complete the story of Unitarian scholarship in relation to the Fourth Gospel, it may be added that Dr. J. Estlin Carpenter, the colleague and successor of Drummond at Manchester College, in his last published work, *The Johannine Writings* (1927) reverted to the position of Tayler and Martineau, though his discussion of the problem is characterised by a wealth of learning without parallel in the writings of his predecessors. He gives no definite name to the author of the Gospel, and of the theory that John the son of Zebedee was put to death in Palestine he is very doubtful. Professor Peake found the "chief value" of the volume "in the very full exposition of the Johannine teaching."

Of Dr. Carpenter's Biblical writings which fall within our period, *The First Three Gospels, Their Origins and Relations* (1st ed., 1890), and the edition of *The Hexateuch* (2 vols., 1900), in which he collaborated with G. Harford Battersby, are the most important.

[1] A. S. Peake, *D.N.B.*, New Series, i.

In *The First Three Gospels* Carpenter differed from Martineau in holding that Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah. Martineau's doctrine, set forth in *The Seat of Authority* (1890), made few converts, and a Unitarian scholar,[1] writing in 1924 on this view that the Messianic theory of the person of Jesus was made for Him and palmed upon Him by His followers, said: "It is clear that we have here the will to believe doing its perfect work, rather than the calm judgment of the purely objective critic." But Carpenter did not think that Jesus identified Himself with the Son of Man—the apocalyptic figure who was to come at the consummation of the ages. This theory, again, is beset with difficulties which to many seem insuperable. On the question of eschatology his views are more generally acceptable, recognising as he does its presence in the primitive sources of the Gospels, yet declining to make it the key to all their problems. Intended originally for Sunday-school teachers, *The First Three Gospels*, which ran into four editions and was translated (1892) into Dutch, was the earliest discussion in English of the problem of the Synoptic Gospels on modern lines. Its value was recognised by its use in colleges and universities.

The Hexateuch remains the standard work on the subject of the structure and composition of the first six books of the Old Testament. *The Introduction*, republished separately in 1902, was the work of Carpenter. In the words of Dr. Peake: "It was then, and still remains, by far the best and most thorough treatment of the whole subject," and constitutes "his greatest work in the department of the Old Testament."[2]

In his studies of Paulinism, James Drummond stands

[1] C. R. Bowen, *Freedom and Truth*, p. 193.
[2] C. H. Herford, *Joseph Estlin Carpenter*, p. 140.

alone amongst the more recent Unitarian scholars, and is excelled by none in his originality, lucidity, and power of interpretation. *The Pauline Benediction*, three sermons published in 1897, brought out clearly the meaning of its three clauses, justified its use by Unitarians in its primitive sense, and elicited its catholic and spiritual significance for all disciples of Christ. The admirable *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, and Philippians* (1899) in the International Handbooks to the New Testament suffers from the limitations imposed by the series to which it belongs, but is marked by its lofty spiritual tone and its rejection of the common view of Paul's teaching as involving the doctrine of imputed righteousness, a theory elaborated in two remarkable articles contributed to the first volume of *The Hibbert Journal* (1903), which have never received the attention they deserve from orthodox scholars who have built elaborate schemes of salvation upon justification in the Pauline epistles as a forensic acquittal from guilt. In *Paul, His Life and Teaching* (1911), Drummond addresses himself primarily to Sunday-school teachers, but his independent judgment and sympathetic interpretation lend to this little volume a value beyond that suggested by its scope. *Pauline Meditations*, published posthumously in 1919, was Drummond's final revelation of the depth and width of the most fundamental tenets of Paulinism, which he related with penetrating insight to the inner life of man. As he declared in his Essex Hall lecture on *Christology* (1902): "No belief has any vitality which is without a spiritual root in ourselves; and, whatever may be our intellectual confession of faith, our operative convictions are only those which link themselves to our inward needs and experiences."

In an unpublished address Drummond said: "Nothing more sublime can I imagine than the truth as it is in Jesus, nothing which so fills the cravings of the soul as the spirit

of life in Him." As we should expect, therefore, his interpretation of the Gospel narrative is singularly suggestive and helpful. In his *Hibbert Lectures* (1894) and *The Way of Life* (2 vols., 1918), he discusses the Parables, the Lord's Prayer, and the Teachings of Jesus with reverence, scholarship, and sweet reasonableness which are most winsome.

It is important to observe that scholars like Drummond and Carpenter, differing as they do in matters of New Testament criticism, and departing in different directions from the paths marked out by Martineau, were yet at one with him in the underlying principle that guided and animated their researches. For them the seat of authority in religion was no longer the Bible. As Drummond observed in *Via, Veritas, Vita*, the Hibbert Lectures in which he gave "a general description of the spiritual teaching of Christianity": "We can no longer assume that a statement is true simply because it is between the covers of the venerable book. . . . If there be an error here, there may be an error there, and the basis of belief must be shifted from the Bible to some other ground of belief." In his *Studies in Christian Doctrine* (1908) he indicated that ground: "Men are thrown back on a religion of the Spirit, and forced to listen to the living voice of God within their own souls." In other words, he openly repudiated the principle of "the Sufficiency of the Scriptures," which, however it may have been implicitly challenged by the instrument of reason professedly employed in its service, had constituted the Bible the ultimate court of appeal from the seventeenth century to the middle of the nineteenth, for all Unitarian scholars seeking to apprehend and set forth the nature and mode of the Divine revelation to humanity.

It was a principle, as we have seen, which had proved fruitful for good, even beyond its early promise. It had inspired the zeal for the recovery of the most primitive texts of the two Testaments. It had dictated the publication of

lucid and unbiassed translations into English from their original tongues. It had opened the way for paraphrase and interpretation which met the demands of reason and defied the mandates of a dead past. And from first to last it had welcomed new light on the Scripture from the researches of scholars on the Continent. Though not equally successful in every field of study, in operation the principle of the sufficiency of Scripture might almost be said to have been justified by its works, and it was equally acceptable to Unitarians of both the Arian and Socinian schools.

It was none the less defective and fundamentally unsound. Even within the limits of its operation the principle had proved its ineffectiveness to restrain the free mind. The authority of the Bible could not remain unquestioned when its contents and teaching were freely examined. It was impossible to confine criticism to the evidence of revelation and deny it a place in regard to its substance. Textual criticism had disclosed what margin of probability justified particular readings on which important doctrines might depend; and as further evidence of manuscripts or fathers was discovered or more critically examined, the comparatively slender and shifting basis on which doctrinal interpretations were grounded became more manifest. Translations by men of equal honesty and freedom from restraint differed not a little, and it was patent that, by their very nature, each involved an element of interpretation, and that none, on purely philological grounds, could claim to be final or a perfect equivalent of the original text, itself in many important details a matter of controversy. Interpretations, when not confessedly in the interests of a sect or system of belief, were none the less liable to error springing from the equipment of the author and the general body of accepted opinion in the period of their production. Moreover, the principle of the Sufficiency of Scripture was ill-suited to serve the needs of a new generation distrustful of reason in

bonds, however lightly worn, and, at the same time, sensitive to different levels of morality in the books of the Bible, and desirous of founding its faith on a more impregnable rock than Holy Scripture in the face of the attacks of science upon its history, cosmology, anthropology, psychology, and ultimate spiritual authority.

It was during the long life of one man, James Martineau (1805–1900), that the change was accomplished from the old to the new conception of Scripture, and it followed mainly as the result of his incomparable labours in philosophy and religion, for him hardly separable fields of study.

Martineau had been a pupil at York under Charles Wellbeloved, who had declared in his controversy with Archdeacon Wrangham: "I adopt the common language of Unitarians when I say, Convince us that any tenet is authorised by the Bible, from that moment we receive it." He was also the friend and later the colleague of John James Tayler, who at his own ordination in 1821 had pleaded that the "Scriptures alone contain the revealed will of the Deity," and whatever they teach "as indubitably the word of God," it was "his bounden duty to recommend and enforce." Martineau himself had moved some distance from this position in 1828, for whilst he defined the commands of Jesus as "a voice from heaven" and His teachings "as the words of everlasting truth," he added: "The successive revelations of God's will to mankind I believe to be contained in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. These Scriptures were written in languages now extinct, and are the productions of a people widely separated from us, not only by time and distance, but by manners, character and condition. Hence there arises a necessity for human learning and research in order to understand and explain the content of God's word."

W. J. Fox in 1819 had defined the points common to Unitarians and other Christians thus: "(i) That a series of

revelations confirmed by miracles had been made by God to mankind. (ii) That the Old and New Testaments contain an authentic account of those revelations. (iii) That Jesus had a divine commission, that He rose from the dead, and that He will come again to judge the world."

Martineau gradually turned his back on these conceptions of Scripture, expressive of the principle of the Sufficiency of Scripture, partly under the influence of Channing, and partly as the result of his abandonment of the philosophy of Priestley and Belsham, itself derived from Hartley—a movement of thought to be traced hereafter.[1]

In his *Rationale of Religious Inquiry* (1836) Martineau describes the books of the New Testament as "perfectly human, though recording supernatural events." "They are a collection of writings singularly difficult to understand," hence the variety of Protestant interpretations, due to the assumptions with which men approach them. "The Unitarian takes with him the persuasion that nothing can be scriptural which is not rational and universal." The statement that Unitarians reject doctrines "not because they deem them unreasonable, but because they perceive them to be unscriptural," he cannot adopt, since "if they were in the Bible, they would still be incredible."

Plainly, reason is here exalted to a position of authority superior to that of the Bible itself, and this Martineau does not hesitate to affirm. "Against the judgments of the human mind Scripture cannot have any authority." As yet, Christ is still essentially a supernatural Being, who "has achieved the triumph of the tomb." But further movement is now comparatively easy. In the Liverpool controversy of 1839 he distinguished the Johannine discourses from those of the speaker of the Sermon on the Mount, and accepts the miracles of Jesus no longer as proofs of His mission but of His "compassionate impulse." In the words of his biographer:[1] "The old conception of Revelation as a communication of truth, certified by miracles, is practically abandoned. In its place appears a new principle, approached before, now definitely realised: that Revelation is effected through character, that its appeal is to the conscience and affections, and its real seat is a soul." Accordingly we hear for the first time of the "internal or self-evidence of Christianity." In a letter to Mary Carpenter (Feb. 1841) he said: "It seems to me impossible to maintain the authority of Christianity on purely historical and testimonial grounds, and that the internal evidence to which I refer must, to say the least, take the primary place." "The partial fallibility of Christ" he regarded as "perfectly compatible with his own idea of Divine inspiration" (Oct. 1, 1842). In the Bible as a whole he recognised (1845) three systems of morals "at variance with each other," those of Moses, Solomon, and Christ.

It goes almost without saying that Unitarians of the old school did not surrender their positions without a struggle. In 1851 a writer in the *Christian Reformer*, alluding to what he called a "foolish sermon" by Martineau at Hope Street Church, Liverpool, appealed to the authority of Locke, and declared: "By reasonings which have never been confuted, and by Scriptures of unmistakable clearness, that great philosopher has proved that it is the primary article of Christianity that Jesus is the Messiah; that this title is synonymous with 'Son of God'; that it was affirmed not only by Christ's direct words but confirmed by miracles."[2] A fellow-student of Martineau at York probably had him in mind when four years later he wrote: "Brought up in a school in which Locke was the object of traditional veneration—a veneration heightened and justified by reading, reflection, and experience—I have seen with mingled astonishment and pain the attempts recently made to depose

[1] See pp. 248–51.

[1] J. E. Carpenter, *James Martineau*, p. 180.

[2] 1851, p. 615.

the master from his seat of honour, among those from whom better things were to be expected."[1]

"The attempt to confute the theologians of Tübingen out of the *Reasonableness of Christianity* seemed to Martineau," as Dr. Carpenter said, "a childish anachronism." "On the one hand, his critics saw in him the destroyer of revealed religion; on the other, he felt himself entangled in a 'sect enslaved to the letter of Scripture and tradition.' "[2]

Martineau's appointment, however, in 1857 as Professor of "Religious" as well as "Mental and Moral Philosophy" at Manchester New College is said by his interpreter and successor in the Chair, Charles Barnes Upton, to be "very significant," "for it indicates that by 1857 the distinction between 'natural' and 'revealed' religion was in the view of the majority of the supporters of the College losing the meaning which it had in the writings of Priestley, Belsham, and their disciples, and was acquiring the meaning which it now bears in Dr. Martineau's *Seat of Authority in Religion*; that is to say, the word 'revelation' was beginning to signify not some particular historical disclosure authenticated by miracles, but the progressive self-revelation which God makes of His existence and of His character in the divinest experience of the human soul."[3]

The Seat of Authority in Religion, published in 1890, whatever strictures may be passed on its criticism of particular New Testament books or even on its theology as a whole, completed the movement of thought begun more than half a century earlier. The Scottish Free Kirk theologian, reported by Dr. Carpenter,[4] had seized upon its most essential teaching when he thus summed it up: "The whole book comes to this, that the foundations of religion are in

[1] E. Tagart, *Locke's Writings and Philosophy*, p. 6, London, 1855.
[2] *James Martineau*, p. 364.
[3] Drummond and Upton, *Life and Letters of James Martineau*, ii, pp. 290–1.
[4] *James Martineau*, p. 587, *n.* 1.

reason and the conscience, and the heart of man, and that proposition no one can gainsay."

During the years that have passed since 1890 the conviction has been strengthened in the minds of thinkers of many schools that, despite qualifications of the philosophy with which they are associated, these foundations are secure, and Scripture as interpreted by open-minded scholars, of whom Martineau was one, if it does not provide the whole content of God's relations with man, does indisputably yield invaluable material for the study of man's quest for God and the revelation of the Divine through the human.

II. EDUCATION

CHAPTER I

THE NONCONFORMIST ACADEMIES[1]

"In their totality," says Dr. W. A. Shaw, "the academies present a brilliant galaxy of talent in fields of learning far removed from mere theological studies. Such a result could not have been achieved, had it not been for the powerful solvent of intellectual freedom which the Unitarian Movement brought in its train. Few of the academies, whatever their denominational colour at the outset, escaped contact with it, and those of them which assimilated the influence most freely produced great tutors and scholars."[2] In what follows this statement is elucidated, justified, and illustrated.

Unitarian tutors, the descendants, in the main, of the English Presbyterians, inherited a tradition from the ejected ministers of 1662, university men of high academic attainments, who first engaged in the task of preserving university learning for Nonconformists—their liberal interpretation of the scope and character of education, their freedom in the use and criticism of text-books, their toleration of different types of ecclesiastical opinion, their scruples about subscription to dogmatic formulae, and their opening of seminaries to laymen as well as to students of divinity. Hence it was that slowly but surely "modern studies were introduced into a new and isolated branch of education in England," and by the end of the seventeenth century Nonconformists "had made considerable headway in introducing a wider curriculum of modern subjects. Their curriculum had indeed the fault of being too wide and superficial, but in the eighteenth century it was to provide a

[1] For an account of these academies, see McLachlan, *Education Under the Test Acts*, 1931.

[2] *Cambridge History of English Literature*, x, p. 382.

training for some of the first scientists and philosophers in Europe."[1]

It was in the eighteenth century that the movement for intellectual freedom, the concomitant and presupposition of the Unitarian movement, was "reflected in the Dissenting academies—in their feverish zeal for physical and chemical study, as well as in their actual tendency towards Unitarian thought."[2] Other academies besides those in which the tendency named was most marked shared in the general Nonconformist zeal for intellectual freedom, but many of them required subscription from tutors and students, were founded on narrow Calvinist trust-deeds, were controlled by outside Calvinist funds, and most of them excluded laymen. Where there was freedom, or even comparative freedom from authority in religion (e.g. Carmarthen, Taunton, Exeter, Hoxton, Kendal, Northampton, Daventry, Warrington, Manchester New College, and Hackney College), there was noticeable progress in the extension of the curriculum and in the methods of study.

The mingling of lay and divinity students in the academies, and the preparation of men for all the learned professions and for commerce, continued from Rathmell in 1670 to Manchester New College towards the middle of the nineteenth century, when the advent of new university colleges (London and Manchester) offered more ample instruction for laymen, free from the tests of Oxford and Cambridge. It is, however, not a mere coincidence that only in the liberal academies, like those named, were the doors open to laymen. Their presence, not merely of necessity, maintained the need for a curriculum which had others in view besides prospective ministers of religion; it also provided a stimulus, especially during the American War and

[1] G. N. Clark, *The Seventeenth Century*, p. 196.
[2] W. A. Shaw, *Dissenting Academies* in *Encyclopaedia and Dictionary of Education*.

the French Revolution, to free discussions of political and religious problems. The young men lay and ministerial, who pursued their studies together, were united, not chiefly by theological agreement, for the liberal academies were open to men of every Church not excluding that by law established, but by their inherited zeal for emancipation from every bond, civil and religious, and by their belief in freedom as the necessary prelude to the acquisition of truth and the only firm foundation of government.

This, of course, was not without its perils. Liberty degenerated into licence when, as at Warrington, Manchester, and Hackney, discipline was weak or ineffective; but on the whole the gains were greater than the losses where young men of differing types, outlook, and profession were in residence together.

Again, whilst in none of the academies was science neglected, though more prominent in one than another, it was in those where Unitarianism made itself felt that science was pursued with most zest; and, on the contrary, at Attercliffe, an early academy (1670–1720) under a Calvinist tutor, mathematical studies were prohibited "as tending to scepticism and infidelity."

The liberalising influence of Scottish scientific and philosophical teaching upon the academies through students, who went to North Britain and returned to become tutors in their own or other academies, has been shown elsewhere.[1] It need only be added that a high proportion of tutors who had thus been subjected to Scottish influences were Unitarians who proceeded to the northern universities on scholarships provided by the Dr. Williams' Trust, or, at an earlier date, by the Presbyterian Fund.

The broadening of theology in the liberal academies by the acceptance of the principle of "the Sufficiency of the Scriptures" has been discussed elsewhere in this volume.[2]

[1] *Education Under the Test Acts*, pp. 30–3.
[2] See pp. 14 ff.

The oldest of the academies which, during the eighteenth century, came into contact with Unitarian influences is Carmarthen (est. 1672?). Almost from the beginning its students were supported by the Presbyterian Fund (est. 1690), and after 1757, when the Congregational Fund (est. 1695) withdrew its support from lack of sympathy with its liberal theological tone, it became, as it still is, largely dependent upon the older fund. No test or subscription to articles of faith was demanded, and students were drawn from all the Nonconformist Churches and from the Established Church. The broad principles on which the Academy was conducted were clearly enunciated in the report of the visitation, June 21, 1826, which speaks of "permitting and encouraging the utmost freedom of inquiry, and placing no restriction on the open avowal of the honest sentiments students may possess, beyond what may be demanded by the respect and decorum in reference to language and manner, which are due to the all-important subject of religion."

At Carmarthen, however, for more reasons than one, progress in the matter of curriculum was less marked than in other academies of like character in England. One difficulty was peculiar to Carmarthen amongst liberal academies. "The language in which instruction was given was a foreign language to a large percentage of the students."[1] Moreover, many of them were drawn from country congregations, were poor, and ill-prepared for advanced studies. The support of the Academy was also inadequate, and its equipment in books and apparatus left much to be desired. Yet instruction in science was given before 1779, and ten years earlier the Academy became possessed of apparatus as the result of a bequest by an old pupil, the Rev. John Jones, Vicar of Shephill. Most of the students were always men preparing for the ministry, but the records show that

[1] H. P. Roberts, *Nonconformist Academies in Wales*, p. 81.

laymen were also admitted from time to time, and the fact that ministerial students, as in other academies, were destined to keep school tended at least to widen the range of subjects prescribed. It is admitted that "Carmarthen attempted a greater variety of subjects than the denominational academies" in Wales.

Many of its tutors were trained in the Academy, and not a few who became tutors in other academies. It was, indeed, almost imperative that Carmarthen should, in general, supply its own teaching staff, since it suffered the twofold disadvantage of being a liberal seminary in Wales, and therefore not favourably regarded by orthodox Welsh academies, whilst to a large extent necessarily outside the range of help from English academies entertaining similar liberal opinions. Many students of the College entered the Church. In 1910 it was said that fifty-two in all had been ordained.

With the establishment of the University of Wales in 1893 and the affiliation thereto of Carmarthen College, the tutorial staff was increased to four, and bursaries were established for students reading for the B.D. degree. From 1915 to 1919 Principal Walter J. Evans was Dean of the Faculty of Theology in the University.

Probably the scientific teaching at Carmarthen in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries did not amount to much more than a smattering, but it represented, at least, a beginning, and the same may be said of the instruction in other modern subjects. In the older subjects of a theological curriculum of the period, the College was, of course, more efficient, and in men like Dr. David Lloyd and Dr. George Vance Smith it enjoyed the services of principals with more than a local renown.

Taunton Academy (1670?–1719), open to both laymen and divinity students, was founded by Matthew Warren (1642–1706), who is said to have "encouraged the free and

critical study of the Scriptures as the best system of theology." The course was five years. Warren was succeeded by Henry Grove, an old pupil, in 1707. For nine years he taught Ethics and Pneumatology, to which on the resignation of a colleague, Robert Darch, in 1716, he added Mathematics and Physics, and early in 1725, on the death of Stephen James, he took over also Divinity. An excellent English scholar, a contributor to the *Spectator*, and a correspondent of Samuel Clarke, the Arian metaphysician, he avoided the doctrinal disputes of the period, and, in particular, the current speculations on the Trinity, whilst maintaining the liberal atmosphere of the Academy. In theology, like Warren and unlike James, Grove "confined himself to no system but the Scriptures, directing his pupils to the best writers on the several subjects of each lecture, hearing and answering their doubts and objections."[1] In one point he was an innovator, for in the older academies ethics generally went with theology until he made it a separate study.[2] His lectures on Moral Philosophy were published posthumously. From 1725 Grove was assisted by his nephew and former pupil, Thomas Amory (1701–74), an Arian divine who succeeded him as principal tutor in 1758. Dr. Kippis described Amory's learning as "solid, judicious, and extensive. He was well acquainted with ethics, natural and experimental philosophy, and the best ancients, especially the moral writings."

During its long career Taunton Academy was a seminary of very considerable importance. Under Warren, it had the repute of being "one of the most celebrated in all the West, which sent out men of the best sense and figure among the ministers of the county in the Dissenting way."[3]

Under Grove it more than retained its repute. No fewer

[1] *Protestant Dissenter's Magazine*, iii, p. 21 f., London, 1796.
[2] Drummond and Upton, *Life and Letters of J. Martineau*, ii, p. 258. Note by Alx. Gordon.
[3] *Monthly Repository*, xvi, pp. 258–9, 1821.

than one hundred and fifteen men were educated by him. These included two sons of Viscount Barrington; Lord Willoughby of Parham, afterwards President of Warrington Academy; Dr. William Harris the historian; Dr. S. M. Savage, tutor at Hoxton; Micaijah Towgood, tutor at Exeter; and Dr. John Hodge. The last named (August 18, 1767), "as an acknowledgment of the benefits he received during the course of his academical studies, bequeathed to the Academy his valuable library of books." Upon the dissolution of the seminary, they were removed to Exeter.[1]

During the twenty-one years under Amory (1759–59), the Academy hardly maintained its pre-eminence, possibly owing to his lack of attractiveness and his more pronounced theological opinions. Amongst his Unitarian students were Thomas and John Wright of Bristol, Dr. Joseph Jeffries and Francis Webb, who had previously been at Northampton under Doddridge, and after eight years in the General Baptist ministry entered the Diplomatic Service and was engaged in various negotiations with Napoleon.

Many students of Taunton enjoyed grants from the Presbyterian Fund, and for the greater part of its history others received aid from the United Brethren of Devon and Cornwall.

The first Exeter Academy (1690?–1722) under Joseph Hallett was open to laymen and candidates for the ministry. The course was four years. The atmosphere of the Academy was liberal, but "no taint of heresy attached to it until 1710."[2] The subsequent part played by its students, leading up to the Salters' Hall Conference in 1717, and the excellent pioneer textual studies of Joseph Hallett, Jr., pupil and later assistant tutor in the Academy, have been already noted.[3]

Amongst the distinguished students of the Academy were

[1] W. Wilson, *Dissenting Churches*, i, p. 114.
[2] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Hallett, Joseph I.*, by Alx. Gordon.
[3] See pp. 26–27.

Peter King, afterwards Lord Chancellor; John Huxham, F.R.S., who studied later at Leyden; James Foster, the celebrated General Baptist preacher; and John Fox the biographer.

At Hoxton Academy (1701–85) John Eames, F.R.S. (d. 1744), an Independent, taught from 1712 Languages, Mathematics, and Natural Philosophy, to which he added, on the death of his senior colleague, Thomas Ridgley, D.D. (1734), Divinity and Oriental learning. Though quite orthodox, he "was a friend of free inquiry," and was described by his friend Sir Isaac Newton as "the most learned man I ever knew." "He excelled particularly in classical literature and in a profound knowledge of mathematics and natural philosophy."[6] It is claimed for him that he was the first to introduce Anatomy into the curriculum of an academy.[7] His manuscript notes of lectures were used later by tutors in the Academy.

Under David Jennings (1744–62) the classical and mathematical tutor was Samuel Morton Savage, who succeeded him as tutor in Theology in 1762. Whilst Jennings was rigidly orthodox in doctrine, Savage "in his capacity as tutor, acted in a truly liberal spirit; as the friend of truth he encouraged free inquiry, and threw no difficulties in the way of those who honestly pursued their inquiries, though they embraced views different from his own."[8]

Savage "possessed a valuable library"—a consideration of some importance to his students. "He excelled in mathematical science, and with this united a taste for poetry."[9]

Two men appointed (1762) members of the staff of the Academy were scholars of distinction and both heretical in opinion. Andrew Kippis, D.D. (Edin. 1767), F.R.S., F.S.A., a Socinian, and a former student under Doddridge

[6] W. Wilson, *ut supra*, ii, p. 71.
[7] Alex. Gordon, *Addresses, Biographical and Historical*, p. 107.
[8] *Protestant Dissenter's Magazine*, iii, p. 161. [9] Ibid., iii, p. 162.

at Northampton, became tutor in Classics and Belles-lettres, whilst Abraham Rees, D.D. (Edin. 1775), F.R.S., an Arian and an old student of Hoxton, was resident tutor and lectured in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy. Under his tuition, students learnt mechanics, statics, hydrostatics, optics, spherical geometry, and the use of applied mathematics in navigation, geography, and astronomy—a comprehensive course. Kippis, besides teaching classics, lectured on Oratory and the History of Eloquence. He also gave a course on Chronology, and another on the Theory of Language and Universal Grammar. In the former he probably used his friend Priestley's Chart of Chronology, as in the latter he certainly used his printed lectures on the subject. His favourite subject appears to have been the Belles-lettres. In this he did not confine himself to the history of literature and taste, but discussed versification with illustrations, and thus sought to quicken the appreciation of his students for English poetry.

Many distinguished students were trained at Hoxton, including Unitarians like Dr. Joshua Toulmin, the historian, Drs. Cogan, Wright, Harris, Harwood, and Wilton, and Harry Toulmin, eldest son of Dr. Toulmin, who migrated to the United States of America in 1793, studied law, and was appointed Judge of the District Court in the Mississippi Territory, whose laws he codified.

Findern Academy (1710?–1714) was founded by Thomas Hill (*d.* 1720), the son of an ejected minister ordained at Nottingham, April 6, 1703. On August 9, 1712, he was presented at Derby Assizes for keeping school, but the case was dismissed. Classics must have been well taught, for Hill printed in 1715 for his pupils to sing a small collection of Psalms in Latin and Greek verse. Other subjects of instruction were Theology, Logic, Natural Philosophy, and Metaphysics. Four of his pupils enjoyed (1717–20) bursaries from the Presbyterian Fund. His most distinguished pupil

was John Taylor, D.D., the Hebraist and Arian theologian who became the first Divinity tutor at Warrington Academy.

Hill was succeeded in the ministry as tutor by Ebenezer Latham, M.A., M.D., a former student at Shrewsbury Academy and Glasgow University. The course was four years, and the subjects taught included Logic, Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Chronology, Anatomy, Hebrew, Theology, and Antiquities. One of his pupils, who claimed an acquaintance of forty years with him, said that "his chief skill to the last was that of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, for which he was eminently qualified by a penetrating understanding, critical skill in the learned languages, and a good acquaintance with history and antiquity."[1] Elsewhere it is said[2] that "his determined resolution never to make his instructions subservient to a narrow-spirited party and supposed want of entire orthodoxy made several of the Dissenters in London and other places rather averse to sending pupils to him, and the growing reputation of Dr. Doddridge's Academy, together with some pecuniary advantages attending it which Dr. Latham had not, drew many of them who might otherwise have been sent to him to Findern."

Four hundred students are said to have been trained by him, most of whom were not destined for the ministry. Thirty-five theological students received bursaries from the Presbyterian Fund. His most distinguished pupils were William Turner of Wakefield, the friend of Joseph Priestley, and Paul Cardale, the Radical Dissenter of Evesham. Another Unitarian student was Thomas Hartley, minister at Hyde Chapel, 1732–53, who was known as "A New Light," the common name for Arians at that period, and Samuel Stubbs (1715–53), whose library was presented to Manchester New College, was a pupil, who, Latham hoped,

[1] W. Willet, *Memoir of E. Latham*. Prefixed to Sermons, 1774.
[2] MS. account of Dissenting academies . . . in Dr. Williams' library.

would "succeed him in the direction of the seminary" but he prematurely died. With Latham's death in 1754 the Academy was dissolved.

None of the principal tutors of the first Northampton Academy (1729–51), or of its successors at Daventry (1752–89), Northampton (1789–98) and Wymondley (1799–1852) were Unitarians. Nevertheless, in all four academies, though not to an equal extent in each, the influence of Unitarianism was felt, and assistant tutors and students left with Arian or Socinian opinions.

At Northampton, Philip Doddridge, like his tutor John Jennings at Kibworth, encouraged "the greatest freedom of inquiry,"[1] and "was the founder of what might be called a science of comparative theology."[2] His open-minded discussion of views he did not share had results which he cannot have foreseen, and it is admitted that "the transition of Lancashire to Unitarianism was greatly assisted by the Doddridge students."[3]

In several directions Doddridge was a pioneer. Before his time the rule in the academies was that lectures should be in Latin, a legacy from the old universities. He lectured in English, and made his mother tongue the vehicle by which he taught a more modern Science and Divinity. With the full recognition of the claims of English in the academies comes another subject much cultivated in the later academies known as Belles-lettres, defined by Samuel Johnson as "polite literature"; "used somewhat vaguely," adds Webster, "for literary works in which imagination and taste are predominant."

Lectures on English literature in the Latin language would not, anyhow, have proved either easy or profitable. Its study, however, was more than an exercise in the

[1] *Correspondence and Diary of Philip Doddridge*, i, p. 151.
[2] Alex. Gordon, *Addresses, Biographical and Historical*, p. 214.
[3] J. H. Colligan, *The Arian Movement*, p. 71.

English language. It was an evidence of the steady decline in the exclusive hold of classical and Hebrew thought upon the minds of Nonconformists. The line of demarcation between sacred and secular, though still rigidly maintained, was also becoming fainter. The term "Belles-lettres" itself implicitly expressed indebtedness to the France of the eighteenth century, whose language, science, and politics (almost alone of those on the Continent) exercised so potent an influence upon Englishmen, and by no means least upon Protestant Dissenters of a radical cast of doctrine during the last quarter of that century.

Again, the comparatively subordinate position of classics at Northampton, "and the fact that language classes were of the nature of tutorials, indicate that Doddridge in the true realistic spirit condemned excessive study of languages, and did not require more than a general knowledge from a student unless he was preparing for some profession in which specialised knowledge was required."[1] Doddridge's systematic examinations of students, tests taken so indifferently and even carelessly neglected at the old universities, his establishment of an academic library and lectures on its contents, his provision of suitable apparatus for scientific experiments, when "experimental study was not within the province of undergraduates at Oxford and Cambridge,"[2] also marked advances in the direction of modern educational methods.

Amongst Northampton students who served as assistant tutors and manifested Unitarian opinions were John Aikin, D.D., afterwards tutor at Warrington Academy, and Samuel Clark, tutor at Daventry. Other students of similar opinions who became tutors at other academies were Andrew Kippis, D.D., tutor at Hoxton and at Hackney College, and Samuel

[1] T. Parker, *Dissenting Academies*, p. 89.
[2] J. W. Adamson, art. *Education* in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, ix, p. 393.

Merivale, tutor at Exeter, whilst students whose ministry was essentially Unitarian are too numerous to be separately named.

At Daventry the Doddridge tradition was maintained and even carried further. Under Caleb Ashworth (1752–75) "the main stress was laid on dogmatics, philosophy, pneumatology, ethics, and physics."[1] Languages, except Hebrew, of which Ashworth had written a Grammar, were rather neglected. Priestley, the first new student at Daventry, criticised the curriculum on this score, but added: "The Academy was in a state peculiarly favourable to the serious pursuit of truth, as the students were about equally divided upon every question of much importance. . . . The tutors also were of different opinions; Dr. Ashworth taking the orthodox side of every question, and Mr. Clark, the subtutor, that of heresy, though always with the greatest modesty."[2] Samuel Clark, afterwards minister at the Old Meeting, Birmingham, was responsible from 1752–56 for natural and experimental philosophy. Thomas Halliday, an old pupil of the Academy, was appointed assistant classical tutor in 1763 and held office for four years. Noah Hill, mathematical tutor from 1760, succeeded him as tutor in Classics in 1769, but resigned next year to be followed by Thomas Belsham, who taught Mathematics, Logic, and Metaphysics for seven years. From 1775 to 1781 Thomas Robins, a former pupil at Kibworth school under John Aikin, was principal tutor. Much more attention was now given to languages, and the curriculum included, in addition to mathematics, natural philosophy, and anatomy, lectures on Civil Government and Ecclesiastical History. The plan of study reveals the progressive character of the curriculum and the movement from the philological to the philosophical and theological subjects with science as a prominent subject in four of the five years.

[1] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Ashworth, Caleb*, by Alx. Gordon.
[2] Rutt's edition of Priestley's Works, i, pt. i, p. 81.

In 1779 Timothy Kenrick, having finished his course, was appointed tutor in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy —a post he held until 1784, when he accepted a call to the ministry of George's Meeting, Exeter, and received an address of appreciation signed by the twenty-five Divinity students. Later (1799) he became one of the first tutors of the third Exeter Academy.

Doddridge's lectures on Pneumatology, Preaching, and Jewish Antiquities were used by both Ashworth and Robins.

In September 1781 Thomas Belsham was appointed to succeed Robins as Divinity tutor. His chief assistant was William Broadbent, who had entered the Academy as a student in 1777, and afterwards removed with it to Northampton. He became tutor in Classics in 1782, and in Mathematics, Logic, and Natural Philosophy two years later, when the classical tutorship was filled by Eliezer Cogan—another old student of the Academy (entered 1780). Cogan became a most distinguished classical scholar, and after he entered the ministry conducted for thirty-six years a very successful school.[1] By the year 1789 Belsham, who had been steadily advancing in the liberal direction, found himself a Unitarian, and resigned his position as principal tutor.

The peculiar feature of Daventry Academy from the beginning, which evoked the warm admiration of Priestley and his circle, was an object of reproach by orthodox dissenters. Robert Hall, the famous Baptist divine, described Daventry in 1824 as "this vortex of unsanctified speculation and debate," and declared that "the majority of such as are educated there became more distinguished for their learning than for the fervour of their piety, or the purity of their doctrine."[2] Hall's conception of "piety" and of "purity of doctrine" may colour his view of the Daventry

[1] See pp. 129–31.

[2] *Sermons by T. N. Toller*, to which is prefixed a Memoir of the author by Robt. Hall, A. M., pp. 4–5.

alumni, but there is certainly truth in his admission as to their learning. Of 274 students educated there from 1752 to 1789 no fewer than seventeen became tutors at academies, of whom thirteen were Unitarians, whilst of the nine assistant tutors at Daventry all but one, Noah Hill, became Unitarian ministers.

At Northampton (1789–98) the principal tutor was John Horsey, who in his inaugural address outlined the principles he meant to follow: "It is not the design of this institution, and it is very far from my inclination, to usurp any authority over Conscience, or to cherish Bigotry or party zeal. It contributes not a little to the credit of this seminary that it has been conducted for a series of years on generous and liberal principles—principles which I devoutly wish may still be cherished. Freedom of inquiry on all subjects is the birthright and glory of a rational being. In this seminary it has been enjoyed. In this seminary it shall be enjoyed. . . ." Of Horsey as a tutor a pupil observed: "He had a judicious mode of directing the attention to the points on which difficult subjects in metaphysics and divinity hinge, and his plan of lecturing on disputed points was quite exemplary. He was so anxious not to give an undue bias to his youthful auditors that it was very difficult to ascertain in the lecture-room his own precise views in the more controverted subjects."[1]

At Northampton under Horsey laymen were not admitted, a change of policy which neither the tutor nor his predecessor Robins at Daventry approved. The period of study was the same as at Daventry, and the subjects almost unchanged. Doddridge's *Lectures on Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity* remained the theological text-book. Horsey also lectured on Evidences of Christianity, with special reference to Textual Criticism, Moral Philosophy, Logic, and on Government and the British Constitution.

[1] *Monthly Repository*, N.S., iv, p. 609, 1827.

From 1789 to the end of 1791 the tutor in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy was William Broadbent, who afterwards settled at Cairo Street Chapel, Warrington. The advent of his successor, David Saville of Edinburgh, a Calvinist, introduced discord into the Academy. He informed the Coward Trustees, who supported the Academy, that it "was tinctured not a little with Socinian principles." The Trustees, sympathising with the Scotsman and dissatisfied with the drift of the Academy towards heterodoxy, resolved to dissolve it, and on June 15, 1798, communicated their decision to Horsey. Past and present students presented their tutor with a testimonial expressive of their regard for him, and it was inserted in the *Monthly Magazine*.

Of the students whose courses were incomplete, some went to Manchester New College, and the rest (with one exception) went to Glasgow with the assistance of the Dr. Williams' Trust.

Amongst the pupils of Horsey were William Stevenson and William Johns, tutors at Manchester New College; John Bickerton Dewhurst, a fine classical scholar who was designated tutor at the Hackney Unitarian Academy when he died, and Lant Carpenter, LL.D., a distinguished Unitarian minister and schoolmaster at Bristol.[1] It is not without significance that when Horsey's ministry of fifty years at Castle Hill Congregational Church ended with his death his friends, including his son and daughters, seceded and formed the Unitarian Church at Northampton.

At Wymondley (1799–1819) the principal tutor was William Parry, an old student of Homerton Academy (1774–80), who, it was thought, would preserve the Academy from the taint of heresy. Neither he nor any of his six assistant tutors was Unitarian in opinion, though Parry is said to have been "the avowed and unshaken advocate for freedom of inquiry," and did not escape suspicion of

[1] See pp. 151 ff.

being unsound in the faith. The course remained one of five years and the instruction was the same as before. The infection of Unitarianism was by no means stamped out. "Neighbouring Churches held aloof from Wymondley. . . . The students were rarely invited to preach; they could not meet their personal expenses, and some of them got into debt. . . . The taint of Socinianism was on them."[1]

In 1820, the year after Parry's death, two students were expelled. A little later several migrated to Manchester New College, York. Dr. Martineau recalled in 1886 that "they came in a body from Wymondley, swept away thence by a wave of heterodoxy, which almost desolated the place by removing some of its best students."[2]

Amongst the distinguished Unitarian pupils of Horsey were John Philip Malleson (1796–1869), who proceeded to Glasgow, graduated B.A. in 1819, and in 1828 succeeded Dr. Morell as Unitarian minister and schoolmaster at Brighton, and Benjamin Carpenter (1796–1819), minister for thirty-seven years of High Pavement Chapel, Nottingham.

At Kendal Academy (1733–53) the tutor was Caleb Rotheram (1694–1752), a former student at Whitehaven under Thomas Dixon, M.A., M.D., who on his acceptance of the pulpit at Bank Street Chapel, Bolton, in 1725 removed his Academy to that town. In 1743 Rotheram graduated M.A. and D.D. at Edinburgh University. The Academy was recognised by the Presbyterian Fund from the beginning. The course was four years. Students were trained for the learned professions generally, and from first to last about two-thirds of them were laymen.

James Daye, a former pupil of the Academy, described Rotheram as "excellently well qualified as a tutor," "an impartial lover of truth," who "encouraged the most free

[1] A. W. Dale, *History of English Congregationalism*, pp. 596–7.
[2] Address, June 14, 1886, in *Theology and Piety Also Free*, p. 355.

and unbounded inquiry after it, in every branch of science."[1] It is probable that Daye was for a time assistant tutor in the Academy. He was afterwards minister at Lancaster. Other tributes to Rotheram confirm his judgment of his old tutor. Dr. George Benson, a distinguished theologian, speaks of Rotheram as "a considerable scholar in many branches of literature. But he chiefly excelled in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy. . . . He taught the other branches of Philosophy and Divinity with great success."[2] William Turner, one time student at Warrington, "from a perusal of papers in the Doctor's own handwriting," says that "he not only instructed his pupils in the theory of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, but also possessed the happy talent of illustrating them with great success, by means of experiments performed with an extensive, and, for that time, well-constructed apparatus."[3] The apparatus in question had formerly been in the possession of John Horsley, F.R.S., on whose death in 1731 it had been purchased by Rotherham. It is described as "a considerable apparatus in mechanics and hydrostatics." A catalogue of his books, which would be at the service of his pupils, included works on philosophy, history, divinity, and Biblical criticism. In doctrine Rotheram was apparently an Arian, and it is perhaps significant that he possessed the eight folio volumes of *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum quos Unitarios vocant*.

One of his pupils, Thomas Dixon, son of his old tutor at Whitehaven, who afterwards became colleague of Dr. John Taylor at Norwich, is said to have set great store by two quarto volumes of MS. notes in shorthand on the New Testament with which he left Kendal,[4] and he is stated, on the evidence of his writings, to have been "amongst

[1] *Sermon Occasioned by the Death of C. Rotheram, preached at Kendal*, June 14, 1752, p. 19.
[2] *Monthly Repository*, v, p. 218, 1810.
[3] *Memoirs of Winder*, p. 33.
[4] Ibid., p. 326.

the best Scriptural critics and fearless minds of his day."[1]

During the illness of Rotheram in 1752 the Academy was conducted by his assistant, Richard Simpson, a former pupil at Northampton under Doddridge, who continued it for a year after his colleague's death. Shortly after Rotheram's death, however, the Presbyterian Fund students were withdrawn, and, with one exception, sent to Daventry. During the twenty years of its existence there were educated at Kendal one hundred and twenty laymen and fifty-six Divinity students. Amongst the latter were many who became Unitarian ministers, and two who were appointed tutors at Unitarian academies—John Seddon, tutor at Warrington, and George Walker, F.R.S., tutor at Warrington and Manchester New College.

The apparatus of the Academy was acquired by the Trustees of Warrington Academy, and on the dissolution of that institution was transferred to Hackney College in 1786.

Warrington Academy (1757–86), established by Unitarians, was open to young men of all religious opinions preparing for civil or ministerial life. No academy had so large a proportion of lay students. Of three hundred and ninety-three educated during the less than thirty years of life which the Academy enjoyed, only fifty-five were Divinity students, of whom twenty were assisted by the Presbyterian Fund. The full course of study was one of five years, but for men "intended for a life of Business and Commerce" a course of three years was arranged. Their curriculum included Mathematics, French, Natural Philosophy, English, and Commercial subjects. In addition to the first four subjects named, Divinity students were taught Hebrew, New Testament Greek, Philosophy, Belles-lettres, Classics, Homiletics, Jewish Antiquities, Church History, and Chemistry. The tutors included Divinity: John Taylor, D.D., 1757–67; John Aikin, D.D., 1761–80;

[1] F. Baker, *Nonconformity in Bolton*, p. 54.

Nicholas Clayton, D.D., 1780–83. Classics: John Aikin, D.D., 1757–61; Languages and Belles-lettres: Joseph Priestley, LL.D., 1761–67; Languages and Natural History: J. Reinhold Forster, LL.D., 1767–70. Belles-lettres: John Seddon; Gilbert Wakefield, A.B., 1779–85; Pendlebury Houghton, 1778–79; Natural Philosophy and Mathematics: John Holt, 1757–72; George Walker, F.R.S., 1772–74; W. Enfield, LL.D., 1774–83. Rector Academicus: John Seddon, 1767–70; W. Enfield, 1770–83. Almost without exception these were men of distinction. Other teachers at different times included Frenchmen. Only at Warrington does French seem to have formed part of the regular curriculum of an academy, and there alone a Frenchman was appointed to teach it. "The weak point in Nonconformist academies, however, was the treatment or non-treatment of History which rarely appears in the schemes of lectures, except under the denomination of Chronology, and this was largely Biblical. Sacred history was to some extent dealt with incidentally under the head of Jewish Antiquities, but ecclesiastical history was not treated, nor history of doctrine."[1] History, indeed, in any proper sense as a fully recognised subject of university study, belongs to the nineteenth century. In history and geography, Priestley at Warrington was a pioneer, and his place in the van has now been generally recognised. He gives his reason for his innovation. It was "in consequence of observing that, though most of our pupils were young men designed for situations in civil and active life, every article in the plan of their education was adapted to the learned professions." To further the new studies, Priestley published in 1765 his *Essay on a Course of Liberal Education for Civil and Active Life*, with "Syllabuses of the three new courses of lectures" on "History and General Policy," on the "Laws and Constitution of England," and on the

[1] Alx. Gordon, *Addresses, Biographical and Historical*, p. 77.

"History of England." The numerous text-books written by the tutors and their contributions to learning during and after the period of the Academy afford ample testimony to their scholarship. The Academy was fortunate in having at Warrington in William Eyres (1741–1809) a printer of more than common merit, from whose press issued text-books and other works by the tutors as well as numerous works by them and other scholars, including maps, charts, classical, scientific, literary, and homiletic publications intended for more general circulation. One of the chief reasons for the dissolution of the Academy was the wild conduct of the students, especially those from the West Indies. Happily, as the record of their careers fully proves, many students from first to last were men of character, and not a few of distinction, in medicine, law, literature, journalism, politics, and divinity. As a recent leader in *The Times* observed (August 5, 1932): "If its influence could be fully traced the ramifications would seem extraordinary for so small an institution. It bore no mean witness to the principle that men and not money make an academy."

The second Exeter Academy (1760–71) was opened "for the purpose of educating young persons for the ministry and other learned professions as well as for commercial life."[1] The tutors were Samuel Merivale (1715–71), Micaijah Towgood (1700–82), and John Turner (*d.* 1769). Merivale, a friend and correspondent of Nathaniel Lardner, and "equalled by few of his contemporaries in various branches of learning,"[2] is thus described by one of his pupils: "As a tutor he was diligent, communicative, and patient of opposition. . . . From a sincere zeal for truth he permitted his own opinions to be thoroughly canvassed; concealing no objections to them which might have escaped the notice of his pupils; always endeavoured to give the most im-

[1] James Manning, *Life of M. Towgood*, p. 64.
[2] *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1793.

partial view of every side of a question, and recommended an absolute and unbiassed field of inquiry."[1] His parents had been Calvinist Baptists, but he became an Arian and finally a Socinian. He was a contributor to the *Theological Repository*, edited by Joseph Priestley. Unlike most tutors, Merivale was in easy circumstances, his marriage in 1748 having brought him a modest fortune. An old pupil of Northampton under Doddridge, he was influenced by his educational ideas and used his system of theology to which he added many notes and references.

Micaijah Towgood was an old student of Taunton under Henry Grove. His *Dissenting Gentleman's Letters*, 1746–48, in defence of the principles of Dissent, ran into several editions and was very highly esteemed. His particular interest in the Academy was Biblical interpretation. John Turner, a pupil of Hoxton under Dr. Jennings, lectured in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy during the first nine years of the existence of the Academy. He was succeeded (1770) by Thomas Jervis (1748–1833), another former student at Hoxton, who also discharged the duties of classical tutor. His abilities led to his appointment (1772) as tutor to the two sons of the Earl of Shelburne, in which capacity he was associated with Joseph Priestley, then librarian to that peer. From 1810 to 1818 he was minister of Mill Hill Chapel, Leeds. The course at the Academy was five years. Its library consisted of the valuable books removed from the Taunton Academy on its dissolution in 1759, a collection augmented by the bequest of the Rev. John Hodge, D.D. (*d.* 1767), a former distinguished pupil at Taunton.

The total number of students educated at Exeter in the eleven years of its existence was forty-eight, of whom twelve only entered the ministry. Other students went into medicine, law, trade, the army, and the navy. Joseph Bretland,

[1] Joseph Bretland, *Sermons*, ii, p. 43, 1802.

afterwards tutor at the third Exeter Academy, and John Pope, afterwards tutor at Hackney College, were amongst the theological students. Philip Taylor, grandson of Dr. John Taylor, removed from the Academy in 1766 to Warrington with the exhibition from the Presbyterian Fund which he enjoyed at Exeter. From 1761 to 1769 nine students were assisted by the fund.

At the third Exeter Academy (1797–1805) the principal tutor was Timothy Kenrick, minister of George's Meeting, Exeter, formerly student and then tutor at Daventry Academy. He obtained the loan of the library and apparatus of the second Exeter Academy, and the valuable assistance of Joseph Bretland, an old student under Merivale, who had conducted a classical school in the city (1775–90) and, like Kenrick himself, had received and declined an invitation from the trustees of Manchester New College to become tutor in Theology there.

Students were admitted between the ages of sixteen and twenty-three, and a society was established to provide their support. Kenrick and Bretland jointly taught Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Bretland was responsible for "Geography, the Use of the Globes, Geometry, Algebra, and other branches of the Mathematics." He also "read lectures on General Grammar, Oratory, and History." Kenrick lectured on Logic, Metaphysics, and Morals; the Evidences, Doctrines, and Duties of Natural and Revealed Religion; Jewish Antiquities and Ecclesiastical History, and "gave critical lectures on the New Testament." His *Exposition of the Historical Writings of the New Testament*, transcribed from shorthand notes and published posthumously (3 vols. 1807, 2nd edit. 1824) is a work of considerable value.

As a tutor Kenrick "encouraged the inquiries of his pupils, and gained their love without forfeiting their respect." English Composition and Elocution were taken through the whole course, which was five years for students

in Divinity, and "three years for persons intended for other professions and employments." Of Bretland it was said by one of his pupils that "in mathematical learning he was no common proficient, and he had a taste especially for the reasonings and investigations of geometry, the influence of which in the general cast of his compositions it was not difficult to perceive."[1]

The Academy was open to pupils of any religious denomination, no assent to articles of faith was required, and students were allowed "to attend whatever places of worship their friends might approve." "In general, the course of instruction and discipline pursued resembled that which had been followed with success at Daventry."[2] Kenrick, however, did not accept Doddridge's lectures as his text-book, being "convinced of the necessity of deriving Christian truth from the unpolluted fountain of the Scriptures."[3]

When the Academy closed, March 25, 1805, following the premature death of Kenrick in the previous year, eleven students had been educated, and four others, including John Kenrick, Timothy's son, received part of their education.

Hackney College (1786–96), an institutional Academy like Warrington, its predecessor, and Manchester New College, its contemporary, was planned on a generous scale. It was liberally supported, nobly housed, amply equipped, and well staffed. It opened with four tutors, soon increased to six. During the ten years of its life no fewer than thirteen tutors were appointed, excluding teachers of French and Elocution, but only one, Dr. Rees, was on the staff from first to last. This succession of distinguished tutors included men of ripe experience like Abraham Rees, D.D., F.R.S., and Andrew Kippis, D.D., F.R.S., F.S.A., formerly tutors at Hoxton; Gilbert Wakefield, B.A., and Joseph Priestley,

[1] *Monthly Repository*, xiv, p. 474, 1819.
[2] *Memoir of T. Kenrick*, prefixed to *Exposition of Historical Writing of New Testament*, I, p. xx. [3] Ibid., p. xlv.

LL.D., who had taught at Warrington; Thomas Belsham, and Hugh Worthington, formerly on the staff at Daventry; Richard Price, D.D., LL.D., the famous mathematician; John Pope, an old student of Exeter under Merivale; and John Corrie, F.R.S.

The Academy was open to all, and the education was designed to be "comprehensive and liberal, and adapted to youth in general, whether they are intended for civil and commercial life, or for any one of the learned professions." The course was, for Divinity students five years, and for lay-students three years, with an extension if desired. As the number of students increased, laymen became far more numerous than Divinity students. Several Anglicans and at least one Roman Catholic came into residence.

The curriculum varied slightly from time to time, but for several years included Mathematics, Ancient Geography, Mythology, Roman Antiquities, Universal Grammar, Rhetoric and Criticism, Chronology, History, the General Principles of Law and Government and the English Constitution, Theology, Classics, Hebrew, Astronomy, and Natural Philosophy.

Dr. Priestley, after being driven from Birmingham by the Riots, generously offered to assist the College by delivering gratis the lectures on Chemistry and History formerly given at Warrington. From 1790 Belsham lectured to a class of thirty on Logic, Metaphysics, the Evidences of Religion, and the New Testament. He also gave a course on shorthand. French and modern languages generally were always an "extra" for which a special fee was charged. At morning prayers Divinity students were expected to translate the prescribed portions from the original tongues of the Old and New Testaments.

The library was that of the second Exeter Academy which was loaned to the College. The apparatus came from Warrington Academy.

The College appealed to young men of idealistic temperament. One, Thomas Dix Hincks, who had been four years at Trinity College, Dublin, left without graduating, crossed the Channel, purchased a horse, rode the whole way, and sold the animal at the end of the journey in order that he might not lose the first session. Unhappily, the weakness of the administration in the matter of discipline, the ferment of political opinions within and without the College during a period of revolutions, the controversies of one tutor with his colleagues and the Committee of the institution, and the injudicious expenditure on building schemes, completely wrecked the College.

The students included Charles Wellbeloved, tutor at York, John Jones, LL.D., Thomas Dix Hincks, LL.D., John Kentish, Jeremiah Joyce, and John Rowe, all of whom became influential Unitarian divines. Eleven students received exhibitions from the Presbyterian Fund.

The premature fate of the College dismayed Unitarians and delighted their adversaries. The feelings of many Unitarians were expressed by Samuel Kenrick, an uncle of Timothy Kenrick the Exeter tutor, who lamented "the fall of Hackney, rising from the ashes of Warrington, under the direction of the most virtuous, the most enlightened, and the most public-spirited men of the age." In a fine passage Thomas Belsham declared: "The spirit of the times was against it; it fell—and the birds of night, ignorance and envy, bigotry and rancour screamed their ungenerous triumph over the ruins of this stately edifice; whilst virtue, truth, and learning mourned in secret over the disappointment of their fond hopes and of their too highly exalted expectation."

From an academic point of view, Hackney College was no unworthy successor of Warrington, Exeter, and Hoxton. As Augustine Birrell said:[1] "As things went in England

[1] Hazlitt, *English Men of Letters*, p. 25.

in 1793, Hackney College was a better Studium Generale than either Oxford or Cambridge at the same date."

Of Manchester College (1786–1889) a full account has recently been published.[2] Its record is an honourable one, and the publications of its teachers and pupils constitute a corpus of works on philosophy, Biblical criticism, history, doctrine, and comparative religion of which any university college might well be proud. Some of these are noticed elsewhere.[3] The College has ably maintained the fine traditions of the Warrington Academy out of which it sprang and whose library it inherited. From Manchester (1786–1803), York (1803–40), Manchester (1840–53), London (1853–89), and Oxford (1889–) have gone forth a succession of ministers and laymen who have taken a conspicuous part in English civil and religious life. It was the first dissenting college affiliated (1840) with the University of London. Edward Caird was Visitor to the College (1902–08), and gave to it "his unflinching moral support," saying of its action in retaining a member of the Church of England among its teachers: "This truly proves that Manchester College is the most truly liberal institution in the country."[4] Its historian rightly remarks: "The College, dedicated 'to Truth, to Liberty, to Religion,' had its origin in the religion of the Founders and their faith in spiritual freedom, the result of which the whole course of this record has served to illustrate."[5]

[1] V. D. Davis, *The History of Manchester College*, 1932.
[2] See pp. 153 ff.
[3] Sir Henry Jones and J. H. Muirhead, *The Life and Philosophy of Edward Caird*, p. 130, Glasgow, 1921.
[4] V. D. Davis, *ut supra*, p. 197.

CHAPTER II

SCHOOLS

"The ministers of the older Dissent," said Alexander Gordon, "not merely in some cases but as a general rule, were the educators in their several neighbourhoods."[1] Clearly, then, in what follows it will be impossible from the nature of the case, not less than from the scanty extant records of their activities, to review more than a selection of the schools established by liberal Nonconformist divines during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

There were three chief reasons for their existence. It was necessary to give what was often called "grammar learning" to youths who were being prepared to enter the academies, and so to continue the succession of Nonconformist ministers. The older Grammar Schools were in the hands of the clergy of the Established Church and therefore closed to all boys, whether destined for the civil or religious life, whose parents scrupled about exposing them to the influence of Anglican doctrine. Last, but not least, the salaries of Dissenting ministers were so meagre as to compel them to supplement their income in almost the only way open to them, namely, by keeping school.

At Taunton, where the historian and biographer Joshua Toulmin (1740–1815) was minister from 1765 to 1803, the salary was so small that he kept a school and his wife carried on a bookseller's shop. Both had to be given up in 1791, when, in common with many Unitarian divines, Toulmin suffered at the hands of a mob for his liberal political opinions. His most distinguished pupil was John Towill Rutt, the editor of Priestley's works.

At Alcester, Benjamin Maurice (1747–1814), a former

[1] *Addresses, Biographical and Historical*, p. 5.

pupil under Dr. Jenkins at Carmarthen Academy, during a ministry of twenty-nine years had a stipend of little more than £20, though, *mirabile dictu*, he "left behind him a sufficiency to cover the expenses of his funeral"—always a primary obligation on the religious-minded then and much later—and also a few small legacies for some worthy women more impoverished than himself. At Colyton, Joseph Cornish (1750–1823), a pupil of Hoxton Academy, during his ministry of half a century (1775–1823) seldom had a salary of more than £40, and though in the West of England during the early part of that period a minister could board with one of his members for £20 a year, or in a farm-house for something less with a horse gratuitously at his service for visitation purposes, the margin left for other necessaries of life was too slender to be tolerable—to say nothing of the cost of books, the coveted and, in days before lending libraries, the necessary possession of cultured ministers. At Needham Market, Suffolk (1755–61), Joseph Priestley had an income of £40 a year, and, as he confessed,[1] "was barely able, with the greatest economy, to keep out of debt." In February 1814 a Presbyterian minister complained that his father, also in the ministry, had a salary "never less and often more than that which is paid to me," and *he* lived in days when "butcher's meat was threepence per pound, bread not a penny, butter seldom higher than sixpence, and poultry and other articles of consumption of proportionate prices." The war with France caused paper money to depreciate and raised the cost of living, so that in the early years of the nineteenth century dissenting ministers were worse rather than better off as compared with their predecessors. The querulous scribe, already quoted, found himself, therefore, half against his will, compelled to keep school. As late as 1841 nearly half a total ministerial salary of £100 was derived from pupils'

[1] Rutt's edition of Priestley's works, I, i, p. 43.

fees. "In 1777 the minister's stipend at Kaye Street, Liverpool, was actually £150 a year! Wedgwood called it a 'fat living,' and compared it to a 'Bishopric.' Probably no other minister in the denomination at that date got so much."[1] It often happened, indeed, that a congregation which could afford to maintain a minister fairly handsomely preferred to adopt the plan of engaging two ministers at salaries which, unaugmented, kept both in some degree of penury. Whether this practice was good or bad for the congregation, it was assuredly good for the promotion of liberal education, for, by dividing the ministerial services between two men, it afforded leisure for the junior colleague whilst at the same time providing him with a strong incentive to employ it profitably. Again, the stipends of ministers were often irregular and varied in amount. At Chesterfield in 1737 the salary varied from £35 to £40, in 1753 it was £30, and Thomas Astley, appointed in 1773, had £80, but kept school. Even when salaries reached as much as £90 a year, with a manse in addition—the size of which sometimes suggested the need of turning its accommodation to account—ministers were provided with a motive, and the lack of suitable secondary schools gave them an opportunity to establish and maintain schools, or academies, as they were often grandiloquently called, in most towns and many villages throughout the country.

Such schools were by no means the exclusive monopoly of the so-called Presbyterians, the ancestors of modern Unitarians. Independents, Friends, and Baptists had their schools, some of which, like those of Stephen Addington the Independent at Harborough (1718–81), and of the Rylands, Baptists, at Warwick, Northampton, and Exeter from 1745 for half a century, enjoyed more than a local reputation. Nevertheless, as a minister born in 1785 proudly said: "It was one of the incidental blessings for which our country

[1] McLachlan, *Alexander Gordon: A Biography*, p. 111.

ought to thank the old English Presbyterians and their ministers that, with the exception of the old Grammar Schools, the private schools of those ministers were almost the only places of instruction for the children of the middle and upper classes, and it was by them that the range of education was extended beyond that which the old Grammar Schools afforded, and by them the chief improvements in education were successively made. The beneficed clergy of that day seldom devoted themselves to this task, and ministers of other denominations were rarely competent to it. It was the Presbyterian ministers who were in the main the educators of our gentry and professional and commercial classes in those days."

Even when some deduction has been made for the writer's partiality as one of the teachers, the story of the schools kept by Presbyterian divines affords ample justification for his statement, and, in particular, for the latter part of it. What the academies did in the realm of university scholarship as compared with the ancient seats of learning[1] was effected in secondary education by the Presbyterian schools in comparison with the old endowed Grammar Schools. "By them the stream of learning and the currents of thinking were kept in motion."[2]

Many tutors in academies had previously kept school, and, though naturally fewer in number, tutors who returned to the ministry took in pupils. Thus John Aikin, D.D. (1713–80), and Joseph Priestley, LL.D. (1733–1804), of the Warrington Academy, had been schoolmasters at Kibworth and Nantwich respectively; Ralph Harrison (1748–1801), tutor at Manchester College, had kept school for a dozen years in Manchester, and Joseph Bretland (1742–1819) of the third Exeter Academy had been a schoolmaster for seventeen years in that city. Charles Wellbeloved conducted

[1] H. McLachlan, *Education Under the Test Acts*, pp. 16–44.
[2] Als. Gordon, *Addresses, Biographical and Historical*, p. xvi.

a school from 1793 to 1803 before becoming tutor at Manchester College, York; John Pope (1743–1802) of Hackney College had taught at Stand, near Manchester, and Thomas Morell, LL.D. (1775–1840), of the Unitarian Academy, Hackney, at Exeter and elsewhere; John Relly Beard, D.D. (1800–76), before his appointment as First Principal of the Unitarian Home Missionary Board, Manchester, was for many years a schoolmaster, and David Lewis Evans (1815–1902) had a school at Colyton when he joined the staff of Carmarthen College. On the other hand, Pendlebury Houghton after serving as assistant tutor at Daventry Academy had a school at Norwich; John Corrie, F.R.S. (1769–1834), one time tutor at Hackney College, kept school at Birmingham; William Johns (1772–1845) after being classical tutor at Manchester College established a school in Manchester, and Dr. Morell after his tutorship at Hackney Academy returned to the ministry and to teaching at Brighton. Instances might be multiplied.

The singular relation of Carmarthen College with the Welsh schools is illustrated from the fact that David Evans (1719–1823), a pupil of Carmarthen Academy, left the Academy for a year in 1760 in order to assist Josiah Rees, of Gellionen, returning to resume his studies which he completed in 1765. Josiah Rees, who successfully conducted a school from 1763 to 1783, was, it may be added, the editor of one of the first Welsh periodicals (1770). Occasionally some deduction from the course of academical study was allowed in consideration of the pupil's previous training at school. Joseph Priestley, who entered Daventry Academy in 1752, "was excused all the studies of the first year and a great part of those of the second"[1] for this reason, and Lant Carpenter, when he became a student of Northampton Academy under John Horsey in 1797, was considered "as having passed one year of the pre-

[1] Rutt's edition of Priestley's *Works*, I, i, p. 15.

scribed course of five sessions"[1] in view of his two years' study at Kidderminster under William Blake, an old student of Northampton Academy.

The academies, then, regularly provided teachers of the Dissenting schools, which in turn sent many of their pupils to the academies. Now and again a few academies, like Warrington, for a short period attempted to provide the necessarily preliminary training for their students by admitting boys of fourteen and even under, but the experiments proved unsuccessful, and the academies were generally content to rely for candidates upon schools conducted by their old pupils or by those of other similar seminaries. One consequence of this close connection of academy and school is obvious. Every advance in the standard of education in the one involved more or less a corresponding movement in the other. Hence it came to pass that the schools of the English Presbyterian ministers often provided an education much superior to that of the old Grammar Schools, content to remain in the ruts well worn by the ancient classical traditions. As late as the third decade of last century, Dr. John Relly Beard (1800–76), an old pupil of Manchester New College, York, and for thirty years in charge of a school in Manchester, was recognised as an educational reformer. W. H. Herford, a well-known educational pioneer and early disciple of Froebel and Pestalozzi, always acknowledged his obligations to his old teacher. Writing to Dr. Beard in 1876, he said: "My indebtedness to you begins about 1835, when I came to your school, having till then been gnawing—with particularly little appetite—'the asinine meal of sow-thistles and brambles,' as Milton calls it, meaning thereby the classical and mathematical education *more majorum* at the Manchester Grammar School! The introduction to literature, the rational geometry, and the natural science which

[1] *Life of Lant Carpenter*, ed. by R. L. Carpenter, p. 18.

you provided for me, were all openings up of rich feasts, after starvation. Myself, as you know, pretty much of an idealist in education, I shall always look upon you as one of the 'Reformers before the Reformation.'"[1] Amongst Beard's assistants, it may be added, were a Scotsman named Peter Livingstone and a German named Crains.

The appeal of these schools extended far beyond the limits of the denomination to which the teachers belonged, and one of the problems which still awaits solution by modern educationalists seems to have been solved as early as the eighteenth century. Thus the Presbyterian minister, already quoted, speaking of his school in the West of England, observes: "I had children of all religious denominations, including Catholics, Quakers, and Jews, and never experienced any religious difficulty. My school was non-sectarian—indeed, non-theological and non-doctrinal—and would by some be designated non-religious, for I did not even use the Scriptures in the school." Clearly, it was only on this foundation principle of unsectarianism that schools could be conducted by Unitarian ministers, and no school is known to the writer in which doctrinal opinions consonant with those of the teacher were to be accepted as a condition of entrance. Matthew Anstis (1740–1823), an old student of Carmarthen Academy, after a brief ministry at Colyton (1766–68), was actually invited by the Corporation of Bridport to undertake a school in that town. Both day boys and boarders were admitted, and some of the principal families sent their children. After his retirement from the ministry Anstis took occasional services and was a frequent contributor to *The Monthly Repository*.

Ralph Harrison, minister at Cross Street Chapel, Manchester, kept school from 1774 to 1786, when he became classical tutor at Manchester College. In the Memoir of his father, William Henry, M.D., F.R.S., Copley Medallist,

[1] MS. letter.

a pupil at the school, Dr. Charles Henry says: "Harrison's repute as a teacher of the ancient languages was so widely spread as to draw to Manchester sons of persons of rank at a distance, and, among others, those of the Marquis of Waterford, attended by their accomplished tutor, M. de Pelier."[1]

David Davis (1745–1827), the Welsh poet, for forty-four years (1783–1827) provided[2] not only the sons of Dissenters but also of many Churchmen with an excellent education, and for many years a large part of the candidates for ordination in the diocese of St. David's were young men from his school, until Bishop Horsley, the able antagonist of Joseph Priestley, alarmed by this fact, determined that no candidate from a Dissenting school should receive ordination. Davis could boast that "in the course of twenty years he sent above twenty students to the academies, four of whom had become tutors, two at Carmarthen, one at Manchester, and one at Oswestry." Owing to the number of pupils and the scanty accommodation of the school, the older scholars, it is said, were allowed "to study out of doors in the open air, bringing in their lessons when prepared."

James Lindsay (1753–1821), a graduate of King's College, Aberdeen, and minister (1783–1821) at Monkwell Presbyterian Church, kept a school at Newington Green, which he removed to Bow, Middlesex, in 1805, the year in which his university conferred on him the degree of D.D. One of his pupils in residence at Bow (1809–12) was William Page Wood, afterwards Lord Chancellor Hatherley, whose brother had preceded him at Bow. From him we learn that both regularly attended Bow Church, "as did the majority of the boys belonging to the school." At Liverpool in 1813 another school is described in which "most of the pupils are sons of parents who attend the Established Church."

[1] *A Biographical Account of the late William Henry*, p. 5, Manchester, 1837.
[2] At Castellhywel, Cardiganshire.

Schools varied greatly, as we may naturally suppose, in size, and many of them were quite small, the earliest particularly so, affording little more than provision for the private tuition of a few pupils ambitions to enter upon a professional career. Not a few of the schools were confined to day boys, but almost as many seem to have taken in boarders or admitted both types of pupils. Mixed schools were the exception, and the number of schools for girls was inadequate, a fact not surprising in the light of the predominant opinion in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century of the proper sphere and influence of women. Indeed, not until the present century, when careers in commerce and the professions were opened to women, did schools for girls in general offer a curriculum equal to that provided elsewhere for boys. Such schools for girls as dissenting ministers conducted in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, for reasons springing directly from their religious convictions, hardly met the need in circles of middle- and upper-class society for "accomplishments for the purpose of ornament," and therefore represented an advance in the direction of the more sensible education provided in modern schools. One school towards the beginning of last century began with day boys only. The minister was then induced to admit boarders also, and, on his removal to another congregation, opened the school to girls. Finally, as girls became more numerous than boys, he converted his school into one for girls only.

The highest number of pupils in a school (between sixty and seventy) may well have been in that of Eliezer Cogan (1762–1853), which he conducted for thirty-six years (1792–1828), mostly at Walthamstow whilst in the ministry there. It was after his removal to Walthamstow in 1801 that the school became famous. He was compelled to enlarge his house at Higham Hill to accommodate the increasing number of pupils, and at one time refused as many as

twenty applicants for admission. In addition to boarders he also admitted a few day boys.

Joseph Cornish at Colyton (1782–1819) had for a period forty boarders, and John Jones (1780–1813), an old student of Carmarthen and Manchester New College, York, who opened with two pupils, soon had an equal number in his school at Plymouth (1810–12), whilst Robert Kell at Wareham (1787–99) had "upwards of thirty boarders, besides day scholars."

In general, the number of scholars was smaller than the figures given, and much must always have depended upon the capacity of the manse or upon the success of the school enabling the minister to hire or purchase a suitably commodious building. The prospects of establishing or taking over a school were, as a matter of course, always carefully weighed in the balance by a minister contemplating removal from one congregation to another.

Occasionally, though less frequently than the older and more responsible youths in academies, pupils moved from one teacher to another. Samuel Wood (1797–1849) was first with William Johns in Manchester, then with William Broadbent at Warrington, and finally with William Shepherd at Liverpool, whence he proceeded to Glasgow and graduated before entering Manchester New College, York, in preparation for the ministry. All his teachers were men of some distinction. William Johns (1772–1845) was a pupil at Northampton Academy under John Horsey, for a year classical tutor at Manchester College, Manchester, and for some time joint secretary with his friend John Dalton of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society. William Broadbent (1755–1827) was a student at Daventry Academy, and later classical tutor there and at Northampton. Of William Shepherd and his school at Liverpool mention must be made later.

One reason for these peregrinations of pupils was that

the subjects of instruction were not precisely the same in all schools, and were never quite unrelated to the characteristic features of the academy in which the teacher had been trained.

In the earlier part of the eighteenth century the chief stress was laid upon Classics, especially Latin, the language in the academies until the time of Doddridge,[1] in which most text-books and manuals were written. To training in Classics were added such preparatory studies as best served the needs of pupils passing on into the academies. As some scholars, however, even from the first were destined for commercial careers, there was a certain stock of subjects in which all received instruction, and, with the development of the curriculum in the academies, that of the schools, as already indicated, tended to be widened and deepened, especially on what is now called "the modern side." Amongst the usual subjects taught were Latin, French, Mathematics, English, and sometimes even Dancing —the whole blessed with much admonition to cultivate a moral and religious life.

Samuel Catlow (*d.* 1820), an old student of Daventry Academy under Thomas Robins, whilst minister at Mansfield (1785–1798), conducted a successful boarding school. He continued the school after his ministry ended, and did not resume ministerial work until 1819, at Hampstead. The school was held in what is still called "Cromwell House," the former residence of John Cromwell, the ejected minister of Clayworth, who was licensed in 1672 "to be a Pr. Teacher in his howse at Mansfield."[2] Catlow's property, "situated in West-gate," was extensive, and his name was given to a street afterwards made upon it, now called St. John Street. In 1789 he published an *Outline of His Plan of Education*. Pupils were admitted to the school at ten or twelve years

[1] McLachlan, *Education Under the Test Acts*, p. 21.
[2] G. Lyon Turner, *Original Records of Early Nonconformity*, ii. 716.

of age, and were then taught "English Language, Writing, Commercial Accounts, Classics, and French." To these subjects older scholars added, "Composition, Geography, Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, and Moral and Religious Instruction," whilst those "designed for the Pulpit were also taught Hebrew." The amenities of the school were said to include "Conveniences for Dancing, the Military Exercises, and Cold Bathing." There were two vacations of a month each, at midsummer and Christmas. "Military Exercises" are presumably to be understood in the light of the exigencies of the Napoleonic War as corresponding to the activities of the modern cadet corps. At Walthamstow the schoolmaster "enabled his pupils to read the best classical authors in both prose and poetry, whilst Latin and Greek composition always formed a part of the duties of the school." Here, however, according to an old pupil, science, literature, history, and commercial subjects were rather neglected. "Feeble though conscientious attempts were made to teach a little geography and French; Goldsmith's *History of England* was read over regularly, from beginning to end, two or three times a year; and there was a drawing and dancing as well as music-master provided, as extras for those boys ordained to benefit thereby."[1] The writer, none the less, admitted that Cogan "took a world of pains to keep his pupils abreast of the scholarship of the day." An old student of Daventry Academy, Eliezer Cogan, had been classical tutor there and declined an invitation to fill a similar position at Manchester College. Thomas Belsham described him as "one of the most learned Dissenting ministers of his day," and Dr. Samuel Parr, the Whig Episcopalian pedagogue, said: "I know Mr. Cogan to be an accurate Greek scholar, and a diligent and discriminating reader of the best critical books which have of late been published at Berlin, Leyden, Göttingen, Leipsig, and Paris,

[1] Henry Solly, *These Eighty Years*, i. 81, London, 1893.

and at home by Porson, Blomfield, Gaisford, and Elmsley." The school possessed an excellent library regularly replenished with new publications. Wednesdays and Saturdays were half-holidays, and games were greatly encouraged, though, singularly enough, not football. Cogan was so punctual and methodical in habit that "the farm labourers in the neighbouring fields were accustomed to take their time from him as he took his daily ride at noon." "Never a severe disciplinarian, he looked on the flogging system as equally useless and inhuman, arguing, 'You can never whip brains into a dull boy, and a clever boy will do better without than with the whip.'" Moral offences he severely punished. Henry Solly relates that "one of the younger boys was convicted of theft and publicly flogged with great solemnity by Mr. Cogan, after a few earnest words, the only time that punishment was inflicted while I was at school." Cogan was remarkably successful with his pupils. One was Benjamin Disraeli, who entered at thirteen and stayed three or four years. Of his reading as a pupil he left an account—somewhat exaggerated, say his biographers[1]—in a diary disfigured by blunders in Greek accidence, and his master once said of him: "I don't like him. I never could get him to understand the subjunctive."[2] In a tribute to Cogan, Disraeli said: "Though a very reserved, shy, calm man, his whole being became animated when he was interpreting a great classic writer."[3] Solly tells us that "the future statesman slept in the same room with my brothers, and I have heard them describe how he would sometimes keep all its occupants listening to the marvellous stories he would tell them long after the one candle was put out." "The boys who were members of the Church of England had to walk some distance on Sundays to attend

[1] Monypenny and Buckle, *Life of Benjamin Disraeli*, i, p. 51, London, 1929. [2] P. W. Clayden, *Samuel Sharpe*, p. 18, London, 1881.
[3] Monypenny and Buckle, *Life of Benjamin Disraeli*, i, p. 29.

morning service, and it resulted from this that they fared rather badly at the midday dinner, which was usually half over by the time they got back. Disraeli was himself amongst the victims, so he solemnly threw out the suggestion to his Anglican companions that it might be as well if they all became Unitarians for the term of their life at school."[1] Other distinguished scholars at Higham Hill were Samuel Sharpe, the Egyptologist; Thomas Milner Gibson, the statesman who went to Charterhouse and Trinity College, Cambridge; Russell Gurney, afterwards Recorder of London; and Alexander John Ellis, philologist and mathematician, who proceeded to Shrewsbury, Eton, and Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1810 a number of his old scholars then in residence at Cambridge presented Cogan with a splendid copy of Schweighaeuser's *Athenaeus* in fourteen volumes. In 1816 he resigned his ministry at Walthamstow but continued his school. During the last fifteen years of the school Cogan was assisted by his son Richard, afterwards (1853–64) librarian of Dr. Williams' library, the only layman until recently who ever held that office. On December 20, 1828, on his retirement from the school "after thirty-six years of scholastic life during which he had never been absent from his duties in pursuit of pleasure,"[2] one hundred and eighteen of his former scholars presented Cogan with his portrait in life-size, painted by Thomas Phillips, R.A., "in grateful remembrance of early and lasting obligations."

Philip Holland (1721–89), minister of Bank Street Chapel, Bolton, 1755–80, an old pupil of Doddridge at Northampton and one of the founders of Warrington Academy, taught Latin, Greek, Chemistry, and Natural Philosophy, in addition to English subjects, in his school at Bolton. Two of his scholars, in a brief memoir (1792), observe: "On the

[1] Monypenny and Buckle, *Life of Benjamin Disraeli*, i, p. 29.
[2] *D.N.B.*, s.v. Cogan, Hilarge, by Alx. Gordon.

first principles of language and numbers his ideas were remarkably clear and distinct. Short grammars and long exercise books, a few rules and many examples were, in his opinion, the best means of perfecting a person in the knowledge of any particular tongue. He also greatly admired and recommended Sir William Jones' method of double translation; and he frequently exercised his scholars in rendering back into the original tongue what they had translated into English, which was then carefully compared with the French or Latin author, and corrected accordingly. It is greatly to be lamented that he did not live to complete an excellent guide to the practice of arithmetic, which not only showed the principles of every method and rule in the clearest and most philosophical manner, but proposed many new and short ways of answering such questions as usually occur in common life."

Many of his pupils, like William Turner, afterwards of Newcastle, and Samuel Shore, of Norton, near Sheffield—a distinguished Unitarian minister and layman—proceeded to Warrington Academy. Another pupil, afterwards famous as a schoolmaster and politician, was William Shepherd, LL.D., who, entering at 14, stayed three years and then went successively to Daventry Academy and Hackney College. Scholars came from parts then reckoned remote from Bolton, though up to a late period in the eighteenth century roads in the North were bad and travelling difficult. In 1754 a "Flying Coach" between Manchester and London was advertised to do the journey, "barring accidents, in four and a half days." A son of one of the principal merchants in Liverpool regularly made the journey to and from Philip Holland's school in the care of a carrier riding on a pack horse. Postal facilities were also meagre and expensive, and William Turner, of Wakefield, sent his letters to his son at school by means of the "butchers" who went from Yorkshire to the market at Bolton.

School fees differed greatly according to the character and repute of the teacher and the cost of living at the date when the school was established. John Aikin at Kibworth (1739–58) offered instruction and board for £12 per annum. Joseph Priestley, whilst at Needham Market (1755–58), was prepared to teach Classics, Mathematics, etc., for half a guinea a quarter, and to board pupils for twelve guineas a year, but though, as Sir Edward Thorpe remarks,[1] "there was no obvious connection between Arianism and Arithmetic, not a pupil was entrusted to his care." Joseph Cornish at Colyton (1782–1819) for four years used the gallery of his meeting-house as a school until he saved enough to buy a house and take boarders. He then charged a guinea entrance fee and £18 per annum, later increased to £20, including tuition and board. Cornish was a good teacher and a ready writer, publishing his first effort whilst still a student at Hoxton Academy (1772). Consequently he attracted many pupils to his school, though but few hearers to his chapel, and at the low fees he charged was able to recompense himself sufficiently to pay off in full the creditors of his father, who had failed many years earlier as the result of the trade depression during the American War. Samuel Catlow at Mansfield (1785–98) charged twenty-five guineas a year for board and tuition. In other schools fees were approximately two guineas a quarter for day-boarders, whilst full boarders paid thirty to thirty-five guineas per annum. The highest fees were probably those of Dr. Lant Carpenter at Bristol (1817–29), which amounted to no less than a hundred guineas a year, but this was a comparatively late school and pupils were limited to a dozen.

Sometimes a school descended from father to son. John Worsley (*d.* 1767) conducted a successful school at Hereford for fifty years, which was continued by his son of the same name for another thirty years, but with less success, he

[1] *Joseph Priestley*, p. 28, London, 1906.

being too easy a disciplinarian. John Worsley (Primus) was an excellent scholar, and his translation of the New Testament, published posthumously by subscription in 1770, has merit.[1] Amongst his pupils were John Howard, the famous philanthropist, and John Wilkes, the notorious politician. John Worsley (Secundus) was the author of a Latin Grammar in which the rules were given in English. Israel Worsley (1768–1836), son of the second John and a pupil under him, entered Daventry Academy in 1786, and proceeded to Aberdeen University. He was minister at Dunkirk for a time and established a school there. Subsequently (1806–13) he was at Lincoln and at Plymouth (1813–31), where one of his pupils was John Johns, the hymn-writer, who went to Edinburgh University.

It remains to notice the work of a few of the more important schools. John Milner, D.D. (1688–1757), an old pupil under John Moore at Bridgwater, settled in Yeovil in 1723 and opened a school which met with much success. In 1729 he published a Latin grammar, in 1732 a Greek grammar, and in 1736 a treatise on Rhetoric, besides other works on education. In 1741 he became minister at Peckham, near London, where he transferred his school, and continued it until his death, June 24, 1757. He was a man of scholarly attainments. One of his pupils was Edward, Lord Justice Copeland; another was Thomas Brabant, who proceeded to Glasgow University and Northampton Academy, and was classical tutor with Doddridge for five years. Edward Sandercock (1743–70), afterwards minister of St. Saviourgate Chapel, York, was an assistant at Peckham for a time. Another (1717) was Oliver Goldsmith, and though he describes his life as "Browbeat by the master, hated for my ugly face by the mistress, worried by the boys," he appears to have been well treated. As he spent his small salary the day he received it, Mrs. Milner, we are told

[1] See pp. 37–38.

on the authority of her daughter,[1] would say to him, "You had better, Mr. Goldsmith, let me keep your money for you, as I do for some of the young gentlemen," to which he would good-humouredly answer, "In truth, madam, there is equal need." It was at Milner's house he was introduced to Griffiths, the proprietor of the *Monthly Review*, a Whig journal to which Dr. Milner was a contributor, and Goldsmith thereupon entered upon his precarious life as a man of letters.

John Aikin (1713–80), a pupil under Doddridge at Northampton, assistant tutor there and a graduate of Aberdeen (M.A. 1737; D.D. 1774), had a famous school at Kibworth from 1739 until his appointment as tutor at Warrington Academy in 1758. Amongst his pupils were John Simpson, who proceeded to Warrington and Glasgow University and was a prolific writer on theological subjects; Thomas Robins, who went to Northampton Academy in 1750 and was principal tutor at Daventry from 1771 to 1781; Thomas Belsham, who succeeded Robins at Daventry and was later tutor at Hackney College; Dr. Thomas Cogan, who went to Hoxton Academy and Leiden University and was one of the founders of the Royal Humane Society; and John Aikin, M.D., later a pupil under his father at Warrington, lecturer in Chemistry there and a conspicuous figure in the eighteenth-century world of letters.

Daniel Lowe (1698–1776), a member of an old Presbyterian family, who graduated M.A. at Glasgow University in 1723, was minister at Norton, near Sheffield (1744–76), to a little congregation which worshipped for almost a century in the fine entrance-hall, provided with a gallery, at Norton Hall. The parsonage, "Hill Top," built in 1744 by Joseph Offley, Lowe's patron and former fellow-student at Glasgow, was designed to permit of its use as a

[1] John Forster, *The Life and Adventures of Oliver Goldsmith*, p. 64, London, 1848.

school. Writing January 21, 1757, Lowe modestly said: "I knew I was not qualified for popularity, and therefore, when I married, I accepted a small congregation and betook myself to teaching and instructing a few boys in my own house, which I have continued ever since for above twenty years, and have always had about eight or ten. I have fitted many for apprentices, and some for Glasgow and other places."[1] "Most of the Dissenting youths of the better condition in the counties of York, Notts, and Derby," says Joseph Hunter,[2] "were educated at this school. During many years it enjoyed a high reputation." Amongst Lowe's pupils were Samuel Shore, Senr., and Samuel Shore, Junr., who became High Sheriffs of the county and were generous patrons of Priestley and Lindsey, and Michael Hunter, a member of an influential Sheffield family. The Norton parsonage continued to be used as a school until 1845, when the failure of the Shore family involved the sale of the chapel erected in 1794. The last minister (1803–43) was Henry Hunt Piper, a former student at Hoxton and Homerton Academies, who kept a school first for girls and then for boys. In 1812 he is said to have been "somewhat unsettled in his position at Norton chiefly because of the non-success of the school for girls which he conducted." "Really," said a contemporary, Asline Ward, "he has not the art, or heart, to puff. He is too modest to state what I think is the fact, that his 50 guineas school is as good as most at double the price, and as cheap as most at half, because of their extras." The boys' school proved more successful. In 1816 Ward writes: "Piper succeeds in his school; his half-year is commencing with eighteen boys," and in 1820 (July 17th) "Mr. Piper's school is flourishing. He is expending £200 in enlarging his premises." Six years later he reports: "Mr.

[1] *Transactions of Unitarian Historical Society*, i, 30, art. by C. J. Street.
[2] *Memoirs of S. Shore* contributed to the *Sheffield Independent*; reprinted as Appendix to Funeral Sermon by H. H. Piper, London, 1829.

Piper has more pupils than ever he had." "Holbrook Gaskell, who was a boarder from 1823 to 1827, says there were then thirty or forty boarders." Four years later there was a change for the worse. On August 1, 1831, Ward declares: "Mr. Piper's school is very small. He almost despairs of rallying it at Norton. He thinks the clergy have injured him, but he has not a single pupil from Sheffield, not even one from the Unitarians, though he is very popular with them." In 1833 there were only eight pupils; so shortly afterwards the school was closed.[1]

Many of the best Liberal Nonconformist families were educated at this school. Holbrook Gaskell remembered among his fellow-scholars Rodgers, of the old cutlery firm, and one of the neighbouring Bagshawes. John Bowring, the eldest son of Sir John, was there; also two sons of Professor Milne, of Glasgow, and relatives of Dugald Stewart. The girls of the Shore family and their cousins, the Humbles, were educated at the school as well as the boys. Mrs. Piper used to help her husband in directing the studies of the pupils.[2] Piper was an able teacher, much beloved by his scholars, with a gift for music and a turn for carpentry, and possessed a fine collection of scientific instruments.

Joseph Priestley had a school at Nantwich (1758–61), which, he said, "consisted of about thirty boys, and I had a separate room for about half a dozen young ladies. I was employed from seven in the morning until four in the afternoon, without any interval except for dinner."[3] He succeeded so well that he was able to add books to his library, and purchase "a small air-pump and an electrical machine, which he taught his pupils to use," and for them he compiled an English grammar on a new plan. *The Rudiments of English Grammar* is described by a modern

[1] *Memoirs of S. Shore* contributed to the *Sheffield Independent*; reprinted as Appendix to Funeral Sermon by H. H. Piper, London, 1829, pp. 144–5.
[2] Ibid., pp. 145–6. [3] Rutt's edition of Priestley's works, I, i, p. 42.

educationalist as "marked by a common-sense parsimony of technical terms very unusual in writers on the subject, and by a deference to customary usage which would shock the pedant."[1] Later, whilst tutor at Warrington Academy, he wrote much on Education, and has a respectable place among the pioneers of modern pedagogy.

Thomas Watson (1743–1826), educated at Edinburgh University, after serving for some time as a private tutor in two Scottish families, entered in 1769 upon a ministry of fifty-six years with the English Presbyterian congregation at Whitby. After his marriage in 1770 he opened a school for day boys and boarders. Charles Wellbeloved, principal tutor at Manchester New College, York, pays tribute to "the extent and soundness of his knowledge." "Attachment to mathematical science, and an extensive acquaintance with natural philosophy and natural history, rendered him useful to pupils, who, by their birth and connections in a seaport, would, in many instances, be destined to naval occupation." One gentleman, sensible of his obligations to Watson, "offered to present him to a very valuable living in the Church of England, that he might hold it for his son, then a pupil of Mr. Watson, guaranteeing a certain and a handsome provision when his son should be of age to receive that living himself." Watson declined the offer, as he did that from a minister of the Church of Scotland, being a convinced and radical Dissenter. He was a personal friend of the second Baron Musgrave (1744–92), the navigator, and of his brother Henry, the first Earl, statesman and soldier. In 1775 Watson established in Whitby a subscription library, of which from its foundation until 1822 he was president and treasurer. Amongst his publications was *A Useful Compendium of Many Important and Curious Branches of Science and General Knowledge*, 1812.

[1] J. W. Adamson, art. *Education in Cambridge History of English Literature*, xiv, p. 356.

Thomas Astley (1738–1817), an old student of Daventry Academy under Caleb Ashworth and of Warrington under John Taylor, soon after his removal to Chesterfield in 1773, opened a boarding school. Five years later the increasing number of his pupils led to his removal to Dronfield, five miles from his chapel. In 1784 he returned to Chesterfield to live, and in 1800 gave up the school. Astley was an efficient and scholarly teacher, and in 1779 was strongly urged to become classical tutor at Warrington. At Chesterfield he was succeeded by George Kenrick, who stayed only a little over a year. Robert Wallace, an old student of Manchester New College, York, then ministered there from 1815 to 1840, when he became the principal tutor at Manchester College in Manchester. During his ministry he kept a successful school.

John Pope (1745–1802), an old student of the second Exeter Academy under Merivale and Bretland, whilst minister of Blackley Chapel, near Manchester (1767–91), was Master of Stand Grammar School, which for long enjoyed the services of Unitarian ministers. One of his pupils was Thomas Broadhurst (1767–1852), who proceeded to Hoxton Academy and Hackney College, and in 1791 succeeded Pope in his ministry at Blackley, when the latter accepted the classical tutorship at Hackney College after the retirement of Gilbert Wakefield. Pope was a man of real classical scholarship if less brilliant than his predecessor at Hackney, and his gifts were highly esteemed by his contemporaries. His copy of John Mill's *Novum Testamentum* (1707, folio) exhibits his painstaking diligence. He numbered the paragraphs of the double-columned Latin Prolegomena of 168 pages, greatly enlarged the Index, and on its wide margin wrote countless notes in Greek and shorthand. The first note which he signed affords an indication of the time and labour spent on the work: "In the Gospel of Matthew I have copied exactly R. Stephen's margin from his edition

of the New Testament of 1550. For the rest I have only corrected the margin of Mill in his transcript from this edition, so that this may be regarded as corresponding exactly to Stephen's copy. A list of Stephen's errors is at the end of the volume." It may be added that one of the pupils of Thomas Broadhurst in his school at Manchester "liberally patronised by Churchmen and Dissenters" was Dr. Jabez Bunting (1779–1850), afterwards President of the Wesleyan Conference. Another, who had been under Pope (1787–91), was Robert Smethurst, who whilst minister of Monton Chapel was for twenty-four years (1798–1822) Master of the old Grammar School at Stand.

At Palgrave, Suffolk, Rochemont Barbauld, an old Warrington student, conducted a school from 1774 to 1785. He was assisted by his gifted wife, the daughter of John Aikin, D.D., tutor at Warrington. Dr. Johnson spoke slightingly of Mrs. Barbauld as "an instance of early cultivation," which terminated "in marrying a little Presbyterian parson, who kept an infant boarding school, so that all her employment was 'to suckle fools, and chronicle small beer.' She tells the children, 'This is a cat, and that is a dog with four legs, and a tail; see there! you are much better than a cat or dog, for you can speak.'" It is hardly a judicial estimate of the school, its mistress or its pupils. In point of fact, infants formed but a small proportion of the pupils, nor was Mrs. Barbauld exclusively concerned with their tuition.

The school opened with eight pupils, including William Taylor, of Norwich, afterwards well known as a translator from the German, and Frank Sayers, M.D., poet and author of *The Dramatic Sketches of Northern Mythology*, 1790. Next year there were "twenty-seven scholars and two more bespoke places at midsummer," and an assistant, who had a gift for making verse, was engaged. Sayers acknowledged his great indebtedness to Mrs. Barbauld for instruction in

English Composition. "On Wednesdays and Saturdays the boys were called in separate classes to her apartments. She read them a fable or story or moral essay, and then sent them back into the schoolroom to write it out in their words, each exercise being then separately corrected by her."[1] The department of Geography was also undertaken by her, and she kept all the accounts of the school. The infants' class was entirely in her charge. Thomas Denman, afterwards Lord Chief Justice, was entrusted to her before he was four years of age, and Sir William Gell, archaeologist and traveller, was another of her young pupils. It was for the benefit of this class that her *Hymns in Prose for Children* was written. The school, which increased in numbers year by year, admitted both day boys and boarders, and many sons of noble families received their early education at Palgrave, including Lord Dacr, and three of his brothers, including the Earl of Selkirk, two sons of Lord Templeton, Lord More Aghrin, and the Hon. Augustus Phipps.

A public examination was held at the close of the winter term, and at the end of the summer term a play was presented by the senior pupils under the superintendence of Mrs. Barbauld—in 1775 the play was the first part of *King Henry IV*, two years later *The Tempest*. In 1785 the school was taken over by Nathaniel Phillips (1751–1837), an old student of Hoxton Academy, and his course of instruction at Palgrave included Mathematics, Ethics, History, Natural and Experimental Philosophy, in addition to the more usual subjects. Phillips also coached students of the English and Scottish universities during their vacations, and was awarded the degree of D.D. by Edinburgh University in 1794. He left Palgrave in 1796 for Walthamstow, where he kept school for five years. It is said that he could talk Latin fluently, and always corresponded with his father in that

[1] *Works of A. L. Barbauld. With a Memoir* by Lucy Aikin, i, p. xxvi.

language. He was minister of Upper Chapel, Sheffield, from 1805 to 1837.

At Bristol, William Foot (1707–82), a General Baptist minister who had studied at Taunton Academy under Henry Grove and at Stratford-upon-Avon under John Alexander, conducted a grammar school at St. Michael's Hill from 1756. He was a gifted writer, and amongst his publications was a small work on "Education," explaining the course of studies pursued in his school. His "unorthodoxy as to the doctrine of the Trinity was in some measure compensated by sound traditional views on the uses of the cane."[1] One of his day boys (1770–71) was Robert Southey, who for a time bore on his back the marks of his master's accomplishment with the ferule. The poet described the school as "then esteemed the best in Bristol," but added: "Foot was an old man, and if the school had ever been a good one, it had woefully deteriorated."[2] Bryan Edwards, another pupil, described Foot as "a learned and good man," and commends his "excellent method of making the boys write letters to him on various subjects such as 'The beauty and dignity of Truth,' 'The benefits of a good Education,' and 'The mischiefs of Idleness,' previously stating to them the chief arguments to be urged, and insisting on correctness of orthography and grammar."[3] The school was taken over in 1771 by John Prior Estlin (1747–1817), an old student of Warrington Academy, minister of Lewins Mead Chapel (1770–1817), a friend of Coleridge, Southey, and Robert Hall, and a voluminous writer. Southey esteemed him "a good scholar and an excellent man. Had I continued at the school, he would have grounded me well, for he was just the kind of man to have singled me out and taken pleasure in bestowing careful culture where it would

[1] E. Dowden, *Southey, English Men of Letters*, p. 6.

[2] *Life and Correspondence of R. Southey*, edited by His Son, i, p. 45. London, 1849.

[3] J. G. Fuller, *Rise and Progress of Dissent in Bristol*, p. 258, n., London, 1840.

not have been lost."[1] Two volumes of Estlin's *Lectures on Moral Philosophy*, delivered to his pupils, were posthumously published in 1818. Amongst his scholars were many who attained distinction in various walks of life, in the universities and the learned professions. These included Richard Bright, F.R.S., Physician-Extraordinary to Queen Victoria in 1837; Sir Henry Holland, Physician-in-Ordinary to Prince Albert and Queen Victoria; and John Cam Hobhouse (Baron Broughton De Gyfford), the friend of Byron. For many years his old pupils held an annual meeting on Estlin's birthday (April 9th), and at one of them (1807) they presented him with the diploma of LL.D., which they had procured without his knowledge from Glasgow University. On his 70th birthday he announced his intention of discontinuing the school. He resigned his ministerial charge in June 1817 and died on the 20th of August in the same year.

James Pickbourne (1733–1814), an old student of Hoxton Academy, kept a boarding school for more than twenty-seven years at Hackney. He opened it in 1777, and educated, amongst others, Samuel Rogers, the poet, and William Maltby, the bibliographer. Maltby went to Cambridge, and in 1809 was appointed Librarian of the London Institution in succession to Richard Porson. Pickbourne had been Librarian of Dr. Williams' Library, 1770–73, 1775–77, and in the interval between the two appointments had made the "grand tour" as tutor to some young men of quality. He was the author of *A Dissertation on the English Verb* and another on *Metrical Pauses*. The friendship formed as schoolboys between Rogers and Maltby lasted three-quarters of a century and was only dissolved by death. Pickbourne in 1790 described himself as "Master of a Boarding School." When the school was given up is not clear.

Pendlebury Houghton (1740–1822), an old student of Warrington Academy, and for a time assistant tutor there,

[1] *Life and Correspondence of R. Southey*, p. 46.

became in 1767 colleague with Dr. William Enfield in the ministry of the Octagon Chapel, Norwich. Thereupon he united with his father, John Houghton (1730–1800), an old student at Northampton under Doddridge, in establishing a classical school. John Houghton had kept school during his ministry at Nantwich (1761–71), where he succeeded Joseph Priestley, and at Elland (1771–82). He had the repute of being a sound scholar and a severe disciplinarian. Amongst the pupils at the Norwich school were R. H. Gurney, afterwards M.P. for Norwich; Marsham Elwin, for twenty years Chairman of the Norfolk Quarter Sessions; W. F. Drake, Minor Canon of Norwich Cathedral; Henry Cooper, a leading barrister in the county; and J. W. Robberds, author of the Life of William Taylor, of Norwich, and other works. In 1797, on the death of Dr. Enfield, Pendlebury Houghton became sole minister of the Octagon Chapel. John Houghton died in 1800. The school was probably discontinued between 1797 and 1800.

William Field (1768–1851), an old student of Homerton Academy and of Daventry Academy under Thomas Belsham, minister at Warwick, 1789–1843, kept a boarding-school for many years at Leam, near Warwick. Field's devotion to classical studies won for him the friendship of Dr. Samuel Parr, whose Life he wrote (2 vols., 1828). Amongst his numerous pamphlets were educational manuals, one of which was recommended in the *Critical Review* (June 1794) to the theological students in the two universities. His pupils included James Russell, surgeon and philanthropist of Birmingham, and Thomas Eyre Lee, President of the Law Institution, Birmingham, a direct descendant of a lieutenant who fought at Naseby with Cromwell, from whom William Field himself was descended on the spindle-side.

James Crombie (1730–90), who graduated at St. Andrews in 1752, and in 1760 came under the influence of William

Leechman at Glasgow College, was called, February 14, 1768, to the First Presbyterian Church, Belfast. His new meeting-house was opened June 1, 1783, and in September of that year he received the degree of D.D. from St. Andrews. Two years later (September 9, 1785) he issued proposals for the establishment of an academy in Belfast. The scheme was ambitious, including the teaching of Languages, ancient and modern, Philosophy, Science, and Mercantile subjects. An English master and a tutor in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy were appointed, Crombie himself being responsible for Classics, Philosophy, and History. Dr. Crombie left the manse to reside in the new premises, and took in boarders at twenty-five guineas per annum, exclusive of tuition fees. The result did not realise the anticipations of its founders, but foreshadowed the system more perfectly attained by the foundation of the Royal Academical Institution in 1810 and of the Queen's College (now Belfast University) in 1849. With the abandonment of its collegiate classes the Academy from 1790 became a high-class secondary school under Crombie's successor at the First Presbyterian Church. William Bruce (1757–1841), a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, who spent one year at Glasgow University and two years at Warrington Academy, was in charge of the Academy from May 1790 to November 1812. He so impressed his personality on the school that it was known for a generation as "Bruce's Academy." It was in April 1792 that the youths of the school, fired by the revolutionary spirit of that period, broke out in rebellion against Bruce. They seized the mathematical room, renamed it "Liberty Hall," stocked it with provisions, arms, and ammunition, and attempted to dictate terms to the principal and his patrons. When the Rev. Dr. Bristow, vicar of the parish, arrived and demanded their surrender, they threatened to "put a ball in his wig." Eventually they were got under control by Bruce, and the famous "barring

out," as it was called, came to an end. Bruce, it is said, "taught well, and ruled firmly, not forgetting the rod."[1] From 1802 on he delivered courses of lectures on History, Belles-lettres, and Moral Philosophy, but his chief role was that of schoolmaster. One of his assistants for three years was Thomas Blain, LL.D. (1802–89), a graduate of Glasgow, who was Headmaster of the Royal Belfast Academical Institution from 1845 to 1861. The foundation of the Academical Institution in 1810 struck a severe blow at the Academy, and Bruce aired his protest in a pamphlet, *Observations on the Present State of Education in Belfast*. A place, however, was quickly found for both academy and institution in the town. Many Unitarians, including William Drennan, M.D., were associated with the foundation of the Academical Institution, which later enlisted the services of distinguished Unitarian ministers like Henry Montgomery, LL.D., Thomas Dix Hincks, LL.D., and Bruce's own son and colleague in the ministry, William Bruce, Junr.

Bruce had both day boys and boarders, the latter being under the care of his excellent wife. A distinguished scholar, preacher, and theologian, William Bruce was one of the founders of the Belfast Literary Society (1801), which frequently met under the roof of his academy.

A school with many illustrious pupils was that of William Shepherd (1768–1847), minister of Gateacre Chapel, near Liverpool, 1791–1847, an old student of Daventry Academy and of Hackney College. He educated at "The Nook," as the parsonage was called, amongst others, Benjamin Gaskell, who proceeded to Manchester College and later entered Parliament; Richard Vaughan Yates, the Liverpool philanthropist; Thomas Roscoe, author and translator; and William Stanley Roscoe, the poet, who went to Peterhouse, Cambridge. Shepherd, who declined a tutorship at Manchester College, was the author of the *Life of Poggio Bracciolini*[2]

[1] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Bruce, William.*

[2] See p. 256.

(1802), and other works, and received the degree of LL.D. from Edinburgh University in 1834. He was an eloquent speaker and a prominent politician of the Liberal school. An assistant in the school, Thomas Lloyd, said to have been "well versed in the Latin, French, and Italian languages, and possessing a tolerable acquaintance with German and Greek," was imprisoned in 1798 for two years and ordered to pay a fine of £50 for a song which he composed that was pronounced to be seditious.

Charles Lloyd (1766–1829), an old student of Carmarthen Academy whilst housed at Swansea, after a ministry at Evesham, settled with the General Baptist Congregation at Ditchling in May 1790 at a salary of sixty-five guineas, reduced to sixty guineas in his second year. Here in 1791 he took "a good house with a large garden," and at the beginning of 1792 began his career as a schoolmaster. Next year he removed to Exeter, where, at "a large house near Palace Gate," his first pupil was John Kenrick, afterwards tutor at Manchester College, York. Kenrick described him as "a good classical scholar, who grounded his pupils well, interesting them by his remarks on his authors, but his temper was warm and he corrected passionately." After being minister in Cardiganshire for a time, he removed in 1802 to Palgrave, Suffolk, where, in addition to the charge of a congregation, he again kept school. In 1809 he received the degree of LL.D. from Glasgow University. He published several works, including *Observations on the Choice of a School*, and contributed classical and theological articles to *The Monthly Repository*.

William Evans (1769–1847), a former student at Carmarthen Academy, on settling at Tavistock in 1794, opened a school at Crowndale, a farmhouse in the neighbourhood, in which Sir Francis Drake was born, and later, to secure more room for his scholars, removed to Kilworthy, the former residence of Sir John Glanville. During the war with

France a number of naval and military officers sent their sons to him. The sons of Sir Michael Seymour, Sir Edward Codrington, Sir Richard King, and Admiral Tollemache were in the school. Sir William Knighton, Keeper of the Privy Purse to George IV, was a pupil, and several of his Irish scholars afterwards became famous. Evans also educated the sons of John Taylor, the hymn-writer of Norwich; of William Hazlitt; and of Robert Aspland, the tutor of Hackney Unitarian Academy. Robert Brook Aspland proceeded to Glasgow University and thence to Manchester College. The fact that such men entrusted their sons to Evans is a tribute to his ability as a schoolmaster. He was a regular contributor to the Unitarian journals—*The Monthly Repository* and *The Christian Reformer*, edited by Robert Aspland.

John Currie, F.R.S. (1769–1839), first a pupil then a tutor at Hackney College, had a school at Birmingham, including in his curriculum Classical Literature, Mathematics, Geography, History, English, and Political Economy. From September 1801 until midsummer 1802 he was assisted by Lant Carpenter, afterwards a successful schoolmaster at Bristol. Currie is described as a man "of high classical attainments with a sound and extensive acquaintance with Physical and Mathematical Science." Amongst his scholars were John Kentish, who proceeded to Daventry Academy, and Robert Scott, M.P., son of Charles Wellbeloved, who assumed his wife's name on marriage.

Charles Wellbeloved himself conducted a school at York from 1793 to 1803, when he became principal tutor at Manchester College, which removed to York in that year. In 1796, "in order to accommodate boarders, he removed to a larger house at the end of Gilligate, and in 1779 purchased the house in Monkgate in which the remainder of his life was spent."[1] Amongst his pupils were Sir George

[1] J. Kentish, *A Biographical Memoir of C. Wellbeloved*, p. 47, London, 1860.

Strickland, M.P., and his brothers, and the Rev. William Foster, a clergyman who founded the Doncaster School for the Deaf and Dumb.

Thomas Morell, LL.D. (1775–1840), a student of Homerton Academy, after ministries at Daventry and Enfield with the Independents, was in charge of schools at Exeter, Northampton, and London. In 1816 he was appointed classical and mathematical tutor at Hackney Unitarian Academy, and in 1818 became minister of the Unitarian Church at Brighton. At Hove, near Brighton, he conducted a flourishing school until 1830. "His erudition," said one of his pupils, "was extensive, and as a tutor he was eminently successful." He was an excellent classical scholar, and "a great admirer of Horace." Consequently, says another pupil, "the senior class was steeped in his poetry." Devotion to Classics at Hove School did not mean, however, neglect of Science. French was taught by an assistant, and occasionally the scholars produced a French play. The assistant in 1818 was a Major Bercher, an Italian by birth, who had served under Napoleon in his fatal Russian campaign. After dinner it was the custom for elder boys to recite English poetry, whilst essays on various subjects were regularly prescribed during term and as vacation exercises. Amongst pupils who attained distinction was Thomas Solly, philosophical writer, who proceeded to Cambridge and later became Lecturer in English at Berlin University.

Joseph Hutton, LL.D. (1790–1860), an old student of Manchester College, York, and minister at Mill Hill Chapel, Leeds, 1818–34, kept a small school in that town. The curriculum included Classics, French, and Elementary Mathematics, and particular attention was given to English Composition. One of his pupils, Frederick Swanwick (1810–85), at seventeen proceeded to Edinburgh University. He served as a pupil under George Stephenson and became a famous engineer. At the opening of the Manchester and

Liverpool Railway (September 15, 1830) he drove one of the engines which drew the first passenger train.

John Philip Malleson (1796–1869), an old student of Wymondley Academy, who, as Dr. Williams' scholar, graduated B.A. at Glasgow in 1819, after a brief ministry in London, opened a day school in Leeds (1822), whilst acting as chaplain to Robert Penberton Milnes (father of Lord Houghton) at Fryston Hall, near Wakefield. In 1828 he settled as minister at Brighton in succession to Dr. Morell and continued the school at Hove House until 1860. After teaching for twenty-five years, and again when the school was discontinued, he received valuable testimonials from his pupils, many of whom entered Manchester College and became Unitarian ministers. Amongst those who did not were William Shaen (1820–87), barrister and social reformer, who graduated M.A. (London), gaining the gold medal in philosophy, and P. A. Taylor, afterwards M.P. for Leicester.

One of Morell's pupils was J. Reynell Wreford, D.D., the hymn-writer, who became a student of Manchester College, York, and whilst minister at Bristol had twelve boys as boarders. The school course included Classics, Mathematics, English, and French. German, Music, Drawing, and Dancing were taught by assistants, and a drill-sergeant gave regular instruction to those who desired it. For pupils under twelve the fees were fifty guineas per annum; over twelve, sixty guineas. Another of Morell's pupils was Henry Acton (1797–1843), a printer's apprentice twenty-one years of age when he entered the school, who was prepared for the ministry. He spent three years at the school, giving five days a week to classical, mathematical, and Biblical studies; on the sixth "writing for the pulpit," and preaching twice in local chapels every Sunday. One of the members of his first congregation—at Walthamstow—Eliezer Cogan, the distinguished schoolmaster, spoke highly of Acton's gifts. As minister at Exeter (1823–43), Acton became widely known as

an eloquent preacher, and for many years conducted a school with as many as twenty scholars in residence with him.

Lant Carpenter (1780–1840), already mentioned as assistant in Corrie's school at Birmingham, was a student at Northampton Academy under Horsey and at Glasgow University. He was minister at Lewins Mead Chapel, Bristol, from 1817 to 1839, and kept a first-class boarding-school there from 1817 to 1829 in his "large old house in Great George Street."

A man of marked academic attainments, he twice declined invitations to be classical tutor at Manchester College, York, and was awarded the degree of LL.D. by Glasgow University in 1806. Both boys and girls were admitted to the school, never more than a dozen in all, and the fees, a hundred guineas a year, were very high for that period. Amongst Carpenter's voluminous writings were *Systematic Education* (2 vols., 1813; 3rd ed., 1822), a comprehensive survey in which he collaborated with Dr. William Shepherd, the Liverpool schoolmaster, and Jeremiah Joyce, a former tutor at Hackney College, and *The Principles of Education*.

Carpenter laid more emphasis on moral and religious instruction than some earlier teachers. The pupils conducted a debating society and supported a poor's fund amongst themselves. One of his most distinguished scholars was James Martineau, the philosopher and Principal of Manchester College, who in 1841 testified in generous terms to the character and capacity of his old schoolmaster.[1] "The utmost grammatical accuracy and precision were insisted on. . . . In the more advanced classes the same moral feeling regulated the selection of books to be read: *The Moral Treatises of Cicero*, *The Agricola of Tacitus*, *The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Satires of Juvenal*, portions of *Xenophon's Memorabilia*, and of *Plato's Dialogues*. . . . How far the practical turn which he gave to his scientific teaching, and

[1] *Memoirs of Lant Carpenter*, edited by his son, R. L. Carpenter, pp. 342 sqq.

his preference for the physical applications over the abstract researches of mathematics, was an indirect effect of the same characteristic and arose from an instinctive quest for some *human* interest, I will not attempt to describe. . . . The critical reading of the Greek Testament every Monday morning gradually accumulated an amount of theological information respecting the text and the interpretation of the sacred writings, rarely placed within reach of any but divines." Intended at that time for the profession of civil engineer, the future philosopher and theologian was allowed, as he said in a biographical memorandum,[1] "to devote some extra time to Mathematics, and the elements of Natural Philosophy and Chemistry, so that before I left I had been put in possession of Euclid, the Conic Sections, Plane Trigonometry, and the elementary formulae of Spherical, and of the fundamental conceptions and methods of Physical Chemistry, Physiology, and Geology." Martineau, it should be noted, entered the school at fourteen and left at sixteen. Amongst his companions at school were Samuel Greg (elder brother of William Rathbone Greg), afterwards a well-known philanthropist; James Heywood, M.A., M.P., F.R.S., Samuel Worsley, the Earl of Suffolk (then Viscount Andover), and two of his brothers. Other pupils were Sir John Potter and his brother, T. B. Potter, and W. P. Price. Robert Needham Phillips, afterwards M.P. for Bury, went from Bristol to Rugby and thence to Manchester College, York. He informed Charles Wickstead that when he entered the House of Commons he found more members that had been at Dr. Carpenter's small school than had been at Rugby, and told Estlin Carpenter that "at the first Speaker's Dinner which he attended the guests on either side of him had been at the school."[2]

James Martineau, on leaving Manchester College in 1827,

[1] Drummond and Upton, *Life and Letters of James Martineau*, i, p. 21.
[2] *James Martineau*, p. 18, *n.* 1.

supplied the pulpit at Bristol for a time, and conducted the school for some ten months in the absence of Dr. Carpenter on the Continent in search of health. On his appointment as assistant to the Rev. Philip Taylor in Dublin, he took several of the boys with him and, after his marriage, December 18, 1828, had half a dozen pupils in residence with him.

Charles Wallace (1796–1859), minister of Hale and Altrincham Chapels, 1819–56, an old student of Glasgow University (M.A. 1817) and of Manchester College, York, in addition to two congregations and the care of a farm, for long boarded a number of pupils in his house and enjoyed a considerable reputation as "an accurate and able teacher of Classical Literature and a good disciplinarian." Many sons of leading Dissenters in Lancashire and Cheshire were instructed at Hale Lowe or Hale Lodge—to which he removed in order to secure more accommodation for his scholars. One of his pupils was W. H. Herford, who afterwards went to Dr. Beard's school in Manchester.

The Rev. H. P. Roberts, a Calvinistic Methodist minister, speaks highly of the schools kept by Unitarian ministers in South Wales. He enumerates fifteen in all, and says: "The Unitarian ministers did good work as schoolmasters: they assisted many a poor lad to become a scholar, holding up the lamp of learning when the dawn was only just breaking."[1] The connection of these ministers with Carmarthen College was very close, most of them having been trained there and many of their pupils entering the Academy when school-days ended. The numbers of their scholars at any one time do not appear to have been large, and their fees, like their stipends, were low as compared with those of their English brethren. "Five shillings the first quarter and ten shillings and sixpence the second" suggests that learning at one school, at least, advanced in price as it did in character.

[1] *Nonconformist Academies in Wales*, p. 78, Lond., 1930.

The school in question, kept by John Thomas at Llandyssul in the "forties" of last century, was "held in the stable" of an inn—"The Black Lion." Apparently most scholars at Welsh schools were day boys. "One of the most important" of these schools was that of Owen Evans at Cefyn-coed, near Merthyr. Owen had been educated at Castle Howell School and Carmarthen College, where for some time he was Examiner in Hebrew. His first school was opened in 1834, and that at Cefyn three years later. "He would instruct boys in the Classics, providing they would go in for the ministry. He did not allow the use of "Keys," gave short lessons; new work on the first four days of the week, and an examination on Friday." He died suddenly in 1865. Another schoolmaster, Thomas Thomas (1824–1908), was a Carmarthen student, "who shone in Mathematics, Classics, and Hebrew." His school at Pontsian (opened, October 8, 1847) "was celebrated for thirty years. He taught Navigation as well as the usual subjects, and prepared boys for the ministry, law, medicine, business, and the sea." Many Unitarian ministers owed to him their early education. W. Marles Thomas, M.A., an old student of Carmarthen College and Glasgow University, had a school at Llanyssul (1860–79), which attracted pupils of all denominations. He was a ready writer with a gift for verse, and contributed freely to Welsh periodical literature.

David Lewis Evans (1813–1902), a distinguished student of Carmarthen, was assistant from 1845 to 1850 in the school at Bridgend, Glamorgan, to the Rev. John Edward Jones. In the last-named year he removed to Colyton, taking with him three of his pupils. Here he kept school for eight years, during which there flowed to him, it is said, "an unbroken stream of Welsh boys, who boarded in the Parsonage." Amongst his pupils were the Rev. Edmund Warts, a clergyman of the Established Church; Arthur J. Williams, afterwards M.P. for South Glamorgan; Alderman William

Howells, brother to the Very Rev. the Dean of St. David's; Jenkin and John Davis, bankers at Porthcawl; and William Davies, Librarian of Bridgend Public Library. In 1864 David Lewis Evans was appointed to the Chair of Hebrew and Mathematics at Carmarthen, which he held until 1874.

Of English schools in the second and third quarters of the last century only a few typical examples can be noticed.

Henry Green (1801–75), M.A. (Glasgow, 1825), taught for a time in Dr. Beard's school in Manchester. He was minister at Knutsford, 1827–72, and in his school taught Classics, Science, and Commercial subjects, whilst assistants were responsible for French, German, Drawing, Music, and Dancing. One of his assistants was Alfred William Worthington, who had been a pupil under Dr. J. R. Beard before entering Manchester College in 1844. He was a graduate of London University and had also studied at Bonn before taking up teaching at Knutsford. Later, in the boarding-school for girls at Heathfield, conducted by his daughters, Green taught English Literature, Physical Science, and Mathematics. He was Visitor (1859–74) at the Unitarian Home Missionary Board, of which Dr. Beard was First Principal, and was the author, *inter alia*, of a *History of Knutsford* and *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers*, and was one of the founders of the Holbein Society.

Thomas Elford Poynting (1813–78), who had been two years master at a factory school, Hyde, established by Thomas Ashton, before entering Manchester College in 1843, was a student of great ability. He excelled in Philosophy and Semitics, and, in the absence of the Professor through illness, took charge for a time of the Hebrew classes in the College. Towards the end of 1845 he was appointed minister at Monton, near Manchester, and remained there until his death thirty-two years later. Until 1874, when he was appointed Theological Tutor at the Unitarian Home Missionary Board, he kept school. In 1843

he published *The Temple of Knowledge*, a skilful attempt to enlist imagination in the service of subjects as diverse as Geography, Morality, History, Languages, and Religion. Another volume from his pen, *Glimpses of the Heaven That Lies About Us*, published in 1860, was favourably reviewed by Dr. Martineau in *The National Review*.

As examples of small schools successfully conducted by country pastors may be cited the school opened by the Rev. Edward Parry at Battle under the shadow of the Abbey Gateway in the middle of the nineteenth century, and the school at Horsham, Sussex, kept from 1878 by the Rev. T. W. Scott. The latter flourished so much that Scott gave up his ministry to devote his whole time to it. Members of the Turner, Carter, Rowland, Evershed, Burgess, Agate, Crosskey, and other Unitarian families, as well as boys of other denominations, were amongst its scholars.

Castle Howell School, Lancaster (1850–89), perhaps the most famous of the schools of the later period, was conducted by William Henry Herford, B.A. (1820–1908), and David Davis, B.A. (1821–97), old students of Manchester New College, York, and graduates of London University, who had completed their education in Germany, the one at Bonn and Berlin and the other at Bonn and Jena.

W. H. Herford, one-time pupil in Dr. Beard's school in Manchester, after eight years of college life and a year in the Unitarian ministry, became in 1846 tutor to the grandson of Lady Byron, in whose company he went to Hofwyl, near Bern, and studied the educational methods pursued at Fellenberg's famous school. In 1848 he settled in the ministry at Lancaster and two years later opened his school. Late in 1850 his brother-in-law, David Davis, became his colleague in ministry and school. In 1854 Davis accepted a call to the Octagon Chapel, Norwich, but early in 1862 returned to the school at Lancaster, to which henceforth his undivided energies were devoted. Herford left Lancaster in

1862, became minister at Upper Brook Street Church, Manchester (1866–70), and taught with much success in Ladyham school at Fallowfield, whose jubilee was celebrated this year. He was the author of *The School*, described by Sir Michael E. Sadler as "a masterpiece of English educational writing," and of *The Student's Froebel*, the best English presentation of the educational doctrine which it summarises and expounds. *The Manchester Guardian*, in an obituary notice of Herford, spoke of him as "the first Englishman who devoted his life to the work of building up in England a school in Froebel's sense, making 'reverence for childhood' according to the ideal of Pestalozzi and Froebel the corner-stone of education." He himself said: "Much that we endeavoured to carry into practice at Lancaster was learned from conversation with Mr. Wilhelm von Fellenberg, and from observation of plans at the Institute at Hofwyl." "All prizes, place-taking, merit-marks, etc., were set aside as harmful and needless. . . . We tried to make the school a small Commonwealth by carrying on government, as far as possible, by means of the pupils themselves. . . . There was constant association of Teachers with the Pupils on the model of family life, and natural and wholesome bodily recreation, play, country walks, and gymnastics, skating and bathing (in their season), carpentering and drilling (wherein after my time swimming was added) as parts of the weekly routine." Religion was "based upon the daily reading of the New Testament, along with Sunday's public worship, and with evening readings calculated to foster a true humanity, based on the human character of Jesus Christ."[1]

Begun in a modest house in West Place, the school was soon removed to more commodious quarters in Queen Square. There Davis took it over from his brother-in-law, and some years later (in the interests of London University

[1] *The Castle Howell School Record*, p. xxviii.

lists) gave it the name "Castle Howell," thus associating it with the memory of his grandfather's school in Cardiganshire.

Davis, whose wife was a German lady with a family tradition of scholastic interest, had usually two assistants, one of whom was a German, and during the last half-dozen years of the school's life, his son Rudolf, a former pupil (B.A. London, 1885), was an assistant master.

The character of the education provided is indicated by Herford. "We undertook," he said,[1] "to give a sound classical and commercial education, making thoroughness our aim rather than extent of knowledge. Nature study was particularly encouraged, "and the manner of teaching was regarded as of more moment than the matter."

Many boys matriculated in the University of London and, as the register shows, not a few went much further in their academical studies. "At Cambridge," it was announced in 1883, former pupils had gained four firsts, and other distinctions included a Fellowship at St. John's and a Whewell Scholarship. In course of time the ages of the boys advanced until towards the end there were "more over fourteen than under, and sometimes twice as many." The elder boys enjoyed certain privileges, the most prized being perhaps in the matter of bedtime, and they were dignified by the name of "students."

Seventy boys were pupils under W. H. Herford and two hundred and fifteen under D. Davis. Of the latter number, a dozen had been with Herford, so that in all two hundred and seventy-three pupils were educated at Castle Howell School during the thirty-eight years of its existence. Many of the leading Unitarian families were represented in the school, though it was not confined to Unitarians. Amongst its most distinguished scholars were William Hancock, F.L.S., of the Chinese Imperial Customs Service; Norman Moore, M.D.,

[1] *The Castle Howell School Record*, p. lxix.

the eminent physician; Charles H. Herford, D.Litt., University professor; Oliver Herford, the journalist; Percy Scott Worthington, D.Litt., the architect; A. H. Worthington, LL.D., Chairman of the Council of Manchester University; Arthur Milnes Marshall, the naturalist, and many others.

Undoubtedly Castle Howell School was a notable example of the educational activities of Unitarians in England.

Though private schools kept by ministers continued to flourish until the end of the nineteenth century, their decline dates from the third quarter of the century. It was due: (*a*) to the increasing vogue of proprietary schools formed by local committees of men of various religious opinions inspired by the enthusiasm for higher education which then began to manifest itself throughout the country; (*b*) to the growing demand for specialisation in the training of teachers and (from 1870 on) the Government control of education; and (*c*) to the multiplication of ministerial activities, particularly in urban and industrial areas, together with the more ample remuneration of ministers which accompanied the abandonment of joint pastorates, thus depriving ministers of the leisure and removing from them the necessity to keep school.

Before the end of the nineteenth century two public schools were founded by Unitarians. Channing School (originally Channing House School), a public school for girls, named after the American divine, was founded in 1885 at Highgate Hill, London, by Miss Matilda Sharpe (1830–1916), daughter of Samuel Sharpe, the Egyptologist, a gifted woman with a talent for painting. From the beginning the school flourished and amongst its pupils were many daughters of Unitarian ministers for whom special provision was made. From time to time the premises were enlarged by the acquirement of neighbouring houses, and in May 1904 the school was placed in the hands of trustees, who are now

its governors. It is splendidly equipped, has a staff of seventeen resident and seven visiting mistresses, and eleven scholarships varying in value from £10 to £80, the last, the Emily Sharpe Scholarship, being tenable for one year by a Hungarian.

Willaston School, Nantwich, a public school for boys, was founded under the will of Philip Barker in 1899 and opened in the following year, the founder's house becoming the headmaster's residence. It is equipped with gymnasium, laboratory, museum, memorial hall, and swimming bath, and the grounds extend over twenty acres. There is also a preparatory school. Both Channing School and Willaston School are established on the same basis of freedom from religious tests as obtained in the private schools which preceded them, and offer an excellent education on broad lines in preparation for commercial and professional life.

"During most of the nineteenth century," it has been said,[1] "the very term 'secondary education' was unknown in England, and such intermediate education as existed was provided by public endowment or by private initiative."

What the "private initiative" of Unitarians provided during the century and the one before it forms a chapter in the history of English education which, if comparatively slight in bulk, is not without importance, and deserves to be rescued from the obscurity and oblivion into which it has been long plunged.

[1] Art. *Secondary Education in England* in *The Encyclopædia and Dictionary of Education*, iii, 1921.

CHAPTER III

THE MODERN UNIVERSITIES

The remarkable movement, beginning in the middle of last century, which led to the foundation of colleges and ultimately of universities in Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool, Birmingham, and Sheffield, may be termed a happy by-product of the Industrial Revolution during the eighteenth century. The extraordinary growth of population in the centres named, the complex industrial and commercial problems, and the follies and perils of ignorance which that Revolution involved, induced many far-sighted leaders in commerce, law, medicine, and the Church to realise the need for university education within reach of the town-dweller, free from the restrictions, traditions, and heavy expenditure associated with learning in the ancient universities.

By none was the movement welcomed and supported more enthusiastically and generously than by Unitarians. For this there were more reasons than one.

The principle of non-subscription to creeds, now at length recognised at Oxford and Cambridge, was adopted from the first, almost without question, by the colleges which were to become in process of time the modern universities. Their founders had before them the notable example of University College, London (est. 1826), to which Unitarians like Crabb Robinson lent their support "as a sort of debt to the cause of civil and religious liberty,"[1] and for which, as a hall of residence, they had built University Hall in 1849 in commemoration of the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Act in 1844. The principle in question constituted, moreover, the only possible basis for that appeal to all sections of the community for support which the absence of endowments

[1] H. H. Bellot, *University College, London, 1826–1926*, p. 190.

and State subventions made imperative. Orthodox Nonconformists and Jews, in view of their experience of the tests imposed by the older universities, could not away with them, whilst Unitarians in the middle of the nineteenth century, if not too numerous were certainly too public-spirited and wealthy to be passed over in any effort to finance great educational enterprises in the North of England. Here and there a virtue may have been made of necessity, but the fact remains that Episcopalians and Nonconformists of every denomination united in the establishment of colleges free from the religious tests that excluded Dissenters, outside London, from university education in England.

Sharing with others both the hopes of increased efficiency in their industrial undertakings from the services of young men trained in the technical and scientific processes of industry and the expectations of a loftier personal and social life from those whose minds had been exercised by the intellectual discipline of studies in arts and letters, Unitarians, almost alone, as an organised group of religious thinkers, had long maintained the principle of non-subscription in their schools and academies, and made it a fundamental tenet of their common religious life. As the story of their own academical institutions clearly proves,[1] they also entertained a keen interest in higher education, and were even curiously obsessed by an unquestionable faith in its power, unfettered by bonds and shackles, to promote the advance of Truth, Liberty, and Religion, and further the political ideal, enshrined in their favourite toast at dinners and assemblies, of "Civil and Religious Liberty the World Over."

In a letter addressed to R. C. Christie, January 4, 1864, by Henry Hallam, one of his examiners at Oxford, congratulating him on his appointment as Professor of History at Owens College, the aged historian remarks that he "had

[1] See pp. 72–97.

been apprised" of the appointment by Mr. James Heywood, who "was solicitous to know whether you had very High Church opinions. . . . The truth is the Dissenters claiming the name of Liberal are, in fact, the narrowest of men *sauf quelques exceptions*; and Oxford is a bugbear to them."[1]

Here the "judicious Hallam" forgot that Oxford was a preserve of the Church, and the "jealousy" he detected in Heywood's inquiry was a not unnatural anxiety that the foundation principle of the College should be honoured by its teachers. "Narrowness" was hardly the word to apply to the "liberal Dissenters" excluded from the ancient universities and much else for their convictions, who yet opened their schools and academies to all comers. Miss Haldane understood their principles and position better when she wrote: "One was not born a Unitarian in those days without having a tradition of protest in one's bones. The sect was small but extraordinarily intellectual and efficient, and if born within it, it was impossible not to gaze at the world from a rather superior angle, though always with a touch of self-consciousness."[2]

Illustrations of the character and interests of Unitarians at this period and earlier may be drawn from any of the towns already named. A few from Manchester, which gave birth to the earliest of the university colleges in the North, may suffice.

The Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society (est. 1781) originated in weekly meetings held in the home of Dr. Thomas Percival, an old student of Warrington Academy, who was joint President of the Society from 1782 and President from 1790 till his death in 1804. The first Secretaries were the Rev. Thomas Barnes, D.D., and Thomas Henry, F.R.S., and for some years the Society

[1] *Select Essays and Papers of Richard Copley Christie*. Edited with a Memoir by W. A. Shaw, p. xvii, London, 1902.

[2] *Mrs. Gaskell*, p. 1, London, 1930.

held its meetings in the Cross Street Chapel Room. The first President of the Manchester Natural History Society (est. 1821) and of the Chetham Society (est. 1844) was Dr. Edward Holme. The first President of the Mechanics' Institute (est. 1824) was Benjamin Heywood, and two years later James Heywood became the first President of the Athenaeum.

In 1821, we are told,[1] "the sum of £1,000 was raised in more or less equal contributions by some twelve friends of John Edward Taylor, all of them Whigs and Reformers and most of them Unitarians, and this sum formed the capital on which *The Manchester Guardian* began its career."

The first Mayor of Manchester (1838) was Thomas Potter. All those named were members of Cross Street Chapel. In 1829 Cross Street and Mosley Street Chapels between them counted as members no fewer than a dozen men who afterwards entered Parliament, and five who became mayors of Manchester. The Manchester subscription library, known as the Portico Library, owed much to Unitarians for its inception and administration, and the Rev. William Gaskell, M.A., minister of Cross Street Chapel, was its Chairman from 1849 to 1884. In the establishment and work of the Manchester Society for Promoting National Education (1837), the Lancashire Public Schools Association (1847), and the National Public Schools Association (1856), Unitarian ministers like William Gaskell, John Relly Beard, and John James Tayler took an active part. It was on the initiative of Sir John Potter (son of Thomas Potter), who became M.P. for the town and was three times its mayor, that the free library was founded in 1852—the first public library established in the country after the passing of the Free Libraries Act of 1850.

Plainly, Sir Alfred Hopkinson, one time Vice-Chancellor of Manchester University, had good reason for saying[1] that, "In Mid-Victorian days the intellectual aristocracy of South Lancashire was largely Unitarian," and Unitarians "took an active part in the local life of the cities and especially in the University movement."

[1] W. H. Mills, *The Manchester Guardian, A Century of History*, p. 33.

In what follows no attempt is made to trace that movement in any detail, or to belittle, by the necessary omission of almost every reference thereto, the work of non-Unitarians in it, but of university teaching in the North of England Unitarians were undoubtedly heralds and pioneers.

MANCHESTER

On April 9, 1783, Dr. Barnes read a paper before the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society entitled, *A Plan for the Improvement and Extension of Liberal Education in Manchester*. He pleaded for the establishment of a college in which "the happy art might be learned of connecting together, Liberal Science and Commercial Industry" by instruction in "Natural Philosophy, the Belles-lettres, Mathematics, History, Law, Commerce, Ethics, and Languages ancient and modern." At the request of the Society he drew up a plan of study "for young men designed for Civil and Active Life, whether in Trade or in any of the Professions." "In this institution," he declared, "every narrow principle ought to be rejected. . . . Science and Art are of no political or religious party." On the lines laid down by Thomas Barnes, the short-lived College of Arts and Science was instituted June 6, 1783, of which the nine officers of the Literary and Philosophical Society became Governors, including the three prominent Unitarians, Thomas Percival, Thomas Henry, and Thomas Barnes, of whom the last two were appointed lecturers.

On February 22, 1786, Manchester College was estab-

[1] *Penultima*, p. 37, London, 1930.

lished with Dr. Barnes and his colleague as tutors. It was open without religious restrictions to lay and Divinity students, and the former predominated in numbers. Students attended lectures in Chemistry, Anatomy, and Physiology at the College of Arts and Science so long as these were offered. But though Manchester College enlisted the services of distinguished teachers, including John Dalton and George Walker, F.R.S., it failed to evoke adequate support as a centre of "university learning," and in 1803 was removed to York.

In 1836 a bold and comprehensive scheme, which owed its publication to James Heywood, was outlined by Harry Longueville Jones, M.A., late Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge, in a paper read before the Manchester Statistical Society. Apart from the general excellence of the scheme, what probably commended it to James Heywood was the principle it laid down that "the honours and advantages of a liberal education should be offered to persons of all religious persuasions, without distinction, and the University has no right exclusively to enforce or to encourage any one religious creed in preference to any other." An article on the subject, entitled *Collegiate Education in Manchester*, was immediately published in *The Christian Teacher*, a Unitarian magazine founded by Dr. John Relly Beard. "The plan" was heartily approved and the passage already quoted singled out for special commendation. The article concluded: "Many circumstances now concur to encourage the establishment of a university in Manchester. There now exists a praiseworthy pride among its inhabitants to raise it high in the estimation of the intellectual world. They have already their literary and philosophical societies, their natural history society, their royal and mechanics' institutions, and they possess within themselves all the materials for a university. Their medical schools are numerous and flourishing, and they have proved themselves able and willing to assist in the work."

As events proved, this summary statement of the intellectual enthusiasm prevalent in Manchester in 1836 was unduly optimistic, but at least it expressed the warmth of the welcome which Unitarians were ready to give to any liberal scheme for the provision of university teaching.

A little later they demonstrated their interest in it in a practical fashion, for in 1840 Manchester College returned to its birthplace, and a second attempt on a larger scale was made to establish a seat of learning in Manchester free from all tests. There were eight regular members of the staff, including at the outset John James Tayler, James Martineau, John Kenrick, and Francis William Newman, lectureships in French and German, and for one year a professor of Civil Engineering. The course was five years for Divinity, and three years for lay students, and pupils were prepared for graduation in the University of London.

The financial problem which the equipment of the College raised, the appeal which London made as a centre for the institution in association with University Hall, and the establishment of Owens College in Manchester, led finally to the removal of Manchester College to London in 1853.

There is apparently no evidence that John Owens (1790–1846), the founder of Owens College, was acquainted with Longueville Jones' "Plan," but he certainly sympathised with it, and in his bequest of nearly £97,000 for "providing or aiding the means of instructing young persons of the male sex in such branches of science and learning as are usually taught in English universities," he declared that no one connected with the institution shall be "required to make any declaration as to, or submit to any test whatsoever of, their religious opinions, and that nothing shall be introduced in the matter or mode of education in instruction which shall be reasonably offensive to the conscience of any such student."

John Owens himself was an Independent, who in his later

years worshipped in an Established Church. He appointed as the executors of his will his intimate friend Samuel Faulkner, a Churchman, and Samuel Alcock, a Unitarian, for many years Treasurer of Cross Street Chapel and the Chairman of its Trustees. The Trustees of Owens' educational scheme included, besides the Mayor of Manchester, the Dean and the M.P.s for the borough, ten prominent citizens, of whom four were Unitarians.

The first secretary of the College was John Partinton Aston, an able and versatile lawyer, who was a member of Dr. Beard's Congregation, and he was succeeded in 1867 by another Unitarian, J. Holme Nicholson, who had acted as clerk and librarian from 1853, and from 1871–82 was Registrar of the College. In 1869, when the College Extension Fund was opened to provide for the removal of the College from Quay Street, Deansgate, to its present site in Oxford Road, the four largest donations (£5,000 each) were those of Unitarians Thomas Ashton, J. and N. Phillips, Thomas Wrigley, and Edmund Potter. In 1874 Principal Greenwood, in his Annual Report, referred to Thomas Ashton, Chairman of the Fund, as one "to whom more than to any single man the successful prosecution of our arduous enterprise must be ascribed." Other Unitarians, whose donations to the Fund ran into four figures, were Ivie Mackie, J. Benjamin Smith, and James Worthington; whilst for long the familiar Unitarian names of Greg, McConnell, Fairbairn, Schunck, Fielden, Darbishire, Robinson, Taylor, and Scott were prominent in the lists of benefactions.

The Library, now the largest possessed by any of the newer universities, owes much to Unitarians. It was begun in 1851 by a gift of 1,200 volumes from James Heywood, F.R.S. In 1874 C. J. Darbishire, a prominent member of Bank Street Chapel, Bolton, gave £1,000 in augmentation of it. In 1882 Salis Schwabe added £200 for the same

purpose, and Samuel Robinson, an Oriental scholar and an old student of Manchester College, bequeathed to it all his Oriental books and MSS. and a further £500. A condition governing the gifts of Messrs. Darbishire and Schwabe is indicative of their religious principles, and may be said to point forward to the foundation on which the Faculty of Theology was erected in the University in 1904. "The Library should include so-called sacred books and works of comparative theology, but not such as treat of dogmatic or controversial subjects in a spirit other than that of scientific and unprejudiced pursuit of truth and frank declaration of the results from time to time attained by intellectual research free from the bonds of authority and preconception." Two years before the faculty of Theology was established, it may be added, Mr. C. P. Scott, editor of *The Manchester Guardian*, purchased and presented the library of the late Professor Marillier "containing 2,200 volumes and especially rich in works on the history of religion."

In 1880 Thomas Wrigley, of Bury, bequeathed £10,000 for the general purposes of the College, and almost half a century later Lady Durning-Lawrence bequeathed the same sum to the University.

In every advance of the College, Unitarians played their part. In 1877 a memorial was presented to the Privy Council "praying for the grant of a charter to Owens College conferring upon it the rank of a university." Amongst the petitions in its support was one signed by the President and Principal of the Unitarian Home Missionary Board (now Unitarian College). The President, Mr. C. S. Grundy, was the Mayor of Manchester, and it therefore fell to him to be one of the speakers in favour of the memorial when presented. The Charter was granted, April 20, 1880, and Owens College constituted a College of the Victoria University, University College, Liverpool, being admitted in 1884 and Yorkshire College, Leeds, in 1887.

In 1899 Captain Partington (afterwards first Lord Doverdale) gave £2,000 and Mr. J. P. Thomasson, of Bolton, £1,000 towards the Physical Laboratory. In 1901 Mrs. James Worthington, of Sale, made a donation of £2,000 to the Women's Department, and Mrs. Thomas Ashton one of £1,000 to the Jubilee Fund of 1902. Miss M. E. Gaskell bequeathed to the University in 1912 £1,000 and the plate presented to her father by the Cross Street Chapel Congregation on the completion of his fifty years' ministry.

The names of five Unitarians are associated with Chairs in the University. In 1904, the federal university being dissolved, Owens College received a new charter with the title of the Victoria University of Manchester. From its foundation Unitarians have been amongst the members of its Court and Council, and recent Treasurers include Hermann Woolley and A. E. Steinthal; whilst the present Chairman of the Council is Mr. A. H. Worthington, for long associated with Manchester College as Secretary, Chairman of Committee, and President. Of Unitarian honorary graduates, whose degrees were conferred primarily in recognition of their work for the University, there are ten, including the two last-named.

BIRMINGHAM

Birmingham University, whose relation to Mason College resembles that of Manchester University to Owens College, was the first of the modern civic universities. When the university charter was granted, Mason College, like Owens, the foundation of a public-spirited citizen, had been amalgamated with the Medical School of an earlier institution, Queen's College. Lectures to medical students at the General Hospital, beginning as early as 1779, mainly through the enterprise of William Sands Cox (1801–78), developed

(April 1828) into a School of Medicine and Surgery. The generous support of the Rev. Dr. Warneford, a local rector, then provided the school with equipment and a residence, and faculties of Divinity, Medicine, Law, and Engineering were established. "Admirable as Dr. Warneford's intentions were, as appears clearly from his letters, he wished the College to be conducted strictly and entirely on Church of England principles."[1] By a charter, July 16, 1843, it became "The Queen's College, Birmingham," with its patron as Visitor. A few years later, differences of opinion amongst the Governors led to a separate charter being given (December 1851) to the Theological School. From this time on the number of students decreased, and the College became involved in financial difficulties. Mr. Sands Cox withdrew from it in 1867. As one result of an inquiry by the Charity Commissioners, the Queen's Hospital, with which the College had been associated, was separated from it, and the medical school freed from theological control. Meanwhile, to meet the needs of students at the General Hospital, Sydenham College had been established, August 1851, as a medical school without theological restrictions. The amalgamation of the two schools took place in April 1868. One of the Professors of Medicine at the General Hospital was James Russell, M.D. (1818–85), an ardent Unitarian, described as "the most prominent of those who supported the amalgamation, to whom, indeed, the successful union was very largely due."[2]

In 1870 Sir Josiah Mason founded Mason College as a college of science with benefactions amounting to over £200,000. One of the first four professors appointed was Dr. J. H. Poynting, son of the Rev. T. E. Poynting, of Monton. Of this group of early teachers, Poynting is said to have been "perhaps the most prominent. . . . He became

[1] *History of the Birmingham Medical School, 1825–1925*, p. 29.
[2] Ibid., p. 42.

one of the real inspirers of intellectual life and learning in Birmingham, and Mason College and the University owe a deep debt of gratitude to him for having laid the foundations of learning and research in so sound a manner."[1]

The Rev. Henry William Crosskey, LL.D., of the Church of the Messiah, took an active part in all matters of education during his ministry (1869–93) in Birmingham and was anxious to see the edifice of educational institutions in the town crowned by the establishment of a university. As President of the Birmingham Literary and Philosophical Society, he read a valuable paper before its members, February 10, 1887, entitled, *Proposals for a Midland University*. He contended that "an Examining Board cannot be regarded as a substitute for a university granting degrees to students in its associated colleges alone"; that "a degree examination ought to be conducted by a board on which the teaching staff of the College is largely represented," and therefore argued against affiliation with the University of London. He also declared himself opposed to the incorporation of Mason College with the Victoria University on the ground, amongst others, that "the Midlands constitute a separate and independent district, animated by its own genius and having its own wants," and "that such an alliance would not specially interest our own merchants and manufacturers in university affairs—fire their imaginations with the light of its achievements and arouse their ambitions to promote its aims." He observed that "the Charter of Queen's College provided for the teaching of 'all the various branches of Literature, Science, and Learning,' but there is one fatal obstacle in the way of any attempt to convert it into a Midland University—it is compelled by law to be a denominational institution. . . . A university appealing for support to all the inhabitants of the

[1] Burstall and Burton, *Souvenir History of the Mason Science College and the University of Birmingham, 1880–1930*, p. 13.

Midlands must be entirely and absolutely unconnected with any ecclesiastical organisation. . . . The Medical Faculty of Queen's College is, however, of eminent public value, and might readily and wisely be incorporated in a Midland university. . . ."

The first step in the direction indicated in the last sentence was taken in 1892, when, through the efforts of Lawson Tait, Dr. (afterwards Sir) Bertram Windle, and others, the Medical Faculty of Queen's College became associated with Mason College. The movement to procure for the College the status of a university quickly followed.

Dr. Crosskey was one of the promoters of the scheme, carried out in 1894, for transferring from the Birmingham School Board to Mason College the Day Training College for Elementary Teachers. Sir George Kenrick, a member of an old Unitarian family, anonymously presented the College with a capital sum producing an income of £200 towards the expenses of the new department. One of the last developments during Mason College days was the establishment of a school of commerce, which developed into the first Faculty of Commerce in an English university. "Its creation was largely due to the influence of Mr. Arthur Chamberlain."[1] Joseph Chamberlain, a member of Crosskey's Congregation, as early as 1893 expressed himself strongly in favour of a university for Birmingham. He had been Mayor when the foundation-stone of Mason College was laid, and on the death of its founder, June 16, 1881, became one of the five representatives of the town council on the governing body of the College. Like Crosskey, he was much opposed to incorporation with Victoria University, which met with favour in some quarters. He saw, and was one of the first to see, the value of a civic university, and (November 18, 1898) a petition for a charter for Birmingham University was set on foot. A public meeting in

[1] Burstall and Burton, *ut supra*, p. 20.

its support was held, when Charles Gabriel Beale, another member of Crosskey's Congregation, took the chair. Chamberlain interested Andrew Carnegie in the project, and the result was a gift of £50,000 towards the endowment fund. Carnegie suggested that a deputation should visit the United States to study the teaching of science there. Two of the three members of the deputation were Sir George Kenrick and Professor J. H. Poynting. In April 1900 the Charter was granted, and Joseph Chamberlain became first Chancellor. The first Vice-Chancellor, not then an academic appointment, was C. G. Beale, who, until his death in 1912, gave himself wholeheartedly to the service of the University, and especially interested himself in the planning and erection of the new buildings at Edgbaston. The Chair of Engineering, bearing his name, was endowed in memory of his work for the University. Mrs. Beale was largely responsible for the provision of a university hostel in 1908, and to a wing added a little later her name was given. Sir George Kenrick was Chairman of the Building Committee when the new university buildings were erected, and the Clock Tower was built as a memorial of Joseph Chamberlain.

In Birmingham, as in the university towns in the North of England, many generous and public-spirited members of all religious denominations united in the effort to establish the University, but none more readily than the Unitarians under the leadership of Joseph Chamberlain, the distinguished statesman, to whose initiative and enterprise the movement owed so much.

LIVERPOOL

At Liverpool, as in Manchester and elsewhere, the establishment of a university college was preceded by the foundation of other institutions designed to promote culture and education in the town, some of which were destined ultimately to be incorporated in it.

The Royal Institution, established, May 29, 1817, by the efforts of a committee, including prominent Unitarians like William Roscoe and the Rev. William Shepherd, was "a centre of intellectual life for three-quarters of a century." From 1834 to 1844 it provided a home for the embryo School of Medicine; its school was for long distinguished and successful, and in its hospitable rooms most of the Liverpool learned societies came into existence. When in 1878 the movement for the establishment of a university college began to take shape, the Rev. Charles Beard was Chairman of the Committee of the Association for the Promotion of Higher Education in Liverpool which presented a requisition to the Mayor to call a town's meeting to consider the scheme, and he was appointed to draw up a pamphlet explaining the objects of the College. "In *The First Page of the History of University College, Liverpool* (1892), Dr. J. Campbell Brown, one of the Honorary Secretaries of the General Committee, remarks: 'The work was mainly done by small sub-committees, including altogether about half a dozen members, of whom it will not be invidious to name one, wise, earnest, and self-denying, the late Rev. Charles Beard.' " In a *Memoir of Beard*, by Professor A. C. Bradley, it is said that "the College owes its existence in part to Charles Beard. . . . He was keenly interested in the first appointments on the staff, and he had much to do with the framing of its policy and the construction of its statutes. We owe to him perhaps more than to anyone else that fundamental condition of the constitution of the College by which it was placed in equal relations of sympathy with all religious denominations. He could not fail to feel, what no one who cares for education can fail to feel, that a university college debarred, as our College is by this provision practically debarred, from teaching one of the most important subjects (theology) suffers a grievous loss. But he knew that the blame of that loss lies not with the friends of higher education in

particular but with English society in general, and the very depth of his feeling of the importance of theological instruction made him also feel that in a university it is better to leave it untouched than by introducing it to run in danger of divisions hurtful to religion and education alike. . . . After the College was opened, Mr. Beard was Vice-Chairman of its Council, and from his knowledge, energy, and decision, was to the end one of its most useful members."

The change in the relations of Protestant Churches towards each other and their recognition of the principle of non-subscription in every branch of university learning, which has led to the erection of open faculties of Theology in Wales, London, and Manchester, has removed the "danger" to which Professor Bradley referred, but the almost complete absence of theological colleges in the Liverpool district has not yet made necessary any revision of the first rule of the Constitution of the College which embodies the principle named. "It shall be a fundamental condition of the constitution of this College that no Student, Professor, Teacher, or other Officer or Person connected with the Institution shall be required to make any declaration as to, or to submit to any test whatsoever of, his religious opinions; and that no gift or endowment for theological or religious purpose to which any theological condition is attached shall be accepted on behalf of the College." This clause was afterwards included in the Charter of Liverpool University, with an addition providing, if thought fit, for the teaching of Semitics, Hellenistic Greek, and Ecclesiastical History, and for the recognition "by affiliation or otherwise" of "any college or institution in which theological teaching may be given or any member of the staff or any student thereof."

In his work for University College, Beard was most generously supported by the members of his congregation

and by Liverpool Unitarians generally. Speaking of the two Unitarian ministers, W. Robertson Nicoll says,[1] "Ian Maclaren in common with the whole city regarded with admiration and pride their unquestioned gifts of sanctity and intellect. It may be doubted whether in any city of England Unitarians were better represented than they had been in Liverpool."

"Beard was a man," said a later member of the University staff, "to whom the University owes a debt that can never be adequately acknowledged. . . . He, more than any other single man, was the inspirer of the movement which led to the foundation of University College. . . . It needed the strong faith, the fine tact, and the practical sagacity of William Rathbone to turn the dream into a reality, but the dream would never have been realisable but for Charles Beard."[2]

Opened January 23, 1882, the College was admitted as a constituent college of Victoria University, November 1, 1884, and by the Charter granted, July 15, 1903, became Liverpool University. In these and subsequent developments Unitarians played a conspicuous part. In all no fewer than thirteen Chairs in Art, Science, and Medicine owe their foundation to them, and the names of Rathbone, Brunner, Gaskell, Holt, Tate, Jones, Bowring, Herdman, and Booth, representing in more than one instance two or more donors, are indissolubly associated with the teaching of the University. The library, the museum, and the geological laboratory were the gifts of Sir Henry Tate, George Holt, and Sir William Herdman, and, more recently, the Institute of Education with its own library and the School of Social Science, both in Abercrombie Square, are the munificent gifts of Mr. C. Sydney Jones, who inherited his father's interest in the College. Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Rathbone and

[1] *Life of John Watson*, p. 80, London, 1908.
[2] Ramsay Muir, *William Rathbone*, Inaugural Lecture, p. 3, Liverpool, 1908.

Miss Emma Holt have largely assisted in the provision of hostels for men and women students, and several of the most valuable fellowships and scholarships offered to students were founded by Unitarians.

The first Treasurer of the University was Mr. Hugh Rathbone, to whose initiative it is due that Liverpool was the first of the modern universities to adopt a superannuation scheme for its staff. The present Treasurer is a Unitarian, the son of a former Liverpool minister, whilst Mr. C. Sydney Jones is one of the Pro-Chancellors and President of the Council. Amongst the honorary graduates, whose work for the University has been thus recognised, are six Unitarians.

It may be idle to suppose that Liverpool University could not have come into being without the co-operation of its Unitarian citizens, but it can hardly be denied that the small religious community to which they belong has contributed, out of all proportion to its numbers, alike to its establishment, its equipment, its development, and its government from the beginning.

LEEDS

In a chapter on "The Development of Thought in Leeds" in a volume published in 1927 in connection with the meeting of the British Association in the city, Professor A. J. Grant refers to "the fine subscription library" founded by Dr. Priestley during his ministry of Mill Hill Chapel, and to the various educational institutions in which the members of the chapel played so prominent a part. Of the Leeds Mechanics' Institution, founded in 1824, John Luccock was one of the two Vice-Presidents, and John Darnton the Treasurer. After its amalgamation in 1842 with the Leeds Literary Institution (founded 1834), James Kitson, father of the first Lord Airedale, was one of two Honorary Secretaries. From this society, says Professor

Grant, "have sprung such important institutions as the Leeds Boys' Modern School, the Girls' Modern School, and the Leeds School of Art." It may be added that the foundation-stone of the present building of the Leeds Institute was laid in 1865 by the President, J. D. Luccock, one of the many Unitarian Mayors of Leeds, whilst Sir James Kitson (afterwards Lord Airedale) performed the same ceremony for the Leeds Boys' Modern School in 1889 and the School of Art in 1901. "When Dr. Priestley had laid down the ministry of the chapel in 1773," says the historian, "he had in his farewell sermon thanked the authorities of the chapel because while in his pulpit he had had 'full liberty to speak, write, or do'; and the words aptly characterise the atmosphere of the chapel ever since. Here was large, if not yet complete, intellectual liberty; here was the idea of social service constantly maintained as an integral part of religion; here was criticism and controversy of a stimulating and challenging kind. Dr. Hutton was minister from 1818 to 1834, and he was succeeded by Mr. Charles Wicksteed, during whose incumbency the present chapel was built. Both men, but especially the second, exercised a great influence in Leeds. How great a part has been played by Mill Hill in the life of Leeds—both in its social and intellectual life—will be plain to anyone acquainted with the history of Leeds who reads the names of the trustees of 1810. Many of the most important families of Leeds are represented there. Of the influences that made the Leeds of 1810 so different from the Leeds of 1815, here was one of the most important."

Yorkshire College, from which Leeds University has sprung, was not, like the colleges at Manchester, Birmingham, and Sheffield, the creation of a single generous donor, and, as might be expected, it enlisted the support of many Unitarians. It was opened, October 1874, primarily as a college of science, but arts subjects being required for the

London University examinations to which students were attracted led to the establishment of classes in languages, literature, and philosophy. In 1887 Yorkshire College became an integral part of the Victoria University. With the break-up of the federal university, Yorkshire College, less willingly than her sister colleges at Liverpool and Manchester, petitioned for a separate charter, which was granted, April 22, 1904. In view of the subsequent rapid progress of Leeds University, it seems certain that the reluctance of the College to stand alone was by no means justified.

Amongst the Life Governors of the College in 1874 were members of well-known Unitarian families: Briggs, Brown, Fairbairn, Fielden, Lupton, Marriott, and Schunck; and amongst other generous supporters later may be found the names of Buckton, Kitson, Oates, Gaskell, and Mather. The Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Council from the beginning until his death in 1884 was Francis Lupton. A resolution of sympathy passed by the Council on his death concluded: "They feel that among the names of those who deserve to be held in lasting honour in the Yorkshire College, few, if any, will stand higher than that of Francis Lupton"; whilst the obituary notice in *The Leeds Mercury* (May 21, 1884) observed: "The idea of founding and raising into due prominence a Yorkshire college was perhaps that which of late years had the largest measure of his thought."

It was probably due largely to Unitarian influence that the first clause in the Articles of the Association of the College (July 9, 1878), signed by seven subscribers, including Francis Lupton, contained the provision: "That no Student, Professor, Teacher, or other officer or person connected with the College shall be required to make any declaration as to, or submit to any test of, his religious opinions." Substantially the clause is retained in the section of the Charter of Leeds University relating to the powers of the Court.

The connection of Unitarians with the University is clear from the names of the members of the Court, which include those of Briggs, Kitson, Lupton, and Marriott—in more than one instance representing several members of the family, whilst amongst the honorary graduates are the names of Lupton, Airedale, and three Unitarian divines—Robert Collyer, Charles Hargrove, and Philip Henry Wicksteed. Of these, Collyer, the famous American preacher, was a Yorkshire man by birth, and Wicksteed was the son of the former minister of Mill Hill Chapel. Charles Hargrove (1840–1918) was the minister of the chapel from 1876 to 1912, and, according to Dr. L. P. Jacks, his biographer, there was at one time "a suggestion, emanating from Leeds itself, that he should become Professor of English in the Yorkshire College."

CHAPTER I

THE UNITARIAN CONTRIBUTION TO PERIODICAL LITERATURE

DURING the eighteenth century liberal-minded Presbyterians, the ancestors of the modern Unitarians, were responsible for a large share in the literary essays, issued at more or less regular intervals, that heralded the birth of the later monthly and quarterly journals, in the conduct of which during the century which followed their descendants played an equally active and honourable part.

John Dunton (1659–1733), the Whig bookseller, led the way with the *Athenian Gazette* (1690–96), a kind of "Notes and Queries" published weekly. In 1704 Daniel Defoe (1661?–1731), one time student at the academy of Charles Morton, began his *Review*, which pointed the way to the *Tatlers*, *Spectators*, and *Guardians* which followed. The character of the *Independent Whig*, a weekly founded in 1719, may be seen from the title given by Thomas Gordon (*d.* 1750) to the reprint (1732) of his articles in it, *The Pillars of Priestcraft and Orthodoxy Shaken*.

Much of what was written in such journals was inspired by the dominant fear of Roman Catholicism. It was not long since a Roman Catholic monarch had misruled the country. The rising of the Old Pretender in 1715 and that of the Young Pretender thirty years later reminded Dissenters of the precarious tenure of their toleration. No ecclesiastical party at this date stood for the toleration of Roman Catholics, but the High Church party cherished sacerdotalism in the hope of preventing conversions to Rome, whilst Dissenters favoured a root and branch policy, and opposed not only sacerdotalism but every manifestation of ecclesiasticism.

More definitely religious in outlook than the rest of the periodical publications were *The Occasional Papers* (1716–19), published monthly at threepence or fourpence each. The writers were anonymous. Joshua Toulmin (1740–1815), in a manuscript note dated April 26, 1792, on the fly-leaf of his copy of Volume I, identified them with the exception of one (Nathaniel Lardner), whom, however, he included in a list contributed to *The Monthly Repository* in 1813. Toulmin owed his information to the Rev. Thomas Watson, of Bridgwater, who received it from Dr. Roger Flexman (1708–95), a scholar who, it was said, "possessed a store of literary and biographical information." The writers were Doctors Grosvenor, Avery, Wright, Evans, Lardner, Lowman, Earle, and Browne. Known as "The Bagwell Papers"—each letter representing the surname of a contributor—and afterwards collected in three volumes, they were the product of men who represented the liberal element in the Salters' Hall Conference.[1] They were men of distinction, and a few were decidedly heterodox in theology. All were Nonconformist divines. Simon Browne (1680–1732) was a Congregationalist and a Sabellian. Benjamin Avery (*d.* 1764) was a Presbyterian and a moderate Arian, who withdrew from the ministry after the Salters' Hall pronouncement against Arianism, and after Barrington Shute became a peer, succeeded him as leader of the liberal laity. He was the friend and biographer of James Peirce, of Exeter. Nathaniel Lardner (1684–1768), who contributed one paper, was afterwards a famous patristic scholar and a Unitarian of the humanitarian school. The breadth and tolerance of the contributors to *The Occasional Papers* may be seen from the reply of Moses Lowman[2] to the question: "Would you have *them* received as our fellow-Christians who err in fundamentals?" "I never yet could see a list of fundamentals in Christianity . . . that only, in my notion, is

[1] See p. 14.

[2] ii, p. 179.

a fundamental mistake in religion, which is inconsistent with a good heart and a religious conversation."

Dr. Edmund Law (1703–87), Bishop of Carlisle, in his *Theory of Religion*, spoke of the "papers" as "almost forgotten," but "as well deserving a new edition." Certainly, even now, some of their sentiments are not so trite as to be completely out of date.

From March 13, 1735, to March 13, 1738, was published *The Old Whig, or The Consistent Protestant*, a weekly quarto under the editorship of Benjamin Avery. No article was signed. Amongst the contributors were Dr. Caleb Fleming (1698–1779), the first Dissenting minister who preached humanitarian doctrine concerning the person of Christ during the whole of his ministry, 1740–79; Dr. James Foster (1659–1753), the eloquent Unitarian Baptist divine whose preaching won the praise of Alexander Pope; Dr. George Benson, whose contributions to Biblical scholarship have been already noticed;[1] Dr. John Disney (1746–1816), then Vicar of Swinderby, afterwards colleague of Theophilus Lindsey at Essex Street Chapel; and Micaijah Towgood (1700–93), the Arian tutor of the second Exeter Academy (1760–71). Under the name of "Charistes," Benson contributed two remarkable articles on Servetus as the basis of a polemic against Calvinism, but when the articles were reprinted (1739) in two volumes, these and similar contributions were omitted, probably because they exposed their authors to prosecution.

The Library, or Moral and Critical Magazine, by a society of gentlemen (56 pp.), circulating from April 1761 to May 1762, was edited by Dr. Joseph Jeffries, an old student of Taunton Academy under Dr. Thomas Amory. It included articles on Divinity, Ethics, Science, and Literature, Politics, and Civil and Religious Liberty, whilst a place was reserved for Poetry. Humour was not excluded, and

[1] See p. 27.

one article is entitled *A Genuine Sketch of Modern Authorship*, by Elias Mountgarret, of Grub Street, author of *A Panegyrical Essay upon Potatoes*. The Preface to Volume I declares that the promoters were "guided by no mercenary views and were under no temptation to huddle together any crude, undigested compositions that may be produced," but confessed in their concluding remarks in the second volume that "the sale of the journal has not been such as to afford a sufficient compensation to the proprietors for the trouble and expense that attend a monthly composition." Articles were unsigned. Unitarian contributors included, in addition to the editor, Ebenezer Radcliffe (1732–1809), an old student at Northampton under Doddridge; Andrew Kippis, tutor at Hoxton; John Alexander (*d.* 1765), an old student of Daventry; Daniel Noble (1727–83), a former pupil at Kendal; and, apparently, as a MS. note in the Edinburgh University copy of the journal informs us, Dr. Nathaniel Lardner.

The periodicals already named were the offspring of liberal Dissenting principles, religious and political, and exhibited some pretensions to literary style but hardly to philosophical and theological scholarship.

The Theological Repository. This magazine, first published, January 2, 1769, by Joseph Priestley, was avowedly Unitarian, and may claim to have been the first in a long line of Unitarian periodicals not quite unbroken, but covering in all a period of more than a century and a half. Priestley might have made his own the opening words of *The Hibbert Journal*, written in 1902—a hundred and thirty-three years after he founded his journal: "We shall judge of opinions by the seriousness with which they are held and the fairness and ability with which they are maintained. We propose to practise the doctrine of the open door. . . . We shall allow the journal to exhibit the clash of contrary opinions. No attempt will be made to select the views of concordant

minds. Rather will controversy be welcomed, our belief being that the encounter of opposites kindles the spark of truth."

As its title-page informs us, *The Theological Repository* consisted of "Original Essays, Hints, Queries, etc., calculated to promote Religious Knowledge." Considerable stress was laid on the originality of the contributions. An exception was made of "translations from foreign publications" even though "not of recent date because, to our English readers they will give as much satisfaction as communications that are properly original." It does not appear that such translations found their way into the *Repository* (though quotations from the writings of foreign scholars were not infrequently introduced), but Priestley's attitude towards Continental scholarship at this date is in itself an evidence of openness of mind. Irregularity in publication and fluctuation in price doubtless adversely affected the circulation of the periodical. Probably this fact determined the fixing of a uniform price of two shillings a number when the fourth volume was reached. On the title-page of every volume two mottoes from the letters of Paul and Horace denoted the spirit of the enterprise: *πάντα δοκιμάζετε* (1 Thess. v. 21) and "Si quid novisti rectius istis Candidus imperti" (Ep. i. 6, 68).

The first three volumes were published during Priestley's residence in Leeds (1769–71), the last three whilst he was minister in Birmingham (1784, 1786, 1788). The hostile reception which the *Repository* met with at the hands of orthodox critics may be judged from Priestley's spirited rejoinder, printed on the cover of the third number of Volume I, and addressed "To our Enemies." As William Turner, of Wakefield, observed in his Preface to an article in the third volume, the times were "not propitious for the commonwealth of sacred literature amidst the distractions of party and politics," and a periodical which printed excerpts from Biblical texts and versions in Latin, Greek, Hebrew,

and Syriac could make nothing like a popular appeal, whilst the continuation of a single article in two or more numbers published at long intervals cannot have added to the interest or attractiveness of the journal. By the end of 1772 it seemed as though the last had been seen of the short-lived *Theological Repository*. Twelve years later, however, it was revived on the same plan. Its support again proved as weak as the opposition to it was strong. The last number was published on August 6, 1788. Any dream its founder may have entertained of a second resurrection must have been dissipated by the outbreak of the French Revolution, with its far-reaching influence upon Nonconformists, and especially Unitarians, in England, culminating in the Birmingham Riots, July 14, 1791, which ultimately drove Priestley to find refuge in America. Of the forty-one names of contributors that have been identified, twenty have been deemed worthy of a place in *The Dictionary of National Biography*. These include Samuel Merivale (1715–71), tutor at the second Exeter Academy; Joseph Bretland (1742–1819), tutor at the third Exeter Academy; George Walker (1734?–1807), tutor at Warrington Academy and Manchester College; Gilbert Wakefield (1756–1801), tutor at Warrington Academy and Hackney College; Theophilus Lindsey (1723–1808), then Vicar of Catterick, afterwards minister at Essex Street Chapel, London; and Joshua Toulmin (1740–1815), the historian of Dissent. Lindsey's articles reveal his acceptance of Unitarianism before his withdrawal from the Church, one of them being, in fact, *A Reply to Objections to the Socinian Hypothesis*. Lay contributors included Thomas Amory (1691?–1788), the eccentric author of *The Life of John Buncle*, and Michael Dodson (1732–99), an eminent lawyer and a Biblical scholar. A clergyman, Robert Edward Garnham (1753–1802), Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, was the author of some of the most radical articles. Priestley himself was

by far the most voluminous writer, and made use of no fewer than a dozen signatures. He did not know all the contributors to the *Repository*, and had pledged himself in the Introduction to the first volume that "no pains should be taken to trace the authors of any anonymous communications." His open-mindedness is illustrated by his insertion in Volume III (1773) of a reply by Martin Tomkins (*d.* 1759) to Lardner's *Letter on the Logos*, published anonymously in 1759, which had converted Priestley himself to Socinianism in 1768.

As a pioneer in Biblical research, *The Theological Repository* is entitled to respect for its scholarly articles on textual, historical, and exegetical subjects, and it stands to its credit that various writers anticipated modern critical verdicts in the fields of translation and hermeneutics. As an open journal of liberal theological opinion, it also enabled divines and laymen of different schools to exchange their views and place them before the rather limited public interested therein at a time when religious periodicals generally were under the domination of dogmatic prejudice and ecclesiastical bias.

In 1792 *The Christian Miscellany, or Religious and Moral Magazine* was published, eight numbers only (January to August), edited by Benjamin Kingsbury, an old student of Daventry Academy under Thomas Belsham. Its plan was said to have been "suggested at an Annual Provincial Meeting of Ministers, which appointed a committee to prepare and receive materials for the work." As the prospectus was drawn up by John Holland, minister of Bank Street Chapel, Bolton, presumably it was the Provincial Meeting of Lancashire which fathered the plan. Each number consisted of forty pages, and included poetry and reviews. Articles were initialled, and the contributors included Joshua Toulmin; his son Harry, afterwards a judge in the Mississippi Territory, U.S.A.; John Holland (1766–1826);

and William Turner, of Newcastle (1761–1859), an old student of Warrington Academy. It was frankly Unitarian in sentiment. Mrs. Barbauld contributed a "Chapter of Modern Apocrypha," written in 1773, the occasion of which was the disapprobation by thirteen Scottish Presbyterian ministers of the renewal of an application to Parliament for relief by the Protestant Dissenting ministers. It was afterwards republished in *The Christian Reformer* in 1853. A sympathetic notice by Holland of Mrs. Wollstonecraft's *Rights of Women* closed with the remark: "It cannot signify by whom this paper is written, but perhaps it may remove the prejudice of some readers to be informed that it is not the production of a female."

From 1794 to 1799 appeared *The Protestant Dissenter's Magazine*. In view of the political crisis in the country when it was floated, the promoters avowed their "determination to admit nothing inflammatory," and impressed on their readers "those precepts of our holy religion, 'Fear God and honour the King.'" "It was their wish to make it a truly catholic work," and they requested "Christians of all parties to assist." Dissenters of different denominations responded to the appeal, including Congregationalists, Baptists, and Presbyterians. Amongst Unitarian contributors were John Evans, the General Baptist tutor; Abraham Rees, the Arian tutor at Hoxton Academy and Hackney College; Edmund Butcher, minister at Sidmouth, who edited the later volumes; and John Towill Rutt, an active layman who edited Priestley's works. From 1795 to 1798 Joshua Toulmin contributed valuable biographical sketches of sixteen Nonconformist divines. The magazine, which included engravings of ministers and old chapels, contained historical materials, copies of original letters, and other manuscripts from an earlier date.

The Analytical Review, or History of Literature, Domestic and Foreign, an octavo of 128 pages, circulated from May

1788 to December 1799 (28 vols.). It was published by Joseph Johnson (1738–1809), "for many years before his death the father of the book trade."[1] He was a personal friend of Theophilus Lindsey, a member of his congregation, and the publisher of Priestley's works. One of his regular contributors was Anthony Robinson (1762–1827), a pupil of Caleb Evans at the Bristol Baptist Academy, who turned Unitarian, left the ministry, and was also a contributor (Vols. III to XX) to *The Monthly Repository*. Under the signature of "S. A." he controlled the department of Politics and Economics in *The Analytical Review*. Other Unitarian writers were William Enfield, LL.D., of Norwich, and William Turner, of Newcastle. The very favourable notices of Unitarian publications suggests that several other contributors were Unitarians. Few books or pamphlets by Priestley, Price, Lindsey, Kippis, Frend, Wakefield, or other members of their circle escaped commendation, and even tracts and sermons by less-known writers received a welcome. Of Lindsey's *Address to the Students of Oxford and Cambridge*, it is said: "We do not recollect having met a controversial publication which breathes a more Christian spirit," and of Priestley's *Sermon on the Death of Robert Robinson*, the somewhat quaint remark is made: "Of all the funeral sermons which have ever come before us, this is, in our opinion, one of the most rational, most original, and, we apprehend, calculated to be the most extensively useful." Amongst non-Unitarian writers to the *Review* was William Cowper, who contributed a notice of Glover's *Athenaid* to the February number in 1789.

The Analytical Review cast its net wide and included, besides a section on Theology, others on History, Law, Natural History, Surgery, Poetry, Essays, Foreign Literature, Music, Chemistry, the Arts, Geography, Travel, Commerce, and the Drama.

[1] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Johnson, Joseph.*

The name of Aikin is associated with no fewer than three periodicals in the first decade of the nineteenth century. *The Monthly Magazine*, founded by Mr. (afterwards Sir) Richard Phillips (1767–1840), a friend of Joseph Priestley, was edited (1796–1806) by John Aikin, M.D. (1747–1822), son of Dr. John Aikin, formerly tutor at Warrington Academy, where he himself had been a student and lecturer. As a man of letters he was even more distinguished than as a physician. The magazine was, in the main, literary, with some interest in science and music, and included, amongst other features, "mathematical correspondence" resembling the chess columns of modern journals. The editor declined articles "on disputed points in theology and in Biblical criticism," wishing "as much as possible to prevent the work from becoming a theological repository." The last words suggest that Dr. Aikin was not unmindful of the fate that befell the journal of that name founded by Joseph Priestley. Amongst Unitarian contributors were William Enfield, who wrote a series of articles under the title of "The Inquirer"; Sir James Edward Smith, a member of his congregation in Norwich, who wrote *Fanaticism a Vision*; Charles Lamb and George Dyer, who both contributed verse. Dyer also was responsible for a series of articles under the name of "Cantabrigiensis." One of the chief contributors was William Taylor, of Norwich, who for twenty-nine years wrote "in an uninterrupted series of nearly 800 articles." In it "most of his German criticism and many of his best translations first appeared."[1] "Memoirs of Eminent Persons," "Proceedings of Learned Societies," "Obituaries," "Original Letters," and "Notes on Public Affairs" were regular items. Under Aikin the claims of Nonconformists to notice were not overlooked. The connection of the readers of the "magazine" with the country is curiously illustrated by the appearance in each number of an "Agri-

[1] J. W. Robberds, *Memoir of William Taylor*, i, p. 156, London, 1843.

cultural Report for the Month," discussing weather and farming prospects, crops and their prices. In 1806, dissatisfied with an award in which Aikin was an arbitrator, Richard Phillips, the proprietor of *The Monthly Magazine*, terminated his editorship of the journal.

In 1807 *The Athenaeum: A Magazine of Literary and Miscellaneous Information*, was founded with Aikin as editor. In form and contents it closely resembled *The Monthly Magazine*, though articles often ran through several numbers, and each opened with "General Correspondence," whilst more space was given to classical literature. A valuable series of articles on the Scottish universities was of special interest to Nonconformists as depicting the life and work of many of their students who migrated there from the academies in England. Unitarian writers for *The Athenaeum* included Eliezer Cogan, George Dyer, John Towill Rutt, Henry Crabb Robinson, William Taylor, Catharine Cappe, Lucy Aikin, John Jones, LL.D., and divines like Thomas Rees, Thomas Jervis, and John Bickerton Dewhurst, a classical scholar designated tutor at the Hackney Unitarian Academy, when he prematurely died.

The obituaries of Unitarians, like those of William Wood, Theophilus Lindsey, and William Rathbone, were excellent.

A correspondent who urged the claim of "Questions and Answers" to more space was informed by the editor that "experience has shown that a great proportion of magazine querists have only in view to save themselves a little trouble in searching for information, which might easily be had from common sources, whilst others make use of this form of query to introduce answers of their own."

Unhappily *The Athenaeum* was in circulation during the great war with Napoleon. In June 1809, with the completion of the fifth volume, it was discontinued, the proprietors regretting that "the attempt to unite with the common

matter of a magazine the products of superior literature has failed to obtain that degree of popularity which, at this period of extraordinary expense, is necessary to prevent loss."

In 1802 appeared *The Annual Review*, edited by Arthur Aikin (1773–1854), son of John Aikin, M.D., a large octavo published by Longmans and Rees, and entirely devoted to reviews. Books noticed were listed and their price given in the Table of Contents, whilst each section of the *Review* was prefaced by Introductory Remarks summarizing the character of the volumes under review. Charles Wellbeloved, Principal of Manchester College, York, was placed in charge of the department of Theology and Metaphysics; William Wood, minister of Mill Hill Chapel, Leeds, for thirty-five years, undertook Natural History; William Taylor, a well-known translator from the German, connected with the Octagon Chapel, Norwich, had charge of Politics, History, and German Literature; and John Bickerton Dewhurst undertook the department of Classical Literature and Bibliography. Taylor's articles in the first volume numbered seventy-six, and constituted a fifth of its thousand pages. Amongst other Unitarian contributors were John Aikin, father of the editor, and Dr. Lant Carpenter. Mrs. Barbauld "took part of the poetry and polite literature in one or two of the earliest volumes, and gave that *critique* on *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* which Sir Walter Scott said he had approved and admired the most."

In his first Introductory Remarks Wellbeloved observed: "Impartiality, in persons employed as we are, is a virtue of difficult attainment—and in our endeavour to acquire it we may not always be successful, but we will take care that no endeavours shall be wanting." "What," he added, "would meet with censure would be all those pretensions to the notice of the public not warranted by a due proportion of talents and of knowledge, and everything uncandid and illiberal, hostile to freedom of inquiry, and unbecoming the philosopher or the Christian."

The work of William Wood for the *Review* won a deserved encomium from his biographer for its "candour, judgment, and taste"; whilst that of Dewhurst earned general praise.

Seven volumes of *The Annual Review* were published when it came to an end in 1808, the last volume being edited by Thomas Rees, minister of Stamford Street Chapel, London, and a distinguished historian.[1] The work contains much valuable material relating to the literature of the period, and many notices of Unitarian publications neglected by contemporary journals.

William Vidler (1758–1816), who was in turn Anglican, Independent, and Baptist, professed Universalism in 1792, and five years later began to publish *The Universalist's Miscellany, or Philanthropist's Museum*. Sold at a popular price (6d.), largely Biblical in interest, and devoted to the propagation of Universalist doctrine, in the second year of its issue it enlisted the pen of Richard Wright (1764–1836), afterwards well known as the Unitarian Missionary who converted his chief to Unitarianism in 1802. Vidler boasted that "it is the peculiar felicity of our magazine to be open to all parties," "a liberality which has given much offence to some narrow-minded men." In another direction he was also a reformer in advance of his day. In 1801 he wrote an article upon "the neglected subject of cruelty to animals," denouncing cock-fighting, bull-baiting and the like nearly half a century before the first Act of Parliament on the subject of cruelty to animals. With Volume VI (1802) the title of the magazine was changed to *The Universal Theological Magazine*, the paper and type improved, engravings introduced, and the price raised to a shilling. Two years later it became *The Universal Theological Magazine and Impartial Review*, and

[1] See pp. 238, 259.

Joshua Toulmin and William Turner occasionally imparted to it a tincture of scholarship; whilst a few letters and records from the past found their way into its pages. John Kentish's first publication—an article on Belsham's *Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind*—appeared anonymously in it in 1804. After his conversion to Unitarianism, Vidler lost many of his early supporters without gaining a corresponding number from his new associates. Richard Wright, in his Memoir of his friend (1817), says: "The journal was ill supported by respectable correspondents, and it must be confessed that Mr. Vidler excelled in nothing so little as in the office of editor of a magazine. Oppressed by debt it expired in 1805."

In all (1797–1805) thirteen volumes had been published. The magazine was purchased by one of the contributors, Robert Aspland (1782–1845), a former student at Bristol Baptist Academy and Glasgow University, then minister to the Unitarian congregation at Gravel Pit Chapel, Hackney. It became *The Monthly Repository of Theology and General Literature*. Its plan was materially altered for the better. Originally published at a shilling, in 1811 it was increased in size and cost eighteenpence. The editor's purpose, set forth in his prospectus, was "to blend literature with theology, and to make theology rational and literature popular." His first thought was to call it *The Inquirer*, a name actually given to the small quarto journal published by subscription at Cranbrook, a monthly circulating amongst the Free-thinking Christians and Unitarians of East Sussex and West Kent in 1818–19. The title of *The Monthly Repository* was doubtless suggested by Priestley's journal, of which Aspland entertained a high opinion. In the Preface to the first volume he expressed the hope "that this, together with the succeeding volumes of the work, will be accounted, like *The Theological Repository*, edited by Dr. Priestley, a valuable part of a theological library, and be consulted in time to

come as a collection of sound argument and rational criticism as well as of authentic biography and interesting intelligence." It was to be "the advocate of Scriptural Christianity and to guard the Protestant privilege of liberty of conscience," whilst "its pages were open to all writers of ability and candour, whatever their peculiar opinions." It resembled, therefore, *The Theological Repository* in the maintenance of the open forum for debate, but its chief interest lay in the struggle then being waged to free Nonconformists, and particularly Unitarians, from legal disabilities. From time to time supplements to the volumes were published containing matter crowded out of the monthly issues, and engravings of chapels and divines were inserted.

Declining a contribution from "A Free-thinking Christian," Aspland remarked: "The magazine is open to all 'thinkers' and the 'freer' the better, but in becoming writers for *The Monthly Repository*, they must restrain themselves within certain limits, viz. those of orthography, grammar, and sense."

A few articles were signed, some contributors employed a pseudonym, and others gave initials only. From October 1806 a page or two in every number were reserved for poetry, whilst under the head of "The Inquirer" biographical and bibliographical contributions of the "Notes and Queries" type were made for many years.

Amongst ministerial contributors were Dr. Lant Carpenter, the schoolmaster divine; William Field, biographer of Samuel Parr; Thomas Morell, LL.D.; John Kenrick, classical tutor at Manchester College; John Kentish; William Turner, of Newcastle; Jeremiah Joyce, one time tutor at Hackney College; Charles Wellbeloved; John James Tayler, Principal of Manchester College; Robert Wallace, theological tutor at Manchester College; John Relly Beard, first Principal of the Unitarian Home Missionary Board (now Unitarian College, Manchester);

Francis Adrian Van der Kemp (1752–1829), a Dutch Unitarian minister in America; John Bickerton Dewhurst; and Samuel Palmer, for fifty years an Independent minister at Hackney. Amongst the lay contributors were John Towill Rutt; Benjamin Flower, the political writer; Mrs. Barbauld, the poetess; Sir Thomas Noon Talfourd, judge and author; Henry Crabb Robinson, the diarist; Samuel Parkes, the chemist; Edgar Taylor, the lawyer; Sir John Bowring, linguist, writer, and traveller; and Professor Paulus, of Jena.

Translations from the German began with the first volume when a version of Zechariah ix-xi, with notes on the original text, appeared. In 1806 its pages contained the first English translation of Lessing's *Education of the Human Race*, by Henry Crabb Robinson, and in 1812 much of Eichhorn's "Genesis" was given in English with the Hebrew text.

John Kentish and John Towill Rutt contributed to every volume for the first twenty-one years of its editorship by Aspland. Kentish's articles on Biblical Criticism were afterwards collected and published (1841) in book form, and very favourably reviewed in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, which was not wont to waste praise on the work of Dissenters. Rutt was not only a valued and regular contributor, but "sometimes took upon himself the editorial duties." A series of articles beginning in Volume XIII under the title of *The Nonconformist* were papers read before the "Non-Con Club" (est. July 1817) by its members. They were introduced as the product of "gentlemen who had associated to promote inquiry into the literature and history of the Nonconformists."

The editor did not always know from whom contributions came. They were accepted on their merits, and when Lucy Aikin's Memoir of her aunt appeared in 1825, Aspland learnt that two poetical contributions in Volumes II and IX, besides others he had recognised, were from the pen of Mrs. Barbauld.

Indexed and bound in boards, *The Monthly Repository* cost 12s. 6d. a volume. The work met with much opposition. Booksellers in various parts of the country declined to sell it on account of its theology, and in April 1807 the editor threatened to expose their names "if any further tricks of this sort were reported to him." Occasionally an evangelical journal, which bitterly criticised its contents, paid it the tribute of reprinting large portions of articles without acknowledgment.

Not until its ninth year did the *Repository* pay its way, and the industry, ability, zeal, and self-sacrifice of its editor were most praiseworthy. Memoirs and obituaries in *The Monthly Repository*, as in Unitarian journals generally, are much more valuable to the modern historical student than similar notices in contemporary evangelical journals, since they lay much less stress upon subjective matters of experience and conversion and the dying witness of the deceased than upon the facts of his life, education, published writings, and the like. Aspland, indeed, expressly counselled writers of obituaries (March 1819) to forbear "unqualified panegyrics," and "restrict their communications to a brief statement of facts and a delineation of the leading features of character."

In 1826 the journal, then regarded as well established, was transferred to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, founded a year earlier by the amalgamation of three societies founded earlier. Of the new Association, Aspland was Secretary from 1825 to 1830. In the last number edited by Aspland, Richard Wright said that "until the birth of *The Christian Reformer* (to be noticed later), *The Monthly Repository* was the only periodical in the kingdom in which writers could be heard on more than one side of a theological question."

Under the new management the journal became *The Monthly Repository and Review of Theology and General Literature*. A note in the April number discloses the interest of "the conductors" in "biographical and critical accounts of the more eminent German theologians and their works."

The *Repository* did not answer expectations in the matter of circulation. In 1829 this was said to be "not more than it was twenty years ago."

William Johnson Fox (1786–1864), then minister of South Place Chapel, and Secretary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, 1830–31, who acted as editor from September 1828, purchased it in 1831 and dropped the subtitle. He declared his policy (1832) to be "to expose cant and sophistry and demolish prejudice in every department," whilst "striving to create or to diffuse a correct taste in literature and art, a spirit of freedom in politics and rationality in religion."

Fox remained editor until June 1836. During the latter part of his control, politics and literature took the place of theology as the chief interest of *The Monthly Repository*.

It is claimed that "Fox's venture forms in one respect an era in the history of English periodical literature, for it was the first endeavour to establish a monthly magazine corresponding to the great quarterlies in general elevation and seriousness of tone."[1]

Articles were unsigned. A key to the contributors from 1832 to 1836 is contained in a manuscript in the British Museum, made from Fox's manuscript notes by his daughter.

These include William Bridges Adams (1797–1872); Dr. (afterwards Sir) John Bowring (1792–1872), the Unitarian linguist, writer, and traveller; Ebenezer Elliott (1781–1849), "the corn-law rhymer"; and Charles Pemberton (1790–1840). One of the most constant contributors, under three signatures, was Harriet Martineau (1802–1876). Her recent

[1] R. Garnett, *Life of W. J. Fox*, p. 91, London, 1910.

biographer observes: "Fox was not in a position to offer her any remuneration at all for her articles. All he could hold out was a promise of full and careful criticism. He kept this promise, and his contributor accepted his critical admonitions with gratitude. She poured out work for the *Repository*—essays, poems, and reviews—but the stream flowed under difficult conditions, for no true gentlewoman could afford to be seen labouring with a pen. Harriet was under the obligation to conceal her literary habits from the neighbours as assiduously as Fox concealed her sex from his readers."[1] James Martineau contributed to it in 1833 an essay on Priestley in three articles—his first production of importance—which, when republished in 1852, was considerably revised, its author having by that time thrown off his bondage to the philosophical school in which he was trained as a student at York, and of which Priestley for long had been the chief Unitarian representative. In 1834 he contributed an eloquent review of Bentham's *Deontology*, which revealed still more clearly his devotion to the school of David Hartley and James Mill. Amongst other Unitarian writers for *The Monthly Repository* under Fox was Henry Crabb Robinson, who gratuitously contributed a series of nine articles on Goethe in 1852–53 "memorable as the first systematic introduction of Goethe to England."[2] The two most distinguished contributors, though not Unitarians, probably owed their introduction to Fox to their friendship with members of his congregation. Harriet Taylor, afterwards Mrs. John Stuart Mill, brought into the circle her future husband, whilst Eliza and Sarah Fuller Flower (afterwards Mrs. W. B. Adams) introduced Robert Browning. Eliza Flower was responsible for the "Music of the Months," apparently her own composition in 1834, and Sarah Fuller Flower contributed poems and essays (1832–36). One of the

[1] Theodora Bosanquet, *Harriet Martineau*, pp. 31–4, London, 1927.
[2] R. Garnett, *The Life of W. J. Fox*, p. 120, London, 1910.

essays (1833) describing an evening with the Lambs and Coleridge was reprinted in Dobell's *Sidelights on Charles Lamb*. Robert Browning wrote for the *Repository* a sonnet in 1834 and other verse in 1835 and 1836, and it was Fox's reviews of the early poems of Browning that first brought the poet before the English people. Unfortunately his articles on the subject of divorce estranged many of his supporters.

In July 1836 *The Monthly Repository* was transferred to R. H. Horne (1803–40), who had contributed to it from 1834 essays, poems, and reviews, and over the signature "M. I. D." gave an account of his early adventures in the Mexican Navy, and his subsequent experience of shipwreck, fire at sea, and mutiny. The journal did not prosper, and Horne plaintively protested: "We are still perseveringly considered a Unitarian magazine by the public who persist in not reading us to see the absurdity of their opinions, and of course we have lost all the Unitarian connection, with lots of all other Dissenters to boot, by being beyond all sectarianism." Next year Leigh Hunt (1784–1859) took it over and conducted it from July 1837 to March 1838, but even his bright spirit failed to animate the almost moribund magazine, and in March 1838 it quietly expired.

It is no reflection on the brilliant band of writers who gathered round Fox and his successors, most of whose writings may be read elsewhere, to say that *The Monthly Repository* still commands respect amongst the periodical literature of the first half of last century by reason of its contents under the editorship of Robert Aspland. He and his friends made it an invaluable storehouse of Dissenting history and biography. Many of the contributors, like Joshua Toulmin, John Towill Rutt, and William Turner—to name only three—were competent scholars deeply interested in the congregations, academies, literature, and personalities of the old Dissent, and by their researches were

happily able to rescue from oblivion letters, minutes, records, and reminiscences, the originals of which have long since perished. To *The Monthly Repository*, therefore, modern students of Nonconformity owe much for its pictures of the life and work of Dissenting ministers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and for its invaluable narratives of the rise and progress of Nonconformity during that period in almost every part of the country.

As early as 1815 Robert Aspland had founded *The Christian Reformer, or New Evangelical Miscellany*, a duodecimo monthly of thirty-six pages. "It is called the 'Reformer,' said its editor, "because its object is to promote the true principles of the Reformation, the sufficiency of the Scripture, and the right of private judgment and of free public worship, and it is further denominated 'Evangelical,' because it is established for the assertion and defence of 'the faith once delivered to the saints' unmixed with the commandments and traditions of men."

It is a statement which provides a clear index to the mind of Robert Aspland during his ministry from first to last. Designed to be more practical and less controversial than *The Monthly Repository*, and appealing to a humbler class of readers, *The Christian Reformer* for nearly twenty years was really a pioneer of its kind, for in the year of Waterloo there were no religious journals suited to the intelligence of those who had learnt the three "R's" and something more in the Lancastrian schools and the Sunday schools of the country.

Occasionally contributors left it to the editor's discretion to insert their articles in one or the other of his two journals.

In 1834 *The Christian Reformer*, bearing the sub-title, *Unitarian Magazine and Review*, was enlarged to octavo size, and aspired to be the Unitarian successor to *The Monthly Repository*, which by this time seemed to have strayed far from the straight path of its founder. At the end of 1844 Robert Aspland became seriously ill. His last contributions

were the obituaries of Sir William Follett and Earl Grey, but the whole of the January number (1843), published the day after his death, had been read and revised by him. *The Christian Reformer* was continued by his son, Robert Brook Aspland, until December 1863. Many of the characteristic features of *The Monthly Repository* were retained, especially its interest in biography and history. As Alexander Gordon said of its editor: "His knowledge of Nonconformist and Unitarian biography, the result largely of his own laborious researches, was singularly wide, minute, and exact. He combined in a remarkable degree the cultured tastes of a bookish divine with the tact and experience of the man of affairs."[1]

In theology *The Christian Reformer* was conservative, stoutly maintaining the Scriptural basis of faith and the determinist philosophy of Belsham. Its contributors included many, like John Towill Rutt, who had written for *The Monthly Repository*; and Robert Brook Aspland, in the Memoir of his father (1850), which originally appeared in the *Reformer*, observed that "six writers gave voluntary assistance to the two journals over a period of forty-two years," "perhaps an unequalled circumstance in the history of periodical literature."[2] He claimed that the early volumes of the *Reformer* were "perhaps as valuable as any of the long series issued by its editor."[3] He could not claim what must be allowed, viz. that the volumes edited by himself were of even greater value than those edited by his father. Scholars like Joseph Hunter (1783–1861), the antiquary, John James Tayler, and James Yates, F.R.S., wrote for the first volume. A series of articles on German universities (1837–38), by Dr. Walter C. Perry (1815–1912), indicated the interest of the journal in contemporary education on the Continent. His volume on *German University Education* was published in 1843.

[1] *History of Dukinfield*, p. 83. [2] Ibid., p. 191. [3] Ibid., p. 146.

Samuel Sharpe's articles on Biblical Criticism were afterwards collected by him and published under the title, *Historic Notes on the Old and New Testaments* (1854). Letters, papers, and other manuscript materials were published in one number after another. An admirable feature was the inclusion of brief, scholarly sketches of the old chapels in the possession of Unitarians. Several articles by William Jevons (1794–1875), an old student at York, who had contributed to the *Repository* and retired from the ministry, revealed a rational view of the origins of the Gospels—"compilations by unknown hands from documents, the authors of which are equally unknown"—a view remarkable for its date. The series of articles entitled *Historical Sketch of the Trinitarian Controversy from the Accession of William IV to the Passing of the Blasphemy Act* (1841–46), by Robert Wallace, theological tutor at Manchester College, 1840–46, prepared the way for his valuable work on *Anti-Trinitarian Biography*, published in three volumes in 1850. These attracted the attention of Dr. Turton, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and led to a short correspondence between the two scholars—an evidence that *The Christian Reformer* was sometimes read with interest by learned opponents of its doctrine. The autobiography of Francis Adrian Van der Kemp (1791–1829), which appeared in the *Reformer* in 1837, was republished in 1903.

When *The Christian Reformer* was discontinued (December 1863), father and son had edited it without pecuniary remuneration for fifty-eight years. In his farewell, Robert Brook Aspland said that whilst maintaining Unitarianism, "a supernatural and miraculous Christianity" as "the true Gospel," its pages "have always been open" to those who differed from its editor. He acknowledged that he had been protected from financial loss "by a fund raised by friends," of which W. Rayner Wood, Esq., of Manchester, was

Treasurer, and the services to the journal of the Rev. Edward Higginson, of Swansea, were especially noted. Next year (June 22, 1864) Aspland's friends presented him with silver plate and £600 "on his retirement from *The Christian Reformer*, which for nearly twenty years had been conducted by him, as by his honoured father, in a spirit of fairness to all parties, as a memorial of his long and unrequited labours in the cause of Christian truth and freedom."

The Christian Reformer was not the only Unitarian monthly during the last thirty years of its existence. From 1831 to 1836 *The General Baptist Advocate*, edited by Joseph Calrow Means (1801–79), minister of Worship Street Chapel, London, circulated amongst the Unitarian General Baptists. It was a small periodical of eight pages, issued at twopence, enlarged in the second year to sixteen pages and costing threepence. General Baptists, a declining body, were not sufficiently numerous to maintain it without aid from their fund, and the journal never enlisted the support of Unitarians generally. For the last six months it was edited by the Rev. Benjamin Mardon, M.A., who continued it for three years in an enlarged form as *The Unitarian Baptist Advocate*. *The Unitarian Baptist Advocate*, which contained some original letters of interest and value, came to an end in September 1839.

The Unitarian Chronicle and Companion to the Monthly Repository (1832) was an attempt to provide for the needs of Unitarian subscribers to the last-named journal after it had fallen into the hands of W. J. Fox. Edited by Edwin Chapman (1798–1875), it was continued (1834–35) as *The Unitarian Magazine and Chronicle*, and ceased with the publication of *The Christian Teacher* in 1835.

The English Presbyterian was started as a monthly magazine under the inspiration of Joseph Hunter, whilst Unitarians were engaged in the lawsuit which led to their being removed from the management of the Lady Hewley Fund (1842). It

ran only eight months, and was almost wholly absorbed in preparing what may be called the case for the defence in the suit in question.

The Christian Moderator, a monthly periodical, was published in London in the interests of Arianism from 1836 to 1838. Its title gives a clue to the mediating position taken up by its contributors and supporters between orthodoxy on the one side and the radicalism of Belsham on the other. It received much support from the North of Ireland, where its doctrine flourished more vigorously than in England during the nineteenth century. Its chief English contributors were John Evans, LL.D., General Baptist minister and tutor; David James, minister of Newbury, Berks, 1761–1804; and John Kitcat, son-in-law of James and his successor (1805–27) at Newbury. John Scott Porter, later a leading figure in Irish Unitarian circles, then minister of Carter Lane, London, was one of the editors. Most of the articles were unsigned. The editor claimed that he was "solicitous to do ample justice to every sect and party," and that "no article was rejected on account of its opposition to his own peculiar sentiments." Evans wrote for it a valuable series of memoirs of Arian divines. Unfortunately the journal was born too late to enjoy a long life. Arianism, though by no means dead, was now no longer the predominant form of Unitarianism, and the more discreet Arian divines contrived to preserve at least the appearance of harmony amongst their flocks by steadfastly avoiding speculative and doctrinal subjects in their preaching.

In 1835 *The Christian Teacher and Chronicle*, edited by John Relly Beard, was established. Printed in Manchester and circulating in the North of England, it constituted a more serious rival to *The Christian Reformer*. Popular in style, it included "Chapters for Children," gave much attention to the new movements of temperance and domestic missions, and was designed "to be not a controversial but a practical

work." Articles were generally unsigned. Contributors included John James Tayler, Lant Carpenter, Harriet Martineau, William Turner, and Walter C. Perry. James Brooks wrote an important series of articles (1837) on *Arianism Amongst English Presbyterians*, afterwards reprinted. Towards the end of 1837 Beard intimated that he "had sunk £100 in the undertaking," and pleaded for "an increase in sales." Some promise of this being forthcoming, next year the Revs. William Johns and George Buckland were associated with him in the conduct of the periodical, which became *The Christian Teacher and Chronicler of Beneficence*. In 1839 John Hamilton Thom (1808–94), a well-known Liverpool divine, became sole editor, changed the sub-title to *A Theological and Literary Journal*, and converted it into a quarterly, published at half-a-crown, since, "having no remuneration to offer," he had "no means of securing the contributions he desired," and hoped that a quarterly "would relieve the editor from the painful necessity of publishing, to fill his pages, not with what he would, but with what he could." At the same time, he declared that the character of the journal "shall be constructive, not destructive; affirmative, not negative; nutritive, not combative." Amongst his helpers were John Kenrick, John James Tayler, Charles Wicksteed, Thomas Dix Hincks, John Relly Beard, James Martineau, and William Rathbone Greg. A number of articles were translations from the German. Beard, who was then conducting a successful school in Manchester, wrote a series of valuable articles on *Popular Education*. Martineau contributed (1841) his essay on *The Five Points of Christian Faith*, in which he "showed a decided leaning towards Victor Cousin's religious philosophy,"[1] and in an appended note exhibited "the doctrine that man directly apprehends the Divine presence," which "inspires all his grandest and truest utterances,

[1] Drummond and Upton, *Life and Letters of James Martineau*, ii, p. 518.

though it finds but little distinct expression in his formulated philosophy."[2] From the first, the competition of *The Christian Teacher* adversely affected *The Christian Reformer*, the editor of which spoke of it with some asperity. In reply its first editor said (1835): "With *The Christian Reformer* we have no rivalry, but that of good-will. We should indeed be sorry that *The Christian Teacher* should interfere with the interests of *The Christian Reformer*, if for no other reason than this, that *The Christian Reformer* does a work which we have no thought of attempting." With the enlargement of the scope of *The Christian Teacher* under Thom, however, this reason ceased to be valid. The difference between them largely related to Unitarian institutionalism, theology, and philosophy. A letter written (November 8, 1849) by Charles Wicksteed to Robert Brook Aspland, after the death of his father, makes clear what is meant, and explains the suspicion entertained by Robert Aspland of the influence of *The Christian Teacher*. "A new periodical had been commenced in Lancashire, occupying, as he conceived, the same ground and aiming at the same general object as the magazine which he had conducted for so long a time and with so untiring an energy. A disposition was manifesting itself to undervalue some of those central denominational institutions which he had, from a conviction of their great importance, devoted so much time and effort to establish; and much was said about the age of controversy—that is, as he regarded it, of earnest and open defence of Scriptural truth—being past. Added to this, a reaction was manifesting itself in many minds against some of the distinguishing principles of Locke and Priestley, and a mode of discussing several theological questions was arising which appeared to him to have the danger, without the explicitness, of scepticism. These things had given him considerable pain."[3] The first

[2] Drummond and Upton, *Life and Letters of James Martineau*, ii, p. 503.
[3] R. B. Aspland, *Memoir of Robert Aspland*, p. 360, London, 1850.

article in the new series of *The Christian Teacher*, by John James Tayler, on *The Influence of Periodical Literature*, dealt with publications "addressed to the general public and intended to influence its judgments on matters of literature, morals, politics, and religion." As the aim of *The Christian Teacher*, this was not realised, and at the end of the fifth volume (1845) Thom observed: "We have carefully shunned all rivalry with our older magazines, whilst we have felt the great importance of clearly identifying ourselves with the Unitarian body, as the only portion of the religious community which could find full satisfaction in our pages." No articles were paid for, and an ordinary number cost thirty to forty pounds to produce. The editor appealed for a circulation of a thousand in order to give some remuneration to contributors, as "the advertising department would more than meet all incidental expenses." On November 23, 1844, he announced that during the six years and a half in which the periodical had been under his management, it "had amply supported itself . . . a result obtained only by the free gift of voluntary contributors." With Volume VII (1845) *The Christian Teacher* was merged into *The Prospective Review: A Quarterly Journal of Theology and Literature*, edited by John Hamilton Thom, John James Tayler, James Martineau, and Charles Wicksteed, and published at half-a-crown. "This periodical," said Alexander Gordon, "reached the high-water mark of Unitarian journalism."[1] It did not thereby escape criticism, good-humoured and otherwise. John Kentish said its title must have been suggested by "the Irish member of the firm" (Thom), and, alluding to its motto from St. Bernard, "Respice, Aspice, Prospice," John Gooch Robberds, minister of Cross Street Chapel, Manchester, described it as "a magazine of allspice." *The Inquirer*, established in 1842, not only denounced it as Hibernian, but also frequently gibed at its articles on the

[1] *Heads of English Unitarian History*, pp. 47–8, 1891.

ground of their radical tendencies in the treatment of Scriptural authority. The philosophy of the *Prospective* belonged, it was said, to "the exploded errors of darker times," and to this charge was added that of "robbing Christ of His authority."[1] "The work was conducted in a catholic spirit," said Dr. Drummond, "and restrained by no rigid orthodoxy the free expression of different forms and tendencies of the mind," "though it was understood to be the organ of what was then a new and growing school among the Unitarians"—in other words, the school of which Tayler and Martineau were the chief representatives and exponents. Martineau himself defined the position of the *Prospective* thus: "From the known position of the editors, this *Review* has often been regarded as an organ of the Unitarians, notwithstanding its own disclaimer, at the outset, of any such character. In one sense—and that a most important one—its aim might be more correctly described as anti-Unitarian; for the great object of its conductors was to prevent the course of liberal theology from slipping into the rut of any Unitarian or other sect, and to treat its whole contents and all cognate topics with philosophical and historical impartiality, apart from all ecclesiastical or party interests. And, in point of fact, this breadth of purpose, while securing it some circulation and marked respect among studious persons in various connections, caused it to be coldly looked upon by the very people it was supposed to represent."[2]

At this time Martineau and Thom were in the ministry at Liverpool, Wicksteed in Leeds, and Tayler in Manchester; whilst the first and last-named were also tutors in the College at Manchester and, after the summer of 1853, in London. The method of collaboration was thus described by Martineau. "Mr. Thom, having his hands most free, was

[1] J. E. Carpenter, *James Martineau*, p. 290, London, 1905.
[2] Drummond and Upton, *Life and Letters of James Martineau*, I, p. 264.

executive officer; but the contents of the successive numbers were blocked out at cabinet councils held at one of our Liverpool or Manchester houses. We dined and spent the evening together, often remaining till next day. We were different enough in modes and materials of thought to stimulate each other, yet so congenial as to be drawn nearer by the polarity."[1] It may be added that Charles Wicksteed was generally regarded as the conservative member of the board. Articles were unsigned. Amongst the contributors were Lord King, Richard Holt Hutton, Lord Houghton, Blanco White, Anna Swanwick, Walter Bagehot, and William Caldwell Roscoe—the last sharing the editorial labours towards the end of the journal's life. The range of interest exhibited was remarkable—Arts, Sciences, Letters (English and Foreign), Architecture, Philology, Theology, and Philosophy.

In the *Prospective* appeared some of the most brilliant of Martineau's essays; whilst his old tutor at York, John Kenrick, contributed scholarly articles to every volume except four (III, IV, V, X). Towards the end of 1850 "a private circular" was sent out asking for "additional support," "not for the remuneration of its writers, whose services have always been gratuitous, but to prevent the publication from continuing to be a source of pecuniary loss, or from being given up altogether." A periodical "not exclusively representing the views of any sect" meets with peculiar difficulties. Again, "it is not always and cannot be attractive to the general reader. The range of its characteristic subjects is high; and it aims at a certain thoroughness of treatment. . . . We still need a considerable accession of subscribers to enable us to carry on the undertaking." Ten volumes had been published when *The Prospective Review* came to an end—the last number appearing in February 1855. There were some overtures for amalgamation with

[1] Preface to Thom's *Spiritual Faith*, xix seqq.

The Westminster Review, founded in 1852 and edited by John Chapman, but Martineau was not satisfied with the conduct of that journal. Instead of this the *Prospective* was expanded into *The National Review*, "a separate large quarterly, embracing the field of Literature and Politics, in addition to the scope of its predecessor." "This move was preferred," says Martineau, "because the tone of the *Westminster*, to which he had contributed, "was becoming more and more uncongenial with the philosophical and religious convictions of the *Prospective*."[1] In 1858 Chapman failed, and the *Westminster* passed into the hands of the Comtists. The first number of *The National Review*, published at five shillings, appeared June 30, 1855. Subsequently the price was advanced to six shillings. "The selection of our name," it was declared in the prospectus, "is no accident." "Having a rooted faith in indigenous products of thought and feeling, we conceive that too foreign a cast has been imparted to the character of our Christianity. *The National Review* will impart the deliberate faith of most cultivated English laymen, however now scattered among different Churches—a faith that fears no reality, and will permanently endure no fiction."

In a letter (February 18, 1855) to Charles Wicksteed, Martineau intimates that W. R. Greg was to have been the editor, but withdrew through fear of compromising his relations with the *Edinburgh*, that the editor would be Richard Holt Hutton at a salary, and the contributors were to be "partly volunteers, partly paid on a certain graduated scale, the whole expense such as to be balanced by a sale of 1,250."[2] According to a letter written to *The Westminster Gazette* fifty-three years later (November 3, 1908) by William Theobald, son of Robert Theobald, the publisher and business manager of the *National*, "the proprietors were R. D. Darbishire and James Martineau, and R. H.

[1] Drummond and Upton, *ut supra*, i, p. 264. [2] Ibid., p. 269.

Hutton was the principal editor, though Walter Bagehot did almost an equal share of the work." None of his biographers credit Martineau with being a proprietor of the journal, but Dr. Estlin Carpenter says: "He was its principal founder and was chiefly instrumental in securing the pecuniary support with which it was started."[1] Dr. William Hunt reports that "it was said to have been financed by Lady Byron,"[2] the widow of the poet, who was deeply interested in philosophical and theological questions. She was one of its financial supporters, as was also Crabb Robinson.

The first number was well received by its contemporaries. *The Spectator* described it as "an able work, catholic in sentiment, independent in view, often original, always penetrating in thought; vigorous, spirited, and striking in style; with pungent salt enough to give flavour without bitterness."

When Robert Theobald gave up business in 1856 the *National* was published by Chapman and Hall.

A remarkable group of writers was enlisted in its service, including, besides those mentioned, J. A. Froude, Matthew Arnold, William Caldwell Roscoe, and Charles Henry Pearson.

Walter Bagehot (1826–77) contributed a series of essays, "which," says Hutton, "attracted very general attention by their brilliancy of style and lucidity of thought—amongst them *First Edinburgh Reviewers*, *Hartley Coleridge*, and *Bishop Butler*, which best represent his peculiar genius."[3] William Caldwell Roscoe (1803–59), poet and essayist, brother-in-law of R. H. Hutton, wrote for the *National* during the first four years of its existence and, in the opinion of Richard Garnett, "did some of his best critical work on this paper."[4] The essays of R. H. Hutton published in it were amongst the most remarkable from his pen; whilst James Martineau, his former tutor, was respon-

[1] *James Martineau*, p. 111, n. 1.
[2] Ibid., *Bagehot, Walter*.
[3] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Pearson, C. H.*
[4] Ibid., *Roscoe, William Caldwell*.

sible for many illuminating articles, amongst them one, which Dr. Estlin Carpenter describes[1] as "the first serious study in this country of *The Early History of Messianic Ideas*" (1863–64).

No articles were signed, and the reviewers could never distinguish those of Martineau and Hutton, their style and thought being so much alike. Consequently, when in 1866 a collection of *Essays Philosophical and Theological*, by Martineau was published in Boston, U.S.A., an article on *Revelation*, by Hutton, was included in error. Charles Henry Pearson (1830–94) edited *The National Review* (1862–63), and a critic detected in the *Review* under the new management "a disposition to coquet with the Broad Church party and disavow either direct or indirect sympathy with Nonconformity."

It is curious to read to-day the opening sentence of article three in the second number, on *Decimal Coinage*, by Augustus De Morgan, the celebrated mathematician. "It seems pretty well settled that we are to have a decimal coinage." The words are typical of the forward look of men who were before their time writing in a journal which, as Richard Garnett said, "helped for several years to maintain a high standard both of literary and political criticism." *The National Review* was continued until 1864, the April number being the last. Its resumption in November as a half-yearly periodical containing essays instead of reviews aroused no enthusiasm, although the names of writers were given. One number only appeared to which E. A. Freeman, Walter Bagehot, W. R. Greg, Matthew Arnold, George Cooper, John James Tayler, and James Martineau contributed, and an unsigned article on *Modern Editions of the Greek New Testament* was believed to be written by Dr. Samuel Davidson.

The theological articles by Tayler and Martineau were

[1] *James Martineau*, p. 446.

severely noticed in *The Inquirer*, representing the older school of Unitarianism, and thus a blow was struck at the *Review* in Unitarian circles.

Already in March 1864 was published the first number of a new quarterly, *The Theological Review: A Journal of Religious Thought and Life*, under the able editorship of Charles Beard (1827–88). The original title proposed in the prospectus as "Thought and Life," which became part of the sub-title. Reference was made to the suspension of *The Christian Reformer*, and it was announced that "the new journal will be conducted by members of those Churches which, while many of them trace back their origin to Presbyterian Non-conformity, and all agree in suffering the imposition of no creed, at present rest in the profession of a Unitarian theology." "It was believed," says James Drummond, "that it would not interfere with the *National*, for it was more limited in scope, and though it was conducted on broad lines and was not confined to Unitarian contributions it was understood to be in a loose sense a denominational organ." Martineau "regarded it with approval, though he felt unable to be one of its regular staff."[1] Tayler was a director from the beginning until his death in 1869.

At first a bi-monthly of about 130–50 pages, it was published at two shillings. Charles Beard, in his introductory article, outlined its programme: "*The Theological Review* will endeavour to give distinct form and clear expression to the thought, the wants, the aspirations, of the Free Churches to which it makes its first and chief appeal. . . . It will endeavour to quicken their intellectual life by the free admission to its pages of thoughtful and able theological essays, whatever the precise shade of opinion which they may display; and wherever a marked divergence of theory is known to exist, to secure a fair presentation of the argument on both sides." This declaration was welcomed by the reviewer in *The*

[1] Drummond and Upton, *ut supra*, i, p. 406.

Inquirer. "It is satisfactory to find that *The Theological Review* occupies a clear and definite ground. It does not, like the old *Prospective Review*, aim to represent a philosophical religion which affects to look down upon all denominational distinctions and sectarian names. It does not, like *The National Review*, assume to represent free thought by striving vainly to reconcile a scientific theology with the old formularies and creeds of the Established Church. *The Theological Review* honestly aims to advocate the Unitarian theology in its broadest interpretation, and discerns clearly the danger of that intellectual indifferentism which would absorb all theological differences in a vague latitudinarianism."[1]

In January 1866 it became a quarterly, published at half a crown by Williams and Norgate. In announcing the change (December 30, 1865) the editor observed: "The *Review*, without in any way abandoning its original position, will in future contain a greater number of contributions from writers who, differing from the editor and from one another in theological opinion and ecclesiastical position, agree in the desire that religious questions should be freely, thoroughly, and reverently discussed." Richard Acland Armstrong, writing in 1880, when the *Review* had ceased, was able to declare: "The co-operation of competent scholars and thinkers from every Church wherein liberalism is possible gave to *The Theological Review* a position more and more representative of the best and most liberal culture among English theologians."[2]

Martineau and some of his former coadjutors on the *Prospective* contributed to it, but it is not surprising, in view of their experience of Unitarian journalism, that they were content to see another generation of Unitarian scholars win their spurs on this difficult and unremunerative field. These included James Drummond, Charles Barnes Upton, Robert B. Drummond, William Binns, Alexander Gordon, Joseph

[2] *Modern Review*, i, p. 31.

Estlin Carpenter, Philip Henry Wicksteed, Hy. Wm. Crosskey, J. Frederick Smith, and James Edwin Odgers, who were assisted by the veteran scholar and teacher, John Kentrick, George Vance Smith, and John Relly Beard. A stalwart band of Unitarian laymen also lent a hand, including Sir John Bowring, Russell Martineau, Samuel Sharpe, W. J. Lamport, and Courtney Kenny. Amongst non-Unitarians the most prominent writers were Samuel Davidson, John Owen, C. Kegan Paul, William Sanday, Viscount Amberley, Augustus Samuel Wilkins, A. H. Sayce, Mandell Creighton, F. R. Conder, T. K. Cheyne, W. C. Smith, and James Donaldson; whilst scholarship of other lands was represented by J. H. Scholton, Albert Reville, Abraham Kuenen, F. H. Hedge, and others. At the outset some articles were initialled and a few signed, the rest were anonymous. With the third volume, Charles Beard departed from the tradition of his predecessors by giving most of the names of contributors in full, though now and again an Anglican writer preferred a *nom de plume*. Two posthumous articles on the New Testament, published in 1872, had been found amongst John Kentrick's papers. Though the editor did not know it, they had been written seven years earlier. Kentrick's last article (January 1877) was written when he was within a month of entering his ninetieth year.

More clearly than any other Unitarian journal did *The Theological Review* reveal the range and depth of scholarship in the ranks of Unitarian ministers and laymen in the nineteenth century, most of whom had been educated in Manchester College. One who did not belong to this circle was William Binns, a remarkable man, whose most characteristic essay was a brilliant article (January 1878) on *Matthew Arnold as a Religious Teacher*, in which the famous man of letters met his match in wit and irony. Articles on Erasmus by Robert B. Drummond were quickly followed by his biography of the great Dutch scholar, not

even yet surpassed.[1] Articles on German thinkers by J. Frederick Smith were published in 1880 as *Studies in Religion Under German Masters*. Articles on the Fourth Gospel by James Drummond were later to form part of his masterly book on that Gospel published in 1903.

In one department, that of History, thanks to the comprehensive and judicial survey of men and movements on the Continent by Charles Beard, afterwards author of *The Hibbert Lectures on the Reformation*,[1] and to the original researches of Alexander Gordon embodied in a series of eleven remarkable articles (1873–79), *The Theological Review* does not suffer by comparison with its forerunners and contemporaries published in London and Edinburgh during the nineteenth century.

It was, indeed, somewhat too specialist and advanced a journal for the constituency to which it made its primary appeal, and evoked some criticism on this account, and, less reasonably, for its omission of articles on subjects outside the range of its title and interest. As early as 1875 it was said to be "languishing for want of support," but continued four years longer, being discontinued in 1879.

In 1880 another quarterly made its appearance, *The Modern Review*, edited by Richard Acland Armstrong (1843–1905), then minister of the High Pavement Chapel, Nottingham, afterwards of Hope Street Church, Liverpool, a former pupil of Martineau and an excellent interpreter of his religious philosophy. Published by James Clarke & Co., and consisting of nearly 250 pages, its format was more attractive than its predecessor, and for its support a small endowment fund was raised. More popular in style than *The Theological Review*, it included articles on biographical, literary, and scientific as well as theological subjects, but was characterised by the same breadth, tolerance, and inclusiveness. A series of four articles (1881–84) by J.

[1] See pp. 263–4.

Estlin Carpenter on Old Testament subjects are marked by the scholarship and independent judgment which later established his reputation as the greatest authority on the Hebrew Scriptures amongst Unitarians; while the contributions of his father, William Banjamin Carpenter, an illustrious physiologist, strengthen the *Review* on the scientific side. After two years as editor, R. A. Armstrong withdrew on account of the demands of ministerial labours, and his place was taken by R. Crompton Jones, who then enjoyed freedom from such ties. As with earlier magazines, editor and contributors gave their services gratuitously. Many of those who had written for *The Theological Review* supported its successor. Notices of books, English and foreign, constituted a valuable feature of the journal, which contained also articles from orthodox divines and laymen, and from scholars overseas. Its circulation proved insufficient, the endowment fund was exhausted, and the illness of the editor brought matters to a crisis which led to its discontinuance in 1884.

On April 15, 1885, the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed read a paper before the National Conference of Unitarian, Free Christian, Presbyterian, and other non-subscribing and kindred congregations at Birmingham on *A New Magazine of Religious Thought and Scholarship*. A committee was appointed of which J. Estlin Carpenter was a member and R. A. Armstrong, secretary, to go into the matter. In the subsequent discussion in *The Inquirer*, a layman pointed out that "during a period of fifty years our body had two magazines (*The Monthly Repository* and *The Christian Reformer*, and then *The Christian Teacher* and *The Prospective Review*) representing distinct objects and tendencies, the one advocating Unitarian theology and recording current events, the other discussing wider questions of religious and philosophical criticism," and he pleaded for one magazine to represent both schools.

In January 1886, with the assistance of certain guarantors, was published *The Christian Reformer: A Monthly Magazine of Religious Thought and Life*, edited by Francis Henry Jones (1845–1919), who had recently been appointed librarian of Dr. Williams' library. It was not a revival of the journal of the same name founded by Robert Aspland. Its name was explained by the editor thus: "Christian, not because it is founded upon special dogmas, but because the higher religious movements and the present religious principles of to-day are the legitimate developments of Christianity," and "Reformer, because the method which we especially desire to encourage and to follow is that of increasing Reform." It was to be less given to technical theology and criticism and more suited to the general reader than some of its predecessors. Amongst its contributors were James Martineau, George Vance Smith, Charles Wicksteed, R. A. Armstrong, James Drummond, C. B. Upton, J. Estlin Carpenter, P. H. Wicksteed, and Henry William Crosskey. There were also non-Unitarian and lay contributors, the latter including Russell Martineau, Henry Morley, and John Henry Muirhead. A series of articles on *Human Automatism and Free Will*, by Dr. W. B. Carpenter, appeared after his unexpected death; and James Martineau contributed *A Way Out of the Trinitarian Controversy*, which attracted widespread attention. Dr. Thomas Sadler's interesting articles (February-March 1887) on *The Unitarians of London Between Forty and Fifty Years Ago* were afterwards reprinted; and Estlin Carpenter's seven articles on *Phases of Early Christianity* formed the basis of his volume of that name in the *American Lectures on the History of Religions*, published in 1916. An article on *Philo*, by James Drummond, as a footnote informs us, "formed a part of a complete work on the Philosophy of Philo," which, under the title *Philo Judaeus* (2 vols.) appeared in 1888, and quickly took rank as an authority on the subject;[1] whilst another on *The*

[1] See pp. 233–6.

Jerusalem Talmud, by Dr. R. Travers Herford, was the first of a long series of valuable studies in the field of rabbinical learning from his pen, of which *Christianity in the Talmud and Midrash* (1903) is perhaps the most notable. Ecclesiastical Notes, giving an excellent summary of the proceedings of the various organised Churches, were included every month.

In 1887 this *Christian Reformer* came to an end, "the circulation not having been sufficient to justify the continual demand upon the guarantors." The Unitarian periodicals from *The Theological Repository* (1769) to *The Christian Reformer* (1887) were marked by certain characteristics in common. The chain of contributors was almost unbroken. Those who survived the death of one journal gallantly gathered round the standard of its successor, and veterans like Joshua Toulmin, Henry Crabb Robinson, John Kentrick, and James Martineau wrote for one periodical after another. In most of the journals contributors were not confined to the ranks of Unitarians. Indeed, laborious efforts were made by editors from Priestley onwards to enlist recruits from liberal thinkers in other Churches, not excluding the Church by law established.

Clashes of opinion sometimes resulted, but editors, whilst confining debate within proper limits, seldom sought to suppress it. Laymen, not less than ministers, were encouraged to write, and a long succession of articles and reviews demonstrated at once their ability and their interest in questions theological and philosophical as well as literary and scientific. Reviews in general were marked by catholicity and sobriety of judgment, and included notices of works elsewhere passed over in silence or treated with a scurrility happily not now associated with religious periodicals. Though philosophy and theology not unnaturally predominated, these topics never constituted the exclusive fare offered to readers even by those journals whose appeal was primarily to the ministers and more cultured members of

Unitarian Churches. The relative proportion of space occupied by them varied from one periodical to another, but none was devoid of interest in literature, history, or science. Politics, especially as they related to Dissent, were prominent in most of these publications; whilst education in its different branches was a frequent subject of discussion. *The Monthly Repository*, under Aspland and Fox, was the only journal to publish music, but several included articles on it, and most found room for verse, original and translated. John Johns (1801–1848), e.g. contributed verse in succession to *The Monthly Repository*, *The Christian Teacher*, and *The Christian Reformer*. Foreign scholarship, particularly the liberal thought of France, Germany, and Holland, not only came under notice, but was also represented in not a few instances by the contributions of distinguished Continental scholars themselves. The influence of these periodicals in thus introducing the liberal doctrines of foreign scholars in the fields of philosophy and Biblical science to the Free Churches of England at a time when such doctrines were anathema to most orthodox teachers and preachers can hardly be overestimated. Finally, unknown writers, whose works came under review, were treated with the respect due to their abilities, and many men and women, who afterwards attained a considerable measure of fame, owed their introduction to the public to the discriminating and appreciative criticism of Unitarians; whilst many Unitarian scholars themselves first made their bow to the public in the pages of these periodicals. Though most editors and contributors did their work gratuitously, the larger and more ambitious journals were almost constantly dependent for their existence upon generous Unitarian laymen. The failure of these periodicals to become self-supporting was partly due to the comparatively small number of cultural laymen in a community of no great proportions. The field to which appeal was made was too restricted. It must also be remembered that the

names of the writers were practically unknown to the larger world of letters. *Alumni* of Nonconformist academies with an honourable record of scientific and theological activity, they were yet outside the main stream of academic learning, working in almost unrelieved obscurity, maintaining unpopular doctrinal opinions, and lacking every adventitious aid of birth, rank, and tradition to bring the products of their genius to the notice of patrons of religious literature.

In addition to the periodicals noticed, a number circulated during the first half of the last century in Scotland and the North of England more denominational and less literary in character, making their appeal exclusively to artisan and working-class members of Unitarian Churches.

The Christian Reflector and Theological Inquirer (1820–29) was a monthly of twenty-four pages, published in Liverpool, costing 4½d. and edited by George Harris and Francis Brown Wright, the brother of Richard Wright, the Unitarian missionary. After 1825, when Harris left Liverpool for Glasgow, it was continued by Wright alone. F. B. Wright (1769–1837) was an intelligent printer and lay-preacher, author of a *History of Religious Persecution* (1826), who had been imprisoned for unlicensed printing, and seen his brother John suffer an abortive prosecution in 1817 for blasphemy after preaching a Unitarian sermon. Wright has the credit of having first introduced Channing's sermons and essays to the English public, printing them separately as they came to hand from America. George Harris (1794–1859) was an able and enthusiastic if not always a wise and temperate propagandist of the Belsham type of Unitarianism. Of this aggressive Unitarian movement, Robert Aspland was the chief apostle, Richard Wright the principal missionary, and George Harris the popular preacher. *The Christian Reflector* was in no way distinguished as a periodical, apart from its vigorous championship of liberty—personal, political, and religious—and its stout advocacy of Unitarian

principles. It met with much opposition from the more sober and staid Unitarians adverse to proselytising, one of whom warmly characterised it as "the impudent and scurrilous organ of a faction." In 1825 Harris resigned his ministry in Liverpool and went to Glasgow, thence in 1841 to Edinburgh, and in 1845 to Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

The Christian Pioneer (1826–1845) and *The Christian Pilot* (1847–51) were edited by George Harris. Both were monthlies, duodecimos, and published at fourpence. *The Christian Pioneer* was the first Unitarian periodical published in Scotland. Its objects were "to promote the glorious principles of the Reformation, the Sufficiency of Scripture, the right of individual judgment, and of fearless inquiry." In Calvinistic Scotland of the first half of the nineteenth century Harris' task was not easy, and it was not made less difficult by his radical political opinions and the adoption of the new tenet of total abstinence. He took part in the Reform agitation of 1832 in conjunction with Major Cartwright and Colonel Thompson, and "the first petition from Scotland was prepared and brought before the public by him." In 1839, having firmly established the journal, he contemplated converting it into a newspaper, published fortnightly, but the proposal did not meet with much encouragement. Four years later (December 23, 1843) he confessed that "the establishment of other periodicals" and "the state of the country in the last five years has so materially lessened the sale as to induce the fear that the publication must be given up." *The Christian Pioneer* had the distinction of publishing *Martyria*, by William Mountford, an old student of Manchester College, York, afterwards published in a volume and republished in America (1846), where his writings enjoyed a great reputation. *The Christian Pioneer* ceased with the nineteenth volume, when the editor accepted a call from Newcastle-upon-Tyne, where he published *The Christian Pilot and Gospel Moralist* (1849–51) on the lines of its pre-

decessor. Articles on English History, Natural Theology, and Monthly Notes of a Naturalist gave to it something of the character of a popular educator. Though George Harris never lacked helpers in his work for these periodicals, he was himself the chief contributor, and may be said to have continued the work first begun by Robert Aspland in 1813 with the original issue of *The Christian Reformer*.

The Gospel Advocate, edited by Henry Acton, minister at Exeter, which ran from July 1833 to July 1837, circulated in the West of England. Its character is indicated by its name.

Joseph Barker (1806–75), the popular, eloquent, and unstable Methodist, who turned Quaker, Unitarian, Agnostic, and Methodist again, during his liberal phase published *The Christian Investigator* (1842–43) and *The Christian* (1844–48), the latter circulating extensively amongst societies, several of which developed into Unitarian Churches. On July 6, 1846, a steam press was presented to Barker by his Unitarian admirers, and *The Barker Library*, which was quickly launched, included original contributions and reprints of standard works, and earned for him a place as a pioneer of cheap literature in England. An eightpenny edition of *Channing*, for example, spread a knowledge of the American divine from one end of the country to another.

The Truth Seeker, a threepenny monthly of the popular type, edited by John Page Hopps, ran from May 1863 until December 1887, and thus enjoyed a longer life than any Unitarian monthly since *The Christian Reformer*. In 1891 he began the publication of its successor, *The Coming Day*, which ran until 1911.

Before the nineteenth century ran its course, a few journalistic efforts flourished for a time whose names deserve to be recorded. *The Unitarian* (est. 1846); *The East Sussex and West Kent Unitarian Magazine* (1887), which became *The Southern Unitarian Magazine* (1888–89), a bi-

monthly; *The Unitarian Bible Magazine* (est. 1893); and *The Sunday School Helper* (1885–97).

Two other monthlies, similar in certain respects to those conducted by George Harris but less conservative and propagandist in doctrine, were launched in the same year in different parts of the country.

Light on the Way: A Magazine for the Liberal Faith for Home Reading, a large octavo of twenty and then twenty-four pages, was published in Manchester (1893) under the editorship of three active ministers: C. J. Street, C. Roper, and A. W. Fox. The last retired from the board after a year, and Mr. Street in 1895, when he left Manchester. Originally costing twopence, in 1896 it was reduced to a penny and its pages to sixteen. Popular in price and character, it circulated chiefly in Lancashire and Yorkshire. It included occasional hymns with music, nature notes, brief sketches of leaders and workers, and chats about our churches. In December 1897 it was discontinued, and was followed by *The New Kingdom*, conducted on similar lines (1898–1900).

The Seed Sower (16 pages), published at Birmingham, was edited by the Rev. Joseph Wood, assisted at different times by the Rev. James Crossley and the Rev. L. P. Jacks, afterwards famous as the editor of *The Hibbert Journal*. It was intended for "the home as well as the Church, the school as well as the study." It included sermons, Sunday-school lessons, interviews with prominent Unitarians, "authentic interviews," illustrated, of thinkers and leaders of other days based on their biographies and writings, a series of brief sketches of *Our Ancient Chapels*, and some valuable articles on Midland churches by Mr. George Eyre Evans, afterwards incorporated in the book of that name published in 1899.

Light On the Way represented the "Forward Movement" of Manchester and other Unitarians of the period; *The Seed Sower*, whose contributors included many distinguished

ministers, was more concerned to preserve catholicity of outlook and freedom from doctrinal fetters. In March 1901 its editor boasted that it "had the largest circulation of any magazine, newspaper, or journal published for the use of our Free Churches." Unfortunately its proof-reading was very defective, and every number contained many errors. It was discontinued in November 1907.

Apparently there was never any lack of writers for these two journals, but the constituency to which they appealed was too small to support two monthlies. They may be said to have represented the two divisions in Unitarian Churches, which, by the amalgamation of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association with the National Conference in the General Assembly of Unitarian and Free Christian Churches in 1928, have happily disappeared.

Irish Unitarian periodicals have a history and character of their own, largely determined by the origin and traditions of the Non-Subscribing Presbyterian movement to which they belonged.

The Bible Christian, "designed to advocate the Sufficiency of Scripture," came into being as the direct result of the secession in 1830 from the General Synod of the Irish Presbyterian Church, which, under the leadership of Henry Montgomery (1788–1865), erected the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster. A duodecimo of forty-eight pages, it cost sixpence, and so marked was its early success that five hundred additional copies of the second number were printed. With the decline of the excitement caused by the secession, its circulation decreased. With a new series in 1836, the price was reduced to 2½d. and the pages to thirty-six. Three years later it cost threepence. "Much of the value of *The Bible Christian*, it was said, consisted in the extracts from American writers," especially, it may be added, from Channing, whose works enjoyed great popularity in the North of Ireland. *The Bible Christian* was discontinued in December 1845, but

revived next year as *The Irish Unitarian Magazine and Bible Christian*, an octavo of 32–40 pages, costing threepence, and edited by George Hill. For this journal Dr. Henry Montgomery contributed, at the request of the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, a series of valuable articles on *The History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*. Hill severed his connection with it in October 1847, and it was discontinued in December of that year. *The Christian Unitarian*, a monthly magazine (12mo, 32 pages), edited by C. J. McAlester, followed in February 1862. The title was intended to distinguish Unitarians of a Scriptural and Christocentric school from the rest, and an article in the first number on *The New Theology* examined and controverted the contemporary English Unitarian doctrine influenced by the writings of Theodore Parker, the American divine. In Volume IV the editor defended his practice of "not publishing articles on both sides of a controversial subject." "*The Christian Unitarian*," he declared, "was not to be the organ of Trinitarians, nor yet of those who think that the Scriptures have no more authority than the Koran," and "regard Jesus as simply a man of genius and goodness." Amongst its contributors were John Scott Porter and Henry Montgomery, the leaders in the Remonstrant Synod, and it included historical sketches of the old Irish congregations and much information respecting the various controversies which so often disturbed the peace of Irish Unitarian Churches. Its discontinuance in 1866 was hailed in *The Inquirer* "with considerable satisfaction" as that of "the organ of a defeated party in the North of Ireland."

The Disciple, a monthly journal (price 3d.), bearing the significant motto from Servetus, "Nemo Christianus, nisi discipulus," circulated from 1881 to 1883 under the editorship of Alexander Gordon (1841–1931), successor to John Scott Porter in the ministry of the First Presbyterian Church, Belfast, and (1889–1911) Principal of the Unitarian

Home Missionary College, Manchester. In its theology it continued the tradition of its predecessors, but contained much biographical and historical material, chiefly from the pen of its gifted editor. Unhappily, the journal did not meet with the support it merited, and when the three years expired for which its publication was originally guaranteed by its friends, it was discontinued.

It will be seen that the Irish Unitarian periodicals departed from the practice of most of those in England in their exclusive doctrinal and Biblical interest, but exhibited the same general concern for the preservation of biographical and historical materials.

WEEKLIES

The number of weekly newspapers published by Unitarians has always been, to those unacquainted with their history, a somewhat astonishing phenomenon. During one period of thirteen years (1876–89) this comparatively small religious community could boast no fewer than three, whilst two circulated simultaneously for forty years more (1889–1929).

The Inquirer (est. July 9, 1842), now in its ninety-first year, was founded by Edward Hill, with the Rev. William Hincks (1794–1871) as editor. Hincks, who was then minister of Stamford Street Chapel, London, was a man of some distinction. He had been formerly a tutor at Manchester New College, York (1827–39), and was afterwards Professor of Natural History at University College, Cork (1849–55), and at University College, Toronto (1853–71).

The object of *The Inquirer*, according to an advertisement in *The Christian Teacher*, July 1842, was "to combine what is peculiarly interesting and valuable to us as a Religious Body, with a superior General Newspaper." It was to be "a well-conducted Weekly Newspaper, of decidedly Liberal

Politics . . . due attention being given to Literature, Science, and the Fine Arts." . . . "The name," said the first editorial, "expresses that we do not come forward as the advocates of a definite course of policy on party questions, but that we propose to assist and promote inquiry upon all the great subjects of interest to man as a moral and social being."

Its comprehensive character was determined by the needs of a time when penny dailies were unknown and the reading public neither extensive nor enthusiastic. Besides a sub-editor, the staff included at the outset a dramatic critic. As he tells us in a MS. note in his copy of Volume I, Samuel Sharpe "voluntarily contributed a short article on *The Panic against Light Gold*, but finding that other articles on subjects more agreeable to myself would be equally agreeable to Mr. Hincks, I changed accordingly, and each week sent a column or two." Before the fifth number appeared, the proprietor of the paper had lost faith in its future, and threatened to discontinue it. "Mr. Hincks," says Sharpe, "not wishing the paper to drop, got Mr. Richard Taylor (a member of the well-known Norwich family) to buy it." "Accordingly he printed number seven, and though he retained Mr. Hincks as editor, he in some respects changed the politics of the paper, making it more decidedly radical." One illustration of this was the occasional correspondence of Joseph Hume (1771–1855), the radical politician, under the name of "Charter." "On this," continued Sharpe, "I ceased my contributions and wrote nothing for numbers 8, 9, 10, 11." Richard Taylor, faced with loss on its production, resolved, after a fortnight's experience, to abandon the enterprise. Hincks (September 3rd) successfully appealed for subscriptions in its support, and the sale reached about six hundred at the end of the first three months. Taylor "remained proprietor, but took no further part in its management," so that the paper "again spoke Mr. Hincks's more moderate politics," and with number twelve Sharpe

resumed his contributions to it. As subscriptions decreased, for the third time the paper was in peril, when Hincks found in Richard Kinder a cheaper printer, bought the paper for £70, Taylor's out-of-pocket losses, and Kinder, being satisfied by the sales, was content himself with the subscriptions. The sale, then under 750, was now increasing six or twelve every week. As proprietor, Hincks employed his son as sub-editor. Several times he threatened discontinuance, but was encouraged by fresh support to persevere, and by July 1843 "about 900–1,000 copies were printed." After these strenuous efforts to keep afloat, *The Inquirer* had sailed into smooth waters. Finance was not the editor's only problem. Correspondence threatened to swamp the paper, for readers in these early days wrote much and often on almost every subject under the sun. The conservative tone of the paper under Hincks is seen in its notice of the second number of *The Prospective Review*, "regretting its influence," and stating that "so far from submitting to its influence, our body are unlearning the truths hitherto deemed both certain and most important," concluding with an appeal to "those who have yet anything in them of the spirit of the philosophy of Priestley and Belsham to exert themselves in exposing the prevalent delusions."

Amongst several outstanding contributions at this period was a valuable series of eighteen articles (1845) by Dr. W. B. Carpenter on *The Harmony of Science and Religion*. Two writers who appeared for the first time in print in *The Inquirer* were Sir Francis William Brady and Hodgson Pratt; the former writing on *Cleanliness next to Godliness* and the latter on *The New Pentonville Model Prison*, both in the first number.

On May 22, 1847, William Hincks resigned the editorship and was presented by his friends with a pocket-book and £450 "as a slight requital for great but unremunerated labours." In saying farewell, Hincks enumerated the subjects

in which as editor he had been interested: Education, Peace, Temperance, Abolition of Slavery and of Death Punishment, Shortening of Hours of Labour, and the Rational Use of Leisure.

For about six months *The Inquirer* was directed by Dr. Thomas Sadler, minister of Rosslyn Hill Chapel, assisted by Mr. (afterwards Sir) Edmund Hornby, and afterwards for a few months by Henry Enfield and C. L. Corkran, appointed January 1848 minister of Spicer Street Mission.

From this time on notices of books became a feature of importance, and reviews of great novels published about the middle of the century often betrayed insight and acumen. A lengthy review (November 11, 1848) of Mrs. Gaskell's *Mary Barton*, published anonymously, closes with the remark: "We half suspect the author to be of the gentler sex." Similarly, of Charlotte Brontë's *Shirley*, also anonymous, it is said: "We have tried to treat the author like a gentleman. If he be one, however, he has contrived to write wondrously like a lady," and reasons for this judgment are given.

At the beginning of 1849 John Lalor (1814–56) became editor. A graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, and a distinguished writer of Roman Catholic family, he had been on the staff of *The Morning Chronicle*. Under Lalor served Mr. (afterwards Sir) John Robinson, who wrote his first review in *The Inquirer* and later made a great reputation on *The Daily News*. In a letter (December 16, 1848) to the committee which had been formed to increase the efficiency of the paper and make it possible to secure the services of the new editor, Lalor set forth his plans concerning "the capacity of *The Inquirer* to promote concord amongst Unitarians," and "its utility as an organ for the discussion of political and social questions in a religious spirit."

At this date, interest in London University—the only one open to Dissenters—led *The Inquirer* for many years to

publish on Monday or Tuesday a second edition giving a list of the successful candidates in the matriculation or B.A. examinations.

Unfortunately John Lalor suffered from ill-health and his reign was brief. Richard Kinder then became the owner of the paper, securing as contributors, amongst others, Edwin Wilkins Field (1804–71), the lawyer, and Samuel Sharpe, who again renewed his connection with *The Inquirer*. From 1851 to 1853 the editor was Richard Holt Hutton, afterwards for thirty-six years (1861–97) editor of *The Spectator*. Amongst those whom he enlisted in his service were Walter Bagehot, John Langton Sanford, William Caldwell Roscoe, and Timothy Smith Osler. He has left us an admirable description of *The Inquirer* under his regime in the memoir prefixed to the first volume of Bagehot's *Literary Studies*: "In 1851 a knot of young Unitarians, of whom I was then one, headed by the late Mr. J. Langton Sanford—afterwards the historian of the Great Rebellion, had engaged to help for a time in conducting *The Inquirer*. . . . Our regime was, I imagine, a time of great desolation for the very tolerant and thoughtful constituency for whom we wrote. Sanford and Osler did a good deal to throw cold water on the rather optimist and philanthropic politics of the most sanguine, because the most benevolent and open-hearted, of Dissenters. Roscoe criticised their literary work from the point of view of a devotee of the Elizabethan poets; and I attempted to prove to them in distinct heads, first that their laity ought to have the protection afforded by a liturgy against the arbitrary prayers of their ministers, and next, that at least the great majority of their sermons ought to be suppressed, and the habit of delivering them discontinued almost altogether. Only a denomination of 'just men' trained in tolerance for generations, and in that respect at least made all but 'perfect,' would have endured it at all; but I doubt if any of us caused the Unitarian body so much

grief as Bagehot's series of brilliant letters on the *coup d'état*, in which he trod just as heavily on the toes of his colleagues as he did on those of the public by whom *The Inquirer* was taken. In these letters he not only eulogised the Catholic Church, but he supported the Prince President's military violence, attacked the freedom of the Press in France, maintained that the country was wholly unfit for true Parliamentary Government, and, worst of all, perhaps, insinuated a panegyric on Louis Napoleon himself, and declared that he had been far better prepared for the duties of a statesman in gambling on the turf than he would have been by poring over the historical and political dissertations of the wise and the good. This was Bagehot's day of cynicism. . . . The seven letters were light and airy and even flippant on a very grave subject. They made nothing of the Prince's perjury; they took impertinent liberties with all the dearest prepossessions of the readers of *The Inquirer*, and assumed their sympathy just where Bagehot knew they would be most revolted by his opinions. . . ." It was during Hutton's connection with *The Inquirer* that his articles in *The Prospective Review* (1853) on the writings of F. D. Maurice led to his introduction to that eminent representative of the Broad Church whose influence was to draw Hutton away from the Unitarianism in which he had been bred and educated.

It must be admitted that under Hutton *The Inquirer* might be offensive, but was never dull. Some of the literary reviews of Roscoe, like that of Thackeray's *Humorists*, afterwards reprinted in his *Poems and Essays*, edited by Hutton, reached a high standard of excellence. Hutton's editorship was brought to an end by an illness in 1853 necessitating a voyage to the West Indies, and his friend Sanford was in the chair until 1855.

In 1856 Thomas Lethbridge Marshall (1825–1915), minister of Stamford Street Chapel, London, entered upon

an editorship of thirty-two years, and the paper gradually assumed the guise with which living readers are familiar. It now sold well enough to enable Kinder to pay the editor a modest salary.

As the organ, in the main, of the conservative school of Unitarian thought, it was supported by the contributions of John Kenrick, John Relly Beard, R. L. Carpenter, Edward Higginson, John Wright, and, after the discontinuance of the old *Christian Reformer*, Robert Brook Aspland. The editor strove, not always successfully, to mediate between what was known as the "Old" and the "New" schools of Unitarianism, and in an article (January 2, 1858) on "*The Inquirer*": *Its Aims and Views*, said: "We would be the organ of every Unitarian in England, and of no particular section of our body. . . . We have always felt our Church broad enough for the two phases of thought regularly represented by *The National Review* and by *The Christian Reformer*, and our own position is midway between the two, recognising what is good and true in each." The paper stands "for not the old Presbyterian negation of free inquiry, but the definite Unitarian bond of a common worship of our Heavenly Father through our Saviour Jesus Christ"; whilst its philosophy is "not the utilitarian and materialistic philosophy of the eighteenth century," but "the nobler philosophy which is supplanting it."

In 1863 the paper was sold by Kinder to Marshall, Robinson, and E. T. Whitfield. Next year, however, Robinson withdrew from it. In 1873 a testimonial, signed by one hundred and ninety friends, was presented to the editor. In his reply, Marshall spoke of *The Inquirer* as "pledged by its very name to the cause of free religious inquiry." Three years later, Whitfield, not liking Marshall's views, retired, and Richard Bartram became associated with Marshall in the editorship and proprietorship of the paper.

In 1883 a company was formed to purchase *The Inquirer*, Marshall continuing as editor and Bartram becoming one of the directors. In December of that year, when Marshall completed thirty years as editor, he noted that only one of the contributors of 1853, R. L. Carpenter, still remained associated with it. To Marshall must be attributed many fruitful suggestions that appeared in *The Inquirer*, and, in particular, that Essex Chapel might be converted into Essex Hall. Writing in 1892, on the occasion of the Jubilee of the paper, he referred to his former conduct of it, and more especially, it would appear, to its severe strictures on the Martineau school of theology. "I began my journalistic career at an early age with little or no previous experience. I had to learn by painful experience that even editors are not infallible—not even the youngest of them; and I freely confess that had I to go over the same career again I should adopt a more reconciling spirit in reference to the curious discussions that once threatened to divide us, and to emphasise the principles we hold in common, rather than those which once separated us into 'Old' and 'New' school, supernaturalist and anti-supernaturalist."

In January 1888, the Rev. William George Tarrant, minister of Wandsworth Unitarian Church, who had already assisted Marshall for some time, succeeded him as editor, and continued in office until 1897, being assisted for the last two years by George Herbert Perris, afterwards a distinguished journalist. He had a second period of service in the present century. Under him a natural tendency towards the "left," which began as early as 1876, when another Unitarian weekly[1] was established to voice the sentiments of the conservatives, more and more manifested itself, partly, no doubt, owing to the decline of the earlier school of thought with the growing influence of men trained under Martineau. Under Tarrant, too, there was a great increase in the circulation of *The Inquirer*.

[1] *The Christian Life*.

Amongst non-Unitarian contributors under Marshall were Dr. F. A. Paley, the classical scholar, and two clergymen, H. N. Hoare, of Keswick, and J. A. Cross, of Leeds. Reviewers under Marshall and Tarrant included C. G. Upton, J. E. Carpenter, P. H. Wicksteed, R. A. Armstrong, and W. Binns.

The price of *The Inquirer* varies from sixpence to a penny: 1842–55, sixpence; 1855–83, fivepence; 1884–89, twopence; and 1889–1917, a penny. With the reduction in 1884 to twopence, "a remunerative circulation" is said to have been "considerably more than doubled."

The sub-title has been frequently changed, but from the beginning its motto has been one from Marcus Antoninus, "I seek after truth, by which no man ever yet was injured." From time to time an index was published.

As already indicated, the features of the paper have changed much in the course of its long history. In 1845 it was "a sufficient newspaper," and aimed at being "the best they could procure who choose to take but one, and yet to have its independent interest for those who read many," and we hear of country congregations taking in one copy "for circulation amongst those members who could not think of taking a newspaper themselves." With the change of the general newspaper into the religious journal there disappeared the "Foreign and Colonial News, Parliamentary Reports, University Intelligence, the Money Market Column, and Notes on Drama and Musical Festivals."

The Inquirer is the oldest Nonconformist weekly and one of the oldest religious weeklies in the country, acknowledging as its seniors only *The Record* (est. 1828), founded in the interests of the Evangelical Church party, and *The Tablet* (est. 1848), a Roman Catholic journal.

The Unitarian Herald was established in Manchester, May 1861, under the joint editorship of four zealous ministers, John Relly Beard, William Gaskell, Brooke Herford, and John Wright. All four were deeply interested in missionary enterprise, in the Unitarian Home Missionary Board (now Unitarian College), established 1854, and in the congregations arising in Lancashire and Yorkshire following the secessions from Methodism of Joseph Cooke (1806), and Joseph Barker (1841). From 1865 Gaskell and Herford alone were in charge of the paper, and from 1887 to July 1889 two other ministers acted as editors—James Black and Samuel Fletcher Williams, the last-named a journalist of capacity.

With each successive editorial change, the size of page and style of printing were changed. *The Unitarian Herald* contained, besides the usual reports of meetings, etc., stories and other popular features. Brooke Herford's *Eutychus and His Relations*, a humorous account of his ministerial experiences, which appeared in its pages, was afterwards published in book form.

It was the first Unitarian weekly published at a penny, and circulated widely amongst the growing congregations in the industrial centres of Lancashire and Yorkshire. With the appearance of *The Christian Life* in 1876, its circulation declined, and Brooke Herford expressed the opinion that the two should be united. They were incorporated in July 1889. In saying farewell, the editors acknowledged "the pressure caused by the existence within the limits of our small denomination of three weekly periodicals," and remarked "it is a matter of interest to ourselves and will be to our friends that Mr. Spears (founder of *The Christian Life*) was invited by Dr. Beard, Mr. Gaskell, and other founders of the *Herald* to undertake the management of this paper, which his acceptance of the Stamford Street pulpit compelled him to decline."

On May 20, 1876, appeared the first number of *The Christian Life*, founded and edited by Robert Spears (1825–99), a minister of remarkable missionary enthusiasm,

who was Secretary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association (1867–76) and established *The Christian Freeman*, a popular monthly in 1859, that lived on after his death under various editors until 1909.

In 1881 he was joined by Samuel Charlesworth, who had previously edited two provincial weeklies, and for some years was sub-editor of *The Sheffield Independent*. On the death of Spears (February 25, 1899), Charlesworth acted as editor for a few months and remained a contributor to the paper, writing numerous leading articles, until his death in 1910. From midsummer 1899 to the end of June 1902 R. W. Kittle, LL.B., was editor, being succeeded by the Rev. D. Delta Evans, who remained in the chair until, at the end of June 1929, *The Christian Life* was amalgamated with *The Inquirer*. During its life of fifty-four years, therefore, three editors alone were practically in control. With the incorporation of *The Unitarian Herald* in 1889, the sub-title was changed from *A Unitarian Journal* to that of the weekly which had been taken over.

Amongst the contributors from the beginning were Professor Courtney Kenny, LL.D., of Cambridge, and Alexander Gordon, M.A., Principal of the Unitarian Home Missionary College (1890–1911). Its financial supporters included Samuel Sharpe, the members of the Lawrence family, Sir Henry Tate, James Hopgood, and Frederick Nettlefold. Sharpe was a contributor from its foundation until his death in 1881, and other contributors included James Freeman Clarke, the distinguished American divine; Robert Collyer, the popular American preacher; John Kentrick, tutor and scholar; Hugh Stannus; and Thomas Lethbridge Marshall, the former editor of *The Inquirer*.

It is no reflection on these writers, however, to say that *The Christian Life* owed most to Professor Kenny and Alexander Gordon. For many years Gordon was literary editor in charge of the page of "Views and Reviews," and

it is doubtful if there appeared in any contemporary journal more original, learned, and critical reviews of the literature of Protestant Dissent than those from his pen, which no student of Nonconformity can afford to neglect.

Two special illustrated numbers of *The Christian Life*—the "Van Mission" number of 1908 and the "Commemoration Number" of 1913, celebrating the passing of the Trinity Act (1813)—enjoyed an extensive sale. The latter, which enlisted the contributions of numerous influential Unitarians, had an issue of twenty-five thousand and was disposed of within a week of publication.

Throughout its career *The Christian Life* was the organ of an aggressive Unitarianism of the Scriptural and conservative type associated with the name of its founder, Robert Spears.

The story of Unitarian periodical literature in all its forms reflects the singularly complex history of Unitarian Churches in the British Isles, and discloses the changing views of science, philosophy, and Scripture during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It illustrates further the intense interest in politics, literature, and education of liberal religious thinkers during that period, and constitutes a contribution to the social and intellectual life of the country remarkable as the product of a small community outside the main stream of Nonconformity, and subject for most of the time to personal, ecclesiastical, or legal ostracism. Speaking of a time as late as "the middle of last century," a modern politician and man of letters, himself the son of a Baptist minister, has said:[1] "The current doctrine of the Atonement cut Unitarians, however respected in civic life, adrift from the moorings of orthodoxy, and it is hardly to exaggerate to say that they lived their religious lives by themselves, almost outside the pale of Christianity."

[1] Augustine Birrell, *Review of the Life of Joseph Chamberlain* in *The Observer*, December 4, 1932.

IV. DOCTRINE, PHILOSOPHY, HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, AND BELLES-LETTRES

CHAPTER I

DOCTRINE

In Unitarian circles during the eighteenth century Christian doctrine was generally regarded as a department of Biblical scholarship. Nathaniel Lardner, D.D. (1684–1768), indeed, with his *Credibility of the Gospel History*, in twelve volumes and three supplementary volumes, published during the course of thirty years (1727–57), was "the founder of the modern school of critical research in the field of early Christian literature,"[1] but, though his method is excellent, his scholarship accurate, and his candour praiseworthy, the apologetic character of his great work is apparent even in its title. Two other writings of his are deserving of mention for different reasons. The *Dissertations Upon the Two Epistles Ascribed to Clement of Rome*, published in 1753, showed them not to be genuine, and the *Letter Concerning the Logos*, published anonymously in 1759, made Joseph Priestley a Socinian some nine years later.

John Taylor (1694–1761), a pupil of Thomas Dixon at Whitehaven and of Thomas Hill at Findon, the first Divinity tutor at Warrington Academy, published several books on doctrine which were both valuable and influential. An Arian of the school of Samuel Clarke, soon after his settlement at Norwich, finding his people disturbed and in doubt on the question of the Trinity, he read with them (1730) Clarke's *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*. The title of his first treatise, *The Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin Proposed to Free and Candid Examination* (1740), reveals his indebtedness to Clarke, and the basis and method he adopted, viz. Scripture and reason. Taylor examines five passages relating to the first sin of Adam, then passages adduced in defence

[1] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Lardner, Nathaniel.*

of the doctrine of Original Sin, and finally the possible objections to the rejection of the received opinion. In a supplement in the following year he met the criticisms of two anonymous works entitled *The Vindication of the Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin*, by David Jennings, and *The Ruin and Recovery of Mankind*. His intimate knowledge of Hebrew was of great advantage to him in his examination of the Old Testament passages concerned. More interested in ethical than in speculative theology, in this treatise he combated with signal success the Calvinistic view of human nature. The book ran to four editions and was widely read. Mr. J. H. Colligan describes it[1] as "not only one of the standard books of English Arianism, but, estimated by its reputation, one of the masterpieces of eighteenth-century theology." Puritan theology on Original Sin was severely shaken by it in this country. In Scotland, Robert Burns remarked its influence in his *Epistle to John Goudie*. "In Ireland," said Alexander Gordon,[2] "a worthy minister begged that none of his hearers would read it, for it is a bad book, and a dangerous book, and an heretical book, and what is even worse than all, the book is unanswerable." Jonathan Edwards, the great American Calvinist theologian, admitted that no one book did so much towards rooting out orthodox theology on Original Sin as Taylor's *Scripture Doctrine on Original Sin*. Ten years after its publication John Wesley wrote to Taylor that it "had gone through all England and made numerous converts." Its literal treatment of passages like the first chapter of Genesis do not commend it to modern liberal theologians, but, granted its Scriptural premises—in the middle of the eighteenth century rarely questioned—it is a powerful and convincing statement of the case against the traditional view. Amongst those who took up their pens to answer it were Isaac Watts, David

[1] *The Arian Movement in England*, p. 92.
[2] *Heads of English Unitarian History*, p. 37.

Jennings, and John Wesley. Taylor's reply to the last-named was included in the fourth (posthumously published) edition of his work (1769), though Wesley's early biographers (Coke and Moore) suggested that Taylor never could be persuaded to answer Wesley's criticism.

The Scripture-Doctrine of Atonement Examined (1751) was less completely satisfactory. Here he was stronger on the negative than on the positive side. He controverted current doctrines, but substituted nothing. Believing that Christ's death sufficed to save men, he refused to allow that it was meant to satisfy justice, or that the suffering was a vicarious punishment. Taylor was not prepared to go the length of Socinianism in transferring the work of Christ from an operation upon God to one upon man. He desired to retain so much of the old view as that Christ's work was directed towards the Divine Being and performed for man's sake. In his *Paraphrase with Notes on the Epistle to the Romans* (1745; 3rd ed., 1754), Taylor defines more clearly his view of the Atonement. "The Blood of Christ, or that by which He has bought or redeemed us, is His love and goodness to men, and His obedience to God; exercised indeed through the whole of His state of humiliation in this world, but most eminently exhibited in His death," and in a MS. note written in a copy of the third edition, he adds: "The redemption that is in Jesus Christ is not the cause of God's justifying grace; but 'tis the way in which, or the means through which, it is exercised and communicated to us."

In *The Lord's Supper Explained Upon Scripture Principles* (1756), Taylor adopted a commemorative view of the rite. "Do this in remembrance of Me, your Teacher and Master, by bringing to mind what I have taught you, and the example of virtue and piety which I have set before you, that you may improve in all moral excellence." "The 'flesh and blood' of Christ is the moral excellence of our Teacher, and we eat the flesh and drink the blood of our Teacher

when we believe in Him, see Him, and come unto Him."

Samuel Bourn (1714–96), who became Taylor's colleague at Norwich in 1714, was an old student of Glasgow University under Hutcheson and Simson. Amongst his publications were *Discourses* (2 vols., 1760), in the Introduction to which he denied that "resurrection" in the New Testament implies "a reference to the body"; it signifies simply "a transition to another state or life."[1] The second volume contains sermons on "The Office and Dignity of Christ," "Salvation," etc., and has been described as "one of the earliest, and one of the best pieces of constructive theology on the Person of Christ which English Arianism produced."[2] Bourn's books were largely subscribed for by Nonconformists and Anglicans alike; Samuel Parr described him as a "masterly writer and a profound thinker," and he was offered an Irish living as a sinecure, if he would only conform. His writings indicate, it is said,[3] "a definite stage, prior to the transition from Arianism to Socinianism."

The transition was very largely effected in consequence of the work of Joseph Priestley, but that is not his greatest service to the study of doctrine. In his *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (1783) and other works which aroused much opposition, not without some justification, we may see his greatest work in this field. "If you ask me what I should reckon his greatest service to theological science," says Alexander Gordon, "I should say that it is to be found in his adoption of the historical method of investigating the problem of doctrine, and in his special handling of that method. . . . The whole object of his histories of doctrine is to get at the mind of the common Christian people in the first age; to make their primary understanding of Scripture the norm for its true interpretation; and then to trace the process by which this first impression, this real meaning

[1] J. H. Colligan, *The Arian Movement in England*, p. 104. [2] Ibid.

suffered transmutation by the speculative genius of philosophising divines. . . . The plan was novel, the conception original, the whole endeavour strictly scientific in its method and basis. . . . The progress of Biblical knowledge implies, no doubt, a readjustment of his argument and a revision of his conclusions. But the readjustment and revision are effected by the use of principles which he was the first to set forth and apply. . . . He is the genuine precursor of the properly historic treatment of Biblical and theological questions."[4] It need only be added that though he lacked Harnack's extraordinary scholarship and exhibited a tendency to find what he looked for in his sources, Priestley anticipated the great German theologian in his general view of the history of doctrine as a record of progressive departure, under the influence of Hellenic thought and secularisation, from the primitive faith. Again, in the attempt "to get at the mind of the common Christian people in the first age" he had the same aim as a modern school of German critics, though he employed none of their methods and arrived at none of their results. He was content to get behind the Fathers to the New Testament, and rationalising what he discovered there to set forth a Jesus who belonged to the great human family, though He did many mighty works. The so-called *formgeschichte* school to-day seeks to fill up the gap between the death of Jesus and the earliest sources for his life by reaching our, through a comparative study of the forms of folklore, sacred and secular, to the mind of the earliest Christian community, and find therein the recognition of a superhuman figure in the Lord Jesus Christ. Both methods may be justified and condemned by their results. Priestley deposed Arianism from its former pre-eminence amongst liberal thinkers in virtue of its supposed primitive origin, but his criticism of the evangelical narra-

[4] *Heads of English Unitarian History*, p. 122.

tives was necessarily imperfect and misleading. The modern method brings to light the nature of the task attempted by the evangelists and the character of their material, but it fails to account satisfactorily for the emergence of the humanitarian elements so prominent in the earliest sources of the Gospel story; the results cannot be made to fit into an ordered scheme of development, and at most are inferences from premises by their nature shadowy and uncertain, in regard to which no considerable degree of unanimity has yet been attained. In general, Priestley and his friends apart, little interest was exhibited by eighteenth-century Unitarian divines and scholars in Patristic literature and still less in Medieval Scholasticism, whose contribution to Christian thought was regarded as purely negative, and no attempt was made to relate the one or the other to current doctrine in any historical order. One reason for this was that the History of Doctrine, like the sister topic, Ecclesiastical History, was much neglected in Nonconformist academies. Again, the Reformers, as pioneers of freedom in their revolt from Rome, were tendered every respect, but neither their individual contributions to theological thought nor their collective formulations of doctrine being acceptable, they were seldom sympathetically or even critically studied. Chillingworth's famous book, *The Religion of Protestants* (1638), with its emphasis upon free inquiry into the meaning of Scripture as "a safe way of salvation," formulated the principle adopted by Unitarians. Not until the nineteenth century did Christian Doctrine in the wider sense receive due attention at their hands. With the rejection by the teachers and pupils of Manchester College of the principle of "the Sufficiency of Scripture," and their recognition of the essential relation of Christian doctrine to religious philosophy and the new science of comparative religion, the Unitarian study of Christian Doctrine took a new and decisive turn.

The leaders in this movement were John James Tayler, James Martineau, James Drummond, Joseph Estlin Carpenter, and Philip Henry Wicksteed. Martineau's *Essays and Reviews*, apart from their style and illustrations, both noteworthy in themselves, are conspicuous for breadth and philosophical treatment, and have long been recognised far and wide, even by those who reject their tenets, as the product of a master mind. Wicksteed's writings in this field are marked by a profound understanding of medieval thought, Carpenter's by the comparative study of non-Christian systems, and Drummond's by a first-hand acquaintance with Christian literature throughout the ages and a temper unsurpassed for sobriety of judgment. It is probably not too much to claim that amongst the most eminent English students of Christian doctrine during the last century none excelled these four, *alumni* of a single academy, in their wide and exact knowledge of Christian literature, patristic, medieval, and modern, united, as it was, with a singular freedom from bias and, in the case of Carpenter, with an intimate acquaintance with the literature of the great ethnic religions, especially that of India.

Of Martineau's essays no word need be said. *Studies in Theology*, by Carpenter and Wicksteed, thirteen lectures and essays published in 1903 but, with a single exception, first printed in the nineteenth century, contain many of their doctrinal studies. Not a few are to be found also in the pages of the numerous Unitarian journals and periodicals noticed elsewhere. Fuller discussions published later in separate volumes like Wicksteed's *Dante and Aquinas* (1913), *The Reactions Between Dogma and Philosophy Illustrated from the Work of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Hibbert Lectures, 1916), and Carpenter's *Phases of Early Christianity* (1916) amplify and extend with a profounder knowledge and a surer grasp principles and positions outlined or suggested in the earlier writings. The late Professor C. H. Herford, who spoke with authority, counted the Hibbert Lectures as "perhaps the greatest" of

Wicksteed's books, one which "could probably have been written by no other man." It certainly evoked remarkable tributes from competent judges, Catholic and Protestant alike, as a comprehensive, lucid, and eloquent exposition of medieval thought. As Herford saw it: "It was an attempt to make clear to Protestant eyes the solidity which Thomas had given, by the help of the Hellenic mortar of Aristotle, to the fabric of Catholic faith." That a Unitarian who rejected the fundamental positions of Aquinas should have done this so successfully is not the least testimony to his openness of mind. Wicksteed's *Dante and Aquinas* Herford esteemed his "most perfect" work, and observed: "It is probable that Wicksteed was the first Englishman who taught us to glory in Dante, not as an armoury of weapons against the papacy, or simply as a supreme master of poetic craftsmanship, but as a poet-prophet, whose mighty Catholic hymn, rightly heard, is vocal to the whole of humanity."

James Drummond's contributions to the study of Christian doctrine deserve a more detailed treatment. He alone surveyed the whole field; whilst two of his larger works have long been recognised as authoritative studies subsidiary to the history of Christian doctrine.

To take them in an order that is not merely chronological, *The Jewish Messiah: A Critical History of the Messianic Idea Among the Jews from the Rise of the Maccabees to the Closing of the Talmud* (1877) is a substantial volume which for many years was the standard English work on one of the most complex problems of Jewish and Christian doctrine. Apart from the references to the Targums and the Talmud, it is based on first-hand knowledge and investigation. Book I, an introduction to the Apocalyptic Literature, has been superseded by the works of later scholars employing sources unknown to Drummond and equipped with a knowledge of Oriental tongues to which he made no claim.

In especial, the analysis of the sources of Apocalyptic writings has been carried much further during the last half-century, and in some matters of moment, as in his recognition of Christian interpolations in the Messianic passages of Enoch, Drummond's views have not been generally accepted. Book II, however, which traces the historical development of the Jewish Messianic idea in all its forms, if not unaffected by conclusions presumed to be established in the previous book and now rejected, enjoys even to-day a deservedly high repute. The author's candour, lucidity, and eminently judicial temper, which never failed him, are here, as rarely elsewhere, united with a tone of irony in his critical examination of the conflicting conclusions of radical and conservative scholars. In his review of the book, Dr. T. K. Cheyne said of Drummond: "It would be impossible to ascertain from the work before us to what religious or historical school he belongs. Scrupulous impartiality characterises all his discussions."

Philo Judaeus, or The Jewish Alexandrian Philosophy in Its Development and Completion (2 vols., 1888), like *The Jewish Messiah*, was based on lectures delivered in Manchester College. The pioneer character of this work and its originality of treatment may be learnt from the statement in the Preface: "A treatise on Philo's philosophy needs no apology; for not only is English literature deficient in this respect, but I have been led to entertain views which differ on fundamental points from those which are most current; and have arrived, rightly or wrongly, at a much higher estimate of Philo's speculative power than at one time I was tempted to form from the strange and incoherent jumble which has been ascribed to him by some eminent expositors." Amongst the points referred to is Drummond's view of the Logos in Philo, not as a distinct personality, but as the divine thought objectified permanently in the order of the universe and assuming personality in individual minds.

Only those who have attempted to make a path through the luxurious and stubborn growth in the Philonic forest can estimate aright the difficulties overcome by Drummond, and whilst his treatise in some of its parts has naturally been supplemented by more recent scholars, e.g. the discussions of the Wisdom of Solomon and the Letter of Aristeas, it still remains the standard work on the philosophy of Philo. It was no part of Drummond's plan to exhibit the influence of Philo upon New Testament writings like the Fourth Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews, or upon the Fathers whose indebtedness to Alexandrian philosophy is generally acknowledged, but none the less *Philo Judæus* forms an admirable introduction to the study of the literature named.

The origin of *Studies in Christian Doctrine* (1908) is seen in its dedication: "To the Author's Friends and Pupils, who, free from dogmatic restrictions, have sought with him for a deeper knowledge of divine truth." As the title indicates, it is not a history of the development of doctrine, but a fresh and original discussion of the main topics of doctrine with reference at once to their origin and abiding significance. Following the Introduction, the book is divided into four parts: (I) Sources of Doctrine; (II) Doctrine of God; (III) Doctrine of Man; (IV) The Relation Between God and Man as Affected by Historical Conditions.

As early as 1870, in a volume entitled *Spiritual Religion*—a course of sermons preached in Cross Street Chapel, Manchester—Drummond displayed in a deeply devotional spirit his clear apprehension of the person and work of Christ: in *An Introduction to the Study of Theology* (1884) he disclosed the wide range of his knowledge of the various branches of theology, and in the *Essex Hall Lecture on Christology* (1902) his understanding of speculative Christology. These volumes and the larger works on the Jewish Messiah and on Philo find their crown and completion for

the student of Christian doctrine in the *Studies in Christian Doctrine*, which, whilst lacking the apparatus of a documented work of research, represents the fruit of many years' labour in the field of Christian origins and history by one fitted in a peculiar degree by spirit and temper to pursue truth reverently and unflinchingly, without bitterness or contention. It remains the only adequate Unitarian exposition of all the central themes of Christian doctrine.

Particular points of doctrine, like the Atonement, the Trinity, and the Incarnation, not unnaturally were the subjects of many treatises by Unitarian divines, amongst whom Lant Carpenter, William Johnson Fox, Russell L. Carpenter, George Vance Smith, and, later, Richard Acland Armstrong were the most prominent. The revision of the New Testament awakened a fresh interest in the proof texts of Trinitarianism, either omitted or modified in the new version, but all such publications, even when marked by exact scholarship and logical precision, seldom appealed to those outside the Unitarian fold. The numerous controversies into which Unitarians were drawn, not always unwillingly, aroused more attention. Priestley's eight years' controversy with Samuel Horsley sprang out of his heretical *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (1782) and culminated in his *History of Early Opinions of Jesus Christ* (1786). "As a pure polemic," said Alexander Gordon, "Horsley was beyond question by far the stronger man. . . . Certainly he demonstrated that Priestley's mind, impervious to Platonic ideas, was, so far, not constructed for a sympathetic estimate of the theology of the Greek Fathers. His repugnance to their underlying philosophy may be proof of the limits of his mental digestion; at the same time it sharpened his sensitiveness to the introduction of a new and foreign element in the patristic exposition of the Gospel. Horsley had twitted him with being in Platonism 'a child.'" "This does not, I hope," responded Priestley, "prevent

me from being a man in Christianity." One result of the controversy, possibly not quite unexpected on one side, was the elevation of Horsley to the episcopal bench.

The controversy between James Yates and Ralph Wardlaw, the Independent, produced Yates' *Vindication of Unitarianism* (1815), which ran to four editions, and was for long a standard work of reference amongst Unitarian apologists. James Yates (1789–1871) was a scientist of some note, a Fellow of the Geological, Linnean, and Royal Societies, and one of the chief contributors to the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*.

The York controversy (1822–24) between Charles Wellbeloved and Francis Wrangham was one between men, both of whom were scholars of distinction. The impression it made upon Sydney Smith, the witty Canon of St. Paul's, is seen in his remark: "If I had a cause to win, I would fee Wellbeloved to plead for me, and double-fee Wrangham to plead against me."

The Belfast discussion (1834) between John Scott Porter and Daniel Bagot was the only discussion of the kind in which both sides are given in the same publication, which reached a fourth edition in 1870.

The Liverpool controversy (1839) was the last and greatest of these controversies. Thirteen clergymen attacked Unitarianism in a series of lectures published as *Unitarianism Confuted*, and James Martineau, John Hamilton Thom, and Henry Giles replied in *Unitarianism Defended*. "It raised controversial writing on this topic," said Alexander Gordon,[1] "to a higher level of literary expression and intellectual eminence than it had previously attained in Great Britain." Dr. William Shepherd, of Gateacre, took a hand in the discussion by publishing anonymously in *The Albion* an amusing series of articles, afterwards reprinted as *The*

[1] *Heads of English Unitarian History*, p. 116.

Clerical Cabbage Garden, or, The Rev. Fielding Ould's Modesty Asserted and Vindicated, in which he showed that one of the assailants of Unitarianism had borrowed extensively without acknowledgment from a tract by Andrew Fuller the Baptist theologian (1754–1815).

CHAPTER II

PHILOSOPHY

WRITING in 1840 and speaking of his co-religionists, James Martineau said: "Descended as we are from John Locke, we have brought the understanding to do all our work for us, from the baking of bread to the worship of God." In these words he denoted the philosophy dominant in Unitarian circles for more than a century, marked its excessive emphasis upon reason, and, by implication at least, declared his rejection of it. It was, indeed, Martineau himself who led the movement which displaced for Unitarians the foundation of their doctrine and Biblical theology, established by Locke, and substituted for it another of different order and origin. He might have said with Novalis: "Philosophy can bake no bread, but she can procure for us God, Freedom, and Immortality."

Between Locke and Martineau came other philosophers who influenced, in varying degrees, the thought of Unitarians—Hutcheson and Wollaston from without, Price, Priestley, and Belsham from within their ranks. But all these, by attraction or repulsion, sometimes both, were related in one way or another to Locke, and though Hutcheson and Price had much in common with Martineau, neither contributed materially to his philosophy.

John Locke (1632–1704) was a great pathfinder in philosophy, and Martineau, even when he had successfully thrown off his spell, did not lack appreciation of his work and character. He has been described as "the father of Rationalism" and as "the founder of modern philosophy." Professor S. Alexander calls him "the first critical philosopher" from his "method of determining the limits of our knowledge by an inquiry into the instrument." His place

as a pioneer is universally acknowledged, and his doctrine was developed, supplemented, or criticised by most of those who followed him in the eighteenth century. "The office which Bacon assigns to himself with reference to knowledge generally," says Thomas Fowler,[1] "might well have been claimed by Locke with reference to the science of mind. Both of them did far more than merely play the part of herald, but of both alike it was emphatically true that they 'rang the bell to call the other wits together.'"

Ideas, the material of thought and knowledge, Locke derived from sensation and reflection. The system of innate ideas, dear to earlier thinkers, he entirely discarded, and gave to reason a predominant place—a position welcome to Unitarian scholars who followed him in Biblical exegesis[2] and shared his principles of civil and religious freedom. Locke therefore tended to overestimate the passive receptivity of the mind and underestimate its activity and spontaneity. This exaggeration of the influence of external circumstances, education, and habits inspired in Unitarians a doctrine of works which found expression in zeal for social and political reform, in scientific experiment and journalistic enterprise, in secular education, secondary and university alike, in a stern and sometimes severe morality, and in a decided preference for James rather than Paul as the apostolic interpreter of the Gospel message.

The exaltation of reason in Locke by no means implied the debasement of revelation. On the contrary, revelation attested by supernatural sanctions was freely admitted, and in his study of the New Testament he gave a high place to the evidence of miracle and the fulfilment of prophecy. In these matters he pointed the direction which Unitarians gladly followed until Martineau and his school showed them a better way. Francis Hutcheson (1694–1746), in metaphysics following Locke, laid stress on an "internal sense"

[1] Locke, *English Men of Letters*, p. 113.

[2] See pp. 44–4.

of beauty intuitive and universal in man, which owed something to Shaftesbury, and on a "moral sense" which was apparently influenced by Butler's doctrine in his sermons. As Professor of Philosophy at Glasgow College (1727–46) he helped to shape the thought of Unitarians through a succession of pupils who came to Glasgow from the liberal Dissenting academies and returned to take up appointments as tutors. Hutcheson was a pioneer in the use of English instead of Latin in the lecture-room, and a text-book written for his class in Latin and translated into English 1717 was read in the academies at Carmarthen and elsewhere. His written lectures were collected and edited, with a memoir, by William Leechman as *A System of Philosophy* (2 vols., 4to, 1752).

"The broad theology of Leechman and the ethics of Hutcheson," said Martineau, "had relaxed the severe Calvinism of Glasgow, and had given a liberal tone to a large intellectual minority both within and without the University."[1] The appeal which Hutcheson made to open-minded liberals may be illustrated from English and American writers. Samuel Bourn, of Norwich (1714–96), a former student under Hutcheson, whose sermons were highly prized by Robert Burns, clearly portrayed the influence of his master. In the first volume of his sermons, published 1760, he spoke of "the greatest good or happiness of the universe in general"—an expression in a slightly different form borrowed by Bentham from Hutcheson, and made famous by the Utilitarian school, especially by John Stuart Mill.

Channing, the American Unitarian divine, more than half a century later, declared: "While reading one day some of the various passages in which Hutcheson asserts man's capacity for disinterested affection, and considers virtue as the sacrifice of private interests and the bearing of private

[1] *Essays, Reviews, and Addresses*, i, pp. 400–1.

evils for public good, or as self-devotion to absolute, universal good, there suddenly burst upon his mind that view of the dignity of human nature which was ever after to 'uphold and cherish' him, and thenceforth to be 'the fountain light of all his days, the master light of all his seeing.'"[1]

The influence of Hutcheson on Channing was permanent and, through him, indirectly on Martineau, whose mind was much moved by the teaching of the American.

John Taylor, Divinity tutor at Warrington Academy 1757–61, was a critic of Hutcheson, though a personal friend of Leechman. He based his philosophy lectures on William Woolaston, whose *Religion of Nature Delineated* (1724) went through many editions. It is "a version of the intellectual theory of which Samuel Clarke was the chief contemporary representative."[2] Taylor published in 1760 two brief manuals for the use of his class, which were reprinted in 1768: (1) *An Examination of Dr. Hutcheson's Scheme of Morality*, and (2) *A Sketch of Moral Philosophy*, which was intended as an introduction to the reading of Wollaston. In the former he argued against "benevolence" and "moral sense" as the only principles of virtue and morality in the mind, and pleaded for "reason as the Principal in the affair of virtue." In the latter he made a free use of *An Inquiry Concerning Virtue and Happiness*, by his friend Philips Glover (1751), and *A Review of the Principal Questions in Morals*, by Richard Price, argued strongly for Freedom of the Will, laid it down that "Happiness is not the necessary consequence of virtue," and declared that "conscience is not a distinct faculty in the human soul, but the judgment of our Minds concerning our own actions." As a philosopher, however, John Taylor's influence was almost negligible. Richard Price, whom he had read with appreciation, was

[1] *Memoirs of W. E. Channing*, i, p. 63, seventh edition, Boston, 1857.
[2] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Woolaston, William.*

one whose influence was more felt in Germany and America than in England. "I read Price," said Channing, "when I was in College. Price saved me from Locke's philosophy. He gave me the doctrine of ideas, and during my life I have written the words Love, Right, etc., with a capital. That book profoundly moulded my philosophy into the form it has always retained." The reference is to *Four Dissertations* (1767; 4th ed., 1777). Richard Price (1723–94), an Arian divine, published in 1717 (3rd ed., 1787) his first philosophical treatise: *A Review of the Principal Questions in Morals*. It was professedly directed against the doctrine of Hutcheson and set forth three positions, which have been thus summarised: "Actions are in themselves right or wrong; (2) Right and wrong are simple ideas incapable of analysis; (3) These ideas are perceived immediately by the intuitive power of the reason or understanding," and "when the reason or understanding has once apprehended the idea of right, it ought to impose that idea as a law upon the will, and thus it becomes, equally with the affections, a spring of action." Price was influenced by Butler and Clarke, and in some points anticipated Kant. Against Locke he contended that the understanding was a source of ideas and distinguished "speculative" and "moral" reason. Right he regarded as absolute and immutable and perceived by the intuitive reason. An action to be right was not necessarily to give pleasure, as later Utilitarians thought, nor necessarily to be devoid of it, as Kant supposed. The authority of Rectitude or Virtue is finely expressed by Price in a passage of which a recent biographer properly said:[1] "Kant himself nowhere clothes his imperative with more imperious sovereignty." Following upon the publication by his friend, Joseph Priestley, of *Disquisitions Relating to Matter and Spirit* (1777), Price entered into a discussion with him, resulting in the publication of *A Free Discussion of the Doctrines of*

[1] R. Thomas, *Richard Price*, p. 57, London, 1924.

Materialism and Philosophical Necessity (1778), in which the two men collaborated. Price argued for the existence of the soul and the freedom of the will in discussions which mark him "as one of the most capable exponents of modern Idealism." Though he taught for a short time in the ill-fated Hackney College, and in the economics and politics of the day was a prominent figure, Price exercised but little influence as a philosopher on English Unitarianism. Partly this was due to the decline of Arianism, with which he was always identified, in face of the aggressive Unitarianism of Priestley and Belsham and the philosophy with which it was closely associated. When Martineau independently revived later a spiritual philosophy and the doctrine of freewill, he found reason to reject a fundamental tenet of Price's ethics, which, as a whole, singularly enough, had never presented much attraction for him.

Priestley and Belsham, whose influence on Unitarians was much wider and deeper than that of Price, were not his equals in grasp or originality, being little more than interpreters and mediators of the philosophy of Locke and Hartley.

David Hartley (1705–57), the son of a Yorkshire clergyman, simplified and developed in certain ways the system of Locke. He combined a doctrine of association of ideas with one of vibrations of ether as the cause of sensation, and sought to explain psychological phenomena on principles of physiology. His relation to Locke and the tenor of his teaching are thus set forth by John James Tayler: "The tendencies to materialism and philosophical necessity, and the suggestion of the association of ideas, which had appeared in the writings of Locke as pregnant hints and mere germs of thought, were developed by Hartley into an ample doctrinal form. Of the two sources to which Locke had traced back all ideas, one was now given up, and all the materials of human knowledge, belief, and senti-

ment were resolved into the elementary impressions on the senses, out of which, it was maintained, the most refined and disinterested affections of benevolence and piety could be successively evolved through the transforming processes of the all-pervading law of the association of ideas."[1]

Joseph Priestley was an enthusiastic, if not always a discriminating, disciple of Hartley, and ranked his *Observations on Man* (1749; 2nd. ed., 1791) "next to the Bible." He published selections from it in 1777, and discarded the doctrine of vibrations, though inclined to believe it, in order to win acceptance for the theory of the association of ideas. From Hartley and Collins he derived his necessarianism, and his materialism from his own scientific studies. In *Disquisitions Relating to Matter and Spirit* (1777) he expounded his materialism, the sentient principle or soul acting only through the body, and, in his discussion with Price, his doctrine of philosophical necessity. The object of the mind willing is pleasure, but like Hartley before him and John Stuart Mill after him, Priestley impaired his Hedonism by admitting differences of quality in pleasure. Following Locke, Priestley found a support for a theology which his philosophy could not properly afford and, despite his fearless use of reason in the interpretation of Scripture, he did not move far from the fundamental positions of his master. His influence on Unitarian thought was deepened and widened by Thomas Belsham, a more powerful thinker, who, first at Daventry Academy and then at Hackney College, imparted his doctrines to students with much ability. The influence of Priestley peeps out in the letters of Lamb to Coleridge. As a hearer of Belsham at Gravel Pit, Hackney, and as one who confessed that he "loved and honoured" Priestley "almost profanely," Lamb did not like in Coleridge "a certain air of mysticism" and instanced his allusion to man's being "an eternal partaker of the Divine

[1] J. J. Taylor. *A Retrospect of the Religious Life of England*, pp. 434-5.

Nature" (October 24, 1796). He himself clung to the New Testament thought of God as Heavenly Father and Friend. Lamb later admitted that the objectionable phrase was Scriptural, but was afraid lest "with mystical notions and the pride of metaphysics" we might give it a meaning "which the simple fishermen of Galilee never intended to convey." Behind Lamb's remonstrance was the philosophy of Belsham with its materialist view of man's nature, its distrust of mysticism, and its reliance upon the revelation of the Gospel.

Belsham's *Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind* (1801) enjoyed considerable vogue, and, in the opinion of Alexander Gordon, "there are few expositions of determinism more forcible and lucid than will be found therein." It formed the text-book at Manchester College used by William Turner from 1809 to 1827, covering the period (1822–27) of Martineau's life as a student. It was in allusion to this period of his life, beginning at College and extending over the early years of his ministry, that Martineau said: "Steeped in the 'empirical' and 'necessarian' mode of thought, I served out successive terms of willing captivity to Locke and Hartley, to Collins, Edwards and Priestley, to Bentham and James Mill."[1]

Edward Tagart (1804–58), a fellow-student of Martineau at York, continued "a willing captive" to Locke, Hartley, and Priestley. He published in 1855 *Locke's Writings and Philosophy Historically Considered and Vindicated from the Charge of Contributing to the Scepticism of Hume*. It won the commendation of Hallam, who wrote (November 25, 1857): "I think it will have the effect of restoring Locke to the place he ought to take in the estimate of his country." It is a clever apologia, the result of wide reading and shrewd reasoning, but little more. As its Preface indicates, it was evoked not merely to correct misrepresentations of Locke,

[1] *Types of Ethical Theory*, i, ix.

but also to protest against a contemporaneous movement amongst Unitarians which was undermining his authority alike in philosophy and in Biblical theology—a movement led by James Martineau. The book may have succeeded in freeing Locke from undeserved censures; it failed to restore him to the place he once held in the thought of Unitarianism.

James Martineau (1805–1900) did not publish his three greatest works until he was an octogenarian, but *Types of Ethical Theory* (2 vols., 1885), *A Study of Religion* (2 vols., 1888), and *The Seat of Authority in Religion* (1890) had been preceded by the publication of college lectures and other addresses and by a long series of brilliant essays contributed to periodicals already noticed. These volumes, therefore, represented constructive work on which he had been engaged more or less continuously during the forty-five years of his tutorship in philosophy at Manchester College (1840–85).

C. B. Upton dates Martineau's emancipation from captivity to necessarian and utilitarian principles in 1839—the year before he began his career at Manchester College, then in Manchester. He owed his freedom to more causes than one—the difficulties which met him in expounding satisfactorily James Mill and Thomas Brown to a small class in Liverpool, difficulties which increased when he grappled with the problem of Moral Evil in his preparation for the Liverpool controversy.[1] To these may be added the influence of the writings of Channing and, almost certainly, Cousin's criticism of Locke. He then became aware, in his own words, "of the distortion which necessarian doctrine gave to the whole group of moral conceptions," and "began to see in causation something behind the phenomenal sequences traced by inductive observation." "Along with this discovery of a metaphysical realm, beyond the physical, came a new attitude of mind towards the early Christian modes of

[1] *Life and Letters of John Martineau*, II. 169.

conception, especially those of the Apostle Paul, whose writings seemed to be totally transformed and to open up views of thought of which I had previously no glimpse."

For Martineau, man became "a partaker of the divine nature," though, as his critical *Study of Spinoza* (1882) showed, he made no truce with pantheism. God was revealed in man's rational, moral, and spiritual nature. In the operations of conscience man's moral freedom and the possibility of sin are manifest, whilst God's presence in the soul is attested by the ethical, aesthetic, and affectional ideals in man. Upon nothing is Martineau more insistent than upon the relationship between Ethics and Religion, and upon the supremacy of conscience—hence his rejection of the hedonistic theories of Hobbes, Bentham, and Bain with their view of happiness as the end of human endeavour; of the intellectual theories of Cudworth, Clarke, and Price, which explained moral ideas from intellectual intuitions; and of the aesthetic theories of Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, which derive them from the intuitive principle of the beautiful. He held that the intuitional and moral evidence is primary, alike in the ideas of causality, obligation, and beauty, and the moral character of God revealed in man's ethical ideals is not at variance with his causality revealed in the phenomena of the visible universe. Martineau did not shrink from facing the difficult problem of moral evil or the scientific view of man and the universe as presented by naturalists and biologists in the nineteenth century.

In the words of Dr. Carpenter, endorsed by Sir Henry Jones, "Whatever limitations may seem to lie around his speculative insight, or to contract the generous breadth of his sympathies, are born of his impassioned grasp of what he conceived to be the fundamental facts of moral experience. Both ethics and metaphysics rest for him on the incidents of his inner history, and this supplies the clue to the whole fabric of his thought."

The philosophy of Martineau was outlined and elaborated by two of his pupils, C. B. Upton and R. A. Armstrong; the former in the Hibbert Lectures on *The Basis of Religious Belief* (1897) and his contribution to the *Life of Martineau*, afterwards separately published, the latter in *God and the Soul: An Essay Towards Fundamental Religion* (1896), which ran into three editions, and *Martineau's Study of Religion* (1900), originally published as a series of articles in *The Inquirer*. Both scholars made valuable additions to the teaching of their master, and both, though not in equal measure, qualified his judgments and rejected some of his positions.

As a whole, Martineau's philosophy has not proved acceptable to twentieth-century thinkers, despite the skill, eloquence, and learning with which it was expounded. His doctrine of "the springs of action" was admitted by Upton not to be proof against critical assaults, and his dualism—the eternal existence of Space and Matter in independence of God—has proved equally difficult of defence. The inference from the authority of conscience to the supreme authority of God seems to many to involve a *non sequitur*, and the neglect of factors outside the mind in the operation of the Will to be contrary to experience. The excessive individualism of Martineau, manifested in his politics, also impaired the force of his philosophy. What he held in common with Kant and especially with Lotze must probably be reckoned, together with the deep spiritual teaching of his sermons, to constitute his greatest contribution to the philosophy of religion. To his contemporaries certainly he meant much. Dr. Fairbairn, writing in 1903, said: "It is largely owing to him that our age was not swept off its feet by the rising tide of materialistic and pseudo-scientific speculation. The qualities of his rhetoric made him the more efficient an apologist for his theistic idea, and clothed it in an elegance of form that commended it to the fastidious in literary feeling. He commended it with a fervour that made it impressive to the religious emotion. He justified his criticism by psychology, and made the man who lived in an age of doubt realise the intellectual energy and the ethical force that lived in our ultimate religious ideas. The services he rendered on this side of his activity are hardly capable of critical apprehension. I am content for my own part to speak as a pupil and as a distant admirer, and say that at critical moments the name of James Martineau was a tower of strength to the feeble, and his words—like Luther's—were not only half battles, but equal to whole victories."

Upon Unitarians, apart from his Biblical criticism in *The Seat of Authority* (1890), his last and most fallible work, Martineau's influence may be traced in a more catholic and tolerant spirit, a deeper and more spiritual church life, and, through the work of his pupils in almost every field of scholarship, in a more scientific yet reverent approach to all the problems of thought and life.

CHAPTER III

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

The Unitarian Movement, with its complex origins, deriving, though not in equal measure, from two of the oldest lines of English Dissent, the Presbyterian and the General Baptist, and receiving into its main stream small tributaries, first of Episcopalians in the eighteenth century and then of Methodists in the nineteenth, has not unnaturally produced historians and biographers alive to the importance of preserving an accurate knowledge of their principles, ancestry, and traditions. Many of these found opportunity to publish their researches in the journals and periodicals founded by them or by others like-minded and public-spirited. Their more weighty contributions remain to be briefly noticed. But the interest thus kindled and expressed was by no means confined to Dissent, to this country, or, indeed, to any form of organised religion. For this there are good reasons. "To Socinianism alone belongs the glory of having as early as the sixteenth century made toleration a fundamental principle of ecclesiastical discipline, and of having determined, more or less immediately, all the subsequent revolutions in favour of religious liberty."[1] Again, it is not for nothing that John James Tayler, in his *Retrospect of the Religious Life in England* (1845), began with a brief statement of the "relation of the religious history of England to the General History of the Church," dealing not with ecclesiastical establishments or politics, but with religious principles. The operation of the characteristic Unitarian principle of toleration, together with a large and free conception of Christian history, led English Unitarian writers to turn their attention to men and movements

[1] F. Ruffini, *Religious Liberty*, p. 90.

abroad. Furthermore, Unitarian indifference to the orthodox doctrine of "sacred" and "profane," which in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries rigidly defined the territory of religious and secular, not only broadened the education offered in their schools and academies and led their laymen, out of all proportion to their numbers, to enter Parliament and public life, it also brought their writers to view with sympathy and understanding the life of man flowing outside the narrow channels of the Churches.

The first history of Unitarians, written by a clergyman, Stephen Nye, entitled *A Brief History of the Unitarians, Called also Socinians* (1687), the second edition of which was included in the Unitarian Tracts,[1] is a history only in name. It is really a lucid and even powerful argument for Unitarian doctrine, in the course of which Nye declares: "Unitarians have always been extremely candid to those that differ from them, from a principle common to them and the Remonstrants only, that consciences ought to be free in matters of faith. This is a principle with them; other families of Christians take it up as an expedient." A fuller knowledge of the early Baptists might have somewhat qualified the last part of the statement, but, as a whole, it cannot be disproved. A work with more claims to rank as history, but with no distinction of style or originality of research, is *An Historical View of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship*, published almost a century later (1783) by Theophilus Lindsey, an ex-clergyman whose lofty character won the respect of friends and adversaries alike. Lindsey's main object, like Nye's, was doctrinal, and he expressed the hope that "the historical facts intermixed, many of them little known, may draw attention" to the main subject of his discourse.

Two biographical dictionaries in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries owe much to Unitarians.

[1] See pp. 16–22.

Andrew Kippis, D.D., was employed by the booksellers to edit the second edition of the *Biographia Britannica* (1788–93), and enlisted the co-operation of Joseph Towers, LL.D., another Unitarian divine—Towers had previously edited the first seven volumes of the *British Biography* (1768–72), on the basis of the original edition of the *Biographia Britannica*, but "containing much original work, the fruit of research at the British Museum."[1] To new articles and additions to old ones in the new edition of the *Biographia Britannica* were appended the letters "K" and "T" distinguishing their respective shares in the work. This edition ran to five volumes and ended with the article *Fastolf*. It met with much criticism. Too much prominence was given to obscure Nonconformists, and the original memoirs, instead of being rewritten, were corrected in long notes, sometimes irrelevant. "But in spite of these defects," says a modern scholar,[2] "Kippis made a valuable addition to our national biographical literature."

John Aikin, M.D., son of the former tutor at Warrington, was the chief editor of *General Biography* (10 vols., 1799–1815), and articles marked "A" constitute more than half the work. After the death of Dr. William Enfield, which took place before the first volume was out, other helpers were secured, chief of whom was Dr. Thomas Morgan, who was responsible for divines, philosophers, and scientists, Aikin himself being the author of the rest. From first to last Aikin was engaged on it for twenty years. Though long since superseded, the *General Biography* was an admirable compilation and presented a valuable survey of biographical materials much of which was accessible only to scholars.

Joshua Toulmin, a Unitarian minister of Baptist opinions, was a voluminous writer on many subjects. "As annalist and biographer," said Alexander Gordon, "his industrious

[1] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Towers, Joseph.* [2] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Kippis, Andrew.*

accuracy is of permanent service." He was the author of *Memoirs of Faustus Socinus* (1777) and *The Life of John Biddle* (1789), two excellent sketches of outstanding figures in the history of Polish and English Unitarianism, and of numerous biographical and historical sketches of Dissenters of all shades of opinion contributed to a long series of Unitarian periodicals. His most noteworthy historical works were his edition of *Neal's History of the Puritans* (3 vols., 1763–67), originally published 1733–58 in four volumes, and *An Historical View of the Protestant Dissenters* (1814). To Neal's *History* he prefixed memoirs of the life and writings of the author based in part on a manuscript source, examined and corrected the references, added numerous notes reviewing and meeting the criticisms passed on the original work by Bishops Maddox and Warburton, and Dr. Zachary Grey, whilst, in his own words, "he has not suppressed strictures of his own, when he conceived there was occasion for them." Toulmin's prefaces to the volumes, his notes throughout, and the supplements to the last two volumes constitute a valuable addition to the work, the whole of which is provided with a complete index. *An Historical View of the State of the Protestant Dissenters from the Revolution to the Accession of Queen Anne* (1814) was intended as "a sequel" to the *History of the Puritans*. It is written in a broad and tolerant spirit, and exhibits considerable research, but its plan is too biographical. The extent to which it has been used by later writers is a tribute to its worth.

William Roscoe (1753–1831) was the author, amongst other works, of *The Life of Lorenzo de Medici* (1785) and *The Life and Pontificate of Leo the Tenth* (1805).

Largely self-taught, Roscoe early acquired a knowledge of languages and exhibited a gift for verse. *The Life of Lorenzo de Medici* had an amazing reception, winning the praise of men like Horace Walpole, Lord Lansdowne, and Lord Bristol, and was translated into French, German, and

Italian. Roscoe had not visited Italy, but through a friend who had access to the libraries in Florence acquired much useful material. If the book, in the opinion of modern scholars, has serious defects, principally arising from an uncritical use of authorities, it was "much in advance of the average historical writing of its age." Roscoe, at any rate, "made use of a great mass of new material, and was the first to give anything like a just account of a glorious period."[1] *The Life of Leo the Tenth* enjoyed a larger sale than its predecessor, but was marked by the same defects and was not so good a book.

Roscoe was a great Liverpool citizen; one of the founders of the Literary and Philosophical Society, and of the Liverpool Library, which developed into the Lyceum, "and was the first public collection of books in Liverpool"; together with his friends, he drew up the scheme in 1797 "on the basis of which, two years later, the Athenaeum was built," and was the promoter and first President of the Liverpool Royal Institution (1817). If his historical works have been surpassed, they "served their end." "They disclosed to the busy money-making England of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries some vision of a community which, not behind ours in the development of commerce, yet kept alive other longings of men's minds than that for wealth."[2]

William Shepherd (1768–1847), minister and schoolmaster at Gateacre, near Liverpool, was the author, amongst other writings literary, political, and religious, of *The Life of Poggio Bracciolini* (1802; 2nd ed., 1837), an Italian humanist (1380–1459), who "was the first man of the Renaissance who had studied the monuments of Rome with the method of a scholar and an archaeologist, comparing them with the testimony of the Latin classics."[3] As historian and classical

[1] Ramsay Muir, *William Roscoe*, Inaugural Lecture, p. 13.
[2] Ibid., p. 14. [3] *Cambridge Modern History*, I, p. 347.

scholar, Bracciolini has a distinguished place amongst the citizens of Florence.

Shepherd's Life, which surpassed its predecessors, was translated into French, German, and Italian. He had made good use of materials collected by his friends, William Roscoe and William Clarke, but the publication of the book brought him intelligence of a manuscript volume of *Poggio's Letters in Cardiganshire*, whilst the Italian translator disclosed the existence of other collections in his epistles. These fresh sources enabled Shepherd to supplement and correct his narrative in the second edition, e.g. the date when Poggio commenced the study of Greek, the name of his teacher, and the place where he taught. This edition is, however, not given in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which speaks of Shepherd's work as "a good authority on Poggio's biography," nor in the *Cambridge Modern History*, which names it alone in the bibliography on Poggio Bracciolini. The Life is a work of considerable distinction, and still the best English authority on the subject. In 1807 Shepherd also edited for private circulation from the manuscript in the Royal Library of Paris *Dialogus, an Seni sit Uxor ducenda, circa A.D. 1435 conscriptus*, by Bracciolini. In 1834 Shepherd's scholarly attainments were recognised by the degree of LL.D. conferred on him by Edinburgh University.

Robert Wallace (1791–1850), an old student of Manchester College, under Wellbeloved, at York, and his successor when the College removed to Manchester in 1840, was the author of *Antitrinitarian Biography* (3 vols.) published in 1850. It represented the result of nearly twenty-four years' labour. Lives are included, Continental and English, extending from the Reformation to the beginning of the eighteenth century. There is a Chronological Table and an admirable Introduction "containing a review (392 pages) of the ecclesiastical affairs of England, from the Reformation to the close of the seventeenth century, drawn

chiefly from contemporary sources." Wallace covers more ground than any previous writer, and brings English and foreign Unitarianism into clearer relations with each other. The authorities cited indicate the careful and laborious nature of his researches. In some matters of detail, as in his accounts of Sozzini in Italy and of the seventeenth-century Unitarian Tracts in England, Wallace now needs to be supplemented and corrected, but the *Antitrinitarian Biography* is still an indispensable work of reference for the English student of Unitarian history.

A man who, in the opinion of Alexander Gordon, exhibits greater "breadth of treatment and depth of original research" was Thomas Rees, LL.D. (1777–1864). "In his knowledge of the history of antitrinitarian opinion, especially during the sixteenth century, Rees had no equal. He made a remarkable collection of the literature of his theme, and, excepting Hungarian and Polish, he was at home in all the languages necessary for access to original sources; and his breadth of treatment invested his topic with more than a sectarian interest."[1]

Besides important papers in *The Monthly Repository* and *The Christian Reformer*, he published (1) *The Racovian Catechism*, translated from the Latin, to which is prefixed a Sketch of the History of Unitarianism in Poland and the adjacent countries (1818), and (2) *A Sketch of the History of the Regium Donum* (1834). The Introduction to *The Racovian Catechism* displays the author's exact knowledge as historian and bibliographer, whilst the translation, provided with notes, is excellent. *The Racovian Catechism*, first published in Polish, 1605, embodies the classic Socinian principle of toleration, completing the earlier confession of 1574. The principle of liberty, it has been said, "is the mainspring of the *Catechism*, and is invoked right from the Introduction, which, as Harnack says, it is impossible to read without a

[1] *D.N.B.*, s.v. *Rees, Thomas*.

feeling of the deepest emotion."[1] *The Catechism* had been first translated into English anonymously in 1652, probably by John Biddle, but we owe it to Rees that this epoch-making document was made generally accessible in this country. "What an abyss between this Confession and those of all the other Protestant Churches—Swiss, Scottish, Belgian, Saxon, which affirm the duty of the magistrate to punish heresy!"[2]

The *Sketch of the History of the Regium Donum* (1834) deals with the Royal gift by George I and his successors, beginning from 1723, and clears English Nonconformists from the aspersions of subserviency to the Government cast upon them by political opponents. The earlier gift by Charles II, dating from 1672, to the Irish Presbyterian ministers is not discussed.

Joseph Hunter (1783–1861), a student under Wellbeloved at York and minister at Bath (1809–33), was an industrious and accurate antiquary and historian to whose researches in different fields of learning many important discoveries are due. From 1833 he was in the Public Record Office. His *Histories of Hallamshire* (1819, folio) and of *The Deanery of Doncaster* (2 vols., folio) rank amongst the finest topographical works in English. A voluminous writer, especially on pedigrees, he was among the first to discover the English homes of early American settlers, and his unprinted volumes in the British Museum on genealogical, philological, and literary topics number nearly two hundred and fifty. Amongst other works, he edited *The Diary of Ralph Thoresby, F.R.S.* (2 vols.), with Life prefixed (1830), and (for the Camden Society) *The Diary of Dr. Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester* (1843). By the exercise of his critical faculty Hunter restored to their legitimate owners the authorship of Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey* and that of *The Life of Sir Thomas More*, by his great-grandson, Cresacre More. Six volumes

[1] Bullini, *Religious Liberty*, p. 86.

[2] Ibid., p. 87.

on English poets and verse-writers form the basis of many articles on the minor poets in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. In 1842 he published *The Rise of the Old Dissent Exemplified in the Life of Oliver Heywood, 1630–1702*, and, in a series of pamphlets and articles engaged vigorously in the controversy leading up to the Dissenters' Chapels Act, 1844. Hunter's interests and abilities typify and illustrate those of the cultured Unitarian divines of his period whose devotion to the principles of the older Dissent was united with a singular acquaintance with the history, languages, and literature of the past.

John James Tayler (1797–1869), who, by his appointment as Professor on Ecclesiastical History at Manchester New College in 1840, inaugurated the first "special provision for the teaching" of that subject in Nonconformist colleges, was a man to whom his colleague, James Martineau, and his pupils, Charles Beard and Alexander Gordon, paid such tributes as seldom fall to a teacher from those so admirably qualified to speak of character and ability. Amongst his published writings was *A Retrospect of the Religious Life in England* (1845; 2nd ed., 1853), second edition reissued with an introductory chapter on recent developments by James Martineau (1876). "Modest," said Martineau, "as are the pretensions of this volume, it occupies a peculiar, if not a unique position in English Literature. . . . It is not Theology, though treating of the deepest grounds of faith. It is not Ecclesiastical History, for it passes by incidents and personages dear to the memory of the Church, and travels freely into State affairs and the vicissitudes of secular society. It is not Biography, though it reviews and estimates a series of writers, English and Foreign, from Wycliffe and Chaucer to Ewald and Strauss. It approaches most nearly to the German *Culturgeschichte*, yet is still marked out among productions of this kind by the survey of all culture only in its bearings upon the changing aspects of religion. . . . In no

notices of English ecclesiastical literature have I ever met with the breadth of conception, the unforced justice, the various appreciation of excellence, which, without any loss of fine discrimination, characterise this little volume." This is high praise, indeed, but not undeserved, and it owes little either to the friendship or community of aspiration and opinion between the writer and his former colleague.

Nearly nine decades have passed since Tayler wrote, but the *Retrospect* remains alone of its kind—without a peer. In the "English Schleiermacher," as Martineau called him, "there was a rare blending of the historical intellect with the prophet's soul." The book, of course, has its defects. Tayler made no profession of deep and original research. He accepted "facts familiar to every student," which he sought to interpret and relate, "and determine their operative principle and the inferences they might yield." Still there is in it something less of historical research than a wide range and variety of topics covered properly required, and neither the notes in the second edition nor Martineau's Introduction to its reissue corrected its errors or repaired its omissions. Here and there, too, Tayler's judgment is at fault, e.g. his view of Methodism is too narrow and frigid. "It represents," he thinks, "no great idea; it expresses no principle . . . it is a mere outbreak of feeling that was pent up and wanted free expression." But, as the pragmatists teach, "A thing is what it does," and an emotional faith need not lack principles because its adherents in the main do not consciously start out from them. Tayler was of opinion that if the Established Church was reformed, "Methodism would be reabsorbed into the womb that gave it birth." Otherwise, as it "rests on no great historical tradition and embodies no distinct principles," he saw no future for it—a prophecy now seen to be falsified by events.

When all is said, the *Retrospect* is probably one of the few historical books written before the middle of the nineteenth

century that deserves to be edited and reissued. So profound is its thought, so serene its spirit, that even to-day discerning readers may still be surprised by its sympathetic and deep understanding of the principles and characters of the men who inspired, and of the movements that constituted, the religious life of England from the days of "the morning star" of the Reformation.

To Elizabeth Cleghorn Gaskell (1810–65), the well-known novelist, wife of the minister of Cross Street Chapel, Manchester, we are indebted for one of the most important literary lives in the nineteenth century, that of Charlotte Brontë, published in 1857. It has been frequently reprinted, and, despite the fresh light on the Brontës cast by Clement Shorter and other scholars, is still unsurpassed in its literary skill and psychological insight. "If not equal to the best biographies in the language, it is worthy of a place in the class nearest to that small group."[1] A more recent review in *The Times* (December 20, 1932) speaks of the Life as "among the best English biographies. In all modern re-estimates we miss the touch of that masterly narrative."

Charles Beard (1827–88), a pupil under Tayler at Manchester College and under Neander at Berlin, besides numerous sermons and articles published three historical works of outstanding merit.

Port Royal: A Contribution to the History of Religion and Literature in France (2 vols., 1861) is not only a pioneer work, "an attempt," in the words of the Preface, "to supply to English students a chapter of the History of Christianity heretofore unwritten," it is also a sketch of the leaders of the Jansenist movement, their disciples and their antagonists, written with psychological insight, sympathetic imagination and critical acumen. Based upon original memoirs and a close study of all the available literature relating to St. Cyran, Pascal, Arnauld, Racine, Boileau, Tillemont, and the

[1] H. Walker, *Age of Tennyson*, p. 106, London, 1897.

rest, it represents five years' research by one whom Professor A. C. Bradley described as "a student through and through," whose "range of knowledge in *litteris humanioribus* I have known equalled only twice or thrice," and who "had in a degree I have never seen equalled the full and immediate possession of what he knew." It was a delicate task for a Protestant, and, in particular, for one with such radical convictions as Beard, to trace the nice theological distinctions that meant so little to him and so much to the devout Romanists of Port Royal, and to present, with reverence and fidelity, the relation of their controversies to the inner spiritual life of the community, whilst, at the same time, never refraining from passing judgment on such matters of morality as they involved. Occasionally he contents himself by putting searching questions, left unanswered, that provoke the reader to penetrate to the heart of the problem under discussion, as when, in reference to Pascal's theory of religious evidence, he asks: "What is the function of reason in regard to revelation? Has it a critical office to perform towards the truth which it is confessedly unable to originate? . . . Is it right that reason should freely test even the external authentication of revealed truth, or is there an authority which may stand in the place of evidence, and imposes a system of doctrine upon the unwilling mind?"

"The history of Port Royal," said Professor Ramsay Muir, "is the best book in English upon that group of French scholars and thinkers, with whose temper Beard found himself deeply in sympathy. It is amazing that work so admirable should have been done by a man with so little leisure for research, and with so little command over the elaborate equipment of books and material which modern scholarship demands."[2]

The Hibbert Lectures (1883) on *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century in its Relation to Modern Thought and*

[2] *William Ramsay*, An Inaugural Lecture, Liverpool, 1908.

Knowledge is Beard's best-known work. It ran into several editions and was reprinted in 1927 with an Introduction by Principal Ernest Barker. Its place in the extensive literature on the origins of Protestantism is assured. Dr. Barker compares it with Maine's *Ancient Law* and Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire* as a book which formed a "landmark" in his reading, and adds: "The forty and more years which have passed since it was first published have not dimmed its light or superseded its substance. It remains a book in which a candid and generous intelligence has expressed, in admirable and often eloquent English, a general view of the Reformation—alike in its beginnings, its course, its consequences and its modern implications—which none can read without profit, and few without admiration."

The book does not profess to be a detailed history of the Reformation period, and stress is laid by Beard in his Preface on the latter part of its title: "the relation of the results of the Reformation to modern knowledge and modern thought." It reveals not only wide reading and a close acquaintance with sources but also a detached philosophical judgment and a profound sense of the channels of thought running beneath the surface of events from one age to another. Beard, it may be, hardly realised the crucial position of the burning of Servetus in the history of Protestant toleration, as did Alexander Gordon in his review of the book or Harnack in his *History of Dogma*[1] the radicalism of Socinus as a Biblical scholar is not clearly brought out, and some details of his personal history are incorrectly stated, but these errors, uncorrected in the edition of 1927, even when taken with a tendency to overrate the merit of Erasmus, do not materially qualify the eulogy of Dr. Barker. The volume contains, undoubtedly, a most valuable discussion of principles born of Protestantism and woven into the web of modern thought.

[1] English Translation, viii. p. 134.

Martin Luther and the Reformation in Germany Until the Close of the Diet of Worms, published posthumously under the editorship of J. Frederick Smith in 1889, is "the first instalment of a larger work on the History of the Reformation." It is not, however, an unfinished fragment but a volume of 418 pages left by the writer ready for the press. As its editor observed: "From the list of authorities and from the notes it will be seen that Dr. Charles Beard kept pace to the very last with the latest research in a field which has been upturned by the critical industry of specialists." Professor Muir described it as "one of the sanest and most sympathetic estimates" of Luther. Had it been completed, it might well have taken a high place as a critical study, for Beard united with the skill of a biographer the research of the historian and the grace of a man of letters.

To a younger contemporary of Beard we owe what has been freely acknowledged as the best Life of Erasmus. Robert Blackley Drummond (1833–1921), a pupil at Manchester College, 1854–57, and minister of St. Mark's, Edinburgh, for over half a century, enjoyed as Hibbert Fellow a year's study on the Continent (from May 1869), the fruits of which were published three years later.

Erasmus, His Life and Character, as Shown in His Correspondence and Work, had certainly no serious rival in English as a study of the great humanist when published in 1873. *Jortin's Life* (1758–60), more than a third of which was in Latin, is little more than a translation of Le Clerc's of 1703, and lacks both order and proportion; whilst that of Butler (1825) was described by Milman as "a neat and terse, but unsatisfactory abstract of Burigny's *Vie d' Erasme*," published in 1757. Drummond's use of the correspondence of Erasmus, for fullness and exactness, was not surpassed in English until Dr. P. S. Allen began the issue of his monumental edition of the letters. Ephraim Emerton, in his *Erasmus* (Heroes of the Reformation) (1899), observes:

"Of more recent biographies, that of R. B. Drummond is, all things considered, the best; careful and serious, but showing the almost universal tendency to take Erasmus at his word, even while admitting his incapacity to tell the truth"; and Professor J. Huizinga, of Leyden, in a later monograph in the Great Hollanders series, 1924, briefly characterises Drummond's as "the best of the numerous Lives of Erasmus." Dr. Allen, in his generally favourable view of Erasmus, is more in agreement with Drummond than with Emerton or even with Huizinga. Drummond's Life, it may be added, is named in all the bibliographies of twentieth-century works of reference, Protestant, Catholic, and Historical, covering the period of the Reformation.

Drummond found "the true key to the position of Erasmus in the character of his intellect. His mind was essentially of the sceptical and inquiring, by no means of the affirmative or dogmatic order"—hence his criticism of Catholic practice and his rejection of Protestant theology. Despite his execration of Arians in one of his later Apologies, Drummond detects in Erasmus "a strong tendency towards them." His position is compared to that of the "Broad Churchman." "He embodied in himself what we now call the modern spirit." As the work of a little-known writer on one of the greatest figures in the history of European literature, published sixty years ago and still retaining its pride of place, this Life of Erasmus is amongst the unique products of Nonconformist scholarship in the mid-Victorian Age.

Alexander Gordon (1841–1931), another student of Manchester College under Tayler and Martineau, who was Principal of the Unitarian Home Missionary College, Manchester, 1890–1911, had attained before his death an unique position amongst Nonconformist historians. A Congregationalist historian described him in 1925 as "not only the Nestor of Nonconformist historians, he is the Nonconformist Lord Acton. . . . In every century since the sixteenth he seems equally at home."[1] Gordon was the author of seven hundred and seventy-eight biographies in the *Dictionary of National Biography*—one of two only (the other was Sir Sidney Lee) who contributed to every volume of the original issue in sixty-three volumes and to each of the six volumes of the two Supplements. To the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* he contributed thirty-nine articles, mostly on foreign scholars and religious movements, and for sixty years his initials, appended to articles on Nonconformist history and biography in journals and newspapers, were familiar to students. His range of knowledge in fields of study at home and abroad was not more striking than his originality, lucidity, and accuracy. Of the many volumes from his pen, *Heads of English Unitarian History* (1895), the Essex Hall Lecture on *Heresy: Its Ancient Wrongs and Modern Rights in These Kingdoms* (1913), *Freedom After Ejection* (1690–92), *A Review of Presbyterian and Congregational Nonconformity in England and Wales* (1917), and *The Cheshire Classis, 1691–1745* (1919), are the most important, but Gordon was perhaps seen at his best in the long series of reviews contributed to *The Christian Life*, which subjected to a minute examination most of the publications relating to Nonconformity and added fresh information from the rich stores of his knowledge. In 1919 he was offered, and declined, the honorary degree of Litt.D. by Manchester University in recognition of his contributions to learning.[2]

If the Unitarian community in the nineteenth century had only produced Alexander Gordon it might justly have claimed that it had made a notable contribution to historical and biographical study. That it did much more than this has

[1] A. Peel, *Congregational Quarterly*, April 1925. For other remarkable tributes, see McLachlan, *Alexander Gordon: A Biography with a Bibliography*, pp. 86–7.

[2] For a fuller account of his work, see McLachlan, ibid., 1932.

been shown, to say nothing of the numerous historical and biographical publications by minister and layman, like *The History of Presbyterian and General Baptist Churches in the West of England*, by Jerom Murch (1855)—to name only one—which deserve on their merits honourable mention.

CHAPTER IV

LITERATURE

"Dissenters and Churchmen," says a recent historian,[1] "had been common champions of the Revolution settlement. The evangelical revival had provoked some controversies, but it was not political, nor at first sectarian. The Unitarian movement was far more serious, because it appeared as a disruptive force among the ablest of the younger clergy and university teachers."

Serious it was in politics and religion from its strenuous advocacy of freedom. This movement, of which Priestley was an acknowledged leader, attracted, by his sufferings for freedom not less than by his advocacy of it, a number of young men destined to write their names in large letters across the annals of English literature.

Like their less-known contemporaries, the students reading Divinity and Tom Paine in the Dissenting academies, they derived incentive and inspiration from America and France—countries answering for them to the "Jerusalem which is above, that is free, which is the mother of us all." Distance lent enchantment to the view, and the glamour of the prospect proved bewitching. Like the seer in the lonely isle of Patmos, in their visions they beheld across the seas, far and near, nothing less than "a new heaven and a new earth."

Not all of them remained faithful to the principles so ardently embraced in youth, nor were all equally devoted to reason and liberty in both religion and politics and, need I add, "the first heaven and the first earth" did not pass away. Wordsworth and Southey, though not in the same degree, were deaf to the appeals of Unitarianism, and both emerged from the fervour and passion of republicanism into

[1] P. A. Brown, *The French Revolution in English History*, p. 81.

the staid and sober conservatism of pillars of Church and State. The one apparently never felt the force of Priestley's militant propaganda; the other seemed to have had his moments of doubt respecting the Trinity not less than his dream of a Utopia across the Atlantic. Coleridge, who in December 1794 described himself as "a Unitarian Christian," nine months later spoke of Southey as "a downright, upright Republican" whom he hoped to present to his correspondent, George Dyer, "right orthodox in the heterodoxy of Unitarianism." It proved a fruitless expectation. Coleridge himself continued to coquet with heresy a little longer. He addressed a sonnet to Priestley—the "patriot and saint and sage"[1] of his *Religious Musings*—and preached occasionally in Unitarian pulpits, without gown, in blue coat and white waistcoat, on "Corn Laws," "the Hair Powder Tax," "Peace and War," "Church and State, not their alliance but their separation," and, as he said, "on other subjects, preciously peppered with politics."

The poet named his first son Hartley, after the necessarian philosopher who delivered Priestley from libertarianism; his second, who died in infancy, significantly enough, he called Berkeley, thus doing homage to materialism and idealism within the space of twenty months. Some time after his visit to Germany "to study Kantian philosophy" (September 1798–June 1799), probably about 1802, he renounced Unitarianism, its philosophy and Christology, and eventually found salvation in an orthodoxy, theosophic and philosophic, which formed the staple of his utterances as the oracle of Highgate Hill, so admirably described by Carlyle in his *Life of Sterling*.

Other friends and quondam allies of the three poets—Hazlitt and Lamb, and, at a greater distance, men like Dyer and Frend, who now live in the light of their lustre—remained more or less in the Unitarian fold.

With William Hazlitt (1778–1830) it was less. True, he

was the son of a Unitarian minister, friend and correspondent of Priestley and contributor to his *Theological Repository*,[1] who, "after being tossed about from congregation to congregation in the heats of the Unitarian controversy and squabbles about the American War, had been relegated to an obscure village, far from the only converse that he loved, the talk about disputed texts of Scripture and the cause of civil and religious liberty." Moreover, the future essayist spent two years at Hackney College (1793–95) in preparation for the Unitarian ministry he never entered. Crabb Robinson says he left College "an avowed infidel," but he wrote his *Reminiscences* half a century later. "Hazlitt's own account is that his notions changed and he imbibed a taste for the fine arts, that he came to doubt certain points in the creed in which he had been brought up."[2] Leslie Stephen, in his essay on Hazlitt, calls him "a freethinker," yet "a Dissenter to the backbone who never shook off the faults characteristic of small sects." But these are the words of a great scholar, an ex-Churchman and avowed agnostic, who in his *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century* could speak with contempt of "the desultory cram of a teacher of a Dissenting academy," and confess, in criticising Priestley's *History of Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ*, his greatest theological work, that it was "the easiest course to follow Horsley's example" and leave the book unread. Hazlitt's contemporary, Lucy Aikin, referring to Hazlitt's criticism of Channing's essay on Napoleon, observed (June 1, 1830) that "he was brought up at the feet of Priestley and Belsham, and probably retains of their system materialism and necessity, and little more." But even this is going much too far. Long before 1830 Hazlitt had lost his admiration for Priestley as a philosopher, and

[1] See p. 168–171.

[2] H. W. Stephenson, *Hackney College and William Hazlitt*, Trans. of Unit. Hist. Soc., iv, p. 402.

in 1812 described his arguments on philosophical necessity as "mere hackneyed commonplaces" and the man himself as "an able controversialist, not a philosophical reasoner." Hazlitt had written a *Life of Napoleon*, who, as the ruthless destroyer of ancient privileges and the established order, remained his idol to the last, and Channing had dared to lay impious hands upon the image he had set up. Hence the vials of his wrath were poured forth. The truth is, as Mr. Augustine Birrell has said:[1] "Hazlitt had religion in his mind, though it early disappeared from his life." Intellectually, at least, Hazlitt was a radical in religion as in politics from the time when, as a boy of thirteen, he penned his epistle to the *Shrewsbury Chronicle* on the Birmingham Riots, vindicating the Christian character of Priestley, to his death, after a singularly chequered and seemingly sad career, with the words on his lips: "Well, I have had a happy life."

One of his early friends was John Wicksteed, father of the Rev. Charles Wicksteed, "the only home acquaintance," said Crabb Robinson, "I ever heard Hazlitt warmly praise." From temperament and manner of life, Hazlitt became an Ishmael, "his hand against every man, and every man's hand against him." In a letter to Leigh Hunt he plaintively asked: "Why has everybody such a dislike to me?" "Everybody" did not include Charles Lamb, who wrote: "Protesting against much that he has written, and some things which he chooses to do; judging him by his conversation, which I enjoyed so long, and relished so deeply, or by his books, in those places where no clouding passion intervenes, I should belie my own conscience if I said less than that I think W. H. to be in his natural and healthy state one of the wisest and finest spirits breathing." It is the Hazlitt whom Lamb knew and loved that is still honoured more than a century after his death.

As a radical Dissenter, Hazlitt was more open-eyed than

[1] Hazlitt, *English Men of Letters*, p. 214.

as a radical politician. He was not blind to the perils of sectarianism as he was to the follies of revolutionary France. Writing on "The Tendency of Sects," he said: "Those who, from their professing to submit everything to reason, have acquired the name of Radical Dissenters, have their weak sides as well as other people. . . . The faculties are imprisoned in a few favourite dogmas, and they cannot break through the trammels of a sect." Then, lest he should be misunderstood, he adds: "We certainly are not going to recommend the establishment of articles of faith, or implicit assent to them, as favourable to the progress of philosophy; but neither has the spirit of opposition to them this tendency, so far as relates to its immediate effects, however useful it may be in its remote consequences." The implications of the last clause are not unimportant. His contempt for Anglican clergy Hazlitt never concealed. He relates the story of Dr. Paley's submitting a thesis to his bishop which he meant to maintain in the University: "That the Eternity of Hell torments is contradictory to the goodness of God." The bishop thought it a bold doctrine. Paley persisted, but having sounded the opinions of certain persons high in authority and well read in the orthodoxy of preferment, he came back, said he found the first thesis would not do, and begged, instead of his first thesis, to have the reverse one submitted in its stead: "That the Eternity of Hell torments is not contradictory to the goodness of God." Again, the merciless strokes with which Hazlitt marshals the characteristics of Roman Catholicism—the antipodes of Unitarianism in its view of authority—reveals the marks of that religion which alone could ever lead him to bow the head or bend the knee. In his strictures on sectarianism, Hazlitt anticipated Martineau, Tayler, and Thom, who endeavoured to restrain the sectarian spirit of their contemporaries by recalling them to a sense of their inheritance as descendants of liberal-minded English Presbyterians.

For the virtues of Dissenters, Hazlitt retained a profound respect. "The Dissenter does not change his sentiments with the seasons, he does not suit his conscience to his convenience. . . . The same principles of independent inquiry and unbiassed conviction, which make him reject all undue interference between his Maker and his conscience, will give a character of uprightness and disregard of personal consequences to his conduct and sentiments in what concerns the most important relations between man and man. He neither subscribes to the dogmas of priests nor truckles to the mandates of Ministers." Here, in the mind of the writer, religion and politics are indissolubly connected, having their root, as for radical Dissenters generally, in the single principle of freedom. One sentence Hazlitt repeats again and again: "Dissenters are the safest partisans and the steadiest friends." The memory of two Unitarian ministers meant much to him—one, the Rev. Joseph Fawcett; the other, his father. Joseph Fawcett (1758–1804), an old student of Daventry Academy under Thomas Robins, was famous for his pulpit oratory, and is said[1] to have attracted to the Old Jewry "the largest and most genteel audience that ever assembled in a Dissenting place of worship." Fawcett published sermons and verse from which it is apparent that in politics he was a radical and a pacifist. "A heartier friend or an honester critic," said Hazlitt, "I never coped withal. With him I passed some of the pleasantest days of my life. The conversations I had with him on the subjects of taste and philosophy gave me a delight such as I can never feel again." "He was almost the first literary acquaintance I ever made, and I think the most candid and unsophisticated." To his father Hazlitt paid two notable tributes: one, overtly, already quoted, in his famous essay on *My First Acquaintance with the Poets*; the other, hardly concealed, in *Dissenters and Dissenting Ministers*,

[1] *Monthly Repository*, 1817, p. 90.

which glows with veneration of his person and love of his principles. "They cherished in their thoughts—and wished to transmit to their posterity—those rights and privileges for asserting which their ancestors had bled on scaffolds, or had pined in foreign climes. Their creed, too, was 'Glory to God, peace on earth, good will to man.'" The ministerial library, that he describes, which included the works of Calamy, Baxter, Lardner, and the Polish Socinians, was almost certainly his father's. That he was caused to stumble by some of the names of the contributors to the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum quos Unitarios vocant* is not surprising, particularly as he wrote from memory of those heavy folios with their melancholy frontispieces.

In his lectures on Elizabethan literature, Hazlitt endeavoured to measure the influence of the Bible in that golden age of letters, and maintained that the spread of truth and freedom in this country was primarily due to its translation into English. To the English Bible, as we have seen, Martineau traced the origin of Unitarianism in England, and John Bidle, "the father of English Unitarianism," confessed that "he experienced his first doubts respecting the Trinity in reading the Bible." Few testimonies more lofty than Hazlitt's to the power and worth of Scripture are to be found in English literature. In the same lectures he draws a matchless portrait of Christ, scriptural and humanitarian, illustrating from the Gospel narrative the "sublime humility" of "the first true teacher of morality." Plainly, Hazlitt was possessed by a profound sense of the nature and mission of "Christianity in its most simple and intelligible form," however inattentive to its public services or its private demands. In his fifty-first year, not long before his death, he wrote an essay "On the late Dr. Priestley," giving the most remarkable contemporary pen-picture of his former tutor, to whose gifts he paid high tribute. "Dr. Priestley was certainly the best controversialist of his day, and one of

the best in the language: and his chemical experiments (so curious a variety in a Dissenting Minister's pursuits) laid the foundation and often nearly completed the super-structure of most of the modern discoveries in that science. . . . We do not place the subject of this notice in the first class of metaphysical reasoners either for originality or candour: but in boldness of inquiry, quickness, and elasticity of mind, and ease in making himself understood, he had no superior. He had wit, too, though this was a resource to which he resorted only in extreme cases."

Hazlitt was a great if by no means an infallible critic, "one of the keenest and brightest that ever lived," said Thackeray. But little store has been set on his religion—and rightly so, if account be taken only of its formal profession or even of its real exercise, but the faith of Hazlitt, inspiring so much of what he wrote, was a liberal and reverent humanitarianism that scorned rites and dogmas, despised hypocrisy and bigotry, and acknowledged the power unto salvation of the life and teaching of the man, Christ Jesus.

His friend, Charles Lamb, "to the end, I think," says Mr. E. V. Lucas,[1] "remained nominally a Unitarian, a profession of faith to which probably he was first led by his Aunt Hetty (a constant attender at Essex Street Chapel) and in which he was fortified by Coleridge." His Unitarianism was open and avowed. At twenty-two he tells Coleridge that he is "re-reading Priestley's examination of the Scotch doctors; how the rogue strings them up! three together! You have no doubt read that clear, strong, humorous, and most entertaining piece of reasoning!" Obligations to Priestley he readily confessed, and that he loved and honoured him almost profanely. He quotes his words, recommends his sermons, and approves his philosophy. Once he boasted to Coleridge of "a transient superiority" over him, because he had seen Priestley, and the poet had

[1] *Life of Charles Lamb*, i, p. 90.

not. He was an occasional hearer of Belsham at Hackney, and in the *Essay on the Tombs in the Abbey*, originally published in *The London Magazine* (October 1823) as a letter addressed to Southey, referring to that poet's invitation "to a compliance with the wholesome forms and doctrines of the Church of England," he said: "I am a Dissenter. The last sort with which you can remember me to have made common profession was the Unitarians. You would not think it very pertinent if (fearing that all was not well with you) I were gravely to invite you (for a remedy) to attend with me a course of Mr. Belsham's Lectures at Hackney." In his early enthusiasm for Unitarian doctrine, Lamb did not scruple, after the manner of the strictest sect of the Priestleyans, to call those men "idolators" who were "for exalting the man Christ Jesus into the second person of an unknown Trinity." His Unitarianism, however, mellowed and deepened, if it found less expression in formal observance, as youth ripened into age, and he busied himself less with doctrine and more with life. It was impossible for him to give up to party what was meant for mankind. At best he was a sorry sectarian, his heart being so full of sympathy and hatred so foreign to his nature. His heresy, nevertheless, peeps out occasionally, as in the remark, reported by Sarah Flower, during a conversation with Coleridge in 1823: "One of the things that made me question the particular inspiration of Jesus Christ was his ignorance of the character of Judas Iscariot,"[1] whilst as late as October 24, 1831, only three years before his death, he asked a correspondent: "Did G. D. send his 1d. tract to me to convert me to Unitarianism? Dear, blundering soul! Why I am as old a one Goddite as himself."

In radical politics, similarly, Lamb was curiously disinterested—sometimes to the dismay of his friends. Engrossed, in his own whimsically serious fashion, with the intimacies

[1] *Monthly Repository*, 1835, p. 162.

of human life amid scenes near and dear, he recked little of kings, thrones, principalities, and powers at home or abroad, and was never carried off his feet by the agitation for civil and religious liberty. Once or twice he indulged his friends, Leigh Hunt and John Thelwall, with lampoons in verse on the so-called "first gentleman in Europe," but more from detestation of his personal conduct than from disagreement with his political opinions.

Lamb cannot be wholly acquitted of levity in speech or laxity in conduct, but Carlyle's description of him as a "rickety, gasping, staggering, stammering tomfool" is a gross caricature that casts a lurid light on the character of its author. Lamb had known, as he said in 1802, "a conviction of the truth and a certainty of the usefulness of religion." When the great sorrow befell him by reason of his sister's affliction, "it was," he declared, "a religious principle that most supported me." In the supreme article of faith, the Life Eternal, his belief rarely faltered. Twice in his letters he employed the argument drawn from the need of a larger sphere for the aspirations of the human soul. The first is a quotation from Priestley: "Fellowship is the true balsam of life; the cement is infinitely more durable than that of the friendships of the world; and it looks for the proper fruit and complete gratification to the life beyond the grave." The second is curiously characteristic of the writer. He is registering his solemn vow, not for the first or last time, to give up smoking, and adds, in words that are not mock serious, for they precede the mention of a loss by death, the reflection that we are endowed with potentialities that need an eternity for their realisation: "This very night I am going to leave off tobacco. Surely there must be some other worlds in which this unconquerable purpose shall be realised. The soul hath not her generous aspirings implanted to her in vain." For the Quakers, as is well known, he ever cherished a high regard,

and "in feelings and matters not dogmatical" hoped he was "half a Quaker." In one particular he held them up as an example and a reproach to Unitarians. At this date Unitarians could be married only in Episcopalian churches. Their practice, borrowed from the Freethinking Christians, was to enter a written protest in the vestry, after the ceremony, against the disability they suffered. Lamb allowed the grievance was a real one, but disliked the remedy. "Quakers," you say, "are indulged with the liberty denied to us; they are, and dearly have they earned it. The Quaker character was hardened at the fires of persecution in the seventeenth century. No penalties could have driven them into the Churches." He therefore bids Unitarians be bold, defy the law, and take the consequences, rather than imperil their conscience and take refuge in idle protest.

Scotsmen and Jews Lamb found it hard to love. "I have been trying all my life to like Scotsmen, and am obliged to desist from the experiment in despair. . . . I have, in the abstract, no disrespect for Jews. . . . But I should not care to be in habits of familiar intercourse with any of that nation." Amongst others, there is what may fairly be called a religious reason for these aversions. The Scotsman was too positive and dogmatic. "The twilight of dubiety never falls upon him." Generous and tolerant, Lamb, as a Unitarian, had a wholesome suspicion of dogmatism. The Jew he could not love because he thought he detected about him an air of revenge and spiritual pride. Lamb was not by nature submissive to the Law of Moses; he was drawn to the love of Christ.

The Bible he read much and loved deeply. "So far from poetry tiring me because religious," he writes, "I can read, and I say it seriously, the homely old version of the Psalms in our Prayer Books for an hour or two together, sometimes without sense of weariness." He was no lover, as he said, of books that "were stuffed with Scripture," but "no book

can have too much of silent Scripture in it." I take him to mean: Scripture should make itself felt as a pervasive, ennobling influence, not serve as a substitute for reason, or as an arsenal from which to draw dogmatic fireworks. Crabb Robinson, who knew him well, writes in his Reminiscences: "Lamb was a man of 'natural piety,' and his supposed anti-religious language was in fact directed solely against the dogmatism of systematic theology—he had the spirit of devotion in his heart and the organ of theosophy in his skull." With this Coleridge is in agreement: "The wild words that come from him sometimes on religious subjects would shock you from the mouth of any other man, but from him they seem mere flashes of firework. If an argument seem to his reason not fully true, he bursts out in that old desecrating way: yet his will, the inward man, is, I well know, profoundly religious. Watch him when alone, and you will find him with either a Bible or an old divine, or an old English poet; in such is his pleasure."[1]

As a student and interpreter of English literature, above all, as an essayist, in which he is *sui generis*, Lamb's place is secure, but it is as a man that he, more than most, has won the affection of his readers. Independent in his thinking, charitable in his judgment, and self-sacrificing in his labours, Charles Lamb was an adherent of the liberal faith, which sustained him in his sorrow and sanctified his services to posterity. As Southey wrote, with more than wonted prescience, "There are some reputations that will not keep, but Lamb's is not of that kind. His memory will retain its fragrance as long as the best spice that ever was expended upon any of the Pharaohs."

Anna Letitia Barbauld (1743–1825), a popular essayist and poet in her day, as the daughter of John Aikin, D.D., principal tutor of Warrington Academy, and a personal friend of Priestley, was naturally nearer to the centre of the

[1] *Monthly Repository*, 1833, p. 817.

Unitarian circle than the writers already named, and in her numerous writings displayed complete sympathy with his theological and political principles. In his Memoirs Priestley wrote: "Mrs. Barbauld has told me that it was the perusal of some verses of mine that first induced her to write anything in verse, so that this country is in some measure indebted to me for one of the best poets it can boast of. Several of her first poems were written when she was in my house, on occasions that occurred while she was there." What verses of Priestley led Mrs. Barbauld to take up her pen, it is impossible to conjecture. It cannot have been the not very poetical lines addressed "To Mr. Annet on his New Shorthand," written whilst a boy at Batley Grammar School, which were alone published in his lifetime. That he wrote other verse is clear, however, from the hymn written for Radcliffe Scholefield, minister of the Old Meeting, Birmingham (1772–99). It was intended to be sung by the children at the Annual Service on behalf of the Protestant Dissenters' Charity School. Scholefield, not being told by Priestley whose composition it was, frankly pronounced it not good enough, and the hymn did not appear in print until 1881.[1] Mrs. Barbauld published her first volume of poetry in 1773, but six years earlier (September 1767) had given a MS. copy of her first poem to Priestley as he was about to leave Warrington for Leeds, so that whatever verse of his inspired hers must have been written before 1767. It is an indication of Priestley's saving common sense that amongst his many writings ("a literary Jack of all Trades," Boswell called him) he published no poetry. One of Priestley's sermons, *On Habitual Devotion*, delivered before an assembly of ministers at Wakefield in 1769, as he tells us in the Preface when published in 1782, "was the occasion of that excellent poem of Mrs. Barbauld's entitled *An Address to the Deity*." The poem was actually written, it may be added, in the

[1] In *The Disciple*, edited by Alexander Gordon.

house of the Rev. William Turner, the intimate friend of Priestley, with whom Miss Aikin was then staying. In her poem, *The Invitation*, Mrs. Barbauld depicts the situation, character, and ideals of Warrington Academy:

> "Mark where its simple front yon mansion rears,
> The nursery of men for future years!"

"No academic," said her niece and biographer, "has celebrated his *alma mater* in nobler strains, or with more filial affection."

Her poems include also one *To Priestley* and another on *An Inventory of His Study*, whilst in *An Epistle to Dr. Enfield on His Revisiting Warrington*, she celebrates again the Academy of which he was once tutor.

> "Lo there the seats where Science loved to dwell,
> Where Liberty her ardent spirit breathed."

Mrs. Barbauld, it may be frankly allowed, was at least as distinguished a Unitarian as poet, but she did not altogether lack inspiration. The well-known lines, written in extreme old age, concluding

> "Life! we've been long together,
> Through pleasant and through cloudy weather"

won the praise of contemporary and later writers. Wordsworth said of it: "I am not in the habit of grudging other people their good things, but I wish I had written those lines." He placed Mrs. Barbauld at the head of the poetesses of the period, but thought she was "spoiled by being a Dissenter and concerned with a Dissenting academy!" The poem, *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven*, whose title gives a clue to its contents, aroused bitter animadversions from political opponents. In it is the prophecy that some day a traveller from the Antipodes will, from a broken arch of Blackfriars Bridge, contemplate the ruins of St. Paul's,

which provided Macaulay with the original of his famous New Zealander.

As a writer of prose Mrs. Barbauld won general commendation. One of her essays drew an encomium from Johnson. "The imitators of my style have not hit it. Miss Aikin has done it the best; for she has imitated the sentiment as well as the diction."

Mrs. Barbauld enjoyed the friendship of most of the distinguished men and women of her age. She was an admirable correspondent, and wrote on literature, politics, and theology with grace, wit, lucidity, and conviction. Amongst her works is a *An Edition, With Essays and Lives, of the British Novelists*. The inscription on the tablet, erected to her memory, in Newington Green Chapel, and written by her nephew, Arthur Aikin, aptly describes her as

> "Endowed by the Giver of all good
> With wit, genius, poetic talent, and a vigorous understanding,
> She employed these high gifts
> In promoting the cause of humanity, peace, and justice,
> Of civil and religious liberty,
> Of pure, ardent, and affectionate devotion."

The Aikin tradition was maintained by her brother and his daughter. John Aikin, M.D. (1747–1822) was a former pupil and lecturer at Warrington Academy (1773–83), for whose students he wrote a couple of scientific manuals and translated a third from the French. When, in 1790, the publication of two pamphlets on the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts ruined his professional prospects at Yarmouth, he went to London. One attraction of the metropolis was the presence in the neighbourhood of his sister, to whom he was always deeply attached, and of his old and valued friends, Priestley and Wakefield, then resident at Hackney and, for a time, engaged as tutors at the College, in which Aikin's eldest son was a student. In 1797 he removed to Newington Green, and henceforward devoted

himself to literary pursuits. He was the editor in succession of *The Monthly Magazine* (1796–1806), *The Athenæum* (1807–1809) and *The Annual Review* (1802–1808).[1]

The early works of Mrs. Barbauld and John Aikin were printed at Warrington by William Eyres, the celebrated printer, whose presence in that town was of great moment to the tutors of the Academy and their friends.[2] His first volume, *Essays on Song-Writing, with a Collection of Such English Songs As Are Most Eminent for Poetical Merit*, was published in 1772. It ran into two editions and, much later, was remodelled with many additions under another title. In the following year he and his sister collaborated in *Miscellaneous Pieces in Prose*, which again proved popular. Like all the Aikins an excellent linguist, he published translations from the works of Tacitus and D'Alembert and an autobiographical Memoir of Huet, Bishop of Avranches. He assisted his friend John Howard in his work on prisons, printed at Warrington, and, on his death, published an excellent Life of him (1795). He wrote also various geographical and scientific treatises, occasional verse, and numerous biographies, including Memoirs of the Warrington tutors, Priestley, Enfield, Walker, and Wakefield.

Aikin was a strenuous supporter of the cause of civil and religious liberty. In his characterisation of Priestley, whom he greatly esteemed, he adopted the simile of his sister: "He followed truth, as a man who hawks follows his sport at full speed, straight forward, looking only upward, and regardless of what difficulties the chase may lead him into."

Lucy Aikin (1781–1864) began to contribute articles to magazines and reviews at the early age of seventeen. In 1810 appeared her chief poetical work, *Epistles on Women*, in spirited but conventional heroics. Other slighter poems followed. Her first historical work, *Memoirs of the Court of*

[1] See pp. 174–176. [2] McLachlan, *Education Under the Test Acts*, pp. 225–6.

Queen Elizabeth, published in 1819, ran into half a dozen editions, and was succeeded by two similar works on James I and Charles I; all of which, and especially that on James, evoked the praise of Macaulay. Amongst her biographical writings were *A Life of Addison* and Memoirs of her father and aunt. For nearly twenty years she corresponded with Dr. Channing, whose friendship, though they never met, she greatly valued. Published after her death, her letters reveal at once her wide reading, literary interests, and the character of the society in which she moved. Incidentally also they afford an admirable picture of Unitarians of the period, which partly explains their relations with men of letters outside their circle. "Long before my time," she wrote, "my kindred the Jennings, the Belshams, my excellent grandfather Aikin, and his friend and tutor Doddridge, had begun to break forth out of the chains and darkness of Calvinism, and their manners softened with their system. My youth was spent among the disciples or fellow-labourers of Price or Priestley, the descendants of Dr. John Taylor, the Arian, or in the society of that most amiable of men, Dr. Enfield. Amongst these was no rigorism. Dancing, cards, the theatres, were all held lawful in moderation: in manners the Free Dissenters, as they were called, came much nearer the Church than to their own stricter brethren, yet in doctrine no sect departed so far from the Establishment. At the period of the French Revolution, and especially after the Birmingham Riots, this sect distinguished itself by the vehemence of its democratical spirit, and becoming in a manner a faction, as well as a sect, political as well as religious animosity became enraged against it." Writing, March 23, 1859, she said: "It is remarkable that the Unitarian sect, confessedly one of the very smallest in the country, has more Members of Parliament in proportion belonging to it than any other denomination whatever."

The last Aikin tribute to Priestley was addressed to Channing, a Unitarian who rejected his Christology and philosophy. "I have a vivid memory of Priestley, the friend of my father, the dearer and more intimate friend of my aunt, Mrs. Barbauld. In his manner, he had all the calmness and simplicity of a true philosopher; he was cheerful, even playful, and I still see the benignant smile with which he greeted us little ones. . . . I know you have disapproved him on some points, you differ on many; but you are brothers in the assertion of intellectual freedom, and the earnest search after and unhesitating avowal of truth."

Samuel Rogers (1763–1855), like his friends the Aikins, was of Unitarian stock, and his early ambition had been to enter Manchester College and prepare for the ministry. His father was Chairman of the Committee of Management of the ill-fated Hackney College, in which Hazlitt was a student and Priestley a tutor. In his seventieth year, in a letter to John Towill Rutt, the editor of Priestley's works, Rogers recalled a visit of Priestley to his home shortly before he left England for America. "No man could be more amiable in his family than Dr. Priestley, and he had his reward; for no man could be more beloved than he was. I have, all my life, received delight from the works of the great masters in painting; but no picture of theirs ever affected me as a living one which I saw, a night or two before his departure from this country. . . . Though it is now over forty years ago, it is as present to my mind as if it had been yesterday." Rogers's mother was the daughter of Daniel Radford, Treasurer of the Stoke Newington Congregation, and an intimate friend of Dr. Price, its minister. One of Rogers's early recollections was that "on one evening after reading from the Bible at family prayers, his father explained to his children the cause of the rebellion in the Colonies, and told them that our nation was in the wrong, and it was not right to wish that the Americans should be conquered."[1]

Rogers, who was offered and declined the Laureateship on the death of Wordsworth, enjoyed great popularity as a poet. Of his *Pleasures of Memory* (1794), 14,000 copies were sold in a dozen years, but with the recognition of writers of greater gifts his prestige disappeared, and he owes his modern reputation to his association, throughout his long life, with all the most distinguished artists and men of letters of his time, to his mordant wit, and his almost boundless generosity. His breakfasts at St. James's Place were as famous as his biting tongue and his ugly features were notorious. When the second part of his *Italy* was published and failed to please the critics in 1828, "he made a bonfire," says his nephew, Samuel Sharpe, "of the unsold copies, and set himself to the task of making it better." The result was the magnificent edition of the poem, revised and enlarged, illustrated with engravings from Turner, Stothard, Prout, etc., at a cost of £7,325, which was more than covered by the sale. This encouraged him to publish a similar edition of his *Poems*. These illustrations by Turner, it is said, "first made him known to vast multitudes of the English people."

Rogers's poems betray little of the influence of politics or religion. In one poem, written after the funeral of Charles James Fox in 1806, tribute is paid to the great Whig statesman, and in another written in 1834 and addressed to Grey, the reformer is united with Hampden and Sydney, who died for the sacred Cause which he served so well. Rogers never forsook the faith of his father. "He had been made a trustee of the old chapel at Newington Green in his boyhood, and continued one till his death." "When the Dissenters' Chapels Bill was before Parliament, a petition was presented in behalf of the descendants of Philip Henry,

[1] P. W. Clayden, *The Early Life of S. Rogers*, p. 15.

the ejected clergyman. When it was handed to Macaulay for presentation, he at once thought of Rogers, and asked if he had signed it. Rogers had signed it, and another for the Trustees of the Meeting House at Newington Green." As Professor Elton says: "Rogers was a connoisseur who took to verse-making, and wrote with patient though somewhat ineffectual care." "He derives from Goldsmith . . . But *Italy* is in blank verse of a kind that betrays new influences, especially that of Wordsworth, mingling with the old . . . the aim is purity and simplicity of diction, and this aim he reaches, though he has not poetic energy to sustain him." "The mistake of Rogers was not to write more prose."[1] It is probably significant that Crabb Robinson reports Rogers as "preferring prose to verse."

Henry Crabb Robinson (1775–1867), whose span of life equalled that of his friend Samuel Rogers, curiously resembled him in many ways, though he rarely attempted verse. He shared his religious and political opinions, "rejoiced at the French Revolution" and distrusted Napoleon, was generous and helpful in relations with literary friends, and rivalled the poet in his acquaintance with them and in his utter lack of attractiveness in personal appearance.

By profession a barrister and afterwards a *Times* correspondent, save as a populariser of German literature and an early exponent of German philosophy in England, Crabb Robinson had few claims in his lifetime to be considered a man of letters, and he never suffered under any delusions as to his powers or position. Six weeks before he died, he said to Macmillan the publisher, "I early found that I had not the literary ability to give me such a place among English authors as I should have desired, but I thought I had an opportunity of gaining knowledge of many of the most distinguished men of the age, and that I might do

[1] *A Survey of English Literature, 1780–1830*, i, pp. 65, 66.

some good by keeping a record of my interviews with them."

Fond of travelling, a voracious reader and a great conversationalist, his extraordinary memory enabled him in his Reminiscences and Diary to make his peculiar contribution to English literature. The Diary, in thirty-five volumes, "a priceless chronicle," Professor Elton calls it, part of which, edited by the Rev. Thomas Sadler, was published in 1869, and other portions quite recently, edited by Miss Edith Morley, were bequeathed, together with journals, reminiscences, and letters, to Dr. Williams' Library, of which Crabb Robinson was a trustee for twenty years. It contains some of the most shrewd and acute criticism of the characters and writings of Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Lamb, Goethe, Wieland, Schiller, and many others that are extant, and reveals its author as a man of personal integrity, with a genius for friendship, remarkable powers of conversation, keen observation and penetrating insight. His "record of his numberless friends and their talk, and of the thought of the time," says Professor Elton, "is of an extraordinary variety, intimacy, and distinctiveness. . . . Receptive and reflective, rather than originative, he nevertheless thought for himself, and kept his head, and his criticisms are always strong-witted and pointed. . . . In his old age, at his famous breakfasts, he became himself a personage, like Rogers but far more significant, and the repository of a thousand memories."[1]

Crabb Robinson was profoundly interested in religious speculation, and contributed freely to Unitarian journals for many years. He was a member of Essex Street Chapel under Thomas Madge, and after his resignation in 1859 joined Little Portland Street Chapel, where John James Tayler and James Martineau were joint ministers. As a youth he was strongly moved by the Birmingham Riots, and in 1795

[1] *A Survey of English Literature, 1780–1830*, ii, p. 109.

attended a dinner at which Dr. Priestley was toasted; half a century later he said of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, which secured their chapels for Unitarians, "It is the single subject in which I take a warm interest." Of University Hall, erected by Unitarians in celebration of the passing of the Act, he was one of the chief promoters.

No apology on any ground is needed for including "Crab," as Lamb called him, in the calendar of Unitarian men of letters.

The religious opinions of Charles Dickens (1812–70), the most popular of English novelists, have naturally been frequently canvassed, but no complete statement on the subject has been published. John Forster, whilst admitting that Dickens had sittings for a time in Little Portland Street Chapel, and "had a friendly regard for its minister, Mr. Edward Tagart, which endured long after he ceased to be a member of his congregation," continues: "That he did so cease, after two or three years, I can distinctly state. . . . Upon essential points he had never any sympathy so strong as with the leading doctrines of the Church of England; to these, as time went on, he found himself able to accommodate all minor differences." The latter part of this statement lacks both proof and probability. Mr. J. T. Ley, in a recent edition of *Forster's Life* (1928), says: "Dickens' temporary interest in Unitarianism was probably due to the fact that Forster was a member of that sect." Unfortunately for that conjecture, Forster, as a friend of Dickens, never was connected with Unitarians, though he came of a Unitarian family in Newcastle-on-Tyne. Forster himself attributes Dickens' connection with Unitarians to his differences with the clergymen of the Established Church on the question of requiring children to learn "the Church Catechism and other formularies and subtleties." Such a difference, assuming these catechisms were not in themselves obnoxious, would more naturally have led the novelist to throw in his lot

with one or other of the larger and more influential bodies of Nonconformists, to whom on ecclesiastical grounds alone such instruction was offensive. That Dickens joined the Unitarians, "a sect everywhere spoken against," raises at least a presumption that he objected to the content not less the form of teaching, and found what he could accept in the Church of his adoption. His actual membership of that Church appears to have been five years, 1842–47.

Sir Adolphus Ward, writing in 1882, is more judicial on this point. "Born in the Church of England, Dickens had so strong an aversion for what seemed to him dogmatism of any kind, that he for a time connected himself with a Unitarian Congregation, and to Unitarian views his own probably continued during his life most nearly to approach."[1] "Dickens," continues Ward, "loved the New Testament," and, in his own words, "thought that half the misery and hypocrisy of the Christian world arises from a stubborn determination to refuse the New Testament as a sufficient ground in itself, and to force the Old Testament into alliance with it—whence comes all manner of camel-swallowing and of gnat-straining." The historian might have gone even further. In the forties of last century the essential unity of the two Testaments was an article of faith common to the Established Church and to orthodox Dissent, upon which both based the twin doctrines of the Fall of Man and his redemption through the blood of Christ, rejected by Unitarians alone.

It is a view of Scripture which finds expression in the Prayer Book, and, as late as 1867, Liddon, in his famous Bampton Lectures on the *Divinity of Our Lord*, said: "If the sense of the Old Testament became patent in the New, it was because the New Testament was already latent in the Old. . . . The Church of Christ has ever believed her Bible to be throughout and so emphatically the handiwork of the

[1] *Dickens, English Men of Letters*, p. 182.

Eternal Spirit that it is no absurdity in Christians to cite Moses as foreshadowing the teaching of St. Paul and St. John." It would be easy to parallel this teaching from the writings of contemporary orthodox Nonconformists. From it Dickens turned to a Church where Scripture was interpreted by reason, where creeds were rejected, and non-subscription formed the fundamental basis of membership. In process of time, probably for domestic reasons, he resigned his membership, but he retained to the end his hold upon its principles.

Forster is more to the point in suggesting, with regard to Dickens' solemn aspirations, that "it was depth of sentiment rather than clearness of faith which kept safe the belief on which they rested against all doubt or question of its sacredness." There is no reason to believe that he went deeply into any speculative questions of theology, and it is very improbable that a man of his character and pursuits ever did, but of his sympathy with Unitarianism there is considerable evidence, apart from the harmony with a rational and liberal Christianity of the tone and current of thought in his writings.

On his first visit to America in 1842 he attended the services of eminent Unitarian ministers, and rarely visited other places of worship. He met and expressed his appreciation of Unitarians like Channing, Longfellow, Jared Sparks, Bancroft, and Adams. After his return to England he worshipped for a few Sundays at Essex Street Chapel under Thomas Madge. He left it for Little Portland Street and, as already stated, took a pew in the chapel of which Edward Tagart was minister. Tagart, an old student of Manchester College, York, was the Secretary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, and a zealous disciple of Priestley and Belsham, whose philosophy, imbibed at York, he stoutly defended against the rising school represented by Taylor and Martineau. When in 1844 the Little

Portland Street Congregation acknowledged the value of their minister's services by a handsome present of plate, Dickens was one of the subscribers, and wrote the inscription graven on the chief piece. The terms of the inscription are indicative of his opinions. "The Congregation, with sentiments of warm affection and respect, gratefully present this slight memorial to the Reverend Edward Tagart, not as an acquittance of the debt they owe him for his labours in the cause of that religion which has sympathy for men of every creed and ventures to pass judgment on none, but merely as an assurance that his learning, eloquence, and lessons of divine truth have sunk into their hearts, and shall not be forgotten in their practice." The English Prayer Book has many merits. "Sympathy for men of every creed" and "judgment passed on none" are not amongst them.

That Dickens continued to detest ecclesiasticism is illustrated, without reserve, in his *Child's History of England* (1852–54). Writing to M. de Cerjet in 1864, he said: "The Church that is to have its part in the coming time must be a more Christian one, with less arbitrary pretensions, and a stronger hold upon the mantle of our Saviour as he walked and talked upon this earth." The last few words are significant. Four years later, addressing a son then entering Cambridge, he said: "I most strongly and affectionately impress upon you the priceless value of the New Testament, and the study of that book as the one unfailing guide in life. Deeply respecting it and bowing down before the character of our Saviour, as separated from the vain constructions and inventions of men, you cannot go far astray." His Will, written at the end of life, ends with the words: "I commit my soul to the mercy of God, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and I exhort my dear children humbly to try to guide themselves by the teaching of the New Testament in its broad spirit, and to put no

faith in any man's narrow construction of its letter here and there."

A doctrine of Atonement, not the same, was common to Arians and Socinians, and many, whilst rejecting the Trinity, believed in the Atonement as the essential doctrine of Christianity. Nothing Dickens wrote on religion could not have been said by his old friend and one-time minister, Edward Tagart, or even by Tagart's guides in philosophy and theology, Locke, Priestley, and Belsham.

With the passing of Dickens, Priestley's influence, direct and indirect, on men of letters perished. His star had set with the rise of Channing and Martineau, and the materialistic philosophy united with a singular blend of Scripturalism, ultimately derived from Locke, was no longer the dominant force in Unitarian religious thought. Henceforth, until the nineteenth century ran its course, Martineau and his school exercised an almost undisputed sway in religious philosophy and Biblical criticism. His authority did not extend to politics; indeed, the conservatism and individualism of the Principal of Manchester College were virtually repudiated by many of his most gifted pupils, including Estlin Carpenter and Philip Henry Wicksteed. Such unity of religious and political idealism as still survived amongst Unitarians, under the spell of Gladstone's leadership of the Liberal Party, was finally shattered by his Home Rule Bill of 1886, and the subsequent emergence of the Labour Party. Politics and religion became, and remain, for radical as for evangelical Dissenters, two separate spheres of thought and action, whose relations provide a problem, challenging, perplexing, and still unresolved.

In the North of Ireland, where Arianism took root in the Presbyterian Church early in the eighteenth century, Priestley's influence counted for little or nothing, and the philosophy and Christology of Channing, when they crossed the Atlantic, were welcomed even more enthusiastically

than in England. The radicalism of Irish Unitarians in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was national in spirit, and shaped by the political relations of the century with England, the predominant partner in the unwillingly United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

The writings of two Irish poets illustrate what is meant.

William Drennan, M.A., M.D. (1754–1820), son of the Rev. Thomas Drennan, M.A., minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Belfast, after practising medicine in Belfast and Newry, settled in Dublin, December 1789, where he threw himself into politics. He was a member of the club formed in 1790 by T. A. Emmet and Peter Burrows, and wrote the original prospectus of the society of the United Irishmen, of which he was Chairman, 1792–93. He was tried for sedition and acquitted, June 26, 1794, after a brilliant defence by Curran. He took no part, however, in the Rebellion of 1798, and left Dublin for the North in 1807. He was one of the founders of *The Belfast Magazine*, and of the Belfast Academical Institute. He died, February 5, 1820, and his body was carried to the grave by six Protestants and six Catholics. Amongst his published poems were *Fugitive Pieces* (1815) and *Glendalloch and Other Poems* (1859), edited by his sons, with additional verse by them. He also published a translation of *Electra* of Sophocles, and was the author of a number of hymns. To him is attributed the first use in literature of the epithet, "The Emerald Isle," applied to Ireland. His beautiful lyrics became famous throughout the country, but he was rather overshadowed by Thomas Moore, to whom some of Drennan's poems have been so frequently assigned.

William Hamilton Drummond, D.D. (1778–1865), a prominent Unitarian divine, was minister in succession of the Second Presbyterian Church, Belfast, and for fifty years of Strand Street, Dublin. He received his doctorate from Marischal College, Aberdeen, on the recommendation of

his friend, Bishop Percy, of Dromore. He was one of the first members of the Belfast Literary Society, and in Dublin was a member of the Royal Irish Academy, and for long its librarian.

He published his first volume of verse whilst still a student of Glasgow University in 1795, and from that date to 1852 thirteen volumes in all came from his pen, including a translation of *The First Book of Lucretius' "Of the Nature of Things"* (1805). Another volume, entitled *The Preacher: A Poem in Three Cantos*, was published posthumously (1867), with a Memoir by John Scott Porter. Many of his hymns found their way into Unitarian and other collections. One of his antagonists in the field of controversy, arguing that Unitarianism was a dry and barren system of negation incapable of exerting the imagination or moving the devotional feelings, challenged him to produce from the whole range of Unitarian hymnology a composition that could be compared with that admirable lyric beginning:

"Give thanks to God the Lord
The Victory is ours."

and was discomfited to learn from Drummond that he was himself the author. An enthusiastic admirer of Nature, his greatest poem is *The Giant's Causeway* (1811), but though less involved in politics than Drennan, he was not wanting in patriotism. *The Man of Age* (1797), written at the age of nineteen, depicted an old man compelled to leave home for a foreign shore, and it is said that after the battle of Antrim in 1798 young Drummond met the Royalist troops in Larne, when "one of the cavalry officers presented a pistol at the young poet's head, exclaiming, 'You young villain, it is you and the like of you that has brought this upon us.' Drummond's companion turned the arm and weapon aside, else, it is surmised, the bard would not have survived to chant another lay."[1]

[1] J. S. Porter, *Memoir of W. H. Drummond*, iv, London, 1867.

Drummond celebrated in verse two events in Irish history: the overthrow of the Danes by Brian Boroihme in 1014 at Clontarf, and Bruce's invasion of Ireland in 1315 to assist the Irish to throw off the yoke of their common enemy. By no means a lover of martial deeds, Drummond justified the war that "dissevers the chains that would nations enslave."

Elizabeth Cleghorn Gaskell (1810-65), wife of the Unitarian minister at Cross Street Chapel, Manchester, wrote half a dozen novels, including one classic, many shorter sketches, and an excellent *Life of Charlotte Brontë*, already noticed.

Cranford, though rather a series of episodes than a tale, gives a vivid, kindly, and humorous picture of life in a Cheshire village, drawn from nature by a master hand. *Ruth*, if not as a novel truly great, is eminently readable, and incidentally delineates the character of a Unitarian minister, William Turner, of Newcastle, an old student of Warrington Academy and a leading divine in his denomination. *Mary Barton* and *North and South* are excellent stories, and present materials of some importance for the historian of the English people. Only less than Dickens, amongst novelists of the period, was Mrs. Gaskell interested in "the condition of the people" question. "She was the first writer of any real gift," says a modern critic,[1] "who described, as an inhabitant and from within, both the black country and also some of the green country upon its fringe." The district in question "was one," says a contemporary historian,[2] "the inhabitants of which still used an uncouth dialect, and which was chiefly known by its smoking chimneys, its perpetual rains, the length and severity of its winter, its almost sunless summer, as well as by a lawless turbulence, which embarrassed the Government, perplexed the legislature, and dis-

[1] O. Elton, *Survey of English Literature, 1830–1880*, ii, p. 257.
[2] Molesworth, *History of England for the Years 1830–1874*, ii, pp. 178–9.

mayed the inhabitants of the more-favoured parts of the kingdom."

It is an evidence of the division in Unitarian political opinions at this date that one of Mrs. Gaskell's severest critics, who took up cudgels in behalf of the employers, was William Rathbone Greg, the Unitarian essayist and philanthropist.

Sylvia's Lovers is by many esteemed the greatest of Mrs. Gaskell's novels. Her range is really rather limited, despite her attempts to enlarge it, but within her reach she has rarely been surpassed, if never attaining to the height or the depths of women of genius like Jane Austen or the Brontës. "Through her work as a whole," says a distinguished French critic, "Mrs. Gaskell deserves to be ranked among the representatives of psychological realism; she has there a place by herself; for if she does not penetrate very deep, and scarcely probes for the abnormal regions of consciousness, she moves within the average expanses of the inner world with remarkable ease and sureness."[1]

Anna Swanwick (1813–99), a member of an old Liverpool Unitarian family who at the age of eighteen came under the influence of James Martineau, studied in Berlin and gained an intimate knowledge of German and Greek and some acquaintance with Hebrew. In 1845 she began her work as a translator by publishing a translation from the writings of Goethe and Schiller. In 1850 she translated into blank verse Part I of *Faust* and *Egmont*, and in 1878 the second part of *Faust*. In 1865 she published a translation of the Trilogy of Aeschylus, "blank verse for the iambics and rhyme for the lyric metres." Eight years later she completed the whole of the dramas of Aeschylus, which, illustrated by Flaxman's drawings, ran into four editions. Her renderings of the Greek not only won popular approval, but elicited the warm appreciation of scholars like Sir Richard Jebb and Dr. Butler;

[1] L. Cazamian, in *A History of English Literature*, 1933, p. 1178.

whilst Edward Dowden and Sir Theodore Martin spoke highly of her translations from the German.

Miss Swanwick was deeply interested in social questions, in religion and the higher education of women. She was a member of the councils of Queen's and Bedford Colleges, London, for a time President of the latter, and was associated with the founding of Girton College, Cambridge, and Somerville College, Oxford.

A delightful talker and endowed with an excellent memory, she counted amongst her many friends, Gladstone, Tennyson, Browning, Crabb Robinson, and other distinguished people. On April 7, 1899, the University of Aberdeen conferred upon her *in absentia* the degree of LL.D., when Professor Pirie observed that: "She was one of the workers, of whom Thomas Carlyle is the most famous, who about the middle of the century set about familiarising the people of this country with the masterpieces of German literature. . . . She is not less distinguished as a Greek scholar. In 1873 appeared her great work, a verse translation of Aeschylus, a rendering which has not yet been surpassed in its kind. She has also done much by her example and influence to establish Ladies' Colleges in England, and generally to raise the standard of female education."

In spreading a knowledge of German literature in England, Miss Swanwick was at one with Unitarians like Crabb Robinson and the editors of the Unitarian journals, whilst in her educational activities she maintained the tradition of the tutors in the private schools and academies during the eighteenth and nineteeth centuries.

Stopford A. Brooke (1832–1916) was five years old when Queen Victoria came to the throne and lived until the middle of the Great War. He left the Church of England in 1880, and though the name "Unitarian" had no attractions for him, "theologically," as his biographer remarks,[1] "he

[1] L. P. Jacks, *Life and Letters of S. A. Brooke*, i, p. 319.

had abandoned the particular doctrine of the Incarnation on which the Church of England is founded, holding it in a universal form which could not be accommodated to formularies he had subscribed"—and thus embraced an interpretation of the doctrine in question for which Martineau, in particular, had pleaded with great power.

Brooke was as eminent in literature as in the pulpit, and most, but by no means all, of his work was done after he left the Church. His *Life of F. W. Robertson*, published as early as 1865, met with universal approbation, and the *Primer of English Literature* (1875), which had an extraordinary circulation, remains unsurpassed within its limits. The merits of later works on Tennyson, Browning, early English literature, Shakespeare, etc., have been widely recognised. The study of Tennyson ranks as a particularly able piece of poetic criticism. Brooke also wrote verse which exhibits a true lyrical note and beauty of phrasing, though it made no great appeal. His *Theology in the English Poets* contains an admirable discussion of the fundamental religious thought of the poets, especially of Wordsworth. Stopford Brooke's fine insight into the nature and worth of the religious teaching of thinkers and writers far removed from his own theological position may be paralleled by Martineau's ability to penetrate to the source and strength of the religious convictions animating the hymns of Charles Wesley and the Catholic piety of Richard Baxter.

The history of the Unitarian Movement from the earliest days of the eighteenth century has been sketched, at least in outline, more than once. Individualistic, though liberal in temper, Unitarians were not effectively organised as a community until the twentieth century, but their contributions to thought and learning during the two preceding centuries, however neglected in studies of the religious life of England, have been significant and substantial in Biblical scholarship, education, periodical literature, history, doctrine, philosophy, and English literature.

INDEX OF PERIODICALS

INDEX OF PERSONS

INDEX OF PLACES

* Denotes seat of Academy, † of School.

GENERAL INDEX

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
LONDON: 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1
CAPE TOWN: 73 ST. GEORGE'S STREET
SYDNEY, N.S.W.: WYNYARD SQUARE
TORONTO: 91 WELLINGTON STREET, WEST
WELLINGTON, N.Z.: 8 KOROI CRESCENT, LOWER HUTT

Scepticism and Construction

Bradley's Sceptical Principle as the Basis of Constructive Philosophy

by CHARLES A. CAMPBELL

Demy 8vo. Lecturer in Moral Philosophy, University of Glasgow *About* 12s. 6d.

The purpose of the book is twofold. In the first place it seeks to defend and develop the Sceptical side of the philosophy of Bradley, urging that Bradley's epistemological conclusions are decisively confirmed by evidence from many aspects of experience other than the cognitive. In the second place it endeavours, on the basis of metaphysical scepticism, to establish the "final phenomenal truth"—the highest truth accessible to man—of certain vital propositions in the domain of human values.

The History of the Anglo-Catholic Revival from 1845

by Canon W. J. SPARROW-SIMPSON D.D.

Lg. Cr. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

"This book is one both to read and to keep. It is admirably written and arranged; it is never bitter or unfair."—*Church Times*

"Real value as a work of reference."—*The Times*

"Well arranged history and exposition of the movement which seems irresistible."—*Spectator*

The History of Manchester College

by V. D. DAVIS, B.A.

Demy 8vo. *Illustrated* 10s.

This book, with some account of a preceding line of Nonconformist Academies of "university learning," tells of the progress of the College, founded in Manchester in 1786 on the principle of undogmatic freedom and since 1889 established at Oxford, as a post-graduate School of Theology and place of training for the ministry of Religion. Notable names of teachers in the record are John Kenrick, Martineau, Drummond, and Estlin Carpenter.

The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches

by ERNST TROELTSCH

TRANSLATED BY OLIVE WYON

Imp. Royal 8vo. *Two Vols.* 42s. *the set*

Dean Inge, in the *Church of England Newspaper*, writes: "It is the standard work on the subject, immensely learned, judicially impartial, and full of interest to all who are occupied with modern social problems."

The Religion of Masonry

An Interpretation

Cr. 8vo. by JOSEPH FORT NEWTON 5s.

"I would advise all who are interested in Masonry (and who is not?) to read this stimulating and refreshingly fragrant interpretation of a very remarkable 'social-service' religion. . . . Dr. Newton is as sympathetic as he is helpful when he deals with religion as when he treats of his own beloved Masonry."—*Sunday Referee*

The Holy and the Living God

Demy 8vo. by M. D. R. WILLINK 10s.

Some years ago Professor Otto's book, *The Idea of the Holy*, brought into prominence the awful and daunting side of our apprehension of deity. The present writer has traced the idea in the Bible and Christian history, and shows that it plays an essential part in the working of spiritual forces, that it throws light on obscure passages of the Old Testament, and that the present weakness of our religious life may be partly due to our forgetfulness of this aspect of religious consciousness.

"Profoundly able and heart-searching . . . very much in the line of Rudolf Otto's great work on *The Idea of the Holy*, and well worthy to stand in that noble succession."—*Expository Times*

Outlines of Teaching Sermons for a Second Year

edited by the Rev. C. E. HUDSON and a Clerical Sub-Committee

Cr. 8vo *Cloth 3s. 6d., Paper 2s.*

This is the second volume of

OUTLINES OF TEACHING SERMONS FOR A YEAR

Second Edition *Cloth 3s. 6d., Paper 2s.*

which was edited by the same committee.

"I am very glad to have the opportunity of commending these Outlines."—*Archbishop of York*

The Conception of God in the Philosophy of Aquinas

Demy 8vo. by R. L. PATTERSON 21s.

This is a fresh treatment from a strictly philosophical point of view of St. Thomas Aquinas's conception of God. It is founded on a thorough acquaintance with the original texts and the work of recent scholars. Confining himself to the main subject of Aquinas's idea of God, the author is able to do justice by ample quotations to the details of the great doctor's doctrine, and also to indicate its central place in mediaeval theology, and its perennial interest for the history of thought.

"Dr. Patterson's study of the 'Angelic Doctor' is the most important which has appeared in England for some time past. . . . It deserves careful study on the part of all who are interested in the philosophy and the theology of the Middle Ages."—*Methodist Recorder*

Personal Problems of Conduct and Religion

Cr. 8vo. by J. G. McKENZIE, B.D. 5s.

"His counsel is marked by a simple common sense, all the more valuable because it is reinforced by the fruits of his knowledge as an expert psychologist."—*Times Literary Supplement*

All prices are net

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD