The Ecclesiastical Public Sphere in England, 1815-1861

Ralph Henry Roberts

Submitted for the Award of Doctor of Philosophy

School of History, Department of Arts & Humanities, University of Kent

August, 2025

91,045 words

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank The Consortium for the Humanities and the Arts South-east England (CHASE) for funding this PhD project with a three-year grant, and for providing workshops, seminars, and conferences, which offered opportunities to meet other students and to develop as a PhD candidate. This funding was attainted through the University of Kent, and I am grateful to the institution for the use of its facilities, and for providing an environment that enabled me to go from an undergraduate to submitting a PhD thesis. I am particularly grateful to the university's support and admin staff; Faye, Emma, Angela, and Jenny have been tremendously helpful, and I thank them for all that they do.

Dr Ben Marsh was initially the Supervisory Chair for this PhD, and I appreciate his advice, support, and encouragement. Dr Emma Hanna chaired later meetings of the supervisory committee, and her input was much appreciated. Dr Mark Lawrence has been a diligent and helpful second supervisor, and he always brought fresh insights to committee meetings.

Dr Ambrogio Caiani has gone above and beyond in his role as primary supervisor; his advice, guidance, and, above all, patience, have been invaluable. I will always be indebted to him for his role in getting this thesis to the point of submission; beyond the usual supervisory role of practical advice and sources of material, Dr Caiani has given a great deal of moral support, and I greatly appreciate it.

The Hathi Trust, Google Books, and archive.org have all been central this thesis due to the materials available on their platforms which has been used in this thesis. In March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic forced a change in the nature of this project; the aforementioned repositories enabled me to put the plans for this thesis in place. At a time when these online collections of texts are under threat, this thesis is just one example of myriad projects that would not have been possible without them.

My parents have been constant sources of support, and I could not have reached this point without them. My friends have listened to a lot of rambling that meant nothing to them, and I thank them for their patience. My partner, Ari, has got me through this, and I will never be able to put into words how much she means to me. All of this is for her, and it always will be.

Abstract

The significance of religion in nineteenth-century England has been the subject of much historiographical discussion, and it has received renewed attention in the twenty-first century. This thesis aims to illustrate the breadth and depth of ecclesiastical debate within the public sphere during the middle years of the nineteenth century, and how these interacted with, influenced, and were influenced by the broader public sphere at this time. Seeking to provide further evidence against the "secularisation thesis" as applied to the nineteenth century, this work situates religious controversies and contentions within the context of a period that was deeply concerned about such matters. The forms of printed media used in this thesis have not been sufficiently considered as contributors to ideas of Christianity in England, nor as forums to develop and interrogate them. As this work demonstrates, these sources encourage a greater understanding of the ecclesiastical public sphere. This thesis builds upon existing work on religion and print culture, and it further highlights the relationship between them.

This work uses periodicals, histories, and collections of sermons to analyse contentions surrounding ecclesiastical issues in the mid-nineteenth century. Selected examples of each have been deployed to assess the means by which publications and individuals from within the Church of England, and those from Dissenting perspectives, understood both contemporary and historical elements of Christianity. These targeted case studies, drawn from across the period under consideration, illuminate the vibrant and dynamic nature of religious debate. The consequent effect of this debate on the publications and individuals themselves is also considered, where appropriate. Using both a chronological and thematic approach, the malleable nature of the ecclesiastical public sphere is investigated over the course of the four chapters.

By harnessing these materials and applying them to this area of intellectual history, this thesis displays the value of neglected sources for studies of religion in the nineteenth century, or under-utilised aspects of familiar sources in certain cases. It accentuates the value of periodical literature as a means of exploring religious debate. It also foregrounds changing approaches to ecclesiastical history writing and the varying methods of delivering sermons during this time. This thesis helps to substantiate the view that, rather than religion becoming less prominent in public sphere discussions in the mid-nineteenth century, it remained a pivotal element of them.

Table of Contents

Introduction 5

Chapter 1: “Religious” Publications 43

Chapter 2: “Broader” Periodicals 89

Chapter 3: Ecclesiastical History-Writing in the Mid-Nineteenth Century 195

Chapter 4: Published Sermons 257

Conclusion 324

Bibliography: 334

Introduction

Part 1 - Context

"Victorian England was religious" - so begins the first volume of Owen Chadwick's two-volume survey of the Victorian Church, wonderfully succinct scene-setting for over one thousand pages on religion in England between the years 1829 and 1901.[1] Among Chadwick's proofs were a keen appetite for religious literature, a concerted increase in the number of clergymen in order to maintain a consistent ration of clergymen to laymen, and an overwhelming belief among most that "the law of England must seek to conform to the law of God."[2] The religious census of 1851, which prompted contemporary panic over the number of potential worshippers absent from religious services, was reframed by Chadwick as a curious one-off, its results not tested by further examination; moreover, the lack of churches, especially in London, meant that the problem was not a surfeit of Godlessness, but a want of pews.[3] For Chadwick, the entire period covered in his survey was shaped by Christian ideals, and the frequent doctrinal and denominational disputes underscored his central thesis.

George Kitson Clark agreed that religion was pivotal in the nineteenth century, seeing only the seventeenth as a potential rival to the nineteenth in terms of the extent to which religion influenced national life.[4] Boyd Hilton, whose *A Mad, Bad, and Dangerous People?* incorporated only the first half of the

---

[1] Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church, Part I: 1829-1859* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1987; first published in 1966 by A. & C. Black), p. 1. For 1860 to 1901, see Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church, Part II: 1860-1901* (London: SCM Press, 1987; first published in 1970 by A. & C. Black).
[2] *Ibid*, *Part I*, pp. 443-44; *Part II*, p. 244; Part 1, p. 476.
[3] *Ibid*, *Part I*, pp. 366-67.
[4] George Kitson Clark, *The Making of Victorian England* (London: Methuen, 1962), p. 20.

nineteenth century, considered it "an intensely religious period", although an undercurrent of "doubt" was present.[5] For Linda Colley, Protestantism was "at the core of British national identity", underpinning a perception of a "chosen people", evidenced by God's granting of a substantial empire to rule and proselytise to.[6]

The nation was, indeed, religious; as Joshua King has indicated, the crucial shift in the nineteenth century was that its religious identity "could not be securely linked to a dominant religious institution".[7] Protestantism was central to national identity, but affiliation to the established Church was becoming increasingly less intrinsic. Dissent took many forms, Old and New, and interdenominational rivalries between them had been commonplace since there had been a Nonconformist presence in the nation. As David W. Bebbington has observed, the Church of England was typically the chief target of Dissenting approbation; its presence, and the haughty contempt (both actual and perceived) in which it held Nonconformists brought about increased cooperation among various Dissenting groups to undermine the Church of England.[8] Contemporary evidence suggests that, collectively, these denominations rivalled the Church of England with regard to attendees of religious services. Flawed as the religious census of 1851 might have been, the fact that almost as many adults attended Nonconformist services as they did Church of England equivalents cannot be disregarded as a statistical anomaly.[9]

While acknowledging the flaws of Horace Mann's work, Hugh McLeod has stated that the census clearly demonstrated that the working classes "played

---

[5] Boyd Hilton, *A Mad, Bad, and Dangerous People?: England 1783-1846* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 690.
[6] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 368-69.
[7] Joshua King, *Imagined Spiritual Communities in Britain's Age of Print* (Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 2015), p. 8.
[8] David W. Bebbington, *Victorian Nonconformity* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2011), pp. 15-17.
[9] Hugh McLeod, *Religion and Society in England, 1850-1914* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), pp. 11-12.

little or no part in organised religious life".[10] Christianity was, more often than not, "a religion of the successful" – little wonder, perhaps, that the working classes did not find religion comforting if the sacred mirrored the secular.[11] This is a contested view, however. David Hempton has asserted that the extent to which the working classes accepted religious values went beyond what most social historians have been prepared to accept.[12] This is not merely a contemporary issue – according to E. R. Norman, Victorian middle-class churchmen underestimated the religiosity of the working classes.[13] The 1851 census might have caused both contemporaries and later historians to overestimate the irreligiosity of the Victorians, and its findings need to be qualified when considering its usefulness as an indicator of Victorian religious feeling.[14]

What can be identified is an apparent disconnect between the Church of England as the national church and the influence it had over the population, particularly among the middle and working classes. Noel Annan has recognised that religion was a "familiar referent" in Victorian culture, although it had its limits; moreover, Annan has seen a disconnect between religion as an ideal and the practical limitations of the church and its ministers.[15] Kenneth Thompson has noted that the Church of England could not rely on its ties to the aristocracy to influence public opinion after 1850, and that employment and deployment of middle-class laymen was necessary to try and retain this influence.[16] According

---

[10] Hugh McLeod, *Religion and the Working Class in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1984), p. 57.
[11] *Ibid*, p. 60.
[12] David Hempton, 'Religious Life in Industrial Britain, 1830-1914' in Sheridan Gilley and W. J. Sheils (eds.), *A History of Religion in Britain: Practice and Belief from Pre-Roman Times to the Present* (Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell, 1994), p. 321.
[13] E. R. Norman, *Church and Society in England, 1770-1970* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), p. 125.
[14] See David M. Thompson, 'The 1851 Religious Census: Problems and Possibilities', *Victorian Studies*, 11.1 (September, 1967), pp. 87-97 and W. S. F. Pickering, 'The 1851 Religious Census – A Useless Experiment?', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 18 (1967), pp. 382-407 for considerations of the value of the census.
[15] Noel Annan, 'Science, Religion, and the Critical Mind: Introduction' in Philip Appleman, William A. Madden and Michael Wolff (eds.), *1859: Entering an Age of Crisis* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1959), p. 49.
[16] Kenneth A. Thompson, *Bureaucracy and Church Reform: The Organizational Response of the Church of England to Social Change 1800-1965* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), p.91

to Sara Slinn, efforts to diversify the recruitment of clergymen were unsuccessful in preventing the "declining fortunes" of the Established Church, which Slinn notes was "obvious to some in the 1860s."[17] On a more positive note, Arthur Burns has emphasised the role of the Diocesan Revival between 1800 and 1870 in providing a professional structure for the Church of England that incorporated lay involvement. This allowed the institution to adapt to "the religious free market that was emerging in the later nineteenth century."[18] That such a "free market" existed by 1870 lends credence to Frances Knight's conclusion that "the Church of England could no longer claim to be the Church of the English nation" by this date; repeated challenges in the nineteenth century, and a narrowing of the church's support, brought about this shift from "national Church to denomination."[19]

Frank O'Gorman agrees that the Church of England was in decline in the nineteenth century, and that it was "responsible for its own decline." This was due to "complacency" on the Church's part regarding its established status, and a sustained inability to solve its own problems, relying on an increasingly disconnected State to defend it.[20] In contrast, P. T. Marsh considered the Church of England to still be in a position of relative strength until Gladstone's first ministry, which began in 1868; Marsh sees the period from Victoria's accession until this point to be one in which the Church of England was well placed, despite the challenges it faced in the mid-nineteenth century. [21] David Nicholls finds middle ground between the two, writing that "in 1820 the notion that England was a Christian nation was fairly realistic", and that the perceived connection

---

[17] Sara Slinn, *The Education of the Anglican Clergy, 1780-1839* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2017), p. 208.
[18] Arthur Burns, *The Diocesan Revival in the Church of England, c. 1800-1870* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 263-64.
[19] Frances Knight, *The Nineteenth Century Church and English Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 201.
[20] Frank O'Gorman, *The Long Eighteenth Century: British Political & Social History 1688-1832* (London: Arnold, 2003), pp. 294-95.
[21] P. T. Marsh, *The Victorian Church in Decline: Archbishop Tait and the Church of England, 1868-1882* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 1.

between Church and State was an important aspect of this Christian national identity. Nicholls cites Gladstone's axiom that the State must aid a Church "teaching truth" in all ways possible, and that "establishment is the normal way of doing so."[22] There is no lack of irony, therefore, in Gladstone's first ministry as a potential signpost of the Church of England's decline.

According to J. C. D. Clark, the Church of England was an integral part of the old order, the *ancien regime*, and its subjugation to the state was complete by 1832. For Clark, the key question was whether the monarchy or the Church of England was the most important institution. In 1688/89, the political order chose the Church in favouring William of Orange over James II; in 1828/29, they had decided the monarchy took precedence by passing the Catholic Emancipation Act.[23] This amounted to the "destruction of the Anglican ascendancy", and it effectively brought the long eighteenth century to a close.[24] Clark's conception of the *ancien regime* has had its critics. Joanna Innes decried Clark's image of a "Little England" that was static and unquestioning; for Innes, Clark's study was lacking in the nuance and flexibility of thought that he considered typical of most of the upper echelons in society in the long nineteenth century.[25] Ambrogio Caiani has observed that the *ancien regime* shaped politics in Europe long after the fall of Napoleon, and that "conservatives, liberals and radicals" all constructed "versions of new-old regimes" to legitimise their positions.[26] Given the strong link between Church and State, it is not surprising that religious denominations were engaging in similar activities from an ecclesiastical perspective.

---

[22] David Nicholls, *Church and State in Britain since 1820* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967), p. 3.
[23] J. C. D. Clark, *English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 419.
[24] J. C. D. Clark, 'England's Ancien Regime as a Confessional State', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 21.3 (Autumn, 1989), p. 473.
[25] Joanna Innes, 'Review: Jonathan Clark, Social History and England's "Ancien Regime"', *Past & Present*, 115 (May, 1987), pp. 199-200. For Clark's response to Innes, see J. C. D. Clark, 'On Hitting the Buffers: The Historiography of England's Ancien Regime. A Response', *Past & Present*, 117 (November, 1987), pp. 195-207.
[26] Ambrogio Caiani, 'Re-inventing the Ancien Régime in Post-Napoleonic Europe, *European History Quarterly*, 47.3 (July, 2017), p. 453.

Much like P. T. Marsh, Eric Evans has viewed the Church of England's position as being more favourable after Catholic Emancipation in 1829, stating that it was "revived and renewed" in the 1830s and 1840s; it was not cast aside but rather "yoked to the State", albeit in a subordinate position, during this period.[27] The reforms of 1828-1832, culminating in the First Reform Act, did not destroy the "old beliefs" of the clergy and the nobility, according to Boyd Hilton, but actually "gave them a new and final lease of life." [28] Even if the Church of England's position was a good deal weaker by 1870, Michael Bentley has observed the "near omnipresence of religion as a touchstone of party feelings" in the years 1868-74, a period that witnessed the "most radical legislative programme" of the nineteenth century.[29] If the Church of England was permanently undermined by this point, religion was still a crucial aspect of political, and social, life. For David Hempton, "a predominantly evangelical pietism" spread from its churches into society as part of "an unremitting war against urban vice and irreligion", and this lasted into the early twentieth century. That irreligion was a target illustrates its presence in society, but Hempton notes the strength of religious fervour, particularly among the middle classes, aligned with an "administratively reformed" and "spiritually enlivened" Established Church.[30] It should be kept in mind that "irreligion" might mean "forms of religion not in alignment with the Established Church" rather than a lack of piety.

That religion was so important throughout the nineteenth century, not just in the middle years, has been reaffirmed in recent years, particularly in response to the "secularisation thesis" that has viewed the nineteenth century as a general starting point for the retreat away from religion that has continued up to the present. Generally, secularisation is seen as a phenomenon that gained

---

[27] Eric Evans, *The Forging of the Modern State: Early Industrial Britain, 1783-1870* (London: Pearson, 2001), p. 305.
[28] Hilton, *A Mad, Bad, & Dangerous People?*, p. 26.
[29] Michael Bentley, *Politics without Democracy, 1815-1914: Perception and Preoccupation in British Government* (London: Fontana, 1984), p. 206.
[30] Hempton in Sheridan and Gilley (eds.), pp. 320-21.

momentum towards the end of the nineteenth century, although Mark Chapman has viewed secularisation as a process obvious to some in the middle of the century.[31] He cites Matthew Arnold's perception of the "melancholy, long, withdrawing roar" of the "Sea of Faith" as an awareness of this secularization.[32] *Dover Beach* was written in 1867; while still outside the limits of this thesis, it is scarcely believable that this supposed decline of religiosity would have taken place over six years.

Chapman cites Arnold's lament in connection with Chadwick's work on secularization, but Chadwick saw this as a later eventuality – "The Victorian father goes to church" whereas "the Edwardian son stays at home".[33] Regarding Arnold, Joshua King views the poet as an "early and idiosyncratic exemplar" of "Hegelian secularism."[34] This descriptor, used by Matthew Scherer, situates secularism as "an extension of Christianity" as opposed to a Kantian "rebuke of Christianity."[35] While Arnold might well have mourned the retreat of religious fervour, he had an awareness that the sacred and the profane were not distinct entities but were interconnected. This contradicts the separatist notion of traditional secularisation ideas, which tend to see religion as being marginalised during the nineteenth century or even earlier, as a consequence of the French Revolution. While the secularisation debate is broad and far-reaching, it is sufficient to state that its effects were only considered by a few far-sighted individuals at the very end of the period studied in this thesis, and even then, the notion of a religious/secular dichotomy must be treated with a good deal of

---

[31] Mark D. Chapman, 'Liberal Anglicanism' in Rowan Strong (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume III: Partisan Anglicanism and its Global Expansion, 1829-c.1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), p. 230.
[32] Matthew Arnold, 'Dover Beach', in Christopher Ricks (ed.), *The Oxford Book of English Verse* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 453-54.
[33] Owen Chadwick, *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 5.
[34] King, p. 6. Chapter 3 of King's work discusses Arnold's "poetic national church".
[35] Matthew Scherer, 'Landmarks in the Critical Study of Secularism', *Cultural Anthropology*, 26.4 (November, 2011), p. 624.

scepticism.[36] Jeremy Morris has affirmed that Matthew Arnold must have been onto something that influenced *Dover Beach*, but that evidence of a "trickle down" effect is lacking, at present.[37]

While Deism had been a fringe but present reality in England since the seventeenth century, and atheism was used as a means of frightening the timidly pious into being increasingly receptive to "correct" theological teaching, Christianity was dominant in mid-nineteenth-century England. Charles Taylor's "immanent frame" delineates the potential for individuals to interpret the world without reference to God, or gods, in any form; Taylor asserts that this was realised in the nineteenth century.[38] While the framework for such a perspective may well have been realised by this point, for the majority in England during the years 1815-61, institutional religion still dominated, even if the Church of England's hegemony was being whittled away. Taylor notes the possibility for the sacred and the profane to overlap in the definition of the "immanent frame"; indeed, the writers of the *Edinburgh Review* may well have contributed to such an as-yet unrecognised model, at least in the early years of its existence. The typical reaction to any insular or anti-Establishment sentiments (actual or perceived) emanating from the *Edinburgh* was approbation, not consultation. Taylor's position makes more sense towards the end of the nineteenth century, rather than at this juncture.

The principal conflicts were denominational, and intra-denominational. Anglicans, Nonconformists, and Roman Catholics all had plenty of reasons to condemn and undermine each other, but clashes among individuals and groups

---

[36] For an overview of secularism in a Western context, with a focus on Britain, see Alan D. Gilbert, *The Making of post-Christian Britain: A History of the Secularization of Modern Society* (New York: Longman, 1980), pp. 4-41. Gilbert's observation that discussion on the subject involves "entering a minefield of semantic confusion" is apt.

[37] Jeremy Morris, 'The Strange Death of Christian Britain: Another Look at the Secularization Debate', *The Historical Journal*, 46.4 (December, 2003), p. 962.

[38] See Chapter 15, 'The Immanent Frame' in Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), pp. 539-93, for a full and thorough explanation of the meaning and implications of Taylor's term.

that were under the same broad umbrella were not uncommon. With respect to the Church of England, this was most prominently witnessed in the disputes between "High" and "Low" Churchmen, with the development of the "Broad Church" being an Anglican *via media*, of sorts. As will be seen across the chapters in this thesis, the fact that an individual or a publication was, nominally at least, on the same side did not preclude them from being a target if their line was not sufficiently orthodox from the arbiter's perspective.

The most well-known example of this from the period under consideration is the Oxford Movement, which began in the 1830s in response to the Irish Church Temporalities Bill in 1833, but its most able adherents became some of the most well-known ecclesiastical figures in the country, and often the most reviled. Prominent from 1833 until 1845, the Oxford Movement, also known as Tractarians after the ninety tracts published by its adherents, had a profound influence on ecclesiastical debates during these years, and indeed beyond. Of particular importance for this thesis is James Pereiro's notion of the "ethos" of the Oxford Movement, a term that was frequently used by its members and, as Pereiro illustrates, was a key influence on every aspect of the Movement.[39] Not only did this impact on the writings of Tractarians, it, by extension, influenced those who responded to the Movement. Stephen Skinner has shown that Tractarianism was not simply a theological movement but that the "condition of England" was a central issue for its supporters. Skinner's work uses the *British Critic* to support this contention, a publication that is one of the case studies used in Chapter One of this thesis.[40]

---

[39] James Pereiro, *'Ethos' and the Oxford Movement: At the Heart of Tractarianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). The Conclusion, on pages 233-37, summarises Pereiro's arguments on the importance of 'ethos', and the influence this prominence had.

[40] S. A. Skinner, *Tractarians and the 'Condition of England': The Social and Political Thought of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). See 'Introduction - 'Meddling with the World': Tractarian Commentary and Posterity', pp. 1-28, for the methodology and implications of Skinner's work.

While 1845 marked the zenith of the Movement's influence, Anglo-Catholicism remained an important element of the Church of England; indeed, it remains so to this day. Marvin O'Connell has noted that many of its key ideals "profoundly effected the worldwide Anglican and Episcopalian bodies", and the shock of 1845 marked a beginning as much as it did an end.[41] Peter Nockles agrees that the Movement left a legacy beyond 1845, although its overarching emphasis on theology put it at odds with popular Anglicanism, and thus it was ultimately all "it could ever hope to become."[42] George Herring disagrees with the latter point, arguing that the Movement had practical application in mind when developing their theories; for its adherents, the main aim was to bring out the existing but dormant catholicity of the Church of England.[43] Whatever the perception one has of it, the Movement possesses an impressive historiography evaluating its impact. It is the subject of an Oxford Handbook consisting of an impressive forty-three chapters, and another edited volume considering its impact on, and relationship with, Christianity around the world.[44] Lawrence Crumb's collation of almost five-and-a-half thousand primary and secondary sources on the Oxford Movement demonstrates the interest in it, and the historiography has continued to flourish since Crumb's work was published in 1988.[45]

Essentially, the Oxford Movement, and the debates surrounding it, were a continuation of the aforementioned High and Low Church contestations that had been well-attested throughout the eighteenth century, as J. C. D. Clark has

---

[41] Marvin O'Connell, *The Oxford Conspirators: A History of the Oxford Movement 1833-45* (London: Macmillan, 1969), pp. 422-23.
[42] Peter Benedict Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 326-27.
[43] George Herring, T*he Oxford Movement in Practice: The Tractarian Parochial Worlds from the 1830s to the 1870s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 1-6.
[44] Stewart J. Brown, Peter B. Nockles, and James Pereiro (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017); Stewart J. Brown and Peter B. Nockles (eds.), *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830-1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
[45] Lawrence N. Crumb, *The Oxford Movement and its Leaders: A Bibliography of Secondary and Lesser Primary Sources* (Metuchen: The American Theological Library Association and The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1988).

noted.[46] Clark finds the notion of a "Broad Church" party existing before 1853 (when the term first appeared in print, used by the Anglican priest W. J. Conybeare in the *Edinburgh Review*) potentially problematic, although Jeremy Morris has demonstrated that Frederick Denison Maurice had a tripartite view of the Church of England in 1842, with "Liberal" being the middle ground between "Evangelical" and "High Church" or "Catholic". Morris asserts that Maurice "evidently considered liberal an equivalent term to the later broad church." [47] Janet Larson views the Broad Church as being a recognisable party before 1842, noting the loss of the leadership of Thomas Arnold when he died in the same year.[48] Demonstrating that discord could arise not only intra-denominationally but within distinct parties, Rowan Strong recognises four parties in the Victorian period, separating "High Church" and "Anglo-Catholic" as two of the four, alongside "Evangelical" and "Broad Church".[49] These parties frequently had much to say to, and even more often about, each other throughout the mid-nineteenth century. A tremendous amount of ink was devoted to convincing readers why affiliates of differing denominations, or indeed individuals or groups within the same party (nominally, at least), were gravely mistaken.

Internal denominational squabbling was by no means solely the preserve of the Church of England. Even the English Roman Catholics, targets of opprobrium that was often vitriolic throughout the period under consideration, managed to fall out with each other on occasion. Geoffrey Rowell has noted the suspicion held by older forms of English Catholicism towards more "exuberant worship and intense piety" that increased after 1829.[50] Mary Heimann has argued

---

[46] J. C. D. Clark, 'Church, Parties, and Politics' in Jeremy Gregory (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume II: Establishment and Empire, 1662-1829* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 312-13.
[47] Jeremy Morris, 'The Spirit of Comprehension: Examining the Broad Church Synthesis in England', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 75.3 (September, 2006), pp. 424-25. Maurice considered "High Church" and "Catholic" to be one party – a knowingly provocative conflation, undoubtedly.
[48] Janet L. Larson, 'Skeptical Women v. Honest Men v. Good Old Boys: Gender Conflict in the High Victorian Religion Wars' in Jude V. Nixon (ed.), *Victorian Religious Discourse: New Directions in Criticism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 84
[49] Rowan Strong, 'Introduction' in Strong (ed.), p. 16.
[50] Geoffrey Rowell, *Hell and the Victorians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), p. 153.

that these divisions have been too rigidly cast, and that the internal divisions among English Catholics have been overstated, but they were present to some extent.[51] For Josef Altholz, the decades after 1815 represented a "period of revival" for the Roman Catholic Church in Europe, and this renewed vigour found expression in England in 1829 with Catholic Emancipation, and in 1850 when Pius IX proclaimed the bull *Universalis Ecclesiae*, restoring the Roman Catholic diocesan hierarchy in England.[52] If Roman Catholics sometimes found themselves at odds with each other, the near-constant opprobrium from Protestants of all denominations had a galvanising effect. After all, being vehemently opposed to Roman Catholicism was one of the very few points of agreement among the majority of Protestants, aside from those Anglo-Catholic churchmen who were at least somewhat sympathetic to the Roman Catholic Church.

Despite this shared animosity towards Roman Catholics, Evangelicals and High Churchmen managed to maintain a high degree of mutual antipathy throughout the mid-nineteenth century. Evangelicalism had "expanded" in the 1790s, as Doreen Rosman has shown, and by 1815 Evangelicals were an active minority within the Church of England.[53] Bebbington has charted the growth of Evangelical influence in the nineteenth century, viewing it as having reached its peak "just after the middle of the century." According to Bebbington, the "vital religion" expressed by Evangelicalism was more attractive to the increasing number of young men hearing a call to ministry in the 1830s and 1840s; thus, by the 1850s, these relatively recent ordinands were more numerous and particularly influential.[54]

---

[51] Mary Heimann, *Catholic Devotion in Victorian England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 1-10 for an overview of existing historiography on Roman Catholicism in Victorian England.
[52] Josef L. Altholz, *The Churches in the Nineteenth Century* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1967), p. 59.
[53] Doreen M. Rosman, *Evangelicals and Culture* (London: Croom Helm, 1984), p. 20.
[54] David Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Routledge, 1989), p. 106.

J. Douglas Holladay has observed that this growth in Evangelical influence coincided with disharmony among Evangelicals; according to Holladay, the combative Recordite group, named after Alexander Haldane's newspaper *The Record*, was the main source of the approbation towards other Evangelicals.[55] Boyd Hilton has suggested that the Recordites were the "extreme" wing of the Evangelicals, whereas "Clapham Evangelicalism" was the moderate counterpoint.[56] The "Clapham Sect", or "Clapham Saints", were the group that has traditionally been seen as being primarily responsible for kick-starting the expansion of Evangelicalism referred to by Rosman at the end of the eighteenth century. While the Clapham members certainly played a role, Gareth Atkins has shown that a wide array of interconnected networks made this happen, and that grassroots Evangelicalism could often be as effective, if not more so, than "top down" Clapham efforts.[57] Evangelicalism is a term that continues to be widely used today, and its importance in assessing nineteenth-century ecclesiastical matters cannot be underestimated.[58]

The rich and varied historiography of religion in the nineteenth century is evidence that Chadwick's claim of Victorian England being religious remains an accepted position to hold. Indeed, the reaction against the secularisation thesis at the turn of the twenty-first century, and the number of innovative studies of religion that have been produced to date, demonstrate that Chadwick's assertion holds the same gravitas today as it did in 1966. Matthew Cragoe has identified an "antipathy to the state Church", but not to Christianity, in the industrial northern

---

[55] J. Douglas Holladay, 'English Evangelicalism, 1820-1850: Diversity and Unity in "Vital Religion"', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 51.2 (June, 1982), pp. 147-57. As it was a newspaper, *The Record* was not considered as a case study for this thesis.

[56] Boyd Hilton, *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1795-1865* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 98.

[57] Gareth Atkins, *Converting Britannia: Evangelicals and British Public Life, 1770-1840* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2019). See 'Introduction: Redefining the "Age of Wilberforce"', pp. 1-25, for the reasoning behind Atkin's reconsideration of the period covered by the work in question.

[58] For a comprehensive study of Evangelicalism from its origins to the present day, considered in a wide range of contexts, see Andrew Atherstone and David Ceri Jones (eds.), *The Routledge Research Companion to the History of Evangelicalism* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019).

towns by the 1860s.[59] Such an assessment exemplifies the greater degree of nuance present in analyses of nineteenth-century religion. James Sack ended *From Jacobite to Conservative* by stating that religion, and "specifically the place of the Church of England in the national life", was the overriding concern of conservatives in 1832.[60] On the eve of the first Liberal ministry in 1859, the role of the Church of England, and religion itself, were still vital issues for many in England, despite the industrial apathy. If the former had collected enough opponents to challenge its prominence, the concept of religion remained pivotal in the everyday lives of many in the country throughout the middle years of the nineteenth century.

Religion as an important facet of social, political, and cultural life was not a new phenomenon in the nineteenth century. What was different was the role of print culture in facilitating the spread of ideas and in providing environments in which religious topics could be discussed and contested, offering opportunities to influence readers utilising arguments made from the perspective of specific denominations or parties. If W. L. Burn's perception of the mid-Victorian period as an "age of equipoise" has been challenged, his assertion that religion was "pervasive" during this period is broadly supported, albeit with certain modifications, such as Cragoe's.[61] Burn's observation that religion "could be talked about easily and naturally" was, in part, facilitated by a print culture that, while pre-existing the nineteenth century, came into its own during it.[62] Bernard Reardon has shown that the Victorian era was replete with religious debate; the

---

[59] Matthew Cragoe, '"The Hand of the Lord is upon the Cattle": Religious Reactions to the Cattle Plague, 1865-67' in Martin Hewitt (ed.), *An Age of Equipoise? Reassessing Mid-Victorian Britain* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2000), p. 202.
[60] James J. Sack, *From Jacobite to Conservative: Reaction and Orthodoxy in Britain, c. 1760-1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 258.
[61] See W. L. Burn, *The Age of Equipoise: A Study of the Mid-Victorian Generation* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1964). For a counterpoint to Burn, see Hewitt (ed.). Cragoe's chapter is the only one to address religion directly; as a whole, the volume considers Burn's perspective from a range of cultural, social, and political paradigms.
[62] Burn, p. 46.

burgeoning print market aided this interchange of ideas.[63] Brian Heeney has identified the "professionalisation" of parish clergymen in mid-Victorian England, and how their working interests went beyond their churches, but his work does not address the extent to which writing played a part in this expansion.[64] There was a growing expectation that clergymen would be well-read in the nineteenth century; a necessary, but often-overlooked corollary, is that many of them would contribute the material to be read. The burgeoning print market gave them ample opportunity to find literary pews for their thoughts.

Section 2: Methodology; Public Sphere and Print Culture

This thesis uses the term "public sphere" in the traditional sense of being the space in which opinions are expressed, and issues discussed and debated. Jürgen Habermas, the theorist responsible for introducing the term, sees the public sphere as having emerged from salons, coffee houses, and early print media to create "public opinion", which was to challenge the traditional aristocratic power bases prevalent in Europe. While these locales of public discussion were limited to those with the education and means to participate in them, Habermas argued that this predominantly eighteenth-century, pre-Industrial Age public was "conscious of being part of a larger public."[65] For Habermas, the role of the public in Britain reached its zenith in 1834, with the publication of the Tamworth Manifesto and the introduction of seating for the press in the House of Commons in the same year representing the high points of public influence in the

---

[63] Brian Reardon, *Religious Thought in the Victorian Age: A Survey from Coleridge to Gore* (New York: Longman, 1980).
[64] Brian Heeney, *A Different Kind of Gentleman: Parish Clergy as Professional Men in Early and Mid-Victorian England* (Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1976).
[65] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989), p. 37.

political realm.[66] By 1868, according to Habermas, this influence had greatly diminished due to the professionalisation of politics, which heralded the starting point of mass political propaganda that has accelerated ever since.[67]

Habermas's notion of the public sphere has received much attention since its emergence in the 1960s, but it is sufficient to state here that the notion of a "public sphere" as a realm of ideas, made up of individuals and groups contributing to it, is a helpful way of understanding ecclesiastical discussions in the nineteenth century.[68] Additional aid in understanding the public sphere that emerged in the eighteenth century is provided by Steven Pincus's assertion that it "was not a tangible material space; it was an ideal."[69] This can be transferred to the present thesis on the nineteenth-century ecclesiastical public sphere: while contributors had their own ideals, and they were trying to "sell" these to readers, to borrow the capitalistic language of Habermas, the ecclesiastical public sphere was mutable. Printed materials were vital armaments in the ongoing battles against heresy in all its forms, and the rise of Dissent in the nineteenth century, coupled with the strengthening of the Catholic position after 1829, made the ecclesiastical public sphere an increasingly contested space. The eighteenth century saw the development of reading and writing publics, as James Van Horn

---

[66] *Ibid*, pp. 62-67.

[67] *Ibid*, p. 203. See section 20, 'The Public Sphere as a Platform for Advertising', pp. 181-95, for Habermas' reflections on the development of the public sphere from a place for "private men" to engage in public debate to a state in which such discussions are subsumed by seller/consumer considerations. Habermas argues that this amounted to a "refeudalization" of the public sphere, as "privileged private interests" remoulded the public sphere for their own ends (p. 195). Habermas sees this development as the starting point for the State seeing citizens as consumers and "selling" ideas to them through public means, which in turn permanently corrupted the democratic nature of the public sphere.

[68] For a sample of the responses to Habermas, see Martina Lauster, 'Habermas Anticipated: The Eighteenth-Century Public Sphere as "Theater of the World"' in Christian J. Emden and David Midgley (eds.), *Changing Perceptions of the Public Sphere* (New York: Berghahn, 2012), pp. 142-63; Kenneth Baynes, *Habermas* (New York: Routledge, 2016); Kenneth MacKendrick, 'Does Past Religion Have a Past? Habermas, Religion, and the Sacred Complex', *Critical Research on Religion* 6.3 (December, 2018), pp. 309-30.

[69] Steven Pincus, 'The State and Civil Society in Early Modern England: Capitalism, Causation and Habermas's Bourgeois Public Sphere' in Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (eds.), *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), p. 215.

Melton has shown.[70] These were utilised and deployed in the nineteenth century to shape religious discourse and create the "imagined spiritual communities" that Joshua King has identified.[71]

The first two chapters of this thesis will consider specific examples of nineteenth-century periodicals. The serious scholarly study of periodicals properly began with the *Wellesley Index*. Developed and produced by Walter Houghton and his associates in the 1960s, it was indeed "a blessed scholarly event" that made the study of periodicals much more feasible by not only collating articles printed in particular publications but also by providing attributions to anonymously-published articles and reviews.[72] The *Index* encouraged scholars to consider the context of each article within its periodical, which, in turn, led to the development of a historiography that Victorian and nineteenth-century historians have continued to expand.[73] There have been numerous works on specific aspects of society as understood and conveyed by the press, including periodicals, in the nineteenth century; gender, and science, in particular have received careful consideration.[74] As J. Don Vann and Rosemary T. VanArsdel have stated, "nineteenth-century Britain was uniquely the age of the periodical".[75] Interestingly, not one of the eighteen chapters in Don Vann and

---

[70] James Van Horn Melton, *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Chapter 3 (pages 81-122) considers 'Reading Publics', and the subsequent chapter (pages 123-159) 'Writing Publics'.

[71] See King, pp. 3-4, for the basis of the book's title.

[72] Robert A. Colby, Reviewed Work: 'The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, 1824-1900, Vol. I' by Walter E. Houghton, *Modern Philology*, 65.4 (May 1968), p. 412.

[73] Leslie Howsam, 'Mediated Histories: How Did Victorian Periodicals Parse the Past?', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 50.4 (Winter, 2017), pp. 805-06.

[74] For works on gender, see: Marianne Van Remoortel, *Women, Work and the Victorian Periodical: Living by the Press* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Alexis Easley, *First-Person Anonymous: Women Writers and Victorian Print Media, 1830-1870* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004); Kate Flint, *The Woman Reader, 1837-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993). For works on science, see: Geoffrey Cantor, Gowan Dawson, Graeme Gooday, Richard Noakes, Sally Shuttleworth, and Jonathan R. Topham (eds.), *Science in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical: Reading the Magazine of Nature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Geoffrey Cantor and Sally Shuttleworth (eds.), *Science Serialized: Representations of the Sciences in Nineteenth-Century Periodicals* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004); W. H. Brock, 'British Science Periodicals and Culture: 1820-1850', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 21.2 (Summer 1988), pp. 47-55 For class, see: Jonathan Rose, *The Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001).

[75] J. Don Vann and Rosemary T. VanArsdel, 'Introduction' in J. Don Vann and Rosemary T. VanArsdel (eds.), *Victorian Periodicals and Victorian Society* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1994), p. 6.

VanArsdel's edited volume is dedicated to religion. This is not altogether surprising, given the relative lack of focus on religion in studies of the nineteenth-century periodical press; however, as this thesis argues, that needs to be redressed.

Existing scholarship has recognised that the nineteenth century was the heyday of the periodical; as Joanne Shattock has noted, although a burgeoning newspaper press diminished the influence of quarterly reviews from the 1840s onwards, they remained an important component of nineteenth-century literature until the end of the century.[76] This has been reflected in the analysis of periodicals by historians. There has been a recognition that the "political, religious, and cultural identities of the proprietor and publisher" of a given periodical have become necessary considerations.[77] In a chapter published in 1982, Louis James declared that "useful work" had been done in establishing the religious orientation of particular titles, and that attention should instead have shifted to a "holistic" approach that would consider the overall tone and content of a given publication.[78] Seven years later, Laurel Brake and Anne Humphreys stated that historians studying periodicals had been "using more or less uncritically, selected parts of the Victorian periodical press as reflections of readership, attitudes, and responses".[79] They advocated a shift away from the focus on authorship towards the consideration of the periodical itself, as advocated by James; however, recent scholarship has often emphasised the quest to determine authorship of articles in periodicals, as opposed to considering the context of the periodicals.[80]

---

[76] Joanne Shattock, 'Quarterly Reviews' in Laurel Brake and Marysa Demoor (eds.), *Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland* (London: The British Library, 2009), p. 1471.
[77] Howsam, pp. 805-06.
[78] Louis James, 'The Trouble with Betsy: Periodicals and the Common Reader in mid-Nineteenth Century England' in Joanne Shattock and Michael Wolff (eds.), *The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and Soundings* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1982), p. 349.
[79] Laurel Brake and Anne Humphreys, 'Critical Theory and Periodical Research', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 22.3 (Fall, 1989), p. 94.
[80] Alexis Easley, Andrew King, and John Morton, 'Introduction: Researching the nineteenth-century periodical press: case studies' in Alexis Easley, Andrew King, and John Morton (eds.), *Researching the Nineteenth-Century Periodical Press: Case Studies* (London: Routledge, 2018), pp. 2-3.

This lack of attention to religion in secular periodicals could be because periodical studies, as a discipline, is still developing. In 1982, Shattock and Wolff deplored the current state of the field, in that it forced scholars to "be satisfied with a casual or glancing knowledge" of the field.[81] Curiously, in her *Politics and Reviewers*, published in 1989, Joanne Shattock stated that she would not consider what the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly* reviews had to say about specific issues as this had been dealt with "extensively elsewhere". While this may be true of the reviews' consideration of well-known poets and of certain political events, such a broad, far-reaching statement overstates the case.[82] Other historians continued to see potential in evaluating the content of periodicals. In 1990, Lyn Pykett was offering a well-considered overview of the potential approaches to the study of periodicals for up-and-coming students and future scholars, placing emphasis on textual analysis in order to open up the study of periodicals to interdisciplinary research and avoid formulaic methodological practices.[83] Fionnuala Dillane is of the view that Pykett's work challenged existing historical approaches that "interprets texts as individually created, singular expressions of beauty, balance, and proportion".[84]

While a periodical might be considered beautiful, perhaps by a proud editor if not their readership, they were, by design, not "singular expressions", neither in terms of content nor contributors. They were complex compositions, diverse collections of mostly anonymous content that scholars have devoted careers to

---

[81] Joanne Shattock and Michael Wolff, 'Introduction' in Shattock and Wolff (eds.), p. xiii.

[82] Joanne Shattock, *Politics and Reviewers: The Edinburgh and The Quarterly in the Early Victorian Age* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1989), p. vii. One of the works that Shattock cites as having "dealt with" the early years of the *Quarterly* is Hill and Helen Shine's *The Quarterly Review under Gifford: Identification of Contributors 1809-1824* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1949). Other than a twenty-page introduction, this volume is entirely devoted to attributing articles and reviews in the *Quarterly*; while there is some discussion of the range of topics considered by the publication in the book's introduction, it certainly could not be described as "extensive". The assertion that there was little to say about the content of nineteenth-century periodicals seems unsatisfactory today.

[83] Lyn Pykett, 'Reading the Periodical Press: Text and Context' in Laurel Brake, Aled Jones, and Lionel Madden (eds.), *Investigating Victorian Journalism* (London: Macmillan, 1990), p. 16.

[84] Fionnuala Dillane, 'Researching a Periodical Genre: Classifications, Codes, and Relational Terms' in Easley, King, and Morton (eds.), p. 78.

unmasking. Dillane has delineated the tendency to situate multi-authored periodicals, perceived as expressing set "imperatives" (religious, political, etc.) opposite individual works, and for the former to be deemed "less worthy of serious scholarly study" and "less worthy of cultural preservation".[85] When the "press" has been considered, this has often been post-1855, coinciding with the abolition of newspaper stamp duty in 1855 amid an increasingly literate population. Hannah Barker has made the case that even before this date, the newspaper press was the most important element in forming public opinion.[86]

During the nineteenth century, there was certainly an increase in magazines and newspapers catering to all manner of interests within a population much more literate than in 1800.[87] Despite this, the monthly and quarterly publications continued to be printed, and they maintained their influence up to the end of the period covered by this thesis and beyond, at least in some cases, primarily because they were not aimed at this nascent reading public, and never had been. Some scholarship has challenged the idea that the study of periodicals has been weighted too heavily at the start of the century. For Nicholas Mason and Tom Mole, it is the Romantic Period that has been neglected. Their perception is that the last seven decades of the nineteenth century have been overemphasised at the cost of the first three.[88] While such discussions of theory and emphasis are beyond the scope of this chapter, it is important to situate this consideration of five case studies within a broad and lively scholarship that still has much to discover.

Alexis Easley, Andrew King, and John Morton's two edited works, *The Routledge Handbook to Nineteenth-Century British Newspapers and Periodicals* (2016) and *Researching the Nineteenth-Century Periodical Press: Case Studies*

---

[85] *Ibid*
[86] Hannah Barker, *Newspapers, Politics, and English Society, 1695-1855* (London: Pearson, 2000), p. 1.
[87] John Feather, *A History of British Publishing* (Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1988), p. 164.
[88] Nicholas Mason and Tom Mole, 'Introduction' in Nicholas Mason and Tom Mole (eds.) *Romantic Periodicals in the Twenty-First Century: Eleven Case Studies from Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020), pp. 4-7.

(2018) are invaluable to scholars evaluating this area of study. The former work provides an overview of the state of the field, and the latter offers possible methodologies for the study of periodicals; both demonstrate what has been achieved in this field of study and what can be considered in future research.[89] Ecclesiastical topics are not prominent in these works; Lisa Peters' chapter on Welsh periodicals and newspapers is the only example of religion directly considered in the wider context of a specific article. The chapter on 'Periodicals and Religion', written by Mark Knight, addresses this lack of consideration. He asserts that some works have provided "useful context" regarding religion and the periodical press and that some scholars have used periodicals as sources for studies of religion in the nineteenth century. Although not mentioned by Knight, Doreen M. Rosman's *Evangelicals and Culture* is a good example of a work that utilises periodicals.[90] Knight opines that the death of Josef Altholz in 2003 has meant that "scholarship on Victorian periodicals has had some difficulty knowing what to do with religion".[91]

Even the journal dedicated to Victorian periodicals seems to struggle in this area; as Knight identifies in his chapter, The *Victorian Periodicals Review* occasionally publishes articles concerning religion, but these are relatively rare,

---

[89] Alexis Easley, Andrew King, and John Morton (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook to Nineteenth-Century British Newspapers and Periodicals* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016); Easley, King, and Morton (eds.), *Researching the Nineteenth-Century Periodical Press: Case Studies* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018). See the Introduction of the latter for the authors' overview of their aims and intentions.

[90] Doreen M. Rosman, *Evangelicals and Culture* (Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1984).

[91] Mark Knight, 'Periodicals and Religion' in Easley, King, and Morton (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook to Nineteenth-Century British Newspapers and Periodicals* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), pp. 357-358. Knight cites the following as examples of scholarship that provides "useful context" on religion: Felicity Jensz and Hannah Acke, *Missions and Media: The Politics of Missionary Periodicals in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag; 2013); Anthony McNicholas, *Politics, Religion and the Press: Irish Journalism in Mid-Victorian England* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007); David Cesnari, *The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841-1991* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). For works that use periodicals as sources for studies of religion, Knight cites the following: Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church* (2 volumes) (London: A&C Black, 1966 & 1970); Timothy Larsen, *A People of One Book: The Bible and the Victorians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); David Bebbington, *The Dominance of Evangelicalism: The Age of Spurgeon and Moody* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2005); Dennis Paz (ed.), *Nineteenth-Century English Religious Traditions: Retrospect and Prospect* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1995). Knight also acknowledges Louis Billington's 'The Religious Periodical and Newspaper Press, 1770–1870' in Michael Harris and Alan Lee (eds.), *The Press in English Society from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Centuries* (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1986) and Linda E. Connors and Mary Lu MacDonald's *National Identity in Great Britain and British North America, 1815-1851: The Role of Nineteenth-Century Periodicals* (London: Routledge, 2011).

given the frequency of the publication.[92] Knight highlights the fact that scholarship on print culture has often neglected religion. When it has been considered, it has frequently been mishandled or over-simplified due to scholars not knowing about the subject and not being able to interpret theological material that they encounter.[93] This has caused readers to misinterpret the nature of religion in the nineteenth century; as a result, according to Knight and Emma Mason, these readers "arguably tend to isolate religious questions from other apparently non-spiritual or material discourses." Separating "the sacred and the secular… is to demarcate religious space in a narrow and misleading manner."[94] The tendency for scholarship to avoid religion, or to misinterpret it when it is considered, has increased the problem further. Knight and Mason have shown that most people in the nineteenth century perceived culture to be "principally Christian"; this extended to the periodical press, as the second chapter will demonstrate.[95]

Section 3: Sacred and Profane Publishing

By 1815, periodical publishing was showing signs of becoming a burgeoning industry. While this was not an inevitability by this point, the immediate impact made by the *Edinburgh Review* and *Quarterly Review* hinted at the likelihood of this happening. As religion occupied a significant place in

---

[92] Knight, 'Periodicals and Religion', p. 357. Whether this apparent reticence is due to a lack of submissions regarding religion or an unwillingness on the part of the journal's editorial board to publish articles on religion is difficult to ascertain.

[93] *Ibid*. Regarding the term "print culture", it is used as per Jason McElligott and Eve Patten's definition: "A print culture can be said to exist when men and women from a range of backgrounds are used to seeing, reading, buying and borrowing print in a variety of social contexts. It exists when print is both commonplace and unexceptional, and when print is traded as a commodity within a market economy." James McElligott and Eve Patten, 'Introduction' in McElligott and Patten (eds.), *The Perils of Print Culture: Book, Print and Publishing History in Theory and Practice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), pp. 6-7. Print culture developed in England between 1815 and 1861, but it was certainly in existence at the start of this period.

[94] Mark Knight and Emma Mason, *Nineteenth-Century Religion and Literature: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 3.

[95] *Ibid*, p. 4.

social and cultural life in England, it was inevitable that it would form part of this nascent periodical culture. As this thesis will show, this was not limited to a "religious press"; rather, ecclesiastical issues became pivotal points of debate in the broader periodicals.[96] Chapter One will consider four religious periodicals that formed part of the religious periodicals section of the ecclesiastical public sphere. Two of these were High Church in their outlook: the *British Critic* and the *Christian Remembrancer*. The *British Critic*, founded in 1793, was a pivotal element of the anti-Jacobin press, and its establishment was a reaction to the French Revolution. It took a strong conservative line on politics and theology. In 1811, it came under the influence of the Hackney Phalanx, a group of High Church Tories that supported, and defended, Anglican orthodoxy.[97] The *British Critic* was the principal publication of this group, and it remained as such until the late 1830s, when the periodical was taken over by Oxford Movement figures, with John Henry Newman taking on the editorship in 1838.[98] Although it closed in 1843, its impact on the period up to that point was significant, and it continued to exert an influence even after its demise. Newman saw the *Critic* as being in alignment with the *Quarterly Review*, a case study in the second chapter, although the *Critic*'s target was primarily clergymen and those at university, as opposed to the *Quarterly's* broader audience.[99]

The *Christian Remembrancer* was perhaps overshadowed by its more illustrious – and controversial – High Church stablemate. Like the *Critic*, the

---

[96] A delineation could be made between the "religious" and "secular" presses, but one of the central arguments of this thesis is that these overlapped to a large degree, and therefore such a distinction risks distortion.
[97] For more on the Hackney Phalanx, see E. A. Varley, *The Last of the Prince Bishops: William Van Mildert and the High Church Movement of the Early Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
[98] The Tractarian takeover will be discussed below; see also S. A. Skinner, 'Newman, the Tractarians and the *British Critic'*, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 50.4 (October, 1999), pp. 716-59.
[99] Letter from J. H. Newman to J. R. Hope, January 31, 1840, published in Gerard Tracey (ed.), *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman, Volume VII: Editing the British Critic January 1839-December 1840* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 228-29. Newman's letter to Hope addressed the question of whether an article by the latter was to appear in the *Critic* or the *Quarterly*; Newman considered the decision to be Hope's to make, but the difference in the audiences between the two periodicals favoured the *Critic*, in Newman's opinion. Hope's article was on Tract LXXXVII, 'On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge', written by Isaac Williams. Hope would follow Newman to Rome, albeit six years later – he would convert along with Henry Manning, in 1851.

Remembrancer had a Tractarian editorial line for a time, from 1844, once James Mozley became the editor, but this only lasted until the resolution of the Gorham Controversy in 1850. For the majority of its existence, the Remembrancer took a line that might complement Tractarianism, but it generally espoused a non-Tractarian High Church viewpoint.[100] In its early years, it formed part of the expansion of religious publications in the early nineteenth century, and subsequently established itself to capitalise on the gap in High Church religious literature caused by the *Critic's* closure.[101]

The *Christian Observer* had a similar impact but from a Low Church perspective, becoming one of the most significant evangelical periodicals of the early- and mid-nineteenth century. The *Observer*, as a counterpoint to the *Critic* and the *Remembrancer*, reflects, in specific instances, the broader contestations between Church parties during the period being considered. All of these publications' audiences were primarily clerical, with some readership occurring at the universities, as Newman recognised. This meant their influence went beyond their subscription numbers, as extensive, in-depth articles on pertinent subjects supplied clergymen with talking points for their sermons and any writing they sought to undertake themselves. The *Critic*, *Remembrancer*, and *Observer*, and many other similar periodicals, provided context and intellectual reasoning on the great debates of the day, and supplied High or Low Churchmen with material to support their own endeavours.

---

[100] The *Remembrancer* was edited by Francis Garden and William Scott for much of its existence; the former allied himself to the Oxford Movement in his youth, but he moved towards a Broad Church position in later years. Scott remained connected to prominent Tractarians such as Keble and Pusey, but his position was one of conciliation, of finding a place for the Anglo-Catholic party among a broadly High Church understanding of Anglicanism. See William Scott, *A Letter to the Rev. Daniel Wilson, M.A., Vicar of Islington, Occasioned by His Recent "Appeal to the Evangelical Members of the Church of England"* (London: J & C. Mozley, 1850) for an example of this. Scott's position was certainly at least amenable to the Tractarians, as evidenced by the fact that James Mozley co-published the letter.

[101] The *British Critic* was replaced by the *English Review*, another High Church periodical published by Rivingtons, but its impact was negligible.

The *Remembrancer* and the *Observer* were selected in part because of their prominence, but also because they both survived beyond the end date of this present study. The final case study for the first chapter, the *Church of England Quarterly Review*, almost made it to the end, just missing out by three years as it closed down in 1858. Although it did not come into being until 1837, this meant it still lasted over twenty years. The *Church of England Quarterly Review* is a more obscure title than the others chosen, but it was included for two main reasons. Firstly, it is important to acknowledge that the religious periodical press was indeed vast, and that even towards the middle of the nineteenth century, churchmen perceived a need for new publications. Secondly, the *Church of England Quarterly* represented an early example of a religious periodical attempting to forge a path between High and Low Church. It is a valuable and overlooked source for assessing early delineations of what would come to be called the "Broad Church" movement, or at least as some method of establishing a tripartite system of Anglican church parties.

The second chapter will evaluate five periodicals that covered myriad topics, sometimes verging into the outright niche, but which maintained an interest in religious subjects throughout their existence. At least two of the five will be familiar to anyone with an interest in nineteenth-century periodical literature: the *Edinburgh Review* and its great rival, the *Quarterly Review*. Both have been pivotal aids to scholars who have focused on reviews and reviewing in the nineteenth century, but their role in shaping and reflecting discourse surrounding ecclesiastical subjects has not been emphasised as much as it should. Excepting Jonathan Cutmore's work, the religious dimension of the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly* has not been adequately analysed.[102] Indeed, Cutmore's PhD thesis was highly focused, centre on evangelicalism in both periodicals, along with *Fraser's Magazine*, another case study in the second chapter of this work; while

[102] Jonathan Cutmore, 'Saints, Prophets and Paternalists: Evangelicalism in the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews and Fraser's Magazine', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Toronto (1990).

this thesis does not examine these publications in as much detail, it does seek to add to Cutmore's recognition of a religious dimension to these publications. There was a contemporary recognition of this focus on religion; the American essayist Edwin Whipple noted, in 1851, that the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly* had "vehemently discussed… almost all systems of… theology" in their pages.[103]

Two more of the five case studies in Chapter Two had a religious dimension that warrants greater attention. *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country*, established in 1830 as a bastion of Tory High Church principles, constantly included ecclesiastical subjects among its varied topics of consideration.[104] It is also a fascinating example of the shifts in tone and perspective that a publication might undergo. Despite its early defences of the Established Church, by 1860 it was edited by James Anthony Froude, whose *Nemesis of Faith* caused a scandal upon publication in 1849, which included William Sewell burning a copy of it during a class at Exeter College.[105] Although Froude repudiated the novel in 1858, and never lost his faith, he remained outside of the Church of England after its publication. That somebody like Froude would be the editor of *Fraser's* would have been unthinkable not too many years prior to him taking on the role, and it illustrates why the periodical is such an interesting case study.

The *Gentleman's Magazine* was the eighteenth-century equivalent of the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly*, in that it was possibly the most famous example of periodical literature until it was usurped by the latter two. Despite this relative demotion, it retained an influence into the nineteenth century, and many of its contributions came from clergymen. Whereas the other periodicals considered in this chapter contained long and detailed articles, the *Gentleman's* prioritised shorter reviews and provided space for letters to the editor, who always went by

---

[103] Edwin P. Whipple, *Essays and Reviews, Volume II* (Boston: Ticknor, Reed, and Fields, 1851), p. 94.
[104] *Fraser's Magazine*, or simply *Fraser's*, will be used from this point onwards.
[105] Basil Willey, *More Nineteenth Century Studies: A Group of Honest Doubters* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1956), p. 131.

the pseudonym "Sylvanus Urban". The *Gentleman's* provides a fascinating counterpoint between this approach and that of the later periodicals, and applying this to the ecclesiastical public sphere opens up a rich area of study. The shift in style almost mirrors the changing nature of religious dialogue in the nineteenth century, reflecting the inadequacy of short, simple answers to problems as opposed to more detailed elaborations. As shall be demonstrated at the end of Chapter Four and the emergence of Charles Spurgeon, perhaps the pendulum was beginning to swing back towards the concise approach, at least in some quarters.

The final case study considered in Chapter Two is the *Eclectic Review*, which had the most porous boundary between ecclesiastical publication and a review akin to the *Quarterly*, *Edinburgh*, and *Fraser's*. As noted above, it has been included in this chapter due to its similarity in approach to the three cited, but its inclusion represents a broader point about religious affiliation being an aspect of all the case studies included in this chapter, even if the *Eclectic* was the most overt example. It was a crucial aspect of the Dissenting press, and it frequently set itself at odds with the Church of England on ecclesiastical matters (unsurprisingly), but this association with a religious "position" was shared with the other four periodicals considered, although in each of the other cases the nature of that association shifted over time, depending on ownership and the editorial direction. Chapter Two will explore this dimension of each of the publications evaluated, and it will explore how these shifting editorial directions affected the religious output.

This thesis will consider three formats of printed media widely available in the nineteenth century: periodicals, histories, and collections of sermons. The first two chapters are centred on periodicals – the first considers religious publications, the second those that neither took a specific denominational position nor focused the majority of its output on religious topics. This is why the *Eclectic Review* is included in the second chapter rather than the first. While its

ecclesiastical position was Nonconformist throughout its existence, there were extensive periods in which its content almost matched the likes of the *Edinburgh Review* and *Quarterly Review* in breadth, compared to the narrowly religious focus of the case studies included in the first chapter.

Section 4: Geographic Context and Rationale

Admittedly, these case studies operate in an English context, rather than covering the entire British paradigm. The *Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume II*, contains separate chapters on England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, and this work will follow that convention in asserting that each nation deserves to be considered separately for a project such as this. It would not be possible to expand the case studies to include their impact across Great Britain and Ireland, and the analysis of each case study, and, therefore, each chapter, is considered in an English context. Although the *Edinburgh Review* was based in Scotland, it formed an important part of the English public sphere in general and of the ecclesiastical public sphere in England, as this thesis will show.

The date range for this project is bookended by two significant dates for the Established Church: 1815 and the fall of Napoleon, viewed as the end of the French Revolution and the repudiation of anti-religious Enlightenment ideals; and 1861, when *Essays and Reviews* began to draw significant attention, its challenges to Biblical accuracy and Christian orthodoxy representing challenges to the Church of England, and Christianity itself, scarcely conceivable earlier in the century. The case studies selected for this thesis – religious periodicals, broader periodicals, histories, and sermons – will evaluate some of the theological and intellectual issues that contributed to this altered standing of the Church of England, while also considering how denominational and party contentions

affected this shift. While it is impossible to cover all that this encompasses, the case studies chosen, situated within this timeframe, will attempt to highlight some of the ways the ecclesiastical public sphere affected and reflected this shift, while simultaneously illustrating how religion was a pivotal aspect of the broader public sphere. It is hoped that this will serve as a basis for further research in due course.

Section 5: Histories and Sermons

Histories and sermons represent vital media that were intrinsic to the ecclesiastical public sphere. Of course, tracts, novels, poems, music, art, and indeed many other cultural artefacts contributed to it. Periodicals were chosen for this thesis as the nineteenth century was the heyday of the format, and the religious aspect of this still requires further study. Newspapers remain a rich source of information for historians, but they were not used in this project due to the necessary brevity of their contents and the consequent (relative) lack of intellectual contribution to the ecclesiastical public sphere. Histories were chosen for a similar reason to periodicals, in that the nineteenth century witnessed the professionalisation of the discipline, and ecclesiastical history, as a prominent and popular subsection, was compelled to develop in accordance with this broader sophistication.

Sermons were selected partly because they were very popular in the nineteenth century, but also because they represent something of a bridge between the narrowly intellectual public sphere and the broader, less demanding sphere that did not require the learning that periodicals and histories typically did. Sermons could be high-minded, especially if written for university audiences, but those for parish congregations needed to be intelligible to all present, at least if they were to be as efficient as possible. Sermons were a crucial element in

supplying the numinous to the numerous, and their role in disseminating "appropriate" moral teaching was significant. It is also important to note that sermons could also be submitted in support of applications for preferments; as a result, the need for the writer to be in accord with the examiners provided an institutional basis to ensure that the content of the sermons was sound.

Alongside the selected periodicals, Chapter Three will consider five ecclesiastical histories written during the years 1815-1861, representing three general trends in ecclesiastical history writing during this period, through the polemical style before 1829, to a transitional phase during the time of the Oxford Movement, moving towards a more "academic" approach towards the end of the period. Chapter Four will evaluate five collections of sermons as representative of the chosen individuals' perspectives on contemporaneous religious issues, and their views as to what their congregations, and the wider nation, needed to hear.

In the case of histories, James Kirby has recognised that history had diminished in importance to Anglicans by the early nineteenth century, but "the Oxford Movement (and to a lesser extent liberal theology) restored it to its former glory from the 1830s".[106] For Kirby, the effects of this renewed interest became manifest towards the end of the nineteenth century, which is why his study begins in 1870. However, the years prior must also be considered regarding the increasing sophistication of ecclesiastical history. Even if this period before 1870 was developmental, it was still crucial. The creation of the Regius Professorship of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Oxford in 1842 was clear evidence of a desire to raise the study of ecclesiastical history to an academic level. The first holder of the chair, Robert Hussey, was "not a party man", which probably made him at least a tolerable choice for most of his colleagues, and indeed

[106] James Kirby, *Historians and the Church of England: Religion and Historical Scholarship, 1870-1920* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 9.

individuals and parties outside of the university.[107] Denominational politicking was never far away from any such decisions, after all.

The post at Oxford represented a turning point in ecclesiastical history becoming a professional discipline in its own right, although it did not mark the summation of that process. Indeed, Hussey continued to combine his professorship with clerical duties, and collections of his sermons were published along with his historical studies. Gordon Rupp cites R. W. Dixon, who published his *History of the Church of England* in 1887, as writing at a turning point in the development of ecclesiastical historiography; Nixon was one of the last enthusiastic amateurs, soon to be sidelined by the professionals honing their craft.[108] For Duncan Forbes, "Liberal Anglicanism", which he views as being dominant in the first half of the nineteenth century and still influential afterwards, influenced not just ecclesiastical history but the entire field. They were "pioneers in England of the historical movement proper" - thus, even if they were "amateurs", their theories and practices shaped the discipline as it became more refined in later years.[109]

The third chapter of this thesis will begin with an introductory essay on the development of the study of history in the nineteenth century, and the place of ecclesiastical history as part of it. This will provide the necessary context for the evaluation of the five case studies included in the chapter, and an overview of the historiography on nineteenth-century history-writing. This will have the dual effect of situating the five case studies within the context of history as a discipline in the nineteenth century, and in positioning the analysis of them within existing

---

[107] William Alexander Greenhill, 'Hussey, Robert', *The Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1900*, viewed online via https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Dictionary_of_National_Biography,_1885-1900/Hussey,_Robert [accessed 18 June 2025].
[108] Gordon Rupp, 'The Victorian Churchman as Historian: A Reconsideration of R. W. Dixon's *History of the Church of England*' in G. V. Bennett & J. D. Walsh (eds.), *Essays in Modern English Church History: In Memory of Norman Sykes* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 211.
[109] Duncan Forbes, *The Liberal Anglican Idea of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), p. 142.

studies of the pursuit of history during the years 1815-61. Such an approach is comparable to that taken by A. Dwight Culler in his *The Victorian Mirror of History*; Culler also uses specific examples to evaluate conceptions of historical understanding, although this thesis seeks to locate its case studies within the broader context of the ecclesiastical public sphere.[110]

Biblical criticism did not really take off in England until the end of the period with the publication of *Essays and Reviews* in 1860, so it does not factor into this thesis. However, the process of making ecclesiastical history more "academic" prepared some ground, at least, for the discussions surrounding the historical reliability of the Bible. Such questions were not unknown in England prior to *Essays and Reviews*, but the answers typically amounted to restatements of Biblical accuracy. By the time these were no longer sufficient, historians had some experience of conceiving Christian history in different ways, even if they had not needed to confront Strauss head-on.[111]

This chapter will assess five works of history by five writers active during the period under consideration. None of them was solely a historian; each took an interest in history as an aspect of being a "man of letters", or they combined their historical studies with their clerical duties.[112] This reflects a pre-professional approach to history, or at least an acceptance that one did not have to specialise in the discipline, much less in a specific period or area of study, to write on the subject. There was a perception in mid-Victorian England that History, as a

---

[110] A. Dwight Culler, *The Victorian Mirror of History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

[111] For Strauss and the impact of his work, see Horton Harris, *David Friedrich Strauss and his Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973). Strauss's *Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet* (1835) was first translated into English by George Eliot in 1846. The *English Review* sounded an alarm over the work potentially appealing to an appetite for "religious novelty" in England, but Strauss's work certainly did not have anything like the impact of *Essays and Reviews*.

[112] T. W. Heyck has noted that the term "men of letters" was frequently used to "denote those who gave symbolic interpretation to experience". For Heyck, "men of letters" shared moral and social concerns with the middle classes, and this remained the case until the expansion of research positions at universities in the 1860s and 1870s. Subsequently, such men became "intellectuals", disconnected from shared class experience by their expertise and their specific focus(es). For a thorough assessment of this development, see T. W. Heyck, 'From Men of Letters to Intellectuals: The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Nineteenth-Century England', *Journal of British Studies*, 20.1 (Autumn, 1980), pp. 158-83. The quote referred to above is from page 158.

subject to be studied, was more suitable for girls, who generally, some important and notable exceptions aside, were not destined to contribute to academic debates. If Victorian England was still enchained to the rigid distinctions of things being either "manly" or "unmanly", History appeared to be a candidate for the latter. Indeed, it has been speculated that girls were more likely to take History at school. Outdated conjectures regarding the gendered segregation of studying History as a school subject aside, it is sufficient to state that, while the study of history was not an intellectual free-for-all, it had not undergone a serious and sustained process of "disciplinisation" by the 1860s.

Despite this, approaches to the subject did indeed shift, and the third chapter of this thesis will evaluate the five case studies as examples of differing approaches to history writing in the nineteenth century. Of course, this is not to say that every work of history written in the second half of the century was more academically rigorous than that which had preceded it – denominational polemics were still being written in the field of ecclesiastical history. Rather, it is the chapter's aim to highlight changing approaches to writing ecclesiastical history across the period in question, and to situate these specific examples as indicators of a refinement in approach taken by history writers attuned to the shifting intellectual winds in the mid-nineteenth century.

To achieve this, the chapter will first assess two examples of the "typical" approach to ecclesiastical history, written by Robert Southey and Henry Soames. Robert Southey was one of the most well-known writers of his day, the incumbent Poet Laureate who deserved the title on the strength of his prodigious output of material, if not, perhaps, for the quality. Other than poetry, Southey contributed numerous articles for a variety of publications, most notably the *Quarterly Review*, with which he was associated from its creation in 1809. A noted biographer of prominent figures, including Nelson, Oliver Cromwell, and John Bunyan, Southey's work as a historian, and particularly as a historian of religion,

has not received as much attention. For Southey, the Established Church was central to conceptions of "Englishness", and his work reflects that central tenet.

Henry Soames, a clergyman and historian, shared an anti-Catholic outlook with Southey, and both took this as the starting point for their historical studies. As will be expounded upon in the chapter, this reflected a general, although not universal, perspective among clergymen and laymen in England in the early period of this study. While Southey was the famous figure battling to save the Established Church, and using his profile and abilities to do so, Soames represented the curiously-minded clergyman seeking to preserve the institution he had dedicated his life to from any challenges to its hegemonic status. This relative intransigence perhaps represented the dying embers of the *ancien regime* as per Clark, whereby appeals to historical legitimacy and the demonisation of traditional foes were no longer sufficient to satiate the intellectual curiosity of the nation. It is useful to consider the examples of Southey and Soames as indicators of where the dial was in the aftermath of Waterloo, and how far it had moved by the time of the reforms in the late 1820s and early 1830s.

Although a work similar in tone to Southey's and Soames's, Henry Stebbing's *History of the Reformation* was an attempt to refine the art of history writing, and to combine a greater intellectual flair with virulent anti-Catholicism. As shall be demonstrated, he succeeded in the latter, but he was not wholly successful in terms of the former. Despite this, Stebbing's work can be viewed as something of a turning point in approaches to ecclesiastical history, as it made use of comparative studies and attempted to situate European Reformations within their own contexts. There are incidents of moderation and consideration for non-Church of England viewpoints in Stebbing's work, which compare favourably to Southey and Soames, although there is still much room for vitriol. Essentially, Stebbing's work represents the confused state of the Anglican conception of history, trying to walk the line between rigidly defending the

Established Church and engaging in the intellectual curiosity required to produce more sophisticated history writing.

Frederick Denison Maurice and Robert Hussey both provide examples of this increased sophistication in ecclesiastical history. This is not to suggest that their understanding of religion was any more valid than that of the others included in this chapter – the relative merits are not its focal point. Rather, it is to suggest that ecclesiastical history writing had developed, in both manner and approach, over the period considered in this thesis, and that Maurice and Hussey represent two instances of this improvement in the craft. While Hussey might have been a safe choice as the first Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Oxford, he was also a capable one, and his published works illuminate the breadth of learning that underpinned his scholarship, as well as his theology.

Maurice is best known for his contributions to the development of Christian Socialism, but his appreciation for, and utilisation of, historical material formed an important aspect of his understanding of Christianity. Both Hussey and Maurice agreed with their fellow case studies in this chapter that Roman Catholicism had had a deleterious effect on the faith – anti-Catholicism is the theme which links them all within the context of ecclesiastical history writing. Where Hussey and Maurice differ from the rest is in their understanding and application of an analytical approach to history writing that mirrored the developments in the discipline during the mid-nineteenth century. Both recognised that the old wine was not for the new skins, and that Anglicans had to learn to enjoy the new wine if they wanted to be taken seriously at the party.

The third chapter will, therefore, attempt to chart these changes in approach across the five case studies, which will be contextualised by an introductory essay on the development of history writing during the years under consideration. By evaluating these five authors' differing approaches to ecclesiastical history writing, the chapter will show that anti-Catholic sentiments were qualified and

moderated by the increasingly academic approaches to the subject. Thus, the ecclesiastical public sphere was intrinsically linked to changing intellectual ideals, and its output was modified and moderated by these shifting patterns.

The final chapter, on sermons, will consider selected compilations from five clergymen whose approaches to framing Christianity as an intelligible phenomenon for their audiences varied widely. While not intended to provide a comprehensive survey of the vast array of theologies being preached from 1815-61, they do offer some insight into the methodologies by which clergymen sought to get their message across. The chapter will provide an overview of each case study's background and ecclesiastical position, which will aid the reader in contextualising each one's output of sermons, which will be discussed in the second section. The final part of the chapter will give a brief summary of the value of these collected volumes of sermons, considering their impact as printed materials alongside the notion of the sermon as a spoken medium.

The value of printed collections of sermons was that their purpose was multi-faceted; they could form part of household worship, and reviews of sermons often referred to the favourability of a clergyman's sermons to be read in sitting rooms across the country. A sermon given in situ, at a place of worship, might reach into the local community if certain individuals were not present at a Sunday service and were informed of the most recent sermon by attendees. A printed collection of sermons could impact readers far beyond the boundaries of the parish, especially if recommended by a periodical or other publication taken by the household. The positive influence of collected sermons had the potential to go beyond the lay community; for clergymen writing their own sermons, the example of a talented colleague might prove helpful if divine inspiration was not forthcoming. This is not to suggest that plagiarism was rampant – this would be pure speculation, and there is no basis for assuming this to be the case. Rather, it is feasible – and more grounded speculation, perhaps – that certain themes and

approaches might serve as useful starting points for readers from the clergy to construct their own homilies.

However, the final chapter will not focus on these conjectures. Instead, it will assess the content of selected examples from each author's sermons, evaluating the theology that inspired them and which underpinned the messaging present in the sermons. Doing so will demonstrate the role that sermons played in the ecclesiastical public sphere, as a means of conveying each individual's ideas to a broader audience than would have read periodicals and ecclesiastical histories. Of course, the case studies selected in this chapter are not comprehensive in terms of the five chosen case studies' output over the course of their lives; the purpose of this chapter is not to survey a given clergyman's theological journey, so to speak. The collections used are intended to situate the views of prominent clerical figures within the broad, multi-faceted ecclesiastical debates and disputes occurring during the period under consideration, and to evaluate their role in shaping, and reacting to, these issues.

The second part of the chapter will group the case studies into two pairs and one individual analysis. The reasoning behind this is that two of the individuals whose work is assessed are associated with the nascent "Broad Church" movement. Although one of these, Thomas Arnold, passed away before the term was first used, his ecclesiology took a latitudinarian perspective that could certainly be considered "Broad Church". Comparing the works of Arnold and Charles Kingsley provides an opportunity to explore the methods by which this development of the latitudinarian idea of a "middle way" between High and Low Church theologies found expression in the sermons of these two. A second section in this chapter will consider the sermons of John Keble and Henry Manning, two High Church clergymen associated with the Oxford Movement but whose ecclesiastical paths diverged drastically in the 1840s, with Manning eventually following John Henry Newman to Rome while Keble remained within

the Anglican fold. The final part of the chapter will consider the Baptist minister Charles Spurgeon. While there is not an evangelical case study in this chapter, Spurgeon's focus on Biblical literalism and his call to return to the basics of Protestant tradition resonate with modern evangelicalism as it is frequently understood, in the mould of Billy Graham.[113] Viewing Spurgeon as a prototype for Graham might be an oversimplification, but there are certainly points of comparison between them. The chapter will conclude with some observations on sermons as oral and printed materials.

Summary

This thesis, using the targeted case studies in the areas of religious periodicals, "broader" periodicals, ecclesiastical histories, and sermons, will demonstrate the variety, interactivity, and vibrancy of the ecclesiastical public sphere in the years 1815-1861. It did not operate in isolation from the profane elements of the broader public sphere - it was an integral aspect of it. It not only reflected intellectual discourse but shaped it, and therefore the ecclesiastical public sphere aids understanding not only of Christianity in England in the mid-nineteenth century but of the nation's cultural milieu during these years.

[113] For an example of evangelical preaching in the nineteenth century, see James M. Houston (ed.), *Evangelical Preaching: An Anthology of Sermons by Charles Simeon* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2003).

Chapter 1: "Religious" Publications

Introduction

As demonstrated above, the nineteenth century was overtly religious. "Probably in no other century, except the seventeenth, did the claims of religion occupy so large a part in the nation's life, or did men speaking in the name of religion contrive to exercise so much power."[114] It also witnessed the establishment of the periodical press as a vital method of conveying information, on all subjects, to a dedicated and growing readership.[115] Given these dual phenomena, it is no surprise that the religious press flourished in the nineteenth century. Altholz has illustrated the diversity of religious publications that were available: a broad range of denominational periodicals were published, and some targeted a specific class, age, or interest.[116] Walsh and Taylor have cited the unifying effect of church periodicals, and their ability to "give a sense of kinship to readers scattered across the country."[117]

Religious periodicals were therefore critical in the process and development of "imagining and participating in competing versions of a British Christian community", as Joshua King has put it.[118] Periodicals acted as a focal point for intellectual development among these disjointed communities, and enabled provincial and parochial readers to participate in this process; moreover, publications could assert themselves as arbiters and propagators of orthodoxy

---

[114] George Kitson Clark, The Making of Victorian England (London: Methuen, 1962), p. 20
[115] Josef Altholz, *The Religious Press in Britain, 1760-1900* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1989), p. 1.
[116] *Ibid*; see pp. 181-201 for a comprehensive index of the periodicals catalogued by Altholz.
[117] John Walsh and Stephen Taylor, 'Introduction: The Church and Anglicanism in the 'Long' Eighteenth Century' in John Walsh, Colin Haydon and Stephen Taylor (eds.), *The Church of England c.1689-c.1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 51.
[118] Joshua King, *Imagined Spiritual Communities in Britain's Age of Print* (Ohio: Ohio State Press, 2015), p. 2.

along distinct denominational or theological lines, instructing their readerships to take defined positions on specific issues and giving them the intellectual ammo necessary to proselytise to their own local audiences, should they have the ability or inclination to do so.

The dissemination of "correct" opinion, and the need for this to take place across the country, was fostered by the contested nature of the ecclesiastical public sphere. This breadth of perspective was very much in evidence in 1815, and it broadened across the nineteenth century; so, too, was the divisive nature of diverse religious thought playing out in the public sphere. In one of his Bampton Lectures on *The Truth and Consistency of Divine Revelation* in 1811, the author and educator John Bidlake remarked upon the tendency for difference of opinion regarding religion to produce "bitter animosity", and that the proliferation of such feeling could lead even well-tempered individuals away from reasoned consideration of sacred matters.[119] This was, as Bidlake was keenly aware, nothing new – contestation of "correct" Christian doctrine is almost as old as the religion itself. What shifted in the nineteenth century was more readily available access to the public sphere, and the potential for such animosity, or indeed less charged forms of critique, to find expression in the pages of the burgeoning periodical press. An enlarged public sphere brought both opportunity and risk: there were more readers to target, but periodicals espousing errant opinions and, even worse, incorrect doctrine, also had access to this increased readership. The battle for hearts, minds, and souls was increasingly being waged in numerous pages of tracts, pamphlets, newspapers, and all manner of printed media; the value of periodicals was their ability to digest, synthesise, evaluate, and offer comment on this vast array of material, and to analyse it from a given theological perspective for those periodicals that were primarily, or indeed overtly, religious.

---

[119] John Bidlake, *The Truth and Consistency of Divine Revelation, With Some Remarks on the Contrary Extremes of Infidelity and Enthusiasm, in Eight Discourses Delivered Before the University of Oxford,* Second Edition (London: Richard Rees, 1813), pp. 200-02.

As Altholz has shown, the religious press was vast and varied, and to summarise it in its entirety would be to re-skin old wine, having also soured the product by attempting to do in a chapter what Altholz did in a monograph. Given the prominence of Tractarianism in this thesis and its connection to High Church Anglicanism, there are two periodicals with High Church affiliations. This is not to suggest that publications from other parties or denominations were irrelevant; regrettably, there is not the space to do them justice in a chapter which seeks to chart the development of the chosen periodicals over the period under consideration. As Tractarianism was central to ecclesiastical debates in the mid-nineteenth century, this chapter will focus on a number of periodicals that attempted to define High Church Anglicanism along Tractarian, or anti-Tractarian, lines.

This chapter will engage in a detailed analysis of four "religious" periodicals from the period under consideration: the *British Critic*, the *Christian Observer*, the *Christian Remembrancer*, and the *Church of England Quarterly Review*. Two of these span the entirety of the period studied, the *Christian Observer* and the *Christian Remembrancer*. However, each of the four offers valuable insights into the perspectives of different theological factions within Anglicanism. The *British Critic* and *Christian Remembrancer* were both High Church periodicals, the former a well-known and influential publication by 1815, the latter coming into being through the auspices of the same group, the Hackney Phalanx, as another weapon in the High Church's intellectual armoury.

Having two High Church periodicals in a chapter of only four case studies might seem excessive, but the maintenance of a High Church presence throughout the period needed to be reflected in the choice of case studies. The *Critic* expired in 1843, and its successor, *The English Review*, was too wedded to pre-Tractarian High Church theology to be viable in a saturated print market.[120] The

[120] Altholz (1989), p. 26. The *English Review* began in 1844 but only lasted until 1853.

Remembrancer, as a more general High Church periodical, at least maintained its appeal to clergymen until the 1860s. The *Christian Observer* was the "principal organ" of the Anglican evangelicals, and offered a counterpoint to the High Church periodicals, not infrequently sparring with them in its pages.[121] Like many of its contemporaries, it engaged in literary analysis and considered a wide array of topics, but religious content was its staple fare. The *Eclectic Review* "transcended the usual limitations of religious journalism", the *Observer* did not, hence why the former is not included in this chapter.[122]

The final case study, the *Church of England Quarterly Review*, did not come into being until 1837, lasted until 1858, and did not gain the recognition of the other periodicals considered in this chapter. Its value is as a typical Church of England periodical of the middle nineteenth century; the scant historiographical trace it has left behind reflects that it was not a significant publication in its day, but the fact that it lasted for over twenty years means that it was serving some purpose. Its readership was almost certainly overwhelmingly from the clergy, and the transmission of ideas among these clergymen represents an example of one of the wider arguments of this thesis: that such publications comprised and contributed to the ecclesiastical public sphere, and it should not be dismissed when considering this notion. Although the *Church of England Quarterly Review* may not have had a large readership, William Gladstone made it part of his voracious reading, referring to articles of interest in his diaries.[123] Charlotte Brontë read the publication on at least one occasion, although that might have

---

[121] Altholz (1989), p. 16.
[122] *Ibid*, p. 58. As noted in the Introduction, this thesis considers the *Eclectic Review* to have been, on the whole, a purveyor of "journalism" that was often religious, rather than a religious periodical that had a wide remit.
[123] See M. R. D. Foot and H. C. G. Matthew (eds.), *The Gladstone Diaries: Volume III, 1840-1847* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), *passim*. Gladstone wrote to the editor of the *Church of England Quarterly Review*, Henry Christmas, in 1841 – see p. 151 for a reference to this.

been the only time she took the periodical, given that it negatively reviewed her novel *Shirley*.[124]

Part One: The Origins and Theologies of the Selected Case Studies, 1815-32

The *British Critic* was founded in 1793, on High Church and High Tory principles, in response to troubling developments in the course of the French Revolution. Wedded to Church and State principles, the *Critic's* "ideological rationale" was indeed self-evident", as Skinner has observed.[125] The very first issue highlights religion and politics as the 'two great topics', and that literature that attacks Church and State, in its current form in Britain (in 1793) is 'the evil that so much demands a remedy'.[126] Its line was indeed "obviously political", as Antonia Forster states, and the *Critic* was one of the key drivers of greater political engagement encouraged by periodicals that Forster has observed.[127]

That its political identity was inexorably tied to its religious stance is just as clear, and "proper" religious understanding contextualised its interpretation and analysis of events. It was directly tied to the Hackney Phalanx, which embodied this marriage of Tory politics and "Conservative" theology, as well as creating mutually beneficial networks for its members.[128] The Phalanx believed

---

[124] Clement K. Shorter, *Charlotte Brontë and Her Circle* (Cambridge, Mass: John Wilson and Son, 1896), p. 205.
[125] S. A. Skinner, *Tractarians and the 'Condition of England': The Social and Political Thought of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2004), p. 34.
[126] 'Prospectus', *British Critic,* Volume I (1793), p. 1.
[127] Antonia Forster, 'Book Reviewing' in Michael F. Suarez and Michael L. Turner (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume V, 1695-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 641. John O. Hayden correctly points out that there was "nothing political" in the preface to the first volume of the *Critic*, but the adherence to Tory principles was made abundantly clear early on in the pages of the *Critic*. See John O. Hayden, *The Romantic Reviewers, 1802-1824* (Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited, 1969), p. 44.
[128] Robert Bud, *Applied Science: Knowledge, Modernity, and Britain's Public Realm* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024), p. 25.

the Church should consecrate the State, to use Houghton and Altholz's expression, and the *Critic* became a means of doing so.[129] Skinner's contention that the *Critic*, like its contemporaries the *Sun* and the *True Briton*, was "probably founded at least partly out of government funds", illustrates that the Pittite government viewed a High Church, Tory publication as a useful accessory.[130] The *True Briton* and *Sun* were daily newspapers, and the *British Critic* the sole monthly, responsible for detailed analyses of cultural, political, and theological topics. The *Critic*, along with the two newspapers cited, "midwifed the revival of a right-wing mentality in the English press in the 1790s", according to Sack, and it maintained this perspective until the start of the period considered in this thesis.[131] The revival might have been detrimental to the *Critic's* sales, which lessened from 3,500 per issue in 1797 to 2,000 in 1807.[132] Despite this, its dramatic finale as a Tractarian organ would demonstrate that it retained an influence into the nineteenth century.

The *Critic* was a monthly publication until 1825, when it became a quarterly. Esther Rhoades Houghton and Josef Altholz have speculated that the main reason for the shift was to refocus the magazine on ecclesiastical issues, to

---

[129] Esther Rhoades Houghton and Josef L. Altholz, 'The "British Critic", 1824-1843', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 24.3 (Fall, 1991), p. 111.
[130] S. A. Skinner, 'The British Critic: Newman and Mozley, Oakeley and Ward' in Stewart J. Brown, Peter B. Nockles and James Pereiro (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 290.
[131] James J. Sack, *From Jacobite to Conservative: Reaction and Orthodoxy in Britain, c. 1760-1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 13. For more on the "right-wing press" in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, see pp. 8-29 of Sack's work.
[132] C. Y. Ferdinand, 'Newspapers and the sale of books in the provinces' in Suarez and Turner (eds.), p. 442, for the 1797 figure. The *Monthly Magazine* cites the figure for 1807; it is contained in a prefatory note to the American edition of the November 1815 issue, in which the *Monthly Magazine* compares its sales of 5,000 a month favourably to its rivals, including the *Critic*. The *Monthly Magazine* was considered for this thesis, especially given its Dissenting and Unitarian background, and its high number of contributors affiliated with such positions. Unfortunately, it had rather run out of steam by 1826, its appearance and character being comparable to many of its contemporaries, and it therefore lost out to the *Eclectic* in chapter 2 as a wide-ranging periodical from a Dissenting background. It ended in 1843, as did the *Critic*, but the latter's association with the Oxford Movement and its continual presence as a bastion of High Church and Tory principles, until the Tractarian takeover, led to its inclusion in this chapter. The *Monthly Magazine* is certainly a periodical worthy of more attention than it has received, however. For a brief overview, see Kenneth Curry, 'The Monthly Magazine' in Alvin Sullivan (ed.), *British Literary Magazines: The Romantic Age, 1789-1836* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1983), pp. 314-319, and Geoffrey Carnall, 'The *Monthly Magazine*', *The Review of English Studies*, 5.18 (April, 1954), pp. 158-64.

counter criticism that the magazine's mixture of topics had become "frivolous".[133] The *Critic* itself opined that becoming a quarterly would enable it to devote "more time for deliberation and enquiry" to its subjects, to improve the quality of its attempts to produce "a *Review* undertaken and conducted upon British principles and for British objects".[134] Houghton and Altholz assert that the shift occurred due to a break with the publication's publisher and the formation of a short-lived rival, the *Quarterly Theological Review*, in 1824. The split did not work out for either the *Critic* or the *Review*, and the two merged in 1827. Marvin O'Connell has suggested that the move to quarterly publishing, with a more strictly theological scope, was due to the *Critic's* inability to compete with publications such as the *Eclectic Review* for writers on non-theological topics.[135]

This re-issuing of the publication with a prevalent theological focus meant that it had come full circle. Initially, the *Critic* was centred on ecclesiastical topics, much like its contemporary, the *Anti-Jacobin Review*. The Critic was infused with a Tory ideology, although Peter Nockles has stated that "High Church theological themes… subservient to Tory political concerns" were only prevalent in the 'early' period of the *British Critic*.[136] This is, generally, a fair point, but an interesting discussion emerges from this in terms of religious subjects influencing and shaping political discourse in Britain in the years after the Napoleonic Wars, rather than the Church of England acting as a vehicle for 'traditional' Toryism. The *British Critic* retained its High Church perspective – such was the appeal for the Oxford Movement to assume control of it in 1837, despite the publication's parlous financial situation. This will be discussed in more detail below. It was the subservience to Tory concerns that did indeed appear to shift, but that is not to state that the magazine became apolitical post-1815.

---

[133] Rhoades Houghton and Altholz, p. 111.
[134] 'Preface', *British Critic*, Series 3, Volume I (1825), p. v.
[135] Marvin O'Connell, *The Oxford Conspirators: A History of the Oxford Movement, 1833-1845* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1991), p. 270.
[136] Peter Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 271.

Rather, the *Critic* took the position that the Church of England needed to speak for itself and to guide the nation away from creating political scenarios that would damage the Church as an institution.

The establishment of the *Christian Remembrancer* in 1819 sought to provide further defence of traditional Anglicanism and was set up for that purpose. As per its first issue, the aim of the publication was:

> To strengthen and dictate the influence of religion; to demonstrate the authenticity of revelation; to discover and point out the manoeuvres of scepticism; to trace certain sentiments up to their source; to explain the connexion and tendency of principles, which appear harmless until they are united; to prove, that even now they are disseminated with a proselyting zeal, and that, contemptible as they may be thought, they are still able to do mischief.[137]

The founder of the *Remembrancer* was Frederick Iremonger, about whom not much is known, other than that he was a prebendary canon of Winchester Cathedral from 1818 until his death in 1820.[138] Iremonger was encouraged to start the publication by Joshua Watson and Henry Handley Norris, two influential members of the Hackney Phalanx that had also been instrumental in the founding of the National Society for the Education of the Poor in 1811. According to Norris, the country clergy were too focused on such peculiarities as could be found in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, such as "what becomes of swallows in winter", and they needed theological nourishment.[139] The Hackney Phalanx was

---

[137] 'Introduction', *Christian Remembrancer*, Volume I (1819), p. 1.
[138] This is confirmed by the memoir of Joshua Watson, which notes that Frederick Iremonger gave "his eminent services in the cause of Christian education", and that he was placed on the list of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. His tomb is in the crypt, and a monument to him is located in the northern transept.
[139] Churton (ed.), p. 156.

a group of Anglican High Churchmen that were primarily based in London, though 'Hackney Phalanx' was not used by the members themselves. According to Mark Smith, the group's remit was as follows:

> The interests of the phalanx were not limited simply to measures designed to shore up the theological and political defences of the church. They also engaged in a series of initiatives designed to render it more capable of meeting the challenges of the nineteenth century and in doing so they sought to realize their ideal of the church acting as a whole in its corporate capacity.[140]

The activities of this group, with the intention of realising the aims stated above, were often covered by the *Remembrancer*, as well as the *British Critic*, which was founded by Watson and Norris. This encouragement to establish another High Church periodical is interesting, given that it could have potentially lessened the readership of the *Critic*. Watson and Norris, however, saw the opportunity for a complementary publication that would:

> Assist the studies of the clergy, by furnishing literary notices of books, essays of a critical character, chapters of ecclesiastical history and biography, and selections from devotional writers.[141]

---

[140] Mark Smith, 'Hackney Phalanx', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-52465, [accessed 18 June 2025].
[141] Churton, p. 156.

The *Critic* contained these aspects too, though it was more overtly political, and it is eminently plausible that Watson and Norris saw the *Remembrancer* as a space to illustrate what the clergy, and religiously-minded laymen, should be consuming in order to support and engage in the political writings found in the *Critic*.

The *Critic* and the *Remembrancer* both sought to appeal to High Church Anglicans by presenting articles and reviews that suggested traditional Christianity was under threat, and both aimed to provide counters to these perceived menaces within their pages. There are no surviving publisher's records for the *Remembrancer*, so inferences about the publication's origins and purpose must be made with great care.[142] That being said, the publication declared itself to be a bulwark against increasing challenges to traditional English Anglicanism. As a result, the origins of the *Christian Remembrancer* and its context as both an addition to, and offshoot of, the *Critic*, must be foregrounded.

The *Remembrancer* saw itself as another lance in the battle for Christianity, and it sought to both complement the older publication as well as occupy intellectual spaces that the *Critic* had not managed to penetrate in its 26-year history. As Watson and Norris had purchased the *Critic* only five years prior to the inception of the *Remembrancer*, in 1814, and were so influential in the latter's founding, there must have been compelling reasons for them to encourage Iremonger to establish the newer periodical.[143]

That the *Critic* was seldom profitable, and had to be sustained by Watson's generosity, indicates that the main reason was not financial gain.[144] Perhaps Watson, Norris and Iremonger took the stance that defending Anglicanism, as

---

[142] Ellen Jordan, Hugh Craig, and Alexis Antonia, 'The Brontë Sisters and the *Christian Remembrancer*: A Pilot Study in the Use of the "Burrows Method" to Identify the Authorship of Unsigned Articles in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical Press', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 39.1 (Spring 2006), p. 23, assert this lack of records.
[143] Altholz (1989), p. 24.
[144] *Ibid.*

they saw it, was more important than being financially viable, at least in the short term. They might have calculated that if ecclesiastical periodicals appeared to be blossoming, it would indeed bring financial rewards, primarily for the two key innovators, the *Critic* and *Remembrancer*. This is speculation, but it must be kept in mind that the *Remembrancer* operated in much of the same space as the *Critic*, and that this parallel would continue even in the Tractarian period of the 1830s and 1840s.

In contrast, the *Christian Observer* was the "principal organ of the Anglican evangelicals", hence why it has been included in this chapter with its overarching focus on Anglicanism, instead of rival publications such as the *Evangelical Magazine*.[145] It was founded in 1802 by William Hey, a renowned surgeon who was awarded Fellowship of the Royal Society in 1775. Hey also had literary and theological interests, and he was heavily involved in literary societies in his native Leeds.[146] According to Margaret DeLacy, Hey founded the *Christian Observer* "in response to the dissenters' *Leeds Mercury*", though no more is said about what it was in particular that motivated Hey to react.[147]

John Pearson, in his biography of Hey, states that the surgeon was interested in starting a publication that would "support the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England, and tend to promote serious piety and godliness and piety throughout the various ranks and orders of society".[148] There

---

[145] Altholz (1989), p. 16.

[146] There is some confusion as to Hey's role in this. In her entry for Hey in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Margaret DeLacy asserts that Hey was "the President of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society in 1783". However, the Society's website states that it was founded in 1819, with Hey convening the meeting that led to its foundation. The confusion possibly arises from DeLacy misconstruing John Pearson's *The Life of William Hey, Esq. F. R. S.*, and a passage that states that "in the year 1783 a Philosophical and Literary Society was formed in Leeds, of which it appears that Mr Hey was the President" (pp. 275-76), but one that appears to have ceased to function in 1786 (p. 276). Pearson's usage of capital letters to cite the society might have caused the uncertainty. It would seem that the society of which Hey was President was a precursor of the later society that was co-founded by Hey and that currently maintains the name. See Margaret DeLacy, 'Hey, William', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-13163?rskey=8D7hO1&result=2 [accessed 18 June 2025].

[147] DeLacy, 'Hey, William'.

[148] John Pearson, *The Life of William Hey, Esq., F. R. S.* (London: Hurst, Robinson and co., 1822), p. 204. Viewed online at

is no mention of Hey's motives for founding the *Observer* in a collection of his writings published posthumously, but his justification for a piece entitled 'Thoughts on the Sabbath', published in the magazine, was to put across what Hey saw as "the doctrine of scripture".[149] The first issue of the *Observer* provided the following raison d'être:

> At a period like this, when Dramatic Compositions, Novels, Tales, Newspapers, Magazines, and Reviews, are disseminating doctrines subversive of all morality, and propagating tenets the most hostile to piety, order, and general happiness, some friends of civil government and revealed religion, have felt it incumbent on them to oppose the progress of lawless opinions, to strip scepticism and imposture of their artful disguise, and, by displaying the true features of libertinism and impiety, to expose them to deserved contempt and abhorrence.[150]

This was published in 1802, so somewhat before the period that will be considered in the thesis, but the central theme of supporting 'correct' principles and procedures, and challenging opposing ones, is consistent throughout the publication's lifespan. This is not unique or noteworthy in itself. What is pertinent is the fact that often the *Observer* was more moderate in its opinions and relatively balanced in its considerations, and that this led to its usurpation as the chief organ

---

https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=bzsXAQAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=the+life+of+william+hey&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjtpYOc9NvrAhUqQUEAHSCxCc0Q6AEwAHoECAMQAg#v=snippet&q=observer&f=false [accessed 18 June 2025].

[149] William Hey, *Tracts and Essays, Moral and Theological* (London: Hurst, Robinson and Co., 1822), p. 275. Viewed online at https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=3mNjAAAAcAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=Tracts+and+essays,+moral+and+theological,+including+a+defence+of+the+divinity+of+Christ,+and+of+the+atonement&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjQkczN8dvrAhWssKQKHaEQAWwQ6AEwAHoECAAQAg#v=onepage&q=observer&f=false [accessed 18 June 2025].

[150] 'Prospectus', *Christian Observer*, Volume I (1802), p. iii.

of literary evangelicalism in the 1830s, which will be discussed below. Further exploration of the *Observer's* origin can be found in E. M. Howse's *Saints in Politics: The 'Clapham Sect' and the Growth of Freedom*, but it is sufficient here to note that its intended purpose was to appeal to the evangelical elements of English Anglicanism and was thus a counterpoint to the High Church *Critic* and *Remembrancer*.[151]

For each of the three publications being assessed, there was a clear focus on stressing the twin dangers of liberalism and Roman Catholicism, and many pages were devoted to these efforts. In 1822, the *British Critic* published extracts of a letter from a Roman Catholic priest to the Archdeacon of Bath, Charles Moysey, that included a commentary stating that attempts to undermine the Church of England had circulated "in virulent publications, which have lately issued from the press, grossly maligning our religion and our Clergy".[152] In what can be seen, with hindsight, as a rather hysterical foreshadowing of the emergence of Tractarianism, the writer of the piece in the *Critic* alleges that:

> Some of these performances, in which the ESTABLISHED CHURCH and her ministers are described as uncharitable, intolerant, slanderous, persecuting, are the handywork of certain Popish Clergymen amongst us, who make this grateful use of the liberty for which they are indebted to the mild and tolerant spirits of that CHURCH.[153]

---

[151] Samuel F. Pickering Jr., 'Literature and Theology: The *Christian Observer* and the Novel, 1802-1822', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 43.1 (March, 1974), p. 33, for this assertion of Howse's importance in charting the foundation of the publication.
[152] 'Baynes's Letter to Archdeacon Moysey', *British Critic*, Series 2, Volume XVII (1822), p. 85.
[153] *Ibid.*

The *Christian Remembrancer*, like the *British Critic*, sought not only to inform its readership but to influence it, with particular emphasis on the adherence of its readers to the 'correct' form of Anglicanism, and offered warnings against the alternatives. As with the *Critic*, many pages were devoted to refutations of Roman Catholicism in the 1810s and 1820s. In 1822, the publication carried a favourable review of *Plain Reasons why Political Power should not be granted to Papists*, a pamphlet written by Samuel Wix, a Fellow of the Royal Society and a cleric vehemently opposed to Catholicism. The reviewer asserts that "the Catholic enjoys as full toleration in his faith and worship, and is as secure in the possession of his property, as the most favoured of his Protestant brethren", thus making the notion of Catholic emancipation "preposterous".[154] The same issue commends the rejection of a Roman Catholic Peers Bill in the House of Lords, having passed a third reading in the Commons. The *Remembrancer* applauds the wisdom of this rejection, noting the 'blessings' that had resulted from the establishment of the Protestant Ascendancy.[155] The political aspect of these ecclesiastical parleys require further examination, but the salient point at this juncture is that both the *Critic* and the *Remembrancer* kept a close eye on developments in Westminster, and reported on them frequently, and those centred on the subject of Catholic Emancipation were of particular interest to both publications.

The *Christian Observer* also reported on political considerations of ecclesiastical subjects and did its best to ensure that its readership was provided with the wider context of contemporary deliberations on religion. In 1821, the *Observer* provided commentary on the progress of a Bill for Catholic relief, that would eventually pass through the House of Commons but be rejected by the House of Lords.[156] This was a recitation of facts, rather than an opinion piece, and

---

[154] 'Wix's Plain Reasons &c', *Christian Remembrancer*, Volume IV (1822), pp. 431-2.
[155] *Ibid*, p. 437.
[156] 'Public Affairs – Domestic; Parliament', *Christian Observer*, Volume XX (1821), pp. 202-3.

the publication did not address Catholicism as stridently as the *Critic* and the *Remembrancer* did in the early 1820s. However, by 1826, in a review of Joseph Blanco White's *Practical and Internal Evidence Against Catholicism*, the *Observer* concluded its favourable review by stating that, with regard to the Roman Church, its readership should take note of the 'threat' of Roman Catholicism:

> As Britons, as Christians, as Protestants, we have a responsible part to perform as respects this corrupt church. First, we must in heart, as well as in name, renounce its unscriptural doctrines and practices; some of which are but too ready to cling around our common nature, under every variety of sect and persuasion.[157]

So pervasive was the fear of growing Catholic influence in England among both High Church and Low Church Anglicans that it was a rallying cry for the evangelical *Observer* as well as the High Church *Critic* and *Remembrancer*. Toward the end of the 1820s, the approbation directed at Roman Catholics became more apparent in each of the publications. The *Observer* opined the historical repression of the French Protestant Church, which the publication attributed to 'ignorant' 'Popery'.[158] The *Remembrancer*, in a review of *Defence of the Creed and Discipline of the Catholic Church* by a Catholic priest, one F. C. Husenbeth, ended a scathing review by stating:

> We rejoice, however, in being able to give publicity to its title and subject, being convinced that the more generally our brethren of

[157] 'Review of White's *Evidences Against* Catholicism', Christian *Observer*, Volume XXV (1826), p. 585.
[158] 'Religious Communications', *Christian Observer*, Volume XXV (1826), pp. 129-30.

> Rome betake themselves to writing and publishing their arguments, the more obvious will be their errors to others, the more likely to be discerned even by themselves.[159]

Such condescension was not uncommon in the pages of any of the periodicals, though perhaps the *Observer* was less likely to resort to such belittling commentary of Roman Catholicism as this. What is worth assessing further is the usage of derogatory language toward Roman Catholics in each of these publications over the course of the 1820s.

As Catholic emancipation drew nearer, the use of the terms 'popery' and 'papist', or variants thereof, differed among the three periodicals. In the *Remembrancer*, 'popery' increases from 10 uses in volume 4 in 1822, to 24 in volume 9 in 1827, and then subsequently to 46 in volume 12 in 1830 once Catholic Emancipation has passed.[160] The years in between show a general trend of increased usage. 'Papist' is also used more frequently, though not to the same extent as 'popery'. The *Remembrancer* concurrently focuses more on direct attacks on Roman Catholicism in its pages, whereas the *Critic* and *Observer* remain relatively consistent throughout the same period of 1822-1830. In the *Critic*, 'popery' is used 14 times in 1822, 18 in 1828, but only 10 times in 1830, with 'papist' increasing from 1 to 4 uses over the period in question.[161] In the *Observer*, 'popery' or 'popish' is used relatively sparingly only 9 times in 1822 and 12 in 1828, but balloons to 62 uses in 1830. Each of these volumes, comprising 12 issues, is between 850 and 900 pages, so the term was not being used constantly, and in the volumes from 1829 and 1860, the term 'Catholic' is

---

[159] 'Defence of the Catholic Church', *Christian Remembrancer*, Volume X (1828), p. 91.
[160] *Christian Remembrancer*, Volume IV (1822); Volume IX (1827); Volume XII (1830).
[161] *British Critic*, Series 2, Volume XVII (1822); Series 4, Volume III (1828); Series 4, Volume VII (1830).

used more frequently, specifically in reference to 'Catholic Emancipation' and 'Catholic Associations'.[162]

An extensive article covering the Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829 provides many of these uses, and a few form part of a quotation, but the passing of the Act as the release mechanism for more pejorative language choices in the publication is striking.[163] The fact that the *Critic* did not follow the same path as the *Remembrancer* and the *Observer* in this regard is interesting, and it suggests that the *Critic* was not as anti-Catholic as its peers by 1830. This is possibly due to the presence of contributors such as Charles Webb Le Bas, professor of maths at the East India College at Haileybury and writer of over 80 articles for the publication between 1827 and 1838.[164] "Considered by some to be a link between the Caroline divines, the nonjurors and the Oxford Movement of 1833", men like Le Bas might have influenced a more reserved approach to Roman Catholicism in the *Critic* in the immediate aftermath of Catholic Emancipation.[165] This is speculation, but it might go some way to explaining why the *Critic* was, overall, not as virulent in its criticism of Roman Catholicism as it had been previously.

It is interesting to compare the approaches of the three publications mentioned thus far regarding attitudes to Roman Catholicism, and the extent to which they increase their usage of derogatory language, or not in the case of the *Critic*. Much has been written about Catholic Emancipation, both the build-up to it and its impact in the 1830s and beyond, and this chapter, nor this thesis, attempts to replace the literature that exists on the topic.[166] Rather, the passage of

---

[162] *Christian Observer*, Volume XXII (1822); Volume XXVIII (1828); Volume XXX (1830).
[163] It is possible that the numbers for the *Observer* are inaccurate, as the search function for Google Books does not include every use of the term, so the totals have been arrived at through manual counting. Each number might be an underestimate, but certainly not an overestimate.
[164] Rhoades Houghton and Altholz, p. 112.
[165] *Ibid*.
[166] See, for example: G. I. T. Machin, *The Catholic Question in English Politics, 1820-1830* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964); Richard W. Davis, 'Wellington and the "Open Question": The Issue of Catholic Emancipation, 1821-1829', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 29.1 (Spring, 1997), pp. 39-55; B. N. Ward, *The Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, 3 vols. (London: Longman, 1911-12).

Catholic Emancipation heralded a shift in High Church Anglicanism and is a pivotal moment in the decline of traditional English Toryism and, with that, a key support structure for the Established Church. Shorn of its political base and forced to confront a rapidly changing social environment, High Church Anglicanism, as represented by the *Critic* and the *Remembrancer*, underwent a period of profound change and would be permanently altered as a result. Evangelicals, and a broad range of Dissenters (some evangelical, some not), were buoyed by the challenge to the 'old order' and unnerved by the increased tolerance shown towards the Roman Catholics that many of them regarded with suspicion, if not outright hostility.

This had been brewing throughout the nineteenth century. Pitt's attempts to bring about Catholic Relief, and his resignation over the issue in 1801, demonstrated to Anglicans that even members of the Tory Party were prepared to grant it.[167] Such a challenge to the established order meant that new approaches had to be found to protect what was viewed as the sacred rights of Protestantism in England, and the development of an ecclesiastical public sphere was crucial to this. By collating and disseminating the theological ideas and theories of clergy and religiously minded individuals across the country, periodicals could attempt to impose an orthodoxy on their readers and, crucially, their congregations, regarding the clergy. In a post-Catholic Emancipation world, it was imperative to regain a sense of control, and these publications were a key facet of that operation. However, the emergence of Tractarianism in the 1830s would prove to be influential in shaping the content of the *Critic*, *Remembrancer*, and *Observer*; it would also directly prompt the creation of the *Church of England Quarterly Review*, which aimed to find a middle way between the Anglo-Catholic and evangelical perspectives.

---

[167] Bruce Coleman, *Conservatism and the Conservative Party in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (London: Edward Arnold, 1988), pp. 24-5.

Part 2: Tractarianism and its Impact

In the years surrounding the key events of Catholic Emancipation in 1829 and political reform in 1832, all three publications sought to set a precedent of identifying what needed to be done and encouraging their readerships to achieve the aims stated on the page. The *Critic* attempted to establish its credentials as a beacon of traditional Church ideology (specifically High Church, as per the above). In the October 1833 edition, a review of a pamphlet entitled 'The Reform Ministry and the Reform Parliament' took the opportunity to castigate the 'public mind' during the reform process in the following manner:

> It can hardly have escaped any reflecting person that the grossest and most truculent calumnies were received greedily and without enquiry… Men swallowed the most enormous slanders with the stomach of an ostrich, and then strained at the simplest truths, as something too big for the delicacy of their throats, and too hard for the weakness of their digestion.[168]

The *Critic* often highlighted the rich literary tradition of the Church of England, and very much saw itself as a vehicle to promote ecclesiastical literature that would provide "weapons always at hand to be wielded against the infidel, the Socinian, the Papist, the fanatic, and the sciolist [a person that pretends to be

[168] 'The Late Session of Parliament', *British Critic*, Series 4, Volume XIV (1833), p. 444.

knowledgeable and well-informed]."[169] Until 1836, the *Critic* maintained its criticism of Roman Catholicism, though terms such as 'popery', though still present, were even less common than they had been in the 1820s. Repudiation of Catholic views, if not outright anti-Catholicism, was evident in volume twenty-two of the *Critic*, published in 1837 – the final edition before the Tractarian takeover. A consideration of a series of lectures regarding transubstantiation, given by Nicholas Wiseman, a prominent English Catholic and later a cardinal, was published, along with comments on a review of the lectures by Thomas Turton, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge and the future Bishop of Ely, and criticisms of Wiseman's views on faith and the eucharist by Philalethes Cantabrigiensis.[170] It is obvious which way the *Critic* leant, and the challenges by Turton and Cantabrigiensis were supplemented by robust criticism from the contributor to this particular section of the issue in question.

The *Remembrancer* differed from the *Critic* in that it had occasionally softened its stance toward Anglo-Catholicism, if not Roman Catholicism, in the 1830s. As Peter Nockles has noted, the *Remembrancer* hailed the *Tracts of the Times* "as almost forming a new era in the Church – an era of the revival and renovation of the principles of her earlier and better days", although the review also cautioned against any measures that might uproot the traditional foundations of the Anglican Church.[171] The *Remembrancer* remained a staunch defender of the Established Church throughout the 1830s; indeed, part of the reason for the support of the *Tracts* was its condemnation of, and subsequent criticism from, Dissenters.[172] The distinction between Roman Catholicism, and of catholic as meaning 'universal', attains significance in the publication in the 1830s,

---

[169] 'Melvill, Eden, Dale, Blunt', *British Critic*, Series 4, Volume XX (1836), p. 114.
[170] 'Drs. Wiseman and Turton', *British Critic*, Series 4, Volume XXII (1837), pp. 134-60. I do not know who is behind the pen name 'Philalethes Cantabrigiensis' in this volume; I have managed to work out that it was not the scientist James Jurin, who used the pseudonym, on the grounds that he had been dead for 87 years. Other than that, I am at a loss.
[171] Nockles (1994), p. 274.
[172] 'Tracts for the Times', *Christian Remembrancer*, Volume XVIII (1836), pp. 646-47.

particularly toward the end of the decade. The *Remembrancer* included articles and reviews that condemned the Roman Catholic Church while highlighting and encouraging the unity of the early Church and the shared traditions that remained.

This was often done in opposition to dissent. For example, in 1839, the publication carried a selection of quotes from Henry Melvill, at the time a priest in London and a future canon of St. Paul's. In reviewing a sermon by John Henry Hopkins, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Vermont, Melvill differentiates between the "purity" of the early Roman Church and the "abuses" and "corruption" of the Catholic Church. In a passage that it would be hard to imagine being published in earlier editions of the *Remembrancer*, Melvill states:

> The adherence to catholic tradition as well as to Scripture… fits the Anglican Church to enter the lists with Romanism. Dissent will never make any head against popery, even if it should weary of it as a political ally; for in ecclesiastical contests there must be an appeal to antiquity, to the practices and principles of the primitive Church; and this is an appeal in which Romanism, with all its abuses, must carry it over Sectarianism with all its reforms.[173]

This shift from broad condemnation of Roman Catholicism to illustrating the shared heritage of Anglicanism and 'Romanism' (mediated through Newman's theories of a *via media* between the two) with suggestions of the potential for a closer working relationship with a reformed Catholic Church, meant that the *Remembrancer*, in general, saw Dissenters as a separate and greater threat from the mid-1830s. Though always hostile to any form of Dissent that challenged traditional forms of High Church Anglicanism, the gradual

[173] 'Bishop Hopkins on the Church of Rome', *Christian Remembrancer*, Volume XXI (1839), p. 387.

lessening of Roman Catholicism as an aspect of this can be viewed as a harbinger of the Tractarian takeover in 1844, as it did not need to substantially modify its content. The *Remembrancer* was softening its stance some years before. The extent to which this was the result of Tractarian supporters or sympathisers contributing to the publication, or influencing editorial decisions, requires more research.[174]

Prior to the Tractarian takeover of the other periodicals mentioned so far, there were occasional references to the *Critic* and the *Remembrancer* in the *Observer*. In 1829, the *Observer* and the *Critic* were at odds with regard to a report in the latter of the Society for the Conversion of Negro Slaves [sic], and the criticism that the former levelled at the society in response. The *Critic* criticised the *Observer's* report as "impudent, stupid, and most disgraceful"; the *Observer* responded that:

> The British Critic must rely upon his readers possessing more of an unflinching party spirit, than a love of candour or justice, before he can presume that such language as the above affords the best vehicle for conveying his arguments.[175]

Given that the *Observer* supported the Anti-Slavery Society, founded by William Wilberforce, a key member of the Clapham Sect, this clash, and the strident language used, makes more sense. The Clapham Sect was an evangelical group that sought to proselytise to a wider community, and the *Observer* was central to that ethos. According to John Wolffe, "their long-term impact was a complex and paradoxical one, establishing a paradigm of evangelical

---

[174] This may prove difficult, due to the aforementioned lack of publishers' records, and the practice of contributors often publishing anonymously.
[175] 'Public Affairs-Catholic Question', *Christian Observer*, Volume XXIX (1829), p. 131.

commitment, upper middle-class family life, and social engagement which was to inspire variously emulation, caricature, and revolt among their Victorian successors."[176] This included defending evangelical values where possible. Such an opportunity was provided in response to the Remembrancer, in a passing reference to "The Tractarian *Christian Remembrancer*" in a scathing review of a book critical of evangelicalism published in 1843.[177] It is quite probable that the *Observer's* view that the author writes in the manner of Dickens, and is thus cited multiple times in the *Remembrancer*, is more than a little sarcastic. Not quite as vitriolic as the clash with the *Critic*, but evidence that there was some level of direct interaction, as with the *Critic*. These were rare examples of direct interaction, however, and the *Observer* sought to proffer its own views rather than directly challenge those of the High Church publications.

For their part, the *Critic* and *Remembrancer* were being challenged at their own board levels, and in the late 1830s and early 1840s, the direction of each publication's future involved a great deal of introspection. In the *Critic's* case, financial difficulties persuaded the editor, James Boone, to sell space in the publication to John Henry Newman for a series of articles which proved to be too 'Catholic' for Boone's taste. By the end of 1837, Boone had resigned, and after a few months of uncertainty the periodical was unquestionably under Tractarian control by April 1838.[178] The publication's shifting outlook across its existence is interesting, and provides opportunities to assess the tactics of the Oxford Movement, as far as the use of the term 'tactics' is valid, and the extent to which they were successful. That the *Critic* was still publishing stridently anti-Catholic views in the mid-1830s has been ascribed to the editorship of Boone by Nockles,

---

[176] John Wolffe, 'Clapham Sect', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-42140?rskey=PwyeFI&result=1 [accessed 18 June 2025].
[177] 'Review of *Memoir of the Life of the Rev. Peter Roe*', *Christian Observer*, Volume XLIII (1843), p. 100.
[178] Esther Rhoads Houghton, 'The *British Critic* and the Oxford Movement', *Studies in Bibliography*, 16 (1963), p. 119.

and the subsequent response of the quarterly's owners to reach out to Tractarians in order to regain editorial control.[179]

After Newman's influence was cemented in 1838, a much more nuanced approach was being taken, and a review of a work on the Church fathers was favourable to the idea of a shared heritage that all of Christianity should recognise.[180] By 1840, the *Critic* was propagating Anglo-Catholicism in its pages, arguing that "the English Church, however defectively represented, has, we maintain, the principle of true Catholicity within it".[181] The *Critic* aimed to delineate between Roman Catholic as a specific denomination, and 'Catholic', either with a capital or lowercase 'c', in the universal sense. In the same article, the author states "we will never, God helping us, go over to Rome so long as we have the Creeds and the Sacraments".[182] This is interesting because the author of the piece has been identified by Bernard Reardon as Frederick Oakley, an Anglican clergyman who would indeed convert to Roman Catholicism in 1845.[183] Oakley associated with the Tractarians, but he used the term 'Popery' in his article – perhaps an attempt to reassure readers that Tractarianism was an appropriate ideological distance away from Roman Catholicism.

The Tractarian takeover proved to be a short-lived swansong for the *Critic*, and it was Newman's decision to relinquish editorship of the publication in 1841 that hastened its demise, due mainly, according to Houghton and Altholz, to accusations that its brand of Anglo-Catholicism was too often redolent of Roman Catholicism.[184] A space for a high-profile Tractarian publication was left vacant, and the *Remembrancer* was brought under the control of the Oxford Movement to fill this void. Though gradually more tolerant of Anglo-Catholicism in the

---

[179] Nockles (1994), p. 277.
[180] 'Use of the Fathers', *British Critic*, Series 4, Volume XXIII (1838), pp. 24-47.
[181] 'The Church Service', *British Critic*, Series 4, Volume XXVII (1840), p. 265.
[182] *Ibid*.
[183] Bernard M. G. Reardon, *Religious Thought in the Victorian Age: A Survey from Coleridge to Gore* (London: Longman, 1995), pp. 76-7.
[184] Rhoades Houghton and Altholz, p. 115.

1840s, the periodical only became a publication outwardly supportive of Tractarianism in 1844, under the editorship of James Mozley.

A theologian educated at Oxford, Mozley was the brother-in-law of John Newman, whose conversion to Roman Catholicism in October 1845 marked the decline in national prominence of Tractarianism. Thus, the *Remembrancer* is perhaps best utilised in the years after 1844 as an indicator of what Anglo-Catholicism post-Newman focused on, and how it presented its arguments to its readership. This break with Newman, and Newman's break with Anglicanism, were not necessarily problematic for the publication: Newman had reportedly been told that "the new review is very stupid", the *Remembrancer* having "the calm of dulness [sic], unmitigated and hopeless", and he was thus uninterested in it.[185] Perhaps there was a tinge of frustration due to the closure of the Critic and its replacement by the *English Review or Quarterly Journal of General and Ecclesiastical Literature* under the same publisher (Rivingtons). As the *Critic* had been procured by Newman in 1836 to give a platform to writers supportive of the Oxford Movement, the *Remembrancer* overtaking its stablemate as the primary Tractarian periodical might have caused a sense of frustration for Newman, though this is speculation. While the Oxford Movement lacked its previous prominence, O'Connell has stated that, after 1845, "the ideals… of a Catholicism without the pope were maintained, and, more than that, were promoted to a degree which has profoundly effected the worldwide Anglican and Episcopalian bodies".[186]

That Tractarians, both pre- and post-1845, had targeted existing periodicals with an established readership is fascinating and suggests that the key proponents of the movement deliberately targeted existing readerships in the ecclesiastical sphere. By shifting the approach of recognised publications, the editorial teams

---

[185] O'Connell, pp. 398-99. The *Remembrancer* was relaunched as a quarterly periodical in 1844, having been a monthly prior to the takeover, hence the description of the 'new review'.
[186] *Ibid*, pp. 422-23.

aimed to tap into existing literary networks to exert their influence, rather than begin anew. This suggests that, though the *Critic* and the *Remembrancer* might have had relatively modest sales figures compared to contemporary publications such as the *Quarterly* and *Edinburgh* Reviews, their wider outreach was broad enough that it was more worthwhile to attempt to re-contextualise these publications rather than start new ones with distinct identities. One notable one was started, the *British Magazine*, which ran from 1832 to 1849. It sought to be a professional magazine for the clergy, to achieve more overtly what the *Critic* and *Remembrancer* had attempted to do by way of persuasive articles and reviews. However, it was not very successful in this endeavour: its first editor, Hugh James Rose, a High Churchman by education who helped start the Oxford Movement, was viewed as too 'conservative' in his selection of articles. His death in 1838 saw the publication lose its initial momentum, and it quickly became 'superfluous'.[187] The *Remembrancer* thus remained the chief High Church publication until its dissolution in 1868, and its continued prominence justifies its inclusion in this chapter. The *Remembrancer's* increased toleration of Tractarianism in the 1830s and the takeover in 1844 meant that there was space for a publication to attempt to re-establish traditional Anglican values within the ecclesiastical public sphere, and in 1837, the *Church of England Quarterly Review* was set up for just such a purpose.

William Pickering, a prolific publisher in the mid-nineteenth century, mostly of poetry collections but with an interest in periodicals, was the one to attempt this task. It is unknown what motivated Pickering to launch the *Review*, but perhaps it was inspired by his purchasing of shares in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1833 and his subsequent partnership with the clergyman John Mitford, who would edit the *Magazine* until 1850.[188] Perhaps Pickering saw a

---

[187] Altholz (1989), pp. 25-6.
[188] Bernard Warrington, 'Pickering, William', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-22213?rskey=m4nSQH&result=2 [accessed 18 June 2025].

need, or an opportunity, to launch a new publication with a High Church perspective that was more 'traditional', to counter the growing influence of the Oxford Movement upon Anglicanism. The first issue of the *Review* sets out its position thusly:

> After much serious thought, devout meditation, and earnest prayers for the Divine blessing upon our undertaking, we institute a crusade against the triple alliance of infidelity, liberalism, and papistry, by putting forth the First Number of The Church of England Quarterly Review.[189]

The *Review* sought to defend the ideals of 'Church and State', and at a time when the subject of religion was highly contested; this was, as Altholz has stated, "a throwback to the pre-Tractarian age".[190] An example of this, in the introduction of the first issue, is the publication's approach to Catholicism, and its apparent desire not only to halt but roll back tolerance of it. While seeming to accept that Catholics should be permitted to practice their faith, the *Review* states that "they will never permit the veto of the crown upon the pope's nomination of their bishops… We may here discern the dire spirit of papal domination."[191] For those old enough to remember, or aware of their parliamentary history, this possibly reminded them of the spectre of Papal interference in the Catholic Relief Bill proposed in 1813. After the Bill failed to pass, the Pope's delegate, a Mgr. Quarantotti, presented a Rescript, an official Papal announcement, to the Catholic aristocracy stating that the Bill should have been accepted.[192] This incident of

---

[189] 'Introduction', *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, Volume I (1837), p. 1.
[190] Altholz (1989), p. 26.
[191] 'Introduction', *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, Volume I, p. 6.
[192] Ambrogio Caiani, *To Kidnap a Pope: Napoleon and Pius VII* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2021), pp. 265-67.

direct Papal involvement in English politics had almost certainly made many Anglicans fearful of similar action being taken, despite Quarantotti's approval of the Royal Veto on Catholic Bishops, and that Pius VII's imprisonment, and therefore lack of sanction, nullified Quarantotti's efforts.[193] However, the *Review's* interactions with Catholicism, and the Anglo-Catholicism of the Tractarians, would shift over time, and this degree of fear would not be as prominent in the publication's pages.

This change in attitude would occur relatively soon into the *Review's* existence, beginning with the first period of editorship of Henry Christmas, a clergyman and scholar who would go on to be a Fellow of the Royal Society. Christmas would edit the *Review* over two separate periods, from 1840-43 and 1854-58, and his initial editorship would see the publication re-establish the High Church principles upon which it was supposedly founded. According to Peter Nockles, criticism had been levelled at the *Review* that its strident anti-Tractarianism was causing it to lose its 'character', and thus changes needed to be made to correct this development.[194] Presumably, this loss of character was linked with a drop in sales and/or reputation, and the introduction of Christmas as editor was designed to prevent further damage from being done. This is an interesting detail, and one that encourages further analysis. While there is no record of sales figures to hand, and Nockles does not cite his sources for the criticism of the *Review*, it is evident that the publication underwent a change in tone in the early 1840s. In volume VI, published in 1839, the first article covering a letter from Edward Pusey to Richard Bagot, the Bishop of Oxford, was vitriolic in its condemnation of Tractarianism:

---

[193] Myles V. Ronan. 'What Is Meant by Catholic Emancipation', *The Catholic Historical Review* 15.4 (January, 1930), pp. 378-9.
[194] Peter Nockles, 'The Church of England Quarterly Review' in Laurel Brake and Marysa Demoor (eds.), *Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland* (London: The British Library, 2009), p. 325.

> The yoke of Mosaic ordinances, from which the Christian Church was emancipated, was light in comparison with that which is attempted to be imposed upon us; and the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free is sought to be degraded into a most abject spiritual slavery. The writers of the Oxford Tracts may differ from us in opinions and practice, and delight in macerating their bodies; but it is the grossest intolerance to force us to imitate them; nor have they, as individual members of the Church, substantiated their authority to dictate to her.[195]

Volume IV, from 1839, included an essay on biblical criticism supplemented by two lectures given by Herbert Marsh, the former Bishop of Peterborough, who died in the same year.[196] Marsh was known to be critical of dissenters, and he was hostile toward Methodists, Calvinists, and evangelicalism. The inclusion of lectures by Marsh to support High Church interpretations of the Bible is emblematic of the stance that the *Review* took against its own narrow view of High Church Anglicanism.

However, the introduction of Christmas as editor meant a change in approach and saw the *Review* attempt to find a more balanced exposition of Anglicanism. In volume VIII of the *Review*, published in 1840, Christmas uses the term "Evangelical High Churchmen" in an article discussing the role of Bishops in the Church of England.[197] Andrew Atherstone asserts that Christmas was the first to coin this term to describe "those who were concerned for both 'evangelical truth and apostolic discipline', naming Charles Blomfield and J. B.

---

[195] 'Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford', *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, Volume VI (1839), p. 2.
[196] 'Hengstenberg's Christologie', *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, Volume IV (1838), pp. 1-26.
[197] 'The Office of a Bishop', *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, Volume VIII (1840), pp. 1-25.

Sumner as examples of the type".[198] Atherstone cites GS Faber's explanation of 'Evangelical High Churchmanship' as "a 'just medium' between Tractarianism and Ultra-Protestantism'.[199] This does not mean that the *Review* avoided the topic of Tractarianism, or that it became ambivalent toward the Oxford Movement after 1840; however, volumes IX and X, both accounting for that year, contain only passing mentions of Tractarianism, and nothing like the histrionic opposition as noted above. An article in volume X, challenging the idea of the Church of England being divided between Tractarians and Calvinists, even criticises those who use the term 'Puseyite' as an insult as "unchristian": the article notes that this is levelled at any "who have any reverence for antiquity, who have been convicted of studying the fathers, or adhering to the rubrics".[200] In the same volume, a short but sharp critique of a poem entitled 'Luther on Rome and the Reformation' by one Alfred Lord, includes the following:

> We verily believe that anybody – no matter who – who should get up and declare publicly that the Pope is antichrist and the beast, and Dr. Pusey the false prophet, would forthwith find not a few to consider him something less than an angel.[201]

---

[198] Andrew Atherstone, 'Anglican Evangelicalism' in Rowan Strong (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume III: Partisan Anglicanism and its Global Expansion, 1829-c.1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 174.

[199] *Ibid*, p. 174. It is likely that this 'GS Faber' was Geoffrey Faber, one half of the publishing company Faber & Gwyer that would subsequently become Faber & Faber in 1929.

[200] 'Montgomery's Sanderson', *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, Volume X (1841), p. 109.

[201] *Ibid*, p. 491. The first part of the review makes clear the reviewer's regard for Alfred Lord's abilities: "*Were we inclined to be severe, we should take some specimens from this thing, which Mr. Alfred Lord is pleased to call a 'poem', and expose him; as it is, we shall spare him such a pillory*". The poem is available via Google Books, and it is not exactly first-rate. See Robert Montgomery, *Luther on Rome and the* Reformation (London: James Blackwood, 1852), viewed online via https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/Luther_Or_Rome_and_the_Reformation/OnY_AQAAMAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=0 [accessed 18 June 2025].

While not a complete defence of Pusey or the Tractarians, the fact that the *Review* was willing to print a challenge to notions of Pusey as a false prophet is notable, given the view of Tractarianism as a threat to the Established Church and its practices in earlier editions of the publication.

As per the previous paragraph, the *Review* did not stop addressing the subject of Tractarianism in the 1840s, and there was still criticism. Though not as excitable as it had been in the earlier issues, the *Review* would still, on occasion, challenge the veracity of the Oxford Movement. Rather than attacking Tractarianism as a pernicious influence, the quarterly would take issue with the movement's use of the term 'Anglo-Catholic'. For example, in 1843, an article asserted that "because the writers of the Tracts choose to call themselves Anglo-Catholics, surely we are not to give up our own claim to the title, nor yet to concede to those individuals, a designation which they have assumed, but which belongs to all sound members of the Anglican Church".[202] This is an interesting point regarding terminology, and is more than just a question of semantics, as Peter Nockles has shown by demonstrating that the use of 'Anglo-Catholic' was an attempt to synonymise the term with traditional High Church principles.[203]

There is potentially compelling overlap with Tractarians, and indeed post-Tractarians, and their interest in social issues, as covered by S. A. Skinner in his work *Tractarians and the 'Condition of England'*. Skinner challenges the idea that the Tractarians were not interested in social questions, and that there was indeed a focus on quality of life issues within the nation.[204] If that was the case, and they were using the term 'Anglo-Catholic' for themselves, perhaps this insistence on regaining the term on the part of traditional High Church members as a historic concept was a method of appearing to have had similar social

---

[202] 'Review of *Puseyism, or Anglo-Catholicism briefly considered in connexion with the Doctrine of the Church of Rome*', The *Church of England Quarterly Review*, Volume XIV (1843), p. 248, cited in Nockles (1994), p. 42.
[203] Nockles, pp. 42-43.
[204] See Skinner (2004), especially pp. 8-10 & 292-96.

concerns prior to the emergence of the Oxford Movement. Thus, the Tractarians would be mimicking the behaviours of the Established Church, rather than offering something more far-reaching, if perhaps not entirely new. This conjecture encapsulates debates broader than the purely ecclesiastical, but it is at least worth considering, even if the reality was more muted.

The cessation of the *Critic* in 1843 opened the space for a publication that could occupy the same ideological ground that the *Critic* had been founded upon in 1793, albeit in differing circumstances. The *Church of England Quarterly Review* sought to establish itself as the predominant High Church periodical that was not under the auspices of the Tractarian movement, and to regain ideological control of Anglicanism in England. Indeed, a reviewer writing for the *Review* in 1843 dismissed the ecclesiastical ideas presented in a work of fiction as "insufficient", asserting that "it is not by such that the Tractarian heresy can be overthrown".[205] The *Review* positioned itself against the elements of High Church Anglicanism that were coming under the influence of the Oxford Movement's adherents, as well as against forms of dissent present within Anglicanism, such as the evangelicalism presented in the pages of the *Observer*. Though the nature of Anglicanism and the future of the Church of England were key issues for all these periodicals, as they had been for the *Critic* before its demise, wider social considerations were also prominent within these publications.

The reforming spirit of the mid-nineteenth century permeated many aspects of society, and religion enjoyed a reciprocal relationship with it. As the traditional interlocution of Church and State was challenged, and the nature of Anglicanism was further contested, the periodicals in question attempted to foster a readership that could influence these developments. In the nineteenth century, the clergy still exerted influence in their communities, and although urbanisation

---

[205] 'Review of *Catholicity versus Sibthorp; or some help to answer the question whether the Rev. R. Sibthorp, B.D., is now or ever was a Catholic*', *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, Volume XI (1842), p. 490.

presented challenges to this historical precedent, in many places the clergy represented the principal figure of authority and education. These periodicals thus competed to be the foci of the clergy's preaching, and to exert influence using them as conduits in their communities.

Part 3: Re-contextualizing the Ecclesiastical Public Sphere

The four publications assessed in this chapter were part of a wider literary culture that had existed since the eighteenth century, but that underwent a period of change beginning in the 1810s. The launch of *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* in 1817 precipitated this shift, as it "startled the public and encouraged others to follow its lead". *Blackwood's* "offered a model of magazine writing which influenced writers across a wide political, social and cultural spectrum", one that sought to challenge works directly and views that it disagreed with and stake its claim in an increasingly saturated market.[206] Magazines and periodicals of various persuasions were formed in the early nineteenth century, some that would last and others that disappeared from view rather quickly. This burgeoning literary culture saw magazines consider frequently a wider array of subject matter, and ecclesiastical subjects themselves were covered within many of these publications. *Blackwood's* itself was censured by the *Remembrancer* about the visit to England of one Bishop Hobart of New York in 1826, who published a book about his European travels that was highly critical of the state and the Established Church. *Blackwood's* criticised Hobart, stating that he had qualified his "fierce attack" on the clergy by "eating, drinking, and sleeping in, as many of

[206] David Stewart, 'The Magazine and Literary Culture' in Joanne Shattock (ed.), *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), p. 34. See also: Robert Morrison and Daniel S. Roberts (eds.), *Romanticism and Blackwood's Magazine: 'An Unprecedented Phenomenon'* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

their houses as he could".[207] The *Remembrancer* chided the "improper tone" of the rebuke, stating that "Bishop Hobart did not come here to hunt for abuses, but to revive wasting spirits and recruit departing strength".[208]

Of course, there is an Anglo-Scottish rivalry simmering underneath this spat, but the wider point to be made is that ecclesiastical magazines were not the only sources for theological commentary in the nineteenth-century literary world. While this had been the case prior to the foundation of *Blackwood's*, from the mid-1810s, there was a wider pool of publications offering a greater number of opinion pieces.[209] Ecclesiastical publications, such as the four considered here, had to contest with an increasing literary sphere and a growing consumer public. This wider readership and proliferation of ideas challenged the primacy of the traditional hierarchy in England, which included the Church of England. The *Critic* and the *Observer* were affected by this; the *Remembrancer* was established as this shift was beginning to accelerate, and the *Review* was created twenty years after its inception. Ecclesiastical publications were operating in a buoyant public sphere, and this encouraged them to consider topics beyond the narrowly theological. Though its readership was predominantly clergy or ecclesiastically minded secular individuals, these publications needed to encompass a wider remit in order to ensure that its readership could inform their congregations, or communities, of the correct approach(es) to these wider, and often more secular, topics.

The *Critic* had already been making these connections prior to 1815, given that its formulation occurred as a reaction to the French Revolution. This engendered a profound opposition to revolutionary theory in its pages from the outset, and a reluctance to accept reform because revolution might be the ultimate

---

[207] 'London', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, Volume XX (1826), p. 325.
[208] 'Bishop Hobart', *Christian Remembrancer*, Volume VIII (1826), p. 544.
[209] This will be addressed later in the thesis, contextualising the ecclesiastical dimension within the wider public sphere in the years 1815-61.

result of such measures. In 1805, the author of a work on the reign of George III to date was praised by the *Critic* because " no writer… has more severley [condemned the pernicious, as well as visionary, theories of the first French reformers, and the savage cruelty of their successors".[210] The implication that Britain would do well to avoid encouraging such thoughts on its own shores is not difficult to ascertain. In the same issue, it condemned those men "most forward to reform and instruct the world in religion and politics, have themselves been most grossly ignorant of the facts on which both are founded".[211] However, in the early years of the nineteenth century, one can make the case that such views were predominant in England, certainly within the literate English public and quite possibly beyond.

That Cobbett and other radicals were defending Napoleon's restored regime as "democratic and liberal" upon his return to power in March 1815 was ample demonstration to those opposed to reform that dangerous elements threatened England's stability if leeway was given to reformists, who were often equated (rightly or wrongly) with English radicals writers.[212] Prior to 1815, the *Critic* had a history of addressing wider issues from a position of widespread agreement with its general positions, if not always in terms of the details. After Napoleon's fall and the early beginnings of the transformation of print media in England after 1815, the *Critic* became a relatively smaller voice in an increasingly noisy public arena.

After 1815, the *Critic* found itself as one part of a nascent right-wing press that often competed for the same audience: James Sack has an excellent chapter on this in *From Jacobite to Conservative*, which leads nicely into the next chapter in his work on 'the spirit of the English Right'.[213] There are indications that the

---

[210] 'Bisset's History of the Reign of George III', *British Critic*, Series 1, Volume XXV (1805), p. 21.
[211] *Ibid*, p. 266.
[212] Stuart Semmel, *Napoleon and the British* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), p. 162.
[213] Sack, pp. 8-45.

publication struggled financially (not for the first time, as the Tractarian takeover in 1837 demonstrates) in the 1820s, and this saturation of the press was part of the reason. The merger with the *Quarterly Theological Review* in 1827 was partly motivated by poor sales for both entities, and the switch to predominantly theological content was effectively an admission that it could no longer compete with other, newer publications that covered a wide array of topics. The increase in the number of periodicals and the gradually widening scope of what was deemed 'acceptable' content to produce and consume hurt the *Critic's* position, and this eventually led to its Tractarian shift.

The *Critic's* struggles mirrored the breakdown of the old order in England, or what J. C. D. Clark has denoted as the end of England's *ancien régime*. By 1828, the year in which Anglican privileges were severely dented through the Sacramental Test Act, it had gone from a publication that attracted a wide variety of contributors to one that "leaned heavily… upon a relatively small number of regular contributors".[214] Although it continued to direct much ire at liberals, reformers, abolitionists, and anyone that threatened to challenge the old order, its criticisms were no longer as impactful as previously. The *Critic's* slow demise was emblematic of the shock to the social order that occurred from 1828-32, what J. C. D. Clark has termed "the shattering of a whole social order".[215] Though the publication carried on until 1843, this was solely due to the Tractarian takeover in 1837, discussed above. The *Critic* represented a renowned name for the Tractarians to utilise, but its difficulties in the 1820s meant that, once the initial resurgence of interest caused by the takeover had worn off after John Henry Newman ceased his involvement with it in 1841, it was destined to fail. The decision to scale back its content to being predominantly theological was part of

[214] Rhoades Houghton and Altholz, p. 112.
[215] J. C. D. Clark, *English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 90.

the reason it ended in 1843, and the other publications assessed in this chapter recognised that a wider remit was necessary to keep the attention of its readership.

The *Remembrancer*, created in 1819, took the opposite approach to the *Critic*, focusing mainly on theological topics as per the mission statement in its first issue (see above) until the early 1840s. The shift to Tractarianism, and the closing of the theologically-driven Critic, initiated a period from January 1841 to July 1844 during which the *Remembrancer* "welcomed articles on secular as well as theological and ecclesiastical topics, and its contributors included churchmen who held a variety of opinions".[216] This is reflected in the contents of the publication in these years; while there are still articles and reviews centred on Church matters, there is a noticeable increase in articles devoted to other subjects, including military operations in Afghanistan, reviews of secular literature, and a review of John Stuart Mill's *Utilitarianism* in 1843 that is more accommodating than previous editions of the *Remembrancer* would have been.[217] While the reviewer acknowledges, albeit somewhat grudgingly, that consideration of every class of citizen is worthwhile in 1843, in 1836 the periodical bluntly asked "What in the world has the working class to do with questions of state policy and political economy?" when reviewing an address to the working classes of England.[218] Of course, different contributors have different views, but it is hard to imagine these two pieces co-existing in the same pages, had one been written seven years sooner or later.

The changing nature of the *Remembrancer*, as alluded to above, is an interesting dimension and is indicative of the reality that rigid, authoritarian, elitist Anglicanism was no longer an effective basis for a publication. That is not

---

[216] Mary Louise McIntyre, 'Julius Charles Hare on the Catholic Revival: "Signs of Hope"', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 75.2 (June, 2006), p. 224.
[217] 'Logic-Mill', *Christian Remembrancer*, New Series, Volume VI (1843), pp.392-413 for the consideration of Mill. The publication added "A Monthly Magazine and Review" to its title from this point; the footnotes in this thesis will omit the suffix, and volumes cited after the switch will be delineated as being part of the "New Series".
[218] 'Literary Report', *Christian Remembrancer*, Volume XVIII (1836), p. 731.

to say that the *Remembrancer* transmogrified into a bastion of liberalism in this period, nor that it abandoned its interest in theological subjects. Most of volume XV, in 1848, covered the consecration of liberal clergyman Renn Hampden as Bishop of Hereford; the *Remembrancer*, unsurprisingly, was not in favour, questioning the legality of Hampden's promotion.[219] There is a certain irony here, given that Hampden had briefly edited the *Remembrancer* in 1825-26. The publication took opportunities to advocate Anglo-Catholicism in secular contexts, and was a champion of Charlotte Mary Yonge, whose works the periodical effusively praised in 1853.[220] The *Remembrancer* opposed challenges to Anglo-Catholic High Church ideals: for example, its response to *Essays and Reviews*, the publication emanating from the Broad Church movement that elicited "perhaps the greatest religious controversy of the Victorian period".[221] The *Remembrancer* contained a thirty-four-page analysis of the work in October 1860, and it was not positive.[222] The *Remembrancer* maintained its Anglo-Catholic stance until the end of its existence in 1868, and it viewed every work, controversy, and societal issue that fell within its purview through this lens.

The *Observer*, much like the *Remembrancer*, was slow to adjust to the changing social dynamics in early-nineteenth-century England, and it continued to fill most of its pages with theological topics that were much more centred on methods for instructing and directing the public, as church congregations, rather than addressing the issues that affected them. In its 'Family Sermon' for September 1815 (the 'Family Sermon' was a regular feature of the publication), the *Observer* noted that Luke 11:27-28 could be used "in addition to many other proofs which might be adduced of the effect of our Lord's discourses upon simple and candid minds" – the "simple and candid minds" being any given priest's

---

[219] 'The Church of the Future', *Christian Remembrancer*, New Series, Volume XV (1848), pp. 86-88.
[220] 'Miss Yonge's Novels', *Christian Remembrancer*, New Series, Volume XXVI (1853), pp. 33-63. For more on Charlotte Mary Yonge, see Alethea Hayter, *Charlotte Yonge* (Plymouth: Northcote House, 1996).
[221] Josef L. Altholz, 'Early Periodical Responses to Essays and Reviews', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 19.2 (Summer, 1986), p. 50.
[222] 'Essays and Reviews', *Christian Remembrancer*, New Series, Volume XL (1860), pp. 327-370.

parishioners.[223] By the time of Catholic Emancipation and the First Reform Act, the publication recognised that the desires of the wider public needed to be addressed and considered. Volume XXXI chided the Christian who failed to account for the hopes and fears of those not in his immediate vicinity:

> But is the Christian, therefore, indifferent to the passing events which chequer human history? Are the public concerns of religion nothing to him? Are the airs of his country nothing to him? Does he take no interest in the rise and fall, the flourishing and decaying of nations! Is it nothing to him whether his fellow creatures are wise or ignorant, vicious or virtuous, religious or irreligious, miserable or happy? Does he wrap himself up in cold selfishness, or at most in the narrow circle of his immediate friends and relations, and forget all around him? Far otherwise.[224]

The *Observer* saw the 'state of the nation' as of paramount concern to its readers and sought to engage in these wider lines of enquiry from the 1830s onward. However, it addressed these concerns directly to a narrow group of evangelicals within the ecclesiastical public sphere, and in this respect, it did not keep in touch with the expanding literacy of the wider public in the nineteenth century. Even within evangelical circles, it was losing ground at the time that its awareness of social issues, and expanded remit to address them, was taking place.

---

[223] 'Family Sermons-No. LXXXI. On Luke ii. 27, 28', *Christian Observer*, Volume XIV (1815), p. 576. Luke 11:27-28: "And it came to pass as he spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked. But he said, Yea rather blessed are they which hear the word of God and keep it."

[224] 'Preface', *Christian Observer*, Volume XXXI (1831), p. iii.

This is due to the fact that the *Observer* was not the only publication advocating for evangelicalism in the years 1815-61, and it had its rivals. Boyd Hilton has averred that the *Observer* gained ground from the Calvinistic *Christian Guardian* in the early nineteenth century, as the *Observer's* 'Arminian bias', and thus rejection of predestination, proved more popular with subscribers.[225] Hilton does not provide specific dates, but it is reasonable to assume that by 1829, the *Christian Observer* was the primary publication of evangelical Anglicanism, in terms of readership. However, at some point during the 1830s, Hilton states that the *Record*, founded in 1828 by Alexander Haldane, a Scottish barrister, eclipsed the *Observer* as the best-selling evangelical publication. From the mid-1820s, a more extreme form of evangelicalism spread, buoyed by economic unrest, Catholic Emancipation, and "other 'signs' of an impending divine initiative".[226] Chadwick is blunt: he asserts that "the *Christian Observer* practised charity and had few subscribers, the *Record* acted vituperative partisan and had many subscribers" by the 1850s.[227]

Robert Hole has suggested that, in the 1830s, Recordites, as devoted subscribers of the *Record* were known, were more volatile, and more prone to engage in secular issues, than many Anglican factions had previously been.[228] There is not a great deal of research into the *Record* and its devotees, and often they are cited only in passing in works devoted to Church history, if at all. Josef L. Altholz's article 'Alexander Haldane, "The Record, and Religious Journalism"', is the only consideration of the group widely available. What can be deduced from the *Record's* comparative success is that the *Observer* did not match its rivals, particularly its chief one, the *Record*, for opinionated invective,

---

[225] Hilton, *Age of Atonement*, pp. 8-9.
[226] *Ibid*, p. 10.
[227] Chadwick, p. 448.
[228] Robert Hole, *Pulpits, Politics and Public Order in England, 1760-1832* (Cambridge: University Press, 1989), p. 11. Hole cites the unpublished D. Phil of Ian Bradley, an academic and theologian formerly of St Andrews. Bradley's thesis is not readily available, and his other works do not directly suggest a focus on the Recordites, but further research may yield more profitable results with regard to Bradley's work and its potential influence.

and rested too much on an appeal to intrinsic Anglican values. This was much the same problem that the *Critic* and, to a lesser extent, the *Remembrancer* experienced, one that is indicative of the Anglicanism, in all its guises, failing to maintain pace with the zeitgeist.

Attempts to "keep up", so to speak, with social developments were not made by all publications. The final publication considered in this chapter, the *Church of England Quarterly Review*, did not make any serious attempt to engage with subjects that were not centred on ecclesiastical topics. The *Review* did not devote many pages to social issues in general, and it did not offer many solutions when they were mentioned. Indeed, it is fair to state that the *British Critic,* the *Remembrancer* and the *Christian Observer* all devoted more pages and more energy to such concerns, albeit with more enthusiasm in certain periods, and that this happened in part due to the interests in these areas of prominent figures associated with the publications. The *Review*, in its attempts to advocate traditional eighteenth-century Anglicanism, set itself up in the style of magazines from that period, and did not venture into more secular areas as much as the other three periodicals considered here did. The *Review* carried the usual contents of traditional ecclesiastical magazines, such as commentaries on sermons and reviews of works, and these articles expected a high level of education from its readership.

Many pages were devoted to classical studies, to the extent that the *Review* is quoted in several works on Greek studies in the nineteenth century.[229] Poetry and fiction were common subjects, and Leigh Hunt's review of Tennyson's 'St Simeon Stylites' in the pages of the *Review* in 1842 was a cultural moment for

[229] M. L Clarke, *Greek Studies in England, 1770-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1945) and John Edwin Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship: The Eighteenth Century in Germany and the Nineteenth Century in Europe and the United States of America, Volume 3* (Cambridge: University Press, 2010), as examples.

the periodical.[230] Disraeli's novels *Sybil* and *Coningsby* were reviewed in 1845, and although there is an investigation into social 'evils', the publication does not offer much more than 'good Christian education' as the remedy, and bemoans the presence of those that do not adhere to the correct form of this education holding positions of prominence in both church and state.[231]This 'correctness' is often considered in the context of the *Review's* continued opposition to Rome, as shown by the commentary on a letter from the Bishop of Exeter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1850.

Consideration of potential differences in the Anglican Church is celebrated by the publication, contrary to the "deadness of the Roman Church, which extinguishes all interests, forbids all enquiry, permits no appeal from itself, not even to Scripture, and calls this blind submission unity".[232] As discussed above, there was a conscious effort to cleave 'Anglo-Catholicism' away from 'Papistry', to use a term often employed by the *Review* (among others), and lends itself to wider considerations of different interpretations and meanings of the term 'Catholic'.

Conclusion

Religious periodicals in the nineteenth century were emblematic not only of the challenges posed to Anglicanism in the nineteenth century, but of the dynamic nature of Anglicanism itself. Each of the four publications considered in this chapter, the *British Critic*, the *Christian Remembrancer*, the *Christian*

---

[230] 'The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice', *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, Volume XI (1842), pp. 361-76. For further assessment of the poem, see Richard J. Walker, *Labyrinths of Deceit: Culture, Modernity and Identity in the Nineteenth Century* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007), pp. 124-36.
[231] 'Oxford University Sermons', *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, Volume XIX (1845), pp. 161-83.
[232] 'The Church of England and the Church of Rome', *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, Volume XXVIII (1850), p. 2.

Observer, and the *Church of England Quarterly Review*, took different approaches regarding crucial themes that resonated not only with religious communities in England but with wider society. As the validity of the 'old order' came under increasing scrutiny as the century progressed, the *Critic*, *Remembrancer*, and *Observer* went through periods of tending to either address or avoid the issues that precipitated these challenges. The *Review* mostly avoided them, unless a sound theological context could be applied. The next chapter will seek to place the editorial decisions of these publications in a wider context, but from the analysis conducted in this chapter, it is notable that the two publications that closed before the end of the period assessed, in 1860, were the two publications steeped in a pre-nineteenth-century Tory Anglicanism – the *Critic* and the *Review*. The *Critic*, a product of reactionary concern generated by the French Revolution, did not survive its Tractarian takeover, whereas the *Remembrancer* did: the *Critic's* replacement, the *English Review*, was unremarkable and petered out in 1853.

The switch to Tractarianism was disastrous for the *Critic* and signposted its demise. This suggests that it had a readership frustrated by the switch that looked elsewhere for a reliable periodical. Though the *Church of England Quarterly Review* might have benefited initially from any disillusion with the *Critic* in terms of additional readership, this did not endure, and neither did the periodical, ending as it did in 1858. High Church Anglicanism was changing and developing in the nineteenth century, and it was coming under increased scrutiny from both secular and religious quarters. That its very nature was being challenged by the Oxford Movement's Anglo-Catholicism, and this movement was usurping its periodicals, is indicative of the profound effect that Tractarianism had on Anglicanism in the mid-nineteenth century.

The rise to prominence of the Tractarians in 1833, ostensibly in reaction to the Irish Church Temporalities Bill of 1833, but as a group that considered and

challenged the nature of Anglicanism, shaped the content of ecclesiastical periodicals from that point onward. Each of the four publications considered in this chapter was initially hostile, but each ended up modifying and softening its approach to Anglo-Catholicism, with the *Critic* and *Remembrancer* becoming advocates after takeovers. The evangelical *Observer*, which had a mutually hostile relationship with Tractarianism, was, on occasion, able to acknowledge the achievements and the importance of the Oxford Movement. Even the *Church of England Quarterly Review*, which was founded as a reaction to the *Critic* and *Remembrancer* becoming Tractarian publications, was able to take a more nuanced approach over time.

As the century wore on, Anglicanism was forced to consider challenges beyond the religious: Anglo-Catholicism was, perhaps, not as problematic to the Church as was the rise of secularism in the latter quarter of the century. Michael Rectenwald sees John Henry Newman's conversion to Roman Catholicism as part of a 'triumvirate of secularity' with his brothers Francis William and Charles Robert: though he deems Francis to be the most central to his notion of secularism, he sees the loss of John Henry as a tremendous blow to the intellectual credibility of Anglicanism, and its ability to defend itself from encroaching secularity.[233] What can be stated at this juncture is that Tractarianism, emerging as it did after strong challenges to the primacy of the Church of England and forcing a change of direction for Anglicanism, was pivotal in altering the nature of the Church of England, and this was reflected in these publications. Once secularists and radicals began to gain ground, Anglicanism had bigger issues than defining 'catholic', and the predominance of differing views, as expressed in these periodicals, indicates that there was no consensus for addressing them.

---

[233] Michael Rectenwald, *Nineteenth-Century British Secularism* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), pp. 135-67.

As the periodicals appraised in this chapter have indicated, religion found itself rather on the defensive from the 1830s, but this did not mean that it ceased to play a role in most people's lives. Secularism was a growing concern, but not among the working classes, who continued to attend church services in high numbers throughout the nineteenth century.[234] The rise of evangelicalism, and indeed other forms of dissent, mattered more to those not able or inclined to join in the wrangles over terminology or practice, and the high-minded debates covered in the periodicals should be recognised as the preserve of the relative few able and inclined to participate in them. That is why the relatively small readerships are not determining factors – as previously stated, these publications were, in a sense, reference points for clergy to refer to when taking the message(s) out to their congregations. For Tractarians, and many High Church Anglicans, the theological intricacies of Biblical scripture was "none of the people's business".[235] It was the job of sufficiently trained clergy to do that on their behalf, and the *Critic* and the *Remembrancer*, and indeed the *Church of England Quarterly Review*, though not Tractarian, were all there to instruct the clergy, rather than address the wider public directly. Religiosity was evident in the Victorian period: Doreen Rosman has found enough evidence to state that Victorian Christianity was 'vigorous' in its appeal to every stratum of society.[236] Intellectual aspiration was given greater impetus in the Victorian era, and the proliferation of a cheaper press after the repeal of stamp duty in 1855 enabled the indulgence of this intellectual curiosity. The reality of ecclesiastical and secular ideas percolating among society, without the correct interpretation from a member of the clergy, emboldened the periodicals to continue to strive to enable their readership to combat these circumstances.

---

[234] Hugh McLeod, *Religion and the Working Class in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (London: Macmillan, 1984), p. 14.
[235] Horton Davis, *Worship and Theology in England: From Watts and Wesley to Maurice, 1690-1850* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 314.
[236] Doreen Rosman, *The Evolution of the English Churches, 1500-2000* (Cambridge: University Press, 2003), pp. 207-32.

The next chapter will consider a selection of periodicals that situated their own religious commentaries as part of a broader cultural, political and social focus. It will analyse responses to ecclesiastical topics within the pages of these publications that had broader remits, and it will be demonstrated that the ecclesiastical public sphere broadened over the period in question, and that the periodicals utilised in this chapter were effectively competing with a burgeoning periodical press that could do what religious periodicals did, admittedly to a lesser extent. Building on work such as that by Louis Billington, the chapter will evaluate the impact of this burgeoning focus on religion in broader periodicals on Anglicanism itself, and how the Church of England, and Nonconformists, sought to self-identify during the period being considered.[237] The key facet of each of the four publications included in this chapter is that each sought to impose ideas on its readerships, and to ensure that ideological consistency was maintained as far as possible. However, as the examples of the *British Critic* and the *Christian Remembrancer* in this chapter have shown, this depended on the current editorial line of a given publication. The ecclesiastical line of the case studies in Chapter Two was liable to these effects, as will be seen.

[237] Louis Billington, 'The Religious Periodical and Newspaper Press, 1770-1870' in Michael Harris and Alan Lee (eds.), *The Press in English Society from the Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries* (London: Associated University Press, 1986), pp. 113-32.

Chapter 2: "Broader" Periodicals

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to contextualise and evaluate the role of five periodicals within the ecclesiastical public sphere in England, and to demonstrate that attempts to determine the Anglican narrative occurred in the volumes of these periodicals, with widespread interest not just from clergymen but the laity too. This analysis contributes to an understanding of the "diverse ways in which religion was commodified, debated, and practised in a wide range of nineteenth-century texts and contexts".[238] How this found expression in contemporary periodicals has not been considered sufficiently. Jon Klancher has noted that, since the turn of the twenty-first century "the literary magazine from Blackwood's in 1817 to Fraser's Magazine in 1830 has been more intensively studied than any other kind of periodical from the Romantic age."[239] Klancher's chapter appears in Mason and Mole's *Eleven Case Studies from Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*; none of these case studies focus on religion. This chapter's contention is that this "intensive study" has not sufficiently encompassed religion.

This is not to suggest that religious subjects were the exclusive remit of these broader periodicals; as previously discussed, religion was one subject of many covered, and most pages of each issue were dedicated to topics other than religion. As will be shown in this chapter, the extent to which the selected periodicals considered religion varied, depending on the publication, the wider context, and the focus of the editor. This chapter will demonstrate that religion

---

[238] Joshua King and Winter Jade Werner, 'Introduction' in Joshua King and Winter Jade Werner (eds.), *Constructing Nineteenth-Century Religion: Literary, Historical, and Religious Studies in Dialogue* (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2019), p. 3.
[239] Jon Klancher, 'Rethinking the Periodical Medium in the Digital Age' in Mason and Mole (eds.), p. 17.

was frequently discussed in these periodicals, and that their consideration of religion contributed to the ecclesiastical public sphere. In an era when "Church and State" was a familiar, if contested, idea, the religious dimension of politics needs to be kept in view. The *Quarterly Review* originated in 1809 as a counter to the "stridently Whig" *Edinburgh Review*; its founders sought to propagate Tory ideals to oppose its declared rival.[240]

As this chapter will show, there was undoubtedly a religious aspect to these political differences, but at this juncture, it should be noted that often such controversies centred on political issues that did not have an explicit religious aspect or were based upon literary works that occasionally had theological underpinnings. *Fraser's Magazine* and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, along with the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly*, comprise four of the five case studies in this chapter; all follow a similar approach, for the most part. They offered theological commentaries, often through reviews of published works, but this is only one aspect of each publication. The *Eclectic Review* "reviewed books in every field", and the "extraordinary range and richness of the *Eclectic's* sixty-five year parade of literary history" made it comparable to the other periodicals as a broad review of numerous topics.[241] However, Altholz lists it among the religious press in Britain due to its "studied moderation" being "modified somewhat" when it was sold to a Baptist minister, Thomas Price, in 1837, who edited the periodical from 1837-55 (with co-editors from 1850). Prior to this, "there was nothing specifically religious about it", according to Altholz, other than being established and controlled by non-conformists, and its contents included theological topics

---

[240] Roger P. Wallins, 'Quarterly Review, The' in Alvin Sullivan (ed.), *British Literary Magazines: The Romantic Age, 1789-1836* (London: Greenwood Press, 1983), p. 359.

[241] James E. Basker, 'Eclectic Review, The' in Sullivan (ed.), pp. 124-129. While Basker does acknowledge that the "underlying religious and philosophical tenets of its authors may have shaped its readership and affected its tone" (p. 127), the *Eclectic* covered a vast array of subjects, including taking an interest in American literature that superseded any other English periodical of the time. Therefore, while the Nonconformity of the *Eclectic* must be recognised, and Price's ownership and editorship marked a shift in its consideration and perspective on religious topics, the periodical maintained a wide field of interest throughout its existence, and thus it belongs in this chapter.

among many others. This continued to be the case after 1837, despite it becoming more strident in its theological pronouncements.[242] Its renewed commitment to Dissenting opinion was not to the detriment of covering a range of subjects – the *Eclectic* continued to live up to its name. While Altholz is correct in recognising this crystallisation after 1837, the *Eclectic*'s wide scope throughout its existence makes it a better fit for this chapter. The Dissenting perspective of its theological output makes it an interesting comparison to the other four considered, although it was not the only one of the five selected to publish articles from Dissenting and Nonconformist voices, as shall be discussed below.

It is not the intention here to suggest that these periodicals took an approach comparable to those considered in the previous chapter. Rather, these reviews and magazines had a theological aspect to them that was integral to their identity. The *Gentleman's, Edinburgh, Eclectic, Quarterly,* and *Fraser's* all contained reviews of religious works, many of them relatively obscure even at the time of publication, and each offered commentary on ecclesiastical matters that represented the perspectives of the editors and contributors of each periodical.

The contents of these periodicals were aimed at a highly literate and educated audience, one familiar with topics that were frequently niche, intricate, and/or contentious. Articles addressing theological subjects often ticked all three of these boxes – perhaps an inevitability, given the contested nature of Anglicanism during the years considered in this thesis. It has been suggested that the Religious Tract Society, an organisation founded in 1799 to disseminate "suitable" reading materials among the working classes, intended to "secure the religious and social compliance of its beneficiaries".[243] One could make a case that the theological articles and reviews in the aforementioned periodicals sought

---

[242] Josef L. Altholz, *The Religious Press in Britain, 1760-1900* (Westport: Greenwood Press Inc., 1989), pp. 58-59.

[243] John Feather, *A History of British Publishing* (London: Croom Helm, 1988), p. 110. See also: Jonathan Rose, *The Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes* (London: Yale University Press, 2002), esp. chapter 1.

to do the same amongst its audiences, albeit through overpronounced intellectualism rather than the often patronising cajoling of the Religious Tract Society's publications.[244] Perhaps it is more accurate to suggest that the aim of the periodicals was to ensure that their readers were informed sufficiently, not only regarding the pertinent issues of the day, but of the correct understanding of these issues. A good proportion of the readership of these publications engaged in instruction or persuasion, such as clergy, educators, and politicians, and thus it was imperative that they were not leading their charges astray. Such concerns became particularly acute after the 1851 Census, which suggested an alarming rate of absence at any form of church service, with Church of England services notably affected. Absences among the working classes were particularly high. However, as will be discussed below, these fears were overemphasised by contemporary observers, and later analysis has cast doubt on the significance of the census.

This was seen as symptomatic of the decline of the Church of England, to the extent that David Hempton has declared that it could "no longer claim to be *the* church of the nation".[245] As Susie L. Steinbach has recognised, this did not mean that the country was well on the way towards secularisation; despite falling church attendances and the end of the Church of England's pre-eminence, Christianity pervaded many aspects of people's lives, and that the nation was still

---

[244] There are myriad examples of the overbearing paternalism that emanated from the Religious Tract Society and its output, but the following, from an 1846 work entitled *Calls of Usefulness*, should demonstrate the point. The tale is told from the perspective of an incredibly persistent visitor, who makes no less than 103 calls on various individuals or groups to impart Christian wisdom. In the call to "a sabbath idler", the visitor chides the "idler" that "The sabbath bells have rung in your ears, and several places of worship have been opened around you, yet here you are, idly lounging about in your dirty clothes, reading a newspaper, neglecting your own soul, and forsaking the worship of Almighty God". It is interesting to note that this tract, though written with palpable condescension, does reflect a concern surrounding church attendances; SHOULD BE A FULL STOP although this particular tale is referenced as occurring in Scotland, the message would certainly have applied to IN an English context as well.

[245] David Hempton, 'Established churches and the growth of religious pluralism: a case study of Christianisation and secularisation in England since 1700' in Hugh McLeod and Werner Ustorf (eds.), *The Decline of Christendom in Western Europe, 1750-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 91.

a Christian one at the end of the nineteenth century.[246] The continued importance of Christianity is evident in the frequent and detailed considerations of theological topics in popular periodicals, and the societal status of many of their readers meant that their influence extended far beyond the number of copies sold. As Christianity maintained a key role in both private and public settings, these periodicals' influence on the ecclesiastical public sphere needs to be examined. This chapter will do this by analysing five prominent examples from the period under consideration.

This wider evaluation took place in the context of a development in the nature of reviewing in the early nineteenth century, which John O. Hayden has recognised in *The Romantic Reviewers*. He notes that there were "responsible critical organs", such as the *Critical Review* and *Monthly Review*, which provided reviews of recent works, but that the inception of the *Edinburgh Review* in 1802 not only "transformed the reviewing periodicals already in existence" but also "became the model of all Reviews of the nineteenth century".[247] The *Edinburgh Review*, and its rival the *Quarterly Review*, established in 1809, represented a new approach to reviewing that was more polemical, predicated on a set political position that incorporated clearly defined ecclesiastical principles. Hence, Cornelius Darcy has stated that, by the turn of the nineteenth century, the *Gentleman's Magazine* was "solid and serious, but no longer very consequential in the world of the *Edinburgh Review* and the *Quarterly Review*".[248]

That the *Gentleman's* experienced a drop in prestige from its zenith in the eighteenth century cannot be disputed; that it was bordering on insignificance by the turn of the century is, however, to overstate the case. James M. Kuist's

---

[246] Susie L. Steinbach, *Understanding the Victorians: Politics, Culture and Society in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017), p. 260.
[247] John O. Hayden, *The Romantic Reviewers, 1802-1824* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited, 1969), p. 8.
[248] Cornelius P. Darcy, 'The Gentleman's Magazine' in Alvin Sullivan (ed.), *British Literary Magazines: The Augustan Age and the Age of Johnson, 1698-1788* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1983), p. 138.

assertion that the *Gentleman's* represents "an authentic compendium of thought, opinion, and learning" from the "late eighteenth" to the "early nineteenth" centuries shows its value until 1815, but its significance extends beyond this date.[249] Thus, this value is not merely *post hoc*; Kuist has demonstrated that the wider contributions to the magazine beyond a fixed staff, a practice restricted but not halted after the death of editor John Nichols in 1826, was a "distinguishing feature" when set against "the advent of more rigidly oriented journals" at the start of the nineteenth century.[250] According to Emily Lorraine de Montluzin, Nichols' death was a "blow" to the *Gentleman's* readership.[251] Kuist has stated that the magazine's "significance among English periodicals had declined" by 1856.[252] However, it remained a fixture of the public sphere, and its longevity, and legacy in terms of democratising the reading audience as potential contributors, should be recognised.[253] The idea that 1815 represents the finale of the *Gentleman's* relevance has been challenged by Thomas Vranken's contention that the magazine and the Romantic period "participated in a kind of philosophical dialogue" that prolonged the *Gentleman's* importance.[254] Even 1856 might be too early to dismiss it; de Montluzin sees 1868 as the culmination of the *Gentleman's* literary merit, when the new direction under editor Joseph Hatton saw it become something that earlier contributors and readers "would not even have recognised".[255]

---

[249] James M. Kuist, 'A Collaboration in Learning: "The Gentleman's Magazine" and Its Ingenious Contributors', *Studies in Bibliography*, 44 (January, 1991), p. 303.
[250] *Ibid*, p. 317.
[251] Emily de Lorraine Montluzin, 'Attributions of Authorship in the Gentleman's Magazine, 1824-1826: A Supplement to the Union List', *Notes and Queries* 69.4 (December, 2022), p. 323.
[252] James M. Kuist, *The Nichols File of the Gentleman's Magazine: Attributions of Authorship and Other Documentation in Editorial Papers at the Folger Library* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1982), p. 4.
[253] Gillian Williamson, *British Masculinity in the Gentleman's Magazine, 1731 to 1815* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), p. 31.
[254] Thomas Vranken, '"A Well-Preserved Piece of Useless Antiquity": The *Gentleman's Magazine* and Anti-emotional National Identity' in Jock Macleod, William Christie and Peter Denney (eds.), *Politics and Emotions in Romantic Periodicals* (Cham: Springer Nature, 2019), p. 84.
[255] Emily Lorraine de Montluzin, 'Introduction' to the *Attributions of Authorship in the Gentleman's Magazine, 1731-1868: An Electronic Union List*, viewed online via https://bsuva.org/bsuva/gm2/GMintro.html#history [accessed 18 June 2025].

Gillian Williamson has asserted, with some confidence, that the *Gentleman's* had a readership for each monthly issue of "at least" 50,000 by 1815, including not only direct sales but library borrowing and sharing of copies.[256] Though he is not entirely convinced that it is accurate, William Stafford has put forward the "generally cited" figure of 4,550 copies circulated in 1797, and he has suggested that this could be a fair approximation for the period 1785-1815.[257] Comparing Williamson and Stafford's numbers show the significance of wider consumption of periodicals, even if they are based on estimations by both historians' admission; they also show that the *Gentleman's* was not an irrelevance by 1815. Furthermore, Stafford, using the work done by Kuist and de Montluzin to identify contributors to the magazine, has come to the conclusion that "almost 30%" of the writers identified by Kuist and Montluzin were clergymen.[258] 39% of the list of contributors to the *Gentleman's* in the General Index for the years 1787-1818 were members of the clergy.[259] Clearly, it was of interest to at least a section of the clergy to participate in the "democratised" reading audience perpetuated by the *Gentleman's*, and to utilise its pages to diffuse ideas within a burgeoning public sphere. As will be discussed later, the importance and efficacy of these periodicals shifted during the period in question. It is sufficient to state that the *Gentleman's Magazine* is a viable case study for the purpose of this chapter.

---

[256] Williamson, p. 34.
[257] William Stafford, 'Representations of the Social Order in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1785-1815', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 33.2 (April, 2009), pp. 66-67.
[258] *Ibid*, p. 67. Regarding attributions of the publication's contents, de Montluzin has been prodigious in identifying contributors to the *Gentleman's*; see her multiple submissions to *Studies in Bibliography* and *Notes and Queries* for her lists of attributions.
[259] John Nichols, *General Index to the Gentleman's Magazine from the Year 1787 to 1818, Volume 3* (London: John Nichols and Son, 1821), pp. lxxiv-lxxviii. The list is "formed principally from a *memoriter* collection of departed Friends and Patrons", and is incomplete, but the sample size is large enough to give an indication of the *Gentleman's* audience prior to 1815. The list provided by Nichols contains 521 names, and 203 are listed as "Rev" or identified as a Bishop, which is 38.96% of the total. This does not mean that every one of these 203 contributors wrote about religion, but it does demonstrate that the clergy made up a significant percentage of the *Gentleman's* active participants.

The purpose of this chapter is to stress that religion has not been adequately considered in scholarship centred on periodicals despite its growth in the last forty years. Religion has often been neglected as a topic of consideration, and the presence of religion as a reference point for considerations of literature, philosophy, science, travel writing, and more niche topics needs much greater evaluation. Moreover, there needs to be greater focus on the involvement of the laity in ecclesiastical debates; these were not solely the preserve of the clergy. While periodicals have received greater attention in the past forty years, the nature of discourse on religion within their pages has not been part of this development. In general, the study of periodicals has grown in sophistication since 1982, to the extent that Shattock and Wolff's comments no longer summarise the field.

To do this, the chapter will be divided into three sections, taking a chronological approach as per the previous chapter. This chronological approach is a useful framing method for the thesis, and this chapter will also utilise it. The first section will assess the period from 1815 until 1832, when prominent periodicals not only reflected social, political, and cultural divisions but played an active role in sharpening them. The *Gentleman's*, *Edinburgh*, *Eclectic*, and *Quarterly* were all in existence by 1815, and each had contributed markedly to the intellectual public sphere by the beginning of the period under consideration. The first part of the chapter will evaluate the ecclesiastical position of these periodicals, which was often intertwined with their political affiliation, and it will also assess their contents as a means of disseminating ideas about religion, with a particular focus on what this meant for the Church of England. While this was not the overwhelming focus for these publications as it was for those considered in the first chapter, it was present in the pages of each of these publications, and this has not been given the attention that it warrants.[260] This first section will also

[260] In terms of comparing the periodicals considered in this chapter to those in the previous one, The *British Critic* is perhaps the closest comparison, until its focus became more theological under the editorship of

consider the periodicals' reaction to three crucial acts: the Sacramental Test Act of 1828, the Catholic Relief Act of 1829, and the Reform Act of 1832. While there has been much commentary on each of these, particularly the latter two, the response of periodicals from an ecclesiastical perspective has not been considered. This chapter will seek to analyse how lay periodicals reacted to ecclesiastical controversies by using the aforementioned four case studies. There will also be an evaluation of the impact made by the establishment of *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* in 1830, both in terms of how this new publication reacted to recent events and the extent to which the initially arch-Tory *Fraser's* represented the mood of the ecclesiastical public sphere.

The second part of the chapter will evaluate the ecclesiastical landscape as it was considered in the periodicals in question after 1832. Although J. C. D. Clark went too far in declaring that 1832 represented the end of the "*ancien régime*" in England, one of the effects of the First Reform Act was to weaken the status of the Church of England, even though many of its members voted in favour of it. Owen Chadwick has commented on the opprobrium directed towards those bishops in the House of Lords, and the invective against the Church of England that led some to call for its disestablishment, and the despondency of many within the Church regarding the process of reform.[261] As Robert Saunders has remarked, religion has not been appropriately considered as an aspect of the First Reform Act. Saunders' exhortation that religion should be given broader consideration during key moments of the nineteenth century is valid. Saunders' work utilised the press and sermons in order to consider religious, particularly clerical, opposition to reform. It is the contention of this chapter that the periodicals

---

Archibald Montgomery Campbell; for some brief comments on this, see S. A. Skinner, *Tractarians and the 'Condition of England': The Social and Political Thought of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), pp. 35-6.

[261] Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church, Part One: 1829-1860*, Third Edition (London: A. & C. Black, 1971), pp. 24-47.

considered can offer similar insights into nineteenth-century events.[262] The second section of the chapter will consider ecclesiastical commentary in the selected periodicals post-Reform Act until 1845, a period that coincided with the prominence of the Oxford Movement. The Tractarians provided a constant source of consideration, contention, and often frustration for the publications in question, and this second part of the chapter will appraise these commentaries and their impact on the ecclesiastical aspect of the public sphere.

Thirdly, the chapter will consider the period from 1845, when John Henry Newman's conversion to Roman Catholicism had a profound impact not only on the Tractarians but also on the Church of England itself.[263] In order to do this, this section will focus on the selected periodicals' responses to Pope Pius IX's bull *Universalis Ecclesiae*, published in 1850. Considered an act of hostility, if not downright aggression on the part of the Pontiff by many commentators, the responses to the bull revealed concerning divergences of thought regarding the appropriate response from the Church of England. The uncertainty surrounding the stability of the Church of England was reflected in the periodicals considered, and this extended far beyond niche theological clashes that took up relatively little space. Of much greater significance was the nature of the State, to which religion was indelibly linked. Conversations centred on this relationship spilt over into dialogues on philosophy, economics, education theory, and a great many other areas that were frequently addressed in these periodicals.

Finally, the chapter will consider the periodicals' responses to *Essays and Reviews*, the collection of essays published in 1860 on theology and Biblical criticism that caused much consternation, but which also signalled the

---

[262] Robert Saunders, 'God and the Great Reform Act: Preaching against Reform, 1831–32', *Journal of British Studies*, 53.2 (April, 2014), pp. 378-99.

[263] For the enduring legacy of John Henry Newman in an Anglican context, see Geoffrey Rowell, 'Anglican Theological Receptions' in Frederick D. Aquino and Benjamin J. King (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of John Henry Newman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 517-537. For more on John Henry Newman's life and theology, see Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: A Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988) and Sheridan Gilley, *Newman and His Age* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1990).

popularisation of more "liberal" approaches to religious thought. Published at the end of the period considered in this thesis, *Essays and Reviews* affords an opportunity to evaluate how the theological positions of the five case studies had developed since 1815, and to assess the periodicals' reviews of its contents as an indication of their theological positions in 1861, when focus on the publication had reached its apex.[264] Representing a crucial moment in conceptions of Christianity in England, *Essays and Reviews* encouraged deliberations of the tenets of the faith within the public sphere, and it is therefore an ideal focal point for the final part of this chapter.

Part 1: Emancipation, Reform and its Discontents, 1815-32

That the *Edinburgh Review* had been marked out as an opponent of religion by 1815 is demonstrated above, and its detractors were strident in their accusations. The *Anti-Jacobin Review* declared in 1804 that the "object of the *Edinburgh Review* is the depreciation of whatever tends to elevate, or to support our country." To achieve this involved a plan to "vilify every writer who supports constitutional loyalty, patriotism, and order", at least according to the excited commentator in the *Anti-Jacobin*.[265] The *Christian Observer* took issue with the article 'Hints respecting the Education of a Young Princess', published in the *Edinburgh* in October 1805. This was not the first occasion on which the *Observer* had "complained of the religious sentiments" of the *Edinburgh*, the article in question apparently being the most egregious example to date.[266] The Reverend William Cockburn, the future Dean of York, chastised the *Edinburgh*

---

[264] *Essays and Reviews* was published in March 1860, but Frederic Harrison's review in October 1860, in the *Westminster Review*, stimulated further considerations. As will be noted below, Wilberforce's article in the *Quarterly* further raised its prominence.
[265] J. B., 'Criticism of the *Edinburgh Review*', *The Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine, Volume XVIII* (August 1804), p. 417.
[266] 'Review of the *Edinburgh Review*… Mrs. More's Hints', *Christian Observer, Volume IV* (1805), p. 758.

Review (and Edward Gibbon) for calling into question the credibility of the Exodus. While he declared his "sincere belief" that the *Edinburgh* reviewers were Christians, he would go on to state that the publication would "deplore" its actions if it had "weakened the religious faith of any", or if it had "diminished those hopes which might have cheered the gloomy evening of life".[267] A curious twist in this tale is that the *Quarterly Review* came to the defence of the *Edinburgh* regarding this charge, bluntly asking "is Mr. Cockburn in his senses?"; the *Quarterly* challenged Cockburn to "retract his compliment or his charge".[268] Even the *Edinburgh's* avowed opponents felt it necessary to step in when the accusations were too ridiculous; in the case of the *Quarterly*, this was in its very first volume, when the founders were setting out their stall against "the enemy".[269]

The more extreme denunciations of the *Edinburgh* can perhaps be explained by the attitude of "Mentor", who, in their polemic against the periodical, declared that they were "utterly unconnected with any set of men of an opposite character".[270] For his part, Francis Jeffrey wished to "forward the great ends of liberty", and that "considerable latitude should be indulged" as a means of achieving this; men of talent should be allowed to express their abilities however they desired "unless the excesses were very great and revolting".[271] For Mentor, Cockburn, and many of the *Edinburgh's* other critics on religious grounds, their view of "excesses" greatly exceeded that of Jeffrey. He wanted to avoid the publication being regarded as partisan; he was unsuccessful, as categorisations of the *Edinburgh* ranged from Whig to Radical, but he was able to bring together an array of talented contributors that brought the *Review* instant notoriety, and a reputation that persisted long after Jeffrey was no longer the

---

[267] William Cockburn, *The Credibility of the Jewish Exodus, Defended against Some Remarks of Edward Gibbon, Esq. and the Edinburgh Reviewers* (London: J. Hatchard, 1809), pp. 92-3.
[268] 'Cockburn on the Old Testament', *Quarterly Review*, Volume I (February, 1809), p. 96.
[269] Kim Wheatley, 'Plotting the Success of the *Quarterly Review*' in Cutmore (ed.) (2007), p. 21.
[270] "Mentor", *The Dangers of the Edinburgh Review; or a Brief Exposure of its Principles in Religion, Morals and Politics* (London: F. C. and J Rivington, 1808), p. 35.
[271] William Christie, *The Edinburgh Review in the Literary Culture of Romantic Britain: Mammoth and Megalonyx* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), p. 26.

editor. Finkelstein and Nash point to Jeffrey's repeated condemnation of the state of literary criticism prior to the establishment of the *Edinburgh*, criticising it as dull and mostly intended to sell publishers' own works. The new review would eschew such triteness, and its principal aim was to serve the public interest.[272] With regard to religion, this meant that the *Edinburgh* published articles and reviews that intended to inform its readership of the pertinent issues; this led to accusations of irreligiosity, partisan perspectives, and a failure to support the Established Church.

As Philip Flynn has stated, much of this can be attributed to Jeffrey imbuing the *Review* with a "spirit of analytical philosophy" that incorporated his "sceptical position" on epistemological issues. Flynn sees this as occurring against the backdrop of "Jacobin extremism and Tory reaction".[273] J. C. D. Clark has described the period 1815-1827 in more muted terms, as the "Defence of the Protestant Constitution".[274] There was a fear among certain Tories in 1831 that some beneficiaries of proposed parliamentary reform would "mock established institutions, and especially the Church of England's privileges".[275] This would certainly have been based on a perception that such mockery had already been occurring, and the *Edinburgh Review* was frequently accused of such behaviour, as has been shown. Analysis of religious and ecclesiastical topics in the *Edinburgh* demonstrates that it sometimes did its best to encourage such shrill warnings of doom for the Established Church, whether this was deliberate or incidental.

---

[272] David Finkelstein and Andrew Nash, 'The Edinburgh Review(1802-1902)' in David Innes and Andrew Nash (eds.), *The British Publishing Industry in the Nineteenth Century, Volume IV: Publishers, Markets, Readers* (London: Routledge, 2024), p. 227.
[273] Philip Flynn, 'Francis Jeffrey and the Scottish Critical Tradition' in Massimiliano Demata and Duncan Wu (eds.), *British Romanticism and the Edinburgh Review: Bicentenary Essays* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), p. 16.
[274] J. C. D. Clark*, English Society, 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology, and Politics during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 515.
[275] Joanna Innes, Mark Philp, and Robert Saunders, 'The Rise of Democratic Discourse in the Reform Era: Britain in the 1830s and 1840s' in Joanna Innes and Mark Philip (eds.), *Re-imagining Democracy in the Age of Revolutions: America, France, Britain, Ireland 1750-1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 118.

An article in February 1815 is a good example of the *Edinburgh* being provocative, whether deliberately or incidentally. The subject was Joanna Southcott, a woman from Devon who claimed to be a prophet in the late 1790s; by 1814, she had announced that she was pregnant with the new Messiah, who failed to appear in that same year. Southcott viewed her mission as being in conjunction with the clergy of the Church of England; her efforts to secure support from the Church of England, which she saw as the destination of reconciliation for all Christian sects, were overwhelmingly unsuccessful.[276] She was denounced as a blasphemer, having distorted the Scriptures for her own ends.[277] The *Edinburgh Review* saw the furore surrounding Southcott as an example of the "humiliation" of credulity being overawed by passionate excitement.[278] After summarising the affair, dismissing Southcott's prophecies and lamenting the critical faculties of those who followed her, the writer of the article, possibly Jeffrey himself, offers a note of caution to the reader:

> But while we laugh at the simplicity of her disciples, we may all of us do well to look homeward, - and to consider whether our own belief is not on various occasions determined by our feelings, more than by evidence, - whether we are not sometimes duped by respected names or bold pretenders – and sometimes by our own fancies, fears or wishes.[279]

---

[276] James K. Hopkins, *A Woman to Deliver Her People: Joanna Southcott and English Millenarianism in an Era of Revolution* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982), pp. 57-62.
[277] G. Denham, *Remarks on the Writings and Prophecies of Joanna Southcott: Being an Attempt to Prove Her Assertions Inconsistent with the Will of God as Revealed in the Scriptures of Eternal Truth* (London: Dean and Munday, 1815). The entire pamphlet accuses Southcott of falsehood; one example is on page 19, where Denham condemns Southcott's view of the literal personification of the Holy Spirit as "awful blasphemy indeed". The satirist John Wolcot, writing under the pseudonym Peter Pindar, wrote a short play about Southcott entitled *Physic and Delusion! or, Jezebel and the Doctors* (London: James Johnston, 1814).
[278] 'Joanna Southcott', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume XXIV (February, 1815), p. 453.
[279] 'Joanna Southcott', *Edinburgh Review*, p. 471. The Wellesley Index entry for this article gives the attribution as "Francis Jeffrey?", based on a letter from the lawyer John Whishaw to a Mr. Smith. Whishaw gives the names of the contributors to the February edition of the *Edinburgh* "as far as I know or can guess them"; he does not elucidate which are known to him and which are guesses. The article on Southcott was described as "Chiefly

Perfectly reasonable advice, on the face of it, but potentially provocative, given that it might undermine the pronouncements of any religious figure and cast doubt on the veracity of any individual's belief as an error of emotion over logic. In the very next issue of the *Edinburgh*, in June 1815, an article on the 'Liberty of the Continental Press' asserts that, when it comes to religion, "its most zealous, able, and successful defenders have condemned the law which makes it a crime to speak or write in opposition to it".[280] The author is writing on a broad European context, although the inference that the protection of free speech should be maintained at home is evident.

Pithy comments and criticism of poets might have aroused the ire of the more excitable defenders of the Established Church, but the *Edinburgh Review's* continual support for Catholic Emancipation, from the Review's foundation until the passing of that motion in 1829, was a position that was much more concerning even to more reasonable Churchmen. In 1816, the *Review* asserted that conceding the Catholic claim would "allay the animosities of every religious denomination" and, subsequently, "evince the wisdom of universal religious liberty".[281] The *Review* stuck to this position until the passing of the Emancipation Act in 1829. In 1818, an article on Catholics in Ireland was centred on a review of a work by Reverend William Phelan, a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. The *Edinburgh* contributor noted that, in England, High Churchmen viewed Catholic leaders as

---

Jeffrey". See Lady Seymour (ed.), *The "Pope" of Holland House: Selections from the Correspondence of John Whishaw and His Friends, 1813-1840* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1906), p. 92.

[280] 'Liberty of the Continental Press', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume XXV (June, 1815), p. 129. Wellesley raises the possibility that James Mill, historian, economist, philosopher, and father of John Stuart Mill, was the author of this piece; he had written for the *Edinburgh Review* previously, having complained to Jeremy Bentham that an article Mill submitted had been "mangled"; Letter from James Mill to Jeremy Bentham, Monday 27 November, 1809, published through *Electronic Enlightenment Scholarly Edition of Correspondence*, available online via https://www-e-enlightenment-com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/item/bentjeOU0080051a1c/?letters=corr&s=milljames0003945&r=6 [accessed 18 June 2025].

[281] 'Toleration', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume XXVI (February, 1816), p. 66. Wellesley states that this was "possibly" the work of Jeffrey, who had written on the 'Catholic Question' in the November 1810 edition; as Wellesley notes, 'Toleration' expresses the views of Jeffrey, and refers to the earlier article in several places.

a "parcel of fanatics"; however, Phelan, a Protestant High Churchman himself, denied that Roman Catholics sought the usurpation of the Established Church in Ireland.[282] For the *Edinburgh* reviewer, Phelan was much more credible as his views were founded "upon actual observation and personal experience", and not the conjecture of the English High Church party. It is interesting to note that Phelan might not be deemed an "impartial" observer; he grew up Catholic, and after his conversion "he never ceased to bear the tenderest affection towards his Roman-Catholic brethren".[283] The writer of the article in the *Edinburgh* trusted his judgment, and they used Phelan's work as the basis for claiming that opposition to "Popery" was based on "ignorance or inattention".[284] The use of derogatory language was a reflection of "No-Popery" exclamation used by opponents of Emancipation. The author of this article was effectively making the same argument that Michael S. Carter would make almost two hundred years later when he explained that "antipopery" (the term used by Carter) was rarely based on Catholicism or Catholics, but rather "an opposition to *imagined* Catholic beliefs, practices, and political realities".[285]

Whether it was a misunderstanding, or the more serious charge of wilful ignorance regarding Catholics and their intentions, Jeffrey was determined to stay the course. He would continue to publish articles that supported Emancipation, from either a moral or a pragmatic standpoint. In April 1825, the *Edinburgh Review* asserted that both were equally valid, declaring the "political necessity and Christian duty of toleration in religious matters".[286] Henry Parnell, an Irish

---

[282] 'Catholics of Ireland', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume XXXI (December 1818), p. 250. The author of this article is unknown. Phelan is erroneously referred to as "Phelaw" throughout.
[283] John Jebb, 'Biographical Memoir of William Phelan, D. D.,' in Margaret Phelan (ed.), *The Remains of William Phelan, D.D., Volume I* (London: A. & R. Spottiswoode, 1832), p. 13.
[284] 'Catholics of Ireland', p. 251.
[285] Michael S. Carter, 'A "Traitorous Religion": Indulgences and the anti-Catholic Imagination in Eighteenth-Century New England', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 99.1 (January, 2013), p. 53. Though Carter's main focus is New England, he notes that anti-Catholicism was a trans-Atlantic phenomenon, and that anti-Catholicism was "deeply rooted in the collective English Protestant imagination's perception of Catholic belief and practice" (p. 54).
[286] 'Recent History of the Catholic Question', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume XLII (April, 1825), p. 224. The author is unknown.

writer and Whig politician, also saw Emancipation as a mix of morality and expediency:

> So long as the Catholics are treated as a degraded caste, and unjustly deprived of their rights, so long will there be disaffection and rancour brooding in their minds, which misguided ambition or instinctive turbulence may easily direct to purposes of danger.[287]

Parnell's grand-nephew, Charles Stewart Parnell, would be involved in what one could describe as "turbulence" towards the end of the nineteenth century; as the leader of the Irish Land League, he would oversee a politicisation of rural Catholics that included anti-English and anti-Catholic sentiments, a possibility Henry Parnell warned against should Catholics be denied their rights.[288]

Sydney Smith, one of the founders of the *Edinburgh Review*, provided a rare instance of a clergyman commenting on Catholic Emancipation in its pages, at least of those contributors who are known. In a review of works centred on the Catholic Question, he directed remarks at various groups considering the issue. The "No-Popery Fool" was told that they were being used by men who laughed at them, and who "despise you for your folly and ignorance". The "No-Popery Rogue" was chastised for using the issue "to gain some increase of public power". The "Base", by which Smith meant the majority, was told that the "anti-popery people are fast perishing away" and that the "Base" should not be caught off-guard by an "emancipating Administration" – prophetic words, given what would

---

[287] Henry Parnell, 'Catholic Emancipation – Power of the Pope – Divided Allegiance of the Catholics', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume XLIII (November, 1825), p. 163.
[288] *Ibid*, p. 162. For Charles Stewart Parnell, the Land League, and Nationalisation, see R. F. Foster, *Modern Ireland, 1600-1972* (New York: Penguin, 1989), pp. 415-21.

occur two years later. Smith told the Catholics to wait, and not to "add to your miseries by a mad and desperate rebellion". Smith clearly delineated his position in his advice to these various groups of his own categorisation, but his pithiest, and most amusing, address was to the "Honest No-Popery People": "We respect you very sincerely – but are astonished at your existence".[289] At the heart of Smith's various addresses was a clear declaration of principles: Emancipation should be passed, the public should be aware of the changing tide regarding Emancipation, and its opponents should stop being used, or using others, and recognise the spirit of the age. Jeffrey would undoubtedly have been pleased to include such sentiments from one of the periodical's founding fathers.

In 1829, the *Review* would publish an article on 'The Last of the Catholic Question' by William Empson, the barrister and journalist who would later edit the publication. He observed that the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828 "restored Protestants and Dissenters to the evenhandedness of the common law", and asked why it should be that Roman Catholics "should not stand in the same condition" as the Dissenters.[290] Empson accused the Church of England of manufacturing false alarm over Emancipation to strengthen its own position; Brougham would later use this idea by suggesting, in 1831, that failure to pass parliamentary reform in the House of Lords would be blamed on the bishops.[291] Brougham had used the pages of the *Edinburgh* to warn the Peers that they might "render themselves hateful by an odious use of their property for political purposes".[292] The inference was that, if the bishops in the Lords used the Established Church as an excuse to dodge reform, the previous goodwill of the public towards the Lords would quickly dissipate. Empson would extend the spirit of reform to the Church itself in the same issue, noting that the clergy and

---

[289] Sydney Smith, 'Catholic Question', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume XLV (March, 1827), p. 445.
[290] William Empson, 'The Last of the Catholic Question', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume XLIX (March, 1829), p. 235.
[291] William Gibson, *Church, State and Society, 1760-1850* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), pp. 106-07.
[292] Henry Brougham, 'The Dissolution and General Election, with Suggestions to the Peers', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume LIII (June, 1831), p. 500.

the majority of the public were "separated by such a distance – we had almost said such a chasm". The only way that the Church of England would remain a "national blessing" was by being "calmly and judiciously reformed".[293] For those who believed the Church of England to have been perfectly enshrined since the Reformation, or at least 1688, such sentiments were anathema. The *Edinburgh* made itself a target through such pronouncements, and its erstwhile rival, the *Quarterly Review*, aimed its sights.

Robert Southey was the one with his finger on the trigger; as Walter Graham has noted, it was Southey who decided that Emancipation was to be a direct standoff between the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh*. Southey was one of the *Quarterly's* most prominent contributors, and he was keen to use his platform in the periodical to launch an offensive against Emancipation. John Gibson Lockhart, who had only taken over as editor in 1826, feared losing Southey, especially as the Spanish Protestant convert Joseph Blanco White was planning to establish a rival to the *Quarterly*, which would emerge as the *London Review* in 1829.[294] In a letter to John Wilson Croker, another of the *Quarterly's* most pivotal figures, Lockhart would state that he and publisher John Murray allowed Southey to "overrule" them. Croker supported Emancipation and would have been a powerful counter to Southey, possibly with enough influence to veto Southey's article despite the threat of Southey leaving. However, Croker was not on good terms with Lockhart in 1828, having broken contact the previous year; the details are unclear, but resentment from Croker at not being consulted over the direction of the *Quarterly*, and Lockhart discovering that Croker was not enthusiastic about Lockhart becoming editor, probably played a part.[295] Thus,

---

[293] William Empson, 'Political and Vested Rights', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume LIII (June, 1831), p. 541.
[294] Walter Graham, 'Robert Southey as Tory Reviewer', *Philological Quarterly*, 2 (January, 1923), p. 107.
[295] Scott Bennett, 'Catholic Emancipation, the "Quarterly Review," and Britain's Constitutional Revolution', *Victorian Studies*, 12.3 (March, 1969), pp. 289-90.

Croker was not involved in the *Quarterly* and could not object to Southey steering the course.

Southey's article was the product of a long-held anti-Catholicism that was already present in the 1790s, according to Stuart Andrews.[296] He was certainly vehemently opposed to Catholic Emancipation throughout the 1820s, describing the House of Lords' decision to reject a bill in 1821 after it had passed through the Commons as "the most important act it has ever performed".[297] Southey declared that "a religious war in Ireland" would be the consequence of such a bill passing both Houses, and the subsequent "overthrow of the church establishment" in England due to the "intrusion of the dissenters". Lord Liverpool might have seen the writing on the wall regarding Emancipation in 1821, but Southey chose to avert his gaze. Southey's rancour is blatantly obvious in his *Quarterly* article: he uses the term "Papist" four times, "Popish" on three occasions, "Popery" six times, and "Romish" fifteen times, using twenty-nine derogatory terms over sixty-four pages – an average of more than one slur every three pages. Allowing Catholicism to wield influence in Ireland was a failing that had meant England had "permit[ted] and give[n] opportunity for evil".[298] Southey was not leaving any room for equivocation in his polemic.

The *Edinburgh Review* would not miss its opportunity to ridicule Southey. William Empson's article on the Catholic Question in the March 1829 edition of the *Edinburgh* made no direct reference to Southey. However, in an article on the 'United States of America' in June 1829, Empson would name Southey as an example of fiction writers who "make generally a sorry business of it when they descend from their poetical machinery to earth, and condescend to grapple with real life." Empson continued the attack by declaring that writers such as Southey

---

[296] Stuart Andrews, *Robert Southey: History, Politics, Religion* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 33.
[297] Letter from Robert Southey to Walter Savage Landor, 19 December 1821, in Curry (ed.), p. 231.
[298] Robert Southey, 'The Roman Catholic Question – Ireland', *Quarterly Review,* Volume XXXVIII (October, 1828), p. 538.

insisted "on having a world of their own, and on ruling, distorting, and colouring it in their own way, as despotically as a girl deals with her first doll".[299] Reviewing Southey's *Wat Tyler* in 1817, Jeffrey had expressed great surprise that the Poet Laureate was capable of writing something "so insane and so silly" as the poem under review. In the eyes of supporters of Catholic Emancipation, Southey might have managed a repeat.

As hyperbolic as Southey's 1828 article was in style, its content kept it in line with the anti-Catholic sentiments of the *Quarterly*. Bennett and Machin both declare this to have been the case, and the evidence generally supports this view.[300] The derogatory terms used by Southey in his polemic are a constant presence in the *Quarterly*, and he had previously been responsible for their use. In January 1816, in an article on the Italian poet and dramatist Vittorio Alfieri, Southey alleged that "the Romish superstition begins early to loosen the roots of natural affection, that it may more easily pluck them up"; his contention was that Catholic education ruined familial bonds and redirected children's affections towards the Catholic Church. In 1823, writing on the 'Progress of Infidelity', Southey called the Catholic Church "wicked" and "inhuman" in the context of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, asserting that the measure gave England a warning as to the danger "if ever Popery should prevail". In an article on 'Church Missions' in 1826, Southey denounced the propagation of "false miracles", stating that "the Romish has pursued a system of such fraud from time immemorial", which nobody could believe in unless he had "prostrated his intellect to the authority of that church". If Gifford did not want to give High Church Tories space in the *Quarterly* due to their opposition to Catholic

---

[299] William Empson, 'United States of America', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume XLIX (June, 1829), p. 477.
[300] Bennett, p. 287; G. I. T. Machin, *The Catholic Question in English Politics, 1820 to 1830* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964), p. 197.

Emancipation, he was willing to let Southey unleash his wrath on Roman Catholics whenever the Poet Laureate deemed it necessary to do so.[301]

Southey was not the only one to utilise the language of intolerance, although nobody else managed to do it with as much vitriol. John Wilson Croker got in on the act in a review of *Maurice and Berghetta* by William Parnell, Henry Parnell's brother. Croker questioned William Parnell's sincerity as a Protestant, given that the work offered "warm praises of the popish church" in its dedication. Hugh James Rose, a young priest at Horsham and the future Principal of King's College, condemned William Hone's *Apocryphal New Testament* in 1821. Hone had been tried in court for publishing materials that the prosecution deemed harmful to society and to religion. He was acquitted, but his opponents lined up to rebuke him, Rose being among this group. While condemning Hone, Rose cited a story from the Gospel of Thomas, involving a young Jesus being blamed for the death of another child, describing it as "monstrous stuff". Rose then cited the *Monthly Magazine*'s view that apocrypha such as this would "command the attention of all, and the respect of those who do not yield their faith to the authority of Popish councils". Rose was appalled that the *Monthly* would suggest that such "blasphemy" would distinguish Protestantism from Roman Catholicism. Both Rose and Hone are interesting characters. Hone would lampoon Southey, but he would subsequently benefit from Southey's endorsement in 1830. Rose would quickly establish himself as a High Church theologian of merit, proving that, for all of Gifford's intentions to avoid publishing contributions by High Churchmen, some managed to slip through the net.

Other contributors freely expressed anti-Catholic sentiments. Henry Hart Milman, the *Quarterly's* most vociferous clergyman contributor, repudiated the validity of the Roman Catholic Church, lamenting Catholics' adherence to "the

[301] Jonathan Cutmore, 'A Plurality of Voices in the *Quarterly Review*' in Cutmore (ed.), p. 83.

old Popish doctrines in all their uncompromising bigotry", apparently without a hint of irony.[302] Milman would go on to write *The History of the Jews*, in which he would assert that the Jewish people were "more or less barbarians" – bigotry was very much his own forte.[303] Although it is not referenced in the article, his work may well have influenced Thomas Babington Macauley's 'Civil disabilities of the Jews' in the *Edinburgh Review*, in which Macauley sardonically offered the view that excluding the Jewish community from political power meant that they should be murdered and banished, given the precedent set in previous times.[304] In an 1823 article on 'Pulpit Eloquence', Milman expressed confidence that the systems "adopted in Roman Catholic countries on one hand, and by the dissenters on the other", did not amount to as much as had been achieved by Church of England ministers. A much less excoriating commentary on the Catholic Church, certainly, but the equation of Catholics and Dissenters exemplifies the hostility that some *Quarterly* contributors had to anyone outside the Church of England.

Gifford encouraged this hostility, having moulded the *Quarterly* into an organ that encouraged partisan politics, robust defence of the Established Church, and religious discrimination such as that described above. John Taylor Coleridge took over as editor in March 1825, determined to be more academic and less partisan.[305] He was not particularly successful, given that Milman's 'Reformation' article previously referenced was published under Coleridge's watch. Perhaps religion was something of a blind spot for Coleridge in terms of aiming to make the *Quarterly* more "academic"; he had written for the *Christian*

---

[302] Henry Hart Milman, 'The Reformation in England', *Quarterly Review,* Volume XXXIII (December, 1825), p. 36.
[303] H. C. G. Matthew, 'Milman, Henry Hart', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, available online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18778 [accessed June 18 2025]. The comment about bigotry being Milman's forte is my own.
[304] Thomas Babington Macauley, 'Civil Disabilities of the Jews', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume LII (January, 1831), p. 367.
[305] Russel M. Wyland, 'John Taylor Coleridge, Forgotten Editor of *The Quarterly Review'*, *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 44.3 (Fall, 2011), p. 226.

Remembrancer and the *British Critic*, having attempted to take over the editorship of the latter in 1822, and his experiences with these publications might have encouraged him to allow a more strident approach.[306] Maybe he did not have enough time to change the *Quarterly's* direction, given that he was gone by the end of 1825. In his own writing on religion in the *Quarterly*, Coleridge was much more even-tempered than Milman. An article co-written with one Rev. Dealtry in March 1825 considered the Protestant Church in Ireland, and the alleged abuses of its clergy, especially financial ones. Coleridge and Dealtry used extensive statistical analysis to challenge the accusations levelled at the Irish clergy, while also maintaining a defence of the Established Church in both England and Ireland, stating that any serious challenge to the authority of the Church of Ireland would be repeated in England.

James E. O'Neill has demonstrated the "organic connection" between religion and politics in the *Quarterly Review* and the publication's avowed mission to protect the Established Church from perceived threats to its position. His assertion that the *Quarterly* wished the Dissenters and the Catholics no harm is questionable, given the obvious harm that social exclusion can inflict, both at an individual and a collective level. The *Quarterly* did at least concede that Dissenters could be removed of their disabilities, as O'Neill notes.[307] However, Milman directed some of his ire at Dissenters in the *Quarterly* in 1824, suggesting that "the bitterness of dissent has worked and fermented with the leaven of discontent and sedition".[308]

O'Neill's contention that the *Edinburgh* "heaped" "sophisticated abuse" on Dissenters is refuted by Brougham, who maintained that such accusations had been directed at the *Edinburgh*, which felt "a sincere respect" for all but a few

---

[306] *Ibid*, pp. 220-21.
[307] James E. O'Neill, 'The British Quarterlies and the Religious Question, 1802-1829', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 52.3 (October, 1966), pp. 361-62.
[308] Henry Hart Milman, 'Progress of Dissent', *Quarterly Review,* Volume XXXI (April, 1824), p. 244.

individuals that "regard those very disabilities as their own passports to distinction, emolument, and power".[309] The article on 'Toleration' in 1816 argued that the Test and Corporation acts should be removed, as Dissenters were, by this point, so numerous that they "could not be disregarded or insulted with safety".[310] Sydney Smith called the acts "the most absurd enactments (as they at present stand" which ever disgraced the Statute-book of any country".[311]

Heber's observation that Methodists encouraged the clergy of the Established Church to adopt "a greater seriousness" represents an improvement over the position of Smith and Brougham, according to O'Neill. However, this is somewhat spurious; that O'Neill believes Southey declaring Dissenters had done more damage than Catholics could have, and that their numbers threatened the security of the state was also better, is difficult to support.[312] O'Neill comments on the contradictory nature of the *Quarterly's* attitude to Dissenters, referencing an article of Southey's from 1813 in which he wrote that the growth of dissent to be "a growing and most serious evil". However, there is still the inference that the *Edinburgh* treated Dissenters more harshly, and that is difficult to support. The *Eclectic Review*, in an article defending the British and Foreign School Society from remarks made against it in the *Edinburgh* in 1820, notes that the article was markedly different in the "language and tone uniformly held by the same Journal with regard to its proceedings up to that number".[313] This is not to say that the *Eclectic* was the voice of the entire body of Dissenters, vast and varied as that great number was, but that the notion that the *Edinburgh* constantly "heaped abuse" on Dissenters is challenged, in one noteworthy aspect at least, by an organ predominantly controlled and written by Dissenters.

---

[309] Henry Brougham, 'Education Bill', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume XXXV (March, 1821), p. 215.
[310] 'Toleration', p. 64.
[311] Sydney Smith, 'Dissenters' Marriages', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume XXXV (March, 1821), p. 72.
[312] O'Neill, p. 363.
[313] 'British and Foreign School Society', *Eclectic Review*, Series 2, Volume XV (March, 1821), p. 291.

Though the *Eclectic* aimed to be a broad literary review that was averse to denominational association, Basker has correctly pointed out that the religious and philosophical perspectives of its contributors may well have influenced both its tone and its readership.[314] During Josiah Conder's time as editor (1814-1836), the *Eclectic* desired to be a broad review that appealed to a wide audience, but he was moved to lament the poor sales of the publication in 1821, and again in 1826.[315] Its association with Dissenting communities might have been a reason for it lagging behind its competitors. In comparison, the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly* were read even by those that disagreed with their stances on certain issues. The *Eclectic* was seen as a "Dissenting" organ, and thus not read as widely for this reason.

On occasion, the *Eclectic's* link to Dissenters was clear; in 1827, an article on the Test and Corporation Acts asserted that it had become impossible to "afford a pretext for any longer withholding from Dissenters their undeniable rights".[316] The same article lamented the correlation between the claims of Dissenters and Roman Catholics, noting that the claims of the former had been "invidiously and injuriously" mixed up with the latter.[317] This perceived link was a recurring theme in the *Eclectic*. In 1821, a brief article ridiculed an "affectionate address to Dissenters" from the High Churchman Samuel Wix, who had entreated Dissenters to effectively make peace with the Church of England.[318] His plea was ridiculed by the publication; his previous suggestion that the Churches of England and Rome might be able to move closer together, made in a work published in 1818, did not escape the *Eclectic's* attention. In its preface, Wix had written that the British and Foreign Bible Society was "considered to be the grand modern engine of religious Schism and Insubordination"; this was the organisation to which the

---

[314] Basker in Sullivan (ed.), p. 127.
[315] Hiller, p. 182.
[316] 'A Summary of the Laws peculiarly affecting Protestant Dissenters', *Eclectic Review*, Series 2, Volume XXVII (June, 1827), p. 536.
[317] *Ibid*, p. 522.
[318] 'Wix's Address to Dissenters', *Eclectic* Review, Series 2, Volume XV (January, 1821), p. 90.

profits from the *Eclectic* were donated, as per the wishes of the publication's founders in 1805.[319] The *Eclectic* made clear its editorial stance in regard to the author, and of the Catholic Church, by declaring that the pages of Wix's *Reflections*:

> Supply a defence of the greatest errors of Popery, there being scarcely one great doctrinal pollution of the Church of Rome, which these Quotations do not either openly defend or ingeniously palliate.[320]

Summarising Pope Leo XII's initial circular in 1824, the *Eclectic* noted the new Pope's criticism of the British and Foreign Bible Society, whose efforts to provide vernacular Bibles might have produced a "Gospel of the Devil" as stated in the circular. The author of the piece in the *Eclectic* took pride in wondering if the "Protestant enemies of the Bible Society" would be keen "to see whose work they have been doing".[321] The vast majority of contributors to the *Eclectic* prior to 1824 are unknown, so it is not possible to state that such words emanated from the pen of a Dissenter. Given the background of the known contributors, and the origins of the periodical, it is likely that such proclamations originated outside the Church of England, although this cannot be stated with certainty. However, Conder, a Congregationalist, certainly approved of the sentiments. Rather than see a common cause with Roman Catholics as religious groups marginalised by existing legislation, he published material that denigrated the Roman Church, instead emphasising to the Established Church that any refusal to accommodate

---

[319] Samuel Wix, *Reflections Concerning the Expediency of a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome Being Holden, with a View to Accommodate Religious Differences, and to Promote the Unity of Religion in the Bond of Peace* (London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1818), p. vii.
[320] 'Wix on a General Council', *Eclectic Review,* Series 2, Volume XI (May, 1819), p. 443.
[321] 'Papal Circular', *Eclectic Review*, Series 2, Volume XXIII (February, 1825), pp. 180-81.

Dissenters was indirectly supporting the Catholic Church that they mutually held in contempt.

The *Eclectic* used the appeal to history that many other writers on religion used in its attempts to discredit the Roman Catholic Church. The line taken was that the Christian Church was perfect at its inception, but it had been corrupted over time by various incidents and individuals. As a result, it had become so polluted that the Reformation was needed to undo the damage. Such arguments had been utilised extensively by Protestant writers in one form or another.

An example of this can be found in the *Eclectic* in 1823, in a review of *History of Intolerance*. The reviewer in the *Eclectic* criticised the book's author for not making a greater comparison between Islam and Christianity, the former was more spiritual and more "Christian" than its counterpart during Saladin's time at the end of the twelfth century, according to the article. The reviewer wrote that the "devotion of the mosque brought the moslem [sic] into far more intimate communion with the idea of Deity – partook more of the character of worship, than the unmeaning ceremonials of the Romish monolatry".[322]

The *Eclectic* consistently published material about the Catholic Church; however, sentiments such as the above could quite easily have been included in regard to the Anglican religious periodical press. One could also consider it to be entirely in keeping with Southey's various polemics directed against the Church of Rome. The *Eclectic* offered a different perspective in an 1826 review of Blanco White's *The Poor Man's Preservative against Popery*, declaring that "all Roman Catholics are not Papists", although the same article declared the majority to be "Papists", that being the case in Ireland.[323] While "Papists" and "Popery" are the main targets in this article, the author also criticises the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Churches of England and Ireland for criticising

---

[322] 'Clarke's *History of Intolerance*', *Eclectic Review*, Series 2, Volume XIX (May, 1823), pp. 451.
[323] 'White's *Preservative against Popery*', *Eclectic Review*, Volume XXV (February, 1826), p. 178.

the Bible Society, suggesting that the concentration of power in the clergy is antithetical to civil liberty. The final line of the review asserts that the granting of civil liberties in Ireland will cause the people of that nation to "say to their priests, Our swords are the king's, our consciences are our own".[324] Such a line would certainly not have made it into the pages of an Anglican periodical, or one in open allegiance to it; a free conscience could end up anywhere, whereas it should recognise the veracity of the Church of England after the break with Rome. Given its Dissenting background, it is not surprising that the *Eclectic* suggested a wider remit for this supposedly liberated mind.

The *Eclectic* was in a difficult position in the 1820s regarding its stance on religion. Roman Catholics were disqualified from participating fully in civil society, but so was everyone else outside the Established Church. This placed the purveyors of, and contributors to, the *Eclectic Review*, in an accordance of sorts with Roman Catholics, as much as they might have baulked at such an association. Michael Ledger-Lomas has identified the Roman Catholic Church as the "third pugilist on the bill" in political confrontations between the Established Church and Dissent, and this is a good way of setting out the Dissenters' conundrum.[325] The contributors to the *Eclectic* were not shy in condemning the Roman Catholic Church, often in the derogatory terms common in much nineteenth-century literature – usually the same terms as those freely used by the religious periodicals evaluated in the previous chapter. However, there was also the conflict between Dissenters and the Established Church to consider. In 1818, Josiah Conder decried ecclesiastical power when he sought to demonstrate "how utterly incompatible the existence of such an engine of arbitrary tyranny, is with a constitutional government".[326] The *Eclectic* had been founded on "chiefly

---

[324] *Ibid*, p. 187.
[325] Michael Ledger-Lomas, 'Introduction' in Timothy Larsen and Michael Ledger-Lomas (eds.), *The Oxford History of Protestant Dissenting Traditions, Volume III: The Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 5.
[326] Josiah Conder, *On Protestant Nonconformity, Volume I* (London: Josiah Conder, 1818), p. 292.

Congregationalist" principles, and these came to the fore in articles on religious topics in its pages. The 1833 Declaration of the Faith, Church Order, and Discipline of the Congregational, or Independent Dissenters, asserted that all Christian Churches were only responsible to Jesus Christ, and not to any other authority.

This was a long-held stance in Congregationalism, as in other forms of Dissent, and the *Eclectic* affirmed this principle in 1821 when it declared that it would have no issue with the Church of England if it "made no demands upon our conscience" and "left us in possession of the freedom which the Gospel recognizes in its adherents".[327] Biblical justification for this position was used in a review of the Bishop of Salisbury's *A Short Catechism on the Duty of Conforming to the Established Church* in 1827. The reviewer notes that the writers of the New Testament did not comprehend a "national church", but rather that a "church" referred to a community of Christians.[328] Another contributor warned that church reform might strengthen the bond between Church and State, and thus the Dissenting position should be to resist all efforts at reform of the Established Church, as this would be to the Dissenters' detriment.[329] In 1831, the *Eclectic* averred that the Church of England viewed Dissenters as "enemies and rebels", partly necessitating the refrain of "the Church in danger". Moreover, the Established Church had offered no concessions, and was, in language and character, stuck in the seventeenth century.[330]

This continued tension between Dissenters and the Established Church, and by extension, with the state that was connected to it, might well have been exacerbated by a belief that the Dissenters were in common cause with the Catholics. The United Committee of Dissenting Deputies was a pressure group

---

[327] '*Thomas Johnson's Reasons for Dissenting from the Church of England*', *Eclectic Review*, Series 2, Volume XVI (December, 1821), p. 564.
[328] 'Bishop Burgess's *Catechism*', *Eclectic Review*, Series 2, Volume XXVIII (October, 1827), p. 324.
[329] 'Hurn's *Reasons for Secession*', *Eclectic Review,* Series 3, Volume IV (August, 1830), p. 130.
[330] 'Whately *on the Origin of Romish Errors*', *Eclectic Review*, Series 3, Volume V (February, 1831), p. 113.

that had produced numerous petitions, and it had lobbied Whigs and Radicals to repeal the Test and Corporation Acts. In January 1828, the Catholic Association approached the Committee's Secretary, Robert Winter, to propose a joint meeting with the aim of creating a dialogue between the two groups. Winter rejected the offer, not wanting to speak on behalf of the Committee, but the *New Times* reported the meeting, alleging that it was the Dissenters who had taken the lead.

The Committee issued a statement that rejected a joint enterprise agreement with the Roman Catholics; the statement also made it clear that this denial did not mean that there was hostility to "the claims of that numerous and respectable body of petitioners".[331] Dissenting support for the claims of the Roman Catholics was also reported in Parliament. Lord Milton told of his experience that the Dissenters he knew personally "were unquestionably favourable to the Catholic Claims".[332] Several other MPs expressed similar sentiments, although George Lamb, the MP for Dungarvan in Ireland, pointed out the declared separation between Dissenters and Catholics.[333] The reality was that Dissenters were split on the issue of supporting Catholic Emancipation; more petitions against Catholic Emancipation than for were produced by Dissenters in 1828, although the reverse was true in 1829.[334] What can be said is that the connection between Dissenters and Catholics was accepted by some Anglicans as a means of undermining both groups. This mistrust of Dissenters by the Establishment and the Established Church was noted by the *Eclectic*. In 1832, a brief review of a work by a secessionist from the Church of England was used as an opportunity for the *Eclectic* to challenge the institution on its corruptions; the same piece also accused the *Christian Remembrancer* of "pandering to the

---

[331] Richard W. Davis, *Dissent in Politics, 1780-1830: The Political Life of William Smith, MP* (London: Epworth Press, 1971), pp. 243-44.
[332] John Henry Barrow (ed.), *The Mirror of Parliament for the Second Session of the Eighth Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, Volume I* (London: Winchester and Varnham, 1828), pp. 273-74.
[333] *Ibid*.
[334] G. I. T. Machin, 'Resistance to Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, 1828', *The Historical Journal*, 22.1 (March, 1979), p. 120.

intolerance of the ignorant".[335] The *Eclectic* would continue to quarrel with the Established Church throughout the period considered, and often in more strident language.

The *Gentleman's Magazine* repeatedly declared itself a defender of the Established Church, and this had been a constant refrain, in one form or another, throughout its history. In 1820, an index for the publication from 1731 to 1818 was announced; the index would be able to demonstrate the publication's "sincere attachment to the ESTABLISHED DOCTRINES of the CHURCH of ENGLAND [sic]" during this period.[336] This was expressed in articles and reviews, which were much shorter than in its nineteenth-century contemporaries considered in this chapter, but also through other forms of contribution, particularly letters and poems. The quality of the latter was not always high; while the other periodicals considered in this chapter reviewed works which had received national, and even international, attention, the *Gentleman's* published pieces that were not lacking in piety but did not quite have the technical execution to match. While the following is not the worst of its kind, it is an example of the uninspiring fare often found in the magazine:

I love the organ's joyous swell,
Sweet echo of the heavenly ode !
I love the cheerful village bell,
Faint emblem of the call of God.[337]

---

[335] 'The present State of the Established Church, an Apology for Secession from its Communion' *Eclectic Review*, Series 3, Volume VIII (July, 1832), p. 94.
[336] The *Gentleman's* Magazine, Volume XC (December, 1820), p. 664.
[337] J. W. Cunningham, 'The Village Church', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume LXXXV (January, 1815), p. 63.

The poet was an evangelical churchman, the Reverend John William Cunningham, and he possessed an "ardent attachment" to the "doctrines and discipline" of the Church of England, according to the *Gentleman's*, although it was also stated that he could be considered "too liberal to those of opposite sentiments".[338] Cunningham had an association with the Clapham Sect through John Venn, one of the group's key members, and Cunningham would go on to edit the evangelical *Christian Observer* from 1850 to 1858.[339] For the *Gentleman's Magazine*, an individual's support for the Established Church was the paramount consideration of their work or their character; less favourable traits, such as Cunningham's liberality, could be overlooked if their adherence to the Established Church was sufficient. The *Gentleman's* published a few passages from a work entitled *Considerations on the Doctrines of the Evangelical Clergy*, emphasising the author's view that evangelical clergy deviated from the principles of the "Establishment", and as such, pious Christians could not hold the words of these evangelical clergymen to be "good".[340] Cunningham's evangelicalism was sufficiently couched in the Church of England for the *Gentleman's* to be able to review him in a mostly positive fashion; those evangelical churchmen that seemed to lack Cunningham's orthodoxy were liable to be condemned.

Upholding the principles of the Church of England was non-negotiable for the *Gentleman's Magazine* when it came to consideration of ecclesiastical matters; some leeway was possible so long as this was the starting point, as was the case with Cunningham, but any hint of a challenge was usually given short shrift. The *Gentleman's Magazine* often belied its name, and the standard of behaviour traditionally associated with "gentlemen", by engaging in the sort of

---

[338] 'The Velvet Cushion, by J. W. Cunningham', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume LXXXV (April, 1815), p. 337.
[339] A. F. Munden, 'Cunningham, John William', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-6927?rskey=c9v9R9&result=1 [accessed 18 June 2025].
[340] 'Considerations on the Doctrines of the Evangelical Clergy', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume LXXXVII (August, 1817), p. 141.

polemical writing that the *Edinburgh*, *Quarterly*, and *Fraser's* were often accused of at various moments by their opponents. In the *Gentleman's*, this took the form of single sentences or short phrases that aimed to make the point abundantly clear to the reader. Given that articles and reviews were much shorter than in the other periodicals referred to, brevity was a necessity, often matched with a stinging phrase or two. Much like the *Eclectic*, and the *Quarterly* when the virulently anti-Catholics such as Southey and Milman were let off the leash, contributors to the *Gentleman's* used the usual slurs to refer to Catholics. Some managed to be more creative in their intolerance. A two-page review of *Popery the Religion of Heathenism* that appeared in August 1818 declared that Roman Catholicism took on "Pagan forms" in the "barbarous ages", and that it was interminable "to think of retaining such trash in the present state of society". The reviewer claimed that Catholics "demand a licence to smoke tobacco in our drawing-rooms, and spit upon our carpets". The reviewer maintained that they meant "nothing offensive to this body of men personally", but the ship might have sailed on that particular hope among any Catholics that might have read this piece.[341]

The *Gentleman's Magazine* was an ideal receptacle for writers who were convinced of the pernicious influence of Roman Catholicism. Peter Austin Nuttall, an author and translator, held such a view, and he was a frequent contributor to, and possibly editor of, the periodical.[342] In November 1828, with fears of emancipation growing among men such as Nuttall, he wrote that "Popery is the eternal enemy of political freedom", and echoed Lord Winchelsea's observation that Catholicism was "the religion of slavery".[343] Winchelsea's opposition to emancipation was such that he fought a duel with the Duke of Wellington over the issue in March 1829, although Winchelsea would

---

[341] '*Popery the Religion of Heathenism*', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume LXXXVIII (August, 1818), p. 152.
[342] John Considine, 'Nuttall, Peter Austin', *The Oxford Dictionary of National* Biography, viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-65145?rskey=I1Mhes&result=1 [accessed 18 June 2025].
[343] Peter Austin Nuttall, 'Popery the Religion of Slavery', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume XCVIII (November, 1828), p. 390.

deliberately miss Wellington; Nuttall, and by extension, the *Gentlemen's Magazine*, were happy to align with the most vociferous opponents to Catholic Emancipation.

Although attacks on Catholics were commonplace in the pages of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, this was certainly not the only ecclesiastical interest in the publication's pages. Given its "gentlemanly" interests, and its high proportion of clergymen contributors and readers, it is not surprising that the *Gentleman's* resisted calls to reform, or even abolish, the tithe system. The idea was antithetical to traditional notions of gentlemanly inheritance, after all. Tithes were usually set at one-tenth of "the annual increase of the produce of the soil", and were paid to the rector of a parish, or split between the rector and an appointed vicar, if applicable.[344] This had long been a source of resentment for farmers and rural communities, and the church was viewed as a "parasite" by the more extreme writers in the radical press.[345] The *Gentleman's Magazine* reviewed an inquiry into abolishing or commuting tithes in 1817, agreeing with the author of the work's view that the extinction of tithes would lead to all rights of land and property being revoked, which would be followed by "anarchy, civil war, and rebellion".[346]

The *Quarterly Review* took the same stance as the *Gentleman's* in defending the rights of the Established Church regarding tithes, but it did so in manner more typical of the periodical press. Edward Edwards, a divine and literary advisor to John Murray, would produce an article in July 1823 that sought to prove the economic necessity of Church of England clergymen retaining their revenues, although he did manage to take aim at the "ignorant and credulous

---

[344] H. C. Prince, 'The Tithe Surveys of the Mid-Nineteenth Century', *The Agricultural History Review*, 7.1 (1959), p. 14.
[345] Eric J. Evans, Some Reasons for the Growth of English Rural Anti-Clericalism c. 1750 - c. 1830', *Past & Present*, 66 (February, 1975), p. 106.
[346] 'An Essay on the Revenues of the Church of England: with an Inquiry into the Necessity, Justice, and Policy of an Abolition or Commutation of Tithes', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume LXXXVII (February, 18178), p. 154.

dupes" that were opposed to the tithe system.[347] Overall, though, Edwards' article provides an example of the shift in literary style that marked the *Gentleman's* as being out of step with the newer reviews. Though all of the other case studies in this chapter were no strangers to well-directed opprobrium, the *Gentleman's* shorter articles meant that it could not devote as much time to providing the requisite information to support its assertions, as extreme as they could be, as in the case of tithe commutation.

Defending the tithe system was an example of the *Gentleman's Magazine* attempting to maintain the status quo in relation to the Church of England's position. Its consideration of Dissent was more nuanced, and often delineated between Dissenters that were a danger to the Establishment and those that were not. The *Gentleman's* provided space for a range of perspectives regarding Dissenters. A letter printed in the magazine in November 1817, regarding a case of treason in Derby that involved members of a Methodist congregation, did concede that there were many "well-meaning and conscientious" Dissenters, but not enough of them to affect the subversive nature of Dissent overall, according to the letter-writer. Moreover, according to this concerned individual, the Church and "liberty" were at risk if the renegade Dissenters were not checked; freedom of religious expression could be tolerated, but not to the detriment of the Establishment, for this writer.[348]

Dialogue between contributors was possible across issues of the *Gentleman's* through letters submitted, and the publication gave "A Dissenter" a right of reply to the letter of November 1817. The responder stated that the threat

---

[347] Edward Edwards, 'Ecclesiastical Revenues', *Quarterly Review*, Volume XXIX (July, 1823), p. 560. Edwards is referenced as John Murray's literary advisor in Samuel Smiles, *A Publisher and His Friends: Memoir and Correspondence of the Late John Murray, with an Account of the Origin and Progress of the House, 1768-1843, Volume II* (London: John Murray, 1891), p. 211. Edwards "proved no use" as an advisor, and he condemned the contributions of some of the *Quarterly's* most prominent writers, including Southey. Edwards would contribute to the *Quarterly* eleven times during Lockhart's time as editor, despite Edwards being critical of him as well.
[348] 'Necessity of some Restraint on Sectaries', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume LXXXVII (November, 1817), pp. 403-05.

to the Establishment from Dissenters was "trifling" when compared to the output of "intemperate writers" such as the composer of the 1817 missive.[349] A letter published in June 1820 rebuked over-excited criticism of Dissenters, calling them "a very respectable and religious body".[350] Interestingly, this submitter declared that they were not seeking to consider the question as to whether Trinitarian or Unitarian faith was "the most correct" – that the latter should even have been considered would have had many readers up in arms!

The *Gentleman's* editor, John Nichols, allowed it to pass without comment. This was not the case in a letter signed *Clericus Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, which contrasted the lack of "brotherly love and affection" among Church of England ministers with the feelings apparently present in Dissenting churches. Nichols noted that *Clericus* "must have been particularly unfortunate", the editor hoping that "there can be rarely a cause for such complaint". *Clericus* began his letter by stating that the *Gentleman's* was "in the hands of most Clergymen"; this might well have been an exaggeration, but such a statement illustrates the importance of the publication in facilitating information-sharing among clergymen and secular contributors with an interest in the matters being considered.[351] *Clericus*' letter received a reply from "A Country Rector" in the next volume, who declared that *Clericus* had demeaned the clergymen of the Church of England, and was far too generous in his praise of Dissenters.[352]

Although the *Gentleman's* published material that defended Dissenters, or that at least downplayed the threat to the Established Church from that group, it was not averse to including material that demeaned them in the highest degree. This was more noticeable directly before and after the Sacramental Test Act. In

---

[349] 'The late Insurrection in Derbyshire', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume LXXXVIII (March, 1818), p. 208.
[350] 'Dissenters Vindicated', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume XC (June, 1820), p. 607.
[351] *Clericus Ecclesiae Anglicanae* [pseud.], 'True Cause of Increase of Dissenters', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume LXXXIX (December, 1819), pp. 596-97.
[352] A Country Rector [pseud.], 'The Clergy Vindicated', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume XC (May, 1820), p. 404.

October 1827, a contributor referred to the Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, a Dissenting pressure group, as sharing the same mentality as the Devil. The author was reviewing a work entitled *The Case between the Church and the Dissenters, impartially and practically considered*; this impartiality was certainly not present in the *Gentleman's* in this instance. The writer concluded his review by stating that it "may do good among the very few Dissenters who are able to understand it."[353] Such condescension would be repeated in the publication's pages, as in 1830 when a review of *The Church of England and Dissent* would declare that Dissent was encouraged by individuals who used "the cover of religion" to "exasperate the lower orders against their superiors in Church and State".[354]

The breadth of responses to Dissenters, ranging from qualified defence to accusations of being in league with the Devil, are fascinating. The *Gentleman's Magazine* functioned as a self-contained public sphere, in that varying opinions could be put forward, and contributors could directly address each other across issues. This was theoretically possible in the other periodicals considered in this chapter, but the shorter length of individual contributions in the *Gentleman's*, and the much greater number of them per issue, made this much easier. The *Gentleman's* reputation in the eighteenth century meant that it could act as the repository for varied opinion, at least as much as the editor would allow. The *Gentleman's* usurpation by the *Edinburgh and Quarterlies*, and the imitators of their style, in the nineteenth century meant that its self-contained dialogues were not as effective by 1815. However, its continued reputation with the clergy, and its continued relevance to the public sphere until the 1860s, meant that it retained an influence when intervening in ecclesiastical matters.

---

[353] 'Review – Merewether *on Dissent*', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume XCVII (1827), p. 326
[354] 'Review – *Church of England and Dissent*', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume C (1830), p. 524.

The *Gentleman's Magazine* was ostensibly a competitor for the *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly*, but its output, and the high percentage of clergymen readers and contributors, invites a comparison with the *Eclectic* in terms of having a high degree of religious content in a publication with a broad array of topics. The *Gentleman's* was a miscellany, while the *Eclectic* was a review in the nineteenth-century style, but the religious aspect of the two is certainly comparable. Both were intersections of the secular and the clerical; both had lay contributors writing on religion, and clergymen covering non-religious topics, and both situated their religious output within a broader periodical that sought to appeal to a wide audience. Both could almost be considered a bridge between the overtly religious periodicals considered in Chapter 1, and the broader reviews that included a focus on religion, such as the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly*.

Religion was part of what David E. Latané has interpreted as William Maginn's mission to transform Tories into "conservatives", by defending the interests of the church and the state but not of rank and privilege, and "by looking forward rather than backward".[355] Tories, especially High Church Tories, had frequently appealed to the Reformation and the settlement of 1688 as the basis for opposing reform of the Church of England, and Maginn was wise enough to realise that this was not sufficient after the passing of the Sacramental Test Act and the Catholic Relief Act.

This did not mean that *Fraser's* did not reference history in its pages, nor appeal to precedent at opportune moments; rather, that it sought to direct readers' attention towards taking steps to preserve the Church of England and defend it from present and future dangers, rather than revel in past glories, or lament previous injustices. An article in the very first issue of *Fraser's* used the typical terms directed at Roman Catholics by its most venomous opponents – Romanists,

---

[355] David E. Latané, *William Maginn and the British Press: A Critical Biography* (London: Routledge, 2013), p. 165

Papists, etc. – but it advised its readers to follow Milton's advice not to engage in disputes with Catholics, but to do whatever was necessary to ensure the "hindrance of the growth of popery".[356] Readers were informed that Jesuits had remarked on the spread of their religion across the country, despite laws designed to prevent it; the inference being that efforts needed to be made to check this apparent growth.[357] With regard to Ireland, *Fraser's* offered two choices: repeal the Catholic Bill, or repeal the Union between Great Britain and Ireland. Ireland was dismissed as financially burdensome and lacking in the requisite power to become an enemy in the event of a break.[358] While the proposed "solutions" were simplistic and dismissive of Ireland's status, they represented *Fraser's* ethos of being part of a proactive conservative public sphere, one that regained the initiative and did not languish in the doldrums of reactionary High Church Toryism.

A key aspect of this endeavour was the principle that *Fraser's* was "universal" in its choice of topics, and that these topics were not segregated into separate "worlds" of religion, or politics, or anything else. Thus, an article on the "Oxford controversy", the result of a sermon preached by the radical clergyman Henry Bulteel, heralded the "reunion of this long-estranged sisterhood, religion and literature" to make sense of the controversy.[359] Part of the article considered Dissenters, and specifically referenced the British and Foreign Bible Society, which was funded by profits from the *Eclectic*. While the article in *Fraser's* lamented the reality that organisations such as the Bible Society were established and administered by Dissenters rather than members of the national Church, *Fraser's* declared that "the Church of England is mainly blameable in this".[360] While *Fraser's* delineated itself as a defender of the Church of England from the

---

[356] 'The Philosophy of Catholicism', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume I (February, 1830), p. 22.
[357] *Ibid*, p. 23.
[358] 'The Repeal of the Union', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume III (February, 1831), p. 10.
[359] 'The Oxford Controversy', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume III (July, 1831), p. 758.
[360] *Ibid*, p. 764.

outset, this did not preclude the publication from highlighting the Church's faults. As a publication that was in the same spirit as the notoriously caustic *Blackwood's*, it is not surprising that Dissenters did not escape vitriol; the same article warned that they would "league with the very devil himself, and make a covenant with hell" to challenge the Established Church.[361] *Fraser's* applied this disdain to individuals it believed had wronged the Church. Henry Phillpotts was guilty of "unparalleled and glaring apostasy" for supporting Catholic Emancipation; his accession to the House of Lords would, according to *Fraser's*, occasion its end due to "having been undermined by RATS [sic]". An addendum at the end of the article approved Phillpotts' loss of his *commendam* [church living] due to the fall of the Wellington administration, and Grey was praised for "purifying the Church" as a result.[362] Although Maginn aimed to conduct *Fraser's* along nascent Conservative lines, the publication was not averse to praising the Whigs if decisions taken upheld the security of the Church of England, at least as far as *Fraser's* was concerned.

Catholics remained the biggest threat to this security in 1832, according to *Fraser's*; a review of a new series under the title "Theological Library", declared that the Roman Catholic faith could do more damage to the country than the entirety of the Dissenting communities if the former was able to gain influence in England. The same article criticised Protestants that propagated the "Church in danger!" warning but did nothing to prevent Catholics, or other opponents, from undermining the "Protestant Church".[363] That Dissenters were not regarded as being as much of a threat as Catholics, and the dichotomy between "Protestant"

---

[361] *Ibid*, p. 765.
[362] 'Dr. Phillpott, the Bishop', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume II (January, 1831), p. 690. Wellesley gives "William Maginn?" as the attribution, but the fact that this is a possibility rather than a probability means that it has not been granted as an attribution to Maginn in calculating the data for this chapter. The article refers to "Dr. Phillpott" throughout; either the author was mistaken, or there was an error during printing. Confusingly, "Henry Philpott" was a distinct clergyman and academic in the nineteenth century, but he was not yet twenty-two when Catholic Emancipation passed, and he was not known nationally. Note that the article in *Fraser's* spells the name with two l's, which is correct for Henry Phillpotts, but not Henry Philpott. For these reasons, it is certain that the article is referring to Henry Phillpotts.
[363] 'Life and Times of Wiclif', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume V (March, 1832), p. 177.

and "Roman Catholic", enabling Dissenters to be categorised as a part of the former rather than a separate body, indicates that perhaps not every contributor believed that Dissenters were in league with Satan, albeit not as pious as members of the Established Church. Universal liberty of conscience was the cornerstone of Protestantism, according to *Fraser's*, and this was the key principle that shaped its ecclesiastical output in its early days.[364] It explains why some contributors were less hostile to Dissenters, although others clearly retained their prejudices. The journalist Thomas Powell, in an article reflecting on Wellington's government, opined that the Church of England no longer retained its "high character" because many of its bishops had "bartered the integrity of conscience for the tinsels of this transitory life".[365] Based on its early output, *Fraser's'* mission was to remarry this liberty of conscience with the integrity that Powell thought it lacked, and to ensure that its readers were left in no doubt as to how the Church of England was culpable in enabling recent events to occur.

Part 2: 1832-1850: Religious Contestations and Their Impact on Periodical Literature

The passing of the Sacramental Test Act in 1828, and Catholic Emancipation in 1829, stoked fears in the Church of England that the institution was under severe pressure. For those who saw conspiracies at every turn and who feared that such measures were attempts to undermine, erode, and potentially even destroy the Established Church, the Reform Act was more grist to this mill. The suspicion was mutual: if ardent supporters of the Church of England often

---

[364] R. A. Willmott, 'Life of Bishop Heber', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume II (September, 1830), p. 121; J. A. Heraud, 'Rationalism', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume IV (August, 1831), p. 61; 'Life and Times of Bishop Ken', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume IV (November, 1831), p. 387.
[365] Thomas Powell, 'Thoughts on the Wellington Administration', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume I (July, 1830), p. 730.

adopted a siege mentality, it was because they were certain that its walls were at risk. As Sack has identified in the conclusion to *From Jacobite to Conservative*, the place of the Church of England was the principal concern for conservatives on the eve of the 1832 Reform Act.[366] The same was true after the passing of that measure, given that the Church, and particularly the clergy, had come under intense scrutiny in the lead-up to reform. Calls for parliamentary reform occurred in tandem with hostility toward the Church of England, buttressed by anticlericalism that found expression in the Radical press and among Dissenting communities.[367] A need for church reform was the next logical conclusion; the flaws of the Hanoverian Church were "bundled together", to use Burns' apt expression, with the judicial system and the state as the "Old Corruption" that needed to be overcome.[368]

Some perspicacious individuals recognised that the spirit of reform was active and engaged by 1830; thus, the crux of the matter was not to prevent reform, but to have a seat at the table when it was being discussed. One contributor to *Fraser's Magazine*, a self-professed advocate of the Established Church, declared that "some Reform is much better than no Reform" in 1831, asserting that modification would be necessary, which would be an opportunity for conservative interests to steer such alterations in their direction.[369] Such was the pressing need for reform to move the country forward that *Fraser's*, already having achieved a reputation for attacking its opponents with an almost-rabid frenzy, commended Earl Grey for his commitment to the cause of reform, despite

---

[366] Sack, p. 258.
[367] Eric Evans sees the European Enlightenment and English Deism as the chief causes of this anticlericalism - Eric J. Evans, 'The Church in Danger? Anticlericalism in Nineteenth-Century England', *European Studies Review*, 13 (April, 1983), p. 203. If Deism was historically a contributing factor, it did not form a significant part of the argument in the nineteenth century. Shirley Mullen has argued that freethinkers, under which heading Deists can be included, were in step with the direction of nineteenth-century England, but that they were not of "major significance" in Victorian England - Shirley A. Mullen, *Organized Freethought: The Religion of Unbelief in Victorian England* (London: Routledge, 1987), p. 8.
[368] Burns, p. 4.
[369] 'Parliamentary Reform', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume III (April, 1831), p. 280. The contributor is, unfortunately, unknown.

the publication noting that the broad changes being suggested might be questioned.

The publication would subsequently call Grey "feeble" and "overrated"; it was partially to blame for the latter.[370] In the same article, *Fraser's* praised the bishops in the House of Lords for rejecting the Second Reform Bill, and it charged them with staying the course in defiance of "the terror of the mob".[371] Attitudes frequently shifted during this tumultuous period, and *Fraser's* was no different. That its proclivity for contradiction occurred in its own pages is interesting; that there were examples in the same issue is jarring. The May 1831 volume, which had praised Grey, carried another article that considered a piece in the *Quarterly*, in which *Fraser's* stated that "the enemies of our institutions" pushed for Catholic Emancipation as "the preliminary measure to Jacobin reform."[372] It was the *Quarterly's* defence of nomination boroughs that *Fraser's* took issue with; agreement was expressed with the *Quarterly's* contention that the aim of the reformers was to threaten existing establishments, and that every man who desired "the peace and welfare of society" should oppose them.[373]

Maintenance of the "peace and welfare of society" was exactly why reform should be supported by the Church of England, according to Brougham in the *Edinburgh*. Indeed, many prelates within the Established Church knew as much; they had introduced church reform measures into Parliament, and an enquiry into ecclesiastical revenues and emoluments was underway, with the understanding that any alterations made would certainly be unfavourable to the Church. Brougham was not surprised by these moves; his view was that public opinion of the Anglican Church was at its lowest point since 1688. Writing in September 1831, as the Second Reform Bill passed through the Commons, he averred that

---

[370] 'The Reaction against Reform', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume IV (November, 1831), p. 512.
[371] *Ibid*, pp. 508-09.
[372] 'The *Quarterly Review* on Reform', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume III (May, 1831), p. 530.
[373] *Ibid*, p. 526.

only "insanity" on the part of the bishops would lead them to risk conflict with supporters of reform.[374] Brougham's assertion that rejection by the Lords Spiritual would place them against "the whole body of the people" is certainly an overstatement, but the rejection led to disturbances across the country, and severe riots in Bristol.[375] If it was not the whole body against them, many were greatly perturbed.

Little wonder, then, that, in another piece on reform for the *Edinburgh*, Brougham would cast doubt on the idea that a separate Convocation to consider ecclesiastical issues would garner broad support, as such a body would risk angering the public should it ever come into contact with the legislature, which it inevitably would.[376] Brougham would subsequently accuse the Tories of exactly the sort of expediency expressed by *Fraser's*, that support for reform was not principled, but rather, that it was a means to retain popular support with a view to returning to government. In terms of the Established Church, Tories would choose to reform it as the loss of the abuses would be preferable to an assault on the establishment itself.[377] Brougham, clearly the *Edinburgh's* representative in all matters relating to reform, averred in another article of the January 1834 edition that the *Edinburgh Review* "assumed" the existence of a national church protected by the State. The pronounced unpopularity of the Church of England was noted, however, and Brougham declared the necessity not only of reform, but that the Church "should be shorn of its splendour and stript [sic] of its chiefest [sic] privileges".[378]

---

[374] Henry Brougham, 'House of Lords Reform', *Edinburgh Review*, Volume LIV (September, 1831), p. 271.
[375] *Ibid*. For reform agitation prior to the 1832 Reform Act, with a focus on events in Bristol, see Jeremy Caple, *The Bristol Riots of 1831 and Social Reform in Britain* (Lewiston, New York: E. Mellen Press, 1990).
[376] Henry Brougham, 'Lord Henley on Church Reform', *Edinburgh Review*, Volume LVI (October, 1832), pp. 215-16.
[377] Henry Brougham, 'Tory Views and Machinations', *Edinburgh Review*, Volume LVIII (January, 1834), pp. 458-60. An interesting detail in this article is that Brougham uses "Tory" and "Conservative" interchangeably, switching from one to the other halfway through without any obvious reason.
[378] Henry Brougham, 'The Church of England', *Edinburgh Review*, Volume LVIII (January, 1834), p. 498.

Brougham's confidence to make such a statement was borne of his belief that the Tories could no longer rally round the banner of "Church and King".[379] Brougham was too bombastic, and Jörg Neuheiser has shown that such focal points still resonated for many in England.[380] However, Brougham was certainly correct in noting that the Church of England was under pressure. For many clergymen and those who supported the prerogatives of the Church of England, the best form of defence was attack. Both the *Quarterly* and the *Gentleman's Magazine* provided ground for them to bear their arms.

As Brougham had been for the *Edinburgh*, John Wilson Croker was the chief sword-bearer for the *Quarterly's* defence of the Established Church, although he was ably assisted by others. John Gibson Lockhart became the editor in 1826, and he brought with him High Church and High Tory perspectives that were mobilised in response to reform.[381] Cutmore has commented on the reality that they were decidedly anti-Erastian, and that publisher John Murray's alliance with Croker in 1832 made the *Quarterly* a "less accommodating breed of conservatism"; such a development was a continuation of the publication's narrowing stance after Southey's blast against Catholic emancipation in 1827.[382] The loss of support from Wellington's government occasioned by Southey's article, and the passage of the Whigs' Reform Bill, had left the *Quarterly* without political guidance until the deal with Croker, as William Thomas has adroitly observed.[383] This did not mean that contributors did not try, however.

Edward Edwards revisited the subject of tithes in the January 1830 edition of the *Quarterly*, reaffirming the position he had posited and, to his and the publication's satisfaction, proven in 1823. Recent developments, in conjunction

---

[379] Brougham, 'Tory Views and Machinations', p. 458.
[380] Neuheiser, *passim*.
[381] Jonathan Cutmore, 'A Plurality of Voices' in Cutmore (ed.), *Conservatism and the Quarterly Review*, p. 83.
[382] *Ibid*, pp. 84-85.
[383] William Thomas, *The Quarrel of Macaulay and Croker: Politics and History in the Age of Reform*
The Quarrel of Macaulay and Croker: Politics and History in the Age of Reform (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 105.

with renewed calls for church reform including its financial benefits, led to the necessity for Edwards to produce a follow-up. Although he dedicated almost exactly forty-three pages to the subject, Edwards gave the game away on page four. He acknowledged the rise in dissatisfaction with the tithe system, and he gave his support to a modification that "would conciliate the feelings… of the more moderate and reasonable portion of the public", disregarding those whose objections were considered petty. Any alterations made to the system should prevent "any real and permanent injury" to tithe-holders; effectively, that they should not feel any material effects at all.[384] Edwards later makes this explicitly clear when he states that the modification proposed would not impinge upon "either the rights or revenues of the clergy".[385] While Edwards acknowledged that diminishing frustrations around tithes would benefit the Church of England, he was not prepared to see the clergy lose out as a result.

There was further defence of the clergy in the same issue, praising the "improvement" among the clergy as being practically without compare in the nation's history; the "exemplary zeal and assiduity" with which the clergy carried out their duties was also heralded. While offering such fulsome praise of the clergy, the article added that "a great deal yet remains to be done", and expressed a hope that parliament would aid and direct these efforts.[386] The *Quarterly's* hope for parliamentary aid in achieving church reform that was meaningful, and palatable to the Church of England, was bolstered by the presence of a Tory government in January 1830, albeit one that was still reeling from Catholic emancipation. As discussed above, 'Internal Policy" probably was not written by Croker, but the fact that it was mistakenly attributed to him demonstrates that it is redolent of his style and that it encapsulated his ideas. While noting that the *Quarterly* was no friend to parliamentary reform, the article did express support

---

[384] Edward Edwards, 'Ecclesiastical Endowments', *Quarterly Review,* Volume XLII (January, 1830), p. 108.
[385] *Ibid*, p. 118.
[386] 'Internal Policy', *Quarterly Review*, Volume XLII (January, 1830), pp. 234-35.

for limited reform in certain areas, which Croker suggested to the government as a means of alleviating pressure from the Whigs in 1830.[387] The article's recognition of the importance of the Church of England, and the assertion of further work needing to be done, echoed Croker's sentiments on reforming the tithe system. Although he assessed the system in the context of Ireland, Croker's approach to church reform tallied with 'Internal Policy', and it meant that the publication would retain a sense of consistency when he returned to its pages in earnest in 1832.

Croker's proposed amendment to the tithe system in Ireland was that there should be a poundage on rents less than the one-tenth inherent in the tithe system, which perpetuated "evils" that created division. Croker accepted the necessity of first amending the tithe system in England, and while he desired a solution that was palatable to the Church of England, he desired "innovation" and not mere conciliation of the laity.[388] This was a call for tangible alterations in affected communities, and not merely the illusory affectations that Edwards prescribed. Like the author of 'Internal Policy', Croker would have been optimistic that a Tory government headed by Wellington would initiate the changes that Croker thought were necessary. Croker respected the Duke of Wellington; upon the Whigs' election victory in November 1830, Croker elected to leave his role as Secretary to the Admiralty as he was "determined to follow" the Duke, though he acknowledged he would not have been retained by the new administration.[389] He trusted Wellington, especially after the Duke's acceptance of the necessity of Catholic emancipation, despite personal misgivings. Once the Whigs had returned to government, Croker used the pages of the *Quarterly* to offer more pessimistic assessments of church reform being adequately carried out.

---

[387] Keith Feiling, *The Second Tory Party, 1714-1832* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1959), p. 377.
[388] John Wilson Croker, 'A Sketch of the State of Ireland, Past and Present' in Louis J. Jennings (ed.), *The Croker Papers: The Correspondence and Diaries of the Late Right Honourable John Wilson Croker, Secretary to the Admiralty from 1809 to 1830, Volume I* (London: John Murray, 1885), pp. 457-58.
[389] 'Mr. Croker to Mr. Doyle, November 22, 1830' in Jennings (ed.), *The Croker Papers, Volume II*, p. 79.

This began in an article published in the Quarterly in December 1832, during the general election of that year, the result of which was that the Tories, under Wellington, lost further ground to the Whigs. Gone was Croker's optimism that acceptable reform of the Church of England was possible, put to bed by the accession of the Whigs in the previous year to form a government that had passed the Reform Bill without knowing how it would work. Such uncertainty undermined the constitution and the establishment, and it acted as "an incentive to revolutionary efforts", in Croker's view.[390] Moreover, the Church could not even rely on those that were expected to defend it; the language used by "many even of the so-called Conservative candidates" would "have driven even a Radical from the hustings!".[391]

Croker's analysis of the situation was stark, and it was surely intended as a wake-up call to the Conservatives. He was certainly not throwing his lot in with the ultra-Tories as the defenders of the constitution; Croker had categorised them as a "different party" in February 1832, the majority of whom would never "vote with us".[392] While his view of them would deteriorate in short order – he would call them the "silliest and the wildest party I have ever seen" in 1834 – Croker's concerns for the fate of the church under the Whigs echoed ultra-Tory fears over Catholic emancipation although, of course, the ultra-Tories were opposing what was supposed to be their "own" side.[393] Croker's criticism of Conservative candidates was a warning that the position of the Church of England was sacrosanct, and it should not be undermined by careless exhortations at hustings.

Croker was assisted by Henry Phillpotts in the 1832 article, who probably covered Lord Henley's plan of church reform that Brougham had considered for

---

[390] John Wilson Croker and Henry Phillpotts, 'How will it work?', *Quarterly Review*, Volume XLVIII (December, 1832), p. 542. Wellesley notes that Murray assigned the first half and the end to Croker, and the rest to Phillpotts. Given that the consideration of Lord Henley's plan for church reform makes up the majority of the second half of the article, it is very likely that this is the part that was written by Phillpotts.
[391] *Ibid*, p. 553.
[392] Croker to Lord Hertford, February 21, 1832, *Croker Papers, Volume II*, p. 151.
[393] Croker to Lord Hertford, May 6, 1834, *Croker Papers Volume II*, p. 210.

the *Edinburgh*. Unlike Brougham, Phillpotts was supportive of the church having its own forum, so much so that he was instrumental in the campaign that achieved restoration of the convocation in the 1850s.[394] Thus, Lord Henley's suggestion of the possible renewal of the convocation in 1832 was welcomed in the article. However, Henley's suggestion that prebendaries should be abolished, and that bishops should be excluded from the Lords, was met with opprobrium. Dispensing with prebendaries would deprive young priests of vital guidance in their first parishes, and this would diminish the Church, according to the article. Removing bishops from the Lords was an attempt to "secularise" the House. Such a measure was scandalous to the *Quarterly*, the author of this section being particularly perturbed that Henley suggested this at a time when:

> There has never, probably, been a time when a greater portion of zeal, of talent, of theological learning, and of all those qualities which best become a Christian prelate, could be found on that bench, than at the present moment.[395]

If the composer of this section was indeed Phillpotts, it was a glowing self-recommendation, given that he sat in the Lords as the Bishop of Exeter. But this was more than self-aggrandization: it was taken as proof that plans for church reform were circulating that would harm the Church of England. For Croker, Phillpotts, and the *Quarterly*, it was the responsibility of its defenders to counter the threat. Much like Croker and Phillpotts had done in this article, the inference

---

[394] Burns, 'Phillpotts, Henry', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-22180#odnb-9780198614128-e-22180-div1-d1349317e285 [accessed June 18 2025].
[395] Croker and Phillpotts, p. 572.

was that ecclesiastical and secular interests would have to combine to achieve acceptable reform, rather than be forced to suffer that which was not.

Croker felt as though he was swimming against the tide in his efforts. By 1833, the dual effects of the Whig ministry and the Reform Bill had uprooted the old political order that Croker valued, the result being that "the friends of good order and good government" felt that "catastrophe" was inevitable, and that the Established Church would be strongly affected by it.[396] The majority of the Church of England's supporters had admitted that it was in a "critical condition" in 1831; Croker offered a similarly gloomy prognosis in 1833, and, as a result, the *Quarterly* was most decidedly a part of the collective hand-wringing.[397]

Another article on church reform by Croker, in January 1834, opened by declaring the Church of England to be a "beleaguered city", at great risk from its enemies, particularly the Roman Catholics and Dissenters who wished to effect "the overthrow of the Church".[398] But there were enemies within the gates, too. Thomas Arnold's *Principles of Church Reform* revealed the "real principle of Church Reform", according to Croker: the amendment of the form of worship in order to appeal to all tastes – "the sour tastes of the Unitarians on one side, and the luscious palates of the Papists on the other."[399] Whereas Croker's summation of Arnold's broad church principles were colourful, his assessment that Arnold's plan was impracticable was shared by his supporters and opponents alike.[400] For Croker, this was a relief, given his aversion to what he saw as the ultimate aim of church reform. His previous amenability to moderate reform had been replaced by desperate pleas to Church of England members to defend it from such

---

[396] John Wilson Croker, 'The Reform Ministry and Parliament', *Quarterly Review*, Volume L (October, 1833), pp. 270-71.
[397] William Law Mathieson, *English Church Reform, 1815-1840* (London: Longman, Green and Co., 1923), p. 65.
[398] John Wilson Croker, 'Liturgical Reform', *Quarterly Review*, Volume L (January, 1834), pp. 509-10.
[399] *Ibid*, p. 560.
[400] Chadwick, *Volume I*, p. 47.

machinations, and he comforted himself, and the *Quarterly's* readers, by recalling what the Church of England had been, rather than what it might be in the future.[401]

If Croker had brought the *Quarterly* to a point of wistful reminiscence in 1834, with hopes of tolerable church reform seemingly dashed, the *Gentleman's Magazine* remained forward-looking, convinced that church reform could be enacted that kept the majority of the Established Church's adherents satisfied, if not exactly thrilled. Anything that went beyond these bounds would be rejected, and defiantly so. An 1832 review of a work that considered church reform bullishly began by declaring that:

> When fanatics are maddening society with their folly, it is essential to public well-being that they should be exposed by reason and history, and be taught that if they become fire-brands, philosophers become fire-engines.[402]

The implicit equation of clergymen with philosophers, in opposition to the "fanatics" peddling dangerous ideas, would undoubtedly have pleased the large percentage of the publication's clerical readership. Where the *Gentleman's* had to tread more cautiously, given its interest in ecclesiastical matters and the wide range of opinions it potentially had to cater to, was on the issue of reform itself. Its rather hesitant position was perhaps best expressed by a lay contributor, Alfred John Kempe. In a review of several proposals for church reform, he stated that "our opinion is that gradual amelioration, not sweeping changes, should be

---

[401] Croker, 'Liturgical Reform', p. 561.
[402] Thomas Dudley Fosbroke, 'Thoughts on Church Reform, by a true Protestant; Remarks on the New Bible Society', *Gentleman's Magazine,* Volume CII (March, 1832), pp. 240-41.

operated", and that this would "repair and uphold the fabric of church and state" – a position suitably bland as to avoid all but the most trifling offence.[403]

The Bishop of London, Charles James Blomfield, had fewer scruples when it came to risking offence, and Thomas Arnold felt the force of his disparagement in March 1833. The "Sophist Doctor", as Blomfield referred to Arnold, had advocated principles that would lead to "the extinction of Christianity" if put into place; Blomfield felt compelled to agree with the conclusion drawn by the *Christian Remembrancer* that Arnold "is any thing but a Churchman".[404] Blomfield's objections were the same as Croker's regarding Arnold's plan to broaden the Established Church, putting the *Gentleman's* in step with the *Quarterly* in this regard. Blomfield made it clear that the laity was to blame when it came to reform; almost all the "evils" in the Church of England that necessitated reform measures originated outside of the Church, at least according to Blomfield.

The insinuation was that making church reform a secular practice had caused the issues that secular interests were now proposing to correct. Blomfield made this clear in April 1833 when he requested that politicians leave church reform to the clergy, effectively advocating for the removal of the state from the church, contrary to the more typical formulation of that relationship. Proposals to either redistribute or tax church property were condemned as not only unjust, but "forbidden by the laws of God".[405] Blomfield knew his audience: concerned clergymen, fearing the consequences, would have been encouraged by such a robust defence of their livings. Blomfield's involvement in the pages of the *Gentleman's* illustrates its importance among clergymen. Although he did not sign his articles, in accordance with contemporary practice, it is significant that

---

[403] Alfred John Kempe, 'Review – Church Reform', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume CIII (February, 1833), p. 141.
[404] Charles James Blomfield, 'Church Reform No. I', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume CIII (March, 1833), pp. 197-98.
[405] Charles James Blomfield, 'Church Reform No. II', *Gentleman's Magazine* (April, 1833), p. 315.

the holder of the third-most senior post in the Church of England considered the *Gentleman's* to be an acceptable forum to disseminate his views. Given his general unpopularity, it was probably advantageous that Blomfield did not sign his articles, but the presence of such an illustrious figure in its pages would have been a boon to the *Gentleman's* behind the scenes.[406]

Indeed, the *Gentleman's Magazine* effectively adopted Blomfield's position on church reform as its official stance through John Mitford, who became its editor in 1834 and would remain until 1850. Mitford echoed Blomfield's key points: the existence of problems within the Church of England, an assertion that "the fault is *not* in ourselves" (meaning the Church), and an exhortation for the government not to meddle with tithes or church property, such endowments being "held of divine right by the ambassadors of Christ".[407] Interestingly, Mitford signed this article "J. M.". Perhaps his elevation to the position of editor had been confirmed by this point, and the signature was a way of announcing his presence in the publication ahead of his editorship. Mitford would contribute frequently during his time as editor, on a range of subjects, and he was the dominant voice on church reform. He also took it upon himself to be the publication's chief scourge of two groups that he viewed as pernicious threats to the Established Church – Roman Catholics and Dissenters. Contrary to the varied attitudes shown towards Dissenters in the *Gentleman's* under Nichols, Mitford would situate them as the Church's opponents in the magazine's pages during his editorship. Indeed, in May 1834, he declared full agreement with the notion that compromise between the Church and Dissenters regarding the payment of church rates was

[406] Chadwick, *Volume I*, p. 133.
[407] John Mitford, 'Review – Dr. Bloomfield on Church Reform', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume CIII (September, 1833), p. 248.

impossible, and that this was the result of proclamations made by "the enemies of the Church."[408]

Any Dissenters who refused to pay church rates, as they were required to by law, were therefore "enemies", according to the simple formulation above. The simplistic inference was that the Church of England had to defend itself from its opponents, who were massing their forces and readying themselves to attack it at any given opportunity - 'The Church in danger', indeed. Apart from being overly dramatic, it was simplistic; Dissent was not a uniform body, as Mitford, and anyone who read beyond scare-mongering sensationalism, was fully aware. Moreover, those that could be included in the term "Dissenters" were certainly not in agreement about how to deal with the issue of reforming the Church of England, as an article in the *Eclectic Review* in August 1830 illustrates. Considering several pamphlets on church reform as an opportunity to comment on the subject, the article declared that reform should begin with the removal of the necessity for Dissenters to pledge the Oath of Supremacy, which required them to recognise the monarch as the Supreme Governor of the Church. Despite rejecting further reform as being impractical while the Oath remained a factor, the *Eclectic* regarded this as a possibility for the future. The periodical acknowledged "a class of Dissenters, with whom our own consistency and integrity will be placed in jeopardy" by advocating reform of any sort. The *Eclectic* mockingly lamented the damage that removing "abuses and evils" would do to the Dissenting cause, while also commenting that church reform would cause it to lose "a fertile topic of invective, which no controvertist [sic] is willing to part with".[409] Such comments made it clear that the *Eclectic* was advocating

---

[408] John Mitford, 'Review of "Ecclesiastical Establishments not inconsistent with Christianity, with a particular view to the leading objections of Modern Dissenters", by William Hull', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume CIV (May, 1834), p. 525.
[409] 'Hurn's Reasons for Secession', *Eclectic Review*, Series 3, Volume IV (August, 1830), p. 130.

Dissenting principles in 1830, but that it was not unwilling to risk upsetting Dissenters that were not in step with it.

Regarding church reform, the *Eclectic* was in step with Mitford in the *Gentleman's*, Brougham in the *Edinburgh*, and with the contributors to *Fraser's* that took the view that "some reform is better than no reform", as had been stated in the latter in 1831. It was "the conviction of all parties", as the *Eclectic* observed in 1832; at least, the conviction of the vast majority, as some hard-liners in the Established Church and in Dissenting communities were opposed, albeit for very different reasons.[410] Those in the Church of England that opposed reform did so due to fears that it would be the first concession of many until the Church of England was unrecognisable. The Dissenters that opposed reform did so from a fear of having their quarrels with the Church of England undermined – at least, this was the contention of the *Eclectic* when it came to Dissenting anti-reformers, as noted above.

Of course, what this reform should entail was a salient question; the *Eclectic* declared Henley's plan to be favourable, and that his proposal to equitably adjust church property would be "the *emancipation* of the church".[411] Mitford and Phillpotts would have vehemently disagreed, along with many other Church of England clergymen and advocates. Despite his criticisms of Dissenters, Arnold was praised in the *Eclectic* for the "object and purpose" of his *Principles of Church Reform* – anathema to Mitford, and anyone else opposed to broad church theories.[412] The *Eclectic's* claim that church reform was almost universally accepted as a necessity was qualified by the claim that it was opposed by Tory interests that desired a "Tory Church monopoly", in opposition to "the religious people of England". This was most likely motivated, at least in part, by an article

---

[410] 'A Plan of Church Reform by Lord Henley', *Eclectic Review*, Series 3, Volume VII (June, 1832), p. 515.
[411] *Ibid*, p. 518.
[412] 'Principles of Church Reform, by Thomas Arnold', *Eclectic Review*, Series 3, Volume IX (February, 1833), p. 176. Hiller notes that this was "probably" written by Josiah Conder.

in the *Quarterly*, referenced by the *Eclectic* as "impudent and abusive". The *Quarterly* article was one of Croker's, in which he denigrated Dissenters as "inferior to the Church in numbers, wealth, education, and abilities", and set out any attempts to alter England's constitution as "the reveries of madmen enforced by the extravagance of demagogues." If one consequence of the *Quarterly's* High-Church, High-Tory turn was the entrenchment of its position on reform, to the point that even previously-expressed support for moderate reform was off the table, another outcome was the excessive vitriol directed at Dissenters.

Church reform was a major issue in the late 1820s and early 1830s; it would continue to be afterwards, and still is today, but the measures enacted during these years magnified its importance, especially in the context of the Reform Act. Periodicals were crucial in disseminating ideas about church reform, and in encouraging the broader public sphere to consider them. Andrew Franta's observation that, in the early nineteenth century, there was "an explosion in the public circulation of opinions about books, exemplified by the unprecedented prominence of periodicals" can be applied to opinions about ecclesiastical topics, as well.[413] Franta's work focuses on poetry, but religious questions were considered in all of the prominent periodicals, even the *Edinburgh Review*, which faced accusations of irreligiosity, or at least a lack of interest in religion, in the nineteenth century and in analyses of the publication. If the prominence of periodicals reflected an increase in public debate, religion must have had a role in this, too.

This was a reciprocal relationship – quite obviously, periodicals sought to influence their readerships. If belief in newspapers being able to influence society was indeed "axiomatic" among their proprietors, those involved with periodicals must have believed similarly, even if their publications were not as frequent. In

[413] Andrew Franta, *Powers of the Press: Newspapers, Power and the Public in Nineteenth-Century England* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), p. 180.

the case of church reform, periodicals were able to summarise numerous pamphlets and tracts for their readers, and to then interpret them through their own lens in order to persuade readers of the merits or defects, often both, of a particular work. Norman Gash has written that by 1830, the Church of England was "politically unpopular, socially exclusive, and administratively corrupt", and it had attracted "a seething flood of attack".[414] Richard Brent's less stark observation is that "Anglican politicians of most political persuasions" were convinced of the need to reform the Church of England to make it "a more efficient propagator of Christian truth".[415] Brent has commended 'liberal Anglican politicians' for transforming the "language of liberalism" and the "political agenda" in the 1830s, but he does note that many of the changes called for were not enacted until the 1860s and 1870s.[416]

The Established Church's privileged position was eroded "bit by bit", as David Nicholls has put it – why would change be relatively slow if a clear design for church reform was wedded to the unpopularity of the institution, and opprobrium directed towards it?[417] Perhaps because the Church of England was not as unpopular as Gash has stated, or at least that desire for reform was tempered by a fear of the consequences among politicians and the wider public, as well as among clergymen. The *Quarterly* had a direct link to the Tory/Conservative Party through Croker, and this would have strengthened the link to the Lords Spiritual. The *Gentleman's* had many contributions from clergymen, including the Bishop of London. It is this thesis' contention that this reflected broader clerical interest across the country.

---

[414] Norman Gash, *Reaction and Reconstruction in English Politics, 1832-1852* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 61.
[415] Richard Brent, *Liberal Anglican Politics: Whiggery, Religion, and Reform, 1830-1841* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 3.
[416] *Ibid*, p. 18.
[417] David Nicholls, *Church and State in Britain since 1820* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1967), p. 5.

Of course, they were not solely responsible for any reluctance towards reforming the church, or institutions that had direct church involvement; nor was periodical literature as a whole the driving force. However, the dissemination of ideas in these periodicals enabled readers to keep abreast of relevant literature and to imbue arguments pertinent to them. For clergymen potentially facing hostility from parishioners aware of developments, any assistance would have been appreciated. One could not rely solely on a quarterly publication, or at least they would have struggled to keep up, but periodicals could have formed a key part of the armoury of a clergyman, or anyone else keen to formulate a robust defence of the Church of England.

Throughout the 1830s and 1840s, the *Quarterly*, *Gentleman's*, and *Fraser's* all maintained that one of the Church's chief threats came from the Dissenters. The *Quarterly* had Lockhart as its editor until 1853, and Mitford remained in his post at the *Gentleman's* until 1850, so it is not surprising that anti-Dissent feeling that had come to the fore in both remained a subject of discontent. *Fraser's* retained its brash, combative style until 1847, when the switch from George Nickisson to John William Parker Jnr as editor represented the shift from the "riotous mirth" of the Regency to the more sober stylings of Victorian literary publishing.[418] From this point, *Fraser's* would not slander Dissenters as they had previously been wont to do; the magazine barely mentioned them at all, usually only in passing if at all. The April 1849 issue criticised unscrupulous MPs for courting Dissenters when it was favourable to them, but it also declared that these same politicians would espouse the glories of Church and State if that was the more popular view in a given constituency.[419] The target of *Fraser's* less volatile ire was the prospective MP, not the Dissenters. Regarding university reform at Oxford in July 1850, the question of admitting Dissenters was one that *Fraser's*

---

[418] Walter Houghton, 'Fraser's Magazine' in Houghton (ed.), *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900, Volume II* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), p. 310.
[419] 'Insolvent Members of Parliament', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XXXIX (April, 1849), p. 476.

would "expressly decline entering".[420] It is difficult to imagine the publication declining to proffer an opinion prior to 1847, yet that was its position under Parker. The Broad Church principles that he brought to the publication were almost certainly key in precipitating this change.

Lockhart's *Quarterly* was in no danger of relaxing its stance on Dissenters during the 1830s and 1840s. In 1835 Croker, still the dominant contributor to its political output, maintained his "Church in Danger" rhetoric by warning that the Protestant Church was at risk of being reduced to a "tolerated sect" equivalent to "popery, unitarianism [sic], Judaism, and all the nameless varieties of dissent and infidelity."[421] To be on the same level as any of these groups was a terrifying thought to Croker – his ire was not limited to Dissenters and Roman Catholics, but Dissenters having influence even close to approaching that of the Established Church, let alone equalling or potentially surpassing it, was a constant fear for the *Quarterly*, and for Croker. In 1849, he would upbraid Lord John Russell's Whig government for its chief support being drawn from "the various classes which may be generically described as dissent and disloyalty." The government was, in actuality, the result of an alliance between "Whiggery and Popery", meaning that Croker was able to tie the Church's spiritual enemies to its political one, which was the Whig Party, in Croker's eyes.[422] Croker was the *Quarterly's* main critic of Dissent, but John James Blunt, the future Lady Margaret Chair of Divinity at Cambridge, condemned Dissenters in 1836; William Sewell, the White's Chair of Moral Philosophy at Oxford, quite possibly did the same in 1837.[423]

---

[420] 'University Reform – Oxford', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XLII (July, 1850), p. 94.
[421] John Wilson Croker, 'Sir Robert Peel's Address', *Quarterly Review*, Volume LIII (February, 1835), p. 275.
[422] John Wilson Croker, 'Lord Clarendon and the Orange Institution', *Quarterly Review*, Volume LXXXVI (December, 1849), p. 229.
[423] John James Blunt, 'Church-rates', *Quarterly Review*, Volume LVII (December, 1836), pp. 363-73; 'The Universities', *Quarterly Review*, Volume LIX (October, 1837), pp. 439-83. The latter is rated as "possibly" being by Sewell in Wellesley; the attribution stems from the *Gentleman's Magazine*, which declared Sewell to be the author in 1845.

The *Gentleman's Magazine* under Mitford was consistently hostile to Dissenters, and this did not change throughout his time as editor. Mitford would review Robert Benton Seeley's *Essays on the Church* three times for the magazine, in 1833, 1835, and 1839. Curiously, Mitford would treat the subsequent instances as distinct reviews, with no reference to his earlier considerations; of course, Mitford was not afforded the space that contributors to the other periodicals were granted, so brevity mattered. Each of his three reviews took aim at Dissenters. In 1833, Mitford declared that Dissent would never "disappear", as Seeley had argued in his work, due to Dissenters' persistent and long-held desire to disestablish the Established Church.[424]

In 1835, Spencer Madan's *The Principal Claims of the Dissenters Considered* was vilified for containing "language of carnal hatred, unchristian prejudice and suspicion, unconstitutional principle, unmanly insult, and ungentlemanly imputation"; its basis as a Dissenting text thus invalidated the claims of the Dissenters, in Mitford's view.[425] Mitford did manage to praise Dissenting communities for taking care of their ministers, comparing the situation to that in the Church of England, where some clergymen struggled for sustenance.[426] In the 1835 review, Mitford referred to the *Eclectic's* report that 235 out of 258 Presbyterian congregations were Unitarian as proof that Dissenting communities were highly susceptible to heresy.[427] Seeley would also use the *Eclectic* to castigate Dissenters, citing an article in that periodical that indicated the divisiveness of Dissent, which Seeley viewed as being antithetical to the aims of the early apostles.[428] The 1839 review simply restates the view that Dissenters were opponents of the Church of England, which was always

---

[424] John Mitford, 'Essays on the Church', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume CIII (June, 1833), p. 528.
[425] John Mitford, 'Essays on the Church', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume CV (March, 1835), p. 281.
[426] *Ibid*, p. 286.
[427] *Ibid*, p. 284.
[428] Robert Benton Seeley, *Essays on the Church, by A Layman, Second Edition* (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1834), pp. 146-47.

Mitford's and the *Gentleman's* contention, however abrasively it was put across on various occasions.[429]

Fraser's maintained similarly vitriolic criticism of Dissenters until its softening under Parker in 1847. An 1836 article remarked on the supposed union between "Papists and Dissenters", working with the Whigs to undermine and ultimately destroy the Church of England; such hysteria was shared among Tory-leaning periodicals.[430] This article accused the *Eclectic Review* of fostering the connection between Roman Catholics and Dissenters; the *Eclectic* article referred to in *Fraser's* spoke of the "soul-destroying errors of the Romish Church", so perhaps they were not quite as fond of the Roman Catholics as *Fraser's* intimated.[431] Notions of "Radical Whigs" permeated Tory thought in the mid-1830s, so the addition of Radicals to the alliance at the end of 1836 is not surprising. *Fraser's* contention was that these three groups were "all agreed in the main destruction to be wrought", and that Church of England-supporting churchmen should band together to oppose them; Heaven would ensure that justice would be done in the end.[432]

Fraser's praised Seeley's work in 1839 for showing that an established church was a product of Divine revelation. By 1841, *Fraser's* was celebrating the "rapid decay" of Dissent, as Dissent was becoming a political movement and thus losing ecclesiastical support to the Church of England. Perhaps the successes of the Ecclesiastical Commission in achieving the Established Church Act, The Pluralities Act and the Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Act spurred this confidence, errant as it proved to be: Dissenters were almost equal in number to Anglicans in the mid-nineteenth century, making the assertions of *Fraser's* either

---

[429] John Mitford, Essays on the Church', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume CIX (June, 1839), p. 618.
[430] 'Union of Papists and Dissenters to Achieve the Disunion of Church and State', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XIII (May, 1836), pp. 521-25.
[431] *Ibid*, p. 521. For the quote from the *Eclectic*, see 'Young's Lectures on Popery', *Eclectic Review*, Series 3, Volume XVI (July, 1836), p. 18.
[432] 'The Radicals, the Dissenters, and the Papists', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XIV (December, 1836), p. 692.

misguided or misguiding.[433] Lockhart's policy would ensure that the publication could not be accused of being either.

Perhaps it was the presence of the Oxford Movement, which *Fraser's* delineated as a "semi-popish theory", that threatened the gains the Established Church stood to make from Dissenters. If the theory was only semi-popish, the association with the Pope was complete, according to the same article in *Fraser's*; the Tractarians were in league with the Papacy, and they were a new weapon the Roman Catholics could wield in their continued attempts to bring down the Church of England.[434] *Fraser's* was scathing in its review of Hurrell Froude's *Remains* in 1838, declaring it to be the point at which "popery of Rome, and the popery now disseminating at Oxford, meet and embrace each other" – "popery" obviously being a terrible thing to *Fraser's*.[435] Those at Oxford that embraced the new spirit were enabling Roman Catholicism to gain a foothold in England again, at one of its universities, no less, and thus their behaviour qualified as "treason" to the publication. *Fraser's* took the unusual step of allowing the right to reply in December 1838, in which a responder dismissed the earlier article as "a piece of Protestant Jesuitism, quite worthy of Loyola". *Fraser's* was therefore attempting to "poison men's minds" by prejudicing them against the Tractarians without giving them a fair hearing.[436] A rejoinder from *Fraser's*, possibly by the unknown author of the first article, dismissed the criticism as "petty" and "unmanly."[437] A final article on 'Treason within the Church' in March 1839 reasserted the claim that the Oxford Movement was indistinguishable from "Popery".[438] As such, it

---

[433] Richard D. Floyd, *Church, Chapel and Party: Religious Dissent and Political Modernization in Nineteenth-Century England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 3. See pages 186-236 of Floyd's work for statistical data regarding Anglican and Dissenting communities and how these influenced voting patterns in elections; further evidence contrary to *Fraser's* claim that the influence of Dissent was diminishing.
[434] 'Bishop Sanderson's Sermons', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XXIV (February, 1841), p. 213.
[435] 'Treason within the Church', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XVIII (August, 1838), p. 190.
[436] 'Treason within the Church', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XVIII (December, 1838), p. 751.
[437] *Ibid*, p. 755. The refutation may have come from the editor, and not the original author of the article in question.
[438] 'Treason within the Church', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XIX (March, 1839), pp. 367-70. The author repeats the claim throughout. The March edition of the magazine opened with an article entitled 'Statistics of Popery in

was heresy, as *Fraser's* deemed it, and the publication would later lament that the Convocation could not be assembled to prosecute the writers of the *Tracts for the Times* as heretics. The exchange in 1838-39 prefaced this perspective.[439]

Much like *Fraser's*, the *Quarterly* and the *Gentleman's* had been vociferous in their opposition to those it viewed as having interests antithetical to the Church of England. Dissenters and proponents of church reform had come in for heavy-handed criticism in all three publications, but often the most aggressive invective was directed towards Roman Catholics, although dislike for Dissenters sometimes ran this close. The charge that Roman Catholicism was inveigling its way into Anglicanism via the University of Oxford was serious; given the aversion to Roman Catholicism in the *Quarterly* and the *Gentleman's*, often expressed in derogatory terms, one might expect full-blooded exhortations of fury directed at any clergymen associated with such an endeavour. However, this was not the case.

The *Quarterly* did not even begin to consider Tractarianism, or the Oxford Movement, until 1838, when William Sewell defended Oxford University from the claims that it was falling prey to Roman Catholic influence. Sewell declared that the university was "at this time, as it always has been, the bulwark of the Church of England", and that the accusers were ignorant of the difference between "the Catholicism which they all profess, and the Romanism with which it was corrupted."[440] In 1839, Sewell praised the *Tracts* as "a very seasonable and valuable contribution to the cause both of the Church and the State".[441] The catholicity of the Bible was once again impressed upon readers, Roman Catholicism and Dissent being two forms of error that took Christians away from this concept. For Sewell, the Tractarians were on the right side of history. This is

---

Great Britain and the Colonies', which declared that "long and impartial observation" on the part of the publication had led to the conclusion that "the enemy we have reason to guard against… is Popery".

[439] 'The Tracts for the Times', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XXIII (May, 1841), p. 603.

[440] William Sewell, 'Memorials of Oxford', *Quarterly Review*, Volume LXI (January, 1838), pp. 226-27.

[441] William Sewell, 'Oxford Theology', *Quarterly Review*, Volume LXIII (March, 1839), pp. 571-72.

unsurprising, as Sewell supported the Oxford Movement from its beginning. His sister wrote that he "felt so much in sympathy with it as to give it all the support in his power", until the "unsound principles" of Newman's *Tract XC* caused him to withdraw from "direct co-operation."[442] Sewell would state that "we owe so much" to the Oxford Movement shortly before his death in October, 1874; despite his aversion to *Tract XC*, he remained an admirer of the Tractarians for the rest of his life.[443]

That the *Quarterly* was willing to give space to a defender of the Movement is contextualised by Peter Nockles' observation that Tractarianism was largely a "revolt of Oxford Toryism" directed at the reforms of the Grey ministry in the early 1830s.[444] Combining this with Robert Andrews' assertion that High Churchmanship retained a "strong defence of the confessional state" throughout the Victorian period, only moving away from this in the Edwardian era, provides ample reasoning for the *Quarterly* to support the Movement.[445] Tractarianism was politically High Tory, and opposed the Whig reforms, as did the *Quarterly*; its theological precepts were tied to a strong link between Church and State, which the *Quarterly* advocated. These principles were very much in accordance with those of Lockhart and Croker. Walter Hook, the vicar of Leeds, wrote to Croker in April 1839, praising him for the contents of 'Oxford Theology' which Hook mistakenly thought Croker had written. Hook stated that it had achieved the "exorcism of that evil spirit of Reform" which had threatened the Church a few years previously. Croker responded, correcting the misattribution, expressing fears that misunderstandings of the *Tracts* might lead to a schism, which he hoped

---

[442] Elizabeth Missing Sewell, 'Introductory Notice' in William Sewell (D. D.), *Some Last Words of the Rev. W. Sewell D. D., Being a Brief Review of Certain Controverted Religious Questions* (London: Rivingtons, 1876), p. vi.
[443] Sewell, *Some Last Words*, p. 13.
[444] Peter Benedict Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 67.
[445] Robert M. Andrews, 'High Church Anglicanism in the Nineteenth Century' in Rowan Strong (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume III: Partisan Anglicanism and its Global Expansion 1829-c.1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 164.

the efforts of the *Quarterly* could help avoid. Hook was not the only Churchman impressed by the article: Henry Phillpotts would write to John Murray that the article was "one of the most valuable your Review ever contained."[446]

Croker's fear of schism was heightened in 1839; by 1843, with Newman's effective withdrawal from the Church of England occurring amid acerbic sparring at Oxford University among Newman's followers, Croker was ready to distance the *Quarterly* from the Movement.[447] Having initially excited a zealous flame, the Tractarians "burned their own fingers, and very nearly, if not actually, set fire to the Church." Croker praised the increased spirit of theological learning among the clergy encouraged by the Movement, but he condemned those who had taken it in a "popish direction", which included some of the original leaders.[448] Early good intentions had been undone by the development of theological precepts and devotional practices incompatible with the Church of England's doctrines and practices, as Croker viewed the situation.

The *Gentleman's* rather hedged its bets on the Tractarians, and Mitford was responsible for some of the proclamations made in the publication that went beyond mere notice of a work referring to them. In his third review of Seeley's *Essays on the Church* in 1839, Mitford praised the virtues of Newman, Keble, Froude, and Pusey, and declared a hope that *some* of the ideas attributed to them by Seeley would be disavowed by them.[449] In 1842, when all ninety of the *Tracts* had been published, Mitford was on the fence, although seemingly leaning more towards the Tractarian side. He wrote that "in many points of ecclesiastical discipline we think them right, in some parts of doctrine we cannot go along with

---

[446] *Croker Papers, Volume II*, pp. 352-54.
[447] Sheridan Gilley, 'Newman's "Anglican Deathbed": Littlemore and Conversions to Rome' in Stewart J. Brown (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 322.
[448] 'John Wilson Croker, 'Rubrics and Rituals of the Church of England', *Quarterly Review*, Volume LXXII (May, 1843), pp. 236-37.
[449] Mitford, 'Essays on the Church', *Gentleman's* Magazine, p. 620.

them."[450] Note that on "many points" they were right, and only "some parts" of doctrine were incompatible. Mitford asserts that a "considerable party" agrees with the Tractarians; as the editor of a magazine that was ready by many of the clergy, perhaps Mitford was being careful not to offend sizeable numbers of his readers, although it would seem that he at least respected the Tractarians, even if he did not necessarily agree with them. Later in 1842, he would reject the equivocation of the Oxford Movement with "popery", declaring the *Gentleman's* satisfied that there was no correlation between them.[451]

William Bentinck Lethem Hawkins, an Anglican clergyman, had made the same point in the publication in July 1842, stating that the writers of the *Tracts for the Times* were devoid of "popery", but that younger Tractarians were writing in such a way that might be advantageous to the Roman Catholic Church's attempts to "corrupt" Anglicans.[452] Hawkins would continue to hedge the *Gentleman's* bets in December 1843 when he proclaimed the Tractarians had both merits and defects. More interestingly, he offered the view that the Oxford Movement was a response to calls from within the Church of England to defend it from "the combined forces of the liberals, radicals, and infidels of the day."[453] Perhaps this was where the discussion of the Movement was best left for the *Gentleman's*, and indeed, the *Quarterly*. While both would continue to rail against Roman Catholicism, deploying the usual array of slurs, references to the Oxford Movement would be few and far between after 1843, and only in passing rather than offering any analysis of the Movement's merits or defects.

---

[450] John Mitford, 'The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice', *Gentleman's Magazine*, New Series, Volume XVIII (July, 1842), p. 56.
[451] John Mitford, 'Oxford Divinity compared with that of the Romish and Anglican churches', *Gentleman's Magazine*, New Series, Volume XVIII (November, 1842), pp. 501-02.
[452] William Bentinck Lethem Hawkins, 'A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford', *Gentleman's Magazine*, New Series, Volume XVIII (July, 1842), pp. 63-64.
[453] William Bentinck Lethem Hawkins, 'Narrative of Events Tracts for the Times', *Gentleman's Magazine*, New Series, Volume XX (December, 1843), p. 620.

Given how prominent a target Dissent had been for the *Quarterly*, the *Gentleman's*, *Fraser's*, and even the *Edinburgh Review* on occasion, the Oxford Movement provided an excellent opportunity for the *Eclectic Review* to hit back at the Established Church. Much of the opposition to Hampden's elevation to the post of Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford University centred on his support for non-Anglicans being admitted to Oxford. At the same time, in the mid-1830s, that institution was home to a group of clergymen whose doctrinal inclinations were suspected of being rather too close to those of Rome. For the *Eclectic*, this was rank hypocrisy of the highest order. Hampden was the victim of "theological hatred on the part of a nest of Papists, or semi-Papists", High Churchmen that criticised the Church of Rome at one turn, and then embraced "Papistical tenets" at another.[454] In 1834, Conder recorded the opposition from Oxford, in conjunction with that of the "Tory scribblers", towards any Member of the House of Commons that advocated church reform.[455] Dissenters and Roman Catholics had been accused of being in league to undermine the Church of England; the Tractarians seemed to be embracing the tenets of one of the Church's avowed enemies. In 1840, the *Eclectic* would accuse the Tory Party of despising Roman Catholicism but encouraging the application of its principles at Oxford and Canterbury.[456] Extending this logic, Hampden was therefore to be opposed, but Pusey, Froude, Newman, and the other leaders of the Oxford Movement could be accepted, even if their theology was redolent of "Romanism".

Tractarian theology was viewed as a grave threat by the *Eclectic*, a "poison" that was more dangerous than "the outright popery of the Jesuits"; the clergy embracing and propagating such theology was the "most pernicious that has ever appeared", at least since the mid-seventeenth century.[457] Newman's

---

[454] Josiah Conder, 'Oxford Popery', *Eclectic Review*, Series 3, Volume XVI (July, 1836), p. 45.
[455] Josiah Conder, 'The Church and its Adversaries', *Eclectic Review*, Series 3, Volume XII (July, 1834), p. 48.
[456] 'Fitzgerald on the Oxford Tracts', *Eclectic Review*, Series 4, Volume VII (May, 1840), p. 514. The article uses the term "Tory Party" in its pages.
[457] 'Newman's Lectures on Justification', *Eclectic Review*, Series 4, Volume VII (June, 1840), p. 637.

proximity to Roman Catholicism regarding the Sacraments was observed in 1840, the only point of division seeming to be Newman's uncertainty on the number compared to Roman Catholic doctrine of there being seven.[458] The *Eclectic* was certainly not predicting Newman's conversion, or even suggesting the possibility of it, but the inference was that Tractarian clergymen were advancing positions very close to those of Rome, hence the extreme concerns expressed by the *Eclectic*.

The fear of Tractarian influence was put forward in a review of sermons by Charles James Blomfield, the Bishop of London and an occasional contributor to the *Gentleman's*. The *Eclectic* castigated Blomfield as "a weather gauge" to decipher the extent to which "the hateful heresies of the Oxford school have infected the body ecclesiastic".[459] The Bishop's condemnation of Dissenters was contrasted with his prevarication regarding the Oxford Movement, attributed to a combination of the strength of the Movement's influence and Blomfield's shortcomings as a theologian.[460] The prevarication of the Established Church to counter Tractarianism emboldened its adherents to move to "unprotestantize" the Church of England, drawing ever nearer to "Romish doctrine and Romish practice" as a result.[461] By 1848, the *Eclectic* was once again writing on Hampden, and the opposition to his nomination as the Bishop of Hereford, contrasting his treatment to that of the Tractarians. Considering the damage done by the Oxford Movement, and the Church's inability or unwillingness to address the issues, the *Eclectic's* conclusion was that an established church was not only unnecessary but unhelpful and antithetical to free religious practice. Severing the

---

[458] 'Dr. Bennett on Justification', *Eclectic Review*, Series 4, Volume VIII (July, 1840), p. 322.
[459] 'The Bishop of London and the Dissenters', *Eclectic Review*, Series 4, Volume XII (September, 1842), p. 294.
[460] *Ibid, passim*, pp. 293-318.
[461] 'Mr. Ward and the Oxford University', *Eclectic Review*, Series 4, Volume XVII (May, 1845), p. 514.

link between Church and State would lead to "more real religion" and "more individual conscientiousness", which the *Eclectic* deemed highly desirable.[462]

An increase in both "real religion" and "individual conscientiousness" chimed with Thomas Arnold's Broad Church principles, which he had the opportunity to elucidate in the *Edinburgh* in 1836. Arnold's conception of what constituted a Christian included any Trinitarian believer; by this metric, Roman Catholics could be part of the Established Church as long as they did not consider it necessary to always obey the declarations of the Pope. Arnold believed that the majority of Catholics did not follow the Pope in this way, and they were not guilty of the charge of being "bigots" that had been levied at Catholics for this crude oversimplification.[463] But, for Arnold, the Tractarians exhibited High Church "fanaticism", which would, if implemented widely, change "sense into silliness, and holiness of heart and life into formality and hypocrisy."[464]

Even if Arnold did not refer to the Tractarians as the "Oxford Malignants" – this was an editorial decision, presumably taken by the editor, Macvey Napier – his dismay at the attacks on Renn Dickson Hampden, which he saw as the result of the Tractarians at Oxford, led to a direct attack in the *Edinburgh*. Equating the Tractarians with other instances of High Churchmen stifling plurality of ecclesiastical opinions, Arnold referred to "the bigot Dr. Jane" being responsible for foiling an attempt by the Church of England and Dissenters to reach an agreement after the events of 1688.[465] The *Edinburgh* had earlier advocated for the acceptance of Dissenters into the universities, in October of 1834, regarding

---

[462] 'The Case of Dr. Hampden and the Episcopal Movement', *Eclectic Review*, Series 4, Volume XXIII (February, 1848) p. 248.
[463] Thomas Arnold, 'The Christian Duty of Conceding the Claims of the Roman Catholics' in Arthur Penrhyn Stanley (ed.), *The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold, D. D.* (London: B. Fellowes, 1845), p. 42.
[464] Thomas Arnold, 'The Oxford Malignants and Dr. Hampden', *Edinburgh Review*, Volume LXIII (April, 1836), p. 235.
[465] *Ibid*, p. 236. It is not apparent who "Dr. Jane" is, but Arnold's choice of language and his tacit approval of bringing the Established Church and Dissenters into accord are the salient points.

their exclusion to be "unjust".[466] This displeased the *Quarterly*, which included a note in an article on the subject the following month accusing the *Edinburgh* of inventing claims for the acceptance of Dissenters. In January 1835, Hamilton was "pleased to note" that the *Quarterly* had, in Hamilton's view, quoted non-existent passages and refuted arguments not made in the *Edinburgh*.

It was another element in the rivalry between the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh*, and one that demonstrated the ecclesiastical positions of both. The *Quarterly's* shift to its High Church, High Tory position under Lockhart coincided with the *Edinburgh* becoming markedly less hostile to Dissenters, while being hostile to the Tractarians; the *Quarterly* maintained hostility to Dissenters while offering space in its pages to defenders of the Oxford Movement, which was centred on mutual opposition to Grey's Reform Ministry. Although the admiration of the Tractarians was not to last, abandoned due to the proximity to Rome of many of its adherents, it is indicative of the *Quarterly's* robust support of Church and State principles. The Catholicity of the Tractarians was perfectly acceptable, even favourable if it strengthened the shared principles – it was the Roman Catholicism of the Tractarians that eventually ruptured the link.

By contrast, the *Edinburgh* had been perceived, by the *Quarterly* and elsewhere, as an opponent of the Established Church and, by extension, the Establishment. If Oxford University can be seen as a pillar of the Establishment in the 1830s and 1840s, an argument can be made that the *Edinburgh's* opposition to the Oxford Movement, through Arnold's condemnation in response to the treatment of Hampden, was indeed anti-Establishment. Before the overt link to Rome was made, principally through Newman's conversion, certain High Churchmen believed that the Tractarians were exactly what was needed to combat the reforming spirit of the 1820s and 1830s that, it was believed, threatened the

[466] William Hamilton, 'Admission of Dissenters to the universities', *Edinburgh Review*, Volume LX (October, 1834), p. 202.

Church of England so drastically. Conversely, the reluctance among High Churchmen to accept the need for reform, both in the Church and in the country generally, made the *Edinburgh* hostile to the Tractarians, even though the *Edinburgh* was less vociferous in its attacks on Roman Catholics than the *Quarterly* had been throughout the history of both.

The reforming spirit of the *Edinburgh* was underlined and inspired by its links to the Whig Party, through Brougham and Macaulay. Both were prominent Whigs as well as contributors to the periodical, and they helped to establish a firm connection to the Whigs that had not been present until Macvey Napier became the editor in 1829. At the same time, the Whigs developed an association with Dissenters that reaped electoral benefits in the 1830s; "the Whig appeal to Nonconformity proved remarkably potent", as Brent has put it.[467] Gash's statement that the Reform Act increased the political strength of "the intellectual and sectarian enemies of the Establishment" illustrates how useful this link was to the Whigs.[468] As an organ closely tied to the Whig Party, the reasoning behind the *Edinburgh* becoming more sympathetic to the Dissenting cause is evident.

By 1850, the editorial positions of the *Quarterly, Edinburgh*, and *Gentleman's* were all firmly established. Lockhart had edited the *Quarterly* since 1826; Mitford the *Gentleman's* since 1834. Both had consistently defended the claims of the Church of England, attacked Roman Catholics and Dissenters seemingly at every possible juncture, and both had initially been favourable to the Oxford Movement before pulling back. Lockhart and Mitford's time as editors of their respective periodicals represented the apex of each one's staunch defence of the Established Church; neither would be as active, or as vociferous, as under these two editors. Whitwell Elwin, the rector of Booton, in Norfolk, succeeded

[467] Brent, p. 23.
[468] Gash, p. 62.

Lockhart in 1853, an appointment that "marked the formal transition to a new and more moderate conservatism."

Mitford was followed by John Gough Nichols in 1850, who had been involved in the *Gentleman's* since the late 1820s and was the son of John Bowyer Nichols, who had preceded Mitford. John Gough Nichols largely maintained the spirit of the *Gentleman's* as it had been since his grandfather John Nichols took control of the publication in 1792; however, on ecclesiastical matters, he did not have access to a contributor as indefatigable or as bombastic as Mitford, who only contributed a handful of times after ceding the editorship. Miftord's departure caused the *Gentleman's* to devote less space to ecclesiastical issues, although they certainly remained within its pages. Religion continued to form an important part of the *Quarterly's* output, although seldom was it as bombastic as under Lockhart, at least for much of the first decade after his departure.

The *Edinburgh* had been under the same editor since 1829, Macvey Napier, and it had maintained the connection to the Whig Party until his death in 1847. Indeed, in Napier's time as editor, the *Edinburgh* "became the voice of the Party."[469] This was maintained under William Empson, the editor from 1847 to 1853, and Sir George Cornewall Lewis, editor from 1853 until he had to give up the position to focus on his new job as Chancellor of the Exchequer in a Whig government. Consequently, the *Edinburgh* was a Whig organ, and its ecclesiastical perspective can be defined as "liberal Anglican", as opposed to the political "Liberals" who were typically evangelicals or high churchmen; Hilton has demonstrated this by comparing Richard Brent's and Peter Mandler's definitions of "Whigs" and "Liberals".[470] This set the *Edinburgh* in direct opposition to the Oxford Movement, and helps to explain why it was so

[469] Houghton, *Wellesley Index, Volume I*, p. 420.
[470] Boyd Hilton, 'Whiggery, Religion and Social Reform: The Case of Lord Morpeth', *The Historical Journal* 37.4 (December, 1994), p. 836.

vociferous in its condemnation of the Tractarians, and why its position on Dissenters had softened over the years.

The *Eclectic* was under the editorship of Thomas Price until 1849, and Basker has noted that his time at the helm brought a "reinvigoration" of the periodical that coincided with a principle of "absolute neutrality" being maintained in religious matters. This view coincides with that of the *Athenaeum* in 1850, which described the *Eclectic* as "religious, without being sectarian". The *Eclectic* was as enthusiastic in its condemnation of Roman Catholicism during Price's time as editor, from 1837 to 1849, as it had been under Conder, but an argument could be made that Roman Catholicism was exempt from considerations of "neutrality" or "sectarianism" as that was not the State religion.

The *Eclectic's* hostility to the Tractarians does not fit these descriptors, however. It is impossible to square supposed benevolence on religious issues with the avowal that Tractarianism was a "poison" infecting not only the Church of England but the nation itself. Indeed, in an article on the formation of the Evangelical Alliance in 1846, the *Eclectic* observed that it was not a "chronicle", and that its readers had "a right to claim what assistance we can give them in the formation of their estimates of all great public movements".[471] In 1842, the *Eclectic* declared its pleasure that twenty-four tracts on the *Errors and Evils of the Church of England* were being widely circulated; these included "The Popery of the Church of England", "The Glaring Inconsistencies of the Evangelical Clergy", and the unequivocal final tract, "The Church of England a signal and miserable failure".[472]

If the *Eclectic* was not sectarian, it was not so because the situation was the same as with the Roman Catholic Church; the *Eclectic* represented Dissenting

---

[471] 'The Projected Evangelical Alliance', *Eclectic Review*, Series 4, Volume XIX (April, 1846), p. 487.
[472] 'Tracts on the Errors and Evils of the Church of England. By the Rev. W. Thorn', *Eclectic Review*, Series 4, Volume XII (October, 1842), pp. 473-74.

interests, and it was thus not liable to take sides in disputes within the Church of England. This is tenuous, given Dissenters' status as Protestants. Regardless of how it might be framed, Price himself rejected the accusation of sectarianism. In 1841, a dispute had arisen with the *Christian Observer* regarding a statement in an article that had appeared during Conder's editorship, in which it was implied that some Dissenters wished harm to the Church of England. Distancing himself and the *Eclectic* from such a suggestion, Price remarked that he hoped his efforts had managed to "relieve ourselves from the charge of sectarian bitterness, which has been so liberally preferred against us". Price declared that it was not the *Eclectic's* mission to "wound unnecessarily", and that "strong" writing was unavoidable, at times; others had to ask themselves if they "could honestly have done other than we have done". Therefore, the argument was that the *Eclectic* was not sectarian, but that it was writing in the spirit of the age. The problem with this defence is that sectarianism imbued the *zeitgeist*, and the *Eclectic* was guilty of it, even if its approach was less confrontational than it had been during Conder's time. Its strident criticism of the Tractarians was just one aspect of this approach.

Fraser's had undergone its editorial shift in 1847, some years before the *Quarterly* and the *Gentleman's*, and it was now under the control of Parker, who was "open-minded and tolerant", and desirous that the publication should be free from polemics.[473] This impacted its consideration of ecclesiastical topics; it went from the vitriolic anti-Tractarianism of Nickisson, redolent of the spirit of Maginn, to a general spirit of reporting perspectives rather than commenting on them. *The Nemesis of Faith*, James Anthony Froude's semi-autobiographical novel that criticised the shortcomings of the Church of England, created a furore when it was published in 1849.[474] The *Fraser's* of old would have had the sharpest knives prepared for Froude; *Fraser's* under Parker published a review of the work

---

[473] Houghton, 'Fraser's Magazine', *Wellesley Index, Volume II*, p. 311.
[474] Ciaran Brady, *James Anthony Froude: An Intellectual Biography of a Victorian Prophet* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 112-13.

that professed the "genius" of Froude, and that passages of the book were so beautiful as to be "unsurpassed, we believe, in the English language".[475] The piece ended with sympathy regarding Froude's crisis of faith, and a hope that Froude might, like Luther, overcome the difficulties he was facing.[476]

If *Fraser's* could be as compassionate towards a work that attracted accusations of atheism, it is not difficult to see why it did not feel obliged to wade into the theological disputes of the day. Parker's tolerant, Broad Church outlook negated the publication's propensity for engaging in theological disputes, and this was a seismic shift for *Fraser's*. Froude's accession to the position of editor in 1860, after Parker, is not difficult to comprehend, especially given that it was a rare source of (qualified) praise in an ocean of controversy created by *Nemesis*. A man such as Froude becoming the editor of a publication that was previously run by Maginn and Nickisson would have been seen as ludicrous before Parker's time, and it is a testament to how successful he was in changing its tone. Unfortunately, much of *Fraser's* reputation was built on its willingness to engage in controversy, a good deal of it on behalf of the Established Church. The Church of England lost an ally, albeit a raucous and unpredictable one; *Fraser's* lost much of its lustre on the eve of an explosion of the press that would greatly increase its competition.

Part 3 - *Universalis Ecclesiae*

If Tractarianism had enlarged fears that Roman Catholicism had infiltrated the Church of England, leading to a steady increase in tensions, Pius IX's Bull *Universalis Ecclesiae* of 1850 caused "the last great outburst of No-Popery

[475] J. M. Ludlow, 'Froude's Nemesis of Faith', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XXXIX (May, 1849), pp. 558-59.
[476] *Ibid*, p. 560.

feeling" in England.[477] 1850 had been a turbulent year for Church-State relations. In March, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council granted George Cornelius Gorham his institution at a parish in Devon after an almost three-year dispute over Gorham's views on baptism; Gorham took the view that the sacrament was only suitable for professing adults, and not the children of believers. The Tractarians were appalled, and they opposed Gorham's candidacy. They reacted furiously when he was finally confirmed in his parish, and Henry Manning was one of fourteen defectors to Rome over the decision. Lord John Russell made his dislike of Tractarians known; to him, they were "traitors".[478] A riled-up Prime Minister and an enlivened suspicion of Roman Catholics meant the atmosphere was volatile towards the end of 1850: the Papal Bull caused pandemonium when it was made public in England. Russell issued a letter attacking Roman Catholics and Tractarians.[479] Nationwide protests took place during the last two months of 1850. More disturbingly, effigies of the Pope and of Cardinal Wiseman, the newly-instated Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, were burnt or hanged. Catholic priests were attacked in the street, and projectiles were launched at their places of worship. A national issue had been created by Pius IX's proclamation.

The press covered the issue in detail, much of its output excoriating Pius IX, Wiseman, and often Tractarians as the harbingers of this "Papal Aggression". For many, the fears surrounding Catholic Emancipation in 1829 had been proven to be well-founded; just over twenty years after the event, the consequences were about to be felt. The "Church in Danger" cries were reignited; that Roman Catholics made up roughly four percent of the population in the early 1850s did not preclude anxious commentators from worrying about Papal plans to bring England, and the rest of Britain, back into the Roman Catholic fold.[480] Fears over

---

[477] Walter Ralls, 'The Papal Aggression of 1850: A Study in Victorian Anti-Catholicism', *Church History*, 43.2 (June, 1974), p. 242.
[478] Ralls, p. 250.
[479] D. G. Paz, 'Another Look at Lord John Russell and the Papal Aggression, 1850', *The Historian*, 45.1 (November, 1982), p. 54.
[480] Hugh McLeod, *Religion and Society in England, 1850-1914* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), p. 12.

Ireland had been long-held, but this manoeuvre of Pius IX went far beyond merely Ireland in the most hysterical of reactions to *Universalis Ecclesiae*. Even those who did not have such drastic fears were concerned about the implications of the restoration of the hierarchy; if Catholics recognised the reinstated hierarchy, would they take it to its ultimate conclusion and declare loyalty to the Pope instead of the Crown? As D. G. Paz has observed, building on the work of R. J. Klaus, there was a pronounced air of xenophobia that infused anti-Catholic feeling; the Irish, Italians, and French were all viewed negatively in certain quarters, and Roman Catholicism was the link that united them.[481] In sum, the public were agitated, and periodicals were practically compelled to comment. Most were only too happy to do so.

The *Quarterly* was quick out of the traps in December 1850, and in the first paragraph of its article on the subject, it referred to the Bull as the "natural fruit" of the 1829 Relief Bill. It also blamed "the persevering malice of Whig governments against the Church of England", and the *Quarterly* laid the "aggression" directly at the door of Whig ministers who had wilfully ignored the "intolerance, arrogance, and prepotency" of the Papacy.[482] The accusation was made that the Papacy's plans to reinstate the Catholic diocese had been well-known since 1847; furthermore, that the envoy to Rome, Lord Minto, knew in advance that the Bull was to be published. The Home Office had declared that Minto was not consulted ahead of publication. Minto would subsequently be required to declare as much in the House of Lords in February 1851, due to allegations such as those made by the *Quarterly*.[483]

---

[481] D. G. Paz, 'Popular Anti-Catholicism in England, 1850-1851', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 11.4 (Winter, 1979), pp. 355-56. For Klaus, see *The Pope, the Protestants, and the Irish: Papal Aggression and Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Nineteenth Century England* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1973).
[482] R. H. Cheney and John Gibson Lockhart, 'The Ministers and the Pope', *Quarterly Review*, Volume LXXXVIII (December, 1850), pp. 247-48.
[483] Hansard, House of Lords, Feb 6, 1851 via https://hansard.parliament.uk/Lords/1851-02-06/debates/86a8096b-c19b-4078-b4e1-042622ba47ee/LordMintoSMissionToTheCourtOfRome [accessed 18 June 2025].

To add to the list of accusations, the *Quarterly* would lay the blame for the development of Tractarianism at the Whigs' door. It would also reproach Russell for blaming the Papal aggression on the "unchecked spread of Tractarian delusions", "delusions" being the *Quarterly's* term.[484] If the Papal Bull represented an opportunity to castigate the Whigs' alleged lack of support for the Church of England, it also offered the *Quarterly* room to forget its previous prevarication on Catholic Relief, and its tacit support for Tractarianism in previous years. An article on Lord John Russell in the same volume declared that "Puseyites" were small in number, those that tended towards Rome even smaller still, and that their "ostentatious nonsense" barely factored into the ambitions of Rome.[485] Croker, the writer of this article on Russell, had previously been credited with an article sympathetic to the Tractarians, and he had blended his appreciation for the movement's theology with his fears of schism. Now, he was keen to paint the Tractarians as a facet of Papal aggression, albeit a relatively inconsequential one. Nevertheless, the events of 1850 offered an excellent opportunity for ideological revisionism.

Croker would refer to the "Puseyite infection" in 1851, expressing relief that the Catholic clergy in Ireland was more inclined towards "practical Popery" and thus less likely to be infected with the malady Croker had identified.[486] Another article in volume eighty-nine equated "Popish and Puseyite" writers in advancing the notion that the Pope should cease to be a temporal sovereign but retain spiritual independence; the *Quarterly* asserted that such a plan would "establish a tyranny which would have no bounds but that of human credulity and endurance".[487] If the initial reaction of the *Quarterly's* contributors had been to

---

[484] Cheney and Lockhart, 'The Ministers and the Pope', p. 262.
[485] John Wilson Croker, 'Lord John Russell', *Quarterly Review*, Volume LXXXVIII (March, 1851), p. 566.
[486] John Wilson Croker, 'Rubric versus Usage', *Quarterly Review*, Volume LXXXIX (June, 1851), p. 207.
[487] R. H. Cheney, 'Papal Pretensions', *Quarterly Review*, Volume LXXXIX (September, 1851), p. 464.

downplay Tractarian influence, a year later they were making sure to include them as co-conspirators in the nefarious scheme of the Roman Catholics.

The *Quarterly* maintained its attack on the Papacy. In volume XCI, John Wilson Croker wrote a postscript to the first issue regarding the prospects of the new Conservative government headed by the Earl of Derby. Croker cited "Popish aggression" as a major concern for the new government.[488] He expounded upon this in an article on 'Parliamentary Prospects' in the second issue of volume XCI, in which he poured scorn on the notion that the renewal of the Catholic hierarchy was necessary for the Catholic Church to function in England. Croker derided Wiseman's announcement of his installation as Archbishop of Westminster. Wiseman's delineation as to how the Roman Catholic Church in England would be governed was set out in a way that Roman Catholic kingdoms themselves would baulk at if they were in England's position, according to Croker.[489] The idea that England had been forced to tolerate what Roman Catholic nations would not countenance had previously been expressed in the pages of the *Edinburgh*. In January 1851, Anthony Panizzi, an Italian exile who had become friends with Henry Brougham, wrote the *Edinburgh's* first response to the controversy. In it, he contrasted the tolerance enjoyed by Roman Catholics in England with the difficulties that Dissenters of all stripes might encounter in Rome.[490] Panizzi also agreed that the efforts of the Tractarians had offered encouragement to Rome; he gave them greater "credit" for this than the *Quarterly* had.[491] It is not a tremendous shock to discover that the overtly Whig *Edinburgh* did not blame that party for the rise of the Tractarians as the *Quarterly* had.

Two articles in the April 1851 edition of the *Edinburgh* sought to contextualise *Universalis Ecclesiae*, and it was almost certainly an editorial

---

[488] John Wilson Croker, 'Postscript', *Quarterly Review*, Volume XCI (June, 1852), p. 270.
[489] John Wilson Croker, 'Parliamentary Prospects', *Quarterly Review*, Volume XCI (September, 1852), p. 559.
[490] Anthony Panizzi, 'Kings and Popes', *Edinburgh Review*, Volume XCIII (January, 1851), pp. 181-82.
[491] *Ibid.*

decision to place the two articles consecutively in this issue. The first, on the military defeats of Italy in the preceding years, contrasted the "brave and intelligent men" of the government of Rome with the Pope, whom the *Edinburgh* condemned as having neglected the people of Rome while denying any sense of political freedom.[492] "Rome is hopeless, but from the very excess of evil" was the pessimistic conclusion.[493] If the Pope was inclined to authoritarianism, and he was prepared to treat the people of Rome in such a manner, the insinuation was that he would have no qualms in interfering in matters spiritual and temporal in England. The nefariousness of the Pope was contrasted with the defence of English Catholics in the second article, which professed faith that their loyalty and patriotism were steadfast. Any attempts from the Papacy to eradicate religious liberty, using English Catholics as conduits for this task, would be rebuffed. The *Edinburgh* expressed confidence that English Catholics would become "champions of religious toleration" in the wake of the Bull, given that they had demonstrated "sincere zeal on behalf of religious liberty" because such had been granted to them.[494] One detects more than a slight hint of political considerations at play here. The Whig government had been accused of foreknowledge of the Papal Bull, and of enabling or encouraging the Tractarians to lay the groundwork for it. By painting the Pope as one who stifled political freedom, the *Edinburgh* implicitly suggested that Lord Minto had no prior knowledge of *Universalis Ecclesiae*. Heralding English Catholics' alliance to the State allayed fears that they were preparing to launch some form of insurrection. If the *Quarterly* was directing opprobrium in the Whigs' direction, the *Edinburgh* was doing its best to deflect as much of it as possible in volume XCIII.

An article by the political economist Bonamy Price in the next volume propagated much of the same "Church in Danger" rhetoric that the *Edinburgh*

---

[492] Henry Lushington, 'The Defeat of Italy', *Edinburgh Review,* Volume XCIII (April, 1851), p. 530.
[493] *Ibid.*
[494] Henry Rogers, 'Ultramontane Doubts', *Edinburgh Review*, Volume XCIII (April, 1851), p. 572.

had undermined in previous years. Price even went as far as to critique Russell's government by asserting that the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, which made it a criminal offence for anyone outside of the United Church of England and Ireland to use episcopal titles, would not do anything to stem the tide of conversions to Rome. This error was compounded by the lack of any attempt to "cure the Church of England of the malady which is consuming her". This was "the Tractarian treason", and the failure to root it out was the fault of the Church of England, which had allowed it to take root and grow.[495] Shaftesbury's warning that the laity would enact church reform if the bishops failed to take action was noted, as was the fact that his declaration was apparently met with "enthusiastic applause".[496] If the Whigs had not yet gone far enough, in Price's view, the Church of England had been much more culpable, and for far longer.

Tractarian ideas continued to spread after 1845, and the number of incumbent Tractarian clergy increased from 141 in 1845 to 211 by 1852. The inference was clear: if the Church of England could not, or would not, deal with the Tractarian problem, the secular government would do the job instead. Price accused the Tractarians of having long desired to eradicate the legitimacy of the Church of England; by so doing, Anglo-Catholics would find their way to Rome, as the Tractarians desired, according to Price. This was, essentially, a validation of earlier criticisms of the Oxford Movement in the *Edinburgh*, and a warning to the Church of England that it needed to get its house in order. Given the *Edinburgh's* proximity to the Whig Party, this was more than mere periodical bluster.

The furore over *Universalis Ecclesiae* and the renewed suspicion of the Tractarians enabled the *Edinburgh* to position itself as a defender of the Church of England, or at least of an Established Church that required reform. The

---

[495] Bonamy Price, 'The Anglo-Catholic Theory', *Edinburgh Review*, Volume XCIV (October, 1851), pp. 529-30.
[496] *Ibid*, p. 530.

Edinburgh's target was the High Church, which was linked to the Tory/Conservative Party. Tractarians were High Churchmen, but the periodical sensed an opportunity to broaden the attack. In January 1852, it took the opportunity to put the boot into Henry Phillpotts, then the Bishop of Exeter and one of the most prominent High Church Tories in the country. Phillpotts had threatened to "excommunicate" the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Bird Sumner, over the latter's decision to uphold the installation of Gorham in Devon. The *Edinburgh* vilified Phillpotts as a schismatic that had "virtually separated himself from the National Church".[497] Much was made of Phillpotts' condemnation of Catholic Emancipation prior to 1829, before a *volte face* that saw him defend the Act; the *Edinburgh's* contention was that the Tory government needed a prominent churchman to support their efforts, and Phillpotts fit the bill. He was characterised as a duplicitous meddler, attached only to principles that would advance his position.

Such a condemnation undermined not only Phillpotts and his supporters, but the Tory Party as well, for having associated with such a risible individua. By criticising the conduct of Phillpotts and the Tories the *Edinburgh* avoided criticising the Relief Act, which the publication had supported. Instead, it portrayed Phillpotts as a power-hungry would-be schismatic, the Tories/Conservatives as being supported by such individuals, and the Church of England as needing protecting from men such as Phillpotts – the *Edinburgh* published this article "solely in the interest of religion and of the Church".[498] The inference was that the Whigs had been proven right all along, and it was imperative that the Church of England be directed along lines more in keeping with Whig sensibilities.

---

[497] 'Bishop Philpotts', *Edinburgh Review*, Volume XCV (January, 1852), p. 65.
[498] W. J. Conybeare, 'Bishop Philpotts', *Edinburgh Review*, Volume XCV (January, 1852), pp. 93-4. Note another instance of Phillpotts' name being misspelt, but once again, it is clear that Henry Phillpotts is the subject of this article.

The *Edinburgh* was overtly pursuing the line that the Whigs were the ablest defenders of the Church of England, albeit an Established Church that was, in their view, patently in need of reform. Also nailing its colours firmly to an absolute position was the *Eclectic Review*, which reacted to Pius IX's proclamation by condemning the Roman Catholic Church, as it had frequently done, but also to reject categorically any possibility of rapprochement with the Church of England by equating the two institutions. The *Eclectic* decried the "crimes of Papal Christendom", emanating from the "arch-enemy of religious freedom", noting the "heresies" it had been guilty of propagating.[499] In responding to these heresies, though, the Church of England had, in the *Eclectic's* view, matched the Catholic Church for theological errors. As a result, the *Eclectic* averred that "there remains little more of difference than that which exists in their names, and in the *odium theologicum* ["theological hatred"] of two powerful and rival factions".[500] The *Eclectic* expressed amusement that the Church of England was aggravated by the fact that the Papal Bull ignored its existence; the "uniform tone and practice of the Anglican Church" had been to treat Dissenters in the same manner.[501] The claim of Charles Blomfield, the Bishop of London, that the only alternatives to the Church of England were "Popish superstition" and "wild sectarianism" met with further ridicule. An equation had been formulated by the *Eclectic*: The Dissenters were to the Church of England what the Church of England was to the Roman Catholic Church – an irrelevance to be ignored. It did not add up for the *Eclectic*.

Accusations of hypocrisy regarding the Church of England's conduct towards Dissenters were repeated in 1851. In January, the 'Review of the Month' remarked tersely that the clergy of the Established Church "have long been accustomed to do to us what the Pope and Cardinal Wiseman are now doing to

---

[499] 'The Rival Hierarchies', *Eclectic Review*, Series 4, Volume XXVIII (December, 1850), p. 742.
[500] *Ibid*, p. 742.
[501] *Ibid*, p. 754.

them".[502] In the same issue, the *Eclectic* announced its intention to seek Parliamentary protection from both Protestant and Papal ascendancy, as Dissenters adhered to doctrines that were equally opposed to the Church of England as to the Church of Rome.[503] An article on 'Ultramontanism' in February 1851 concluded that the most dangerous principle of Roman Catholicism was the union between Church and State; therefore, the *Eclectic* declared that it must "stand forth against the Popery of Protestantism as well as of Rome".[504] The 'Popery of Protestantism' line was clearly one that resonated with the publication's anti-Catholic Nonconformist sensibilities. The immediate aftermath of *Universalis Ecclesiae* offered the *Eclectic* an opportunity to condemn Catholicism while also mounting the most damning attack on the Church of England possible: that it was practically indistinguishable from its rival in Rome. The *Eclectic* firmly reestablished its credentials as a defender of Dissenting interests, at a time when these were perceived as being especially at risk; renewed attempts to persuade the Government to legislate against "errors and superstitions in religion" by the Church of England were met with intense hostility. On this, the *Eclectic* took a very similar position to the *Edinburgh*: these "errors" and "superstitions" emanated from within the Church of England from the Tractarians.

A more muted, but still damning, condemnation of the Church of England was offered in October 1852; it was said to be "too much like the Church of Rome, in some of her characteristics".[505] Conversions to Rome were almost entirely from its ranks, and the Tractarians that made up the majority of these converts had frequently attacked Dissenters – thereby exculpating Dissenting bodies. Moreover, the Dissenters were the closest to the evangelists and apostles in spirit,

---

[502] 'Review of the Month', *Eclectic Review*, Series 5, Volume I (January, 1851), p. 122.
[503] 'The Papal Controversy', *Eclectic* Review, Series 5, Volume I (January, 1851), p. 100.
[504] 'Ultramontanism', *Eclectic Review*, Series 5, Volume I (February, 1851), p. 357.
[505] 'The Contest with Rome', *Eclectic Review*, Series 5, Volume IV (October, 1852), p. 446.

and in application of the faith, and thus more Protestant, and more catholic, than the Church of England could hope to be.[506]

This line of argument was intended to show that Dissent was not merely an offshoot of Anglicanism, or a case of having agreed until a certain point before the occurrence of a separation; rather, that Dissenting theology was, and had always been, closer to first-century Christianity than any instituted denomination. This was contrasted to the Tractarians, who were accused of being schismatics desirous of creating their own church, retaining the wealth and prestige of the Church of England but built upon Roman Catholic theological and ecclesiastical maxims.[507] Such plans had been fuelled by the Bishop of London, a constant target of criticism. High-and-dry Tractarian clergy were pilloried as being the most "starkly denuded of the intellectual endowments of the species", but their pretensions were encouraged by the Bishop, who had, according to the *Eclectic*, done more than anyone else to encourage converts to Rome.[508] Tractarians were "insolent and foolish"; the Bishop of London guilty of "avarice" and "dishonour".[509]

For the *Eclectic*, the Papal Bull of 1850 had shown up the startling similarities between the Papacy and the Church of England, and the conversions to Rome, predominantly via Tractarianism, had been the fault of ignorant pseudo-Catholics and the unsuitability of men such as Blomfield for the positions that they held. The intention was to give the Dissenting cause greater weight by contrasting it favourably with these two institutions. The controversy had made it clear that not only were the Churches of Rome and England similar, but the latter was also harbouring clergymen who were, spiritually and theologically, aligned with the former. Never had the arguments for the necessity of an

---

[506] *Ibid*, p. 448.
[507] 'Popery: Its Genius and Policy', *Eclectic Review*, Series 5, Volume VI (July, 1853), p. 37.
[508] 'The Bishop of London', *Eclectic Review*, Series 5, Volume VII (June, 854), p. 742.
[509] Ibid, p. 753.

established church been weaker in the eyes of the *Eclectic*. In December 1850, the conclusion to the explosive 'Rival Hierarchies' article had been that "THE WAY TO EXTERMINATE TIGERS, IS TO BURN THE JUNGLE".[510] This set the tone for the *Eclectic's* output on the controversy; as a result, it escalated its opposition to the Church of England.

In previous years, *Fraser's* would have joined in the battle on the side of the Church of England. However, Parker's aloofness on ecclesiastical matters meant that the periodical was far more measured in its consideration of the issue. Its response to the Papal Bull is as indicative of the magazine's shift in tone as any other issue could be. Parker's efforts to reshape *Fraser's* as a sober and measured organ, devoid of the cantankerous rabble-rousing it was known for, are evident. Its first response to the controversy was not published until April 1851; it should be kept in mind that *Fraser's* was a monthly, and it had more opportunities to comment on the issue than did the *Edinburgh* or *Quarterly*, and so chose to wait this long. *Fraser's* was much more interested in the parliamentary debates surrounding the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, and barely any comment was made on the Bull itself; the greatest extent of its condemnation of Pius IX and Wiseman was in calling the Bull a "labour of love" pursued in the Vatican.[511] Several references to the "Romish" church were made, but they read as a descriptor frequent in descriptions of the Roman Catholic Church. Evidently derogatory, but, in this instance, used as a conventional description rather than a direct attack.

Before 1847, *Fraser's* would have been virtually guaranteed to be the fiercest critic of the Roman Catholic Church, and of anyone guilty of enabling such a manoeuvre as *Universalis Ecclesiae*. Parker had blunted its swords. It was still capable of barbs in the matter, however. In June 1851, one contributor stated

---

[510] 'The Rival Hierarchies', *Eclectic Review*, p. 763. The capitalisation is present in the article.
[511] 'The Ministry and the Papal Bull', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume LXIII (April, 1851), p. 463.

that Pius IX seemed to be "enveloped in an odour of sanctity" in England but was "mere carrion" in Rome due to the threat of invasion and the necessity of foreign protection. The flattering comparison was to that of a dead dog, which was said to smell "like musk" from a distance.[512] The old instincts of *Fraser's* still occasionally came to the fore.

They had certainly been dulled, though, and the comparison of the Pope's varying fragrance with that of a decomposing canine was a rare gesture of offence in Rome's direction. Much of the anti-Catholicism present in *Fraser's* after Parker's takeover came from Charles Kingsley, whose novel *Yeast* was serialised in 6 instalments in 1848, and *Hypatia* in sixteen instalments from January 1852 to April 1853. Parker was Kingsley's publisher, and both novels were published in serial form in *Fraser's* before being published separately afterwards. *Fraser's* had a history of publishing satirical fiction; Richard Salmon's observation that this was often "slanted from a 'radical' Tory perspective" held true in the years leading to Parker's takeover, and perhaps Parker considered a work such as Kingsley's a useful way of maintaining previous readers while shifting the overall tone of the magazine towards being more liberal.[513]

Nevertheless, Parker had concerns about the novel drawing approbation from readers of *Fraser's*. Klaver has observed that this was indeed the case for "many" of the periodical's middle-class readers.[514] Kingsley's Christian Socialism was probably the reason for this concern, but it is worth noting that he revised *Yeast* in 1851 into a version more overtly anti-Catholic, after Pius IX's letter. *Hypatia* also followed *Universalis Ecclesiae*, and the anti-Catholicism is much more overt. Simon Goldhill has aptly referred to Kingsley's novels as "fighting prose", and this was at its most intense when referring to Catholic

---

[512] 'The Story of Free Trade', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XLIII (June, 1851), p. 721.
[513] Richard Salmon, 'A "Yeasty State of Mind"' in Jonathan Conlin and Jan Marten Ivo Klaver (eds.), *Charles Kingsley: Faith, Flesh, and Fantasy* (New York: Routledge, 2021), p. 39.
[514] J. M. I. Klaver, *The Apostle of the Flesh: A Critical Life of Charles Kingsley* (London: Brill, 2006), p. 150.

extremism in *Hypatia*. Goldhill's summary that violence, anger, stupidity, lack of self-discipline, and "prudish self-torture" inspire Catholic actions in the novel reflect Kingsley's intentions, and this is what readers of *Fraser's* would have imbibed over the course of its sixteen-part serialisation.[515] This was very much an outlier in terms of anti-Catholic content in *Fraser's* in the 1850s, and it was not bolstered by further references to Pius IX's "Papal aggression", nor attacks on the Tractarians. Indeed, in October 1852, during *Hypatia's* run, *Fraser's* made reference to the "great intellectual movement of Newmanism" – a sentiment that Kingsley would undoubtedly have decried in the strongest terms.[516] Kingsley continued to write for *Fraser's* under Parker, and also Froude after the latter became editor in 1860, but he was not given space to expand on his anti-Catholic views. This was in keeping with the periodical's policy under Parker.

Much like *Fraser's*, the *Gentleman's* response to the Papal Bull was not as indignant as it might have been in previous years. Its most virulent criticism came from John Bruce, an antiquary who had written sporadically for the *Edinburgh Review*, predominantly on literary and diplomatic subjects.[517] Writing in December 1850, Bruce contributed to the hysteria that the Bull created. He declared the move was evidently suffused with the intent to "take insidious advantage" of previous concessions to Roman Catholics, and that Pius IX wished to alter the mode of government in England rather than merely instruct the spiritual inclinations of Roman Catholics.[518] Bruce further sounded the alarm by stating that Pius IX's proclamation was the sixth attempt by the Roman Catholic Church to regain ascendancy in England; this most recent attempt was supported

---

[515] Simon Goldhill, 'How Odd is Kingsley's *Hypatia*?' in Conlin and Klaver (eds.), pp. 92-93.
[516] 'The Colleges of Oxford', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XLV (April, 1852), p. 364.
[517] William Hunt and Nilanjana Banerji, 'Bruce, John', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, available online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-3740?rskey=DqbyOV&result=3 [accessed 18 June 2025]. The ODNB entry for Bruce states that he was "for some years the editor of the *Gentleman's Magazine*", but it is not any more specific than this. See Cornelius P. Darcy's list of editors for the *Gentleman's Magazine* in (Sullivan (ed.), *British Literary Magazines: The Augustan Age and the Age of Johnson, 1698-1788* (London: Greenwood, 1983), p. 140).
[518] John Bruce, 'The recent Papal Bull', *Gentleman's* Magazine, New Series, Volume XXXIV (December, 1850), p. 623.

by Tractarian clergymen, "puffed up by… notions of self-importance" imbued from the spirit of Roman Catholicism that they subsequently spread among their parishes.[519] The message was clear: the Church was, indeed, in danger, and good Anglicans had to be ready to come to her defence.

Bruce continued the attack in February 1851, in an article that compared "Laudism" with "Puseyism", insinuating that each was an attempt to enable the Roman Catholic Church to gain influence in England.[520] The inclination among adherents of Newman and Pusey – the two Tractarians named by Bruce – to look toward Rome was declared to be common knowledge, as it had been going on for more than ten years at the time of writing. Bruce professed a determination that the Church of England would be protected from the "modern Church-papists".[521] One would almost think that Bruce was setting up to be Mitford's successor as the resident defender of the Church of England and scourge of Roman Catholicism and Tractarianism, but this was not to be the case.

Bruce wrote the "Notes of the Month" feature, a brief summary of monthly happenings usually over five or six pages, from January until June 1851, and contributed a few other reviews and articles, but none on religion. Bruce drops from view as a contributor after 1851; it is entirely possible that he made further contributions that have not been attributed to him, but the *Gentleman's* did not return to the subject of "Papal aggression" with anywhere near as much venom as Bruce did. Mitford's contributions after 1850 were sporadic, and he did not contribute any ecclesiastical polemics after ceasing to be the publication's editor. A pithy remark about Oxford tending to house schismatics was as bold an attack as the *Gentleman's* mustered after Bruce's double volley.[522]

---

[519] *Ibid*, pp. 625-26.
[520] John Bruce, 'Laudism and Puseyism', *Gentleman's* Magazine, New Series, Volume XXXV (February, 1851), p. 134.
[521] *Ibid*.
[522] 'Memoir of Bishop Copleston', *Gentleman's* Magazine, New Series, Volume XXXV (October, 1851), p. 365. The work in question offered the *Gentleman's* hope that Oxford might produce men able to contend with those

Although the *Gentleman's* continued to review ecclesiastical works under John Gough Nichols, Mitford's successor as editor, and to announce the marriages and deaths of clergymen, it did not engage in the sort of religious commentary that filled its pages under Mitford. Perhaps John Gough Nichols had a similar mentality to John William Parker at *Fraser's* – that controversy should be avoided, and the focus should be on intellectual engagement rather than polemical outpourings. In the case of *Fraser's*, Parker improved the "literary calibre" of the periodical, but at the detriment of the verve that made it stand out.[523] The publication was already struggling when Parker took it over, due to Nickisson being unable to match Maginn's energy; Parker's shift to ostensibly higher pursuits did not arrest the slide.

There is no similar analysis for the *Gentleman's*, but its shift away from direct engagement with ecclesiastical issues must have been to its detriment, given its reliance on this during Mitford's time. Mitford prevaricated on the Tractarians until the late 1840s, but he did engage with the movement. After Bruce's two articles, the publication barely dealt with the Roman Catholic issue, which contrasted with its previous focus on it. It is fascinating to note that these two periodicals, both notable for passionate defences of the Established Church, decreased their output at precisely the time that the *Edinburgh Review*, often accused of being against the Church of England in the past, became one of its staunchest supporters in the periodical press. It even outstripped the *Quarterly*, especially after the High Church-supporting Lockhart ceased to be the editor from 1853. As the *Quarterly* moved away from a delineated position on religious issues, the *Eclectic Review* repositioned itself as an overtly Dissenting organ, frequently using "we" in opposition to the Church of England on points of contestation.

---

that aimed to cause schism in the Church "by the revival of superannuated ceremonies and mediaeval sophisms".

[523] Houghton, 'Fraser's Magazine', *Wellesley Index, Volume II*, p. 310.

The *Eclectic* had always been associated with the Dissenters, but under Thomas Price, who became editor in 1837, this became more apparent than it had been during Conder's time as editor. Gash has commented on the "tenuous" nature of Dissenting faith in Whig governments present in the 1840s.[524] The Papal Bull was as clear an example of this pride in Dissenting identity as any in the periodical: the repeated comparison of the Church of England to the Church of Rome, at such a time as during the national outcry over Pius IX and Wiseman's actions, was as provocative as it was possible to be. The ire directed by the *Eclectic* towards the Church of England, and the *Edinburgh's* defence of that institution as an example of the validity of the Whigs as defenders of the Establishment, reflected the growing gulf between Whigs and Dissenters that had developed in the 1840s after the latter's support for the former's reform proposals.[525] In April 1851, the *Eclectic* declared that "the family coteries of Whiggery require to be broken up" in response to the re-election of Lord John Russell; the *Eclectic* professed respect for the history of the Whigs, but otherwise did not regret the "loss of reputation and political status" that would affect the Party.[526] In the same article, the *Eclectic* would instruct its "friends" not to "compromise your principles by entering into protestant associations with Churchmen".[527]

The Whigs were to be respected from a historical perspective only; the controversy with Rome was not a reason to align with members of the Church of England. Although the *Eclectic* and *Edinburgh* were diverging from each other politically and theologically, they were comparable in that they were moving to stricter ecclesiastical positions, in contrast to the *Quarterly*, *Fraser's*, and the *Gentleman's*, which were travelling in the opposite direction.

---

[524] Gash, p. 100.
[525] Richard Brent, 'The Whigs and Protestant Dissent in the Decade of Reform: The Case of Church Rates, 1833-1841', *The English Historical Review*, 102.405 (October, 1987), pp. 908-10.
[526] 'Review of the Month', *Eclectic Review*, Series 5, Volume 1 (April, 1851), p. 502.
[527] *Ibid*, p. 510.

Part 4: Essays and Reviews

Papal challenges to the authority of the Church of England, actual and perceived, were nothing new; appeals to the necessity of the Reformation, and celebrations of the victory of 1688, were familiar grounds, well-trodden in the pages of the periodicals considered in this chapter, as well as in many other places. Biblical criticism was not unknown, either. George Eliot's translation of David Strauss's *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet* was published in 1846, eleven years after its first edition in Germany.[528] Before Eliot's translation of Strauss, the exalted position of the Bible had been queried, if not outright dismissed, by Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Thomas Arnold. The former expressed this in a literary form, albeit not in a work produced during his lifetime; *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*, published in 1840, six years after his death, decried doctrinal instruction in favour of a personal connection to the divine formulated within the human soul. Arnold had familiarised himself with the German study of theology that Strauss was part of, in the process determining that Christian faith was distinct from Biblical interpretation; while the latter was inspired by the divine, it was a human production, and historical criticism of its contents was perfectly valid in Arnold's view.[529]

Arnold's death in 1842 hampered the development of Biblical criticism in England. As his student and biographer Arthur Penrhyn Stanley put it, the country

---

[528] Eliot's translation of Strauss made her a recognisable name among educated English readers, although they were, of course, unfamiliar with Mary Ann Evans. A letter to *Leigh Hunt's Journal* in February 1851, detailing the submitter's chance encounter with "this celebrated man", indicates the level of regard in which Eliot was held among some of that publication's readers. The contributor rejected the reproduction being a "breach of confidence" due to Strauss being "a public, I had almost said, an historical character." *Leigh Hunt's Journal; A Miscellany for the Cultivation of the Memorable, the Progressive, and the Beautiful*, February 22, 1851, p. 187. Strauss' work presumably fell into the second category, which is why such an encounter met the requirements of the first. The *Journal* ended after only 17 issues, beset by financial problems and, possibly, a lack of contributors of renown. See the section on Leigh Hunt in *Notes and Queries*, May 10 (1884), pp. 370-71.

[529] J. Estlin Carpenter, *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century: Eight Lectures* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903), pp. 20-24.

was not prepared to tolerate "a free and unfettered discussion of scriptural Exegesis", and while Arnold had put in place a method "for interpreting Scripture", he was not able to produce much in this direction before his untimely passing.[530] It would be another eighteen years before England had a work to rival that of Strauss in terms of causing consternation to the Church.

That work was *Essays and Reviews*, published in March 1860.[531] A collection of seven essays from a Broad Church perspective, it called into question several key precepts that many churchmen would have taken for granted. It was the cause of "intense controversy" not only in the Church of England but in the press, the universities, the government, and in both ecclesiastical and secular courts.[532] It caused a "pamphlet war" among its supporters and detractors, was condemned by both High and Low Church adherents, and even saw two of its contributors prosecuted for heresy.[533]

Stanley's remarks on the readiness of English society to consider Biblical inerrancy appeared to hold as true in 1860 as they had in the mid-1840s. Perhaps it was this realisation that caused Stanley to decline the offer to contribute to *Essays and Reviews*, citing his commitments to the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly Reviews* as being insurmountable.[534] He may well have feared for his place at the latter if he had been directly associated with the work in question. This worry might have been unfounded: Henry Hart Milman had shocked the public in 1829 by describing Abraham as a "Bedouin sheikh" in his *History of the Jews*, and he contributed sixty-six articles to the *Quarterly*, sixty-two of which came after the

---

[530] Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D., Volume I* (London: B. Fellowes, 1844), p. 196.
[531] For the full text of the seven essays and analysis of events preceding and antedating the publication of the work, see Victor Shea and William Whitla (eds.), *Essays and Reviews: The 1860 Text and Its Reading* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2000).
[532] Victor Shea and William Whitla, 'Part One: Reading "An Epoch in the History of Opinion" in Shea and Whitla (eds.), p. 4.
[533] Jeremy Morris, 'Liberalism Protestant and Catholic' in Stewart J. Brown (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 592.
[534] Josef A. Altholz, *Anatomy of a Controversy: The Debate over "Essays and Reviews"* (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 13.

first volume of his *History*.[535] Whatever his reasoning, Stanley did not choose to participate, but he would write the review of the work for the *Edinburgh* in 1861. Unsurprisingly, he did not do the same for the *Quarterly*, given that it was not as complimentary about the collection as its erstwhile rival.

That the major periodicals would review the work is not surprising; it was a major publishing event, and the broader responses it triggered attracted the attention of contemporary literary reviews. For Josef Altholz, *Essays and Reviews* had implications beyond the religious; as a composite volume, it helped to bring about the "liberation of the English essay from its long imprisonment by the periodical".[536] The reception of *Essays and Reviews* carried greater weight. Ieuan Ellis has stated that "the story of *Essays and Reviews* is the story of the greatest religious crisis of the Victorian age".[537] As with the Tractarian controversies, many of the central players were situated within the Church of England: six of the contributors to *Essays and Reviews* were clergymen. The crucial difference was that, ultimately, the disputes with the Tractarians were doctrinal, even if their more hysterical opponents accused them of being against their religion, whereas the seven essayists appeared to be undermining a central tenet of Christianity, the unquestioned truthfulness of the Bible. Stephen Booth has rightly pointed out that such perspectives were not new, but it was the fact that they were being promulgated by members of the Church of England that caused tremendous controversy across the country.[538]

---

[535] *Ibid.*
[536] Josef L. Altholz, 'Periodical Origins & Implications of "Essays and Reviews"', *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter*, 10.3 (September, 1977), p. 151.
[537] Ieuan Ellis, *Seven Against Christ: A Study of 'Essays and Reviews'* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980), p. ix. Ellis' title comes from Stanley's review of *Essays and Reviews* in the *Edinburgh Review*, in which Stanley chided those critics who portrayed the essayists as "the seven champions not of Christendom", or the S*eptem contra Christum*. Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, 'Essays and Reviews', *Edinburgh Review*, Volume CXIII (April, 1861), p. 465.
[538] Stephen Booth, 'Essays and Reviews: The Controversy As Seen In the Correspondence and Papers of Dr. E. B. Pusey and Archbishop Archibald Tait', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 38.3 (September, 1969), p. 260.

Much of this approbation played out in the pages of magazines and reviews, such was the importance of the discourse initiated by the work. Several historians have been diligent in identifying where and when particular periodicals discussed the controversy. Altholz, in the customarily indefatigable manner in which he operated as a historian, collated and summarised the initial responses to *Essays and Reviews* in 1986.[539] Shea and Whitla included an extensive list of responses to the work in their volume, although without the sort of commentary provided by Altholz; given the impressive number of responses identified, providing additional comments on each one would have been a Herculean feat, if not a Sisyphean exercise.[540]

Their efforts illustrate that *Essays and Reviews* was a prominent issue in Victorian England, and that religion remained a crucial topic for periodicals to consider in the 1860s. Altholz's assertion that the reviews in the *Westminster Review*, *Quarterly Review*, and *Edinburgh Review* marked "a major stage in the controversy" is apposite, as much of the literature on the subject came after these reviews, and incorporated their perspectives.[541] However, they were not the first to review the work, and the *Quarterly* and *Edinburgh*, publishing in January 1861 and April 1861 respectively, were not the first of the periodicals considered in this chapter to respond.

Fraser's Magazine published a review by the writer and barrister William Davy Watson, whose previous contributions to the publication had been predominantly on the subject of linguistics, in August 1860. Watson approached

---

[539] Josef L. Altholz, 'Early Periodical Responses to Essays and Reviews', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 19.2 (Summer, 1986), pp. 50-56.
[540] Victor Shea and William Whitla, 'Appendix D: A Bibliography of Responses to *Essays and Reviews*' in Shea and Whitla (eds.), pp. 919-39.
[541] Altholz, 'Early Periodical Responses to Essays and Reviews', p. 50. The *Westminster Review* is not a case study in this chapter, but Altholz correctly points out that Frederic Harrison's review in that periodical inspired Wilberforce's in the *Quarterly*, which in turn influenced Stanley's response in the *Edinburgh*. This chapter will continue the policy of focusing on the five periodicals chosen as case studies, but the importance of Harrison's review in October 1860 must be recognised. See Ellis, pp. 106-08, for the impact of Harrison's review in the *Westminster*.

the subject as a member of the "educated laity", and considered how *Essays and Reviews* would be considered by "a large body of English lay readers".[542] Ellis has categorised Watson's review as "sympathetic", which it certainly was.[543] Watson concluded his article by declaring that "criticism is, in truth, a restorative and conservative power", and that the seven essayists aimed to reveal the origins of the early Christians that had been concealed over the centuries; Watson compared their efforts to stripping "whitewash and plaster" from ancient churches in order to display the marble and granite walls of the originals.[544] A favourable review in *Fraser's* was no surprise given that John William Parker and Son published the magazine. They had both been involved in planning *Essays and Reviews*, and their Broad Church sympathies have been noted above. The firm published *Essays and Reviews* until its acquisition by Longman in 1863, the sale probably occasioned by the death of Parker Jnr in 1860.

The Parkers most likely hoped that the review in *Fraser's* would benefit both interests, and it could have been a particular shot in the arm for the magazine, which had not hit the heights it had achieved under Maginn and Nickisson. The religious press was overwhelmingly hostile to *Essays and Reviews*, both High and Low Church as well as Nonconformist, and *Fraser's* could use the occasion to situate itself as a pioneer of the "third way" in English ecclesiastical society, that of the Broad Church. The High Church revival after 1860, coupled with Parker's withdrawal from the magazine in November 1860, put paid to such ambitions, if indeed they existed in the first place.

The Nonconformist ire manifested in the *Eclectic Review*, as indeed it did in other Dissenting publications, but the *Eclectic's* responses were interesting as they represented a vehement rejection of the Broad Church movement that might,

---

[542] William Davy Watson, 'Essays and Reviews', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume LXII (August, 1860), p. 228. Watson signed his article "W.D.W.", perhaps a nod to the signed articles in *Essays and Reviews*, which ran counter to the usual practice of publishing articles anonymously.
[543] Ellis, p. 105.
[544] Watson, p. 242.

in its ultimate expression, have found a compromise with the Nonconformists.[545] In actuality, they were not repudiations of Broad Church theology but attacks on the "Oxford School"; as many of the contributors had links to the University of Oxford, the *Eclectic*, on the face of it rather bizarrely, positioned the contributors to *Essays and Reviews* as the successors of the Tractarians. One suspects that this was not a haphazard association but a deliberate attempt to undermine that institution, which the *Eclectic* linked directly to the Church of England. The Tractarians had insisted on the authority of the Church – now the seven essayists were subverting the pious inclinations of the public.[546] The implication was that Oxford was supplying a high number of clergymen for the Church of England, who were imperilling the faith of the people due to the pernicious theologies running rampant at the university. The seven essayists were accused of being on a mission to "lower the authority of the Bible" – to some Dissenters, this might have seemed a natural corollary to fears that the Tractarians wished to overemphasise the importance of the clergy and of non-scriptural traditions.[547]

For the *Eclectic*, *Essays and Reviews* was "the great heretical volume of the day", and an overt link was made to the Tractarians, whom the *Eclectic* suggested put Shakespeare on par with the Bible as a source of inspiration.[548] Essentially, *Essays and Reviews* was cited as the next step in the great subversion of Protestantism emanating from the University of Oxford, and the *Eclectic* wished to remind its readers of that fact as much as it encouraged them to retain their belief in the veracity of Scripture.

---

[545] This is perhaps a stretch, given that Nonconformists, by definition, were opposed to the Church of England, but a Broad Church/Nonconformist alliance might have offered some interesting possibilities. A pamphlet entitled *Liberal Christianity* was produced by a self-described "Broad-Church Nonconformist" in 1875, and the writer delineated their position as a desire to recognise "whatever is good and true in every church" but with an inability to "subscribe creeds and articles" which "no longer represent the enlightened thought of the present age". See *Liberal Christianity By a Broad-Church Nonconformist* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1875).
[546] 'The Oxford School, Part I', *Eclectic Review*, Series 7, Volume IV (July, 1860), pp. 1-2.
[547] 'The Oxford School, Part II', *Eclectic Review*, Series 7, Volume IV (August, 1860), p. 126.
[548] 'A Contrast', *Eclectic Review*, Series 7, Volume IV (October, 1860), p. 351.

If the *Eclectic* saw *Essays and Reviews* as part of an Oxford plot designed to distort Protestantism to fit its plan for the Church of England, the *Quarterly* saw it as a reason to proclaim the old refrain of the "Church in danger". The review in the *Quarterly* was written by Samuel Wilberforce, the Bishop of Oxford, who was no stranger to controversy – he had become involved in the Hampden controversy before withdrawing, and he had written against Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* for the *Quarterly* in 1860.[549] Arthur Burns has portrayed Wilberforce as a champion of orthodoxy, and that his prerogative was to "resist challenges to doctrinal orthodoxy emerging from liberal churchmen and new scientific theories".[550] If Darwin was the preeminent example of the latter, Wilberforce had the contributors to *Essays and Reviews* in his sights as the most dangerous of the former. Harrison in the *Westminster* had critiqued the collection as "earnest", "able", and "suicidal" as an attempt to meld religious thought with morality and faith with science.[551] Wilberforce could not even grant the contributors the first two descriptors. Appalled by the possibility that young minds might be corrupted from within the Church by notions that reeked of infidelity, if not outright atheism, Wilberforce sought to eviscerate the essays and the essayists.[552]

In the case of Benjamin Jowett, who contributed *On the Interpretation of Scripture*, Wilberforce certainly succeeded. James Barr has contended that Jowett's dislike of traditional interpretations of the Bible was based on semantics, and not the historical validity of the events described, and that Jowett's attitude is "easily misunderstood".[553] In Wilberforce's case, it was probably wilfully so.

---

[549] Samuel Wilberforce, 'Darwin's *Origin of Species*', *Quarterly Review*, Volume CVIII (July, 1860), pp. 225-64.
[550] Arthur Burns, 'Wilberforce, Samuel', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, available online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-29385?rskey=gxAb4V&result=2 [accessed 18 June 2025].
[551] Shea and Whitla, p. 32.
[552] Samuel Wilberforce, 'Essays and Reviews', *Quarterly Review*, Volume CIX (January, 1861), p. 249.
[553] James Barr, 'Jowett and the 'Original Meaning' of Scripture', *Religious Studies*, 18.4 (December, 1982), p. 434.

Jowett was accused of possessing "remarkable indifference to all doctrine", a damning condemnation of a fellow clergyman.[554] Wilberforce's opinion of the other essayists was scarcely any better, but Jowett's desire to have the Bible read as one would any other classical text clearly hit a particular nerve with Wilberforce.

Wilberforce's review marked a crucial moment in the furore surrounding *Essays and Reviews* due to its status as one of the "big three" contemporary periodicals, along with the *Westminster* and *Edinburgh Reviews*. His article would also prove to have long-term significance as one of the last times that an article in the *Quarterly* would have genuine national significance. Wilberforce's review was published three months after Whitwell Elwin gave up the editorship of the publication to focus on his clerical duties; Houghton has stated that Elwin was the final editor of the *Quarterly* to impress their views upon the publication.[555] This lack of editorial direction meant that the publication did not have a recognisable identity as it did under Gifford and then Lockhart.[556] Wilberforce's stridently reactionary High Church polemic jarred with the moderate conservatism that Elwin had sought to propagate during his time as editor; a Wilberforce-Lockhart combination could have created momentum on the back of Wilberforce's attack, but the somewhat rudderless nature of the *Quarterly* prevented this. It remained a defender of the rights of the Church of England, as it had always professed to be, but the *Quarterly's* consideration of *Essays and Reviews* revealed the contestation between High Church and moderate influences at the publication.

At least readers of the *Edinburgh* had a response to *Essays and Reviews* to consider, even if it ran the risk of disappointing the vast majority of them. The *Gentleman's Magazine* was conspicuous in its silence, confining its comments to

---

[554] Wilberforce, 'Essays and Reviews', p. 271.
[555] Walter E. Houghton, 'The Quarterly Review' in Walter E. Houghton (ed.), Volume I, p. 699.
[556] *Ibid.*

describing it as a "mischievous publication" in a short review of a collection of sermons in April 1861.[557] Curiously, an obituary of one of the contributors, Baden Powell, in August 1860 praised his essay as one infused with a "calm and temperate spirit" which made "just allowance for the feelings and opinions of others".[558] Even more astonishing, in the context of its recent history, was the proclamation that the *Gentleman's* had not commented on the controversy because "we do not consider theological controversy as coming legitimately within the province of the *Gentleman's Magazine*".[559] Mitford might have prevaricated on the Tractarians, but a complete refusal to engage in theological disputes in the magazine's pages would have been incomprehensible only a few years previously. Such a comment was made in the review of *Replies to "Essays and Reviews"*, which sought to refute and undermine its target – a goal that the *Gentleman's* supported. Wilberforce was the editor of this riposte. "Nothing quite so bad had before been ventured by men 'professing and calling themselves Christians'" was the publication's view; the praise of Baden Powell's essay had been forgotten even more quickly than Mitford's editorial approach.[560]

It is not a coincidence that the *Gentleman's* became essentially irrelevant after it refused to engage to any real extent in theological controversies. If Mitford had to periodically walk a tightrope, at least he climbed high enough to make the attempt: after his departure, the magazine effectively became a rather dull miscellany of the sort that had become increasingly common by the mid-nineteenth century. While the *Quarterly* might never again have dictated the nature of the public sphere, it maintained a presence within that space. The *Edinburgh*, under the strong guidance of Henry Reeve, continued to be an influential organ from an old Whig/moderate Liberal perspective. Both continued

---

[557] 'Review of *Sermons on the Beatitudes, with others, mostly preached before the University of Oxford*, by George Moberly', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume CCX (April, 1861), p. 450.
[558] 'Obituary: The Rev. Baden Powell', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume CCIX (August, 1860), p. 205.
[559] 'Review of "Replies to Essays and Reviews"', *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume CCXII (February, 1862), p. 204.
[560] *Ibid.*

to focus on theology as they redefined their position in literary society. The *Gentleman's* mostly abandoned theology, other than mundane announcements and noncommittal perspectives; it was a bad error, from which it would never recover.

The *Eclectic* was not as nuanced in its attitude to analyses of the historical reliability of the Bible. Its histrionic proclamation was that interpreting Scripture as if it was any other book would lead to "an end to all light, to all instruction, to all certainty".[561] The *Westminster's* article on *Essays and Reviews* had, in the *Eclectic's* view, encouraged "a rabid, savage, and foaming hatred to Christianity far from amusing to contemplate".[562] The *Westminster* was accused of supporting the collection as a reflection of its atheism – as discussed above, Harrison's review was certainly not unequivocal in its praise, and included a good amount of criticism of the essayists. The equation of the destruction of peoples linked etymologically to books in the Old Testament, as a prophetic warning to the supporters of *Essays and Reviews*, is one of the most intense reactions to the work one is liable to find.[563] The *Eclectic* had previously condemned *Essays and Reviews* as a work utterly devoid of religion, but tacit threats of annihilation went far beyond this.[564] As the immediate fury wore off, a more cynical line emerged in the *Eclectic*; the publisher Longman's was cited as having published many of the recent works on Biblical criticism, and the insinuation was that it was doing so in order to profit off of controversy.[565] Publishers being interested in works liable to sell was certainly not a new phenomenon, but the *Eclectic* charged Longmans with commissioning additional volumes in order to monetise theological discord.

---

[561] 'The Panic of the Creeds', *Eclectic Review, Series VII, Volume V* (May, 1861), p. 495.
[562] *Ibid*, p. 496.
[563] *Ibid*, p. 504.
[564] 'A Contrast, or Theological Differences', *Eclectic Review,* Series 7, Volume IV (October, 1860), p. 351.
[565] 'Dr. Manning's Encyclical', *Eclectic Review,* Series 8, Volume VIII (March, 1865), p. 273.

The *Eclectic* was finding enemies everywhere, but it found an unexpected ally in Henry Manning, who admired Dissenters, in part because they had not produced works comparable to *Essays and Reviews* or that of Colenso.[566] That the *Eclectic* was directing its wrath at liberal Christians, but it was finding common ground with a convert to Roman Catholicism, is a perfect example of how mutable public sphere discourses surrounding theology and religion could be.

Conclusion

Analysis of the five periodicals considered in this chapter has demonstrated that religion was a focal point for all of them; throughout the period under consideration, ecclesiastical topics were given preferential treatment, often handled by experienced contributors or even the publication's editor. Senior bishops and government ministers were also among writers on religious subjects, and ambitious priests hoping to engage in national conversations on religion saw the pages of periodicals as ideal for that purpose. Periodicals had a wide reach within the public sphere, one that went far beyond the raw monthly or quarterly sales figures; issues would be shared and discussed in both public and private, increasing readership and ensuring a wider dissemination of ideas. In one sense, they were a great equaliser: as long as the editor accepted an article, and they could find space for it in an upcoming edition, a provincial priest could, potentially, reach the same readers as one of the leading bishops of the day. Conversely, periodicals often relied on the same few contributors to write about a certain subject; for example, Croker was often the *Quarterly's* go-to contributor on religion under Lockhart, despite the array of talent available to the editor. In

[566] 'Manning's England and Christendom', *Eclectic Review,* Series 8, Volume XII (June, 1867), p. 460.

the case of the *Gentleman's*, John Mitford wrote most of that publication's ecclesiastical output himself upon becoming editor in 1834.

The proclivities of the editor, or perhaps of the editorial board, impacted the tone of the ecclesiastical content of these periodicals. All five considered in this chapter shifted perspectives across the period. In the case of *Fraser's*, it went from a staunch defender of the Church of England's interests in the 1830s, based upon Tory notions of Church and State inviolability, to an organ sympathetic to the Broad Church movement from the late 1840s. By 1860, the publication was under the editorial control of James Anthony Froude, whose well-known difficulties with Christianity had caused a mild sensation in 1849. Although not as dramatic as *Fraser's* transformation, the *Gentleman's* had gone from being a magazine that had taken an active interest in the religious questions of the day up until the end of Mitford's tenure in 1850, to one that barely commented on national religious debates, such as the "Papal aggression" of 1851 and the publication of *Essays and Reviews*. Given the high percentage of clergymen contributors up to this point, this is surprising, and it may well have expedited the decline of the publication, enshrined in 1868 when Joseph Hatton became editor and turned the magazine into a generic publication unrecognisable from what it had been even in the mid-nineteenth century.

The examples of *Fraser's* and the *Gentleman's* might suggest that religion was becoming a less prominent subject, or that there was a shift away from overtly religious editorial policies to those that avoided the topic, or even displayed outright hostility to religion, or to the Church of England in particular. The *Gentleman's* was guilty of the former, primarily because Mitford's attempts to keep the various High, Low, and Broad Church readers happy had led him to prevaricate on the Tractarian issue; after his departure, the magazine relegated itself to occasional pointed comments, often well after the event. *Fraser's* displayed a hostility to High Church orthodoxy throughout the 1860s, but it was

fulsome in its praise of Christianity that embraced scientific and historical enquiry. In the case of Frederick Temple, one of the contributors to *Essays and Reviews*, *Fraser's* applauded his curiosity of spirit while simultaneously chastising his proclivity for espousing the traditional formulas of the Church of England. Declaring uncertainty as to whether Temple had "varnished his opinions with scientific phrases" or if he merely had a soft spot for orthodox language, the magazine made it clear that progressive Christianity, which acknowledged the work of the German theologians and Darwin, was certainly no bad thing.[567] If the Church of England sidelined such views to preserve the traditionalism of Pusey and the High Churchmen, *Fraser's* would oppose it, but the magazine had no quarrel with a Church of England imbued with a healthy dose of rationalism. This was a far cry from the "extreme Evangelicalism" that permeated the publication's early years, which denigrated Peel and Wellington as traitors to the Established Church's cause.[568]

The *Quarterly* and *Eclectic Reviews* both retained key principles at their cores throughout their various changes in editors and outputs. For the former, it was a defence of the Church of England and its exalted position in English society. The *Quarterly* enjoyed a close connection to the Tory Party, and subsequently the Conservative Party; whether evangelical, Tractarian, or otherwise, contributors could reasonably expect to be given space in its pages as long as their ultimate conclusion was that any challenge to the Church of England beyond the superficial was anathema. Religion remained a consideration for the *Quarterly* as it was deemed a necessity that the Church of England retain a central position in English life. For the *Eclectic*, it abandoned Josiah Conder's precept of not being an overtly Nonconformist organ to embrace its position as a voice for Dissenters, ensuring that rigid "Church and State" positions, such as those often

---

[567] Leslie Stephen, 'Dr. Pusey and Dr. Temple', *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume LXXX (December, 1869), pp. 734-35.
[568] Cutmore, *Saints, Prophets, and Paternalists*, pp. 270-79.

espoused by the *Quarterly*, did not inhibit social and institutional changes that had become urgent during the nineteenth century. The *Edinburgh*, so often castigated as being anti-Church of England at the start of the period under consideration, had become a proponent of the Whigs' idea of the Church of England as a pivotal element of English society that needed to be amenable to the idea of reform in order to maintain its position. Ultimately, *Fraser's*, the *Quarterly*, and the *Edinburgh* all advocated for the Church of England to play a key role in English life, albeit from differing perspectives. It is therefore not altogether surprising that one of the most prominent Broad Churchmen of the 1850s and 1860s, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, was able to contribute to all three.

A recurring theme throughout the period, across all five of the periodicals considered, is the appeal to history. In the case of the *Edinburgh Review*, it had become an advocate of the "Whig idea of history" with respect to the Church of England: gradual improvements and amendments would save it from the risk of its influence diminishing over time. In retrospect, all five periodicals appealed to historical precedent to support their positions. This was influenced by the "professionalisation" of history in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, which combined with an inherent sense that "correct" religious practice had been enshrined centuries earlier; in the case of the supposed errors of the Roman Catholic Church, "incorrect" practice was often almost as old as the Church itself. Faced with Anglican doctrinal disputes, Nonconformist agitation, the constant presence of Roman Catholicism in England, and, through German theologians, challenges to the historicity of the Bible itself, ecclesiastical writers frequently deployed historical precedent as a primary weapon in their arsenal. The next chapter will evaluate how five individuals conceptualised and utilised history to support their theological positions.

Chapter 3: Ecclesiastical History-Writing in the Mid-Nineteenth Century

Introduction

Alongside the establishment and development of numerous ecclesiastically minded periodicals, such as those considered in the previous chapter, the burgeoning of the ecclesiastical public sphere in the nineteenth century included histories written from a religious perspective. That is not to state that this was a new phenomenon: to a much greater extent than the periodicals, extensive ecclesiastical histories had been produced and circulated prior to 1815. Indeed, the legacy of the Enlightenment and the religious historians active during this period, and those that offered extensive commentary on the importance of ecclesiastical matters in history, such as Gibbon, impacted the methodology of history-writing in the nineteenth century.[569] Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* functioned as something of a 'bridge' between Enlightenment historians and the emergence of new approaches in the nineteenth century, and the changing patterns of history-writing that were occurring in the years 1815-61 must be foregrounded. Therefore, this chapter will begin with an introduction that focuses on the historiography of historical writing to establish the academic environment in which the five ecclesiastical histories considered in this chapter were written. After this, the chapter will be divided into three main sections: the first dealing with Southey, Soames and the reactionary anti-Catholicism that characterised the period pre-1829; the second on Stebbing and a gradual change in approach after

[569] For an overview of the relationship between religion and historians in the eighteenth century, see B. W. Young, 'Religious History and the Eighteenth-Century Historian', *The Historical Journal*, 43.3 (September, 2000), pp. 849-68.

Catholic Emancipation; the third on Maurice, Hussey and a more 'reasoned/moderate' approach to disseminating Anglican history in the 1850s.

The five ecclesiastical histories considered in this chapter were situated within an expanding and developing field, and part of this chapter's remit is to involve ecclesiastical history-writing in existing dialogues around this subject. Part of this requires a consideration as to how modern historians have viewed the development of the craft during this period, and thus the extent to which it can be said that history was becoming a 'discipline', built on a foundation of more tangible principles, and becoming less reliant on rhetoric and elan on the part of the author. Professionals in the universities were also utilising this new approach, to be learned and developed by young scholars under their tutelage. Not that a 'disciplinised' historiography is devoid of such talents – it would be dull if it all were so – but that history should value meticulous research and a dispassionate attitude above pontificating and moralising that risks the integrity of the writer's professionalism.

As most of the modern historians considered in this introductory passage note, there were varying levels of success in this regard, and indeed it must be stated that impartiality does not preclude a personal view – historians would be reduced producing nothing more than charts and tables if it were so.[570] As deliberations on nineteenth-century historiography demonstrates, these considerations about what constituted acceptable approaches to history writing were varied and complex, and that numerous books have been written on the subject shows this to be the case. The following section will attempt to summarise a few of the key subject areas that the books under assessment cover in their pages.

[570] This is not to suggest that data analysis is irrelevant or unimportant in any sense, but that a historian requires the articulation necessary to explain any data sets they use to their audience.

What is made abundantly clear in each of the works consulted is that the development of historical writing took many forms in various locations across Europe and benefited from the influence of a number of different figures who approached history from numerous perspectives. It is perhaps redundant to point it out, but it is abundantly clear that history writing did not suddenly break with past endeavours in the field at some fixed point in the nineteenth century. While analysis of the 'professionalisation' of history is only pertinent from the nineteenth century onward, refinement of the craft had been ongoing, even if this was not an explicit aim of those responsible for any such alterations. Discussions surrounding the Enlightenment are particularly relevant, given their influence on subsequent developments into the nineteenth century. Hayden White has declared that the influence of the *philosophes* meant that historiographical writing "strove for objectivity and disengagement" but also "recognized the impossibility of attaining these goals".[571] Through a comprehensive study of seven historians and/or philosophers that influenced historical theory in the nineteenth century, White argues that throughout the nineteenth century, the 'idea of history' was often contested between 'true' and 'philosophical' histories, the view being that the reflections necessitated by the latter would distort the purity of the former.[572]

This represents a relatively new shift in the process of historical writing, as Pocock's work on Edward Gibbon in the context of the Enlightenment demonstrates. He asserts at the end of the first volume of his *Barbarism and Religion* that Gibbon's Anglo-French experiences, and the diverse influences of the Enlightenment on England and France respectively, meant that Gibbon's "movements in Europe" ended up "needing and developing diverse forms of Enlightenment and comparably if not correspondingly diverse forms of

[571] Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (London: John Hopkins University Press, 1973), p. 65.
[572] *Ibid*, p. 267.

historiography".[573] Pocock sought to "reconstruct an Enlightenment into which he [Gibbon] may seem to fit", and consequently Gibbon's historiographical approaches mirror this (necessarily, in Pocock's view) complex appraisal of the times in which he found himself.[574] To this end, Gibbon's work can be seen as both a continuation and extension of that of Mabillon and Muratori, who used such techniques as diplomatics and philology to produce histories that embraced more of the 'true' than the purely 'philosophical'.[575] Peter Gay has reinforced this notion of Gibbon as an 'intermediary' of sorts, asking at the end of his chapter on him:

> Is it right to conclude, then, that while for this learned gnome, there was much in the past that he saw better than anyone, there was also much in the past that he had no way of seeing? That the question should arise at all is the final irony of Gibbon's history.[576]

Gay's question of "whether with Gibbon style adapted itself to matter, or matter yielded to style" is a prescient one, and frames Gay's assessment of the presentation and implementation of varying styles in history.[577] His conclusion nicely frames the next point of conversation running through many works that discuss the subject of history writing, which is the categorisation of history, broadly divided into the two camps of 'art' and 'science'.

Gay is blunt with his view on whether history should be considered as either an art or a science: he states that "the straightforward dichotomy between

---

[573] J. G. A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion, Volume One: The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon, 1737-1764* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 308.
[574] *Ibid*, p. 295.
[575] Fritz Stern, *The Varieties of History: From Voltaire to the Present* (London: Macmillan, 1956), p. 211.
[576] Peter Gay, *Style in History* (London: Lowe and Brydone Ltd., 1975). P. 56.
[577] *Ibid*, p. 54.

art and science is quite untenable".[578] His consideration of the topic in his conclusion leads to his clever quip that "style is the art of the historian's science" with which he ends his work.[579] Gay's consideration of Gibbon, Ranke, Macaulay and Burckhardt is intended to illustrate that although each wrote history from their own perspectives, and that the world influenced each of them as it appeared to be from their own particular vantage points, this is not problematic, as history, by definition, depends on the interpretation of a historian to bring it into the public consciousness. As E. H. Carr put it: "The belief in a hard core of facts existing objectively and independently of the interpretation of the historian is a preposterous fallacy, but one which it is very hard to eradicate".[580] The question of style is crucial, and it is one that must not be obfuscated by a swing too far away from rhetoric and elan to one that relies on a trove of objective evidence that, for the most part, is entirely fictional.

Fritz Stern acknowledges the variety of style, and indeed, his edited work highlights the range of styles and genres that historians have utilised since the time of Voltaire. For him, the two dominant factors that occasioned the "transformation of history" from the late eighteenth century and beyond are the development of history as an academic discipline, with the rigours involved in such a process, and the demand from the public for historical writing, particularly at a time when national identities were being formed and codified in emergent nations, and challenged/modified in the case of older nations and states.[581] His edited volume contains excerpts from writers of history that seek to define the nature of historical writing, and they run the gamut between the (admittedly simplistic) dichotomy of history as art, via notable practitioners such as Carlyle and Trevelyan, to John Bagnell Bury's claim for 'history as a science'. Of particular interest is Stein's partial reproduction of Thomas Buckle's introduction

---

[578] *Ibid*, p. 185.
[579] *Ibid*, p. 217.
[580] E. H. Carr, *What is History?* (London: Macmillan, 1961), p. 6, cited in Gay, p. 198.
[581] Stern, p. 11.

to *The History of Civilization in England*, in which Buckle suggests, in 1856, that it will one day be possible to collect the "totality of human knowledge" and subsequently "ascertain the whole of the laws which regulate the progress of civilization".[582]

The only reason this has not yet been done, according to Buckle, is because "history has been written by men so inadequate to the great task they have undertaken, that few of the necessary materials have yet been brought together"; instead "the vast majority of historians fill their works with the most trifling and miserable details" that are anecdotal rather than factual.[583] Such a hatchet job on one's fellow enthusiasts is quite startling, but it points to a wider point, present throughout the works cited by Stein, that considerations of representations of the past were taking place in the nineteenth century, and indeed prior to that, and that it is not a settled subject, at least when Stein's work was published.

Perhaps Buckle's criticisms, though sweeping and generalised, were not too far off the mark: in his introduction to *The Clothing of Clio*, Stephen Bann postulates the idea that "the distinguishing mark of the period between 1750 and 1850 – in England at any rate – would not be the new professional practice of history but the increasingly expert production of pseudo-historical forgeries".[584] Bann is offering a deliberately provocative counter to the notion that modern history-writing as we understand it today originated during the period cited, and instead posits a clash between 'historical poetics' and 'irony' which did not ebb and flow between the two but saw intersections, often better described as clashes between disparate approaches to the emerging discipline. As Bann himself notes later in his introduction, he has deliberately chosen more "peripheral" historians of the nineteenth century in order to show "the other side of the coin" to the likes

---

[582] Thomas Buckle, *The History of Civilization in England*, cited in Stein (1956), p. 133.
[583] *Ibid*.
[584] Stephen Bann, *The Clothing of Clio: A Study of the Representation of History in Nineteenth-Century Britain and France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 2.

of Macauley and Froude, to "reveal the ingenious ways in which the test of historical authenticity survived the ironic stage, and yet at the same time engendered outlooks and attitudes which still persist in the historical culture of the modern world".[585]

Bann's memorable chapter titles serve to highlight the varied influences that were at work on the development of history, and the underlying thread of 'authenticity' that most were striving for, in numerous guises, runs through his work. The final chapter, on the literary interpretations of history and the push-and-pull between historical accuracy and artistic licence, and the politics of historical representation in literary forms, reminds the reader that the Romantic inclination to produce nationalistic histories that focused more on myth than legend was at work among some history writers in the nineteenth century.[586]

Both David Sorkin and Peter Fritzsche cite the French Revolution as having had a great influence on the development of history writing; the Revolution was a crucial example in demonstrating how the past formed a continuity to the present. For Sorkin, the French Revolution concludes his book *The Religious Enlightenment*, whereas it begins Fritzsche's *Stranded in the Present*, and this provides a useful opportunity to assess shifting approaches to historical writing at the end of the long eighteenth century. Sorkin's work seeks to re-position the Enlightenment to include a religious dimension, and he cites a series of influential theological thinkers across Europe to demonstrate that theological concerns were prevalent in Enlightenment thought until the end of the eighteenth century. Sorkin takes a similar line to Pocock, that the Enlightenment resulted from religious debate, rather than being a reaction against it: religious thought was an integral aspect of the Enlightenment, and not the primary target

[585] Bann, p. 6.
[586] Bann, pp. 138-63.

of its opprobrium.[587] Of particular interest is Sorkin's overview of William Warburton, and his form of Moderation that rose to prominence in the mid-eighteenth century and then began to wane from the 1760s as the Jacobite threat receded and the association of Moderation with nascent forms of radicalism shifted its position from the mainstream to the periphery, and, more than that, as a threat to the status quo that it once assisted in upholding.[588] Regarding his overall argument that the Enlightenment had an irrefutable religious aspect, Sorkin declares that the French Revolution "virtually eliminated the religious Enlightenment", and that later attempts to "rehabilitate the Enlightenment" in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries did not extend to the ecclesiastical sphere.[589]

Peter Fritzsche declares that "it is difficult to overemphasize the extent to which the prolonged nature of the French Revolution disrupted Western conceptions of historical continuity".[590] Fritzsche's central argument, underpinning his book, is that the French Revolution caused historical writers to move away from conceptions of history as continued cycles of returning past modalities to present circumstances, or as "inevitable progress toward enlightenment". Rather, history began to be seen as a series of events that created boundaries in time, that separated particular periods or epochs from one another. Fritzsche contends that this shift in perspective broadened the social, political, and cultural horizons of historians as they sought to justify the new approach to historical writing that was emerging. Much like other historians cited in this chapter, Fritzsche references a wide array of sources and writers to support his contentions, and his conclusion that "historical mindedness disenchants before it

---

[587] David Sorkin, *The Religious Enlightenment: Protestants, Jews and Catholics from London to Vienna* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), p. 3.
[588] *Ibid*, p. 64.
[589] Sorkin, p. 311.
[590] Peter Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present: Modern Time and the Melancholy of History* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2004), p. 25.

re-enchants" is sombre, but understandable in a work that ably illustrates the validity of such a statement.[591]

Fritzsche shows that historians in the nineteenth century often recognised that history writing could be a depressing business, and that the works they produced for societies keener than ever to learn about their pasts could engender feelings of nostalgia for a way of life unknowable to their contemporary audiences. Moreover, as nationalism and empire grew and developed as concepts, history writing could be co-opted into building an idealised narrative that was far beyond the control of the writer behind it. Consequences such as these need to be kept in mind when considering history writing, and while the intentions of the historian(s) need to be accounted for, so too should the reactions to their work that they might not have foreseen or intended. 'Melancholy' is an apt term if Fritzsche's concerns merit the attention he has given them.

Regardless of the ramifications of historical writing, intended or otherwise, there is a sense that the nineteenth century witnessed a progression toward a more 'academic' approach to history writing, and thus a legitimisation of describing this process as a 'disciplinization', as above. In *The History Men*, John Kenyon states that professionalisation was driven by the increased interest in history during the Victorian era, including modern history, and an attendant recognition of the importance of history in helping societies understand themselves. England was comparatively late in this regard, particularly when compared to the developments in German states in the early nineteenth century.[592] Kenyon sees the importance of Cambridge and Oxford in getting England on the path toward a more rigorous application of academic history, although this was adversely affected by the need for training for lecturers, and the reluctance of many of the

---

[591] *Ibid*, p. 217.
[592] John Kenyon, *The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1983), p. 149.

nineteenth century's most distinguished historians to be involved in university life.

For Kenyon, while the interest of the Victorians and the erosion of history writing as a tool of political factionalism enabled the professionalization of history to begin in the nineteenth century in England, it did not gain ground in this area until the latter half of the century.[593] Michael Bentley has also written on this topic, and he asserts that Anglican Protestantism still influenced much of English historical writing, and that it was not until 1870 that a more scientific (to reintroduce that contentious term) approach took hold – the establishment of the *English Historical Review* in 1886 and John Seeley's tenure as Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge are seen as pivotal moments by Bentley.[594] Daniel Woolf has written about the professionalization of history under the auspices of the 'broken mirror', his metaphor for suggesting that whereas eighteenth century historians saw history reflected in their own times and vice versa, creating a sort of feedback loop that influenced their work; such a view had been supplanted by a historical process that sought to look beyond the mirror to see the past 'as it was', hence the broken mirror.[595] However, the presence of numerous ideologies seeking to influence the development of history, nationalism perhaps (arguably) being the most important one, meant that this peering back was often still coloured by the contemporary situation that the historians found themselves in during the nineteenth century.

This contemporary situation was relevant to the ecclesiastical historians cited in this chapter, but for them it was (unsurprisingly) religious questions that they sought to address in their historical writing. For each of the five men

---

[593] *Ibid*. See chapters 3-5 for the progression from factionalism in the eighteenth century to more 'impartial' historiographical efforts in the nineteenth.
[594] Michael Bentley, 'Shape and Pattern in British Historical Writing, 1815-1945' in Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maiguashca, and Attila Pók (eds.), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, Volume 4: 1800-1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 204-13.
[595] Daniel Woolf, *A Global History of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 364-95.

considered in this chapter, it was the spiritual issues of the day that required historical context – each of their histories is written from the perspective that England has an established identity rooted in its Protestant history, and that Roman Catholicism is a corrupted and pernicious distortion of Christianity that sought, in the nineteenth century and indeed previously, to undermine and weaken the nation. This reflected a growing interest in such subjects, often at times when Catholicism was a prevalent topic. The increased production of ecclesiastical histories was the result of both a wider ecclesiastical public sphere in which to operate and concerted efforts among the Anglican establishment to offer historical arguments to support their position.

That Oxford University created the Regius Chair of Ecclesiastical History in 1842 epitomises this desire to ensure that future students would receive 'correct' education in religious history and would disseminate this orthodoxy in the face of ever-growing dissent and factionalism. The first holder of the position was Robert Hussey, who will be considered predominantly in the third part of this chapter. By the middle of the nineteenth century, it had become apparent that more institutional and considered approaches to the passing-on of ecclesiastical histories was required: Catholic Emancipation in 1829 had made it clear that shrill anti-Catholic rhetoric did not influence the establishment as much as it previously had, and the pressures that had caused Pitt to fall in 1801 were not as effective almost thirty years later. However, that did not stop men such as Southey and Soames from attempting to dissuade support for Catholic Emancipation among moderate Anglicans by producing sensationalist histories that attempted to demonstrate Catholicism's inherent evils in the years that immediately preceded emancipation.

Part 1: Southey, Soames and the pre-Catholic Emancipation style

While it is of course true that two works do not constitute the entirety of the literature published prior to 1829, nor do they represent the entire spectrum of thought on matters of ecclesiastical history, they are indicative of a trend visible in the development of ecclesiastical publications as studied in the first chapter: namely, that works produced before 1829 were much more overtly anti-Catholic, and the language of their content was much more vitriolic. In the years preceding Catholic Emancipation, in 1829, and the First Reform Act in 1832, conservatively-minded Anglicans seemed sufficiently confident to take a reactionary stance against plans to make concessions to Catholics, due to a general prevalence of the feeling that the majority of the educated public was on their side. Alternatively, perhaps this stridency betrayed a fear of being overrun by a growing tolerance of Catholics that threatened the established order. Anti-Catholic sentiment, often expressed as a form of hysteria, was commonplace, and those producing ecclesiastical histories that put the boot into the Roman Catholic church could be sure of a receptive audience. What they did not realise was that this audience was not as sizeable as they assumed, and that many who did hold anti-Catholic feelings were prepared to overlook them in favour of political expediency. Thus, stridently anti-Catholic works were often guilty of preaching to the converted, and possibly even alienating some who were not necessarily pro-Catholic, but were in favour of concessions, to some degree, to prevent a wider political crisis emerging. With this in mind, it is worth examining the two histories produced by the men cited above, and what they set out to achieve.

The Book of the Church was written by the Poet Laureate Robert Southey, with the first volume being published in 1824 and the second in 1825. An ardent supporter of the French Revolution at first, the Revolution's descent into disorder and the horrors of the Terror compelled Southey to follow the line of his

contemporaries, Wordsworth and Coleridge, toward a more conservative outlook. Southey espoused the virtues of the monarchy and the Church of England and argued that the importance of both was interwoven into the fabric of the nation, and that they must be protected from challenges to their enshrined authority.

Such views had already been articulated by François-René de Chateaubriand in his work *The Genius of Christianity*, a staunch defence of Christianity against attacks from revolutionaries and anti-religious philosophers. Southey was familiar with Chateaubriand's writings, as a letter to his uncle Thomas Southey demonstrates, mentioning as it does one "Mrs Barbauld, who wrote the review of Chateaubriand's *Beauties of Xtianity* [sic]".[596] The *Foreign Quarterly Review*, in a review of a collection of Chateaubriand's works, observed a similarity of thought between him and Southey – "there are two of our countrymen, one of them still living, to whom M. de Chateaubriand, in the quality of his mind, seems to have a strong resemblance: we allude to Mr. Southey - and to one still greater – to Mr. Burke".[597] Though the comparison to Burke was deemed more fitting, it is notable that Southey was familiar with Chateaubriand's work, and that he was compared to him in terms of the content of his ideas.

Southey received praise from like-minded supporters and drew ire from those whom he had effectively distanced himself from and made himself a controversial figure in the first half of the nineteenth century.[598] As Poet Laureate, Southey did not shy away from his prominent position, and sought to produce works that would promulgate his notions of church and state to a wider audience;

---

[596] Robert Southey, "Robert Southey to Thomas Southey, 17 December 1803" in Lynda Pratt and Ian Packer (eds.), *The Collected Letters of Robert Southey* (College Park: University of Maryland, 2009), available online via https://romantic-circles.org/editions/southey_letters/Part_Two/HTML/letterEEd.26.871.html [accessed 23 April 2023].

[597] "*Œuvres Completes de M. le Vicomte de Chateaubriand", Foreign Quarterly Review, Volume X (1832), p. 298.*

[598] For further details on Southey's political outlook and his shift in perspective, see: G. Carnall, *Robert Southey* (London: Longmans, 1964); Mark Storey, *Robert Southey: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); Chine Sonoi, 'Southey's Radicalism and the Abolitionist Movement', *The Wordsworth Circle* 42.1 (Winter, 2011), pp. 22-26.

having written extensively for the *Quarterly Review*, Southey was no stranger to the task, and his reputation had already been built on his prose as well as his poetry.[599]

When the educationalist Andrew Bell sought to commission textbooks on British church and state history to be used in schools, Southey appeared an obvious choice. Though Southey never finished the proposed work, *The Book of the State*, he did produce two volumes of church history, which will be considered below. The *Book of the Church* was published "as a defence of Anglicanism in National Schools", intended to ensure that children grew up with a 'correct' understanding of the nation's ecclesiastical history.[600] Philip Harling asserts that Southey "saw popular education as little more than an instrument of social discipline".[601] Southey was clear in his intentions in producing the two volumes: writing to his uncle, the Reverend Herbert Hill, Southey stated that "many young minds will receive from it a right bias".[602] Southey's use of the term 'bias' is appropriate, as the two volumes constitute a defence of the Church of England against reform, and the rejection of Catholic emancipation: the work was written to inculcate, as well as to educate.

The *Book of the Church*, spread over the two volumes, covers England's ecclesiastical history from the ancient Britons and the subsequent invasion of the Romans to the Glorious Revolution that began in 1688. The core principle of Southey's work, the importance of the role of the Church of England (in Southey's eyes), is set out in a short preface to the first volume:

---

[599] From a literary perspective, Southey is often more fervently praised as a 'man of letters' rather than for his abilities as a poet: many critics have compared him unfavourably to Wordsworth and Coleridge.
[600] Philip Harling, 'Robert Southey and the Language of Social Discipline', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 30.4 (Winter, 1998), p. 644.
[601] *Ibid*.
[602] Southey to Rev. Herbert Hill, January 2, 1824, cited in David Eastwood, 'Robert Southey and the Meanings of Patriotism', *Journal of British Studies* 31.3 (July, 1992), p. 264.

> Manifold as are the blessings for which Englishmen are beholden to the institutions of their country, there is no part of those institutions from which they derive more important advantages than from its Church Establishment, none by which the temporal condition of all ranks has been so materially improved. So many of our countrymen would not be ungrateful for these benefits, if they knew how numerous and how great they are, how dearly they were prized by our forefathers, and at how dear a price they were purchased for our inheritance.[603]

This passage, part of a two-page exhortation to use the texts to instil in the young an appreciation of the Established Church, captures the essence of Southey's mission: to aid the young in their religious education, and to ensure that future generations are not as ignorant of the supposed wonders of the Church of England as their forebears have apparently been. An essential aspect of this education from Southey's perspective is an understanding of the myriad errors of the Roman Catholic Church. Thus the works make constant reference to "the errors and crimes of the Romish church", which Southey notes as having previously been a threat to England; he asserts the "purity" of an institution (the Church of England) that demonstrated its value, in Southey's eyes, "when it opposed the monarch who would have brought back the Romish superstition, and, together with the religion, would have overthrown the liberties of England".[604] As W. A. Speck has noted, "the central thrust of this work… was to extol the Church of England as a bulwark against Catholicism and dissent".[605] It is clear in this work that Southey sought to protect the Established Church from what were ever-growing threats of Roman Catholicism and dissenting denominations in the

---

[603] Robert Southey, *The Book of the Church, Volume I* (London: John Murray, 1824), p. 1.
[604] *Ibid*, p. 2.
[605] W. A. Speck, 'Robert Southey, Benjamin Disraeli and Young England', *History* 95.2 (April 2010), p. 195.

1820s, and that this was a contemporary warning to society in general, rather than purely a historical aid for the younger generation.

Henry Soames was certainly not as well-known as Robert Southey, but he was, arguably, his equal in espousing anti-Catholic sentiments. His four-volume *The History of the Church of England* was published between 1826 and 1828, and an abridged version of the work, intended to give a more basic overview of the period, was also published in 1828. Soames was a clergyman and an ecclesiastical historian: he was made rector of Shelley, in Essex, in 1812, and of Little Laver, also in Essex, in 1821.[606] He would later become vicar of Brent, in Hertfordshire, between 1831 and 1839, and he was appointed chancellor of St Paul's Cathedral in 1842.[607] He was an ecclesiastical historian that wrote primarily on the Anglo-Saxon Church, and the Reformation, as in this four-volume work under consideration.

As well as these subjects, Soames wrote multiple works that sought to undermine and criticise the Roman Catholic Church, using provocative titles such as *Reasons for Opposing the Romish Claims* (1829) and *The Romish Reaction and its Present Operation on the Church of England* (1843). The former comprised a collection of statements made at a meeting of clergy in Brentwood, Essex, that were subsequently collated and expounded upon by Soames and published in 1829 in opposition to the imminent passing of Catholic Emancipation. In the introductory remarks to *Reasons*, Soames indirectly offers his reasoning for the publication of his four-volume work on the Reformation, published just prior to his 1829 work. Soames asserts that the government's shift to supporting Emancipation gave succour to Roman Catholic perceptions of the Reformation as a scheme set up not by men of God, but opportunists "intent upon

---

[606] Ronald Bayne, 'Soames, Henry', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-25981?rskey=IeDQxC [accessed 18 June 2025]. It is unclear as to whether Soames was rector of both parishes from 1821, but as they are small parishes in close proximity, it is quite likely that he was.
[607] *Ibid*.

enriching themselves by plundering the Church".[608] Soames goes on to contend that:

> Romish books thus represent The Reformation, up to the present hour. The reformers, we are told in such publications, were led by their lusts and interests to support a government and parliament religion, in fact, no religion at all, but merely such opinions as the ruling powers thought proper to patronise for their own unworthy purposes.[609]

This continues into a broader evaluation of the relationship between the clerical and political spheres, and is of much interest for a subsequent chapter, but its value for the current chapter is in providing justification for Soames' four-volume work under consideration here. His fear was that the foundation of English faith was being undermined by concessions to a form of Christianity inimical to the state, and to its religious institution, the Church of England. Soames states his belief in the importance of the Papacy in history, and in an enlightening part of the introduction to volume I, he illustrates his belief in its significance whilst simultaneously hinting at the hostility toward it that permeates all four volumes of his work. It is worth quoting it at length, as follows:

> There are few objects exhibited in the annals of mankind more worthy of attentive consideration than the Papacy. A power physically weak, exercised during several centuries an influence almost despotic over states at a distance from its seat, and bound

[608] Henry Soames, *Reasons for Opposing the Romish Claims* (London: C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1829), p. 2.
[609] *Ibid.*

> together by no other common tie; from which also, in an age of poverty, it succeeded in drawing considerable pecuniary supplies. There are those who would readily solve this political problem by referring its particulars to that spiritual superiority, which, it is asserted, was divinely conferred upon the acknowledged visible head of the Roman Church. But since that dignified personage never has been universally considered among Christians as the depositary of such an exalted privilege, a large number of enquirers will naturally seek to account for the pre-eminence attained by his see upon grounds merely secular.[610]

For both Southey and Soames, the errors and machinations of the Roman Catholic church pervade every aspect of religious history, and neither missed an opportunity to mount an attack. Southey brings his anti-Catholicism to the forefront of practically every subject that he covers: the murder of Thomas Becket was chiefly abhorrent because, in Southey's view, "the cause for which he was worshipped as a saint and martyr [was that] of the Roman Church" and that "they who venerated St. Thomas of Canterbury… necessarily believed that the authority of the Pope was supreme on earth".[611] Southey does acknowledge that this was not always problematic for England: he praises Pope Innocent III's involvement in the capture and ransom of Richard I by the Duke of Austria as a positive example.[612] However, the negative implications far outweigh any singular instances of this authority working well, in Southey's mind, and the overarching anti-Catholicism is frequently to the fore. Southey does go as far as declaring that the Papacy was the "saviour of Europe" from "Mahommedanism [sic]", given its

---

[610] Soames, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, Volume I* (London: C. & F. Rivington, 1826), p. 3.
[611] *Ibid*, p. 262.
[612] *Ibid*, p. 264-67.

ability to command powerful kings and nobles to take action to benefit Europe (in Southey's opinion). Despite this, he still declares that in the eleventh century (when the threat of further Islamic encroachment into continental Europe was heightened) "the corruptions, doctrinal and practical, of the Roman Church were, in these ages, at their height".[613] Much of the first volume is given to establishing the frequency, and severity, of these supposed Papal iniquities.

The second volume maintains this approbation toward the Roman Catholic Church but situates it against nascent Protestantism and the subsequent establishment of the Church of England, which Southey considered to be necessary in forming the character of England that he sought to defend. The second volume commences with a brief consideration of the Lollards, who rejected many of the doctrines and practices that the Roman Catholic church considered to be of great importance, such as transubstantiation and the veneration of the saints. Southey contrasts the harsh punishment of the Lollards, many of whom were put to death, with the tolerance of the Church of England that would later be established – one of many grand oversimplifications that Southey makes throughout the two volumes.[614]

This is worth highlighting because Southey takes a condemnatory attitude toward the Lollards in the first volume: he wrote that "undoubtedly the Lollards were highly dangerous at this time… the greater number were eager for havoc, and held opinions which were incompatible with the peace of society".[615] He goes on to state that Lollard opinions "founded as they were in gross error, and leading to direct and enormous evil" would have deserved "temperate and just" repression on the part of the Church. It was the Catholic Church's heavy-handed response, and insistence on an acceptance of transubstantiation on pain of death via the

---

[613] Southey, *Book of the Church, Volume 1*, (first edition, 1824), pp. 292-3.
[614] Southey, *Book of the Church, Volume 2* (first edition, 1825), pp. 9-12.
[615] Southey, *Volume 1*, p. 360. "This time" refers to the 'Earthquake Synod' of 1382, convened by William Courtenay, Archbishop of Canterbury, to address Lollard opposition to the church, and in particular John Wycliffe's twenty-four theses, which had earlier been condemned by a synod in 1377.

stake, that Southey views as unwarranted, and conferred upon the Lollards, in his view, the ability to perceive themselves as defending "truth".[616]

For all of Southey's Anti-Catholic rhetoric, the example of the Lollards demonstrates that he was not fully in favour of any denomination or sect that opposed Roman Catholicism. Rather, he was of the opinion that the Catholic Church in England was inherently unfit for purpose in terms of its (in his view) flawed interpretations of the Bible, and its supposed corruptions. Moreover, these flaws emboldened forms of opposition that, in Southey's eyes, did, or at least had the capacity to, cause damage to the moral and spiritual well-being of the communities they operated in, and indeed across greater swathes of the country if their influence spread.

Despite his reservations with regard to the Lollards as a collective, Southey praised John Wycliffe, although he did assert that the vernacular Bible-writer "held some erroneous opinions, some fantastic ones, and some which, in their moral and political consequences, are most dangerous.". These concerns were surpassed by the legacy of serious challenge to Roman Catholic authority, with Southey opining "it is a reproach to this country, that no statue has been erected to his honour, and that his translation of the Old Testament should never have been printed".[617] Wycliffe and the Lollards may have held some 'dangerous' views, in Southey's eyes, but when they offered reasoned, intellectual challenges to Roman Catholic supremacy, without the threat of violence or political instability, Southey was keen to praise them as a significant example of English opposition to control from Rome.

---

[616] *Ibid*, p. 361. Southey also notes that the Lollards would have "destroyed the monasteries" which, given his more negative comments on the monastic system, seems a contradictory complaint regarding the Lollards and their potential to cause harm. Perhaps it is the potential for violent dismantling that Southey is against – it is not clear in the text as to what Southey is in opposition to regarding the Lollards and the monasteries.
[617] Southey, *Volume 1*, p. 358.

Soames' work was, much like Southey's, clearly intended to offer a reminder to readers that the Papacy is a subversive influence wherever it gains influence, and thus the work offers a timely reminder to Anglicans of what the Reformation 'won' at a time, in the mid-1820s, when the 'threat' of rejuvenated Roman Catholicism in England was prevalent. The preface to volume I states that a modern history of the Reformation, to both supplement and revise earlier publications by Burnet and Strype, is necessary, so that intellectuals "should be directed to the particulars of our national emancipation from papal thraldom".[618]

That Soames had a passion for history is not to be denied, to which the more than two-thousand pages of this work testify; however, it is clear that Soames was an Anglican for whom Roman Catholicism was not just incorrect but incorrigible, represented by a hierarchy, in the form of the Papacy, that enlarged and expounded upon the errors that had built up over the centuries. Soames declares that this was inherent in the Catholic Church, and that its very *raison d'être* was invalid. In a note in the fourth volume regarding papal persecution under Queen Mary I, Soames cites (in his view) the absurdity of Catholics having the authority to pass judgment due to a misinterpretation of a key Bible passage. Regarding Jesus' words to Peter in Matthew 16, and the doctrine of transubstantiation, Soames writes:

> Thus the papal primacy is defended by means of the text, "Thou art Peter", &c. (St. Matt. xvi. 18.) The language here is evidently metaphorical; and even eminent Romish divines have differed as to its precise meaning. Transubstantiation is defended by means of passages considered as metaphorical by a large proportion of the Christian world, and which learned Romanists are compelled to

[618] Soames, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, Volume I (1826)*, p. vii.

> consider as difficult, because their insufficiency for the proofs mainly built upon them has been acknowledged by many high authorities in the papal Church.[619]

Conveniently, Soames does not cite any examples of "learned Romanists" that hold these views, and his attempts to 'demonstrate' that even the most academically-minded of Roman Catholics cede such ground is indicative of an attempt to undermine Roman Catholicism by means of self-censure. Throughout the four volumes, such attempts to highlight the fallibility of the Roman Catholic faith are intertwined with illustrations of sinister machinations and manipulations emanating from Rome toward England. To give one example from a multitude of possibilities, at a clerical convocation in 1542:

> The Romish party made another attempt to stay the progress of scriptural knowledge. Existing English versions of the Bible were again loudly decried as incorrect, and it was represented that, in justice to the people, a new version of the sacred volume was imperiously required.[620]

The inference is that the Roman Catholic Church, supposedly with the aim of satisfying the religious inclinations of 'the people', interfered in English ecclesiastical, and by extension political, business to achieve its nefarious goals – it was surely Soames' intention that such a passage would have struck a chord with his modern readership. They would recognise the parallels Soames sought to draw between England's 'escape' from the Catholic yoke during the

---

[619] Soames, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, Volume IV (1828)*, p. 439.
[620] Soames, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, Volume II (1826)*, p. 503.

Reformation, and the apparent risk of its re-ensnarement in the 1820s. Soames sought to warn Anglicans of the impending dangers of what he would later term "the contemporary carnage of Popery" from affecting England and bringing with it all of the deleterious dogma of which Soames was so afraid.[621]

This fear of Roman Catholicism pervades the four volumes that Soames produced between 1826 and 1828, as it does his later work, and Soames' chief method of combating it is excoriating criticism of Roman Catholic doctrines, written in a style that demonstrates contempt, hostility, and an intolerance made obvious at almost every conceivable opportunity. An example of this is contained in volume III, in an article on calls for church reform in the initial months of Edward VI's reign:

> Ever since the Word of God had been unsealed, and enquiring minds in all conditions had anxiously turned over its pages for the purpose of discovering how far the established religion could be traced to any satisfactory source, a belief had been gaining ground that the whole mass of Romish doctrines connected with the confessional were of human origin, and even of pernicious tendency.[622]

This is but one example of the approach that Soames takes throughout the work, utilising any and every opportunity to condemn the practices, intentions, and integrity of the Roman Catholic Church. Against such a decadent and malignant institution, as portrayed by Soames, the Reformers naturally become heroic counterpoints, defending the interests of the faith in the face of such wanton corruption. As Soames states toward the end of the fourth volume,

---

[621] Soames, *Reasons for Opposing the Romish Claims*, p. 32.

[622] Soames, *Volume III (1826)*, p. 275.

"nothing, therefore, was done in settling the English Reformation which those employed in that important work were not fully justified in accomplishing".[623] Soames is unequivocal in his belief that the Reformation was a monumental achievement of integral importance in championing 'correct' Christianity as opposed to the corruptions of Roman influence, and his method of constantly reaffirming the wickedness of Roman Catholicism and the goodness of Protestantism to reach such a conclusion is mirrored in later works by other ecclesiastical historians.

Another aspect of ecclesiastical history-writing that was widespread in the mid-nineteenth century was the use of pejorative language when discussing the author's opponents, and Soames in particular used this technique to full effect in his work. Over the course of the four volumes, he employs the term "Romish" 446 times, always meant as a derogatory method of referring to the Church of Rome. Soames uses other negative terms, such as "Papist", "Popery", and "Romanist", sporadically, but "Romish" is very much his preferred descriptor.[624] Soames is certainly creative in his repeated use of the term "Romish". Throughout the work, the reader becomes acquainted with the initial spread of "Romish monkery" in England; that Cranmer's rise and fall demonstrated that "the Romish polemic could often place very little reliance" on appeals to Scripture; and that the execution, and martyrdom, of the Reformer John Bradford in 1555 was an occasion of "Romish infamy".[625] Soames, like many of his contemporaries, mixed an approach to historical writing that aimed to be scholarly with the polemical language that (one can imagine) would have been commonplace at many a pulpit in the nineteenth century. Indeed, collections of sermons were published, as well

---

[623] Soames, *Volume IV (1828)*, p. 737.
[624] This figure is derived from search results using the editions available on Archive.org, which contains a more robust search feature than Google Books. With the four volumes containing a combined total of 2673 pages, the term "Romish" appears, on average, once every 6 pages.
[625] Soames, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, Volume II (1826*), p. 58; Soames, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, Volume III (1826)*, p. 387; Soames, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, Volume IV (1828)*, p. 441.

as lecture series that were converted into book format, and the stylistic approach taken in these various printed forms often conflated an attempt at academic rigour with the charged vernacular of the pulpit. In Soames' case, the latter very much comes to the fore.

This is exacerbated by an admission in the preface to volume I that Soames' work is not as well-sourced as it might have been. The four volumes were written without access to certain key texts, and thus he was not able to reference to the extent that some readers might have wished.[626] This admitted lack of references, coupled with the often elaborately contrived attacks on Roman Catholicism, confers on these volumes a sense of Anglican propaganda. Though Southey is less reliant on inflammatory language than Soames, perhaps due to his more natural inclination toward literary endeavours, it is still an aspect of his work – he uses 'romish' 96 times over his two volumes, and other desultory terms are incorporated sporadically. Southey also has a reluctance toward illustrating his sources, preferring instead to rely on general assertions of widely accepted historiographical knowledge to support his notions and ideas. Both Southey and Soames relied on invective and traditional illustrations of English ecclesiastical history as anchors for the anti-Catholicism they wished to disseminate to their fellow Anglicans.

That is not to say that there is nothing of any merit in either work; Southey, in particular, is able to craft passages that move beyond the repetitive attacks on the Catholic church. His assessment of Henry VIII intersects with broad analyses that cover many years, as to the motives of the monarch to bring about the Reformation, and the extent to which his own personal failings interfered with the process. Southey summarised Henry VIII's role as follows:

---

[626] Soames, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, Volume I (1826)*, p. xii.

> With regard to the Church of England, its foundations rest upon the rock of scripture, not upon the character of the King by whom they were laid. This, however, must be affirmed in justice to Henry, that mixed as the motives were which first induced him to disclaim the Pope's authority, in all the subsequent measures he acted sincerely, knowing the importance of the work in which he had engaged, and prosecuting it sedulously and conscientiously, even when most erroneous.[627]

When not pushing an overtly anti-Catholic, anti-dissent agenda, Southey demonstrates some degree of nuance in his work, and although he seldom neglects an opportunity to judge, he does make some pretence to engage in the methodology of the historian at certain junctures. Unfortunately, these are few and far between, and the author's tendency to constantly proffer his own opinions negates these attempts to mimic legitimate historical enquiry. For example, his overview of the Synod of Dort (Dordrecht), which took place between 1618 and 1619, is marred by his statement that the English divines prevented the sanctioning of the "monstrous doctrine" of Supralapsarianism, the idea that God had predestined humanity to sin even before the Fall of Adam, and that he would then punish them eternally for these unavoidable offences.[628] Such personal interjections, as well as the constant anti-Catholic bias that is clear throughout, make reading Southey's work quite tedious, and fairly repetitive. At the end of the second volume, Southey writes that the Church of England:

> Has rescued us, first from heathenism, then from papal idolatry and superstition; it has saved us from temporal as well as spiritual

[627] Southey, *Volume 2*, (first edition, 1825), p. 100.
[628] *Ibid*, p. 327.

> despotism". This is the crux of Southey's two volumes: that Roman Catholicism, or 'Romanism' as he often terms it, corrupted the English establishment, and it took the Reformation and the establishment of the Church of England to save the soul of the nation.[629]

Soames is rather less concerned with wider considerations of motive, albeit ones that are often coloured with the usual bias in Southey's examples. Soames' work is clearly intended as a warning to contemporary English society, with the Reformation cited as the defining moment in the ongoing struggle to resist the influence of Roman Catholicism. At a time when the professionalisation of history was a dynamic process, one not clearly delineated by any means, Soames' approach was one potential method of bringing the past into the present, in a way that spoke to his audience. To the extent that this audience comprised Anglicans concerned about the impositions of Catholicism, it would have clearly spoken to these deeply entrenched fears. Both Southey and Soames, whatever else they were trying to achieve, had this as a primary aim when crafting and producing their works.

This aim was picked up in the various responses to both Southey and Soames' work. In Southey's case, his conclusion clearly spelt this out, and subsequent evaluations of his work were centred on it. *The Book of the Church* ends at the Glorious Revolution in 1688, with the "national voice" being proclaimed through Parliament that "Popery is inconsistent with the English constitution" and had thus been permanently superseded by the Church of England, with the inference that it would not have to cede any of the ground that it had won up to that point. Southey's wider point is not subtle: his argument is

[629] Southey, *Volume 2*, (first edition, 1825), p. 511.

that what had been gained at the end of the seventeenth century should not be given away, either wholly or piecemeal, in the nineteenth. Southey himself refuted this notion in his 1826 work *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, a defence of *The Book of the Church*, by stating that:

> The Book of the Church is strictly an historical work, and so free from all allusion to existing circumstances, that I had no scruple in dedicating it to one whose opinions were in favour of political concessions to the Romanists. Assuredly I should not have done this, if it had borne upon that question in any other manner than as a faithful history of the English Church, and a faithful view of that system from which the Reformation delivered us, must bear upon it.[630]

This is rather disingenuous, and it is not unreasonable to identify a contradiction between this statement and Southey's previous declaration that he sought to instil in his readers "the right sort of bias". Southey's contemporaries did not buy this defence either: *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae* was produced in response to Charles Butler's *The Book of the Roman Catholic Church*, a response to, and often refutation of, Southey's *The Book of the Church*.[631] Butler's *Roman*

---

[630] Southey, *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (London: John Murray, 1826), p. xiv. The dedication was to the Reverend Peter Elmsley, apparently the "best Greek scholar yet produced by Oxford". Elmsley's politics are unknown, at least based on materials available online, but it is reasonable to assume that Southey's statement regarding Elmsley being in favour of some degree of political concession to Roman Catholics is accurate. Elmsley was a friend of Southey's, and the former called on the latter and offered him money, should he have needed it, upon the death of his mother (Charles Cuthbert Southey (ed.), *The Life and Correspondence of the Late Robert Southey, Volume 2* (London: Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans, 1850), p. 180.) It is highly likely that Southey dedicated his two volumes to Elmsley due to the companionship between them, and that the latter's penchant for concessions to Roman Catholics was a convenient by-product for Southey to utilise against his critics. For a brief overview of Elmsley as a Greek scholar, see N. H. Horsfall, 'Classical scholarship in England 1810-1825,' *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 15 (1974), pp. 449-77.

[631] Charles Butler, *The Roman Catholic Book of the Church* (London: John Murray, 1825). Butler's work highlights key aspects of Southey's *Book* and offers counterpoints from the Catholic perspective.

Catholic history sought to assess the events cited in Southey's work from the Catholic perspective; Butler, a Roman Catholic lawyer, engaged in a series of letters with Southey, many of the responses to which were published in *Vindiciae*. The ensuing debate aroused some degree of controversy and spilt out into the pages of other publications eager to have a say on one of the most contentious issues of the day.

Southey's work was not quickly forgotten: in 1832, a group of Catholic journalists in Dublin produced *The Poor Man's Book of the Church*, a satirical jab at the Anglican Church that took its title from Southey's work as a deliberate mockery of the Poet Laureate.[632] As a prominent literary figure of the day, Southey's work drew attention, and played a role in shaping and embodying the discourse of the Anglican establishment, as well as influencing critical responses to the ecclesiastical ideologies contained within its pages.

In Soames' case, his work received attention in some contemporary ecclesiastical publications, and among those that reviewed it, there was widespread praise for his frank and forthright condemnation of the many errors that the Roman Catholic Church had committed. In a generally favourable review of the first two volumes in the *Christian Remembrancer in 1826*, it was predicted of Soames "that he will be classed among our established historians".[633] However, while the *Remembrancer* does agree with Soames' praise for Henry VIII's undermining of the monastic system in England, the periodical fails to excuse the king's excesses in the manner that Soames does in his work. Discussing Henry's treatment of Anne Boleyn, Soames states that Henry "plainly convicted himself of a culpable deficiency in the better feelings of humanity".[634] The *Remembrancer* opines that Henry's "excesses were disgraceful, disgusting, a violation of laws

---

[632] Tom Scriven, *Popular Virtue: Continuity and Change in Radical Moral Politics, 1820–70* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), p. 31.
[633] 'Soames' History of the Reformation', *The Christian Remembrancer*, Volume IX (July, 1827), p. 413.
[634] Soames, *Volume II (1826)*, p. 144.

both divine and human", and that Soames is not critical enough in his analysis of the king, that his commitment to opposing Roman Catholicism did not excuse his behaviour in other areas.[635] It is interesting that the *Remembrancer* was not as forgiving of Henry's defects as Soames.

The *Christian Observer* praised Soames' diligence and research prowess, despite his admission, but declared that a more focused series comprising fewer digressions and a shorter length would prove beneficial – perhaps such advice encouraged the publication of an abridged version of the *Reformation* volumes in 1828.[636] The *Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine* published a review that did not feel that Soames went far enough in his criticism of "Popery", contrary to the notion of Soames' anti-Catholicism above. The periodical wished that he had "more fully exhibited the immense superiority of scriptural truth, as inculcated by the Reformers, to the mummeries of Popery", and that Soames had shown more clearly in a historical context how Roman Catholicism had a tendency to "produce a slavish disposition, and to embarrass and perplex the mind".[637] In a short but favourable review, the *Gentleman's Magazine* declared that the fourth volume "is a standard historical work, and will no doubt find that favourable reception which it so justly merits".[638] That this was considered a "standard historical work" is indicative of the approach to historical writing in the mid-nineteenth century, and of how disciplinisation would affect the development of historiographical approaches over the course of the century.

Both Southey and Soames' publications were centred on an anti-Catholicism that was unrestrained and sought to instil in their readerships a profound fear of Roman intervention, couched in a form of patriotism that was based on England's switch to Protestantism. This switch was seen by both

---

[635] 'Soames' History of the Reformation', *The Christian Remembrancer*, p. 413.
[636] 'Review of Soames' History of the Reformation', *The Christian Observer*, Volume XXVII (1827), p. 427.
[637] *The Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine*, Volume XLIX (1826), p. 326.
[638] 'Review – Soames' *History of the* Reformation, *Gentleman's Magazine*, Volume XCVIII (March, 1828), p. 323.

Southey and Soames as a natural reaction to the deprivations of the Roman Catholic Church, an unavoidable consequence of its repeated and continuous deviations from 'authentic' Christianity as they saw it. As Poet Laureate, Southey's views held weight, and although Soames was far less well-known, his similarities to Southey in terms of unambiguous hostility to views different to his own were beneficial to him among those who shared his sentiments. This group was not as influential as it was thirty years before, and the shifting tide of political consideration outranked the reactionary Anglicanism of Southey and those who shared his views. In the years after Catholic Emancipation, it became apparent that a more measured appeal to wider sensibilities was needed in ecclesiastical writing, including in the form of histories. The following parts will demonstrate that this was not generally an immediate reaction, however. Henry Stebbing's work, though a step toward a more considered form of history writing, still bore many of the hallmarks of Southey and Soames' approach.

Part 2: Stebbing and the inadequacies of the 'old' approach

The two-volume *History of the Reformation*, written by Henry Stebbing and published in 1836, aims to give a comprehensive overview of both the chronology and the impact of the European Reformation, with the primary focus on the nefarious corruptions of the papacy, and by extension the Roman Catholic Church. Stebbing's work considers the Reformation within distinctive European contexts, and in the second volume, the Reformation in England is afforded one chapter (chapter XVIII), the same as France, and there are separate chapters devoted to the progress of the Reformation in other European states. The first volume is even less directly related to England and is much more concerned with developments in the German states, assessing the apparent depredations inherent

in the Roman Catholic Church and the subsequent responses to them. Thus, Stebbing's work can accurately be categorised as 'European history' from an ecclesiastical perspective. As with many contemporary ecclesiastical writers, Stebbing contextualises his subject within the scope of Roman Catholic error. As he states in the introductory remarks to the first volume:

> To prevent the light of the Gospel, therefore, from freely circulating, to put a ban upon reason when it ventured to assail even the outworks of usurped authority, was the grand policy of Rome; and in this it succeeded till it left no alternative for mankind but to groan perpetually under the most galling of yokes, or assert the rights of reason and the liberty of the Gospel, with a new and holy enthusiasm. Happily for our race, the spirit of truth led to the adoption of the latter course.[639]

Stebbing thus sets out, over the two volumes, to cover the development of Reformation ideas and to justify the opposition to the Roman Catholic church that occurred with it. Unfortunately, he was not "an academic of the highest ability", as was Guizot, and so his work on the Reformation fits in with the "crabbed learning which marks so much writing on the Reformation", rather than the "searching intelligence" that marks a "refreshing interlude" in Guizot's work on the subject.[640] François Guizot, a historian and statesman that was ambassador to London for a time in the 1840s and Prime Minister of France from September 1847-February 1848, forms an interesting point of comparison. He was a Protestant, born at a time when they did not have their full civil rights in France,

---

[639] Henry Stebbing, *History of the Reformation, Volume I* (London: John Taylor, 1836), p. 2.
[640] A. G. Dickens and John Tonkin, *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1985), p. 152.

and, as Larry Siedentop has noted, Guizot learned positive lessons from this discrimination, and that as a historian and politician "his theme was pluralism".[641] Though it is unfair to expect Stebbing to be at the same level as Guizot, it is worthwhile to note the difference in intention in history writing between them, and to witness Guizot embrace new paradigms while Stebbing is emblematic of Anglican historians that were still very much rooted in the traditional narratives that they had grown up with; narratives that they were apparently unwilling, or unable, to extricate themselves from.[642]

Similarly, Stebbing did not produce a work of the quality that Macaulay did, although he certainly shared the creation of works "flawed by unrelenting prejudices".[643] That is not to say that Stebbing's work is without merit: its "European" approach is commendable, and it is written with a degree of elan throughout. However, one cannot ignore the constant moralising throughout the work: it is virtually omnipresent and is retrogressive in comparison to the 'professionalisation' of history taking place in the mid-nineteenth century. Compare the introductory remarks above to those in Ranke's introduction to his *History of the Popes of Rome*:

> One of the most difficult problems presented to the historian of a nation or other political community is, to apprehend correctly the connection of its particular with its general relations. It is true that the peculiarities in the life of a nation, like those in the life of an individual, are determined by causes inherent in its original character, and therefore retain through every age a certain

[641] Larry Siedentop, 'Introduction' in François Guizot, *The History of Civilization in Europe* (Indiana: Liberty Fund Inc., 1997), trans. William Hazlitt, ed. Larry Siedentop, p. xix.
[642] For further reading regarding Guizot's innovative approaches to understanding history, see Dominique Poulot and Richard Wrigley, 'The Birth of Heritage: "le moment Guizot"', *Oxford Art Journal*, 11.2 (1998), pp. 40-56.
[643] *Ibid*, p. 155.

> uniformity. It is, however, equally true that every nation is continually influenced by general causes, which powerfully affect its progress.[644]

Though one can argue that this is a case of cherry-picking certain passages to make a point, the broader emphasis is on Stebbing's narrow approach, namely, to inherit the anti-Catholic traditions of English ecclesiastical historiography, in comparison to Ranke's more nuanced approach. While Stebbing's work can be said to have been guided by "conscious theoretical assumptions" in the same Manner that Ranke's was, the former's were centred around hostility to the papacy and a mission to convey this to the reader.[645] Whereas Ranke was a proponent of the critical method, Stebbing falls back on a presupposition that ecclesiastical history was shaped by the moral and intellectual depravities of the Catholic Church. At the end of volume II, he illustrates the necessity of the Reformation as a means of advancing the realisation of the Kingdom of God in the face of Roman Catholic power. At such moments, Stebbing says:

> The darkness prevails; the children of light pass away with their burning lamps; the divine word is delivered by slothful messengers; and the world sinks back into its unconsciousness of God and the end of his kingdom. Melancholy would be the reflections of the

---

[644] Leopold von Ranke, *The History of the Popes of Rome*, trans. Sarah Martin (London: John Murray, 1840), p. 2.

[645] Georg G. Iggers, 'Introduction' in Georg G. Iggers (ed.), Leopold von Ranke, *The Theory and Practice of History* (London: Routledge, 2011), p. xiii. This is not to say that Ranke's approach is the only one and that anything divergent is incorrect; rather, that Ranke's methodology embraces academic rigour and nuance in a way that Stebbing does not. While Stebbing presents his work in this style, it is betrayed by the anti-Catholicism inherent in every part. There is no rigorous consideration necessary, because it is, to him, self-evident that Protestantism, though flawed in part, is vastly superior to Roman Catholicism, and history reveals this to be the case.

> believer were there not something permanent on which to fix his eye in the midst of these changes.[646]

It is evident, in the context of the two volumes, that Stebbing is referring to the Catholic Church as the prevailing darkness; the 'children of light' are the brave reformers taking a stand against an institution that has (in the author's view) fallen well below what is expected of it. Stebbing falls into the pattern very common among ecclesiastical historians of the mid-nineteenth century, of using the past to provide a historical 'basis' for widely-held beliefs in the present age. At a time when anti-Catholic sentiments were still prevalent in English society, writers such as Stebbing provided legitimacy to these notions by providing 'proofs' of the fundamental flaws inherent within Roman Catholicism, thus validating, to holders of such opinions, their biases.

Henry Stebbing was a cleric, assigned to numerous parishes over the course of his life: from 1834 to 1879, he was the chaplain to University College Hospital, which he combined with clerical roles in and around London.[647] He was also a prolific writer, involved in a wide variety of literary activities in his time. Such a duality was viewed as a curiosity in Victorian England, and Stebbing was an advocate of the idea that the Church of England could utilise literary pursuits to enhance its message. As Arthur Burns notes in his *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry for Stebbing:

> The apparent contradiction between a clerical career and the literary activity through which he came to know Southey, Coleridge, Scott,

---

[646] Stebbing, Volume II, p. 338.
[647] Arthur Burns, 'Stebbing, Henry', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-26337 [accessed 18 June 2025].

> Dickens, and Thomas Campbell was recognized but deplored by Stebbing, who argued in The Athenaeum and elsewhere that the divorce between contemporary literature and the Church of England was a significant weakness in the religious life of the nation.[648]

As well as ecclesiastical histories, Stebbing was involved in editing and writing for periodicals, and he was involved in the foundation of the *Athenaeum* in 1828, becoming the working editor of the publication for some time in the early 1830s.[649] Stebbing's relationship with the *Athenaeum* is curious. In 1830, a review of his work *The History of Chivalry and the Crusades* was warmly praised, the reviewer declaring that "This volume of "Constable's Miscellany" is, on the whole, decidedly superior to the greater number of its predecessors".[650] Constable's Miscellany was a series of works published by Scottish publisher Archibald Constable, and Stebbing's contribution was the fiftieth volume, so the praise for the work was indeed effusive. Given his role at the publication, one might volunteer that a negative review of the work would not be published.

However, by 1836 and the publication of the *History of the Reformation*, the *Athenaeum* did exactly that, and carried a review that, while noting Stebbing's previous scholarship and commitment to his views, was critical of his approach to the subject in this work. Noting that clerical historians often analyse their subjects from their own theological perspectives, and chastising those that do, the publication states, "Mr. Stebbing, we are sorry, though not surprised, to perceive, is no exception to the censure we have passed on clerical historians. He is evidently a special pleader, whose object is to serve his party, *coute qui coute*

---

[648] Burns, 'Henry Stebbing', *ODNB*.
[649] William Prideaux Courtney, 'Stebbing, Henry (1799-1883)', *Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1900*, viewed online via https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Dictionary_of_National_Biography,_1885-1900/Stebbing,_Henry_(1799-1883) [accessed 18 June 2025].
[650] The *Athenaeum*, Volume CXV (January 9, 1830), p. 6.

[sic].”[651] The review accuses Stebbing of gross inaccuracies, and of consistently siding with the Protestant cause to the detriment of truth and integrity – fair criticisms, by all means. Concluding the review are the following, rather damning, remarks:

> We assure him that we value the blessings of the Reformation as much as he does; that we care as little for the papists: but to no church, to no party, to no individuals, will we ever sacrifice one iota of truth; for none will we ever, knowingly, suppress fact; and though we may not win the applause of a bigoted coterie, we shall, at least, have the approbation of the many who dare think for themselves, and, what is of infinitely more importance, that of our own consciences.[652]

Stebbing’s role in the establishment of the publication clearly did not carry much weight when it came to sparing him from accusations of membership among a coterie of bigots. Such a summation of Stebbing’s ecclesiastical outlook contrasts with the response to his establishment of the *Christian Enquirer* in 1848, which he owned and edited. The *Christian Reformer, or Unitarian Magazine and Review*, stated that the *Enquirer* was “moderate as to the authority of the Church” and that the introductory remarks to the first edition could scarcely be more critical of the Church of England.[653]

Such moderation is not present in the *History of the Reformation*, as the *Athenaeum* reviewer correctly asserts. Stebbing’s previous work, the two-volume

---

[651] The *Athenaeum*, Volume CDXLII (April 16, 1836), p. 270.
[652] *Ibid*, p. 271.
[653] ‘Critical Notices’, *The Christian Reformer, or Unitarian Magazine and Review*, Series 2, Volume IV (January, 1848), p. 118.

History of the Christian Church, published in 1833, is not as blatant in its prejudices and even ends on an inclusive tone. Concluding the work with a summation of the key subjects pertinent to the development of the Christian church prior to the Reformation, he states that they:

> Involve principles dear to every friend of humanity, to whatever church or party he belongs; and the writer may fairly be charged with folly and presumption, who could venture to approach near the limits of such a theme without having sufficient space to give to every circumstance of importance its due place and expansion.[654]

For Stebbing, then, the Reformation represents the period during which the depravities and vices of the Roman Catholic church peaked, thus necessitating a reaction from those who, as he sees it, sought to uphold the standards that Christianity should represent. This was a contested area in the nineteenth century, and there was an ever-increasing number of commentators, from a wide range of theological perspectives, seeking to define, or perhaps even redefine, the essence of the faith. Arthur Burns has referred to "the contemporary importance of religious publishing" during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in seeking to maintain England as an '*ancien régime'*: writers such as Stebbing attempted to utilise this prominence to make a case for their visions of contemporary Anglicanism, using historical precedent to justify their assertions.[655]

---

[654] Stebbing, *The History of the Christian Church, volume II* (London: Jon Taylor, 1833), p. 350.
[655] Arthur Burns, *The Diocesan Revival in the Church of England c.1800–1870* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 4. Burns goes on to state: "For all the contemporary importance of religious publishing, knowledge of the development of the institutional presence of the Church, and with it the 'means of delivery' of potentially ideologically loaded sermons and pastoral work, is of great importance in assessing the plausibility of such claims".

To this end, Stebbing makes numerous appraisals throughout, offering praise and condemnation as he sees fit. However, this is not always a consistent endeavour. For example, in volume I, he reproaches Martin Luther, otherwise mostly a figure of adoration, for his attitude toward those who disagreed with him:

> The Protestants were convicted of heresy; and heresy had always been considered, not as a disease to be viewed with compassion, but as a crime to be punished by the sword. Luther himself spoke of those who dissented from him, in terms which manifested almost as much ignorance of the true nature of religious freedom as appears in the denunciation of the popes. This lamentable error continued to infect the minds of men to a late period of the reformation [sic], and it was not till after civil freedom had greatly increased, that Christian liberty could assert its rights in safety.[656]

This is rather a liberal approach from Stebbing, and one that perhaps reflects the relative moderation that his later periodical, the *Christian Enquirer*, would adopt. However, in the second volume, he is scathing in his assessment of John of Leiden (Leyden in Stebbing's work), a leader of the Anabaptist movement in Münster in the 1530s, subtitling part of the fifteenth chapter "The inhuman barbarity of John of Leyden". Detailing the Anabaptist insurrection in 1535, and the subsequent failure and execution of the ringleaders, Stebbing concludes as follows:

---

[656] Stebbing, *History of the Reformation, Volume I*, p. 236.

> Thus ended the reign of John of Leyden. Never had the name of Christianity been employed to support a grosser imposture. Licentiousness and cruelty marked every step of its progress; and had not Divine Providence brought it to a speedy termination, every vice which shrouded its head on the downfall of heathenism would have been resuscitated and again deified.[657]

So much for religious freedom. Of course, Stebbing's vitriol stems from his reading of the reports of the behaviour of the Anabaptists, but these are almost certainly exaggerations made by their opponents, both Catholic and Protestant. Even so, it is perhaps not a logical inconsistency in his theology that Christianity can tolerate freedom of expression up to a point, beyond which there must be a level of condemnation, and possibly not always as dramatic as above. That the Reformation was, in the author's eyes, such a crucial period in the development of Christianity meant that any attempts to divert its gains had to be rejected in the strongest possible terms. Stebbing believed in the importance of the Church of England and a set liturgy upon which worship would be based. In his view, the completion of the *Book of Common Prayer* meant that "the people of England received from the venerable fathers of our church the noblest gift, after the translation of the Bible, they ever received from man".[658] Thus, in volume one, freedom of religion is encouraged in response to the vices of the Roman Catholic church, but by volume two there are attempts to set boundaries upon which the Church of England, and by extension Protestantism, was founded and which should continue to be maintained.

Thus, Stebbing's work is a slightly confused mix between the ardently rigid Anglicanism as propagated by Southey and Soames, with elements of toleration

---

[657] Stebbing, *History of the Reformation, Volume II*, pp. 111-12.
[658] *Ibid*, p. 274.

and moderation that were mostly inconceivable to the pair assessed in part one. As an attempt to regain the initiative and refocus ecclesiastical history, it was not tremendously successful. Such an aim was almost certainly impossible by this point, however. Stebbing produced his two volumes in the mid-1830s, at a time when the Church of England was trying to run the gamut between reasserting a form of authority in the wake of Catholic Emancipation and trying to avoid ceding further ground and witness momentum continue to build up against it. Stebbing's work embodies this dichotomy: the anti-Catholicism that was still standard for most Anglicans is tempered by a moderation that is noticeably sparse, if not absent entirely, in the two previous histories considered in this chapter.

The rather confused responses to Stebbing's work, and the situation of it within the existing ecclesiastical public sphere, further highlight the confused and contested picture of Anglicanism in England in the 1830s. Stebbing's work was part of a wider process of Anglican ecclesiastical historians taking a more restrained approach to their craft, especially with regard to Roman Catholicism. Significantly, the next time that the Church of Rome came into conflict with the Church of England, over the restoration of Catholic dioceses in England in 1850, prominent ecclesiastical historians maintained this continued process of moderation, in spite of waves of active 'no-popery' protests. The final part of this chapter will assess two examples of such works that took this approach.

Part 3: Maurice, Hussey and a more 'refined' approach

Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries was published in 1854, and was the work of Frederick Denison Maurice, one of the most influential Anglican theologians of the nineteenth century. Maurice wrote extensively, and his interpretations and implementations of Christianity have received attention from historians who have engaged with Victorian Christianity. Maurice has left a legacy that has not been ignored: Bernard Reardon states that Maurice was "arguably the most original theological thinker that the nineteenth century produced in this country".[659] Arthur Ramsey qualifies his importance in the following passage:

> Suffice it to say here that by the close of the century the typical Anglican view of the relation between religion and questions of the social order had undergone a very big change. And among the causes a special place belongs not to a direct influence of Maurice so much as to a diffused influence which passed from him through the more popular and intelligible energies of Charles Kingsley.[660]

Ramsey's suggestion is that while Maurice's works and theological ideas circulated among intellectual circles in Victorian society, they required a more prominent figure, such as Kingsley, to reach a wider audience. That Maurice influenced his peers, and those that came shortly after him toward the end of the nineteenth century, has been demonstrated by the work of Frances Knight, who

---

[659] Bernard Reardon, *Religious Thought in the Victorian Age: A Survey from Coleridge to Gore* (London: Longman, 1980), p. 118.
[660] Arthur Michael Ramsey, *F. D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), p. 100.

illustrates the importance of Maurice to the changing nature of Anglican theological thought, and cites other influential figures that took inspiration from him.[661] While the importance of Maurice as a theologian has been widely considered, his considerations of church history, and the concomitant influence on his theological outlook, has not been assessed. Maurice did not write many histories, and his written work was much more concerned with the impact of the Bible in present society rather than in any given historical context. The work analysed here can be considered as a very brief overview of Maurice's views of early church history and its relevance to nineteenth-century Anglicanism.

In the introduction to *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries* (hereafter referred to as '*Lectures*'), Maurice declares "I have not attempted to exchange the familiarity of the lecture-room for the solemnity of an historical style", stating that "the latter might be more agreeable and respectful to the reader, but the former is more natural to me".[662] Indeed, *Lectures* is written in a vernacular style, and it must be said that it suffers from it: frequent reference to 'my previous lectures' is often of little help when such references are 200 pages back in print form. Maurice's approach in this regard is not unique, and it was very commonly used in collections of sermons. However, whereas Guizot's *History of Civilization in Europe* meshes the language of prose intended to be spoken aloud with a readability that makes life easier for his audience. Maurice's familiar style comes across as rather outdated when compared to other examples, especially given that Guizot's work was produced over twenty years before. One example of Maurice's style, which could be considered typical, is as follows:

---

[661] Frances Knight, *Victorian Christianity at the Fin de Siècle: The Culture of English Religion in a Decadent Age* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2016), p. 229.
[662] Frederick Denison Maurice, *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries* (Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1854), p. ix.

> I hope I may assist you in profiting by them all, as well as in using the work of Mosheim, which is a most learned and valuable index to ecclesiastical history, drawn up by an honest, conscientious man, but from which I think you would hardly learn what the church is, or what it has done in the world. If you read him in English, you must get the latest translation, revised by Soames. Gibbon, though he hated Christianity, will make you feel the reality of the Church, and its influence on the politics of the world, far better than the regular Ecclesiastical Historian.[663]

Of course, Maurice's approach must be contextualised within the aforementioned development of historical writing in the nineteenth century, and the reproduction of lectures was not uncommon, but the style does not compare favourably to more 'polished' examples of the time. Regarding Maurice's academic abilities, contemporary opinions were decidedly mixed. While John Stuart Mill and Charles Kingsley celebrated Maurice's intellectual prowess, Thomas Carlyle declared that he was "one of the more uninteresting men of genius".[664] There was criticism of his merit as a speaker from Irish poet Aubrey de Vere, who "compared listening to him to eating pea-soup with a fork", presumably in the sense that it's a complete waste of time.[665] Reading the *Lectures*, one feels that there is perhaps merit in such a summation, particularly given the preponderance of notes in the margins to clarify the often-convoluted nature of the main text, despite its withering tone. Evidently, this would have been for Maurice's benefit as a lecturer, to refer to key topics if needed, but they serve a

---

[663] Maurice, *Lectures*, pp. 163-64.
[664] Hugh Walker, *The Literature of the Victorian Era* (Cambridge: University Press, 1921), p.101.
[665] *Ibid*.

dual purpose in assisting the reader to keep track of the subject at hand when the main text becomes overly verbose.

A contemporary of Maurice was Robert Hussey, who was Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Oxford from 1842 until his death in 1856, the first holder of the position, as mentioned in the introduction. There seems to be a paucity of biographical material on Hussey, but the work considered here contains a short biography of him, written by one 'Staverton' as an addendum to the second edition, published in 1863, some years after Hussey's death.[666] This biography notes that Hussey had long considered such matters as "Professorial teaching" and "the importance of a more elaborate Elocution on the part of the Clergy", and had put forth his views on such matters.[667] Therefore it is no surprise that Hussey sought to utilise both his skills and his position at Oxford to address what was seen as a renewed threat emanating from Rome in the early 1850s. *The Rise of the Papal Power Traced in Three Lectures* was originally published in 1851 in response to the papal bull *Universalis Ecclesiae*, issued by Pope Pius IX in September 1850.[668] The bull created an alternative Roman Catholic diocesan hierarchy in England, supplanted by the Anglican establishment since the sixteenth century, and it caused a considerable degree of consternation among Protestants and aroused much anti-Catholic feeling in the country.

Hussey asserted that such robust criticism of Roman Catholicism was necessary as the Church of Rome was openly hostile to Anglicanism, and thus it was right and proper that the integrity of the Anglican Church be protected. As Hussey states in the preface to the lectures:

---

[666] I have not been able to ascertain who this 'Staverton' is: the ODNB contains no results, and other searches have proven fruitless thus far. Presumably a colleague or friend of Hussey in some capacity, but I have no solid information about them.

[667] Robert Hussey, *The Rise of the Papal Power Traced in Three Lectures* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1863, 2nd edition), p. xv.

[668] See Danilo Raponi, *Religion and Politics in the Risorgimento: Britain and the New Italy, 1861-1875* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), pp. 36-43.

> The facts do speak with the voice of truth, which nothing will ever silence, against the system of the Roman Communion, as it now is. It is no pleasure to me, God knows, to dip my pen in gall, and rail at "Antichristian corruptions", or the faults of any community "that nameth the name of Christ". And, in these times of doubt and fear especially, every good man would labour to "build up" rather than "pull down". But something we have a right to say in our own defence, against those who deny that we possess anything, and would take from us everything which we have, if the power were given to them.[669]

Hussey paints himself as a reluctant interventionist, not keen to engage in criticism of his fellow Christians but forced to do so due to the apparent intentions of the Roman Church to undermine and even eradicate Protestantism. He states that though the supremacy of Rome might have been a fact in the early years of the faith, by the mid-nineteenth century notions of "Roman Supremacy" aroused only feelings of "disunion and disorder" conveyed in language "which is unintelligible to all nations alike".[670] Hussey seeks to chart this transformation in a series of three lectures, the third of which is presented in two parts, perhaps reflecting the fact that it would have been delivered to his students in separate lectures.

Hussey asserts that his opposition to *Universalis Ecclesiae* was not merely religious quibbling but an attempt to protect the integrity of the English state, as "Papal authority is a political principle, as well as a religious one".[671] He continued

---

[669] Robert Hussey, *The Rise of the Papal Power Traced in Three Lectures* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1863, 2nd edition), pp. xxxv-xxxvi.
[670] *Ibid*, pp. xxxviii-xxxix.
[671] *Ibid*, p. xxxix.

by stating that "subjects of a free government may hold what opinion they like of the Pope's authority as S. Peter's successor", but that, in regions under Papal authority that is not the case; indeed, "if the relative positions of the parties were inverted" in England, "they would be in duty bound by their own principles to punish us".[672] In the course of these lectures, Hussey sought to regalvanise the fear of Roman Catholic tyranny in an extensive and intricate reading of Church history: he attempts to demonstrate an 'intellectual' basis for his concerns of Catholic imposition into English ecclesiastical life. This sets up his core argument: that while Catholics have the liberty to express their views in England, "no mandate nor functionary of the Pope can claim a right to be received and acknowledged within this country, in consequence of that liberty which is allowed".[673] *Universalis Ecclesiae* was therefore a violation of this maxim that Hussey had contrived, and subsequently necessitated this series of lectures as a form of repudiation.

Hussey's lectures, as set out in the printed work, expect a high level of existing knowledge on the part of the audience and assume a familiarity with events central to his thesis on Rome's arrogation of ecclesiastical supremacy. As well as frequent passages in Latin, which his audience would have been expected to understand, Hussey often utilises direct quotes in Greek. The text is replete with ecclesiastical terminology and assumes that its audience does not need to expand upon them unless a criticism of their interpretation forms part of the argument. These lectures were intended for a student body cognizant of the classics, and the published editions had the potential to be much more effective as tools for clergy to repackage for their congregations, should they so desire, rather than to be re-delivered verbatim. Owen Chadwick described Hussey as "safe, solid, dull": his *Three Lectures* could reasonably claim the first two of these

---

[672] *Ibid*.
[673] *Ibid*, p. xl.

descriptors, though usually not the third.[674] His refutations of Roman Catholicism were grounded in doctrinal controversies, and he attempted to tread a well-worn path of demonstrating Roman Catholicism's inherent fallibilities through its responses to these controversies. The ecclesiastical rebuttals that he put forward were in the style of erudite Anglicanism, steeped in detailed analyses of a vast array of texts, emanating from councils and synods as well as scripture.

Much like Hussey, Maurice sought to demonstrate that Christianity had been corrupted by the influence of Rome, but he aimed to do so in a manner befitting the more analytical approaches more common in historical methodologies in the mid-nineteenth century. In *The Kingdom of Christ*, Maurice frequently stresses this point: for example, asserting that the importance of family and society led the Teutonic states to Protestantism, whereas the Latin nations and their "lower standard of domestic and national feeling" became Catholic.[675] For Maurice, the notion of a centralised authority within the Church was invalid, and not in keeping with the original principles of the Church.[676] The *Lectures* can thus be read as Maurice's historical justification for his theological perspectives, and the basis for his rejection of Catholic hierarchy. Unlike other commentators, such as Southey, Maurice hoped for a reconciliation between Protestantism and Catholicism, and hoped that the Church of England might succeed in such an endeavour.[677] He believed that the press was an ideal method of reaching the wider public, that it could enable the Church to establish its visions of Anglicanism in the face of increasing, and developing, opposition.[678]

---

[674] Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church: Part 1* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1966), p. 228. Chadwick is discussing the appointments to various positions made by Robert Peel, and Hussey is cited as an example of this policy due to his muted opposition to the Oxford Movement.
[675] F. D. Maurice, *The Kingdom of Christ*, Volume I, 4th Edition (London: Macmillan and Co., 1891), p. 105.
[676] Jeremy Morris: *F. D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 87.
[677] Joshua King, *Imagined Spiritual Communities in Britain's Age of Print* (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2015), p. 61.
[678] *Ibid*, particularly Chapter 2, 'F. D. Maurice's Universal Society', pp. 57-95.

Though *Lectures* is something separate from the press that Maurice wished to utilise for ecclesiastical purposes, its style, discussed above, is emblematic of his wish to make these connections to the wider public. Though the *Lectures* were intended for a learned audience, he still hoped that his familiar style employed in the text might increase the likelihood of his readers engaging with the subject matter. Maurice sees this as a lesson for all aiming to achieve such connections: "may it not help us, to think that they are still listening to us?" he asks at the end of the preface, encouraging other ecclesiastical authors to consider the human connection as an aid to reaching as many people as possible.[679] These lectures form the earliest historical basis for Maurice's theology, and the style they were published in are emblematic of his philosophy, held since his days as a journalist in the 1820s, that a familiarity with, and reasoned appeal to, readers will elicit the best response to the contents.

This approach can be read in the *Lectures*, which are free from the sorts of attacks against the Roman Catholic faith that can be found in Southey's *The Book of the Church*. Maurice sought to provide rational reasons for rejecting the Supremacy of Rome, rather than to create further divisions with charged rhetoric designed to aggravate and alienate. For example, in the second lecture on the first century, he indicates that the original character of Christianity was expressed in Greek, as the Roman expansion did not diminish the language or the culture, and thus the early Church was shaped by Greek influences, rather than Roman. As a conciliatory note, Maurice acknowledges the impact of Roman rule on Britain. He states that Julius Caesar put in place changes that would forever alter Britain's destiny, and that "God used him to do that work".[680] Thus, Maurice demonstrated the cultural impact of Rome on the wider world, including Britain, while simultaneously attempting to show that this did not extend, at least as far as the Roman Catholic Church might argue, into the development of early Christianity.

---

[679] F. D. Maurice, *Lectures*, p. ix.
[680] *Ibid*, pp. 13-33. The quote cited is from page 28.

Maurice did not seek to mimic Southey and Hussey by denying the Roman Catholic Church every morsel of influence in the early centuries. Rather than see the establishment of Roman Supremacy as a cynical grab for power, he equates the propensity for prominent Christian martyrs to have their remains interred in Rome with a natural assumption on the part of surviving Christians that Rome was thus inherently imbued with a natural authority, based on this established fact.[681]

Furthermore, much of Maurice's lectures deal with the persecution of early Christianity, of the Roman Church's fortitude in being treated as a perverse and bizarre sect within the Roman Empire. His discussion of the characterisation of Christians as 'Atheists', the strange rituals they partook in compared to the vibrancy of paganism, and the audacity to consider themselves apart from tolerated monotheism in the form of Judaism, are of much merit, despite the overly familiar style of the prose alluded to above. Indeed, Maurice's work in this area is not out of place with modern scholarship in this area, albeit less academically rigorous than is to be expected nowadays.[682] Though *Lectures* is, by present-day standards, crafted in a highly unusual fashion, it is not without its value as a work of history.

Hussey deviated from ecclesiastical historians who came before him, particularly in terms of the language he used. He does not use terms such as 'Papist' or 'Romish' at all and was sure to cite primary sources in support of his arguments, rather than relying on inflammatory invective to persuade his audience. Hussey's lectures repeatedly sought to demonstrate factual bases for his primary assertion that "the supremacy of the See of Rome began in the fourth century", and that it was a manipulated fiction rather than a natural continuation

---

[681] *Ibid*, pp. 250-2.
[682] F. D. Maurice, *Lectures*, pp. 292-302. One such modern comparison, written by a leading scholar in the field, would be Bart D. Ehrman's *The Triumph of Christianity: How a Forbidden Religion Swept the World* (London: Oneworld Publications, 2019).

of the prominence granted to St Peter by Jesus Christ.[683] Hussey's work formed part of a burgeoning body of ecclesiastical history that focused to a far greater extent on the rational rather than the emotional, to deconstruct the notion of Catholic supremacy from a doctrinal, rather than moral, standpoint.

As William Greenhill has noted, though Hussey was "in a general way opposed to the Oxford Movement… he was not a party man", and he came out against proposals to condemn Newman's Tract 90 for a second time in 1845, four years after its first publication.[684] In an updated entry for the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew describes Hussey as "a protestant high-churchman of an old-fashioned and cautious kind", and also that he was "not an ecclesiastical historian to rival the Germans".[685] This combination of 'old-fashioned' high-churchmanship and reluctance to occupy contentious ground in doctrinal disputes perhaps goes some way to explaining Hussey's attempts to appeal to the rational, and maybe it is appropriate to associate him with a lingering latitudinarianism that was popular among Anglicans in the eighteenth century, but which had begun to unravel and transmogrify in the nineteenth – perhaps into forms akin to Hussey's work. It might also be explained by a realisation among ecclesiastical writers in the mid-nineteenth century that the old method of over-emphasised vitriol toward Roman Catholicism, à la Southey and Soames, was no longer effective.

The developing discipline of history and its attendant requirement for 'professional' research, combined with the reality that Catholicism had gained ground in England and was potentially poised to do so again via *Universalis Ecclesiae*, meant that a new approach was necessary. Though Hussey was not

---

[683] Hussey, p. 1.
[684] William Alexander Greenhill, 'Hussey, Robert', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Volume 28, 1885-1900*, viewed online via https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Dictionary_of_National_Biography,_1885-1900/Hussey,_Robert [accessed 18 June 2025].
[685] H. C. G. Matthew, 'Hussey, Robert', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-14269?rskey=VUJnQa&result=2 [accessed 18 June 2025].

principally an ecclesiastical historian – it was secondary to him after his lecturing – he still recognised this need to approach historical writing, even with respect to reproducing lectures he had previously given, in a different method to how it had typically been delivered earlier in the nineteenth century.

It may not be unreasonable to view Hussey as a successor to those early-nineteenth century historians that "experience[ed] the elation of a new and concrete vision of the past", as Stephen Bann has described various creative types that worked from this new basis of relative certainty.[686] Hussey's work is infused with a strong conviction that Papal Supremacy is a creation enabled and emboldened by the historical precedence of Rome and its Empire, even at a time when the Western Empire was crumbling, and indeed extinguished permanently in AD 476. The idea of Hussey and other ecclesiastical 'historians' as part of a nascent culture of historiography in the nineteenth century deserves further consideration.

Hussey's work also needs to be considered in the context of continued fear of Roman Catholic 'intrusion' into English life, both spiritual and temporal. The Oxford Movement had made attempts to bring together Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Anglican perspectives together, and Catholic Emancipation had created concern, bordering on hysteria in some quarters, that further concessions would be made. There was a fear that the Reformation, categorically enshrined in the Glorious Revolution in the eyes of its most ardent supporters in the nineteenth century, had already been tarnished, and that further encroachments would erode its God-given legitimacy to an even greater extent. As such, a basis of historical criticism emerged in the nineteenth century to challenge the validity of Catholic, or Anglo-Catholic, perspectives. 'Liberal Anglicans' were the first to criticise the "essentially unhistorical nature of the ethos of the Oxford Movement".[687] These

---

[686] Bann, p. 6.
[687] Duncan Forbes, *The Liberal Anglican Idea of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), p. 103.

Anglicans "attacked the Romantic medievalism which was a strong element in the Oxford Movement, and which tended to lead men to Rome".[688] Hussey goes beyond such style of criticism, both chronologically and stylistically. He does not argue that Roman and Anglo-Catholics have skewed understandings of historical incidents and developments that are otherwise accepted; rather, that an accurate reading of contemporary accounts of councils, disputes, encyclicals, and other ecclesiastical communiques reveals that the Papacy's basis for its exalted position is, in his view, demonstrably without merit.

Maurice and Hussey both espoused the view that Roman Catholicism was to be opposed, and the background of the Ecclesiastical Tithes Act of 1851, a largely ineffective attempt to prevent the Roman Catholic Church from using episcopal titles in England, added weight to their concerns. Protests and petitions against Catholicism re-emerged in the early 1850s and appeared to galvanise Anglicans keen to oppose the influence of Rome. Though Maurice and Hussey both contributed to the historical criticism of Catholicism, they did so in a manner and style that attempted to mirror the analytical histories that had emerged across Europe in the first half of the nineteenth century.

However, virulent anti-Catholicism was still very much ingrained within Anglicanism, and the rise and fall of the Oxford Movement had left many observers fearful of what an established Catholic base in England might achieve, to the detriment of Anglicans across the country. Hussey appealed to this more primal fear when he felt sufficiently compelled to do so. For him, it was the codification of the doctrine of Papal Supremacy, developed over a period of 150 years, that was most threatening. During this period, the various controversies and issues that the Church faced made the Papacy less amenable to dissent and more aggressive in imposing its claim of superiority over other ecclesiastical centres. Ian Wood has attributed the Papacy's ability to do this to the increasing

[688] Forbes, p. 103.

religiosity of Western Europe in the later years of the Western Roman Empire, and in the first few centuries after its fall.[689] Hussey saw an emboldened institution that had survived scandal and intrigue and managed to strengthen its hand into the bargain. As a result, he suggests, the Papacy was destined to continue to commit further egregious acts of despotism and to debase the sanctity of the Christian faith further over the centuries. In a particularly polemical passage, Hussey contends that:

> Succeeding Popes never retracted, but adopted and uniformly improved upon the pretensions of their predecessors; how an Innocent went beyond a Julius, as Leo beyond Innocent, and a Gregory VII, in later times, overshot him; when we see the care and anxiety with which Popes seem in all things, and sometimes above all things, to have provided for the security of their own authority; and how this end was carried out by interpolations and falsification of ecclesiastical documents, which, when detected, were never retracted or disavowed, and somewhat later grew into a notorious and scandalous system of forgery; when we weigh all these things, it seems impossible for unprejudiced readers to acquit the Papal Seat of the charge of worldly ambition and corrupt motives.[690]

---

[689] Ian Wood, 'Entrusting Western Europe to the Church, 400-750', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6.23 (2013), pp. 37-73.

[690] Hussey, p. 149. Hussey's use of 'interpolations' is interesting in the context of Jean Mabillon's consideration of the authenticity of certain medieval documents, and indeed whether their verisimilitude was relevant or not, in *De re diplomatica*, translated and published as *On Diplomatics*, toward the end of the eighteenth century. It is impossible to assert whether or not Hussey was familiar with Mabillon's work, but the use of this particular term is intriguing. For an English translation of Mabillon's work, see 'On Diplomatics', trans. Richard Wertis, in Peter Gay and Victor G. Wexler (eds.) *Historians at Work, Volume II* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), pp. 161-98.

This was a return to the central thesis of the three lectures: that Papal ambition, based on false pretexts, had grown into a monolithic beast that "unprejudiced readers" (written without a trace of irony, it would seem) must oppose, or else be swept up in its wake. With the announcement of *Universalis Ecclesiae* in 1850, that "ambition" and "corruption" again threatened English sensibilities and seeking to institute the resumption of an authority rejected by the English. Thus, Hussey was encouraging his readers to be wary of this challenge and was doing so in a style that attempted to use an emergent style of historical writing to offer intellectual arguments to justify his anti-Catholicism.

Perhaps inspired by the values that underpinned the Christian Socialism that he did so much to craft, and by his desire to see Christians come together in a spirit of unity whenever possible, Maurice consistently attempted to avoid the sort of attacks that Hussey periodically launched, in spite of his own reservations regarding Roman Catholicism. Overall, the *Lectures* appear to embody that which was written of Maurice by William Edward Collins in *Typical English Churchmen* (1902):

> His method was ever the same: drawing out all that was best in others, never trying to force himself upon them; going as far as possible with his opponent, and always endeavouring to discover some bond between them, some common ground deep down then their disagreement; and abhorring nothing so much as the spirit of partisanship which so often causes disunion and hazards the cause of the Truth by presuming to be its advocate.[691]

[691] William Edward Collins, 'Frederick Denison Maurice' in Collins (ed.), *Typical English Churchmen: From Parker to Maurice* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1902), p. 359.

The *Lectures*, and their lack of the sort of agitation and condemnation of 'opponents' as found in Southey and Hussey, is perhaps due to Maurice's theological conviction that "all human beings are in Christ, [and] any human being has the potential to initiate the transformation of English society".[692] Thus, it was true for Maurice that cohesion and cooperation was vital for the Church in England for these two reasons: Christ was present in the unfolding of human history, and therefore all involved in its history worked through him, and this potential in each person threatened the very fabric of society, and its (Anglican) Christian basis, and so needed to be curtailed through cooperation rather than encouraged via division. Charles Richard Sanders' explanation of Maurice's position remains a good one: that although the Universal Church was "conceived as resting upon eternal, immutable truth", the form of revelation could change over time, and thus while the Roman Church worked in its day, the Church of England after the Reformation was a different, and more relevant, embodiment of the truth that transcended time and space.[693] Toward the end of the *Lectures*, Maurice suggests that "to oppose sects and heresies by decrees, because they interfere with good order and efficient work, was the temptation of the Roman Church", and that "this led to a dangerous assumption of authority" in due course.[694] The African Church, Maurice states, sought to crush heresies "by setting up a certain opinion which should be maintained as the right opinion on the ground of tradition or of prescription". Thus:

> The heretics were not wrong for exalting opinions into the place of Christ, but only for choosing one opinion about Him instead of another. I believe that to learn the difference between these two

[692] Paul Daffyd Jones, 'Jesus Christ and the Transformation of English Society: The "Subversive Conservatism" of Frederick Denison Maurice', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 96.2 (April, 2003), p. 227.
[693] Charles Richard Sanders, 'Was Frederick Denison Maurice a Broad-Churchman?', *Church History* 3.3 (September, 1934), p. 230.
[694] Maurice, *Lectures*, p. 397.

> principles and methods is to learn the cardinal lesson of ecclesiastical history, the one which all its darkest and its brightest records are intended to impress upon our hearts.[695]

Though Hussey and Maurice were different in many respects – the final quote directly above would never have come from the pen of Hussey, for example – they shared a common approach in their work to speak to reason, rather than predominantly rely on emotional appeals wrapped up in extravagant prose. Both Maurice and Hussey were around the age of fifty when the works cited here were produced and were old enough to remember the process of Catholic Emancipation, and the failure of its opponents to prevent it. While both were fearful of further Catholic gains in England, Hussey perhaps more so than Maurice, they also both recognised that a more erudite and considered evaluation of Catholic 'failings' was necessary to make an impact on their potential readerships. Though the Oxford Movement had largely fizzled out by the early 1850s, its legacy was still prominent, and there was a recognition among some Church of England members (though by no means all) that a bullish and confrontational approach was more likely to cause further rifts and divisions than it was to unify disparate factions. Thus, by the 1850s, ecclesiastical historians were practically required to present their work in a more 'scholarly' way, not merely to conform with more rigorous standards of history as a discipline, but to maintain the Church of England's standing in the nation. Raucous denunciations of 'opponents' were no longer sufficient by the 1850s: Maurice and Hussey represented the new methods of presenting history, ones that required their authors to limit their prejudicial outpourings or repackage them in more palatable passages for their audiences.

---

[695] Maurice, *Lectures*, p. 397.

Both Maurice's and Hussey's works were originally intended as oral presentations, *i.e.* lectures, which were subsequently published in the form of books. Hussey's lectures were given to his students at Oxford; Maurice originally planned to deliver his to students at King's College, Cambridge, but their association ended before this was possible. This formulation of oral into written works will, naturally, apply in the final chapter on sermons, but, clearly, they were not the only media to which this applied. Relevant to this chapter is the fact that these works began as lectures to be given to university students in an academic environment and were then published for public consumption. Both went through multiple editions. There was evidently an appetite for this material within the public sphere, and it is this thesis' contention that, rather than Maurice and Hussey being outliers, the interest in their work points to broader interest in more refined studies of history. While Maurice was a well-known name, at least among those involved in the public sphere, Hussey was not. It is not unreasonable to suggest that it was his role as Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History that drew interest in his work. That this position led to his books going through multiple editions adds further support to the idea that there was greater interest in academic religious history, and that the increased sophistication in the craft was allied to the ecclesiastical public sphere experiencing a concomitant refinement.

Conclusion

This chapter has evaluated a selection of case studies across the period 1815-61, and has charted a shift in approach, from overtly partisan polemics to relatively measured approaches to historical enquiry that began to incorporate methodologies in accordance with the more professional approach to the discipline. The overarching theme of this chapter has been that this

"professionalisation" of ecclesiastical history occurred in tandem with a general sophistication of the subject across all forms of history. While histories had been written since Herodotus, and advances had occurred since antiquity (as one would expect), History really developed into a true field of scholarship in the nineteenth century. This is not to denigrate the works that had come before this period – Gibbon's achievements are still remarkable, but his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* would be at least somewhat different, in both methodology and tone, if written today. The developments in the nineteenth century are important in accounting for this disparity.

Concurrent with the increasingly "professional" approach in the mid-nineteenth century were the theological, denominational, and party disputes, such as those evaluated in the first two chapters of this thesis. The growth in Nonconformism challenged the position of the Church of England, undermining its status as a pillar of the State. Moreover, the Established Church was a house divided; Low and High Church were frequently at odds, and the Oxford Movement further complicated the situation. Anti-Catholicism had typically been a unifying force for disparate voices, and although it remained so throughout the period under consideration, it was not sufficient to hold back the tide of ecclesiastical fervour on more nuanced theological subjects. In turn, ecclesiastical historians had to adapt. Although they could still be opposed to the Roman Church, more refined analyses were necessary as the discipline developed in the nineteenth century. Popular anti-Catholicism appears to have been on the wane by the late 1850s, and possibly even sooner; Walter Ralls has observed that although *Universalis Ecclesiae* and the reinstatement of the Roman Catholic diocesan hierarchy caused outrage, it had effectively petered out by the spring of 1851.[696] Anti-Catholicism was becoming less of a focal point among the general

[696] Walter Ralls, 'The Papal Aggression of 1850: A Study in Victorian Anti-Catholicism', *Church History*, 43.2 (June, 1974), p. 256.

population; for intellectuals and those participating in the intellectual public sphere, it was positively unfashionable.

Of course, opprobrium towards Roman Catholics did not disappear from ecclesiastical histories; rather, it became necessary to avoid polemics and provide reasoned, precise evidence demonstrating the "errors" of that denomination. Ecclesiastical history came to require the same standards of intellectual rigour as "secular" histories. Legitimation of religious perspective required academic "proofs" – merely writing from an Anglican position was becoming less of a requirement, although it was very much still considered the default position. This is why there was so much uproar directed at *Essays and Reviews*, which appeared to challenge fundamental positions of Christianity, such as the reliability of the Bible and the existence of Hell. While neither position was new, it was the first time such ideas had permeated the printed public sphere, and indeed beyond. While it is going too far to suggest that the development of ecclesiastical history charted in this chapter anticipated the emergence of *Essays and Reviews*, it can be stated that the application of historical methodologies to the Bible, including critical analysis, was the result of a longer shift in considerations of the study of ecclesiastical history. Anti-Catholicism somewhat lost its lustre in the face of apparent challenges to the Bible itself.

Such sentiments comprised one aspect of more intellectual conceptions of the study of ecclesiastical history, and this process accelerated during the middle years of the nineteenth century. This chapter has considered the work of Robert Hussey, the first Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Oxford; the creation of the position reflects the university's recognition that the study of ecclesiastical history needed to be "disciplinised" within the institution. As mentioned above, Hussey was a safe choice, competent in his studies but unlikely to cause much upset, either in his writing or his teaching. If he was not an avowed Broad Churchman – as previously noted, the term post-dated Hussey's

accession to the chair – his successor, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, certainly was. A pupil and admirer of Thomas Arnold, later to become his master's biographer, Stanley would have been a contentious choice in 1842, given his opposition to the condemnation of the Tractarians the year before. Similar defences of Renn Dickson Hampden and George Cornelius Graham, in 1847 and 1850 respectively, might also have made him a difficult choice immediately after *Universalis Ecclesiae*.

In the event, a man who believed contradictory opinions were a fundamental aspect of the Church of England, took the position in 1856. How far the needle of ecclesiastical history had moved from Southey and Stebbing, at least at Oxford! This does not mean that there was not a reactionary element among clergymen, or that this was absent from the ecclesiastical public sphere; *Essays and Reviews* generated tremendous opposition, and the Bishops of Canterbury and York criticised the decision to overturn all charges of heresy against two of the contributors in 1864.[697] Rather, the developments in ecclesiastical history writing in the years 1815-61, and the fact that intellectually and theologically broad-minded individuals held the Regius Professorship of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, illustrate this change in approach during this period.[698] It was still early in development, and it was not instituted by all contributors to the ecclesiastical public sphere – one could still find polemics easily enough in the 1860s. Rather, it reflects the sophistication of the discipline in these years, and the processes by which ecclesiastical history-writing became more refined.

---

[697] For Stanley's perspective on the controversies surrounding *Essays and Reviews*, see Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, *Essays, chiefly on Questions of Church and State from 1850 to 1870* (London: John Murray, 1870). The *Contemporary Review* stated that the work "might be called the epic of 'the Thirty Years' War' in the Church of England" – 'Dean Stanley's Essays on Church and State', *Contemporary Review*, Volume XV (September, 1870), p. 274.

[698] Later evidence of the relationship between the study of ecclesiastical history and broader developments in the field can be seen in Mandell Creighton's appointment as the first Dixie Chair of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Cambridge; Creighton was the founding editor of *The English Historical Review*, which was first published in 1886. For more on this, see Doris S. Goldstein, 'The origins and early years of the English Historical Review', *The English Historical Review*, 101.398 (January, 1986), pp. 6-19.

Such was the status of historical writing; regarding sermons, the situation was different, as the next chapter shall demonstrate. Or rather, the situation in the early 1860s did not mirror that of ecclesiastical history-writing. Sermons were utilised as a means of responding and contributing to dialogues on theology, and they reflected and shaped the religious issues of their day. As will be seen below, they were both oral and written forms of communication, which affected their construction and delivery, but the requirement that they speak to a broader audience meant that the same academic requirements were not necessary, unless one of the universities was the location for the sermon(s). The next chapter will complement the former chapters as a consideration of selected case studies across the period, comparing the writers' attitudes to pertinent theological and ecclesiastical issues. The end of Chapter Four witnesses a divergence, however, particularly when compared to the present chapter. Whereas ecclesiastical history-writing tended away from the polemic, the most notable sermon writers/performers embraced it. At a time when the dull parish priest droning on was becoming a literary staple, an exception to the rule was bound to stand out. This next chapter will evaluate such an example in the context of more "typical" sermons that went before this exception.

Chapter 4 – Published Sermons

Introduction

As exhortations of the moral and spiritual edification that clergymen wished to pass on to their congregations, the value of sermons is self-evident. Sermons afforded opportunities to explain and expound upon Biblical passages, and they enabled clergymen to offer instruction, guidance, or condemnation as they saw fit. The emphasis was on connection to the listeners; Jeffrey S. Chamberlain's assessment of sermons in the long eighteenth century notes that they "could be rhapsodic and soaring, and undoubtedly moving and meaningful to congregants".[699] When discussing "pulpit oratory", James Downey's assertion that sermons retained "power and influence" until the mid-nineteenth century, when the Church of England began to lose its dominant place in intellectual and social life, is a testament to the importance of preaching as an exercise in this period.[700]

One could suggest that it was not that sermons in general were not as influential, but those that promulgated the indisputable primacy of the Church of England did not retain this influence. The Oxford Movement and the rise of nonconformity undermined the Church's influence, and adherents of these movements attracted both listeners and readers, and contemporary periodicals reviewed their works throughout the period in question and beyond. As Gibson and Francis have observed, respected preachers were prominent figures, and

---

[699] Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, 'Parish Preaching in the Long Eighteenth Century' in Keith A. Francis and William Gibson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon, 1689-1901* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 60.
[700] James Downey, *The Eighteenth Century Pulpit: A Study of the Sermons of Butler, Berkeley, Secker, Sterne, Whitefield and Wesley* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 2.

printed sermons remained a key component of printing houses' output until the end of the nineteenth century.[701] This reflected the desire of congregants to hear sermons preached; Frances Knight has recounted the assertion of the curate of Stretham, in Cambridgeshire, writing in 1825, that parishioners would be more inclined to visit the Methodist meeting house if a sermon was not preached during an Anglican service.[702] "Indifferent perhaps to Anglicanism, the parishioners of Stretham were clearly not indifferent to the power of preaching", as Knight has astutely observed.[703] The influence of an authorised person, recognised as such by a community, to speak on behalf of the masses has many precedents; in nineteenth-century England, preachers, Anglican or otherwise, certainly aspired to this authority.[704]

It is necessary to delineate between sermons as events that took place in front of an audience, or those that were submitted in support of preferment, and printed collections of sermons that could be digested and considered in much greater detail at a time of the reader's choosing. Francis has rightly pointed out the difference between preached and printed, but he overemphasises the disparity when he declares that "the published sermon served a very different purpose from the preached one".[705] That a spoken sermon is a very different undertaking from collating a number of them into a volume, whether by the preacher, the publisher, or a third party, is evident; that a listener is much more inclined to have a visceral,

---

[701] William Gibson, 'The British Sermon 1689-1901: Quantities, Performance, and Culture' in Francis & Gibson (eds.), pp. 3-30; Keith A. Francis, 'Sermons: Themes and Developments' in Francis & Gibson (eds.), pp. 31-44.
[702] Frances Knight, *The Nineteenth-Century Church and English Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 21.
[703] *Ibid*, p. 82.
[704] Roy A. Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 115. Rappaport's work is an anthropological study of religious and ritualistic behaviours across a wide scope of time periods and locales, but his assertion that recognition of authority, involving the general acceptance of pronouncements made by authority figures as true, relates to the notion of priests and preachers as individuals that are accepted as prevalent figures within religious communities, and therefore to be trusted in their interpretations and explanations of Scripture.
[705] Francis in Francis & Gibson (eds.), p. 42.

instinctive response to a spoken sermon rather than a written one can also be assumed.

Although there was a difference in delivery, the purpose remained religious instruction, regardless of the method of delivery. Published sermons were certainly "used" differently, as Francis has noted, but this does not reflect a distinction of purpose.[706] A more helpful consideration of the relationship between preached and published is given by Robert H. Ellison in *The Victorian Pulpit*. He has identified a "juxtaposition" between spoken and printed sermons, recognising that printed sermons both relied on and supported the spoken form to which they were linked.[707] Ellison has deemed that his research on sermons forms part of "orality-literacy theory", and that sermons challenge the notion of a demarcation between print and oral cultures, as outlined by Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn; rather, to Ellison, sermons are inherently both "oration and essay".[708]

This is not the focus of this chapter, but it must be recognised that there is scholarly debate surrounding the nature and intentions of sermons in these two forms. Jeremy Morris has noted that even though many sermons were intended for parish congregations, their publication and subsequent notoriety brought them into wider ecclesiastical domains.[709] Although Morris was discussing this phenomenon in the context of the Oxford Movement and its most well-known figures, the idea has a broader application for the period in question. In short, it should be appreciated that although not every sermon was recorded for posterity – even among the most well-known figures, some of whom are the focus of this chapter, there are many lost sermons – it was a recognised practice to transcribe

---

[706] *Ibid*, p. 43.
[707] Robert H. Ellison, *The Victorian Pulpit: Spoken and Written Sermons in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1998), p. 45.
[708] *Ibid*, pp. 120-23. The work Ellison was responding to is Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn (eds.), *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1992); specifically, Greenblatt and Gunn's 'Introduction' on pages 1-11.
[709] Jeremy Morris, *The High Church Revival in the Church of England: Arguments and Identities* (Boston: Brill, 2016), pp. 173-96.

and publish sermons, both individually and collectively, to disseminate the message(s) of the speaker as widely as possible.

There has not been much focus on sermons in the nineteenth century. Gibson has written that the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were the "golden age of the sermon in Britain".[710] If it is accepted that this is the case, the nineteenth century is, naturally, less interesting, given the inability of its preachers to match the heights of their predecessors in previous centuries. This lack of interest is evident in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism* series: the second volume contains Gibson's chapter on sermons, the third does not even have an index entry for 'sermons'. The *Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon* has chapters centred on the nineteenth century, but there is more to be said about the contribution of sermons to the public sphere in general, and to the ecclesiastical public sphere specifically.

Had the impact of sermons deteriorated to such an extent by the end of the long eighteenth century? W. M. Jacob has used parishioners' diaries to show that many were unprepared to attend a service without a sermon in eighteenth-century England, which in turn meant that preparing sermons was a vital aspect of clerical life.[711] It is not unreasonable to assume that this desire to hear good-quality preaching continued into the nineteenth century, and that effective preaching still appealed to parishioners.

This was articulated in the nineteenth century, and the necessity of powerful pulpit oratory was evident to ecclesiastical figures in the nineteenth century. As a result, guides to effective preaching and sermon writing were produced in the middle years of the century, aimed at young clergy and those undertaking their training. William Gresley's *Ecclesiastes Anglicanus*, published

---

[710] William Gibson, 'Sermons' in Jeremy Gregory (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume II: Establishment and Empire, 1662-1829* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), p. 270.
[711] W. M. Jacob, 'England' in Gregory (ed.), pp. 107-08.

in 1835, begins with an encouragement for clergy to write their own sermons, which suggests that the preparation of new sermons was not as prevalent as it had been previously.[712] Even if there had been a trend in priests reusing existing sermons, that does not suggest a downturn in the interest of congregations to hear good preaching. Rather, it might reflect a desire on the part of the clergy to ensure that they had good material to use in services if they were not confident in their own writing abilities. Where Gresley wrote with a High Church audience in mind, James Smith, a Baptist minister in Ilford, sought to offer guidance to young Baptist ministers in both thought and deed; his advice to up-and-coming ministers included avoiding long sermons, which many listeners apparently thought "disgusting".[713]

Such guides were being produced at the end of the period considered in this thesis, and indeed beyond it. An anonymous author, or collection of authors, produced *Lay Suggestions on Modern Preaching and Preachers* in 1867, in which it was declared that a desire for good preaching existed among the laity, as it, seemingly, always had.[714]. In the *Contemporary Review*, James Davies warned preachers not to talk down to their congregations, nor to worry them with "spiritual terrors", in an article published in 1868.[715] An article by J. S. Blackie in 1864 advised that clergy would do well to give fewer sermons and focus instead on the content of those that they did decide to deliver.[716] In a work with a title that was ahead of its time from a marketing perspective, James Dawson produced *Pulpit Power, and How to Attain It* in 1865, a work directed at nonconformist

---

[712] William Gresley, *Ecclesiastes Anglicanus: Being a Treatise on the Art of Preaching, as Adapted to a Church of England Congregation, in a Series of Letters to a Young Clergyman* (London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1835).
[713] James Smith, *The Pastor and the Flock, Or, Hints to Young Pastors, and Advice to Church Members* (London: S. Bagster, 1831), p. 18.
[714] Anonymous, *Lay Suggestions on Modern Preaching and Preachers* (London: Rivingtons, 1867).
[715] James Davies, 'Preachers and Preaching', *The Contemporary Review, Volume IX* (September-December 1868), pp. 203-220.
[716] J. S. Blackie, 'On Pulpit Eloquence', *The Museum and English Journal of Education, Volume III* (April 1863-January 1864), pp. 287-300.

ministers that emphasised the value of effective preaching.[717] Clearly, the demand for effective preaching had not diminished by the 1860s. Although there were differing perspectives on the role and nature of sermons, it is evident that the debate was lively during the years under consideration; existing historiography does not adequately consider the role of sermons in contributing to, and facilitating, this discourse in the nineteenth century.

This chapter seeks to emphasise the continued importance of sermons in the period 1815-1860, both as oratorical and published artefacts and as salient indications of the theological perspectives of their writers. To this end, the chapter will focus on four individuals from an Anglican background whose published sermons have been neglected. These are: Thomas Arnold, who was renowned as an educational reformer; John Keble, a poet and a key part of the Oxford Movement; Henry Manning, also allied to the Tractarians but then converted to Rome in 1851; and Charles Kingsley, a polymath most recognised for his novels. The final individual included is Charles Spurgeon, a Baptist minister who, unlike the others, was most well-known as a preacher. Spurgeon's sermons continue to be reproduced, and he is recognised as an important figure in the history of the Baptist movement, particularly in the US.[718] Spurgeon offers a fascinating counterpoint to the other four cited, given the legacy that has followed him and the fact that this prominence is based on his sermons; the sermons of the others have, for the most part, been ignored or undermined.

This would seem to be a combination of the other focal points of the other four, and the uncertainty that remains in scholarship as to how widely-read sermons were in the nineteenth century. Ellison has given an excellent summary

---

[717] James Dawson, *Pulpit Power, and How to Attain It; Or, Thoughts on the Preparation of Sermons Required by the Age* (London: W. M. Lister, 1865).

[718] For example, *Knowing the Holy Spirit: Ten Classic Sermons* was published in 2019, and a republished edition of sermons from 1855 was produced in 2021. Both independently published, these reflect the continued interest in Spurgeon that continues to the present day. https://www.spurgeon.org/ has thousands of resources on Spurgeon, both the minister's own works and analyses of them, administered via the Spurgeon Center in Kansas City, Missouri.

of the differing views regarding the latter; Amy Cruse, Horton Davies, and Walter Houghton have all vouched for the prominence of sermons as having been widely read in the nineteenth century. However, Simon Eliot has stated that sermons outselling novels was a rarity, contrary to the picture presented by the three scholars above, and increasingly so as the nineteenth century progressed. Patrick Scott has written that the "cheapening of periodicals in the eighteen-sixties" doomed volumes of sermons, although that would appear to be something of an overstatement.[719] Richard Altick has observed that even into the late 1880s, works of "theology, sermons, biblical etc", as categorised by the *Journal of the Statistical Society*, comprised a higher total in terms of number of works than any other class of published work.[720] Rivingtons, a renowned publishing house in London, was well-known for its publication of ecclesiastical works; its proclivity for publishing religious works, including sermons, reflected its adherence to the aim of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, which encouraged such endeavours.[721]

E. D. Mackerness has written that in the Victorian age "the sermon was the standard vehicle of serious truth"; he also cites the historian G. M. Young's assertion that a young man brought up in a "serious home" would have heard, either delivered or read aloud "a thousand sermons".[722] Sermons continued to influence social and cultural life beyond the period under review in this thesis; thus, assessing the content of sermons produced by some of the most significant

---

[719] Ellison, pp. 136-137. The works cited by Ellison to frame this discussion are: Amy Cruse, *Victorians and Their Reading* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1935); Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England, Volume IV: From Newman to Martineau, 1850-1900* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962); Walter Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957); Patrick Scott, 'The Business of Belief: the Emergence of 'Religious' Publishing', *Studies in Church History*, Volume 10 (1973), pp. 213-24. Simon Eliot's contribution was through direct correspondence to Ellison.
[720] Richard Altick, *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1957), p. 108.
[721] Alexander Chalmers, 'Charles Rivington' in Septimus Rivington (ed.), *The Publishing House of Rivington* (London: Rivington, Percival, & Co., 1894), p. 29.
[722] E. D. Mackerness, *The Heeded Voice: Studies in the Literary Status of the Anglican Sermon, 1830-1900* (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons Ltd., 1959), pp. xi-xii.

religious figures of the period is necessary to understand how they presented their ideas to the public.

That is the fundamental aim of this chapter. The first part will evaluate the theological positions of the five figures chosen for this chapter, and it will seek to situate them within the changing dynamics of ecclesiastical debate in the period in question. Others could have been selected for this chapter: John Henry Newman is clearly a monumental figure, but he has been covered in Ellison's excellent work on Victorian sermons; Manning provides an alternative example of a High Church Anglican that converted to Rome, albeit for a different reason to Newman, and Keble is an interesting counterpoint as a high-profile Tractarian that did not convert to Rome, but rather attempted to reconfigure Anglicanism to prevent further conversions. Manning and Keble are sufficiently interesting examples of High Church sermon writers that Newman can be omitted as a central figure in this study. Charles Simeon is the other major figure that was under consideration for this chapter, but he was left out because, in his own lifetime and the years immediately following his death, he was not as prominent as Arnold or Kingsley, both of whom were figures of great renown in their own day.

The *Christian Remembrancer's* opinion that Simeon "was not born, indeed, for much theological importance" has proven to be erroneous, and it was clearly motivated by opposition to Simeon's evangelical position. That said, it does suggest a lack of prominence that did not elevate Simeon to the level of his contemporaries.[723] The *Christian Observer* was certain that he would attain renown after he died in 1836, but this acknowledged lack of recognition ultimately brought about the decision to omit Simeon.[724] As a sermon writer and preacher, he was formidable, as John R. W. Stott has noted, and a more general

[723] 'Memoirs of the Life of the Rev. Charles Simeon', *The Christian Remembrancer*, Volume XIV (October, 1847), p. 382.
[724] 'Obituary – Rev. Charles Simeon, MA'. *The Christian Observer*, Volume XXXVI (1836), p. 813.

study would incorporate him.[725] However, the case study method employed in this chapter precludes greater consideration of his work and its merits. In contrast, Charles Spurgeon is included due to the impression that his preaching made in the late 1850s and 1860s, and for the challenges that it presented to an Anglican tradition that was struggling to redefine itself in the early years of Spurgeon's ministry, particularly that caused by his 1864 sermon on 'baptismal regeneration', seen by many Anglicans as an affront to the decency of Christianity itself.

The second section of the chapter will focus on the content of the sermons of each of the five individuals selected; in each case, these will primarily be from one collection of sermons, often over multiple volumes, although other sermons will be cited that expand upon or develop theological ideas held by the individual in question. In the case of Arnold, Keble, Kingsley and Manning, there has been a tendency in existing historiography to look in poems, novels, tracts, or in private correspondence, where available, for their theologies. This chapter will demonstrate that the sermons produced by each of these figures are necessary to construct a theological overview of each of them, and these sermons require more attention than they have hitherto been given. Spurgeon is a separate case, given his renown as a preacher as mentioned above, but it is still necessary to assess the content of his sermons in the context of the challenges they presented to Anglicanism. The enduring legacy of Spurgeon and his work encourages this analysis. Finally, the third part will offer concluding remarks on the contribution of these selected collections of sermons to the ecclesiastical public sphere, and specifically what Spurgeon's fame and legacy mean for nineteenth-century sermon studies. Given that printed sermons remained of interest to reading publics beyond the period of this thesis, it is necessary to assess the impact that they had in the immediate aftermath of their release.

---

[725] John R. W. Stott, 'Introduction – Charles Simeon: A Personal Appreciation' in James M. Houston (ed.), *Evangelical Preaching: An Anthology of Sermons by Charles Simeon* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2003), p. xxxvi.

Part One: An Overview of the Five Individuals Selected for the Chapter

John Keble

John Keble, clergyman and poet, was one of the most prominent figures of the Oxford Movement; Hurrell Froude, another early initiator of the movement, declared that the best thing he had done in his life was to enable Keble and Newman to understand each other and thus encourage its development.[726] For his part, Newman saw Keble as the originator, as he considered Keble's sermon on "National Apostasy", given on July 14, 1833, to the be the starting point of the movement.[727] Based on the First Book of Samuel in the Old Testament, Keble's sermon was interpreted as a rebuke of Grey's Whig government; the Church Temporalities Act of 1833, which reorganised the Church of Ireland and reduced its bishoprics from twenty-two to twelve, was viewed by its opponents as evidence of concerted attempts to undermine the primacy of the Church of England. Keble sought to reassert the rights of the Church in his sermon, as is evidenced in the following passage:

> The case is at least possible, of a nation, having for centuries acknowledged, as an essential part of its theory of government, that, as a Christian nation, she is also a part of Christ's Church, and bound, in all her legislation and policy, by the fundamental rules of that

[726] Perry Butler, 'Keble, John', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15231?rskey=UwK4yc&result=2 [accessed 18 June 2025].
[727] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: A History of his Religious Opinions* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1879), p. 35.

> Church. The case is, I say, conceivable, of a government and people, so constituted, deliberately throwing off the restraint, which in many respects such a principle would impose on them, nay, disavowing the principle itself; and that, on the plea, that other states, as flourishing or more so in regard of wealth and dominion, do well enough without it. Is not this desiring, like the Jews, to have an earthly king over them, when the Lord their God is their King? Is it not saying in other words, 'We will be as the heathen, the families of the countries,' the aliens to the Church of our Redeemer?[728]

Chadwick has stated that "the sermon is untypical of the movement as it later developed"; it was "more akin to the sermons of high churchmen in Queen Anne's Reign" than to those of Keble's contemporaries Newman and Froude.[729] To Chadwick, its value was the fervour it inspired in Newman, and in the others that would become affiliated with the movement. Georgina Battiscombe has seen more of a direct link to ideas that inspired the Oxford Movement in Keble's sermon on "National Apostasy". Battiscombe has asserted that it demonstrates Keble's view that the Anglican Church was "the representative in England of the whole Church Catholic and Apostolic", and thus developments that were perceived as Erastian in nature, such as the Temporalities Act, challenged the supremacy of the Church that had existed, in Keble's view, since its inception.[730] Though his approach to considering theological subjects may have evolved in the years after the sermon, as the collection considered here will demonstrate, Brian Martin's assertion that the "universality" and "catholicity" of the Church "were

---

[728] John Keble, "National Apostasy" in *Sermons Academical and Occasional*, *Second Edition* (London: F. and J. Rivington, 1848), p. lxxi.
[729] Owen Chadwick, 'Introduction' in Chadwick (ed.), *The Mind of the Oxford Movement* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960), p. 33.
[730] Georgina Battiscombe, *John Keble: A Study in Limitations* (London: Constable and Company, 1963), pp. 155-56.

fundamental ideas which Keble's writings and preachings were always based on" is an astute one.[731] Keble

While Keble advocated reform of the Church of England, a necessity that was as apparent in 1847 as it was when the Church Temporalities Act was passed in 1833, he sought to ensure that there were parameters for such reform(s). As Morris has observed, Keble's "defence of primitive tradition", and his desire for the Church of England to broaden its considerations of what it ought to have recognised as legitimate doctrinal methods of embodying the wishes of the Church Fathers, "also reflected the assertion of a significant boundary between what was required and what was – at best – permissible".[732] Keble was a pragmatist; he wished to see the Church of England reformed, in order to avoid further losses to Rome, but he also knew that reform would be contested, and would not satisfy all of those who held grievances toward it.

By 1847, Tractarians had muddied numerous waters in the quest to reform church practice; Burns has discussed the "polarization which the Oxford Movement precipitated" regarding bishops' visitations in the 1840s, and the theological and ecclesiological content of the charges given on such occasions.[733] This involvement by Tractarians resulted in charges becoming either "sufficiently controversial" to hinder the togetherness in communities that the charges sought to produce, or else the charges became "masterpieces of studied tediousness" of no interest to anyone not concerned with ecclesiastical minutiae.[734] Keble's *Sermons*, a collection of thirteen sermons preached throughout Keble's career, including the famous "National Apostasy" address, was an attempt to provide clarity and guidance to Catholic-minded Anglicans wavering in their loyalty to the Church of England. Keble had long been suspicious of print culture and what

---

[731] Brian W. Martin, *John Keble: Priest, Professor and Poet* (London: Croom Helm, 1976), p. 11.
[732] Morris, p. 223.
[733] Arthur Burns, *The Diocesan Revival in the Church of England, 1800-1870* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 39-40.
[734] *Ibid*, p. 40.

he saw as "the threat it posed to the nation's religious self-conception".[735] Despite these misgivings, he had contributed to it on previous occasions; in 1847, as Pusey insisted, it was imperative that he do so again in order to try and realign this self-conception to prevent further damage being done.

Thomas Arnold

In his own lifetime, Thomas Arnold was principally involved in the area of school reform; as headmaster of Rugby School from 1828 until his untimely death in 1842, "his chief educational aim was to make Rugby a Christian school producing Christian gentlemen".[736] Arnold was greatly concerned with social questions, and he recognised the necessity for reform in the late 1820s and early 1830s: he was in favour of Catholic Emancipation, and wrote a pamphlet in 1829, *Roman Catholic Claims*, stating as much. Unlike many of his contemporaries, who believed that the Protestant establishment must be maintained in Ireland, Arnold thought that the people of Ireland must have the freedom to practice religion as they saw fit, however unappealing an idea seemed. Arnold did not hide his prejudices: he asserted that England was connected to an "uncompromising race and with this dreadful religion", and that nowhere else in Europe was Roman Catholicism "a more fearful corruption of Christ's Gospel".[737] However, he thought that the influence of Protestantism "improved the Catholic religion in Germany", and that the same effect might be possible "if it were once disentangled from its encumbering armour of ascendancy, to produce a much

---

[735] Joshua King, *Imagined Spiritual Communities in Britain's Age of Print* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2015), p. 134.
[736] A. J. H. Reeve, 'Arnold, Thomas, 1795-1842', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-686?rskey=gH4moK&result=4 [accessed 18 June 2025].
[737] Thomas Arnold, 'Christian Duty of Conceding the Roman Catholic Claims' in Arthur Penrhyn Stanley (ed.), *The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold, D. D.* (London: B. Fellowes, 1845), p. 33.

stronger effect in Ireland".[738] To Arnold, the best approach was one that minimised disruption and strife, and that enabled Protestantism to continue to have an influence, albeit at a distance, rather than impose its strictures on a population largely unwilling to accept them.

This is emblematic of his desire to maintain harmony in society, even among those who harboured profound religious differences; such was his disposition, he had to involve himself in these concerns.[739] JRH Moorman has astutely observed that Arnold took his cue from his time as headmaster of Rugby School: the school provided, in microcosm, an example of "a truly Christian State in which all work together for the common good".[740] Arnold believed that this model was a suitable allegory for the relationship between Church and State, and the theme of "Christian education", for schoolboys and adults alike, was a constant theme in his religious thought.

Arnold devoted himself to the task of biblical exegesis in a way that was comprehendible to his audiences: as he stated himself in the preface to his first volume of sermons, "my object, then, has been to bring the great principles of the Gospel home to the hearts and practices of my own countrymen in my own time".[741] This was a long-standing ambition. Arnold wrote to a friend in 1827 that he was considering a work on "Christian Politics" that would address "the whole question of a religious establishment and of the education proper for Christian members of a Christian commonwealth".[742] As Mark Chapman has observed, Arnold viewed the Church as "a society for the purpose of making men like

---

[738] *Ibid*, p. 39.
[739] T. W. Bamford, *Thomas Arnold* (London: The Cresset Press, 1960), pp. 36-56, for a detailed evaluation of Arnold's personal interest in social issues and his desire for reform.
[740] John R. H. Moorman, *A History of the Church in England, Third Edition* (Harrisburg: Morehouse, 1980), p. 331.
[741] Thomas Arnold, *Sermons , Volume I*, *Third Edition* (London: J.G. & F. Rivington, 1832), p. vi.
[742] Arnold to Mr Blackstone, 1827, in Stanley, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, Volume I* (London: B. Fellowes, 1844), p. 48.

Christ", rather than as an institution that was too narrowly focused on liturgy and procedure.[743]

In order to achieve this, Arnold combined his considerable scriptural knowledge with an appreciation for a historical view of religion, one that, as Reardon has noted, was "enlarged by the wider context of other religious and literary traditions, showing revelation to have been progressive".[744] This goes some way to explaining Arnold's acceptance of Catholic Emancipation, as he recognised that different traditions had meaning for adherents to them, even if he did not value them himself. Indeed, in the same letter to Mr Blackstone cited above, Arnold stated that he would devote space in his work on "Christian Politics" to a consideration of the "pretended conversion" of early kingdoms to Christianity, which he considered as "one of the greatest *tours d'addresse* that Satan ever played, except his invention of Popery".[745] Tolerance did not necessitate respect when it came to Roman Catholicism.

Henry Manning

Henry Edward Manning had an unconventional career. An Anglican priest, he was appointed Archdeacon of Chichester in 1841, although he would subsequently follow his fellow Oxford Movement member John Henry Newman into the Roman Catholic Church, though not until 1851, six years after Newman. A High Church Anglican universalist that believed the rites of the Church were consecrated in the first centuries after Jesus' crucifixion, Manning would convert

---

[743] Mark D. Chapman, 'Liberal Anglicanism' in Rowan Strong (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume III: Partisan Anglicanism and its Global Expansion, 1829-c.1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), p. 219.
[744] Bernard M. G. Reardon, *Religious Thought in the Victorian Age: A Survey from Coleridge to Gore* (London: Longman, 1980), p. 51.
[745] Stanley, p. 48.

in the wake of the Gorham judgement, whereby the Church of England was forced to institute an evangelical priest that denied that baptism conferred "unconditional regeneration" upon the recipient.[746] For Manning, this was a denial of the fundamental realities of the sacraments, and he could not align his principles with the Church of England any longer. His "Romeward tendency" was "completed" shortly after, once further disagreements over the reintroduction of a Roman Catholic hierarchy had occurred.[747]

It is principally as a Roman Catholic that he is remembered: his promotion to Archbishop of Westminster in 1865 has been seen as the starting point of Manning exerting influence in the English ecclesiastical sphere, and indeed beyond.[748] As an Anglican, Manning has been assessed as one of the leading figures of the Oxford Movement, but always in the company of the others – Newman, Pusey, Keble, and so on. As a Roman Catholic, Manning has received more individual attention, and understandably so, given his role as a Cardinal from 1875 and his participation in the election of Pope Leo XIII in 1878. This is beyond the scope of my thesis: it is his years as an Anglican that are of interest in this project.

In that regard, the four volumes of his sermons, published between 1842 and 1850, offer key insights into his theological perspectives immediately prior to his conversion. Analysis of his sermons enables counterbalance the accusations of his first biographer, Edmund Sheridan Purcell, that Manning was "simply a power-hungry hypocrite".[749] Manning's reputation has been coloured by Purcell's *Manning as Anglican*, which inspired Lytton Strachey's 1918 anarchist

---

[746] G. I. T. Machin, *Politics and the Churches in Great Britain, 1832 to 1868* (London: Clarendon, 1977), pp. 202-08.
[747] *Ibid*, p. 207.
[748] See, for example: Vincent Alan McClelland, *Cardinal Manning: His Public Life and Influence, 1865-1892*.
[749] Robert Gray, *Cardinal Manning: An Autobiography* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985), p. 5.

defamation of Manning in his *Eminent Victorians*, in which he popularised the notion of Manning as having a "preoccupation with himself".[750] Although his sermons do not paint a full picture of Manning's character, they do demonstrate, across the four volumes, that Manning's decision to convert was not for power or prestige: his theological convictions are clearly set out, and there was a consistency in his opposition to secular interference in the business of the Established Church, and to the alleged disregard of the sacraments and the apostolic grounding of the faith.[751]

Charles Kingsley

Charles Kingsley was a man about whom much has been written, due to his wide range of interests and his status in the nineteenth century. Kingsley has been viewed through a variety of lenses. His work as a novelist has attracted attention, often as part of wider studies evaluating the development of life and ideas in Victorian England.[752] Indeed, this is how he is primarily remembered, in spite of his breadth of influence.[753] He was a friend of Charles Darwin, and a supporter of the scientific community at a time when many of his Anglican contemporaries viewed the discipline as a threat to faith; his interest in the subject has been analysed by modern commentators.[754] Other facets of his character have

---

[750] Lytton Strachey, *Eminent Victorians* (London: Penguin, 1986, first published in 1918), p. 55.
[751] I am using 'apostolic' in the sense of 'primitive': like his fellow Tractarians, Manning was a proponent of the idea that the early Church was divinely inspired, but that corruptions had tainted its sanctity.
[752] See, for example: Colin Manlove, 'Charles Kingsley, H. G. Wells, and the Machine in Victorian Fiction, *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 48.2 (September 1993), pp. 212-39; Justin Prystash, 'Rhizomatic Subjects: Thomas Carlyle, Charles Kingsley, and the Origins of Victorian Identity, *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 66.2 (September, 2011), pp. 141-69.
[753] Susan Chitty, *The Beast and the Monk: A Life of Charles Kingsley* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1974), p. 15.
[754] See: Piers J. Hale, 'Darwin's Other Bulldog: Charles Kingsley and the Popularisation of Evolution in Victorian England', *Science & Education*, 21.7 (July, 2012), pp. 977-1013; Hale, 'Monkeys into Men and Men into Monkeys: Chance and Contingency in the Evolution of Man, Mind and Morals in Charles Kingsley's "Water Babies"', *Journal of the History of Biology*, 46.4 (Winter, 2013), pp. 551-97; John C. Hawley, 'Charles Kingsley and The Book of Nature', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 60.4 (December, 1991), pp. 461-79.

been considered, from the legacy of his time at Cambridge to his highly questionable, though unfortunately not contextually atypical, attitudes toward race and gender.[755] As a Christian priest, Kingsley has been associated with the concepts of 'Christian Socialism' and 'Muscular Christianity': the former an understanding of Christianity through what one might call an anti-capitalist lens, the latter an evocation of the importance of the body and physical health as a means of exemplifying the discipline and verve Kingsley saw as necessary to achieving good works in life.

Kingsley himself preferred the term 'Christian manliness': 'Muscular Christianity' originated as a gibe directed at Kingsley by T. C. Sandars in a review of the former's 1857 novel *Two Years Ago*.[756] Guy Kendall has asserted that this notion was indeed first delineated by Kingsley in the aforementioned novel, and therefore after the publication of the collection of sermons considered here, but Kingsley had previously stressed the importance of physical health before writing the novel.[757] Indeed, Kendall notes that in his first novel, *Yeast*, published in 1848, "'muscular Christianity' is in evidence".[758] His adherence to 'Christian Socialism' was evident throughout his working life, and his "personal practice strode always vigorously ahead of his preaching".[759] As will be detailed in the following consideration of *Sermons for the Times*, 'Christian Socialism' and 'Muscular Christianity', or 'Christian manliness' in Kingsley's words, were central to Kingsley's understanding of the faith, and its role in society.

---

[755] For the former, see Owen Chadwick, 'Charles Kingsley at Cambridge', *Historical Journal* 18.2 (June, 1975), pp. 303-25. For his views on race and gender, see Stanwood S. Walker, '"Backwards and Backwards Ever": Charles Kingsley's Racial-Historical Allegory and the Liberal Anglican Revisioning of Britain', *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 62.3 (December, 2007), pp. 339-79.
[756] Norman Vance, 'Kingsley, Charles (1819-1875)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15617 [accessed 18 June 2025].
[757] Guy Kendall, *Charles Kingsley and His Ideas* (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1947), p. 113.
[758] *Ibid*, p. 106.
[759] Margaret Farrand Thorp, *Charles Kingsley, 1819-1875* (New York: Octagon Books, 1969), p. 33.

Kingsley declared that the Christian faith should act as a catalyst for action, that everyone who believed in the Word of God should do what they could to improve the lot of the poorest in society, and be proactive in this, in order to be in harmony with God Himself. As to how wide a spectrum of people that declared themselves to be Christians this covered is contentious, but it certainly was not everyone. There have been varying suggestions as to how far Kingsley embodied a 'Broad Church' position: Christian Dickinson has suggested that Kingsley "embodied" the notion in his 1853 novel *Hypatia*, whereas Guy Kendall has asserted that Kingsley was not part of the Broad Church in the mid-nineteenth century as that term "included the first 'Biblical critics', and Kingsley was far from being such a critic."[760] Kingsley was certainly not as wide-ranging in his approach to the idea of who could be part of the Church of England as Arnold was; however, this does not necessarily mean that he should not be considered as a Broad Church adherent. Whatever Kingsley's affiliation with Broad Church principles, he did not appreciate dissenters or Catholics, as will be seen in the *Sermons*.

Charles Spurgeon

Charles Haddon Spurgeon was a Calvinist who became "the most popular preacher of his day".[761] Having started his career at the age of seventeen in the small parish church of Waterbeach, in Cambridgeshire, he was approached to preach at New Park Street in Southwark in late 1853. A Reformed Baptist church that had seen attendance dwindle, New Park Street was reinvigorated by the lively preaching of the young man, who was still only nineteen when he started there.

---

[760] Christian Dickinson, 'A Crucified God: Charles Kingsley's Broad-Church Embodiment in Hypatia', *Victorians: A Journal of Culture and Literature*, 136 (Winter, 2019), pp. 159-76; Kendall, p. 125.
[761] 'Spurgeon, Charles Haddon' in Michael Walsh (ed.), *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (London: Continuum, 2001), p. 1076.

By 1861, Spurgeon and his burgeoning congregation had moved to the purpose-built Metropolitan Tabernacle at London's Elephant and Castle, with space for between 5,000 and 6,000 attendees to hear him speak.[762] Spurgeon remained an influential figure until his death in 1892: the 'Downgrade controversy' of 1887, in which Spurgeon chastised religious figures whom he perceived to be undermining the sacred nature of the Bible, caused severe ruptures within the Baptist Union.[763]

Though still in his mid-thirties by the end of the period considered in this thesis, Spurgeon's influence was considerable from the time of his emergence in the early 1850s, and his popularity dwarfed that of many of the other individuals analysed in this work. As a preacher, Spurgeon was unparalleled in nineteenth-century England. Writing on the construction of the Tabernacle in 1861, Chadwick saw him as a "young genius" who "strengthened the impact of dissent and of the Baptists upon the nation".[764] While he was also a literary figure through his magazine *The Sword & the Trowel*, which he edited from its creation in 1865, Spurgeon's primary method of influence was his sermons, which were assiduously recorded and disseminated by his supporters.

Unlike the other four, Spurgeon was notable primarily as a preacher of sermons; more broadly, he is representative of a tendency among non-denominational ministers and preachers to preach directly to larger congregations and build a reputation as speakers, using plainer and more direct language, rather than focus on exegesis as many in the Anglican tradition did. Spurgeon's oratorical style was noticeably different to the other case studies in this chapter;

---

[762] Rosemary Chadwick, 'Spurgeon, Charles Haddon', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, available online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-26187?rskey=e7bDXB&result=2 [accessed 18 June 2025].

[763] This is beyond the scope of the thesis, but for more information, see: Patricia Stallings Kruppa, *Charles Haddon Spurgeon: A Preacher's Progress* (New York: Routledge, 1982), chapter 8; Tom Nettles, *Living by Revealed Truth: The Life and Pastoral Theology of Charles Haddon Spurgeon* (Fearn: Mentor, 2013), chapter 16. [Nettles was Professor of Historical Theology at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, so might not be the most impartial reviewer of Spurgeon's life.]

[764] Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church: Part I* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1966), pp. 417-18.

he avoided the rhetorical flourishes and organised syntax of the university-educated Anglican clergymen, relying instead on a plainer style more in keeping with his audience than his contemporary clergymen.

Part 2: The Aim and Intention of Sermons

Each of the five individuals studied in this chapter wrote their sermons with the intention of instructing and guiding their congregations; the priest, or minister, took on the role of the shepherd guiding the flock, and was duty-bound to counsel congregations in the ways of Christ. Published volumes enabled sermons to have a reach beyond the locale of the preacher. Collected works were carefully constructed to ensure that they represented the best examples of theology and instruction of the individual's work they were centred on. Published volumes of sermons were worthwhile endeavours for printing companies, as they remained viable up to and beyond 1861. They were also tremendously helpful in enabling an increasingly literate population to encounter and imbibe the teaching of the most prominent ecclesiastical figures of the day, or to aid similarly-minded clerics in terms of content and delivery of effective sermons, given their importance as previously discussed. As the Church of England came under increasing pressure in the mid-nineteenth century, volumes of sermons represented an aspect of the disputes that were occurring; they could act as a means of allowing influential figures to state their views to a wider audience, in order to shape the rhetoric around key issues.

Thomas Arnold and Charles Kingsley were both particularly focused on the education and development of Christian men, and how this could be understood through Biblical interpretation. Arnold's 'Christian gentleman', moulded and honed through schooling that focused on the production of young

men who were Christian above all else, is evident in his sermons, most of which in his volumes were given at Rugby School. Charles Kingsley is associated with 'Muscular Christianity', or 'Christian Manliness', which was also to be developed at an early age and maintained throughout a good, Christian life. Both men's heavily gendered approach to Christianity, in terms of masculinity, invites comparison, which the first part of this chapter will address. Keble and Manning were both Tractarians who sought to delineate and advocate a High Church position within Anglicanism, in contrast to Arnold and Kingsley's wider-reaching notions of the faith. Keble and Manning both stressed the catholicity of the Church of England, and they sought to impress these views on listeners and readers of their sermons.

However, the events of the late 1840s, regarding the Gorham Decision and church reform, would see each man reach a different conclusion as to their own way forward. Keble sought to regroup and reinvigorate High Church elements of the Church of England, whereas Manning would determine that he no longer had a place within it and would convert to Roman Catholicism. Their comparative responses to controversies from their Tractarian perspectives form the second part of this chapter. Finally, Spurgeon's popularity and influence will be considered as a counterpoint to the struggles within Anglicanism in the mid-nineteenth century. This is not to suggest that Dissenters and nonconformists possessed unanimity of thought, but that the relative fragility of the Church of England, and the rising numbers of non-Anglican Protestants in Britain, were reflected in the immediate popularity and dissemination of published sermons that emanated from outside of the Church of England. Spurgeon's rise is perhaps the best example of this phenomenon. The final part of the chapter will assess the vibrancy of his ministry and the spread of his ideas through sermons as a counterpoint to the difficulties encountered by the Church of England in the mid-nineteenth century.

Arnold and Kingsley: What is a 'Christian', and how is Christianity presented?

Thomas Arnold was determined to write with historical legitimacy in mind; his assertion was that historical accuracy was often neglected in favour of presenting a particular message. In this regard, he was a forerunner of the academic integrity that exerted a greater influence on ecclesiastical history writing, as explored in the previous chapter. Arnold wrote to the Reverend John Tucker, a contemporary during their Oxford University days, in 1825, stating "I have never seen a single commentator who has not perverted the truth of history to make if fit the prophecy".[765] History showed that religious disagreement was inevitable, and that the consequences of these disagreements could be severe; Arnold's answer was a new way that sought to draw a line under previous disputes and that was centred on a refocused Christian unity that would not be affected by previous issues.[766] With this focus, Arnold advocated for a position that incorporated a range of "dissenting" perspectives, albeit one that had no place for Roman Catholics, Quakers, or Unitarians. In Arnold's view, Church and State should have the same goals and outcomes in mind; "the State in its highest perfection becomes the Church".[767] The three groups listed rejected this notion, in one form or another, and so could not be included.

Still, this was still an ambitious attempt to unite disparate groups under the broad banner of an "English Church"; this would subsequently be known as the "Broad Church" movement, although the term was coined after Arnold had died.[768] The idea that all procedural and liturgical disputes could be overcome by

---

[765] *Ibid*, p. 65.
[766] Marvin R. O'Connell, *The Oxford Conspirators: A History of the Oxford Movement* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1991), p. 78.
[767] Arnold, *Principles of Church Reform*, cited in J. C. D. Clark, *English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 416.
[768] King, p. 97.

an adherence to a national church that would naturally supersede such difficulties was controversial. Marvin O'Connell has observed that to most Anglicans Arnold's plan "itself was unbelief", "unsound" and "dangerous" theology that was more of a problem than a solution.[769] His "scheme of comprehension", to use Nockles' rather unflattering term, only seemed convincing to those already sold on such an idea; most Anglicans had their doubts, but particularly the Tractarians, whose leaders "saw in this proposal the confirmation of some of their worst fears".[770]

For his part, Arnold was not in favour of the Oxford Movement. He wrote in October 1833, after the first of the *Tracts for the Times* had been published, that he was "annoyed" by the "extravagances" of the Oxford group; he wondered "what is to become of the Church, if the clergy begin to exhibit an aggravation of the worst superstitions of the Roman Catholics, only stripped of that consistency, which stamps even the errors of the Romish system with something of a character of greatness".[771] It is no wonder that Arnold fell out with his old friend from Oxford John Keble, the deterioration of their relationship hastened by Arnold's article entitled 'The Oxford Malignants' in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1836, regarding Renn Dickson Hampden's appointment as Regius Professor of Divinity.[772]

Six volumes of Arnold's sermons were published between 1829 and 1845, although only four of these were published in his lifetime; the final two volumes were released after Arnold's death in 1842. Owen Chadwick has written that Arnold "left volumes of the finest sermons of the century".[773] Even his critics have acknowledged the quality and tone of his sermons; in an article that condemns

---

[769] O'Connell, pp. 77-79.
[770] Raymond Chapman, *Faith and Revolt: Studies in the Literary Influence of the Oxford Movement* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970), p. 28.
[771] Arnold to Mr Sergeant Coleridge, October 23, 1833, in Stanley, p. 329.
[772] See Georgina Battiscombe, *John Keble: A Study in Limitations* (London: Constable, 1963), pp. 186-97, for a summary of the Hampden affair, and of the acrimony between Arnold and Keble that arose as a result.
[773] Chadwick, *Part I*, p. 43.

Arnold's attempts to equate the Church with the State, which he somewhat overstates as "totalitarianism", David Nicholls does recognise that "the personal piety evidenced in his [Arnold's] sermons" are a reason to admire him.[774] Even Lytton Strachey, whose caricature of Arnold is generally not worthy of consideration, concedes that Arnold's volumes of sermons were "received with admiration by a wide circle of pious readers", including Queen Victoria.[775] Most of the sermons in the volumes were given at Rugby School, and so were intended as practical instructions to the boys in attendance: part of Arnold's "campaign for a manly moral culture" at the school.[776]

Arnold's sermons have been viewed as "self-indulgent but highly influential demagogy", particularly through the lens of Stanley's *Life of Doctor Arnold*; Stanley was a former pupil of Arnold's, and he had witnessed many of these sermons in his time at Rugby between 1829 and 1834.[777] Based on this assessment, Stanley was not impressed; perhaps the experience of the austere formalities at the school, of which Arnold's sermons were a key component, influenced Stanley's perspective of his old headmaster's approach. The charge of "self-indulgence" is not entirely unwarranted, however; statements such as "There is indeed a great deal of ignorance of the Gospel in the world; but it is generally an ignorance which the least desire of knowledge would remove" do have the air of the supercilious schoolmaster about them.[778] Arnold's sermons were certainly centred on him and his views on the topics at hand, and he certainly sought to transmit an air of authority on his subjects to those in attendance.

Arnold relied on his personal perspectives in his sermons; as an example, he used "I" two hundred and twenty-three times across the third volume of

---

[774] David Nicholls, 'The Totalitarianism of Thomas Arnold', *The Review of Politics*, 29.4 (October, 1967), p. 518.
[775] Strachey, p. 174.
[776] Rowan Strong, 'Introduction' in Strong (ed.), p. 6.
[777] Terence Copley, *Black Tom: Arnold of Rugby, The Man and the Myth* (London: Continuum, 2002), p. 16.
[778] Arnold, *Sermons, Volume I*, p. 13.

sermons, although this does include uses in notes and appendices in which he elaborates or qualifies points made in sermons, as well as Biblical quotes that use the first-person.[779] Still, despite these qualifications, it is clear that in all of Arnold's volumes of sermons, he did have a tendency to lead with his interpretation of Scripture, rather than to let the Biblical passages speak for themselves. Naturally, a sermon is from a personal perspective, and cannot be expected to avoid first-person usage; Keble used "I" much more sparingly in *Sermons Occasional and Academical*, but it was certainly used. However, Arnold's approach was much more personally involved, and he sought to instruct his congregants through his personal insights. This is not surprising, given his role as an educator, but it is worth noting as a potential explanation of the perspective of him as self-important and engaging in "demagogy", a view put forward by Stanley's biography and subsequently reinforced by Strachey's exaggerated character study.

The primary reason for Arnold's idiosyncratic approach to delivering sermons was, in his mind, to ensure that the boys at Rugby went out into the world as Christian men with a clear understanding of their duty to uphold Christian values that were present in the early Church, but which had been lost sight of since. As Arnold noted in the preface to the second volume in 1831:

> It is certainly very bad to remain as we are; and to go back to the original state of the Church would be most desirable, if we could have no hope of going on to that glorious state of perfection for which Christ designed it… the means are yet in our hands, which it seems far better to use even at the eleventh hour, than desperately to throw them away.[780]

---

[779] Arnold, *Sermons, Volume III*.
[780] Arnold, *Sermons, Volume II*, p. vi.

This desire for uniformity based on the principles of the early Church could be interpreted as being at odds with Arnold's "Broad Church" perspective, but another way of assessing this potential issue is that Arnold was attempting to square this circle through both educational and church reform. His attempts to expand the national church into a broad coalition of denominations tallied with his desire to make Scriptural understanding the bedrock of education.

Bringing Christians of most persuasions together, save those who, at least initially, could not participate due to their inability/unwillingness to accede to the requests of the State, would encourage unity in the present; ensuring that young people received an education grounded in the fundamental principles of early Christianity would, in Arnold's mind, ensure this project lasted. In a sermon on 'The Things that Shall Come to Pass', Arnold averred that "the immediate prospect for middle age is not so much change as steadfastness".[781] He was discussing the notion of change, or the lack thereof, in the condition of most individuals by their middle age, but his words can be interpreted as an instruction to his students not to yield to the temptation to diverge from the path Arnold and his staff at Rugby were setting them on.

Arnold had set this out explicitly in a sermon on Romans 1:16, in which Paul asserts that he is "not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ", in the second volume of his sermons. Arnold told the boys in attendance that "you should in youth gain the knowledge which may make you better and wiser men hereafter", and that such knowledge would imbibe them with "an ardent love of what is beautiful, of what is true, of what is good".[782] Arnold saw this as his duty as headmaster of Rugby; he believed that it was beneficial to publish these sermons that they might be preached to, or read by, young men at other institutions. This belief perhaps

[781] Arnold, *Sermons, Volume II*, p. 80.
[782] Ibid, p. 95.

contributed to the view of Arnold as self-focused, but to him, it was imperative that educators inculcate these principles in their students for the good of the Church of England, and indeed for the State, which he viewed as being inextricably interlinked with the Church.

This link between Church and State was a constant presence in Arnold's sermons throughout his career; he wished to instil in his listeners, and readers, an understanding that they were members of a Church as well as citizens of a nation. For Arnold, the discord within Anglicanism, along with the increasing prominence of Dissenting congregations, was contributing to a perception that religion and nationality, in the minds of many in England, were separate aspects of an individual's identity. As he saw it, these were inseparable, or they certainly should have been. As he put it in a sermon on 'The Christian Church':

> Men continually seem to forget that they are members of the church; citizens, to use St. Paul's expression, of Christ's kingdom, as much as ever they are citizens of their earthly country. But they speak of the church as they might speak of any useful institution or society in their neighbourhood, whose object they approved of, and which they were glad to encourage, but without becoming members of it, or identifying themselves with its success or failure.[783]

Arnold contended that this lack of commitment to the Church of England as an intrinsic aspect of society was detrimental both to the Church and the nation, and that this relationship had to be reconstituted to protect both the Church and the character of the country. Much of Arnold's preaching had this aim in mind; he sought to bridge the divides of religious thought to achieve what he saw as a

[783] Arnold, *Sermons, Volume IV*, p. 291.

loftier aim, that of protecting the union between Church and State. As he observed in *Principles*, this did not require a unity of thought or a cessation of discourse regarding religious ideas; such uniformity was impossible.[784] Rather, it was to help individuals recognise that faith in God and the truth of Jesus' mission dwarfed quibbles over doctrine or practice; that people from different backgrounds, and of varying persuasions, could be united under one church as long as they agreed with the most fundamental tenets of the faith.

Arnold argued that the educated classes often had serious differences, but despite this, retained "a sense of belonging to the same society"; he asserted that ecclesiastical differences could be understood in the same way.[785] His wish was for students, both at Rugby and beyond, was not so much that they would not be drawn into defining Anglicanism in absolute terms, as differences in doing so were inevitable. As an Oxford man, Arnold knew this all too well. Rather, he hoped that future generations would rise above such differences. He hoped that Church reform would occur in conjunction with a renewed respect for the national aspect of the Church of England: hence why his ideas for reform "owed much to contemporary secular constitutionalism", as Burns has appreciated.[786]

Charles Kingsley's *Sermons for the Times* was published in 1855, by which time he had drawn attention for his literary work: *Westward Ho*, a historical novel based on an Elizabethan privateer, was released in the same year and was widely reviewed. The reviews were mixed: *Fraser's Magazine* called the latter "the best historical novel… of the day", and *The British Quarterly Review* declared it a work produced by a "genius" that was "far superior to [Walter] Scott".[787] However, *The Athenaeum* stated that "the spirit in which the book is written is neither good nor pleasant", and that Kingsley treated the novel as an extension of

---

[784] Arnold, *Principles*, pp. 36-40.
[785] Arnold, *Sermons, Volume II*, p. 398.
[786] Burns, p. 221.
[787] Jan M. I Klaver, *The Apostle of the Flesh: A Critical Life of Charles Kingsley* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), p. 397.

the pulpit from which to preach at his readers.[788] *The Christian Remembrancer* agreed: in its review, it proffered the opinion that Kingsley was "condescending", and added that writers such as Kingsley:

> Are our betters and superiors, much more learned, and kind, and good than ourselves. But they know it - and somehow we find out that they know it - and, still worse, let us feel that they know it, and wish us to know it.[789]

The point to be drawn from these reviews is that many who encountered Kingsley, or his work, recognised that he was a forceful voice, although some clearly did not welcome the moralising aspects of Kingsley's character.[790] But Kingsley was a priest, it was his role to guide not only his congregations but wider society, and the pulpit enabled him to achieve this. Writing within the context of Kingsley's scientific interests, Diarmid A. Finnegan notes that it was "through novels, lectures, and sermons" that "Kingsley presented a post-Darwinian version of natural theology to a wide audience".[791]

This refers to a time after the work under consideration here, as Darwin's seminal work was published in 1859, but it illustrates that sermons were a key part of Kingsley's methodology. Indeed, in the first of his series *Sermons on National Subjects*, published in 1852, he utilised a sermon entitled "The Fount of Science" to elaborate on the influence of the divine over the sciences. For example, he did not dismiss or denigrate the scientific wonders of the Great Exhibition of 1851 but criticised his readership for the lack of credit given to God

---

[788] *Ibid*.
[789] 'Notices', *The Christian Remembrancer*, Volume XXXI (1856), pp. 495-96.
[790] Kingsley's first novel, *Yeast*, was essentially a moral fable about the plight of the poor in society and set the tone for much of his later writings, and indeed the content of his sermons.
[791] Diarmid A. Finnegan, 'Anglicans, Science, and the Bible in the Nineteenth Century' in Strong (ed.), p. 429.

for enabling humankind to achieve such feats.[792] Preaching was another method by which Kingsley could attempt to espouse his views and exert influence, and his "outspoken" style "excited" those who heard him.[793] As a well-known figure from the early 1850s onwards, there was a high level of interest in what he had to say, and he had supporters and detractors. Crucially, his words had weight, enough to arouse strong reactions in those who heard and/or read them.

It was Kingsley's work from the pulpit that was central to his moral and theological outlook – his novels were "auxiliary to his sermons", and his preaching was the basis for much of the literary work that he produced in the course of his life.[794] The *Sermons for the Times* (hereafter merely referred to as *Sermons*), published in 1855, is indicative of Kingsley's theological positions, and of the methodologies that he used to deliver his message to those in attendance. For all the criticisms of him as a moraliser with copious reserves of self-esteem, Kingsley was a skilled writer, his talent with the pen conducive to an effective style of oratory. His sermons were a mixture of considered reasoning and imperative, blending implicit suggestions with explicit commands to those in attendance. As Rector of Eversley in Hampshire, his first post in the Anglican Church, he "was always at pains not to offend the susceptibilities of the latent church-goers and yet anxious to fill his church".[795]

This necessity to strike the right balance clearly influenced his preaching style. In the *Sermons*, Kingsley frequently issues commands to his listeners, but he is keen to retain a familiar style: he uses the phrase "my friends" fifty-two times over the course of the publication. Sometimes he mixed the two, utilising the convivial expression to introduce a stern command to the listener, or indeed

---

[792] Charles Kingsley, *Sermons on National Subjects* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1890 reprint), p. 111.
[793] Thorp, p. 128.
[794] *The London Quarterly Review*, Volume VIII (April, 1857), p. 3.
[795] Una Pope-Hennessy, *Canon Charles Kingsley: A Biography* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1948), p. 50.

the reader of the published version. In a sermon on Ahab and Naboth, Kingsley offers a stark warning on the implications of emulating Ahab:

> But, my friends - and be you rich or poor, take heed to my words – whenever any man gives way to selfishness, and self-seeking, to a proud, covetous, envious, peevish temper, the Devil is sure to glide up and whisper in his ear thoughts which will make him worse – worse, ay, than he ever dreamt of being.[796]

Kingsley frequently reminded his audience that the Devil is a very real presence in life, constantly waiting to take advantage of any moral failings that might occur. Kingsley melded his political beliefs into these concerns, overtly declaring that poorer members of society are more at risk of being led astray. He noted the "Temptation where the Devil stands calling to the poor man all day long, 'Fall down, and worship me; and I will relieve those wants of thine which man neglects!'".[797]

Ideas of social inequality and collective responsibility permeate the *Sermons*, and Kingsley stressed the importance of charity and assisting the poorest in society. In one particularly stirring passage, he praised charity not only as an act that can directly benefit those in need of it, but as something that everyone can engage in, given that it is, in his view, the 'Spirit of God at work. The following passage illuminates Kingsley's views wonderfully:

---

[796] Charles Kingsley, *The Sermons for the Times* (London: John W. Parker & Son, 1855), p. 172. In the Old Testament story, King Ahab desired a vineyard owned by Naboth, and Queen Jezebel conspired to have him executed so that her husband could possess the vineyard. Elijah prophesied the king's destruction, and though Ahab repented and was personally spared, God transferred the punishment to his son, who was subsequently killed. Jezebel also met a gruesome end in due course. Kingsley used the Biblical tale as an allegory for the situation as he saw it in the 1850s and warned that nobody should become as greedy as Ahab, lest they suffer divine wrath for their actions.

[797] Kingsley, *Sermons*, p. 360.

> In one word, while the spirit of the world thinks of itself, and helps itself, Charity, which is the Spirit of God, thinks of other people, and helps other people. And now: - to be always thinking of other people's feelings, and always caring for other people's comfort, what is that but the mark, and the only mark, of a true gentleman, and a true lady? There is none other, my friends, and there never will be. But the poorest man or woman can do that; the poorest man or woman can be courteous and tender, careful not to pain people, ready and willing to help every one to be the best of their power; and therefore, the poorest man or woman can be a true gentleman or a true lady in the sight of God, by the inspiration of the Spirit of God, whose name is charity.[798]

The importance of conveying this message to the public was paramount to Kingsley at this time; in 1855, he wrote to Frederick Denison Maurice that:

> Everything seems to me not worth working at, except the simple business of telling poor people, 'Don't fret, God cares for you, and Christ understands you'… I cannot escape that wretched fear of a national catastrophe… I live in dark, nameless dissatisfaction and dread, which has certainly not diminished during the last few months.[799]

---

[798] Ibid, pp. 311-12.
[799] Charles Kingsley to F. D. Maurice, August 6, 1855, published in Frances Eliza Kingsley (ed.), *Charles Kingsley: His Letters and Memories of His Life* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1914), p. 168.

This theme runs through the sermons, and Kingsley married the idea of charity to the notion that salvation is granted at baptism, rather than being earned over the course of one's life, and that salvation is a gift bestowed at baptism to lose, not a reward to be earned. In a passage that does rather vindicate, to an extent, some of the accusations of pomposity levelled at Kingsley, he offered a linguistic 'proof' of inherent salvation:

> If you say of a man, 'he is in a state of happiness', you mean, do you not, that he is happy now, not that he may perhaps be happy some day? If you came to me and told me that you were in a state of hunger, you would think it a very strange answer to receive if I say, 'Very well then, if you become hungry, come to me, and I will feed you?' You all know that a man's being in a state of poverty, or of misery, means that he is poor or miserable now, here, at this very time; that if a man is in a state of sickness, he is sick; if he is in a state of health, he is healthy. Then what can a man's being in a state of salvation mean, by all rules of English, but that he is saved?[800]

When he went on the offensive, Kingsley was a strident preacher who desired that his words be accompanied by meaningful action. Considering his work for the penny journal *Politics for the People*, founded by Kingsley, Maurice, and the socialist barrister John Malcolm Ludlow, Owen Chadwick has observed that "Kingsley never wrote for analysts… If more of the contributors had resembled Kingsley, more of the workers might have read the paper".[801] In terms of taking action, "Kingsley was for drawing the sword and throwing away the

[800] Kingsley, *Sermons*, pp. 34-5.
[801] Chadwick, *Part 1*, p. 353.

scabbard".[802] This verve and vigour, evident in his early career, was consistent throughout his career, and he sought to instil in his audiences a similar inclination toward meaningful actions. Kingsley exhorted his listeners/readers to:

> Ask yourself in every action, 'What is right, what is my duty, what would God have me do?' And so far from finding it unpleasant, you will find that you are saving yourself a thousand troubles, and sorrows, and petty anxieties which now torment you; you will find that in God's presence is life, the only life worth having, and that at His right hand are pleasures for evermore".[803]

Indeed, Kingsley showed his disdain for these two groups in a sermon entitled "Justification by Faith", in which he praised the catechism of the Anglican Church but criticised what he viewed as the inappropriate implementation of it in certain quarters. He chided such 'flawed' instruction, declaring that:

> The explanations which were given of it were no explanations at all, but another doctrine, which our forefathers knew not; either Dissenting or Popish; either a religion of fancies, and feelings, and experiences, or one of superstitious notions and superstitious ceremonies which have been borrowed from the Church of Rome, and which, I trust in God, will be soon returned to their proper owner,

[802] Chadwick, p. 353.
[803] Kingsley, *Sermons*, pp. 274-75.

> if the free, truthful, God-trusting English spirit is to remain in our children.[804]

The rejection of Dissent, presumably in all its forms, and Roman Catholicism is clear, but it is far less inflammatory than the invective produced in *Westward Ho*, a novel by Kingsley set in the sixteenth century and also published in 1855. Simon Goldhill has described it as a "boy's-own, swashbuckling anti-Catholic adventure story", and the combination of anti-Catholic vitriol and persistent racism are prevalent even by the standards of the 1850s.[805] Such repugnant views are clearly at odds with the spirit of charity and understanding that Kingsley promoted elsewhere, and it must be kept in mind that his vision of utopia was not open to all. Hypatia, published in 1853, was equally "strident" in its anti-Catholicism. Despite his 'progressive' attitude in some areas, in others, he was very much a man of his time, as lamentable as that is to modern readers. With regard to Dissenters and Roman Catholics, he attempted to offer an olive branch immediately after the passage quoted above by saying "I know that there are good men among Dissenters, my friends; good men among Romanists. I have met with them, and I thank God for them".[806]

Ironically, this is one of the few times that he used 'Romanist' to describe Roman Catholics, and he only used 'Popery' once throughout the collection of sermons. Clearly, he was not beyond using these slurs, but he was much more restrained than some of his contemporaries. However, as demonstrated above, he was not against denigrating groups for their faith, race, or nationality, and the *Sermons* are much more muted than some of his other works in terms of espousing his ideas in these areas. Kingsley's anti-Catholicism is present in these works, but

---

[804] *Ibid*, p. 90.
[805] Simon Goldhill, 'How Odd is Kingsley's Hypatia?' in Jonathan Conlin and Jan Marten Ivo Klaver, *Charles Kingsley: Faith, Flesh, and Fantasy* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2021), p. 86.
[806] Kingsley, *Sermons*, pp. 90-91.

it would be the clash with Newman in 1864 that would highlight it: Frank Turner believes that the rivalry re-energised Newman's career and catapulted him back into the public sphere.[807] This was still to come, though. In 1855, Kingsley was measured in his attacks on Catholicism and Dissent, at least outside of his novels.

At the heart of much of Kingsley's preaching, and indeed in his novels, was the idea of 'manliness', and expressing that notion in a Christian context. This has also been defined as "Muscular Christianity"; whatever name it is given, it represented an inducement to be fit and active as a manifestation and celebration of the gift of humanity as bestowed by God. As Norman Vance has observed, Kingsley's "vigorous spirit", honed through youthful experience of traditional countryside pursuits, merged with the theological insights that he developed in adulthood.[808] This was potentially strengthened by Kingsley's opposition to Tractarianism and its ascetism that he viewed as a rejection of God's gift to mankind.[809]

Vance has emphasised that the insistence on the necessity of physical activity was what Kingsley meant by 'manliness', and so Vance uses the term 'Christian manliness' much more frequently in his work. However, Donald E. Hall has opined that, for Kingsley, "'manliness' was synonymous with strength", and thus 'muscular' better represents Kingsley's focus on the male form as a focal point for his theology.[810] C. J. W. -L. Wee has stated that Kingsley's muscular Christianity was a way to improve England's poor performance politically and militarily, and thus had applications beyond the ecclesiastical.[811] Kingsley had been advised by Frederick Denison Maurice not to blithely assume that the world

---

[807] Frank M. Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 4.
[808] Norman Vance, *Sinews of the Spirit: The Ideal of Christian Manliness in Victorian Literature and Religious Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 29-30.
[809] *Ibid*.
[810] Donald E. Hall, 'Introduction: Muscular Christianity' in Donald E. Hall (ed.), *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 9.
[811] C. J. W. -L. Wee, 'Christian Manliness and National Identity in Hall (ed.), pp.67-8.

was good: people had to be instructed, lest they fall from grace.[812] Seeing the Oxford Movement as a pernicious influence on Anglicanism, and perceiving that England was struggling due to laziness and lethargy, Kingsley propagated muscular Christianity as a solution to these supposed ills.

In a sermon on 'The Doxology', Kingsley pointedly remarked that each creature on Earth had been granted "fitness" by God in order to accomplish that which He desired.[813] However, "fitness" was different in the masculine and feminine dichotomy as Kingsley viewed it. The sermon 'Death in Life' illustrates this: Kingsley chided men for not keeping their bodies in good condition; he criticised women for "selling their modesty"; they are further chastised for taking pleasure in their appearances, men for not doing so.[814] Kingsley did not neglect to address women in his sermons, but he did not apply the same criteria to considerations of their spiritual well-being. His rhetoric reflected a more generalised chauvinism that saw men as active agents and women as rather more passive, whose activity most likely risked their own souls, and, more tellingly, that of the men they risked destabilising with their inappropriate behaviours.[815]

Keble and Manning: The Oxford Movement Divided

As Peter Nockles has recognised, the natural conclusion of constitutional changes between 1828 and 1833 "was that religion and politics could no longer be presented as but 'two aspects of the same thing'", Keble inevitably found it necessary to defend the interests of religion.[816] This defence would help to shape

---

[812] Vance, p. 85.
[813] Kingsley, *Sermons for the Times*, p. 153.
[814] *Ibid*, p. 262.
[815] See Laura Fasick, 'Charles Kingsley's Scientific Treatment of Gender' in Hall (ed.), pp. 91-113 for more on the subject of gender in Kingsley's work, although Fasick primarily focuses on Kingsley's novels.
[816] Peter Bendict Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 44.

a movement that left an indelible mark on Anglicanism, even if it never enjoyed mass popular appeal.[817] Keble did not produce the *Assize Sermon* from nowhere. It was the product of intellectual consultations, primarily with three of his students from Oriel College, Oxford, that would also be part of the movement: Richard Wilberforce, Isaac Williams, and Richard Froude.[818] Keble's ideas, developed in this small reading group, formed part of the wider development of Tractarianism that had its origins in the challenges to the Church's primacy in the 1820s, which Jeremy Morris has considered.[819] Though its precise origins are potentially impossible to place, this is not particularly problematic. What is of importance is that the Oxford Movement, in its various guises, "presented a deliberate challenge to a consensus within Anglicanism".[820] Avis has stated that "in general terms, it [the consensus] comprised an acceptance of the protestant character of the Church of England and its articles, liturgy and polity".[821]

Having been an integral part of the Oxford Movement, it was no surprise that Keble would be a prominent figure in attempts to prevent others influenced by the movement following Newman's lead and converting to Roman Catholicism. Indeed, Keble was encouraged to try and rein in a group that he had excited in the 1820s with both his writing and his sermons. *The Christian Year*, a series of poems for Sundays and certain feast days, made Keble a national figure when it was revealed that he was its author. Though Marvin O'Connell has determined that, in literary terms, it was "a minor achievement to brighten the wasteland between Keats and the young Tennyson", he does state that "its success made Keble overnight a national figure".[822] As a result, he became a focal point

---

[817] *Ibid*, pp. 326-27.
[818] Eugene R. Fairweather, 'Introduction to John Keble's *National Apostasy* sermon' in Fairweather (ed.), *The Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 35.
[819] Jeremy Morris, *The High Church Revival in the Church of England: Arguments and Identities* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 11-12.
[820] Paul Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989), p. 163.
[821] *Ibid*.
[822] O'Connell, p. 94.

not only for Anglicans that were concerned by recent machinations and developments regarding the Church of England, but also for those who sensed the development of a movement that was taking shape around men such as Keble.

The primary aim of *The Christian Year* was conventional: it was "designed to bring private readers into conformity with modes of thought and feeling trained in the Prayer Book".[823] However, as Joshua King has stated astutely, a large part of its appeal was that it spoke to "a cross-denominational community of anonymous, faithful readers united by basic piety and a generally Christian typological code for interpreting national and daily life."[824] This broad appeal, coupled with a sense that the present situation was alarming, and that good Christians needed to do their part to avert catastrophe, only increased Keble's appeal.

Keble's High Churchmanship appeared to have momentum, and within Oxford, it became a more attractive proposition to "young Oxonians who sought a ginger group" than belonging to other traditions, even the recently popular Evangelical groups; students were to be found "flocking to hear Keble and later Newman rather than aligning themselves with a movement whose radical appeal now appeared jaded".[825] The Oxford Movement had become a prominent element of Anglicanism in England, but it was deeply damaged by Newman's conversion in 1845. Although "defections" among Anglican clergy had started in 1843, Newman's conversion to Rome encouraged many who had previously demurred on the grounds that Newman had remained within the Church of England.[826] Thus, from 1845, there was a need to limit the damage done by Newman's change of allegiance: encouraged by Pusey, Keble's *Sermons Academical and Occasional*

---

[823] Joshua King, 'John Keble's "The Christian Year": Private Reading and Imagined National Community', *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 40.2 (2012), p. 408.
[824] *Ibid*, p. 416.
[825] Gareth Atkins, 'Anglican Evangelicalism' in Jeremy Gregory (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume II: Establishment and Empire, 1662-1829* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), p. 472.
[826] James Pereiro, 'The Oxford Movement and Anglo-Catholicism' in Strong (ed.), p. 196.

was published in 1847, with the intention of "reassuring the anxious and the waverers while trying to give direction to what was left of it [The Oxford Movement]".[827]

Sermons Academical and Occasional was Keble on the defensive, attempting to stem the tide of conversions to Rome while having to account for why Newman, and those who had followed him, had made such a decision. It is not difficult to miss the irony of the situation. While arguably not the precise origin of the Oxford Movement, the "National Apostasy" sermon of 1833 certainly introduced Tractarianism to the wider public; it was the first example of Tractarian efforts to highlight "in an often provocative way theological issues that had lain dormant" within the Church of England.[828] Fourteen years later, Keble attempted to mitigate the damage that had occurred after Newman's break with the Church of England, with the publication of the sermons under consideration. If Dean Church was correct in stating that Keble "was absolutely without ambition" and "hated show and mistrusted excitement", this must have been a challenging period for such a reserved individual.[829]

Even if it was, in the period after Newman's conversion "Keble really came into his own."[830] Along with Pusey, Keble sought to steady the ship; as a figure of some public renown, thanks mainly to *The Christian Year*, Keble was the obvious choice to address the issue. His primary method was to avoid discussing the clash with Rome, and the preface to *Sermons Academical and Occasional* marks the only time that he publicly addressed the issue.[831] In this preface, Keble stressed the shared heritage of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church, noting it to be part of the "English theory" that "those from whom we are

---

[827] *Ibid*, pp. 196-97.
[828] Nockles, p. 311.
[829] Dean Church, *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years, 1833-1845* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1904), p. 25.
[830] Battiscombe, p. 267.
[831] *Ibid*, p. 276.

separated are yet in the Church, since we inherit, as it were, through them".[832] As Battiscombe has noted, Keble sought to show High-Church Anglicans that "what they were seeking was to be found within the bounds of the Church of England"; it was not necessary to look outside for what, in his view, existed within.[833]

Keble took his cue from Joseph Butler's *The Analogy of Religion*; Butler's work was intended to demonstrate the validity and necessity of Christianity at a time when doubts were appearing regarding such notions in the middle years of the eighteenth century. Butler began his conclusion by stating that:

> Whatever account may be given of the strange inattention and disregard, in some ages and countries, to a matter of such importance as religion; it would, before experience, be incredible, that there should be the like disregard in those, who have had the moral system of the world laid before them, as it is by Christianity, and often inculcated upon them: because this moral system carries in it a good degree of evidence for its truth, upon its being barely proposed to our thoughts.[834]

Keble modified this statement, not to demonstrate the validity of Christianity, which was a given to Keble and to those whom he was addressing, but to foreground the reality that the Church of England retained the ability to encourage this natural reaction in its members. Keble acknowledged that certain individual desires would have to go unfulfilled through allegiance to the Church of England, but he always "insisted that the requirements of reason be submitted

---

[832] Keble, p. lxix.
[833] Battiscombe, p. 276.
[834] Joseph Butler, *The Analogy of Religion to the Constitution and Course of Nature* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1857, originally published in 1736), pp. 306-07.

to the demands of duty and morality".[835] Keble says as much in the preface to *Sermons*. On the subject of maintaining allegiance to the Church of England, he wrote:

> While we forego some things, in themselves desirable, for charity's and obedience' [sic] sake, there remains yet a great body – enough, if rightly improved, to fill out a whole life – of Catholic opinions, usages, and sympathies, wherein we may indulge without a shadow of offence.

Keble was seen as the right person to undertake such an endeavour due to the favourable reputation that he had maintained since his early career as a poet, academic, and clergyman in the 1820s. Rowell has recognised that many who responded to the Assize Sermon in 1833 were moved to do so by the prominence of Keble, as well as by the power of his oratory; such a reputation "ensured that his words had greater force".[836] It was hoped, by those who wished to maintain a place for Catholicity in the Church of England, that Keble's words still had the same impact fourteen years later. By including the "National Apostasy" sermon, as well as several others from earlier in Keble's career, it was hoped that any High Church Anglicans that were uncertain of their future would be sufficiently moved by a sense of continuity across Keble's time in the public eye: he had been a galvanising presence in previous moments of uncertainty, and would be so again in 1847, as the preface to the *Sermons* would (hopefully) attest.

---

[835] Maria Poggi Johnson, 'Probability the Guide of Life: The Influence of Butler's "Analogy" on Keble and Newman', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 70.3 (September, 2001), p. 323.
[836] Geoffrey Rowell, *The Vision Glorious: Themes and Personalities of the Catholic Revival in Anglicanism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p.21.

The first three sermons, given at Oxford University in 1822 and 1823, are on the subject of 'implicit faith', and serve to provide a basis for Keble's theology. Keble began with "Favour Shewn to Implicit Faith", in which he sought to demonstrate that absolute faith, which did not require inquiry, was preferable for all Christians. Keble quotes Paul's letters to the Corinthians as 'proof' of his notion; the fact that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many noble, were called" demonstrated, in Keble's view, that those who trust the message without needing to evaluate its contents are in a better position than their more inquisitive contemporaries.[837]

The second sermon, "Implicit Faith Recognised by Reason", sought to provide a logical rationale for Keble's position as set out in the first sermon. He aimed to illustrate to potential sceptics that human reason is an aspect of God's work, that faith is not the absence of reason, but rather its zenith. As Keble states:

> What is chiefly required is, duly to impress serious persons with the belief, that God's Spirit works on our spirits, not miraculously, but by quiet methods, guiding not superseding reason, and in such a way, as we must never expect to distinguish from the natural movements of our own thoughts.[838]

This was a constant theme in his writing and preaching. God was constantly at work, subtly guiding the faithful toward revealed truth, truth that could only be attained by implicit faith. Individuals who attempted to decipher God's plan by their own reasoning, if not guided by God but by their own hubris or outside interference, risked undermining their connection to the divine. Such a message

[837] Keble, p. 21.
[838] Ibid, p. 41.

took on a new meaning when the sermon was included in *Sermons*; namely, that those leaving for Rome from 1845 onward were guilty of betraying reason by trying to determine the course of their actions. If the Church of England was an aspect of God's reason, and it was perfectly possible to attain spiritual satisfaction within it, it was, by Keble's logic, erroneous to step outside of the divine plan.

The third sermon of this initial trilogy, "Implicit Faith Reconciled with Free Enquiry", was Keble's attempt to demonstrate that the highest capacity for understanding came from implicit faith. James Pereiro has aptly summed it up by stating that, as Keble understood it, "the many-layered richness of Holy Scripture was well adapted to the ethical process of discovering truth".[839] As long as an individual was embarking upon a process of free enquiry in the true spirit of the Bible, they would naturally be led to the highest truth, which could be found in the Word of God. Of course, should one pursue "truth" via means not directly tied to scripture, there was a risk of being led astray. Keble's mistrust of print culture was evident in this regard: he viewed the diffusion of ideas through various media as potentially dangerous. In a slightly ironic passage, Keble cautioned against overemphasising the importance of a preacher's sermon at the expense of the Biblical truths present in the service as a whole. He stated that:

> The acknowledged fact, that literature and criticism are now more widely diffused than ever they were before, would, of itself, lead one to expect as much. For these are obviously the very pursuits, the prevalence of which would most perilously tempt the teacher to an undue display of oratory or ingenuity, and the hearer to unprofitable remark, and an irreverent way of treating sacred things.[840]

---

[839] James Pereiro, 'John Keble and the Ethos of the Oxford Movement' in Kirstie Blair (ed.), *John Keble in Context* (London: Anthem Press, 2004), p. 64.
[840] Keble, p. 48.

Such a passage would have resonated with readers in 1847 and in the immediate years after the first edition, given the events of 1845. Keble conceived a concept of an *ethos* that was centred on doctrinal assessment of Scripture; anything that did not conform to this, even if it purported to do so, was not in accordance with God.[841] Each individual has the capacity to comprehend the world and to understand it as the product of His will: it is when the individual becomes distracted by oratory or literature not centred on the Word of God that the power of reason becomes dangerous. Keble's asserted that, as long as the Church of England maintained this focus on doctrine, and it engaged in reform that ensured doctrine was central to its practices and principles, it was a suitable place for High Church Anglicans who embraced the catholicity of the Church.

The remainder of *Sermons* consists of a collection of oratories selected to demonstrate Keble's conviction that the Church of England was suitable for High Church Anglicans, despite its shortcomings. Keble was also keen to stress that, because of this suitability, its adherents had to rally to it and support it, lest the Church be further undermined by its opponents. Moreover, it was necessary to reassert the primacy of the Church of England in the relationship between church and state. In the seventh sermon, "Church and State", Keble sought to affirm the superiority of the Church of England over civil government. Taking Isaiah 49.23 as his basis, which states that monarchs were to be the "nursing fathers" or "nursing mothers" of a given Church, he sought to show that the Church ought not to be constrained by the apparatus of the state. While Keble avoids the question of the independence of the Church of England, he does declare that a Church that "depends mainly on state support" risks undermining itself in accordance with the will of the state. Such a relationship would encourage the

[841] James Pereiro, *'Ethos' and the Oxford Movement: At the Heart of Tractarianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 94.

Church "to sacrifice more, much more, of ecclesiastical rights to political expediency, than would be sacrificed, if the Church were deemed independent".[842] Although this sermon was given in 1835, republishing it as part of the *Sermons* was an astute move, given the concerns that Newman, Oakeley and other converts had regarding State interference in the business of the Church. A repudiation of such practices from a prominent Tractarian was certainly a wise move as an attempt to prevent further conversions. By re-acknowledging the issue and communicating that to concerned High Church Anglicans, Keble's work sought to assuage fears that there was no resistance to such interference among the leaders of the Oxford Movement that remained within the Church of England.

Manning's conversion in response to an issue over the sacraments seemingly vindicated "old High Church warnings that the importation of adapted Roman devotions would act rather as an enticement than a bulwark against secession".[843] Owen Chadwick has asserted that Manning was "always an extremist", and that this was combined with an inability to remain silent against what he viewed as errors occurring within the Church of England, which would lead to his conversion.[844] "He always defended positions so clear and unsubtle that they could be crude": while Chadwick was positing this from a political perspective, there is certainly evidence of this in these four volumes.[845] Discussing the "degradation" of sin in 'regenerates' – those that have been baptised, and thus had grace conferred upon them – Manning states that such sin "makes man, who is but little lower than the angels, to be the slave of corruption, like the beasts that perish".[846] He goes on to declare that the "wilful sinner":

---

[842] Keble, p. 151.
[843] Nockles, (1994), p. 227.
[844] Chadwick, *Part* I, pp. 300-01.
[845] *Ibid*, p. 300.
[846] Henry Edward Manning, *Sermons, Volume III* (London: James Burns, 1847), p. 122.

> Becomes the slave not only of the world and of the devil, but of his own corruption, of his own flesh, and of his own tyrannous passions, which, each one, gain a sort of outward personality, and usurp a despotism over the sordid and sensual will, degrading him, and, in every several act, making the degradation intense, because it is freely chosen and willingly endured. Such is every habit of vice, even in the heathen. But how much worse in those that have been born again, who, of sons of God, make themselves again "twofold more the children of hell than" before – who, out of the glorious liberty of the children of God, sell themselves to the bondage of lust, pride, revenge, and the like.[847]

Such severe rhetoric is commonplace in Manning's *Sermons*: there is no hint of an affectionate rejoinder such as Kingsley's 'my friends' in these volumes. Manning frequently employs emotive terms and proffers warnings that there are many ways to stray from God's path. Whereas Kingsley appealed to his audience's reason, encouraging them to work out for themselves why a certain issue might be as he (Kingsley) put forward, Manning employed a much more authoritarian style in the pulpit. In his youth, Kingsley subscribed to the evangelical wing of Anglicanism, but by the 1840s, he had rejected its theological perspectives. However, he had "absorbed its spiritual temper, unction, and zeal", and this is evident in the *Sermons*.[848] "Evangelicalism gave an example of intense piety and enthusiasm" and as Manning was from an evangelical background, as was Newman, Machin is correct to state that "the original imprint was by no means erased by their later proclivities".[849] As Manning states in the second

---

[847] *Ibid*, p. 123.
[848] Peter Nockles, 'Review: Cardinal Manning: An Intellectual Biography by James Pereiro', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 51.2 (October, 2000), p. 778.
[849] Machin, p. 76.

volume in a sermon entitled 'The Right Use of Rest after Trial', "If we enter upon a devout life, we must not do it by halves, but with decision. There must be no reserves, but a full surrender of ourselves, to be wholly sanctified 'in spirit, and soul, and body".[850]

For Manning, a devout life involved subjugating oneself to Christ, and this was to be carried out under the auspices of the Church. Of course, Manning would go on to change his mind about which Church that should be, but by 1850, that was still the Church of England in his mind. As Rowan Strong has noted, Manning held the belief that only the Church was blessed with the divine promise of endurance, and thus "only insofar as the state supported the Church would the state share in the permanency of the Church".[851] It was to the Church that each individual owed their loyalty, not the state. In practical terms, Manning's *Sermons* make it clear that subordination is not only a rhetorical action but involves embracing toil and hardship, and a denial of one's desires. This theme runs throughout the *Sermons*. In volume I, Sermon VII, 'A Severe Life Necessary for Christ's Followers', Manning asserts that "No two powers can be more antagonist than man's nature and Christ's service; and the struggle issues, as either power prevails, in apostacy or in self-denial".[852] He continued:

> A self-sparing temper will make a man not only an utter contradiction to his Lord, but even to himself. Only let difficulties gather and hedge him in, and, though honest in the feeble longings of his heart, he will compromise himself with petty equivocations, or crooked dealing, just within the verge of self-evident duplicity; or he will explain away his meaning, and wear down the severe truth

[850] Manning, *Sermons, Volume II*, p. 176.
[851] Rowan Strong, 'Anglicanism and the State' in Strong (ed.), p. 110.
[852] Manning, *Sermons, Volume I*, p. 93.

> of his principles, and come out of the trial no better than a worse man would issue from a like temptation.[853]

Sermon XV of volume II is entitled 'Poverty: A Holy State', in which Manning celebrates the 'virtues' of a life of poverty. The final part is worth quoting at length:

> How clear and direct is their insight into the world beyond the grave! How little have they to divide their thoughts with God! How soon they release themselves from life! How simply they die! What are our hurried days and waking nights, but the tyranny of a multitude of thoughts, which are worldly, ambitious, selfish, or needless, empty, and vain? What is it that keeps us perpetually straining, and moiling, and wearing ourselves away, but some desire which is not chastened, some thought of the heart which is not dead to this worldly state? What makes us lament the flight of time, and the changes of the world, but that we are still a part of it, and share its life? What makes us die so hard, but that we leave behind us more treasures than we have laid up in heaven – that our hearts are not there, but here? How much of mercy and meaning does that put into all worldly reverses! The loss of fortune is, as it were, a call to perfection; the appointment of a poor lot in life, or of a precarious livelihood, are tokens of His will to make us share in the likeness of His poverty.[854]

---

[853] Manning, *Sermons, Volume I*, p. 95.
[854] Manning, *Sermons, Volume II*, p. 303.

Manning would certainly have been a hypocrite of the highest order if Purcell and Strachey's assertions that he was a self-serving, vainglorious individual held water. Such accusations have been subsequently dismissed, but one can much more legitimately assert that there is more than a trace of the puritanical in Manning's words. Sermon VII in volume IV, 'Complaining a Hindrance to the Spiritual Life', would not look out of place in a Victorian satire of High-Church Anglicanism. The following excerpt would fit in well in such a piece:

> There is no doubt that the habit of looking into ourselves, and dwelling upon ourselves, produces a train of spiritual evils, such as scruples, sadness, fearfulness, misgiving, doubting of God, shrinking, depression, despondency, weakness, religious egotism, and the like. For in truth, many look into themselves when they ought to be looking to the Sacrifice upon the cross.[855]

It is quite curious to read that scruples are a 'spiritual evil', but such was Manning's wont. A charge of hypocrisy is perhaps more fitting here on the grounds of the curiously labelled 'shrinking'. On hearing the news of Newman's resignation of St Mary's in 1843, effectively the end of his allegiance to the Church of England, Manning wrote that he would have gone to see Newman but for a "cold in the face". Marvin O'Connell waspishly, but probably not unfairly, posited that Manning most likely "suffered from a cold in the feet".[856] Perhaps looking inward was a prudent move in the right circumstances. Indeed, in a letter to his good friend William Gladstone in October 1843, Manning cited Ecclesiastes 12:2 in writing that "the clouds return after the rain" on the subject

[855] Manning, *Sermons, Volume IV*, p. 125.
[856] O'Connell, p. 400.

of Newman's letter announcing his resignation.[857] There are almost certainly more examples that could support a charge of hypocrisy against Manning, but it is sufficient to leave it at these.

What is of greater importance is the theology behind Manning's *Sermons*, and the subject of suffering encourages comparison with Kingsley's views in his work. Both Manning and Kingsley championed poor relief, and both focused heavily on the condition of the poorest members of society. However, their understanding of poverty and its religious implications warrants comparison. For Kingsley, poverty was a collective failing to heed Jesus' commands to feed and clothe the poor. Charity is the "Spirit of God", a collective act that could improve the lot of everyone in society, for the poor were as much a part of society as everyone else.[858] In an appeal to the more well-off that comes across as somewhat patronising to a modern ear, Kingsley asserts:

> If you leave the poor careless and filthy, you can obtain no good servants: if you leave them profligate, they make your sons profligate also: if you leave them tempted by want, your property is unsafe: if you leave them uneducated, reckless, improvident, you cannot get your work properly done, and have to waste time and money in watching your workmen instead of trusting them.[859]

Kingsley saw not only a spiritual but a social benefit to improving the lives of the poor, and he made this a central aspect of his theological outlook. For Manning, poverty was practically a blessing, a means of being closer to Christ

---

[857] Henry Edward Manning to William Gladstone, October 27, 1843, in Peter C. Erb (ed.), *The Correspondence of Henry Edward Manning and William Ewart Gladstone, 1833-1844* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 393.
[858] Kingsley, *Sermons for the Times*, p. 311.
[859] Kingsley, *Sermons for the Times*, p. 351.

than those who were distracted by material want. "Blessed poverty, to have nothing, that we may possess Christ! for then 'all things are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's'", as Manning states in Sermon XII, 'The Only Sacrifice', in volume IV.[860] Manning was not indifferent to the real suffering of the poor, or that he encouraged the maintenance of poverty as a badge of spirituality: he worked hard on behalf of the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor, and as archdeacon he highlighted the suffering of the poor in his charges.[861]

Indeed, Manning was "devoted" to pastoral work, and wished to communicate with all of his parishioners, whatever their status or situation.[862] Manning's emphasis was on the spiritual purity of the poor, and to encourage others that had been waylaid by greed and desire to emulate this. The trick, for Manning, was to improve the lot of the poor without them losing the 'purity' that they possessed, and for those waylaid by 'desires of the flesh' to imbibe this holiness. Kingsley argued that the poor could not fulfil their spiritual potential, and they had to have their lives improved to do so: Manning argued that the poor were spiritually purer than the more well-off, and that the latter should assist the former not only from a societal perspective, but in order that their spirituality might rub off on those around them.

Spurgeon's effective approach

It was the sermons preached at New Park that marked Spurgeon out as an orator of the highest calibre. His rhetoric appealed not only to Baptists but to

---

[860] Manning, *Sermons, Volume IV*, p. 225.
[861] David Newsome, 'Manning, Henry Edward 1808-1892', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, viewed online via https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-17970?rskey=Fj7ApD&result=2 [accessed 18 June 2025].
[862] Erb, p. 197.

members of other denominations, and his style appealed to people "from all ranks of society".[863] Michael Watts has summarised Spurgeon's appeal, and the condescension with which his preaching was met. Watts stated:

> He did not have a commanding presence. He was short, thick set, with a broad face, low forehead, and small eyes. But he had an exceptionally strong, clear, musical voice which contemporaries variously described as bell-like or silvery and which was sufficiently penetrating to reach every corner of Exeter Hall or the vast Surrey Gardens Music Hall. His sermons were homely, laced with humour, and displaying 'a coarse familiarity with holy things', which struck his critics as irreverent. Upper-class observers, such as Lord Rosebery, noted condescendingly that he had a special appeal to grocers. He knew, commented a writer in the Temple Bar, that his congregation's 'understanding can be best opened by metaphor and parables taken from the retail trade'.[864]

Even many of his critics acknowledged the efficacy of his style. Despite his comment about Spurgeon's appeal to 'grocers', Rosebery asserted that, at the Tabernacle, Spurgeon had built up "a great multitude, powerful, wealthy, devoted, with a perfect organization… with a leader of genius". Rosebery wondered if "it would not be well for 'society' to ponder this?".[865] Francis Edward Paget, a supporter of the Oxford Movement, was derisive of Spurgeon's style, decrying it

---

[863]Dominic Janes, 'Material Religion: C. H. Spurgeon and the "Battle of the Styles" in Victorian Church Architecture' in Joshua King and Winter Jade Werner (eds), *Constructing Nineteenth-Century Religion: Literary, Historical, and Religious Studies in Dialogue* (Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 2019), p. 194.
[864] Michael Watts, *The Dissenters Volume III: The Crisis and Conscience of Nonconformity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 61.
[865] Watts, p. 61.

as “profane ribaldry” that made him (Paget) “shudder”. However, he went on to concede that:

> Spurgeon, with all his hatred of the Church of England, and in spite of his bitter revilings against her, will be one of her best friends if he incites the young clergy to cultivate a facility of speaking in public.[866]

Although the Tractarians were often critical of evangelicalism (despite many of them having been drawn to evangelical perspectives at one time or another), many were not blind to the appeal of men like Spurgeon. As Jeremy Morris has stated, “grudging admiration was often present alongside condemnation” in Tractarian considerations of evangelical preachers.[867] Spurgeon was a sensation in the second half of the nineteenth century, and his sermons were the driving force behind his notoriety.

Spurgeon’s sermons were emotive, designed to entertain and even amuse the listener, but also to elicit strong sensations and provoke reactions from his audience. During a single sermon, he would create a sense of optimism and hope in his audience, but this would be contrasted with the consequences of what might happen if these expectations were not met. Spurgeon would mix the prospects of what appropriate implementations of Christianity, as he saw them, could achieve with the fear of what might occur if this were not so. In sermon 216, ‘Confession and Absolution’, Spurgeon quoted Luke 18:13, in which a Roman public contractor appeals to God to be absolved of his sins. Spurgeon began the sermon by declaring that “The heroes of our Saviour’s stories are most of them selected

---

[866] Francis Edward Paget, *The Parish and the Priest* (London: Joseph Masters, 1858), pp. 82-3.
[867] Jeremy Morris, *The High Church Revival in the Church of England* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), p. 176.

to illustrate traits of character entirely dissimilar to their general reputation".[868] Spurgeon goes on to state that even though this publican might have committed many heinous acts, and might have treated people terribly, he took it upon himself to plead for forgiveness, and that is an example to everyone to heed. No matter how grievous the sin, there is a route back to God. However, later in the sermon, Spurgeon raises an objection to the granting of absolution by priests in particularly strident terms:

> Absolution from the lips of man I do believe is little short of blasphemy. There is in the Prayer Book of the Church of England an absolution which is essentially Popish, which I should think must be almost a verbatim extract from the Romish missal. I do not hesitate to say, that there was never anything more blasphemous printed in Holywell Street, than the absolution that is to be pronounced by a clergyman over a dying man; and it is positively frightful to think that any persons calling themselves Christians should rest easy in a church until they have done their utmost to get that most excellent book thoroughly reformed and revised, and to get the Popery purged out of it.[869]

Spurgeon attempted to instil in his listeners a methodology for achieving union with God, and it was an appreciation for, and understanding of, the doctrines of Calvinism that would make this possible for his congregants. Opposition to Roman Catholicism influenced this direction, and in this regard, he was not much different to many other prominent Protestant figures outside of the

---

[868] Charles Haddon Spurgeon, 'Sermon 216: Confession and Absolution' in Charles Haddon Spurgeon (ed.), *The New Park Street Pulpit, Volume IV*, p. 924.
[869] Spurgeon, Sermon 216, 'Confession and Absolution' in Spurgeon (ed.), *Volume IV*, p. 937.

Anglo-Catholic tradition. What set him apart from many Anglicans was his willingness to use anti-Catholic slurs that were becoming less common in ecclesiastical and religiously oriented literature after 1850. The significance of the Tractarian movement, fading memories of the 1829 Catholic Emancipation Act, and attempts to mirror the development of more 'professional' forms of history had created a culture in which Roman Catholicism was more often critiqued rather than ridiculed, at least in public. Spurgeon had no interest in conforming to this trend.

Over the course of the six volumes, he used the term 'Popery' thirty-five times, 'Romish' seventeen, and 'Papist' and 'Romanism' five times each. Spurgeon found other ways of insulting Roman Catholicism, or anyone he thought was under its sway. In 'The Work of the Holy Spirit' in 1858, he declares that 'Puseyites' are 'devils in white'.[870] In 'Effects of Sound Doctrine' in 1860, Spurgeon delineated the difference between Lutheran Protestants that were, in his view, falling back into Roman Catholic traditions, and Calvinists that represented "Truth as it is in Jesus".[871] He stated that:

> I have been informed by those who are capable of judging, that too many of the followers of Luther have become degenerate, have cast aside spirituality and have really returned to the beggarly elements of Romanism, even though they persist in their Protestant profession. But, my Brothers and Sisters, the like cannot be said of the followers of Calvin.[872]

---

[870] Spurgeon, Sermon 178, 'The Work of the Holy Spirit' in Spurgeon (ed.), *Volume IV*, p. 235.
[871] Spurgeon, Sermon 324, 'Effects of Sound Doctrine' in Spurgeon (ed.), *Volume VI*, p. 733.
[872] *Ibid.*

Although anti-Catholic sentiments had often been sanitised by the middle of the nineteenth century, vitriolic opposition to Roman Catholicism remained at all levels of English society. That over 250 Anglican clergy had followed Newman to Rome between 1845 and 1865 certainly contributed to this opprobrium. The recreation of the Roman Catholic diocesan hierarchy in England in September 1850 by Pope Pius IX had reignited public opprobrium, and Spurgeon's emergence as a preacher of note coincided with this phenomenon. As D. G. Paz has stated, although *Universalis Ecclesiae* increased tensions that were already heightened by Catholic immigration, denominational rivalries within Anglicanism, and poor relations with France, it was "traditional, latent anti-Catholicism" that underpinned popular aggravation toward what was contemporaneously seen as 'Papal Aggression'.[873]

Spurgeon's preaching encouraged these 'latent' feelings to come to the fore among his listeners. Spurgeon was the most prominent example of David Bebbington's conception of a 'conservative' preacher, one who melded a literal interpretation of the Bible that pronounced the imminent return of Jesus, with an aggressive anti-Catholicism predicated on the notion that Roman Catholicism distorted the true image of Christ and would corrupt, rather than save, souls.[874] Spurgeon's preaching contained a good deal of anti-Catholic rhetoric: he regularly highlighted the importance of adherence to Biblical truth as he saw it, and he would often denounce the failings of Roman Catholicism that he perceived. "Much of Popish superstition and idolatry has passed under my observation, and if nothing else could make me a Protestant, what I have seen would do so", as he declared in 'Special Thanksgiving to the Father'.[875] He would also write an article 'Against Romish Anglicanism' in 1865, in which he would

---

[873] D. G. Paz, 'Popular Anti-Catholicism in England, 1850-1851', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 11.4 (Winter, 1979), p. 355.
[874] David Bebbington, *The Dominance of Evangelicalism: The Age of Spurgeon and Moody* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2005), p. 242.
[875] Spurgeon, Sermon 319, 'Special Thanksgiving to the Father' in Spurgeon (ed.), *Volume IV*, p. 630.

ask "Evangelical Churchmen, lovers of the Lord Jesus, how long will you remain in alliance with the defilements of High Churchism [sic]? You are mainly responsible for all the Popery of your Church, for you are its salt and its stay."[876] Spurgeon remained ardently opposed to Roman Catholicism throughout his life – he would condemn the Liberal Party for introducing the Government of Ireland Bill in 1886.[877] Of note for this thesis, his opposition to Rome in his early career would galvanise many anti-Catholics during a period when many Anglicans feared ever-increasing 'encroachment' into English life from Rome.

A Bible reference precedes every sermon in the six volumes, and both Old and New Testament verses are utilised across the volumes. Spurgeon's practice of introducing every sermon with a biblical quote was done to enable his audience to understand the scriptural basis for the theme of a given sermon. He wished to have his audience understand why God made the demands on them that he did, in order that they might not be led astray or fall into sin. Spurgeon sought to create a sense of a personal connection with his audiences, both to encourage and to chastise. He could be startlingly forthright, as in this excerpt from sermon 299, 'Sin Immeasurable':

> And now I single out any other member of my congregation, and whatever be your position in life, whatever your education, or the peculiar providences through which you have passed, I will insist upon it that there is something special about your case which makes your sin such sin, that you cannot understand how vile it is.[878]

---

[876] Spurgeon, 'Against Romish Anglicanism', *Sword and Trowel* No. 16 (August, 1865) p. 357, viewed online via https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/The_Sword_and_the_trowel_ed_by_C_H_Spurg/7SQEAAAAQAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&dq=Sword+and+Trowel&pg=PA122&printsec=frontcover [accessed 18 June 2025].
[877] James Munson, *Nonconformists: In Search of a Lost Culture* (London: SPCK, 1991), p. 56.
[878] Spurgeon, Sermon 299, 'Sin Immeasurable' in Spurgeon (ed.), *Volume VI*, p. 249.

However, there is a strange element of reassurance in such passages; Spurgeon was keen to impress upon his audience that many other had made the same mistakes, and that salvation was not closed off despite them having been made. He ends the sermon by declaring that although everyone is vile "beyond our own comprehension", belief in Jesus is sufficient in order that each individual might be saved.[879] While often stark in his rhetoric, Spurgeon was not averse to making jokes and comical remarks in the pulpit. One device he used was to depict scenarios that caricatured and ridiculed reasons and excuses given for not being able to connect with God. In a sermon on 'The Immutability of God', Spurgeon tells his audience that "There is a woman: she did not pray this morning; she was so busy sending her children to the Sunday School, she had no time to pray. No time to pray? Had you time to dress?"[880] Such passages were designed to make the congregation laugh, and indeed the readers of the published editions, but in a way that questioned the validity of excuses to not engage in behaviours conducive to pleasing God.

Chadwick has declared that this approach to preaching was a reflection of Spurgeon's character. "He was a Calvinist preaching a Calvinist gospel. The assurance of the saved transformed him in a pulpit and filled his being with power. The jokes welled out of a spring of deeper gaiety." While Spurgeon was determined to preach a 'correct' interpretation of the Bible, as he saw it, he recognised that it needed to be conveyed in a way that would speak to his congregation. He knew that jokes, anecdotes, and commonly-understood references would aid in a deeper understanding of scripture. Moreover, he delineated between 'good' and 'bad' in a way that was comprehensible to his audiences, but left enough room for nuance, at least to some degree. He advised

---

[879] *Ibid.*
[880] Spurgeon, Sermon 1, 'The Immutability of God' in Spurgeon (ed.), *Volume I*, pp. 15-16.

his listeners, or readers, to avoid assuming that they understood the hearts of man - "The Christian is a consecrated man, but his consecration is unseen by his fellows, except in the outward deeds which are the result thereof".[881] Outward appearances can be deceptive, and Spurgeon sought to ensure that his listeners did not risk casting out one of their own for spurious reasons. To those who were beyond salvation, as he understood the concept, Spurgeon was less charitable. In the following passage, from a sermon entitled 'The Church of Christ', he lamented the inability of his church to help such 'sinners' because they are too far gone to help:

> I am paralyzed sometimes, when I think that we are of so little service to the neighbourhood, though this is a green oasis in the midst of a great spiritual desert. Just at the back of us we could find you hundreds of Roman Catholics and men of the very worst character; and it is sad to think that we cannot make this place a blessing to them.[882]

It is not due to failings within the Tabernacle that it could not become a 'blessing': it was the faults within these 'men of the very worst character' that precluded them from salvation. For Spurgeon, self-mastery was crucial, and a good preacher could be invaluable in enabling individuals to achieve this. All people should adhere to the teachings of Christ: "Coming to Christ is just the one essential thing for a sinner's salvation. He that cometh not to Christ, do what he may, or think what he may, is yet in 'the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity'".[883] More than this, though, they had to do so in the right way. Spurgeon's

---

[881] Spurgeon, Sermon 224, 'Samson Conquered' in Spurgeon (ed.), *Volume IV*, p. 1066.
[882] Spurgeon, Sermon 28, 'The Church of Christ' in Spurgeon (ed.), *Volume I*, p. 474.
[883] Spurgeon, Sermon 182, 'Human Inability' in Spurgeon (ed.), *Volume IV*, p. 43.

mission was to enable this. Chadwick has written that, whereas Keble was "English religion of the past", Spurgeon was "English religion of the future", "more brash, aggressive, public, biting, and worldly".[884] The New Park sermons demonstrate these qualities in abundance. It is not difficult to discern why it is that Keble is very much a figure of the past, as are the other figures considered in this chapter, whereas Spurgeon is still read and studied in the present day, particularly in American Baptist traditions.

Conclusion

This chapter has evaluated the contents of selected collections of sermons by five clergymen who occupied differing theological positions during the years 1815-61. It has explored the methods by which these individuals espoused their messages to both listeners and readers, and both methods of delivery impacted the ecclesiastical sphere. As oratorical events, sermons operated at the local level, communicating directly with parishioners attending the place of worship, or to students, academics, and fellow-clergymen in a university setting. Word-of-mouth as to the strength (or lack thereof) of the preaching might affect attendances, and the aforementioned importance attached to the effectiveness of a priest's sermons probably played a part in this, too. A clergyman capable of delivering effective and affecting sermons that offered counsel and wisdom to listeners, as well as religious instruction on avoiding the pitfalls of sin, would, most likely, have met the needs of his congregation in a parish church setting.[885] In a university context, these criteria would still have applied, but they would

[884] Chadwick, p. 421.
[885] For an overview of the expectations and realities of parish preaching in the long eighteenth century, which overlaps with the first seventeen or so years of this thesis's date range, see Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, 'Parish Preaching in the Long Eighteenth Century' in Francis and Gibson (eds.), pp. 47-62.

have required greater theological underpinning to satisfy the audience.[886] There was also a higher likelihood of scrutiny from listeners who understood the complex theology involved, and who might be liable to provide a written response in a periodical, or other publication, if the speaker was found to be in error.

While sermons need to be considered as oral communications, it is primarily as collected volumes, available on a print market favourable to them in the nineteenth century, that this chapter has situated the analyses of the selected works. Collections of sermons sold very well during the middle years of the nineteenth century, and it was not until the final decades that sermons' share of the market declined in terms of sales. As a result, collections of sermons were frequently reviewed in periodicals, and favourable reviews opened up the possibility of interested readers seeking out copies of morally and theologically sound sermons. Popular collections might go through multiple additions, sometimes with additional material or prefatory remarks added to them, and publications might even re-review a collection if it was deemed necessary or worthwhile to do so. It is possible that this was due to a favourable relationship between a publication, or its editor(s), and the author of a given work; this is speculative, however, and it is also perfectly plausible that a collection would have a second review if earlier editions had garnered attention. Of course, this does not preclude the initial assessment being unfavourable, and a further review being another condemnation of unsuitable material.

The popularity of collected sermons and their interaction with the broader public sphere through the processes of local discussions and periodical reviewing, made them an important aspect of the ecclesiastical public sphere. Much like periodicals and histories they enabled the ecclesiastically-minded to contribute to

---

[886] There is overlap with Martin Hewitt's conceptions of nineteenth-century religious lectures – see Martin Hewitt, 'Preaching from the Platform' in Francis and Gibson (eds.), pp. 79-96. Hewitt evaluates these lectures as "culture and practice" rather than the lectures as "embodiments of thought", but his analysis is interesting, and it opens up further areas of research into religious lecturing.

a dynamic intellectual space, making it possible to communicate with lay folk far beyond the delineations of their parishes. Consideration of diminishing attendances at churches in the nineteenth century must be counterbalanced by the creation and development of Joshua King's "imagined spiritual communities"; in the nineteenth century, the expansion of print culture enabled the national to supersede the local, at least for those able to participate in the literary public sphere. Even if the local priest was not an engaging speaker, there was a tremendous market for sermons that could be purchased and read at home, to counteract the insipid preaching one might be subjected to at the parish church. Missing church might be permissible as long as there were good-quality sermons at home to provide religious instruction; indeed, it might be theologically preferable to stay at home, as well as being convenient. This is speculative, and more research is necessary to explore these ideas further, but the extent to which printed sermons were a replacement for live preaching, as opposed to being supplementary to it, is an intriguing consideration.

There was certainly still an appetite for preaching in the nineteenth century; as the guides to preaching referenced in the introduction to this chapter demonstrate, there was no shortage of guidance for young clergymen to help them become effective preachers. This must have been due to a perception that this was an integral aspect of clerical life; "spreading the message", especially in an increasingly contested arena of religious division, was about more than putting on a good show. This thesis has primarily focused on the printed aspects of the ecclesiastical public sphere, and in this regard, debates surrounding religion and theology took place on a national scale.

However, the local aspect cannot be disregarded; for those who could not participate in the written form of the public sphere, due to lack of educational opportunity or sufficient time to engage with it, hearing sermons (or preaching in general) might be their main, and quite possibly sole, means of connecting to the

issues they raised. While this could not be considered direct participation, at least in most cases, congregations could be supplied with "correct" religious instruction. After the 1832 Reform Act, Peel recognised the importance of appealing to the public, as evidenced by the publication of his "Tamworth Manifesto" in 1834. Although public opinion did not have anything like the influence it does in the twenty-first century (at least in theory), there were long-standing concerns about the moral health of the nation, and fears as to what the adverse effects might be if it was lacking. Collectively, sermons were among the most listened-to public orations and so provided excellent opportunities to inoculate the nation against blasphemies, heresies, and religious error.

While sermons could serve this function for national ends, they also help us to further understand the theological perspectives of some prominent nineteenth-century clergymen, which has been another aim of this present chapter. Whereas Chapter Three on ecclesiastical histories selected a few lesser-known individuals who exemplified contemporary trends in history-writing, this chapter has chosen four individuals who are best-known in other capacities, but whose sermons form a substantial part of their literary output. Arnold, Kingsley, Keble, and Manning are all significant figures in nineteenth-century religious history in England, but this chapter contends that their sermons have not been sufficiently considered in aiding understanding of their theological positions.[887] All four engaged in the ecclesiastical public sphere, and their sermons can be utilised to glean further information as to how they conceptualised and communicated their positions. This present chapter has offered some insights into these possibilities, but each case study can be evaluated in much greater depth in future research.

[887] Keble's "Assize Sermon" is well-known as a catalyst for the Oxford Movement, but the broader point referred to in the main body at this juncture still applies.

The final case study, Charles Spurgeon, differs from those four as his renown was primarily garnered as a preacher, although his written output also formed part of this, chiefly the *Sword and Trowel*, the magazine started by Spurgeon. Spurgeon's example illustrated that the local could become the national, and even the international, in his case. Beyond this, one might say that he has become historical, given that his works, particularly his sermons, are still read today, predominantly by Baptists. His preaching, the apex of which was the sermons centred on a Bible passage, brought him attention in London, which quickly led to him drawing crowds numbering in the thousands. He is a revered figure in Baptist traditions, and the *Sword and Trowel*, which began in 1865, is still going strong in 2025. The ultimate power of preaching was manifest in Charles Spurgeon, and his example surely concerned and inspired Church of England clergymen to varying degrees. Charles Simeon had implored these Church of England priests to craft their sermons and learn homiletics earlier in the century – Spurgeon demonstrated what might be possible if effective preaching was introduced to the public.[888]

This chapter has attempted to situate Spurgeon alongside Arnold, Kingsley, Keble, and Manning as exemplars of nineteenth-century sermon writers, to evaluate the contents of a selected number of their sermons, and to explore how these sermons reflect their interactions with the ecclesiastical public sphere. Framing these evaluations through the lens of Robert Ellison's "juxtaposition" between spoken and printed sermons, and as an element of "orality-literacy theory", this chapter has analysed collections of sermons as aspects of and contributions to the ecclesiastical public sphere.

[888] Simeon was on the shortlist for consideration in this chapter; any expansion of this present chapter into further work on sermons should incorporate his work and discuss his influence in greater detail.

Conclusion

Summary of contents

This thesis has explored four forms of printed media that contributed to what is termed the "ecclesiastical public sphere": religious periodicals, what have been termed "broader" periodicals, ecclesiastical histories, and collections of sermons. Dedicating a chapter to selected case studies from each of these areas has enabled this work to contextualise and evaluate different perspectives on and contributions to the ecclesiastical public sphere, using materials that shaped and reflected the nature of religious debate in England in the years 1815 to 1861. The combination of periodicals, histories, and sermons has shown that the ecclesiastical public sphere operated in a range of contexts, and that discourse on religion found expression in different formats. Previous research has shown that religious materials sold well in the nineteenth century, and while religion's share of the market declined in the second half of the century, it was still among the most popular genres. While the eminence of religion in the nineteenth century has been acknowledged, the methodologies and theologies of writers on religion has not received the attention concomitant with religion's position in nineteenth-century life. Through the case studies selected within the types of media chosen for this project, this thesis has aimed to contribute towards foregrounding this approach to understanding religion in nineteenth-century England.

Chapter one considered four religious periodicals: the *British Critic*, the *Christian Remembrancer*, the *Christian Observer*, and the *Church of England Quarterly Review*. Periodical culture flourished in the nineteenth century, and this chapter evaluated how those four examples operated in this burgeoning field. The chapter assessed the origins of each periodical, the theological purview of each

of them, and how they responded to discussions on religion. Moreover, this chapter assessed how these approaches by the selected periodicals evolved over time, whether this was due to socio-cultural changes during the period or editorial shifts that affected a given publication's output. Developing print culture occurred in tandem with more serious challenges to the status of the Established Church; Anglicanism itself was divided, the demarcation between parties within becoming more prominent. Religious periodicals offered contributors an opportunity to elucidate their views to like-minded audiences; more than this, religious periodicals presented opportunities to disseminate ideas, which could help fellow-readers to understand and defend their own theological positions. This chapter, using the four case studies, has provided instances of religious periodicals involving themselves in discussions on religion in England, how these were put across using specific examples, and what this meant for the ecclesiastical public sphere. This chapter has examined specific examples from a small fraction of the available literature in this area, meaning that the potential for further research in this area is rich.

The next chapter considered the discussion of ecclesiastical matters in five "broader" periodicals, which this thesis interpreted as publications whose contents covered a variety of topics. Despite this range of interests within their pages, these "broader" periodicals had much to say about religion. While contributors to articles on religion were often from the laity, many clergymen wrote for them, too, including bishops. This chapter argued that the *Edinburgh Review*, the *Quarterly Review*, the *Gentleman's Magazine*, *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country*, and the *Eclectic Review* all took an active interest in religion that was not dispassionate. Each of them took theological positions, dictated by their editorial situation, and their religious output reflected this. Much like the examples in Chapter One, these positions were malleable. This was often linked to the political perspective of a given periodical; the variations in this regard mirrored the dynamic relationship between Church and State, which was a

frequent consideration for these periodicals. As above, Chapter Two assesses a selection of examples across the period, and many other nineteenth-century periodicals could be utilised as the five in this chapter have been.

The third chapter evaluated five works of ecclesiastical history, considering them as aspects of the ecclesiastical public sphere and in relation to the "professionalisation" of History as a discipline in the nineteenth century. With the latter in mind, the chapter was arranged chronologically, charting a path from what might be considered "coarser" histories, reliant on invective and intensely reflective of the authors' beliefs, to relatively more nuanced approaches. Before this, an essay on the development of history writing in the nineteenth century was provided, to contextualise and situate the ecclesiastical histories chosen for the chapter. After this introductory essay, Robert Southey's *Book of the Church* and Henry Soames' *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* were analysed together. They were "typical examples" of ecclesiastical history being written ahead of Catholic Emancipation in 1829, and represent strident pro-Church of England, anti-Catholic writing. After these, the chapter assessed Henry Stebbing's *History of the Reformation* as a turning point away from the histories of Southey and Soames. Although Stebbing's work was not devoid of the anti-Catholicism found in the previous works, it relied less on rhetoric and more on argument, which mirrored a general shift in nineteenth-century history writing. Finally, Frederick Denison Maurice's *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries* and Robert Hussey's *The Rise of the Papal Power traced in Three Lectures* represented nascent academic approaches to ecclesiastical history. These two works mirrored a desire within the public sphere for more refined approaches to history writing, as a point of departure from earlier works that Southey and Soames typified.

The final chapter of this thesis considered the contribution of sermons to the ecclesiastical public sphere. While it did provide some analysis of them as spoken performances, the primary focus was on printed collections of sermons.

Whereas periodicals and histories targeted a narrower audience with the time and education to engage in high-minded debate (even if this was often laced with virulent anti-Catholicism), printed sermons had a wider remit. Obviously, they required someone to be able to read them, but they could be read among households, in classrooms, or any other location in which a group might receive religious instruction. In the nineteenth century, this could apply to a broad range of contexts. Sermons provided means for clergymen to dispense wisdom and guidance to the laity, and this could incorporate current discussions occurring within the ecclesiastical public sphere. Much like periodicals and histories, sermons could be used to influence the public sphere rather than merely interpret and reflect it. While all of the case studies considered in this chapter used their sermons as an important aspect of their contribution, the chapter contends that Charles Spurgeon was the most successful in this regard as his style of preaching best lent itself to the model of moral and spiritual instruction that sermons typified.

Research aims covered by the thesis

Through targeted case studies, across the forms of printed materials covered above, this thesis has examined the role of the ecclesiastical public sphere in the exchange of ideas related to religion in England in the years 1815 to 1861. This exploration has shown that it was a dynamic and vibrant intellectual space that was participated in by individuals and groups from within the Established Church and outside of it. The range of case studies, spanning denominations, Anglican Church party affiliations, and time periods, shows that this was a highly contested arena across the nineteenth century. Periodicals, histories, and sermons all facilitated this ecclesiastical sparring; the case studies selected for this project all considered the situation as they perceived it, and all contributed to modifying

or reinterpreting it through their own lens. This thesis aimed to use these case studies to provide a snapshot of the contributions made by participators in the ecclesiastical public sphere, both on their own merits and as indicators of what further research might yield.

This thesis has suggested further avenues of research into nineteenth-century religion, using the case studies to show that an array of printed materials can be used to contribute to this. While periodicals, histories, and sermons have all been cited in works that consider religion in the nineteenth century, this thesis has explored ways in which deeper and more focused studies of these materials can further contribute to these considerations. Analysis of specific passages in articles, histories, and sermons have elucidated the theological deliberations behind them, thus showing that they are helpful for historians in comprehending nineteenth-century religious discourse. Contextualising them within the dynamic ecclesiastical public sphere situates these passages within contemporary discussions of religion, and it provides further evidence that their purpose was both reactive and constructive.

Another objective has been to reinforce the vitality of religious discourse in the years under consideration, and to highlight the extent to which it comprised a key aspect of print culture in England. This thesis has aimed to build on the work of Joshua King, Mark Knight, and others in signposting the role that religion played in print culture, and that it acted as a cultural and intellectual rallying point for numerous groups in the middle of the nineteenth century. In doing so, this thesis sets itself against the secularisation thesis, and it has offered a contribution to a growing body of work, particularly in the twenty-first century, that counters the idea of secularisation as a fundamental idea in the nineteenth century. While accepting Frances Knight's conclusion that the Church of England was less influential by 1870, this thesis rejects the view that secularisation was occurring to a significant extent in the nineteenth century. It agrees with Callum Brown's

assertion that secularisation was a later phenomenon, and not one that gradually took hold during the period under consideration.

This thesis has used the terms "ecclesiastical public sphere" and "public sphere" throughout; it is important to state at this juncture that it has considered the ecclesiastical public sphere as a distinctive entity in its own right, and as an aspect of the all-encompassing "public sphere". These are malleable conceptions, and this work has interlinked the ecclesiastical element of the public sphere to this broader idea. Chapter Two illustrates that religion was an important part of "secular" periodicals' output, but it must be remembered that the case studies in Chapter One were all periodicals in the manner of the template constructed by the *Edinburgh Review* and the *Quarterly Review*. The difference was in the narrowly theological output of the examples in Chapter One, but the institution of "religious" periodicals along the lines of the two great examples of nineteenth century periodicals shows that religious dialogue, in this regard, was shaped by existing, nominally "secular" aspects of the wider public sphere. Of course, this thesis has argued that the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly*, along with the other case studies in Chapter Two, had an ecclesiastical dimension. The salient point here is that this thesis has shown that the ecclesiastical public sphere was not a dislocated subsection, although it could function as such in isolation, but that it often overlapped with secular aspects of the public sphere.

This thesis contends that religion remained central to social, cultural, and intellectual life in England in the middle of the nineteenth century. This maintained influence found increased opportunities for expression in a burgeoning public sphere, stimulated by the rise of the periodical press, the professionalisation and "disciplinisation" of historical studies, and increased rates of literacy that led to greater participation in the public sphere. Chapters One and Two pertain to the point about the periodical press, Chapter Three to advancements in historical study, and Chapter Four to greater participation in the literary public sphere, as this increased market led to greater sales due to the

popularity of religion as a topic of interest for consumers. This Church of England certainly faced challenges during the period under consideration in this project, but these came predominantly from Dissenters with fundamental differences to the Established Church, and Governments that considered religious toleration to take precedence over the wants of the Church of England. The cries of "Church in Danger" resonated in the nineteenth century, even if it was often overblown. "Christianity in danger" would not have rung as true, even if accusations of "atheism" were not uncommon. "Atheism" often translated as "unorthodoxy", or to disagreement over a particular issue. It seldom meant what we understand it as today.

Each of the case studies in this thesis was chosen due to their relevance to the chapter each was in, and this work has provided rationales as to why they were included. All four chapters could have contained different case studies to those chosen; those that were selected have been justified at the start of each chapter, and collectively they provide wide-ranging insights into individual and collective contributions to the ecclesiastical public sphere. Alternatives could have been utilised, given the range of options in each area, but this work has purposely sought to offer targeted case studies that fit the aims and objectives of this study. That is not to say that those chosen covers the full spectrum of theological perspectives, but that they provide a suitable range for the purposes of this project.

Possibilities for future research

It is hoped that this thesis has shown that there are ample materials to develop and refine understanding of the ecclesiastical public sphere. Employing familiar sources and more esoteric ones in tandem exhibits its scope demonstrates that there is a rich variety of materials to be drawn on for future projects. While the individual value of each source varies, collectively they offer myriad

possibilities for studies at national or local levels. Certain periodicals or other works might have been popular in certain locations or among particular groups and could be used in innovative ways. This project has chosen certain areas of religious debate to consider, and a limited number of case studies through which to examine them. The many other events, themes, and case studies can be utilised in future research projects, either as specific focal points or as aspects of broader studies such as this one. This thesis has placed emphasis on the Catholic Question and Dissenters, applying novel areas of study within the ecclesiastical public sphere to familiar topics. Further studies could use other materials within the nineteenth-century ecclesiastical public sphere to explore these issues in more detail, or they could be applied to other areas of interest during this period.

As detailed previously, this thesis has contended that studies of nineteenth-century print culture do not adequately consider religion; this project has challenged this, in part, but there is greater scope to extend this challenge. There was not adequate space in this work to cover this in as much detail as possible due to its other research aims, but it is certainly an avenue of exploration that can be pursued in various ways. Understanding nineteenth-century print culture is an ongoing task, and religion's place within it has not been situated as prominently as it should have been. While this thesis has offered some contributions to each of these issues, there is undoubtedly more to be said. The aspects of these discussions included here could act as launching points for subsequent investigations.

Part of the process of conceptualising nineteenth-century print culture has taken place through the Wellesley Index and the Curran Index, both of which have aimed to identify contributors to periodicals. While this thesis does not offer any additions to these indexes, it does offer the possibility of using the attributions made in them to investigate who was participating in the public sphere, and the extent to which these participants were clergymen, or laymen writing on ecclesiastical subjects. This thesis has conducted a limited amount of

this statistical analysis in Chapter Two, but there are tremendous possibilities to extend this much further, using the two indexes cited, as well as any other collections of contributors. Emily de Lorraine Montluzin and James Kuist have demonstrated what can be done via their work on the *Gentleman's Magazine*; similar achievements might be possible for other publications. This work has focused on the content rather than the attributions; combining the two offers a range of possibilities.

As with the periodicals, the histories considered in this thesis represent a tiny fraction of those available, meaning that there are numerous possibilities in this direction, too. This project has evaluated ecclesiastical history writing as its own genre, and as an element of the study of History in the nineteenth century; much more can be done in this area. Chapter Three provides an evaluation of the interaction between churchmen and history writing between the years 1815 and 1861; the latter date suggests further study encompassing *Essays and Reviews*, which is a natural basis to extend the investigation undertaken in this chapter. James Kirby's work on *Historians and the Church of England* commences in 1870; Chapter Three of this thesis is, of course, not as detailed as Kirby's work, but it does suggest that there is potential to consider the relationship between religion and history in the period before Kirby's superb study.

Finally, sermons remain an under-utilised aspect of the ecclesiastical public sphere; while the function and form of sermons has been assessed, there is room to evaluate the content of sermons to a greater extent. The Introduction to *Charles Kingsley: Faith, Flesh, and Fantasy*, edited by Jonathan Conlin, Jan Marten and Ivo Klaver, acknowledges the lack of attention given to Kingsley's sermons. This chapter provides this to some extent, but there is much more that can be done in this area. Moreover, all the case studies in Chapter Four could have their sermons evaluated in detail to further comprehend their theological positions, and there will be other prominent nineteenth-century religious figures

outside of this thesis that would benefit from similar research. Considerations of the influence of sermons can be conducted in conjunction with Robert Hole's *Pulpits, Politics and Public Order*, and detailed reading of sermons reveals the methods used by preachers to attempt to exert this influence. Regarding influence, today's most influential preachers are the mega-church pastors that preach to thousands in huge arenas; Charles Spurgeon's orations to crowds of up to ten thousand at the Metropolitan Tabernacle can be seen as a prototype of the modern phenomenon, and there is room to explore this across the second half of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth and the era of Billy Graham.

Final comments

This thesis has sought to emphasise the importance of religion in mid-nineteenth-century England, using selected forms of print media to do so. Periodicals, ecclesiastical histories, and collections of sermons have been deployed and evaluated to achieve this overarching goal; these materials, and the many others not used in this thesis, can be deployed in future projects to expand and refine this line of research. The nineteenth century was religious – this thesis has offered a few of the many ways in which this was so.

Bibliography

Periodicals

The British Critic

The Christian Observer

The Christian Remembrancer

The Church of England Quarterly Review

The Eclectic Review

The Edinburgh Review

Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country

The Gentleman's Magazine

The Quarterly Review

Other works

Albion, Gordon, 'The Restoration of the Hierarchy, 1850' in George Andrew Beck (ed.), *The English Catholics 1850-1950* (London: Henderson and Spalding, 1950), pp. 86-115

Altholz, Josef L., *Anatomy of a Controversy: The Debate over "Essays and Reviews"* (London: Routledge, 1994)

——*The Churches in the Nineteenth Century* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1967)

—— 'Early Periodical Responses to Essays and Reviews', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 19.2 (Summer, 1986), pp. 50-56

—— 'Periodical Origins & Implications of "Essays and Reviews"', *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter*, 10.3 (September, 1977), pp. 140-54

—— *The Religious Press in Britain, 1760*-1900 (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1989)

Altick, Richard, *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1957)

Andrews, Robert M., ‘High Church Anglicanism in the Nineteenth Century’ in Rowan Strong (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume III: Partisan Anglicanism and its Global Expansion 1829-c.1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 141-64

Andrews, Stuart, *Robert Southey: History, Politics, Religion* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)

Anonymous, *Lay Suggestions on Modern Preaching and Preachers* (London: Rivingtons, 1867)

Appleman, Philip, William A. Madden, and Michael Wolff (eds.), *1859: Entering an Age of Crisis* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1959)

Arnold, Thomas, *Sermons* (London: J.G. & F. Rivington, 1832, Three Volumes)

Atherstone, Andrew, ‘Anglican Evangelicalism’ in Rowan Strong (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume III: Partisan Anglicanism and its Global Expansion, 1829-c.1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 165-86

——, and David Ceri Jones (eds.), *The Routledge Research Companion to the History of Evangelicalism* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019)

Atkins, Gareth, ‘Anglican Evangelicalism’ in Jeremy Gregory (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume II: Establishment and Empire, 1662-1829* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 452-73

—— *Converting Britannia: Evangelicals and British Public Life, 1770-1840* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2019)

Avis, Paul, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989)

Bamford, T. W., *Thomas Arnold* (London: The Cresset Press, 1960)

Bann, Stephen, *The Clothing of Clio: A Study of the Representation of History in Nineteenth-Century Britain and France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)

Barker, Hannah, *Newspapers, Politics, and English Society, 1695-1855* (London: Pearson, 2000)

Barr, James, ‘Jowett and the 'Original Meaning' of Scripture’, *Religious Studies*, 18.4 (December, 1982), pp. 433-37

Barrow, John Henry, (ed.), *The Mirror of Parliament for the Second Session of the Eighth Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, Volume I* (London: Winchester and Varnham, 1828)

Basker, James E., ‘Eclectic Review, The’ in Alvin Sullivan (ed.), *British Literary Magazines: The Romantic Age, 1789-1836* (London: Greenwood Press, 1983), pp. 124-33

Battiscombe, Georgina, *John Keble: A Study in Limitations* (London: Constable and Company, 1963)

Bayne, Ronald, ‘Soames, Henry’, *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-25981?rskey=IeDQxC> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Bebbington, David*, The Dominance of Evangelicalism: The Age of Spurgeon and Moody* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2005)

—— *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Routledge, 1989)

—— *Victorian Nonconformity* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2011)

Bennett, Scott, ‘Catholic Emancipation, the "Quarterly Review," and Britain's Constitutional Revolution’, *Victorian Studies*, 12.3 (March, 1969), pp. 283-304

Bentley, Michael, *Politics without Democracy, 1815-1914: Perception and Preoccupation in British Government* (London: Fontana, 1984)

—— ‘Shape and Pattern in British Historical Writing, 1815-1945’ in Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maiguashca and Attila Pók (eds.), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, Volume 4: 1800-1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 204-24

Berger, Stefan, and Chris Lorenz (eds.), *Nationalizing the Past: Historians as Nation Builders in Modern Europe* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)

Bidlake, John, *The Truth and Consistency of Divine Revelation, With Some Remarks on the Contrary Extremes of Infidelity and Enthusiasm, in Eight Discourses Delivered Before the University of Oxford*, Second Edition (London: Richard Rees, 1813)

Billington, Louis, ‘The Religious Periodical and Newspaper Press, 1770–1870’ in Michael Harris and Alan Lee (eds.), *The Press in English Society from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Centuries* (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1986), pp. 113-32

Blackie, J. S., ‘On Pulpit Eloquence’, *The Museum and English Journal of Education*, Volume III (April 1863-January 1864), pp. 287-300

Blair, Kirstie (ed.), *Form and Faith in Victorian Poetry and Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

—— *John Keble in Context* (London: Anthem Press, 2004)

—— ‘The Poet Preachers’ in Keith A. Francis and William Gibson (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon, 1689-1901 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 565-78

Booth, Stephen, ‘Essays and Reviews: The Controversy as Seen in the Correspondence and Papers of Dr. E. B. Pusey and Archbishop Archibald Tait’, *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church,* 38.3 (September, 1969), pp. 259-79

Bradley, Matthew and Juliet John (eds.), *Reading and the Victorians* (London: Routledge, 2015)

Brady, Ciaran, *James Anthony Froude: An Intellectual Biography of a Victorian Prophet* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Brake, Laurel, and Anne Humphreys, ‘Critical Theory and Periodical Research’, *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 22.3 (Fall, 1989), pp. 94-95

——, and Marysa Demoor (eds.), *Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland* (London: The British Library, 2009)

——, Aled Jones, and Lionel Madden (eds.), *Investigating Victorian Journalism* (London: Macmillan, 1990)

Brent, Richard, *Liberal Anglican Politics: Whiggery, Religion, and Reform, 1830-1841* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987)

—— ‘The Whigs and Protestant Dissent in the Decade of Reform: The Case of Church Rates, 1833-1841’, *The English Historical Review*, 102.405 (October, 1987), pp. 887-910

Brock, W. H., ‘British Science Periodicals and Culture: 1820-1850’, *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 21.2 (Summer, 1988), pp. 47-55

Brown, Stewart J., *Providence and Empire: Religion, Politics and Society in the United Kingdom 1815-1914* (London: Routledge, 2013)

——, Peter B. Nockles, and James Pereiro (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017)

—— and Peter B. Nockles (eds.), *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830-1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Bud, Robert, *Applied Science: Knowledge, Modernity, and Britain’s Public Realm* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024)

Burn, W. L., *The Age of Equipoise: A Study of the Mid-Victorian Generation* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1964)

Burns, Arthur, *The Diocesan Revival in the Church of England, c. 1800-1870* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

—— 'Phillpotts, Henry', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-22180#odnb-9780198614128-e-22180-div1-d1349317e285> [accessed 18 June 2025]

—— 'Stebbing, Henry', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-26337> [accessed 18 June 2025]

—— 'Wilberforce, Samuel', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-29385?rskey=gxAb4V&result=2> [accessed 18 June 2025]

—— and Joanna Innes (eds.), *Rethinking the Age of Reform: Britain 1780-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Butler, Charles, *The Roman Catholic Book of the Church* (London: John Murray, 1825)

Butler, Joseph, *The Analogy of Religion to the Constitution and Course of Nature* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1857)

Butler, Perry, 'Keble, John', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15231?rskey=UwK4yc&result=2> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Caiani, Ambrogio, *Losing a Kingdom, Gaining the World: The Catholic Church in the Age of Revolution and Democracy 1700-1903* (London: Head of Zeus, 2023)

—— 'Re-inventing the Ancien Régime in Post-Napoleonic Europe', *European History Quarterly*, 47.3 (July, 2017), pp. 437-60

—— *To Kidnap a Pope: Napoleon and Pius VII* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2021)

Cantor, Geoffrey, and others (eds.), *Science in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical: Reading the Magazine of Nature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)

—— and Sally Shuttleworth (eds.), *Science Serialized: Representations of the Sciences in Nineteenth-Century Periodicals* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004)

Caple, Jeremy, *The Bristol Riots of 1831 and Social Reform in Britain* (Lewiston, New York: E. Mellen Press, 1990)

Carnall, Geoffrey, 'The Monthly Magazine', *The Review of English Studies*, 5.18 (April, 1954), pp. 158-64

—— *Robert Southey and His Age: The Development of a Conservative Mind* (London: Longmans, 1964)

Carpenter, J. Estlin, *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century: Eight Lectures* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903)

Carr, E. H., *What is History?* (London: Macmillan, 1961)

Carter, Michael S., 'A "Traitorous Religion": Indulgences and the anti-Catholic Imagination in Eighteenth-Century New England', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 99.1 (January, 2013), pp. 52-77

Cesnari, David, *The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841-1991* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Chadwick, Owen, 'Charles Kingsley at Cambridge', *Historical Journal*, 18.2 (June, 1975), pp. 303-25

—— *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)

—— *The Victorian Church, Part One: 1829-1859* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1987, first published in 1966)

—— *The Victorian Church, Part Two: 1860-1901* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1987, first published in 1970)

Chadwick, Rosemary, 'Spurgeon, Charles Haddon', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-26187?rskey=e7bDXB&result=2> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Chalmers, Alexander, 'Charles Rivington' in Septimus Rivington (ed.), *The Publishing House of Rivington* (London: Rivington, Percival, & Co., 1894), pp. 28-32

Chamberlain, Jeffrey S., 'Parish Preaching in the Long Eighteenth Century' in Keith A. Francis and William Gibson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon, 1689-1901* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 47-62

Chapman, Mark D., 'Liberal Anglicanism in the Nineteenth Century' in Rowan Strong (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume III: Partisan*

Anglicanism and its Global Expansion, 1829-c.1914 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 212-31

Chapman, Raymond, *Faith and Revolt: Studies in the Literary Influence of the Oxford Movement* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970)

Chitty, Susan, *The Beast and the Monk: A Life of Charles Kingsley* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1974)

Christie, William, *The Edinburgh Review in the Literary Culture of Romantic Britain: Mammoth and Megalonyx* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016)

Churton, Edward, (ed.), *The Memoir of Joshua Watson* (London & Oxford: John Henry and James Parker, 1863)

Clark, George Kitson, *The Making of Victorian England* (London: Methuen, 1962)

Clark, J. C. D., 'Church, Parties, and Politics' in Jeremy Gregory (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume II: Establishment and Empire, 1662-1829* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 289-313

—— 'England's Ancien Regime as a Confessional State', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 21.3 (Autumn, 1989), pp. 450-74

—— *English Society, 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology, and Politics during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

—— *English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)

—— 'On Hitting the Buffers: The Historiography of England's Ancien Regime. A Response', *Past & Present*, 117 (November, 1987), pp. 195-207

Clarke, M. L, *Greek Studies in England, 1770-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1945)

Colby, Robert A., Reviewed Work: 'The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, 1824-1900, Vol. I' by Walter E. Houghton, *Modern Philology*, 65.4 (May, 1968), pp. 411-14

Coleman, Bruce, *Conservatism and the Conservative Party in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (London: Edward Arnold, 1988)

Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992)

Collini, Stefan, Richard Whatmore and Brian Young (eds.), *History, Religion, and Culture: British Intellectual History 1750-1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Collins, William Edward, 'Frederick Denison Maurice' in William Edward Collins (ed.), *Typical English Churchmen: From Parker to Maurice* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1902), pp. 327-60

Conlin, Jonathan and Jan Marten Ivo Klaver (eds.), *Charles Kingsley: Faith, Flesh, and Fantasy* (New York: Routledge, 2021)

Connors, Linda E., and Mary Lu MacDonald, *National Identity in Great Britain and British North America, 1815-1851: The Role of Nineteenth-Century Periodicals* (London: Routledge; 2011)

Considine, John, 'Nuttall, Peter Austin', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* <https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-65145?rskey=I1Mhes&result=1> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Copley, Terence, *Black Tom: Arnold of Rugby, The Man and the Myth* (London: Continuum, 2002)

Courtney, William Prideaux, 'Stebbing, Henry (1799-1883)', *Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1900*, <https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Dictionary_of_National_Biography,_1885-1900/Stebbing,_Henry_(1799-1883)> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Cragoe, Matthew, '"The Hand of the Lord is upon the Cattle": Religious Reactions to the Cattle Plague, 1865-67' in Martin Hewitt (ed.), *An Age of Equipoise? Reassessing Mid-Victorian Britain* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2000), pp. 190-206

Crumb, Lawrence N., *The Oxford Movement and its Leaders: A Bibliography of Secondary and Lesser Primary Sources* (Metuchen: The American Theological Library Association and The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1988)

Cruse, Amy, *Victorians and Their Reading* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1935)

Curry, Kenneth, 'The Monthly Magazine' in Alvin Sullivan (ed.), *British Literary Magazines: The Romantic Age, 1789-1836* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1983), pp. 314-23

—— (ed.), *New Letters of Robert Southey, Volume Two: 1811-1838* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965)

Cutmore, Jonathan, *Conservatism and the Quarterly Review: A Critical Analysis* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007)

—— *Contributors to the Quarterly Review: A History 1809-25* (London: Routledge, 2008)

—— *John Murray's Quarterly Review: Letters 1807-1843* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2019)

—— 'A Plurality of Voices in the Quarterly Review' in Jonathan Cutmore (ed.), *Conservatism and the Quarterly Review: A Critical Analysis* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007)

—— 'Saints, Prophets and Paternalists: Evangelicalism in the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews and Fraser's Magazine', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Toronto (1990)

Darcy, Cornelius P., 'The Gentleman's Magazine' in Alvin Sullivan (ed.), *British Literary Magazines: The Augustan Age and the Age of Johnson, 1698-1788* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1983), pp. 136-40

Davies, Horton, *Worship and Theology in England, Volume III: From Watts and Wesley to Maurice, 1690-1850* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961)

—— *Worship and Theology in England, Volume IV: From Newman to Martineau, 1850-1900* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962)

Davis, Richard W., *Dissent in Politics, 1780-1830: The Political Life of William Smith, MP* (London: Epworth Press, 1971)

—— 'Wellington and the "Open Question": The Issue of Catholic Emancipation, 1821-1829', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 29.1 (Spring, 1997), pp. 39-55

Dawson, James, *Pulpit Power, and How to Attain It; Or, Thoughts on the Preparation of Sermons Required by the Age* (London: W. M. Lister, 1865)

DeLacy, Margaret, 'William Hey', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-13163> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Denham, G., *Remarks on the Writings and Prophecies of Joanna Southcott: Being an Attempt to Prove Her Assertions Inconsistent with the Will of God as Revealed in the Scriptures of Eternal Truth* (London: Dean and Munday, 1815)

Dickens, A. G. and John Tonkin, *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1985)

Dickinson, Christian, 'A Crucified God: Charles Kingsley's Broad-Church Embodiment in Hypatia', *Victorians: A Journal of Culture and Literature*, 136.1 (Winter, 2019), pp. 159-76

Dillane, Fionnuala, 'Researching a Periodical Genre: Classifications, Codes, and Relational Terms' in Alexis Easley, Andrew King, and John Morton (eds.), *Researching the Nineteenth-Century Periodical Press: Case Studies* (London: Routledge, 2018), pp. 74-90

Dixon, Richard Watson, *History of the Church of England, from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction*, Six Volumes (London: Smith, Elders, & Co.; London: G. Routledge and Sons, 1891-1902)

Don Vann, J. and Rosemary T. VanArsdel (eds.), *Victorian Periodicals and Victorian Society* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1994)

Dwight Culler, A., *The Victorian Mirror of History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985)

Easley, Alexis, *First-Person Anonymous: Women Writers and Victorian Print Media, 1830-1870* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004)

——, Andrew King, and John Morton (eds.), *Researching the Nineteenth-Century Periodical Press: Case Studies* (London: Routledge, 2018)

——, Andrew King, and John Morton (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook to Nineteenth-Century British Newspapers and Periodicals* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016)

Eastwood, David, Robert Southey and the Meanings of Patriotism', *Journal of British Studies*, 31.3 (July, 1992), pp. 265-87

Ellis, Ieuan, *Seven Against Christ: A Study of 'Essays and Reviews'* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980)

Ellison, Robert H., 'The Tractarians' Political Rhetoric, *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 77.3 (September, 2008), pp. 221-256

Emden, Christian J. and David Midgley (eds.), *Changing Perceptions of the Public Sphere* (New York: Berghahn, 2012)

—— *The Victorian Pulpit: Spoken and Written Sermons in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1998)

Erb, Peter C., (ed.), *The Correspondence of Henry Edward Manning and William Ewart Gladstone, 1833-1844*, Four Volumes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Evans, Eric J., 'The Church in Danger? Anticlericalism in Nineteenth-Century England', *European Studies Review*, 13.2 (April, 1983), pp. 201-23

—— *The Forging of the Modern State: Early Industrial Britain, 1783-1870* (London: Pearson, 2001)

—— ‘Some Reasons for the Growth of English Rural Anti-Clericalism c. 1750 - c. 1830’, *Past & Present*, 66 (February, 1975), pp. 84-109

Evans, G. R., *Crown, Mitre and People in the Nineteenth Century: The Church of England, Establishment and the State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021)

Fairweather, Eugene R. (ed.), *The Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964)

Farooq, Jennifer, *Preaching in Eighteenth-Century London* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013)

Fasick, Laura, ‘Charles Kingsley’s Scientific Treatment of Gender’ in Donald E. Hall (ed.), *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 91-113

Feather, John, *A History of British Publishing* (Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1988)

Feiling, Keith, *The Second Tory Party, 1714-1832* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1959)

Ferdinand, C. Y., ‘Newspapers and the Sale of Books in the Provinces’ in Michael F. Suarez and Michael L. Turner (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume V, 1695-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 434-47

Finkelstein, David and Andrew Nash (eds.), *The British Publishing Industry in the Nineteenth Century, Volume III: Authors, Publishers and Copyright Law* (London: Routledge, 2024)

—— and Andrew Nash (eds.), *The British Publishing Industry in the Nineteenth Century, Volume IV: Publishers, Markets, Readers* (London: Routledge, 2024)

—— and Andrew Nash, ‘The Edinburgh Review (1802-1902)’ in David Finkelstein and Andrew Nash (eds.), *The British Publishing Industry in the Nineteenth Century, Volume IV: Publishers, Markets, Readers* (London: Routledge, 2024), pp. 221-30

Finnegan, Diarmid A., ‘Anglicans, Science, and the Bible in the Nineteenth Century’ in Rowan Strong (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume III: Partisan Anglicanism and its Global Expansion, 1829-c.1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 416-39

Flint, Kate, *The Woman Reader, 1837-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)

Floyd, Richard D., *Church, Chapel and Party: Religious Dissent and Political Modernization in Nineteenth-Century England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008)

Flynn, Philip, 'Francis Jeffrey and the Scottish Critical Tradition' in Massimiliano Demata and Duncan Wu (eds.), *British Romanticism and the Edinburgh Review: Bicentenary Essays* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), pp. 13-32

Foot, M. R. D., and H. C. G. Matthew (eds.), *The Gladstone Diaries: Volume III, 1840-1847* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974)

Forbes, Duncan, *The Liberal Anglican Idea of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952)

Forster, Antonia, 'Book Reviewing' in Michael F. Suarez and Michael L. Turner (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume V, 1695-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 631-48

Foster, R. F., *Modern Ireland, 1600-1972* (New York: Penguin, 1989)

Francis, Keith A., 'Sermon Studies: Major Issues and Future Directions' in Keith A. Francis and William Gibson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon, 1689-1901* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 611-30

—— 'Sermons: Themes and Developments' in Keith A. Francis and William Gibson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon, 1689-1901* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 31-44

—— and William Gibson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon*, 1689-1901 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Franta, Andrew, *Powers of the Press: Newspapers, Power and the Public in Nineteenth-Century England* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016)

Fritzsche, Peter, *Stranded in the Present: Modern Time and the Melancholy of History* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2004)

Gash, Norman, *Reaction and Reconstruction in English Politics, 1832-1852* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965)

Gay, Peter, *Style in History* (London: Lowe and Brydone Ltd., 1975)

—— and Victor G. Wexler (eds.) *Historians at Work*, Four Volumes (New York: Harper & Row, 1972)

Gibson, William, 'The British Sermon 1689-1901: Quantities, Performance, and Culture' in Keith A. Francis and William Gibson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon, 1689-1901* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 3-30

—— *The Church of England 1688~1832: Unity and Accord* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2001)

—— *Church, State and Society, 1760-1850* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994)

—— 'Sermons' in Jeremy Gregory (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume II: Establishment and Empire, 1662-1829* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 270-88

Gilbert, Alan D., *The Making of post-Christian Britain: A History of the Secularization of Modern Society* (New York: Longman, 1980)

Gilley, Sheridan, 'Newman's "Anglican Deathbed": Littlemore and Conversions to Rome' in Stewart J. Brown (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 320-30

—— and W. J. Sheils (eds.), *A History of Religion in Britain: Practice and Belief from Pre-Roman Times to the Present* (Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell, 1994)

Goldhill, Simon, 'How Odd is Kingsley's Hypatia?' in Jonathan Conlin and Jan Marten Ivo Klaver (eds.), *Charles Kingsley: Faith, Flesh, and Fantasy* (New York: Routledge, 2021), pp. 86-104

Graham, Walter, 'Robert Southey as Tory Reviewer', *Philological Quarterly*, 2 (January, 1923), pp. 97-111

Gray, Robert, *Cardinal Manning: An Autobiography* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985)

Greenblatt, Stephen and Giles Gunn, *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1992)

Greenhill, William Alexander, 'Hussey, Robert', *Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1900*, <https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Dictionary_of_National_Biography,_1885-1900/Hussey,_Robert> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Gregory, Jeremy (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism Volume II: Establishment and Empire, 1662-1829* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017)

Gresley, William, *Ecclesiastes Anglicanus: Being a Treatise on the Art of Preaching, as Adapted to a Church of England Congregation, in a Series of Letters to a Young Clergyman* (London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1835)

Habermas, Jürgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere,* trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989)

Hale, Piers J., ‘Darwin’s Other Bulldog: Charles Kingsley and the Popularisation of Evolution in Victorian England’, *Science & Education*, 21.7 (July, 2012), pp. 977-1013

—— ‘Monkeys into Men and Men into Monkeys: Chance and Contingency in the Evolution of Man, Mind and Morals in Charles Kingsley's “Water Babies”’, *Journal of the History of Biology*, 46.4 (Winter, 2013), pp. 551-97

Hall, Donald E. (ed.), *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Harling, Philip, ‘Robert Southey and the Language of Social Discipline’, *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 30.4 (Winter, 1998), pp. 630-55

Harris, Horton, *David Friedrich Strauss and his Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973)

Harris, Michael, and Alan Lee (eds.), *The Press in English Society from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Centuries* (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1986)

Hawley, John C., ‘Charles Kingsley and The Book of Nature’, *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 60.4 (December, 1991), pp. 461-79

Hayden, John O., *The Romantic Reviewers, 1802-1824* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited, 1969)

Hayter, Alethea, *Charlotte Yonge* (Plymouth: Northcote House, 1996)

Heeney, Brian, *A Different Kind of Gentleman: Parish Clergy as Professional Men in Early and Mid-Victorian England* (Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1976)

Heimann, Mary, *Catholic Devotion in Victorian England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

Hempton, David, ‘Established Churches and the Growth of Religious Pluralism: Aa Case Study of Christianisation and Secularisation in England since 1700’ in Hugh McLeod and Werner Ustorf (eds.), *The Decline of Christendom in Western Europe, 1750-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 81-98

—— *Methodism: Empire of the Spirit* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005)

Herring, George, *The Oxford Movement in Practice: The Tractarian Parochial Worlds from the 1830s to the 1870s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)

Hewitt, Martin (ed.), *An Age of Equipoise? Reassessing Mid-Victorian Britain* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2000)

—— ‘Preaching from the Platform’ in Keith A. Francis and William Gibson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon*, 1689-1901 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 79-96

Hey, William, *Tracts and Essays, Moral and Theological* (London: Hurst, Robinson and co., 1822)

Heyck, T. W., ‘From Men of Letters to Intellectuals: The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Nineteenth-Century England’, *Journal of British Studies*, 20.1 (Autumn, 1980)

Hilton, Boyd, *A Mad, Bad, and Dangerous People?: England 1783-1846* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)

—— *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1795-1865* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988)

—— ‘Whiggery, Religion and Social Reform: The Case of Lord Morpeth’, *The Historical Journal*, 37.4 (December, 1994), pp. 829-59

Hole, Robert, *Pulpits, Politics and Public Order in England, 1760-1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

Holladay, J. Douglas, ‘English Evangelicalism, 1820-1850: Diversity and Unity in "Vital Religion"’, *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 51.2 (June, 1982), pp. 147-57

Hopkins, James K., *A Woman to Deliver Her People: Joanna Southcott and English Millenarianism in an Era of Revolution* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982)

Houghton, Esther Rhoads, ‘The British Critic and the Oxford Movement’, *Studies in Bibliography*, 16 (1963), pp. 119-37

—— and Josef L. Altholz, ‘The “British Critic”, 1824-1843’, *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 24.3 (Fall, 1991), pp. 111-18

Houghton, Walter (ed.), ‘Fraser’s Magazine’ in Walter Houghton (ed.), *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900, Volume II* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), pp. 303-319

—— ‘The Quarterly Review’ in Walter Houghton (ed.), *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, Volume I* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966), pp. 696-702

—— *The Victorian Frame of Mind* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957)

—— (ed.), *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, Volume I* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966)

—— (ed.), The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900, Volume II (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972)

Houston, James M. (ed.), *Evangelical Preaching: An Anthology of Sermons by Charles Simeon* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2003)

Howsam, Leslie, 'Mediated Histories: How Did Victorian Periodicals Parse the Past?', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 50.4 (Winter, 2017) pp. 802-24

Hunt, William and Nilanjana Banerji, 'Bruce, John', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-3740?rskey=DqbyOV&result=3> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Hussey, Robert, *The Rise of the Papal Power Traced in Three Lectures* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1863, 2nd edition)

Iggers, Georg G., 'Introduction' in Georg G. Iggers (ed.), *Leopold von Ranke, The Theory and Practice of History* (London: Routledge, 2011), pp. xv-lxxii

Innes, Joanna, 'Review: Jonathan Clark, Social History and England's "Ancien Regime"', *Past & Present*, 115.1 (May, 1987), pp. 165-200

——, Mark Philp and Robert Saunders, 'The Rise of Democratic Discourse in the Reform Era: Britain in the 1830s and 1840s' in Joanna Innes and Mark Philp (eds.), *Re-imagining Democracy in the Age of Revolutions: America, France, Britain, Ireland 1750-1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 114-28

Jacob, W. M., 'England' in Jeremy Gregory (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume II: Establishment and Empire, 1662-1829* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 91-119

James, Louis, 'The Trouble with Betsy: Periodicals and the Common Reader in mid-Nineteenth Century England' in Joanne Shattock and Michael Wolff (eds.), *The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and Soundings* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1982), pp. 349-66

Janes, Dominic, 'Material Religion: C. H. Spurgeon and the "Battle of the Styles" in Victorian Church Architecture' in Joshua King and Winter Jade Werner (eds), *Constructing Nineteenth-Century Religion: Literary, Historical, and Religious Studies in Dialogue* (Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 2019), pp. 190-205

Jebb, John, 'Biographical Memoir of William Phelan, D. D.,' in Margaret Phelan (ed.), *The Remains of William Phelan, D.D., Volume I* (London: A. & R. Spottiswoode, 1832), pp. 1-96

Jennings, Louis J., (ed.), *The Croker Papers: The Correspondence and Diaries of the Late Right Honourable John Wilson Croker, Secretary to the Admiralty from 1809 to 1830,* Three Volumes (London: John Murray, 1885)

Jensz, Felicity, and Hannah Acke, *Missions and Media: The Politics of Missionary Periodicals in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag; 2013)

Johnson, Maria Poggi, 'Probability the Guide of Life: The Influence of Butler's "Analogy" on Keble and Newman', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 70.3 (September, 2001), pp. 302-23

Jones, Paul Daffyd, 'Jesus Christ and the Transformation of English Society: The "Subversive Conservatism" of Frederick Denison Maurice', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 96.2 (April, 2003), pp. 205-28

Jones, Tod. E., *The Broad Church: A Biography of the Movement* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2003)

Jordan, Ellen, Hugh Craig and Alexis Antonia, 'The Brontë Sisters and the Christian Remembrancer: A Pilot Study in the Use of the "Burrows Method" to Identify the Authorship of Unsigned Articles in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical Press', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 39.1 (Spring, 2006), pp. 21-45

Jung, Sandro (ed.), *British Literature and Print Culture* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013)

Keble, John, *The Christian Year: Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holydays Throughout the Year* (London: Rivingtons, 1884, originally published in 1827)

—— *Sermons Academical and Occasional* (London: F. and J. Rivington, 1848, Second Edition)

Kendall, Guy, *Charles Kingsley and His Ideas* (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1947)

Kenyon, John, *The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1983)

Ker, Ian, *John Henry Newman: A Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988)

King, Joshua, *Imagined Spiritual Communities in Britain's Age of Print* (Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 2015)

—— 'John Keble's "The Christian Year": Private Reading and Imagined National Religious Community', *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 40.2 (September, 2012), pp. 397-420

—— ‘Print Culture’ in Frederick D. Aquino and Benjamin J. King (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of John Henry Newman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 90-110

—— and Winter Jade Werner (eds.), *Constructing Nineteenth-Century Religion: Literary, Historical, and Religious Studies in Dialogue* (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2019)

Kingsley, Charles, *Hypatia, or New Foes with an Old Face* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1922, originally published in 1853)

—— *Sermons on National Subjects* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1890 reprint)

—— *Yeast: A Problem* (London: John W. Parker, 1851)

Kingsley, Frances Eliza (ed.), *Charles Kingsley: His Letters and Memories of His Life* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1914)

Kirby, James, *Historians and the Church of England: Religion and Historical Scholarship, 1870-1920* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)

Klancher, Jon, ‘Rethinking the Periodical Medium in the Digital Age’ in Nicholas Mason and Tom Mole (eds.), *Romantic Periodicals in the Twenty-First Century: Eleven Case Studies from Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020), pp. 17-32

Klaver, J. M. I., *The Apostle of the Flesh: A Critical Life of Charles Kingsley* (London: Brill, 2006)

Knight, Frances, *The Nineteenth Century Church and English Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

—— ‘Parish Preaching in the Victorian Era: The Village Sermon’ in Keith A. Francis and William Gibson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon, 1689-1901* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 63-78

—— *Victorian Christianity at the Fin de Siècle: The Culture of English Religion in a Decadent Age* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2016)

Knight, Mark, ‘Periodicals and Religion’ in Alexis Easley, Andrew King, and John Morton (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook to Nineteenth-Century British Newspapers and Periodicals* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), pp. 355-64

—— and Emma Mason, *Nineteenth-Century Religion and Literature: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Kruppa, Patricia Stallings, *Charles Haddon Spurgeon: A Preacher’s Progress* (New York: Routledge, 1982)

Kuist, James M., ‘A Collaboration in Learning: "The Gentleman's Magazine" and Its Ingenious Contributors’, *Studies in Bibliography*, 44 (January, 1991), pp. 302-17

—— *The Nichols File of the Gentleman’s Magazine: Attributions of Authorship and Other Documentation in Editorial Papers at the Folger Library* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1982)

Larsen, Timothy, *A People of One Book: The Bible and the Victorians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

—— and Michael Ledger-Lomas (eds.), *The Oxford History of Protestant Dissenting Traditions, Volume III: The Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017)

Larson, Janet L., ‘Skeptical Women v. Honest Men v. Good Old Boys: Gender Conflict in the High Victorian Religion Wars’ in Jude V. Nixon (ed.), *Victorian Religious Discourse: New Directions in Criticism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), pp. 83-116

Latané, David E., *William Maginn and the British Press: A Critical Biography* (London: Routledge, 2013)

Law, Graham, ‘Periodicalism’ in Martin Hewitt (ed.), *The Victorian World* (London: Routledge, 2012) pp. 537-554

Lawrence, Mark, *Spain’s First Carlist War, 1833-40* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2014)

Ledger-Lomas, Michael, ‘Introduction’ in Timothy Larsen and Michael Ledger-Lomas (eds.), *The Oxford History of Protestant Dissenting Traditions, Volume III: The Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 1-36

Machin, G. I. T., *The Catholic Question in English Politics, 1820-1830* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964)

—— *Politics and the Churches in Great Britain, 1832 to 1868* (London: Clarendon, 1977)

—— ‘Resistance to Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, 1828’, *The Historical Journal,* 22.1 (March, 1979), pp. 115-39

Macintyre, Stuart, Juan Maiguashca, and Attila Pók (eds.), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, Volume 4: 1800-1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

Mackerness, E. D., *The Heeded Voice: Studies in the Literary Status of the Anglican Sermon, 1830-1900* (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons Ltd., 1959)

MacLeod, Jock, William Christie and Peter Denney (eds.), *Politics and Emotions in Romantic Periodicals* (Cham: Springer Nature, 2019)

Maidment, Brian, 'Periodicals and Serial Publications' in Michael F. Suarez and Michael L. Turner (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume V, 1695-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 498-512

Manlove, Colin, 'Charles Kingsley, H. G. Wells, and the Machine in Victorian Fiction', *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 48.2 (September, 1993), pp. 212-39

Manning, Henry Edward, *Sermons* (London: James Burns, 1847, Three Volumes)

Marsh, P. T., *The Victorian Church in Decline: Archbishop Tait and the Church of England, 1868-1882* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969)

Martin, Brian W., *John Keble: Priest, Professor and Poet* (London: Croom Helm, 1976)

Mason, Nicholas and Tom Mole (eds.), *Romantic Periodicals in the Twenty-First Century: Eleven Case Studies from Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020)

Mathieson, William Law, *English Church Reform, 1815-1840* (London: Longman, Green and Co., 1923)

Matthew, H. C. G., 'Hussey, Robert', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-14269?rskey=VUJnQa&result=2> [accessed 18 June 2025]

—— 'Milman, Henry Hart', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18778> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Maurice, Frederick Denison, *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries* (Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1854)

McElligott, James and Eve Patten (eds.), *The Perils of Print Culture: Book, Print and Publishing History in Theory and Practice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014)

McIntyre, Mary Louise, 'Julius Charles Hare on the Catholic Revival: "Signs of Hope"', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 75.2 (June, 2006), pp. 224-44

McLeod, Hugh, *Religion and Society in England, 1850-1914* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996)

—— *Religion and the Working Class in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1984)

—— *Secularisation in Western Europe, 1848-1914* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000)

—— and Werner Ustorf (eds.), *The Decline of Christendom in Western Europe, 1750-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

McNicholas, Anthony, *Politics, Religion and the Press: Irish Journalism in Mid-Victorian England* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007)

Mentor, *The Dangers of the Edinburgh Review; or a Brief Exposure of its Principles in Religion, Morals and Politics* (London: F. C. and J Rivington, 1808)

Montgomery, Robert, *Luther on Rome and the Reformation* (London: James Blackwood, 1852)

Montluzin, Emily de Lorraine, 'Attributions of Authorship in the Gentleman's Magazine, 1824-1826: A Supplement to the Union List', *Notes and Queries*, 69.4 (December, 2022), pp. 323-31

Moorman, John R. H., *A History of the Church in England,* Third Edition (Harrisburg: Morehouse, 1980)

Morris, Jeremy, *F. D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)

—— *The High Church Revival in the Church of England: Arguments and Identities* (Boston: Brill, 2016)

—— 'Liberalism Protestant and Catholic' in Stewart J. Brown (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 585-604

—— 'The Spirit of Comprehension: Examining the Broad Church Synthesis in England', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 75.3 (September, 2006), pp. 423-43

—— 'The Strange Death of Christian Britain: Another Look at the Secularization Debate', *The Historical Journal*, 46.4 (December, 2003), pp. 963-76

Morrison, Robert and Daniel S. Roberts (eds.), *Romanticism and Blackwood's Magazine: 'An Unprecedented Phenomenon'* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)

Mullen, Shirley A., *Organized Freethought: The Religion of Unbelief in Victorian England* (London: Routledge, 1987)

Munden, A. F., 'Cunningham, John William', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-6927?rskey=c9v9R9&result=1> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Munson, James, *Nonconformists: In Search of a Lost Culture* (London: SPCK, 1991)

Nettles, Tom, *Living by Revealed Truth: The Life and Pastoral Theology of Charles Haddon Spurgeon* (Fearn: Mentor, 2013)

Neuheiser, Jörg, *Crown, Church and Constitution: Popular Conservatism in England, 1815 – 1867* (New York: Berghahn, 2016)

Newman, John Henry, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: A History of his Religious Opinions* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1879)

Newsome, David, 'Manning, Henry Edward,1808-1892', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-17970?rskey=Fj7ApD&result=2> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Nicholls, David, *Church and State in Britain since 1820* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967)

—— 'The Totalitarianism of Thomas Arnold', *The Review of Politics*, 29.4 (October, 1967), pp. 518-25

Nichols, John, *General Index to the Gentleman's Magazine from the Year 1787 to 1818, Volume 3* (London: John Nichols and Son, 1821)

Nockles, Peter B., 'The Church of England Quarterly Review' in Laurel Brake and Marysa Demoor (eds.), *Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland* (London: The British Library, 2009), p. 118

——*The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

—— 'Review: Cardinal Manning: An Intellectual Biography by James Pereiro', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 51.2 (October, 2000), pp. 777-80

Norman, E. R., *Church and Society in England, 1770-1970* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976)

O'Connell, Marvin, *The Oxford Conspirators: A History of the Oxford Movement 1833-45* (London: Macmillan, 1969)

O'Gorman, Frank, *The Long Eighteenth Century: British Political & Social History 1688-1832* (London: Arnold, 2003)

O'Neill, James E., 'The British Quarterlies and the Religious Question, 1802-1829', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 52.3 (October, 1966), pp. 350-71

Paget, Francis Edward, *The Parish and the Priest* (London: Joseph Masters, 1858)

Paz, Dennis, 'Another Look at Lord John Russell and the Papal Aggression, 1850', *The Historian*, 45.1 (November, 1982), pp. 47-64

—— (ed.), *Nineteenth-Century English Religious Traditions: Retrospect and Prospect* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1995)

—— 'Popular Anti-Catholicism in England, 1850-1851', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 11.4 (Winter, 1979), pp. 331-59

Pearson, John, *The Life of William Hey, Esq., F. R. S.* (London: Hurst, Robinson and co., 1822)

Pereiro, James, '*Ethos' and the Oxford Movement: At the Heart of Tractarianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

—— 'John Keble and the Ethos of the Oxford Movement' in Kirstie Blair (ed.), *John Keble in Context* (London: Anthem Press, 2004)

—— 'The Oxford Movement and Anglo-Catholicism' in Rowan Strong (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume III*: *Partisan Anglicanism and its Global Expansion, 1829-c.1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 187-211

Pickering Jr., Samuel F., 'Literature and Theology: The Christian Observer and the Novel, 1802-1822', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 43.1 (March, 1974), pp. 29-43

Pickering, W. S. F., 'The 1851 Religious Census – A Useless Experiment?', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 18.4 (January, 1967), pp. 382-407

Pincus, Steven, 'The State and Civil Society in Early Modern England: Capitalism, Causation and Habermas's Bourgeois Public Sphere' in Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (eds.), *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 213-31

Pocock, J. G. A., *Barbarism and Religion, Volume One: The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon, 1737-1764* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Pope-Hennessy, Una, *Canon Charles Kingsley: A Biography* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1948)

Poulot, Dominique and Richard Wrigley, 'The Birth of Heritage: "le moment Guizot"', *Oxford Art Journal*, 11.2 (1998), pp. 40-56

Pratt, Lynda and Ian Packer (eds.), *The Collected Letters of Robert Southey* (College Park: University of Maryland, 2009)

Prince, H. C., 'The Tithe Surveys of the Mid-Nineteenth Century', *The Agricultural History Review*, 7.1 (1959), pp. 14-26

Prystash, Justin, 'Rhizomatic Subjects: Thomas Carlyle, Charles Kingsley, and the Origins of Victorian Identity', *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 66.2 (September, 2011), pp. 141-69.

Pykett, Lyn, 'Reading the Periodical Press: Text and Context' in Laurel Brake, Aled Jones, and Lionel Madden (eds.), *Investigating Victorian Journalism* (London: Macmillan, 1990), pp. 3-18

Ralls, Walter, 'The Papal Aggression of 1850: A Study in Victorian Anti-Catholicism', *Church History*, 43.2 (June, 1974), pp. 242-56

Ramsey, Arthur Michael, *F. D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951)

Raponi, Danilo, *Religion and Politics in the Risorgimento: Britain and the New Italy, 1861-1875* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014)

Rappaport, Roy A., *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Reardon, Bernard, *Religious Thought in the Victorian Age: A Survey from Coleridge to Gore* (New York: Longman, 1980)

Rectenwald, Michael, *Nineteenth-Century British Secularism (*London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016)

Reed, John Shelton, *Glorious Battle: The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism* (Chapel Hill: Bozart Books, 2017)

Reeve, A. J. H., 'Arnold, Thomas, 1795-1842', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-686?rskey=gH4moK&result=4> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Rivers, Isabel, 'Religious Publishing' in Michael F. Suarez and Michael L. Turner (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume V, 1695-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 579-600

—— *Vanity Fair and the Celestial City: Dissenting, Methodist, and Evangelical Literary Culture in England 1720-1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018)

Ronan, Myles V., 'What Is Meant by Catholic Emancipation', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 15.4 (January, 1930), pp. 363-88

Rooney, Paul Raphael and Anna Gasperini (eds.), *Media and Print Culture Consumption in Nineteenth-Century Britain: The Victorian Reading Experience* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016)

Rose, Jonathan, *The Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001)

Rosman, Doreen M., *Evangelicals and Culture* (London: Croom Helm, 1984)

—— *The Evolution of the English Churches, 1500-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Rowell, Geoffrey, 'Anglican Theological Receptions' in Frederick D. Aquino and Benjamin J. King (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of John Henry Newman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 517-37

—— *Hell and the Victorians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974)

—— *The Vision Glorious: Themes and Personalities of the Catholic Revival in Anglicanism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)

Rupp, Gordon, 'The Victorian Churchman as Historian: A Reconsideration of R. W. Dixon's History of the Church of England' in G. V. Bennett & J. D. Walsh (eds.), *Essays in Modern English Church History: In Memory of Norman Sykes* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 206-16

Sack, James J., *From Jacobite to Conservative: Reaction and Orthodoxy in Britain, c. 1760-1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)

Salmon, Richard, 'A "Yeasty State of Mind"' in Jonathan Conlin and Jan Marten Ivo Klaver (eds.), *Charles Kingsley: Faith, Flesh, and Fantasy* (New York: Routledge, 2021), pp. 36-54

Sanders, Charles Richard, 'Was Frederick Denison Maurice a Broad-Churchman?', *Church History*, 3.3 (September, 1934), p. 222-31

Sandys, John Edwin, *A History of Classical Scholarship: The Eighteenth Century in Germany and the Nineteenth Century in Europe and the United States of America, Volume 3* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Saunders, Robert, 'God and the Great Reform Act: Preaching against Reform, 1831–32', *Journal of British Studies*, 53.2 (April, 2014), pp. 378-99

Scherer, Matthew, 'Landmarks in the Critical Study of Secularism', *Cultural Anthropology*, 26.4 (November, 2011), pp. 621-32

Scott, Patrick, 'The Business of Belief: The Emergence of 'Religious' Publishing', *Studies in Church History*, 10 (1973), pp. 213-24

Scriven, Tom, *Popular Virtue: Continuity and Change in Radical Moral Politics, 1820–70* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017)

Seeley, Robert Benton, *Essays on the Church, by A Layman,* Second Edition (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1834)

Semmel, Stuart, *Napoleon and the British* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004)

Sewell, William (D. D.), *Some Last Words of the Rev. W. Sewell D. D., Being a Brief Review of Certain Controverted Religious Questions* (London: Rivingtons, 1876)

Seymour, (Lady), (ed.), *The "Pope" of Holland House: Selections from the Correspondence of John Whishaw and His Friends, 1813-1840* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1906)

Shattock, Joanne (ed.), *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017)

—— *Politics and Reviewers: The Edinburgh and The Quarterly in the Early Victorian Age* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1989)

—— 'Quarterly Reviews' in Laurel Brake and Marysa Demoor (eds.), *Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland* (London: The British Library, 2009), p. 523

——and Michael Wolff (eds.), *The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and Soundings* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1982)

Shea, Victor and William Whitla (eds.), *Essays and Reviews: The 1860 Text and Its Reading* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2000)

Shine, Hill and Helen Shine, *The Quarterly Review under Gifford: Identification of Contributors 1809-1824* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1949)

Shorter, Clement K., *Charlotte Brontë and Her Circle* (Cambridge, Mass: John Wilson and Son, 1896)

Siedentop, Larry, 'Introduction' in François Guizot, *The History of Civilization in Europe* (Indiana: Liberty Fund Inc., 1997), trans. William Hazlitt, ed. Larry Siedentop

Simms, Brendan and Torsten Riotte (eds.), *The Hanoverian Dimension in British History, 1714-1837* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Skinner, Stephen A., 'The British Critic: Newman and Mozley, Oakeley and Ward' in Stewart J. Brown, Peter B. Nockles, and James Pereiro (eds.), *The*

Oxford Handbook of the Oxford Movement (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 289-303

—— 'Newman, the Tractarians and the British Critic', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 50.4 (October, 1999), pp. 716-59

—— *Tractarians and the 'Condition of England': The Social and Political Thought of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

——, Peter B. Nockles, and James Pereiro (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017)

Slinn, Sara, *The Education of the Anglican Clergy, 1780-1839* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2017)

Smale, Irene Euphemia, *Women, Theology and Evangelical Children's Literature, 1780-1900* (Cham: Spinger International, 2023)

Smiles, Samuel, *A Publisher and His Friends: Memoir and Correspondence of the Late John Murray, with an Account of the Origin and Progress of the House, 1768-1843, Volume II* (London: John Murray, 1891)

Smith, James, *The Pastor and the Flock, Or, Hints to Young Pastors, and Advice to Church Members* (London: S. Bagster, 1831)

Smith, Mark, 'The Anglican Churches, 1783-1829' in Jeremy Gregory (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism Volume II: Establishment and Empire, 1662-1829* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 68-87

—— 'Hackney Phalanx', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-52465> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Soames, Henry, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (London: C. & F. Rivington, 1826, Two Volumes)

—— *Reasons for Opposing the Romish Claims* (London: C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1829)

Sonoi, Chine, 'Southey's Radicalism and the Abolitionist Movement', *The Wordsworth Circle*, 42.1 (Winter, 2011), pp. 22-26

Sorkin, David, *The Religious Enlightenment: Protestants, Jews and Catholics from London to Vienna* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008)

Southey, Charles Cuthbert (ed.), *The Life and Correspondence of the Late Robert Southey, Volume 2* (London: Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans, 1850)

Southey, Robert, *The Book of the Church*, (London: John Murray, 1824, Two Volumes)

—— *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (London: John Murray, 1826)

Speck, W. A., 'Robert Southey, Benjamin Disraeli and Young England', *History*, 95.2 (April, 2010), pp. 194-206

Stafford, William, 'Representations of the Social Order in The Gentleman's Magazine, 1785-1815', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 33.2 (April, 2009), pp. 64-91

Stanley, Arthur Penrhyn, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D.*, Two Volumes (London: B. Fellowes, 1844)

—— (ed.), *The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold, D. D.* (London: B. Fellowes, 1845)

Stebbing, Henry, *The History of the Reformation* (London: John Taylor, 1836, Two Volumes)

Steinbach, Susie L., *Understanding the Victorians: Politics, Culture and Society in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017)

Stern, Fritz, *The Varieties of History: From Voltaire to the Present* (London: Macmillan, 1956)

Stewart, David, 'The Magazine and Literary Culture' in Joanne Shattock (ed.), *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 31-46

Storey, Mark, *Robert Southey: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

Stott, John R. W., 'Introduction – Charles Simeon: A Personal Appreciation' in James M. Houston (ed.), *Evangelical Preaching: An Anthology of Sermons by Charles Simeon* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2003), pp. xxvii-xlii

Strachey, Lytton, *Eminent Victorians* (London: Penguin, 1986), originally published in 1918

Strong, Rowan, 'Anglicanism and the State in the Nineteenth Century' in Rowan Strong (ed.*), The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume III: Partisan Anglicanism and its Global Expansion, 1829-c.1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 92-115

—— (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume III: Partisan Anglicanism and its Global Expansion, 1829-c.1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019)

Suarez, Michael F. and Michael L. Turner (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume V, 1695-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Sullivan, Alvin, (ed.), *British Literary Magazines: The Romantic Age, 1789-1836* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1983)

Taylor, Charles, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007)

Thomas, William, *The Quarrel of Macaulay and Croker: Politics and History in the Age of Reform* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)

—— 'Religion and Politics in the *Quarterly Review*, 1809-1853 in Stefan Collini, Richard Whatmore and Brian Young (eds.), History, Religion, and Culture: British Intellectual History 1750-1950 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Thompson, David M., 'The 1851 Religious Census: Problems and Possibilities', *Victorian Studies*, 11.1 (September, 1967), pp. 87-97

Thompson, Kenneth A., *Bureaucracy and Church Reform: The Organizational Response of the Church of England to Social Change 1800-1965* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970)

Thorp, Margaret Farrand, *Charles Kingsley, 1819-1875* (New York: Octagon Books, 1969)

Tracey, Gerard (ed.), *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman, Volume VII: Editing the British Critic January 1839-December 1840* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995)

Turner, Frank M., *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2002)

Vance, Norman, 'Kingsley, Charles (1819-1875)', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15617> [accessed 18 June 2025]

—— *Sinews of the Spirit: The Ideal of Christian Manliness in Victorian Literature and Religious Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)

Van Horn Melton, James, *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Van Remoortel, Marianne, *Women, Work and the Victorian Periodical: Living by the Press* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015)

Varley, E. A., *The Last of the Prince Bishops: William Van Mildert and the High Church Movement of the Early Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)

von Ranke, Leopold, *The History of the Popes of Rome*, trans. Sarah Martin (London: John Murray, 1840)

Vranken, Thomas, '"A Well-Preserved Piece of Useless Antiquity": The Gentleman's Magazine and Anti-Emotional National Identity' in Jock Macleod, William Christie and Peter Denney (eds.), *Politics and Emotions in Romantic Periodicals* (Cham: Springer Nature, 2019), pp. 73-8

Walker, Hugh, *The Literature of the Victorian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921)

Walker, Richard J., *Labyrinths of Deceit: Culture, Modernity and Identity in the Nineteenth Century* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007)

Walker, Stanwood S., '"Backwards and Backwards Ever": Charles Kingsley's Racial-Historical Allegory and the Liberal Anglican Revisioning of Britain', *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 62.3 (December, 2007), pp. 339-79

Wallins, Roger P., 'Quarterly Review, The' in Alvin Sullivan (ed.*), British Literary Magazines: The Romantic Age, 1789-1836* (London: Greenwood Press, 1983), pp. 359-67

Walsh, John, Colin Haydon and Stephen Taylor (eds.), *The Church of England c.1689-c.1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)

Ward, N., *The Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, 3 vols. (London: Longman, 1911-12)

Warrington, Bernard, 'Pickering, William', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-22213?rskey=m4nSQH&result=2> [accessed 18 June 2025]

Watts, Michael, *The Dissenters Volume III: The Crisis and Conscience of Nonconformity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015)

Wee, C. J. W. L., 'Christian Manliness and National Identity' in Donald E. Hall (ed.), *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 66-88

Wheatley, Kim (ed.), *Romantic Periodicals and Print Culture* (London: Frank Cass and Company, 2003)

Wheeler-Barclay, Marjorie, *The Science of Religion in Britain, 1860–1915* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010)

Whipple, Edwin P., *Essays and Reviews, Volume II* (Boston: Ticknor, Reed, and Fields, 1851)

White, Hayden, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973)

Willey, Basil, *More Nineteenth Century Studies: A Group of Honest Doubters* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1956)

Williamson, Gillian, *British Masculinity in the Gentleman's Magazine, 1731 to 1815* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016)

Wix, Samuel, *Reflections Concerning the Expediency of a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome Being Holden, with a View to Accommodate Religious Differences, and to Promote the Unity of Religion in the Bond of Peace* (London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1818)

Wolffe, John, 'Clapham Sect', *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-42140?rskey=PwyeFI&result=1> [accessed 18 June 2025]

—— *God and Greater Britain: Religion and National Life in Britain and Ireland, 1843-1945* (London: Routledge, 1994)

Woolf, Daniel, *A Global History of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

Wyland, Russel M., 'John Taylor Coleridge, Forgotten Editor of The Quarterly Review', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 44.3 (Fall, 2011), pp. 215-35

Young, B. W., 'Religious History and the Eighteenth-Century Historian', *The Historical Journal*, 43.3 (September, 2000), pp. 849-68