

ROUTLEDGE REVIVALS

The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century

Alfred Plummer



Routledge Revivals

**THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY**



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

BY

ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

FORMERLY MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM
AND SOMETIME FELLOW AND TUTOR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD



Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

First published in 1910 by Methuen & Co. Ltd.

This edition first published in 2018 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN
and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 1910 Taylor & Francis

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Publisher's Note

The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original copies may be apparent.

Disclaimer

The publisher has made every effort to trace copyright holders and welcomes correspondence from those they have been unable to contact.

A Library of Congress record exists under ISBN

ISBN 13: 978-1-138-55693-5 (hbk)

ISBN 13: 978-0-203-70579-7 (ebk)

HANDBOOKS OF ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

General Editor :

JOHN HENRY BURN, B.D., F.R.S.E.

EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF ABERDEEN

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

HANDBOOKS OF
ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

- I. THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH (to A.D. 800). By J. H. MAUDE, M.A.
- II. THE SAXON CHURCH AND THE NORMAN CONQUEST (A.D. 800-1135). By C. T. CRUTT-
WELL, M.A.
- III. THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH AND THE PAPACY (A.D. 1135-1485). By A. C. JENNINGS, M.A.
- IV. THE REFORMATION PERIOD (A.D. 1485-1603). By HENRY GEE, D.D.
- V. THE STRUGGLE WITH PURITANISM (A.D. 1603-1702). By BRUCE BLAXLAND, M.A.
- VI. THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE EIGH-
TEENTH CENTURY. By ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

BY

ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

FORMERLY MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM
AND SOMETIME FELLOW AND TUTOR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD

METHUEN & CO.
36 ESSEX STREET W.C.
LONDON

First Published in 1910

PREFACE BY THE GENERAL EDITOR

THE initial impulse to undertake the task of editing this series was given me, so far back as 1897, by the late Dr Mandell Creighton, Bishop of London. He was good enough to suggest the names of some of the writers whom I should invite to collaborate ; and he drew up what he called "a rough scheme," of which the following is a modification.

- I. The Foundations of the English Church (to A.D. 800).
- II. The Anglo-Saxon Church and the Norman Conquest (A.D. 800-1135).
- III. The Mediæval Church and the Papacy (A.D. 1135-1485).
- IV. The Reformation Period (A.D. 1485-1603).
- V. The Struggle with Puritanism (A.D. 1603-1702).
- VI. The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.

The names of the six scholars, who have accepted the invitation to contribute to this series, are a sufficient guarantee that the work is conceived in no narrow spirit of partisanship, but with the earnest desire to do justice to all parties, whether religious or political. The Editor has thought it right to allow to each writer the utmost freedom of treatment consistent with the general plan of the series. If here and there this has resulted in some slight divergence of view between one volume and another,

he believes that it will prove rather advantageous than detrimental to the utility of the work ; for much would be lost, and very little gained, by preventing a writer from giving free expression to his own view of the facts, and of the inferences to be drawn from them.

J. H. BURN

THE PARSONAGE
BALLATER

PREFACE

IN a period of which so much is known, and of which the materials for additional knowledge are so abundant, as is the case with the eighteenth century, the writer of a handbook sees from the first that a very great deal, of even important matters, will have to be omitted: and one of his chief difficulties will be to decide which topics must be selected in order to give the reader an intelligible and coherent picture—faithful, as far as it goes—of the period as a whole. In such circumstances, no two persons' judgments will always agree as to what should be sacrificed, and what ought, however concisely, to be preserved. It is, therefore, inevitable that some readers will think that, in the present volume, some features of the age have been retained which might well have given place to others that are passed over in silence. It is hoped that such readers will believe that, at any rate, nothing worse than an error of judgment has been committed. The topics presented to the reader have been selected with a view to giving a correct impression of the leading characteristics of the century. They have not been selected in order to give a particular impression, favourable or unfavourable, of this or that religious body, or of this or that leader. And it has been thought better not to load the pages with details, which, however interesting, might blur rather than deepen, the general effect.

There is room also for difference of opinion as to the way

in which the century ought to be subdivided. It is believed that the points of division which have been adopted are intelligible and tenable; for the years 1717, 1737, 1760, 1787 are distinguished by events of sufficient importance to justify a division of some kind, and they mark off periods which are fairly equal in length. It is in the three central periods, each of which runs to twenty or more years, that the special characteristics of the century are most abundantly found.

The notes show the writer's obligations to many who have written upon this period during the last fifty or sixty years. They also show that original authorities have not been neglected. It is from the latter that the student of the eighteenth century will derive the most abundant instruction and delight.

DULANY, BIDEFORD
CHRISTMAS, 1909

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE BY THE GENERAL EDITOR	V
PREFACE	vii

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY	I
------------------------	---

CHAPTER II

FROM A.D. 1701 TO THE SILENCING OF CONVOCATION IN 1717	29
---	----

CHAPTER III

FROM THE SILENCING OF CONVOCATION IN 1717 TO THE DEATH OF QUEEN CAROLINE IN 1737	74
---	----

CHAPTER IV

FROM THE DEATH OF QUEEN CAROLINE IN 1737 TO THE DEATH OF GEORGE II. IN 1760	111
--	-----

CHAPTER V

FROM THE DEATH OF GEORGE II. IN 1760 TO THE CON- SECRATION OF TWO BISHOPS FOR AMERICA IN 1787	147
--	-----

x **CHURCH IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY**

CHAPTER VI

	PAGE
FROM THE CONSECRATION OF TWO BISHOPS FOR AMERICA IN 1787 TO THE END OF THE CENTURY IN 1800 .	190

CHAPTER VII

SOME LEADERS OF ENGLISH THOUGHT AS CHARACTERISTIC OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY	223
--	-----

INDEX	241
-----------------	-----

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

THE writer on this period of English History is confronted with two great difficulties: (1) the vast amount of material that is available as evidence and comment; and (2) the apparently contradictory character of the evidence as to the goodness or badness of the age which he has to study.

(1) It is quite true, as regards the first part of the century, that brilliant as is the literature of the age of Queen Anne, there is hardly anything of the first rank that can be placed under the head of contemporary history. When one has mentioned Swift and Bolingbroke, one has named the only two authors of really great talent who attempted to write the history of their own times; and neither of these two has done so with anything like completeness. Nevertheless, even for this part of the period there are smaller writers, of whom perhaps the best is the continuator (? Tindal) of Rapin's *History of England*. But, as the century advances, the number of persons who write memoirs, letters, and other materials for history, becomes very large indeed. One need do no

more than mention such writers as Horace Walpole, Lord Hervey, Lady Mary W. Montagu, John Byrom, Lord Chesterfield, Gray, Burke, Fanny Burney, and many others, some of whom will be mentioned below. No doubt the majority of these writers were not specially concerned with the affairs of the English Church, or with religion of any kind. But the affairs of Church and State were so closely intertwined that every leading statesman had an immense influence on the Church, and, either from choice or necessity, many of the clergy, and most of the bishops, were politicians. If we wish to know the worst,—and sometimes more than is true,—about the clergy, we shall find it often enough in the pages of Horace Walpole. Sidelights as to the way in which statesmen regarded the Church, and Church appointments, appear from time to time in the *Memoirs* of Lord Hervey. And much that bears directly upon the English Church, and the condition of religion in England will be found in the speeches and writings of Burke; as also in the cogitations of the Essayists, in the *Tatler*, *Spectator*, *Guardian*, *Rambler*, and *Idler*.

But the student who has made himself acquainted with most of what has been mentioned above will still have a vast mass of literature to explore in the writings of those who treated of religious questions in general, or of the Church of England in particular. It will suffice to mention the voluminous pamphlets, sermons, and more substantial writings in connexion with the Trinitarian controversies, Deism, Romanism, the Nonjurors, Nonconformity, the Bangorian Controversy, Convocation, Clerical Subscription, Methodism and the Evangelical movement. Nor can the philosophical writers be neglected, least of all those who had such influence upon religious thought as Locke, Berkeley, Butler, and Hume.

Add to all this original material the treatment of it in our own day by such writers as Abbey and Overton, Bogue and Bennett, Burton, Coxe, Hallam, Hunt, Lecky, Macaulay, Lord Mahon, Perry, Leslie Stephen, Skeats, Stoughton, and Thackeray, and we have an amount of literature to be read, or at least to be consulted, which may well seem to be overwhelming.

(2) But, great as is the difficulty of mastering the more important portions of the multitudinous data, the difficulty of drawing from these facts correct conclusions as to the character of the eighteenth century is at least as great. Was it, on the whole, a good or a bad age in Church and State? Was it one on which Englishmen and Churchmen can look with thankfulness and pride; or one which they study, when they are compelled to study it, with shame and distress? Or is it of that chessboard character, which can be called either black or white, according to the squares to which we direct our attention? If the last view is nearest to the truth, it would seem as if, both at the time and during the century which followed, it was the black squares which attracted most attention. The eighteenth century is commonly condemned as a dull, coarse, irreligious age, in which politicians were faithless and venal; in which bishops were place-seekers, who neglected all duties, except controversial pamphleteering; in which the clergy were ignorant, vulgar, and fanatical, nominally Hanoverian, but Jacobite at heart; in which the educated laity were either sceptics who questioned the fundamentals of revealed religion, or scoffers who openly derided all forms of religion alike; and in which the upper classes, whether educated or not, set an example of unbridled profligacy, which the lower orders, sunk in materialism and misery,

were only too ready, according to their opportunities, to follow.¹

As to the frequency, fulness, and intensity of these black squares, there can be no doubt: the evidence is abundant and indisputable. The question is, whether there were not also very many white squares, which are too often forgotten, although the evidence for their existence is ample, if only people have the patience to look for it and the discernment to recognize it. There is also the further question, whether, as regards the shortcomings and wrongdoings of the Church of England, there is not very much to be pleaded in extenuation, seeing that before the century was twenty years old, the Church was handcuffed and gagged, and otherwise most ungenerously treated by statesmen who despised it, and cared only to use it for their own purposes. It is quite true that the history of the English Church during the eighteenth century is the history of a steady and grievous decline. But it is also true that a great deal of that decline, perhaps far the greater part of it, was due much more to the ill-treatment which it received than to its own spontaneous negligence and misconduct.

It is not necessary here to recapitulate in detail the dark features of the period: many of them will be evident enough in the pages which follow. But it will be useful to summarize briefly the leading items which ought to be placed on the other side of the account, in order that the reader may be on the look-out for them, and also may bear them in mind, while he is considering the terribly frequent and very conspicuous black pages in the history. It is impossible to read any account of this century with-

¹ Carlyle, in 1832, called it "a decrepit, death-sick Era, when Cant had first decisively opened her poison-breathing lips to proclaim that God-worship and Mammon-worship were one and the same, that life was a lie, and the earth Beelzebub's."—(*Essay on Boswell's Life of Johnson.*)

out becoming aware of the truth of many of the charges which are brought against it. But it is quite possible to know a great deal about those times, and yet not notice; or not give due weight to, the many bright and even beautiful features, which go a considerable way towards redeeming its blackened character. To speak of either Church or State or society in general as being, throughout that century, rotten to the core, is to use intelligible but extravagant language. There was much that was rotten, but the heart remained sound: otherwise recovery would have been impossible, or would have come with much less sureness and completeness. And it is very much to be noticed that the worst features of the age become most conspicuous after the Church had begun to sink into torpor in consequence of the cruel treatment which it had received; and that it was when the National Church began to revive, that the nation began to recover enlightenment and moral earnestness. In more ways than one the special features of the eighteenth century are found, at any rate in their fulness, only in about seventy or seventy-five years; and this is specially true of its bad characteristics. In quality, the opening years belong to the seventeenth century, and the closing years to the nineteenth century, rather than to the period which lies between them. And, even as regards the longer and darker period, there is much that can be said by way of eulogy. The testimony of Mr Miller, in his *Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century* (1803), may be quoted here.

“In no period have the various branches of science, art, and letters received, at the same time, such liberal accessions of light and refinement, and been made so remarkably to illustrate and enlarge each other. Never did the inquirer stand at the confluence of so many

6 CHURCH IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

streams of knowledge as at the close of the eighteenth century."

And he goes on to point out that, among the learned professions, the clergy produced as many authors of distinction as any other; also that, among the laymen, whose works adorn literature, there were plenty whose Christianity was as conspicuous as their ability. In the former class we think of Swift, Waterland, Bentley, Berkeley, Butler, Law, Warburton, and Paley; in the latter of Addison, Sir Isaac Newton, Johnson, Burke, and Cowper.

In summarizing some of the brighter features of the eighteenth century, let us begin with *literature*. It was, no doubt, a prosaic age. Its poetry was intellectual rather than emotional,—very often didactic, and frequently controversial. Form was cultivated to the uttermost, in order to give point to controversy; but there is serious lack of imagination.¹ Wordsworth has pointed out that, excepting the *Nocturnal Reverie* of Lady Winchilsea and a passage or two in the *Windsor Forest* of her friend Pope, the poetry of the period between *Paradise Lost* (1663) and *The Seasons* (1726-30) does not contain a single new image of external nature, or a familiar image that shows genuine imagination. Indeed, sometimes there is as much poetry in the prose, as in the polished verse, of this literary age. For instance, is not the *Vicar of Wakefield* as rich in poetry as the *Essay on Man*? Yet this prosaic age has commanding merits.

The literary productiveness of the age is in itself extraordinary, quite independently of the very high quality of the best things that were produced. Quite early in

¹ "I fear," says Gray, "the quickness and delicate impatience of these polished times, in which we live, are but the forerunners of the decline of all those beautiful arts which depend upon the imagination."—(*Essay on the Poems of Lydgate.*)

the century Swift calls attention to this fact in an amusing adaptation of Herodotus IV. vii. "From such elements as these, I am alive to behold the day, wherein the Corporation of Authors can out-vie all its brethren in the field. A happiness derived to us, with a great many others, from our Scythian ancestors; among whom the number of pens was so infinite, that the Grecian eloquence had no other way of expressing it than by saying, That in the regions far to the North it was hardly possible for a man to travel, the very air was so replete with feathers."¹ In the same section, however, Swift hints that diligent readers are not as common as diligent writers. "The most accomplisht way of using books at present is twofold; either first, to serve them as some men do Lords, learn their titles exactly, and then brag of their acquaintance; or secondly, which is the choicer method, to get a thorough insight into the index, by which the whole Book is governed and turned, like fishes by the tail."

If there is nothing that is quite of the very best, yet the literature of the eighteenth century has a sustained richness and fulness not to be found elsewhere. The numbers of writers of high excellence and power is very great, and their variety is very remarkable. Moreover, they are accompanied by a multitude of authors, whose works, though hardly in the second rank, are still read with pleasure, and still count for something in English literature. In what other century could we find twenty-five such names as these?—Addison (1672-1719), Congreve (1670-1729), Steele (1672-1729), Bentley (1662-1742), Pope (1688-1744), Swift (1667-1745), Thomson (1700-48), Bolingbroke (1678-1751), Butler (1692-1752), Berkeley (1685-1753), Fielding (1707-54), Law (1686-1761), Richardson

¹ *Tale o a Tub*, sect. vii.

(1689-1761), Young (1681-1765), Gray (1716-71), Goldsmith (1728-74), Hume (1711-76), Johnson (1709-84), Adam Smith (1723-90), Gibbon (1737-94), Boswell (1740-95), Burns (1759-96), Burke (1729-97), Cowper (1731-1800), Sheridan (1751-1816). And these twenty-five are very far indeed from exhausting the list of notables. We shall do but scant justice to the literature of the eighteenth century, unless we add fifty or sixty more, not a few of that might justly have been placed in the same rank with some of those which have been already named. Let us add thirty more, and they would, by themselves, make no mean list in any age: Parnell (1679-1718), Prior (1664-1721), Collier (1650-1726), Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727), Defoe (1661-1731), Gay (1685-1732), Mandeville (1670-1733), Arbuthnot (1667-1735), Waterland (1683-1740), Savage (1698-1743), Hutcheson (1694-1746), Middleton (1683-1750), Hartley (1705-57), Collins (1721-59), Lady Mary W. Montagu (1689-1762), Sterne (1713-65), Akenside (1721-70), Smollett (1721-71), Chesterfield (1694-1773), Warburton (1698-1779), Blackstone (1723-80), Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-92), W. Robertson (1721-93), Horace Walpole (1717-97), Priestley (1733-1804), Paley (1743-1805), Blake (1757-1827), Bentham (1748-1832), Crabbe (1754-1832), and Fanny Burney (1752-1840). But another thirty or more might be added, and even this list will contain not a few distinguished names, and leave others unmentioned. Norris (1657-1711), Hickes (1642-1715), Burnet (1643-1715), Rowe (1674-1718), Lady Winchilsea (d. 1720), Lady Rachel Russell (1636-1723), Jeremiah Jones (1693-1724), Samuel Clarke (1675-1729), Derham (1657-1735), Hearne (1678-1735), Strype (1643-1737), Tickell (1686-1740), W. Somerville (1675-1742), Watts (1674-1748), Doddridge (1702-51), Carte (1686-1754),

Dyer (1699-1758), Orrery (1707-62), Byrom (1692-1763), Chatterton (1752-70), B. Stillingfleet (1702-71), Tucker (1705-74), Garrick (1717-79), Charles Wesley (1707-88), Price (1723-91), Gilbert White (1720-93), Reid (1710-96), Mason (1724-97), Warton (1722-1800), Elizabeth Montagu (1720-1800), Charlotte Lennox (1720-1804), Elizabeth Carter (1717-1808), Ann Redcliffe (1764-1823), T. Somerville (1741-1830).

Let us look at a few of the notable writings produced in this age. Granted that there is a marked decadence in dramatic productions, yet are not *She Stoops to Conquer*, *The Rivals*, and *A School for Scandal* among the best of such things?¹ In the *Life of Dr Johnson* we have the very best of English biographies; and in the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* one of the greatest of historical works. For finish in versification, the *Essay on Man* is unrivalled, excepting by other works of Pope: and, as regards finish in prose, especially of the light and graceful kind, the *Spectator* is unsurpassed. In robust English, used for purposes of fierce satire, we shall not find anything to excel the *Tale of a Tub* and some other writings of Swift. And yet, as a political writer, Daniel Defoe is not much behind him, while in inventive power he is perhaps Swift's equal. As fiction, *Robinson Crusoe* is more credible, and perhaps not very much less ingenious, than *Gulliver's Travels*. For influence upon thinkers and workers, not many have excelled the writings of Berkeley, Hume, Adam Smith, and Bentham. And, as literature, whose letters rank higher than those of Gray, Cowper, and Horace Walpole—to say nothing of those of Lady Mary W. Montagu, Lady Rachel Russell, and Lord Chesterfield? And of the same

¹ The restoration of Shakespeare to the stage by Garrick, under the influence of Pope, Theobald, Warburton, and Johnson, is among the good features of the age.

general type we have Swift's and Wesley's Journals. In short, the capabilities of English prose, which had been discovered by Hooker and Bacon, had now been completely mastered. What had been a rare phenomenon in their age had become a common inheritance in the age of Addison, Swift, Berkeley, Johnson, Gibbon, and Burke.

Nor should translations from the classics, whether in poetry or in prose, be forgotten: Rowe's *Lucan*, Pope's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Christopher Pitt's *Virgil* and *Vida*, and Gilbert West's *Pindar*; also Melmoth's *Letters of Pliny*, Middleton's *Letters of Cicero*, Hampton's *Polybius*, Franklin's *Sophocles*, *Horace* both by Francis and by Smart, Elizabeth Carter's *Epictetus*, and Spelman's *Xenophon*.¹

Among the various writings mentioned above, two classes were an entirely new birth. The periodic essay and works of fiction were creations of the eighteenth century. The *Tatler* (April 1709-January 1711), *Spectator* (March 1711-December 1712), *Guardian* (March 1713-October 1714), *Freeholder* (December 1715-June 1716), *Rambler* (March 1750-March 1752), *Adventurer* (November 1752-March 1754), and *Idler* (April 1758-April 1760), constituted a new feature in the literary world, and an important one.² These weekly or daily essays were very widely read, and were a powerful instrument in educating public opinion and taste; and the moral influence of a constant supply of literature, which was at once attractive and pure, was very considerable. Nor was the influence of works of fiction very much less.

¹ During the years 1701-1751 about 250 editions of classics were published at Oxford.

² The *Tatler* had been preceded by Tutchin's *Observator* (April 1702), Defoe's *Review* (February 1704), and Leslie's *Rehearsal* (August 1704); but these were political and polemical periodicals.

Under this head are included novels and tales, not dramas and plays. Fiction in this sense begins with Defoe.¹ His *Shortest Way with Dissenters* had taught him how like the truth sheer invention can be made to look ; for the people whose brutality he was exposing were taken in, and thought that he was their ally. People like facts ; and it is much easier to invent facts than to find them. Hence we have the immortal *Robinson Crusoe* and its endless progeny.

When we look more particularly at religious literature, there are some great names. Berkeley in metaphysics, and Butler in philosophical apologetics, still hold the field. Earlier in the century we have works which are still of great value ; Wake's *State of the Church of England in those Councils, Synods, Convocations, etc.*, Law's *Serious Call*, Wall's *Infant Baptism*, Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, and Waterland's *Critical History of the Athanasian Creed*. In controversial writings the age is only too rich ; and it will suffice to mention the names of Conybeare, Atterbury, Wake, Kennett, Warburton, and Paley. The sermons of Beveridge are still read by some, and the hymns of Watts and of the Wesleys are still sung by thousands. Nor should it be forgotten that most of the best poems of S. T. Coleridge,—often very rich in religious feeling,—together with some of those of Wordsworth and of Southey, belong to the eighteenth century, so far as date of composition is concerned. And what a change from Parnell, Prior, and Pope to Southey, Wordsworth, and Coleridge ! A century which has seen the workings of that change occupies no unimportant place in the history of English literature.

Moreover, it was a century in which authors not only

¹ W. J. Dawson, *Makers of English Fiction*, pp. 3-11.

abounded, but very often had their powers recognized in a very substantial way. There was, it is true, no Augustus on the throne ;¹ neither Anne nor the Georges had any taste for literature. Nor was there, as at the present time, any great reading public, that in a few weeks might make a book a financial success. But there was "a vast system of bounties and premiums. There was, perhaps, never a time at which the rewards of literary merit were so splendid, at which men who could write well found such easy admittance into the most distinguished society, and to the highest honours of the state."² Rowe was Poet Laureate and held several lucrative offices. Addison was Secretary of State. Prior was Commissioner of Customs, and was sent to Paris in 1711 to negotiate what became the Peace of Utrecht (1713), and was known as "Matt's Peace."³ Stepney was envoy to Vienna in 1702 and to the Hague in 1706. Congreve had no sooner brought out his comedies (1693-1700) than he began to be rewarded with a series of offices which placed him beyond the reach of poverty. Newton was made Master of the Mint, and was knighted in 1705. Steele was Commissioner of Stamps. Gay was taken by Clarendon to Hanover as secretary of legation in 1714. Ambrose Philips, John Hughes, Arthur Mainwaring, and Thomas Tickell are similar instances : and it is hardly necessary to mention the pension to Dr Johnson. But Johnson's star rose rather

¹ George I., however, gave Steele £500 for the *Conscious Lovers*, which had been dedicated to the King.

² Macaulay, *Essays*, i. p. 377 ; Minto, *Literature of the Georgian Era*, chap. i.

³ Hearne mentions Prior's being "splendidly interr'd" at Westminster ; "and there will be a stately Monument erected in the said Abbey to his Memory, to which will be fixed a Bust of himself, wrought by one of the finest Artists in Europe, at the Expence of the late King of France" (30 Sept. 1721). Was this in gratitude for "Matt's Peace" ?

late for this system of patronage: it was dying out, and the new system, of multitudes of readers, had not yet begun.

Although only a small portion of it has become literature, we ought not to pass by in silence the oratorical power which, throughout this period, was exhibited in the English Parliament, and especially in the Lower House. The eighteenth century was "the Golden Age of parliamentary oratory: no modern assembly has matched for lofty eloquence the Houses of Commons that listened to the speeches of the two Pitts, Burke, Fox, and Sheridan."¹ Grattan might be added to these, and a distinction be made with regard to Burke. It was not as "parliamentary oratory" to be listened to, that Burke's speeches were great, but as literature to be read. Erskine, who heard the great speech on conciliating the American colonies, said that it drove people away when it was delivered, including those who read it again and again, and could hardly think of anything else, when it was printed. And Bolingbroke's oratory must have been of very high merit. Pitt said to Lord Stanhope that there was scarcely any loss in literature which he so deeply deplored, as that no adequate record of Bolingbroke's speeches should remain.² Lord Chesterfield said that Bolingbroke's "most familiar conversations" would bear to be printed "without the least correction as to method or style."

Along with the literature of the eighteenth century something ought to be said respecting its *art*; all the more so, because one of its greatest artists holds no mean place in literature. Ruskin has pronounced Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-92) to be "the prince of portrait painters,"

¹ Courthope, *History of English Poetry*, v. p. 224.

² Lord Mahon, *History of England*, i. p. 28.

and one of the "seven supreme colourists" in the world, the others being Titian, Giorgione, Tintoretto, Veronese, Correggio, and Turner (1775-1851). Gainsborough (1727-88) is a worthy companion. "No artist," it has been said of him, "was ever at once more new, more natural, and more English"; and he often approached Reynolds so nearly "that the distance between them is scarcely measurable." Allan Ramsay (1713-84), in his prime was by some preferred to Reynolds, especially as a painter of women. Romney (1734-1802), if not quite equal to Reynolds and Gainsborough, belongs to the same great English school. We must add Sir Thomas Laurence (1769-1830), Opie, "the Cornish wonder" (1761-1807), and Sir William Beechey (1753-1839). Earlier in the century, we have the great pictorial re-producer of contemporary life, especially in its humorous and horrible elements, William Hogarth (1697-1764), and his companion and fellow-worker, Francis Hayman (1708-76); also the animal-painters, J. Wootton and G. Lambert, who both died in 1765. Nor must Paul Sandby (1725-1809), who helped to teach Englishmen the beauties of England, be forgotten; to whom may be added Sir Henry Raeburn, Nat. Hone, Thomas Stothard, John Hoppner, and Robert Freebairn. No country on the Continent can, during this century, show such a list of painters. In another sphere of art we have Flaxman (1755-1826) and the Wedgwoods.

From literature and art let us turn to *education*. There is plenty of evidence to show that the teaching which was supplied in schools for all ranks and in the Universities was often very wretched. Many of the poor went without any teaching at all.¹ But there were exceptions. Competent and conscientious masters of schools, such as

¹ *Letters of Radcliffe and James*, Oxf. Hist. Soc., p. 62.

John Coleridge of Ottery St Mary, did exist. The *Guardian* of 22nd May 1713 (No. 62) gives a much better account of public schools than other reports would lead one to expect. Dr John Brown, writing in 1757, goes so far as to say that, "to do Justice to the Times, the most considerable of these Seminaries were never more ably supplied than at present."¹ And Bentley has left on record what reforms he carried out at Trinity College, Cambridge. The case of Thomas Hearne, the antiquary, who was taken from a village by Francis Cherry, the Nonjuror, educated, and sent to Oxford, was probably no isolated one. And it is quite certain that the Charity Schools were a noble and a very successful effort to supply sound instruction to the poor. Writing for Queen Anne's birthday in 1712, Addison says that these schools are the greatest instances of public spirit which the age has produced, and that it would be a good way of honouring the anniversary to give support to such schools.² Steele writes in the *Guardian* of 11th July 1713: "I have always looked on this institution of Charity-Schools, which, of late years, has so universally prevailed through the whole nation, as the glory of the age we live in."³ The S.P.C.K. was labouring in the same field. And, according to the *Idler*,⁴ it was a common thing for foreigners to remark how much better the lower orders in England were educated than the lower orders on the Continent; while in England it was sometimes said that they were over-educated and made discontented with their lot. Dissenters, in proportion to their numbers, were more vigorous in the cause of education than Churchmen were. They not only helped in promoting Charity

¹ *Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times*, p. 30. George Fothergill, servitor at Queen's College, Oxford, gives a good account of the tuition there, 1722-26.—(*The Fothergills of Ravenstonedale*, pp. 67 ff.)

² *Spectator*, No. 294.

³ No. 105.

⁴ No. 7.