

nineteenth-century Britain.³ His published lectures on the subject (given in Edinburgh between 1801 and 1810) provide an important insight into the views to which a large proportion of a new generation of political economists were exposed.

Mary Poovey has shown how Stewart's moral philosophy and political economy were closely connected by his belief in 'a grandiose design governed by a beneficent deity.' Due to the inherent morality of nature, moral philosophy was for Stewart the means by which humanity could become aware of providential design. Through moral philosophy, it was possible to identify those human actions which would contribute to the realisation of divine providence. This meant that

him the the practices with which he is familiar, and prevent[s], in this order of men, the possibility of mutual communication', which (he assumed) would assist improvement. It was therefore up to government to de

happiness.¹⁰ Assisted by improvements in printing, intellectuals could specialise and recombine their efforts to manufacture rational knowledge more effectively.

The most influential of Stewart's pupils who sought to bring these educational recommendations to fruition were those connected with the foundation of the *Edinburgh Review* in 1802. The connections between Stewart and the founders of the *Review* have been noted by a number of scholars. All four founding editors - Francis Horner, Henry Brougham, Sydney Smith and Francis Jeffrey - attended his lectures on political economy.¹¹ Indeed, the following passage from those lectures may well have provided inspiration for those involved in the new periodical venture:

One circumstance [for the improvement of instruction] which, indeed, has been operating more or less ever since the period of the Protestant Reformation... [is] the

knowledge, as that which obtains in this country with regard to classical knowledge.' Although valuable, the ancient languages should be studied for their usefulness rather than as a way of distinguishing between those who could afford an expensive education and those who could not.¹⁴ Nor was it only schools that were to blame for English ignorance. The 'public feelings' heaped applause on those who could demonstrate a mastery of classical poetry rather than those practical subjects which - if cultivated - would improve the economy of the nation. As Smith scornfully proclaimed:

A learned man! - a scholar! - a man of erudition! Upon whom are these epithets of approbation bestowed? Are they given to men acquainted with the science of

child does his catechism, by heart, so as to answer readily to certain interrogations.¹⁷

on his 'patriotic prejudices' - could not help suspecting that, due to inadequate training, the young men of England 'are not equal as a body to those of France, Germany, or Russia. They reason less justly, and the subjects with which they are conversant are less manly.'²¹ By claiming to have the interests of the country at heart, contributors to the *Review* sought to establish a critical stance regarding English education (and especially the Anglican-dominated university system) without exposing themselves to accusations of unpatriotic (and by implication impious) sympathies from those speaking from positions of authority. By casting their calls for the improvement of education in terms of national competition, Stewart's pupils and their associates sought to establish the teaching of physical science (including political economy) as a standard activity in English schools and universities. Using the same rhetoric, they aimed to deflect attention away from those who

At the same time, the concentration in London of scientists, artists and writers meant that it would also be more convenient to teach other subjects in the metropolis. Nor did the *Reviewers* portray such arguments as unequivocally opposed by members of the ancient universities. An article attributed to Brougham – provocatively signed 'An Oxonian' - suggested that 'medicine in its principal branches, Nosology and Anatomy, can only be taught where there are large hospitals - best where the largest of these are established; and the fine arts can nowhere be taught except in the grand resort of artists, the great mart for their productions.'²⁷ A new centre for professional education would not make Oxford and Cambridge redundant - they remained the unchallenged centres of religious education for the Anglican clergy. Rather, it would provide training for new members of the 'professions', to be drawn from the newly self-aware 'middling ranks' of the country.

The projected new university was conceived in accordance with principles of political economy. It was felt that increasing expansion and specialisation meant that it was becoming more and more difficult to obtain the general mastery of knowledge that had typified a 'liberal education' during the eighteenth century. One reviewer suggested that as well as understanding the ancient languages, the term included a knowledge of French, Italian, German, Spanish, mathematics, experimental sciences and moral philosophy. Such wide-ranging learning was simply impractical for participants in the new economy: 'Few of those who are intended for professional and commercial life can find time for all these studies. It necessarily follows, that some portion of them must be given up'.²⁸ The constantly changing and advancing state of knowledge meant that there could be no 'immutable principles' on which a curriculum could be based. No single subject could be singled out as either worthy or unworthy of (,)-580.W n.6(d)1.6(i)46.9(.)-874.7(t)-.5(a)1.6

trade and competition. As well those directly taught or influenced by Stewart such as Sir James Mackintosh, George Birkbeck, Brougham and Mill, members included other writers on political economy such as George Grote and Joseph Hume. Their interests ensured that the university adopted a number of policies intended to turn principle into practice. Most importantly, lecturers were to rely on students' fees for their income, and thereby be 'permanently regulated by the demand for different sorts of instruction' (as an 1826 prospectus would have it). The university was also set up as a joint-stock company funded by private investors.³⁰ Nevertheless, it would be inaccurate to characterise the university as completely under the control of political economists. Politicians, intellectuals and businessmen such as mathematician (and editor of the *Ladies' Diary*) Olinthus Gregory, evangelical abolitionist Zachary Macaulay, prominent lawyer William Tooke and financier and Jewish community leader Isaac Goldsmid also took an active part in the formation of the faculty. Despite the *Review's* claim that competition between subjects would be 'perfect', the number of subjects that could be included on the syllabus remained limited. The Council therefore

subjects such as medicine and law, the inclusion in the syllabus of fields of knowledge not conventionally taught at universities such as Sanskrit, French, Italian, Spanish, and English Language and Literature signified a broadening of the marketplace of knowledge. At the same time, teachers of subjects such as zoology insisted on the independence of their own areas of expertise from other areas of investigation.³²