

The Origins and Aims of F. D. Maurice’s Christian Socialism

A Consideration
of Patristic Motifs

Dylan Pahman
Acton Institute

This article demonstrates how salient characteristics of F. D. Maurice’s Christian socialism resonate with his appreciation of Ignatius of Antioch, Clement of Alexandria, and Augustine of Hippo. Maurice’s understanding of the divine family of God that motivated his solidarity with the working classes resonates with his understanding of Ignatius. This solidarity drove him to Christian socialism, which he conceived as primarily an educational project in line with his reading of Clement. Ultimately, this extended to his mentorship of younger Christian socialists mirroring his appreciation for the early Augustine’s philosophical pedagogy. These patristic motifs thus nuance and clarify Maurice’s sometimes puzzling involvement with Christian socialism in Britain from 1848 to 1854.

I should like you to feel that the facts of Ecclesiastical History concern yourselves and your flocks; that the people whom it brings before us were men of our own flesh and blood; that He who called them to their work is calling us to ours.

~ F. D. Maurice¹

Introduction

Despite common mischaracterizations of the church fathers as “communist” or “socialist”²—often based on isolated readings of some of their statements about wealth and stewardship—the relation between the Christian socialist John Frederick Dennison Maurice (1805–1872) and the church fathers has received little attention. John C. Cort dedicates an entire chapter in his *Christian*

Socialism to arguing that the church fathers were socialists, but he does nothing to connect this reading to Maurice, of whom he is critical as being insufficiently political and radical, if not insufficiently socialist.³ Jeremy Morris, in his book, acknowledges Maurice's theological debt to the fathers, but does not examine the connection in detail.⁴ This is despite acknowledging in an earlier article that "Michael Ramsey and A. M. Allchin long ago pointed out the debt Maurice owed to the Greek and Latin fathers, but this has never been explored adequately."⁵ In this article, Morris acknowledges the fathers' influence on Maurice in his relational Trinitarian theology, singling out "the Alexandrian fathers Clement and Athanasius"⁶ in particular, but nevertheless he does not strongly connect this influence with Maurice's socialism. Alec R. Vidler comes closer in that regard with his passing claim that Maurice "thought that the early Church and the Fathers had had a grasp of Christ's relation to the whole race and of the universal scope of the redemption, which had subsequently, especially since the Reformation, been relaxed."⁷ David Young, despite his emphasis on Unitarian influences, recognizes the importance of the fathers for Maurice's thought in general, correctly singling out Clement of Alexandria as "Maurice's favourite among the Fathers of the Greek Church," and acknowledging that Clement's vision "of the whole of creation as the work of a benevolent creator is to be seen in ... Maurice."⁸ Moreover, Young notes that "[d]uring 1824 Maurice's personal tutor was Frederick Field (1801–85), a leading Patristic scholar responsible for notable work on Origen and Chrysostom... Already drawn to Plato, Maurice was led by Field to an appreciation of the Greek Fathers, and Field's exact scholarship was popularized by Maurice in pulpit, lecture room, and letters."⁹ Nevertheless, he cautions that "Maurice's debt to the Greek Fathers must not be overemphasized... But it is important to reaffirm that it is the spirit of Greek theology that pervades Maurice's thinking."¹⁰ Yet apart from a few relevant details relating to Clement, even Young does not go much further than C. F. G. Masterman did at the turn of the twentieth century, when he wrote that for Maurice, "Charity, as in the theology of the Greek Fathers, is the ground and centre of existence; and God, as the Infinite Charity, is the starting-point of all."¹¹

While Maurice's Christian socialism had many influences—the Bible, his Unitarian upbringing, the idealism of Coleridge, his conversion to the Church of England, French socialism, personal contacts—this article argues that the church fathers must be acknowledged as vital among them, despite their relative neglect in Maurice scholarship. As a historical theologian, Maurice referenced the fathers on many occasions, including in whole works and sections of works dedicated to Church history and the history of philosophy and morals. This article will demonstrate how salient characteristics of Maurice's Christian socialism

resonate with his treatment of three church fathers in particular: Ignatius of Antioch, Clement of Alexandria, and Augustine of Hippo. Specifically, I will demonstrate how Maurice's understanding of the divine family of God that motivated his solidarity with the working classes resonates with his understanding of Ignatius. This solidarity drove him to Christian socialism, which he conceived as primarily an educational rather than economic or political project reminiscent of his reading of Clement's conception of Christian education. Ultimately, this educational project extended to his mentorship of younger Christian socialists in line with his appreciation for the early Augustine's philosophical pedagogy. Reading Maurice in light of these and other fathers' contributions to his thought nuances and clarifies his sometimes puzzling rhetoric and behavior during the Christian Socialist Movement in Britain from 1848 to 1854.

“Our Father”—Ignatius on the Family of God

When the February Revolution broke out in Paris in 1848, Maurice had just begun a series of sermons on the Lord's Prayer.¹² While Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and his proclamation, “*La propriété, c'est le vol!*” (“Property is theft!”)¹³ were ascendant in France, Maurice preached to his congregation at Lincoln's Inn, “Property is holy.”¹⁴ A wider contrast of statements could not be conceived, yet for Maurice it is what makes property holy that set him on a path of social activism and, ultimately, Christian socialism, in the coming months: “Beneath all distinctions of property and of rank lie the obligations of a common Creation, Redemption, Humanity.”¹⁵ He had already established this foundation in his first sermon on the words “Our Father”: “the name Father loses its significance for us individually, when we will not use it as the members of a family,”¹⁶ he claimed. Moreover, “when a man arises and goes to his Father, he renounces his vile, selfish, exclusive life, and takes up that human privilege which God has given him in Christ.”¹⁷ Property is not holy *per se*. Rather, it is only to the extent that property preserves the relations of each to all as brothers and sisters under the fatherhood of God, that property is holy. For Maurice, the same basis that drives him to minister to the working classes as brethren in Christ also commits him to defend private property.¹⁸

Without diminishing the importance of other influences, we can see that Maurice found confirmation of this societal foundation in Ignatius of Antioch, the Apostolic Father martyred in Rome by wild beasts in 110 AD.¹⁹ In the Church at this time, Maurice tells us in his *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries*, published in 1854, “God was said to be revealing Himself as the Head and Parent of a family, and that family was to spread itself

east and west, north and south, to the ends of the earth.”²⁰ It was this that the pagan emperors of Rome feared, and this that brought Ignatius before Trajan. Maurice was especially fond of the ancient account of Ignatius’s martyrdom, referencing it not only in this work but peculiarly in his 1847 *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, wherein he remarks, “Ignatius affirmed that the Invisible Guide had actually come upon earth, and borne a human nature, had died a human death; He was not a mere dæmon, not a special teacher of the wise man—He was the Governor and Ruler of men. To all races and all classes, Syrians and Romans, masters and serfs, His kingdom must be announced.”²¹ As the *Martyrdom* records it, Ignatius claimed to Trajan, “there is but one God, who made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that are in them; and one Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, whose kingdom may I enjoy.”²² For Maurice, this simple, creedal statement amounted to a political affront to the Roman Empire.

Such basic, catechetical sources were precisely what Maurice believed his own time called for: “At certain periods in the history of the Church . . . men have exhibited a weariness of the ordinary theological teaching. . . . The Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord’s Prayer, were found to contain the treasures for which they were seeking. The signs of such a period are surely to be seen in our day.”²³ In a time on the verge of revolution, when the working classes struggled to make ends meet in harsh conditions, people once again needed to understand the true foundation of their mutual brotherhood by praying the words “Our Father.”

So also, for Ignatius the Church hierarchy itself is a witness to this new divine family: “everyone must show the deacons respect,” he commanded the Trallians. “They represent Jesus Christ, just as the bishop has the role of the Father, and the presbyters are like God’s council and an apostolic band. You cannot have a church without these.”²⁴ For Maurice, following the biblical narrative of the progressive unfolding of the divine order of the cosmos, human society—and God’s works of redemption for it—first began with the family, grew into nations, and then finally into the universal society, the Church.²⁵ Thus, according to Maurice, Ignatius countered “[t]he restless assertion of rights and powers, in one brother against another,”²⁶ through his proclamation of the universal family of God in the Church.

The day after Maurice finished his sermons on the Lord’s Prayer, on April 10, 1848, the Chartists, asserting the “rights and powers” of the working class, planned a massive march on London. The political ambitions of the Chartists at this time were distinct from the social activism of the socialists, who promoted entrepreneurial worker cooperatives and other nonpolitical organization. The Chartist demonstration was quelled before it could happen, but the commotion was enough for Maurice, having fallen ill, to send Charles Kingsley (1819–1875),

a young, fellow-minister of the Church of England, to fetch his friend J. M. Ludlow (1821–1911), a young, idealistic lawyer just returned from Paris.²⁷ The result of their meeting was the start of a short-lived publication *Politics for the People*,²⁸ in which Maurice wrote the opening article, the first of a series on the principles of the French Revolution—liberty, equality, and fraternity—beginning, of course, with the last of those three. Socialism was not mentioned until the last issue of the paper, and that article was written by Ludlow after Maurice claimed, according to Torben Christensen, that “he knew nothing” of socialism.²⁹ Meanwhile, says Christensen, “Maurice’s articles in *Politics for the People* only reflected his basic convictions, which differed hardly at all from what he had previously expounded.”³⁰ The fatherhood of God and the Church as divine family was the most fundamental of those “basic convictions.” It is what led Maurice to lend his support to workingmen’s cooperatives in London and eventually even to adopt in 1850 the label “Christian Socialism” for the group’s tracts and other activities.³¹ But if Maurice in 1848 claimed not even to know what socialism was, what did he, only two years later, come to conceive Christian socialism to be?

“A Teacher Come from God”— Clement on Christian Education

Maurice’s appreciation for Clement of Alexandria holds the key to answering that question.³² Maurice was adamant that Christian socialism should not be a political faction or party. On this basis, he refused to be president of a central board for workingmen’s associations and as a result significantly transformed the idea his followers first proposed.³³ This “system-phobia” and opposition to party-spirit is one of the first things Maurice appreciates about Clement, as well as Justin Martyr before him.³⁴ In his *Paedagogus*,³⁵ says Maurice, Clement at first rejects all pagan philosophy, only expressing appreciation for Plato. But then, “Having discovered this one memorable exception to the idolatrous tendency of the surrounding world, Clemens proceeds to notice others, both poets and philosophers, who bore at least an unconscious testimony to the invisible God.”³⁶ Thus, Clement’s rejection of systems of thought and philosophical parties appeals to Maurice, but Maurice also resonates with Clement’s ability, *contra* Tertullian’s dichotomy between Athens and Jerusalem,³⁷ to recognize deep truth in the systems he rejects.

Both of these aspects of Clement factor into Maurice’s Christian socialism. Maurice rejects any attempt to politicize or centralize Christian social action that might reduce it to a party distinct from the ministry of the Church. For Maurice, this would contradict the positive core common to all socialisms current in his

day: cooperation. As Peter R. Allen notes, summarizing Ludlow's account in an 1896 article, "Maurice's definition of socialism [was] nothing more than belief in the principle of social cooperation," especially "Christian brotherhood," but this has "nothing whatever to do with anything a political economist would call socialism."³⁸ And Morris observes that many since Maurice's time have doubted whether he can really be called a socialist: "An implicit assumption of many of these writers is that true Socialism is defined by reference to economic policy, with collective control over the means of production as the basis of political life for Socialist societies. By this standard of economic foundationalism, Maurice's Christian Socialism looks thin indeed. Others, even acknowledging an ethical Socialism, have been chary of Maurice's apparent sacralizing of existing political arrangements through his concept of the divine order."³⁹

Indeed, Maurice was a one-time acquaintance of John Stuart Mill,⁴⁰ a critic of Robert Owen,⁴¹ and a measured appreciator of Adam Smith's moral philosophy.⁴² Yet as early as his *Kingdom of Christ*, despite his criticism of Owen's determinism, Maurice admitted that "the idea of co-operation, on which Owen dwells, is one of wonderful depth and importance."⁴³ And in an 1850 letter, he concedes, "The principle of association, I am convinced, has taken too strong a hold on the minds of the working classes for any power directly to fight against it. It may be worked well or ill, destructively or savingly."⁴⁴ That is hardly a glowing endorsement. In the same letter, Maurice speculates that if capitalists simply took better care of their workers, the workers would gladly let them run their businesses howsoever they saw fit.⁴⁵

In the first of his *Tracts on Christian Socialism*, Maurice presents a dialogue between "Somebody," a skeptic, and "Nobody," a Christian socialist (himself). He claims, "I seriously believe that Christianity is the only foundation of Socialism, and that a true Socialism is the necessary result of a sound Christianity."⁴⁶ He explains, "The watchword of the Socialist is Co-operation; the watchword of the Anti-socialist is Competition. Any one [*sic*] who recognizes the principle of co-operation as a stronger and truer principle than that of competition, has a right to the honour or the disgrace of being called a Socialist."⁴⁷ Yet Maurice does not hold back his criticism for other socialists of his time: "there is an influence adequate to resist competition ... latent in the old world, which Socialists have wished to destroy."⁴⁸ Which "old world" did Maurice mean?: "there has been a sound Christianity in the world, and ... it has been the power which has kept society from the dissolution with which the competitive principle has been perpetually threatening it."⁴⁹ Again, he appeals to the Bible and Church history in contrast to French socialists of his day:

if they begin to look earnestly at the Bible history, at the creeds of the Christian Church, at the records of it from the Day of Pentecost to this time, I believe they will find more and more, that they have the ground there, the only one upon which they can stand or work. They will not read in the Divine book of a great strife of individual competitors, but of a Divine family, expanding itself into a Divine nation, of a universal society growing out of that nation, recognising and preserving both the forms of human fellowship out of which it was unfolded.⁵⁰

Based upon the foundation of the Bible and Church history, which of course includes the church fathers, Maurice goes so far as to declare himself a truer socialist than Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, or Louis Blanc, stating, "I assume that to *be* the only possible condition of society which they wish to *make* the condition of it."⁵¹ The socialism they long for, Maurice already sees in the Church.

One could read Maurice's words about cooperation and competition as a radical repudiation of the new science of political economy.⁵² Yet while Maurice may have had some differences of opinion with the economists of his day, his own account of Adam Smith raises the question whether he rejected economic science or only what he believed to be harmfully competitive business practices at the time. In his 1847 *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, commenting on the moral significance of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, Maurice wrote, "If it is discovered that there are laws regulating the production, distribution, exchange of commodities, it can scarcely be supposed, as much as heretofore, that what men are to get depends upon the restlessness of their cupidity; that what they lose they lose only by chance."⁵³ Thus, the law of supply and demand, to Maurice, has an anti-selfish moral significance, acting as a check on "cupidity." He continues to note how

Adam Smith's doctrines at once roused against them what seemed the obvious self-interest of a multitude of monopolists who traded with different commodities, who traded also in the bodies and souls of men. He proclaimed that these supposed interests of theirs clashed with everlasting laws. He averred, for instance, as strongly as any man, that the cultivation of the soil by slaves is not good for a land—not good for those who buy or sell the slaves any more than for those who are bought and sold.⁵⁴

Thus, Maurice praises Smith's moral opposition to slavery, and he viewed Smith's discovery of economic laws to be opposed to the selfishness of monopolists. He then cautions that Smith "made no profession of turning all things into gold.... If he did not find all the incantations and exorcisms that were necessary, he at least pointed out many of the mischiefs in our social polity that required them."⁵⁵

At just the time he would become involved with Christian socialism, Maurice did not strongly criticize Adam Smith's economic analysis but rather those who idolized him and failed to see that additional moral work needed to be done, while at the same time commending what work Smith did. Moreover, in his later work *Social Morality*, commenting on the connection between Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* and his *Wealth of Nations*, Maurice claims Adam Smith's arguments for free trade—which are grounded upon the same logic of exchange Smith famously observed between the butcher, the brewer, and the baker—are an example of his support for mutual sympathy and cooperation.⁵⁶ By contrast, Maurice claims, “A great enemy of Adam Smith's doctrine of Sympathy appeared in Jeremy Bentham.”⁵⁷ So to the extent many economists had adopted Bentham's utilitarianism,⁵⁸ we may speculate that Maurice would have clashed with them. But to the extent they followed after Smith, he might have even commended their work. To say that “Maurice advances a sharp theological critique of free-market economics,” as does Paul Dafydd Jones,⁵⁹ not to mention later generations of Christian socialists in Britain and the United States,⁶⁰ requires importing economic assumptions about cooperation and competition into Maurice's writing in *Tracts on Christian Socialism* that cannot easily be reconciled with Maurice's own statements about Adam Smith or cooperation.

So how did F. D. Maurice view himself as a Christian socialist? His son, F. Maurice, describes in further detail what cooperation meant—and did not mean—for Maurice:

He applied to the case before him *precisely the same principles as had guided him in each successive stage of his manhood*.... [H]e maintained that all the great work that has been achieved by society *in its existing form* has been achieved by the mutual co-operation of men, and that it has been where selfishness has intruded itself that rottenness and mischief have followed in its train.⁶¹

Moreover, here F. D. Maurice's own son contrasted the “Christian-Socialist view *par excellence*” from that of his father, additionally noting, “His great wish was to Christianise Socialism, not to Christian-Socialise the universe.”⁶² Cooperation, to Maurice, was just another term for the universal brotherhood he had always preached. Thus, Allen is right that cooperation, ultimately fulfilled in Christian brotherhood, represents the essence of socialism to Maurice. On this basis, Maurice criticized and rejected competition and rivalry.⁶³ But the project was more than a mere definition. As noted by his son above, the Christian socialists, including Maurice, supported worker cooperatives. How did this fit with his reluctance to get involved in political movements?

While Maurice resisted any centralizing associations, at the insistence of Kingsley, Ludlow, and others he relented to the point of joining the Society for the Promotion of Working Men's Associations. According to Allen, "His change of mind ... was an admission that an apparently social scheme of reform was in fact educational or moral."⁶⁴ This educational focus is alike at the core of Clement's *Paedagogus*, which begins by noting, "As ... for those of us who are diseased in body a physician is required, so also those who are diseased in soul require a pædagogus to cure our maladies; and then a teacher, to train and guide the soul to all requisite knowledge when it is made able to admit the revelation of the Word,"⁶⁵ that is, the Logos, the Son of God, incarnate in Jesus Christ. As Maurice put it, "The whole education of man [is], according to Clemens, grounded in his original love, and [is] carried on with the most regular method in order to produce the reaction and reciprocation of love in the creature who is the object of it."⁶⁶ Clement soon after details at length how precisely Christians ought to consider themselves children of God.⁶⁷ Thus, Christian education is grounded in our creation in—and redemption to—the brotherly love of the family of God. As Young put it, "Like Clement of Alexandria, [Maurice] saw God as the divine educator, man's invisible teacher who draws out and nourishes seeds already implanted, 'the teachings and impulses of the Divine Word.' Education was an affair of the spirit, concerned with man's own mysterious being and his relationship with his creator."⁶⁸

Others have noticed, both during and after Maurice's time, the extent to which Christian socialism was a moral and educational project to him, consistent with his Unitarian upbringing.⁶⁹ So ingrained was Maurice's concern for education, Young notes that "his earliest letter, written when he was 10 years old, was about education."⁷⁰ For Ludlow, however, the realization that the real Maurice had not simply been a great Christian theologian who was also a socialist dealt a crushing blow to his more radical hopes. Rather, Maurice was an evangelist, who used the rhetoric and momentum of socialism in attempt to forestall violent revolution that would tear apart the God-ordained order of society (as it did in France in 1848 and across many nations in Europe afterward). Looking back in an 1866 letter to Ludlow, Maurice even claimed outright that it had been a good thing for them to step back from "meddl[ing] with the commercial part of the business,"⁷¹ that is, the business of workers' associations. He continued to explain, "A college [i.e., the Working Men's College] expressed to my mind ... precisely the work that we could undertake, and ought to undertake, as professional men; we might bungle in this also; but there seemed to me a manifestly Divine direction towards it in all our previous studies and pursuits."⁷² Instead of a project of economic reform, Maurice's Christian socialism was ultimately

and always about calling people of all classes to—and educating the working classes in—the mutual, brotherly love he believed essential to the Gospel.⁷³ In short, for Maurice Christian socialism was an educational project in the spirit of Clement of Alexandria.

Ludlow's disappointment was occasioned precisely by the founding in 1854 of the Working Men's College in London. The group asked Maurice to be the school's first principal, and he enthusiastically agreed and took to shaping the project according to his own designs. Others in the Christian socialist movement called upon Ludlow to succeed Maurice and continue to promote worker cooperatives and associations, but due to his mother's failing health, he declined their invitation and followed Maurice in teaching at the newly founded college, the first of its kind in adult education, offering not merely practical but humane and liberal instruction to its working-class students. "So Mr. Maurice had his way," Ludlow recalled years later, "and the comparatively broad stream of Christian Socialism was turned into the narrow channel of a Working Men's College."⁷⁴ Many chroniclers of Christian socialism have affirmed Ludlow's assessment, regarding the movement, despite some few victories, as largely a failure. From this perspective, Maurice was not only a founder—but the ender—of the first movement of Christian socialism in Britain.⁷⁵

But Maurice did not see it that way, and such an assessment only holds if we discount his perspective. Indeed, we may say that, understood in the light of his appreciation for Clement's conception of Christian education, the Working Men's College represents the fulfillment of Maurice's hopes for Christian socialism. After all, what better societal instantiation of an essentially "educational and moral" movement could there be than a college that, like the catechetical school of the Alexandrian Church, through moral instruction teaches all who would come to it how to live anew as members of God's divine family?

Yet there is one further aspect of Maurice's conception of Christian socialism. It was both an instantiation of the familial love of the Church *and* an educational project meant to improve not only the material but the moral conditions of *all* those involved—not just tailors and others of the working classes in Maurice's London neighborhood. For this last aspect, Maurice's appreciation of Augustine of Hippo will guide us.

“Go, Making Disciples”—Augustine on Mentorship and Mission

As has just been argued, and as others have noted, for Maurice Christian socialism was an educational matter first of all. However, though many acknowledge his relative age compared to Ludlow and Kingsley (sixteen and fourteen years younger than Maurice, respectively), and while many note that the younger members of the Christian socialist brotherhood looked up to him as a mentor, scholars generally stop short of viewing them as Maurice's mission field, despite his own stated intentions, in a letter to Archbishop Hare in November 1843, that “I think that some time or other my vocation will be . . . generally among all that are in distress and are in debt and are discontented—Quakers, Unitarians, Rationalists, Socialists, and whatever else a Churchman repudiates, and whatever repudiates him. . . . [I]t is a dream which is worth something to me, and out of which, at any rate, I cannot wake myself.”⁷⁶

It is also a dream that resonates with Maurice's treatment of Augustine in his 1847 *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*. Maurice believed Augustine's *Confessions*, where the saint recounts his journey from wayward youth to baptized member of the Catholic Church, is “the key” to his philosophy.⁷⁷ Indeed, Maurice admires most that “all his knowledge was purchased by the fiercest personal struggles.”⁷⁸ Of particular interest for Maurice's Christian socialism are his comments on Augustine's *Against the Academics*, a dialogue on the question whether one can be happy who seeks but does not find the truth, written while he was still a catechumen.⁷⁹ “His new discoveries have not carried him into violent hostility with the thoughts or the friends of earlier days:—they have given him a deeper and livelier interest in both,”⁸⁰ notes Maurice. He observes that for Augustine, “If the mind has nothing actual to grasp, the body which has, must maintain its superiority.”⁸¹ Notably, Maurice admires Augustine's unsystematic method in pursuing this end:

But the method which he adopts for this purpose is as unlike that of a dogmatist of the Tertullian school as can well be conceived. Licentius, the son of Romanianus, and Trygentius, are pupils of Augustin. . . . The Christian neophyte [i.e., Augustine], it might be supposed, would rather deter these youths from debates and arguments, and treat them as only fit to receive what he gave them. On the contrary, he himself puts them upon a trial of strength. . . . The boys enter the lists with hearty good-will, their master from time to time interfering, not to check their ardour but to encourage it, to help either party in recovering any ground which he had unwittingly lost, to hinder them from taking any unfair advantages, to show them the duty of

making sacrifices of favourable positions for the sake of attaining the ultimate end, which is not victory but truth.... [I]t is ... exceedingly instructive as showing that the Academicians could be most effectively answered by one who understood their method best.⁸²

If we merely swap in this quote “Maurice” for “Augustin” and “socialists” for “Academicians,” we would have a perfect summary of the ways in which Maurice ministered to his younger contemporaries. Maurice did not “deter these youths from debates and arguments” but encouraged their efforts to write, teach, and organize, only “from time to time interfering,” etc., including recommending to Kingsley in a letter dated February 11, 1852, that the young minister read Augustine’s *Confessions* and *City of God* to improve his novel *Hypatia*.⁸³

Even while deterring them from what he believed to be imprudent endeavors, Maurice exhorted them to keep trying. As Augustine urged Licentius regarding their discussion whether one can be happy who searches for truth but does not find it, “The question is an important one and deserves serious discussion.” To which Licentius, doubting his own ability, replies, “If it is a matter of importance ... it calls for discussion by men of importance.” Nevertheless, Augustine returns that “when men of little moment apply themselves to great matters, these matters lend greatness to them.”⁸⁴ So also, the young men around Maurice often deferred to him, sometimes to their great disappointment, but he kept encouraging them to try again another way. Christensen even notes, “It was not long before the young men rallying around Maurice called him ‘the Master’ or ‘the Prophet.’” Moreover, “they usually bowed to his decisions and the right of veto of which he frequently made use.” In particular, “By his sermons and Bible readings, Maurice had laid the foundation for this unique position. It is necessary to keep this clearly in mind if one is to understand the history of Christian Socialism.”⁸⁵ In short, the others did not relate to Maurice as peers, but like Licentius and Trygentius to Augustine, as disciples to an elder—in the case of Ludlow, whose father died when he was a young boy, even as a son to the father he never had. I will only reiterate here that family and fatherhood, human and divine, were essential to Maurice’s theological worldview and foundational to his conception of Christian socialism.

According to Florence Higham, Maurice and his first wife Annie’s “first child, a girl, was stillborn and in April [of 1840, his sister] Elizabeth died, whose courage and vigour of mind had often helped him greatly.”⁸⁶ Then, “In the spring of ’41 Maurice’s elder son was born and christened Frederick after his father.” In 1843, while pregnant with their second son, Annie cared for his close friend John Sterling, who nevertheless died of tuberculosis in 1844. Higham goes on to relate,

While nursing Sterling [Annie] had caught the tubercular infection and she failed rapidly. In the spring she was ordered to Hastings. Sadly she said good-bye to the home where she had been so happy, but down by the sea, making the most of every moment with the little boys, she began to think she might recover. If not, she told Maurice, he must marry her friend Georgiana Hare...; she could not bear to think of Frederick and the children without anyone to look after them.... She died on Easter Tuesday, and once again at that season he faced the agony of the Cross.⁸⁷

In the next few years, "All [Maurice] wanted was a chance to serve: joy he did not hope to find again. His new home was at 21 Queen Square. As he walked across the 'quiet and antiquated square[,] the little rush with which he started sobering to a quieter step, as he read aloud to his children or buried himself in his study with no one now to help him write, or as he faced the unruly students at King's with a new sense of insufficiency, it may well have seemed to him that the best of his life was over."⁸⁸

Such was the biographical backdrop leading up to Maurice's involvement with Christian socialism, struggles a younger man like Ludlow could not understand or, it seems, even notice. At their first meeting the radical Ludlow went away disappointed by the "quiet, shy, very good, [and] obviously unpractical" Maurice.⁸⁹ Higham continues to note,

Ludlow did not know at that first encounter how recently Maurice's wife had died, a loss that left him maimed, unable for a while to do more than work at the routine jobs on hand—and pray. Only very gradually did vision and resilience return as he worked hard, too hard, writing, lecturing, organizing the new department of Theology at King's and trying very gently and rather awkwardly to be mother as well as father to the two little boys, gaining thereby new insight into the meaning of the Fatherhood of God.⁹⁰

Maurice's opposition to leading efforts for organized social action for the Christian socialists in the coming years was certainly consistent with his opposition to parties and systems, as has been noted, but all this seems to me to overlook the life of the man, through which, like Augustine, "all his knowledge was purchased by the fiercest personal struggles."⁹¹

In 1849, Maurice became engaged to and married Georgiana, as Annie had wished, "trusting that in her his boys would find the mother's love they needed, and discovering in his tender care for her delicate health and in sharing with her his hopes and disappointments a new serenity in mind and heart."⁹² Working two jobs, with two young boys and a chronically ill new wife at home, could not but

have conditioned Maurice's involvement with the Christian socialists. For the most part, he turned down their invitations to lead big projects, focusing instead on mentorship through intimate and local gatherings.

Maurice led a weekly Bible study in his own home for his young, radical friends, like Augustine to Trygentius and Licentius in his *Against the Academics*, acting as arbiter in their debates—and having the last word.⁹³ As Christensen notes, “The men to become the inner-circle of Christian Socialism took part in these Bible readings and hereby received the strongest impulses for forming their own personal beliefs, at the same time becoming united in a true spiritual fellowship.”⁹⁴ When these same men proposed biweekly conferences with local activists among the working class, Maurice agreed as yet another opportunity for discipleship. “Here,” says Christensen, “they were confirmed in their impression of Maurice's spiritual grandeur which in their eyes made him the undisputed leader whom it was a privilege to serve.”⁹⁵ Yet it was not until controversy over his views of heaven and hell in his *Theological Essays*⁹⁶ occasioned his departure from King's College⁹⁷ that Maurice had time to commit fully to any of their projects. They—and the working men of the neighborhood—called him to lead the Working Men's College; he accepted and channeled all his energy into it.

Moreover, Ludlow's own views of Christian socialism were not only more democratic than Maurice, but also ultimately utopian and communistic.⁹⁸ And Kingsley had supported the Chartists in 1848 and at least rhetorically slipped, on occasion, into the language of revolution in the following years. Can it not be said that, but for Maurice's mentorship, they, too, might have been radicalized like so many other young men? And how many more might have chosen the path of violence without their pacifying witness under his influence? Against the claim of Jones that Maurice “allowed himself to be radicalized by those around him,”⁹⁹ Maurice rather *prevented* the radicalization of those around him. If Maurice's Christian socialism “failed,” according to more conventional socialist standards, it is only because its “ultimate end [was] not victory but truth.”¹⁰⁰ By that Augustinian standard, it succeeded. On his own terms, his efforts preserved the divine order of society established by God, while raising men and women of all classes to a greater awareness that all of life had for its foundation the mutual love of human brotherhood, under the fatherhood of God, redeemed in the universal family of the church of Jesus Christ.

Conclusion

The full extent to which Maurice's appropriation of the church fathers influenced his Christian socialism remains an open question. But that it did, this article has endeavored to show. Moreover, to the extent the question is now open, this article has opened it. Exploring that extent in further detail, however, must remain a task for future research. This much, however, has been established: (1) That Maurice's understanding of the church as universal family testifying to the cooperative foundation of all human society, derives in part from the example of Ignatius of Antioch; (2) that his understanding of Christian socialism as a project of moral education, derives in part from the example of Clement of Alexandria; and finally (3) that his involvement with and discipleship of the other younger and more radical members of the movement, derives in part from the example of Augustine of Hippo. Upon this foundation, further patristic sources of Maurice's Christian socialism may be unearthed, to the end of expanding and further clarifying his unique involvement with the short-lived, activist movement—"short-lived," that is, only by the assessment of those who fail to give Maurice and his patristic sources their due.

Notes

1. F. D. Maurice, *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries* (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1854), 164–65.
2. See, e.g., James Bergida, “Patristic Socialism? Ambrose of Milan and Catholic Social Teaching on Private Property,” *Journal of Markets & Morality* 22, no. 2 (Fall 2019): 263–80; Peter Brown, *Treasure in Heaven: The Holy Poor in Early Christianity* (Charlottesville; London[DP: delete?]: University of Virginia Press, 2016); Dylan Pahman, “Markets and Monasticism: A Survey & Appraisal of Eastern Christian Monastic Enterprise,” in *Orthodox Monasticism Past and Present*, Sophia Studies in Orthodox Theology, vol. 8 (New York: Theotokos Press, 2014), 465–88; Helen Rhee, *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012).
3. See John C. Cort, *Christian Socialism: An Informal History* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988), 42–52 (Church Fathers), 139–52 (Maurice).
4. See Jeremy Morris, *F. D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 176–77.
5. Jeremy N. Morris, “A Social Doctrine of the Trinity? A Reappraisal of F. D. Maurice on Eternal Life,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 69, no. 1 (March 2000): 89. Neither Ramsey nor Allchin say much of substance as far as connecting Patristic influences with Maurice’s Christian socialism. See Arthur Michael Ramsey, *F. D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951); A. M. Allchin, *Participation in God: A Forgotten Strand in Anglican Tradition* (Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow, 1988).
6. Morris, “A Social Doctrine of the Trinity?” 94.
7. Alec R. Vidler, *The Theology of F. D. Maurice* (London: SCM Press, 1948), 46.
8. David Young, *F. D. Maurice and Unitarianism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 15.
9. Young, *F. D. Maurice*, 127–28.
10. Young, *F. D. Maurice*, 129.
11. C. F. G. Masterman, *Frederick Denison Maurice* (London; Oxford: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1907), 118.
12. See F. D. Maurice, *The Lord’s Prayer: Nine Sermons Preached in the Chapel of Lincoln’s Inn* (London: Macmillan, 1861).
13. See Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, *Qu’est-ce que la Propriété? ou Recherches sur le Principe du Droit et du Gouvernement* (Paris: Garnier Frères, 1849 [1840]); ET: idem, *What is Property?* in idem, *The Works of P. J. Proudhon*, vol. 1 (Princeton: Benj. R. Tucker, 1876).

14. Maurice, *The Lord's Prayer*, 65. This quote is from his fifth sermon, given on March 12, 1848.
15. Maurice, *The Lord's Prayer*, 65.
16. Maurice, *The Lord's Prayer*, 5.
17. Maurice, *The Lord's Prayer*, 6.
18. It is worth noting, too, that Maurice was confessionally committed to affirming private property rights. The Thirty-Eighth of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England reads, "The riches and goods of Christians are not in common," etc. For a version with commentary current in Maurice's day, see Church of England, *The Book of Common Prayer and the Administration of the Church*, 5th ed. (London: Gilbert & Rivington, 1840). For Maurice's defense of affirming the Thirty-Nine Articles, which incidentally does not include any commentary on the Thirty-Eighth, see F. D. Maurice, *Subscription No Bondage, or the Practical Advantages Afforded by the Thirty-Nine Articles as Guides in All the Branches of Academical Education* (Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1835). Given Maurice's emphasis on education, the alternate title of the work is noteworthy. It is another datapoint that education was and continued to be a lifelong occupation for him.
19. On Ignatius, see Gregory Vall, *Learning Christ: Ignatius of Antioch & the Mystery of Redemption* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013); William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985).
20. Maurice, *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History*, 347.
21. F. D. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, vol. 1: Ancient Philosophy and the First to the Thirteenth Centuries (London: Macmillan, 1882 [1847]), 287.
22. *Martyrdom of Ignatius*, 2 in *ANF* 1:129.
23. Maurice, *The Lord's Prayer*, 2.
24. Ignatius of Antioch, *To the Trallians*, 3.1 in Cyril C. Richardson, ed. and trans., *Early Christian Fathers* (New York: Macmillan, 1970), 99. Vall offers an in-depth exegesis of this passage in particular. See Vall, *Learning Christ*, 341–350. For the point I am making, however, precisely how to exegete this passage and reconcile it with other of Ignatius's ecclesiological metaphors is beside the point. The significance here is simply that Ignatius clearly thought of the Church in familial terms, grounded in the fatherhood of God. As to why Maurice does not cite this specific passage or any of Ignatius's letters, Maurice seems to have been aware that at the time there were versions of the letters attributed to Ignatius now considered spurious. See Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1:287: "Whatever be our judgment respecting his epistles ... [t]hey stand out in the most marked contrast to the later apologetic

literature: they are simple, child-like, practical in the highest degree.” Seven short epistles of Ignatius (six to churches, one to Polycarp) are considered authentic today.

25. This three-tiered framework of society as family, nation, and church—from most particular to most universal—recurs across Maurice’s works. Most prominently, see F. D. Maurice, *The Kingdom of Christ*, 3rd ed., 2 vols. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1883); idem, *Social Morality*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1872). The latter of these two is structured in three parts, based directly on this societal structure: family morality, national morality, and human (i.e., universal) morality. The categorization of society into these same three spheres, usually referred to as “estates” or “mandates,” is a prominent feature of Lutheran social thought. See, e.g., Niels Hemmingsen, *On the Law of Nature: A Demonstrative Method*, trans. E. J. Hutchinson (Grand Rapids: Christian’s Library Press, 2018 [1562]); Gottlieb Christoph Adolf von Harless, *The System of Christian Ethics*, 6th ed., trans. A. W. Morrison, revised by William Findlay (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1868 [1842]); Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, trans. Neville Hutton Smith (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1955). Interestingly, though he discerns a broader array of spheres than these three, the Danish Lutheran bishop Martensen also ascribed to his own version of Christian socialism. See Hans Lassen Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, Special Part, Second Division: Social Ethics, trans. Sophia Taylor (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899 [1878]), 163–71.
26. Maurice, *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History*, 357.
27. On the April 10, 1848 demonstration, see Cort, *Christian Socialism*, 141–42.
28. See *Politics for the People* (London: John W. Parker, West Strand, 1848). On Maurice’s contributions to this publication, see Torben Christensen, *Origin and History of Christian Socialism 1848–1854* (Universitetsforlaget I Aarhus, 1962), 75–90.
29. Christensen, *Origin and History*, 86.
30. Christensen, *Origin and History*, 76.
31. See Maurice, *To Ludlow*, January or February 1850, in F. Maurice, ed., *The Life of Frederick Dennison Maurice: Chiefly Told in His Own Letters*, vol. 2 (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1884), 50.
32. On Clement, see Piotr Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria: A Project of Christian Perfection* (London: T&T Clark, 2008); Henny Fiskå Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Eric Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); John Ferguson, *Clement of Alexandria* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1974).

33. See Christensen, *Origin and History*, 146; Cort, *Christian Socialism*, 216; Masterman, *Frederick Denison Maurice*, 85–86.
34. On his account of Justin, see Maurice, *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History*, 291–93.
35. See Clement of Alexandria, *The Instructor [Pædagogus]*, in *ANF* 2:207–98.
36. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1:308.
37. See Tertullian, *The Prescription against Heretics*, 7, in *ANF* 3:246. For Maurice's commentary on Tertullian, for whom he had little fondness, see Maurice, *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History*, 271–88; idem, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1:305–6.
38. Peter R. Allen, "F. D. Maurice and J. M. Ludlow: A Reassessment of the Leaders of Christian Socialism," *Victorian Studies* 11, no. 4 (June 1968): 481.
39. Morris, *F. D. Maurice*, 133–34.
40. See Christensen, *Origin and History*, 20; Morris, *F. D. Maurice*, 131–32; F. Maurice, ed., *The Life of Frederick Dennison Maurice: Chiefly Told in His Own Letters*, 2 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884), 1:75–76.
41. See Maurice, *The Kingdom of Christ*, 1:224–27; idem, *To Mr. Ludlow*, 1850, in F. Maurice, ed., *The Life of Frederick Dennison Maurice*, 2:35; Allen, "F. D. Maurice and J. M. Ludlow," 471.
42. See F. D. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, vol. 2: Fourteenth Century to the French Revolution, with a Glimpse into the Nineteenth Century (London: Macmillan, 1882 [1847]), 578–79; idem, *Social Morality*, 339–40.
43. Maurice, *The Kingdom of Christ*, 1:227. The first edition was published in 1838, the second in 1842.
44. F. D. Maurice, *To Mr. Rich*, Ephraim Lodge, Mount Ephraim, Tunbridge Wells, March 28, 1850, in F. Maurice, ed., *The Life of Frederick Dennison Maurice*, 2:49.
45. See F. D. Maurice, *To Mr. Rich*, Ephraim Lodge, Mount Ephraim, Tunbridge Wells, March 28, 1850, in F. Maurice, ed., *The Life of Frederick Dennison Maurice*, 2:48.
46. F. D. Maurice, *Tracts on Christian Socialism*, no. 1: "Dialogue between Somebody (a Person of Respectability) and Nobody (the Writer)," in David Reisman, ed., *Democratic Socialism in Britain*, vol. 2: The Christian Socialists (London: Routledge, 1996), 1.
47. Maurice, *Tracts on Christian Socialism*, no. 1, in Reisman, ed., *Democratic Socialism in Britain*, vol. 2, 1.

48. Maurice, *Tracts on Christian Socialism*, no. 1, in Reisman, ed., *Democratic Socialism in Britain*, vol. 2, 5.
49. Maurice, *Tracts on Christian Socialism*, no. 1, in Reisman, ed., *Democratic Socialism in Britain*, vol. 2, 6.
50. Maurice, *Tracts on Christian Socialism*, no. 1, in Reisman, ed., *Democratic Socialism in Britain*, vol. 2, 7.
51. Maurice, *Tracts on Christian Socialism*, no. 1, in Reisman, ed., *Democratic Socialism in Britain*, vol. 2, 8.
52. See, e.g., Paul Dafydd Jones, “Jesus Christ and the Transformation of English Society: The ‘Subversive Conservatism’ of Frederick Denison Maurice,” *The Harvard Theological Review*, 96, no. 2 (August 2003): 223. Despite this radical reading, even Jones concedes, “When Maurice spoke of socialism, he was not proposing a far-reaching reorganization of the relations of capital and labor. He did not show any awareness of the acroeconomic issues involved when discussing the unequal distribution of wealth and power. He indicated neither enthusiasm for trade unions or specific legislative endeavors nor support for even a limited extension of voting rights. He condemned generally the tendency to seek ‘certain scientific arrangements’ that would remedy social ills. And ... he rejected (albeit more gently) the Owenite index of ‘circumstances’ as a sufficient theoretic basis for the reform of society” (224).
53. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 2:579.
54. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 2:579.
55. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 2:579.
56. See Maurice, *Social Morality*, 339–40; Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Glasgow ed., 2 vol. (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981), 1:25–30 (1.2: “Of the Principle Which Gives Occasion to the Division of Labor”) and 1:452–72 (4.2: “Of Restraints upon the Importation from Foreign Countries of such Goods as Can Be Produced at Home”).
57. Maurice, *Social Morality*, 341.
58. See Jeremy Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (London; New York; Toronto: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1907); John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism, On Liberty, Essay on Bentham* (New York: Meridian, 1962).
59. Jones, “Jesus Christ and the Transformation of English Society,” 225.
60. On this, see Morris, *F. D. Maurice*, 158: “Maurice’s reputation as the founder of Christian Socialism came to be sealed by the subtle radicalizing of his message by later generations of admirers.”

61. F. Maurice, ed., *The Life of Frederick Dennison Maurice*, 2:40–41, emphasis added.
62. F. Maurice, ed., *The Life of Frederick Dennison Maurice*, 2:41.
63. See Maurice, *The Lord's Prayer*, 71; idem, *Tracts on Christian Socialism*, no. 1: "Dialogue between Somebody (a Person of Respectability) and Nobody (the Writer)," in David Reisman, ed., *Democratic Socialism in Britain*, vol. 2: The Christian Socialists (London: Routledge, 1996), 1–12; idem, *To Mr. Rich*, March 28, 1850, in F. Maurice, ed., *The Life of Frederick Dennison Maurice*, 2:47–49.
64. Allen, "F. D. Maurice and J. M. Ludlow," 474.
65. Clement, *The Instructor*, 209.
66. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1:311.
67. See Clement, *The Instructor*, 212–22.
68. Young, *F. D. Maurice*, 185–86.
69. See Morris, *F. D. Maurice*, 141; Young, *F. D. Maurice*, 185–92; Edward Norman, *The Victorian Christian Socialists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 132; W. Merlin Davies, *An Introduction to F. D. Maurice's Theology* (London: S.P.C.K., 1964), 141–42; Vidler, *The Theology of F. D. Maurice*, 203; Frances M. Brookfield, *The Cambridge "Apostles"* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1906), 222–23.
70. Young, *F. D. Maurice*, 185.
71. F. D. Maurice, *To Mr. Ludlow*, November 7, 1866, in F. Maurice, ed., *The Life of Frederick Dennison Maurice*, 2:549.
72. F. D. Maurice, *To Mr. Ludlow*, November 7, 1866, in F. Maurice, ed., *The Life of Frederick Dennison Maurice*, 2:550.
73. For a touching account of Ludlow's disappointment, see Christensen, *Origin and History*, 364–66.
74. Quoted in Christensen, *Origin and History*, 365.
75. See Morris, *F. D. Maurice*, 144; Cort, *Christian Socialism*, 151; Christensen, *Origin and History*, 364–66; Maurice B. Reckitt, *Maurice to Temple: A Century of the Social Movement in the Church of England* (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), 91–92.
76. Maurice, *To Archbishop Hare*, November 1843, in F. Maurice, ed., *The Life of Frederick Dennison Maurice*, 1:358.
77. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1:359. See Augustine of Hippo, *Confessions*, trans. R. S. Pine-Coffin and Robert S. Pine-Coffin (New York: Penguin, 1961).
78. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1:358.

79. See Augustine of Hippo, *Against the Academics*, Ancient Christian Writers, vol. 12 (Westminster; Maryland: The Newman Press, 1959). On this dialogue, see Erik Kenyon, *Augustine and the Dialogue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018); Mark J. Boone, *The Conversion and Therapy of Desire: Augustine's Theology of Desire in the Cassiciacum Dialogues* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016); Daniel Austin Napier, *En Route to the Confessions: The Roots and Development of Augustine's Philosophical Anthropology* (Leuven; Paris; Walpole: Peeters 2013).
80. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1:372.
81. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1:373.
82. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1:373.
83. See Maurice, *To Kingsley*, February 11, 1852, in F. Maurice, ed., *The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice*, 2:109–11.
84. Augustine, *Against the Academics*, 42.
85. Christensen, *Origin and History*, 93. See also Cort, *Christian Socialism*, 142.
86. Florence Higham, *Frederick Denison Maurice* (London: SCM Press, 1947), 46–47.
87. Higham, *Frederick Denison Maurice*, 52–53.
88. Higham, *Frederick Denison Maurice*, 53.
89. Higham, *Frederick Denison Maurice*, 55.
90. Higham, *Frederick Denison Maurice*, 55–56.
91. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1:358.
92. Higham, *Frederick Denison Maurice*, 65.
93. See Augustine, *Against the Academics*. See also Maurice's comments on Augustine's *De Beata Vita*, in which the characters are Augustine, his mother, cousins, friends, and son, in Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1:374: "There is evidently a sense in the mind of all the guests at Augustin's feast, that the blessedness which they seek for is within the reach of all, and that each is helping the other to attain it and enjoy it. A divine conversation has seldom been carried on with more of human friendliness and grace, or with a more evident feeling that all outward and sensible beauties ought to be relished and enjoyed by him who has the highest and the most inward." This could just as easily be a description of Maurice's Bible readings by others in the Christian socialist movement at the time. See also Augustine of Hippo, *The Happy Life (De Beata Vita)*, trans. Ludwig Schopp, in idem, *The Happy Life; Answer to Skeptics; Divine Providence and the Problem of Evil; Soliloquies*, The Fathers of the Church, vol. 5 (New York: Cima Publishing, 1948), 29–84.
94. Christensen, *Origin and History*, 92.

95. Christensen, *Origin and History*, 100.
96. See F. D. Maurice, *Theological Essays*, 2nd ed. (New York: Redfield, 1854). See also Morris, *F. D. Maurice*, 161; Ramsey, *F. D. Maurice*, 43. Perhaps for this reason, Maurice's *Theological Essays* were also placed on the Vatican Index Librorum Prohibitorum. See Beacon for the Freedom of Expression, http://search.beaconforfreedom.org/search/censored_publications/publication.html?id=9701925.
97. See Morris, *F. D. Maurice*, 161; Cort, *Christian Socialism*, 151; Christensen, *Origin and History*, 341; Ramsey, *F. D. Maurice*, 43.
98. See Christensen, *Origin and History*, 157–58.
99. Jones, “Jesus Christ and the Transformation of English Society,” 222.
100. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1:373.