

JOHN WOOLLEY: AUSTRALIA'S FIRST PROFESSOR

By K. J. CABLE

IT must be a matter of reproach to the University of Sydney that it has no full-length history. The University of Melbourne, its junior by a few years, has produced two accounts of its origin and development and even Western Australia, youngest of the original batch of State universities, is commemorated in Professor Alexander's fine volume. Sydney has to be content with the *Short Historical Account* compiled by Henry Ebenezer Barff in 1902.¹

In one respect, Sydney has cause for satisfaction. There is now a fair body of knowledge readily available about the earliest period of its existence. A good deal is known of the educational ideas and activities of mid-nineteenth century New South Wales and much of this is directly relevant to the University. The present paper is an attempt to add to this store, if only obliquely, by giving some information about the early career of the man who became the first Principal of the University of Sydney and was, therefore, Australia's first professor.²

* * *

John Woolley was born in February 1816 at Petersfield, Hampshire, the second son and fourth child of George Woolley, a physician. His mother, Charlotte, came of a well-known Derbyshire family, the Gells, a branch of which had moved to Lewes in Sussex. The Woolley sons were a talented group. One, Charles, became a prosperous solicitor; another, Frederic, was a clergyman and the headmaster of the grammar school at his mother's birthplace, Lewes. Joseph, next brother to John, also entered the Church and then went on to be an inspector of schools and the principal of a naval academy. It was not unusual for the family of an early nineteenth-century professional man to produce three clerical schoolmasters; nor was it quite out of the ordinary for one to entertain grave religious doubts and for another to renounce his orders altogether.³

Dr. George Woolley took up a position with the Humane Society near Hyde Park a few years after John's birth and sent his boys to the Western Grammar

¹H. E. Barff, *A Short Historical Account of the University of Sydney* (Sydney, 1902). R. A. Dallen, Barff's colleague at the University Registry, drew largely on this book for his own brief, illustrated volume, *The University of Sydney, its History and Progress* (Sydney, 1914, rev. ed., 1925).

²The only study of Woolley's Australian career is G. L. Simpson, "The Contribution of the Rev. Dr. John Woolley to Educational Developments in New South Wales, 1852-1866" (B.A. Honours thesis, University of Sydney, 1958). It will be supplemented shortly by a chapter in C. Turney (ed.), *Pioneers of Australian Education* (Sydney, 1968). The present article was written without reference to Dr. Turney's book.

³Woolley to Windeyer, 25 May 1865, 22 August 1865, 25 September 1865, Windeyer Papers; *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. XXI, pp. 903-4; F. Boase, *Modern English Biography* (Truro), vol. III (1901), p. 1495, vol. VI (1921), p. 951; J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge, 1954), pt. 2, vol. VI, p. 577.

School nearby. There they acquired the classical education appropriate to a good proprietary establishment. The headmaster, Robert Sankey, was a former Oxford don who was later to go on to Bishop Broughton's old parish of Farnham in Surrey. He was an apologist for the claims of the Church of England and a notable Low Churchman.⁴ Sankey seems to have entertained a favourable opinion of John and the religious principles of his parents.⁵ It must have been the needs of education rather than piety which led to John's removal in 1830 to University College, London. The boy found it a long journey from the Brompton Road to Gower Street. He recalled in 1859:

When I was at the University of London, I was at much greater inconvenience than students [at Sydney] are put to; I used to go off in the dark very often and spend nearly the whole day on the premises. . . .⁶

Intellectually, the distance was even greater.

University College—the University of London, as it then styled itself—had been founded by Thomas Campbell, Henry Brougham and a mixed company of Utilitarians and Dissenters, leavened by some Low and Broad Church Anglicans.⁷ It was a proprietorial institution, still unincorporated and with no power to grant degrees, whose purpose was to provide education in general Arts studies, Law and Medicine to students ineligible or unwilling to attend Oxford and Cambridge. The “University” was undenominational and gave no religious instruction at this period. It was non-residential, although discussions were taking place about halls of residence which might be religious in character.⁸ The curriculum was “modern” in tendency: to the staple Classics and Mathematics were added Modern Languages, Natural Philosophy, Logic and “Philosophy of the Human Mind”, Political Economy and, optionally, Moral Philosophy, History and Oriental Languages. There was a range of choice and, ideally, a student might frame his own course within certain limits. Instruction in the “General Department” was by lectures—the tutorial system of the old, residential universities was avoided and the model of Scotland followed.

The Edinburgh Review drew attention to the zeal of the professors and the prospect that you would get more lectures for your money at the university than at any other establishment. It might even have seemed that there would be an approach to that state of affairs described by an admiring critic of the University of Bonn, where such was the laborious industry and perseverance of the professors that, with some partial intermissions, they lectured incessantly, either in public or in private, from seven in the morning until eight

⁴ Boase, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 411.

⁵ *Testimonials* . . . , pp. 9-10 (see note 22).

⁶ Evidence of Woolley before Select Committee on Sydney University, 23 September 1859, *Votes and Proceedings of N.S.W. Legislative Assembly*, 1859-60, vol. IV, p. 204.

⁷ H. H. Bellot, *University College, London, 1826-1926* (London, 1929), pp. 14-32.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 55-8, 298.

in the evening. W. B. Carpenter, when a student [at London], attended thirty-five lectures a week. Coleridge called the place contemptuously a lecture-bazaar. . . .⁹

The new institution, assailed by its enemies as "godless" and, what was worse, "popular" and lampooned as "Stinkomalee" and "the Cockney College"¹⁰ represented an earnest attempt to bring the best of modern education to the London middle classes. It was to exert a profound influence on the development of universities in Britain and the colonies.¹¹

Woolley was fourteen years old when he enrolled at University College. It was a tender age but there was ample precedent: thirty of those who had entered at the first session in 1828 were under fifteen; two were only eleven.¹² An age limit was not imposed until 1831 when a school was founded in association with the college.¹³ According to later reports, he did well at his studies. Of these, Classics was the chief. In Henry Malden, he had a meticulous and sensitive teacher of Greek—and one who was to be an elector when he was appointed to Sydney. His other Classics professors were men of greater vigour but less distinction.¹⁴ Woolley gained a medal for Logic. It was a sign of the free-for-all obtaining in the choice of courses that he took the subject: the curriculum reserved it for the third year of studies and Woolley remained for only two years. But there were many indications in his life and thought that he profited by the instruction of the Reverend John Hoppus. Hoppus was a Dissenting minister whose appointment to the chair of Philosophy and Logic had been disputed by the purists who believed that a clergyman should not profess such a subject in a secular institution.¹⁵ In 1866, the selection of a successor to Hoppus in the person of the famous Independent clergyman, James Martineau, led to a similar dispute and, this time, the appointment of Woolley to Sydney was cited as a case in point.¹⁶ Hoppus was a terrible lecturer. He would take a newspaper to his lecture room to pass the time if no students arrived to make up a class.¹⁷ But his exposition of the philosophy of Dugald Stewart, his insistence that philosophical reasoning was the key to all knowledge and logic the tool of philosophy, must have impressed Woolley.¹⁸ He

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 79-80.

¹⁰ "Each Dustman shall speak, both in Latin and Greek,
And Tinkers beat Bishops in knowledge—
If the opulent tribe will consent to subscribe
To build up a new Cockney College." *Ibid.*, p. 68.

¹¹ For London and Sydney, D. S. Macmillan, "The University of Sydney—the Pattern and the Public Reaction, 1850-1870", *The Australian University*, vol. I, no. 1 (1963).

¹² Bellot, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 170.

¹⁴ Introduction by R. Hutton to Walter Bagehot, *Literary Studies* (London, 1884), vol. I, p. xv.

¹⁵ *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. VIII, pp. 729-30.

¹⁶ S. E. De Morgan, *Memoir of Augustus De Morgan, with Selections from his Letters* (London, 1882), pp. 352-3.

¹⁷ Bellot, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

was to be the exponent of a generous philosophy which tried to concern itself with the social consequences of human thought and the propounder of a flexible logic.

The "London University" as an experiment in education cannot have made any impact on Woolley: he was too young to realize that he was participating in something which was new. But his later career was to give him an insight, gradually increasing in penetration, into London's contribution to academic development. The appeal to new social classes in a changing environment, the wide scope of the curriculum, the insistence on the primacy of the professors, the emphasis on non-residence and on non-sectarian (even non-religious) teaching—all these things were gradually to stand out in Woolley's thought and to make him recall his student days to the advantage of his mature educational ideas.¹⁹ During his years in Australia, the example of London came increasingly before his vision. And it was fitting that, during his last sojourn in England, it should be London rather than Oxford which paid him the greater respect, inviting him to participate in its principal ceremony and, twelve months afterwards, noticing his death with official respect.²⁰

* * *

In 1832 Woolley went up to Exeter College, Oxford. His London career had equipped him well for the highly competitive business of gaining one of the few college scholarships unrestricted by qualifications of birth or domicile. His London training stood him in equally good stead in his preparation for the degree examinations, for he had a grounding in Logic and Ancient History that no schoolboy could match. Woolley was the only Exeter man for several years to take a First in Lit. Hum. (Easter 1836).²¹ His examiners complimented him on his classical scholarship and "were also impressed with a very favourable opinion of his philosophical talent and acquirements".²² "In theory", said a friend of Woolley, "all first class men are reputed to be equal" but

one of the public examiners of that time, in speaking of the *shades of merit* which characterised the successful candidates, did not hesitate to place your name amongst the most distinguished of those who had attained the object of their ambition.²³

¹⁹ Two of Woolley's contemporaries at London were afterwards to be associated with him in Australia—W. M. Manning, later University Senator and (in 1878) Chancellor, and J. F. Hargrave, Reader in Jurisprudence; P. Mennell, *The Dictionary of Australasian Biography* (London, 1892), pp. 215, 312.

²⁰ Woolley gave the oration at the annual prize-giving of the Faculty of Arts in 1865 and his death was referred to by Dean Stanley, chairman at the 1866 prize-giving. *Address of the Chairman, the Very Rev. the Dean of Westminster, 23 June 1866*, pp. 5-6.

²¹ *Oxford Historical Register, 1220-1900* (Oxford, 1900), p. 228.

²² *Testimonials of the Rev. John Woolley, D.C.L., Head Master of Rossall College, Fleetwood* (1847), pp. 2-3. The Oxford testimonials in this collection are dated 1840-1842. It was customary in the nineteenth century for candidates for academic and teaching offices to print their testimonials. There are 120 in this 33-page foolscap brochure. Copies are in the Archives of the University of Sydney and of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, Westminster.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

In the next term, Charles Badham of Wadham, Woolley's successor at Sydney, graduated with Third Class Honours.²⁴

A fellowship was the next step on the academic ladder and, as the Rector of Exeter explained, "there is little doubt that [Woolley] would have been elected a Fellow of the College, had there been a vacancy on the foundation for which he was qualified by birth".²⁵ In default of this, he migrated to University College on the Stowell graduate scholarship. This gave him status at Oxford and a place in congenial college society. It brought in little money and Woolley turned naturally to private tutoring. The coach was an indispensable figure in the Oxford educational scene, applied to by candidates for honours and by anxious aspirants for a pass degree. His work was heavy, though remunerative, and it brought him into closer contact with his pupils than that of the official (and often lone) college tutor.²⁶ There is ample evidence that Woolley was a conscientious private tutor who, according to the Master of University College, "was greatly sought after . . . for those who were aiming at distinction in the schools (and who) has exercised a most beneficial influence upon the minds of some of his pupils, in leading them to more serious views of their responsibility".²⁷ This received first-hand corroboration from George Rawlinson, a new Fellow of Exeter and afterwards Camden Professor of Ancient History:

I attribute my own success at the University mainly to the instructions of Mr. Woolley. . . . I never had any other private tutor; and, great as is my debt of gratitude to him on this head, I feel that I owe him yet more for the moral and religious improvement of which he has been the instrument to me.²⁸

Rawlinson became a life-long friend but he was not always mindful of his debt. When Woolley died, and efforts were being made to secure for his young son a nomination to the Charterhouse, Rawlinson gained a place from Gladstone for his own son. "Had he asked Gladstone to name young Woolley, it would have been done," was Sir Charles Nicholson's bitter comment.²⁹

In 1840, Woolley was promoted to a fellowship at University College, Oxford. A few months later, as the statutes of his college required, he was made deacon by Bishop Bagot on the title of his fellowship.³⁰ But now he was ready to leave the University and, as was the practice of many young college fellows, to become

²⁴ *Oxford Historical Register*, p. 229.

²⁵ *Testimonials* . . . , p. 1.

²⁶ For the experiences of Robert Lowe, another private tutor who went to Australia, A. P. Martin, *Life and Letters of the Rt. Hon. Robert Lowe, Viscount Sherbrooke* (London, 1893), vol. I, pp. 93-5.

²⁷ *Testimonials* . . . , p. 1.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

²⁹ Nicholson to Windeyer, 21 May 1866, Windeyer Papers, University of Sydney.

³⁰ *D.N.B.*, vol. XXI, p. 903. This account makes Woolley a fellow of Exeter College.

a schoolmaster.³¹ He took a Long Vacation job in the Channel Islands as tutor to the Governor of Jersey's son and gathered testimonials for an application for the Mastership of Bishop's College, Bristol. At the end of the year he applied for a similar position at the Cathedral School, Hereford. The Bristol post did not materialize but Hereford was more promising. Woolley, who may have served an occasional curacy in the diocese, was ordained priest by Bishop Musgrave in 1841, after "the best examination passed by any candidate at that ordination".³² This was virtually a prelude to his appointment to the Hereford school. Secure financially, Woolley was able to think of the future. He spent the summer of 1842 in Germany, where he married Mary Margaret, daughter of Major William Turner of the 17th Light Dragoons.³³ Marriage involved the forfeiture of his fellowship and severed his last formal link with Oxford. Henceforward, Woolley was to follow the career of a schoolmaster. * * *

What had Oxford meant to Woolley? He was proud to be an Oxonian and he afterwards referred to his university with affection. His later reflections on Oxford's practices and principles, on the other hand, were often highly critical. Woolley's heart and mind seemed at variance when he thought about the university. This is retrospective evidence, influenced by changes at Oxford and the circumstances of Woolley's career. Of contemporary evidence, very little exists. This itself is significant. The 1830s were stirring times at Oxford, as the Tractarian Movement roused the enthusiasm and stirred the passions of dons and undergraduates alike. A great mass of printed correspondence remains one of its most tangible memorials. Yet in all the letter-writing of these hectic years there is scarcely a reference to John Woolley. It can only be assumed that, however large the imprint made on Woolley's mind and character by his residence at Oxford, it was as an observer rather than an actor that Woolley spent his time there.

There were occasional reports, spread over the years after he had gone down from Oxford, that Woolley was a Tractarian.³⁴ Such a reputation would have been damaging to the prospects of a schoolmaster and academic during the forties and fifties when the Movement, itself broken up, was popularly disliked. But the reports were either contradicted or made from hearsay. Woolley had an evident knowledge of the teaching of J. H. Newman and his associates but he showed no

³¹ Formal college teaching and administration occupied only a few fellows. The remainder were free to take parish and school appointments, subject to certain restrictions on the income obtained and the time spent away from Oxford. Most fellowship stipends were too small unless supplemented from other sources.

³² *Testimonials* . . . , p. 12.

³³ *D.N.B.*, vol. XXI, p. 903.

³⁴ E.g. the testimonial letter of the Rev. J. Hull, a Rossall School governor: "You know you came to Rossall [in 1844] with a prejudice on my part against you, from a suspicion I had heard you were of the Tractarian party. This prejudice you have completely removed . . ." (*Testimonials* . . . , p. 14). The rumour was heard in Australia at the time of Woolley's appointment to Sydney (C. Child to W. B. Clarke, 16 June 1852, Clarke Papers, Mitchell Library) and it persisted in Anglican circles in New South Wales until his death.

sympathy with their aims. The fact of his ordination in 1842 by so marked a Low Churchman as Bishop Musgrave of Hereford, after a formal examination by the Bishop's brother, is a clear indication that he did not leave Oxford as an admirer of the *Tracts for the Times*. The ground of the accusation, no doubt, was the fact that Woolley had spent his undergraduate days at Exeter College. The Rector of Exeter, J. C. Jones, had been a patron of the early efforts of Keble and Pusey³⁵ and some of his students followed his example.³⁶ But the College remained old High Church in tradition and Jones's successor, Richards, and the Senior Tutor, William Sewell, were celebrated for their opposition to "Newmania" and the innovations of the liberals.³⁷ Sewell claimed that one quarter of the instruction of college men was devoted to religion³⁸ and it was orthodox in character. Both men testified to the soundness of Woolley's religious principles and the moderation of his churchmanship.³⁹ Woolley's Exeter training could scarcely fail to have given him an acquaintance with the ideas of the Tractarians but it seems equally to have disposed him to receive them coolly.

Woolley was not a cool man. The historian, making his fuller acquaintance at a later period in Woolley's life, cannot fail to notice his fund of nervous energy, his enthusiasms, his impatience with dullness and restraint. Woolley was not an active man at Oxford but he cannot have been unmoved by its controversies. When Sewell defended the religious activities of his college, he had in mind the strictures of the Oxford-educated Scottish philosopher, William Hamilton. It was Hamilton's argument that Oxford was wasting its capacity for teaching by allowing the predominance of the tutorial system over the older method of professorial instruction. This, in its turn, encouraged the unco-ordinated diffusion of old-fashioned knowledge to students mechanically prepared for routine examinations. Hamilton's remedy lay in the revival of professorial instruction (combined with tutorials), the subordination of the colleges to the University and the promotion of an integrated course of study. To Hamilton, this meant the use of philosophy and its handmaid, logic, as the principal underpinning of the B.A. courses.⁴⁰ A group of Oxford teachers had anticipated Hamilton's criticism of the curriculum by seeking to renovate and enliven philosophical and logic teaching but their efforts, like Hamilton's, were submerged in the ecclesiastical clamour of the thirties. It is probable that this movement, rather than the ebullient Tractarianism, caught

³⁵ W. R. Ward, *Victorian Oxford* (London, 1965), p. 86.

³⁶ Henry to Robert Wilberforce, March 1837, quoting J. H. Newman: "Right opinions are strong at Exeter", D. Newsome, *The Parting of Friends* (London, 1966), p. 196.

³⁷ Ward, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-13, 146.

³⁸ W. Sewell, *Thoughts on the Admission of Dissenters to the University of Oxford* (Oxford, 1834), p. 5.

³⁹ *Testimonials . . .*, pp. I, 4.

⁴⁰ *Edinburgh Review*, LIII (1831), 384 ff. Hamilton, who exercised a large influence on the reforming Oxford Commission of 1850-1852, also entered into a controversy about the place of Philosophy with Whewell of Cambridge. Hamilton's models were the Scottish universities.

Woolley's attention. He was, in after years, an admirer of Hamilton's idea of a university and of his advocacy of the claims of philosophy. He was to follow his denigration of college supremacy and his upholding of studies in logic. Woolley's own interest in philosophy while at Oxford is evident in the reports of his examiners and the comments of those who were acquainted with his post-graduate work.⁴¹ In 1840 he produced a small handbook on logic that Hamilton praised as a sign of the "rise of the academic spirit" at Oxford.⁴² The book was little more than an introduction to the subject but it was far removed from the arid primers that had preceded it. Woolley wrote it as an aid to his pupils and his experience as a private tutor and coach may have led him to agree with Hamilton's major criticism of the structure of the University.

If Woolley was impressed by Hamilton in the period when he was studying and teaching at Oxford, then it could have been only in the most general terms. In no sense was he a "Hamiltonian". But Woolley's migration to University College in 1836 and his elevation to a fellowship there four years later brought him into a more persuasive train of thought. Thomas Arnold of Rugby was a vigorous opponent of the Tractarian Movement, regarding it as "priest-directed" and obscurantist. His work for education was less novel than his disciples were to claim⁴³ but his opinions on Church and State were radical and startling. By the late thirties, his pupils were coming to Oxford and, within a few years, their influence was to spread. Men such as Arthur Penrhyn Stanley and Arthur Hugh Clough were, at this time, characteristic of the revulsion which was beginning to occur in Oxford against the Tractarians. They represented, in fact, a return to the mainstream of intellectual development against which Newman and his followers had reacted so spectacularly in the thirties. Thomas Arnold was their inspiration rather than their teacher, for they were to reject much of Arnold's theological orthodoxy. These young men stood for a spirit of inquiry linked to European scholarship and sceptical in character. They were suspicious of closed systems, whether Anglo-Catholic or Utilitarian. They were equally hostile to the old High Church notions of the necessary connection between the Established Church and the State. The "Arnoldian" School was to disperse in many directions and some of its members were to find dead ends. But, in these early years, its youthful associates were content with the exciting prospects opening out to their speculations about university reform, critical scholarship and its relation to Revelation and secular studies and, directly in the line of Arnold's thought, the idea of religion

⁴¹ *Testimonials* . . . , pp. 2-8.

⁴² W. Hamilton, *Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform* (Edinburgh, 1852), p. 126. The opinions of Hamilton and Woolley on matters of logic did not coincide, although Woolley was said to have converted Hamilton on several points. Their coincidence lay rather in their interpretation of the educational uses of philosophy and logic. For a discussion of this point: S. Neil, "The late John Woolley, D.C.L., of Oxford", *British Controversialist*, XXIV (1866), 161-79.

⁴³ T. W. Bamford, *Thomas Arnold* (London, 1960).

generally permeating society and education rather than being formally and narrowly associated with it.⁴⁴

Arthur Stanley, later Dean of Westminster, first met Woolley in 1840, when both were Fellows of University College. His testimonial for him in December of that year was cordially correct but he later recalled that their acquaintance ripened into friendship and mutual understanding.⁴⁵ They were to keep in touch after Woolley left Oxford. Stanley helped Woolley to prepare his volume of *Lectures delivered in Australia* for the printer, remained his patron until Woolley's death in 1866 and was his panegyrist after it.⁴⁶ When the development of Woolley's ideas in the forties is considered, it must remain highly likely that these received their first clear indication in his association with Stanley and the Arnold school. So far as the evidence can go, this seems to have been the most important impression that Oxford made on John Woolley.

* * *

For ten years, Woolley was a schoolmaster, he was headmaster of three schools and he applied for the headship of at least two others, as well as two overseas colleges. It was a time of work and frustrated ambition, when his sense of insecurity and his extreme sensitivity grew apace, alongside a clearer understanding of his position on educational and religious matters.

The Free Grammar School at Hereford was a small institution which had seen better days. Its purpose was to educate the choristers and scholars attached to the Cathedral and those town boys who could pay for tuition. In 1819 it had boasted a hundred pupils, fifty of them boarders, and its sternly classical curriculum had attained some reputation from the textbooks of Dr. Taylor, the headmaster.⁴⁷ Twenty years later, the incompetence of Taylor's successors and the competition of a nearby "modern" school had reduced the enrolment. The school house had been demolished and the pupils were taught in the Master's residence. Woolley did his best to effect a revival. He removed the school to better quarters and tried to broaden the curriculum. It was difficult to make changes in a sleepy cathedral city but other men were making changes in equally unpropitious circumstances. Woolley, fresh from Oxford, was anxious to be of their number. He found little to hearten him: the town was unco-operative and the Dean, Dr. Merewether, was eccentric and difficult.⁴⁸ The number of boarders, on whose fees the headmaster

⁴⁴ Ward, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-3.

⁴⁵ *Testimonials . . .*, p. 6.

⁴⁶ Neil, *cit. sup.*, is based in part on Stanley's information and is clearly guided by him. See also note 20.

⁴⁷ W. T. Carless, *A Short History of Hereford School* (Hereford, 1914), pp. 40-3.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 28. Merewether was the leading figure in the resistance to the appointment of Hampden to the See of Hereford in 1847—an appointment approved by Stanley and his friends. Merewether's motives may have been exalted; his conduct was not. It was he whom Lord John Russell thanked for informing him of his intention of breaking the law. But Merewether gave Woolley a good reference when the latter applied for Tonbridge.

relied to augment his income, continued to fall.⁴⁹ Within a year, Woolley was seeking to leave. With the support of the Hereford Chapter, he made an application for Tonbridge School, a position, said Bishop Musgrave, "more favourable to the exercise of his ability and learning".⁵⁰ Woolley was not successful but the next year saw his release. In 1844 he became headmaster of the Northern Church of England Proprietary School at Fleetwood, Lancashire. He went from one of England's oldest schools to become foundation head of its newest.

Woolley's new field of action—commonly called Rossall School (or, more ambitiously, College)—had been formed in 1843 by a group of local gentry and clergymen. It was a proprietary institution—a mode of management then growing popular—conducted on Anglican principles and intended for middle-class boys. Woolley opened the school in the autumn of 1844 and soon achieved a state of prosperity. The enrolment grew steadily and Woolley laboured hard—nearly forty hours of teaching a week as well as administration.⁵¹ The absence of entrenched custom allowed him some latitude in the construction of a curriculum and the organization of the school. He took advantage of this freedom to introduce a wider course of instruction than had prevailed in the older grammar schools and to set up the prefect system. Woolley was acting in the prevailing mode of things but it is tempting to see in his policy the direct influence of Thomas Arnold. In the volume of *Sermons* preached at the school and published in 1847 to provide information about Rossall's aims and principles, the Arnoldian tone is clearer. The school is society in microcosm; the basic values of the outside world must be realized in schoolboy life; education is essentially a moral process and morality, based generally on Christian ethics, must permeate all instruction. Woolley's attitude is gentler than Arnold's and the emphasis is on the moral value of knowledge rather than on the association of formal Christianity with the learning process. Already Woolley was beginning to go beyond Arnold, but along the same line of development.

Woolley's early period at Rossall was a success. But his conception of his task carried with it the seeds of trouble. The official history of Rossall, favourable to Woolley's pioneering work, says of his highly personal and moral approach to his office:

Woolley was a man of singular charm, a good scholar and a Christian gentleman universally beloved. He ruled the school through the prefects and it is wonderful what power they exercised. The masters played quite a subordinate part.⁵²

An older account, written from the point of view of those connected with the early administration of Rossall, complains of lax discipline, disorderly pupils, parental

⁴⁹ Carless, *op. cit.*, p. 43. In 1845, the year after Woolley's departure, there was only one boarder.

⁵⁰ *Testimonials* . . . , p. 12.

⁵¹ Woolley to Hawkins, 30 April 1849, Bishop's College Papers, 2647/49, S.P.G. Archives.

⁵² W. Furness (ed.), *The Centenary History of Rossall School* (Aldershot, 1945), p. 5.

complaints of bullying and the subordination of the assistant masters to the sixth-form monitors.⁵³ The picture seems distorted but it was drawn from a tradition which must have persisted at Rossall for many years after the departure of Woolley. Dean Stanley's eulogy, delivered a few months after Woolley's death in 1866, probably contains a hint of the truth:

He had a peculiar faculty of attracting and stimulating the young, and a singular uprightness and truthfulness and devotion of character, which require a little reflection to appreciate, but which cannot fail to do immense good to those who appreciate them, by the very fact of the appreciation.⁵⁴

Woolley was a fine teacher with a great influence over his better pupils. But the very simplicity of his character—and a startling over-sincerity of approach—rendered him suspect to the adult world of school governors and parents. He lacked guile; he got on better with his students than with his supporters; he was more suited to the planning than to the control of a large, new institution.

It may have been the tension beneath the appearance of prosperity that led Woolley to make an application, in 1846, for a position elsewhere. It was a long way from Lancashire to the Ionian Islands, yet it was the Directorship of the University of Corfu that Woolley now sought. This bizarre institution had been planned in 1814 by the British Government in order to provide a practical education for young Ionians and to reconcile them to the imminent rule of Britain. Within a few years its direction had been assumed by Frederick North, fifth Earl of Guildford, a son of George III's Lord North and a former Governor of Ceylon. Guildford was a fanatical philhellene who sought to revive the true Attic spirit and culture among the Ionian Greeks. The university, transferred from Ithaca to Corfu, gained a charter in 1824 and enjoyed a brief prosperity. But Guildford's eccentricities—as chancellor, he wore a purple robe of Attic cut and a gold fillet—aroused official opposition. Lord High Commissioner Adam stigmatized the University as “pure humbug” and his successors suspected it of being a forcing-house of Greek nationalism. After Guildford's death, the University assumed a more practical aspect but it remained a source of worry for the hard-pressed British administration. The reason for Woolley's choice of the Ionian Islands is not clear—his application cannot be traced in the Colonial Office records. Perhaps the ideal of permeating the thought and education of the islanders with the literature and philosophy of classical Greece was attractive. Certainly, this was to be the basis of much of his work in colonial Sydney. Perhaps there was the practical consideration that no other academic post may have been available. At all events, Woolley did not gain the nomination. His acquirements were satisfactory but his

⁵³St. V. Beechey, *Rossall School: its Rise and Progress* (London, 1894). This account is repeated in the *D.N.B.* article on Woolley.

⁵⁴See note 20.

clerical status made his appointment impolitic. Lord Seaton, the Commissioner, explained the position with regret:

After much discourse it was considered that in the present state of the Institution, the successor to Dr. Orioli would be more likely if a clergyman to meet with opposition which might affect the interests of the college than a Layman. Had it not been for this consideration, and the jealousy about [*sic*] the nomination of a *religioso*, not belonging to the Greek church might have caused among Priests and Seminants who are members of the College, the experience, acquirements and delightful character of Dr. Woolley would probably have induced the commission to have named him in preference to any of the other candidates.

The Directorship was given finally to George Bowen, a young Oxford layman, who avoided nationalist and religious problems by attending as little as possible to his duties. Woolley was not to meet the man who supplanted him until 1859 when he showed Bowen, the first Governor of Queensland, over the new buildings of the University of Sydney.⁵⁵

The Ionian venture was Woolley's first attempt to return to academic life. He then set his sights nearer home and at a more familiar level. Hereford had been an old school, Rossall was becoming a large one. The Grammar School of King Edward VI at Birmingham combined both elements: under F. A. Jeune and Prince Lee it had risen from ancient obscurity to prominence.⁵⁶ Now Lee had gone to Manchester as its first Bishop and it was natural that the headmaster of Rossall should seek to succeed him. Woolley gathered up his old testimonials and solicited new ones. Here he met with a difficulty. His recent referees were, for the most part, Rossall governors of little standing and gratified parents. The only name to carry weight was that of William Wordsworth, and the old Laureate's testimony to the teacher of his grandsons was not without ambiguity:

. . . from unfortunate circumstances occurring before the boys were under your care at Rossall, they have been unable to advance as far as might have been looked for from their respective ages.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ For the Ionian University and Woolley's application: *Testimonials . . .*, pp. 16-17; Bunbury to Maitland, 12 February 1815, C.O. 159/5; Guildford to Bathurst, 6 February 1824, Bathurst MSS. (Historical Manuscripts Commission Report), p. 531; Adam to Wood, 12 September 1827, C.O. 136/289; Z. B. Ferriman, *Some English Philhellenes* (London, 1919), chapter 7; G. F. Bowen, *Ithaca in 1850* (London, 1851); S. Lane-Poole (ed.), *Thirty Years of Colonial Government* (London, 1889), vol. I, pp. 16-29; J. J. Tumelty, "The Ionian Islands under British Administration, 1815-1864" (Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1953); Nicholson to James Macarthur, 10 November 1859, Macarthur Papers, vol. XXVIII, p. 326, Mitchell Library A2924. Neil (see note 42) states that Woolley withdrew owing to the death of his father and the need to provide for his mother. This is contradicted by the Testimonials and by an unsigned document in the Deas Thomson Papers in the Mitchell Library which is probably the work of Woolley's daughter Emmeline and may be dated 1866 (Simpson, *op. cit.*, p. 2). Woolley's father died in 1860 (*Gentleman's Magazine*, July 1860, p. 103).

⁵⁶ D. Newsome, *Godliness and Good Learning* (London, 1961), pp. 99-117.

⁵⁷ *Testimonials . . .*, p. 22.

F. A. Jeune, formerly of Birmingham and Woolley's agent in the Corfu negotiations, lent some support but, otherwise, Oxford remained silent. Woolley had been too long out of University life⁵⁸ and he had not yet become a part of the public school Establishment. In a strong field of seventeen applicants, Woolley stood no chance.⁵⁹

Meanwhile, life went on at Rossall at a more anxious tempo. There was a decline in the enrolment in 1848—a phenomenon not uncommon in new schools—and there seem to have been personal tensions in the staff and Council rooms.⁶⁰ Woolley, "living in the conflict of most opposite opinions",⁶¹ determined to leave Rossall and renewed his efforts to find another position. Once more he turned his attention overseas. Bishop's College, Calcutta, trained general and theological students on behalf of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. While much of its instruction was elementary, it had pretensions to tertiary status and its principal teachers were styled "professor". The Society was anxious about the College's future prospects and disturbed by the local bishop's attempts to secure control.⁶² A new Head must be appointed who would be responsible to the authorities at Home. Early in 1849, John Thomas, the Archbishop of Canterbury's son-in-law, asked A. P. Stanley to suggest a candidate from among his Oxford acquaintances. Stanley advised Woolley to apply. Woolley did so. "To go to India", he told Edward Hawkins, the Secretary and an Exeter man, "is my oldest day-dream." As for the reported dissension within the College, he had the art of diplomacy in the hard way at Rossall.⁶³ Hawkins was not impressed. The S.P.G. secretariat had its own nominee and, as a High Church body, it was not likely to change its mind to oblige the son of a Broad Church bishop and the son-in-law of an Evangelical archbishop. The result was a foregone conclusion and Woolley found no place in it.⁶⁴

The second effort to secure an overseas position in higher education had failed—once more, the competition had been rendered unfair by the circumstances of the institution. But Arthur Stanley, having taken up Woolley's cause, was determined to serve him successfully. If Woolley had resolved to quit Rossall, then Stanley might accommodate him in his father's patronage. Bishop Stanley of Norwich was a breezy liberal prelate, who had scandalized orthodox opinion at the commencement of his episcopate by inviting Thomas Arnold to preach his

⁵⁸ He had proceeded to the degree of D.C.L. at Oxford on 26 April 1844. He had a considerable knowledge of the Civil Law, but the degree was of less consequence than in later times and was not infrequently given to headmasters. C. W. Boase, *Registrum Collegii Exoniensis* (Oxford, 1894), p. 219.

⁵⁹ List of candidates in *Guardian*, 26 January 1848. One candidate was the head of Bishop's College, Bristol; another was the brother of S. A. Donaldson, first Prime Minister of New South Wales and a foundation member of the Senate of the University of Sydney.

⁶⁰ Furness, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-12.

⁶¹ Woolley to Hawkins, 30 April 1849, *cit. sup.*

⁶² S.P.G. Standing Committee Minutes, 23 March 1849, S.P.G. Archives.

⁶³ Woolley to Hawkins, 30 April and 2 May 1849, *cit. sup.*

⁶⁴ S.P.G. Standing Committee Minutes, 13 April, 1 June 1849.

consecration sermon.⁶⁵ He was too unconventional even to be a leader of the Broad Church party but his ecumenical spirit and his vigorous reforms made him agreeable to men of Woolley's cast of thought and temperament. In May 1849, Henry Banfather, a notorious pluralist,⁶⁶ had resigned the headship of the Norwich Free Grammar School after a long and conservative rule.⁶⁷ The school was old and well-endowed but it was in urgent need of reconstruction and popular support. The Bishop preached the urgency of change and the City Council considered elaborate schemes for improvement.

At the meeting of Council on [16 May] Mr. J. G. Johnson called attention to the opportunity . . . for re-establishing the school on a sound and proper foundation. It was true, he said, that Norwich should have a grammar school equal to any school, and where every species of knowledge will be at the command of the children. The income of the Great Hospital was between £6000 and £7000 a year, and the stipend of the headmaster was only £80, with a house to live in. It was impossible to keep up the credit of the Grammar School without a first-rate headmaster. They must make it worth the while of a man of the greatest talent to seek the mastership. . . . He moved that requisition be made to the Church Charity Trustees, calling their attention to the necessity of taking advantage of the present opportunity to place that establishment on a foundation which would render it a credit and honour to this district, by including those improvements which have lately been adopted by Oxford, Cambridge, and the other large public establishments for learning. . . . One of the Charity Trustees said that the very measures pointed out were in progress. Their object was to select the best master as the headmaster for the school; to appoint sub-masters, who would undertake the modern languages, and that something of a commercial education should be joined to it. . . . Other speakers agreed and Mr. Johnson's motion was carried unanimously.⁶⁸

Reform was already being effected when the Trustees met to select a man to carry it further. Fortified by a recommendation from the Bishop of Norwich and a strong testimonial from the Bishop of Manchester, Woolley gained twelve votes to his main opponent's four and became Headmaster of the Norwich Grammar School.⁶⁹ Ten days later, Bishop Stanley died.⁷⁰

John Woolley often thought himself an unlucky man and this event must have confirmed his opinion. The Norwich patronage of the Stanleys was at an

⁶⁵ A. P. Stanley, *Memoirs of Edward and Catherine Stanley* (London, 1879), p. 80.

⁶⁶ J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge, 1945), pt. 2, vol. II, p. 139.

⁶⁷ *Bury and Norwich Post*, 2 May 1849.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 16 May 1849.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 5 September. The election took place on 27 August. Woolley's opponent, the Rev. H. Goodwin, Fellow of Corpus Christi, Cambridge, had local affiliations; Norwich had closer connections with Cambridge than with Oxford. These factors may account for the votes cast in his favour.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 12 September 1849. Stanley died in Scotland on 6 September.

end. Arthur remained and saw him through the first months at the Grammar School. In the Library of Moore College, Sydney, is a copy of his *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolical Age*, inscribed

To the Rev. Dr. Woolley
from A. P. Stanley.

This volume, the gift of Edward Stanley, Bishop of Norwich, to his candidates for ordination, is left as a token of the interest which the Donor would have taken in the rise of his School, and as a remembrance of the hours which the author has spent with him in the months of September, October and November, 1849, before parting from Norwich.⁷¹

Then Woolley was left with the new Bishop, Samuel Hinds. A notable scholar of unorthodox views—he had trouble with the Trinity—Hinds soon proved a humourless pedant, quite unable to extend to Woolley the sympathy that the Stanleys had offered.⁷² But the School prospered. The curriculum was extended and the building enlarged. The enrolment grew, so that after two years Woolley had an annual income of £2000, most of it from boarders' fees.⁷³ At the house in Upper Close bought for him by the Trustees,⁷⁴ Woolley entertained. He became friendly with young clergymen of the Arnoldian school of thought, played a part in the educational life of the city and preached in the country churches.⁷⁵ Joseph Romilly, the gossipy Registrary of the University of Cambridge, met him at a clerical dinner party in April 1851 at Norwich. He approved of Woolley and noted in his diary that "Mrs. Woolley is a very agreeable fine woman who wears her beautiful hair floating over her shoulders".⁷⁶

In the year of Woolley's arrival at Norwich, a local development of significance took place. A group of citizens promoted the formation of a People's College, on the model of a similar institution at Sheffield.⁷⁷ The College disclaimed any intention of being simply a working-man's institute, for "these had promoted inventions and machinery, and are considered by many operatives as one of the causes of their misery". It was not to be a literary society: "the upper classes look upon them with suspicion and the middle classes have not taken advantage of

⁷¹ The book was given to Moore College by Archdeacon W. J. Gunther of Parramatta, who may have acquired it at the sale of Woolley's library in 1867.

⁷² Hinds' only recorded flash of humanity is that he resigned the See in 1857 in order to marry his cook; S. L. Ollard and G. Cross, *A Dictionary of English Church History*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1919), p. 419. Also W. O. Chadwick, *The Victorian Church* (London, 1966), vol. I, p. 470; *Bury and Norwich Post*, 3 October, 5 December 1849.

⁷³ Woolley's evidence before the Select Committee on the Sydney Grammar School, 7 October 1859; *Votes and Proceedings of N.S.W. Legislative Assembly*, 1859-1860, vol. IV, p. 102.

⁷⁴ *Bury and Norwich Post*, 10 October 1849.

⁷⁵ One printed sermon has survived: *Religious Education, the Safeguard of the State* (London, 1850). It was preached in Cromer parish church.

⁷⁶ Diary of Joseph Romilly, 21 April 1851, vol. XIII, p. 110, Cambridge University Library, Add 6826.

⁷⁷ *Bury and Norwich Post*, 2 May 1849.

them".⁷⁸ The College cherished hopes of a connection with London University but its aim was social rather than academic. By the dissemination of a general education in classical and modern languages, philosophy, history and law, and by the study of "social mechanics", a work of communal reconciliation might be carried on. The College would become "the means of extinguishing the detestable distinctions which at present divide the citizens into hostile sections".⁷⁹ The Utilitarian background of much of this planning would have been distasteful to Woolley but the experiment in social engineering by the diffusion of cultural aspects of knowledge may have attracted his patronage. Norwich was a faction-torn city, caught in economic change, and Woolley was aware of its problems. There were similarities between Norwich and Sydney; there was more than a resemblance between the purpose of the Norwich People's College in its early years and the work of the School of Arts movement in New South Wales during Woolley's time there.⁸⁰ It cannot be accidental that Woolley should have entered with enthusiasm into the movement at Sydney so soon after he left Norwich.

For leave Norwich he did. It is not known how far he extended the range of his applications; he did not add to the testimonials printed for his Birmingham candidature in 1847. But on 21 November 1851 he wrote to the electors for the professorships at the new University of Sydney, expressing the hope that their choice was not restricted to graduates of Cambridge and, if Oxford men were acceptable, announcing his candidature.⁸¹ The answer was favourable and his application proved successful. The selection committee had been so impressed by his qualifications that it had waived the reservation that the Sydney Senate had made against the selection of clergymen.⁸² In July 1852 Woolley and his wife and children arrived at Sydney. Three months later, he made his oration at the official Inauguration of the University of Sydney. As Principal and holder of the chair of Classics, he had become Australia's first professor.

* * *

Why did Woolley go to Sydney? There is no evidence that he was obliged to leave Norwich: financially, he was the loser by his emigration.⁸³ He seems to have wished for a better academic position and he may have become tired of school-mastering. After ten years, he had made little progress in England's school world and there had been signs at Rossall that the business of being a headmaster was

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 15 August 1849.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 12 September, 28 November 1849.

⁸⁰ J. Woolley, *Lectures Delivered in Australia* (London, 1862); J. Woolley, *The School of Arts and Colonial Nationality* (Sydney, 1861). The fullest discussion of Woolley and the School of Arts movement is in Simpson, *op. cit.*, section three; also G. Nadel, *Australia's Colonial Culture* (Melbourne, 1955).

⁸¹ Woolley to electors, 21 November 1851, Windeyer Papers.

⁸² Herschel to Sydney University Senate, 2 February 1852, Senate Minutes 1851-1855, 5 July 1852.

⁸³ At Norwich, Woolley was making £2000 a year (see note 73); his salary at Sydney was fixed at £800 a year plus a residence allowance and a proportion of the fees.

not suited to his temperament. The opportunities for work at an English university were scarce. London and the provincial colleges could offer few openings and meagre salaries. Oxford was enduring the indignities of a Royal Commission (with A. P. Stanley as secretary) which held out the promise of reform. Woolley watched the progress of its investigation with great interest, for it presaged a partial restoration of the professorial system and the admission of teachers hitherto disqualified by marriage.⁸⁴ But he could scarcely hope to become a don once more. The Scottish universities were busy exporting scholars and the Queen's Colleges in Ireland had carried out most of their recruitment by 1850.⁸⁵ There remained the colonies. The colleges of British North America were expanding in the late forties and were seeking academic staff.⁸⁶ Now Sydney had become the first Australian foundation to enter the field. Woolley, having shown his interest in India and the Mediterranean, would look naturally to the advertisements of the colonial universities.⁸⁷

There were reasons for Woolley to look closely at Australia. The Antipodes had come to be something of a Mecca for the disciples and relations of Thomas Arnold. The Doctor himself had advised on the establishment of a college in Van Diemen's Land and, while his advice had been of little avail, he had given J. P. Gell, a devoted pupil, to be its head.⁸⁸ To The Hutchins School in the same colony Gell invited Arnold's nephew and another Rugbeian, J. R. Buckland, who was on his way to farm in New Zealand.⁸⁹ William Arnold preferred the army and educational administration in India but Thomas junior went out to New Zealand and then, inevitably, to Tasmania.⁹⁰ In the case of several of these men, spiritual dissatisfaction and a sense of the constraining influence of English life prompted their emigration.⁹¹ In every instance, the new lands offered new social conditions and opportunities for the working out of present problems. Woolley had his full share of religious dubiety. He was interested in the effect of education on social problems. He was concerned with reformed university structures. He

⁸⁴ Ward, *op. cit.*, chapters VII and VIII. Woolley referred to his keen interest in the Oxford Commission in his inaugural oration and in numerous memoranda to the Senate and private letters in Australia.

⁸⁵ T. W. Moody and J. C. Beckett, *Queen's Belfast, 1845-1949* (London, 1949), vol. I, p. 162.

⁸⁶ These included King's, Dalhousie and Acadia in Nova Scotia; King's in New Brunswick; King's, Queen's and McGill in the province of Canada. To these must be added the hundreds of institutions for higher education in the United States.

⁸⁷ The official lectern of Sydney University belonged to Woolley. Its Latin inscription says that he was given it in 1850. Dallen (p. 34) connects this with Woolley's Sydney appointment but it is far too early. It may have been a belated gift from Rossall, or perhaps a parting present from Norwich for an appointment that came to nothing.

⁸⁸ A. P. Stanley, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold*, 4th ed. (London, 1845), vol. II, pp. 152-3.

⁸⁹ C. E. W. Bean, *Here My Son* (Sydney, 1950), p. 39.

⁹⁰ P. A. Howell, *Thomas Arnold the Younger in Van Diemen's Land* (n.p., 1964).

⁹¹ F. J. Woodward, *The Doctor's Disciples* (Oxford, 1954), Prologue and Chapters 2 and 4.

held convictions about the relation between Church, State and school which approximated to those of Arnold's later years and which might be fulfilled the better in the Establishment-free colonies.⁹² Woolley was sufficient of a "Doctor's disciple" to feel the pull of the Antipodes, an attraction that the sudden prominence of gold-bearing New South Wales can only have strengthened.

Australia had its dangers. It had "crusted [Gell] with Episcopalianisms"⁹³ and it had rejected James Anthony Froude altogether. Froude, a youthful follower of Newman, had gravitated to the company of Stanley, the younger Arnolds and Clough. In 1848 he gained an appointment to the High School at Hobart and was ready to sail in April 1849. The position was secular enough but insufficiently so to comprehend the publication of Froude's sceptical book, *The Nemesis of Faith*. The book was publicly burned by Sewell of Exeter, the college of Froude and Woolley, and the nomination to Hobart became impossible.⁹⁴ There were limitations to Antipodean tolerance.

Woolley was not deterred. Nor was a far closer associate of Arnold, the poet and scholar Arthur Hugh Clough. He was one of Woolley's twenty-three competitors for the Principalship at Sydney.⁹⁵ In 1848, Clough had finally resigned his fellowship at Oriel, convinced that he could not pursue the religious truth which was eluding him while he remained under subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles. He had half-seriously considered the younger Thomas Arnold's invitation to join him at a projected college in New Zealand, but

What is one to teach? Do I know anything that will do for the Antipodes? All sorts of practical geometry and natural philosophy seem to me the natural thing as the basis; with English history and literature as superstructure. About Latin and Greek, query? Now I know very little of anything but Latin and Greek.⁹⁶

Instead, Clough had become head of University Hall, a residential institution associated with University College, London.⁹⁷ It was a time of despondency and spiritual desolation for Clough, the "dreariest, loneliest period of his life".⁹⁸ His depression helped to produce some of his best poetry but he could not be reconciled

⁹² There are phrases reminiscent of Arnold's *Fragment on Church and State* (published posthumously in 1845) in Woolley's Cromer sermon of 1850. Woolley tends to give Christianity a less positive role in secular society than that which Arnold would assign to it. He would minimize ecclesiastical organization to the extent of noticing only the "religious spirit" in the operation of society in general.

⁹³ F. L. Mulhauser, *The Correspondence of Arthur Hugh Clough* (Oxford, 1957), vol. I, p. 245.

⁹⁴ W. H. Dunn, *James Anthony Froude: a Biography* (Oxford, 1961), vol. I, pp. 126, 131-8; Mulhauser, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

⁹⁵ Herschel to Sydney University Senate, *cit. sup.* The letter gives the number but not the names of the candidates.

⁹⁶ Mulhauser, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

⁹⁷ Bellot, *op. cit.*, pp. 261, 300. He also took in 1850 the English Literature chair at University College, a position he had failed to gain in 1848.

⁹⁸ Mulhauser, *op. cit.*, p. xx.

to the "Unitarian Sadducees" of University Hall. In 1851, he forgot his qualms about the colonial curriculum and applied for Sydney. He also would be an outgoing Arnoldian and seek salvation in the South. Clough's friends were against such a proceeding. J. C. Shairp wrote a stern remonstrance:

No — you shan't. You with your confessedly unhard-fisted nature go to bluster and bully among gold digging Australians. It must not be. Whatever there is defective in you, whatever stands between you and success here, will there tell tenfold against you. . . . Remember what you once said to me—better to live with a few of the higher sort at home, than with 5th and 6th rate men out in the colonies.⁹⁹

Matthew Arnold, more accustomed to emigration from the circle, expressed sorrow but produced a testimonial.¹⁰⁰ Provost Hawkins of Oriel, fearing for colonial orthodoxy, always, as he knew, a fragile thing, declined to follow their lead.

I presume, as in [the Queen's University of] Ireland, the Principal of the College would not teach Divinity, or any particular Christian tenets; but still it appears to me that no one ought to be appointed to such a situation who is at all in a state of doubt and difficulty as to his own religious belief. He could not effectually, even if he could properly, conceal them; and his doubts would be supposed by the Students to be even greater than they were.¹⁰¹

Clough was disappointed at the failure of his candidature: he had hoped to become engaged to be married to a cousin of Florence Nightingale on the strength of his expectation.¹⁰² He had persuaded himself to believe in the efficacy of a translation to Australia: "for the Sydney life I was prepared—had made up my mind—had fixed my wishes."¹⁰³ His friends, on the other hand, were pleased. Walter Bagehot congratulated himself "on your not having got your Sydney appointment" and Frederick Temple, the future Archbishop of Canterbury, affected to be sorry ("I wish those confounded Sydney folks were at—Sydney!") only that he might soften Clough's regret.¹⁰⁴ Probably they were right. Clough's temperament would not have served Sydney. He wrote some of his best poetry in times of depression¹⁰⁵ but Sydney might have been too much for him. Clough joined the notable band of young scholars and scientists whose loss of a colonial post was a distinct gain to the world at large.¹⁰⁶

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 294-5.

¹⁰⁰ H. F. Lowry, *The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough* (London, 1932), p. 173.

¹⁰¹ Mulhauser, *op. cit.*, pp. 296-7.

¹⁰² Woodward, *op. cit.*, p. 162.

¹⁰³ Mulhauser, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 301-4.

¹⁰⁵ Woodward, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

¹⁰⁶ Among them were John Tyndall, the physicist, who was rejected by Toronto, and George Saintsbury, the English critic and editor, passed over by Melbourne. T. H. Huxley would have applied for a chair of Biology at Sydney had one been established.

Between Arthur Hugh Clough and John Woolley there were similarities of background and character. But Woolley had the qualifications to secure the appointment at Sydney and he lacked the solicitous friends to dissuade him from accepting it. His career in Australia was often marked by disappointment and unhappiness. After a period of leave in England in 1865 he embarked on his fateful voyage of return to Australia believing himself to have been a failure.¹⁰⁷ But he brought to the University of which he was first Principal and Professor the fruits of a varied life in his homeland and, in almost every respect, these were to prove of lasting benefit to the new foundation and to university education in Australia.

¹⁰⁷ Nicholson to Windeyer, February 1866, Windeyer Papers.