





*The Lord Montagu  
with Sir C. Eardley's kind  
regards*

PRIVATE.

CONFIDENTIALLY COMMUNICATED.



---

University of Oxford.

---

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

SIR CULLING EARDLEY, BART.

AND

THE REV. DR. HAWKINS,

PROVOST OF ORIEL.

---

1854-5.



Belvedere, Erith,  
Sept. 2, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR,—

I have great pleasure in sending you a copy of our forthcoming Service Book.

The more I think of the questions you mentioned to me as existing in your mind about the course you should pursue at Oriel, the more I feel that there need be no obstacle to the restoration of my name to my old college books. The questions of attending lectures and chapel would not apply to me; or, if I came to reside for a Master's degree, I should certainly attend chapel if nothing contrary to the common Protestantism existed there, which I do not apprehend.

Should I become a Master (which implies fresh legislation), I should certainly regard membership of a common room as a thing resting entirely with the previous members. My whole feeling, in short, is that the old Colleges should not be disturbed on their present footing; facility being given to those who do not concur in all the Thirty-nine Articles, to have a hall of their own. A generous mutual regard to conscience (a principle taught me at Oriel) will solve many problems.

Were I an incipient student, I should seek education in such a new hall. Having no option as to the channel through which I must pass to a degree, I wish to return to Oriel.

Believe me, my dear sir,

Faithfully yours,

C. E. EARDLEY.

The Rev. Dr. HAWKINS.

---

Vines, Rochester,

Sept. 6, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR,—

Thank you for your Service Book. In one point of view it is very satisfactory to see how much is retained of the Services of the Church of England by one who has separated himself from her. In another, it is very lamentable to find any one separating himself from the Church to which he belonged with so little, if indeed any, cause. For your abandonment of the Apostolical Order of the Christian Ministry might indeed have been cause for a *Minister's* separating himself, if he thought himself involved in *sin* by it; but was no cause for a *Layman's* separating himself, unless he thought the Government of the Church by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, not simply inexpedient but *contrary to the truth* of the *Gospel*, which I suppose few in these days are so simple as to maintain. You evidently do not maintain it.

In *doctrine*, you do not appear to differ from the Church of England. Something, indeed, you dropped about Church authority, but that is not a question of doctrine, and, rightly explained, I doubt whether you would reject the Article on that subject.

I know you have the *union* of Christians at heart—a most excellent object—but depend upon it, separation cannot but tend to promote disunion. Indeed, you will find it hard to overthrow a maxim of Bishop Copleston's (and he was no bigot), that all "separation is either a duty or a sin."

But you will think this somewhat irrelevant if not impertinent. Pray believe that I do not at all mean it to be so. In fact it relates to a difficulty which I do not recollect that I touched upon in any conversation with you. And the exact extent of the difficulty I cannot state, because I have not the Oxford Statute Book at hand; but I know that there are University Statutes (unconnected with subscription at matriculation or the degree) which are against *schism*. And these Statutes are not touched by the recent Act of Parliament. They will, I apprehend, apply to you, but how far I cannot at present say.

However, I will not keep you in suspense whilst I am examining into subjects of this kind, or endeavouring to lay down general rules about the admission of members into Oriel. But taking your case as it stands, I will readily replace your name on the College Books (if you should still desire it) when I am in Oxford again in Michaelmas Term, unless indeed I should find myself forbidden to do so by the Statutes alluded to.

Nothing is necessary in order to your re-admission, except my restoring your name to the books—no fee either to the College or the University; but you will have to replace your caution-money (which continues the same) till you take the M. A. degree, when it is reduced to £10.

You will then stand precisely where you were before,

and may proceed to your B.A. degree the day after your name is replaced, provided the *College* (for this is no act of mine) give permission.

And I have no reason to anticipate their declining to do so, unless the Statutes against Schism should come in the way. And if they should prove an obstacle in their present form, possibly they may be modified. My own wish is to open our academical advantages to persons of other communions as widely as we can *with safety to the teaching of the Church of England*. But I regard it as a flagrant injustice to say that the Church of England shall not have a *University*—(not merely her Colleges, but her *Universities*, which were also founded by and for the Church of England)—in which she shall *freely teach her own children in her own way*. The Dissenters have such a University already, why may not we have ours?

Believe me, my dear Sir Culling,  
Yours very sincerely,

EDWARD HAWKINS.

Sir C. E. EARDLEY, Bart.

---

Torquay, Sept. 8, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR,—

I am much obliged to you for expressing your readiness to restore my name to the books of Oriel. I accept it with much pleasure, and will willingly run all the risk of difficulties from other quarters. You will let me know (will you not?) at the proper time what sum I have to pay for caution-money; and have I not also arrears of battels to pay?



My impression is that when the subject came to be examined, it would be found difficult to prove me to be a schismatic, or to disprove my membership of the Church of England. I believe every baptised person to be the latter, who has not been *de facto* excommunicated.

But I trust after the recent question has been decided by such vast majorities in both Houses of Parliament, no persons will think it right to raise such points which would be manifestly against the animus of the New Act. Still, as a matter of fact, I may mention that I do frequently communicate in the Established Church.

&c.            &c.,

C. E. EARDLEY.

Allow me to add that I appreciate your kindness in all you say about my separation, and so far from regarding your observations as being as you say, either irrelevant or impertinent, I feel thankful to an old friend who will tell me frankly all he thinks; permitting me to be equally frank.

---

Vines, Rochester,  
Sept. 20, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR CULLING,—

\*            \*            \*            \*

I am ashamed to find that I have allowed your letter to remain so long without acknowledgment. We shall have the pleasure, I hope, of soon seeing you in Oxford.

Your caution-money is £30. I am not aware whether you have any arrears of battels unpaid. There are

no payments due for the period during which your name was not on the College Books. Indeed, we probably ceased to pay any dues on your account to the University long before that time, as your terms had ceased to count after a certain time ; but this I cannot tell here. The former treasurer shall let you know when you come to Oxford or before.

As to *Schism*, &c., &c., the University, as a separate though subordinate Church of England Society, has never depended upon the decisions of *other* courts, civil or ecclesiastical, for proof of anything wrong which she desired to exclude. She has her own methods for ascertaining either any moral offence, or heresy, or schism ; separate judges, in fact, in each case. So that the fact of excommunication by another court would not be required at all.

I am very glad to hear that you communicate with the Church of England. And I have not the slightest wish to exclude you from her Communion. Quite the reverse. But I suspect the fact of your building and frequenting a separate place for public worship (not a private chapel attached to your house), and printing a separate Form of Public Prayer (whether good or bad does not affect *this* question) is an act of *Schism* on the part of any INDIVIDUAL. I have not written this as a lawyer. I merely mention for your private consideration what appears to me absolutely inconsistent with the idea of a religious SOCIETY, as a society. And it is in this point of view that the question is not affected by the circumstance of the particular Form of Worship or Prayer introduced by an individual, being intrinsically good or bad.

In your Preface you quote some very just sentiments expressed by the Church of England, but then she

speaks only of changes made by the *society* not by any *individual*.

Any individual, I need not say, is not only at liberty but is often bound in duty to use his best endeavours to induce the society to make such changes as he may think beneficial, whenever change is allowable; but the individual must submit his views and wishes to those of the society to which he belongs (or there is an end of society as such), or else he must be content to leave that society.

And if, unhappily (in the case of an Ecclesiastical Society) he dissents from her *Doctrine*, he must allow the Society to regard him as involved in *Heresy* or *False Doctrine*, whenever the matter is of any moment; if from her *Discipline*, *Polity*, &c., then as involved in *Schism*. St. Paul seems to have denounced the divisions at Corinth, when the separation was less than is here described.

And as to the fact that there is such a thing as a Church to which each individual ought to belong, it seems quite as clear that our Lord and His apostles constituted a Religious Society, as that they taught religious truth. It may be doubted whether truth itself will be long maintained when religious order is subverted.

I do not write this to provoke a discussion, but merely to suggest a few hints for your calm and serious consideration.

And I am, my dear Sir Culling, yours very faithfully,

EDWARD HAWKINS.

Sir C. E. EARDLEY, Bart.

Belvedere, Erith, Sept. 28, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR,—

Thank you for your kind letter of the 20th. Will you give me timely notice of the next step for me to take? I shall be near Oxford this day week and following day (5th and 6th).

I forget dates, but I rather suppose Term has not begun, and I conclude I cannot take my B.A. till Term begins. Perhaps you will let me know when (abouts) I should come? when you will reinstate my name? when I pay my caution-money? and when and how I am to apply for degree?

In regard to what you say about Schism, I have no doubt that in the eye of many old Laws and Statutes, I am schismatical, heretical, and liable to condemnation; but I rely on the good feeling of the Fellows of Oriel not raising such questions. It has been decided by Parliament that schismatical, heretical (and indeed any) persons are fit subjects for a B.A. degree. If you (personally) let me IN, I will take my chance of the College letting me UP.

Thanking you very much for the kind and friendly spirit in which you have written to me.

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

C. E. EARDLEY.

The Rev. the PROVOST OF ORIEL.

Lamberhurst, Kent,

Oct. 10, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR CULLING,—

I have not left Kent, as my last date will shew,

but had I been in Oxford on the 5th, I could not have advanced your wishes a single step: the Term only begins to-day. I hope to reach Oxford to-morrow, but shall be for some time so much occupied, that I may not be able to attend, or to ask the attention of any one else to your questions. But supposing your name to be restored and your degree to be taken on any day before the close of the Term (Dec. 17), it will be the same thing as if it were done on the first day of the Term; as the Term *is kept* by the act of taking the degree, and cannot be kept by residence or any other step afterwards. In order to the M.A. degree, there must be residence for at least one Term *subsequent* to the Term in which the B.A. degree is taken. I will not forget to let you know your course of proceeding as soon as I can ascertain it.

I Remain, my dear Sir Culling,

. Yours very faithfully,

EDWARD HAWKINS.

Sir C. E. FARDLEY, Bart.

---

7, Adam Street, Strand, London,

Oct. 14, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR,—

My reason for wishing my degree accelerated is, that in a short time I must go down to Torquay for the winter.

As you were so good as to promise that, at all events, my name should be restored; that might be done at once, for that depends on yourself alone. Will you kindly do this at *once*?

And, then, as regards the degree, I should be glad that it should be done *soon*. And, allow me to add, as you mentioned the possibility of some persons attaching importance to the Oxford Statutes against Schism, that I think it only right and honourable that I should apply for my degree under my true colours. I certainly do differ with some of the articles. I do, to a large extent, worship and communicate outside the Established Church. I suppose that this constitutes me a Non-Conformist. In that capacity I apply for my degree; and you will oblige me by conveying to the Fellows of Oriel my respectful claim for it in that capacity, whenever the time arrives.

We much regretted that you could not revisit Belvedere before you quitted Kent.

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Your faithful Servant,

C. E. EARDLEY.

The Rev. the PROVOST OF ORIEL,  
Oxford.

---

London, Nov. 16, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR,—

I am staying in town for a short time previous to going down to the West; and I therefore propose to run down to Oxford next week to pay whatever sum you tell me is due on my re-entering Oriel. You were so good as to say (in your letter of Sept. 6) that you would replace my name, if you did not find yourself forbidden by the University Statutes against Schism, and not hearing from you to that effect, I conclude that no such impediment exists.

I mean to avail myself of your kind promise, without waiting to ascertain whether *the College* will give permission for me to take the degree of B.A., though it would save trouble to do the two on consecutive days. But the two questions are essentially distinct, and I wish not to mix them up together.

You will, perhaps, oblige me with a line—here—at the beginning of next week.

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

C. E. EARDLEY.

The Rev. the PROVOST OF ORIEL.

Oriel College,  
Nov. 18, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR CULLING,—

I thought I had before explained to you that, if I should find myself in a condition to replace your name on the College books, your personal presence would not be at all necessary. It will only be necessary in the event of your proceeding to a degree. At present, however, I find that I cannot replace your name without a violation of University Statutes, and Statutes which are not touched by the recent Act of Parliament. I did not trouble you with a letter on the subject, because I had mentioned to you, in October, that I foresaw there must be some delay (on account of other pressing business) before attention could be drawn to it. And so it has proved. The Statutes are under consideration; but when or in what way they may be altered, I cannot at present say; nor,

indeed, can I at present say whether the alterations will justify me in including your case under them.

Believe me, my dear Sir,  
Yours very faithfully,  
EDWD. HAWKINS.

Sir C. E. EARDLEY, Bart.

---

London, Nov. 21, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR,—

If the obstacle from University Statutes is only a *delay*, I patiently submit to it.

Should the University, however, hesitate to repeal Statutes which prevent willing heads of houses from admitting any Under-graduates that they think fit into their Colleges, such a course would be evidently opposed to the recent Act of Parliament, or, at least, to the spirit of it. I should feel it my duty, if such a barrier were interposed between your own liberal intentions and myself, to appeal to Parliament to protect the rights which it has conferred. I should feel that I owe this not only to myself and to others who may be similarly situated, but to Oriel itself, which, more, perhaps, than any existing College, fostered, in my time, the Duty and Right of Private Judgment. But I hope the case may not arise.

Will you oblige me by sending me the last edition of the University Statutes, and pointing out to me which are those that stand in your way in re-admitting me to Oriel?

Believe me, my dear Sir,  
Faithfully yours,  
C. E. EARDLEY.

The Rev. the PROVOST OF ORIEL.



Oriel College,  
Nov. 23, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR CULLING,—

If you wish to study the Oxford Statute Book, you may probably procure a copy of the Statutes in 4to., corrected up to the present time, from J. H. Parker, Oxford, or 377, Strand, London. I will not answer for this; for the last published edition appeared in 1825, and the Statutes passed, *since that time*, occupy nearly 300 4to. pages in addition, printed, of course, as they were passed.

The 8vo. "Excerpta," given to Undergraduates, do not contain all the Statutes; nor, indeed, several of those now under review.

But you will find the study a considerable one; and I really have not leisure for the task you would impose upon me. The subject, however, as I have already mentioned, is under the consideration of the proper authorities.

I am,

My dear Sir Culling,

Yours very faithfully,

EDWD. HAWKINS.

Sir C. E. EARDLEY, Bart.

P.S. The Statutes at present occupy altogether very nearly 700 4to. pages, but they will probably be consolidated ere long. Allow me to send you a much smaller book, which will not occupy you so long, on the "Duty of Private Judgment."

---

London, Nov. 30, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR,—

I have got the Statute Book, but it is quite impossible to me (as you anticipated) to wade through it. But, pray, understand me, that neither would I (to use your words) impose such a task upon yourself. All I request from you is that, having received your written assurance (as you remember) that you would receive me back into Oriel, if the University Statutes did not prohibit you, you would now, having ascertained that *there are* such Statutes, point out to me *which they are*. You can, I am sure, do this without difficulty; and if you will oblige me by doing this, which I think you will say I am entitled to ask, I will defer taking any steps in Parliament to ascertain what the difficulty is. I can assure you that there is but one opinion among men of all politics, that for the University to put obstacles in the way of Oriel admitting me, if Oriel thinks fit, would be both a hopeless and a suicidal act.

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

C. E. EARDLEY.

The Rev. the PROVOST OF ORIEL.

---

Oriel College,  
Dec. 7, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR CULLING,—

I am very sorry you would not take my advice about our Statute Book, for it could not but be useless to you without such explanations as I really had not leisure to send you. Indeed, as you perceive, I am too much occupied to answer letters as I desire, and the University

is too much occupied to proceed as fast as you desire with the alterations in which you are concerned.

This is the whole of the case. There is not the slightest ground for your imagination that the University is putting obstacles in the way of this College, or of myself, as to our receiving you back again. But the Statutes of the University are, and have been for centuries, framed with a view to the Church of England alone, and therefore contain a variety of passages scattered through the Statute Book against Heresy, Schism, erroneous Doctrine, and attendance at Dissenting Chapels. It is not, of course, your case in particular that is in question. The University, as such, knows nothing of your case. But it must consider carefully how it is to deal with many cases (of Romanists, Unitarians, Deists, &c., &c., &c.) to which the late Act may open the University. And the late Act, I may add, will not facilitate Legislation in Oxford, but rather the reverse, at first at any rate, because it forces a great number of subjects upon us at once, too many for the year which alone it allows to us.

Meanwhile, the questions about Dissenters, &c., and the penalties to which they are at present subject under the Statute is, as I have mentioned to you, under the consideration of the proper authorities. You cannot assist them. There has been no unnecessary delay hitherto; nor do I expect there will be any. There is no case at all for an Appeal to Parliament.

Believe me, my dear Sir Culling,

Yours very faithfully,

EDWD. HAWKINS.

Sir C. E. EARDLEY, Bart.

London, Dec. 18, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR,—

After due consideration and consultation I yield to your arguments against pressing the University for immediate action in my case. I will not moot the subject again before Easter. But I think Easter is long enough, and that I shall not be open to any imputation of hastiness in expecting and asking that; by that time the Law of the University may cease to be opposed to your own promises, and to the spirit of the Law of the Land.

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

C. E. EARDLEY.

The Rev. the PROVOST OF ORIEL.

---

THE REV. THE PROVOST OF ORIEL.

London, Feb. 3, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR,—

I have taken pains to read through the Statutes of the University, and I really cannot find any Article which opposes your kind and liberal intention of re-admitting me to Oriel. The only clause which seems to me to approach to it is in the “Statuta Aularia” (Appendix Statutorum, page 70, Sectio IV. De conversatione honestâ et moribus Aularium). In clause 34, it is enacted, “Quod si quis Hæresia vel pravum aliquod dogma contra doctrinam vel disciplinam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ defenderit; vel Conventiculis illicitis interesse præsumperit; ab Aulâ expellatur, vel Domino Cancellario denunciatur.”

Now, evidently, this enactment is designed to enforce discipline upon the actual Undergraduates within the University, not to compel Heads of Houses to investigate the sentiments of applicants for admission.

Moreover, it is so contrary to the recent Act of Parliament, that, even in its application to Undergraduates, it is evidently null and void. To add to which, you could with truth reply to objectors, what you wrote to me on the 6th of September:—"In doctrine you do not appear to differ from the Church of England. Something, indeed, you dropped about Church Authority, but that is not a question of doctrine, and, rightly explained, I doubt whether you would object to the Article on that subject." Perhaps, *rightly explained*—explaining what is meant by "the Church," and what is meant by "decreeing"—I should not; and even if I did, as you justly say, that is not a question of doctrine.

This, however, I merely say parenthetically—I am sure that no man who is not a Heretic himself would find me a Heretic.

I only wish every person who makes a turmoil about the Church of England were as thoroughly one as I am with its Doctrinal Articles.

But this was purely a question for yourself as the Head and the Mouthpiece of Oriel College. You knew my sentiments, and practice, and, knowing them, you came to the conclusion I have stated.

The University, especially since the new Act of Parliament, appears to me to have no control over your admission of Members, nor over the subsequent faith and liberty of Worship of those whom you may think fit to admit.

To return, then, to my personal position. You wrote

me (Sept. 6th):—"Taking your case as it stands, I will readily replace your name on the College Books (if you should still desire it) when I am in Oxford again, in the Michaelmas Term, unless, indeed, I should find myself forbidden to do so by the Statutes above alluded to." (Statutes against Schism, &c.)

I am persuaded that you are not so forbidden, and I, therefore, now write to ask you to take what I have stated into your consideration between this and Easter.

If it should, then, appear to you that such a prohibition as you have supposed to exist to the free fulfilment of your liberal promises and wishes does really exist in the University Statutes, and that such prohibition is not made void by the Law of the Land, I will ask you to let me know exactly what the prohibitory clauses are, and I am then prepared to appeal to Parliament to vindicate, at once, the independent rights of the Colleges and the claims of the Laity seeking admission into them. Lord Monteaule has agreed to present my petition to the House of Lords, and I feel sanguine that Parliament will either pass some declaratory measure preventing the University from domineering over the faith of Undergraduates and the freedom of yourself and other Heads of Houses, or will, in some way or other, find a free vent for conscience. Will you oblige me with a line, at once, if only to say that you have received this letter. As it may possibly be necessary to my case hereafter to make public use of it, I will ask you, from this time, to regard our correspondence as not necessarily private.

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

C. E. EARDLEY.

The Rev. the PROVOST OF ORIEL.

You will not, I am sure, forget, in coming to a decision, the late Bishop of Llandaff's kind letter to me, in the name of the College, after I passed my examination.

---

THE PROVOST OF ORIEL TO SIR C. EARDLEY.

Oriel College, Feb. 6, 1855.

MY DEAR SIR CULLING,—

The passage you have sent me from the Statutes (or rather from what were once part of the Statutes), but which are not so at present, having been altered about twenty years ago, does not apply to you.

But there are several other passages which, though they do not affect those who are not members of the University, would immediately apply to any one who was admitted into it, and which must at present prevent some persons from being admitted.

Those passages are not in any way repealed by the recent Act of Parliament. But they are all under the consideration of the authorities of this place; and when a new Statute shall have been passed, I will write you word.

Let me now, however, state once more that there is no foundation for your supposition, that the University is domineering over this College or over me.

I am, my dear Sir Culling,

Yours very faithfully,

EDWARD HAWKINS.

Sir C. E. EARDLEY, Bart.

SIR C. EARDLEY TO THE PROVOST OF ORIEL.

Frognel, Torquay,  
Feb. 10, 1855.

MY DEAR SIR,—

If there are such passages as you state, and which prohibit you from fulfilling your conditional promise, I will merely repeat my request to be furnished with them. Will you oblige me by referring me to the clauses, between now and Easter? Allow me to have a line, to say that you will do so.

Believe me, my dear Sir,  
Faithfully yours,  
C. E. EARDLEY.

The passage I sent you remains verbatim in the "Statuta Aularia," as altered in 1835, with only this difference in the penalty, that the heretic is now only to be expelled: the words, "Et Denunciatur Domino Cancellario" are omitted.

The Rev. the PROVOST OF ORIEL.

---

THE PROVOST OF ORIEL TO SIR C. EARDLEY.

Oriel College, Feb. 15, 1855.

MY DEAR SIR CULLING,—

I am sorry you have again asked me to do what I had already declined; because it is really a waste of



time to discuss the existing Statutes, or to send you references to them, while they are under consideration for the very purpose of alteration.

When the new Statute is passed, I will let you know. But if you think I am raising unnecessary difficulties, you should apply for admission at once to some other head of a College or Hall, whom you may hope to find less scrupulous.

I am, my dear Sir,

Yours very faithfully,

EDWARD HAWKINS.

Sir C. EARDLEY, Bart.

---

Torquay, Feb. 16, 1855.

MY DEAR SIR,—

I will not trust my own judgment to reply to your letter. It seems to me that having made such a promise as you made me, I am not unreasonable in asking you to specify at least one or two of the impediments to its fulfilment which you have now discovered to exist. It seems to me also, assuming those impediments to amount to a downright University prohibition to your receiving me back to Oriel, that the University ought not to require time to abolish such impediments; because if they are prohibitions to one College, they are prohibitions to all; and this is virtually shutting the door which Parliament has opened. However, I will not be judge in my own case, and as that case may more or less involve public questions affecting my *alma mater*, still less will I proceed in a public matter without con-

sulting other persons, who are as anxious as myself for the opening of the University to all Protestants.

I hope, therefore, that you will not think me wanting in courtesy to yourself, if I submit to the friends to whom I refer, our entire correspondence in print, marking it, for the present, as private.

Let me only add, that nothing but absolute necessity shall make me enter another College than Oriel; the College of Arnold and Whately, the Newmans, Froudes, and Wilberforces, and in the name of which Dr. Coplestone addressed to me the letter which I sent you. If I am obliged to turn elsewhere, it will only be because I cannot there practise the duty and right of private judgment.

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

C. E. EARDLEY.

The Rev. the PROVOST OF ORIEL.

---

Oriel College, 27th Feb., 1855.

MY DEAR SIR CULLING,—

If you take the liberty of printing any of my letters for the inspection of persons to whom they were not addressed, you will certainly be bound to print them all, this note included.

The result, however, will only be that you will appear to have been for the last few months, if I must speak the truth, endeavouring to raise an unprofitable discussion, which I had no leisure to pursue. For, as to this College, since you have no claim of right to re-admission into it, I must be permitted to judge for myself whether I can properly re-admit you or not. Whilst, as to the

University, it would surely have been unprofitable to discuss Statutes which were all the time under the consideration of the proper authorities for the very purpose of alteration, or, at least with a view to framing a New Statute; and that Statute will, I expect, be before the University to-morrow. And let me remind you of one point more, that the question is not (as you put it again in your last letter) about the admission of *Protestants* alone, but of Romanists, Socinians, Jews, and others, with whom you least of all agree.

I am, my dear Sir Culling,

Yours very faithfully,

EDWARD HAWKINS.

SIR CULLING E. EARDLEY, Bart.

P.S. Though the New Statute will be submitted to the University this week, I cannot say at all whether or when it will be passed, for the new process of Legislation is much more complex than the old.

---

7, Adam Street, Strand, London,  
March 2, 1855.

MY DEAR SIR,—

Your last letter shall certainly be added to the others. The correspondence (from February 3) was by me stated *not to be private*. That which precedes it will only be shewn by me to my friends, marked "Private, Confidentially Communicated." Having received a promise from you to re-admit me to Oriel if the Statutes did not prevent you, and a question having arisen between you and me whether the Statutes did prevent you,

I was entitled to shew the correspondence to my friends. And if I do so in print, it is because extensive copying is impossible.

I shall be happy to hear the result of the presentation of the New Statute, and the effect that it has upon your intentions with regard to myself. I do not anticipate that the discussion which you have been good enough to take part in, will prove to have been unprofitable. I did not wish to raise one. My desire was quietly to re-enter my old College. "Ego vapulo tantum."

Yours very truly,

C. E. EARDLEY.

Rev. Dr. HAWKINS.



