





LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS





CLERICAL HEADSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS  
AT THE UNIVERSITIES.

---

---

A SPEECH

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, JULY 9, 1880,

BY

CHARLES S. ROUNDELL,

M.P. FOR GRANTHAM,

*LATE FELLOW OF MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD.*

---

LONDON:

CORNELIUS BUCK, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

—  
1880.



# SPEECH.

—:0:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Friday, 9th July, 1880.*

MR. CHARLES ROUNDELL: Mr. Speaker, it will, perhaps, be convenient if I make a brief statement of the Parliamentary history of the question which I am submitting to the House. It is just 30 years since Lord John Russell issued the first Commission from which have followed those changes in the Universities the like of which have not been seen since the time of Archbishop Laud. That period of 30 years has been a time of agitation and controversy for the Universities, and it is with the object of putting an end to that agitation and controversy that I submit this Resolution to the House. I am strongly of opinion that it is for the interest of the Universities that they should be allowed to carry out their own proper work without let or hindrance from Parliament. There can, however, be no peace for the Universities until this burning question of religious tests and disabilities has been dealt with. The Tests Act of 1871 affirmed the expediency of the removal of all religious tests and disabilities, under proper safeguards, for the maintenance of religious instruction and worship, in the Universities and the Colleges. It, in fact, affirmed the national character of the Universities; but, while all religious tests on both University and College offices were theoretically abolished, they were re-imposed in the case of certain of the most important offices. It cannot be said that in the words of the Preamble of the Act the benefits of the Universities have been rendered freely accessible to the nation so long as a large number of the Headships and Fellowships of the Colleges are closed to all but clergymen of the Church of England, nor can it be contended that

the maintenance of religious instruction and worship necessarily involves the imposition of any clerical restriction. The principle that the Tests Act affirmed is this—that the national Universities ought not to be the property of any particular church or sect, but the property of the nation. That is a principle dear to the Liberal Party; and it is one upon which, however much they were divided upon questions of foreign policy, the Liberal Party stood together as one man even in the last Parliament. I will now show how the particular question of the Headships and Fellowships has been dealt with. In the year 1870, the year before the passing of the Tests Act, the noble Lord the Member for Calne (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice) moved to include the Headships in the operation of the Bill. He was supported by the then Liberal Government, and the Motion was carried by 205 to 86. In the following year my right hon. Friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Fawcett) moved an Amendment for the purpose of including the Fellowships. For reasons which approved themselves to the Government at that time his Amendment had not the support of the Government, and yet it was lost by a majority of 22 only in a House of Members (182 to 160), the majority including the Members of the Government and 110 Conservatives. When the Bill came on for the third reading, the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister said that—

“ Both he and his learned Friend the Solicitor General thought the question of Fellowships ought not to be allowed to sleep. The tenure of Fellowships was not a thing to be dealt with by a stroke of the pen. It was an old system, fortified by a number of conditions which must be studied as a whole. Let them detach, if they could, the question of religious tests from that of general legislation upon Fellowships. But, first of all, they would watch the fate of that measure in ‘another place.’ If it met with the success they hoped for, they would then apply themselves to considering what practical measures they could best take—whether by the au-

thority of the Executive, or by invoking the aid of Parliament—for placing the Legislature and the Government in a position to deal effectively with the subject of Fellowships.”—[3 *Hansard*, civ. 779.]

When the question next came before Parliament, the Liberal Government was out of Office; and yet in the year 1877, notwithstanding the large Conservative majority, proposals for the abolition of the clerical restriction upon the Headships and Fellowships were rejected by such small majorities as 9 and 22. That brings me to the Universities Act of 1877, which constituted the Commissions for Oxford and Cambridge. Those Commissions are now sitting. The Commissioners are invested with a large discretion for dealing with the subjects of Headships and Fellowships in concert with the Colleges. The Act also provides that when the statutes for the Universities and Colleges have been finally sanctioned by the Commissioners they are to be laid before Parliament. It will be naturally asked how I come to be moving a Resolution to override the discretion vested by Act of Parliament in a sitting Commission? Now, the reason why I have not introduced a Bill to deal with those restrictions is, shortly, the state of the Session; and if, as I hope, a large majority to-night affirms the principle of my Resolution, I shall be ready at the beginning of next Session to introduce a Bill to give effect, in due Parliamentary form, to what I propose. In taking that course I had the strongest desire to act respectfully and courteously towards the members of the two Commissions. I felt that if I had waited till next year, when the work of the Commissions was completed, and the statutes in a complete form were laid on the Table of the House, it might well be urged against me, if I objected to some of the statutes, that it was a strange and a hard thing that I should come down at the twelfth hour and move, as I should be in duty bound to do, the rejection of some of those statutes. The hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce) has given Notice of an Amendment for throwing open the Chairs of Hebrew and Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and the Chair of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge to others than clergymen. I wish to express my hearty approval of that Amendment on the ground that those Chairs are not

theological Chairs. If it is said that the Professorship of Hebrew is a theological Chair, because Hebrew is the language of Holy Scripture, the same thing would apply to the Professorship of Greek, because Greek is the language of the New Testament. If it be thought strange that we should claim for laymen the Chair of Ecclesiastical History, I reply that you might as well say that a Chair of Political Economy should be limited to a Member of one or other branch of the Legislature. Is it to be affirmed that a man like Mr. Robertson Smith, who is thought worthy to revise the translation of the Bible, should be precluded from holding the Professorship of Hebrew at the University of Oxford? I now come to the case of Headships and Fellowships. Headships are the chief offices in the Colleges. It is in the power of a head of a College to make or to mar his College. Moreover, they are the chief prizes open to the Fellows. It is unreasonable, now that such large reductions have been made in the number of clerical Fellowships, to seek to reserve the chief office in a College to a clergyman, and there is a great body of opinion against it among the resident Fellows and tutors of Oxford and Cambridge. The number of Fellowships at Oxford and Cambridge is 704, and the income of those Fellowships, according to a Return made to the Commission in 1871, amounts to £204,000 a-year, or, rather, I should say, exceeds that sum. Both at Oxford and Cambridge the great majority of the Colleges have made proposals to the Commissioners for the abolition of those restrictions to Holy Orders; and the question I have to put to the House is whether the wishes of those who best know what concerns their interest shall be regarded or not. I might appeal to the case of three of the wealthiest, and I fear I must add three of the least efficient, of the Colleges at Oxford, Christ Church, Magdalen, and St. John's Colleges; but I will rest my argument on the case of Christ Church. What is the case of Christ Church? Although there are still matters unsettled between the College and the Commissioners, they are matters of notoriety in the University. At Christ Church there is a dean and chapter connected with the College. In the Governing Body there are the dean and six canons, of whom five are Professors of Divinity. Besides those

there are three readers in natural science, who may be laymen. In addition, according to the proposal now before the Commissioners, there are to be two classes of students—first, those whom I will compendiously call prize Fellows, limited to a tenure of seven years; and, secondly, those who are called tutorial Fellows, who may hold office for 15 years. These tutorial Fellows will vary in number between a maximum of 16 and a minimum of 10; but, in any case, as many as six are always to be in Orders. Thus the Governing Body will consist of a dean having two votes, besides a casting vote, and six canons, besides, at least, six clerical students. This will insure a permanent resident clerical vote of 14. I will make no comment upon this statement. The facts themselves are my strongest argument. I appeal to hon. Members who belong to Christ Church, whose sons and whose sons' sons have a vested interest in its efficiency and credit—shall Christ Church, shall Wolsey's great foundation be the first College in a great University, or shall it be dwarfed to the narrow proportions of a mere appanage of the Church of England? I now come to the general policy of removing clerical restrictions. It appears to me to be important that Colleges should be in a position to elect the best man, and that any restriction whatever must necessarily be undesirable, inasmuch as it tends to limit the field of choice. I need scarcely observe that the object which I have in view is not to exclude clergymen; but simply that clergymen should not be forced upon Colleges. It appears to me to be an invidious thing, and partaking of the nature of a bribe, to select a man of inferior abilities because he is willing to take Orders, and to reject a man of superior abilities because he is unwilling to take Orders. I am anxious that religious education should revive at the Universities; but such a revival will never be brought about by the maintenance of these clerical Fellowships. But this is not a mere College question. It is a national question, and I submit it is not for a casual majority in a College at Oxford or Cambridge to determine a question of large importance—the retention or abolition of religious tests—as a qualification for important offices. It is for Parliament to determine that question. As long as the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge were practically

clerical seminaries there was a reason for retaining the qualification of Holy Orders; but now that restriction is simply an anachronism. But then, it may be said, that argument is all very well as regards the question of retaining Holy Orders as a qualification for Fellowships in general; but we must have regard to those clauses of the Tests Act which provide for the maintenance of religious instruction and worship in the Colleges. That requirement of the Act, it is said, cannot be satisfied unless the person fulfilling those duties be invested with the dignity and influence of membership of the Governing Body. We must also, it is said, have regard in this matter to the feeling of English parents. And again, we must be careful lest we drive our young clergy away from the Universities into clerical seminaries. These are the arguments which deserve our attention. But I submit that it is quite consistent with the Tests Act that religious instruction in Colleges should be provided without imposing the qualification of Holy Orders on holders of these offices. It would be an unwise thing in the present state of public opinion to accentuate the provisions of the Tests Act in the interest and for the protection of the Church of England. It appears to me that it is far better to trust to the operation of natural causes, to trust to the religious feeling which exists in the nation. "As with the people, so with the priest." If the English people are, as I am persuaded, a religious-minded people, then some of their best intellects will always devote themselves to the service of the Church, and I am content to trust to that. For my knowledge of Oxford leads me to make this observation—that, however great may be the differences of theological opinions in the Universities, as in other classes of educated society in the country, there will always be found men of strong religious feeling, who, if they be free to act, will naturally betake themselves to the service of the Church; and I contend that the influence of those men, freely given, would be far more instrumental for good than that of inferior men who had been chosen Fellows simply because they complied with the condition that they should be clergymen of the Church. As to the parents, I contend that what they really look to, both at school and at college, is the efficiency and general popularity of

the place of education. We have had recent experience of this in the case of a distinguished College and a distinguished school, both of which were for a time under a theological cloud; and yet in neither case was there any falling off in the numbers, not even in the number of clergymen's sons. These difficulties are, in fact, imaginary. Parents would be the first to disregard them. But I will not rest my case upon mere argument; I will appeal to experience and authority. I will first take the case of the great public schools. Take the case of Eton, Harrow, Winchester, Westminster, Rugby, and Charterhouse. Of these six public schools, Winchester is the only one in which the qualification of Holy Orders is necessary for the Head Mastership. At Harrow the Head Master is to be a graduate of an University within Her Majesty's Dominions; and yet the Head Master of Harrow, who may be a layman, is charged by the Governors with the entire control of Divine Service in the school chapel. The case of Rugby is still more remarkable. In that case, the Head Master, who is required to be a Protestant of the Church of England, and may therefore be a layman, is charged under the Statutes with the care of instructing the boys in the principles of the Christian religion, morality, and good manners. If that is the case with the great public schools, I contend that the Colleges also may be intrusted with the care of providing for religious instruction and worship without being bound to do so in any particular specified way. So much for the public schools. But I have still higher authority for my proposal. On Monday last I presented a remarkable Petition from 131 resident graduates of the University of Oxford.\* Among the Petitioners are 6 Heads of Colleges, 15 Professors, 72 Fellows of Colleges, 19 other tutors and lecturers, and 19 other resident graduates. The Petitioners, in fact, comprise one-half of the Hebdomadal Council, the Governing Body of the University, one-half of the resident Professors, and a clear majority of College tutors and lecturers. A similar Petition, of at least equal importance, would have been presented from members of the University of Cambridge,

\* See Appendix A.

but that it had been too late in the term to obtain the necessary signatures. I also presented to the Prime Minister a day or two ago a most weighty Memorial, signed by upwards of 800 persons eminent in literature and science, and representing Nonconformist and other places of higher education.\* But that is not all. The Report of the first Oxford Commission contained a recommendation for the removal of these restrictions from Fellowships.† That Commission included such eminent Church dignitaries as the then Bishop of Norwich, who was Chairman, Dr. Jeune, afterwards Bishop of Peterborough, the present Dean of Christ Church, and last, not least, the present Archbishop of Canterbury. With the permission of the House, I will now quote a few figures which will show that at Cambridge there has been a large increase in the lay element. From figures which have been furnished to me, I find that at Trinity College in the year 1854, that is to say, in the time before the recent changes, all the College tutors, five in number, were in Holy Orders; whereas, in the present year, of four tutors only one is in Orders, and yet there are about 160 matriculations at the College every year, and that large number represents but a proportion of those who apply for admission. These figures are another proof of the real feeling of English parents. Similarly, I find that at the present time there are five Colleges at Cambridge with but one tutor, and that tutor a layman. But that is not all. Taking the College tutors and lecturers at Cambridge collectively, I find that in 1854, before the recent changes, out of 93 tutors and lecturers of Colleges there

\* See Appendix B.

† After stating the advantages of open Fellowships, and the necessity for such a measure in order "to render the revenues of the Colleges available for the services of learning and education," the Commissioners go on to say—"It is probable that, even if the rule [of restriction to Holy Orders] were abrogated in all the Colleges, the great bulk of the resident teachers in Oxford would, after all, remain clerical. It is from a deliberate preference, founded on the highest motives, that many of the Fellows of Colleges become clergymen, and by the removal of the obligation to take Holy Orders, under the penalty of losing a Fellowship, we should only take away one of the inferior motives." See Report of the Oxford Commissioners of 1850 page 163.

were but 25 laymen. In 1880, out of 130 tutors and lecturers 77 are laymen. So again, in 1854, of Fellows of Colleges as many as 205 were in Orders. In 1880 only 100, that is, less than one-half, are in Orders. These figures show the set of the tide, the current of opinion in the University. They show, in fact, that the Universities are becoming more and more lay places of education, and, that being so, we may as well struggle against the tide; we may as well attempt to build up a great national institution upon what I will call this "narrow ledge of clericalism," as Mrs. Partington might try to stop out the great Atlantic Ocean with her mop. I will take one more test, that of numbers at the two Universities; and I find that, comparing the present time with the period before the late legislative changes, not only has the number of undergraduates, both at Oxford and Cambridge, nearly doubled, but that the number of those who have distinguished themselves by taking honours at both Universities has largely increased.\* From these figures I draw these conclusions—that, as restrictions have been removed, numbers have increased; that, as the number of subjects of study has increased, the amount of work done has increased; and thus that the removal of restrictions has tended to the advancement of learning and education at the Universities, and in the country at large. Still, it may be said, that is all very well as regards learning and education; but how about religion and religious influences? I will reply—*Qui laborat orat*—given the spirit of honest hard work, given a sense of conscientious duty, given earnestness of purpose, and seriousness in the view of life, and you will have gone far towards exorcising the demon of selfish luxury, that bane of society which lies at the bottom of much of the laxity of morals, and indifference to religion, which we all

\* See Appendix C.

deplore. This is the question which I now submit to the House. It is not a question of religious liberty, but one of academic freedom. It is a question whether the retention of this remaining test, the most stringent of all religious tests, and the most opposed to the spirit of the Tests Act, can be justified upon any adequate grounds of authority, reason, or policy; or whether, as I contend, the principle of the national character of the Universities shall now, once for all, be frankly and fully accepted in the interest of learning and science, and in the interest of religious education. I beg to move—

“That this House, while fully recognizing the obligation to make provision for the due fulfilment of the requisitions of sections 5 and 6 of “The Universities Tests Act, 1871” (relating to religious instruction, and to morning and evening prayer in colleges), deems it inexpedient that, save in the case of the Deanery of Christchurch, any clerical restriction shall remain or be attached to any headship or fellowship in any college of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.”

After a debate in which, amongst others, Mr. GLADSTONE, and also Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY (one of the Oxford Commissioners) took part,

MR. CHARLES ROUNDELL said, that after what had fallen from the Prime Minister, and also from the hon. Member for North Northumberland (Sir Matthew White Ridley), and especially having regard to the promise of the Prime Minister that the Government would afford a full and fair field for the discussion of the statutes of the Commissioners next year, and that they would give a full and fair consideration to the statutes, respectful to the Commissioners, but more respectful to the principles on which University legislation of late years had proceeded, he had no hesitation in responding to the request of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, and begged leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

## [APPENDIX A.]

*Presented July 5, 1880.*

TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM  
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND IN PARLIAMENT AS-  
SEMBLED.

The Humble Petition of the undersigned Resident Graduates  
of the University of Oxford,

Sheweth :—

1. That by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877, it was provided (section 17) that the Commissioners appointed under that Act might among other things make provision for altering and regulating the conditions of eligibility or appointment to any emolument or office held in or connected with any College.

2. That by the same Act it was further provided (section 59) that the said Commissioners should make provision as far as might appear to them requisite for the due fulfilment of the requisitions of sections five and six of the Universities' Test Act, 1871 (relating to religious instruction and to Morning and Evening Prayer in Colleges).

3. That your Petitioners are of opinion that it is desirable that all College offices and emoluments should as far as possible be conferred according to personal merit and fitness.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that with respect to Statutes to be made for Colleges in Oxford by the University of Oxford Commissioners it may be provided that, subject to the requirements of the fifty-ninth section of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877, Holy Orders shall not be imposed or continued as a condition of holding any College office or emolument.

And your Petitioners will ever pray, &c.

B. Jowett, Master of Balliol College and Regius Professor of Greek.	R. G. Tatton, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College.
John R. Magrath, D.D., Provost of Queen's College.	Evelyn Abbott, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College.
Mark Pattison, B.D., Rector of Lincoln.	A. C. Bradley, Fellow and Lecturer of Balliol College.
G. G. Bradley, M.A., Master of University College.	F. de Paravicini, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College.
J. Percival, M.A., President of Trinity College.	A. Toynbee, Lecturer of Balliol College.
T. H. Green, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy.	Arthur L. Smith, Lecturer of Balliol College.
G. W. Kitchin, M.A., Censor of Students Unattached, formerly Censor of Christ Church.	W. H. Forbes, Fellow and Lecturer of Balliol College.
William Odling, M.A., Fellow of Worcester College, Waynflete Professor of Chemistry.	T. L. Cheyne, Fellow and Lecturer of Balliol College.
D. B. Monro, M.A., Fellow and Vice Provost of Oriel.	Arthur Higgs, M.A., Balliol College.
A. S. Chavasse, M.A., B.C.L., Fellow and Tutor of University College, Senior Proctor.	John Watts, M.A., Balliol College.
Bernard Bosanquet, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of University College.	W. F. Donkin, M.A., Magdalen College.
F. H. Peters, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of University College.	T. F. Tozet, B.A., Balliol College.
J. Franck Bright, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of University College.	G. F. Nicholl, Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic, Balliol College.
S. H. Butcher, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of University College.	William Unwin, B.A., Balliol College.
R. L. Nettleship, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College.	John Mac Cunn, B.A., Balliol College.
J. L. Strachan-Davidson, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College.	J. Virinan Jones, B.A., B. Sc., Balliol College.
	Francis P. Simpson, B.A., Balliol College.
	W. C. Sidgwick, M.A., Oriel College.
	E. A. Whitman, M.A., Lecturer of Oriel and Lincoln Colleges.
	Charles L. Shadwell, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College.
	J. Cook Wilson, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College.

- F. H. Hall, M.A., Fellow of Oriol College.  
 Lancelot R. Phelps, M.A., Fellow of Oriol College.  
 George Rolleston, M.D., F.R.S., Linacre Professor of Anatomy and Physiology and Fellow of Merton (with limitation of scope of Petition to offices and emoluments already existing and subject to the operation of the Universities Act of 1877).  
 Edwin Hatch, M.A., Vice Principal of St. Mary Hall.  
 William Wallace, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Merton College.  
 F. H. Bradley, M.A., Fellow of Merton College.  
 William Esson, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Merton College.  
 G. R. Scott, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Merton College.  
 J. W. Russell, M.A., Fellow of Merton College and Lecturer of Balliol College.  
 T. Bowman, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Merton.  
 R. B. Clifton, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Professor of Experimental Philosophy in the University of Oxford.  
 H. W. Jackson, M.A., Sub-Rector and Tutor of Exeter College.  
 Charles W. Boase, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College.  
 Ingram Bywater, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter.  
 Charles J. C. Price, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer, Exeter College.  
 Henry F. Pelham, M.A., Tutor of Exeter College.  
 E. Ray Lankester, M.A., Fellow, late Lecturer of Exeter College.  
 P. F. Willert, M.A., Fellow of Exeter College.  
 Thomas Fowler, M.A., Professor of Logic and Fellow of Lincoln College.  
 W. Warde Fowler, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College.  
 N. Bodington, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College.  
 R. W. Raper, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College.  
 Robinson Ellis, Vice President and Lecturer, Trinity College.  
 J. S. Mann, Fellow and Lecturer of Trinity College.  
 William R. Anson, M.A., Fellow of All Souls.  
 T. R. Buchanan, M.A., Fellow of All Souls.  
 A. H. Johnson, M.A., Tutor and Chaplain of All Souls College, formerly Fellow.  
 Walter Gordon, M.A., Lecturer and Tutor to Students unattached.  
 J. Dennis Hind, M.A., Lecturer to Students unattached.  
 R. Lamb Abbot, M.A., Lecturer to Students unattached.  
 William Little, M.A., Fellow and Tutor, Corpus Christi College.  
 Arthur Sidgwick, M.A., Tutor, Corpus Christi College.  
 W. W. Fisher, M.A., Aldrichian Demonstrator of Chemistry.  
 Henry Nettleship, M.A., Corpus Professor of Latin.  
 Charles Plummer, M.A., Fellow, Chaplain, and Dean of Corpus Christi College.  
 Thomas Corse, M.A., Tutor, Corpus Christi College.
- G. E. Thorbury, M.A., Sub-Warden and Tutor of Wadham.  
 P. A. Henderson, Fellow and Tutor, Wadham College.  
 Herbert Richards, Fellow and Tutor of Wadham College.  
 J. Capel Hanbury, Chaplain and Divinity Lecturer, Wadham College.  
 Alfred Robinson, M.A., Fellow of New College.  
 Hereford B. George, M.A., Fellow of New College.  
 William Leonard Courtney, M.A. Fellow of New College.  
 John Baron Moyle, M.A., Fellow of New College.  
 Arthur D. Prickard, M.A., Fellow of New College.  
 Arthur C. Cranpreys, B.A., Assistant Lecturer of New College.  
 W. Hatchett Jackson, M.A., New College.  
 G. S. Baker, M.A., Fellow and Vice President of Magdalen College.  
 W. D. Allen, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College.  
 W. A. B. Coolidge, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College.  
 T. Herbert Warner, M.A., Fellow and Tutor, Magdalen College.  
 M. A. Lawson, M.A., Magdalen, Professor of Botany.  
 T. H. T. Hopkins, M.A., Fellow and Tutor, Magdalen College.  
 Albert Watson, M.A., Fellow of Brasenose College. So far as is consistent with the proposals submitted by the College and the Oxford University Commission.  
 Wm. Stoelser, M.A., Fellow of Brasenose.  
 C. B. Heberden, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Brasenose.  
 Charles A. Whitluck, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose.  
 Richard Lodge, B.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Brasenose.  
 W. H. Pater, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose College.  
 T. H. Ward, M.A., Tutor, late Fellow of Brasenose College.  
 R. H. M. Bosanquet, Fellow of St. John's College.  
 T. C. Snow, Fellow of St. John's.  
 F. A. Clarke, Fellow of Corpus Christi College.  
 T. S. Osmond, M.A., St. John's College.  
 E. W. Symons, B.A., Fereday Fellow of St. John's.  
 John Griffiths, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Jesus College.  
 E. R. Marton, M.A., Lecturer and late Fellow of Jesus.  
 J. R. Illingworth, M.A., Fellow of Jesus, Tutor of Keble.  
 John Rhys, M.A., Professor of Celtic, hon. Fellow of Jesus.  
 W. Hawker Hughes, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Jesus.  
 Edward B. Poulton, M.A., Jesus College.  
 David E. Ritchie, B.A., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Jesus College.  
 W. E. V. Collins, M.A., Jesus College.  
 Bartholomew Price, M.A., F.R.S., Fellow of Pembroke College and Sedleian Professor of Natural Philosophy.  
 Charles Lewesdorf, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke.  
 A. T. Barton, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College.

John. C. G. Mowat, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College.	Carteret J. H. Fletcher, M.A., Worcester College.
J. Barclay Thompson, M.A., Senior Student and Lee's Reader in Anatomy, Christ Church.	Charles J. Faulkner, M.A., University College.
J. A. Stewart, M.A., Lecturer at Christ Church, late Senior Student.	William Markby, D.C.L., Reader in Indian Law.
Robert E. Baynes, M.A., Senior Student of Christ Church and Lee's Reader in Physics.	James Legge, M.A., LL.D., Corpus Christi College, Professor of Chinese.
A. Vernon Harcourt, M.A., Senior Student of Christ Church and Lee's Reader in Chemistry.	F. Max Müller, All Souls College, Professor of Comparative Philology.
A. H. D. Acland, M.A., Junior Student at Christ Church.	H. G. Wood, M.A., Tutor and late Fellow of Trinity.
T. York Powell, M.A., Law Lecturer of Christ Church.	Franklin T. Rickards, M.A., Lecturer and late Fellow of Trinity.
S. J. Owen, M.A., Reader in Indian History.	St. George Stock, M.A., Pembroke College.
Reginald W. Macan, M.A., Senior Student and Tutor, Christ Church.	Edward Purcell, B.C.L., Lincoln College.

---

[APPENDIX B.]

MEMORIAL TO MR. GLADSTONE.

*CLERICAL RESTRICTIONS AT THE UNIVERSITIES.*

---

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P., FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY, ETC.

WE the undersigned beg to express an earnest hope that Her Majesty's Government will afford their support to the following Resolution, which will be submitted to the House of Commons by Mr. ROUNDALL, on the 9th of July:—

“That this House, while fully recognising the obligation to make provision for the due fulfilment of the requisitions of Sections 5 and 6 of ‘The Universities Tests Act, 1871’ (relating to religious instruction, and to morning and evening prayer in Colleges), deems it inexpedient that, save in the case of the Deanery of Christchurch, any clerical restriction shall remain, or be attached to, any Headship or Fellowship in any College of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.”

And that they will also support the following addition to such Resolution, to be proposed by Mr. BRYCE:—

“Or to the professorships of Hebrew and Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and the professorship of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge.”

When the Universities Tests Abolition Bill of 1871 was before Parliament, it was only by small majorities that proposals for the abolition of clerical Headships and Fellowships were rejected; one reason assigned for the opposition of the then Government to the proposal being that a Commission would probably be appointed to examine the whole question of the tenure of Fellowship and College offices. When, in 1877, the Bill for the appointment of Commissioners, with power to make Statutes for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the Colleges therein, was brought in (by the Conservative Government), clauses providing for the abolition of clerical restrictions were rejected by the small majorities of nine, and twenty-two; notwithstanding the opposition of the Government, with its normally large majority.

At the present time, it is believed that in some of the Colleges the strong representations of the College authorities have induced the Commissioners to virtually assent to the abolition of the restriction, in the case of both the Headship and the Fellowships. It is, however, understood that in other Colleges the clerical Headship will be retained, and that there will be a reduction only in the number of the clerical Fellowships.

The Statutes have not yet been settled for the whole of the Colleges, and none of the Statutes will have force until they have been laid before Parliament. We are therefore desirous that, while the negotiations between the Colleges and the Commissioners are still in progress, there should be an expression of opinion on the part of the newly elected House of Commons that the principle of the Universities Tests Act of 1871 should be fully recognized by the Commissioners.

We are also of opinion that no sufficient reason can be advanced why the Chairs of Hebrew and of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, and of Hebrew at Cambridge, should be filled only by clergymen of the Church of England, or ministers of any religious body, and that, in the interest of learning, and even of religion, as well as on the ground of justice, these Professorships should be thrown open to laymen.

We desire to call your special attention to the fact that Mr. ROUNDELL'S Motion fully respects the compromise, in regard to religious instruction and worship in the Colleges, upon which the Universities Tests Abolition Act was based; it being understood to be practicable to make provision for such instruction and worship without the retention of the existing system of clerical Fellowships.

June, 1880.

*Note.*—To the above Memorial about 850 signatures were attached, including men of eminence in literature and science, a large number of Members of the House of Commons, of the Principals and Professors of Colleges and educational establishments in England, Wales, and Scotland, and of persons occupying an official position. The majority are graduates of various Universities, and, although many Nonconformist names are included, the Memorial is of a general, rather than of a Nonconformist, character.

### [APPENDIX C.]

OXFORD.				CAMBRIDGE.			
I. <i>Matriculations.</i>				I. <i>Matriculations.</i>			
1851*	..	..	359	1850	..	..	441
1879	..	..	798	1879	..	..	865
Or more than double since 1851.				Or nearly double since 1850.			
II. <i>Total Number of Undergraduates.</i>				II. <i>Total Number of Undergraduates.</i>			
1852	..	..	1,484	1856	..	..	1,569
1879	..	..	2,814	1880	..	..	2,653
Or an increase of nearly 90 per cent.				Or an increase of 69 per cent.			
III. <i>Honours in the Final Examinations.</i>				III. <i>Honours in the Final Examinations.</i>			
For the period	1856-1860	..	690	1856	..	..	216
„	„	1875-1879	1,531	1879-80	..	..	273
Or an increase of nearly 122 per cent. But the latter period includes 212 Honours in the School of Theology, which came into operation in the year 1875.				Or an increase of 26 per cent.			

\* This year is taken because it precedes the late legislative changes, and also the Crimean War, when the number of Matriculations largely decreased.









