





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

✓

From the Recd. of

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

A LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT HON. & RIGHT REV.

THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON,

IN REPLY TO THE ARTICLE

IN

No. CLXXII. OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW,

ENTITLED

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

BY

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M.A.

CHAPLAIN OF LINCOLN'S INN.

LONDON:

JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

MDCCL.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY SAVILL AND EDWARDS, CHANDOS STREET,
COVENT GARDEN.

TO THE
RIGHT HON. AND RIGHT REVEREND
THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

MY LORD,

I am very unwilling to intrude upon your lordship at any time; I am especially loth to do so at this time, when your lordship's thoughts must be occupied with questions deeply affecting the interests and prospects of the English Church. But as a bishop must be always anxious that no false or mischievous teaching should go on in his diocese, so I conceive that a moment like the present is one in which he would be most feelingly alive to the existence of any wrong influence which he could prevent, or even to any suspicions of such influence in the public mind. It is not that I may add to your lordship's manifold causes of trouble, but in the hope of diminishing some of them, that I venture to address you on the subject of an article which has appeared in the last number of the *Quarterly Review*.

This article is headed 'QUEEN'S COLLEGE, LONDON.' It purports to be a notice of several books, especially of certain Introductory Lectures, which were delivered in Harley-street about two years ago. The institution called Queen's College is intended for the education of young ladies generally—

of governesses especially. The reviewer approves of its object, and thinks its mechanical arrangements creditable. He makes no complaint of the professors generally; the majority of them he seems to think are doing their work well. But he selects passages from the Introductory Lectures of four of the clerical professors, which prove, he intimates, that *their* influence is anything but salutary. From some of these passages he deduces inferences unfavourable to the orthodoxy of the writers; all of them, he believes, indicate a tone of feeling which must produce very evil effects if it is imparted to their pupils.

I, my lord, am one of these clerical professors. The extracts from which the most offensive conclusions are drawn are found in my Lectures. I gave the lecture which laid down the plan upon which the college would be conducted; I opened the theological course. I also wrote the preface to the volume which is reviewed. I explained, indeed, in that preface, that the sentiments of the particular writers had not been altered or remoulded to suit the notions of the editor; but if I had considered any of those sentiments dangerous, I was bound to state my conviction to the writers, and I am quite sure that they would have been only too ready to make the changes or omissions which I might have suggested. I am, therefore, responsible for my colleagues as well as for myself.

My lord, I am very thankful that a popular Review has thought that the offences of professors in a college established for young women must be serious offences, and deserving of serious animadversion. It is a good sign that so much importance should be attached to the right or wrong management of an institution which might, which probably a few years ago would, have been treated with mere levity and contempt.

Neither then nor now should we look for any such treatment from your lordship. You must have known always—every new year must deepen the conviction—that a good or bad discipline bestowed upon the wives or mothers of Englishmen, must be felt ultimately by the whole church, and the whole of society. On such a ground, were there no other, I might bespeak your lordship's earnest attention to the education of Queen's College. But there is another and more obvious reason for troubling your lordship with the present letter. I am not only a teacher once a week in Queen's College—I am a teacher nearly every day in the week in King's College. By the appointment and under the direction of the council of which your lordship is chairman, I am directing the studies of the members of the general department of that college in English literature and history, and the studies of those who belong to the theological department in ecclesiastical history. It cannot be supposed that I change my tone and habit of speaking when I go from Harley-street to the Strand. If I am giving false and mischievous instruction in one place, I certainly shall in the other. If I am doing what in me lies to corrupt the minds of those who will be hereafter English wives and mothers, I shall also be doing what in me lies to corrupt the minds of those who will be hereafter English citizens and clergymen. Your lordship has therefore the most direct interest in attending to the evidence upon which so awful a charge rests.

My lord, there are some persons I know who would exclaim, when they read the article in the *Quarterly Review*, 'Let us have some more definite charges against these professors: mere inferences and arguments about *tones* and *tendencies* may lead to the most unfair and unrighteous decisions.' Undoubtedly they may; I think I shall be able to show your

lordship that undoubtedly they *will*, if the cognizance of these tones and tendencies is left to mere anonymous tribunals. But however difficult it may be to form a quite fair opinion upon such charges, it is useless and absurd to demur to the charges themselves. Every one will try to arrive at a conclusion, not merely respecting the words of a teacher, but respecting the spirit of his words—respecting his inward mind and intention. I would respectfully ask your lordship to consider the passages which the Quarterly reviewer has produced out of our Lectures, and which I shall quote one by one, just as he has quoted them, with this especial view. I do not ask that I may not be condemned if they are found to contain no tangible, palpable heresy; I ask that they may be weighed and considered with all the additional disadvantage which they may derive from the comments of the reviewer, and I beg your lordship, having done so, to pass judgment—of course, upon the direct words which are presented to you, but also—upon their purport, and upon the probable character of the teaching of which they are produced as instances. Two remarks only I would make, that our case may be fairly tried. The first is, that an introductory lecture, while it is in some respects the best fitted to exhibit the general objects and character of the professor, and is published for that reason, yet, being addressed to a general audience, may be expected to be more superficial and more ornate than his lectures to his ordinary class will be. Next, I would submit to your lordship, that, as the passages which the reviewer has produced have been carefully culled out of a volume consisting of more than 350 pages, by a writer who does not conceal his purpose of presenting all that he conceives most disadvantageous to our character, and nothing

of the opposite kind (*Quarterly Review*, No. 172, p. 382), it is fair to assume that little very offensive remains behind. We shall not be treated, I do not say kindly—we do not beg for kindness—but justly, if it is said of our accuser—

‘This honest creature doubtless
Sees and knows more, much more than he unfolds.’

If his picked passages do not convict us of the crimes which he wishes to bring home to us, it is not likely that the context of these passages would be more damnatory. I say this, however, my lord, merely to avoid the constructions of persons who will not read these lectures, and who habitually give reviewers credit for the good faith which they deny to authors. If your lordship had time to peruse the whole of the lectures from which these sentences are taken, I should be far better pleased.

The first charge which is brought against us is founded upon the following passage of my lecture at the opening of the college:—

‘This is our plan, which we have adopted, because we think it is the best; not because we wish to escape from difficulties which another might have involved. We do not ask you not to suspect us of wrong religious sentiments because we profess only to teach the Bible. If you have not confidence in us on other grounds, you will be very foolish to give it us on that ground. We *may* teach anything we please under the name and cover of the Holy Book; we *shall* teach whatever we think necessary for the illustration of it, without asking who are hearing us, or what their previous conclusions on the subject may be. We cannot please all. God forbid that we should make it our object to please any.

‘I make this remark in reference to one department of the College; it applies equally to all. The teacher in every department, if he does his duty, will admonish his pupils, that they are not to make fashion, or public opinion, their rule; that they are not to draw or play, or to study Arithmetic, or Language, or Literature, or History, in order to shine or be admired; that if these are their ends, they will not be

sincere in their work, or do it well. If you teach them otherwise at home, we shall try to counteract your influence; we *must* counteract it so far as our lessons are honest. But if we preach this doctrine, we should conform to it. We must not, by our acts, confess that public opinion is our master, and that we are its slaves. Colleges for men and women in a great city exist to testify that Opinion is not the God they ought to worship. All hints from those who send their children to us, or even from lookers-on, may do us good; just as much good, or more, when they are ill-natured, as when they are civil. We have asked a body of Ladies* to become visitors of our College; they have kindly promised to communicate between the teachers of it, and the guardians of its pupils. If they ever chance to hear anything favourable of us they may keep it to themselves; all complaints and censures we should wish to be informed of. But we do not promise to shape our course according to the suggestions we shall receive; we shall be glad to improve our practice every day, not to alter our principle. We have considered it, and mean, with God's help, to act upon it. And if any one should tell me, 'Such notions are absurd; if the world agrees to avail itself of your lessons, it will demand your homage; it will insist upon your following its maxims'—I shall not attempt to combat an opinion grounded, it would appear, upon a knowledge of English Society, to which I make no pretension; I shall merely answer, 'If this College cannot stand upon the condition of its teachers continuing to be honest men, by all means let it fall.'

Upon this passage the reviewer remarks:—

'In reply to this observation, we may remind Mr. Maurice that almost every form of error has been taught by 'honest men,' if by honesty is meant a firm conviction that they were teaching truth; so that the mere honesty of the Professor is no security at all; and if error ever does come to be taught by them, public opinion will have a perfect right to step in and insist, not on the teacher altering his belief, or advocating doctrines he does not hold, but on the teacher himself being changed. Mr. Maurice's mode of reasoning would be all very well if this were a mere private establishment. Had he and his colleagues simply agreed among themselves to open classes, and give lectures in a house of their own, they would have been at full liberty to say, 'Such and such are our views and doctrines—come to

* Among these ladies we have the high honour and privilege of reckoning one whose life has been devoted to earnest and successful efforts for the instruction of both sexes and all ages—Mrs. Marcet.

us or not, as you please ;' and parents must then have judged for themselves, and acted on their own responsibility. But Queen's College is a public institution, supported by public subscriptions,* incorporated,—as they take care to tell us in every prospectus—by Royal Charter, and bearing its name by Royal permission ; going forth, therefore, to the world with the highest sanction in the realm.'

You will see at once, my lord, what the reviewer imputes to me as the intent or hidden meaning of this passage. He feels himself bound to 'remind' me, that 'almost every form of error has been taught by honest men, if by honesty is meant,' &c. Of course, he wishes his readers to understand that this is a fact which I am especially prone to forget—that I understand by truth only sincerity of conviction. This is the inference which he deduces from the words of my lecture. Now, then, we shall have an opportunity of testing his capacity for arriving at the tone, or tendency, or intent of the language which he criticises. I am very thankful, indeed, that at the outset of the inquiry we should have so satisfactory a one.

I was afraid that those who heard me should put confidence in our theological teaching, because I professed to teach the Bible. I said, I might teach anything I pleased under the cover of the Holy Book. I expressly warned them that I might impart error, not only while I was putting forth my own convictions, but while I was professing to comment upon the word of truth. I besought them to examine in other ways whether we were competent to teach their children or not, before

* The reviewer here introduces a note, in which he informs his readers that the fees of the pupils are paid to the professors; that out of this sum the professors, in 1848, presented £100 to the parent Society; that this was purely gratuitous, and is not to be looked for again. An absolutely false statement. The professors regularly pay £20 per cent. on all the fees they receive to the Governesses' Benevolent Society.

they trusted their children to us. Why did I do this? Because, my lord, I knew that some who might hear or read my lecture would say, ‘This is liberal; he meets us on a common ground; he does not insist upon creeds or catechisms; he lectures us out of the book which all Christians receive.’ This might be said—I had every reason to believe it was likely to be said. And I knew that if people came to me with that impression, I should be cheating them. I might not be teaching them out of the Creed or the Catechism; but I should be teaching them the things which the Creed and the Catechism had taught me. I have solemnly declared that I find what they teach in the Scriptures. I know that I have arrived at more apprehension of the Scriptures through their help, than by any other help whatever. I, therefore, was bound to tell my hearers and readers, not to give me any credit on the score of my only teaching the Bible; but to consider what I was—what my position bound me to; and if that did not satisfy them, and they thought it worth the trouble, to look into the books which I had written, that they might see whether I attached less importance to the Creed and the Catechism than other people did—whether there was not reason to suspect that I put a somewhat stricter meaning on them than many did. I was bound to set them upon making this inquiry beforehand; because I went on to tell them, for myself and for my colleagues, that when they had once done so, they must take us for better for worse; that we could not change our principles and modes of acting to please them; that we believed we should be utterly unfaithful to our trust, and utterly dishonest men, if we did so. It is because I took up this ground, my lord, that the reviewer thinks it necessary to remind me, that almost every form of error has been taught by honest men.

But this passage of his article is too valuable to be at once dismissed. He has tried to arrive at a knowledge of *my* tone of thinking. I shall take the liberty of examining for a moment into *his*. See, my lord, what a notion he has of the obligations of an English clergyman. If we had opened ‘a private establishment,’ we might have taught what we liked. Could we, indeed? What!—we, who have declared solemnly that we hold such and such things to be true, and such and such things to be false!—we may teach anything we please in ‘a house of our own!’ It makes all the difference that we are in a public establishment—that we are under the operation of a charter—that we have been permitted to call ourselves Queen’s College. *What* difference, my lord? We are responsible to God; we, who are clergymen in your lordship’s diocese, are responsible to you. I am responsible to you in a double character. I hope to show you before I close, that the whole college, instead of shrinking from the same responsibility, seeks it. But the reviewer means, if he means anything which bears upon my words, that we are responsible to the public, and that, because we are not a private establishment, we must adapt our teaching to the notions of the public. Now, precisely the objection which we make to ‘private establishments’ is, that they do adapt their teaching to the notions and tastes of those on whom they are dependent for support; for that reason we say they teach, and must teach, badly. Precisely what we hold, that we are pledged to by our name, is, that we will not give such instruction to the Queen’s subjects as our pupils prescribe, or their parents prescribe, or the reviewers and newspapers which guide their parents, prescribe. For if we do so, we know, my lord, that we shall give instruction which is false and mischievous, and that God will require the souls

of those whom we have sacrificed to the tastes of other masters than Him, at our hands. Therefore, I said, my lord—and I say again—if our college can only stand upon this condition, it stands upon the condition of our not being honest men, and therefore, by all means, let it fall.

I pass to the next charge:—

‘We shall merely throw out a few passing observations; to do more would be stepping beyond our province, which is to invite the attention of higher censors. But this we must say, with deep regret, that we think no critic can fail to detect in this volume traces of a school of so-called *Theology*, which seems to be gaining ground among us—a sort of modified Pantheism and Latitudinarianism—a system of not bringing religion into everything, but of considering everything as more or less inherently religious, which is near akin to—and in its results will be found to be so—abnegating the proper idea of religion.’

My lord, the object of the reviewer is to invite the ‘attention of higher censors’ to this accusation. That is my object also. I solemnly conjure your lordship to look carefully, earnestly, severely, into the evidence which the anonymous critic has produced to convict us—of modified Pantheism and Latitudinarianism. I thank God, my lord, that your lordship knows what these words mean, that they will not be to you mere idle phrases which a man may cast at his neighbour just when he pleases, but the signs of very portentous realities, upon which the history of every age in the church has thrown light. Yet I doubt whether even your lordship, though you may know much more of the import of these words than we, with our smattering of theological knowledge, know of them, can quite as much feel the bitterness of this charge—the intense bitterness of it—as some of us, your lordship’s juniors, feel it. For, my lord, it is this very Pantheism with which we, in our time, have to wrestle, which we feel is assaulting us on all sides,—assaulting us—let me say it at

once boldly—nowhere more than in the phraseology and habits of thinking of that religious fashionable world, of which this reviewer is the spokesman, and by the maxims of which he would have us regulate our thoughts and our education. My lord, I can say for myself, and with as much confidence for those colleagues whom the reviewer has assailed, that if there is one object which we have especially kept before us in all our public discourses, in all our attempts to instruct the young of either sex, it is to encounter that disease which we know to be the disease of the time,—that which we are sure is floating in the air, and will infect every heart that is not protected against it by a far mightier power than ours. To be the instruments in God's hands for keeping from it a few of that sex whose influence must tell most powerfully upon ours—this, I am certain, has been the especial aim which the clerical lecturers at Queen's College have proposed to themselves. How have we attempted to accomplish this aim? In the first place, my lord, we have asserted a distinct and substantive position for Theology. We have refused to identify the words *theology* and *religion*, because we wished it to be understood that we considered the revelation of a living, personal God to man as altogether distinct from the mere feelings and instincts in the minds of men respecting God. We have perceived a continual tendency in the religious public to confound these things together, to put the experiences, emotions, sentiments of their souls, in place of the objects which God presents to our faith. A mere violent dogmatical resistance to this tendency we have not found to be effectual; those who merely oppose dry authoritative propositions to the subjectivity of their pupils, find it too much for them; the female mind, especially, if,

through desire of guidance, it yields for awhile to decrees, soon creates some image for itself to worship, and compels its teacher to sanction and legalize the idolatry. Our second great desire, therefore, has been to present the Revelation of God to those who learn from us, as the Bible presents it, in a living history, to set forth Him to them as the Bible sets Him forth, livingly, personally; not as an abstraction; not by those words and names which the religious fashion of our day recognises; such as 'the Deity,' 'the Divinity,' 'Omnipotence,' 'Providence.' In these phrases, when they are substituted for that name which we ask may be hallowed, we see the germ of all Pantheism; whoever habitually, and by preference, resorts to them, is clearly a Pantheist in *posse*, if not in *esse*. For surely, my lord, such phrases awaken no reverence; they suggest the thought of a natural, not of a moral being: of a power, not of righteousness. There is no sense of evil which meets them in the conscience, there is no unsatisfied yearning which responds to them in the heart. And yet, as your lordship knows well, such phrases occur continually in the most religious writings of our day, and are cheerfully adopted by those who not only do not suspect themselves, but who habitually accuse others of 'modified Pantheism.'

But if we follow the Bible history, we must look upon the revelation of God in a Man as that which makes all the events that went before it intelligible, and as the basis of all that follow it. To bring forth this truth in its fulness, we have considered, my lord, our next great duty as Christian teachers. We could not, we conceived, do this if we merely spoke of the incarnation as part of a scheme of Divinity; if it is that, it must be more; it must be the very ground of human life and human history. That it has not

been presented to men or women in that way, was the cause, we conceive, that history in the eighteenth century became so irreligious, and is the cause that history in the nineteenth century has become religious without becoming Christian—that which is written with a professedly religious purpose consisting merely of commentaries upon facts, and inferences from them, as if the facts could not be trusted to speak for themselves, and of judgments—often most unrighteous judgments—upon our fellow men in different ages—that which is written by philosophers recognising fully and emphatically the worth of all religious feelings and sentiments, but regarding them merely as the products of the human mind, and as belonging to particular ages. How utterly powerless the first of these classes of works, my lord, are to counteract what is wrong in the latter,—how much that wrong is strengthened by all attempts to suppress facts, or to call names, I believe every one who has anything to do with the youth of this time must be aware. How much the plain, manful proclamation of the Son of God and the Son of man, as the real king and centre of human society, does explain the facts, does help those who make it to do justice to the imperfect views of different ages, while they feel most keenly their corruption and wrong; to deal more fairly with the convictions of individuals, than the most tolerant of modern philosophers, while they protest more strongly against their denials and their sins than the most self-righteous pharisee, I am sure we shall one day, my lord, discover, if male or female education is to become really Christian education, if it is not to be a means of separating the present from the past, and the future from both. At all events, my lord, this has been our purpose, which we have distinctly, deliberately set before ourselves, however imperfectly we may have attained it.

But this faith, my lord, cannot be merely exhibited in our teaching of history. If the Son of God has indeed taken the nature of man, we must, I conceive, attach a significance to all the thoughts and acts of men which otherwise would not belong to them. We find that in our old English education, great prominence is given to the study of heathen books. Whether that prominence is too great I do not now inquire; but I cannot believe that Christian men would have established and sanctioned, from generation to generation, that study, unless they had seen in it something which belonged to our character as Christians. Without copying a practice which would not be serviceable to female education, we may adopt the principle on which it is founded. We may declare that all human utterances have a very solemn meaning, because man is a spiritual being, endued with spiritual powers, and intended for a spiritual kingdom. In doing so, are we falling into the intellectual worship of our time? No, my lord, we are taking what seems to us the one successful method of counteracting it. That worship, we believe, has been promoted—very greatly promoted—by the language in which religious men have spoken of the soul, glorifying a word, which, as your lordship knows so well, is not often used in the New Testament, is commonly identified with animal life, is certainly opposed by St. Paul to that which is spiritual. My lord, I do not think religious teachers know the miseries which they sometimes cause by their carelessness of Scripture example in reference to this word, and the ideas which it imports. They tell young men and women to think of their souls, when, surely, the Bible would tell them to think of God. The soul is for a time identified in their minds with the conscience, or rather, with the mere sense of evil in the conscience. So long it seems to them the centre of

all corruption and depravity. But they lose their more lively impressions on this subject; they go forth—their parents send them forth—to receive the cultivation of schools or colleges. They find capacities in their souls of which they never dreamed: they read books which call forth those capacities, and which show them that men living a thousand years ago have been conscious of the same, and have exhibited them. They regarded the soul before as an object of morbid contemplation; they begin to regard it as an object of worship. Parents are struck with the extraordinary revolution; they are terrified by it, as they well may be;

‘Miranturque novas frondes et non’—

My lord, can I finish the quotation? Are they *not sua poma*? Can they deny that they have sown the seed of which these are the natural fruits? Can they fairly say, ‘you masters of schools and colleges have perverted the minds of our children, have made them into infidels?’ Did not they fail to speak the truth at first, to give their children that information respecting their own spiritual condition, as children of God, which would have enabled them to bear the discovery that now bursts upon them and overwhelms them? But, whether it be so or not, the duty of us, who are teachers of schools or colleges, is not less clear. We are bound in the sight of God to tell them what we believe to be true. We are not to hide from them the fact that there are such powers, or to prevent them from seeing how they have manifested themselves in the books of these or of former days. We are to tell them that these powers are there, because God created man in his image, that they can be truly exercised only when man claims his position as a creature restored in the image of the Son. On this principle

we have thought it our business to make literature, not a plaything for holiday afternoons, but a serious work, which those who enter upon it at all are to enter upon as persons who are studying in God's sight. In an article, the first in this number of the *Quarterly Review*, on Giacomo Leopardi, the effects of the opposite course to this upon a man of high genius, are pointed out with wonderful power and truth. There are passages in that melancholy and noble biography which express the very spirit we desire to embody in our teaching at Queen's College.

What I have said about the loose phraseology which the 'religious public' sanctions on the very highest subjects, leads to the next aim of our instructions.

Latitudinarianism is associated by the reviewer with 'modified Pantheism.' We have felt the connexion, my lord. We have felt that vagueness in thought and vagueness in expression are closely, inseparably connected. We have felt that both kinds of vagueness have increased, and are increasing; and that education, if it is good for anything, ought to diminish them. Therefore, my lord, we have thought that the study of words—of language—was one of the most important and necessary of all studies. We have believed, as our fathers believed before us, that it is a peculiarly sacred study—that without it no other can be pursued successfully—that theology, especially, becomes feeble and incoherent if it has not this ally. Females, it seemed to us, had been most unfairly robbed of this precious culture; therefore, they were exposed more than others to all assaults of sophistry and Latitudinarianism; therefore, what was deepest and most precious in their minds had not been awakened; therefore, they especially were liable to become frivolous in their daily occupations—frivolous in their

literature — frivolous in their science — frivolous in their religion. We are certain, from the noble examples in our own and other days, that this is no necessary condition of their minds—that if they yield to it, we are chiefly to blame. As we have desired to counteract it in our lessons respecting theology, and words, and literature, so also we have felt that precisely the same effort must be carried into the teaching of physical sciences and of accomplishments. We dare not separate these pursuits from the others in our course. If truth is not to be sought, if God is not to be honoured, in them, they ought not to be a part of the discipline of Christian women. But how is truth to be sought, how is God to be honoured in them? Not, surely, by some artificial and irreverent introduction of religious phrases and topics into them, but by inculcating the uniform habitual belief that this universe is God's, that all our powers and faculties of every kind are God's; that He wills us to know the laws of His universe; that the knowledge of them is to be sought in the same humble, self-suspecting, patient temper, which is required for attaining the knowledge of himself, and of his inmost mind; that He makes known the secrets of his creation to those who in this spirit inquire after them; that we hold every energy and capacity as a trust from Him; that it is a violation of His commands to engage in any study, as if it were not a godly study, to do any work which we cannot do earnestly and with our hearts.

My lord, it is very easy to make a statement of our views, like that which I have just made. The question is whether it is borne out by our practice. The chief means by which I propose at present to try that question is by producing the passages upon which the Quarterly reviewer has

grounded the charges of ‘modified Pantheism and Latitudinarianism.’ I say boldly that each one of these passages is consistent with the account I have given; does indicate precisely the tone which I have said pervades these Lectures. I say as confidently that not one of those passages—even severed from its context, much more viewed in its context—could receive the colouring which the Reviewer has given it, except from a reader who had a very considerable amount of ‘modified Pantheism and Latitudinarianism’ in his own mind. I proceed to the evidence.

The first passages bearing upon the subject are two which the reviewer has taken from my lecture at the opening of the college, and from a lecture of my valued friend, Mr. Strettell, on the English language.

Mine is as follows:—

‘We look upon all the studies of which I have spoken as religious; all as concerned with the life and acts of a spiritual creature; not to be contemplated out of their relation to such a creature. We look upon them all as tending to the cultivation of reverent feeling; all as tending to lead the pupils from shadows and semblances to realities.’

This is the ground for the charge that ‘we abnegate the proper idea of religion,’ because ‘we consider everything as more or less inherently religious.’ I ask your lordship first to reflect upon what I have said upon this subject, then to compare it with the reviewer’s theory of my intention; lastly to recollect that these words immediately precede his quotation—‘The last subject in our list is theology. We would have avoided a hard word if we could; but if we had substituted religion for theology we should have misrepresented our whole scheme;’ and that these immediately follow his quotation—‘By theology we mean something special and definite; we mean what the word expresses, that which is directly concerned with God and His relation to

man.' I do not complain of the omission of these words by my critic. Those which he has quoted are sufficiently intelligible. But it proves that the reviewer does not admit the distinction between theology and religion; that the last phrase, with all its subjective associations, stands in his mind in place of that, which in my judgment, expresses what is definite and special—a direct relation of God to man. I leave your lordship to judge on whose side is the modified Pantheism.

This is the extract from Mr. Strettell:—

'Do not think it strange if I touch upon higher and holier subjects; for I want you to perceive that the study of language has a distinctly religious element: we all want you to feel that if your course here is to be one not merely of instruction but of education, there is not one of the subjects in which you are instructed which must not, more or less directly, bear upon religion.'

Mr. Strettell has here embodied in what seem to me very clear and beautiful words, the spirit which characterised the whole of our old English education. The sacredness of language—the religious element in language—is precisely that which justifies the importance given to philological training in our schools and universities. To the neglect of that philological training, to the notion that it is to be preserved for some lower or secondary end, I believe we owe the loose theology of our young men. Mr. Strettell wishes to save our young women from that danger. The reviewer ridicules and denounces the attempt. Which, my lord, is fighting the battle of Latitudinarianism? Which is seeking for the old paths? Which is defending a deviation from them?

The next passage is drawn from my Lecture on Theology.

'If then I am asked to acknowledge that all peoples, however little they know of the Bible, may have had a Religion or a Theology, I acknowledge it instantly; if I am told that this Religion or Theology

had very much to do with the stars, the Earth, the seasons, the phenomena of Nature, and its regular course, I say, Nothing is more certain; if I am told that these different thoughts of men are worthy of the deepest study, I have not the slightest wish to dissent. And if, further, any one likes to call this Religion or Theology *Natural*, though I think the phrase is not perhaps the best, or at least requires some further explanations, I should yet not strongly object. But if it is said that there was no revelation contained or implied in this Theology, I should consider the very facts to which I have alluded as all leading to the opposite conclusion.'

My lord, I am quite aware that the formal distinction of 'natural and revealed religion,' is one which received the sanction of writers in the last century, to whom I bow with the profoundest reverence; to whom I feel a gratitude which I cannot easily express. As that distinction—though not older, I believe, or much older than that century—has come down to our own, and has become one of our theological commonplaces, I feel that I am acting boldly in throwing it aside, even though it be for the purpose of returning to a more ancient form of speech, resting, I believe, on still higher authority. Why have I been guilty of that boldness? Precisely from my dread—my nervous dread, it may be—of Pantheism. Precisely, because I do see in the kind of force which is given to the word Nature, in our phrase, 'natural theology,' the germ of much Pantheism. Precisely, because I believe if Butler and his great contemporaries had been called to encounter the kind of infidelity which we are called to encounter, they would have deliberated long before they set their stamp upon a method which certainly has led many into a notion that we do by searching find out God in Nature, and then into a very fearful confusion of God with Nature. I believe, my lord, that no man has taught me more than Butler himself to reject his own phrase. No one has shown me that God, even

our God, the Righteous Ruler, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is speaking to us, revealing himself to us in the whole economy of the natural world. Yet I could not fairly have justified my language, in a general lecture, by a deduction from the writings of him or any other man, when it was at variance, I knew, with their ordinary usage. I felt that it stood upon deeper ground. I might have defended it abundantly by quotations from the most eminent teachers of the church in different ages. How I *did* defend it, your lordship will understand from the following passage occurring in the next page to that which the reviewer has quoted.

‘St. Paul tells us expressly, in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, ‘That which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath shown or revealed it to them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are visible, even his eternal power and Godhead.’ And the Psalmist had said long before, ‘There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard.’’

I have vindicated myself, my lord, from a charge of presumption, to which I felt that I was open. I must now refer to the charges of the reviewer.

‘According to the view given in this lecture (see the whole passage, pp. 248—252, I beseech your lordship to see it) the difference between the religion of the heathen and that of the christian consists not in the one being true and the other false, but only in the greater unfolding of truth in the one case than in the other; and the grand object in both alike is, an ignorant creature to be taught, not a guilty creature to be reconciled.’

My lord, my difference with the reviewer consists in this point simply, that I adhere to the language of the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, (which I have quoted,) and that *he rejects it*. I use the words emphatically, I ask your lordship to weigh them. St. Paul says that God did

manifest His power and godhead to the heathen, in the things that are seen. His power and godhead, I conceive, are true, not false. St. Paul goes on to explain that the falsehood of the religion of the heathen consisted in their not liking to retain that God in their knowledge, who so revealed Himself,—in their worshipping Him after the likeness of four-footed beasts and creeping things; in their worshipping and serving the creature more than the Creator. Therefore he says, ‘They were given over to a reprobate mind.’ Here was sin, here was the need of forgiveness and reconciliation. And because I adhere too strictly, too severely, it may be, to this apostolic language and teaching, because I speak of God as revealing Himself in nature, and as revealing Himself perfectly in His only begotten Son, as the Redeemer and Reconciler, instead of speaking of a Christian religion—a phrase much more palatable to the natural heart and to the pride of intellect—a phrase infinitely more in favour with Pantheists, modified and unmodified—the reviewer intimates that I do not look upon the Gospel as proclaiming the reconciliation of guilty creatures to God! I will make no comments, I leave them to your lordship.

Next, a passage is quoted from a lecture of Mr. Nicolay’s, to show ‘how sacred truth is mixed up with scientific knowledge; or, rather, how their relative position and comparative value are confounded.’

The passage stands thus:—

‘The observation so recently made in this place—that the ancients obtained their scientific knowledge by process of reasoning without observation—while it was held to account for their errors, was in some degree considered as to their credit. I should be the last to question or perhaps to limit, the mental powers of the giants of those days; but I must ever consider the insufficient result of their labours in

this, as in all other things, as an illustration of that of which St. Paul speaks, when he says :—‘ In the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God :’—the simple practical method of observation wanting, they were as far from truth in many things, as if they had wanted that wisdom for which we admire and venerate them.’

One is anxious to know what meaning the reviewer put upon these words, which can bear out his charge. Did he suppose that Mr. Nicolay meant that the knowledge of God is attained by sensible observation, and that the ancients wanted it because they did not employ the method of sensible observation? That would have been a blasphemous statement, and also a nonsensical one; for so far as the ancients were idolaters, they used their senses as a means of attaining divine knowledge more than we do. But it would not have been confounding scientific knowledge and sacred truth. It would have been simply setting both aside. No school of scientific men—Christians or Pantheists—could have tolerated it. The reviewer, therefore, did not *suppose* this to be the purpose of the lecturer. But if it was not this, it must have been just the opposite of this. The lecturer knew that the father of experimental philosophy had started from the principle that we must stoop to Nature, in order to conquer her—that we must divest ourselves of anticipations and preconceptions, that we may receive that which she teaches us of herself. Now, that which Bacon laid down as the method by which all sound physical knowledge must be attained, Mr. Nicolay believed had been laid down sixteen centuries before, as the method by which all spiritual knowledge must be attained. Because the philosophers of old had trusted to their own reasonings, the lecturer says that, though giants, they missed divine, as well as physical wisdom. Does the reviewer mean to deny that these philosophers

failed to attain the knowledge of physics, because they could not give up their wisdom and become little children? Then he is at issue, not with Mr. Nicolay, but with Lord Bacon. Does he mean to deny that they failed to attain the knowledge of God, because they would not give up their wisdom, and become as little children? Then he is at issue, not with Mr. Nicolay, but with St. Paul. Or does he mean that the foundations of our faith are not as fixed and real as the foundations of the physical universe? Then it is idle for him to talk of 'sacred truth.' Truth is with him that which he, the *Quarterly reviewer*, troweth.

Once again, my lord, I come under the reviewer's lash, and on the following ground:

'Every doctrine which has been a solace to the poor, or strength to the martyr; which explains how men are united to God, and to each other; which sets forth the mystery of the Divine name—will assuredly come forth, not in some detached text or difficult inference, but as a part of the revelation, or as its ground, or as its consummation.'

On this the reviewer remarks—

'We do not suppose that this reverend gentleman denies or doubts the personality of the incarnate Son of God; but we think that one who did might be apt to use very much the same sort of language.'

My lord, I beseech your lordship's attention to this comment. The reviewer says, 'we do not suppose this reverend gentleman doubts or denies the personality of the Incarnate Son of God;' that is to say, 'we do not suppose' (the ordinary reviewing form, for 'we strongly suspect') that the reverend gentleman is a deliberate liar, one who doubts or denies that upon which he habitually professes to rest all his teaching and all his hopes.' My lord, I do not complain of this language as personally insulting. I wish to dismiss all personal considerations from my mind. I quite admit the reviewer's right to think of me with as much contempt as

he pleases. I do not require that he should have looked into any book of mine before he threw out such a hint. If he did look into any, he is welcome to say, if he likes: 'This book does not mean what it pretends. It *talks* of a personal Christ as the only ground upon which the individual soul or the Church can rest. That is not what it signifies, but something altogether different and opposite.' I do not protest against such language for myself. But, my lord, I do say that such language is a very gross insult to the order of which I am a member. I do say, that no Christian and no gentleman has a right to make such an insinuation, anonymously, against a clergyman, if he is not prepared to stand forth in his own person, and, throwing off the cowardly phraseology of 'we do not suppose,' and 'the reverend gentleman,' to say before the Bishop—'I charge this particular priest in your diocese with pretending to hold, and with not holding, that article of the Christian faith upon which all the rest depend.' Surely, my lord, such a course is due to you and the diocese, and to the Colleges, in which I must be practising a system of habitual deception.

And why is not this the course which the reviewer has taken? Look at his words, my lord, and you will see. He does not really think he is bringing any very tremendous accusation against me. He speaks of my denying or doubting the personality of the Son of God in just as off-hand a manner as he might speak of my doubting whether there were one Homer or many Homers—whether the stories of Prince Arthur do or not belong to authentic history. The hint comes out in a kind of parenthesis; it is appended to a passage which did not offer the remotest excuse for it. The reviewer says at the end of the article, that he hopes we shall take his remarks in the kindly

spirit in which they are offered. Evidently he does not suppose that he has departed from the most graceful courtesy of tone and expression. Yes, my lord, and this, it seems to me, is the inevitable effect of the habit of mind which I have traced throughout this article. He does not build everything upon the personality of the Son of God. It is a doctrine which it is right and proper to hold, which offers a convenient excuse for attacking others. But the reviewer does not feel that a theologian who denies our Lord's personality is doing just what a physician does who denies the circulation of the blood, or an astronomer who denies gravitation, that the first is just as much taking away the ground from Humanity as the second is destroying the relation between the parts of the human body, as the third is destroying the order of Nature. This is what I believe; this is what makes the accusation seem to me so fearful. But we have no right to apply our maxims to him; he surveys the whole subject from a different point of view. I should say, as I said before, from that point of view which would be taken by a 'modified Pantheist or Latitudinarian.' For he objects, your lordship will perceive, to my statement that the name of God is the great subject of revelation. That assertion which occurs so continually in Scripture in these very words, has something in it which offends him; still more the idea that the name of God, of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the name in which we are baptized, comes out, 'not in some detached text or difficult inference, but as the ground and consummation' of the whole divine history; or, that this name 'is the great solace to the poor, and the strength to the martyr.' Such sentences seem to him almost without meaning. Why? just because, though he is not aware of it, he is yielding to the tendency of the

age—the tendency into which every one will assuredly fall who fancies himself furthest from it, and therefore does not watch and struggle against it; the tendency to look upon Him whom we worship as a floating essence rather than a living person; the tendency to shrink from the fact, however he may assert the dogma, that the Word, who is with God and is God, has been made flesh and dwelt among us.

This difference, my lord, is, in fact, the great one between us and the reviewer. It makes all we write unintelligible and disagreeable to him. He cannot bear to be reminded—by the use of phrases which belong to Scripture, or to the Church, in what he calls ‘a lower sense’—that this truth is at the root of all human thought and language. It distresses him; and I fear we must go on to distress him more and more. Not willingly; not because, as he seems to think, we invent phrases, or intentionally give them a different force from that which they bear in the minds of those who never associate or compare the different senses of the words which they use; but because the phrases do come before us, and before our pupils, in a multitude of different positions and applications, and because we cannot dismiss them, by merely saying, ‘They mean this here, and that there.’

We know by experience that those who are honestly studying cannot be satisfied with such an interpretation of ambiguous and many-sided expressions. They will know how their different uses are related to each other. And if we are not willing or able to show that there is a highest meaning in the light of which the others are intelligible, they will infallibly reduce the higher meaning under the lower. If we will not employ the real Incarnation to illustrate the notions and dreams of an Incarnation which

have been current in the world, we are certain that *it* will be taken as one of these notions or dreams. No policy, therefore, my lord, I apprehend, can be so miserable as that which tries to keep religious phrases safe by denying their connexion with human thoughts and deeds. No method can be so honest as that which uses them, and the truths they express, to explain and harmonize what would be otherwise inexplicable and incoherent in those thoughts and deeds.

In the next passage, the reviewer gathers together a number of half sentences and detached words, to prove that the teachers in Queen's College, Mr. Strettell and Mr. Kingsley especially, speak much 'of the spiritual nature of man, and of the way in which the spirit in us all is to be trained; and that to this end much inherent efficacy is attributed to human studies and human means; while very little indeed is said about the Holy Spirit, by whose agency and blessing alone these means are to be made effectual.' My lord, all the force of this passage lies in one adjective. '*Much inherent* efficacy is attributed to human studies and human means.' I simply and broadly deny this assertion, and defy the reviewer to prove it out of any lecture in the volume. I affirm that no '*inherent*' efficacy is attributed to any human studies or human means; that all are again and again declared to be instruments and means by which God acts upon His creatures, and which are therefore, and therefore only, available, because he has made this creature a spiritual creature, because He intends it to be the subject of a spiritual influence and a spiritual operation. And I maintain, my lord, again, that the reviewer, implicitly denying that man is a spiritual creature, is himself the propagator of that dreadful heresy which he imputes to my

colleagues, with the same carelessness with which he insinuated that I was a denier of the incarnation. ‘*The Spirit*,’ says St. Paul, ‘beareth witness with our spirit.’ In that memorable passage in the Epistle to the Corinthians, he carefully distinguishes between the Spirit of God and the spirit of man that is in us. Your lordship knows, from the history of theology, how all-important the preservation of this distinction is, and how impossible it is to retain one truth except we also retain the other. I need not remind your lordship what fearful fanaticism has arisen from the identification of the acts and operations of the divine, indwelling Spirit, with those of the human. Again, what fearful coldness, what terrible denial of all communion between earth and heaven, has resulted from the reaction against that fanaticism. Where lies the remedy? Surely, my lord, in an education entirely grounded upon the idea of man’s relation to God, of *the Spirit* being given to the child, to sanctify it and guide it into all truth; surely in an attempt with fear and awe to enforce that fact, not in one of our lessons, but in all of them. For making this effort humbly, reverently, consistently, two colleagues of mine in this work are charged by the reviewer with extreme profaneness. Like all his other accusations, this comes out in innuendoes; but they are innuendoes that ordained clergymen are deliberately teaching young women to make light of Scripture, and of the truths contained in it. The ground for them is discovered in the following passages:—

‘Words are not then, we may conclude, arbitrary things, as some suppose, to be chosen or laid aside as we please or as we can, but living powers, expressive, in some measure, of the very nature of things themselves. Depend upon it, there is a reason why every word that we use is as it is. . . . Surely they come from Him who is Himself the Word, ‘by whom all things are made,’ from whom man derives all

the light and knowledge he possesses. Take care, then, how you deal with words; they are sacred things, not lightly to be scattered abroad, not without the greatest danger to be perverted. They are not vain, that is, empty things; 'they are spirit and they are life.'—p. 162. *Rev. A. B. Strettell.*

'You cannot compose a rope of sand, or a round globe of square stones; and my excellent friend Mr. Strettell will tell you, in his lectures on grammar, that words are just as stubborn and intractable materials as sand or stone; that we cannot alter their meaning or value a single shade, for they derive that meaning from a higher fountain than the soul of man—from the Word of God, the fount of utterance, who inspires all true and noble thought and speech—who vindicated language as His own gift, and not man's invention, in that miracle of the day of Pentecost.'—p. 30. *Rev. Charles Kingsley.*

The reviewer declares that 'this application of one of the titles of our Saviour is a truly heinous lapse,' and the quotation from St. John 'worse than absurd.' He goes on to say—

'Most certainly when our Lord said, 'the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life,' he meant the truths contained in those words; and to attribute that power to the mere vocables themselves, placed in any varying collocation, to express the thoughts of common men, is something, to our mind, bordering on the profane. The deduction from the miracle recorded in Acts, ch. ii., may or not be original. It entirely exhibits—if we at all understand Professor Kingsley—a portentous specimen of audacity in trampling on the plainest rules of criticism and common sense. No High-Dutch pedagogue ever vented more pompous smoke.'—p. 377.

A truly heinous lapse, to say that words come from Him who is Himself the Word, by whom all things are made, that they derive their meaning from a higher source than the soul of man—from the Word of God, the fountain of utterance! Alas! my lord, what heinous lapses the prophets of the Old Testament, the Apostles of the New, have committed. Have they not denounced those who thought that their words were their own, that none was lord over them? Have they not denounced those who spoke a word out of their own hearts, instead of referring all to Him, from whom, as Mr. Strettell

has said, man derives all the light and knowledge that he possesses? What! does this reviewer really believe that the Spirit of God used language without a purpose—that the divine Logos is only a chance name, for which any other might be substituted? Will he dare to say this, and then pretend that he believes in the inspiration of the Scriptures?

For mark, my lord, the effect of his denying that all words, all human utterances, should be traced to this source, and are turned to a bad account when they are not traced to it. The effect is, that he cannot give any sacred or holy meaning to the words of *Scripture*; he is obliged to reduce *them* into inanities; he is obliged to say that *they* have no power and no life. There cannot be a better test of his method and of ours. He wishes us to look at Scripture phrases apart from all other associations; and that he may do so, he must empty them of their reality. The clear and awful language of St. John's Gospel is paraphrased into the phrase of some lady's diary, or pocket-book, 'a title of our Saviour.' We, feeling the intense truthfulness and depth of the Scripture language, wish to make it the guide of all our thoughts and expressions: therefore he is religious, and we are profane!

As the reviewer is incapable of doing any justice to the language of holy writ, we need not complain how grievously he misrepresents the utterances of poor fallible men. In order to convict Mr. Strettell of profaneness, he says, 'he attributes power to mere vocables placed in any varying collocation.' Now your lordship must see that Mr. Strettell never said this, or anything like this, but just the opposite of it. To turn the words into mere vocables is simply, according to Mr. Strettell, to exhaust the power out of them; that when

it is gone, when the life has departed and the mere husk remains, all that he has said about them will cease to be true, is a simple, self-evident proposition, to which he would assent, I conceive, quite as readily as his critic.

The reviewer desires to know whether Mr. Kingsley's interpretation of the 2nd chapter of the Acts is original or not. 'Whether it is or not, no High-Dutch pedagogue ever vented more pompous smoke.' Though, as a dweller in London, I am familiar with smoke generally, I am not certain that I am acquainted with that particular species of it which is called 'pompous' smoke. I may therefore have encountered it unawares where I should least have looked for it. Certainly I have met with this interpretation of Mr. Kingsley's before, and not in the book of any high or low Dutch pedagogue. If the reviewer wishes to see the original of it, I would respectfully refer him to the choice of lessons, in our Prayer-book, for Whit Monday. He will there find that the passage from the Old Testament which is taken to illustrate one part of the meaning of the Pentecostal day is the beginning of the 11th chapter of Genesis—that which refers to the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel. That this passage has something to do with human language has generally been admitted. The reviewer may, of course, dissent from the common opinion; but he will then, I believe, be himself entitled to that praise of originality which he has too generously bestowed upon Mr. Kingsley. It has also, I believe, my lord, been the ordinary opinion of divines that the sin of the Tower of Babel consisted in some rebellion against the will and purpose of God, in men claiming to be independent of him. The church appears to teach us that when the Spirit of God descended in cloven tongues upon the apostles, and enabled them to speak as he gave

them utterance, a society was established which depended upon him instead of upon brick walls. She seems to wish that we should compare the symbols of the one event and of the other, and reflect how much all division begins in claiming a right over our own words—all unity, in acknowledging that there is a higher Power who speaketh in us. But, of course, the church like Mr. Kingsley appears to the reviewer to have vented pompous smoke. How can he have any different opinion, when it is evident that he wishes to destroy any connexion between the miracle of Pentecost, as well as the other facts of the Bible, and our own lives and times? Whereas it is the object of the church to set forth that miracle as the sign of the commencement of a kingdom of which there shall be no end—a kingdom whose members receive the same Spirit in their baptism which was bestowed upon the three thousand to whom St. Peter preached. But let him look well to what will come of this temper of mind; let him see whether, if he ridicule those who assert that the truth which was established at Pentecost by that miracle is a perpetual and abiding truth, he does not drive young men and young women to seek for a renewal of the mere sign—whether, in his effort to get rid of what he calls mysticism, he does not introduce a frantic fanaticism. I venture to think, my lord, that it is only by acting upon the principle which Mr. Kingsley has announced, in our education, that we can look to avert either such fanaticism or the dreariest rationalism.

Once more the reviewer returns to me. What he says is so important as disclosing his own feelings and those of the fashionable religious public which he represents, about the human beings in whom we are taught by our Catechism that the Spirit of God dwells, that I must give my own sentence, with all his wit appended to it:—

‘Words are as much subjects of experiment as gases; the words which we speak every hour, when we come to examine them, what wonderful secrets do they tell! How much self-knowledge may be gained by *the most imperfect meditation upon their roots and growth!* Children are especially delighted by this exercise. Their faces become brighter, freer, fuller of deep meaning, as they engage in it; awful truths seem to be shining into them and out of them. And they find that the words which they speak are not to be trifled with; a lie becomes a more serious thing to them; they not only know from your teaching, but in a measure feel for themselves, what it is.’—pp. 18, 19. *Prof. Maurice.*

‘Certain round chubby faces of our acquaintance present themselves, to our mind’s eye, bright enough in their own way, but in which our Professor would find it difficult to conjure up the ‘deep meaning’ of which he speaks; and true and ingenuous as they are, we suspect no amount of grammatical exercise, nor any nor all of the teaching at Queen’s College could ever cause ‘awful truths’ to ‘shine out’ of those laughing eyes. As for a *lie* appearing a more serious offence to a child because it has ‘imperfectly meditated’ on the roots of the vocables in which the lie is told—if this be so, there can be no doubt that we might safely dismiss all our so-called books of Ethics, and substitute at once the Etymological Dictionary.’—p. 378.

My lord, I am perfectly willing to be the victim of this humour; it is satisfactory to see a gentleman, apparently not of much natural vivacity, able to make himself lively by my help. But I must tell him plainly, that though I am a very fair subject for his jests, little children are not; that if he does not regard them, with their chubby faces, as awful beings, God does; that if awful truths do not shine to him out of their laughing eyes, they are there, nevertheless; and that it is at their peril, and at our peril, if we do not confess them. Words seem to him nothing awful; children seem to him nothing awful; education seems to him nothing awful. We are to teach our children a little religion, and a little grammar, and a little arithmetic, and a little music; but we are not to recognise in them anything more than chubby faces and laughing eyes. May God, in His mercy,

keep us, and keep our land, from such grovelling views. May the teachers of our children, whether they are called profane, or pantheistic, or anything else, by the fashionable religious world, be men who have not, in the 19th century of the Christian era, a lower faith than the pagan satirist, who said ‘*Puerum reverere.*’

The rest of the article is directed against Mr. Kingsley’s mode of teaching composition and history. I am grieved to say, my lord, for the sake of the College, that these animadversions, so far as the future is concerned, do not affect us. Mr. Kingsley has found it impossible to give lectures in London, and we have been deprived of instructions which would have done more to elevate the minds and characters of our pupils than almost any which it is possible for them to receive. But as the reviewer discovers in Mr. Kingsley ‘leanings which require to be watched;’ as I trust and hope that he is right in believing that some of the spirit which his lectures embody is to be found among us; and as I apprehend, for the reasons I have already given, that there are few subjects upon which good teaching is so desirable, or bad teaching so hurtful, as on those of composition and history; I think I am not in the least exempted from the duty of meeting any charges against one whom we should count it a great happiness to welcome among us again.

As Mr. Kingsley does not belong to your lordship’s diocese, and may not be known to you personally, and as I feel how much unfair discredit both he and my other colleagues may be suffering from their accidental connexion with me, I am thankful that I am able to call a particularly unexceptionable witness in his favour. In the January number of the *English Review* is an article of some length, on his ‘Saint’s Tragedy.’ That I have no very strong personal motive for

calling your lordship's attention to it, a glance at the Review will satisfy you. I am described in it as an insolent, pragmatical coxcomb, with whom Mr. Kingsley is earnestly advised to have as little intercourse as possible. But the writer—evidently a person of much ability, and with a keen perception of what is beautiful in character and composition—speaks of Mr. Kingsley's play with equal respect for its poetical power and its moral purpose. He claims his genius for the service of the church, and conjures him not to devote it to the service of any party. This admirable advice, my lord, Mr. Kingsley has followed, both in the Tragedy which is the subject of the reviewer's panegyric, and in some Village Sermons, which are especially remarkable for their homely sinewy English, for their acquaintance with the peasant life and habits of England, for their abhorrence of all shadowy abstractions, for their proclamation of God as a living, personal, present ruler; for the prominence they give to the facts of incarnation and redemption; for an unusually earnest assertion of the personality of the spirit of evil.

The approbation of the *English Review*, and these qualities which appear on the surface of his sermons, would scarcely prepare one to expect that the particular 'leaning' of Mr. Kingsley would be to 'Germanism.' Those who know him will be still more startled to find that one whom they have always looked upon as vehemently practical, as devoted to the wellbeing of poor men, in their simplest and most outward works, as loving no statements which have not the test of being directly applicable to *their* hearts, should be associated, for good or for evil, with a habit of mind which, at all events, awakens in the English public notions of whatever is abstract, misty, impalpable. No

charge is so easily made as this; no one is so convenient as suggesting a thousand dark apprehensions, which are far more terrible because they are not expressed; no one is therefore so regular and acknowledged a means of diffusing suspicion of a teacher or a preacher. But it is not often that there is such an opportunity as the *Quarterly* reviewer has afforded us of questioning the opprobrious epithet, and comparing it with the acts of the person to whom it is applied.

There is a proverb, my lord, which I find continually quoted in religious newspapers, and which serves as an excuse for using any little fragment of club gossip as a 'sign of the times,' or for making a brother an offender for a word. It is that 'if you throw up a straw, you may tell which way the wind blows.' Now, the *Quarterly* reviewer in this case has 'thrown up a straw' for the purpose of proving Mr. Kingsley a Germaniser. He has skilfully constructed a passage out of three pages of his lecture on composition, inserting everything which struck him as quaint or unusual in Mr. Kingsley's illustrations or mode of writing, without the relief of the ordinary discourse in the midst of which it occurs.

'Prose then is highest. To write a perfect prose must be your ultimate object in attending these lectures; but we must walk before we can run, and walk with leading-strings before we can walk alone; and such leading-strings are verse and rhyme. Some tradition of this is still kept up in the practice of making boys write Latin and Greek verses at school, which is of real service to the intellect, even when most carelessly employed, and which, when *earnestly carried out*, is one great cause of the public school and college man's superiority in style to most self-educated authors. . . . Practice in versification might be unnecessary if we were all *born world-geniuses*; so would practice in dancing—if every lady had the figure of a Venus, and the Garden of Eden for a playground. . . . Surely when you recollect the long drudgery at Greek and Latin verses which is required

of every highly educated man, and the high importance which has attached to them for centuries in the opinion of Englishmen, you cannot think that I am too exigent in asking you for a few sets of English verses. Believe me, that you ought to find their beneficial effect in producing, as I said before, a measured, deliberate style of expression, a habit of calling up clear and distinct images on all subjects, a power of condensing and arranging your thoughts, such as no practice in prose themes can ever give.'—pp. 35, 36, 41.

The reviewer has done what he could to prevent his reader from discovering the lecturer's aim in this passage. He has failed through desire to prove too much. He was anxious to found a new charge against us; so he betrayed the secret that Mr. Kingsley is defending in these sentences—the very sentences which are chosen to convict him of Germanism,—the public school practice of writing Latin verses! What an unfortunate augury! The straw takes quite the wrong direction! Judging from it, the wind does not blow either from Germany or towards it! For your lordship knows that this practice is emphatically a part of our old English education,—that part which the German education has cast aside, that part which all supporters of German education would especially ridicule.

The reviewer of course is at liberty to object to Mr. Kingsley's application of this plan. He shall state the grounds of his objection.

'As to the Greek and Latin verses of boys—without entering on the question as to the amount of benefit derived from this exercise, we may fearlessly assert that there is no danger in it—not one boy in ten will pen a Latin verse after he leaves school—not one boy at all will be allured away by the fascination of that employment from the duties of active life. But may not dabbling in English rhyme prove more attractive? Is fostering and encouraging this equally safe? It is not perhaps impossible that some real poetry may be produced, but how many poor, meagre, halting verses will there be, not to speak of high-flown nonsense or silly doggerel? And will the weaker sisters always discover that they are not 'born world-genisuses'? We need hardly say that merely to while away a rainy afternoon, or to sharpen the wits

of young folks at a holiday party, we have no objection to all trying their hand at rhyme. What we do object to is making it such a primary, essential, grave piece of business—preceding, if not superseding, plain matter-of-fact, work-day prose. With respect to one class of the pupils especially, it may fairly be asked whether a certificate of proficiency in the Walkerian Science would be considered as any recommendation for a governess?—Would even a page of the *Book of Beauty* be to a sensible mother an overawing document? And since prose is the higher attainment, and doubtless many will never reach so far, are we prepared to place our children under the care of one who has stopped short at the poetry?’

The riddle about the Walkerian Science and the Book of Beauty I have, after much straining of my faculties, been obliged to give up. If it means that governesses in the present day are very likely to occupy themselves with such trash as the Book of Beauty, and that one great object of Mr. Kingsley, and of all our teachings, is to give them good books as a substitute for it, he asserts a truth upon which I may have to say a few words presently. His argument respecting holiday afternoons, and the mischief of making poetry ‘such a grave piece of business,’ is as remarkable for the classical language in which it is conveyed as for its inherent worth. All teachers, I believe, have discovered that to cure a boy or girl of a mere knack of writing—of what the reviewer calls ‘dabbling,’—you should teach them that there are rules and laws appertaining to the subject with which they are trifling; as the reviewer would say, that it is a grave piece of business. This is Mr. Kingsley’s method; what the reviewer’s is, he does not clearly point out. He protests against the setting of poetry above prose, which is just the thing that Mr. Kingsley also protests against. He, a poet, informs his pupils that versification is only a means of acquiring the power of writing plain prose. He may be right or wrong; but if he is wrong, it is not because he has tried to make girls sentimental, but because he has tried to prevent

them from becoming so ; it is not because he has introduced German novelties, but because he had offered too loyal an allegiance to the maxims upon which he and his fathers were trained.

The*last attack of the reviewer is so serious, that at the risk of quite wearying your lordship's patience, I must quote it at length, with the passage by which it is supported. I have carefully preserved the Italics of the review. The words to which they draw attention do remarkably exhibit the characteristics—the peculiarly *anti-German* characteristics—of Mr. Kingsley's mind.

'It is, indeed, in reference to this class—the young governesses elect—that we are most concerned to have so much fault to find with the quality of the teaching at Queen's College—not only because of the wide diffusion which error imbibed by them is likely to obtain, but because they are the least able to protect themselves from it, or we should rather say, their friends are the least likely to afford them protection. The parents of other pupils may have leisure, and be properly qualified to watch and judge the instruction which their children are taking in, and if dissatisfied they have other means at command for securing a suitable education. But the more humble class, absorbed by the cares of providing for their families, perhaps but imperfectly educated themselves, cannot, moreover, afford to be rigidly particular about tuition obtained at a much cheaper rate than any they could find elsewhere, and will be apt to shut their eyes and absolve themselves from an inquiry which might prove so inconvenient in its results. For these young persons, therefore, we call in extraneous aid ; and in addition to the protest we have already entered on their behalf, we must take the liberty to complain of a tone of dreamy, unhealthy sentimentalism pervading a portion of the professorial 'utterances.' If there is any class of the community especially in danger of falling into such a snare, and to whom the consequences may prove especially pernicious, it is this. For what is the position of a governess? Educated for her vocation far beyond what her circumstances would otherwise have permitted, and consequently above her natural connexions—her mind more cultivated, her manners more refined—she probably may find their society uncongenial, and if affection be not weakened, at least pleasant intercourse may be marred and confidence checked. Not only so—she is also separated from them, and thrown among those whose minds and

manners assimilate much more with her own—who have, besides, the charm which birth and breeding may give them in her eyes: but towards whom her affections must not go forth, with whom she can form no lasting ties, in whom she dare take no special interest. If ever poor mortal needed to have the imagination kept under control, and plain practical common sense largely developed, as a safeguard alike for her feelings and her conduct, it is the governess. But—not to recur to the ‘earnest carrying out’ of the art of discipline and sonneteering—how will such teaching as the following effect this end? The Rev. Charles Kingsley thus delivers himself concerning the ‘*true spiritual History of England*’:—

‘*That I call a history—not of one class of offices or events, but of the living human souls of English men and English women—and therefore one most adapted to the mind of woman; one which will call into fullest exercise her blessed faculty of sympathy—that pure and tender heart of flesh, which teaches her always to find her highest interest in mankind, simply as mankind: to see the Divine most completely in the human; to prefer the incarnate to the disembodied, the personal to the abstract—the pathetic to the intellectual; to see, and truly, in the most common tale of village love or sorrow, a mystery deeper and more divine than lies in all the theories of politicians or the fixed ideas of the sage.*

‘*Such a course of history would quicken women’s inborn personal interest in the actors of this life drama, and be quickened by it in return, as indeed it ought: for it is thus that God intended woman to look instinctively at the world. Would to God that she would teach us men to look at it thus likewise! [Teach instinct!] Would to God that she would in these days claim and fulfill to the uttermost her vocation as the priestess of charity! that woman’s heart would help to deliver man from bondage to his own tyrannous and all-too-exclusive brain!—from our idolatry of mere dead laws and printed books—from our daily sin of looking at men, not as our struggling and suffering brothers, but as mere symbols of certain formulæ, incarnations of sets of opinions, wheels in some iron liberty-grinding or Christianity-spinning-machine, which we miscall society, or civilization, or, worst misnomer of all, the Church!*

‘*This I take to be one of the highest aims of woman—to preach clarity, love, and brotherhood: but in this nineteenth century, hunting everywhere for law and organization, refusing loyalty to anything which cannot range itself under its theories, she will never get a hearing till her knowledge of the past becomes more organized and methodic. . . . I claim, therefore, as necessary for the education of the future, that woman should be initiated into the thoughts and feelings of her countrymen in every age, from the wildest legends of the past to the most palpable naturalism of the present; and that not merely in chronological*

order—sometimes not in chronological order at all; but in a true spiritual sequence; that, knowing the hearts of many, she may in after life be able to comfort the hearts of all. . . .

“But once more, we must and will by God’s help try to realize the purpose of this College, by boldly facing the facts of the age, and of our own office. And therefore we shall not shrink from the task, however delicate and difficult, of speaking to our hearers as to women. Our teaching must be no sexless, heartless abstraction. We must try to make all which we tell them bear on the great purpose of unfolding to woman her own calling in all ages—her especial calling in this one. We must incite them to realize the chivalrous belief of our old forefathers among their Saxon forests, that something Divine dwelt in the counsels of women: but, on the other hand, we must continually remind them that they will attain that *divine instinct*, not by renouncing their sex, but by fulfilling it; by becoming true women, and not bad imitations of men: by educating their heads for the sake of their hearts, not their hearts for the sake of their heads; by claiming woman’s divine vocation, as the priestess of purity, of beauty, and of love; by educating themselves to become, with God’s blessing, worthy wives and mothers of a mighty nation of workers, in an age when the voice of the ever-working God is proclaiming, through the thunder of falling dynasties and crumbling idols, ‘He that will not work, neither shall he eat.’”
On English Literature. (Lect. pp. 58-66.)

‘How would our readers like to receive into their families as a governess, one who had been taught to feel such an interest in ‘tales of village love,’—who is prepared to take a ‘personal interest in the actors’ of the domestic ‘life-drama,’—to offer them her ‘sympathy,’ not as events properly and naturally call it forth, but as her chief vocation and highest duty—and to expect that ‘something divine’ is to be attributed to her ‘counsels?’

I have some difficulty, my lord, in answering this last question. It must depend very much on who ‘our readers’ are. If they are assumed to be all of the same mind and disposition with the writer, the reply is easy. Those who see only in their children round chubby faces and laughing eyes, are not at all likely to wish for a governess such as Mr. Kingsley’s discipline would form. One who can teach Pinnock’s catechisms to their daughters, who can drill them to play on the piano for six or seven hours a-day, so effectually getting rid of any superfluous laughter from their eyes, of any

vulgar chubbiness from their faces, one who can go through a routine of lessons, hateful to herself, hateful to her pupils, producing hatred between them, would be far more suitable for such a reader. It is easy for him to procure already what he wants; we do not undertake to provide him. Not for his own sake and for his children's sake only, are we determined, with God's help, that he shall seek elsewhere than at Queen's College for ladies of this description, but quite as much for the sake of that most unhappy and most injured class over which the admirable Institution that called us into existence watches. My lord, we are convinced that it is because parents have had such a low view of the dignity of their children, that they have had such a low view of the dignity of their governesses. We feel that we cannot do anything to raise the one, unless we also raise the other. If children do not want to know the spiritual history of their country; if it is enough for them to learn the dates of kings' reigns out of 'Pinnock's Catechism,' then it is enough also for the governess to be a person who toils through that catechism, who commits those dates to memory, then it is not at all safe or desirable that either her intellect or her imagination should be cultivated. But let not the reviewer imagine that because he has taken this precaution, her imagination and intellect will not seek to cultivate themselves, and that in the most morbid and dangerous manner. She will take revenge for the barrenness of heart, to which upon this miserable calculation you have consigned her, by reading 'Books of Beauty,' and all the wretched stuff of the English or the French Minerva press; or if the exertions of the morning have been too great for even these tasks in the evening, then the study of dress or the most petty occupations will supply their place. Does the reviewer really

think that the dangers at which he darkly hints, the danger of all foolish fancies about actual persons with whom she may be brought into contact, will be averted by her ignorance of the simple, honest, truthful records of womanly life and feeling which Mr. Kingsley would have presented her with? Surely, those who feel that they have an interest in the soil to which they belong, in its domestic life, in its civil life, in its Church, are rather more likely to dwell amidst persons possessing the accidents of birth and breeding, to which the critic somewhat coarsely refers, with female self-respect, without vain or selfish ambition. The part of this article which refers to ourselves and our ill-doings, I can easily tolerate, the part which refers to these poor women makes my blood boil. Thank God, my lord, there are English men and English women who do not wish that the governess's society should always have occasion for exercising its mournful and necessary charity, who do look forward to a time when all the daughters of this land, of whatever order and degree, shall feel that they have a share in its spiritual history, and that they may, in the lowliest occupations, without ever aspiring to be more than women, more than teachers, themselves contribute precious pages to it. To them and to their sympathies our college make its appeal.

My lord, I have now concluded my unpleasant task. The duty which remains is to express my concurrence with the *Quarterly Reviewer* in one part of his observations, the part which he seems to have thought would be least acceptable to us. He says that our constitution is a bad one, that no body of teachers should be responsible only to themselves. He is quite right. We had found out the defect before he told us of it. He seems to acknowledge that our position,

with reference to the Governesses Institution made it inevitable. The moment that certain movements in the governesses' committee led us to think that that connexion might, at some time or other, be dissolved, we began to consider how we might improve our government, how we might get rid of that irresponsible authority, to which the reviewer supposes we cleave so fondly. His scheme of a council naturally suggested itself to us. What we are anxious for, my lord, is, that the council should be composed, not of persons who shall be chiefly financiers, and who, from their other occupations, will not be able to take practical cognizance of our proceedings, or be competent to do so ; but of men acquainted with different branches of education, who can see whether we are going right, and can admonish, coerce, or dismiss us, if we go wrong. I can give your lordship one proof, I think it will be a satisfactory one, that we are sincere in this wish. There is, as your lordship knows, a prelate residing in Harley Street, who is honoured by all members of the English Church, but whose name is especially dear to all those who have had any connexion with King's College. If, for the sake of promoting the cause of female education, and of keeping us in the right way, he would consent to be the chairman of the council, I know that there is not one of our body who would not rejoice to place himself under his immediate inspection and government. We should then, with some courage, ask your lordship to be our Visitor.

Does it seem to your lordship that this profession is inconsistent with the lofty tone which the reviewer says I took respecting our irresponsibility, in my lecture at the opening of the College? I apprehend, that there never were two statements more entirely in harmony. I said

that we would not follow the caprices of the public ; that we could not, as honest men, hold ourselves responsible to it, or to those who guide it. We never dreamed that we could hide ourselves from its oversight, or escape its suspicions ; we never wished to be free from either ; we did believe, that in God's strength we could withstand its maxims, and decrees, and fashions ; we desired that we might perish before we yielded to them. I have stated some considerations in this letter which have strengthened and rivetted that resolution. A writer, who evidently is a very fair—a very advantageous—specimen of the tone of thinking which prevails in our religious clubs and coteries, has set forth, in one of the ablest of our journals, his views of what our Education ought to be ; his objections to that which it is, or he fancies it is. Every one of those views if acted out would, it seems to me, prevent us clergymen from fulfilling the obligations under which our office lays us ; every one of those objections implies a theory of education which I believe never can be the foundation of a sound practical discipline for Englishmen or English women. Now, my lord, the Bishops of this land are, I conceive, its proper and appointed protectors against the loose floating opinion of the time, whether that which pervades its ordinary or its religious circles. They are bound to observe that opinion—to see of what it is the index. But they are the witnesses for that which is permanent ; for that which connects past, present, and future. To base education upon that permanent foundation, to make it not the creature of temporary feelings and notions was, if I have interpreted our King's College maxim rightly, to object of yourself and of those who established that Institution. They were determined to show that instruction,

though it may vary its modes in each age, rests always upon the same principle; that it appeals to man as a spiritual being, that it starts from the acknowledgment of God as the real Teacher, of us as his agents and ministers. To many this proclamation may have had a merely negative sound. A different one seemed to have been put forth by others. This was a convenient watchword for opposing them. But your lordship never could have so regarded it; you never expected us, the teachers in the College, so to regard it. We had no business with the maxims of other men; we were not to bring watchwords into the lecture-room. If we confessed your doctrine to be true, we were to teach in conformity with it, whatever our special function might be. It has seemed to me, the more I have considered it, that your doctrine is a sound one, and that it gives the teacher a power of dealing freely and honestly with the facts of history, with the utterances of men, with the word of God, which no other could give. But I felt, my lord, from the first, that if we follow this course calmly and manfully, we must prepare ourselves for the assaults of all who wish education and the Church to have a local and temporary character. Every school and party must seek, consciously or unconsciously, to give them that character; schools and parties must complain of us, and impute to us the very sins which we are most struggling against in ourselves and our pupils, if we do not adopt their shibboleths and technicalities, if we find the words which the Scripture and the forms of the Church supply us with, more satisfactory, more intelligible, more comprehensive, than their interpretations of them. Yet though it is inevitable that we should incur the denunciation or the contempt of these parties and of their organs—though any scheme for propi-

tiating them must involve a perilous tampering with truth or a failure in our trust, yet every person who entertains a reasonable suspicion of himself, must be aware how great the temptation is to cultivate a proud, self-willed indifference to other men's judgments, instead of a righteous determination not to hearken unto them more than unto God.

In submitting the method of our teaching at Queen's College to your lordship's cognizance, (mine, at King's College, is open to it already), I hope we are doing what we can to avoid this great error. We have no right whatever to any personal indulgence from your lordship—we should not avail ourselves of it if we had. We appeal to you in your episcopal—I was going to have said in your *judicial*—character. If I recal the word, it is because I regard the relation of a Father as far above the office of a Judge; not because I wish to avoid, for myself, or for any institution to which I belong, the strictest investigation which you can institute—the severest sentence which, after such an investigation, you think fit to pronounce.

My Lord, I have the honour to be,

With great respect,

Your Lordship's obedient and grateful servant,

F. D. MAURICE.







