

THE
NATIONALIZATION
OF THE
OLD ENGLISH
UNIVERSITIES

LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D.

Ex Libris

K. OGDEN



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

J. HALL & SON,
BOOKSELLERS

ON THE NATIONALISATION OF THE
OLD ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

ON
THE NATIONALISATION
OF THE
OLD ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES

BY
LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS
HONORARY FELLOW OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD

“LEST WE FORGET”

LONDON: CHAPMAN AND HALL
1901



LA
636.7
C150

TO

CHARLES SAVILE ROUNDELL

MY DEAR ROUNDELL,

You have truly spoken of the Act, which forms the central subject of this book, as "a little measure that may boast great things." To you, more than to anyone now living, the success of that measure was due; and without your help its progress could not here have been set forth. To you, therefore, as of right, the following pages are inscribed.

Yours very sincerely,

LEWIS CAMPBELL



PREFACE

IN preparing the first volume of the *Life of Benjamin Jowett*, I had access to documents which threw unexpected light on certain movements, especially in connexion with Oxford University Reform. I was thus enabled to meet the desire of friends, by writing an article on "Some Liberal Movements of the Last Half-century," which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review* for March, 1900. And I was encouraged by the reception which that article met with, to expand the substance of it into a small book. Hence the present work.

I have extended my reading on the subject, and have had recourse to all sources of information which I found available. My special thanks are due to Messrs. Chapman and Hall, for their permission to use the article in question; to Mr. C. S. Roundell, without whose help and counsel I could have done but little; to Viscount Goschen, for access to valuable correspondence; and to Mr. Hagbert Wright and his subordinates at the London Library, for special assistance in research. I have also to thank Mr. Goldwin Smith, the Right Hon. W. E. H. Lecky, and the Hon. the Warden of Merton, for the

permission which they readily accorded me to quote rather extensively from their writings.

In compiling the chapter on University Extension I have received material assistance from the Lord Bishop of Hereford, from Mr. James Stuart, Lord Rector of St. Andrews University; from Mr. Michael E. Sadler and Miss Emily Davies; and in speaking of the Nonconformist Colleges, from Dr. Fairbairn, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford.

The Master and Fellows of Balliol College and the executors of the late Master have kindly allowed me to make use of a valuable memorandum on University Reform which was drawn up by Professor Jowett in 1874.

LEWIS CAMPBELL

SANT' ANDREA, ALASSIO, ITALY,

March, 1901

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER I.	
INTRODUCTORY	I
CHAPTER II.	
BEGINNINGS OF FREE INQUIRY	15
CHAPTER III.	
EARLY ATTEMPTS AT LEGISLATION	34
CHAPTER IV.	
FREE INQUIRY AT OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE	53
CHAPTER V.	
UNIVERSITY REFORM, 1846-1856	72
CHAPTER VI.	
LIBERAL THEOLOGY	96
CHAPTER VII.	
ATTEMPTS AT LEGISLATION	126
CHAPTER VIII.	
UNIVERSITY TESTS ACT OF 1871	152
CHAPTER IX.	
MEMORANDUM BY PROFESSOR JOWETT, 1874	176

	PAGE
CHAPTER X.	
ABOLITION OF REMAINING CLERICAL RESTRICTIONS . . .	209
CHAPTER XI.	
UNIVERSITY EXTENSION : HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN	220
CHAPTER XII.	
DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGES	239
CHAPTER XIII.	
PROSPICE	253
APPENDIX	273
INDEX	295

ON THE NATIONALISATION
OF THE
OLD ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY

UNIVERSITY life in England has been so continuous and its constituents in successive generations have passed so rapidly—the chain, even when not broken, has had so many separate links, that most persons are unconscious of the extent of change which has come over it in a century or even in sixty years; and the several steps of progress or decline by which the alteration has been effected are still more apt to be forgotten. Looked at superficially, perhaps, the mode of living that prevails among young men is not so very different in the beginning of the twentieth century from what it was in the middle of the nineteenth; but the restrictions, which at that former time still hampered the usefulness of the Universities, and limited what effect they had to a small minority of the nation, were real and grave; and their gradual removal has been brought

about through a long course of persistent and public-spirited endeavour.

The economical conditions which debarred so many from availing themselves of the advantages then existing, can only be alluded to here in passing. It cannot be said that they have even yet been completely overcome. The removal of religious disabilities and artificial clerical restrictions is the chief point to which I now desire to direct attention.

For about two hundred years from the passing of the Act of Uniformity, no one could graduate at Cambridge or be admitted to matriculation at Oxford without professing adherence to the Church of England or subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. And the difference between the two ancient Universities in this respect was felt to be more apparent than real; for no one could reside in either University without belonging to a college, and constant attendance on the chapel services was a part of the college discipline enforced no less strictly at Cambridge than at Oxford. Moreover, in both Universities, emoluments, academical and collegiate, and all University and college offices were absolutely confined to members of the Church of England. In the earlier years of the century, while conscientious Nonconformists still formed an inconsiderable minority, such limitations were commonly regarded as inevitable or as matters of course, and the adherence alike of undergraduates and graduates to the National Church appeared to have little more than a formal significance. Agitations for the abolition of subscription had occasionally

been rife amongst the thoughtful clergy of former days, as on the part of so-called Arians in the reign of Queen Anne, or of Latitudinarians in the time of Fox and Pitt. But these exceptional and abortive attempts had passed out of memory long before 1830.

The social phenomena of communities into which young men are gathered for educational purposes must after all present many common features in different ages and under different conditions. There will be more or less of serious study, more or less of recreation rational or irrational, of discipline wise or unwise, of submissiveness or insubordination. There will be debates and discussions reflecting the political or theological aspect of the time—even outbreaks of physical violence, as in the Middle Ages. There will also occur the occasional emergence of remarkable men, whether as teachers or students; such as the Cambridge Platonists in one age or the Oxford Tractarians in another. Individuals of genius, such as Milton or Gray, the Wesleys, Arthur Clough, or William Morris, will gather about them little coteries of their intimate friends. Traditions held with more or less of obstinacy will be crossed from time to time by movements either revolutionary or reactionary. If we could throw ourselves back into the life of Christ Church at the beginning of the century, when Canning and Peel, Gladstone and Charles Wordsworth were undergraduates there, or into the life of Corpus in the days of Thomas Arnold and Mr. Justice Coleridge, or if we could realise the

condition of Cambridge as Bishop Marsh and Charles Simeon severally knew it, the resemblance to what came later and is more familiar would perhaps strike us not less forcibly than the many differences. This aspect of the subject has been finely expressed by Cardinal Newman in one of his discourses before what professed to be a Catholic University for Ireland, although it had the sanction only of the Vatican without a charter from the nation. This takes nothing, however, from the significance of the passage. Dr. Newman was arguing in favour of the Collegiate System, against the notion of a University as a mere examining board.

“When a multitude of young men, keen, open-hearted, sympathetic, and observant, as young men are, come together and freely mix with each other, they are sure to learn from one another, even if there be no one to teach them; the conversation of all is a series of lectures to each, and they gain for themselves new ideas and views, fresh matter of thought, and distinct principles for judging and acting, day by day. An infant has to learn the meaning of the information which its senses convey to it, and this seems to be its employment. It fancies all that the eye presents to it to be close to it, till it actually learns the contrary, and thus by practice does it ascertain the relations and uses of those first demands of knowledge which are necessary for its animal existence. A parallel teaching is necessary for our social being, and it is secured by a large school or college; and this effect may be fairly called in its own department an enlargement of mind. It is seeing the world on a small field with little trouble; for the pupils or students come from very

different places, and with widely different notions, and there is much to generalise, much to adjust, much to eliminate, there are inter-relations to be defined, and conventional rules to be established, in the process, by which the whole assemblage is moulded together, and gains one tone and one character."

To a casual observer the most striking change which of late years has taken place either in Oxford or Cambridge has been occasioned by the marriage of Fellows, the results of which are pathetically regretted by the Warden of Merton in his interesting reminiscences; another striking development has been the organisation amongst the undergraduates of cricket, boating, and other athletic exercises, in which some of the junior Fellows also take part. But it is not the less true that a deeper and less obvious revolution has altered the entire relation of the ancient Universities to the national life. Their offices and emoluments are no longer confined to a class or section of the people of Great Britain. All parts of the United Kingdom, nay, even of the empire, are represented there; and in particular the ecclesiastical restrictions, which towards the middle of the nineteenth century were threatening to stifle their activities, have been effectually removed. The causes and the long-continued efforts through which so great a change has been gradually brought about will form the subject of the present volume.

This silent revolution, as it may well be called, has been the outcome or resultant of two separate forces, one operating outside the Universities, the other from

within. In consequence partly of an increase of religious earnestness amongst the body of the people, and partly of the short-sighted coldness of ecclesiastical authority, Nonconformity in all its branches had gathered strength and was becoming a power to reckon with, when the centre of political gravity was shifted by the passing of the Reform Bill; while, on the other hand, the growth of philosophical reflection and critical inquiry amongst the rising generation of young men was creating, first at Cambridge, and afterwards at Oxford, a strong determination to obtain some measure of academical freedom. Neither influence could have been effectual without the other. The more enlightened Nonconformists might clearly enough perceive the intellectual profit that was to be derived from the admission of their more gifted youth to the Universities; but the rank and file of their followers were inclined to look too coldly on those ancient seats of learning, to have any vehement desire to gain admission there. The claims which the political Dissenters were bent on urging were mostly negative and destructive, and too sweeping to be immediately practical. Their desire was rather to disestablish and disendow the Universities, together with the Church itself, than by measures of gradual reform to convert them ultimately to the use of the people. Their jealousy of clerical influence made them suspicious of what might follow if their sons were to acquire the status of University men. Oxford, for example, had been unkind to Wesley, and her atmosphere might chill the zeal of his young

followers. This indifference was rather increased by the widespread impression that the Universities were torpid centres of idle luxury and of useless learning, or, as John Bright afterwards expressed it, that they were "homes of dead languages and of undying prejudices."

The other factor in the movement was equally incapable of operating alone. The spirit of reform within the Universities was always confined to a minority, and could only work in conjunction with the aims and endeavours of those who were legislating for the nation at large. It is a trite observation that no long-settled institution can be reformed entirely from within.

Both forces, the academical and the political, acquired new life about the time of the passing of the great Reform Bill, and like other liberal movements, that for the abolition of University Tests then threatened to be more formidable than it afterwards proved; but it gathered force with every succeeding decade, and achieved its final consummation as late as 1881.

It is easy to speak of this growth of half a century as a natural consequence of social evolution or of the spirit of the age. Such general statements are a convenient veil for ignorance or oblivion. In point of fact the motive force behind all such changes is largely due to the thought and energy of leading individuals, whom posterity ought not to be allowed to ignore or to forget. *Evolution* is a mighty word, and so is the *Time-spirit*; but underneath them both, how related to them it would be hard to say,

are individual activities, each guided more or less consciously by an idea.

Again, it has been said that such endeavours as those about to be described would be fruitless nowadays, because the flood of liberal thought has ebbed, and a tide of reaction has set in. But may it not be equally true that there is a lack of individual personalities, whose clear vision, public-spirited enthusiasm, and powers of leadership place them on a par with those who were mainly influential in effecting this reform?

Other and greater changes may be in store, not merely for the Universities, but for our educational and religious institutions generally. When in the twentieth century, or later still, the hour for these new movements shall have struck, will the men who are destined to promote them also appear?

Such a narrative as that which is now proposed may possibly seem to many persons to be needless and unprofitable. "Why revive," perhaps someone will say, "a worn-out controversy? The agitations you describe have long since done their work and have died away; what purpose can be served by seeking to recall them to human memory?" Three reasons at least may be alleged in defence of such an attempt.

1. If the result has proved beneficial and widespread, is it right or fair that the patient struggles of those who at length effected it should be utterly forgotten? If the names of Bright and Cobden, of Clarkson and Wilberforce, of Howard and Elizabeth

Fry, are gratefully remembered in connexion with other reforms, it is a claim not altogether to be despised, that those should sometimes be brought to mind who have secured the old University foundations for the national benefit, and have relieved the Universities themselves from the oppression of an intolerable burden.

2. It may be urged as a second reason that there is some danger, when the agitation is forgotten, when the waters that were then disturbed have settled into tranquillity, that possibly stagnation may ensue. The rest that was then broken, the spirit of slumber and the folding of the hands in sleep, may be renewed; or some reactionary tendency may supervene to nullify what might seem to be an accomplished fact. The habit of acquiescing in venerable or inveterate abuses is older than the reforming spirit, and may reassert its power.

3. Such reminiscences may convey a lesson of encouragement to men whose thoughts indeed forecast some further beneficial change, but who have learned to regard such hopes as a Utopian dream. The course of progress is not yet complete; what is now stationary will not always be so. It is worth remembering that the change which has been effected in the old Universities, restoring them to the nation, in the central period of the nineteenth century, long appeared even to many of those who desired it an impossible thing.

That by the middle of the eighteenth century the education of English youth at Oxford and

Cambridge had fallen very low is a matter of common knowledge. Graduation had become a farce, and tuition was casual or non-existent. Companionship and mere aggregation could not fail to have their influence for good or evil, but whether the result were upwards or downwards was left very much to chance. The cynical remark of the disbeliever in education—"Oh, the young men educate one another!"—is fairly applicable to such times as these. Gibbon's strictures upon the Oxford of his youth have often been quoted, and need not be repeated here. The poet Gray's experience of Cambridge, a generation earlier, was not far different, and lent a halo of fond regret to his retrospect of the life at Eton. The following extract from his letter to West in December, 1736, is perhaps not too familiar for quotation:—

"It is very possible that two and two make four, but I would not give four farthings to demonstrate this ever so clearly; and if these be the profits of life, give me the amusements of it. The people I behold all around me, it seems, know all this and more, and yet I do not know one of them who inspires me with any ambition of being like him. Surely it was of this place, now Cambridge, but formerly known by the name of Babylon, that the prophet spoke, when he said, 'the wild beasts of the desert shall dwell there, and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures, and owls shall build there, and satyrs shall dance there,' " etc.

The first signs of an intellectual revival appeared in the institution of the Tripos at Cambridge in 1747 and the Oxford Examination Statute of 1807. With

the former are associated the great names of Newton and Paley; with the latter, amongst others, that of Cyril Jackson, Dean of Christ Church from 1783 to 1809, whose success as an educator of young men anticipated much that followed, and whose interest in the work induced him to refuse two Bishoprics and the Irish Primacy.* Like Jowett after him, Cyril Jackson used to take a favoured pupil with him in vacation time.

The interest and value of the Honour System, both at Cambridge and Oxford, lay in this: that the higher work of the colleges found a meeting-point and wider scope in the sanction thus given to it by each University as a whole. The stimulus imparted by the Oxford Honour Degree left its impress on such careers as those of Peel and Gladstone, of Thomas Arnold, Mr. Justice Coleridge, and others whose names will long be remembered. At Cambridge, through her pride in the Newtonian philosophy, mathematics long reigned to the exclusion of rival studies, except so far as classics were promoted in the University of Bentley and of Porson by the Chancellor's medal, and prizes for Greek and Latin composition. The Classical Tripos was instituted in 1824. About that time many names, afterwards eminent, were amongst the youth at Cambridge, where the Union Debating Society, and the smaller coterie of the "Apostles," were outward signs of growing mental activity.

But the course of improvement at both Universities was chequered by the condition of the colleges.

* The step was also supported by the honoured names of Coplestone and Davison of Oriel.

The appointment to Fellowships was in most cases subject to obsolete conditions, and the consequent decay of public spirit, allowing scope for individual caprice, gave rise to further corruptions. Graduation at both Universities, and matriculation at Oxford, was burdened with a religious test, which excluded that increasing portion of the nation who on conscientious grounds dissented from the Church of England. Almost all the Fellowships were confined to those who were willing to take Orders, and the management of the colleges as private corporations was such as practically to limit their membership to persons who could afford a large annual outlay. The Universities, as a whole, were clerical and aristocratic. Young men of fortune, who were intended for the Bar, or for a political career, and were willing to profess themselves members of the Church of England, regarded a University course as the natural avenue to their profession. But by far the greater number of matriculated students were intended for the ministry of the Church. Many were encouraged by some preference accorded to their school, or to their town or country, or by their privilege as "Founder's Kin," which gave them a claim on a particular college for a scholarship or exhibition, and afterwards, perhaps, for a Fellowship. In the latter case they took Orders in due course, and waited on until a college living of sufficient value fell to their turn. The obligation of celibacy which bound the holder of a Fellowship made this last object one of no little importance to the individual. In the interim he might hold some

college office, as Tutor, Dean, or Bursar, and years afterwards, if he lived long enough, might have a chance of being elected to the Headship, for which, as for the papal chair, seniority was a prime recommendation. That any good work was done under these conditions stands to the credit of individual educators, of the Honour System appealing to the generous emulation of youth, and of the ideal of higher education, which slumbered but was not dead. The existing arrangements might help to maintain the credit of the Church of England for nurturing a learned clergy, but cannot be said to have conduced to the vitality of personal religion in the parishes so furnished with incumbents. A glance at the first volume of Mozley's *Reminiscences* is enough to convince anyone of this.

Nearly coincident with the institution at Oxford of a higher standard of University training through the Examination Statute of 1807, was the important step in advance made by two colleges, Oriel and Balliol, of which the former threw its Fellowships open to the world, and the latter, anticipating the legislation of 1854, in like manner opened its scholarships to general competition. These acts of wise foresight were mainly due at Balliol to Ogilvie, afterwards Professor of Pastoral Theology, and at Oriel to Coplestone (afterwards Provost of Oriel and Bishop of Llandaff) and Davison (the author of a book on Prophecy), whose act of public-spirited wisdom was thus praised by J. H. Newman, seven years after he had joined the Church of Rome:—

“Whereas the colleges of Oxford are self-electing bodies, the Fellows in each perpetually filling up for

themselves the vacancies which occur in their numbers, the members of this foundation (Oriel) determined, at a time when, either from evil custom or from ancient statute, such a thing was not known elsewhere, to throw open their fellowships to the competition of all comers, and, in the choice of associates henceforth, to cast to the winds every personal motive and feeling, family connexion and friendship, and patronage, and political interest, and local claim, and prejudice, and party jealousy, and to elect solely on public and patriotic grounds. Nay, with a remarkable independence of mind, they resolved that even the table of honours, awarded to literary merit by the University in its new system of examination for degrees, should not fetter their judgment as electors; but that at all risks, and whatever criticism it might cause, and whatever odium they might incur, they would select the men, whoever they were, to be children of their Founder, whom they thought in their consciences to be most likely from their intellectual and moral qualities to please him, if (as they expressed it) he were still upon earth; most likely to do honour to his college, most likely to promote the objects which they believed he had at heart. Such persons did not promise to be the disciples of a low Utilitarianism; and consequently, as their collegiate reform synchronised with that reform of the academical body, in which they bore a principal part, it was not unnatural that, when the storm broke upon the University from the North, their Alma Mater, whom they loved, should have found her first defenders within the walls of that small college which had first put itself into a condition to be her champion."

"The storm from the North" was an attack on Oxford studies in the *Edinburgh Review*, of which mention will be made in a succeeding chapter.

CHAPTER II.

BEGINNINGS OF FREE INQUIRY

OF the two forces above mentioned as having mainly conduced to the liberation of the Universities from ecclesiastical restrictions—such forces may be roughly characterised as Academical and Political—the rise of liberalising thought within the Universities themselves deserves to be treated first, as in the end it proved to be the more effectual. And in considering this it will be necessary to take account of certain changes or developments of opinion within the limits of the Church of England. For in the earlier years of the nineteenth century the Church and the Universities were nearly conterminous. Every graduate had to profess Church membership, and was in most cases an ordained minister, and almost every Fellow of a college was bound after a term of years to be ordained or to resign his Fellowship. These conditions had not tended much to the promotion of religion, but had sufficed in many instances to stifle the activity of thought. It should, perhaps, be noted as a compensatory advantage that almost every clergyman was a University man. But the “learning” on which Churchmen prided themselves was mostly of an uncritical and unenlightened kind. The Evan-

gelical movement had supplanted Latitudinarianism, but was losing something of its earlier vitality, and was abjectly afraid of speculation and inquiry.

After Shelley's expulsion from University College, until the publication of Milman's *History of the Jews*, there were few traces of any prevalence of liberal opinions at Oxford. But in the University of Cambridge, and particularly at Trinity College, the decade from 1820 to 1830 was a period marked by intense intellectual activity. A new spirit of free inquiry showed itself in historical criticism, in theological speculation, and in the bold assertion of Liberal or even Radical opinions.

The critical study of the New Testament had been already introduced from Germany by Bishop Marsh, whose work on the origin and composition of the first three gospels (1802) following on his translation of Michaelis' *Introduction to the New Testament*, although violently attacked by Randolph, Bishop of Oxford, had not ruined his reputation for orthodoxy, nor hindered his preferment. For Dr. Herbert Marsh was the stern upholder of "high and dry" views of Church authority against the Methodistic "enthusiasm" which was the bugbear of the day. Those who afterwards became persecutors were then the persecuted; and in denouncing the "Calvinism" of Charles Simeon and Isaac Milner, and stoutly opposing the Bible Society, Professor Marsh had the sympathy and support of the reigning ecclesiasticism.

Meanwhile, in Germany, the questions broached by Michaelis and Gieseler had reached a further stage, and when young Connop Thirlwall was introduced

to Bunsen at Rome by his friend Waddington (Bunsen's brother-in-law) in 1819, his keen curiosity was gratified by deep, fresh draughts of German thought and literature. His attention was particularly drawn in two directions—to the treatment of the Gospel question by Friedrich Schleiermacher, who, disputing with Eichhorn, in a spirit at once reverent and critical, gave a turn to the problem in some ways preparatory to the mythical theory of Strauss; and to a new *History of Rome* by Barthold Georg Niebuhr, who, as Prussian Minister, was in fact Bunsen's superior in the Embassy at Rome. The few who still remember the copious torrent of discourse that flowed incessantly from Bunsen's lips, can readily imagine how the youthful Cantab's love of knowledge, notwithstanding the "coldness" which Madame Bunsen already perceived in him, would be fired by contact with that full and ever ardent mind.

Those happy days contained the germ of much that followed. Returning to Cambridge, Thirlwall displayed his new treasures to Julius Hare, already a lover of German theological speculation, and the two friends probably then projected their translation of Niebuhr's *Rome*. But Thirlwall had been in doubt as to a profession, and reluctantly left Cambridge for the Bar. No lay Fellowship seemed to be available, and he shrank from the necessity of ordination, not out of scrupulosity, but from the desire to preserve his independence. He had written to his brother:—

"The prospect of filling a station in society which affords means of great utility ought not certainly to

be sacrificed to a punctilio. On articles which are subject to opinion there never can be an universal conformity."

But, on the other hand, he wrote to Bunsen in 1823 :—

"Some kind of employment at the University to which I belong, would, as you rightly suppose, be infinitely more congenial to my inclinations; but in order to fill any station there which would be more than temporary, it would be necessary to enter into the Church, a condition which would deprive such a situation of that which constitutes its chief attraction for me."

And to his brother he defended his choice of a profession in a similar way :—

"Two considerations prevent me from regretting the step I have taken, though not the necessity which caused it. One is my firm determination not to suffer the study of the law to engross my time so as to prevent me from pursuing the other branches of knowledge . . . the second consideration is that I have entered into no engagement which binds me any longer than suits my pleasure or convenience; that I do not make myself answerable for the maxims or doctrines of any set of men whatever, but contrive to enjoy a full independence, in thought, word, and action."

In his London chambers, while preparing diligently for his profession, he did not desert the studies of his choice. His leisure hours were given to a translation of *Schleiermacher on St. Luke*, which, with an elaborate introduction, was published anonymously in 1825. The authorship, however, was well known,

and no attempt was made to conceal it. After two more years of increasing dislike for the law, Thirlwall returned to Cambridge and was ordained. He did not think it necessary to retract what he had written. Though he wrote as a layman, he had been anxious to avoid giving offence. In a letter to Hare (October 31st, 1824), he says :—

“As to the question of inspiration, I have thought it better to take it up at the point where it was left by Marsh and his critics. I do not know whether there are still people capable of reading the book who have not yet reached that point. If there are, I do not wish to disturb their prejudices.”

Whether “capable of reading the book” or not, the religious public of that day could not be expected to tolerate an author who suggested, as Schleiermacher did, that the gospel of the Infancy contained a blending of history with poetry, and that the story of the Temptation was a parable. The book, however, did not attract sufficient attention to create a scandal, and was treated by the higher clergy with prudent neglect. Lord Melbourne, who, for reasons hereinafter stated, had his attention drawn to the translator as having otherwise deserved preferment from a Whig Ministry, consulted more than one bishop, who disapproved; but at last, in 1840, with the reluctant acquiescence of Archbishop Howley, made Thirlwall Bishop of St. David’s, saying at the same time, “I don’t intend, if I know it, to make a heterodox bishop.”

The work had very different consequences for one of its readers. Mr. W. M. W. Call, a parish clergy-

man of high culture and deep feeling, who was also a poet, was led by it into a course of reading and reflection which induced him to resign his living. This fact was recalled long afterwards when Thirlwall joined the other bishops in condemning *Essays and Reviews*. It was referred to with some bitterness in a pamphlet entitled *Essays and Reviews Anticipated*, which at the time was attributed to George Eliot, but was really due to Dr. Brabant, a physician of Bath, whose daughter had married Mr. Call. Dr. Brabant's interest in critical research had led him at one time to desert a flourishing practice in order to study under Paulus, the rationalistic theologian in Germany. "His lordship," says this writer, "has been so fortunate as to discover a royal road to orthodox faith, a solution of every difficulty, a confutation of every heresy; but, unhappily, this royal road opens its magnificent portals only to twenty-six individuals out of twenty millions." It thus appears that the Higher Criticism had already a disturbing influence in the Church of England.

Strangely enough, the translation of Niebuhr's *Rome* by Thirlwall and Hare, of which the first volume was published in 1828, gave rise to suspicions from which the translator of *Schleiermacher* had escaped. One reason, perhaps, was that the translators were known as clergymen; another, that Julius Hare was prone to controversy. But prejudice was excited, not merely by the treatment of the early Roman history as poetical legend, but by an incidental allusion to the opening chapters of Genesis, which were assumed to be unhistorical and mythical.

The long-continued conflict of Genesis with geology, and even with ethnology, was then in its beginnings.

In the light of subsequent events, it is curious in this connexion to observe that Sir W. Hamilton, in 1834, mentioned Thirlwall and E. B. Pusey side by side as having shown an exceptional acquaintance with German theology.

The suspicions thus aroused were soon afterwards confirmed by the publication of Milman's *History of the Jews*, of which more by-and-by. For the present I return to Cambridge and to Trinity College, where Thirlwall and Hare were ruling spirits.

The mind of Julius Hare was less intent on the minutiae of criticism than on speculative theology, to which Samuel Taylor Coleridge had given what was then the dominating impulse in England. Hare's earlier thoughts found expression in *Guesses at Truth by Two Brothers* (himself and his brother Augustus, cut off by a too early death); his later reflections took shape in the *Mission of the Comforter*.

When Coleridge deserted poetry for speculation, he was not guided merely by contemporary German thought. He was also deeply impressed by the English theological literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Much as Keats found poetical salvation by going back from Pope to the Elizabethans, so Coleridge escaped from the arid conventionalities into which our popular theology was drifting, to the "ampler ether and diviner air" surrounding Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, and Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living and Dying*.

His speculations were enveloped in a "bright haze"

of mystical contemplation that admirably fitted them to soften the inevitable transition from narrower to wider views of divine truth. His distinction between "omjective and summjective," caricatured by Carlyle, and still more that between the Reason and the understanding, which he borrowed from Kant, were reconciling formulæ, which encouraged the hope that manifest contradictions and discrepancies, the "antinomies of the Understanding," would ultimately resolve themselves in some higher principle. His conception of the Church as "the congregation of faithful men," was also fruitful in results:—

"As far as the principle on which Archbishop Laud and his followers acted went to reactuate the idea of the Church, I go along with them, but I soon discover that by the Church they mean the clergy, the hierarchy exclusively, and there I fly off from them at a tangent. For it is this very interpretation of the Church that, according to my conviction, constituted the prime and fundamental apostasy."

Coleridge's writings and his endless talk were welcomed by some minds as a timely antidote for the revolutionary wildness so rife amongst young Cambridge wits, resulting, for example, in the Spanish "raid," in which not Sterling and Kemble only (Tennyson's "J. M. K."), but Trench, the future Archbishop, joined. Both in the Cambridge Union, and in the select conclave of the "Apostles," voices were raised in favour of causes hardly whispered of elsewhere. The Cambridge Union of that day included, besides Macaulay and John Sterling, such men as Frederick Maurice, Richard Trench, John M. Kemble,

Charles Buller, Venables, and Monckton Milnes (Lord Houghton). Carlyle's description of the Cambridge Liberal is well known:—

“A young ardent soul looking with hope and joy into a world overclouded to the zenith and the nadir of it by incredible uncredited traditions, solemnly sordid hypocrisies, and beggarly deliriums old and new, which latter class it was clearly the part of every noble heart to expend all its lightnings and energies in burning up without delay, which process it did not then seem to him could be very difficult, or attended with much other than heroic joy of victory or of battle.”

This kind of radicalism seems to have been crushed out of Oxford for the time. There the orthodox Evangelical and the Tory Churchman were maintaining an unequal combat with the Tractarians, who, confident of victory, used the weapon of ridicule against their adversaries. The excellent Dr. Symons, of Wadham, with his thick utterance and awkward gait, became their butt as “Ben Symons,” with “Lydia his spouse”; and Golightly, who “walked delicately,” a good, though narrow-minded man, was rechristened “Agag.” An anecdote told on the authority of Mark Pattison, throws a curious light on the situation. When Newman (about 1840) was in retirement with his disciples at Littlemore, “Ben Symons” called one day. Newman came to the door. “I want to see the monastery here,” said the uncouth visitant. “No monastery here,” said Newman, and shut the door in his face. The latest phase of this contention was the inhibition of Pro-

fessor Pusey by Samuel Wilberforce, in the earlier days of his episcopate.

But amongst distinguished Oxonians there was one sober spirit, at once poet and critic, "a strong swimmer," untouched alike by republican exuberance and clerical reaction, then chiefly known as the author of a poetical drama which had been produced in London, and of a sacred poem on the Fall of Jerusalem. In the quiet of a country vicarage he composed his *History of the Jews*, of which the first instalment appeared in Murray's *Family Library* in 1829. This was, to quote the words of Dean Stanley, "the first decisive inroad of German theology into England: the first palpable indication that the Bible could be studied like another book, that the characters and events of the sacred history could be treated at once critically and reverently. Those who were but children at the time," continues the Dean, "can remember the horror created in remote rural districts by the rumour that a book had appeared in which Abraham was described as a Sheikh." I am able to corroborate this testimony. At some time in the sixties, I had the pleasure of meeting Mrs. Charles Kingsley, who said to me, "When I was a girl I was forbidden to look at Milman's *History of the Jews*. Now I am reading the new edition to my own daughters." The book was publicly condemned, in 1830, at Oxford by Faussett, the Margaret Professor of Divinity, and at Cambridge by J. J. Blunt, the author of a *History of the Reformation*, in his Hulsean Lectures. In the Memoir of John Murray, the publisher, it is

narrated how "a wild storm of disapproval gathered, burst, and fell, and Sunday after Sunday Milman was denounced . . . in language to which we have since unhappily become too well accustomed, as holding heretical opinions, as a most dangerous and pernicious writer." A contributor to the *Edinburgh Review*, supposed to be Tom Moore, observed sagaciously, "Woe unto the young divine who, like the accomplished author of the *History of the Jews*, dares to reason, however unpretendingly and sensibly, upon matters of religious concernment. On him will the theological reviews, monthly and quarterly, pour the vials of their wrath; for him the golden paths of preferment will, as sure as he lives, be shut." But the storm blew over, and after several years "full of activity, intellectual progress, diversified pursuits," the Vicar of St. Mary's, Reading, became the Dean of St. Paul's. And when from the decanal chair he gave his countrymen the *History of Latin Christianity*, the chorus of abuse was changed to sullen silence. Lord Melbourne said, "There must have been a general assembly of all the clergy in the kingdom, in which they have bound themselves by a solemn compact not to mention the book to any human being."

Dean Milman through a long and honoured life adhered steadfastly to the principles enunciated in his earliest work, maintaining, as before, that "God made the Jews no more premature Christians than premature astronomers." At the height of the *Essays and Reviews* controversy, in 1863, he republished the *History of the Jews*, with a Preface

at once bold and dignified, in which he reasserted his position.

“These views,” he wrote, “more free it was then thought, and bolder than common, he dares not say irreverent, have been his safeguard during a long and not unreflective life, against the difficulties arising out of the philosophical and historical researches of our times ; and from such views many, very many, of the best and wisest men whom it has been his blessing to know with greater or less intimacy, have felt relief from pressing doubts, and found that peace which is attainable only through perfect freedom of mind. Others may have the happiness (a happiness he envies not) to close their eyes against, to evade or to elude these difficulties. Such is not the temper of his mind. With these views he has been able to follow out all the marvellous discoveries of science, and all those hardly less marvellous, if less certain, conclusions of historical, ethnological, linguistic criticism, in the serene confidence that they are utterly irrelevant to the truth of Christianity, to the truth of the Old Testament . . . its distinct and perpetual authority and its indubitable meaning.”

The “marvellous discoveries of science,” of which the Dean here speaks, were becoming more widely known at the very time when the popular theology of the Evangelical School had crystallised into a rigid orthodoxy, which insisted on the literal acceptance and interpretation of the Bible records. The truths of astronomy indeed were not disputed, and instead of causing offence, as in the time of Galileo, were rather the object of pious contemplation. It was admitted that in speaking of the earth as im-

movable, or of the sun as travelling across the sky, God had condescended to human ignorance. Speculations as to the plurality of worlds were at this time in abeyance. It was the comparatively new science of geology that was now a source of trouble and confusion. Hutton, in the eighteenth century, and even Dean Buckland and Adam Sedgwick in the nineteenth, had spoken only to the few. An Oxford or Cambridge Professor in those days had a limited audience! Most persons rested contentedly in the diluvial theory. The fossils were remains of animals overtaken by the Flood. But with the publication of Lyell's *Principles of Geology*, in 1830, there commenced the long-continued conflict, of which the echoes are still audible amongst us, between geology and Genesis. The alliteration helped to point the contrariety. Was the world then so very, very old? Must the chronology of Archbishop Ussher, enshrined on the margin of our English Bibles, be discarded as baseless? And to come nearer to a central doctrine, came death into the world before the Fall?

As the geological proofs became more irrefragable, ingenious attempts at reconciliation arose and multiplied, from the interpretation of the six days as periods of immense duration, to the strange hypothesis of a sudden creation with all the appearances of indefinite growth. "Development" in those days was a word that smacked of infidelity, much as its equivalent "evolution" has been associated with agnosticism at a later time. The frank admission that the Bible teaches religion, but not science,

struck too hardly against the prejudices of the religious world. The stages through which such controversy seemed destined to pass, are well characterised in a saying quoted by Sir C. Lyell from Agassiz, "First they say, 'it is not true'; then, that 'it is contrary to religion'; and at last, 'that everyone knew it before.'"

Some uneasiness, however, was manifested by the number of books now published on the subject of Christian evidences. Paley's treatment, in the light of new discoveries, was felt to be inadequate. His *Horæ Paulinæ* was supplemented by Blunt's *Undesigned Coincidences*. The indisputable facts which had occasioned scepticism were ingeniously turned into defences of the Faith. Thus Hugh Miller, the original investigator of the old red sandstone, entitled his chief work the *Testimony of the Rocks*. The whole series of Bridgewater Treatises was conceived in a similar spirit. Chalmers' *Astronomical Discourses*, a few years later, and the institution of the Burnett Prize, had a corresponding motive. It may be noted in passing that the ethnological difficulties connected with the interpretation of the tenth chapter of Genesis had as yet hardly been discussed in England.

Meanwhile the Higher Criticism, though discouraged, was not altogether silent in Great Britain. Thomas Arnold had been greatly fascinated by Niebuhr's work, which was recommended to him by Julius Hare in 1825, and in the first volume of his *History of Rome* he followed the great critic's lead

by casting the lives of the kings into the form of poetical legends. He learned the German language in order to study Niebuhr better, and in his enthusiasm for German criticism was led into a correspondence with Bunsen, which became more intimate as time advanced.

Arnold was not free from prejudices. His wrath against the "Judaizers," as he called the Tractarians, was equalled by his excessive abhorrence of Unitarianism, which shocked his intense adoration of the Person of Christ. His theory of the relations of Church and State, like his friend Bunsen's, were Utopian and impracticable. Thus he was sternly opposed to the admission of Jews to Parliament. Of physical science he knew about as much as other Oxford first-class men of his day. But hereafter it will be accounted to him for righteousness that he protested vehemently against the crude superstition that a proved apostolical succession is an indispensable sign of a pure Christian ministry. And on the subject of biblical criticism his mind was clear. Had he lived longer he would have made his own contribution to the interpretation of the New Testament as a human document; and in his lectures on history, delivered shortly before his lamented death, there are some striking statements, which show the direction in which his mind was working. To him moral and spiritual truths were out of comparison more important than anything external. On the question of miracles, for example, which had been revived by J. H. Newman's attempt to place the medieval miracles and those of the

Gospel on the same footing, he said : " Miracles must not be allowed to overrule the gospel ; for it is only through our belief in the gospel that we accord our belief in them." He is also reported to have declared the narrative of the Deluge to be mythical, and the Mosaic cosmogony to be of no real importance to the Christian faith. Arnold's notice of Niebuhr's first volume in the *Quarterly Review* of 1825 was the first introduction of the work to the English public. His enthusiastic admiration for the writer never flagged, and was confirmed by the acquaintance which he made with Niebuhr shortly before the latter's death, in 1831. He desired to complete Thirlwall's and Hare's labour by translating the third volume. Many passages of his letters suggest the thought, how invaluable a mind so penetrative, so incisive, and so ardently Christian would have been during the contention that arose in the succeeding decades. " I feel almost," he wrote, " as if I had a testimony to deliver, which I ought not to withhold. And Milman's *History of the Jews* makes me more and more eager to deliver myself of my conceptions."

Matthew Arnold once said that his father was the last honest Liberal Churchman, but this was before the judgment of Lord Westbury had made of Mr. Wilson and Dr. Rowland Williams honest men.

The appointment of Renn Dickson Hampden, whose Bampton Lectures on the Scholastic Philosophy had been censured by the Oxford Convocation, to a Regius Professorship of Divinity in 1836, led to a violent, though ephemeral controversy, which

was revived with much acrimony on the preferment of the same divine by Lord John Russell to the Bishopric of Hereford in 1847, when Dr. Merewether, the Dean of Hereford, went so far as to vote against his appointment at the *congè d'élire*. These were "shadows of coming events," but of little importance in themselves. Hampden never seems to have had an influence proportionate to his ability and learning; his writings have no charm, and, once a bishop, he appears to have subsided into inactivity. The sarcasm of a controversialist was probably aimed at him: "There is one remedy for the inconveniences attending upon thought—that is, ceasing to think."

In looking backward it is strange to observe the different limits of so-called orthodoxy which have prevailed at different times. In the years from 1830 to 1850 popular theology, apart from Newmanism, rested on half-understood traditions of the seventeenth century. The Bible, the religion of Protestants, was regarded as too sacred to be investigated like another book. Bibliolatry interfered with interpretation. "Liberty of prophesying" was further narrowed by a rigidly formulated "scheme of salvation" (identified with the Gospel), which every religious teacher was bound to assume. The whole "gospel" must be brought into every sermon: else there was something wrong. The wildest applications of prophecy to recent or even future events found willing listeners. But the teacher who suggested that the narrative of the Creation or of the fall of man was unhistorical was at once liable to be

branded as an infidel. Questions concerning the age and composition of the gospels might be cautiously approached, so long as it was supposed to be understood that the "harmony" so often vainly attempted was surely possible. But the mythical theory with which Strauss had sought to vindicate the Messianic mission of our Lord could no more be mentioned than the rationalistic views of Semler and Paulus, which the work of Strauss was piously intended to supersede. The *Leben Jesu* was quite beyond the pale; and the translation of it, executed partly by Miss Evans (George Eliot), and partly by Dr. Brabant's daughter, Mrs. Hennell, afterwards Mrs. Call (p. 20), could not appear upon the bookshelves of persons professing orthodoxy. *Taboos* were more effectual then than now. Years afterwards, when Professor Jowett made some proposals for a work on Plato to be published by the Clarendon Press, one of the delegates asked him apprehensively whether an essay on the myths of Plato had any connexion with the mythical theory of Strauss!

Another line of inquiry to be avoided at all hazards was that connected with the word *development*, a bugbear which had far more power of scaring religious sensitiveness than the corresponding word *evolution* has had in our day. It was thought that to admit development was to deny creation, and to rob the Creator of His glory. And when the unknown author of the *Vestiges of Creation* (whether Page, the geologist, or Robert Chambers, or both in one) sought by an effort of imagination to combine the nebular theory with the geological record

in such a way as to suggest a possible theory of creation by development, the religious world held up their hands in horror. The saying doubtfully imputed to Laplace that the being of a God was a needless hypothesis, was supposed to lie in wait for the reader of such a book, and to be ready to infect him with atheism. Nor were these suspicions likely to be allayed by the appeal of the Christian philosopher:—

“Shall we doubt the world to be the creation of a divine power, only because it is more wonderful than could have been conceived by them of old time; or human reason to be in the image of God, because it too bears the marks of an overruling law or intelligence?”

This condition of the public mind was not favourable to the relaxation of any bond, however artificial, which was supposed to afford security for religious education on what was considered to be the only sound basis. The upholders of the “Christian deposit,” in their anxiety (which hardly proved the robustness of their faith), feared lest the touch of a profane or incautious hand might bring the whole fabric down. The rise of free inquiry within the Church, having its source in the Universities, thus gave the only clear promise of the removal of restrictions which made these institutions barren, to a great extent, of the benefits which they might else confer upon the nation at large.

CHAPTER III.

EARLY ATTEMPTS AT LEGISLATION

AFTER the passing of the Reform Act the party of progress in Great Britain, in the elation of their triumph, regarded many things as possible which in former years had appeared to be chimerical, or inconceivable without a revolution. Popular aspirations for more enlightenment were met by efforts for the diffusion of knowledge, the founding of mechanics' institutes, and the like. And in the first Reformed Parliament, under the Whig Administration of Earl Grey, much was attempted which, in the succeeding half-century, the persistent energy of Liberal politicians has achieved but slowly, if at all. The abolition of slavery was, indeed, a notable success—a measure which, with whatever drawbacks and faults of overhaste it may have been accompanied, reflects undying honour on our land and people. The factory legislation initiated by the Earl of Shaftesbury (then Lord Ashley) was carried with comparative rapidity to a satisfactory issue. But other enactments, seemingly of minor import, but not less beneficent in their way, of which the present generation quietly reaps the fruit, have only been brought about after a long-continued struggle through the indefatigable agency

of persons more clear-sighted than their contemporaries, whose services, now that their work is accomplished, are too apt to be left out of sight on the part of those who are profiting by the result. It may suffice to mention, by the way, the agitation against flogging in the army, and the movement in favour of voting by ballot—a measure first proposed by Mr. Grote in 1833.

In the years from 1830 to 1834 men were clamouring against disabilities of every kind; and privilege in every form—ecclesiastical privilege most of all—was threatened. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, and Catholic Emancipation, which shortly followed, only made the classes so liberated more eager to occupy the vantage-ground which had been provided for them by parliamentary reform. The Nonconformists were in a better position than they had held since 1689, and, partly through the errors of Churchmen, had of late years greatly multiplied; and in their first bold attempt, the attack on Church emoluments in Ireland, in which they had the Roman Catholics to back them, they succeeded beyond hope. The reduction of Irish bishoprics, the Tithes Act, and the appointment of an Ecclesiastical Commission for Ireland might well seem to hold forth a formidable menace to Church temporalities in general. The admission of a Quaker member on his solemn affirmation, without taking the oath, might further be noted as a sign of coming change.

It is not wonderful that at such a critical time a thinker so far-seeing as Henry Hart Milman should have written to a friend (February 10th, 1831):—

“I suppose in these regenerating times bishops will not last long. How many of them must put on their wigs the wrong way in trembling anticipation of the approaching crisis!”

In 1834 it was actually proposed in Parliament to exclude the bishops from the House of Lords.

The alarm thus created in ecclesiastical circles found expression in Keble's famous assize sermon at Oxford on “National Apostasy”—a *manifesto* which Newman himself regarded as the starting-point of what was afterwards known as the Tractarian Movement.

As an ill wind ever blows some good, the fears now awakened had one remarkable effect in the foundation of the University of Durham, in which the wealthy cathedral establishment of that city, under the enlightened influence of Bishop Van Mildert, sank (or shall we rather say invested?) a considerable portion of their princely revenues; indeed a tub to the whale! This act, whether prompted by generosity or by a wise and public-spirited caution, has borne lasting fruit; and at the time, together with the working of the Ecclesiastical Commission (appointed in 1831) went far to mitigate the force of anti-clerical agitation.

Meanwhile the Nonconformists, on their part, were too confident, and, by asking for too much at once, retarded the progress of the special movement (which at the outset seemed to promise well) for relaxing religious tests in the Universities. Many persons who were sincerely attached to the Church of England as by law established, and shrank from anything

that would undermine her predominance, saw clearly the absurdity of imposing a theological test upon mere boys, and even doubted the expediency of requiring religious conformity as a means of academical discipline. At Cambridge indeed, where, as the reader knows, the free discussion of political and religious questions was already in the air, there was a growing sentiment in favour of complete relaxation. Contemporary opinion is summed up by Thirlwall in a letter to Bunsen :—

“The Dissenters loudly demand admission to all the benefits of education afforded by our Universities. The demand seems very reasonable; but those who look not only to the thing in itself, but to its consequences, believe that such a measure would subvert the Universities as ecclesiastical establishments.”

Meanwhile the entire subject of University reform had been freshly mooted in the *Edinburgh Review*. The Scotch reviewers had in very early days tried their strength in an attack on Oxford, where the University Statute of 1807 gave to Jeffrey and Playfair (with the help of Sydney Smith) an opportunity of inveighing against the English University as the representative of classical education. That criticism was misdirected, and had little effect. It was ably answered by Coplestone, afterwards Bishop of Llandaff, and others. The reviewers had not been contented with saying, “These things ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other (the teaching of modern subjects) undone.” It was a very different matter when, in January, 1831, Sir William Hamilton,

himself an Oxonian, took up the pen and began the famous series of articles on the state of the English Universities, which were republished, with notes, in his volume of *Discussions* in 1852. His assault was based on the essential nature of the Universities as such. The colleges, he contended, as private foundations had usurped the place of the ancient University, which was, or ought to be, a national, or rather a "cosmopolite," institution. The nineteen Heads, empowered by the Laudian Statute which gave them the initiative, had rendered nugatory all professorial instruction, had destroyed the significance of all degrees except the Baccalaureat in Arts, and had entrusted all teaching, except one fortnight's lectures in theology for intending clergymen, to their own Fellows, who were appointed, not for their acquirements, but in most cases because of local or other claims and antecedents, and were elected under hampering conditions. This "illegal system in bestowing on the College Fellows the monopoly of education bestowed it exclusively on the Church." How, then, were the Universities to be restored to the nation? Sir William's answer at this time was simply (1) to give back the government of the University to its graduates; (2) to make the Professoriate a reality; (3) to restore to every M.A., as regent, the right of tuition; (4) to revive the custom, which had lapsed since the Reformation, of licensing halls or hostels, each presided over by a Master of Arts, which should be independent of the colleges. But he admitted from the first that a "tutorial system in subordination to a professorial (which Oxford formerly enjoyed)"

might afford "*the condition of an absolutely perfect University.*"

Thus in 1831 the Scotch logician anticipated much subsequent discussion; but in 1834, when the question of admitting Dissenters was actually raised, he had begun to realise the complexity of the problem, and suggested further that the rights of the colleges as private corporations might be overridden by the authority of Parliament, and that so far at least as non-foundationers were concerned, such rights could not be allowed to have substantial force. The Collegiate System (or "collegial," as Sir William termed it) was too firmly rooted to be set aside (even in 1852 we find J. H. Newman describing the ideal University as an aggregate of colleges), and in the end it will be seen that it was even more through a reform of the colleges in the light of national requirements than by reconstituting the University as such, that the nationalisation of Oxford and Cambridge was secured. In republishing his *Discussions* in 1852, Sir William appears to have been aware of this, and dwells elaborately on the comparative inefficiency of many of the colleges, especially upon the change for the worse that had taken place in Christ Church.

Regarded as a whole, Sir William Hamilton's argument is a splendid piece of reasoned invective. That it should have failed to produce any adequate effect; that his imputation of perjury should be safely ignored by such honourable men as Bishop Phillpotts and Sir Robert Inglis, and even by the Duke of Wellington (then Chancellor of Oxford), may have been due partly to the very vehemence

of the assault; but also proves, if there were need for proof, that oaths and subscriptions imposed in one century can have no binding force in an altered world, but are an inert and fruitless burden on the consciences of succeeding generations. It may have been in consequence, however, of his fierce denunciations, that the oath to observe the Statutes of the University was rescinded by Convocation in 1838.

Sir William Hamilton succeeded in forecasting much of what is now familiar in the life of Oxford, but which at the time when he wrote was non-existent:—

1. The election to college Fellowships by merit, apart from local and other conditions and restrictions.
2. The consequent elevation of the college tutor to a position resembling that of a Professor, and the mutual approximation of professorial and tutorial instruction.
3. The system of intercollegiate lecturing.
4. The institution of University Boards of studies.
5. The admission of Nonconformists to matriculation, graduation, and University and college offices.
6. An increase in the number of houses of residence adapted to the wants of various classes of students.
7. The abolition of artificial social distinctions, such as the position of the Gentleman Commoner and the Servitor, stigmatised already by Southey in his *Life of Wesley* (1820).

8. The increased endowment of the Professoriate and the creation of new chairs in several faculties.
9. The admission of non-collegiate students (provided for by Mr. Ewart's Act of 1867).
10. The restoration to substantial importance of the Faculties of Law and Medicine.
11. The institution of a Theological School.

His writing on the subject had become more practical in the interval between 1831 and 1851, and he saw more clearly than some who have written since that the main lever for improvement rested on the examination system which had been set on foot in 1807. His *Discussions* form, indeed, the quarry out of which many subsequent pamphlets have been hewn. These are but "fragments from his great feast." He himself was led to modify in some degree the sharpness of the difference, which had been too long lost sight of, between the aggregate of colleges and the University properly so-called. The reason was that he at first despaired of nationalising the colleges, and elevating them to an academical standard. When he found that this was possible, he yielded to no one in valuing the possibilities of the tutorial element, or the desirability of combining it in due measure with the professorial. Some characteristic extracts from his diatribes will be found in Appendix A (p. 273).

It appears that more than thirty pamphlets on the Admission of Dissenters to the Universities were

published in 1834. For it was in that year that legislation on this question was for the first time seriously attempted. The Whig Ministry of Lord Grey were still in the heyday of their power, and though they did not propose a Government measure of relief, it was understood that a Bill for this purpose would have their support. The abrogation of the Test and Corporation Acts, together with Catholic Emancipation, had considerably affected the personnel of the first Reformed Parliament, and Nonconformists were confidently expecting further triumphs. "They demanded, as a matter of civil right, that all religious tests should be abolished, and the Universities thrown open for the education and graduation of men of all creeds." But they felt that their chance of success would be increased if they could state the concurrence of persons from within the Universities. No voice to this effect was heard from Oxford, where the Tractarian or reactionary movement was now in embryo;* although Dr. Arnold, from Rugby, circulated a memorial for signature by Oxford and Cambridge men, embodying his own view, viz. that all Christian Dissenters, except Unitarians, should be admitted at all the colleges, and that a separate hall should be opened for Unitarians alone. But at Cambridge a petition for the admission of Dissenters to all degrees, except in Divinity, was signed by about one-third of the residents, including

* The Hebdomadal Board, indeed, moved by Dr. Hampden, proposed to substitute a declaration of Church membership for subscription; but this proposal was rejected by Convocation through the exertions of Dr. Pusey.—*Story of Dr. Pusey's Life*, p. 85.

two Heads of Houses and nine Professors, amongst others Professors Airy, Sedgwick, Musgrave, and Lee. The terms of this petition were not a little remarkable:—

“We are only asking for a restitution of our ancient academic laws and laudable customs. These restrictions were imposed on the University in the reign of James I., grievously against the wishes of many of the Senate, during times of bitter party animosity and during the prevalence of dogmas, both in Church and State, which are at variance with the spirit of English Law, and with the true principles of Christian toleration. . . . The University is a body recognised by the law of England as a lay corporation, invested with important civil privileges. . . . Your petitioners therefore . . . suggest that, as the legislative bodies of the United Kingdom have repealed the Test Act, and admitted Christians of all denominations to seats in Parliament and to places of dignity and honour, they think it both impolitic and unjust that any religious test should be exacted in the University previously to conferring the civil privileges implied in the degrees above enumerated.”

One of the chief promoters of this Cambridge movement was Connop Thirlwall, at this time an Assistant Tutor of Trinity, of whose antecedents and subsequent career something has been said in the preceding chapter. He also printed a pamphlet in which he exposed the hollowness and the mischievous effects of the compulsory attendance at the chapel services. For this he was rebuked by Christopher Wordsworth, the poet's brother, then Master of Trinity, and driven to resign his tutor-

ship; but was shortly afterwards rewarded by Lord Brougham, the Whig Lord Chancellor, with the living of Kirby Underdale, where he wrote his *History of Greece*. Lord Melbourne, as above narrated, saw to his subsequent preferment.

Some of Thirlwall's expressions were quoted with approval thirty-five years afterwards by his junior contemporary, W. Thompson, then Master of Trinity:—

“For my part I am not one of those, if there are any such, who only consider this measure as one of policy, or of liberality, or of justice, but care little about its operation. I heartily wish that, if carried, it may have the effect of attracting many Dissenters to receive an University education. I wish it not for their sakes only, but for our own. I think the substantial interests of the University, literature and science, morality and religion, would all gain by such an accession to our numbers. This belief is more than a vague surmise. It is grounded on facts, which no candid observer can dispute; it is grounded on experiment, which, though limited, is applicable as far as it goes. All observation and all analogy lead us to expect that the sons of Dissenters of the middling class—and it is such alone that we have to look for here—would add strength to that part of our students which we desire to see growing till it absorb all the rest, to that part which includes the quiet, the temperate, the thoughtful, the industrious, those who feel the value of their time and the dignity of their pursuits. Such Dissenters we have had and have now among us. I wish we had more of them. I should think the advantage of their presence cheaply purchased by any share of our endowments, which, if all were thrown open to competition, they would obtain.”

It is rather sad to think that thirty-seven years had to elapse before these rational desires were realised.

The petition was presented in the House of Lords by Lord Grey himself, and in the Commons by Mr. Spring Rice (the member for Cambridge), who shortly after this became Colonial Secretary. And it was supported there by "Mr. Secretary Stanley," afterwards the Earl of Derby and Prime Minister (the "Rupert of debate"). He was at this time a Reformer, and as Secretary for the Colonies had introduced the Ministerial Bill for the Abolition of Slavery. "As a member of the Government and of the Church, he warmly concurred in the prayer of the petition. It was a real and substantial grievance. . . . Such a system was most injurious to the real interests of religion." After some preliminary discussion and the presentation of various counter-petitions from Oxford and elsewhere, a Bill was brought in by Mr. (afterwards Sir George Matthew) Wood, then member for Lancashire, "to grant to His Majesty's subjects generally the right of admission to the English Universities, and to equal eligibility to Degrees therein, notwithstanding their diversities of religious opinion, Degrees in Divinity alone excepted."

Amongst those who spoke in favour of the measure was William Ewart, M.A. of Christ Church, Oxford, M.P. for Liverpool, whose name is honourably associated with the institution of free public libraries and with other educational improvements, including the provision for non-collegiate students at Oxford. He argued that, instead of insuring religious sincerity, the tests generated indifference to all religion. "An im-

mense body of Dissenters had grown up, and their rights could no longer be refused." Some Nonconformist members injured their cause by stating the Dissenters' claims too broadly, and mixing up the question of opening the Universities with that of Church Disestablishment. The effect of this imprudence appeared in Mr. Stanley's speech on the second reading. He had now left the Whig Government, on the Irish Church question, and his Conservative instincts had begun to assert themselves. He stated various difficulties that had occurred to him. Sir Robert Peel spoke strongly in opposition: "No modification which this Bill should receive would reconcile him to vote in favour of its principles." His argument, as summed up long afterwards by Mr. Gladstone, was to the effect that "it was impossible to admit Dissenters to education at the Universities without admitting them to degrees; that it was impossible to admit them to degrees without admitting them to government; and impossible to admit them to government without admitting them to emoluments." The sequel has so far justified the statesman's foresight; but he added the less justifiable assumption that the question now before them was, "Were they or were they not to maintain within the United Kingdom an established religion?"

Mr. Gladstone spoke in opposition to the third reading: "The Universities were undoubtedly national institutions, but only in so far as they were connected with the National Church. The present Bill desired the Universities to open their doors to every sect, Christian or not. This he hoped that the House would never allow."

It may be observed in passing that although the Faculties of Law and Medicine were still recognised, and a University education was the customary preliminary at least to the Bar, yet at this time and long afterwards it was commonly assumed that the Universities were an appanage of the Church of England, and—though little theology was taught or learned in them—ecclesiastical seminaries.

Notwithstanding such powerful opponents the Bill passed the House of Commons by a large majority—185 to 44—“amid a scene,” as we are told, “of clamour and disorder.” Its fortune in the House of Lords was naturally very different. The cry of “The Church in danger” had by this time been raised. The Duke of Wellington said :—

“Never had there been such an invasion of the established institutions of the country. The differences in the regulations of Oxford and Cambridge were more apparent than real. . . . When it was said that the young gentlemen who went to Oxford were sworn to the observation of statutes which they must know they could not keep, the charge is one of perjury. This Bill would inflict a mortal wound between Church and State.”

The Bishop of Exeter (Phillpotts) said :—

“Religion must be the foundation of sound education, and religion could not be taught except in some definite form. Universal comprehension would be universal exclusion.” And he made this characteristic peroration: “My lords, the University of Oxford I know well—many of my happiest years have been passed within it—and from that knowledge of it I speak, when I proclaim my firm conviction, that

if both Houses of Parliament shall pass the Bill which has been brought into the other House, and if His Majesty shall, unhappily, be advised, and shall yield to the advice, to give to it the Royal Assent—you will not at Oxford find a man—certainly very, very few men, who would not submit to be penniless and homeless, to be outcasts on the world, rather than do that which they now, it seems, are to be required to do—to be parties to the desecration of what they hold to be most sacred, and to the destruction of what they deem to be most valuable in this life, because it is connected with the interests of the life to come.”

The House of Lords rejected the measure on the second reading by 187 votes to 85.

This result was for the time accepted as final. The keenness of the first reforming impulse was abated, and the forces of reaction had gained. John Sterling wrote in 1839:—

“English politics seem in a queer state; the Conservatives creeping on, the Whigs losing ground; like combatants on the top of a breach; while there is a social mine below, which will probably blow both parties into the air.”

The Dissenters had shown their hand too openly, by pressing not only for degrees, but for a share of the emoluments and of government, and by bringing the question of Church establishment into the discussion. The alarm thus raised tied the hands of the advocates for academical freedom. But Mr. Ewart, in successive motions on educational matters, persisted in bringing this question also to the front. And Mr. W. Dougal Christie, C.B., a Cambridge

man (the same who edited *The Letters and Speeches of the First Lord Shaftesbury*), ventured in 1843, under Sir Robert Peel's Administration, to bring in a Bill "to abolish certain oaths and subscriptions in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and to extend education in the Universities to persons who are not members of the Church of England." He urged that such a measure would confer a benefit on the Universities, whose usefulness would be extended, and from whose escutcheons a deep stain of injustice would be wiped out; and whose hold on the national respect and affection would be strengthened by granting the rightful claim of the "numerous members of our political community whose consciences will not permit them to adopt the articles and the formularies of the Church that is established." Mr. Christie maintained that his proposal would give to the Dissenters no part in the government of the colleges, or in the professorial instruction of the Universities, but would largely encourage religious toleration. The Bill was thrown out on the first reading by a majority of 175 to 105.

This was the year of the disruption in the Church of Scotland, and in the following spring Mr. Christie again spoke in support of a Bill introduced by Mr. Fox Maule, the Free Church member, better known as Lord Panmure, for the abolition of religious tests in the Scottish Universities. The test at that time exacted from all Professors and public teachers was required by the Act of 16th January, 1707, "ratifying and approving the Treaty of Union," which provided that—

"No professors, principals, regents (*i.e.* Masters of

Arts), masters or others bearing office in any University, or College, or School . . . be capable or be admitted or allowed to continue in the exercise of their said functions, but such as shall owne and acknowledge the civil governments. . . . As also that before or at their admissions, they do and shall acknowledge and profess, and shall subscribe to the foresaid Confession of Faith as the confession of their faith, and that they will practice and conform themselves to the worship presently in use in this Church, and submit themselves to the government and discipline thereof, and never endeavour, directly or indirectly, the prejudice or subversion of the same; and that before the respective presbyteries of their bounds.”

The Bill of 1844 was rejected, although it was notorious that Professor Blackie, when appointed to the Humanity Chair at Aberdeen in 1839, after duly signing the declaration, had immediately followed up the act by a qualifying statement made orally to the Presbytery; and when the Senatus demurred to admitting him, compelled them to do so by an action in the Court of Session. It was a glaring anomaly, and continued so until 1854, when by an Act “for regulating Admission to Lay Chairs in the Scottish Universities,” Professors not in the Theological Faculty were simply required to make a declaration in presence of the Senatus Academicus in the following terms:—

“I, A. B., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that, as Professor of —— and in discharge of the said office, I will never endeavour directly or indirectly, to teach or inculcate any opinions opposed

to the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures or to the Westminster Confession of Faith, as ratified by Law in the year 1690, and that I will not exercise the functions of the said office to the prejudice or subversion of the Church of Scotland as by Law established, or to the doctrines and privileges thereof."

This enactment still remains in force, although Professor Edward Caird, now the Master of Balliol, in giving evidence before the Commission of Inquiry of 1877, objected to the retention of this declaration, and obtained the assent of a minority of the Commission. A minority of the same Commission also further proposed the abolition of the Clerical Test for the chairs of Hebrew and Church History. These points were debated in the Commission at great length (see the Report) and much evidence was led, but no conclusion reached.*

Once more, in 1845, Mr. W. D. Christie moved the following resolution:—

"That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty praying that she would be graciously pleased to appoint a Commission to enquire into and report upon all matters relating to the privileges, revenues, trusts, and to the state of education, learning, and religion in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the colleges of those Universities."

On this occasion Mr. Christie based his argument in part on the theological questionings which had recently emerged at Oxford.

* See Appendix B, p. 282.

“What is the result of all your endeavours to unite the Universities and the Church in an indissoluble theological alliance, and confine the theology of the Universities within the limits of the Thirty-Nine Articles? Why that, under the very greatest disadvantages, after having been long kept down by the heavy incubus of Oxford and Cambridge conservatism, learning has at last proclaimed her independence—burst your theological fetters; aye, and dragged the Church after the Universities into a latitude of theological speculation which well beseems a place of learning, but is utterly subversive of the foundations of your Church; and the Church of England is at this moment shaken to its centre.”

Mr. Christie's motion was seconded by Mr. William Ewart, and it was negatived by a majority of 143 to 82. His speech, above quoted, marks the beginning of an understanding between the Nonconformists represented by Mr. Christie and some of the younger Liberals at Oxford. It may be well, therefore, to reserve the sequel for a succeeding chapter.

In what immediately precedes I have been led to quote somewhat largely from the pages of *Hansard*, “The Dunciad of Political Debate,” as this seemed the only way of bringing vividly before the reader's mind the actual complexion of public opinion at this time. I now return from the political to the academical and theological ground.

CHAPTER IV.

FREE INQUIRY AT OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE

THE year 1845 marks a distinct turning-point in the mental history of Oxford. After the defection of Newman and others and their admission into the Church of Rome, the Tractarian or Neo-Catholic Movement for the time collapsed, and there was little open theological discussion. The Hampden Controversies of 1836 and 1847 were soon forgotten, except in so far as they had left in the minds of High Churchmen a rooted objection to Crown appointments. The much-feared latitudinarian Bishop gave no sign of becoming further troublesome. Dr. Pusey, who with dogged persistence continued to press the opinions associated with his name, had for the present but scant following amongst the ablest of the younger men, and when he was inhibited by Samuel Wilberforce, the new Bishop of Oxford, for preaching on the subject of the Confessional, the fact produced only a slight impression on the Oxford of the day. The Gorham judgment, affirming the admissibility of Evangelical views on Baptism, was a fresh discouragement to the Tractarians, but otherwise commanded little interest, although the preceding controversy had driven into the ranks of Nonconformity a distin-

guished London preacher, Mr. Baptist Noel. The more active minds at Oxford were drawn in two directions at once—towards the study of German philosophy, and to the question of University reform. This was the new spirit referred to by Mr. W. D. Christie in the speech which I have quoted at the end of Chapter III., and there is evidence that, in the year following his motion for a University Commission, he was approached on the subject by A. P. Stanley, and through him by Jowett.

A series of very searching questions to be addressed to Oxford tutors and Heads of Houses by such a Commission as Mr. Christie had proposed exists in Jowett's handwriting, with an endorsement in a different hand, "for Mr. W. D. Christie, from Mr. Stanley, 25th February, 1846." The questions turn on various alleged abuses which have since been remedied, relating chiefly to elections to Fellowships and the appointment of tutors. The question of subscription was not distinctly mentioned, but was probably assumed. It might be safely left in the hands of the Liberal member for Plymouth.

The point was certainly much canvassed in Oxford at that time, though less with a view to the admission of Nonconformists than to the relief of consciences in general. For it had been raised in an acute form by the discussion which followed the famous 90th Tract attributed to J. H. Newman. He and his followers had claimed the right of holding various Roman doctrines while remaining within the Church of England. As it was against these very doctrines that many of the Articles of Religion were originally

directed, the Tractarians were reduced to the dilemma of either treating subscription as a mere form not binding on the conscience, or of reverting to the expedient formerly adopted by candidates for ordination who were inclined to Socinianism, namely, that of upholding a "non-natural" interpretation.* The casuistical leanings of the Tractarian School inclined them to the latter course, which was advocated in the notorious Tract. The minds of thoughtful young men were evidently much exercised on the subject. Jowett was at this time on the point of undertaking the combined responsibilities of college tutor and an ordained minister; and in a notebook of 1842, amongst other pencillings relating to a foreign tour and to the preparation of his lectures, several pages are occupied with a disquisition on the subject, in which reasonings *pro* and *con* are tabulated in the manner recommended by John Locke. Much is said therein concerning the *animus imponentis*. What did the framers of the Articles intend? What precedents have been recorded? Is the intention of the Church to-day the same as in the seventeenth century? What authority is to decide? Can it be seriously affirmed that the existing Bench of Bishops, for example, are unanimous in upholding each and all of five hundred disputed propositions? The querist "finds no end, in wandering mazes lost."

The theological ferment, of which *Tracts for the Times* were the most significant outcome, was by

* On this point it is instructive to look back to the discussions of the earlier and later eighteenth century. See App. to Chap. VII., p. 149.

no means limited to the adherents of High Church views. The critical spirit, of which the rise within the Church of England, especially at Cambridge, has been described above, had consequences which led to much searching of hearts. The case of Mr. W. M. Call has been already mentioned. A more manifest symptom of similar uneasiness appeared in the two Memoirs of John Sterling by Julius Hare and Thomas Carlyle. Sterling was the younger contemporary and pupil of Julius Hare at Cambridge, and after some years of unsettlement, ending in the fatal Spanish "raid," had taken Orders and worked for eight months at Hurstmonceaux as curate to his former tutor. His health broke down, and he resigned the curacy. For a year or two he preached occasionally in London. Then he relinquished clerical work, and for the remainder of his short and broken life devoted himself to literature. A disproportionate interest was given to this slight career by Carlyle's masterly biography. We are told that that splendid record of a broken life is due to a dispute with Thirlwall at Lord Ashburton's table over the Memoir which Hare had written of their friend. To Carlyle it seemed an indignity that so bright a genius should have been bound to the ministry of the Church of England even for so short a time. But is this an altogether worthy judgment? If that lambent flame could have burned steadily on any spot of earth for one lifetime, would its light have been wasted in spreading culture and pure religion around Hurstmonceaux? Might not that have been as useful a function as

the contribution of certain *jeux d'esprit* to "Maga," the reviewing of *Sartor Resartus*, or the production of a thin stream of ineffectual verse?

In his denunciation of this "clerical aberration," of "Coleridgean moonshine" and transcendental fantasies, Carlyle lets fall one saying which would have justified his friend, if the restlessness born of physical infirmity had permitted him to persevere at his post as a Christian minister: "Quit not the burnt ruins . . . while you find there is still gold to be dug there." This is what Sterling's friend and brother-in-law, F. D. Maurice, believed that he had found. This was the prospecting business for which Wilson and Rowland Williams and Colenso, and in a measure Jowett also, were persecuted for years. If Carlyle had poured out his wrath against their persecutors, against those who heaped the rubbish higher, or set a guard upon it and forbade the search, his denunciations would have been more in place. Instead of that we find him siding with those who, in the interest of priestcraft, would suppress inquiry, crying out that such "deserters should be shot," or siding with Samuel Wilberforce, the episcopal hypnotiser, and abetting him in the attempt to stifle the honest endeavour to discard "Hebrew old clothes," and find a way of "exodus from Houndsditch." This was but a lame sequel to his description of the system which the Bishop was endeavouring to uphold:—

"Theologies, rubrics, surplices, Church articles, and this enormous ever-repeated thrashing of the straw. A world of rotten straw; thrashed all into

powder; filling the universe and blotting out the stars and worlds! Heaven pity you with such a thrashing-floor for world, and its draggled dirty farthing candle for sun."

It would seem as if the object made no difference to the reviler, so long as there was matter to revile. Carlyle's friend and Sterling's, John Stuart Mill, although a more hardened sceptic than either of them, once gave expression to a more considerate view:—

"If all were to desert the Church who put a large and liberal construction on its terms of communion, all who would wish to see those terms widened, the national provision for religious teaching and worship would be left utterly to those who take the narrowest, the most literal, and purely textual view of the formularies; who, though by no means necessarily bigots, are under the great disadvantage of having the bigots for their allies, and who, however great their merits may be—and they are often very great—yet, if the Church is improvable, are not the most likely persons to improve it. . . . Almost all the illustrious reformers of religion began by being clergymen, but they did not think that their profession as clergymen was inconsistent with their being reformers. They mostly, indeed, ended their days outside the churches in which they were born; but it was because the churches in an evil hour for themselves cast them out."

No, the work of an English clergyman who holds liberal opinions in theology is not therefore a "sham." I have known several whose labour in elevating the moral and spiritual standard of whole districts, continued through a lifetime amidst uncongenial

surroundings, has, I am convinced, a lasting value, beyond comparison greater than that of a brilliant *litterateur*. One, but lately gone from us, whom I could name here, if it were not impertinent to do so, was an open and ardent supporter of Colenso, and, of course, had no preferment. To eliminate such work as his by pressing the literal acceptance of articles and formularies would tend to the spiritual impoverishment both of Church and nation.*

Maurice, as above said, was Sterling's brother-in-law, and another of the younger friends and contemporaries of Julius Hare, whose sister he married. No more religious nature has appeared in our time. The broken-hearted tones in which he read (not monotoned) the Confession at an ordinary morning service came manifestly from the depths of a soul that had wrestled with God. He had been converted from Unitarianism partly through his intercourse with Coleridge, and the religious writings of modern times which had most influenced him were those of William Law, the author of the *Serious Call*, and Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, who did so much towards softening Calvinistic asperities in Scotland. Maurice's intense attachment to the doctrines of the Church of England as he conceived them, made the aspersions to which he was exposed more painful to him. His dismissal from his post at King's College after the publication of his *Theological Essays* in 1853 marks an epoch in the development of opinion which is

* What Matthew Arnold called "the secret of Jesus" is with such men as these.

here under review. An interesting light is thrown upon the crisis in the biography of C. H. Pearson, who had worked under Maurice at King's College, and whose witness is beyond suspicion. He speaks of Principal Jelf as an amiable man and as deeply regretting what seemed to him the necessity of the step which was forced on him by others. The whole incident afforded a striking example of the kind of misunderstanding which at that time was still possible between good men. The crucial question was that of the eternity of punishment, of which little enough is heard from pulpits in the present day. Maurice's explanation of his views was characteristically laboured and obscure, but appears to have had a fascination for the subtle mind of Mr. Gladstone, who was one of the Governors of King's. To the plain sense of Lord Palmerston it seemed a capital jest that Gladstone should leave his duties as a Minister of State to discuss the difference between "everlasting" and "eternal." What Maurice meant was simple enough. He merely contended that while the principle on which the sinner was condemned was absolute, and the punishment of sin was in that sense eternal, it did not follow that the sinner himself was everlastingly excluded from possibilities of good which resided in the infinity of divine mercy. The painfulness of the position was aggravated by the sensitive and anxious scrupulosity of Maurice's own nature. This showed itself at a later time, when, during an acute phase of the Colenso controversy, he was haunted by the conviction that he ought to resign the incumbency of St. Peter's Chapel in Vere

Street, where he was doing excellent work. The difficulty which friends found in persuading him to overcome this quixotic scruple appears in a letter of Milman to Stanley, in which the Dean of St. Paul's exclaims, "What a strange, perverse, noble, unaccountable, right-hearted, and wrong-headed man it is!"

His misfortune at once gathered round him a band of admiring disciples, especially at Cambridge, where the current of religious feeling that Charles Simeon had set in motion was still flowing, and, through the progress of enlightenment, was prepared to run in wider channels. Henry and Frank Mackenzie, Charles Taylor, and James Clerk Maxwell, at Trinity, and Maxwell's cousin, Charles Mackenzie, the missionary bishop, at Caius, were not unworthy successors of Henry Martyn and Kirke White, and they were lovers of Maurice and his works. The Simeonite tradition dwelt more on personal religion than on ecclesiasticism.

The new interest thus awakened extended to Scotland, where English theological movements have always been followed sympathetically by cultured persons, and the writings of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, after the synodical condemnation of such men as Edward Irving and John Macleod Campbell, were infusing a moral element into a theology which had threatened to become inhuman and to diverge more and more from common life. The Scottish conscience has been less troubled with casuistical scruples than the English mind; changes of opinion even amongst the clergy have passed lightly over

the Confession of Faith ; but at the time now spoken of some of the most promising students of divinity were drawn by Maurice's writings from Presbyterianism into the Church of England. The ablest of these was James Noble Bennie, who became a Canon of Peterborough. These men always spoke of Maurice as "the prophet."

The main outlines of Maurice's theology are abundantly clear. The Fatherhood of God, the Eternal Sonship, the Spiritual Kingdom, were to him realities which penetrated his entire being. But when dealing with particular statements, or with the thoughts of others, now reading his own opinions into theirs, now travestying the views which he controverted, his style became to many readers bewilderingly obscure. There is some truth in the witticism of a contemporary: "Maurice thinks that everybody is right and that everybody is wrong, and that he himself is more right and more wrong than anybody."

The frustration, for the time being, of Maurice's academical and theological career only gave a more intense vitality to the philanthropic schemes which were associated with his beliefs, and in which he showed a far-sighted enthusiasm. The foundation of the Working Men's College—an institution which still exists, and has of late, under Professor Albert Dicey, put forth increased activity—and some years earlier of Queen's College, in London, anticipated much which has been since effected under the name of University Extension. Someone observed that Maurice, when rejected by his compeers, had "turned to the Gentiles." In connexion with the same move-

ment, lectures were given to the workmen at the Oxford Museum, which was then rising under the auspices of Mr. Ruskin. I was myself enlisted as a young B.A., and delivered a discourse on Moral Philosophy, on which I remember being complimented by an elderly artisan.

“Christian Socialism” is a vague and ambiguous term, and has often covered enterprises at once crude and mischievous. But the Christian Socialism of Maurice, by which he and his followers, Charles Kingsley, Mr. Ludlow, and Thomas Hughes, endeavoured to give some rational guidance to the wild aspirations which had failed in Chartism, took a practical direction in the encouragement of the principle of Co-operation, the effect of which is still manifest amongst us, and is fruitful in benefits to society.

C. H. Pearson, in the Memoir already quoted, truly says of Frederick Maurice that he was “not as other men. He had a rare power of stimulating thought. But his real strength was in his personal magnetism.” Speaking of him at a later time, when he was teaching Moral Philosophy at Cambridge, Mr. Pearson adds: “He breakfasted with me one morning to meet some friends from the country. One of them, a lady, said to me afterwards, ‘I have been brought up all my life to look upon Professor Maurice with perfect horror. To-day I can hardly take my eyes off him. I never saw so beautiful a face; it is that of an angel.’ The face was only the very inadequate expression of a mind of great thoughtfulness and a character of singular nobility.”

It is all but forgotten nowadays that Maurice was one of the earliest editors of the *Athenæum*. One whose intellect John Stuart Mill admired, in spite of profound differences of opinion, and who was the honoured friend of Tennyson, must always be mentioned with respect. The reader may recall Lord Tennyson's address to Maurice (dated January, 1854) as

" Being of that honest few,
 Who give the Fiend himself his due,
 Should eighty thousand college councils
 Thunder 'anathema,' friend, at you."

Charles Kingsley had attached himself to Maurice from about the year 1844, and may justly be regarded as his disciple, though having also a message of his own, which may be briefly described as "the consecration of things secular." Those who remember the effect produced in Sabbatarian Scotland by John Caird's sermon on *Religion in Common Life* can appreciate the extent to which such a new gospel was required. Kingsley's peculiar version of it was characterised by T. C. Sandars in the *Saturday Review* as "muscular Christianity," one of those epigrammatic phrases that have taken hold. By his imaginative writings, much more than by any sermon or theological treatise, he succeeded in popularising the more humane conception of religion which Maurice had expounded, and helped others to realise the social and philanthropic theories which his master had initiated. It will appear presently that his views upon these subjects had a distinct bearing on the question of University reform.

Kingsley's blunt attack on Catholicism, answered by Dr. J. H. Newman in his *Apologia pro vitâ suâ*, is chiefly memorable as having called forth that eloquent, pathetic, and dignified, yet strangely reasoned "human document."

The progress of scientific discovery could not fail to have a modifying and disturbing influence on religious thought. In spite of Bridgewater Treatises and other well-meant attempts at reconciliation, the obvious discrepancies between the new and old, between knowledge and tradition, caused uneasiness that could not be ignored. Whewell's *History of the Inductive Sciences* produced a great impression, both from its ability and the position and authority of the writer. It began to be felt that in the present day the miraculous element, so far from being a support to Christianity, was rather a stumbling-block. The uniformity of nature was a necessary postulate of physical science, and some men already perceived that the Reign of Law extended also to the moral world. Not to anticipate too far it may suffice here to quote from Julius Hare, who asks, in his *Life of Sterling*, "Whether in the pure ore of the gospel, the physically marvellous be not a separable alloy," and adds, "The great problem of the age is to reconcile faith with knowledge, philosophy with religion"; and this from Adam Sedgwick, the venerable Professor of Geology, "We are justified in saying that in the moral, as well as the physical world, God seems to govern by general laws . . . and it is our bounden duty to study those laws,

and as far as we can, to turn them to account." The visitation of cholera in 1847 gave a practical significance to such reflections ; and religious persons in Edinburgh were shocked when Lord Palmerston, on being asked to appoint a day of public humiliation, advised them instead to cleanse their streets. It was on account of speculations of this nature that George Combe, the phrenologist (by whom my head was examined when I was a child), was regarded by many persons with suspicion. It was felt that not only the Supernatural but the doctrine of Free-will was in danger from a new form of determinism.

Dr. J. H. Newman, in his discourses on the *Idea of a University*, already referred to, thought to remove the difficulty by distinguishing between Baconian *induction* and theological certitude, whose methods are purely *deductive* ; and while conceding to the inductive philosopher entire freedom within the world of nature, solemnly warned him against intruding into the theological sphere. Such dicta could not satisfy the mind of one who, like Professor Baden-Powell, was at once a scientific investigator and a theologian. His views, however, belong more properly to a succeeding chapter, in which the attempt to combine free-thought with religious reverence will come to be described. Enough for the present to say that one who, holding firmly by the essentials of religion and honestly declaring himself a Christian, devotes the powers of a clear and penetrative intellect to the solution of difficulties which lie on the borderland, such as the nature of

miracles, the meaning of revelation, or the relation of the human to the divine, will not choose to relinquish either his title to the Christian name, or the untrammelled pursuit of truth, at the bidding of a traditional authority which claims to be infallible.

During the period now under consideration the public were entertained for a short time by the revival of an old speculation in Whewell's *Plurality of Worlds*, and Sir David Brewster's reply to it in a book entitled *More Worlds than One*.

M. Anatole France has lately shown us that in our ignorance it is a matter of moods, whether we speculate cheerfully about inhabitants of Mars, or think of life as a sort of disease that is proper to our planet. Yet it is idle to ignore the consequences which the Copernican and Newtonian discoveries have brought about, whether we regard the stars as "timing with things below," or seem to ourselves to have learned

"A sad astrology, the boundless plan
That makes them tyrants in their iron skies ;
Cold fires, yet with power to burn and brand
His nothingness into man."

Here also the question of orthodoxy and of the "scheme of salvation" was dragged in. But the controversy awakened only a passing interest, and when Henry Smith, the Balliol mathematician, summed up the issues in a luminous paper contributed to the *Oxford Essays* in 1857, the public had ceased to care about it. Their attention had been

absorbed by the Indian Mutiny coming so rapidly at the heels of the Crimean War.

The contributions of Stanley and Jowett to religious thought belong properly to the succeeding period, but during the years now in question they were engaged in a course of preparatory study intended to carry out the designs of Arnold through a work of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation. Jowett was in no hurry to publish, and Arthur Stanley's sermons on the *Apostolical Age* had created no great stir. A temperate statement of liberal views by F. Myers, the Vicar of St. John's Church, Keswick (the father of two distinguished sons), in a volume entitled *Catholic Thoughts*, attracted comparatively little notice. Arthur Hugh Clough's resignation of his Oriel Fellowship and the harsh treatment of J. A. Froude at Exeter were, however, sufficient indications that the ferment of religious inquiry was working strongly in a few minds.

The first determined utterance of a liberal theology came from the Bampton Lecturer of 1851. H. Bristowe Wilson, B.D., of St. John's, had hitherto been chiefly known as one of the four tutors, including A. C. Tait, who had publicly protested against the casuistry of Tract 90. After an honourable career at the University he had accepted a country living. But he was an accomplished theologian, whose wide learning was known to be equalled by his intellectual power. His Bampton Lectures on the *Communion of Saints* were the clear

outcome of a sustained effort of spiritual thought. They could not, like Maurice's writings, be censured for obscurity. And although a certain austerity of style, might repel some hearers, yet the cogency of the closely compacted reasoning, the firm, deliberate expression, the loftiness of tone, as well as the nature of the subject, might well have commanded a stronger interest than was felt either by the hearers or the readers of a time when the turgid rhetoric of Samuel Wilberforce could impress even cultured minds. Wilson's Bampton Lectures are a lucid and elaborate argument addressed to the higher Christian consciousness of the age, to the effect that not in confessions and formularies, not in supernatural gifts, not even in the Sacraments as outward ordinances, but in Christian love, is the true bond of communion to be found. But although his praise of Zwingli and his exposition of the doctrine of grace gave considerable offence in certain quarters, no formal step was taken against Bristowe Wilson at that time. The Gorham judgment had caused deep discouragement to Sacerdotalism; and at the moment the two powers, who afterwards combined to stamp out "heresy" at Oxford (E. B. Pusey and S. Oxon.), were in a deadlock of contention. Dr. Pusey, whom the new Bishop of Oxford had inhibited, wrote to him as follows on May 5th, 1851:—

"Mr. Stanley . . . has been forming a school, known as the Germanizing school. . . . The present Bampton Lecturer, Mr. Wilson, of St. John's, has been preaching such doctrine as has much scandalised many of the Heads of Houses. . . . You will be

asked why they are allowed to officiate, I forbidden.”*

Wilson's attitude was independent of contemporary influences. He sought to extend the principles of the Reformation in the light of nineteenth-century thought, and to secure a wider comprehension by enlarging the terms of communion. He was willing that the Thirty-nine Articles should remain as “articles of peace,” a landmark of progress from which the Church should not recede. But the individual clergyman, he thought, should be only in so far bound by them as to submit to the existing law and to recognise the duty of loyalty to the historical body to which he belonged.

Wilson's isolation as a theological writer is proved by the fact that he is not mentioned in the article on Church Parties, which shortly after this appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, where for the first time a “Broad Church Party” was spoken of in contradistinction to the “High” and “Low.” The article was attributed to Conybeare, the part author of *Conybeare and Howson on St. Paul*, a writer perhaps best remembered now by the witticism of Thompson, the former Master of Trinity, who, after hearing a sermon of Howson's, observed, “What a very clever man Conybeare must be!” In thinking over this famous article after a long interval, one is chiefly struck by the narrowness of the writer's conception of clerical “breadth.” His Broad Church Party includes Maurice, and the successors of Arnold, such

* *Life of E. B. Pusey*, vol. iii. p. 335.

as Arthur Stanley, and Jackson, afterwards Bishop of London; but others whose contributions to Free-thought within the Church of England were really more significant seem to have been carefully omitted. They were reserved for separate treatment under the name of Neologians, as beyond the pale.

CHAPTER V.

UNIVERSITY REFORM, 1846-1856.

IT is a fact not sufficiently recognised, that academical progress in England can be traced in part to influences proceeding from the Scottish Universities. The London University, which but for the religious difficulty would have been from the first a teaching institution, was originally proposed and advocated by persons educated in Glasgow and Edinburgh, such as Thomas Campbell, the poet, and Henry Brougham; and as we have seen, the most important criticism of the anomalous condition into which Oxford and Cambridge had lapsed came from an Edinburgh Professor who, before going to Oxford, had studied in the University of Glasgow. Sir William Hamilton was a holder of the Snell Exhibition at Balliol, a benefaction which had originally been founded with a view of providing a higher education for the clergy of the Scotch Episcopal Church. But the Glasgow Professors, in whom the appointment vested, have frequently departed from an intention which proved unworkable; and the history of the foundation, which has just been published, shows a succession of more or less distinguished names, amongst which those of Adam

Smith and John Lockhart are perhaps the most remarkable. Sir William Hamilton's strictures had never been forgotten in Oxford, and as early as 1839 another Snell foundationer, Archibald Campbell Tait, with something of the statesmanlike foresight which he afterwards conspicuously displayed, had given serious attention to the practical issues involved. He made a journey to Bonn on purpose to examine the German University System, and in this he was accompanied by Dr. Arnold's pupil, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley. His younger friend assisted him in the production of a pamphlet which appeared in the course of the same year. The aim chiefly emphasised by the reformers of that day was to reanimate the University as distinguished from the Collegiate System, by making the Professoriate a reality. For this purpose, a course of post-graduate instruction was much advocated, by which it was hoped that while the full advantages of the tutorial method might be retained, it might be combined with such higher academical teaching as might be worthy of the name of a University. In this purpose Dr. Daubeny and other Professors of physical science strongly concurred.

Another desideratum, even yet not fully satisfied, was that no one capable of academical training should be precluded by poverty from obtaining it. Two years earlier than Tait and Stanley's pamphlet we have a letter from Dr. Arnold to George Byrne, Esq., M.P., who had intimated his intention of moving a resolution in Parliament. Dr. Arnold says (March 8th, 1837):—

“As to the great question of all, the admission of Dissenters, it is so mixed up with the still greater question of the Church, that I hardly know how to separate them; and besides, I imagine that nothing on this point could be carried now. . . . The University should be restored—that is, the monopoly of the Colleges should be taken away, by allowing any Master of Arts, according to the old practice of Oxford, to open a Hall for the reception of Students . . . The evils of the present system, combined with a Statute . . . obliging every undergraduate under three years’ standing to sleep in College, are very great.”

But notwithstanding the interest felt in the subject by thoughtful men, all agitation of the question was impossible at Oxford, while the Tractarian controversy was at its height. It was not until February, 1846, as above indicated (p. 54), that Stanley again came forward and communicated to Mr. Christie a series of searching questions drafted by Jowett with a view to a Commission of Inquiry. From this time forward, University reform was the main subject of discussion amongst the Oxford residents, and the more prominent Liberals there held frequent communication with members of Parliament. An important pamphlet, which appeared in March, 1848, was the joint work of Jowett and Stanley. In this, among other improvements, the study of the New Testament after the manner of Arnold was recommended, with some adumbration of a future theological school. Amongst the younger men who took an active part were John Conington and Goldwin Smith. Mark Pattison, who had recovered

from his fit of Newmanism, was also influential on this side. F. Jeune, of Pembroke (afterwards Bishop of Peterborough), a thorough-going reformer, deserves special mention as having carried a spirit of reform into the alien atmosphere of the Hebdomadal Board. The "reading" undergraduates of those days singled out the men I have named, Jowett and Stanley above all, as of a different stamp from the ordinary college Fellow. A "tutors' association" was formed for the special purpose of discussing proposed academical improvements. The subjects most in debate were the reduction of the powers of Convocation, which were to be transferred to the body of residents constituting the House of Congregation, and the suppression of the Hebdomadal Board, who were no longer to have the initiative in University legislation. The proposed abolition of local restrictions in the colleges, affecting scholarships and Fellowships, was a theme of acrimonious controversy. The older Fellows were jealous of existing privileges, and the Founder's intention was appealed to with an almost superstitious veneration. But as this was found most difficult either to define or to apply, the conviction grew that, as some one has expressed it, "the Founder was after all only the ghost of a Founder." But the most earnest reformers were equally convinced of the impossibility of reforming the University from within, except as regarded the one point of the Examination Statute. This was revised after much debate in 1849. An intermediate examination was instituted, and the schools of Modern History and Natural Science were added

to the final examination, thus obviating the reproach of a neglect of modern subjects which had been urged by the Edinburgh reviewers in 1807, and had now become a popular cry.

The actual condition of Oxford at this time has been so well described in his *Reminiscences* by one who has borne no small part in subsequent reforms, the Honourable G. C. Brodrick, now the Warden of Merton, that I am glad to be allowed to quote from a statement on which I could not improve:—

“Both the University and the colleges were subject to antiquated codes of statutes which it would have been no less disastrous than impossible to enforce, but which, in the opinion of eminent authorities, they had no power to alter. The sole initiative power in University legislation, and by far the largest share of University administration, was in the hands of the Hebdomadal Board, consisting solely of Heads of Colleges with the two Proctors, and not unjustly described by Mr. Goldwin Smith as an ‘organised torpor.’ There was an assembly of residents known as the ‘House of Congregation,’ but its business had dwindled to mere formalities, and the only other University assembly, known as Convocation, was virtually powerless, except for purposes of obstruction. It included thousands of non-resident Masters of Arts, mostly ignorant of academical questions. It had the right of debating; but this right was almost annulled by the necessity of speaking in Latin, and it could only accept or reject without amendment measures proposed by the Hebdomadal Board. No student could then be a member of the University, without belonging to a College or Hall, while every member of a College or Hall was compelled to sleep within its walls until

the third year of his residence. Persons unable to sign the Thirty-nine Articles were absolutely excluded, not merely from degrees, but from all access to the University, inasmuch as the test of subscription was enforced at matriculation. It is needless to add that being unable to enter the University, they could not obtain College Fellowships, which, however, were further protected against the intrusion of Dissenters by the declaration of Churchmanship required to be made under the Act of Uniformity. If professorial lectures were not at so low an ebb as in the days of Gibbon, when the greater part of the Professors had 'given up even the pretence of teaching,' they were lamentably scarce and ineffective. The educational function of the University had, in fact, been almost wholly merged in college tuition; but the scholarships, as well as the Fellowships, of the colleges were fettered by all manner of restrictions, which marred their value as incentives to industry, while, in too many cases, favouritism was checked by no rule of law or practice. The great majority of Fellows were bound to take Holy Orders, and the whole University was dominated by a clerical spirit which directly tended to make it, as it has so long been, a focus of theological controversy."

The agitation, which had been so far developed both from without and from within, came to a head in 1850, during Lord John Russell's Administration, when Mr. James Heywood, the member for North Lancashire, moved in the House of Commons for an inquiry into the state of the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin. His motion was thus worded:—

"That all systems of academical education require from time to time some modification, from the change

of external circumstances, progress of opinion, and the intellectual improvement of the people; that in the ancient English and Irish Universities, and in the colleges connected with them, the interests of religious and useful learning have not advanced to an extent commensurate with the great resources and high position of those bodies; that collegiate statutes of the fifteenth century occasionally prohibit local authorities from introducing any alterations into voluminous codes, of which a large portion are now obsolete; that better laws are needed to regulate the ceremony of matriculation and the granting of degrees, to diminish the exclusiveness of the University libraries, to provide a fairer distribution of the rewards of scientific and literary merits; . . . that an humble address be presented praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to issue her Royal Commission of Inquiry into the state of the Universities and Colleges of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, with a view to assist in the adaptation of those important institutions to the requirements of modern times."

In pleading for Government interference, Mr. Heywood urged that the charters of the Universities made them accountable to Parliament, while precedents from the time of Henry VIII. and his successors showed that the right had often been exercised. He dwelt with special severity upon the subscription tests, which, though a farce and a delusion, were a grievance pressing upon large classes.

The motion led to a protracted debate. Lord John Russell observed that "the only reason against interference was the will of the Founders. Such a reason would hardly withstand a great and important public good, so long as the main object of the foundations

was secured, namely, to promote religion and sound learning."

The chief speakers on the other side were Sir Robert Inglis, Mr. Goulburn, Mr. Roundell Palmer, and Mr. Gladstone, who said:—

"As matters now stand there is not the shadow or the pretext of a case for inquiry. . . . As a precedent that would be acted upon in a different spirit and in worse times, I have a great dread of this Commission, even for the Universities alone. But I mainly object to it from the unconstitutional character which appears to me to attach to the proceeding. The habit of self-government is essential to the real health and prosperity of these institutions."

Lord John Russell having intimated that it was the intention of the Government to issue a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the University of Oxford, a resolution approving of this was carried by a majority of 140 to 45.

A strong outburst of Conservative prejudice broke forth on the announcement of the Commission, and was not allayed by the alleged interference of the Prince Consort, who was supposed to have written a letter in vindication of the step. This touched the constitutional susceptibilities of noble lords, especially of Lord Brougham, who said that he thought the issuing of that Commission "a very great error, a very grievous mistake." To staunch Tories like Mr. Henley and the Earl of Powis it seemed enough to say in condemnation of the whole attempt, that

University reform had come to be synonymous with the admission of Dissenters into the Universities.

The appointment of the Oxford University Commission, which came as a welcome surprise to the reforming minority in the University, was keenly resented by the majority in most colleges. The dovescotes were fluttered in good earnest. Some of the older Heads and others in authority talked loudly of resisting the interference, and of following the example of those members of the University of Cambridge who had been mentioned by Mr. Gladstone in the debate as having in 1647 refused, on the ground of their oaths, to furnish the information required by a Royal Commission, the words of the oath being "*non revelabis aliquod secretum collegii.*" Dr. Routh, the centenarian President of Magdalen, was the most obdurate of all. Pamphlets and pasquinades of course came forth in abundance. That which is best remembered, perhaps, was a series of papers entitled "Lord John Russell's Post Bag," attributed to William Sewell, of Exeter, in which, with no small ingenuity and considerable wit and humour, all kinds of real and imaginary grievances and schemes of reform were set forth in a ridiculous light, the object being to throw contempt on the serious purposes of the reformers by associating them with things obviously mischievous or frivolous. Sewell was a prominent personality in the Oxford of that day. He was one of the most active of the tutors, although his educational methods were somewhat eccentric, and, to judge from C. H. Pearson's graphic description of them, cannot have tended

much to edification. But he was a man of ideas, and it appears, for example, that he had anticipated the notion of employing college Fellows in a kind of "Extension" lecturing (see p. 86). He is remembered now as the founder of Radley College. When he left Oxford for Radley it was said of him, perhaps rather illnaturally, "He is tired of deceiving men, who have found him out, and is going to deceive boys." About the same time a satirical poem by Mansel, of St. John's, was popular amongst the Conservatives of Oxford. It was a parody of the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, entitled "Phrontisterion," and turned into ridicule the supposed Germanising tendencies of some of the reformers and of the new examination schools.* Henry Longueville Mansel was a very able dialectician. His learned volume of *Prolegomena* was a real contribution to the teaching of logic. His Bampton Lectures, *On the Limits of Religious Thought*, to which he owed his preferment as Milman's successor in the Deanery of St. Paul's, are less satisfactory. His work, based on Sir William Hamilton's *Philosophy of the Unconditioned*, is one of several attempts to make scepticism the support of faith. Because the limitation of our faculties forbids the hope of knowing absolutely the nature of God, we are exhorted to fall back blindly on the acceptance of tradition. Because "God's ways are

* The *Chorus of Cloudy Professors* are supposed to sing :—

" Professors we, from over the sea,
From the land where Professors in plenty be ;
And we thrive and flourish, as well we may,
In the land that produced one Kant with a K,
And many Cants with a C."

not as our ways" all criticism of dogma that rests on moral judgments is held to be unsound. The question how far the dogma itself has been determined by an undeveloped moral sense is left unexamined. But I am anticipating a point which belongs to the following chapter.

It is strange how little the Oxford reformers either thought or spoke of the great question of the admission of Dissenters. But the subject had now begun to interest a wider public, and outsiders saw plainly enough that if the University was to be restored to the nation so considerable a section of the community could not be excluded. "Christian Socialism" had its word to say. Of this new gospel, if Maurice were the prophet or apostle, Charles Kingsley was the evangelist; and in his novel of *Alton Locke*, where some radical discontents and aspirations which had survived 1848 found expression, a prominent topic is the relation of the Universities to the people. His hero, the Chartist tailor, is supposed to visit Cambridge:—

"Noble buildings!" I said to myself, "and noble institutions! given freely to the people by those who loved the people and the Saviour who died for them. They gave us what they had, those mediæval founders; whatsoever narrowness of mind or superstition defiled their gift was not their fault, but the fault of their whole age. The best they knew, they imparted freely, and God will reward them for it. To monopolise these institutions for the rich, as is done now, is to violate both the spirit and the letter of the foundations; to restrict their studies to the limits of middle-aged Romanism, their

conditions of admission to those fixed at the Reformation, is but a shade less wrongful. The letter is kept, the spirit is thrown away. You refuse to admit any who are not members of the Church of England; say, rather, any who will not sign the dogmas of the Church of England, whether they believe a word of them or not. Useless formalism! which lets through the reckless, the profligate, the hypocritical; and only excludes the honest and conscientious, and the mass of the working men. And whose fault is it that they are not members of the Church of England? Whose fault is it, I ask? Your predecessors neglected the lower orders, till they have ceased to reverence either you or your doctrines; you confess that among yourselves, freely enough. You threw the blame of the present widespread dislike to the Church of England on her sins during 'the godless eighteenth century.' Be it so. Why are those sins to be visited on us? Why are we to be shut out of the Universities which were founded for us, because you have let us grow up by millions, heartless infidels, as you call us? Take away your subterfuge! It is not merely because we are bad Churchmen that you exclude us, else you would be crowding your Colleges now with the talented poor of the agricultural districts, who, as you say, remain faithful to the Church of their fathers. But are there six labourers' sons educating in the Universities at this moment? No! the real reason for our exclusion, Churchmen or not, is because we are *poor*—because we cannot pay your exorbitant fees, often, as in the case of Bachelors of Arts, exacted for tuition which is never given, and residence which is not permitted—because we could not support the extravagance which you not only permit, but encourage,—because by your own unblushing confession, it ensures the University the support of the aristocracy.

“‘But, on religious points, at least, you must abide by the statutes of the University.’ Strange argument, truly, to be urged literally by English Protestants in possession of Roman Catholic bequests! If that be true in the letter as well as in the spirit, you should have given place long ago to the Dominicans and the Franciscans. In the spirit it is true, and the Reformers acted on it when they rightly converted the Universities to the uses of the new faith. They carried out the spirit of the Founders’ statutes by making Universities as good as they could be, and letting them share in the new light of the Elizabethan age. But was the sum of knowledge human and divine, perfected at the Reformation? Who gave the Reformers, or you who call yourselves their representatives, a right to say to the mind of man, and to the teaching of God’s Spirit, ‘hitherto and no farther’? Society and mankind, the children of the supreme, will not stop growing for your dogmas—much less for your vested interests; and the righteous law of mingled development and renovation applied in the sixteenth century, must be reapplied in the nineteenth; while the spirits of the Founders, now purged from the superstitions and ignorances of their age, shall smile from Heaven and say, ‘So would we have had it, if we had lived in the great nineteenth century, into which it has been your privilege to be born.’”

Carlyle had said in 1848, “The question of University Reform goes deep at present, deep as the world—and the real University of these new epochs is yet a great way off.”

The Commissioners were the Bishop of Norwich (Dr. Samuel Hinds), the Dean of Carlisle (A. C. Tait), the Master of Pembroke (F. Jeune, afterwards Bishop of Peterborough), the Rev. H. G. Liddell

(afterwards Dean of Christ Church), J. L. Dampier, Esq., the Rev. Professor Baden-Powell, the Rev. G. H. S. Johnson (afterwards Dean of Wells), and the Rev. A. P. Stanley (secretary).

Mr. Goldwin Smith was appointed assistant secretary. They received voluminous evidence in which the results of the discussions during previous years were largely embodied. Some points in the evidence are interesting in the light of subsequent history. Mr. Mark Pattison who, sixteen years afterwards, when embittered by his experience of the limitations of college life, wrote of academical organisation with a view to making the University a place of science and research, and sought to minimise the Collegiate element, now dwelt exclusively on the advantages of the College System, which he sought to amplify, and of tutorial and catechetical as distinguished from professorial teaching. Jowett, on the other hand, pointed out the defects of an exclusively tutorial system, and suggested the foundation and endowment of additional Chairs, in various subjects, which should be exempt from religious Tests. He was also one of a very few who distinctly proposed the creation of a Theological School, on which Stanley, in his Report, also dwells at length. Jowett wrote on this subject :—

“ At Oxford more encouragement might be given to Theology, either by assigning it a more prominent place in the third Examination, or making it the subject matter of a separate school in which studies of this kind might be based on a knowledge of Hebrew and New Testament Greek.”

University Extension in the present sense had not been thought of then, except in so far as it had been proposed to affiliate theological colleges, to grant degrees without actual residence. This latter proposal was rejected on all hands, but the Commissioners take note of the suggestion made by William Sewell in a letter to the Vice-Chancellor, that the University might found Professorships in Birmingham and Manchester.* This notion, which at the time appeared eccentric, is the only anticipation traceable in the whole Report of a movement which has since been so largely realised. University extension then meant (1) the founding of halls, (2) permission to lodge out under supervision, (3) the inclusion of "unattached" or non-collegiate students.

The Report was issued in April, 1852.

On the main subject of the present volume, the admission of Dissenters, the Commissioners had little to say. It was considered to be beyond their province. But they made some pertinent remarks upon the mode in which the Tests were applied.

"The Subscriptions now in force were imposed upon the University by its Chancellor, Lord Leicester, and King James I.; that to the Thirty-nine Articles by Leicester, in order to exclude the Roman Catholic or Romanising party; that to the Three Articles contained in the Thirty-sixth Canon by King James I., in order to exclude the Puritan party.

". . . The Subscription is found practically neither

* See above, p. 81.

to exclude all who are not members of the Church of England, nor to include all who are. . . .

“It is probably familiarity alone that reconciles us to a system which exacts from youths at their first entrance into the University a formal assent to a large number of Theological propositions, which they cannot have studied, and which in many Colleges they are not encouraged to study till a considerable period after they have subscribed them. This Subscription is required by the Statutes from children of the age of twelve; a requirement now happily in abeyance, owing to the more advanced age at which students come to the University, but which was actually in force as late as the middle of the last century,* and which must be put in force again, if a boy of that age were to present himself for matriculation.”

On two points the Report of the Commissioners went considerably beyond the legislation which followed it. On the question of clerical Fellowships, which after this hung fire for thirty years, the deliverance of the Commissioners was perfectly clear:—

“The great majority† of Fellows are compelled to take Holy Orders, either by the Statutes or by the Bye-laws of their Colleges. As regards those who are induced to take upon them the vows of the Christian Ministry, solely or mainly because of the loss which a refusal to do so would involve, the effects of such an obligation are manifestly evil; and the removal of this obligation would be the removal of a scandal from the University and the Church. We are of opinion that this reason is of itself sufficient to justify an enactment relieving

* This refers to the case of Jeremy Bentham.

† Wadham College was an exception.

Fellows of Colleges from the necessity of taking Holy Orders."

They also expressed a decided opinion on the subject of non-collegiate students, a change which was only introduced after fifteen years; they proposed "That Students should be permitted to become members of the University under due superintendence, but without incurring the expenses incident to connexion with a College or Hall."

On the other hand, they were equally decided in recommending that the celibacy of Fellows should generally be maintained. The Cambridge Commissioners were less stringent with regard to this question.

In 1854 an Oxford University Reform Bill was introduced in the House of Commons by Lord John Russell, then leader of the Lower House. Its chief provisions were: (1) To alter the governing body of the University, to a Hebdomadal Council composed much as at the present time. It was through a suggestion of Dr. Pusey's that the initiative in legislation was given to such a representative council, and not to an assembly of the residents, as had been generally proposed. (2) To abrogate oaths binding persons not to disclose any matter relating to their colleges to any inquiry appointed by law. (3) To give a power of opening private halls by licence of the Vice-Chancellor. (4) To provide that Fellowships should not be held for more than a year, unless the holder should be engaged in academical work. (This proposal was not carried through; "Sinecure Fellowships" were continued.) (5) The appoint-

ment of a Commission which should have the power of altering college statutes and of applying part of the revenues of colleges to increasing the funds for the promotion of education. (6) The powers of Convocation were to be greatly restricted, and their most important functions transferred to the body of the Residents as a House of Congregation.

It was the first time that a measure of University Reform had been introduced by the Government of the day, and although Lord John Russell's opinion on the subject of University Tests was well known, the Bill contained no provision for the admission of Dissenters, which was expressly reserved for separate legislation. This defect seems to have been due to some division in the Cabinet, and the recalcitrant minister was probably Mr. Gladstone, who was still member for the University of Oxford. But Lord John Russell, in introducing the measure, said, "I cannot think the whole purposes of the University are fulfilled while there is a test at entrance which hinders so many persons from entering at all." That the test at matriculation and for the B.A. degree was abolished when the measure became law was due to the persistence of Mr. James Heywood and the eloquent remonstrance of John Bright. The Bill had reached the report stage in the House of Commons when Mr. Heywood moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee on the subject of admitting Dissenters. He regretted that this Bill proposed to perpetuate the clerical element in the governing body. "The Church did not gain much by the compulsory ordination of Fellows." The

motion for a Select Committee was withdrawn, but the pertinacious Mr. Heywood again moved the introduction of a clause—

“That from the first day of Michaelmas Term, 1854, it should not be necessary for any person, upon matriculation at the University of Oxford, to subscribe any declaration except the Oath of Allegiance. His object was to put the University of Oxford on the same footing as that of Cambridge. He did not remember any movement within the University itself for the repeal of religious tests, and he did not expect it. It was rather for Parliament itself to originate a measure to remedy the evil. He regretted that the Government had not ventured to tear the network from Oxford and make the University accessible to the whole nation.”

Mr. Bright characterised the measure as a compromise of a doubtful character.

“We are invited to co-operate in a tinkering amendment of what professes to be a national institution, yet from which five millions of men who hold my sentiments with regard to the Church of England are excluded. You do not exclude us when you send your tax-gatherer round, or when you ask for the performance of the duties of citizenship. You do not exclude us from the statistical tables of your population, of your industries, of your wealth, or of your renown. But when you come to the question of education in the institutions which you call national Universities, then you ask us to accept a Bill of this pusillanimous and tinkering character, insulting, as I have already described it, to half the population of the country.”

Mr. Hadfield, an irreconcilable Nonconformist, made a similar remonstrance. “The Bill does not

concern us," he said. These speeches cast a favourable light on the prudent moderation of Mr. Heywood's attitude.

Mr. Gladstone, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, opposed Mr. Heywood's motion. He said:—

"He would be glad to find himself mistaken in thinking that this vote is intended to be the first of a series of parliamentary interferences by which the system of religious instruction in the University is intended to be altogether broken down.

"Recollecting the title by which he sat in Parliament, he felt that he would betray the solemn and sacred trust which had been committed to him if he were to hold that the interest and position of the Church of England had no place in this discussion.

"It may be all very well to say that the University of Oxford is a national institution, and that, therefore, we ought to admit all parties to the enjoyment of its advantages, irrespective of religious persuasions. Sir, it is equally true that every parochial benefice in the country is also a national institution; but there is no immediate or necessary sequence in the proposition that therefore we should admit to their possession the holders of all descriptions of religious opinions."

Yet the final emancipation of the Universities from the Religious Test was carried out under Mr. Gladstone's own Administration in 1871.

The argument from the analogy of Cambridge was difficult to resist, and before the Bill left the House of Commons the Test had been abolished, not only for Matriculation but for the Bachelor's Degree.

In the Cambridge Act which followed in 1856 all other degrees except in Divinity were also freed from

the Test, though not so as to confer a vote in the Senate, for which a declaration of Church membership was still required. These very limited concessions to the national demand were, in fact, as their enemies regarded them, "the thin end of the wedge." Few Dissenters as yet were induced to matriculate at Oxford; but a good many entered Cambridge, some of whom graduated with high honours. Thus a fresh nucleus of agitation was created within the University, and a fresh argument was supplied to those who were contending for reform. The further phase of the movement which was thus developed will be described in another chapter.

It remains to notice two Conservative amendments to the Bill of 1854, one of which was negatived, the other affirmed. Both affected the constitution of the governing bodies.

It was proposed that the elections to the Hebdomadal Council should be sectional and not congregational, that is that Heads of Colleges should be elected by Heads of Colleges, Professors by Professors, and even that one of the Professors should be always chosen from among the Professors of Theology. These oligarchical proposals were fortunately overruled, and the election was left to the Congregation, except in so far as two members of the Council were to be nominated by the Chancellor. In arguing on this point Mr. Heywood cited the refusal of an honorary degree to Mr. Everett (an American Unitarian) as proving the mischievous effect of clerical influence at Oxford.

On the other hand the House of Congregation,

instead of consisting only of academical residents, was now made to include all Masters of Arts who were resident within the boundaries of Oxford, thus including the town parochial clergy.

The Commissioners appointed under this Act, namely, the Earls of Harrowby and Ellesmere, Bishop Longley, Mr. Justice Coleridge, Dean Johnson of Wells, Sir John Awdry, and Mr. Cornwall Lewis, with the Rev. Samuel Wayte (afterwards President of Trinity) as secretary, were empowered to make ordinances for promoting the main designs of the college Founders, and a limit of time was fixed, during which the colleges were invited to submit proposals for their consideration.

In connexion with the first incidence of the Oxford Act there occurred at Balliol a short-lived dispute, which is worth recording. A majority of the Fellows, led by the new Master, Dr. Scott (afterwards Dean of Rochester), resolved that candidates for scholarships and exhibitions should declare themselves members of the Church of England. This requirement was duly advertised. But Jowett and others appealed to the Visitor, Bishop Jackson; and he decided that the new regulation contravened the spirit of the clause abolishing the Test at matriculation. The minute was accordingly cancelled. What would have resulted, if it had remained in force, is hard to calculate. Would Caird and Wallace ever have been Balliol men? When it was discussed in college meeting, Henry Smith wittily observed that "old fetters were easier to wear than new ones." A test, which excluded Scotch Presbyterians, would

have been particularly ill suited to the tradition of Balliol.

The history of the Cambridge Act of 1856 may be briefly dismissed. A Cambridge Commission of Inquiry—Bishop of Chester (Graham), Dean of Ely (Peacock), Sir J. Herschel, Sir J. Romilly, Prof. Sedgwick, with Rev. W. H. Bateson as secretary—reported in 1852; and a Bill was introduced in the House of Lords in 1855, but withdrawn. A similar measure was brought forward in the House of Commons in the following year, and was introduced by Mr. Bouverie, member for Kilmarnock, who said that—

“The Bill would do away with the restrictions against the admission of Dissenters, so far as the University was concerned, leaving it to the colleges to act for themselves in this matter.”

Mr. Heywood moved that students conscientiously objecting should be exempt from compulsory attendance at chapel services. But this was negatived. The same member carried in the House of Commons the insertion of a clause admitting Dissenters to the full privileges of the M.A. degree. But this was altered in the House of Lords; and the Lords' amendment, denying to Nonconformist graduates a vote in the governing body, was accepted by the House of Commons.

This Act, like the Oxford Act of 1854, included the appointment of an Executive Parliamentary Commission.

The Executive Commissioners appointed under the

Acts of 1854 and 1856 worked diligently for several years. The Oxford ordinances were completed for the most part by the end of 1857. Many local and other restrictions, by which the endowments had so long been rendered ineffectual, were finally abolished. The number of Fellowships tenable by laymen was increased in some colleges, and the tenure of some non-official Fellowships was limited to seven years. Other changes were made, which have worked beneficially. Some Fellowships were set aside, with the consent of the colleges, for the endowment of University Chairs. Thus the Corpus Professorship of Latin was established and conferred on John Conington, who at once set to work on his edition of Virgil. The University, from 1860 onwards, was altogether a more efficient instrument of the higher education and more in touch with the nation at large than in the preceding half-century. The question of celibacy was touched, but with a timid hand. At Oxford, when one or more Fellows of a college were Professors, the senior Professor-Fellow was allowed to marry with the consent of two-thirds of the college. At some Cambridge colleges the option was given to existing Fellows, whether their Fellowships should terminate on marriage or after seven years. Many felt that the celibate restriction belonged to the old monastic ideal; but the removal of it did not seem to lie in the direct path of University reform.

CHAPTER VI.

LIBERAL THEOLOGY

THE article on "Church Parties" in the *Edinburgh Review* for 1853, referred to above (p. 70), brought into prominence the undoubted fact that there were religious teachers in the Church of England who were not satisfied either with "the scheme of salvation" associated with the popular evangelical theology, and resting on seventeenth-century tradition, or with the attempt of the Tractarians, by going back to an earlier tradition, to revive sacerdotalism, and assert the power of a Catholic Hierarchy. There were those who, as Dr. Thomas Arnold had done, believed profoundly in Christianity, but saw that Christian teaching required to be simplified and modified in the light of modern ideas. There were three aspects of this necessity which appealed differently to different minds.

1. The students of historical criticism saw plainly that the Bible must be read more intelligently, if the teaching which it conveyed was to be made available for real instruction, or acceptable to educated men. English scholars who were also theologians, and were acquainted with German criticism, of whom Bishop Marsh, Connop Thirlwall, and Dean Milman

had been the most prominent examples, had given an impetus to this order of studies, which could no longer be repressed. The problem which inquirers now confronted was to harmonise theology with historical and scientific truth.

2. There were theologians who were also students of philosophy, somewhat inclined to mysticism, but refusing to be bound by traditional views that were inconsistent with the Divine attributes as they conceived them. The writings, and still more the table-talk, of Samuel Taylor Coleridge had exercised a powerful influence in this direction, which had been continued in the writings of Julius Charles Hare and Frederick Denison Maurice. If Coleridge's thought, like that of Bunsen in Germany, was surrounded with a *penumbra* or "bright haze" of mystical emotion, that made it all the better suited to win disciples in a moment of transition. Maurice's liberalism in theology was not nursed on criticism, but was rather a result of independent thought. Finding the Unitarian creed unsatisfactory to his emotional nature, he had joined the Church of England, on the broad ground of Trinitarian dogma, which in his mind assumed a mystical form. His powerful intellect was suffused with a spirit of adoration, and although his intellectual integrity was as clear as day, he was not prepared at once to accept the results of critical research. When it was pointed out that St. Paul in writing to the Thessalonians had manifestly expected the coming of Christ in his own lifetime, Maurice referred to the subject in a tone of poignant grief; it seemed to him so dreadful to think that an apostle

could be mistaken. But he afterwards saw more clearly. The result at which he and other cognate spirits were aiming was the moralising of theology.

3. A third source of enlightenment, and also of difficulty, was the progress of scientific discovery. As Milman's *History of the Jews* had called attention to the Higher Criticism, so Lyell's *Principles of Geology*, appearing at the same time, had familiarised what science was revealing about the antiquity of the world. The interest of such a discovery could not fail to reach many religious persons, and although at first unconscious of the exact relation of the new form of teaching to the old, they were soon driven to inquire in what manner the apparent discrepancies could best be reconciled.

But however ingenious attempts at reconciliation may have soothed religious prejudices for a time, divergences were more and more apparent, and in popular writings, such as the *Eclipse of Faith*, became more and more accentuated. Even Dr. Newman, who had joined the Church of Rome, saw the expediency of leaving the scientific inquirer complete liberty within the sphere of Nature, while warning him against encroaching on the theological region, in which, as he maintained, inductive science had no place. And there were others not less anxious for the future of religion, who saw that there could be no stopping at such a point as this. Honest doubt must be met by honest inquiry, even if the result should be nothing less than a new Reformation of Religion. Geology had convinced mankind of the antiquity of the earth, their habita-

tion. And now Egyptology began to open up unthought-of vistas of human antiquity, as the researches of Lepsius and others became popularised through Bunsen's work, *Egypt's Place in Universal History*.

The bearing of such discoveries on the Christian Revelation could not fail to exercise many serious minds, and while timid religionists were grieved at the spread of what they denounced as infidel opinions, the bolder spirits were often driven by such denunciations into an attitude of rebellion against all religious teaching whatsoever. A few individuals, deeply attached to the Church of which they were ordained ministers, and holding firmly by the essential truths of Christianity, foresaw the danger that was likely to be involved in the alienation of the foremost intellects from religious faith. At the sacrifice of their personal interests, for they could not but be aware that preferment did not lie that way, they strenuously endeavoured to set forth the truth which the age required. Their efforts were not, like the Tractarian Movement, the result of previous concert. They sprang from different centres, and each inquirer followed a method of his own. Like Thomas Arnold, they none of them belonged to any party, but for that reason they were the better fitted for delivering each his message. What they had in common was the determination to utter the conviction at which they had arrived after a long course of study and independent thought, a conviction which they claimed the right to hold and to express while retaining the position of clergymen. A few

simple principles they may be also said to have shared. (1) That the essential element of Christianity was the revelation of moral and spiritual truths, which remained untouched, whatever might be the consequences of scientific discoveries or of destructive criticism. (2) That no good could come to religion from the denial of plain facts or any tampering with evidence. (3) That the exegesis of Scripture must be guided by the universal rules of interpretation and not by tradition, whether evangelistic or patristic. They felt that the pursuit of truth could not be displeasing to the God of truth, and that the love of truth was inseparable from the genuine love of God and man. The result was a continuation of the endeavour in which Arnold had led the way; and if he had lived to the natural term of human existence he would doubtless have contributed to its success. For his abhorrence of priestcraft was equalled by his loyalty to the Church of England, and, above all, to the spirit of Christianity, to the teaching of Christ Himself, and of St. Paul.

The chief agents in the movement that followed may be briefly characterised here. Of Bristowe Wilson I have already spoken. In the quiet of a Huntingdonshire vicarage he pursued his theological studies and contemplation with undiminished ardour and continued meditating on schemes of comprehension, uninfluenced by the clerical suspicions which his Bampton Lectures had aroused.

The Rev. Rowland Williams was a gifted Cambridge scholar, whose mind had early been drawn to the study of Sanskrit literature and the Indian religions,

for which Sir William Jones, H. T. Colebrooke, and Professor H. H. Wilson had already done much in England, although the brilliant labours of Max Müller were still to come. Williams' learning, which was considerable, was accompanied with a strong vein of eloquence, for he was a fiery Welshman, and he had been appointed by Bishop Thirlwall to the Vice-Principalship of Lampeter Theological College, which had been founded in 1827. His comparative study of religions had widened his theological views, and in his preaching, which had a controversial tone, he threw doubt on some of the assumptions of what was then the popular theology, letting it be known that he had been with Bunsen and sympathised with recent German thinkers. A collection of his sermons entitled *Rational Godliness* would have attracted little notice in the present day, but to the orthodox of 1854 it had a savour of "neologism," a now forgotten word, and was accordingly attacked by a writer in the *Quarterly Review* in 1855, supposed to be the same who had written the article on "Church Parties" shortly before. No one now talks of "neologians" or of "ideology," yet these were approved weapons of precision in the middle of the nineteenth century. The accusation of heresy spread an alarm amongst the Welsh clergy, and Bishop Thirlwall feared for the effect on Lampeter, a young institution whose success was hardly yet assured. He probably thought that Williams' wisdom was not equal to his zeal, and he was but slightly impressed with a degree of learning which, however great, was hardly comparable to his own. He advised the Vice-Principal

to bend to the storm and to resign. But Williams, unlike Thirlwall at Cambridge in 1834, was "not of the resigning sort," and the position became painful for both men. The younger man probably expected to be shielded from the assaults of "wild parsons" by his *soi-disant* liberally minded bishop. The result was an angry correspondence in which the one demanded reasons, and the other simply reiterated his prudential advice. And there the matter stood until Rowland Williams accepted the Rectory of Broad Chalk, Wilts.

Arthur Penrhyn Stanley had been Arnold's favourite pupil, and his biography of the great schoolmaster had produced a notable effect, though not so much in the religious as in the educational world. The tactful spirit of tolerance which he derived from his father, the amiable Bishop of Norwich, and in which he differed from his master, had saved him hitherto from violent attacks. It may have been remembered in his favour that, at the time of the degradation of Ward, Stanley had been the leader of a little band of Oxford Liberals who had moderated the violence of that day's proceedings by supporting the Proctors in the courageous act of vetoing the condemnation of Tract 90, and by their strenuous opposition to the proposal then aimed against the Tractarians—

"That the Vice-Chancellor should have power at any time to require a member of the University, in order to prove his orthodoxy, to subscribe the Articles in the sense in which they were both first published and were now imposed."

But probably more effectual than any sense of gratitude in a theological party was Stanley's social

position, combined with his unique personal charm. A scion of the aristocracy, the son of a bishop who was deservedly popular and respected, he was free from the angularities of mind and character which in Arnold had been provocative of opposition. Stanley often expressed wonder at his own immunity: "When will they attack me?" he used to say. For he had been determined from the first to continue the work of Arnold, not only on the historical but on the theological side. In the exquisite biography of his master he had said of him:—

"Strong as was his natural taste for history, it was to theology that he looked as the highest sphere of his exertions, and as the province which most needed them. The chief object which he had proposed to himself—in fact, the object which he conceived as the proper end of theology itself—was the interpretation and application of the Scriptures. From the time of his early studies at Oxford, when he analysed and commented on the Epistle of St. Paul, with Chrysostom's Homilies, down to the last year of his life, when he was endeavouring to set on foot a Rugby edition of them under his own superintendence, he never lost sight of this design."

And Mr. Bonamy Price, in the letter which follows this passage, tells us that it cost Arnold a sharp struggle when he had to choose between the interpretation of Scripture and the Roman History; and that the choice was determined not by the consideration of what his peculiar talent was most capable of performing, but by the prejudice of the clergy against him, the unripeness of England for a free and unfettered discussion of Scriptural exegesis, and the

injury he might be likely to cause to his general usefulness.

It was in pursuance of this design of Arnold's that Stanley and Jowett, at the time of their closest intimacy, projected a work on the New Testament, of which a first instalment appeared in Stanley's edition of the Epistles to the Corinthians, and Jowett's of those to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans, which were published in the summer of 1855. Stanley's work was not unkindly received. Orthodox critics might not approve, but they made light of Stanley's theological learning in comparison with Dr. Pusey's, and hardly thought him worthy of a serious attack. With Jowett it was different. The Epistle to the Romans had in every age of Christendom been a battle-ground of controversy, and Jowett had deliberately set himself to the task which seemed to him the chief problem of the age—that of attempting what Auguste Sabatier has lately called the “renewal of Christian dogma.” In particular he had exposed the unconscious immorality of the then prevalent mode of presenting the dogma of the Atonement. This gave occasion for the opening of a series of clerical hostilities, which continued for at least ten years. The article in the *Quarterly Review* on “Neology,” above referred to, appeared in the October of that year, and in this Jowett was grouped together with Rowland Williams and others who were supposed to have stepped beyond the boundary even of the Broad Church.

In the meantime Jowett had been appointed to succeed Dean Gaisford in the Regius Professorship

of Greek, and the Vice-Chancellor, a connexion of Dr. Pusey's, incited by a clerical busybody amongst the M.A.'s,* sent for the new Professor and required him to subscribe the Articles over again, "to prove his orthodoxy"; an unmerited indignity, which Jowett felt deeply at the time, and in later life regretted having submitted to. The Executive Commission were now preparing their ordinances, and one of their most obvious duties would have been to provide for the due endowment of the Professorship of Greek; but, as is well known, objections were raised which delayed this natural provision until 1865. The story of this "ten years' conflict" need not here be fully retold. The restoration of the Professoriate had been one of the main purposes of University reform, and about the time of the passing of the Oxford Act, Dean Gaisford had proposed that the endowment of the Regius Chair of Greek should be one of the first charges on the revenue of Christ Church, where the Professorship was originally founded by Cardinal Wolsey. But when the Commissioners came to deal with Christ Church, other counsels prevailed; and under the influence of the theologians the University steadily refused to endow a heretic appointed by the Crown. The difficulty was solved at last, by Mr. Charles Elton, who discovered documents which clearly proved the intention of the Founder; and it was said of the dispute "*Pulveris exigui jactu composita quievit.*" If Dr. Pusey's conduct at this time in more ways than one appears unreason-

able and harsh, it may be urged in his excuse that he was fighting a "rearguard action" on behalf of a losing cause, that of clerical predominance at Oxford. It is true that in 1864 he changed his tactics, but his followers refused to be called off, and the stalwart archdeacon, George Anthony Denison, like Amompharetus at Plataea, disregarded the signal for retreat. The second edition of Jowett's *St. Paul* appeared in 1859 with many alterations, but Dr. Pusey declared that "the second book was worse than the first."

The difficulties connected with historical criticism and with the endeavour to place theology on a moral basis were accompanied with another set of difficulties occasioned by the diffusion of scientific method. The question of miracles became more and more insistent, as it was more and more recognised that the philosophy of induction rested on the uniformity of Nature. Moreover, it was found that the miraculous element in other religions was no less strongly attested than in Christianity; even Dr. Arnold had said "Miracles wrought in favour of what was foolish or wicked would only prove Manichæism." To this subject the Rev. Baden-Powell, who, after some years spent as a parish clergyman, had been made Savilian Professor of Geometry at Oxford, devoted the highest energies of a clear and comprehensive mind. He was a teacher and experimentalist of no mean order, and held a distinguished place amongst the scientific men of the day. But his deepest interest was centred

in the relation of scientific discovery to natural and revealed religion. In a series of essays on *Tradition Unveiled* (published in 1839, when Tractarianism was in full swing), on the *Connexion of Natural and Divine Truth*, on the *Unity of Worlds*, *Christianity without Judaism*, and the *Order of Nature Considered in Reference to the Claims of Revelation*, he sought to remove the misunderstandings which had arisen between scientific and religious men. He objected, as Bacon had done, to the misplaced argument from final causes, but at the same time asserted that the moral and spiritual truths which are revealed in Christianity and are the objects of faith, not only have an evidence of their own which needs no external support, and is in no wise weakened by the determination to maintain the uniformity of Nature, but are in perfect harmony with the knowledge of the laws which science has revealed; and that a positive method in science is compatible with an unbroken faith in the Christian revelation. His latest independent work, that on the *Order of Nature*, may still be read with interest and profit. One or two short quotations may serve to indicate its general scope:—

“Beyond the province of scientific knowledge, reason acknowledges a blank and a void, which can only be filled up by conceptions of a totally different order, originating from higher sources, in no way opposed to reason, as they present no ideas cognisable by it, but solely objects of spiritual apprehension derived from Divine revelation” (p. 217).

“Philosophy teaches us that ‘we live and move and have our being’ according to certain determinate

laws. Revelation tells us that we do so 'in God.' Reason and Science point out the natural and moral order of the world and its invariable laws. Faith invests them with a new character as the manifestations of Divine government and providence. Metaphysical principles may lead to the theory of moral necessity on the one hand, or of free agency on the other. The Gospel, without entering on the question at all, at once inculcates moral obligation as the result of faith, and refers everything to Divine grace" (pp. 455, 456).

"Conceptions beyond the region of science, beyond the analysis and deductions of reason—such must be all those higher ideas of spiritual and invisible things which are the proper objects, not of knowledge, but of faith, and which, from their nature, can never enter into the range of philosophical investigation, and can consequently be in no hostility to the strictest positivism in science (p. 95)."

"The danger to religion is . . . in continuing to insist on what is untenable, as if it were an essential part of the truth."

"In the existing state of opinions, from the extensive consequences entailed, affecting the entire popular conception of the design and application of Scripture, the diffusion of such views" (as Dr. Arnold's) "must eventually create an epoch in theology hardly less marked than that of the Reformation. . . . Many err in confessing that religion will not stand the test of advancing inquiry, rather than seeking to identify it with all that tends to enlighten, to elevate, and to benefit the human race."

This writer insisted, much as Newman had done, on distinguishing between the provinces of science and theology, but instead of falling back on an infallible authority, he dwelt on the moral and spiritual

element in Christianity. He was fond of quoting Bacon's aphorism, "Give to faith the things of faith."

The following passage is interesting as having been published before the *Origin of Species* :—

"We have no *positive* evidence to *disprove* the formation of organised creatures out of their inorganic elements, however much evidence to *prove* it be wanting. The same is equally true of their development out of existing organised forms; though here we have some slight foundation for conjecture in the occasional deviations from established types, which might be conceivably carried out to a greater extent under great changes of condition and in immense periods of time."

The reader of the present volume may be reminded that Professor Baden-Powell served on the Oxford University Commission of 1850.

I have heard it asserted that the education of the sons of Liberal Churchmen is less effectual than that afforded to their children by persons professing orthodox belief. Professor Baden-Powell's family give striking evidence to the contrary. His sons have done valuable service to the State. Three of them have attained positions of high distinction, and Stevenson Baden-Powell is a name which will always hold a high place in the affectionate memory of Englishmen.

Before going further it may be well to take note of the state of opinion in the Universities and in the country generally. At Oxford the study of German philosophy was largely occupying the more active and influential minds. Under the new Examination

Statute Plato had been added to Aristotle as a book for the schools, and the ancient systems were studied in the light of modern ideas, not as when Aristotle and Bishop Butler had been fused together and compelled to say the same thing. There was much talk about the historical and comparative methods, about mental evolution, about the relativity of thought. A remedy for such-like disorders was supposed by the orthodox to be supplied in Mansel's Bampton Lectures (see above, p. 81) *On the Limits of Religious Thought*. Mr. Goldwin Smith expressed the 'liberal view' in speaking of—

"The attempt, for which the Oxford School of Theology is peculiarly responsible, to crush all conscientious inquiry by arguments tending to universal scepticism, and to prevent the promulgation of inconvenient truths by teaching the world to despair of truth. Yet works affecting to prove that men cannot know God and, by implication, that God cannot make Himself known to man, have been applauded by the enemies of religious inquiry as memorable apologies for the Christian revelation."*

So far as theology was discussed at all, the differences of High and Low Churchmen were of less account than the division amongst liberal thinkers between the moderate and the extreme. A few of the latter kind had been fascinated by the new religion of Auguste Comte, and were inclined to rebel not only against clerical traditions, but against

* On the other hand, Professor Huxley wrote, "When Mansel took up Hamilton's argument on the side of orthodoxy (!) I said he reminded me of nothing so much as the man who is sawing off the sign on which he is sitting, in Hogarth's picture."—*Life of T. H. Huxley*, vol. i. p. 218.

what they conceived to be the merely rhetorical and sophistic tendency of Oxford teaching, based as it was mainly on literary culture and not on science. At Cambridge those who were not absorbed in the studies of the place, and who continued the habit of free discussion which had been prevalent there since John Sterling's days, were greatly influenced by the writings of Mr. John Stuart Mill. Mill's *Logic* was a text-book at Oxford, but his works produced a greater effect at Cambridge amongst the foremost minds. His little book on *Liberty*, in particular, exercised a potent charm. Mr. Arthur Balfour has lately spoken somewhat slightly of "the thin lucidity of Mill." What was more apparent in the later fifties, was the penetrative intensity of his conceptions and the perfection of his philosophical style. The love of open questions, the habit of suspending judgment, the refusal to rest in any conclusion so long as there could be found a handle for discussion, the passion for dialectic on its own account, which has characterised the most eminent Cambridge thinkers of our time (including Mr. Balfour), even the vagaries of the Psychical Society, may be traced directly to their source in the mind of John Stuart Mill. In both Universities the first volume of Buckle's *History of Civilisation* also exercised a vivid although transient influence.

In the country at large, on the other hand, thought was comparatively stagnant, and those whose opinions had been formed by the religious teaching which had prevailed in the earlier decades of the century, whether Evangelical or Puseyite, watched with alarm the

growth of "the infidel tendencies of the age." These fears were fostered by the religious newspapers, which were then far more influential, if not more malignant, than they are to-day. "Would you rather fall into the hands of the *Record* or of the *Guardian*?" was a question sometimes asked at Oxford. The career of Frederick Robertson, of Brighton, threw a sad light on this state of opinion. Mr. C. H. Pearson has described the peculiar difficulties which attended the starting of the *Saturday Review*. All young men of ability, he says, were inclined to liberal opinions more or less extreme. The proprietor, Mr. Beresford Hope, was a zealous High Churchman. By the skilful pilotage of the editor, Mr. Cook, a course was steered which avoided the dangers on either hand, and may be described as "sceptical-conservative."

A publishing enterprise of some consequence was the preparation of a volume of *Oxford Essays*, in which several of the best intellects of Oxford were engaged. Mark Pattison contributed his remarkable paper on "Oxford Studies"; Henry Smith wrote, as before said, on "*Whewell's Plurality of Worlds*," and on Brewster's answer to it; T. C. Sanders on "*Hegel's Philosophy of Right*"; Baden-Powell on the "*Uniformity of Nature*," and so forth. There soon followed a set of *Cambridge Essays*, and a similar volume proceeded from the University of Edinburgh.

The moderate success of these academical ventures may have suggested the more daring enterprise which, under the auspices of Messrs. Parker, the Oxford

publishers, saw the light in 1859, with the colourless title of *Essays and Reviews*. The prime mover in the scheme was Bristowe Wilson, and he sought the help of the other theologians whom I have named above. Stanley was approached through Jowett, but disapproved of the joint publication, which seemed to him to involve some sacrifice of independence. He had not himself been directly attacked, and felt less keenly, perhaps, the force of ecclesiastical bigotry which threatened to stifle thought with obscurantism. He preferred to continue his own separate endeavours by gentler means, to liberalise theology, and to obtain some relaxation of the terms of Subscription for the clergy. Jowett's reasons for his own adhesion are explained in the letter which he wrote to Stanley at Bristowe Wilson's instance. As it goes far to explain the leading motive of the volume, it may be quoted at some length:—

“Wilson wishes me to write to you respecting a volume of theological essays which he has already mentioned, the object of which, however, he thinks he has not clearly set before you, trusting to my being at Oxford, etc.

“The persons who have already joined in the plan are Wilson, R. Williams of King's, Pattison, Grant, Temple, Müller, if he has time, and myself. The object is to say what we think freely within the limits of the Church of England. A notice will be prefixed that no one is responsible for any notions but his own. It is, however, an essential part of the plan that names shall be given, partly for the additional weight which the articles will have, if the authors are known, and also from the feeling that on such subjects as theology it is better not

to write anonymously. We do not wish to do anything rash or irritating to the public or the University, but we are determined not to submit to this abominable system of terrorism, which prevents the statement of the plainest facts, and makes true theology or theological education impossible. Pusey and his friends are perfectly aware of your opinions, and the Dean's, and Temple's, and Müller's, but they are determined to prevent your expressing them. I do not deny that in the present state of the world the expression of them is a matter of great nicety and care, but is it possible to do any good by a system of reticence? For example, I entirely agree with you that no greater good could be accomplished for religion and morality than the abolition of all subscriptions; but how will this ever be promoted in the least degree, or how will it be possible for any one in high station ever to propose it, if we only talk in private? We shall talk A.D. 1868. I want to point out that the object is not to be attained by any anonymous writing."

Rowland Williams had lately retired from Lampeter to the living of Broad Chalk in the diocese of Salisbury, and after his correspondence with Thirlwall and the bitter attacks to which he had been exposed was glad to seize the opportunity of vindicating his theological position. He was no doubt eager for the fray. His attitude throughout was somewhat defiant. Having to preach at Cambridge in his turn, he gave out the text, "After the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers," in tones that made an impression on the audience which is not yet effaced.

Baden-Powell was ready and willing enough to restate when called upon the opinions which he

had expressed in several publications, especially in his recent work on the *Order of Nature*. Sir A. Grant promised to contribute, but was prevented by his appointment to Bombay. Max Müller seems to have excused himself as not having the necessary time.

Who else were applied to without result there is no evidence to show. But three of the essayists have still to be mentioned. Mark Pattison, now one of the most distinguished of the Oxford tutors, whose essay on *Oxford Studies* showed him to be admirably fitted for an historical review of theoretical opinions, wrote on Religious Thought in the Eighteenth Century. Charles Wycliffe Goodwin, Fellow of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge, the only contributor who was not in Priest's Orders, wrote on the Mosaic Cosmogony. He was a distinguished student both of science and of Oriental religion, especially of Egyptology;* a brother of Harvey Goodwin, the Bishop of Carlisle, whose preaching at Cambridge had produced so great an effect. And, lastly (though he came first in the volume), the present Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Temple, was induced, probably by Jowett, his friend of many years, to contribute the substance of a sermon on the Education of the World, which he had preached from the pulpit of St. Mary's, and which had been greatly admired at the time by almost all who heard it.

The hope of the essayists had been that by a temperate statement of convictions which they deliberately held, they might recommend, especially to

* He was afterwards a judge in Shanghai and Yokohama.

the younger amongst intellectual men, an unconventional view of Christianity, which they believed to be tenable together with the fullest acknowledgment of all that criticism had proved or science revealed.

It seemed at first as if the object of the volume might be attained. Henry Smith observed "the stone sank quietly into the waters." But an unlooked-for commotion followed. Liberal thinkers at Oxford were at this time divided between "Moderates" and "Extremists," a state of things which C. H. Pearson has vividly described. Amongst the Extremists were some who had once thought of becoming clergymen, but had declined ordination as incompatible with freedom of thought. Their anger was excited by the claim on the part of ordained clergymen to hold opinions nearly identical with those which had barred their way. The reclamations thus occasioned fired the train which exploded a magazine of latent fanaticism.

The Bishop of Oxford, still warm from his encounter with young Huxley over the *Origin of Species*, immediately saw his opportunity, and fomented the excitement that was already rising amongst the country clergy, who came up to Oxford in overwhelming numbers to oppose the election of Mr. Max Müller to the Chair of Sanskrit. The Bishop wrote in hot haste a violent article for *The Quarterly*, which appeared in January, 1861, and preached at Oxford a sermon afterwards published containing a much-quoted passage on "the Doubter's Death," which was censured even by some of the orthodox

as indelicate, but appeared strangely eloquent to the impressionable mind of J. A. Symonds. Several months of panic and recrimination followed. The "religious" Press of course found a congenial theme, and the sceptical conservatism of the *Saturday Review*, with its High Church backing, was ready with a contemptuous sneer, which found an echo amongst the advocates of "free inquiry for free inquirers."

Arthur Stanley, who had refused to contribute, now showed the full courage and chivalry of his nature. His defence of the essayists in the *Edinburgh Review* did much to calm the general excitement, and went far to save the situation. But the bishops had already committed themselves. The diplomacy of Samuel of Oxford had been too successful. A letter from a country clergyman in the Oxford diocese, Mr. Fremantle, called forth a reply from the entire Bench of Bishops, sometimes described as the "Encyclical," in which the whole volume was condemned. That Hampden should have signed this letter seems inconsistent, but need cause no surprise. That Tait should have done so, after excepting Temple and Jowett from his personal disapproval, only shows that practical wisdom may go along with intellectual limitations. But the position of Thirlwall is more difficult to understand. A glimmer of light, however, appears in some passages of his correspondence with Dean Stanley. In July 1870, he wrote: "In looking back on the case of *Essays and Reviews*, I cannot help lamenting that the secret history of the episcopal letter will never be

known beyond a very small circle of persons, among whom I know only of one who would wish it to have been divulged." And his biographer, probably as well informed as anyone can be, tells us that the authorship of the "Encyclical" was unknown, and the absolute unanimity of the Episcopal Bench was believed only to have been brought about "by the personal efforts and influence of a prominent member of the Episcopate, since dead." We cannot be presuming too far, if we suppose that Bishop Wilberforce is meant.

The religious panic of 1861, of which it is evident that Thirlwall in 1870 was heartily ashamed, was due not so much to any real contrariety between reason and faith, as to an opposition between the knowledge of the few and the ignorance of the many, amongst persons equally sincere in their devotion to the religion of Christ. The history of the prosecutions which followed, and of the judgments in the Court of Arches and in the Privy Council Court of Appeal, has been recorded elsewhere and need not now be repeated at length. The net result of this and of the Colenso controversy was certainly to enlarge the liberty of thought and teaching permissible to the clergy, and it is worth remembering that the two points to which the issues were reduced by Dr. Lushington, and on which his judgment was reversed, the Inspiration of the Bible and the Eternity of Punishment, are questions on which far greater latitude is now practically allowed than was at one time conceived to be possible within the Church. Bristowe Wilson and Rowland Williams fought a

good fight. They suffered, but they won their cause, and their victory is a gain to their successors, even to some who are not of their way of thinking. Dr. Boyd Carpenter, the present Bishop of Ripon, has truly said that "the publication in 1889 of a book entitled *Lux Mundi* was a sort of *amende honorable* paid by its distinguished writers to the fearless lovers of truth, whom their fathers had execrated."

One who had doubted the expediency of "fencing with legal obligations" on the part of clergymen, yet made the admission at the time that the conduct of the essayists, "which inevitably exposed them to obloquy and exclusion from preferment" (in the case of three of them it involved far more than this), "was not only disinterested but self-sacrificing in the highest degree."

It is rather unfortunate that Bishop Thirlwall's charge of 1863 was delivered in the interim between the first judgment and the final decision of Lord Westbury. Thirlwall is generally credited with a calm judicial mind. But while the coldness which the Baroness Bunsen early perceived in him prevented him from sympathising at all fully with those who were continuing a work which he himself began, he seems to have had a peculiar temperament which when once provoked continued to smoulder, and was not readily appeased. After Rowland Williams' death he wrote: "My intentions towards him were always sincerely friendly, and the breach between us was caused by a strange misapprehension on his part." But it certainly would appear as if this long-continued misunderstanding had to some extent

warped the Bishop's judgment on the larger question. How little sympathy Connop Thirlwall, now twenty years a bishop, retained for those who were fighting the battle in which he had once led the vanguard, appears from his quoting in self-defence the act of the Oxford Vice-Chancellor, who required Jowett to sign the Articles anew. The following comment, which was written about the same time, expresses the way in which the same incident had struck an Oxford contemporary :—

“Nobody supposes that any further assurance of his orthodoxy has really been given to any human being. Persecution, and attempts to drive the supposed heretic from the University by insult and injustice, go on after the pretended act of satisfaction, just as they did before. One object only has been attained, the open degradation of an opponent.”

It appears, too, that the Bishop of St. David's was not inaccessible to personal influences. His endorsement of the “Encyclical” can only be explained by a sort of hypnotism exercised on him by Samuel Wilberforce. The counter influence which afterwards prevailed was that of A. P. Stanley, who in 1861 told me of an amusing blunder of his own. He said that at some time, “when it mattered more than it would now,” he had written two letters of importance, to the Bishops of St. David's and of Oxford severally, and after addressing the envelopes, inclosed in either of them the wrong letter! In the words quoted he alluded to the fact that in 1861 Thirlwall, in common with the other bishops, had fallen a victim to the fascinations of the episcopal charmer.

Thirlwall showed evident signs of uneasiness in the whole matter. When attacked in the anonymous pamphlet which I formerly mentioned, *Essays and Reviews Anticipated*, he took the trouble of writing to the *Spectator*, and while maintaining his own earlier teaching, added: "I am not aware of having refused to others the license which I ever claimed for myself; and, if it please God, I shall never consent to the narrowing by a hair's breadth that latitude of opinion which the Church has hitherto conceded to her ministers." And in his charge of 1863, although hampered by his own previous action, by Dr. Lushington's judgment, and by some lingering antipathy to Rowland Williams, he resolutely declined to stigmatise Bishop Colenso as an heretical teacher; and expressed his approval of a relaxation of subscription for the clergy.*

Dr. Lushington's judgment, involving the suspension of Wilson and Williams, was pronounced in 1862, and in 1863 Dr. Pusey brought Jowett into the Vice-Chancellor's Court. In his Preface to the *Case and Opinion of Counsel*, previously printed, he referred to the condemnation of Williams and Wilson in the Court of Arches, and added, that another of the seven, namely Baden-Powell, had been "removed before a Higher Tribunal." Temple and Pattison were for different reasons beyond the reach of legal prosecution. Thus Jowett alone remained accessible. Owing to the wisdom of Mountague Bernard, who

* Something may be attributed to Thirlwall's indifference towards physical science. Baden-Powell's essay seems to have been *too strong* for him.

disclaimed jurisdiction, the attempted persecution came to nothing, and Jowett suffered only from the continued refusal to augment his salary.

The trouble of these years was intensified by the Colenso controversy, on which Dean Milman wrote:—

“The condemnation of Bishop Colenso has been generally based on a theory of biblical interpretation in my judgment not authorised by the Scripture itself; in its rigor only of late dominance or acceptance in the Church, in no way whatever asserted in the formularies or articles of the Church of England, fatal, as I truly believe it, to the lasting authorised influence of the Bible; inevitably leading to endless difficulties and contradictions in perilous and unnecessary conflict with the science and with the discoveries of our time, making it impossible to reconcile and harmonise the spirit of the Old Testament with the spirit of the New.”

The final acquittal of the essayists by the Court of Appeal took place in 1864. Lord Westbury wrote to Dean Stanley, with characteristic irony: “I am told Dr. Pusey says, and that many who agree with him say, ‘one consolation is that the Lord Chancellor will some time feel what is meant by eternal punishment.’” This event was followed in the same year by the famous vote of the Oxford Convocation, when the University was finally committed to the refusal of all endowment for the Regius Professor of Greek. This awkward situation was remedied in 1865, when Christ Church granted the necessary funds, and in the same year, in consequence doubtless of the persistent efforts of Dean Stanley, the form of subscription for the clergy was relaxed by Lord

Granville's Act. A weighty deliverance of Dean Milman's on this subject may still be read in vol. lxxi. of *Fraser's Magazine*.

The tide was turning. "Bibliolatry" was for the time discomfited, and High Churchmen, led now by Canon Liddon, were less absorbed in definitions of doctrine than in the development and defence of a newer phase of Ritualism. But throughout this decade (1861-71) the struggle for clerical predominance in the Universities was continued, although the focus of the contention was transferred from Oxford and Cambridge to London and to the Houses of Parliament, as will be shown in the next chapter.

Meanwhile opinion in the world at large was much influenced by the Darwinian theory, and the word "Evolution" was assuming the importance which it has since maintained, while the spirit of historical criticism in France and Holland, through the works of Renan and Kuenen, extending far beyond the horizon of English "Broad Churchism," produced effects which clerical denunciation was powerless to obviate or to annul.

In the midst of the turmoil, while the case of the essayists was still *sub judice*, and Darwin and Huxley were still under the theological ban, two veteran thinkers came into the field in a manner well calculated to arrest attention.

Sir Charles Lyell, whose *Principles of Geology* had in 1830 created an alarm, was one of the minority of scientific men who in 1860 demurred to the conclusions put forth in the famous *Origin of Species*. But the spirit of investigation was still strong in him,

and after three years of independent study and inquiry, he produced his famous volume on the *Antiquity of Man*, where, on evidence since then amply confirmed, while discussing with admirable candour a few points of difference which remained between himself and Mr. Huxley, he admitted the existence of human beings as a distinct sub-class of the mammalia contemporaneously with extinct animal species, at a time when glaciers still remained in the higher mountains of Scotland and Wales. For this he allowed a period of at least a hundred thousand years. He is careful to add a statement of Dr. Asa Gray, "that there is no tendency in the doctrine of Variation and Natural Selection to weaken the foundations of natural theology; for, consistently with the derivative hypothesis of species, we may hold any of the popular views respecting the manner in which the changes of the natural world are brought about."

And it was now that Dean Milman, unmoved by the popular outcry surrounding him, brought out the second edition of his *History of the Jews*, with the spirited Preface of which I have already spoken. He ended with the following noble words:—

"I have written this Preface with reluctance, and only from an imperious sense of duty. It has been written for the promotion of peace. It may not please the extreme of either party; but this will be rather in favour of its truth, at least of its moderation. If on such subjects some solid ground be not found, on which highly educated, reflective, reading, reasoning men may find firm footing, I can foresee nothing but a wide, a widening, I fear an irreparable

breach between the thought and religion of England. A comprehensive, all-embracing, truly catholic Christianity, which knows what is essential to religion, what is temporary and extraneous to it, may defy the world. Obstinate adherence to things antiquated, and irreconcilable with advancing knowledge and thought, may repel, and for ever, how many I know not, how far, I know still less. *Avertat omen Deus.*"

Rowland Williams died in 1870. Bristowe Wilson's health was already broken, and not long afterwards he was struck down by paralysis. But when I visited him in 1870, he was keenly engaged in organising a second series of *Essays and Reviews*, a scheme in which he was seconded by Dr. John Muir, the Sanskrit scholar. He had himself made some progress with an essay on the Sacraments, and had obtained promises from Jowett, Professor Caird (now the Master of Balliol), myself, and others. The volume was never completed; but the inception proves that the spirit which Pusey, Wilberforce, and others had sought to stifle, was not crushed out.

CHAPTER VII.

ATTEMPTS AT LEGISLATION

"Tante molis erat Romanam condere gentem"

IT may seem fanciful to associate the theological excitements described in the last chapter with the practical question of University reform. But there is a very real connexion between them. Free thought in both the Universities was in the ascendant amongst the ablest of the younger men. And in proportion to their earnestness, they were the more galled by the burden of the test which was now imposed at a later period of their career, when they were already of a full age. The obstinate insistence of the clerical party, in attempting to give the formularies a literal interpretation,* provoked into fresh activity the advocates for academical freedom. At Oxford especially those whom I have described as the moderate and extreme sections of the Liberal wing became united on this one question. Professor Jowett, whose influence in the University

* Compare Jowett's expression in a letter to Stanley, July 17th, 1864: "The Bishop of Oxford certainly puts clergymen in an awkward position by bringing them back to the letter of their obligation. Does he consider in what a much more awkward position he puts himself and the Church by wholly, without a rag to cover him, giving up the very pretence of truth of fact?"—*Life*, vol. i. p. 368.

was greatly enhanced by the calmness with which he faced his adversaries, was determined to concentrate his efforts in this direction. Stanley, in his *Edinburgh Review* article of April, 1861, had expressed with some warmth the indignation of the moderate Liberal at the attitude assumed by an extreme Liberal towards the authors of *Essays and Reviews*. Jowett, while welcoming the article as a whole, regretted this, and immediately did his best to conciliate the holder of the extreme opinion, and to enlist him in the cause of Test abolition. In order to appreciate this action, it is right to consider Jowett's position at the time. He was himself the central object of a contention, in which he took no part, but which lasted four years after this. The ferment was at its height, and Stanley's writing did more than anything else to allay it. But Jowett held firmly to "the direct forthright," like Socrates at Potidæa (except that he did not retreat), eyeing steadily both friend and foe.

At this stage the position of Cambridge was more favourable to the Dissenters than that of Oxford. By the Act of 1856 the Test had been abolished for all degrees except in Divinity, but with the reservation (due to an amendment in the House of Lords) that such degrees should not carry with them a vote in the Senate. But the Fellowships and other emoluments and all University and college offices remained subject to the Test.

The existing law at Oxford may be best stated in the words of Mr. Goldwin Smith:—

"The Act of 1854 (17 and 18 Vict., c. 81) abolished all oaths and declarations at matriculation, and on

taking the degree of Bachelor of Arts, Law, or Medicine. But by the Statutes of the University no person can take the Degree of Master or Doctor, or become a member of Convocation, the governing body of the University, without subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles, and in addition the Three Articles of the Thirty-sixth Canon, the same which are subscribed by the clergy at their ordination, and the second of which, pledging the person subscribing 'to use the forms prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments, and none other,' is properly applicable to clergymen alone.

"Degrees in Theology are confined by the Statutes of the University to persons in Priests' Orders.

"By the Act of Uniformity all Heads and Fellows of Colleges, among other persons, are required, at their admission, to make a declaration of Conformity to the Liturgy of the Church of England.

"In most of the Colleges the Fellows are obliged, either by the College Statutes or by the Ordinances of the late Commission, to take the degree of M.A. or one of the superior degrees, for which, as before stated, subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Three Articles of the Thirty-sixth Canon is required. In other Colleges the Fellowships are expressly confined, either by their own Statutes or by the Ordinances of the Commission, to members of the Church of England. In some cases both provisions occur. In one case only, it is believed, the limitation of the Fellowships to members of the Church of England rests on the Act of Uniformity alone.

"The Act 17 and 18 Vict. authorises persons to open Private Halls for the reception of students with a license from the Vice-Chancellor. But the Master of a Private Hall must be a member of Convocation, and must therefore have taken the Tests."

Owing to the difference in the actual position of the Universities, Reformers at Oxford and Cambridge severally took a special line. The Oxford men in the first instance aimed simply at setting free the Higher Degrees, whereas at Cambridge the grievance chiefly felt was the closeness of the Fellowships ; and a Petition for throwing them open, by repealing the clause in the Act of Uniformity, was circulated by Mr. Henry Fawcett, of Trinity Hall, and was signed by seventy Fellows, including twenty-eight Fellows of Trinity. It was presented to Parliament in the next session. But the House of Commons was not yet prepared to touch the emoluments, and when, in 1863, Mr. Bouverie, the member for Kilmarnock, brought in a Bill, embodying the prayer of this Petition, the proposed measure never reached a second reading. In the same year Mr. Charles Buxton, another Cambridge Liberal, then M.P. for Maidstone, moved a resolution in favour of relaxing clerical subscription, which was withdrawn after a statement of Lord John Russell's which encouraged the hope that something in this direction would be done. And Mr. Dillwyn, also in 1863, made a similar motion in favour of endowed schoolmasters, but without success.

The years of Lord Palmerston's Administration of 1859-66 were not favourable to measures of this order. "Conservative reaction," imbued with a spirited foreign policy, was in the air. And although the Cabinet included Lord John Russell and Mr. Gladstone, Liberal members who supported the

Government had reason to complain that progressive home legislation was neither initiated nor heartily encouraged. Yet it was in these years that the ground was laid for the effective abolition of Tests in the Universities, and even for the relaxation of the terms of clerical subscription. The presence in Parliament of such Cambridge men as Charles Buxton, G. O. Trevelyan, and Henry Fawcett, and of such Oxford men as Mountstuart E. Grant Duff, Charles Neate, Charles Cavendish Clifford, Walter Morrison, and George Goschen, afforded of itself distinct encouragement both to Nonconformist members and University reformers. Stanley's migration from Oxford to the Deanery of Westminster, though in some ways a disappointment, created a new centre of liberalising influence in London, and several of those who, as University men, had been most keenly interested in the movement were now resident there, as barristers or literary men.

The changed conditions which favoured this development of opinion were due to several causes, apart from the Oxford heresy-hunt. Ordination was no longer the only opening for a successful University man. Several of the colleges, with the help of the Executive Commissioners in revising their statutes, had already reduced the number of clerical Fellowships, and as the old local restrictions were everywhere abolished, and both scholarships and Fellowships were open to general competition, the average ability of the Foundationers had been considerably raised. The limitation of age for the Indian Civil Service at this time still left the competition open

to men who might have taken their degree. The Heads of the Education Office were on the look-out for promising young men, and through the example set by Dr. Arnold, an assistant-mastership at Rugby or Harrow or at some other public school had become an object of academical ambition. In Oxford itself it was possible, at Balliol and elsewhere, for a tutor without taking Orders to be virtually a minister of religion. Men like T. H. Green and R. Nettleship not only raised the religious standard of those around them, but exercised an influence that is powerful in some sections of the English Church to this day. The Bar was still open, and there were more men of ability amongst the graduates who were apt to be attracted by its opportunities. It is not wonderful that the number of University candidates for Orders should have greatly diminished. Yet the heresy-hunting was doubtless responsible for the alienation of many whose gifts and graces would have adorned a clerical career. The biography of Mr. C. H. Pearson affords a conspicuous example:—

“He had venerated the Church of England, as at its best the Church of Fraser and Maurice and Dean Church. Later his relations to the Anglican clergy in educational controversies affected his churchmanship, not the essence of his theology, which remained, as it had always been since early manhood, undogmatically Christian.”

The position of a young clergyman coming fresh from Oxford in the years between 1858 and 1864 was in some ways not a happy one. Not that he need have any difficulty with his parishioners if he

were a genuine human being. But to find himself in a minority of one at clerical meetings, to be suspected and misunderstood by his brother clergy, to be required under a semblance of authority to sign memorials whose meaning he abhorred, and which reflected upon his dearest friends—these were not altogether pleasant experiences, and of course he soon discovered that all the avenues of preferment were fast shut.

The signs of uneasiness in those years were still frequent. The deprivation of Dunbar Heath, a clever and uncompromising clergyman in the Isle of Wight, Mr. Voysey's case, and the resignation of the Rev. J. Macnaught, incumbent of St. Chrysostom's, Liverpool, and author of a work on the doctrine of Inspiration, all occurred about this time.

On the other hand, the increasing success of Balliol and of Rugby showed that the effect of the popular outcry did not go very deep. As a contemporary writer observed: "People are willing enough to denounce, perhaps even to persecute, but they are not willing, nor will they ever be willing, to forego the benefit of the best education for their children."

While Mr. Bouverie's Bill was under discussion a petition on the subject was prepared at Oxford and influentially signed. But from some delay in obtaining the signatures it was not presented until late in the session of 1863. It was presented in the House of Commons by Mr. Dodson on the 24th of June, and in the House of Lords by Earl Russell on the 3rd of July. The presentation in the House of Commons was followed by an important debate. Mr. Henley

observed that "they had had three distinct motions on the Notice Paper. The honourable member for Maidstone (Mr. Buxton) dealt with the clergy, the right honourable member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie) dealt with the Fellows of colleges, and the honourable member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) dealt with the schoolmasters; so that between them they took the whole sweep of the Act of Uniformity."

Mr. Goschen, who was a new member, made a speech on the Liberal side, on which he was complimented by Mr. Gladstone.

Mr. Gladstone himself still showed some reluctance to consider the question. He wished that the University would initiate the reform, and while he doubted the wisdom of using the Thirty-nine Articles as a test for laymen, he still thought that some test was indispensable for members of the governing body, though it might be dispensed with in the case of certain Professorships.

"He did not know," he said, "in what manner it would be possible to govern Universities like those of Oxford and Cambridge upon the principle of a general mixture of belief in the governing body. Nor could he conceive how, with a system of religious truth purporting to be revealed and essentially definite, you could separate the propagation of Tests from the principle and maintenance of that religion. It seemed to him like dividing the bone from the flesh, so that vitality itself must escape in the severance. It was a fair and just demand on the part of the Church of England, that the governing body in *her* University and *her* colleges should be composed of *her* members."*

* The italics are mine.

Mr. Grant Duff welcomed Mr. Gladstone's proposal of a simpler test for laymen as a "crumb of comfort" for the Liberal supporters of the Government.

In the debate in the Lords on July 3rd the Bishop of London echoed Mr. Gladstone's wish that the University itself should act. And Lord Westbury seems to have made an amusing speech, recalling the fact that at the tender age of fourteen, when he matriculated at Oxford, he had not been allowed to subscribe to the Statutes, but was compelled to sign the Articles of Religion.

Early in the following year there was published an able and important pamphlet by Mr. Goldwin Smith, in which the whole case for the abolition of Subscription was stated with terseness and vigour. Some extracts will be found in an Appendix to the present chapter (p. 143). In this brochure, for the first time, so far as I am aware, dissenting bodies are spoken of collectively as "the Free Churches." Mr. Smith compared Oxford, with her closed degrees and offices and open bookshops, to a city with strongly fortified gates, but with no walls.

On February 15th, 1864, a Bill was brought in by Mr. Dodson, "to provide for the abolition of certain tests in connexion with academical degrees in the University of Oxford." It was backed by Mr. Grant Duff and Mr. Goschen.

In this Bill no attempt was made to set free emoluments or University and college offices. The proposed measure simply provided for the abolition of the two tests required at Oxford as necessary

conditions for the degree of M.A. or of Doctor in any Faculty, namely, subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles and to the Three Articles of the Thirty-sixth Canon. Divinity degrees were not excepted, because under the existing Statute they could only be taken by men who were already in Priest's Orders.

In the debate on the second reading Mr. Gladstone refused to support the Bill as it stood, but for the first time argued in favour of concession.

"Lately," he said, "it has been too much the fashion to adopt a policy of indiscriminate resistance. Looking back at the history of the Church, her friends have shown too much tenacity in clinging to their privileges. I admit that these are days when the Church is subject to peculiar and, perhaps, unprecedented dangers. But these dangers will neither be averted nor mitigated by declining to make concessions which do not touch her faith, but show her desire to live in goodwill with every branch and section of the community."

Mr. Buxton made a strong speech in favour of academical freedom:—

"It was a delusion to suppose that this was in the main a Dissenters' question. Its main effect was to relieve loyal Churchmen who could not hold all her dogmatic teaching. The strife was between the principle of religious subjection and the principle of religious liberty."

Mr. Goschen maintained that one of the chief motives of the Bill was "to get rid of a system which distressed conscience, promoted dishonesty, impeded learning, discouraged theological study at

the University, and on the whole was unjust, intolerant, and inquisitorial."

The second reading was carried by 211 to 189. The debate in Committee took place on the 1st of June, when the majority in favour of the Bill was reduced to ten (236 to 226). The argument from Cambridge was again used with considerable effect.

An agitation in support of the principles of Mr. Dodson's and Mr. Bouverie's Bill was now set on foot amongst Oxford men in London. A small provisional committee, consisting of Mr. M. E. Grant Duff, M.P., Mr. Frederic Harrison, Mr. C. S. Roundell, and Mr. C. S. Bowen (afterwards Lord Bowen), prepared the way, and they took into consultation Mr. Edward Miall, the Nonconformist member. Other London Oxonians who were active in promoting the movement at that time were the Hon. G. C. Brodrick, Mr. James Bryce, Mr. George Osborne Morgan (afterwards Sir George), Mr. Albert O. Rutson, Mr. R. S. Wright (Mr. Justice Wright), and the Hon. E. L. Stanley.

The Petition of the previous year had clearly shown that the different sections of Oxford Liberals were now firmly united upon this question. Professor Jowett's wish expressed in his letter to Mr. Frederic Harrison in April, 1861, was in so far fulfilled. Amongst other promoters of the movement still resident in Oxford were the Dean of Christ Church (H. G. Liddell), his friend Professor J. M. Wilson, Sir Benjamin Brodie, Mr. T. Fowler, and Mr. Goldwin Smith.

The increase in the number of lay graduates con-

sequent upon the legislation of 1854, the abolition of restrictions upon Fellowships under the ordinances of the Executive Commission, the painful scruples which in notable instances had deterred able men, such as Sir B. Brodie, Henry Smith, John Nichol, and James Bryce, from proceeding in due course to the Master's degree, the opening up of lay careers by the altered regulations for the Civil Services, and similar causes had combined, as before said, to create an altered state of opinion at Oxford; while the diminished number of University candidates for Ordination, and the manifest reluctance to become clergymen on the part of intellectual men, afforded a strong argument for those who still cared deeply for the future of religion.

After some preliminary gatherings in barristers' chambers, such as those of Mr. C. S. Roundell and Mr. Osborne Morgan, it was resolved to organise a meeting of a more public nature, which was held in the Freemasons' Tavern in Great Queen Street, near Lincoln's Inn Fields, on June 10th, 1864. Here resolutions were passed in favour of Mr. Dodson's Bill for the Abolition of Tests at Oxford, and Mr. Bouverie's to remove the Test for College Fellowships required in both Universities by the Act of Uniformity. Mr. Bouverie, M.P., was in the chair, and the principal speakers were Mr. Goldwin Smith, Mr. C. S. Bowen, Professors Fawcett, Jowett, H. J. S. Smith, and T. H. Huxley, Mr. Goschen, M.P., Mr. John Bright, M.P., the Dean of Westminster, Mr. James Bryce, and Mr. T. Fowler (now Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford). It was

upon this occasion that Mr. Bright observed that he had been accustomed to regard the Universities as "places dedicated to dead languages and undying prejudices."

This was a remarkable assembly. The names of a hundred and twenty persons who were present and approved the proceedings were recorded on the spot, many of them in autograph, and almost all would still be recognised as men of note.

These names are so important as indicating the state of public opinion at the time that I have thought it right, in an Appendix to this volume, to repeat them just as they were written down, and to add a few words of comment or explanation after each. (See Appendix C, p. 284.)

More than half of those present at the meeting were Oxford men, and of the Oxonians one-third had originally been educated at Balliol. The latter fact is partly concealed by the Oxford habit of migrating from one college to another in the competition for Fellowships.

This meeting, however influential and important in its after effects, had no appreciable effect on the progress of Mr. Dodson's Bill. Three distinct opinions had formed themselves in the House of Commons—one agreeing with Mr. Dodson in wishing to carry the measure as it stood; one objecting to certain features of it, but ready to consider amendments if proposed; and a third, which was Mr. Gladstone's, proposing to except degrees in theology and to give no vote in Convocation without the Test; in short, to place Oxford in the position of Cambridge.

The Bill passed the Commons in July in a small House by the narrowest of possible majorities—the third reading had been carried by the Speaker's casting vote—and it was obviously too late to bring it forward in the House of Lords.

The passing of Lord Granville's Act in 1865, by which the Act of Uniformity was amended so as considerably to relax the terms of Subscription for the clergy—Archbishop Trench (of all people in the world) leading the opposition and the protest in the House of Lords—was, however, a strong encouragement for those who were persistently aiming at the abolition of Tests in the Universities, and was used as an argument in subsequent debates. The clerical Fellow was now subject to a severer Test than the beneficed clergyman.

Mr. Goschen and Mr. Grant Duff accordingly undertook the preparation of a new measure by which not only the degrees but University offices should be thrown open while the college emoluments remained as they were. In the session of 1866 this Bill was entrusted to Mr. J. D. Coleridge, the future Lord Chief Justice, and was carried successfully through the House of Commons, but was withdrawn after the change of ministry in July. Henry Fawcett was now a member of the House of Commons, having been returned for Brighton, and on the motion for going into committee on Mr. Coleridge's Bill, as well as in the support of Mr. Bouverie's, which was again brought forward, he spoke earnestly in favour of setting free the Fellowships both at Oxford and Cambridge from the religious Test

imposed by the Act of Uniformity. But the House of Commons still shrank from dealing with the college emoluments, and the proposal found little favour at that time.

Mr. Coleridge's Bill was renewed in the following session under the Conservative Government. Mr. Fawcett moved an amendment extending the operation of the measure to the University of Cambridge, and as thus amended it passed the House of Commons (the second reading being carried without a division), but was defeated in the Lords, where it was opposed by the Duke of Marlborough, then President of the Council. Mr. Gladstone gave reasons for not supporting Mr. Coleridge's Bill, while he again admitted that some concession ought to be made to the Dissenters. The Bill for setting free the Fellowships was also brought in again in 1867, but had no chance in either House as yet.

"Conservative reaction" found its issue, strangely enough, in the new Reform Act, by which the suffrage was greatly extended, and as one immediate consequence, besides Mr. Gladstone's return to power, several seats were contested, and a few were won by academical Liberals within the next few years. These elections added greatly to the force that was operating in Parliament for the abolition of Tests and clerical restrictions.

At this point we may turn from the subject of the Test to mention a measure of a different kind, which also gave evidence of the progress of ideas at Oxford,

and conduced to the main purpose of restoring the University to the nation. This was Mr. Ewart's University Education Bill, which created the class of non-collegiate students, as suggested by the Oxford Commissioners in 1852. It passed both Houses in 1867, after being brought by Mr. Fawcett's motion before a Select Committee of the House of Commons, which took evidence from (amongst others) Professor Jowett, Mr. C. S. Roundell, and Dr. Pusey. The evidence is embodied in the Committee's report.

In the course of his evidence Professor Jowett made it known that Balliol, at all events, was ready to give teaching gratis to members of the college not living within its walls. At the same time he not only accepted the principle of "unattached students," but suggested methods for applying it successfully, such as the appointment of a Delegacy for the purpose, and special arrangements for their tuition and discipline. He further observed that to render the scheme effectual, a good share of the emoluments, in the shape of "University scholarships," should be thrown open to them.

Those who have read this little work attentively so far will have perceived a gradual change in Mr. Gladstone's attitude on the question of the University Tests. In 1834, when the question was first mooted in Parliament, he had met the proposal of abolition with an absolute negative. He admitted that the Universities were national institutions, but only in so far as they were connected with the National Church. In 1850 he expressed a great dread of

the Commission of Inquiry, for which he saw no pretext. And there is reason to suppose that in 1854 the exclusion of this question from Lord John Russell's Bill was due to Mr. Gladstone's presence in the Cabinet. In opposing Mr. Heywood's motion on the Report, he appealed to the solemn and sacred trust which had been committed to him as a reason for holding that the position of the Church of England had a place in the discussion. But when Mr. Heywood's amendment had been passed, and the Test at matriculation had been abolished, he saw the wisdom of extending the exemption to the Bachelor's degree, and assimilating the conditions at Oxford to those existing at Cambridge. On the presentation of the Oxford Petition in 1863, he admitted that subscription to the Articles was an unsuitable test for laymen, but talked of the danger of "dividing the bone from the flesh," and maintained that it was a just claim on the part of the Established Church that the governing body in *her* University and *her* colleges should be composed of *her* members.

In 1864, though he still demurred to the abolition of the Test, he became for the first time an advocate in the interests of the Church herself for a limited measure of concession. In 1865 came his repulse at Oxford and his election for South Lancashire, a twofold event which Liberal friends "regarded as his political emancipation," and from this point onward being, as he said himself, "unmuzzled," he was gradually converted from being an opponent of Test Abolition, in the mild and partial form which it had hitherto assumed, to be a more or

less willing supporter of the far more sweeping change which was effected under his Administration in 1871. The "solemn and sacred trust" had been withdrawn. We no longer hear him speak of the Established Church and *her* Universities, or of "dividing the bone from the flesh, so that vitality itself must escape." In his first speech to his new constituents at Liverpool he said, referring to the great University which he had represented for eighteen years:—

"If her future is to be as glorious as her past, the result must be brought about by enlarging her borders, by opening her doors, by invigorating her powers, by endeavouring to rise to the height of that vocation with which, I believe, it has pleased the Almighty to endow her."

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VII.

I.

Mr. Goldwin Smith on the Admission of Dissenters to the Universities.

From *A Plea for the Abolition of Tests*, 1864.

A Petition from members of the University of Oxford for the abolition of tests of religious opinion on admission to academical degrees was presented to both Houses of Parliament last Session. It was signed by 106 persons, two of whom were Heads of Colleges, while the rest were or had been connected, as Professors, Tutors, or Fellows, with University or College government and education. The Petition was presented in the House of Lords by Earl Russell, in the House of Commons by Mr. Dodson. Its prayer

was supported in the Upper House by Earl Granville and the Bishop of London, and in the Lower House by Mr. Buxton, Mr. Grant Duff, and Mr. Goschen. Mr. Gladstone, without actually supporting the prayer of the Petition, commended the question, as one requiring attention, to the consideration of the University, and went so far as to intimate his own opinion that the stringency of the present tests was in the case of laymen, at least, open to reasonable objection. . . . It will scarcely be thought presumptuous to claim for the persons whose names were appended to the Petition credit for not having intentionally done anything insidious or unfair towards their opponents. Those of them especially who are clergymen, and who know well what obloquy they incur in their own profession, and how their professional prospects may be affected by a declaration in favour of liberty of conscience, have, in signing the Petition, given a sufficient guarantee at least for their integrity and courage. The changes which the document underwent were not intended to mislead opponents, but were such as documents intended to be signed by a large number of persons, who, though agreed as to their main object, may differ in details, are very apt to undergo. An anxiety to make the Petition as little open to misconstruction as possible, especially on religious grounds, will scarcely be imputed as a fault to the framers. And it was certainly not by any contrivance or in accordance with any wish of the petitioners that the presentation was postponed till very near the end of the Session of Parliament, when it was scarcely possible that a question of any importance should be effectively discussed, and quite impossible that the discussion should result in legislation.

The number of those who signed the Petition must be compared, as Mr. Gladstone justly remarked, not

with that of Convocation at large, but with that of the much smaller body of men who hold or have held headships, professorships, fellowships, or tutorships, and have thus not merely possessed the academical franchise, but been really connected with the University. It must also be regarded, as Mr. Gladstone emphatically avowed, not merely as a stationary quantity, but as indicative of a growing feeling in the University, in which, twenty years ago, probably not a tenth of the number would have been found ready to sign a similar Petition. And further, the number of clerical signatures must be estimated as having been obtained in the face of a hostile feeling on the part of the clergy generally, falling little short of professional terrorism, which vents itself in the gravest imputations against teachers of Christianity, convicted, by their own act, of believing that reason and conscience, when left unfettered by political tests, will bear free witness to Christian truth.

It has been said that the petitioners ought to have applied, in the first instance, to the University, and that they were guilty of a breach of academical loyalty in going at once to Parliament for relief. No one can feel more strongly than the writer of these pages ; no one, when there was occasion, has more earnestly asserted the expediency of keeping the great places of national education independent of the political government of the country and of the influences by which, especially under the system of Party, that government is controlled. No one can be more sensible of the evils which arose, both to the University and the nation, when Oxford, the common heritage of Englishmen, became, through unhappy accidents, the miserable tool of the Jacobite faction ; and which would again arise if ever she should be made the tool of a similar faction again. But as regards the present question, it is to be observed, in the first place, that these tests were, in fact, imposed

from without by the arbitrary exercise of a political power which was then vested in the Crown and exerted through Chancellors nominated by the Sovereign, but which has now passed into the hands of the Legislature, and carried with it the responsibility for the maintenance of the tests. In the second place, it is to be observed that to the University, in the proper sense of the term, it is idle to apply, since she is not a free agent in the matter. The great majority of Convocation consists of clergymen not resident in the University nor much touched by academical needs or sympathies, who come on these occasions to vote—and can be little blamed for voting—with a single eye to the objects and interests, necessarily and perhaps rightly paramount in their minds, of the clerical profession. To ask such a Convocation to repeal religious tests would seem rather like an act of ironical mockery, especially if the inevitable refusal were to be followed by an appeal to Parliament, than like a tribute of allegiance and respect.

This measure would bring a body of Englishmen who have now become powerful and influential, under the higher culture, which has its seat in the Universities, and from which they have been hitherto excluded, to the detriment of their own interests and no less to the detriment of the State in which they exercise social and political power. It would restore the unity of the nation in the matter of high education, by bringing the youth of the upper classes, whether belonging to the landed gentry, who are mostly Anglicans, or to the manufacturing and agricultural part of the community, who are less within the Anglican pale, to a common place of training, where they would imbibe common ideas, be socially as well as intellectually fused, and learn to understand each other: an advantage the magnitude of which anyone may measure by considering how sharp has hitherto been the social and political division

between those bred at Oxford and Cambridge and those bred elsewhere. And further, it would enable the Universities to become the centres of the educational system in a country where large masses of the people, it may almost be said whole districts, are conscientious and for the most part hereditary Dissenters from the Anglican Church, and will not give their confidence to any institution which is administered exclusively in her interest. The expense of a University education, both in money and time, is probably too great to admit of our reckoning on so large an addition as many expect to the number of the resident students, though their number will no doubt be increased both by the removal of religious disabilities, and by the admission of more useful and popular subjects into the course of academical education. But there is no reason why Oxford and Cambridge should not by their action in the way of examining and visiting, as well as by furnishing masters, books, and other instruments of education, exercise a most beneficial influence over the other places of education, especially those of the different social strata, ranging from the solicitor or engineer to the small tradesman, which are embraced in the wide term middle-class. This has, indeed, already been perceived by the Universities themselves, and the idea has been acted on, though, as some think, rather crudely and hastily, by the institution of the middle-class examinations; but religious difficulties have already been encountered, though, the examinations being perfectly voluntary, no candidates were likely to offer themselves whose parents or schoolmasters were very strict Dissenters, and decidedly objected to placing education under the influence of an Anglican institution. The last Education Commissioners, again, suggested in their report, that the Universities should grant certificates to schoolmasters, and that they should undertake the inspection and examination of

the classical endowed schools: and possibly it may hereafter be thought, that if some of our sinecure Fellowships were charged with some duties of this kind they would be not less valuable to the holders, and more useful to the State. Supposing any central system of inspection to be desirable, a far better, more acceptable, and more trusted centre may be found in Universities independent of political party than in an office connected with the executive power. But to exercise these national functions, and still more to be trusted with national authority to exercise them, Oxford and Cambridge must become the Universities of the whole nation, and it must be clearly established, in a way in which nothing but their complete emancipation from Anglican tests will establish it, that their proper duty is the promotion of national learning and education, not the propagation of Anglican opinions.

That those who have themselves been the great disturbers of men's minds in these matters, who have introduced before our eyes, under the name of a revival, a new religion, the doctrines and ritual of which are still unsettled and in course of furtive development; who have led away many of the youth of England from the paths in which their fathers had walked for generations, and landed not a few of them in Roman Catholicism and some in blank unbelief—that such men above all others should be extreme to mark and punish disturbance of conscience and unsettlement of faith in others, would not, perhaps, be very surprising, but it would be most ungenerous and unjust. And surely if to win waverers back to Christianity were the end in view, odious imputations and harsh treatment—harsh treatment at the age when it is most deeply felt, and makes the most lasting impression—would not be the best means to that end. What is right rather than what is politic should be the question when religion is concerned; but if policy is to be considered at all,

it should be remembered that no enemies of religion are likely to be more deadly or more dangerous than those who have felt religious injustice in their youth.

II.

From LECKY'S *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*,
vol. iii. p. 497.

The movement for abolishing the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles was defended mainly on the principles of Locke and of Hoadly. . . . In 1771 a society, called the Feathers Tavern Association, was formed for the purpose of applying to the Legislature for relief. Blackburne and Lindsey were its most active members; and in February, 1772, a Petition, drawn up by Blackburne and signed by 250 persons, was presented to the House of Commons by Sir W. Meredith. Of those who signed it about 200 were clergymen, and the remainder were lawyers and doctors, who protested especially against the custom which prevailed at the Universities of obliging students who came up for matriculation, at the age of sixteen or even earlier, and who were not intended for the Church, to subscribe their consent to the Articles. It was remarked that Oxford was strongly opposed to the movement, while a powerful party at Cambridge supported it. Watson, who was afterwards Bishop of Llandaff, and who was at this time Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, published two letters in favour of it, under the signature of "A Christian Whig," which were presented to every member of Parliament the day before the Petition was taken into consideration. Paley, who was then rising to prominence as a lecturer at Cambridge, refused to sign the Petition on the characteristic ground that he was "too poor to keep a conscience," but he fully concurred in it, and he wrote anonymously in its support. It was signed by Jebb and

Edward Law, who were prominent tutors at Cambridge, and it was countenanced by the Bishop of Carlisle, who was father of Edward Law, and also, it is said, in some degree by Bishop Louth.

Lord North was anxious that the Petition should be received and silently laid aside, but Sir Roger Newdigate, who was violently opposed to it, insisted upon moving its rejection, and a very interesting debate ensued. On the side of the Petitioners the chief topics were the obscurities, the absurdities, and inconsistencies of the Articles, the manifest severity with which they pressed upon many clerical consciences, . . . the individual right and duty of every Protestant to interpret Scripture freely for himself, the essentially Popish character of all attempts to prescribe religious opinions by human formularies, the danger and the immorality of holding out temptations to dissimulation and prevarication by annexing rewards or punishments to particular opinions, the duty of opening the Church as wide as possible to all conscientious men. . . . Among the arguments on the other side may be mentioned the appearance, perhaps for the first time, of two political doctrines which were afterwards destined, in connexion with Irish politics and with the Roman Catholic question, to attain a great importance. It was contended that the Coronation Oath made it unlawful for the Sovereign to give his assent to any law which changed the form or character of the Established Church, and that a similar incapacity was imposed upon Parliament by the articles of the Scotch Union, which enacted the permanent maintenance of the then existing Church Establishments in the two countries. . . .

The King was very strongly opposed to the prayer of the Petitioners, and Lord North, in a temperate speech, opposed it as disturbing what was now quiet, and as likely to introduce anarchy, confusion, and dissension into the Church. . . . Its advocates

appear to have been chiefly Whigs. Dowdeswell, however, and Burke on this question severed themselves from their friends, and the speech of Burke was by far the ablest in the debate. He urged the great danger of religious alterations, which usually pave the way to religious tumults and shake one of the capital pillars of the State. He dwelt upon the complete indifference of the great majority of the people to the subject. . . . While strongly asserting the right of every man to follow his own convictions in religion, he as strongly maintained the undoubted right of the Legislature "to annex its own conditions to benefits artificially created," and to take a security that a tax raised on the people shall be applied only to those who profess such doctrines and follow such a mode of worship as the Legislature, representing the people, has thought most agreeable to their general sense, binding as usual the minority not to an assent to the doctrines, but to a payment of the tax. The present question, he said, is not a question of the rights of private conscience, but of the title to public emoluments. . . . By a majority of 217 to 71 the House refused to receive the Petition.

The question was again introduced in 1773 and 1774, but it made no progress either in the House or in the country, though the subscription of students at Cambridge was soon after modified [see above, pp. 2, 47]. . . . It was a significant fact that the Methodists and the section of the Anglican clergy who were most imbued with their principles were the most ardent opponents of the relaxation of subscription. . . . The opposition to them (the Articles) soon died away, and when it was next revived it was by the school which was beyond all others the most opposed to that of Hoadly, by the school of Newman and Keble, which justly looked upon the Articles as the stronghold of that Protestant faith which they desired to extirpate from the Church.

CHAPTER VIII.

UNIVERSITY TESTS ACT OF 1871

“**A**T what a rate”—wrote Professor Jowett to a friend in June, 1867—“at what a rate the chariot of Democracy is driving. It almost takes away one’s breath.” And after describing Disraeli’s action in “educating his party,” the Professor adds, “Think of all this also, in connection with the Conservative reaction of six years ago.”

Amongst other Liberal causes which, “with the drops of this most balmy time,” put forth fresh leaves of hope, was the movement for the abolition of the University Tests. Those who for five years had been working steadily for the promotion of this measure in Parliament, whether on the ground of academical freedom or of the claims of Nonconformity, now joined with more spirit than ever in labouring to carry the Bill which the House of Commons had more than once approved. Public opinion was at last enlisted, and University Test Abolition had become, as the journals of the time expressed it, “a hustings question.”

Amongst the Liberal members returned to the new Parliament under the Reform Act of 1867 were several of the younger University men, whose names

have appeared in the preceding narrative. George Osborne Morgan had triumphed over the Welsh territorial magnate, and had been returned for Denbigh; C. S. Roundell for Grantham; R. S. Wright for Nottingham; Lord E. Fitzmaurice for Calne, etc. Of all these Mr. C. S. Roundell was the most persistent, as will appear in the sequel. Moreover, the Earls of Camperdown and Morley, who had been Jowett's pupils at Balliol, were already active members of the House of Lords.

A new stage in the history of the question begins in 1868. It may be worth while here to pause and to compare the first serious attempt at parliamentary action on this subject with its successful achievement. In both cases there had been a political crisis followed by a Liberal triumph. In both cases the Irish Church question had been a point of successful attack. But in 1834 Mr. Gladstone stood forth as a strenuous defender both of Church temporalities and University Tests, whereas in the years from 1869-71 the cause of abolition in both directions was carried further under his Administration than its most sanguine friends had at one time expected.

The Oxford and Cambridge movements had hitherto proceeded side by side. Mr. Bouverie and Mr. Dodson, Mr. Goschen and Mr. Fawcett, had been practically at accord, although the Cambridge men had been more sanguine on the question of the emoluments. And when the University of Cambridge was included in the purview of Mr. Coleridge's Bill, the agreement seemed to be complete. But various collateral questions were now being

agitated at Oxford. Many of the Oxford residents who in earlier days had agitated for Reform were still discontented with the constitution of 1854. They desired to transfer the initiative in University legislation (as at first proposed) to the House of Congregation, which they desired to see purged by excluding those who had no college or University office. They objected to the retention of sinecure Fellowships, and wished to restrict the already reduced powers of Convocation within yet narrower limits. The question of celibacy, which the Executive Commissioners had hardly touched, still pressed for a solution. It was also urged that colleges should have power to alter their own Statutes and revise the Ordinances under an appeal to the Privy Council.

The old opposition between the University and collegiate ideals had sprung up again to life in a new form. Some of the tutors under the pressure of the examination system were "weary of well-doing." The exorbitant claims of education seemed to them to be crowding out research, and the ideas shortly afterwards published by Mr. Mark Pattison in his work on *Academical Organisation* had already considerable currency.

Resolutions on these and other points were passed at a Conference in the Ship Hotel, Charing Cross, on July 1st, 1867. There seemed to be some danger that an attempt might be made to legislate separately for Oxford through a comprehensive measure which it would be very difficult to pass, and that the whole movement might thus be wrecked. Mr. Fawcett wisely insisted on including Oxford and Cambridge

in a single Bill in which the sole provision should be the abolition of religious Tests. His view prevailed, and a Bill for abolishing the Test at both Universities was again brought in by Coleridge and backed by Bouverie and Grant Duff. It passed the second reading in July, 1868, by a majority of 58 in a House of 338, but was ultimately withdrawn. That summer a memorial praying simply for Test abolition was signed by 76 of the most influential residents in Oxford.

Mr. Gladstone's Administration of 1868-74 now began. Sir John Duke Coleridge was Solicitor-General, and brought in his Bill under higher and better auspices than heretofore. The Bill of 1869 was not yet acknowledged as a Government measure, but its introducer was a member of the Government, and it had the assurance of Government support. It made compulsory the abolition of the Test for University degrees and offices, but it was still thought prudent to make it permissive so far as it applied to college Fellowships. An unanswerable argument on the subject of college emoluments was, however, derived from the fact that in nine years there had been no fewer than seven Nonconformist Senior Wranglers, one of whom, it may now be added, Mr. Justice Stirling, has risen to be a Lord Justice of Appeal. Three high Wranglers, Messrs. Aldis, Toller, and Hartog, sent in a joint memorial on their own account.

In the debate on the second reading Sir Roundell Palmer (Lord Selborne) owned himself converted to the principle of the measure. In 1854 he had

opposed the introduction of Dissenters, foreseeing that the demand would not end there, and that the Bill would undermine the influence and authority of religion on the teaching of the University. He had now altered his mind, and denied that the Bill would have that effect. But in the Committee stage he moved the insertion of a form of declaration to be subscribed by Professors and teachers generally. This was a negative test, resembling that obtaining in the Scotch Universities, as mentioned above (p. 50). The member for Chester, Mr. Raikes, described it as certain to produce the minimum of utility with the maximum of injustice. The amendment was not carried.

Mr. (Sir) George Osborne Morgan, a new member, spoke at some length in support of the Bill :—

“Were they to go on restricting these great Universities, with their magnificent endowments, their unrivalled educational machinery, and their world-wide prestige, to the position of mere nurseries for the training of clergymen in the Church of England, or were they to regard them as national institutions administering public trusts for public purposes? . . . They had made Dissenters proselytes of the outer gate, but when they came to the inner gate, within which the good things were, then they shut it in their face, and kept them out in the cold. If ever there was a time when the Church of England could be said to be on her trial, it was now; and was this the time to come down to that House and proclaim to the country that the position of the Church of England in the Universities was so insecure that she could not hold her own unless she was hemmed round by these absurd and obsolete safeguards?

These Tests were an anachronism. They were useless against modern thought. They excluded conscientious and high-minded men, and were disregarded by those who preferred their prospects to their principles."

The Bill again passed the Commons, and Earl Russell moved the second reading in the House of Lords. The opponents of the measure, while ready to grant freedom to the Universities as such, and to the new class of non-collegiate students, were unwilling to relinquish, even permissively, the hold of the Church of England over the colleges. Bishop Ellicott, moreover, would have reserved to Churchmen all places on the University Councils. The Bill was thrown out on the second reading, the numbers being ninety-one to sixty-four. This happened on the 19th of July, 1869, and on July 22nd there appeared in the *Times* an important letter from an Oxford tutor, signing himself "Academicus," and giving strong reasons for making compulsory the clauses affecting the colleges, while he deprecated the notion, which seemed to be gaining ground, of making colleges denominational.

The following correspondence, belonging to the same year, throws some light on the further progress of the measure:—

"VICEREGAL LODGE, DUBLIN,

"November 9th, 1869.

"DEAR MR. GLADSTONE,—I venture to address you on the subject of the University Tests Bill. I have had the opportunity of ascertaining the wishes

and opinions of the chief supporters of the Bill at Oxford and Cambridge, in London, and among the Nonconformists. It is, I think, evident that we have arrived at a critical stage in the progress of the Bill.

“The facts of the case are shortly these: It is felt that we have gained nothing from our opponents by the concession involved in the permissive character of the Bill: that the Bill in that shape was open to grave objections, as regards both its probable effect upon the elections within the Colleges, and still more its liability to be frustrated by the action of particular Visitors, and in very many of the Colleges, by the preponderant majority of the Fellows: and that consequently we ought to seek an effectual settlement by reintroducing the Bill in a compulsory shape.

“This conclusion is strengthened by Lord Carnarvon’s recent course in the House of Lords. His proposal to denominationalise the Colleges is diametrically opposed to the views of the promoters of the Bill, and would never be accepted by them.

“At the same time it is felt that the question is ripe for settlement, that great injury is being done by these disabilities to the interests of learning and education, and that the present temper of the country is eminently favourable to a removal of them.

“A certain soreness and impatience is growing up. At present moderate counsels can prevail. But I see plainly that, if the settlement is deferred, there is much risk of the fortunes of the Bill passing into other hands, and under other influences.

“It is important for us, in determining upon our course, and especially with a view to keeping the question from drifting, to ascertain, if we may, the attitude of the Government towards the Bill. We are anxious to know whether the Government will take up the Bill: or whether, in any case, the Govern-

ment will give the Bill in its compulsory shape their active support.

“We have suffered hitherto from delay in sending the Bill up to the House of Lords. We should consider it a great advantage in that respect if the Bill were to be expedited as a Government measure.

“I may be permitted, I hope, with perfect respect towards the Government, to add that whilst the academical promoters would be desirous of acting in a moderate and conciliatory spirit, there are certain principles which they would not be willing to forego; and that they would sooner postpone the passage of the Bill than hazard those principles under any stress whatever in the House of Lords.

“I may say that the Bill of last session would be regarded as the maximum of concession. But I do not feel sure that even the concession of the ‘permissive’ principle would not now be regarded as ‘too late.’

The Nonconformist body is ready to throw the whole force of their organisation into the support of the Bill.

“I write on my own responsibility and in prospect of seeing next week in London some of the persons in communication with both Universities.

“I remain, dear Mr. Gladstone,
 “Yours very truly,
 “C. S. ROUNDELL.”

“11, CARLTON HOUSE TERRACE, S.W.,
 “*November 10th, 1869.*

“MY DEAR MR. ROUNDELL,—I agree with you in thinking that the University Tests Bill has suffered by delays at the commencement of the session, that it is very desirable the measure should pass, and also very desirable that it should be in the hands of the

Government. But *one* thing, vital for all contests, the Government have not to give, and that is *time*.

"I think that the Bill in its old form would probably not require time, the argument being exhausted. But this opinion does not apply to the Bill in an altered shape.

"I cannot help hoping that, as it is, the House of Lords might be induced to accept it, as several of the men who would have most to say to it are men who would look at the question with singleness of mind and eye.

"Further, I apprehend that the Bill, if altered at all in the sense of extension, ought to be altered not in one particular alone but in several. It would not be wise to open the ground for one fresh and stiff battle now with the prospect of its being very soon succeeded by another. With respect to the altered Bill, in any case, no pledge as to support could be given by the Government until we had seen it in its new form. I have seen Sir J. Coleridge on the subject of the Bill, and I presume you will be in communication with him next week. He will, I think, be able to state what I take to be the present position of the Government in respect to the measure, which I have generally indicated in this letter.

"Believe me, sincerely yours,

"W. GLADSTONE."

Fortunately the Bill was not altered in more than one particular, and Mr. Gladstone was himself induced, as will presently appear, to take part in the "stiff battle" which he anticipated, by giving reasons why the liberation of the Fellowships should be made compulsory.

In November, 1869, an important meeting was held at St. John's College, Cambridge. The Master

of St. John's (W. H. Bateson) was in the chair. The meeting was confined to the Heads, Fellows, and ex-Fellows of Colleges, and sixty of these were present. Resolutions were proposed and seconded by the Master of Trinity (W. Thompson), Professor Adam Sedgwick (then extremely old), the Master of Christ's, and Professor F. D. Maurice, strongly deprecating the permissive element in Sir J. Cole-ridge's Bill, and demanding "that no declaration of religious belief or profession shall be required of any person upon obtaining a Fellowship or as a condition of its tenure." The Master of Trinity referred to Bishop Thirlwall's action in 1834 (above, p. 44). A Committee was appointed, including, besides those named, Mr. Ferrers (afterwards Master of Caius), Mr. Porter (afterwards Head of Peterhouse), and Mr. S. G. Phear (afterwards Master of Emmanuel).

The Bill of 1870 afforded a complete solution of the problem, except in two particulars—the clerical Fellowships remained untouched (except so far as they had been reduced by the colleges themselves under the Commissions of 1854 and 1856), and degrees in Divinity, as well as the theological Chairs, were to continue subject to the Test. Amendments were moved by Mr. Stevenson for freeing the Divinity Chairs and by Mr. Fawcett for abolishing the clerical Fellowships; and both proposals, although not adopted by Government, were supported by large minorities.

Mr. Gladstone himself spoke on the second reading. He said :—

“ It is possible that under the operation of this Bill religion in the Colleges may be various—that it shall be free is the object of this Bill. That it shall cease to be definite, that it shall cease to be accepted with sincere and heartfelt conviction may be the apprehension of the right hon. gentleman, Mr. Walpole, but it is not the necessary, the legitimate, or the natural result of such a Bill as this. . . .

“ What is the main change that the Bill has undergone since it was introduced last year? It is this, that, whereas the Bill of last year permitted the Colleges to resolve by their own separate action whether they would pass from under the operation of the measure or not, it now proposes an absolute and universal repeal of that permissive power. That change, however, is not one calculated in any way to add to the stringency of the Bill. Undoubtedly it gives greater effect and a wider scope to the measure, but it gives at the same time the character of a settlement which, without that change, it would not have possessed. . . . The members of the Universities and of the Colleges felt, and wisely felt, that the optional form of the Bill, appearing to confer upon them great power, did, in effect, threaten them with internal feuds and factions which would have proved most mischievous to their existence as learned bodies, and I must own that, speaking in the capacity of a member of Parliament, I never could see that it was wise and just to permit those persons who might from time to time happen to be the Fellows of the Colleges to determine questions so vital and important as the religious character to be stamped upon the Colleges.”

The effect of the Cambridge meeting and of other similar pressure is manifest in this speech of the Prime Minister.

At a later stage a clause was added, on the motion of Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, by which the Headships of Colleges, as well as the Fellowships, were included in the operation of the Bill. As thus amended it once more passed the Commons; and the Lords this time, instead of rejecting it, appointed a Select Committee, which took evidence in 1870 and in the following year. This Committee was still sitting when (in 1871) Sir John Duke Coleridge's Bill, having been reintroduced (without Lord Edmond's rider), was under debate. At this juncture Professor Jowett was examined and gave some remarkable evidence, part of which has been published in the supplementary volume of correspondence appended to his biography. He spoke strongly, not only in support of the Bill as it stood, but also in favour of the abolition of tests for Professors of Divinity and against the restriction of Fellowships to clergymen. In answer to a query from the Earl of Carnarvon whether his objections would extend to a declaration of a negative character such as that which was proposed by Sir Roundell Palmer in the House of Commons, that all persons in offices of trust as respects teaching, should declare that they would teach nothing in opposition to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England, he replied:—

“Yes, I should object to that. That is a new test, and if enforced strictly requires not only every tutor but every lecturer either to teach the doctrines of the Church or to teach nothing. Such a test is more stringent than the existing declaration of conformity, and would be imposed on some persons of whom the declaration of conformity is not required.”

Lord Carnarvon then put the following query:—

“I conclude from your last answer that had Dr. Newman held any trust in the University at the time when he left the Church of England, you would not have been willing to see his removal from that office; you would have preferred to leave it to the simple effect of public opinion, and to have allowed him to retain whatever power his own individual character and influence might have given him?”

Jowett's answer was, “Yes, for good or evil, whichever it might be.”

On the subject of the Divinity Chairs Jowett was cross-examined at some length by Lord Salisbury as Chairman of the Committee, and the course of the examination and evidence is very instructive as illustrating two opposite points of view (see *Letters of Benjamin Jowett*, pp. 22-9).

The Bill came down again from the Lords with some amendments, including the negative test of Sir Roundell Palmer's motion, intended to secure religious teaching. Mr. Gladstone hesitated on this point. But the Lords' amendments were rejected, and the University Tests Act of 1871 became law.

The preamble to this Act (35 & 36 Vict. c. 26) was drawn by Mr. C. S. Bowen, afterwards Lord Justice Bowen, and is interesting in itself:—

“Whereas it is expedient that the benefits of the University of Oxford and Cambridge and Durham, and the Colleges and Halls now subsisting therein as places of religion and learning, should be rendered freely accessible to the nation.

“And whereas, by means of divers restrictions, tests, and disabilities, many of Her Majesty’s subjects are debarred from the full enjoyment of the same ;

“And whereas it is expedient that such restrictions, tests, and disabilities should be removed, under proper safeguards for the maintenance of religious instruction and worship in the said Universities, and the Colleges and Halls now subsisting in the same ;

“Be it enacted,” etc.

Mr. Gladstone’s final hesitation is not surprising when we review the different phases of his attitude towards this reform. But we hear no more from him at this stage of the claims of the Church of England in connexion with *her* University.

There remained, however, one more proof of the reluctance of the Liberal Prime Minister to grapple frankly with the problem of University emancipation. This was in his treatment of Mr. Fawcett’s motion for extending to the Trinity College and University of Dublin the principle which had been established for the English Universities. In 1873 Mr. Gladstone brought forward the third of his great Irish measures, the proposal to create and endow an Irish University on denominational lines in such a manner as to satisfy the supposed requirements of the Roman Catholic clergy. The affiliated colleges, of which Trinity College, considerably docked of its revenues and prestige, was to be one, might teach what they pleased, but the University would not teach disputed branches of knowledge, or allow its examinations for prizes to include any of the disputed questions. The new University was to have no Chairs for theology,

moral philosophy, or modern history!* “The theological faculty was to be taken away from Trinity College and handed over to the representative body of the Irish Disestablished Church.”

When this essentially retrograde measure had failed, as it deserved, and Mr. Gladstone had wrecked his powerful Administration on this one more cast of the die, he somewhat grudgingly consented, on the eve of his self-chosen dissolution, to help Mr. Fawcett to carry a Bill for the abolition of tests in Dublin University, “as he could do no more just then for University education in Ireland.”† So unwilling was he cordially to accept the larger view, which, contrary to his anticipations as expressed in 1834, had now taken the substantial form of “practical politics.”

“Academical freedom” had at length triumphed, and the result, which to Sir Robert Peel’s audience in 1834 had seemed an absurdity, was fully realised. This end had been secured not only by the gradual

* Mr. Roundell says, with reference to the Irish University Bill: “There was an interesting incident connected with this. Mr. Gladstone was Chancellor of the Exchequer. I went one morning to his house in Carlton Terrace. I sate at one end of a table, Mr. Gladstone at the other. He invited me to express my views. I did so; then pulled up and apologised for thus talking to him at length. ‘That is just what I wished,’ he said. I harangued him for some twenty minutes, making strong representations against the omission of the Chairs to which you refer. At the end he asked me to send him a memorandum of what I had said. A few days later, Lord F. Cavendish (one of his private secretaries), whom I had gone to see about something, said, ‘You will like to see this.’ He handed me a printed copy of my memorandum, which Mr. Gladstone was circulating amongst the Cabinet. A few days later Lord Selborne said, ‘You have done us a service in making these representations to Gladstone.’”

† I quote from Mr. Justin McCarthy’s *History of Our Own Times*.

establishment of a complete and intimate understanding between the Oxford and Cambridge reformers, but also by the mutual encouragement given and received on either side by University reformers in and out of Parliament and by the Nonconformist members (see above, p. 6). The Heads of the Liberation Society, in the interest of the Nonconformists, had given a steady and continuous support to those who on more general grounds were urging the abolition of the Tests. Dr. Foster, the Chairman of the Committee of that Society, had a considerable share of the work; and his successor, Mr. Carvell Williams, conducted important negotiations with Mr. Gladstone in connexion with the Act of 1871.

The following minute of the Liberation Society shows how heartily the Nonconformist agitators acknowledged the indispensable assistance of their academical fellow-labourers:—

“ABOLITION OF UNIVERSITY TESTS.

“At a Meeting of the Executive Committee of the SOCIETY for the Liberation of RELIGION from STATE PATRONAGE and CONTROL, held June 19th, 1871, it was

“RESOLVED:—

“1. That the Committee heartily congratulates the friends of religious equality on the fact, that the Royal Assent, given on the 16th inst., to the ‘Act to alter the law respecting Religious Tests in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Durham, and in the Halls and Colleges of those Universities,’ has crowned with success their long-continued exer-

tions to render the advantages afforded by the national Universities available for the entire nation, without regard to ecclesiastical distinctions.

“2. That this Committee tenders its warmest thanks to JAMES HEYWOOD, Esq., J. G. DODSON, Esq., M.P., the Right Hon. G. J. GÖSCHEN, M.P., the Right Hon. E. P. BOUVERIE, M.P., H. FAWCETT, Esq., M.P., and Sir J. D. COLERIDGE, M.P., who, by their several proposals in successive Parliaments, have contributed to effect a change, not only demanded in the name of justice, but calculated to advance the interests of learning, and to promote unity of feeling among the people. More especially the Committee desires to put on record its high appreciation of the courage and the fidelity with which many members of the Universities have co-operated with Nonconformists in seeking to induce the Legislature to pass the measure which has now become law.

“3. That the Committee is encouraged to believe that the principle upon which the measure is based will hereafter be applied to the abolition of clerical Fellowships, and of other invidious restrictions or privileges still existing in the Universities and Colleges, as well as in connection with the public schools and other educational foundations of a national character.

“J. CARVELL WILLIAMS, *Secretary*.

“2, Serjeants' Inn, Fleet Street.”

To the party politician—even to the practical statesman—the University Tests Act of 1871 may appear a small measure. As a piece of minor legislation it repeatedly suffered amongst other “innocents,” and was passed, if at all, towards the fag-

end of a parliamentary session. But in its consequences, if those whom it was intended to benefit take full advantage of it, *sua si bona nôrint*, it may prove great and memorable. In the volume of history it may occupy fewer pages than it has filled chapters here. But mighty social changes have sometimes turned upon the stroke of a pen.

Just a century had passed since the formation of the "Feathers Tavern Association" in support of the movement for abolishing the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. See the passage from Lecky's *History of the Eighteenth Century* appended to Chapter VII. (p. 149).

The long and successful struggle which has now been described has had its counterpart in America; and it happens that one person whom I have mentioned above, Mr. Goldwin Smith, has played a conspicuous part in both. Those who know anything of the rise and progress of Cornell University will understand my meaning. I cannot describe at any length a movement which did not come under my direct observation. That task must be left to someone who has first-hand knowledge of the facts; and, for preference, to Mr. Andrew Dickson White, now American Ambassador at the German Court, whose admirable work on the *Warfare of Science and Theology* was, I believe, partly suggested by his experience as a chief promoter of the principles of unsectarian education, on which Cornell was established, and which have since prevailed very widely in the United States.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VIII.

I.

The state of the Law of Tests at Oxford before the Act of 1871 is clearly explained in the following memorandum, drawn up by some of those interested in the question in 1868.

At the following colleges, Nonconformists are excluded by the Act of Uniformity only, there being no provision with regard to taking the M.A. or higher degrees, or with regard to any declaration on admission (D.C.L. or M.D.), or with regard to Nonconformity after admission:—

University.
Merton.
Pembroke.
Worcester.

At the following colleges, Nonconformists are excluded only by the Act of Uniformity and by the obligation to take the M.A. or a higher degree (D.C.L. or M.D.):—

Oriel.
New (§ 29, *q.v.*).
All Souls.

At Exeter a Fellow must, according to the new Statutes, be “a member of the Church of England, or of some Church in communion with it.” He must also proceed to the degree of M.A., D.C.L., or D.M. (for the two latter degrees no test is imposed).

At Queen’s a Fellow must, by ordinance, be at the time of election “conforming to the Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland as by

law established." He may also be deprived, if he "shall contumaciously cease to conform to the Liturgy of," etc. He is also bound to take the M.A., D.C.L., or M.D. degree.

At Lincoln a Fellow must, according to the New Statutes, on election be "*fidem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ amplectens*." He may also be deprived for heresy (c. ii.). He is bound to take the degree of M.A.

At Corpus, at the time of admission to the actual Fellowship, the Fellow must declare "*se Ritibus et Sacramentis Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ uti velle*." A Fellow here seems to be *allowed* rather than *compelled* to proceed to his M.A. degree (see c. xx.). Heresy is regarded as a "crime" (c. xxxiv.).

At Christ Church, the senior students must be persons "conforming to the Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland as by law established." They may be deprived for "contumaciously ceasing to conform," and they are compelled to proceed to the degree of M.A., D.C.L., or D.M.

At Balliol, Magdalen, Brasenose, Trinity, Jesus, Wadham, and at St. John's, the Head, or a Fellow, may be deprived for "contumaciously ceasing to conform to the Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland as by law established." At St. John's a Fellow must proceed to the degree of M.A., M.D., or D.C.L.

1868.

TESTS BILL.

STATEMENT OF THE SEVERAL RESTRICTIONS.

The University, Clerical, 1571.—Subscription to the Articles was imposed upon the *Clergy* at ordination, and again at institution to a benefice, by Parliament, 13 Eliz. c. 12, 1571.

Academical, 1581.—Subscription to the Articles was enjoined by the Earl of Leicester, as Chancellor of the University of Oxford, in 1581, to be required of all undergraduates at matriculation: and from all graduates in all the degrees of Bachelor and Masters of Arts, and Bachelor and Doctor of the other Faculties.

Clerical and Academical 1603, 1616.—Subscription to the Three Articles of the Thirty-sixth Canon relating to (1) the Queen's supremacy, (2) the Book of Common Prayer, (3) the Thirty-nine Articles, upon the authority of the Canon itself, passed in 1603, was required from the *Clergy*, and in 1616 from all *graduates in the University* of Oxford.

Degrees.—The Act 17 & 18 Vict. c. 87 abolished all Oaths and Declarations at Matriculation, and on taking the degree of Bachelor in Arts, Law, Medicine, and Music.

But *by the Statutes* of the University* no person can take the degree of Master of Arts, or Doctor (in other faculties than Music),† or become a *member of Convocation*, without (in place of the previous subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Three Articles of the Thirty-sixth Canon) making a Declaration of assent to the Thirty-nine Articles, and to the Book of Common Prayer, etc., and of belief in the doctrine of the Church of England and Ireland, as therein set forth, being agreeable to the Word of God.

Degrees *in Theology* (B.D. and D.D.) are confined by the Statutes‡ of the University to persons in Priests' Orders.

* *Univ. Statutes*, ed. 1858, p. 108, and Statute of February, 1868.

† *Univ. Statutes*, ed. 1858, pp. 108-10.

‡ p. 62.

Government.—The Government of the University is vested in—

1. The Hebdomadal Council.
 2. The Congregation.
 3. The Convocation.
1. The Hebdomadal Council is composed of the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Proctors, six Heads of Colleges or Halls, six Professors, six members of Convocation. All these (except the Chancellor) are Masters of Arts, or, as Professors, at least subject to the Act of Uniformity.
 2. The members of Congregation must all be members of Convocation, and, as such, at least Masters of Arts.*
 3. The members of Convocation must all be Masters of Arts, or Doctors of one of the three superior faculties, having their names upon the books of some College or Hall.

BY THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY

(13 & 14 CAR. c. 24).

Professors.—Public *Professors* and Readers in the University must at or before admission make a declaration of conformity to the Liturgy of the Church of England.

Public Worship.—Provision for the Order of Public Worship in the University is made—

- (1) By the Act of Uniformity, and by
- (2) Statutes of the University,†
by which attendance at Divine Service, accord-

* 17 & 18 Vict. c. 81, s. 16.

† p. 160.

ing to the Liturgy of the Church of England, and at the University Sermons is enjoined upon all members of the University, except Nonconformists.*

The Act 17 & 18 Vict. c. 81, s. 25, authorises persons to open Private Halls for the reception of students, with a licence from the Vice-Chancellor. But the Master of a Private Hall must be a member of Convocation, and therefore have made the Declaration of Assent, etc.

The Colleges.—All *Heads* and *Fellows* of Colleges (amongst other persons) are required at their admission to make the following Declaration:—

“I will conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England, as it is now by law established.”

Heads.—The *Heads* of all the Colleges (except Merton, and in certain sense Oriel) must be in Holy Orders.

Fellows.—In most of the Colleges the Fellows are required either by the College Statutes, or by the Ordinances of the late Commission, to proceed to the degree of M.A., or to one of the superior degrees, which (as above stated) involves a Declaration of Assent to the Articles, etc.

In other Colleges the Fellowships are expressly confined, either by their own Statutes or by the Ordinances of the Commission, to members of the Church of England.

In some Colleges both provisions are found. In one case only (Merton) the limitation of the Fellowships to members of the Church of England rested (before the Ordinances of the late Commission) upon the Act of Uniformity alone.

* p. 251.

In most of the Colleges a certain proportion of the Fellowships is, by the Ordinances of the late Commission, appropriated to clergymen or persons who intend to take Holy Orders.

Public Worship, Discipline, Religious Instruction.
—The celebration of *Public Worship* according to the Liturgy of the Church of England in the Chapels of the Colleges and Halls is provided for:—

- (1) By the Act of Uniformity, ss. 2-6 and 17.
- (2) By (in almost all cases) the Ordinances of the late Commission,

The *Discipline* of the Colleges is maintained by the Tutors. There are also *Divinity Lectures* in the several Colleges, and occasional sermons in the Chapels.

Visitor.—In the case of Exeter, Lincoln, and Corpus, the consent of the Visitor is required for any alteration in their Statutes or Ordinances.

In the case of the other Colleges, the consent of the Visitor is required for any alteration of the Statutes.

Whether it is also required for the alteration of the Ordinances framed by the Commissioners is in dispute.

In any point of view, no change can be made in the College Ordinances except by a majority of the College, with the consent of the Queen in Council.

CHAPTER IX.

MEMORANDUM BY PROFESSOR JOWETT,

1872-1877.

"Nec meus hic sermo est, sed quæ præcepit Ofella."

I WAS threatened with a gap in my history between the abrogation of Tests in 1871 and the final abolition of the clerical restriction on Fellowships and Headships of Colleges. This would have left a whole decade nearly unaccounted for. Unexpectedly, through Mr. Roundell's commendable habit of preserving records, I have been supplied with an authentic document of exceptional value. This is a memorandum of Professor Jowett's, in the beautiful handwriting of his amanuensis, Matthew Knight, entitled, *Suggestions for University Reform*, 1874, in which the Master of Balliol takes stock of the improvements in the University attained so far, points out what is still defective, and indicates several lines of further possible advance. And I have since received from Viscount Goschen a budget of correspondence, proving that although legislation was at a standstill, he and other reformers were busily engaged in efforts which led the way for the appointment of Lord Salisbury's Commission of 1877. Amongst other interesting documents there

is a copy of the identical memorandum in the handwriting of the same calligrapher.

Mr. Mark Pattison's *Hints on Academical Organisation* had appeared in 1868, and his ideas had obtained considerable vogue amongst the younger tutors, some of whom, led by Dr. Appleton, the first editor of *The Academy*, were clamouring for the "Endowment of Research." Pattison's experience of college life, as is too well known, had been a painful one; and his mind had swung round from the Collegiate Ideal which he had commended in his evidence before the Commission of 1850 to the opposite point of view, from which the University as a seat of learned investigation was all in all. He would have transferred the bulk of the college revenues to University uses, getting rid of the idle Passman, with whom the majority of the colleges were infested, and making other radical changes by which the existing state of things would have been upset. The Honour System, founded in 1807 and revised in 1849, which had proved such an effectual stimulus, became now the object of much adverse criticism. Teachers complained that freedom of teaching was hampered and dominated by the examinations. Undergraduates would only attend lectures that would *pay*, and even in the regular subjects for the schools young men were taught to answer questions which they had not mastered for themselves. Why found and endow Professorships, if "Queen Cram" was to be all in all? The standard of individual tuition which had been set at Balliol, making heavy demands upon the Tutor's time, was felt to be burdensome and to be a hindrance

to independent study. The best was becoming the enemy of the good.

The following passage from Mr. Pattison's book (p. 243) may serve to indicate this drift of opinion:—

“It seems to me that the time has arrived when it is imperatively necessary to curtail it of the undue proportions it has acquired among us. The system inaugurated, or rather restored, in 1800 has been to us a means of renewed life. But its work is now done. It has made us aware of the value of education, and given us energy to pursue it. But we now find that, after first encroaching on education, it has ended by destroying it. Teaching is extinct among us. Oxford is now, with respect to its candidates for honours, little more than an examining body. The professors, we are told, lecture to empty walls. The enemies of learning exult over this failure, which they predicted, of the professoriate. What has caused this failure? The tyranny of the examination system. This tyranny has destroyed all desire to learn. All the aspirations of a liberal curiosity, all disinterested desire for self-improvement, is crushed before the one sentiment which now animates the honour-student, to stand high in the class list.”

Mr. Ruskin once got leave from Jowett to use Balliol Hall for a lecture, in which he inveighed against the honour examination system!

The constitutional reforms which had been waived in order to secure the passing of Sir John Coleridge's Bill (above, p. 154) were for the most part unrealised. A modified power of initiation was indeed extended to Congregation by a University Statute approved by Her Majesty in Council on June 25th, 1872.* But Congregation still included the parochial clergy,

* *Statuta Universitatis*, pp. 238-240.

and the powers of Convocation were too extensive. These questions still awaited settlement.

Sinecure Fellowships were still permanent in many colleges. The obligation to celibacy was not removed, and above all the clerical restriction on Fellowships and Headships was largely retained.

A Parliamentary Commission appointed in 1872 for the special purpose of inquiring into University and college finances, led the way for several improvements, especially in the mode of keeping and auditing the college accounts. Mr. Roundell was the secretary to the Commission, and his Report was issued in 1874. It appears from the correspondence that four of the colleges in Oxford had been spending £20,000 a year on the augmentation of college livings! The Conservatives were now in power, and some doubt was felt amongst the Oxford Liberals whether or not it were wise to seek for further legislation, as Mr. Gladstone, the leader of the Opposition, was thought to be out of sympathy with the forward movement. He appears to have objected to proposing the repeal of the clerical restrictions, on the ground that this question could not be touched without raising the other question of the tenure of Fellowships. As late as June 2nd, 1877, he wrote to Mr. Goschen in anticipation of "hearing in the House of Commons the several expositions of view on the very interesting subject" of the clerical Fellowships. He still holds to the opinion that they cannot be dispensed with, without special provisions for the apportionment of Fellowships and Emoluments with regard to general fitness

to serve the purposes of the college as a place of *religion*, as well as of learning and education.

The letter is as follows :—

“HAGLEY,

“June 2nd, 1877.

“MY DEAR GOSCHEN,—I have been in a very notable scene of political as well as municipal activity,* which will, I think, in time to come find you all materials for thought.

“On Monday I hope to be in London, and to hear in the House of Commons the several expositions of view on the very interesting subject of the Clerical Fellowships.

“Your first view of a very rough statement that I made about provisions which might enable us to dispense with Clerical Fellowships was, I am afraid, not favourable; and this I own a little to my disappointment.

“My propositions were two—

“1. That in the appointment of Fellowships and Emoluments to studies a due proportion should be assigned by the Commissioners to Theology.

“2. That the choice of men who are to be permanent governors and teachers in a college (apart from the case of posts allocated to Professorships and the like) should not be governed by the results of examination simply, but that regard should be had to general fitness to serve the purposes of the college as a place of Religion, Learning, and Education.

“A third proposition which I assume rather than postulate is that the choosing body should be very carefully composed.

“Upon thinking over the two propositions special to the subject-matter I find no cause to recede from

* Birmingham.

them, and I do not abandon the hope that, placed clearly before you, they may be found to present a better aspect.

“From Mr. M’Carthy, a very clever member of the Birmingham School Board, I learn what I did not know when I saw you, that two laymen have been chosen headmasters of great schools: in the cases namely of St. Paul’s and Cheltenham. Mr. M. seemed sanguine and confident about their School Board system.

“Ever yours sincerely,

“W. E. GLADSTONE.”

These difficulties notwithstanding, a very active correspondence was maintained between reformers both in Oxford and Cambridge and various members of Parliament, amongst whom Mr. Goschen was particularly consulted. Letters to him from Hon. Lyulph Stanley, Mr. (now Sir Courtenay) Ilbert, Mr. James Bryce, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Albert Rutson, Mr. Henry Jackson, of Trinity College, Cambridge, and others give evidence of the agitation connected with proceedings in Parliament that issued in the appointment of Lord Salisbury’s Oxford and Cambridge Commissions of 1877. The following note of Professor Jowett to Mr. Goschen may serve as a specimen:—

“BALLIOL COLLEGE,

25th April, 1875.

“DEAR MR. GOSCHEN,—The residents here think it better not to have a meeting in London. They propose instead to send up a petition or memorial to the House of Commons. (Is there any impropriety in sending a memorial to all members of the House of Commons, or would the form of a petition be better?)

“Their memorial would embrace three points :—

“1. A request for enquiry and publication of the evidence. (About this there is a very general agreement.)

“2. The non-exclusion of the Headships.

“3. The abolition of all clerical restrictions except in so far as they are required for religious worship and instruction. (About these two latter they appear to be unanimous.)

“There is another question which interests me, and will probably interest you, though nobody cares about it here. It seems to me a great pity that the University should allow the movement for University education in the large towns, which is also partly a movement for female education, to pass out of their hands. But they can get no hold over this, unless they allow some portion of their funds to be used for this object. Do you think it would be possible to get some such clause as the following introduced into the Bill :—

“‘That the Commissioners be empowered, with the consent of the college, to frame a statute enabling a Fellowship to be attached to a Professorship intended to promote University education in any town in the United Kingdom, and enabling the college to contribute a sum not exceeding 6 per cent. of its gross income to the establishment and maintenance of a local college having such an object.’

“This is not a political or ecclesiastical question. Could you speak to Mr. Gladstone or some of the leading persons in either party and try to impress it upon them?”

It was in this condition of University opinion, and during the Administration of Lord Beaconsfield, that Professor Jowett, the Master of Balliol, drew up the following memoir.

SUGGESTIONS FOR UNIVERSITY
REFORM, 1874.I. PRESENT STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF OXFORD.

The reform made in the University by the Parliamentary Commission was in many respects imperfect. It allowed the clerical restrictions in great part to remain; it left several of the colleges in the possession of wealth wholly disproportioned to their educational requirements; it permitted Fellowships to be retained for life if the holders of them remained unmarried, and made no provision for a regular succession of vacancies; it gave a slender maintenance to the Professoriate, and opened no career for Tutors of colleges who were laymen; it did not venture to alter the monastic rule of enforced celibacy; it reserved no funds either for special scientific objects or for material improvements; it did little or nothing for the encouragement of new branches of study; it did not extend the influence of the University in the large towns. Those who wish us to "rest and be thankful" for another generation are not aware of the heavy discouragements under which the University still labours, or of the small results obtained out of the vast wealth which is at the disposal of many of the colleges.

Of the changes introduced by the Commission the most important was the throwing open of the scholarships and Fellowships to merit, and the freeing

of them from local and other restrictions. No other single measure (and perhaps not all of them together) has had an equal effect on the character of the University. The throwing open of the Fellowships has raised the standard of teaching and generally improved the governing bodies of the colleges. It has at the same time broken down the barriers which divided them and paved the way for an inter-collegiate system of instruction. Formerly colleges were apt to become isolated and to regard one another with jealous and supercilious feelings. Now that the Fellowships have been thrown open there is a better understanding among them, the Fellows of one college having often received their education at another. They have found out that co-operation is better than competition, and that there is no natural opposition between the colleges and the University or between the Tutorial and Professorial systems.

Next to the opening of the Fellowships the greatest changes effected by the Commission were: first, the reform of the governing body of the University, which henceforward became elective; secondly, the repeal of the old Statutes of the colleges, and the substitution for them of a mode of government similar to that of an ordinary English corporation.

When the action of the Commission ceased, the power of making alterations was given to the Privy Council on the application of the University or colleges. The restriction to Wales of a portion of the Fellowships and scholarships at Jesus College,

and of half the Fellowships and scholarships at New College to Wykehamists, was still maintained; and contrary to the principles laid down by the first Commission, nearly half the whole number of Fellowships were confined to clergymen. The requirement of celibacy remained in force; a Tutor of a college, if he married, resigned his Fellowship. Some relaxation of the clerical restrictions, and also of the restriction on marriage, has since been obtained at University, Balliol, Merton, and at some other colleges. But for a long time it was supposed that changes in the Statutes could only be made by a majority of two-thirds of the governing body, and with the consent of the Visitor as well as of the Privy Council. Thus a considerable difficulty was thrown in the way of the efforts of colleges to reform themselves. The Privy Council, however, on the application of Merton College, having decided about two years ago that a majority of two-thirds was not required, and that the claim of the Visitor was unfounded, the colleges (with the exception of Lincoln, Corpus, Exeter, whose Statutes were only approved and not made by the Commission) have now the power of altering their Statutes by a bare majority, and with no other safeguard than the consent of the Privy Council.

It may be remarked in passing that the Privy Council has no initiative, and would therefore be unable to effect any complete reorganisation of the University and colleges. Neither is the manner in which its powers are at present exercised altogether satisfactory. The tribunal changes with successive

Ministries, and in the same Ministry may consist of different persons unknown to the public and to the colleges, having to consider for the first time a peculiar and complicated subject. Such legislation can neither be uniform nor comprehensive. The power of approving alterations in Statutes should be exercised (1) by the same persons, (2) who should act upon uniform principles; (3) an opportunity should be afforded to the University and to the public of criticising the proposed alterations, and in some cases of arguing against them; (4) important changes should not be made by a bare majority. The applications to the Privy Council are private, and hence privileges may be granted unintentionally to particular colleges which are injurious to the general system, or give them an unfair advantage over other colleges.

During the sixteen years that have elapsed since the last reform, the University has not been idle. The number of admissions has increased from 400 to 650, and in a few years more will probably be doubled. A measure was passed with some opposition at the time, but now universally approved, for the admission of students unconnected with any college or hall. Already there are about 170 such students, and nearly 300 who are connected with colleges, but do not reside within their walls. The "unattached students" as they are called, can live for about £50 a year; the "semi-attached," who are members of a college, but not resident within the walls, for £75 or £80. Great progress has also been made in the introduction of new studies. No one is

now required to pass a classical examination after his fifth term. The number of candidates for honours in the Schools of Modern History and of Law is beginning to rival the number in the School of Literæ Humaniores. The number of mathematicians and students of natural science has also greatly increased. At the same time, the School of Literæ Humaniores has at least doubled, and the entire number of candidates for honours has quadrupled or quintupled during the last twenty years. The examination of Passmen has also been improved by a better division of their work and the introduction of modern subjects. The University has established Boards of Studies, consisting chiefly of the Professors and Examiners who control and define the examination both in the Pass and Class Schools. An inter-collegiate system of instruction has grown up which renders the lectures of one college accessible to the undergraduates of another, or to unattached students on the payment of a small fee. Private tuition has to a great extent been superseded by public. Distinctions of rank in the colleges have been abolished—there are no longer noblemen or servitors, but the students meet together on the common level of education and personal fitness. Many more poor men now come up to the University than in the days when Bible Clerkships and Servitorships were numerous, and poverty was a qualification for Fellowships and scholarships. Lastly, the religious Tests which were imposed on all members of Convocation have been repealed by Act of Parliament. And any candidate, whether a member of the

Church of England or not, who objects on religious grounds, is excused from the examination either in Scripture or the Thirty-nine Articles, or both.

The constitution of the University has also undergone considerable changes during the last few years. The initiative or power of proposing measures to Congregation and Convocation has been granted to members of Congregation (*i.e.* to all resident M.A.'s) as well as to the Hebdomadal Council.* The changes which are still required are (1) the restriction of Congregation to *bonâ fide* teachers and students, (2) the disfranchisement of Convocation in the election to Professorships and in matters relating to the internal government of the University. The parochial clergy are an incongruous element in the government of Oxford, and members of Convocation residing at a distance are rarely brought up to vote except from some party motive.

Thus far we have attempted to sketch the present state of the University, both as affected by the Ordinances of the Commission and by internal legislation. Nearly as much seems to have been effected fifteen or sixteen years ago as public opinion would have allowed at the time; but the work which was left imperfect then must now be resumed and completed. Nor is there any fear of serious opposition from within to reasonable changes, if sufficient time is allowed for the discussion of them. Provided (1) the revenues of the colleges are solely devoted to the higher education, and (2) the administration of the estates is retained by themselves—provided also

* By a Statute passed in 1872.

(3) their own educational wants are first satisfied, and (4) they have some control over the new uses to which they are applied—no great resistance will be made to the application of them to University or other objects, nor to any provision for their better management or supervision.

II. We may now proceed to consider (1) the nature of the changes required ; (2) the best mode of effecting them.

I. Several objects have attracted the attention of University reformers at different times. (*a*) They have wished to provide a career for eminent teachers, and have complained of the inadequate provision at present made for them. (*b*) They have desired to create posts in which a student might devote his time to special researches, and they have been in the habit of comparing the long catalogue of Professors in a German University with the meagre representation of different branches of knowledge at Oxford and Cambridge. (*c*) Others are impressed with the importance of establishing lectureships or colleges in the large towns. (*d*) Others, again, while acknowledging the desirableness of these objects, would be sorry to see the funds appropriated to Fellowships seriously diminished, although probably all are agreed that sinecure or non-resident Fellowships should be terminable. None of these proposals need conflict with any other. While there is no *embarras de richesse* in the University, there is enough for the gradual development of all of them.

It is not desirable that the colleges should take the place of the University any more than the University

should take the place of the colleges. We must endeavour to obtain the maximum of advantage from both. Collegiate life is characteristic of Oxford and Cambridge, and affords many advantages of society and discipline. Though somewhat more expensive, it is greatly preferred by the undergraduates themselves. It has an *esprit de corps* and associations and interests unknown in Universities which have no colleges. Neither is there any real opposition between college and University teaching. The lectures of Professors may be advantageously supplemented by the personal superintendence of the college Tutor. A teacher who has only fifteen or twenty pupils has a great advantage over one who has two or three hundred, because he can know them personally and test their deficiencies by examinations and exercises. His vocation need not be an inferior one, even if some part of the higher teaching is transferred to University Readers or Professors. He may train the character of his pupils and render them the same sort of assistance in teaching which was formerly given by distinguished private tutors.

Still less is there any opposition between original research and a moderate amount of teaching. The greatest discoveries in Physical Science have been made by lecturers at the Royal Institution. The most eminent German scholars and theologians have been in the habit of teaching almost daily. Money may often be given with advantage for the purpose of carrying on a particular inquiry, or an eminent man may sometimes be rewarded with a sinecure

Fellowship. But this is a very different thing from endowing positions for life to be held on the condition of study only. There are comparatively few persons in England who are qualified to lead a student's life at all; and still fewer possessing the original genius or critical power which is required to produce a considerable work.

At present the revenues of the colleges are deplorably wasted, and in many instances exercise a positively injurious influence on education. It is impossible to suppose that an income of £30,000 or £40,000 a year can be profitably expended upon the education of less than a hundred undergraduates. The money may even do harm instead of good; for a young man may be permanently injured if he is tempted by a scholarship to enter a college at which there are inferior Tutors or a low tone of society. On the other hand the higher education of the country has always been assisted by endowments. The use of them in education should be compared with other uses of corporate property; or with the purposes to which private wealth is devoted. The revenues of the Universities, although large, are not so great as those of the London Companies, and may perhaps be equalled by the fortunes of one or two private individuals. Without endowments it would be impossible to offer a liberal education to those who are unable to maintain themselves at school or college. If it were just, it would be very inexpedient to deprive the colleges wholly of the stimulus of money. Whatever can be done without endowments can be done on a much more liberal and noble scale

if they are rightly directed, and fairly distributed. Of the German Universities, Leipzig, which is the most distinguished, is also the richest.

There seems to be no sufficient reason why the landed estates of colleges should be sold or the management of them transferred to a Commission. They have probably been as well administered as the average of estates, with less knowledge perhaps, but more liberality than those of most resident proprietors. They are likely to be more carefully managed in future, now that the system of beneficial leases has been abolished. The Colleges should be requested to pass an annual audit, and to keep their accounts according to a common form. They might be required also to have a regular land agent or surveyor, and to make reports from time to time to some authority, such as the Copyhold Commissioners, on the state of their property. With these safeguards they could manage their own affairs better than a Commission could. They are naturally desirous of retaining a species of property which is the most secure and the most improving. Many of their estates have belonged to them for centuries, and they would greatly resent any attempt to take them away. It is a minor advantage that the Fellows of a college acquire a knowledge of business in the management of their own concerns. In order to quicken their diligence they might be allowed a pecuniary interest in the residue of their estates after the various charges on them had been defrayed.

The income of the colleges, exclusive of the University income (estimated roughly at £50,000

a year), and including room rents, fees, caution, but not tuition money, amounts probably to £350,000 a year. There is likely to be a further increase of £100,000 a year in the next twenty or thirty years. Leaving out of sight the prospective increase, against which may be set the debts incurred by the colleges in running out their leases, we may assume £350,000 a year to be at our disposal. The question is, in what way can this large sum be best used for the encouragement of education and learning?

The immediate wants of the colleges may be first considered:—

It is proposed to divide the Fellowships into two classes:

1. Those which are devoted to teaching.
2. Those which are of the nature of prizes and are held for short terms of years.

The number of Fellowships of the first kind should be proportioned to the number of undergraduates: ten might be assigned to every hundred, to be increased or diminished in the same proportion on an average of ten years. Their value may be fixed at £250 a year. The income thus obtained would suffice to pension as well as partly to endow the College Tutors, who should also receive fees as at present. For there would be no use in giving a free education to rich men, and poor men may be assisted in a better way by scholarships and exhibitions. The Fellows should be elected generally by examination—for twenty years, after a probation of three years to be spent in teaching, with a power of re-election for ten years at a time. They should be

free from the restriction of Orders, and half of them free from the restriction of Celibacy.

For carrying out these suggestions, that is to say, for the cost of tuition and pensions, a sum of about £75,000 a year would be needed, supposing the number of undergraduates to be increased to 3,000, to which must be added about £30,000 a year for Headships of Houses, making a total of £105,000 a year.

There is at present hardly any connexion between the wealth of the colleges and the number of undergraduates educated by them. Against half the whole number of students may be set less than one-tenth of the revenues of the colleges. The halls and unattached students are almost without endowments, and the three largest colleges after Christ Church are among the poorest. On the proposed scheme far more would be assigned to education than at present; yet there would still remain £245,000 a year to be disposed of. In what way is this surplus to be used?

The first demand is for the increase of the teaching power, not of the colleges, but of the University, that is to say, for the better endowment of Readers and Professors. Oxford, as at present constituted, affords no career for teachers. With the exception of the Headships of Houses, and of the Professorships of Divinity, of the Chichele, Sanscrit, and Linacre Professorships, there are no posts to which a man of ability can look forward as the object of his ambition or the reward of his labours, such as he might find either in the Church or in the Bar, even

without aspiring to the highest honours of his profession. Considering the scale of remuneration which prevails in other employments and the increasing cost of living in England, the sum of £1,500 a year (which is less than the income of several, both of the Heads of Houses and of the Divinity Professors) does not seem more than enough for a distinguished man. There should be other Professorships of £1,000 a year, and some of those already existing should be raised to this amount. From the Reports which the Boards of Studies have recently made to the Hebdomadal Council, it would appear that at least twelve or fifteen new ones are required to represent adequately the various branches of knowledge. All Professors should have official residences as soon as the University is able to supply them, and should be as far as possible connected with colleges. Pensions should be provided for them at a certain time of life or after a certain number of years' service.

In addition to the Professorships the Boards of Studies propose that Readerships should be instituted of a smaller value which might be held with College Tutorships, tenable not for life, but for a period of seven years. Of these not less than thirty would probably be required. Their income might be fixed at £460 a year.

There would thus be three grades of authorised teachers: (1) College Tutors, (2) University Readers, (3) Professors; and an opportunity would be given of testing a teacher in a lower grade before he was promoted to the higher.

The whole expense of this addition to the teachers

of the University may be roughly estimated as follows:—

New Professorships . . .	£	25,000 a year.
Additions to existing Professorships . . .		15,000 „
Readerships . . .		12,000 „

Money would also be required from time to time for University buildings and apparatus, and for carrying on original researches. For this we may suppose that the sum of £8,000 a year would suffice. A total is thus given of £60,000 a year. We have now to consider the manner in which this sum is to be raised. In the case of cathedrals it would have been thought inequitable to take the property of all the chapters in an equal ratio without regard to their wealth or their needs. Nor would such a course be just or expedient in dealing with the colleges. We must at any rate leave them all sufficient for the maintenance of Tutorships and of scholarships, and for the repair and improvement of their buildings.

They should be taxed for the purposes of the University after their own educational wants have been satisfied. The sum required (£60,000) would be rather more than one-sixth of the whole. The control of this sum should be assigned first to a Commission of which the constitution will be hereafter considered; secondly to a Delegacy of twelve, which should be appointed as usual, four members by the Vice-Chancellor and Proctors, four by the Hebdomadal Council, four by Congregation. The

two bodies together should be empowered to arrange schemes for the increase and extension of the Professoriate, for the appointment of Readers, and for other academic or scientific purposes. It would be desirable before the Delegacy be appointed that the constitution of Congregation should be so changed as to include only students and teachers.

The Professors and Readers should be appointed by suitable Boards composed chiefly of persons distinguished in the same subject or faculty, who would be acquainted with the claims of the candidates, and would feel themselves responsible to their own class for making a good appointment. With these should be combined an extraneous element which in certain cases might be a safeguard against jealousy or party spirit. The college which gives the endowment should also be represented on the Board of Electors.

It might be desirable to allow the Professors and Readers either every fourth term or every fourth year for the pursuit of their own studies.

Thus far an adequate provision has been made, first for education in the colleges; secondly, for public instruction in the University. A career would be opened to young men which might compete in attractiveness with the larger emoluments of other professions. At the age of twenty-five or twenty-six an able man might reasonably expect to become a College Tutor or Lecturer; in less than ten years he might add to this a University Readership. Before the age of forty, if he became distinguished in literature and science or of great eminence as a teacher, he might hope to obtain a Professorship.

After the educational wants of the colleges and the demands for the enlargement of the Professoriate have been satisfied, there will still remain about £185,000 a year to be disposed of. Many would desire that this great surplus should be at once handed over to the University. But who could be entrusted to administer so large a sum? What college would consent to be mulcted of a third of its property? What Minister in the present state of politics could hope to carry a measure depriving the colleges of the control of their property, even if such a measure were thought desirable? If this is impossible, the only alternative which remains is that the colleges should submit to a Commission schemes for the better use of their property, or, if they prefer, receive them from the Commission to be approved by themselves, or to be rejected by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the governing body of the college.

The objects to be chiefly aimed at in such schemes are (1) the endowment of sinecure or prize Fellowships to be held for seven years without any restriction to unmarried men or clergymen. Such Fellowships would be the reward of attainments; they would draw young men to the University and enable learning to compete with other professions. But they have other and even more important uses. They provide the means for independent study, and their tenure might fairly be prolonged in cases where the holder of them is able to show that his studies are likely to produce important results in published writings. They also give the opportunity to those

who have to make their way in the world of entering the liberal professions. It is useless to bring poor men to Oxford and Cambridge and to give them no help afterwards; in this way they are driven to become schoolmasters, a calling for which they are often unfitted. The Fellowships will be better filled, and the need of them will be more and more felt, as the students of the University are drawn from a larger area. Nothing could be more unpopular among young men than the attempt to do away with them with the view of enriching the teaching body, for which by the preceding arrangements sufficient provision has been made. During the last fifteen years they have been the most popular and useful institution in the University, and might become still more useful if there were a regular succession of them, and the number of them were increased, while the time for which they are held was diminished. To have a large proportion of their ablest members scattered among the professions and still retaining their connexion with them, must greatly add to the prestige and influence of the Universities, and also act beneficially on the professions themselves.

For these reasons there should be a regular succession of Fellowships vulgarly called sinecures, but in reality supplying to young men the means of further education or advancement in a profession. Taking into account the increasing numbers of the University at least forty or fifty such prizes might with advantage be given away every year after examination. The election should be left in the hands of the colleges, who should be required to

form Boards, associating with themselves the professors and others in the conduct of the Examination. During the term of their Fellowship the non-resident Fellows should form part of the governing body. The Prize Fellowships, like other Fellowships, should be of the value of £250 a year. They should be appropriated to different branches of knowledge in proportion to the numbers and distinctions of the students. They should be filled up at regular intervals, and to some of them the condition of travelling or study in a foreign University might be advantageously annexed.

Estimating the college property roughly at £350,000, we have assumed that less than one-third would suffice for the maintenance of the Heads and Tutor Fellows of Colleges, and somewhat more than one-sixth or nearly two-elevenths for the increase and extension of the Professoriate. Of the larger half which remains, amounting to £185,000 a year, we may take £75,000 for the Prize Fellowships. This would give 300 Fellowships of £250 a year, or about forty-two vacancies a year, if they were tenable for seven years.

(2) A second object is the foundation of Scholarships to be given by merit. Of these there can hardly be too many if it is desired to extend the area of the University or to encourage new branches of knowledge. They should be of the uniform value of £80 a year (sufficient to enable the holders of them to maintain themselves out of college) and should be tenable for five years. There are enough already for the encouragement of

Classical Studies, but many more are required for Physical Science, for Medicine, for Mathematics, for Hebrew, and Oriental Languages. For every Fellowship, appropriated to a special branch of study there should be not less than four or five Scholarships. It is vain to have teachers without pupils, and pupils cannot be obtained if they are drawn off by the attraction of endowments to other studies. Five hundred Scholarships of £80 a year tenable for five years, or 100 in each year, would make a total of £40,000 a year. A proportion of these Scholarships, like the University Scholarships, should be tenable at any college.

(3) The third object to which the college revenues should be applied is the extension and improvement of the college buildings. Many of the colleges require to be rebuilt, almost all of them to be extended and enlarged. If the number of the University is doubled the number of college rooms should also be doubled. The glory of Oxford is its buildings, and though a good deal has been done much still remains to be done for their improvement. The customary transfer of the undergraduates from college to lodgings in the town at the end of three years is inconvenient and generally disliked by them. It is very desirable that the rooms should be let at their present reasonable rates, but this cannot be afforded unless they are partly built at the expense of the college. A sum of £30,000 a year would not be too much to devote to this object.

(4) Not less important than any of the preceding objects is the establishment of colleges and Lecture-

ships in the large towns. To use the revenues of the University for this purpose would not be an alienation, but a most profitable investment of them. While we seemed to be going to the large towns we should be really drawing them to us. The University has already prepared a scheme for examinations which will give a general direction to the higher education. But we must also provide the means of instruction. At present our students are drawn for the most part from the upper two hundred thousand. The intelligence of the lower classes is wasted because they have no opportunity of obtaining education beyond the standard of a National School. What the Church did in the Middle Ages, the Grammar Schools and Universities should now do for them. They should cherish the good seed to be used in the interests of knowledge and for the benefit of mankind. They should open a career for superior natural abilities: they should go out to seek those who cannot come to them. Colleges planted in the great centres of population would continue school education; they would afford to the more active minded of the working classes the opportunity of self-culture; they would solve the problem of a higher education for women, about which many difficulties are felt at the present time. (For there could surely be no impropriety in young persons of both sexes living at home with their parents meeting together in a lecture-room or at an examination.) The power of conferring degrees in Arts should be retained by the old Universities, but the term of residence at Oxford and Cambridge might

be diminished to those who had attended certain courses of lectures at affiliated colleges. Among the benefits which such colleges would confer upon the large towns would be the introduction of a body of highly educated men into a commercial and manufacturing society. Among the benefits which they would confer upon the University may be reckoned the number of spheres of employment and distinction which they would create for teachers and professors.

A revenue of £8,000 a year would amply provide a single college with teachers; a much smaller sum would suffice for the foundation of Lectureships in the principal branches of knowledge. The towns in which they are located should contribute funds equal to those given by the Universities towards lecture-rooms, libraries, laboratories, Scholarships. Ten such colleges, in addition to Owens College at Manchester, and the University of Durham at Newcastle, might be established at Liverpool, Birmingham, Leeds, Bradford, Nottingham, Norwich, Bristol, Exeter, Plymouth, Merthyr Tydvil. They should be polytechnic schools adapted to the wants of the towns, giving instruction in the arts and sciences, as well as in literature. Their students might be allowed to receive degrees in science without requiring of them residence at the older Universities. Some branches of science which are connected with the arts, such as mechanics, and especially medicine, which requires the opportunities of observation afforded by a large hospital, seem to have a more natural home in Manchester or Newcastle than at

Oxford or Cambridge. These local colleges should be managed by trustees appointed, half of them, by the college or colleges from which the funds for the endowment are obtained, half from the town which supplies the money for buildings and Scholarships.

In addition to the property arising from the college estates, room-rents, fees, and payments of undergraduates, an important element is the college livings. Of these the saleable value may be roughly estimated at £30,000 or £40,000 a year. Whether they should be sold or not is a question not free from doubt. The colleges are in process of becoming lay corporations, and will not be able to provide Fellows who can hold them. On the other hand, when not compelled to appoint one of their own body, they will probably be found good patrons; they introduce another element in the Church; and the sale of such trusts is decidedly objectionable and unpopular.

The proposed manner of distributing the revenues of the colleges may be summed up as follows:—

Fellowships assigned for purposes of—

	£
Tuition . . .	75,000 a year.
Headships . . .	30,000 „
Professorships . . .	52,000 „
General scientific purposes .	8,000 „
Fellowships to be given as	
Prizes . . .	75,000 „
For repairs and extension	
of college buildings. . .	30,000 „
Scholarships . . .	40,000 „
Colleges in large towns (say)	40,000 „

The above statement of the revenues of the colleges has been made from the best data which the writer has been able to obtain. The prospective increase in the next twenty or thirty years has not been taken into account, nor are the revenues of the University included. It may seem ridiculous to map out beforehand the uses which may be made of the college revenues. It is not expected or intended that they should be distributed exactly according to the above scheme. But it is useful at the outset to survey the extent of our resources, and to consider the various modes in which they may be advantageously employed.

III. The preceding suggestions can only be carried out by a Parliamentary Commission similar to that which was appointed sixteen years ago. In order to avoid local jealousies and influences the Commissioners should not be residents either in Oxford or Cambridge. They should be empowered (1) to examine witnesses and call for documents; (2) to repeal all restrictions on Headships, Fellowships, and Scholarships; (3) to apply special trust funds which have existed more than fifty years to the general uses of the colleges or of the University; (4) to make provision for the educational requirements of the colleges; (5) after the educational requirements have been satisfied, to appropriate a portion of the income of the colleges to the establishment of Professorships and Readerships, and to general scientific purposes; (6) to alter college Statutes, and to make provision for their alteration hereafter; (7) to unite colleges

and halls, and to authorise the sale and exchange of their property; (8) to make provision out of the surplus revenues of the colleges (*a*) for terminable Fellowships to be given after an examination, (*b*) for an increase in the number of their Scholarships, (*c*) for the improvement or enlargement of their buildings, (*d*) for the establishment of colleges and Lectureships in the large towns, (*e*) to provide for the better management of the estates and the better control of the accounts of the colleges, (*f*) to alter the constitution and functions of Convocation or Congregation.

During the first year after their appointment the Commissioners shall receive schemes from the colleges. In the succeeding years they shall offer them to the colleges for their consideration, and the governing bodies shall have the power of rejecting them by a majority of two-thirds of those present.

The Commissioners shall also receive from the University schemes for the improvement of its constitution or the alteration of its Professorships and trusts during the first year of their appointment. In the succeeding years they shall offer them to the Congregation of the University for consideration, and the Congregation shall have the power of rejecting them by a majority of two-thirds of those present. Schemes not so rejected shall become law.

In case of a disagreement between the colleges and the Commission, or the University and the Commission, respecting the mode of applying any of the University or college funds, the funds in question shall be allowed to accumulate.

Any individual or body whose interests are affected

by the changes proposed shall have an appeal to the Privy Council.

After the cessation of the Commission the University and colleges shall have power to make changes in their Statutes with the consent of a tribunal to be constituted by the Privy Council.

The management of their estates shall be controlled by two Commissions to be appointed by the Crown, whose consent shall be required in all sales or exchanges, and to whom the accounts of the colleges shall be annually submitted.

IV. The above is the outline of the needs of the University, and of the uses to which college and University funds might be applied. But in the present state of politics and, perhaps, of public opinion generally, it is doubtful whether a Parliamentary Commission could be appointed, or, if appointed, could act with effect. The ground requires to be prepared before several of the ideas contained in the preceding sketch could be practically carried out. The last University Commission appointed by Parliament, imperfect as were its results, could not have effected half as much as it did but for the previous labours of the Royal Commission. In the present stage of affairs another Royal Commission is wanted. Such a Commission should be empowered to ask questions and obtain the opinions of witnesses orally or in writing, and, if necessary, to make further inquiries into the management of the college revenues; it should frame a complete scheme of reform, and should report upon

the studies of the University. Great changes, to which many interests are opposed, cannot be carried by a *coup de main*. The University has to be persuaded first, and the gentle compulsion of public opinion may then be added. The weight of the Commission will depend upon the ability of the report; and, therefore, the ablest men who can be found, whether residents in the University or not, should be appointed Commissioners. As the two Universities differ in many respects, it would be desirable that one Commission should be appointed for Oxford and one for Cambridge.

During the last year and a half, while the Commission to inquire into the revenues has been sitting, the Privy Council has refused to hear proposals for alterations in the College Statutes. It would be a great gain to many of the colleges, and would pave the way to a more general reform, if they were permitted to make such alterations as had the approval of a Royal Commission.

CHAPTER X.

ABOLITION OF REMAINING CLERICAL RESTRICTIONS

THE legislation of 1871 marks a point of advance from which there was no retreat. The citadel was taken. It remained to dislodge "the enemy" from certain outlying quarters. In conjunction with the Executive Commission of 1854, or subsequently under sanction of the Privy Council, some colleges at Oxford had considerably diminished the number of their Clerical Fellowships. But this process had not been made compulsory, and the abolition of the Test gave room for an increasing number of aspirants to whom the obligation to take Orders was, for various reasons, objectionable. The condition which had once seemed a matter of course was now felt to be an anomaly and an anachronism. With the exception of Merton, and, with some reservation, Oriel College, no Headship was open to a layman, and all were still subject to the requirement of subscription. In the "liberal colleges," as they were called at the time, there was a growing demand that these defects should be remedied.

Several years passed, however, without any overt

action for this purpose, although, on an appeal from Merton College in 1872, it was ascertained that a college could revise its Statutes by a bare majority under sanction of the Privy Council, without consulting the Visitor. The doubt referred to, which had existed in 1868, was thus removed. But the complaints of which I have spoken as having embarrassed the former legislation became at last so urgent as to induce Lord Salisbury, the Chancellor of Oxford University, to propose the appointment of a new Commission with powers to deal with questions that were still undecided. Of this Commission the present Warden of Merton, the Hon. G. C. Brodrick, has written as follows:—

“In 1877 . . . the Conservative Government, at the instance of Lord Salisbury, carried a fresh measure of academical reform, under which a body of Executive Commissioners, with Lord Selborne for its chairman, was empowered to remodel once more the University and Colleges of Oxford. . . . Its leading principle was essentially socialistic—the spoliation of the Colleges, as rich corporations, for the supposed benefit of the University, as a comparatively poor corporation. . . . Nevertheless, the Commission did good service in abolishing most of the clerical restrictions left by its predecessors, thus carrying out the policy of the University Test Act passed in 1871, of which I had been a very active promoter.”

It belongs to the present narrative to explain how this latter result was compassed.

Whether “socialistic” or not, in its main principle, the constitution of Lord Salisbury’s Commission was

naturally Conservative. Lord Selborne's clericalism was well known, and his proposed amendment to the Bill of 1869 (p. 156) was not forgotten. No fault was found with the corresponding Cambridge Commission; but the progressive party at Oxford were not satisfied. As the Master of Balliol (Professor Jowett) said—

“The Commission are inclined to let the colleges do as they like, and settle the matter by a chance majority. But a great national institution should not be left to this sort of caprice, and the principle adopted by the Commission has a tendency to divide the University into clerical and anti-clerical colleges. Where the colleges are nearly divided, the Commission appear to throw their weight into the clerical side.”

The Commissioners, however, were still sitting in 1880 when Mr. Gladstone had returned to power. Then the Oxford Liberals saw their opportunity. On July 5th, 1880, Mr. Roundell presented in the House of Commons a petition from 131 resident graduates of Oxford. Among the petitioners were 6 Heads of Colleges, 15 Professors, 72 Fellows, 19 other graduates. The petitioners comprised one-half of the Hebdomadal Council—here was a revolution indeed!—one-half the resident Professors, and a clear majority of College Tutors and Lecturers. The prayer of the petition was for the abolition of the remaining clerical restrictions.

Professor Jowett wrote to Mr. Roundell on the following day, July 6th:—

“I think that after provision has been made for

the chapel services and the religious instruction of the undergraduates, all clerical restrictions should be abolished.

“It is an invidious thing, partaking of the nature of a bribe, to elect an inferior man because he is willing to take Orders, to reject a superior man because he is unwilling.

“It is a bad thing both for the colleges and the clerical profession that the management of colleges should pass into the hands of inferior men because they are clergymen. . . .

“The attempt to maintain clerical restrictions is an anachronism in the present state of Oxford opinion” (*Letters*, etc., p. 40).

On July 9th, in the House of Commons, on the motion that the Speaker leave the chair, Mr. Roundell moved as an amendment:—

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

He heartily approved of Mr. Bryce's amendment “for throwing open the Chairs of Hebrew and Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, and the Chair of Hebrew at Cambridge, to other than clergymen, on the ground that those Chairs were not theological Chairs. If it were said that the Professorship of Hebrew was a theological Chair because Hebrew was the language of the Scriptures, the same might be said of Greek

as the language of the New Testament. If it were strange to claim the Chair of Ecclesiastical History for laymen, they might just as well say that a Chair of Political Economy should be limited to a member of one or other branch of the Legislature. Was it to be affirmed that a man like Mr. Robertson Smith, who was thought worthy to revise the translation of the Bible, should be precluded from holding the Professorship of Hebrew at Oxford? Headships were the chief prizes open to college Fellows. It was an anachronism, now that such large reductions had been made in the number of clerical Fellowships, to seek to reserve the chief office of a college to a clergyman. It was important that colleges should be able to elect the best man; subscription limited the field of choice. This was not a mere college question. It was a national question. At Cambridge there had been a large increase in the lay element. In 1854, out of 93 Tutors and Lecturers, 25 were laymen; in 1880, out of 130 Tutors and Lecturers, 77 were laymen. There were now only 100 Fellows in Orders, whilst in 1854 there had been 205. These figures showed the set of the tide. It was impossible to build up a great national institution on 'a narrow ledge of clericalism.' Since the late legislative changes the number of undergraduates at both Universities had nearly doubled. At Oxford the number of Honourmen had more than doubled, whilst at Cambridge they had increased 25 per cent. The removal of restrictions therefore tended to the advancement of learning and education at the Universities and in the country at large."

Mr. Bryce did not see why the teaching of Hebrew and Ecclesiastical History should be confined to clergymen. "Such a restriction unduly narrowed the field of choice, excluding all laymen and Nonconformists. Ecclesiastical History was likewise a lay subject, in which indeed it was more difficult for a

clergyman to maintain strict impartiality than for a layman. The Hebdomadal Council at Oxford had represented to the Commissioners the desirability of having a lay Chair for Hebrew, and it was understood that the new Chair of Ecclesiastical History at Cambridge would be open to laymen."

Mr. Thorold Rogers observed that "religion, learning, and the highest faculties of the human mind would flourish when they were left in the atmosphere of freedom. Protection did no more good to religion than it did to trade."

Mr. Lyulph Stanley spoke "in the interests of religious equality as well as of academic freedom." "He would have liked to point out the illegality of having a new test introduced for Fellows when they had repealed the old test of belonging to a particular church, or, at any rate, the contravention of the spirit of the Universities Tests Acts by any such mode of appointing to Fellowships. He and those with whom he acted had been attacked from the other side for belonging to the Liberation Society, who advocated the most extreme religious equality, and no protection for any denomination of whatever kind. He and his friends declared that if there were one test preserved in the University, it would be just as offensive to their principles as the shilling duty on corn was to the Free-trader. He was glad that the resolution was to be withdrawn, because he knew the difficulties under which the Government was labouring, and how fully it was entitled to generous consideration."

Mr. Roundell said in reply that "the point of his speech was that, according to his judgment, nothing short of the total abolition, out-and-out, of these clerical Fellowships would satisfy the majority of those who, next session, would have to deal with the question of these Statutes. In answer to the Liberation Society, as represented by Mr. Stanley,

he put the question forward as one of academic freedom, not of religious liberty.”

Mr. Gladstone, on the part of the Government, objected on constitutional grounds to such interference with the working of a Government Commission at the present stage, but engaged that in the following session an opportunity should be given for the full discussion of the question. With characteristic insistence, Mr. Roundell took occasion to remind the Government of their promise, and in 1881 the Liberal majority supported him in a resolution on the subject of clerical restrictions, which was passed without a division, and had the effect of an instruction to the Commission. And hence in the final revision of the college Statutes things were established on the footing which now obtains.

Christ Church, with its Dean and Chapter, including the Professors of Divinity, and Keble, from the terms of its foundation, still stand apart, and on a separate ground.* But in the remaining colleges of Oxford, the only Fellows who are necessarily clergymen are those who are directly engaged in the chapel services and in the teaching of Divinity. At Cambridge there is indeed one college, so called, whose membership is restricted to the Church of England, namely, Selwyn College, which resembles Keble in the manner of its foundation; but it is not incorporated with the University, and figures in the

* This is also true of Hertford, in so far as Church membership is involved.

University Calendar only as a hostel, being thus placed upon the same footing with the sectarian colleges, which have been recently founded at Oxford. On this subject there will be more to say in a subsequent chapter.

At the end of the nineteenth century (December, 1900) at Oxford, of the 19 Heads of Colleges, including Christ Church, 9 are laymen, while of 213 Fellows only 68, that is less than a third, are clergymen (the canons of Christ Church, who are necessarily in Orders, being left out of the account). In six of the colleges, the only ordained persons are the chaplains.

The following is a detailed account :—

In the University of Oxford there are nineteen colleges, properly so called, which exist under the recent Statutes. The proportion of Headships or Fellowships held severally by clergymen and laymen will appear from the following table :—

I.

HEADS OF COLLEGES IN OXFORD.

LAY.	CLERICAL.
Balliol	University
All Souls	Christ Church
Brasenose	Corpus
Jesus	Exeter
Magdalen	Hertford
Merton	Lincoln
Oriel	New College
Trinity	Queen's
Wadham	St. John's
	Worcester

II.

FELLOWS OF COLLEGES IN OXFORD.

	LAY.	CLERICAL.
University . . .	6	2
Balliol . . .	11	1
Merton . . .	18	1
Exeter . . .	7	1
Oriel . . .	6	6
Queen's . . .	9	5
New College . . .	20	6
Lincoln . . .	8	1
All Souls . . .	28	4
Magdalen . . .	23	7
Brasenose . . .	10	4
Corpus . . .	11	3
Christ Church . . .	17	7*
Trinity . . .	5	4
St. John's . . .	9	6
Jesus . . .	5	3
Wadham . . .	7	1
Pembroke . . .	4	1
Hertford . . .	9	5
Total . . .	<u>213</u>	<u>68</u>

* Excluding canons.

At Cambridge the proportion of lay to clerical Heads is less, while that of lay Fellowships is rather more, less than one-sixth of the Fellows of Trinity having taken Orders. The following is, I believe, an accurate list:—

III.

HEADS OF COLLEGES IN CAMBRIDGE.

LAY.	CLERICAL.
Peterhouse	Clare
Christ's	Pembroke
Emmanuel	Caius
Sidney-Sussex	Trinity Hall
Downing	Corpus
	King's
	Queens'
	St. Catherine's
	Jesus
	St. John's
	Magdalene
	Trinity

IV.

FELLOWS OF COLLEGES IN CAMBRIDGE.

	LAY.	CLERICAL.
Peterhouse . . .	8	2
Clare . . .	12	3
Pembroke . . .	11	3
Caius . . .	20	6
Trinity Hall . . .	11	2
Corpus . . .	7	4
King's . . .	38	6
Queens' . . .	4	4
St. Catherine's . . .	3	3
Jesus . . .	13	3
Christ's . . .	10	5
St. John's . . .	34	10
Magdalene . . .	3	—
Trinity . . .	56	9
Emmanuel . . .	9	5
Sidney-Sussex . . .	7	3
Downing . . .	5	1
Total . . .	251	69

This is the actual state of matters in the twentieth year after the final abolition of clerical restrictions. The estimate would be little affected by taking in Keble, Selwyn, and other hostels and private halls. The proportion of laymen may be slightly further increased when the few Fellowships which are still held under the old Statutes shall have run out. Of these there are ten at Cambridge, and probably about as many at Oxford. This point I have not precisely ascertained.

CHAPTER XI.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION: THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN

FROM 1826 onwards, and even earlier, various attempts were made to occupy the ground which the exclusiveness of the Universities had left uncared for.

I have already spoken of the University of London, originally conceived on lines analogous to those of the Scottish and Continental Universities. I may be allowed, perhaps, to take some pride in the fact that one of the original advocates and promoters of the plan was my father's first cousin, Thomas Campbell, then best known as the author of the *Pleasures of Hope*, and still remembered for his martial and patriotic lyric strains. As editor of the *New Monthly Magazine*, in 1826-8, he undoubtedly gave a powerful impulse to the scheme. The "religious difficulty," and a mass of prejudice from which even the great Dr. Arnold was not free, interfered with the normal growth of what had promised to be a strong and healthy plant. But it took deep root, and like a tree which has lost its leader, it branched sideways, and overspread the earth. Metaphor apart,

the London University, transformed into an Examining Board, drew its graduates not only from London, but from far and wide. Meanwhile, the teaching function which it had relinquished was assumed not only by King's and University Colleges, but by the British Museum, the Royal Institution, the schools at South Kensington, and other scientific bodies, including the Colleges of Surgeons and Physicians. At long last it would appear that the ideal of seventy years ago bids fair to be realised in a Teaching University for London.

On a lower grade, but still evincing the desire to supply defects which Oxford and Cambridge had been slow to recognise, were the Mechanics' Institutes, Philosophical Institutions, Athenæums, and the like, which sprang up in various centres of population. And it would be wrong not to allude in passing to the Society for Diffusing Useful Knowledge, the *Penny Cyclopædia*, and other enterprises in which Henry Brougham, afterwards Lord Brougham and Vaux, took a leading part; and also to Mr. Ewart's Act for Free Public Libraries, which has of late years borne such manifold fruits.

The first provincial institution which aimed at a University standard was undoubtedly the Owens College, Manchester, which was founded in 1851. Mr. John Owens, with the advice of his friend Mr. George Faulkner, had bequeathed the residue of his estate for providing means of instruction "in such branches of learning as are now and may be hereafter usually taught in the English Universities, free from the religious tests, which limit the exten-

sion of University Education." Under its first Principal, Dr. Scott, a cultured and thoughtful man, the friend of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, the Owens College cannot be said to have flourished greatly. But during the Principalship of Dr. Greenwood, with H. E. Roscoe (now Sir Henry) as Professor of Chemistry, it became frequented and celebrated, especially on the scientific side. In 1875 the Principal and three of the Professors—H. E. Roscoe, A. W. Ward, and J. Morgan—issued a pamphlet proposing the establishment of a University of Manchester. Objections to the one-college University were raised on the part of Yorkshire College, Leeds, then recently founded, and in 1880 a Royal Charter was granted for a University on a federal basis, to which the Owens College, Manchester, was to belong, and to this—the Victoria University—first the Liverpool University College (founded in 1878), and afterwards the Yorkshire College, Leeds, were regularly affiliated, with Dr. A. W. Ward, then Principal of the Owens College, as Vice-Chancellor. The establishment of these University colleges belongs to a later phase of the history, of which more presently.

I have already spoken (p. 62) of the Working Men's College in Great Ormond Street, founded by F. D. Maurice in 1854 (originally in Red Lion Square), as having anticipated larger movements of University Extension. W. Sewell, of Exeter College, Oxford (and it is creditable to his inventiveness), had as early as 1850 suggested something of the kind in a letter to the Oxford Vice-Chancellor, entitled

“Suggestions for the Extension of the University.” Professorships were to be established in Birmingham and elsewhere, and to be held with college Fellowships. In 1857 Mr. T. D. Acland (afterwards Sir Thomas Acland) and Dr. Temple, the present Archbishop of Canterbury, set on foot a scheme of “Middle-class Examinations,” which, with some modifications, is still working under the name of “the Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations.”

The early seventies saw the beginnings of a more spirited and far more effectual endeavour.

In the Universities, as now reformed, the younger generation of college Fellows were waking up to responsibilities and possibilities unthought of heretofore. Some of them at least were touched with missionary ardour, and went forth to do for the people what the people had but imperfectly succeeded in doing for themselves. This began to be rendered more feasible through the rapid development of the railway services. It is important to recognise that the first touch which called forth this latent zeal was an appeal to the sympathies of the younger University men, on the part of those women who had set on foot a movement for the higher and more thorough education of their own sex. In 1848 Frederick Maurice, still a young Professor, was at King's College, and became interested in the Governesses' Benevolent Institution, whose members, with his assistance, organised Queen's College, which he himself opened with an inaugural lecture. Bedford College, with a similar object, was established in the following year. The starting of Miss Buss's

school and of Cheltenham College for girls followed shortly afterwards. In 1854, when Maurice had founded the Working Men's College, a corresponding branch was opened for women under the superintendence of Miss Louisa Twining. These were preludes to the more ambitious attempts that followed soon. The desire of women to obtain a medical diploma was the next symptom that appeared. In 1856 Miss Jessie Meriton White inquired of the University of London whether a woman might "become a candidate for a diploma in medicine if, on presenting herself for examination, she shall produce all the requisite certificates of character, capacity, and study from one of the institutions recognised by the London University." Counsel was appealed to, and decided in the negative. The same happened again in 1862, when Miss Elizabeth Garrett (now Mrs. Garrett Anderson, M.D.) requested admission as a candidate for the London Matriculation. But as the University was about to apply for a new charter, Miss Garrett's friends presented a memorial to the Senate, suggesting the insertion of a clause expressly providing for the extension to women of the privileges of the University. A resolution to this effect, proposed by Mr. Grote and seconded by Mr. Robert Lowe, was all but carried in the University Senate, being only lost by the casting vote of the Chancellor.* Those who had nearly succeeded in so determined an effort of course did not stop there. A committee was formed for obtaining the admission of women to University

* Lord Granville.

examinations, in which Miss Emily Davies, the sister of Mr. Llewelyn Davies, of Trinity College, Cambridge, was especially active. This brought about the first point of contact between the women's movement and University Extension. In 1858 the Ladies' Committee approached the Secretary of the Syndicate for the Cambridge Local Examinations. They obtained leave for female candidates to be examined privately, in accordance with the University regulations, simultaneously with the boys' examination; and this experiment having proved successful, girls were publicly admitted to the Cambridge Local Examinations in 1865. At this time, and for some years afterwards, no corresponding steps were taken at Oxford.

From this moment onwards the beginnings of University Extension and of Women's Higher Education were inextricably blended; and in this new departure the honour of the initiative must clearly be assigned to Cambridge. In 1866 Mr. James Stuart, a graduate of St. Andrews, became a High Wrangler, and (1868) a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. About the same time associations for the higher education of women, in sympathy with the London committee, were organised in various centres, amongst other places at Liverpool, Clifton, Edinburgh, and particularly at St. Andrews, where Miss Garrett, in studying medicine under Dr. Day, had awakened a special enthusiasm. At Clifton Miss Winkworth, of the *Lyra Germanica*, and her sister were an educational force, and Dr. Percival was a tower of support. The late John Nichol,

J. A. Symonds, and Professor Bonamy Price, also Mr. Creighton, since Bishop of London, were amongst the lecturers there. In Edinburgh the leading spirits were the Misses Stevenson. In Liverpool Miss A. J. Clough, the poet's sister, who had been present when Miss Davies founded the London Schoolmistresses' Association, took the chief lead in organising a system of lectures to be delivered by University graduates in Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield, and Leeds. Mr. James Stuart gave a course of lectures in Astronomy in these four towns, and a council, called the North of England Council for Promoting the Higher Education of Women, met for the first time at Leeds in November, 1867. Another of the lecturers, who afterwards carried out a similar scheme in Australia, was C. H. Pearson, the friend and associate of F. D. Maurice. Another was Mr. F. W. H. Myers. Besides Miss Clough, two other ladies helped greatly to promote this scheme, the one by her untiring energy, the other by her subtle and pervasive influence—Miss Margaret Calder and Mrs. Josephine Butler.

If the twenty ships sent by Athens to Ionia were the beginning of disasters to Hellas, these lecture courses were the beginning of manifold benefits; for Mr. Stuart, whose practical enthusiasm was unbounded, was led by his experience of their success to conceive the scheme which he proposed in a *Letter on University Extension* addressed to the University of Cambridge in 1871. A syndicate was appointed and reported favourably on the subject in 1873, and was instructed by a grace of the Senate to carry out its own recommendations. Courses of lectures were

delivered at Derby, Leicester, and Nottingham in the autumn of that year.

Mr. Stuart had also visited Oxford with a view to the prosecution of his scheme, but with no immediate results. He says, "Mr. Jowett enabled me to meet many of the reformers there about that time, but the seed did not bear fruit there just at once."

There was another scheme, however, of a kindred character, in which Oxford reformers were not altogether idle. This was the foundation of the Bristol University College. I have referred above to the lectures given at Clifton under the direction of the local society for the higher education of women. Dr. Percival, who was the life of that society, published in 1872 a pamphlet in which he urged the advantage of some more permanent institution. He urged that the Universities through their Colleges should aid in the foundation of affiliated Colleges in the great towns. In a postscript to his letter,* as reprinted in 1873, he deprecates the opposition of those who were in favour of the rival scheme, then much talked of at Oxford, for the Endowment of Research—a movement much encouraged by Mark Pattison and powerfully advocated by Dr. Appleton, the first editor of the *Academy*.

Largely through Dr. Percival's efforts, in the following year, "when the faculty of the Bristol Medical School were proposing to establish themselves in new buildings, they were met by the suggestion that the opportunity should, if possible,

* *The Connection of the Universities and the Great Towns.*
Macmillan and Co.

be used for the foundation of a Technical College of Science, of which the Medical School might constitute a department. A local committee was accordingly formed to consider this proposal, and a circular was issued appealing to the public for such aid as might be necessary to carry out the scheme" (*Life of Benjamin Jowett*, vol. ii. p. 58).

Two Oxford colleges, Balliol and New College, responded to this appeal with a contribution of £300 a year for five years, stipulating that provision should be made for the education of women and of adult persons engaged in the city during the day. And it deserves mention that in the negotiation which led to the Commission of 1877, the Oxford Liberals proposed the insertion of a clause empowering Colleges "to attach temporarily any office or emolument in the College to a Professorship intended to promote University Extension in any town in the United Kingdom."*

The promoters of the Cambridge "Extension" had also aimed from the first at the establishment of local colleges, and their labours led more or less directly to the foundation of University College, Nottingham (1880), Firth College, Sheffield (1879), and Liverpool University College (1878). Kindred, although not precisely derivative realisations of the same idea have been the Yorkshire College at Leeds (1877), Mason's College (1875), now the University of Birmingham, and the University colleges at Cardiff, Bangor, and Aberystwith, since amalgamated in the University for Wales. The union of Manchester,

* Letter from Professor Jowett to Mr. Goschen, 26th April, 1876.

Liverpool, and Leeds in one organisation as the Victoria University has been already mentioned.

In 1879 the lecture scheme was carried into Northumberland, where Political Economy Courses were arranged for Newcastle, Sunderland, North Shields, and South Shields. Here, for the first time, great enthusiasm was aroused among the artisans, especially the pitmen.

The foundation of the London Society for the Extension of University Teaching dates from a public meeting, held at the Mansion House on June 10th, 1875, when Mr. Goschen moved and Lord Lyttelton seconded the following resolution :—

“That the principle of the Cambridge University Extension scheme be applied to London, and that the various Educational Institutions of the Metropolis be requested to co-operate in an endeavour to apply it.”

The first secretaries of the London Society, appointed in 1876, were Mr. Walter Leaf and Mr. Arnold Morley. They were succeeded in the same year by Mr. Ernest Myers, who held the office until 1882. Viscount Goschen, who was the first President, says, “The infancy of the movement was a very troubled one. The question of funds almost drove us to despair. It was very long indeed before the movement, to use the slang of the day, ‘caught on.’” But from its metropolitan position it became better organised and less sporadic in its multiplied agencies than most of the provincial associations. After a while Oxford, Cambridge, and London

united in forming a Universities Joint Board for the appointment of Lecturers and Examiners. The Secretary to this Board was Mr. E. T. Cook, since Editor of the *Daily News*, who was succeeded by Mr. R. D. Roberts.

The specially Oxford scheme had been started in 1878, but its continuous operation dates from 1885. Dr. Percival, Professor Jowett, and others who cared to extend the operations of the University, had more immediately at heart the foundation of local colleges than what has been familiarly known as "Extension."

But under the exceptional organising talent of Mr. Michael E. Sadler of Trinity College, and afterwards of Christ Church, the success of the Oxford Delegacy also after a time was rapid and sure. Mr. Sadler's appointment was due to Dr. Percival, the present Bishop of Hereford, who also recommended courses of six fortnightly lectures, extending over three months, a plan which was adopted by the Oxford Delegacy, with excellent results. The Reading Centre in particular so thoroughly took root that in five years, under the fostering care of Mr. Mackinder of Christ Church, supported by the good will of the citizens, it grew into what is now known as the Reading College. And at Oxford were set on foot those summer meetings of University Extension students, which have been conducted both at Oxford and Cambridge amidst a glow of enthusiasm that does not seem to fade with years. Something of a similar kind had been suggested as early as 1874 by the Rev. E. G. Foulkes, the Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford.

Now to return, as Plato says, to the "feminine drama" (*Rep.* 451), from which the history of this extension movement cannot be dissociated.

While Miss Clough was engaged with lecture schemes in the north, Miss Davies pursued her narrower but more ambitious scheme of a college for women in immediate connexion with the University of Cambridge.

Here I beg leave to indulge a personal reminiscence. The St. Andrews Association mentioned above was linked with Miss Davies' work in a peculiar way. Its most active promoters were some of those whose enthusiasm for the cause had been awakened by Miss Garrett, when she studied there under Dr. Day; and one of them, Miss Harriet Cook, volunteered to assist Miss Davies in her secretarial work at 17, Great Cumberland Place. Miss Cook never saw the realisation of the plan in which she had taken such a lively interest. She died before her time, but her younger sister was one of the six first students of the college that was established at Hitchin, and took high classical honours from Girton in 1872. Members of the St. Andrews Association also had a leading part in the foundation of St. Leonard's School for girls in 1877.*

Miss Davies' aim from the first was to establish a claim to the University degrees; and with this view she insisted that every Girton student should pass the Little-Go and all other examinations in the manner and in the time prescribed for men. There were other friends of the movement, and amongst

* Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν μνήμη χεχαρισθῶ.—PLATO, *Phædrus*, 250 c.

them the late Henry Sidgwick, who took a less stringent and more adaptable view. The Higher Certificate examination of women above eighteen, in which Cambridge again took the lead, was instituted about this time; and a lecture system in connexion with this examination was organised in Cambridge itself. After a time it was thought desirable to start a hall of residence for women students attending the lectures and preparing for the examinations, and Miss Clough was induced to superintend it. This happened in 1871, and was the beginning of the institution now known as Newnham College.

Oxford during this period still lagged behind. The Oxford Local Examinations were opened to girls only in 1870; a scheme of lectures was set on foot in 1873. The Oxford Higher Certificate Examination was started in 1875. In 1878 an association for promoting the higher education was founded at Oxford, and in 1879 the Lady Margaret and Somerville Halls were opened for the reception of resident students.

The subsequent history of what may briefly be termed the women's movement at Oxford and Cambridge is well known. The coveted degrees are still denied, although they have been granted in all the other Universities of Great Britain.

The University of London was the first to admit women as candidates for degrees. A modified matriculation examination for women had been opened in 1869, and after long agitation, especially with reference to medicine, the Senate and Convocation in 1878 agreed to accept from the Crown a supple-

mental charter, making every degree, honour, and prize awarded by the University accessible to students of both sexes on perfectly equal terms.

The recently founded University colleges had admitted women students from the first, but it was only after considerable discussion that the Owens College came into line. The arrangement, however, was completed when the Victoria University was established in 1880.

All degrees in the Scottish Universities, except degrees in Divinity, have been open to women since 1892, and in Durham since 1895. The former fact must appear strangely significant to those who recall the gallant struggle maintained by Miss Jex Blake at Edinburgh in the early seventies. And according to the regulations contained in the Ordinance of the Scottish University Commissioners, it would appear that the University Courts, or any one of them, might admit women to graduation, if so minded, even in the Faculty of Theology.

Once more to resume the main subject of the Extension Movement. For several years the University colleges, and even the Owens College, Manchester, were contented to avail themselves of the graduation system of the University of London. The Newcastle College of Science, indeed (founded 1871), was early affiliated to its natural parent, the University of Durham, but it seemed improbable that any new charter for a provincial University could be obtained. The Owens College, as already mentioned, was the first to move in this direction; and the

foundation of the Victoria University, elaborately organised under the Vice-Chancellorship of Dr. A. W. Ward, the present Master of Peterhouse, formed an important epoch. The completion of the Welsh movement, by the foundation of Aberystwith College, and the creation of a University for Wales, followed at no long interval.

It may be permitted in one who is half a Welshman to add a few words here on behalf of "gallant little Wales." In no part of Great Britain were the possibilities of higher education more abundant than in the Principality. The people are responsive to culture of all kinds—religious, musical, and literary. But opportunities were lacking, and social conditions were unfavourable to steady progress. The landlords were indifferent, and those clergymen who had any tincture of learning were not in sympathy with the mass of the people. Things now are greatly altered. The removal of disabilities and the creation of educational facilities have inspired hope and generated self-respect. Welsh Nonconformist youths have gone to Oxford and returned with minds enlarged to teach in the University colleges, and have spread the blessing of education among their countrymen. Some who have had ample means of observation declare that the change for the better in the last thirty years has been extraordinary, and they are disposed to attribute this result to the exertions of those public men who, like the late Sir George Osborne Morgan, have applied themselves with persistent personal enthusiasm to the removal of envious barriers and the promotion of liberal reforms.

The recent establishment of the Birmingham University on the basis of Mason's College has probably set the coping-stone upon an edifice which will remain as a monument of the progress of higher education in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

The provincial Universities are the outcome of the Extension Movement, and have in part supplanted it, but by no means entirely. Indeed the Victoria University has become the centre of fresh efforts at extension which are amongst the many proofs of its strong vitality.

There is no room to speak of the great development of similar progress in America, Australia, and elsewhere, and I have not mentioned the University Extension Movement in Scotland, where, as Mr. M. E. Sadler has truly remarked, "the corresponding influences (so far as needed or operative) are coming through other channels."

The whole of the great educational development which it has been the business of this chapter to describe in outline, has been the direct outcome of University reform. The work of the Parliamentary Commissions of 1854 and 1856, by abolishing local restrictions upon college Fellowships and scholarships, and the subsequent abolition of the Tests, had the effect of manning Oxford and Cambridge with a class of men who were characterised not only by high intelligence, but by a public-spirited enthusiasm. As Mr. James Stuart has remarked—

“Activity in one direction is generally accompanied by activity in all directions, and the carrying of University culture to those who cannot come to the Universities is the embodiment in its most distinctive form of that new life which was shed so abundantly around all our undertakings at the time when University extension rose ; and it embodied apart from, and in addition to, our other undertakings that element of popular sympathy, that appreciation of the new order of things, that adaptation of the resources of the past to the exigencies of the present, which endears an ancient institution to the great masses of the people.”

The question has been raised, Will the newer growths ultimately supersede the old? Have the Universities created a Frankenstein that will threaten his makers? At present the University colleges, and, to a great extent, the Scotch Universities also, derive their teaching power from Oxford and Cambridge. This may not always be so. To what extent the old Universities will permanently retain their supremacy and imperial prestige, depends on conditions to which I hope to advert in a concluding chapter. Meanwhile it may be observed that although at first the various local colleges presented mostly the character of Science Schools or Polytechnic Institutes, now, being organised into Universities, they comprise a full complement of Academical Faculties, and, with the prospect of steadily increasing endowments, they have manifestly a great future before them. What further developments await the so-called Extension Colleges at Reading, Exeter, and Colchester, or the University Settlements which have followed in the wake of Toynbee Hall, it would be rash to predict.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER XI.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE.

I owe most of the information contained in the following note to the kindness of Mr. M. E. Sadler.

I.—UNIVERSITY EXTENSION.

- (1) *Suggestions on University Extension*, by the Rev. W. Sewell: 1850.
- (2) *Learning and Working*, by the Rev. F. D. Maurice: 1854.
- (3) *Suggestions for Supplying the Literary, Scientific, and Mechanics' Institutes of Great Britain and Ireland with Lectures from the Universities*, by Lord Arthur Hervey (afterwards Bishop of Bath and Wells): 1855.
- (4) *Some Account of the Origin and Objects of the New Oxford Examinations for the Title of Associate in Arts*, by T. D. Acland: 1858.
- (5) *The Connection of the Universities with the Great Towns*, by the Rev. J. Percival (now Lord Bishop of Hereford): 1872-3.
- (6) *Report to the Syndicate for Conducting Lectures in Populous Places*, by the Rev. W. Moore Ede: Cambridge, 1875.
- (7) *Report of Oxford University Commission of 1877*. Professor Jowett's evidence.
- (8) *The University Extension Movement*, by R. G. Moulton: Derby, 1885.
- (9) *Inaugural Address at Oxford Summer Meeting*, by Professor James Stuart: 1889.
- (10) *University Extension Past and Present*, by M. E. Sadler and H. J. Mackinder: 1891.
- (11) *Eighteen Years of University Extension*, by R. D. Roberts: (1891) 1894.

- (12) *Inaugural Address*, by Mr. James Stuart: Cambridge, 1892.
- (13) *Reading College*, by W. M. Childs, M.A.: 1896.
- (14) *University of Cambridge Local Lectures. Report of a Conference held in the Senate House, Cambridge, on July 6th and 7th, 1898, to Celebrate the Conclusion of Twenty-five Years' Work*: Cambridge, 1898.
- (15) The Victoria University Extension Committee's *Report on the Session 1898-9*.

II.—THE OWENS COLLEGE.

- (1) *History of the Owens College*, by Joseph Thompson: 1886.
- (2) *The Owens College*, by P. J. Hartog: 1900.

III.—BRISTOL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE.

- (1) *Life of Benjamin Jowett*, vol. ii. pp. 58-61, 296.

IV.—HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

- (1) *Women in the Universities of England and Scotland*, by Emily Davies: 1896.
- (2) *Memoir of Annie Jemima Clough*, by Blanche Athena Clough: 1897.

CHAPTER XII.

DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGES

ONE of the earliest schemes of University reformers was that of opening side by side with the colleges private halls or hostels, to be presided over by Masters of Arts with the sanction of the Vice-Chancellor. Another was the admission of non-collegiate students. Both proposals were carried into effect in the course of the legislation above described. But the grounds on which they were originally put forward have in the sequel lost something of their force. The reasons were twofold. It was thought that in such halls of residence the costliness hitherto attaching to life in college might be avoided, and that a student living alone in lodgings might still further reduce his expenditure. But in many colleges the scale of necessary expense has been considerably lowered, and the permission granted to students in special cases to lodge out while attending college lectures affords a combination of advantages. It has been found desirable to organise the unattached into a quasi-college; and still, when they have the chance, they are apt to seek admission within college walls. Thus the college system has on the whole prevailed.

Again, so long as it was feared that while the University would yield, the colleges would resist the admission of Dissenters to their endowments, the foundation of private halls was recommended as a compromise. Since the Act of 1871, and its corollary following on Mr. Roundell's resolution of 1881, that expedient is no longer equally necessary. Something of course for the time depends on the traditional feeling and previous connexion of particular colleges. Balliol has probably still a larger proportion of Nonconformist students than any other. But the experiment has now been sufficiently tried, and in several instances the Dissenting or Presbyterian student, after gaining the full advantage of University culture, has returned to work within his own original communion as a minister or teacher. A striking instance was that of the much-lamented Principal T. C. Edwards, of Bala Nonconformist College, to whom one of Jowett's most interesting letters was addressed.*

But while the Divinity degrees and theological Professorships remained confined to clergy of the Church of England, and after the remarkable vote of Convocation in 1883, by which the Fellow of a college who had distinguished himself as a Nonconformist theologian, was refused a place as an examiner in the rudiments of religion for the B.A., it was natural that Nonconformist bodies should take advantage of the new-found liberty, by placing their theological seminaries within the precincts of the old Universities. It was natural, and it was certainly wise; for the provincial colleges which had hitherto served this

* *Life*, vol. ii. p. 362.

purpose, were manifestly subject to some disadvantages, in being remote from the old centres of learning. That they perceived this, was greatly to the credit of those who first took such a bold and decisive step, and we need not wonder if in doing so they should not have had the unanimous approval of their confraternities. The successors of those who "cast out" Dr. Samuel Davidson might naturally shrink from the contagion of the new learning, and the stricter sort of Romanists were still dreaming of a Catholic University.

A parallel move, which, however, was rather an eddy in the forward current, was made by the Anglican party in the Church of England, when they founded Keble College at Oxford, and Selwyn at Cambridge (which under the Act of 1871 could only rank as a hostel), and by the Evangelical or Low Church party when they established Ridley Hall at Oxford.

The first evidence of a desire on the part of those without to press in at the "open door," had appeared from the side of Roman Catholicism. Shortly after the admission of Dissenters to matriculation, several Roman Catholic laymen of good position had sent their sons to Oxford, and two of these (*proh nefas!*) had been prepared for the University by Father Newman at the Birmingham Oratory. This led to serious apprehensions, heartburnings, and suspicions, which were only confirmed when Newman bought a piece of land at Oxford—five acres, in the neighbourhood of Worcester College, the site of the Old Poor's-house. This was in 1864, when Mr. Dodson's

Bill had passed the House of Commons, but had been rejected by the Lords. Newman's purpose was to found there an Oratory and Mission of St. Philip Neri (the patron of youth), and if possible a Roman Catholic hall.

The Ultramontane intrigue, by which this intention was frustrated, is fully and, I suppose, accurately set forth in Purcell's *Life of Cardinal Manning*, vol. ii. pp. 291 foll.

That the heart of Newman yearned towards Oxford, that he fervently desired to renew, as Catholic priest, the work amongst young men which had been so effectual thirty years before, may well be believed, though we may also believe that his second thoughts were what he wrote to Dr. Pusey two years later (1866): "Personally, it would be as painful a step as I could be called upon to make. Oxford can never be to me what it was. It and I are severed; it would be like the dead visiting the dead." But such were not the grounds on which he dwelt in recommending his design to his superiors. He urged that there was considerable danger to the souls of Catholic youth who went to the Protestant colleges in Oxford; but that there would be comparatively little danger in their going to a Catholic college there. If the latter course were open, the former might be prohibited, while to forbid both courses would be ineffectual, because of the strength of the existing tendency on the part of Catholic noblemen and other laymen to give their sons a University education.

The answer was a refusal to ratify "any scheme

that would imply ecclesiastical sanction of the education of Catholics in a Protestant University."

Newman then pled for the allowance of a mission (of which Bishop Ullathorne of Birmingham had already approved) with a view to the future foundation of an Oratory, for which the ground had been bought. He added submissively—

"We have no intention to co-operate with the University, or with the Colleges of Oxford, whether by taking lodgers, or private pupils, or in any other way. We propose to confine ourselves to the spiritual duties of the mission, taking the care of the present Catholics there, and doing our best to increase their numbers."

This last was an *argumentum ad clerum*, but it was of no avail. The matter was referred to the Propaganda, whose response was at first ambiguous, and a circular was issued, which brought in subscriptions to the amount of £5,000, whereupon "the whole undertaking was suddenly stopped by a letter from the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda. It declared that the presence of Father Newman in Oxford would serve as a pretext for sending Catholic youths to a Protestant University, and enjoined the Bishop to take heed lest Father Newman should do anything which might in any way favour the presence of Catholics at the University of Oxford."

The project was of course abandoned.

What Jowett suffered at the hands of Dr. Pusey was as nothing to what Newman must have endured from Manning and the Propaganda. The liberal air

of Oxford in the sixties was more wholesome than the atmosphere of Rome.

But time brought several changes. Leo XIII. succeeded Pio Nono, and Newman was made Cardinal. The University Tests Act of 1871 was passed, by which all the benefits of the University (save the Divinity degrees and Chairs) were thrown open to all the world. Cardinal Newman revisited Oxford in 1880, when he was received with honour by Trinity College, his first Oxford home, then under the liberal and enlightened headship of Dr. Percival, the present Bishop of Hereford. He called on Pusey, who received him coldly or with constraint; and on Pattison, who received him not at all.

Since then, though Newman did not live to see it, more prudent counsels have gradually prevailed. It was perceived, as I am given to understand, that "for educational purposes no confidence can be felt in a body that holds aloof from the rest of the world." And in 1895, upon a memorial unanimously signed by the Catholic laity, and accepted by the Bishops, "the Holy See withdrew its objections to Catholics at Oxford and Cambridge." The late Father Clarke, S.J., thereupon obtained leave from the Vice-Chancellor, and having gone into residence, opened his Hall with four University graduates in September, 1896. "Clarke's Hall," to give it the acknowledged title, is known to its inmates and their friends as "Campion's Hall," so named "in honour of the Blessed Martyr and former Fellow of St. John's, Edmund Campion, S.J." Father Clarke died in the course of 1900, and was succeeded in his office,

with the renewed permission of the Vice-Chancellor, by the Rev. John O'Fallon Pope, M.A., of Christ Church. The aim of the residents is to provide for the more capable of the teachers in Roman Catholic schools and seminaries "the best education to be got in England." They have now eleven undergraduates under their care, some of whom are permitted to attend lectures in *Philosophy* (see above, p. 165). Two of the hall took honours (first and second class) in the Final Schools of 1900, and are now teaching at Stonyhurst.

The reference to Newman has led me to mention this latest birth of the new movement somewhat out of the order of time. The earliest event of the kind was the foundation of Mansfield College. Soon after the change of 1871 it became a serious question with the English Protestant Nonconformists how best to take advantage of the newly granted opportunities. Like the Roman Catholics, they were anxious not to lose their hold upon the youth of their own Communion, and cases arose which gave grave cause for apprehension amongst those "who loved freedom much, but religion more." Professor T. H. Green, an unimpeachable witness, wrote a letter to Dr. Dale, "in which he stated that the opening of the National Universities to Nonconformists had, in his judgment, been an injury rather than a help to Nonconformity. He said that Nonconformists were sending up to Oxford year after year the sons of some of their best and wealthiest families, and that they were often altogether uninfluenced by the services of the Church

which they found there, and therefore that they not only drifted away from Nonconformity, but also from Christianity, and lost all faith. Nonconformists were bound, he said, now that they had secured the opening of the Universities for their sons, to follow them there in order to defend and maintain their religious life and faith."

The question was practically raised as early as 1876, when some half-measures were adopted, from a natural unwillingness to uproot institutions which had been established amongst congenial surroundings. It was only when more years had passed, and when Nonconformists who had gone to Oxford, and distinguished themselves there—while remaining loyal to the "rock whence they were hewn"—had obtained a rightful influence amongst the members of their own religious bodies, that the decisive step was taken. Dr. R. F. Horton had gained a Fellowship at New College, and had also proved himself an earnest theologian and a powerful preacher. In 1883 he was nominated by Professor Jowett, the Master of Balliol, who was then Vice-Chancellor, to be one of the examiners "in the rudiments of faith and religion." Congregation, consisting of the resident Masters of Arts, confirmed the nomination. But it was rejected on December 13th, 1883, by Convocation, which was still largely composed of clergymen of the Church of England. Shortly after this critical event, it was determined to transfer to Oxford the Spring Hill College, Birmingham, originally founded in 1838 according to the bequest of Mr. G. S. Mansfield, and associated with the memories of Drs. Pye Smith

and Angell James. Dr. Fairbairn, an Aberdonian graduate, then Principal of Airedale College, Bradford, already famous as a theological teacher and writer, was invited to be the first Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. He established himself with several students at Oxford in 1886, and the college was opened three years afterwards. No success could well be more complete. Dr. Fairbairn's learning and eloquence, his genuine liberality and wide culture, his candour and his unfailing tact, have not only raised Mansfield to a high place amongst academic institutions, but have made it a centre of religious influence in the University to an extent which few can have anticipated. While the endowments are confined, under the deed of foundation, to the body on whose behalf the college was set up, its doors are open to all Protestant Nonconformists, excepting (I suppose) the Unitarians, who have their own college hard by. Amongst the members (not scholars) have been not only Congregationalists, but also Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, and the list of lecturers and teachers (not on the foundation) has included Methodists, Presbyterians, Friends, and English Churchmen.

A striking testimony to the success of Mansfield is borne by a Wesleyan writer in the *London Quarterly Review* for October, 1899, who intimates not obscurely that the leaders of his own communion should go and do likewise, since "Oxford is the Mecca of Methodism." He speaks of the tribute, "as adequate as it is simple and direct," which Jowett, in the last year of his life, 1893, paid to

Dr. Fairbairn, who had already been for several years connected with Oxford :—

“I may say of Dr. Fairbairn that he is deeply respected for his learning and ability; that he knows how to win the hearts of youth, and to make himself acceptable to this place, and that he has great gifts of administration.”

Though the college was opened in 1889, the buildings were not then completed, and the formal inauguration only took place in 1892.

At the luncheon given on this occasion, Professor Jowett, now respected throughout Oxford as the Master of Balliol and late Vice-Chancellor, made a speech, from which I will quote at some length, as it clearly expresses the views at which one of the first of University reformers had arrived after some forty years' experience of University reform.

“There are some things,” he said, “in which this institution accords very much with my feelings, and I believe with yours. First of all, in that it does not attempt to rival other colleges in Oxford, that it allows its undergraduates to be scattered up and down the University. They were isolated, perhaps, before—too much isolated—but now they are to have their natural place in society and in the world. There is one other thing of which I may make the same remark. It seems an exceedingly wise provision that all students are required to go through the course of Arts before they pass on to Theology, or at least to study both contemporaneously. I do think this is a very wise provision. There is much more in it than appears at first sight. It asserts the principle that an ignorant man is not capable of teaching others,

and that Theology cannot be safely studied unless it forms a component part of the great whole of knowledge.

“This occasion, ladies and gentlemen, carries some of us back in our thoughts beyond the fortunes of Mansfield College. This is a great festival of union and reconciliation. I might go back into the past and speak of the time when, 230 years ago, a few words introduced into a formula divided the whole people of England against itself. Every sensible man knows that there were things done in the olden time that no good and wise man will now defend; and every sensible man knows, too, that it is better to forget them, and not to think too much of what happened to one's ancestors 230 years ago.

“Now let me draw your attention to points of agreement among us, not points of difference. I want to point out how important the points of agreement are, and how comparatively trifling are the points of difference. Do we not use the same version of the Scriptures? Are not many of the hymns in which we worship God of Nonconformist origin? Is there anyone who is not willing to join with others in any philanthropic work? However different may have been our education, are our ideas of truth and right and goodness materially different? Then there is another point of view in which I should like to put this agreement before you. The great names of English literature, at least a great part of them, although they may be strictly claimed by Nonconformists, do not really belong to any caste or party. The names of Milton, of Bunyan, of Baxter, of Watts, and Wesley, are the property of the whole English nation. This again is a tie between us. We may be divided into different sects—I would rather say different families—but it does not follow that there is anything wrong in the division, or that there should be

any feeling of enmity entertained by different bodies towards one another. These divisions arise from many causes—from the accidents of past history, from differences of individual character, from the circumstance that one body is more suited to deal with one class, and another with another. Nor do I think that much is to be hoped or desired from the attempt to fuse these different bodies into one. Persons have entertained schemes of comprehension that look well on paper, but they are perfectly impracticable, and they really mean very little. But what does mean a great deal is that there should be a common spirit among us, a spirit which recognises a great common principle of religious truth and morality. And as we begin to understand one another better, we also see the points of agreement among us grow larger and larger, and the points of disagreement grow less and less.

“I have trespassed upon your time long enough, and I will therefore end these reflections and bring you back to the purpose for which I originally rose, to express our best wishes for the success of Mansfield College. May it grow up into a great and noble institution! May it fulfil the design of training up Christian ministers! May the spirit of truth and wisdom animate its teachers! May the blessing of God rest upon it!”

Manchester New College had for many years been settled in London as a seminary for future ministers of the Unitarian sect, and had been associated with the honoured name of Dr. James Martineau, and of others only less eminent, amongst whom the venerable John James Taylor was perhaps the chief. It was only after much debate that the leaders consented to transfer the college to Oxford. Dr.

Martineau himself, who had retired from the Principalship, but, although past eighty, was in his prime of intellectual vigour, was disinclined to the transference, which was effected in 1889. But when the college was publicly inaugurated three years later, he came to give it his blessing, and made a speech which greatly impressed the Oxonians and others present. On this occasion, as when he was invested with the D.C.L., he was thoroughly well received. The days when the Oxford Convocation refused an honorary degree to Mr. Everett, the American Unitarian, had long gone by.* It is interesting to recall the fact that a separate college for Unitarians was part of Dr. Arnold's scheme in 1834 (above, p. 42).

The Unitarian College is situated in the same quarter with Mansfield, not far from Holywell Church. Under the learned guidance of Dr. Drummond and of Dr. Estlin Carpenter it is working quietly and well.

At Cambridge there is a handsome and costly building lately erected behind St. John's. This is Westminster College, which has been transferred from London to Cambridge at a great expense. It is, in fact, a theological seminary belonging to the English Presbyterian body, but it has no organic connexion with the University except in so far as most of its members, who are all graduates, have graduated there. The students, unlike those at Mansfield, reside within the college walls.

* The honorary degree of M.A. has since been conferred, with the graceful concurrence of the Theological Faculty, on Dr. Estlin Carpenter.

The Roman Catholics have also an establishment at Cambridge, not far from Westminster College. It has the status of a licensed lodging-house, and is presided over by an M.A. of the University. A proposal to convert it into a public hostel like Selwyn was rejected by the Senate two or three years ago, the younger M.A.'s especially being opposed to additional hostels with a special religious colouring ; but several of its members have become members of the University, either as non-collegiate students or as attached to other colleges.

CHAPTER XIII.

PROSPICE

AFTER all that has been so far effected, and the advance is very great indeed, there remain three subjects which deserve the consideration of those who desire that the old Universities, as national institutions, should adequately perform their function :—

1. The emancipation of the Theological Faculty.
2. The encouragement and guidance of post-graduate studies.
3. The maintenance at Oxford and Cambridge of the highest academical standards, in face of the rivalry of more recent foundations, metropolitan or provincial.

1. One who proposes the abolition of existing restrictions on the teaching of theology in the Universities may well seem at the present day to be crying in the wilderness. That religion should not be excluded from amongst the subjects of University instruction is readily admitted; but it is at once assumed that, if included, it must be denominational.

In English education generally Denominationalism is for the time a reigning idea. Bishop Phillpotts' argument in the debate of 1834, that "religion must be the foundation of sound education, and religion could not be taught except in some definite form," would meet with wide acceptance to-day. But ours is a Denominationalism with a difference, at once milder and more rigid than that of sixty years ago. Those who uphold it are willing to agree to differ, but are determined, if possible, to maintain their differences unabated. The Conservative statesman who chooses to risk his place and power in defending the Anglican Voluntary Schools, presides cheerfully at the prize-giving of a Wesleyan High School, and praises the Governors for adhering loyally to the traditions of their sect. One is reminded of the praise of Custom in Herodotus—one people burn their dead, another bury them, another kill and eat their grandfathers, and each regards the other's ways with horror. "Cambyses must therefore have been mad, to wound the Apis, and outrage that which all men everywhere hold sacred."

At Oxford there is now a Congregational College (to which men of several Nonconformist sects resort), a Unitarian College, a specially Anglican College,* an Evangelical Hall, and a Roman Catholic (Jesuit) Hall, while a Wesleyan Hall seems to be looming in the future. And yet Oxford is no longer, as ere-while, "a focus of theological controversy." The attempt to bring together men of opposite theological

* Viz. Keble. The Foundation of Hertford is also restricted to professing members of the Church of England.

opinions, has been compared to opening the windows in order to extinguish a fire. But in the Oxford of to-day the theologians of divers denominations congregated there might rather be compared to the creatures in a so-called "happy family," whose combative instincts are restrained by some occult and cryptic charm. Can this be the final stage of progress? How is it to be accounted for? What does it mean?

In some geological strata there are visible traces of former convulsions. The dividing lines are tolerably distinguishable, and by superficial rubbing and polishing the original colours may be artificially restored. But time and stress have welded them together. They no longer stand apart, but are included under one general formation. Yet if looked at comprehensively, they reveal new lines of cleavage, traversing the old, and cutting deeper than the streaks of separation that are visible upon the surface. Is not something of this kind happening to the present age?

Mankind are becoming gradually conscious that Christianity is one—like the mother of Prometheus, "One nature called by many names." "Are you a Christian or a Protestant?" is a question that may still be heard in some Roman Catholic countries; but at this the Protestant, whatever may be his communion, only smiles. The quarrels of Calvinist with Arminian, of Presbyterian with Independent, even of Puritan with Prelatist, have no longer the significance they once obtained. We may revive the colours artificially, but it cannot be for long; it is

a kind of temporary make-believe. Meanwhile, other differences, more real and vital, are becoming apparent in all religious bodies. The mystic and the rationalist, formalism and spirituality, symbols and ideas, social and individualistic tendencies—these and other like oppositions show themselves in numberless ways, not dividing sect from sect, but creating divergence within the bosom of each sect amongst the several members.

Some questions of Church government, indeed, remain to trouble us, and will do so while the spirit of sacerdotalism continues to endanger Christian liberty. Even the "Free Churches" are not wholly unaffected by it. But this cannot last. Obscurantism and reaction cannot always maintain their hold. And, after all, Church government is not theology.

Religious influences at Oxford and Cambridge have not been lessened by University reform. At Oxford—whether we look to Christ Church and Keble, where Anglicanism reigns; or to Balliol, where a spiritual philosophy is "tinged with emotion"; or to Mansfield, whence a learned and liberal theology radiates far and wide; or to Manchester New College, where the spirit of the revered James Martineau "is mighty yet"—we find no lack of religious teachers. The Theological Chairs are held by men who stand in the forefront of modern learning and opinion, and are producing effects both in and out of Oxford, for which Drs. Jacobson and Heurtley had no opportunity, if they had the power. At Cambridge the successors of Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort are keeping alive the

school to which the Church of England—and not the Church of England only, but theology in England generally—owes so much. Yet in this one point it is desirable that the nationalisation of the old Universities should be made complete—certainly not by secularising the higher education.

That theology should be included amongst the subjects of education in a national University was felt as strongly by Professor Jowett* as by Dr. Arnold or by Cardinal Newman. The words of Dr. Newman on this subject may find an echo in many thoughtful minds that would dissent *in toto* from the inference which he deduced from them. Speaking on the general subject of theology as a science, he said—

“ It teaches of a Being infinite, yet personal ; all-blessed, yet ever operative ; absolutely separate from the creature, yet in every part of the creation at every moment ; above all things, yet under everything. It teaches of a Being who, though the highest, yet in the work of creation, conversation, government, retribution, makes Himself, as it were, the minister and servant of all ; who, though inhabiting eternity, allows Himself to take an interest, and to have a sympathy, in the matters of space and time. His are all beings, visible and invisible, the noblest and the vilest of them. His are the substance, and the operation, and the results of that system of physical nature into which we are born. His, too, are the powers and achievements of the intellectual essences, on which He has bestowed an independent action and the gift of origination. The laws of the

* “ Human nature without religion is an imperfect, truncated sort of being.”

universe, the principles of truth, the relation of one thing to another, their qualities and virtues, the order and harmony of the whole, all that exists, is from Him ; and, if evil is not from Him, as assuredly it is not, this is because evil has no substance of its own, but is only the defect, excess, perversion, or corruption of that which has substance. All we see, hear, and touch, the remote sidereal firmament, as well as our own sea and land, and the elements which compose them, and the ordinances they obey, are His. The primary atoms of matter, their properties, their mutual action, their disposition and collocation, electricity, magnetism, gravitation, light, and whatever other subtle principles or operations the wit of man is detecting or shall detect, are the work of His hands. From Him has been every movement which has convulsed and re-fashioned the surface of the earth. The most insignificant or unsightly insect is from Him, and good in its kind ; the ever-teeming, inexhaustible swarms of animalculæ, the myriads of living motes invisible to the naked eye, the restless ever-spreading vegetation which creeps like a garment over the whole earth, the lofty cedar, the umbrageous banana,* are His. His are the tribes and families of birds and beasts, their graceful forms, their wild gestures, and their passionate cries.

“And so in the intellectual, moral, social, and political world. Man, with his motives and works, his languages, his propagation, his diffusion, is from Him. Agriculture, medicine, and the arts of life are His gifts. Society, laws, government, He is their sanction. The pageant of earthly royalty has the semblance and the benediction of the Eternal King. Peace and civilisation, commerce and adventure, wars when just, conquest when humane and necessary, have His co-operation and His blessing upon them.

* *Quere*, banyan tree ?

The course of events, the revolution of empires, the rise and fall of states, the periods and eras, the progresses and the retrogressions of the world's history, not indeed the incidental sin, over-abundant as it is, but the great outlines and the results of human affairs, are from His disposition. The elements and types and seminal principles and constructive powers of the moral world, in ruins though it be, are to be referred to Him. He 'enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world.' His are the dictates of the moral sense, and the retributive reproaches of conscience. To Him must be ascribed the rich endowments of the intellect, the irradiation of genius, the imagination of the poet, the sagacity of the politician, the wisdom (as Scripture calls it) which now rears and decorates the Temple, now manifests itself in proverb or in parable. The old saws of nations, the majestic precepts of philosophy, the luminous maxims of law, the oracles of individual wisdom, the traditional rules of truth, justice and religion, even though imbedded in the corruption, or alloyed with the pride, of the world, betoken His original agency, and His long-suffering presence. Even where there is habitual rebellion against Him, or profound far-spreading social depravity, still the undercurrent, or the heroic outburst, of natural virtue, as well as the yearnings of the heart after what it has not, and its presentiment of its true remedies, are to be ascribed to the Author of all good. Anticipations or reminiscences of His glory haunt the mind of the self-sufficient sage, and of the pagan devotee; His writing is upon the wall, whether of the Indian fane, or of the porticoes of Greece. He introduces Himself, He all but concurs, according to His good pleasure, and in His selected season, in the issues of unbelief, superstition, and false worship, and He changes the character of acts by His overruling operation. He condescends, though He gives no sanction, to the

altars and shrines of imposture, and He makes His own fiat the substitute for its sorceries. He speaks amid the incantations of Balaam, raises Samuel's spirit in the witch's cavern, prophesies of the Messiah by the tongue of the Sibyl, forces Python to recognise His ministers, and baptises by the hand of the misbeliever. He is with the heathen dramatist in his denunciations of injustice and tyranny, and his auguries of divine vengeance upon crime. Even on the unseemly legends of a popular mythology He casts His shadow, and is dimly discerned in the ode or the epic, as in troubled water or in fantastic dreams. All that is good, all that is true, all that is beautiful, all that is beneficent, be it great or small, be it perfect or fragmentary, natural as well as supernatural, moral as well as material, comes from Him."

We may concede to the author of this eloquent passage that a University is maimed and incomplete while it neglects theology. But to the implied inference, that the teachers of theology must be armed with authority to control the teaching of other sciences, and must be themselves controlled by the still higher authority of an infallible Church, to this we demur, not in the interest of Protestantism, but of academical freedom. It is an unanswerable argument against the proposal to grant a charter to a Roman Catholic University, that in conceding such a charter the State divests itself of the right and duty of protecting the University teachers in the exercise of their liberty.

Let us now listen to a living voice from a different quarter, yet one which pleads not less earnestly for the academical teaching of theology. In his In-

augural Lecture at Oxford, as Principal of Mansfield College, Dr. Fairbairn said—

“If the history of the Universities proves anything, it is this: that it is impossible to exclude from them religion and religious questions. The local or the peculiar may be shut out, but the universal, the all-pervading, cannot be expelled. Now, religion is, as it were, the one ubiquitous spirit in the realm of knowledge; pierce the realm at any part, and you are sure to touch religion. To educate by communicating knowledge is but to be forced to handle religious questions; to attempt to leave them alone were only to handle them the more roughly. It is impossible to teach philosophy and shut out all discussions as to the being, character, and cognisability of God, the freedom and immortality of man, the basis and standard of duty, the ideal of the perfect life for the individual and society. It is impossible to teach either ancient or modern history without raising questions as to the origin and nature of religion, its action on men and peoples, its functions in the evolution of society, and its place in the order of the world; and it is specially impossible to the serious student or teacher of history to ignore Christianity, or attempt to be blind to its being and significance; how and under what conditions it came to be, who founded it, how it has been realised, how it modified the society into which it was born, how affected the order it has evolved and under which we now live. It is impossible to study literature, and take no account of the Supreme Book of our race, with the immense literature it has created in every tongue used by civilised man. It is impossible to teach language, and repress all thought as to the reason that weaves it; to teach archæology, and refuse to face every question as to the whence and whither of man; to investigate the harmonies

of the universe and the infinite relations of all its parts and all its atoms, and raise no question as to either the intelligence that interprets, or the intelligible that is interpreted. The body of truth is one, as the spirit of religion is ubiquitous, and to dissect it into a multitude of isolated atoms, each limited to its own small point in space, without contact or connection with any other, would be to make a circle of the sciences and a University that embodies it alike impossible. But it is the ubiquitous spirit of religion that creates the unity of the body of truth; where the one is expressed, the other must be experienced. To exclude religion from the place which professes to explore the realm of knowledge and articulate the body of truth is therefore impossible; to accomplish it, it would be necessary to exclude every religious person. For what is the religious man but his religion incorporated? Men who believe dare not be silent about their beliefs. The enthusiasm of faith lives all the more intensely that its right to be is denied; and the very attempt to teach knowledge without religion would evoke the victorious and protesting resistance of men who believe that all knowledge is religious.

“But the history of the Universities proves another thing—that, while the exclusion of religion is impossible, there is nothing harder than to discover the forms and conditions under which it can live freely and justly within the academic body. In order to such a life there must be no violence done to the idea of the University as a society organised for the creation and communication of knowledge; and still less must violence be done to the idea of religion as truth freely believed and life freely realised. The act that does violence to either does violence to both; a fettered University cannot deal with religion as truth, a religion that has its place in a University regulated by civil enactment is changed from the

truth and inspiration of the Eternal into an institution of the State. If the freedom to teach and to learn be denied to the University, it becomes a mere instrument of statecraft ; if the doctrine and practice of religion within it be regulated by a law of uniformity, then it ceases to be a body of truth given by the eternal God, concerning which men are to investigate, to think, to utter, and to argue freely, and becomes a thing of convention and custom, part of the order instituted by man."

I shall be accused of eclecticism ; but it appears to me that the consent of such diverse authorities in one main opinion is a significant fact.

As for the freeing of the Theological Chairs, to a certain extent this has been already achieved at Cambridge, where the Regius Professorship of Hebrew, which, like that of Oxford, is one of the Chairs originally founded by Henry VIII., has now for some time been open to laymen, and the Chair of Church History, endowed by Emmanuel College, having come into existence under the New Statutes, is likewise open to laymen. Moreover, the Cambridge Theological Tripos is open to all the world. The accident, that at Oxford the corresponding Chairs are endowed by having Canonries attached to them, has probably prevented any similar legislation there. At this moment, as I said at first, it is vain to argue in favour of any further change. I will only give expression to my own conviction that if in the far future the remaining religious tests and clerical restrictions on the Theological Degrees and Professorships should be removed, the teaching of theology will not be hindered, but will grow and flourish all

the more. The substance of the instruction given will probably not be altered, but the instruction itself will be more alive, and will have far greater authority and effect.

Sir William Hamilton said in one of the *Discussions* from which I quoted above: "The greater number of those Germans known to us as illustrious Divines, and Professors of Divinity, are and have been simple laymen."

Mr. Goldwin Smith, in his pamphlet of 1864, *On the Admission of Dissenters to the Universities* (pp. 83-97), written at the time when Mr. Bouverie's and Mr. Dodson's Bills were under discussion, made some pertinent remarks on the same subject to which I must here content myself with merely referring. Mr. Stevenson's amendment to Sir J. Coleridge's Bill of 1870 went to the extent of freeing the Divinity Chairs, and though rejected by Mr. Gladstone's Liberal Government, was supported by a large minority in the House of Commons. In the same year Professor Jowett, in his evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords, spoke strongly in favour of removing all clerical restrictions from the Theological Chairs, although he admitted that, "in the present state of this country—I might say, of the Christian world—though I do not think it the very best thing, Divinity Professors should be appointed by the several bodies of Christians."*

* The case for the existing state of things was well put by the Rector of Exeter (Dr. W. Jackson) in 1899. After speaking of the beneficial operation of the University Tests Act on Religion at Oxford, he proceeded: "Everyone is born with a certain deposit committed to him. We must make the best of that deposit. *Spartam*

In 1877, before the Scottish Universities Commission, evidence was given by Professor Edward Caird (the present Master of Balliol) in favour of throwing open the Scotch Theological Chairs to members of all the Presbyterian Churches; and by Dr. Donaldson, now the Principal of St. Andrews, in favour of throwing them open altogether, making the Faculty subject only to the University Courts and exempt from any interference on the part of the Church; and Dr. John Muir, the Sanskrit scholar, who was one of the Commissioners, in a note appended to the Report, gave his emphatic approval to this policy as an ideal aim, adding these significant words:—

“Although the immediate, or even the speedy, realisation of the best ideals is not often to be expected, it is always expedient to place them on record, in the assurance that such publication must lead to their general appreciation, and in the end may bring about, in some form or other, the substantial accomplishment of the objects at which they aim.”

In 1880 Mr. Bryce proposed, as a rider to Mr. Roundell's resolution, that the Chairs of Hebrew and Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, as well as that of Hebrew at Cambridge, should be open to other than clergymen. Mr. Roundell accepted the rider, but the resolution was for the time withdrawn (see p. 212).

nactus es: hanc exorna. I would not for a moment speak slightly of schemes of outward union. I think they are beautiful dreams, and may be realities; but I thoroughly sympathise with the speakers who look beyond all this to that union which can only exist by means of the spread and diffusion of the Spirit of Christ.”

The Chair of Hebrew at Cambridge has since, as we have seen, been made tenable by a layman; but the movement in this direction has made no further progress.

Professor Jowett, in his evidence already quoted, and in his speech at Mansfield College, implied that schemes of Christian comprehension were impracticable, in the present state of the world. However softened and modified may be the lines of demarcation, that practical conclusion may still be true. Yet one is tempted to ask, Why is it that throughout Great Britain, so many sects, once hostile to each other, find it possible for many purposes to combine, while attempts at reconciliation between Nonconformists and the Church of England, or between the Church of Scotland and the "Church in Scotland," seem doomed to failure? Is it not because the principle of Episcopacy is held not merely as a point of high expediency or of venerable tradition, but as resting on "Divine right"? The superstitious figment, long since exploded in English politics, still holds its ground within the ecclesiastical sphere. I will not argue the matter further, but merely quote from a letter of Dr. Arnold to his former colleague, Dr. Hawkins, the Provost of Oriel, of date April 14th, 1834, in the earlier stage of the Tractarian controversy:—

"If you will refer me to any book which contains what you think the truth, put sensibly, on the subject of the Apostolical Succession, I shall really be greatly obliged to you to mention it. . . . I never accused Keble or Newman of saying, that to belong to a

true Church would save a bad man ; but of what is equally unchristian, that a good man was not safe unless he belonged to an Episcopal Church, which is exactly not allowing God's seal without it be countersigned by one of their own forging. . . . I think that their doctrine . . . is in itself schismatical, profane, and unchristian."

In observing the political state of other countries we feel it to be a great wrong that the sincere study of philosophy should be interfered with, as it sometimes has been, by an oppressive government. And can it be right that in the gravest subject of all, in which a calm untroubled judgment is most necessary, the mind either of teacher or student should be hampered by artificial restrictions? At this moment the teaching of theology at Oxford and Cambridge is remarkably free from bias, and the results are such as would astonish Dr. Pusey. But the powers of obscurantism and sacerdotalism are always ready to revive. And in the not impossible case, that the highest living authority in Hebrew, or Church History, or Biblical Criticism, or the History of Dogma should be found amongst laymen or in a Dissenting communion, will it not some day be thought a scandal not easily to be condoned that such a person should be ineligible for a Theological Chair? *

* I do not feel competent to speak on the subject of the Theological Colleges, which, since the foundation of Wells and Cuddesdon, St. Bees and St. Aidan's, have been established in different parts of England. They bear only a doubtful relation to the subject of my book. The late Lord Iddesleigh thought it an objection to the admission of Dissenters that such a measure would lead to the multiplication of these local seminaries. Perhaps he was right ; but no step of progress is without its drawbacks.

2. The mere existence of a theological school, especially when like the Theological Tripos at Cambridge it is open to all comers, already realises in one of the faculties the supply of an important need, viz. the continuation of University education beyond the limit of the B.A. degree. But in other departments it must be admitted that there is still much to be desired on this score. And yet without this the fulness of intellectual development which is the breath of life to a National University can never be attained. Mr. Mark Pattison, whose suggestions on academical organisation contained much that was premature if not impracticable, had much to say upon this subject that is still worthy of attention. Something has been done by means of travelling Fellowships, especially in Archæology. But Professors are too often reduced to the necessity of merely supplementing the work of the tutor or lecturer amongst the undergraduates. If they are unwilling to do so, or if their subjects happen to be unsuited to the "schools,"—though not themselves "chimærae," they are left "bombinantes in vacuo." The earliest reformers saw this defect and sought to remedy it; but the difficulty has been to create the demand. Some would account for this backwardness by the practical instincts of the English race, who grudge the time that would be thus withdrawn from the work of life. But the success of the Johns Hopkins University in America, whose funds are entirely devoted to post-graduate study, seems to militate against such an assumption, and to suggest that ways may yet be found by which our old

Universities may be exonerated from what has hitherto been a just occasion of reproach. There is some advantage certainly in sending our students to Germany or elsewhere for post-graduate study. An exchange of ideas is thus effected and our mental horizon is enlarged. But why do not more students from the Continent come over here?

3. On the two preceding questions, the nationalisation of theology and the development of post-graduate studies, depends the answer to a third question, one of considerable gravity: Will the old Universities retain their imperial pre-eminence and prestige, or will they gradually be supplanted by the younger institutions whose rise has been described in Chapter XI.? Will the daughters, now in the stage of adolescence, continue to revere the mothers, or ultimately reduce them to a sort of dowager dignity? Hitherto the University colleges have drawn their teachers, especially in Arts and Philosophy, from Oxford and Cambridge; but may not the time arrive when the Hall-mark of the Victoria University or of Birmingham may be as highly valued as a Cambridge Wranglership or an Oxford "First"?

Something may depend on the preservation and maintenance, under changed conditions, of the old endowments. A bitter cry has lately gone forth from Cambridge. But may it not be hoped that the response of her wealthier *alumni* will soon satisfy requirements that are only pecuniary?

Meanwhile it is argued, and with some truth, that the younger Universities, whose colleges are in great

centres of population, are accessible to many who cannot afford, even with the aid of endowments, to avail themselves of the culture afforded by Oxford and Cambridge. But as things now are, and still more as one hopes they will be, this argument has only a limited application.

The Bishop of Hereford, speaking at Aberystwith in October, 1900, said :—

“ Their great Universities, to which some of them owed more than they could ever hope to repay, could not claim to have been in any sense the Universities of the people. They had been, and to a large extent still were, the Universities of the upper, the privileged, and the professional classes. They were little known and hardly thought of in the homes of the multitude.”

That is a perfectly valid argument for University Extension, and for founding University colleges in as many centres as possible, but it does not dispose of the doubt which must arise in individual cases, whether it is wise for a youth, at the most critical period of his life, to withdraw his energies from some industrial, wage-earning occupation, and to devote them to the acquisition of learned culture or of abstract science. For without such withdrawal and devotion, except in the rarest instances, time and energy are largely spent in vain. Let personal expenses, whether at Oxford or Cambridge or elsewhere, be reduced to the lowest figure, and let endowments be made available as widely and as freely as they may, University education must still involve a heavy expense, in the renunciation of immediate profit. And where the promise of the future renders this

worth while, there are still manifest advantages in having recourse to the ancient seats.

More formidable is the vaticination of Lord Rosebery to the Glasgow students in the November of the same year :—

“For the practical purposes of the present day, a University which starts in the twentieth century has a great superiority over a University founded in the fifteenth, more especially when it is launched with keen intelligence of direction and ample funds, as is the new University of Birmingham.”

It must have required no little assurance (I speak as a “Don”), even in a Lord Rector, to declare this opinion amongst the pupils and the colleagues of Lord Kelvin; and it may be said of Birmingham, as Huxley said of his boy when a freshman at St. Andrews, “the young cockerel has begun to crow early.” But to the best of my belief, the ultimate issue must depend, as I have said, partly on the wise management and distribution of funds and endowments, and partly on the development of post-graduate studies in all departments, and amongst others in theology.

But there is some prospect of a rivalry more formidable than that of any provincial college. When the teaching University for London, which is now on the stocks, has at length been launched, and has got under way, it may carry heavier metal and do more telling work than the craft of earlier build are fitted for. In the department of History especially, although the school of which Professor Freeman,

Mr. J. R. Green, Bishops Stubbs and Creighton, and others have been the ornaments, has done famous work, this may possibly be outdone in the future by another school, now projected under the auspices of Dr. A. W. Ward, which will have immediate access to the Record Office, as well as to the British Museum. Such rivalry, however, is not to be deprecated. Emulation in well-doing is, as Hesiod called it, a beneficent strife,* and we may pray with the Sophoclean chorus—"Good speed to those who wrestle for our country's welfare." †

* Ἀγαθὴ δ' ἔρις ἤδε βροτοῖσιν.

† Ἦ καλῶς δ' ἔχον πόλει πάλαισμα μή ποτε λύσαι θεὸν αἰτοῦμαι.

APPENDIX A

(See p. 41)

EXTRACTS FROM SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON'S "DISCUSSIONS ON PHILOSOPHY"

(p. 417.) "A tutorial system in subordination to a professorial (which Oxford formerly enjoyed) we regard as affording *the condition of an absolutely perfect University*. But the tutorial system as now dominant in Oxford, is vicious (1) in its application, as usurping the place of the professorial, whose function, under any circumstances, it is inadequate to discharge; (2) in its constitution—the tutors as now fortuitously appointed, being, as a body, incompetent even to the duties of subsidiary instruction" (1831).

(p. 437.) "Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, even at matriculation, imposed by the Calvinist Leicester, was among the few statutes not subsequently violated by the Arminian Heads; the number of poor scholars formerly supported in all the colleges were gradually discarded; the expenses incident on a University education kept graduated to the convenient pitch; and residence, after the first degree, for this and other reasons, dispensed with" (1834).

(p. 448.) "All experience proves that Universities, like other corporations, can only be reformed from without. 'Voilà,' says Crevier, speaking of the last attempt at a reform of the University of Paris by itself—'*voilà à quoi aboutirent tant de projets, tant de délibérations: et cette nouvelle tentative, aussi infructueuse que les précédente, rend de plus en plus visible la maxime, claire en soi, que les compagnies ne se reforment point elles mêmes et qu'une entreprise de reforme où n'intervient point une autorité supérieure, est une entreprise manquée*'" (1834).

(p. 451.) "English bishops have been always anti-reformers; and in the present instance they may have closed their eyes on its perjury, by finding that the illegal system, in bestowing on the College Fellows the monopoly of education, bestowed it exclusively on the Church. Before this usurpation the clergy only had their share of the University" (1834).

(p. 462.) "The Professors, now also most exclusively members of the collegial interest, were allowed to convert their Chairs into sinecures; or to teach, if they ultroneously lectured, what, when, where, how, how long, to whom and under what conditions, they chose. The consummation devoutly wished was soon realised. The shreds of the professorial system are now little more than curious vestiges of antiquity; and the one essential means of education in the legal system of Oxford, as in the practice of all other Universities, is of no more necessity, in the actual system, than if it were not, and had never been" (1834).

(p. 469.) "Nay the oath for the observance of the *Statutes* is, by the academical legislation, held a matter of far more serious obligation than the subscription of the *39 articles*. For by Statute (t. ii. § 3) the intrant is not allowed to take the *oath*, until he reach the age of *sixteen*; whereas the *subscription* is lightly required even of boys matriculating at the tender age of *twelve*" (1834).

(p. 471.) "But it is not in the power of individuals to persuade a body of men in opposition to their interests: and even if the whole actual members of the Hebdomadal meeting were satisfied of the dishonest character of the policy hitherto pursued, and personally anxious to reverse it; we can easily conceive that they might find it invidious to take upon themselves to condemn so deeply so many generations of their predecessors, and a matter of delicacy to surrender, on behalf of the collegial interest, but in opposition to its wishes, the valuable monopoly it has so long been permitted without molestation to enjoy. In this conflict of delicacy, interest, and duty, the Heads themselves ought to desire,—ought to invoke, the interposition of a higher authority. A Royal or Parliamentary Visitation is the easy and appropriate mode of solving the difficulty;—a difficulty which, in fact, only arose from the intermis-

sion, for above the last century and a half, of that corrective, which since the subjection of the University to the Colleges, remained the only remedy for abuses, and abuses determined by that subjection itself."

(p. 472.) "To expect, in opposition to all principle and all experience, that a body, like the Heads,—that a body even like the present House of Convocation,—either could conceive the plan of an adequate improvement, or would will its execution, is the very climax of folly. It is from the State only, and the Crown in particular, that we can reasonably hope for an academical reformation worthy of the name" (1834).

"And on this great subject, could we presume personally to address His Majesty, as supreme Visitor of the Universities, we should humbly repeat to William the Fourth, in the present, counsel which Locke, in the last great crisis of the constitution, solemnly tendered to William the Third:—*'Sire, you have made a most glorious and happy Revolution; but the good effects of it will soon be lost, if no care is taken to regulate the Universities'*" (1834).

(p. 488.) "The only plan that has been proposed to obviate the difficulties which the actual, though illegal, merging of the public University in the private colleges presents to the admission of Dissenters, is to allow them to found a *college or colleges* for themselves. We strongly deprecate this plan. We do not, of course, question the *right* of the Dissenters, if admitted to the University, of founding and endowing colleges, nay, of imposing what religious conditions they may choose, either on a participation in the endowments or on admission within the walls. But we regard the exercise of this right as inexpedient,—even as detrimental, in the highest degree. To say nothing of its expense, and supposing always that such a measure might be carried into effect with far better means of furthering the ends of education than the old foundations, through their Fellows, generally supply; still it would accomplish nothing which may not be effected by much easier methods; whilst it would contribute to entail a continuance of that sectarian bigotry and intolerance which, in this country, at present, equally disgraces the established and dissenting divisions of our common faith. By this proceeding, the

exclusive spirit of the present colleges would be imitated, justified, exacerbated, and perpetuated; and in the old colleges and the new together, the Universities would become the nurseries of camps and battlefields of a ferocious and contemptible polemic; whereas, left to themselves, and to the influence of a more enlightened spirit, there is no doubt but the ancient foundations will be gradually won over by the liberality of the age, and the charities of a common Christianity.

“Without, therefore, proposing to dispense with domestic superintendence altogether, as was originally the case in Oxford and Cambridge, and as has been always generally practised in other Universities, and without supposing the necessity of any expensive foundations, or even of establishments that will not easily support themselves, we think the difficulty may be overcome by simply returning to the ancient practice of the English Universities, in regard to the easy establishment of halls or hostels, under any new restrictions, however, that may be found proper to enhance their character and utility. These halls may be established under a double form. Either the hall shall consist only of a single house, in which its Head or Principal (necessarily a graduate) resides; or of a number of separate houses, each under the care of an inferior officer, bound to report to the Principal all violations of rule. The advantage of the latter form would be its more moderate expense” (1834).

(p. 491.) “The English clergyman is perhaps destitute of academical education altogether; but if he enjoys this advantage, ‘one fortnight’ (to use the words of Professor Pusey) ‘comprises the beginning and end of all the public instruction which any candidate for Holy Orders is required to attend, previously to entering upon his profession’” (1834).

(p. 500.) “And as the sphere of examination for its degrees is necessarily correlative to the sphere of instruction by a faculty; so, in no European faculty of Arts was Theology a subject on which its examiners had a right to question the candidate. The only apparent exception is afforded by the English Universities. And what is that? It is an exception but of yesterday, after the constitution of the University proper had been subverted, its public instruction quashed, and the one private tutor left to supply the place

of the professorial body. In consequence of this revolution, some thirty years ago, candidates for the first degree were, in Oxford, subjected to an examination in the rudiments of religion and the contents of the Thirty-nine Articles; and we believe that in Cambridge a certain acquaintance is required with Paley's *Evidences* and Butler's *Analogy*. Though contrary to all academical precedent, we have certainly no objection to the innovation. And when Dissenters are admitted, the only change required will be, not to make the Thirty-nine Articles a necessary subject of examination in Oxford" (1834).

"Estimated, indeed, by any but the lowest standard, the religious discipline afforded in the colleges of either University is scanty and superficial in the extreme; and the men who, from their acquaintance with the theology of foreign Universities, are the best qualified to estimate at its proper value what is accomplished in their own, are precisely those (we refer to Mr. Thirlwall and Mr. Pusey) who speak of it with the most contempt. But insignificant as it now is, we are confident that a forcible introduction of the Dissenters would not only prevent its improvement, but tend to annihilate it altogether" (1834).

(p. 502.) "'As our Liturgy and Articles are avowedly founded on the Bible, it is the special duty of those, who are set apart for the ministry, to *compare* them with the Bible, and see that their pretensions are *well* founded. But then our *interpretation* of the Bible must be conducted *independently* of that, of which the truth is to be *ascertained* by it. Our interpretation of the Bible, therefore, must not be determined by *religious system*; and we must follow the example of our reformers, who supplied the place of Tradition by *Reason* and *Learning*' (Bishop Marsh, Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge)" (1834).

(p. 504.) ". . . It is sufficient to say, that no Universities, except the English, have ever denied their education and degrees to the members of every sect; and that in many, even of *Catholic* and Italian Universities, Professorships in all the faculties, except the theological, were open to the partisans of different faiths; and this too for centuries before such liberality was even dreamt of in the ultramontane and German universities. But did the alleged

consequence ensue? That no one can maintain. Indeed, the exclusive reference to the German universities is of itself an implicit admission that the experience of the *other* European universities, equally emancipated from religious restrictions, is in contradiction to the line of argument attempted. We may mention, that so little has Holland, a country at once intelligent and orthodox, been convinced of the evil consequences of academic freedom, that it has recently dispensed with the signature of the Confession of Dordrecht, to which all public teachers were hitherto obliged; and Leyden now actually boasts of Catholic Professors as ornaments of her Calvinistic School" (1834).

(p. 533.) "Now, Lloyd, late Professor of Hebrew in Cambridge, circulated proposals for translating the boldest of Eichhorn's *Introductions*,—that to the Old Testament; and Bishop Marsh, in his *Lectures on Divinity*, addressed to the rising clergy of the University, once and again recommends, in the strongest terms, the same work to their study; neither, throughout his whole course, does he think it necessary to utter a single word of warning against the irreligious tendency of this, nor, in so far as we remember, of any other production of the German divines.

"Indeed, with the exception of Mr. Thirlwall's excellent Introduction to his translation of *Schleiermacher on St. Luke* (he might have chosen, we think, a fitter work), and some parts of Mr. Pusey's book, the public had, in every point of view, far better be without all that has recently appeared in this country, in regard to the result of Protestantism in Germany" (1834).

(p. 538.) "A University is a trust confided by the State to certain hands for the common interest of the nation; nor has it ever heretofore been denied that a University may, and ought, by the State to be from time to time corrected, reformed, or recast, in conformity to accidental changes of relation, and looking towards an improved accomplishment of its essential ends. Under this extension the Dissenters would be safe" (1834).

(p. 544.) "But the University has a right to say: The houses which we privilege to receive students, these we authorise every student to enter; the colleges must therefore admit all willing to conform to their economy, or none.

And considering them as incorporations, if their Fellowships were thrown open as prizes of literary merit, they would of course contribute powerfully to the prosperity of the University; but if, as at present, they continued only to crowd the hive with drones, it would still be the fault of the University were they suffered any longer to operate as a direct impediment to its utility, by usurping, for their Fellows, functions which they are rarely competent to perform" (1834).

(p. 544.) "The great measure of a restoration of the *University*, in Oxford and Cambridge, to legal existence and unexclusive nationality could not be resisted; while the comparatively petty measure of opening, *brevi manu*, the English *Colleges* to the Dissenters was successfully opposed. A restoration of the University is, in fact, the only mode through which the Dissenters ought to condescend to accept admission—into Oxford at least. They were plainly told by a member of that University, an active supporter of their rights in Parliament (Mr. Vernon Smith), that a hunted cur, with a kettle at its tail, was but a type of the manner in which a Dissenter would be baited in an Oxford College, under the spirit of the present system. Let that system be changed. Let the Tutorial instruction be elevated, the Professorial re-established and improved. Let the youth of the University no longer imbibe only the small prejudices of small men. Let them be again presented with a high standard of erudition and ability. Let the public schools once more daily collect them in numerous classes to hear the words of wisdom and liberality, and to merge in a generous, sustained, and universal emulation, the paltry passions and contemptible distinctions which the isolation of the college coteries now breeds and fosters. Then will a Dissenter be as sure of civility and respect in Oxford, as in Leyden, Gottingen, Edinburgh, or even Cambridge" (1834).

(p. 550.) "But, speaking of Cambridge, as existing not in *reality* but in *law*: in that seminary the Crown has only to remove the impediment which it originally placed to the admission of Dissenters, and the University will be at once restored to its natural state, of a national, of a European school" (1834).

(p. 758.) "In fact, as already indicated, I look not alone nor principally to what is theoretically the best, but to what is practically the most feasible. I limit myself, likewise, to the fundamental faculty, that of arts or liberal instruction, and to the lower department of that faculty—to that in which alone the University now pretends to educate. From all higher and more ambitious proposals I refrain; refrain from all schemes of reform, which may lightly be desired, but may not lightly be accomplished. I would suggest obvious remedies for obvious vices, and should prefer making use of the means already in appliance to seeking after others which may speculatively be superior. Accordingly, were the institutions of domestic superintendence and tutorial instruction even in themselves defective, I should be unwilling to supersede them, for the simple reason that they are already established and consuetudinary. It is easy also to wish that Headships and Fellowships were, as they ought to be, made the reward of literary eminence; but such a wish it would be difficult, if not impossible, to realise. To found, therefore, a scheme of academical reform on this or any similar ideal would be to frustrate it by anticipation. Any measure of practical reform ought therefore, in my opinion, to attempt only to remove intolerable abuses, and to cure them only by the least violent substitutions. This, at least, in the first instance, for reformation should be gradual. The great end towards perfection is, indeed, to imitate improvement. Every step forward necessitates an ulterior advance, so true is the adage which old Hesiod has sung—'Ἄρχὴ ἡμῖν παντός.' Thus the Oxford Examination Statutes were the first efforts of the University to rise out of the slough of abasement into which it had long subsided; and the examination, now affording an undeniable rule by which to evince that the Oxford houses do not, in general, perform their arrogated office of instruction in any satisfactory degree, at once annihilates by stultifying all resistance on their part, whilst it cannot fail of determining, in public opinion, the necessity of an academical reform. But, in truth, the most zealous champions in the cause may be looked for in those intelligent individuals, whom accident has connected with the collegial interest, and in

the less efficient houses, for it is they who will naturally be most impressed with the academical inadequacy of their colleagues—most ashamed of the inferior level of their colleges, and most active in originating and carrying out any feasible measure of improvement. But the examination not only manifests the urgency, it likewise affords the possibility, of reform. Through the influence of the examination the standard of literary qualification has in Oxford been gradually rising, and accordingly the melioration would now be easy, which formerly could have only resulted in failure" (1851).

(p. 792.) "The Rev. Mr. Sewell, Tutor of New College, and otherwise an able man, has of late gravely proposed to send out to the great towns of England tutorial missions, from the bodies thus so brightly illuminating Oxford; professedly in order that any change may be averted from the system of education which has wrought so admirably in that University, and, at the same time, to communicate the benefit of such system to the lieges at large!" (1851).

APPENDIX B

(See p. 51)

Professor James Mackintosh, of the University of Edinburgh, kindly gives me the following information:—

Religious Tests were imposed by the Scotch Legislature in certain cases soon after the Reformation. Thus by 1567 (c. ix. James VI.) "No person may be Judge, Procurator, Notar, nor member of Court, quha professes not the re-Religion." By 1700 c. iii. a renunciation of Popery is to be made by persons engaged in education; and by 1681 (c. vi. Charles II.), "Act anent Religion and the Test," an oath (owning the Protestant religion contained in the Confession of Faith, declaring allegiance to Charles, and affirming the unlawfulness for subjects "upon pretence of Reformation, to enter into Covenants or Leagues") was required of all persons in offices and places of public trust—[then follows an enumeration . . . "by all Masters and Doctors in Universities, Colleges, or Schools, all Chaplains in families, Pedagogues to children"]—under pain of deprivation and fine; but all Acts "anent the Test" were rescinded by 1690 c. vii.

More definitely aimed at the Universities was an "Act cerning Masters of Universities, Ministers, etc." (Charles II.) 1662, c. iv. Its substance is "that no Masters, Principals, Regents, or Professors be admitted, or continued, in any University or Colledge, unless they be pious, loyal, and peaceable, submitting to and owning the government of the Church by Archbishops and Bishops now settled by law." They are to swear the Oath of Allegiance, and be certified as persons who own the Church government.

The foregoing, together with the Act of 1707 c. vi.,

mentioned above (p. 49), exhaust the legislation on Tests both general and special to the Universities.

There seems to be no trace of a Test imposed upon students; as to graduation, there was not nearly so much of it in old days. It is nowhere said that no one can graduate without taking the Test; but a graduate could not hold office in University, college, or school without submitting to it, so that in practice it must have been a stumbling-block to many.

APPENDIX C

(See p. 138)

LIST OF PERSONS WHOSE NAMES ARE RECORDED THE FREEMASONS' TAVERN,

NAMES AS WRITTEN DOWN.	NAMES IN FULL.
1. <i>Mr. Humphreys</i> . . .	Arthur Charles Humphreys-Owen . . .
2. <i>Mr. Jebb</i> . . .	Richard Claverhouse Jebb . . .
3. <i>George Rolleston</i> . . .	George Rolleston . . .
4. <i>Philip Lutley Sclater</i> . . .	Philip Lutley Sclater . . .
5. <i>Arthur Milman</i> . . .	Arthur Milman . . .
6. <i>Francis Otter</i> . . .	Francis Otter . . .
7. <i>W. H. Flower</i> . . .	William Henry Flower . . .
8. <i>John Westlake</i> . . .	John Westlake . . .
9. <i>James Martineau</i> . . .	James Martineau . . .
10. * <i>B. C. Brodie</i> . . .	Benjamin Collins Brodie . . .
11. <i>Albert Rutson</i> . . .	Albert Osliff Rutson . . .
12. <i>Vincent Scully</i> . . .	Vincent Scully . . .
13. <i>Edward Poste</i> . . .	Edward Poste . . .
14. <i>A. P. Whateley</i> . . .	Arthur Pepys Whateley . . .
15. <i>George Young</i> . . .	Sir George Young, Bart. . .
16. <i>W. Morrison, M.P.</i> . . .	Walter Morrison . . .
17. * <i>Charles Bowen</i> . . .	Charles Synge Bowen . . .
18. <i>H. S. Cunningham</i> . . .	Henry Stewart Cunningham . . .
19. * <i>L. Tollemache</i> . . .	The Hon. Lionel Tollemache . . .

APPENDIX C

(See p. 138)

AS HAVING BEEN PRESENT AT THE MEETING IN
LONDON, ON JUNE 10, 1864.

IN 1864.

SUBSEQUENTLY.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. B.A. of Trinity Coll., Cambridge . | Barrister ; M.P. for Montgomeryshire. |
| 2. Fellow and Lecturer Trinity Coll.,
Cambridge | Knight ; Litt.D. ; Regius Professor of
Greek, Cambridge ; M.P. for Cam-
bridge University. |
| 3. Professor of Physiology, Oxford . | Died 1881. |
| 4. Fell. of Corpus Christi Coll., Oxford | Secretary of Zoological Society, London. |
| 5. M.A. of Christ Church, Oxford . | Registrar of the University of London ;
Biographer of Dean Milman. |
| 6. Fellow of C.C.C., Oxford . . . | M.P. for South division of Lincolnshire.
Died 1895. |
| 7. Conservator of Museum of Royal
College of Surgeons | K.C.B. ; F.R.S. ; Director of Natural
History Museum, South Kensington.
Died 1899. |
| 8. Late Fellow of Trinity Coll., Cam-
bridge | Q.C. ; Professor of International Law,
Cambridge ; M.P. for Romford. |
| 9. Prof. of Philosophy, Manchester
New College | Principal of Manchester New College.
Died 1900. |
| 10. Baronet ; B.A. of Balliol College,
Oxford | Waynflete Professor of Chemistry, Ox-
ford. Died 1880. |
| 11. Fellow of Magdalen Coll., Oxford ;
Barrister | Died 1890. |
| 12. Ch. Ch., Oxford | |
| 13. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford ;
Barrister | Director of Civil Service Examinations. |
| 14. M.A. of Ch. Ch., Oxford | Barrister and Journalist. |
| 15. Fellow of Trinity Coll., Cambridge | Charity Commissioner. |
| 16. M.A. of Balliol College, Oxford ;
M.P. for Plymouth | M.P. for Skipton, Yorks. |
| 17. Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford . | Lord Justice of Appeal. Died 1894. |
| 18. M.A. of Trinity College, Oxford ;
and Barrister | K.C.I.E. ; Judge of the High Court of
Bengal ; Author. |
| 19. M.A. of Balliol College, Oxford . | Author. |

LIST OF

NAMES AS WRITTEN DOWN.	NAMES IN FULL.
20. <i>E. Chandos Leigh</i> . . .	Hon. Edward Chandos Leigh . . .
21. <i>Horace Davey</i> . . .	Horace Davey . . .
22. <i>G. E. Thorley</i> . . .	George Earlam Thorley . . .
23. <i>T. G. Vyvyan</i> . . .	Thomas Grenfell Vyvyan . . .
24. <i>Dr. William Ogle</i> . . .	William Ogle . . .
25. <i>Sir James Kay Shuttleworth</i> . . .	James Kay Shuttleworth . . .
26. <i>Mr. Leatham, M.P.</i> . . .	William Henry Leatham . . .
27. * <i>E. Caird</i> . . .	Edward Caird . . .
28. <i>W. Berkley</i> . . .	William Berkley . . .
29. * <i>T. H. Green</i> . . .	Thomas Hill Green . . .
30. <i>J. Bryce</i> . . .	James Bryce . . .
31. <i>Edward A. Freeman</i> . . .	Edward Augustus Freeman . . .
32. <i>William Stebbing</i> . . .	William Stebbing . . .
33. * <i>Godfrey Lushington</i> . . .	Godfrey Lushington . . .
34. * <i>P. Cumin</i> . . .	Patrick Cumin . . .
35. * <i>A. V. Dicey</i> . . .	Albert Venn Dicey . . .
36. <i>T. E. Holland</i> . . .	Thomas Erskine Holland . . .
37. * <i>R. Ellis</i> . . .	Robinson Ellis . . .
38. * <i>C. Cholmeley Puller</i> . . .	C. Cholmeley Puller . . .
39. <i>Leslie Stephen</i> . . .	Leslie Stephen . . .
40. * <i>J. L. Strachan Davidson</i> . . .	J. L. Strachan Davidson . . .
41. <i>Chas. W. Goodwin</i> . . .	Charles Wycliffe Goodwin . . .
42. <i>Charles H. Robarts</i> . . .	Charles H. Robarts . . .
43. <i>Kenelm E. Digby</i> . . .	Kenelm Edward Digby . . .
44. <i>J. L. Warren</i> . . .	J. Locksdale Warren . . .
45. <i>Strangford</i> . . .	Percy William Frederick Smythe, 8th Viscount Strangford
46. <i>H. Latham</i> . . .	Rev. Henry Latham . . .
47. <i>C. H. Daniell</i> . . .	Charles Henry Olive Daniell . . .

NAMES—*continued.*

IN 1864.

20. Fellow of Magdalen Coll., Oxford
 21. Fellow of University Coll., Oxford ;
 Barrister
 22. Fellow of Wadham Coll., Oxford .
 23. Fellow and Dean, Caius College,
 Cambridge
 24. Fellow of C.C.C., Oxford ; M.D. .
 25. Bart. ; High Sheriff of Lancashire .
 26. M.P. for Wakefield
 27. Fellow and Tutor, Merton Coll.,
 Oxford
 28. Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford .
 29. Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford .
 30. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford .
 31. Late Fellow of Trinity College,
 Oxford
 32. Fellow of Worcester Coll., Oxford
 33. Late Fellow of All Souls Coll.,
 Oxford
 34. M.A. of Balliol College, Oxford .
 35. Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford .
 36. Fellow of Exeter Coll., Oxford ;
 Chichele Prof. of International Law
 37. Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford
 38. M.A. of Balliol College, Oxford .
 39. Fellow of Trinity Hall, Camb. .
 40. M.A. of Balliol College, Oxford .
 41. Fellow of St. Catherine's Coll.,
 Cambridge
 42. Fellow of All Souls Coll., Oxford
 43. Fellow of C.C.C., Oxford
 44. B.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge
 45. M.A. of Merton College, Oxford .
 46. Fellow and Tutor, Trin. Hall, Camb.
 47. Fellow of Worcester Coll., Oxford

SUBSEQUENTLY.

- Recorder of Nottingham.
 Lord of Appeal ; M.P. for Stockton.
 Warden of Wadham.
 Mathematical Master at Charterhouse ;
 Author.
 Superintendent of Statistics, Somerset
 House.
 Hon. D.C.L. Oxford. Died 1897.
 M.P. for South West Riding, York-
 shire. Died 1889.
 Professor of Moral Philosophy, Glasgow ;
 Master of Balliol since 1893.
 Vicar of Navestock, Essex. Died 1896.
 Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy,
 Oxford. Died 1882.
 Right Hon. ; M.P. for Aberdeen ; His-
 torian.
 Regius Professor of Modern History,
 Oxford. Died 1892.
 Assistant Editor of the *Times* ; Author.
 K.C.B. ; G.C.M.G. ; Permanent Under
 Secretary, Home Office.
 Secretary of the Educational Depart-
 ment of the Privy Council. Died 1890.
 Vinerian Professor of Law, Oxford.
 Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.
 Corpus Professor of Latin, Oxford.
 Student of Lincoln's Inn.
 Editor of *Dictionary of National Bio-
 graphy* ; and Author of various works.
 Fellow, Classical Tutor, and Vice-
 Master, Balliol College.
 Egyptologist ; writer in *Essays and
 Reviews* ; Judge in Shanghai and
 Yokohama. Died 1878.
 Barrister ; Remembrancer of the City
 of London.
 K.C.B. ; Bencher of Lincoln's Inn ;
 Permanent Under Sec., Home Office.
 Barrister.
 Died 1869.
 Master of Trinity Hall.
 Tutor and Vice-Provost of Worcester.

LIST OF

NAMES AS WRITTEN DOWN.	NAMES IN FULL.
48. <i>Chas. S. Miall</i> . . .	Charles S. Miall . . .
49. <i>Mr. Vansittart Neale</i> . . .	Edward Vansittart Neale . . .
50. <i>Bishop of Natal</i> . . .	John William Colenso . . .
51. <i>Professor Huxley</i> . . .	Thomas Henry Huxley . . .
52. <i>William Ewart, M.P.</i> . . .	William Ewart . . .
53. <i>B. Gray, Trin. Coll., Camb.</i> . . .	Benjamin Gray . . .
54. <i>Ch. Neate, M.P.</i> . . .	Charles Neate . . .
55. <i>E. P. Bouverie, M.P.</i> . . .	Hon. Edward Pleydell Bouverie . . .
56. <i>Mr. Cartwright</i>
57. <i>H. Mansfield</i> . . .	Horatio Mansfield . . .
58. <i>Will. Geo. Clark</i> . . .	William George Clark . . .
59. <i>Arthur G. Watson</i> . . .	Arthur George Watson . . .
60. <i>E. C. Wickham</i> . . .	Edward Charles Wickham . . .
61. <i>Wm. A. Fearon</i> . . .	William Andrew Fearon . . .
62. * <i>W. H. Fremantle</i> . . .	Hon. William Henry Fremantle . . .
63. <i>G. W. Hastings</i> . . .	Graham W. Hastings . . .
64. <i>John James Taylor</i> . . .	John James Taylor . . .
65. <i>John Grey</i> . . .	John Grey . . .
66. <i>Charles E. C. B. Appleton</i> . . .	Charles E. C. B. Appleton . . .
67. <i>Thomas Fowler</i> . . .	Thomas Fowler . . .
68. <i>C. Fortescue, M.P.</i> . . .	Chichester Samuel Fortescue . . .
69. * <i>R. S. Wright</i> . . .	Robert Samuel Wright . . .
70. <i>J. J. Sylvester</i> . . .	James Joseph Sylvester . . .
71. <i>John Bright, M.P.</i> . . .	John Bright . . .

NAMES—*continued.*

IN 1864.

SUBSEQUENTLY.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 48. Nonconformist | |
| 49. M.A. of Oriel College, Oxford ;
Barrister | Founder of Co-operative Societies.
Died 1892. |
| 50. Bishop of Natal ; Author of book
on <i>The Pentateuch</i> | Died 1883. |
| 51. F.R.S. ; Prof. of Natural History,
Royal School of Mines | P.R.S. ; Privy Councillor ; Author.
Died 1895. |
| 52. M.P. for Dumfries Boroughs | Died 1869. |
| 53. Late Fellow of Trinity Coll., Cam-
bridge ; Barrister | |
| 54. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford ;
M.P. for Oxford | Died 1879. |
| 55. M.A. of Trinity Coll., Cambridge ;
M.P. for Kilmarnock | Member of the Ecclesiastical Com-
mission. Died 1889. |
| 56.† | |
| 57. Late Fellow of Trinity College,
Cambridge ; Barrister | Stipendiary Magistrate for Liverpool.
Died 1887. |
| 58. Fellow of Trinity Coll., Cambridge,
and Public Orator | Part Editor of <i>Cambridge Shakespeare</i> .
Died 1878. |
| 59. Fellow of All Souls Coll., Oxford ;
Assistant Master at Harrow | Retired. |
| 60. Fellow of New College, Oxford | Head Master Wellington College, 1873-
93 ; Dean of Lincoln. |
| 61. Fellow and Tutor of New Coll.,
Oxford | Head Master of Winchester College. |
| 62. Fellow of All Souls Coll., Oxford ;
Chaplain to the Bishop of London | Dean of Ripon. |
| 63. M.A. of Worcester Coll., Oxford ;
Barrister | Q.C. ; Bencher of Lincoln's Inn. |
| 64. Professor of Ecclesiastical History
in Manchester New College | Died 1869. |
| 65.† | |
| 66. Fellow of St. John's Coll., Oxford | First Editor of the <i>Academy</i> Newspaper ;
D.C.L. Oxford. Died 1879. |
| 67. Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford | Professor of Logic ; President of Corpus
Christi College, Oxford ; Vice-Chan-
cellor of Oxford University. |
| 68. M.A. of Ch. Ch., Oxford ; M.P. for
Louth | Created Lord Carlingford 1874 ; 2nd
Lord Clermont 1887. Died 1898. |
| 69. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford | Sir R. S. Wright ; Judge of the King's
Bench. |
| 70. Professor of Mathematics, Virginia
University, U.S.A. | Prof. of Mathematics, Johns Hopkins
University ; and Savilian Professor
of Geometry, Oxford. Died 1897. |
| 71. M.P. for Birmingham | Right Hon. ; President of the Board of
Trade, etc. Died 1889. |

LIST OF

NAMES AS WRITTEN DOWN.	NAMES IN FULL.
72. <i>Rev. Prof. Wilson, C.C.C., Oxford</i>	John Matthias Wilson . . .
73. <i>E. Charles</i> . . .	Ebenezer Charles . . .
74. <i>* H. Jenkyns</i> . . .	Henry Jenkyns . . .
75. <i>Thos. Hughes</i> . . .	Thomas Hughes . . .
76. <i>Prof. Fawcett</i> . . .	Henry Fawcett . . .
77. <i>James E. Thorold Rogers, Prof. of Political Economy, Oxford</i>	James E. Thorold Rogers . . .
78. <i>E. S. Beesly</i> . . .	Edward Spenser Beesly . . .
79. <i>Archer A. Clive</i> . . .	Archer Antony Clive . . .
80. <i>* Henry J. S. Smith</i> . . .	Henry John Stephen Smith . . .
81. <i>W. Pollard-Urquhart, M.P.</i> . . .	William Pollard-Urquhart . . .
82. <i>* R. E. Bartlett</i> . . .	Robert Edward Bartlett . . .
83. <i>J. C. Mathew</i> . . .	James Charles Mathew . . .
84. <i>J. Stirling</i> . . .	James Stirling . . .
85. <i>H. M. Jackson</i> . . .	Henry Mather Jackson . . .
86. <i>W. B. Church</i> . . .	W. B. Church . . .
87. <i>A. Bailey</i> . . .	Alfred Bailey . . .
88. <i>Geo. Wood</i> . . .	George Wood . . .
89. <i>John Rigby</i> . . .	John Rigby . . .
90. <i>* Rev. W. Rogers</i> . . .	William Rogers . . .
91. <i>* The Dean of Westminster</i> . . .	Arthur Penrhyn Stanley . . .
92. <i>* M. E. Grant Duff</i> . . .	Mountstuart Elphinstone Grant Duff . . .
93. <i>Rev. J. R. Byrne</i> . . .	J. R. Byrne . . .
94. <i>Rev. F. D. Maurice</i> . . .	Frederick Denison Maurice . . .

NAMES—*continued.*

IN 1864.

SUBSEQUENTLY.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 72. Fellow of C.C.C., Oxford; Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy | President of C.C.C., Oxford. Died 1881. |
| 73. Barrister | Died 1867. |
| 74. M.A. of Balliol College, Oxford; Barrister | K.C.B.; Parliamentary Counsel to the Treasury. Died 1899. |
| 75. B.A. of Oriel College, Oxford; Barrister | Q.C.; County Court Judge; Author of <i>Tom Brown's Schooldays</i> , etc. Died 1896. |
| 76. Fellow of Trinity Hall, Camb.; Professor of Political Economy | M.P. for Brighton; Right Hon.; Postmaster-General. Died 1884. |
| 77. M.A. of Magdalen Coll., Oxford; Professor of Political Economy . | M.P. for Southwark. Died 1890. |
| 78. M.A. of Wadham Coll., Oxford; Prof. of History, University Coll., Lond. | Author. |
| 79. Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford | Barrister. Died 1877. |
| 80. Fellow of Balliol Coll., Oxford; and Savilian Professor of Geometry | Vice-President of C.C.C., Oxford; Keeper of the University Museum; Mathematician. Died 1883. |
| 81. M.A. of Trinity College, Camb.; M.P. for Westminster | Author. Died 1871. |
| 82. Late Fellow of Trinity Coll., Oxford; Curate of St. Mark's, Whitechapel | Vicar of Pershore; Bampton Lecturer. |
| 83. Graduate of Trinity Coll., Dublin; Barrister | Judge of the King's Bench. |
| 84. M.A. of Trinity Coll., Cambridge; Barrister | Lord Justice of Appeal. |
| 85. M.A. of Trinity College, Oxford; Barrister | Baronet; Q.C.; M.P.; appointed Judge and died 1881. |
| 86. M.A. of Trinity Coll., Cambridge | |
| 87. M.A. of Ch. Ch., Oxford; Barrister | |
| 88.† | |
| 89. Fellow of Trinity College, Camb.; Barrister | Attorney-General and Lord Justice of Appeal. |
| 90. M.A. of Balliol College, Oxford; Rector of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate; Prebendary of St. Paul's . | Educationist. Died 1896. |
| 91. Dean of Westminster, and Honorary Chaplain to the Queen | Author. Died 1881. |
| 92. M.A. of Balliol, Oxford; Barrister; M.P. for Elgin Boroughs | G.C.M.G.; Governor of Madras; Author. |
| 93. M.A. of University College, Oxford | H.M. Inspector of Schools. |
| 94. M.A. of Exeter College, Oxford, formerly at Cambridge; Incumbent of St. Peter's, Vere Street | Professor of Moral Philosophy, Camb.; Author. Died 1872. |

LIST OF

NAMES AS WRITTEN DOWN.	NAMES IN FULL.
95. * <i>George C. Brodrick</i> . . .	Hon. George Charles Brodrick . . .
96. <i>Rev. G. D. Boyle</i> . . .	George David Boyle . . .
97. <i>Alfred Wills</i> . . .	Alfred Wills . . .
98. <i>Henry Reeve</i> . . .	Henry Reeve . . .
99. <i>M. S. Grosvenor Woods</i> . . .	M. S. Grosvenor Woods . . .
100. <i>Montague H. Cookson</i> . . .	Montague Hughes Cookson . . .
101. <i>Charles E. Maurice</i> . . .	Charles Edmund Maurice . . .
102. <i>R. Bosworth Smith</i> . . .	Reginald Bosworth Smith . . .
103. <i>Ingram Bywater</i> . . .	Ingram Bywater . . .
104. <i>Leonard Courtney</i> . . .	Leonard Henry Courtney . . .
105. <i>Charles C. Clifford, M.P.</i> . . .	Charles Cavendish Clifford . . .
106. <i>Frederic Harrison</i> . . .	Frederic Harrison . . .
107. * <i>W. L. Newman</i> . . .	William Lambert Newman . . .
108. * <i>H. Merivale</i> . . .	Herman Charles Merivale . . .
109. * <i>J. A. Symonds.</i> . . .	John Addington Symonds . . .
110. <i>Sir Edward Strachey</i> . . .	Sir Edward Strachey, Bart. . .
111. * <i>R. B. D. Morier</i> . . .	Richard Barnet David Morier . . .
112. * <i>B. Jowett</i> . . .	Benjamin Jowett . . .
113. * <i>A. Vernon Harcourt</i> . . .	Augustus George Vernon Harcourt
114. <i>Jas. Cotter Morison</i> . . .	James Augustus Cotter Morison . . .
115. <i>W. M. Kerr</i>
116. * <i>E. H. Bradby.</i> . . .	Edward Henry Bradby . . .
117. <i>E. Miall</i> . . .	Edward Miall . . .
118. * <i>C. S. Roundell</i> . . .	Charles Savile Roundell . . .
119. <i>J. Carvell Williams</i> . . .	John Carvell Williams . . .
120. <i>George J. Goschen</i> . . .	George Joachim Goschen . . .
121. <i>Goldwin Smith</i> . . .	Goldwin Smith . . .

The asterisk * denotes those who were at Balliol as undergraduates.

NAMES—*continued.*

IN 1864.	SUBSEQUENTLY.
95. Fellow of Merton, Oxford; Barrister	Warden of Merton.
96. Incumbent of St. Michael's, Ilands- worth	Dean of Salisbury.
97. B.A. of Lond. University; Barrister	Judge of the King's Bench Division.
98. Barrister; Editor of the <i>Edinburgh</i> <i>Review</i>	C.B., D.C.L. Died 1895.
99. Fellow of Trinity College, Camb.	Barrister and Q.C.
100. Fellow of St. John's Coll., Oxford; Barrister	M. H. Crackenthorpe, Q.C., Bencher of Lincoln's Inn.
101. B.A. of Ch. Ch., Oxford	Barrister.
102. Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford	Assistant Master of Harrow School; Author.
103. Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford	Regius Professor of Greek, Oxford.
104. Fellow of St. John's Coll., Cam- bridge; Barrister	Right Hon.; M.P. for Bodmin.
105. Fellow of All Souls Coll., Oxford; Barrister; M.P. for Isle of Wight	Baronet. Died 1895.
106. Fellow of Wadham Coll., Oxford; Barrister	Honorary Fellow of Wadham; Author. Reader in Ancient History, Oxford; Editor of <i>Aristotle's Politics</i> .
107. Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford	Author and Playwright.
108. B.A. of Balliol College, Oxford; Barrister	Author. Died 1893.
109. Fellow of Magdalen Coll., Oxford	Author.
110. High Sheriff of Somerset	G.C.B., G.C.M.G., Ambassador to St. Petersburg. Died 1893.
111. B.A. of Balliol College, Oxford; Diplomatic Service	Master of Balliol. Died 1893.
112. Regius Professor of Greek, Oxford	Tutor of Ch. Ch. and Lee's Reader in Chemistry, Oxford.
113. Senior Student of Ch. Ch., Oxford	Author of <i>Life of St. Bernard</i> ; one of the founders of <i>Fortnightly Review</i> . Died 1888.
114. M.A. of Lincoln Coll., Oxford; Student of Lincoln's Inn	Head Master of Haileybury; Canon of St. Albans. Died 1893.
115.†
116. Late Fell. of Balliol, Oxford; Assis- tant Master in Harrow School
117. M.P. for Rochdale
118. Fellow of Merton Coll., Oxford; Barrister	Private Secretary to Earl Spencer; M.P. for Grantham.
119. Secretary to Liberation Society	Chairman of Liberation Society; M.P. for Nottingham.
120. M.P. for City of London	Right Hon. Viscount Goschen.
121. Fellow of University Coll., Oxford; Regius Prof. of Modern History	Professor of History at Cornell Uni- versity; Author.

† Nos. 56, 65, 88, 115, have not been identified.

APPENDIX D

NOTE ON PAGE 72

The action of the Glasgow Senatus in ceasing to confine the Snell benefaction to Scottish Episcopalians who were being prepared for Ordination was confirmed in 1848 by judgment on Appeal in the House of Lords, heard before Lord Chancellor Cottenham, Lord Brougham, Lord Campbell, and Lord Lyndhurst. This judgment reversed a previous Decree of the Court of Chancery, chiefly on the ground that the Episcopal Church was no longer the established Church of Scotland, as it had been in the lifetime of the testator. See *The Snell Exhibitions*, by W. Innes Addison: Maclehose, 1901.

INDEX

- Aberystwith College, 234.
 Academical forces, 15.
 — freedom, 166, 215.
Academy, The, 177.
 Acland, Mr. T. D. (Sir Thomas),
 223.
 Agassiz, 28.
 Agnosticism, 27.
 Airy, Professor, 43.
 Aldis, Mr., 155.
 All Souls College, 170, 216, 217.
Alton Locke, 82.
 Amompharetus at Platæa, 106.
 Anderson, Mrs. Garrett, 224, 225,
 231.
 "Apostles," The, 11, 22.
 Apostolical Succession, 29, 266.
 Appleton, Dr., 177, 227, 288.
 Archæology, 261, 268.
 Aristocracy, 83.
 Aristotle, 110.
 Arminian Heads, 273.
 Arnold, Thomas, 3, 11, 28-30, 42,
 68, 70, 96, 99, 100, 102-4,
 106, 108, 131, 220, 251, 257,
 266.
 — Matthew, 30, 59.
 Articles of Religion, 54, 59, 70,
 77, 86, 102, 128, 133-5, 149,
 151, 169, 171, 172, 174, 188,
 273, 277.
 Ashburton, Lord, 56.
 Astronomy, 26.
 Atheism, 33.
Athenæum, The, 64.
 Athenæums, 221.
 Athletics, 5.
 Awdry, Sir John, 93.
 Baccalaureat in Arts, 38, 91, 128,
 172, 240, 268.
 Bacon, 107.
 Baden-Powell, Professor, 66, 85,
 106, 109, 114, 121.
 — — *Order of Nature*, 107,
 115.
 — — *Tradition Unveiled*,
 107.
 — — *Uniformity of Nature*,
 112.
 Baden-Powell, Stevenson, 109.
 Bala Nonconformist College, 240.
 Balfour, Mr. Arthur, 111.
 Balliol, 13, 93, 94, 131, 132, 138,
 141, 153, 171, 177, 178, 185,
 216, 217, 240, 256.
 Bampton Lectures, 30, 110.
 Baptism, 53.
 Bar, The, 12, 47, 131, 194.
 Bartlett, Rev. R. E., 290.
 Bateson, Rev. W. H., 94, 161.
 Beaconsfield, Lord, 182.
 Bedford College, 223.
 Beesly, E. S., 290.
 Bennie, James Noble, 62.
 Bentham, 87 *note*.
 Berkley, W., 286.
 Bernard, Mountague, 121.
 Bible, The, 24, 26, 27, 31, 96,
 118, 122.
 — Clerks, 187.
 — Criticism, 68, 267.
 — Society, 16.
 Bibliolatory, 123.
 Birmingham, 86.
 — Oratory, 241.
 — University, 235.
 Bishops, 36, 55, 117, 274, 282.
 Blackburne, 149.
 Blake, Miss Sophia Jex, 233.
 Blunt, J., *History of the Reforma-
 tion*, 24.

- Blunt, J., *Undesigned Coincidences*,
Boards of Studies, 40. [28.]
- Bonamy Price, 103.
- Book of Common Prayer, 172.
- Bouverie, E. P., 94, 129, 132, 133,
136, 137, 139, 153, 155, 168,
264, 288.
- Bowen, Lord, 136, 137, 164, 284.
- Boyd Carpenter, Bishop, 119.
- Boyle, Very Rev. G. D., 290.
- Brabant, Dr., 20.
- Bradby, Rev. E. H., 292.
- Brasenose, 171, 216, 217.
- Brewster, 112.
- *More Worlds than One*, 67.
- Bridgewater Treatises, 28, 65.
- Bright, Right Hon. John, 89, 90,
137, 138, 288.
- Bristol Medical School, 227, 228.
- University College, 227, 238.
- British Museum, 221.
- Broad Church Party, 70, 104, 123.
- Brodie, Sir B. C., 136, 137, 284.
- Brodrick, Hon. G. C., 136, 210,
290.
- *Reminiscences*, 76.
- Brougham, Lord, 44, 72, 79, 221,
294.
- Bryce, Mr. James, 136, 137, 181,
212, 213, 265, 286.
- Buckland, Dean, 27.
- Buckle's *History of Civilisation*,
111.
- Buller, Charles, 23.
- Bunsen, 17, 18, 29, 37, 97, 101.
- Baroness, 17, 119.
- *Egypt's Place in Universal
History*, 99.
- Burke, 151.
- Burnett Prize, 28.
- Buss, Miss, 223.
- Butler, Mrs. Josephine, 226.
- Butler's *Analogy*, 110.
- Buxton, Mr. Charles, 129, 130,
133, 135, 143.
- Byrne, George, M.P., 73.
- J. R., 290.
- Bywater, Professor Ingram, 292.
- Caird, Professor Edward, 51, 93,
125, 265, 286.
- Caird, Principal John, *Religion in
Common Life*, 64.
- Caius College, 218.
- Calder, Miss Margaret, 226.
- Call, W. M. W., 19, 56.
- Calvinism, 16.
- Cambridge, 37, 42, 61, 151.
- Act, 91, 94.
- Commissioners, 88, 94.
- *Essays*, 112.
- Radicals, 23.
- Union, 11, 22.
- Campbell, John Macleod, 61.
- Thomas, 72, 220.
- Camperdown, Earl, 153.
- Campion, Edmund, 244.
- Canning, 3.
- Canonries, 263.
- Carlyle, 22, 23, 56, 58, 84.
- Carnarvon, Lord, 158, 163.
- Carpenter, Dr. Estlin, 251.
- Catholic Emancipation, 42.
- Hierarchy, 96.
- Catholicism, 65.
- Cavendish, Lord F., 166.
- Celibacy, 12, 88, 95, 179, 183,
185, 194.
- Century, Seventeenth, 55.
- Eighteenth, 9.
- Nineteenth, 9, 15.
- Twentieth, 8.
- Chalmers' *Astronomical Dis-
courses*, 28.
- Chambers, Robert, 32.
- Chancellor, 146, 173.
- Chancellor's medal, 11.
- Chapel services, 2, 43, 212.
- Charles, E., 290.
- Chartism, 63.
- Cheltenham, 181, 224.
- Chichele Professorship, 194, 287.
- Cholera, 66.
- "Christian deposit," 33.
- Christian Socialism, 63, 82.
- Christianity, 100, 107, 116, 125.
- Christ Church, 3, 39, 105, 122,
171, 194, 212, 215-7, 256.
- Christie, Mr. W. D., 48, 49, 51,
52, 54.
- Christ's College, 218.
- Church, Dean, 131.

- Church, The, 13, 15, 22, 46, 47, 58, 59, 91, 96, 131, 133, 135, 142, 143, 150, 163, 165, 194, 282.
 — History, 263, 265.
 — Irish, 46, 153, 166.
 — membership, 15, 92, 93, 170.
 — National, 46, 141.
 — Scotch, 49, 51, 61, 266.
 — and State, 29.
 — and Universities, 52, 133, 143.
 "Church Parties," 96, 101.
 Civil Service, 130, 137.
 Clare College, 218.
 Clark, W. G., 288.
 Clarke's Hall, 244.
 Clarkson, 8.
 Clergy, The, 126, 171, 172, 178, 276.
 Clerk Maxwell, James, 61.
 Clifford, C. C., 130, 292.
 Clifton, 225.
 Clive, Archer A., 290.
 Clough, Arthur Hugh, 68.
 — Miss, 226, 231, 232.
 Cobden, 8.
 Colebrooke, H. T., 101.
 Colenso, Bishop, 57, 59, 60, 118, 121, 122, 288.
 Coleridge, Lord, 139, 155, 168.
 — Mr. Justice, 3, 11, 93.
 — S. T., 21, 22, 59, 97.
 Coleridge's Bill, 139, 140, 153, 155, 161, 163, 178, 264.
 Colleges of Surgeons and Physicians, 221.
 Collegiate System, 4, 39, 73, 85.
 Combe, George, 66.
 Commission of Inquiry, 51, 54, 78, 79, 87, 141, 161, 179.
 — — Financial, 105.
 — — Cambridge, 88, 94.
 Commissioners, 84, 93, 94, 130, 141, 147.
 Comte, Auguste, 110.
 Confession of Dordrecht, 278.
 — of Faith, 50, 51, 62.
 Confessional, 53.
 Congregation, Oxford, 89, 92, 154, 173, 178, 188, 246.
 Congregational College, 254.
 Conservatives, 79, 140, 179.
 Convocation, 75, 76, 89, 122, 128, 144-6, 172-4, 179, 187, 188, 251, 275.
 Conybeare, 70.
 Cook, Mr. E. T., 230.
 — Miss Harriet, 231.
 Co-operation, 63.
 Copernicus, 67.
 Coplestone, Bishop, 11, 13, 37.
 Cornell University, 169.
 Coronation Oath, 150.
 Corporation Act, 35, 42.
 Corpus, Oxford, 3, 171, 175, 185.
 — Professorship of Latin, 95.
 Court of Appeal, 122.
 — of Arches, 118, 121.
 Courtney, L. H., 292.
 Crackenthorpe, M. H., 293.
 Creation, The, 31, 33.
 Creighton, Bishop, 226.
 Crevier, 273.
 Crimean War, 68.
 Crown appointments, 53, 275.
 Cumin, P., 286.
 Cunningham, Sir H. S., 284.
 Dale, Dr., 245.
 Dampier, J. L., 85.
 Daniell, C. H. O., 286.
 Darwinian theory, 123.
 Daubeny, Dr., 73.
 Davey, Lord, 286.
 Davidson, Dr. Samuel, 241.
 — J. L. Strachan, 286.
 Davies, Rev. Llewelyn, 225.
 — Miss Emily, 225, 226, 231.
 Davison of Oriel, 11, 13.
 Day, Dr., 225, 231.
 Degrees, 42, 45, 46, 86, 91, 127, 128, 129, 155, 172.
 — Divinity, 42, 45, 91, 127, 128, 161, 172, 233, 240, 244, 263.
 Democracy, 152.
 Denison, George Anthony, 106.
 Development, 27, 32.
 Dicey, Professor Albert, 62, 286.
 Digby, Sir K. E., 286.
 Dillwyn, Mr., M.P., 129, 133.
 Disraeli, 152.

- Dissenters, 37, 39, 41, 42, 44, 46,
 48, 49, 77, 80, 82, 86, 89, 92,
 94, 127, 135, 147, 156, 240,
 247, 264, 267, 275, 279.
 Divinity, 215.
 — Lectures, 175.
 — Professors of, 256, 263-5.
 Dodson, Mr., 132, 134, 136-8,
 143, 153, 168, 242, 264.
 Donaldson, Principal, 265.
 Dowdeswell, 151.
 Downing College, 218.
 Drummond, Dr., 251.
 Durham, University of, 36, 167,
 233.
 Ecclesiastical Commission, 35,
 36.
Edinburgh Review, 14, 25, 37,
 70, 76, 95, 117, 127.
 Edinburgh University, 112, 225,
 279.
 Edwards, Principal T. C., 240.
 Egyptology, 99, 115.
 Eichhorn, 17, 278.
 Eliot, George, 20, 32.
 Ellesmere, Earl of, 93.
 Ellicott, Bishop, 157.
 Ellis, Professor R., 286.
 Elton, Charles, 105.
 Emmanuel College, 218, 263.
 Emoluments, 2, 5, 35, 127, 134,
 141, 179, 180.
 Endowments, 177, 191, 194.
 Episcopacy, 266.
 Erskine, Thomas, 59, 61, 222.
Essays and Reviews, 20, 25, 113,
 117, 125, 127.
 — — *Anticipated*, 20, 121.
 Essayists, The, 117, 119, 122.
 Eternal punishment, 60, 118.
 Eton, 10.
 Evangelical movement, 16.
 — school, 26, 111, 241.
 — views on Baptism, 53.
 Everett, Mr., 92, 251.
 Evolution, 7, 27, 32, 123.
 Ewart, W., 45, 48, 52, 221, 288.
 — Act, 41, 141.
 Examinations, 10, 13, 75, 177,
 178, 193, 223, 225, 232, 280.
 Exeter College, 170, 175, 185,
 216, 217.
 Exhibitions, 193.
 Fairbairn, Dr., 247, 248, 261.
 Fall, The, 27, 31.
 Fatherhood of God, 62.
 Faulkner, Mr. George, 221.
 Fawcett, Henry, 129, 130, 137,
 139, 140, 141, 153, 154, 165,
 166, 168, 290.
 Fearon, W. A., 288.
 Feathers Tavern Association, 149,
 169.
 Fellows, 13, 15, 28, 81, 88, 89,
 128, 133, 158, 162, 171.
 — Marriage of, 5, 12, 88, 174,
 214-7, 223, 274.
 Fellowships, 12, 13, 40, 54, 75,
 77, 88, 95, 127, 129, 137, 139,
 140, 144, 145, 154, 155, 160,
 161, 171, 182, 183, 185, 189,
 193, 216, 219, 279.
 — Clerical, 87, 130, 161, 163,
 179, 180, 209.
 — Sinecure, 88, 148, 179, 191.
 — Travelling, 268.
 Female education, 182, 220.
 Ferrers, Rev. Dr., 161.
 Firth College, Sheffield, 228.
 Fitzmaurice, Lord E., 153, 163.
 Flood, The, 27, 30.
 Flower, Sir W. H., 284.
 Formularies, 69.
 Fortescue, C. S., 288.
 Foster, Dr., 167.
 Foulkes, Rev. E. G., 230.
 "Founder's Kin," 12.
 Founder's intention, 75, 78, 82,
 84, 93, 105.
 Fowler, Mr. T., 136, 137, 288.
 Fox Maule, Mr. (Lord Panmure),
 49.
 France, M. Anatole, 67.
 Fraser, Bishop, 131.
Fraser's Magazine, 123.
 Free Churches, The, 134, 256.
 Free inquiry, 33, 66, 117.
 — public libraries, 45, 221.
 — will, 66.
 Freeman, Professor, 271, 286.

- Freemasons' Tavern, 137.
 Fremantle, Dean W. H., 288.
 — Mr., 117.
 Froude, J. A., 68.
 Fry, Elizabeth, 9.

 Gaisford, Dean, 104, 105.
 Galileo, 26.
 Genesis and Ethnology, 21, 28.
 — and Geology, 20, 21, 27.
 Gentlemen Commoners, 40.
 Geology, 20, 21, 27, 32, 98.
 German criticism, 16, 17, 20, 96.
 — philosophy, 54, 109.
 — theology, 20, 21, 24, 29, 101,
 190, 264, 278.
 — University system, 73, 189,
 192.
 Germanizing school, 69.
 — tendencies, 81.
 Gibbon, 10.
 Gieseler, 16.
 Girton College, 231.
 Gladstone, Mr., 11, 46, 60, 79,
 80, 89, 91, 129, 133-5, 138,
 140-5, 153, 155, 157, 159-61,
 165-7, 179, 182, 211, 215, 264.
 Glasgow, 294.
 Golightly, Mr., 23, 105.
 Goodwin, Bishop Harvey, 115.
 — Charles Wycliffe, 115, 286.
 Gorham judgment, 53, 69.
 Goschen, Viscount, 130, 133-5,
 137, 139, 143, 153, 168, 176,
 179-81, 229, 292.
 Gospel of the Infancy, 19.
 Göttingen, 279.
 Goulburn, Mr., M.P., 79.
 Governesses' Benevolent Institu-
 tion, 223.
 Graduates, 38, 136, 172.
 Graham, Bishop of Chester, 94.
 Grant Duff, Sir Mountstuart, 130,
 134, 136, 139, 143, 155, 290.
 Grant, Sir A., 113, 115.
 Granville, Earl, 143.
 Granville's Act, 123, 139.
 Gray, the Poet, 10.
 — Dr. Asa, 124.
 Greek, New Testament, 85, 212.
 — Professorship, 105, 122.

 Green, J. R., 272.
 — T. H., 131, 245, 286.
 Greenwood, Dr., 222.
 Grey, Earl, 34, 42, 45.
 Grote, 35, 224.
Guardian, The, 112.

 Hadfield, Mr., 90.
 Halls, 38, 40, 86, 88, 128, 164,
 167, 173, 174, 194, 239, 240.
 Hamilton, Sir W., 21, 37, 39, 40,
 72, 73, 264, 273.
 — *Discussions*, 38, 41, 264, 273.
 — *Philosophy of the Uncon-
 ditioned*, 81.
 Hampden, Bishop, 30, 31, 117.
 — controversies, 53.
Hansard, 52.
 Harcourt, Professor Vernon, 292.
 Hare, Julius, 17, 19, 20, 21, 28,
 30, 56, 59, 65, 97.
 — *Guesses at Truth*, 21.
 — *Mission of the Comforter*, 21.
 — *Life of Sterling*, 65.
 Harrison, Mr. Frederic, 136, 292.
 Harrowby, Earl, 93.
 Hartog, Mr., 155.
 Hastings, G. W., 288.
 Hawkins, Dr., 266.
 Headships, 13, 38, 54, 92, 128,
 144, 145, 163, 173, 174, 179, 182,
 194, 195, 216, 275, 276, 280.
 Heath, Dunbar, 132.
 Hebdomadal Board, 42, 75, 76,
 88, 92, 173, 188, 195, 211, 214,
 274.
 Hebrew, 85, 212-4, 263, 267.
 Hegel's *Philosophy of Right*, 112.
 Henley, Mr., M.P., 79, 132.
 Hennell, Mrs., 32.
 Henry VIII., 263.
 Heresy, 20, 101, 130, 131.
 Herschel, Sir J., 94.
 Hertford College, 215-7, 254.
 Hesiod, 272.
 Heurtley, Dr., 256.
 Heywood, Mr. James, 77, 89-92,
 94, 142, 168.
 "High" and "Low," 70, 110.
 "High Church" views, 16, 56,
 123.

- Higher Criticism, 20, 28, 98.
 Hindes, Dr. Samuel, Bp. of Norwich, 84.
 Historical criticism, 16, 106, 123.
 History, Modern, 75, 187, 261.
 Hoadly, 149, 151.
 Holland, 278.
 — Professor T. E., 286.
 Holy Orders, 12, 77, 88, 89, 172, 175, 194, 212, 213, 276.
 Honour System, 11, 13, 177.
 Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, 21.
 Hope, Mr. Beresford, 112.
 Hort, Professor, 256.
 Horton, Dr. R. F., 246.
 Hostels, 38, 40.
 House of Congregation, 76.
 — of Lords, 36.
 Howley, Archbishop, 19.
 Hughes, Thomas, 63, 290.
 Hutton, Geologist, 27.
 Huxley, Professor T. H., 110, 116, 123, 124, 137, 271, 288.
 Iddesleigh, Lord, 267.
 "Ideology," 101.
 Ilbert, Sir C. P., 181.
 Indian Mutiny, 68.
 Induction, 66, 106.
 Inglis, Sir Robert, 39, 79.
 Inspiration of the Bible, 118.
 Interpretation, 100, 103, 150, 277.
 Irish Bishops, 35.
 — Catholic University, 4, 165.
 — Church question, 46, 153.
 Irving, Edward, 61.
 Jackson, Cyril, 11, 71, 93.
 — Sir H. M., 290.
 — Dr. Henry, 181.
 — Dr. W., 264.
 Jacobite faction, 145.
 Jacobson, Bishop, 256.
 James I., 43, 86.
 — Dr. Angell, 247.
 Jebb, Professor, M.P., 284.
 — Rev. Dr., 149.
 Jeffrey, 37.
 Jelf, Professor, 60.
 Jenkyns, Sir H., 290.
 Jesus College, Oxford, 171, 184.
 Jeune, Bishop, 75, 84.
 Jews' admission to Parliament, 29.
 Johns Hopkins University, 268.
 Johnson, Dean of Wells, 85, 93.
 Jones, Sir W., 101.
 Jowett, 11, 32, 54, 55, 57, 68, 75, 85, 93, 104, 113, 115, 117, 120-2, 125-7, 136, 137, 141, 152, 163, 176, 178, 181, 182, 211, 227, 230, 240, 243, 246, 249, 257, 264, 266, 292.
 — on *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans*, 104, 106.
 Judaizers, 29.
 Kant, 22.
 Keats, 21.
 Keble, 36, 151, 266.
 — College, 215, 219, 241, 254, 256.
 Kelvin, Lord, 271.
 Kemble, J. M., 22.
 King's College, 59, 218, 221, 223.
 Kingsley, Charles, 63-5, 82.
 — Mrs., 24.
 Kuenen, 123.
 Lady Margaret Hall, 232.
 Laplace, 33.
 Latham, Rev. Henry, 286.
 Latitudinarians, 3.
 Laud, Archbishop, 22.
 Laudian statute, 38.
 Law, 41, 75, 128, 150, 172, 187.
 — Reign of, 65.
 — William, 59.
 Leaf, Mr. Walter, 229.
 Leatham, Mr. W. H., 286.
Leben Jesu, 32.
 Lecky's *History*, 55, 149, 169.
 Lecturing, Inter-collegiate, 40.
 Lee, Professor, 43.
 Leicester, Earl of, 86, 172.
 Leigh, Hon. E. C., 286.
 Leipzig, 192.
 Leo XIII., 244.
 Lewis, Mr. Cornwall, 93.
 Leyden, 278, 279.
 Liberal Churchmen, 30.
 — opinions, 58.

- Liberals, Oxford, 179, 228.
 Liberation Society, 167.
 Liberty of prophesying, 31.
 Liddell, Rev. H. G., 89, 136.
 Liddon, Canon, 123.
 Lightfoot, Bishop, 256.
 Linacre Professorship, 194.
 Lincoln College, 171, 175, 185,
 217.
 Lindsey, 149.
 Literæ Humaniores, 187.
 Liverpool University College, 222,
 225.
 Livings, College, 179.
 Local restrictions, 75.
 Locke, John, 55, 149, 275.
 Lockhart, John, 73.
 London, Bishop of, 134, 143.
 — *Quarterly Review*, 247.
 — Schoolmistresses' Associa-
 tion, 226.
 — University, 220, 221, 224.
 Longley, Bishop, 93.
 Louth, Bishop, 150.
 Lowe, Mr. Robert, 224.
 Ludlow, Mr., 63.
 Lushington, Dr., 118, 121.
 — Sir Godfrey, 286.
Lux Mundi, 119.
 Lyell, Sir C., 28, 123.
 — *Antiquity of Man*, 124.
 — *Principles of Geology*, 27,
 98, 123.
 Lyttelton, Lord, 229.
 Macaulay, 22.
 Mackenzie, Charles, 61.
 — H. and F., 61.
 Mackinder, Mr. H. J., 230.
 Mackintosh, Prof. James, 282.
 Macnaught, Rev. J., 132.
 "Maga," 57.
 Magdalen College, Oxford, 171,
 216, 217.
 Magdalene College, Cambridge,
 218.
 Manchester, 86, 250, 256.
 Manichæism, 106.
 Manning, Cardinal, 243.
 Mansel, Henry Longueville, 81.
 — Bampton Lectures, 110.
 Mansel, *Prolegomena*, 81.
 Mansfield College, 245, 247, 249,
 250, 256, 266.
 Mansfield, Mr. G. S., 246.
 — H. M., 181, 288.
 Marlborough, Duke of, 140.
 Marsh, Bishop, 4, 16, 96, 277,
 278.
 Martineau, Dr. James, 250, 251,
 256, 284.
 Martyn, Henry, 61.
 Mason's College, 228, 235.
 Mathew, Mr. Justice, 290.
 Matriculation, 2, 89, 91, 142, 172,
 273.
 Maurice, C. E., 292.
 — F. D., 22, 57, 59-64, 69,
 70, 82, 97, 131, 161, 222, 224,
 226, 290.
 M'Carthy, Mr., 181.
 Mechanics' Institutes, 34, 221.
 Medicine, 41, 128, 172.
 Melbourne, Lord, 19, 25, 44.
 Meredith, Sir W., 149.
 Merewether, Dean, 30.
 Merivale, H., 292.
 Merton, Warden of, 5.
 — College, 170, 174, 185, 209,
 210, 216, 217.
 Messianic mission, 32.
 Methodistic enthusiasm, 16.
 Miall, Charles S., 288.
 — Edward, M.P., 136, 292.
 Michaelis, *Introduction to the New
 Testament*, 16.
 Middle Ages, 3.
 Middle-class Examinations, 223.
 Mill, J. S., 58, 64.
 — *Liberty*, 111.
 — *Logic*, 111.
 Miller, Hugh, 28.
 — *Testimony of the Rocks*, 28.
 Milman, 24, 25, 35, 61, 81, 96,
 122, 123.
 — *History of the Jews*, 21, 24,
 25, 30, 98, 124.
 — *History of Latin Christian-
 ity*, 25.
 Milner, Isaac, 16.
 Milnes, Monckton (Lord Hough-
 ton), 23.

- Miracles, 29, 30, 65, 67, 106.
 "Moderates," 116.
 Modern History, 75, 187, 261.
 — ideas, 96.
 — subjects, 76.
 Moore, Tom, 25.
 Morgan, Sir George Osborne,
 136, 137, 153, 156, 234.
 Morgan, Professor J., 222.
 Morier, Sir R. B. D., 292.
 Morison, J. C., 292.
 Morley, Mr. Arnold, 229.
 — Earl, 153.
 Morrison, Walter, M.P., 284.
 Mosaic cosmogony, 30, 115.
 Mozley's *Reminiscences*, 13.
 Muir, Dr. John, 125, 265.
 Müller, Max, 101, 113-16.
 "Muscular Christianity," 64.
 Musgrave, Professor, 43.
 Music, 172.
 Myers, Ernest, 229.
 — *Catholic Thoughts*, 68.
 — F. W., 226.
 Mysticism, 97.

 "National apostasy," 36.
 Nationalisation of Colleges, 41.
 Natural Selection, 124.
 — theology, 124.
 Neale, Mr. Vansittart, 288.
 Neate, Charles, M.P., 130, 288.
 Nebular theory, 32.
 Neology, 71, 101, 104.
 Nettleship, R., 131.
 Newcastle College of Science, 233.
 New College, 170, 185, 216, 217.
 Newdigate, Sir Roger, 150.
 Newman, Cardinal, 4, 13, 23, 29,
 36, 39, 53, 54, 66, 98, 108, 151,
 241-3, 245, 257, 266, 292.
 — *Apologia pro vitâ suâ*, 65.
 — *Idea of a University*, 66.
 Newmanism, 31, 75.
New Monthly Magazine, 220.
 Newnham College, 232.
 Newspapers, Religious, 112, 117.
 New Testament, 16, 29, 85, 104.
 Newton, 11, 67.
 Nichol, Prof. John, 137, 225.
 Niebuhr, Barthold Georg, 17, 28.

 Noel, Mr. Baptist, 54.
 Non-collegiate students, 86, 88,
 128, 141.
 Nonconformist Senior Wranglers,
 155.
 Nonconformists, 6, 35, 36, 40, 42,
 53, 54, 152, 158, 159, 167, 168,
 170, 213, 234, 240, 246-9.
 Non-foundationers, 39.
 "Non-natural" interpretation, 55.
 North, Lord, 150.
 Norwich, Bishop of, 84, 102.

 Oaths, 40, 49, 90, 172, 282.
 Obscurantism, 256.
 Ogilvie, Professor, 13.
 Ogle, Dr. William, 286.
 Ordination, 89, 130, 137.
 Oriel, 13, 170, 174, 209, 216, 217.
 Oriental religion, 115.
Origin of Species, 109, 116, 123.
 Orthodoxy, 67.
 Otter, Francis, 284.
Oxford Essays, 67, 112.
 — Higher Certificate, 232.
 — Liberals, 136, 211.
 — petition, 132, 142.
 — reformers, 82.
 — School of Theology, 110.
 — "Studies," 112, 115.
 — University Commission, 80.
 — — Reform Bill, 88.
 Owen, A. C. Humphreys, 284.
 Owens College, The, 221, 222,
 233, 238.
 Owens, Mr. John, 221.

 Page, Geologist, 32.
 Paley, 11, 28, 149, 277.
 — *Horæ Paulinæ*, 28.
 Palmer, Mr. (Sir) Roundell (Lord
 Selborne), 79, 155, 163, 164.
 Palmerston, Lord, 60, 66, 129.
 Parker, Messrs., 112.
 Passmen, 177, 187.
 Pattison, Mark, 23, 85, 112, 113,
 115, 121, 178, 227, 244, 268.
 — *Academical Organisation*,
 154, 177.
 — *Oxford Studies*, 112, 115.
 Paulus, 20, 32.

- Peacock, Dean of Ely, 94.
 Pearson, C. H., 60, 63, 80, 112, 131, 226.
 Peel, Sir R., 3, 11, 46, 49, 166.
 Pembroke College, 170, 217, 218.
Penny Cyclopædia, 221.
 Percival, Dr. (Bishop of Hereford), 225, 227, 230, 244, 270.
 Peterhouse, 218.
 Phear, Mr. S. G., 161.
 Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, 39, 47, 254.
 Philosophical Institutes, 221.
 Philosophy and religion, 65.
Phrontisterion, 81.
 Physical science, 190.
 Pio Nono, 244.
 Plato, 32, 40.
 Platonists, Cambridge, 3.
 Playfair, Professor, 37.
Plurality of Worlds, 27.
 Political forces, 15.
 Porson, 11.
 Porter, Master of Peterhouse, 161.
 Poste, Edward, 284.
 Post-graduate studies, 73, 253, 268, 269.
 Poverty, Preclusion through, 73, 83, 147.
 Powis, Earl of, 79.
 Presbyterians, 93.
 Price, Prof. Bonamy, 226.
 Privy Council, 154, 175.
 Professor-Fellow, 95.
 Professoriate, The, 38, 41, 49, 73, 77, 92, 133, 144, 145, 156, 173, 177, 180, 182-4, 187, 188, 190, 195, 196, 240, 263, 268, 273, 274, 277.
 — Birmingham and Manchester, 86.
 — Glasgow, 72.
 Protestant faith, 151.
 Puller, C. Cholmeley, 286.
Purcell's Life of Cardinal Manning, 242.
 Puritan party, 86.
 Pusey, E. B., 21, 24, 42, 53, 69, 88, 104-6, 109, 114, 121, 122, 125, 141-3, 267, 276, 278.
 Quakers, 35.
Quarterly Review, 30, 101, 104, 116.
 Queen's College, 62, 170, 216-18, 233.
 Radical opinions, 16.
 Radley College, 81.
 Raikes, Mr., M.P., 156.
 Randolph, Bishop, 16.
 Rank, Distinctions of, 187.
 Reaction, 9.
 Readers, 173, 190, 194-6.
Record, The, 112.
 Reeve, Henry, 292.
 Reformation, The, 70, 83, 84, 108.
 Reform Bill, 6, 7, 34, 140, 152.
 Reformed Parliament, 34, 42.
 Reign of law, 65.
 Renan, 123.
 Revelation, 67.
 Ridley Hall, 241.
 Rigby, John, 290.
 Ripon, Bishop of, 119.
 Ritualism, 123.
 Roberts, Mr. R. D., 230.
 Robertson, Rev. Frederick, 112.
 Rogers, Mr. Thorold, 214, 290.
 — Rev. William, 290.
 Rolleston, Professor, 284.
 Roman Catholic Hall (Jesusit), 254.
 Roman Catholics, 35, 148, 150, 165, 242, 245, 252.
Rome, History of (Niebuhr's), 17, 20, 28, 30.
 Romilly, Sir J., 94.
 Roscoe, H. E. (Sir Henry), 222.
 Rosebery, Lord, 271.
 Roundell, C. S., 136, 137, 141, 153, 176, 179, 211, 212, 214, 215, 240, 265, 292.
 Routh (President of Magdalen College, Oxford), 80.
 Royal Institution, 221.
 — visitation, 274.
 Rugby, 132.
 Ruskin, 63, 178.
 Russell, Lord John (Earl Russell), 31, 77-9, 89, 129, 132, 143, 157.
 Russell's (Lord John) Bill, 142.

- Russell's (Lord John) Post Bag*, 80.
 Rutson, Mr. Albert O., 181, 284.
 Sabatier, Auguste, 104.
 Sacerdotalism, 69.
 Sacraments, 69.
 Sadler, Mr. M. E., 230, 235, 237.
 Salisbury, Lord, 164, 176, 181, 210.
 Sandars, T. C., 64, 112.
 Sanscrit Professorship, 194.
Sartor Resartus, 57.
Saturday Review, 64, 112, 117.
 Scepticism, 28.
 Schleiermacher, Friedrich, 17, 19, 20.
Schleiermacher on St. Luke, 18, 278.
 Scholarships, 141, 187, 193.
 Scholastic Philosophy, 30.
 Schoolmasters, 129, 147.
 Science, 65.
 — and theology, 108.
 Sclater, P. L., 284.
 Scotch Union, 150.
 Scott, Dr., 93, 222.
 Scriptural exegesis, 103, 104.
 Sedgwick, Adam, 27, 43, 94, 161.
 Selborne, Lord, 166, 210.
 Selwyn College, 215, 219, 241.
 Semler, 32.
Serious Call, Law's, 59.
 Sermons, University, 174.
 Servitors, 40, 187.
 Sewell, William, 86, 222, 281.
 Shaftesbury, Earl, 34.
Shaftesbury, Letters and Speeches of the First Lord, 49.
 Shelley, 16.
 Shuttleworth, Sir J. Kay, 286.
 Sidgwick, Professor Henry, 232.
 Sidney-Sussex, 218.
 Simeon, Charles, 4, 16, 61.
 Smith, Adam, 73.
 — Bosworth, 292.
 — Goldwin, 76, 85, 110, 127, 134, 136, 137, 169, 264, 292.
 — Henry J. S., 67, 93, 112, 116, 137, 290.
 — Dr. Pye, 246.
 Smith, Mr. Vernon, 279.
 — Sydney, 37.
 Snell Exhibition, 72, 73, 294.
 Socinianism, 55.
 Socrates, 127.
 Somerville Hall, 232.
 Southey's *Life of Wesley*, 40.
 Spanish "raid," 22, 56.
Spectator, The, 121.
 Speculation, Theological, 16, 17, 21.
 Spiritual kingdom, 62.
 Spring Hill College, 246.
 Spring Rice, Mr., 45.
 St. Andrews, 225, 231, 271.
 Stanley, Dean, 24, 54, 61, 68-70, 73, 75, 102, 103, 113, 114, 117, 120, 122, 127, 130, 290.
 — — Epistles to the Corinthians, 104.
 — Hon. E. L., 136, 181, 214.
 — Mr. Secretary (Earl Derby), 45, 46.
 St. Catherine's College, 218.
 Stebbing, William, 286.
 Stephen, Leslie, 286.
 Sterling, John, 22, 48, 56, 58, 59, 111.
 Stevenson, Mr., M.P., 161.
 — The Misses, 226.
 Stirling, Mr. Justice, 155, 290.
 St. John's College, Cambridge, 160, 218, 251.
 — — Oxford, 171, 216, 217.
 St. Leonard's School, 231.
 Stonyhurst, 245.
 "Storm from the North," 14.
 St. Paul's School, 181.
 Strachey, Sir Edward, 292.
 Strangford, Viscount, 286.
 Strauss, 17, 32.
 Stuart, Mr. James, 225-7, 235.
 Stubbs, Bishop, 272.
 Subscription, 40, 49, 50, 54, 78, 86, 87, 113, 114, 128, 134, 135, 139.
Suggestions for University Reform, 176, 183.
 Sylvester, Professor J. J., 288.
 Symonds, J. A., 117, 226, 292.
 Symons, Dr., of Wadham, 23.

- Tait, A. C., 68, 73, 84, 117.
 Taylor, Charles, 61.
 — John James, 250, 288.
 Taylor's *Holy Living and Dying*, 21.
 Temple, Archbishop, 113-15, 117, 121, 223.
 — — — *Education of the World*, 115.
 Tennyson, 64.
 Terrorism, 114, 145.
 Test Act, 35, 42, 43, 164, 168, 212, 214, 244.
 Tests, 7, 12, 37, 42, 51, 78, 85, 89, 91, 126, 130, 137, 141, 148, 152, 163, 167, 170, 176, 187, 209, 235, 283.
 — Scotch University, 49, 50, 156, 282.
 Theology, 31, 108, 124, 180, 233, 248, 257, 276.
 — Nationalisation of, 269.
 — School of, 41, 85, 110.
Theological Essays, Maurice's, 59.
 Theological Colleges, 86, 267.
 — Chairs, 161, 164, 165, 264.
 — Faculty, 253.
 — Tripos, 263, 268.
 Thirlwall, Connop, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 30, 37, 43, 44, 56, 96, 101, 102, 117-21, 161, 277, 278.
 Thompson, Dr. W., 44, 70, 161.
 Thorley, G. E., 286.
 Tithes Act, 35.
 Tollemache, Hon. L., 284.
 Toller, Mr., 155.
 Toynbee Hall, 236.
 Tractarians, 3, 23, 29, 42, 53, 55, 96, 99, 266.
Tracts for the Times, 55.
 Tract 90, 54, 68, 102.
 Tradition, 100.
 Treaty of Union, 49.
 Trench, Archbishop, 22, 139.
 Trevelyan, Sir G. O., 130.
 Trinity College, Cambridge, 16, 21, 171, 216-8.
 — — — Dublin, 165.
 — Hall, 218.
 Tripos, 10, 11.
 Tutorial System, 38, 40, 41, 73, 85, 184, 195, 273.
 Tutors, 13, 54, 144, 145, 163, 175, 177, 183, 185, 190, 191, 193, 211, 279.
 Tutors' Association, 75.
 Twining, Miss Louisa, 224.
 Ullathorne, Bishop, 243.
 Unattached students, 86, 88, 128, 141, 194, 239.
 Uniformity, Act of, 2, 128, 129, 133, 139, 140, 170, 173-5.
 — of *Nature*, 65.
 Union Debating Society, 11.
 Unitarianism, 29, 42, 59, 247, 250, 251.
 Unitarian College, 42, 254.
 University, Catholic, 241, 277.
 — Church, 52.
 — College, 16, 170, 185, 216, 217, 221.
 — Colleges, 228.
 — Disendowment, 6.
 — of Dublin, 165.
 — Extension, 62, 81, 86, 222, 225, 228, 230, 233, 235, 237, 276.
 — a lay corporation, 43.
 — libraries, 78.
 — life, 1.
 — London, 72.
 — Paris, 273.
 — a perfect, 39, 273.
 — Reform, 7, 37, 64, 80, 88, 89, 126, 129, 148.
 — settlements, 236.
 — statutes, 37, 40, 87.
 — for Wales, 228, 234.
 Universities, English and Irish, 4, 78.
 — German, 277, 278.
 — Italian, 277, 278.
 — Scottish, 72, 233.
 Urquhart, W. Pollard, M.P., 290.
 Ussher, Archbishop, 27.
 Van Mildert, Bishop, 36.
 Vatican, 4.
 Venables, 23.
Vestiges of Creation, 32.

- Vice-Chancellor, 196.
 Victoria University, 229, 233, 235, 269.
 Visitor, 158, 175, 185, 210, 275.
 Voysey, Mr., 132.
 Waddington, 17.
 Wadham College, 87, 171, 216, 217.
 Wales, 184.
 Wallace, Professor W., 93.
 Walpole, Mr., 162.
 Ward, A. W., 102, 222, 234.
Warfare of Science and Theology, 169.
 Warren, J. L., 286.
 Watson, Arthur G., 288.
 — Bishop of Llandaff, 149.
 Wayte, Rev. Samuel, 93.
 Wellington, Duke of, 39, 46.
 Welsh Clergy, 101.
 Wesley, 6, 249.
 Wesleyan Hall, 254.
 Westbury, Lord, 30, 119, 122.
 Westcott, 256.
 Westlake, Professor, 284.
 Westminster College, 251, 252.
 — Dean of, 137.
 Whateley, A. P., 284.
 Whewell's *History of the Inductive Sciences*, 65.
 — *Plurality of Worlds*, 67, 112.
Whig, A Christian, 149.
 Whigs, 42, 151.
 White, Mr. Andrew Dickson, 169.
 — Miss Jessie Meriton, 224.
 — Kirke, 61.
 Wilberforce, Bishop, 24, 53, 57, 69, 116-8, 120, 125.
 William III., 275.
 — IV., 275.
 Williams, Mr. Carvell, 167, 168, 292.
 — Dr. Rowland, 30, 57, 100, 102, 104, 113, 118, 121, 125.
 Wills, Mr. Justice, 290.
 Wilson, H. B., 30, 57, 68-70, 100, 113, 118, 121, 125.
 — Professor H. H., 101.
 — — J. M., 136, 290.
 Winkworth, Miss, *Lyra Germanica*, 225.
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 105.
 Wood, Mr. George Matthew, 45.
 Woods, M. S. G., 292.
 Worcester College, 170, 216, 242.
 Wordsworth, Charles, 3.
 — Christopher, 43.
 Working Men's College, 62, 222, 224.
 Wright, Mr. Justice, 136, 153, 288.
 Yorkshire College, Leeds, 222, 228.
 Young, Sir George, 284.
 Zwingli, 69.

PLYMOUTH
WILLIAM BRENDON AND SON
PRINTERS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

AUG 25 1961

SEP 18 1961

REC'D COL LIB

AUG 2 1961



AA 000 637 184 3

LA Campbell -
636.7 On the nationali-
C15o zation of the
old English
universities

AUG 25 1966

LA
636.7
C15o

