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The clergy in 1800 were by tradition part of the 'professional' world; but the professions were not large, nor were they clearly defined in terms either of their membership or of their duties and skills. Responding to both the pastoral needs and the political necessities of an industrialising, reforming nation, the Church reformed itself and greatly expanded its men and materiel. More clergy and clergy of higher calibre were ordained. At mid-century they compared well in education, zeal and rewards with the other growing and reforming professions.

Various factors were to weaken this position. The need for clergy ran ahead of the capacity of the traditional source of supply, the universities, to provide them. The clergy had always tended to be recruited from the poorer university men; now many were from modest backgrounds but without the advantage of a degree. This was at a time when educational background was more and more emphasised and when connections with the old but reforming institutions of university and public school were increasingly prized. The clergy's position within the universities, particularly, was anyway less assured after 1860: there were currents of thought and opinion hostile or indifferent to religion, while at the same time more churchmen questioned the sufficiency of the university course as a training for the Church. The interests, in both senses, of the universities and of the clergy were diverging.

There was, nevertheless, considerable concern in the Church at the weakening of the tie to the universities. But there was no concerted response, if only because the Church possessed no means of making such a response. Theological colleges were set up and run almost as private institutions - or at the most, episcopal ones. They were needed, yet they were resented by many clergy and church people.
Gradually there developed a feeling of corporate responsibility to them; at the same time - the last quarter of the century - ordination procedures and requirements moved closer to standardisation. But even in the early 20th century there was far to go.

If entry requirements seemed to be approximating slowly to the standards of other professions, in their ordained lives the clergy were ever less like other professionals. The fact that, like them, their work was more specialised than before, was outweighed by the exceptional nature of the work itself, at a time when other professions largely rested their social acceptance upon their practical utility and disinterested services. And the careers of the clergy were even more clearly anomalous. The parochial system - with its concomitants of inflexibility, widely dispersed patronage, and an arbitrarily distributed and inadequate endowment income - was incapable of providing a satisfactory 'career structure' for most clergy. The apparent stability of the Church's agricultural income, and the widespread possession of private means by the clergy, delayed full recognition of the problems. By 1900 these factors were ceasing to apply. And though the town parishes were able to benefit from increased voluntary lay contributions, it was to prove immensely difficult to change the habits and assumptions ingrained by centuries of reliance upon an independent clerical endowment.

Before about 1860 the Church recruited more men than the universities could provide. Thereafter it found that a massive growth in the traditional educating institutions of the clergy was accompanied by at best a slow, and certainly a disproportionately small, growth in the number of ordinands. Doctrinal unsettlement doubtless contributed to this fact; especially as the level of religious commitment required for ordination had risen. It was also important that young men had less contact with the clergy in their school and university lives.
The practical and financial problems may, however, have been the most important of all; churchmen thought that such matters weighed particularly with parents, who usually had considerable influence on the careers of their sons. For the Church already presented an unhappy compromise: it would not renounce the social and intellectual standards of the professions, but it patently did not provide, for most of its clergy, the ways and means to maintain them.
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INTRODUCTION

The claims of the Victorian clergy to the interest of historians need little special pleading. They were representatives and officers of one of the central institutions of Victorian Britain. The Church of England loomed large in the considerations of politicians, educators and intellectuals, social reformers, and ordinary Sunday worshippers of all shades of religious persuasion. The clergy themselves constituted the largest body of 'professional men' in the country, and were distributed over it with a regularity and evenness that was unique - however imperfect it seemed to many churchpeople. There was a clergyman prominent in almost every village, and somewhere in every town. It was not until the last decades of the century that there was a generation of respectable Anglican adults\(^1\) which had not been educated in the main by clergymen, at school and at university.

Nor have the clergy lacked historians. There are old-fashioned but thorough and well-informed books by C.K.F. Brown and F.W.B. Bullock\(^2\). There are many lighter books, which have at least anecdotal value\(^3\). And there are more weighty scholarly works.

---

1. The word 'Anglican' is avoided in the text hereafter; in the Victorian period it had 'party' overtones - meaning 'High Church' (and even 'Romanizing') to many Protestants, and meaning moderate (in a pejorative sense) to many Anglo-Catholics. The use of the phrase 'the Anglican communion' was increasingly common after 1867 (the first Lambeth Conference), but the word itself was far from neutral for many years.

2. A history of the English clergy 1800-1900 (1953) and A history of training for the ministry ... 1800-1874 (St. Leonard's, 1955) - though only the latter is still a useful reference work.

3. Among recent examples are A. Tindal Hart, The curate's lot (1970), Brenda Colloins, Victorian country parsons (1977) and Peter C. Hammond, The parson and the Victorian parish (1977): all four male authors so far named were or are clergymen.
Dianna McClatchey's work *Oxfordshire clergy 1777-1869* (1960) is expert and illuminating on the parochial structure of her area, and provides an important description of the various roles the clergy filled in their parishes and the wider community. The latter subject of roles has been studied in considerable detail by A.J. Russell⁴, who gives a straightforward but thorough exposition of the changing emphasis placed on these different roles. Using, inter alia, the same rich evidence provided by the writings of the Victorian pastoral theologians, Brian Heeney⁵ has illustrated the clergy's shared ideals, and many of their methods and activities, in the mid-19th century. In these works, and in a large number of good books and articles about the church in general, or about other aspects of its history⁶, the background and many of the details relevant to the Victorian clergy may be found without great difficulty.

Yet this study is not self-consciously narrow in scope, an attempt to fill a gap in the detail of the historiographical mosaic. Its form is, indeed, perhaps too broad for its own good, at least in terms of the detailed ground covered. It began with the naive

---

⁴ A sociological analysis of the clergymen's role: with special reference to its development in the early 19th century (Oxford D.Phil., 1970): this is summarised, with much on modern problems, in his *The clerical profession*, 1980, which appeared too late to be used here, though it seems not to require any modifications of my views. (Another sociological work with historical background, *The fate of the Anglican clergy: a sociological study*, 1980, by A.P.M. Coxon and R. Towler, I have not yet seen.)


question (for I know very little about the subject) of how far the clergy, as a social group, were affected by 'the decline of religious faith' in later Victorian England. It soon became clear that the question was either too vague or too complex to be suitably tackled by an empiricist tyro like myself. But in the meantime I had realised that there had indeed been a noticeable change in the educational backgrounds of the clergy by about 1860. The questions as to what caused this, and what effects it had upon both the self-image of the clergy and the ways others saw them, have run - unevenly - through the whole study. The questions are not wholly original, but the field seemed open to a sort of basic empirical approach which had not been previously essayed. Another question tempted me greatly at the beginning, and echoes of it may be found in various places: what made different sorts of men want to be ordained at different times? But I still do not know how this can be satisfactorily answered; it remains one of those salutary questions which can only abash the historian.

The structure of the thesis is uncomplicated. After an introductory first chapter, in which the issue of 'professionalisation' is discussed, and some basic background blocked in, it follows roughly the pattern of a clerical life. The universities of Oxford and Cambridge are the subject of a large second chapter; this is called for both by their continued centrality in the provision of clergy, and by the related fact that the declining position of the Church at the universities was a major concern of many influential contemporary churchmen. There is also the advantage that the corporate intellectual and religious life of the universities was recorded at copious length by protagonists of all positions on the
religious spectrum: individually suspect, cumulatively these works provide a unique record. Here, if anywhere, one can at least approach the question of motivation in terms of articulated thought. All this has been excellently studied by others, and I stress that it is as background that I use it. I hoped to use samples of honours men from both places to discover the timing and extent of the effects, on the intellectual cream of the universities, of the well-known broader trends. In the event I was confined by the evidence to Cambridge. This was a pity in that Oxford was much the more dramatic religious arena in the period (c.1840-75); but perhaps this very fact, and the great attention it has received, makes it less necessary to have supporting statistical evidence.

If this evidence threatens to overwhelm at least some sections of the chapter, it must be pleaded that it is all that I claim to be original in it (or at least in the sections directly concerned with Cambridge). I trust, too, that the evidence of these honours graduates has not been made to cover too wide a field. There are two sections in the chapter which look away from the universities, to related institutions which, respectively, aided poor intending clergymen to obtain degrees, and trained (usually richer) graduates to be better clergy. From this chapter it was a natural progression to look at the growing supply of clergy who had not been to Oxford or Cambridge; they and their colleges (or at least the two main early ones) are the subject of chapter three.

The rest of the thesis attempts to cover the major milestones and characteristics of clerical life. From this point there is much reference to samples of clergy ordained between 1841 and 1873, the
years when the change in clergy backgrounds was consolidated. The aim here was not only to describe and discuss the clerical 'career', but also to relate it to the backgrounds of the clergy. It will cause no surprise that the widely differing backgrounds described in chapters two and three were matched by prospects and careers as various after ordination. The nature of the subject - shot through as it is with anomalies and exceptions, and permeated by the institutionalised variety of parishes and independence of the clergy - precludes anything like a 'comprehensive' treatment in such a brief space. The aim is simply to clarify the main elements of the Church qua career, as they affected the ordinary clergy. (There is no attempt at all to consider the factors affecting the winning of the Church's few 'prizes': the successes of the Church are not unknown, and are far less in need of study than their humbler brethren.)

This, it will certainly be objected, is a very partial view - the clergy without their theology, and without consideration even of their day-to-day work. This cannot be gainsaid. But it can be pleaded, first, that the balance has always been rather too much the other way: not that there may not remain much useful work to be done on the thought, theological and otherwise, of the English clergy; but the outlines are well-known. The struggles of Church parties, the agonies of theological restatement, must largely be taken as

7. The main tables on these samples have been placed in the Appendix at the end of the thesis: this is because they tend to be referred to in more than one place; and also because they amount - with some other general tables - to a reasonably cohesive collection, for those with a strong stomach for figures.
read here; though this study may, in its turn, shed a small light upon the channels by which the ideal splendours of theology were actually presented in the parishes and pulpits of England. Second, and despite the acknowledged heightening of vocation and of religious standards among the clergy, they remained a body with many and continuing points of contact and common interest with the lay world. 'Whatever else the ordained ministry is, it is also a profession', wrote Leslie Paul; and the approach that he used in 1961-3 was at least as applicable a century before (though obviously one cannot hope for a similar fullness and exactness).

Another objection may be urged: that there is here a lack of comparative perspective. Why, for instance, not compare the clergy with missionaries, Dissenting ministers, or Catholic priests? A main reason, undeniably, is that this would require a great deal more research; so far as I am aware only missionaries have received the sort of attention which would allow comparisons to be made without considerable primary research. But at the same time they really do not constitute a comparable 'profession' to that of the home clergy (despite the fact that some ended up in English parishes). I do not


9. As Stuart Piggin points out at the start of his paper, 'Assessing 19th-century missionary motivation: some considerations of theory and method', in D. Baker ed., Religious motivation: biographical and sociological problems for the Church historian, Oxford 1978, p.327: I have read only one of the 4 theses he mentions (by S.C. Potter) but the evidence from this, from N. Gunson's Messengers of Grace. Evangelical missionaries in the South Seas 1797-1860, Melbourne 1978, and from the very recent article by C.P. Williams in the Journal of Ecclesiastical History Vol. 31 (July 1980) is consistent on the relatively low status of most missionaries. Though the Melanesian missionaries (D.L. Hilliard, God's gentlemen, A history of the Melanesian Mission, 1849-1942, St. Lucia, Queensland, 1978) and also (I gather from Dr Piggin) those in India, were distinctly better-educated and more 'gentlemanly'.
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mean that the clergy are sui generis and therefore not amenable
to comparative studies; and undoubtedly comparisons with the
nonconformist ministry will be useful. But the clergy were
sufficiently unique to be studied alone without, in my view, serious
loss of perspective. More relevant comparisons may be with the
secular professions. These are touched upon in the thesis,
sufficiently I hope to be useful. But again, there is little
published work of a kind that could be used in much more detail;
indeed the lack of basic background data for most lay professionals
(compared to the clergy, with their ordination papers and usually
an entry in the university register) makes such studies difficult.

Time inevitably imposed constraints on my scope. The use of
large samples necessitated spending long periods on the mechanical
process of tracking down the individuals in various registers and
directories, and in tracing them through ordination papers. Some
were then traced in further detail, through visitation returns,
local directories, and their wills (the main items). I trust that
my use of all this does not appear merely as the effort to produce
a result commensurate with the labour involved. But certainly the
months thus absorbed were so much lost to general archival research.
Then also much of my time in England was perforce spent in reading
at least a portion of the immense book and pamphlet literature that
might be relevant. The negative effects show in two admitted lacunae
in my evidence: the complete absence of private papers consulted,
and - probably more serious - the almost complete lack of reference
to the Church press. That the thesis would have been better for
either or both of these is certain: that it is adequate without them
is my sincere hope.
The result is that the thesis rests heavily on the following sources: biographical and statistical material, largely on the sample graduates and sample clergy, but including some Church-wide statistics: institutional records (particularly of the Elland Society, the theological colleges, and the Curates' Augmentation Fund): and the published debates (and reports) of the Convocations and the Church Congresses. Also, when I began I quarried eagerly into the mountain of clerical biography deposited by the Victorians; and if the specific results amount often to little more than the occasional anecdote or example, the experience was assuredly an excellent introduction to the subject - particularly once the limitations of the material became clear. The Church of England being what it is, records (like activities, and authority) are dispersed, and often difficult to track down. It would be ideal to be able to study more of the theological colleges, more of the Clerical Education Societies, and a lot more of the clergy charities. (And it would, for instance, have been better if I could have followed up in detail men who moved from diocese to diocese, as most did - but the logistics of working with the records of perhaps a score of dioceses were impossibly difficult.) All these will doubtless be studied one day; here I have only been able to use examples, and relate them at best as I could to a general picture.

There are other lines of research which I have not attempted, but which it may be useful to point out. There is, for instance, a

10. The St Aidan's papers took considerable work to find, and they had simply been moved recently: while after quite full efforts, I was unable to find any Ripon visitation returns after 1857: presumably they do exist somewhere, and would be a most valuable source. Societies of course vary in their policies: I gather that the Poor Clergy Relief Corporation disposed of many records quite recently, in an access of 'practical' housecleaning.
great need for more studies of the Church in the large towns\textsuperscript{11}:
the mechanisms of 'Church extension' need closer examination, with
more emphasis upon the issues raised by W.R. Ward in his paper on
Manchester\textsuperscript{12}. It would be valuable to have a clearer idea of the
sort of clergy available for particular towns, and of how far the
Church was dependent upon, for instance, non-Oxbridge clergy, or
young and unmarried clergy, or upon clergy of private means\textsuperscript{13}.
(A related topic of interest is the extent and development of
'private enterprise' Church activity - the proprietary chapels, and
the churches run up as speculations by builders or clergymen).
Patronage, below the level of important Crown appointments, is also
ripe for study: apart from looking at the less exalted Crown
patronage, it should be possible to trace the use of patronage by
some other holders, including lay ones: some of the less reputable
of the latter might well provide more insight into the
'patronage market'\textsuperscript{14}. And the growth of lay parochial help is
a large subject which would certainly repay closer attention\textsuperscript{15}.

\textsuperscript{11} E.R. Wickham's study of Sheffield, Church and people in an
industrial city (1975) remains unique.

\textsuperscript{12} 'The cost of Establishment: some reflections on Church
building in Manchester', in G.J. Cuming, ed., Studies in

\textsuperscript{13} The housing of the clergy in towns (where there was often no
vicarage for many years, and usually no provision for curates)
merits research also.

\textsuperscript{14} The Dowager Countess of Cardigan, ex-mistress of the notorious
Earl and ostracised from respectable society, was a considerable
patron: it is hard to imagine that families of this type - and
the clubs and fashionable regiments must have been full of
patrons - did not sell their patronage rights, rather than
taking seriously the uncongenial duty of appointing good clergy.

\textsuperscript{15} The fullest scholarly treatment is by M.J.D. Roberts, in The
role of the laity in the Church of England c.1850-1885, Oxford,
D.Phil., 1974, pp.201-24: see also H.D. Rack, 'Domestic
visitation: a chapter in early 19th century evangelism', Journal
But such questions constitute the matter for at least another thesis. With a subject like this, it is impossible to be comprehensive. I have tried to provide a somewhat new view of the clergy. I trust that it is not unjust to a body of men whose motives were often unimpeachable. It will however be very clear that most were well aware that they belonged to a profession which could not afford - even if it desired - to be wholly unworldly in its concerns, or in its rewards. After all, the most unworldly of clerics still had a 'background', and still had to find a title, to be ordained, to make arrangements about stipends, to benefit (or otherwise) from patronage, and often, to support a family. The prominence of these matters in the circumstances of individuals is naturally a question that only detailed biography can show. But no clergyman could quite escape them. A view that concentrates on these themes is certainly incomplete, but the part with which it deals is not unimportant, and its consideration is hence not without value.
Chapter one

CLERGY GROWTH: AND ITS 'PROFESSIONAL' CONTEXT

Underlying, and to a large extent making possible, the transformation of the Church of England in the Victorian period, was the rise in the number of clergy. On the whole, both contemporaries and modern historians have emphasised the overall failure of the established Church to make headway against the rising tide of the population as a whole (especially in the towns);\(^1\) concentrating on the effort of having to run merely to fall slowly behind, the effects of the growth of the clergy on the Church itself have been rather ignored; on the Church, viewed as a profession, the impact was substantial, and it shall be argued that the inability of the Church to alter rigid structures to cope with its expanded ministry significantly harmed its chances of seeing the expansion continue into the 20th century. The first impact of growth, however, was rather different.

It is impossible to be completely accurate in giving figures to the numbers of clergy.\(^2\) The most useful figure to start with is the simple total, rather than any attempted calculation of working clergy, if only because clergymen never 'retired' in the conventional sense and remained always at least potentially working priests.\(^3\) Also, the


\(^3\) A notorious illustration was the use of very old clergy to facilitate essentially simoniacal patronage transfers: see, i.e., the evidence of Rev. Lord S.G. Osborne, in the 'Report of the S.C. of the House of Lords on Church Patronage ...'. PP 1874, VII, questions 1079-93.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clergy</th>
<th>Population (000s)</th>
<th>People per Clergyman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>14,613</td>
<td>16,038</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>17,463</td>
<td>18,071</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>19,336</td>
<td>20,210</td>
<td>1,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>20,824</td>
<td>22,857</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>21,786</td>
<td>26,116</td>
<td>1,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>24,374</td>
<td>29,150</td>
<td>1,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>25,363</td>
<td>32,678</td>
<td>1,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>24,968</td>
<td>36,219</td>
<td>1,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census Reports

*Includes 'Islands in the British Seas', i.e. the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands. These were integral parts of the Church of England, but their clergy and population have tended to appear only arbitrarily in other sets of figures. The numbers involved are not great, but it is worth having a consistent set of results.

†The Census Report (P.P.1852-3, Vol.88, Pt.1) is inconsistent here: the higher figure of 17,621 is given on pp.cxii and cxviii: the one used here is given on pp.lxxxvi(note) and ccxi, and is consistent with the age figures given in Table 1.2 (i.e. 17,320 clergy in England and Wales, plus 143 in the Islands).
relatively large (if uncoordinated) body of charities and trusts for aged and indigent clergy represented a commitment by the Church to its priests for life. The only source for such a total is the Census (from 1841), and the decennial totals from 1841 to 1911 are given in Table 1.1. They underestimate by apparently counting teaching clergy as teachers, a factor which it is not possible to correct with accuracy; by 1900 teaching clergy cannot have been more than 1,000, and probably never exceeded 2,000.

The basic mechanism of growth was simple; from the 1830's to the end of the century ordinations ran at a figure of about 600 a year with fluctuations (see Table 2.3 below); with about 11,000 to 12,000 to start with the effect was that additions to the ministry outnumbered the natural wastage by a margin which was very large initially but gradually decreased. (Unfortunately one is forced to argue partly from silence in postulating the sudden rise in clergy numbers from the 1830's as figures for earlier years are scanty; but to judge from, for instance, the estimates of Gregory King and Patrick Colquhoun the number of clergymen had been almost static for over 100 years at a figure close to that of the total of parishes; Victorian commentators appear to have assumed a stable number till the 1830's). In the 1880's, when ordinations reached a peak, growth was

4. See references in Census Reports of 1881 (PP 1883, LXXX, p.619) and 1891 (PP 1893-4, CVI, p.672).
5. A careful estimate in 1897, put clergymen involved in educational work at 1,010 (quoted in Report No.318, Convocation of Canterbury 'On Position of Assistant Curates', 1898, p.2) and in 1875 there were only 709 in the Clergy List (Analysis reported in Report of Curates' Augmentation Fund, June 1875): though Chadwick, V.C., Pt.2, p.244, n.2, mentions 2,000.
again briefly rapid; but thereafter the generations of high growth
died off faster than new priests filled their places, and in 1911
the Census records the first of a long series of decennial decreases.

The overall pattern of failure to keep up with population
growth and eventual absolute decline is well-known. But it seems
appropriate to begin a survey of the Victorian clergy by pointing to
the importance of the early stages of growth. In the census year of
1841, ordinations were 606, and they seem to have risen in the 1840's
before steadying off in about 1850. Allowing for a clergyman's average
life in Orders at 40 years, as was then conventionally done, hence
a natural wastage of one in forty of the whole number every year, at
this stage the excess of ordinations over wastage was at least 250 -
probably nearer 350, as Conybeare suggested. Moreover, a very rapid
change was occurring in the age structure of the clergy; if one takes
12,000 as the total clergy in 1834, they would decrease by about
3,000 over the next ten years; in the same decade over 5,000 new
ordinations - even allowing for early deaths - had joined them (see
table 2.3). Ten years further on, the original group would be down
to about 6,000, outnumbered by the new priests of the peak decade of
1844-1853 and no more than a solid minority of the whole body of
clergy. At these rates, it took about 15 years for clergy ordained
in that period to equal in numbers those ordained before it began.

Looked at in this light, it is clear that by the late 1840's
clergy ordained after the Reform Bill, indeed after the issue of
Tract Number 1, constituted a majority of the clerical body. More

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clergy</th>
<th>-35</th>
<th>-45</th>
<th>-55</th>
<th>-65</th>
<th>Over 65</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>5,108</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>17,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4,628</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>5,115</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15,241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clergy</th>
<th>-35</th>
<th>-45</th>
<th>-55</th>
<th>-65</th>
<th>Over 65</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>4,575</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>20,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4,768</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>15,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>4,333</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>14,684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clergy</th>
<th>-35</th>
<th>-45</th>
<th>-55</th>
<th>-65</th>
<th>Over 65</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>5,771</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>24,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>7,879</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>19,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>7,083</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>18,936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1.2: Age Structure of Clergy (and Lawyers and Doctors)
### TABLE 1.2: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-35</th>
<th>-45</th>
<th>-55</th>
<th>-65</th>
<th>Over 65</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1901</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>5,106</td>
<td>6,286</td>
<td>5,273</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>4,424</td>
<td>25,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>6,134</td>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>4,623</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>20,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>7,027</td>
<td>7,135</td>
<td>4,122</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>22,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|      |     |     |     |     |         |        |
| **1911** |     |     |     |     |         |        |
| Clergy | 4,076 | 5,476 | 6,123 | 4,625 | 4,559 | 24,859 |
|       | 16.4 | 22.0 | 24.6 | 18.6 | 18.3 |        |
| Law   | 5,644 | 5,320 | 5,494 | 3,303 | 1,619 | 21,380 |
|       | 26.4 | 24.9 | 25.7 | 15.4 | 7.6  |        |
| Medical | 5,501 | 7,325 | 6,312 | 3,306 | 2,109 | 24,553 |
|       | 22.4 | 29.8 | 25.7 | 13.5 | 8.6  |        |

Source: Census of England and Wales: Islands are not included, as exact figures are unavailable for last two years, but their impact is negligible.

The 1901 and 1911 tables are adapted from tables in the 'Occupations and Industries' Report (1913 [Cd.7018] 78), pp.XXIII and XX, where the retired members of the clergy, and medical men, are shown broken down by age-group: the lawyers did not include retired men, from 1891.

Figures are for males only.

Law includes barristers and solicitors; medical includes physicians, surgeons, general practitioners.
significantly, there is no reason to doubt that they constituted a substantial majority of the active parochial clergy. The situation was almost certainly unique in the history of the Church of England; since the Reformation it is hard to recall a time when so many young and enthusiastic priests were in such a relatively powerful position in the Church; briefly, the Church was a young man's profession (see Table 1.2) with over half of its body less than 45 years old and only a fifth over 55.11 It is this fact which gives credibility to the language of revival in these decades and which surely was largely the basis for Bishop Selwyn's famous encomium in a sermon to the University of Cambridge in 1854 on the 'great and visible change' which he saw in the Church after an absence of only 13 years.12 It is, of course, impossible to discuss the rising intake of clergymen as a movement without context, but equally it seems imbalanced to ignore its impact; the 'extraordinary vitality which seems to have stimulated every limb of the supposedly sickly body' of the Church in the 1820's and 1830's13 both produced and was in turn fuelled by the influx of new clergy. 'It is almost incredible' wrote Manning to Edward Coleridge in October, 1845, 'that a body which fifteen years ago was elated at being an Establishment should now be conscious of being a Church'.14 While losing none of its interest, it is perhaps more easily understood when seen less as a change of view by 'a body' than as a takeover by a new

11. This makes L. Paul's use of the 1851 figures somewhat misleading, unless rapid growth is assumed as normal (The Deployment and Payment of the Clergy (1964), p.21.
14. Quoted ibid., p.316; for a corrective stress upon continuities in the revival, see G. Kitson Clark, Churchman and the Condition of England (1973) and pp.41-3, 45-7; and, i.e., R. Palmer, Memorials Personal and Political (1896), Vol.I, note on p.409.
body. (Inevitably, and perhaps not entirely fortunately, the memory of this unique vigour and youthfulness coloured the thoughts of the generation who were ordained then and who were to lead the Church of England through the end of the century).

Before looking further at the ideals of clerical life and work, however, the Church's growth should be seen in the twin contexts of the movements of the population as a whole, and of changes in other professions. In the first case (see Table 1.1) it is only necessary here to note that, except in the 1840's and the 1880's, the Church was unable to keep up with the population as a whole in terms of the provision of clergy. There are so many qualifications to this simple comparison, however, that it bears very little by way of argument now. Its significance was that it gave the Church a constant target and was available to be trotted out as the prefatory evidence to every appeal for increased effort, or more money, throughout the century.

The appeal for a body of clergy expanding in proportion to the whole population, however, rested on plausibility as well as upon its theoretical desirability. As late as 1868, after a decade marked by fears of a crisis in the supply of clergy, the figures could be seen to show that the clergy were in fact overhauling lay population growth; and as ordinations were then to rise, it is arguable that not until the mid-1890's, when the trend of ordinations was demonstrably and seriously downwards, was it necessary

---

15. Particularly in terms of the massive variations in density of deployment; but the growth of method in pastoral care, and of the use of lay helpers, is a further major qualification.
16. Census figures were the stock-in-trade of, i.e., the Reports of the two largest Church Extension Societies, the Church Pastoral Aid Society (C.P.A.S.) and the Additional Curates Society (A.C.S.); many educated Victorians must have virtually known the Census by heart, from the use made of them in appeals to philanthropy.
fundamentally to question the practicality of ministering to the population through the traditional clerical framework.

A more significant comparison in terms of the Church as a profession is between its growth and that of other professions. On this subject the statistics of the Censuses present problems of changing definitions, and there is an additional problem that retired clergymen, along with retired doctors and military officers, continued to be included in the ranks of the professions in the 1891 and 1901 censuses. Further, though retired men were previously allotted to their former professions, there is every reason to believe that many retired professionals preferred to be classed simply as 'Persons of Rank or Property'. (This may somewhat balance the underestimation of the clergy due to the classification of many as teachers; see above p.1). It is, however, not difficult to discern the extremely substantial changes that occurred in the professional community in the century after Waterloo.

At the end of the Napoleonic wars the professions were few and clearly conferred but little status on most of their members. The three traditional professions - Church, Law and Medicine - all contained large proportions of men who possessed neither money nor status: the curates of the Church and its 'mountain' clergy of Wales and the North, the bulk of attorneys and the bulk of all medical men - with the latter two shading down to ill-defined and often positively ill-favoured fringes. Only a few - the successful physicians and barristers, the well-connected or exceptionally able clergy with good

19. The classification of retired people away from their original professions (with the noted exceptions) is first explicit in 1891 (PP 1893-4, CVI, Report p.37), but it was noted in 1881 that the 'Unoccupied Class' contained a large number of retired (PP 1883, LXXX, Report p.49).
livings - were at a level at which the profession might give status to those unqualified by birth. And even at this level, it was not what later generations would understand as 'professional competence' which conferred the status (although it might have been a necessary precondition for a man of humble birth) but the state connections, the patronage links to the aristocracy and governing groups (both evidently important in the Church and the Law), and more generally the acquaintance with a broad, non-specialist culture.  

(The great physicians were not so much 'scientifically' effective as reassuring, and their knowledge was almost as far removed from the empirical as possible, in the 18th century).  

The numbers involved were very small; barristers and physicians, even if the latter is extended to include the more successful surgeons, can have numbered no more than 2,000; and the wealth of the Church was notoriously concentrated in the hands of the 'connections' of the powerful, although it probably provided more 'gentlemanly competences' than the other two put together.

By about 1860, the situation was considerably changed. In the older professions, the change was associated not so much with growth (though the Bar and the Church had grown notably) as with a new emphasis upon the functions and distinctive expertise of the profession which had the necessary corollary that the status of all within the profession tended to a more comparable level. In Law, the solicitors, and in Medicine, the general practitioners, had taken the initiative in increasingly successful efforts to regularise entry and

22. Elliott, op. cit., pp.28 and 32.
qualifications, hence both differentiating themselves from the less organised and less respectable fringes and closing the status differentials between themselves and the 'upper branches' of their respective professions. 23 Even in Law, whose division has remained, a quite critical barrister admitted in 1857 that the solicitor 'holds a position in society only one half-pace lower than the bar', and that the difference was traditional rather than substantive, with both branches drawing on the same social rank for their recruits. 24 One can see a similar evening upwards in the Church where the operation of the Pluralities Act (and greatly improved episcopal supervision) had increased the number of incumbents very much faster than the number of curates. 25 Comparing numbers, it is by 1860 increasingly realistic to compare Census figures as a whole rather than merely a small proportion from the upper echelons of each profession; and it is clear that while still the most numerous of the three, clergymen were outnumbered by the ever more respectable lawyers and doctors together. Meanwhile the newer professions based on servicing the technical and financial needs of Victorian society - notably engineers, architects and accountants - were burgeoning, 26 if as yet they constituted relatively ill-defined bodies. Finally, the slow reform of the Civil Service, Home and Indian, was just starting to bring these bastions of patronage into line with the new orthodoxies of professional standards

23. Reader, op. cit., Chap.2.
25. There were over 4,000 curates by 1815, and there were only just over 5,000 by 1860, whereas beneficed clergy had increased from 7,190 to 12,829 between 1835 and 1861 (Currie, Gilbert and Horsley, op. cit., p.196-7).
26. See Table 1.1.
of entry and rationality of reward; and the Army, minimally reformed, was so at least sufficiently to attract a steady flow of recruits from the better-off middle class.

By the end of the nineteenth century most of the modern professions were established and had, like the lawyers and the doctors, their state-confirmed monopolies, regulating bodies, and examinable entry standards. Solicitors and general practitioners, keeping a firm reign on entries, had attained high average earnings and assured respectability, and the other professions were following the same path. With what seemed an over-crowded professional world, the colonies, government and, to a growing extent, business absorbed the enormously expanded output of the universities and the public and grammar schools. The Church, still a large profession, was yet in a quite different quantitative relation to the rest of the professions; it was now in every sense a minority choice.

The changing relationship of the Church to the rest of the professional community was, however, much more significantly qualitative than quantitative. The differentiation that took place was largely intentional, as will be seen below, grounded - or at least rationalised - on religious and spiritual ideals. Before looking


28. G. Harries-Jenkins, The Army in Victorian Society (1977). Chaps.2 to 5 are largely concerned with recruitment, training, and the purchase system, though material on backgrounds is heavily weighted towards the aristocratic contingent.


30. The organisation of the profession has much to do with the slowing of the growth of, i.e., accountants or engineers in the later part of the century. On the comfortable eminence of Edwardian solicitors, Abel-Smith and Stevens, p.187 et seq, and doctors, F.B. Smith, The People's Health (1979), p.367 (and pp.362-82 for the development of the profession generally).
at this process, it is instructive to follow the indications of change in a thoroughly secular form of literature, that of books of advice to parents and guardians on the careers open to their sons. The books chosen are not intended to be a comprehensive list nor can they be seen as simply 'typical', each being presumably infused with the prejudices and experiences of their authors; but the development, if not unexpected, is clear, and any discussion of the Church as a profession must at least notice these tomes of prudential advice. From them attitudes (which are obviously linked) to motives for ordination, ease and cost of ordination, and prospects as a clergyman can be extracted, if sometimes by implication only.

An early example is the 1809 *Essays on Professional Education* by the veteran Anglo-Irish landlord, Rousseauist liberal and educationist, R.L. Edgeworth. A great deal of the book is rendered, to modern eyes, distinctly quaint by his perversely logical application of his theories of directional education, but his comments on the Church are particularly full and are instructive on the attitudes of laymen towards the Church. This is probably least true of motivation, as there seems good reason to believe that his otherwise admirable emphasis on at least a fair degree of commitment and on the quiet and conscientious carrying out of pastoral duty is in part by way of a pointed contrast to the actual behaviour of the intolerant Tory parsons and bishops to whom he was opposed politically. Nevertheless,

31. 1744-1817: an improving Anglo-Irish landlord, scientist, friend of the elder Darwin and the 'Lichfield circle', and meddler in the novels of his famous daughter Maria: *D.N.B.*

32. His most famous book was on *Practical Education*; his directions on, i.e., the education of a boy intended for the Army, are nightmarishly thorough, esp. pp.110-1.

33. On the disinterested ideal, see esp. pp.61-3, 67, 72-3, 106-7; in several passages (i.e. p.67 on elections, pp.72-3 on bishops and church reform) his bias is obvious.
and despite the idiosyncratic instructions on how to educate a boy for the Church, his general message to parents was probably broadly acceptable:

Where the connections of any family put it into the power of parents, or even give them reason to hope, that they may provide for their sons, after a due season of probation, according to their merits [a disingenuous rider?], it is perfectly reasonable that this should have its weight in determining them in favour of the clerical profession.34

and the general suitability of such a choice is particularised by his belief that 'Church benefices may thus be considered as a fund for the provision of the younger sons of our gentry and nobles...'.35

Clearly though, while conceding the right of the well-connected to the pick of Church livings, he feels that he is addressing those without such firm prospects too; and for their benefit he describes how the necessary university education, once endowed for the benefit of the poor and deserving, is no longer so open; such an education 'is now scarcely possible for any man ... without some aid from private fortune'; and the prospects thereafter are not good, the plight of poor curates being characterised as 'the extreme line of human misery'.36 So he advises that no one should consider sending a son into the Church unless 'fully able not only to defray the considerable expenses of his education at a university, but to add to his income, perhaps for many years ...' while he remains unbeficed (though he acknowledges that exceptional men will rise even 'without the aid of parliamentary connections'). Given this original investment, however, 'every clergyman of merit and learning has more than a chance of preferment' - a qualified conclusion in harmony with

34. P.61.
35. P.69: or the same point, p.95 'As it usually happens that younger sons are destined for the Church ...'.
36. Pp.56, 68.
In 1842 there appeared *The Parent's Hand-Book...* by J.C. Hudson, an advanced liberal and, in his youth, the friend of Godwin, Shelley, Tooke and others of that circle. He was perhaps less radical now, for after his 1823 'Pamphleteer' piece on child sweeps, his publications consisted of guides to executors based on his knowledge as chief clerk in legacy at Somerset House (his father had been 'of the Stamp Office'). His aims were entirely practical, and in his Preface he describes the problem to which he has addressed himself - that of the father once blithely proud of his infant first-born, who sees himself eighteen years later...

... surrounded by half a dozen full-grown and fast growing candidates for frock coats, Wellington boots, walking canes, watch guards, and cigars... If the difficult task of placing out a family of sons, in situations in which they may maintain themselves, can be rendered comparatively easy, it must be by premonition.

Naturally, the Church is the subject of his first chapter; motivation is never mentioned, and the Church is treated in every respect as a profession simply. He is illuminating on the educational system in general, with his matter-of-fact advice to 'persons of moderate resources' that the first step in planning a youth for a university education 'is the selection of a school in which an exhibition to a college may be earned...', and he goes so far as to note which colleges have, for instance, the best school patronage should a

school mastership be the desired career for the boy. If planning for a pastoral career he points out that 'there would be no difficulty whatever in purchasing through the medium of any of the clerical agents the next presentation to a living', and one of £300 p.a. with an incumbent aged over 60, might be had 'for less than £1,000'. He expresses no fears as to the prospects of a clerical life, and this was a reasonable reflection of a moment when, with the ending of pluralities under way, new parishes being created, and a healthy reform vigour, prospects were indeed probably as objectively good as they ever had been or were to be. Comparatively, the Church appears as a highly desirable line of life: the forces are expensive (the Army) or slow and not well rewarded (the Navy); medicine is not cheap to enter and in no profession is it harder 'to make a beginning'; the Bar he describes in attractive terms in contrast to later writers, but this was a period of rapid growth; though the now expensive career of solicitor he admits to be a safer, if less potentially spectacular line of life. The Church is thus presented as a safe haven of patronage at least possibly open to men of moderate means, an honourable position and indeed, he suggests, affording 'opportunity for a display of the talents of its members far more easily than the professions of law and medicine'.

There are some interesting and significant changes discernible when one comes to The Choice of a Profession by H. Byerley Thomson, published in 1857. Thomson, at this stage still a struggling barrister, was the son of a prominent Scottish physician long settled in London.

40. Pp.1 and 6-7: at the end of the book he has a 28-page Appendix with details of endowed schools and scholarships to the universities.
41. P.15: he also notes that Irish livings, though the tithe is now settled, are still particularly cheap.
42. P.12: on other professions here mentioned, see (Army) 20, 23; (Navy) 58-9; (Medicine) 89; (Bar) 118; (Solicitor) 119-21; etc.
and a professor at London University, and of a well-known literary mother whose friends included Jeffreys, Thackeray and Lytton. His own tone is sensibly matter-of-fact but withal much coloured by his high view of the importance and status of the professions and of their connection with a broad and liberal education. When he comes to discuss the Church it is clear that to completely ignore motive, like Hudson, was no longer possible. His opening page is concerned to justify the very design of treating the Church in such a context and in such a form as he was doing; thus he points out that practical considerations cannot be ignored now that a minister is no primitive disciple but

must be carefully nurtured, bred as a gentleman, educated as a scholar, be protected and fed by the law, and in connection with his calling fulfil many mere worldly duties.

He admits that in respect of motive for entry the Church 'does, or ought to differ from other professions', but he does not let this pass without comment, saying brusquely that

... it is an assured fact that the true motives which induce the youth of England to engage in the ministry of the establishment are not one whit less time-serving, or selfish, than those that create the lawyer ... (etc.)

and indeed, compare unfavourably with the motives of the soldier, or the poor but persistent artist.

Having thus cleared the decks he proceeds to treat the clerical career as any other and is forthright about the means, honest and

43. The Choice of a Profession: a Concise Account and Comparative Review of the English Professions: Chapman and Hall, 1857 (previous editions 1854 and 1855). With father, mother and brother, as well as himself, commemorated in the D.N.B., it seems unlikely that he 'may perhaps be taken as representative of the professional men of his day' (Reader, op. cit., p.1); he also wrote on military institutions and shipping law, before receiving a post in Ceylon in 1858 (he was a judge there from 1861 till his death in 1867); his book on the laws there was his major work.

44. Pp.4-5, 16, 34-5 and ff.

otherwise, by which such a career may be advanced. He is, however, by no means unaware of current preoccupations of clerical reformers and leaders, noting the growth of non-university clergy and the inadequacy of theological instruction at the old universities; and on prospects his line is one of determined moderation. The 'opulence of the clergy is a mere vulgar prejudice', he writes; but he takes to task the fashionable modern trend of exaggerating the poverty of the clergy. 46 He in fact clearly underestimated this problem, but he evidently spoke from experience in concluding that while the incomes were not generally high, the Church 'does promise a gentlemanly competence to the majority'. The clergy marry well, are well provided for by charities, and

in pecuniary matters (a clergyman) is as well off as members of other professions - his income is more certain, his expenditure can be regulated according to his means, and both are independent of the numerous fluctuations incident to other intellectual callings. 47

After Thomson, however, the treatment of the Church's worldly prospects becomes progressively gloomier. The notable barrister, J.F. Stephen, had in 1850 seriously debated between the Bar and the Church, and then saw little difference in worldly prospects; his father pushed the Church largely on the grounds of its lesser expense, although he was himself put off by the prospect of pastoral work. 48 He later held the balance very nicely in an 1864 article when he wrote that

its attractions are by no means great to an ambitious man who is not rich, though in many cases they are most attractive to a rich man who is not ambitious.

46. P.74: he may well have been thinking of the well-known pamphlets on clerical poverty by W.G. Jervis (see below Chapter seven).
47. Pp.74, 75, 77.
He indeed saw it as the very worst profession for a man of intelligence and ability. By 1870, the new stereotype seems to be established: What Shall My Son Be? by F. Davenant (a book aimed a little lower than Thomson's and including commercial clerkships and travellerships, for instance) begins his chapter on the Church by disclaiming any imputation of worldly motive. 'Something else' motivates the intending clergyman: 'At least, it may reasonably be concluded so now-a-days, whatever may have been the rule in the old time'. As an instance of the 'difference in the ideal of men' he cites the training he says is now necessary and the test of the bishops' examinations; a university education is an advantage but by no means a necessity. Once ordained the prospects as he sees them are very poor: simply, the incomes to be earned 'are so scanty as to be likely to straiten' a married man, whether as curate or as incumbent. 'Without private means a clergyman will have a hard time of it', particularly as his charitable outgoings are expected to be large; for those with money, though, it is still possible to purchase preferment. His


50. What Shall My Son Be? Hints to Parents in the Choice of a Profession or Trade and Counsels to Young Men on Their Entrance Into Active Life: Illustrated by Anecdotes and Maxims of Distinguished Men ..., (1870). I could find nothing on the author ('M.A.'), who was not of Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, Edinburgh or T.C.D. (unless after 1860); other very slightly amended versions of this work were produced in 1881 and 1887, and he also published Hubert Ellis: a Story of King Richard's days, the Second [sic] in 1867.

51. P.9: on improvement generally in the Church, he writes conventionally, pp.9-12.

52. Pp.12-5: Stephen had already described a theological college training as 'by far the cheapest form of anything that can be called liberal education that is to be met with in this country', and the Church as then potentially the cheapest profession to enter (op. cit., p.757).

summary is unequivocal: the training is relatively long and expensive, the prospects poor:

Parents should hesitate, therefore, before they decide on their own account, or yield to the suggestions of their children, to place their sons in holy orders.

The stark nature of this advice is somewhat qualified by the fact that few of the professions are recommended very highly. In prudential terms, the Bar is expensive (he calculates on £200 per annum as the necessary private income) and like the profession of solicitor cannot yield success without much hard work; medicine also requires a 'longish purse' to support the early struggling years; the Civil Service, if no longer a mere haven for the idle and foolish, is yet ill-rewarded, requiring private means to make up a comfortable income; architecture is not cheap to enter and is peculiarly precarious as a living; and so on.  

The series ends in 1898, with the still more modest Guide to Professions and Business, by Henry Jones, Commercial Master at Liverpool College. For the first time, the Church is not the subject of the first chapter - interestingly, it is preceded now by the Army and the Navy. In dealing with it, vocation is first stressed, and when he then turns to its advantages, he now points to the relative openness of entry and its potential cheapness (through a Theological College): notable contrasts to Thomson, and more than the different viewpoints of the authors would explain. The 'material prospects ... are undoubtedly poor', both in terms of income and promotion, and

54. P.19: on other professions, see (Bar)28; (Solicitor) 38-42; (Medicine) 44; (Civil Service) 110-2; (Architect)145, etc.

55. An Entrance Guide to Professions and Business (part of Methuen's 1/6 'Commercial Series'), 1898. The author had been educated at Derby G.S. and Bede Coll., Durham, for his teacher training, and was at Liverpool College from 1895, after 7½ years elsewhere; the school had in 1908 a clerical H-M, and a mostly graduate staff including a further 4 clergymen: it was represented at the H.M.C. (various edns. of the Schoolmaster's Directory).
though 'the social prospects are, of course, good', his last words remind the reader that a social position unsupported by adequate income 'is rather a drawback than an advantage.' Once again, however, the position of the other professions, where the picture is one of serious over-crowding, mitigates the poorness of this depiction of the clerical profession. A major difference is clear, though; both the standards and the costs of entry are now high in all secular professions (as are the rewards for success), and the competition is still fierce. In the Church standards and costs are both shown to be relatively modest, yet - and this he does not say - candidates are falling in number.

The changes thus sketched in the relative standing of the Church were closely connected with changes in the roles and functions of the clergy as perceived within the Church. These must be described briefly as a background to the argument and description which follow. The starting point is with the roles, actual and ideal, of the clergy of the 18th century, a period which clergy of the mid-19th century tended to regard with 'feelings comparable to those of a patient miraculously cured of a mortal sickness, grateful for their deliverance and determined to avoid contagion again.' They reacted against what Sykes has called 'a steady and progressive laicisation of religion, which is the keynote of (the 18th century's) ecclesiastical

57. He is particularly explicit in terms of the Navy (13), Bar (35), Solicitors (36), Medicine (41). Overcrowding and competition in the professions are themes in W.R. Greg's well-known 'Life at High Pressure' (Contemporary Review, Vol.25, March 1875), esp. 629-34, and S.H. Jeyes' 'Our Gentlemanly Failures', (Fortnightly Review, N.S.61, March 1897), passim but esp. 388-90. It is discussed in Reader, op. cit., pp.183-5.
development; a development involving the growth of a new version of establishment theory, emphasizing the social affinities of clergy and laity, tending to glorify their interconnections and mutual dependence, and making it easier to forget, if they wanted to, that the laity still were ultimately in control.

The result at parish level was a clerical role that referred largely, if not overwhelmingly, to social and political criteria of usefulness and to an ideal type increasingly modelled on the (aspired to) peer-group of the landed gentry. This association, in practice largely confined to a minority of better-off clergy, had nevertheless a firm economic base in the rising incomes and extended land-holding of many clergy following the enclosure movement and agricultural improvement generally. The roles of gentry and clergy had significant similarities too, in being diffuse and lacking a central expertise yet carrying authority in a wide range of social activities. The benefice was a freehold and provided a living constrained little more than the normal (settled) landed estate. The 'duty' attached had come to refer mainly to the minimal taking of services and was often deputed to poor curates whose status this one specifically religious function did nothing to improve. Other roles (examined in detail

59. Sykes, Church and State in England in the XVIIIth century (1934).
60. Best, op. cit., p.61.
63. Russell, op.cit., pp.27-35: D. McClatchey, Oxfordshire Clergy 1777-1869, (1960), Chap.VII, who indicates that duty was actually declining till the second decade of the century with the rise in non-residence (for which, pp.32-4 esp.).
by A.J. Russell) were equally prominent, like those of officer of law and order, almoner, clerk (if partly by default); in short, 'The Church contained a large number of clergy whose secular concerns, social and judicial, dwarfed their pastoral ones', and overall it is clear that the Establishment's utility within the society did not end with its specifically religious concerns, and did not necessarily depend on these concerns at all.64

Both image and reality of the dominance of what Gladstone referred to as 'the conventional and secular school of clergy, frozen in doctrine and relaxed in life',65 were challenged by the growth of evangelical seriousness among the clergy. Still a small and unpopular party before the French Revolution, the fortunes of the evangelicals rose as the frightened reactions of the governing classes led to a renewed respect and support for the Established Church.66 By the 1820's they formed a significant and highly active party in the Church: if still widely disliked, they could not be ignored,67 and they reintroduced a vision of clerical work based firmly on the salvation of individual souls; this they combined with strenuous activity, both through their great societies ('always ... the peculiar glory of the Evangelical


65. W.E. Gladstone, Gleanings of Past Years (1897), Vol.V, p.75: in 1830 the 'clergy were, as a body, secular in their habits', (p.8), etc.: this was written in 1843.

66. Best, op.cit., pp.139-44, and R.A. Soloway, op. cit., Chap.1, both making the point that the reaction was already underway before the Revolution itself. See also, V.G. Kiernan, 'Evangelicalism and the French Revolution', (Past and Present, No.1, 1952): D. Spring, 'Aristocracy, social structure and religion in Early Victorian England',(Victorian Studies, Vol.6, 1963) describes the changed tone of upper class life and society.

67. Their exact strength is still moot: D. Newsome, op. cit., esp. pp.8-15, argues persuasively that though numerous and influential, the 1820s were the beginning of a 'crisis' in the party.
Party') and in their parishes. From the 1830's two important new streams joined the forces making for change in the old Establishment: the assertion of priestly powers and religious autonomy in the Oxford Movement (which enjoyed the fortune of early prominence and fame, partly owing to its harnessing of the political reactions of churchmen to the threats presented in the years 1828 to 1835); and the spate of organisational and financial reforms which began the process of rationally reordering the resources of the Church for service, essentially, in the parishes.

The result was a marked change in the relative importance of the clergyman's roles, grounded on a renewed stress on the pastoral aspect of the work. Best writes that by 1810 the parochial clergy 'came more and more to seem the most important' part of the Church and that 'it was becoming generally recognised that the battle of the establishment would be won or lost at the parochial level.' While the organisation of the Church was beginning to change under the impact of reforms (spearheaded by the establishment of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, laws against non-residence and pluralities, and for the commutation of tithe, all backed by growing voluntary financial aid), the Oxford

69. 'Their hostile critics said that they were redeemed by the working of their parishes', in 1860 (Chadwick, V.C., Pt.1, p.443): in the 1830s it was they who pioneered lay help in populous parishes (Soloway, op. cit., pp.321ff).
70. Chadwick's 'Introduction' to his Mind of the Oxford Movement (1960), and V.C., Pt.1, Chap.1; Newsome, op. cit., passim; P. Brendon, Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement (1974), passim, provide the best recent surveys.
71. O. Brosse, Church and Parliament: the reshaping of the Church of England, 1828-1860 (1959), passim (esp. Part Three); Best, op. cit., esp. Chaps. VI and VII.
72. Op. cit., pp.259,260: Russell sees the sharp rise to prominence of the pastoral role (from virtual neglect) as the single most important development of the period c.1815-c.1840: op. cit., Chap. 6 (esp. p.187).
73. The main legislative landmarks are: 1836, Ecclesiastical
Movement added a distinctive turn to the development of the clerical ideal; to the evangelical concern for salvation, faith and probity, was added a new emphasis on the authority of the Church, its resting upon a supernatural order, and the independent, spiritual foundation of its ministry. The foundation of their theological restatement and the rallying cry of their agitations was 'Apostolical Succession': the moral as opposed to the theological (or political) implications are neatly caught in a diary entry of the young William Thomson (later Archbishop of York) in 1843

One pardons good men of the last century for losing sight of the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession. They did not believe that their clergy were descended from the Apostles, for there was no trace of a family likeness.

The stress on the fact that the Church was independent of all earthly institutions (and material endowments) for its authority might be seen to lead logically to a rejection of the establishment, but this extrapolation was and continued to be rare. But if there was now controversy on the basis of the Church's authority, there was by 1850 no (respectable) disagreement with the assertion that the basis of an individual's ordination and continued work in the Church should be religious and spiritual.

F.n. 73 continued.

Commissioners Act, 6 and 7 Will.IV, cap.77: 1836, Tithe Commutation Act (England), 6 and 7 Will.IV, cap.71: 1838, Pluralities Act (also on residence), 1 and 2 Vict., cap.106. These and others are conveniently listed in Brose, op. cit., p.219.

74. See note 68: for some passages relating to obedience due to the authority of the Church, as opposed to private judgement, see Chadwick, Mind of the Oxford Movement, pp.134-47.


76. R.H. Froude seems to have been the most radical of the early Oxford men on this point: see Brendon, op. cit., pp.95, 105, 112-3, 144-6, also. An outline of later Anglo-Catholic political views (Tories still much more prominent than disestablishment men) is in B. Heeney's Mission to the middle classes (1969), Chap.5.

77. The formal primacy of vocation was by then a cliché: it is summed up in Heeney, Different Kind of Gentleman, pp. 35, 93, etc.
Changes in the standards of the clergy are usually seen as processes of 'professionalisation': the Church remained distinctive but underwent changes, many of which were at least analogous to those transforming the secular professions. At the most elementary level there was a change toward professionalism, in the sense of its opposition to amateurism, a change much bound up with the general attempt to seek justification for the Church in terms of its conscientious discharge of duty, and its utility. The main claims to 'professionalisation', however, are somewhat less obvious; they can perhaps be summarised in terms of the interlinked trends towards a specialisation of functions and towards the seeking of professional legitimation on the basis of monopolistic expertise in the specialised role. The specialisation was largely a matter of an enforced contraction of role as secular specialists increasingly took over functions often left to the clergy in the 18th century; for instance, in the areas of law, police, medicine, education, charity administration; more generally, because

The old system of individual responsibility and local initiative, in which the clergy had an important part to play, had failed, and a new social order, with a new and powerful concept of the state, was taking over. The growing emphasis upon their religious, specialist functions was not simply a matter of enforced contraction, though such a tendency has been argued to be characteristic of a

78. Best, op. cit., p.399, refers to the influence in the Church of 'the general reforming spirit of the age, professional, pious, and (in no precise philosophical sense) utilitarian'. Brose, op. cit., Chap.IV, is a sympathetic portrait of Blomfield, the most prominent exponent of moderate reforming 'utilitarianism' (esp. pp.82-3).

certainly the trend was at least rationalised largely in terms of the spread and acceptance of 'high church' doctrines and habits. This was most noticeable in the prominence accorded to the clergyman's leadership of worship, and more specifically, to his administration of the sacraments. The century was marked also by the almost total control asserted by the clergy over the physical structure of their churches and over the actual organisation of, and the participants in, the act of worship.\(^\text{81}\) (Chadwick describes the late 19th century as 'the most clerical age of English life, clerical in the sense that the parson had more individual power in his parish church than ever before or after').\(^\text{82}\) Additional developments adduced as elements of professionalisation include the growth of corporate self-consciousness, signified by the proliferation of clerical journals (and books of pastoral theology), of clerical clubs, and of representative institutions ranging from the inclusive rural deanery gatherings through diocesan conferences to the provincial Convocations.\(^\text{83}\) The earnest, if sporadic and unevenly effective attempts to raise and regularise standards of knowledge and competence at ordination,\(^\text{84}\) also can be seen as attempts to approximate to current professional norms.

---

\(^{81}\) Described in detail by Russell, op. cit., Chaps. 3 and 5 (esp. pp.68-9, 88-97, 147: also, 480-3): he refers, p.482, to 'that central and irreducible religious function of the priestly role, the leadership of public worship. In this element of his role at least the clergyman had a monopoly of legitimate function.'
\(^{82}\) V.C., Pt.2, p.322.
\(^{83}\) Heeney, Different Kind of Gentleman, pp.108-11: for Church and parish publications, see Chadwick, V.C., Pt.2, pp.426-7.
\(^{84}\) See below, esp. Chaps. 3 and 4.
It was thus easy to say, in 1899, that 'The majority of the clergy have become more professional.' The qualifications to the analogy of professionalism, however, are substantial; and on balance I argue that the Church had significantly diverged from other professions in the course of the century to the extent that 'professionalisation' is not the dominant trend, but rather represents a qualification only, to the trend of divergence. Factors which weigh against 'professionalisation' include, most significantly, the following: the lack of a state-protected or -enforced monopoly: despite the continuing grievances of Dissenters, it is fundamental that the 19th century saw the Church brought into a state of substantively free competition with its rival denominations; in this important respect the clergyman as a professional was subject to changes precisely opposite to those affecting other professionals, being forced 'into an arena where the Dissenting minister could meet him on equal terms, and pose as a formidable rival.' At the same time, however, the Church suffered from being tied to parliamentary channels of reform: between 1880 and 1913, of 216 church-related bills introduced in the Commons only 33 passed, and 162 were dropped without discussion; and as late as 1874 the controversial Public

86. Russell, whose discussion is fuller, is more qualified in his acceptance of professionalisation than Heeney, putting greater stress on pre-professional anomalies, and on growing social marginality: see, esp., Russell, op. cit., pp.4-6, 498-503: Heeney, op. cit., pp.3-8: most of the qualifications that follow are noted by one or both of these writers, with varying emphasis.
Worship Regulation Act had been enacted without the Church's concurrence (through Convocation). Furthermore, the direct involvement of the laity, both in the old-fashioned form of lay patronage and in the new shape of lay partnership in Church government (through parish councils and up to the House of Laity), was utterly unlike the general professional trend towards self-regulation.

The functions of the clergy remained incorrigibly hard to fit into the emerging professional model. The salvation of souls was (and is) a function of absolute value entrusted to all clergy irrespective of rank and is inherently inconducive to a rational hierarchy. Doctors share a similar absolute commitment to the saving of physical life, but the work is far more amenable to the normal professional developments of specialisation and of acknowledged levels of expertise. The relationship to 'clients' was distinctive; this is a complex issue, for while the Church retained an undoubted duty to serve (free of direct financial considerations) the whole community, there were distinct signs of a move towards more direct expert-client relationships in various forms of spiritual counselling. This was not, however, a generally-expected skill, and it was notable that in the Great War the Anglican Chaplains seemed bumbling in comparison


89. Reader, op. cit., pp.67, 71, 163-5. (On the lay role, see below, p.28f).

90. Russell, op. cit., pp.181-7, 487-90 (who notes the general significance of the rise of 'private life', to which this was partially a response): also, J. Kent in Holding the fort: Studies in Victorian revivalism (1978) emphasises that the
with the acknowledged skills of the Roman Catholic priests, when faced with dying men.\footnote{91} It has been pointed out that in the oldest professions (religious and military), 'society, not the individual, was the client';\footnote{92} and it is worth at least acknowledging the difference between a 'service' and a 'profession' and that the 19th century Church of England compared in many ways better with the civil and military services than with law, medicine, and the newer professions. The distinction was raised pertinently in the 1870's: J.J. Halcombe, the indefatigable champion of the Church's curates, asked, 'Are we in the future to regard Holy Orders as a \textit{Profession} or a \textit{Service}?', and plumped for the latter on the grounds that the career structure of a service was far more appropriate.\footnote{93} A little later, Bishop Magee asserted that while the Church was, and he hoped always would be, a profession, it 'is also a service, as distinct from a profession ... The clergy of the Church of England ... are the hired servants of the Church, and so they constitute a public service as distinguished from a profession.'\footnote{94} In both cases questions of financial organisation were the immediate issue, and the views were perhaps not widely shared, but the distinction drawn remains worthwhile.

(The very word 'establishment', as applied to the civil and military

\footnotesize{F.n. 90 continued.}

\footnotesize{confessional, in particular, was partly a method to raise, or re-establish, the clergy's professional standing (esp. pp.282-5, 292.)


\footnotesize{92. Elliott, op. cit., p.100.}

\footnotesize{93. In J.J. Halcombe, ed., op. cit., (1874), pp.115-6.}

\footnotesize{94. Speaking in the Upper House of Convocation, 16 Feb. 1876 (Ch.C. 1876, p.58): he was bringing forward the subject of pensions, which, he pointed out, were not an issue in the professions, where individual provision was expected.}
arms of the state, referred to a service - and so may have had similar associations for 'the religious establishment').

Two final, more general, counts on which the Church diverged from the professional remain. First, there is the question of disinterest: certainly the clergyman was in some ways the very embodiment of the professional ideal of service to the community\(^{95}\) - but not from every viewpoint; not from the viewpoint of many Dissenters, most obviously. While other professions were gaining protected monopolies in return, effectively, for guarantees of disinterested service, the clergyman remained locked into a competitive and often explicitly partisan role. Second, by resting their claims to legitimation upon divine and supernatural grounds, the clergy's 'authority for role performance was internal to the institution, and not necessary [sic] (and in fact decreasingly) acknowledged outside.' In short, not only did the clergy lack a monopoly of their distinctive function, but the very basis for their claim to legitimation - a religious world-view - was being eroded; whereas the secular professions rose on the strength of their unquestioned practical utility.\(^{96}\)

A final perspective to complete the background of clergy roles and images is gained by a brief exposition of the relationship between clergy and laity, a relationship inevitably involving all that has been described above. Two broad trends can be noted. The first is that, despite the (continuing) ambiguities involved in being a national

---

95. i.e. 'the responsibility to society expressed by the aristocrat and the clergyman', given as one of the strands making up the dons' ideal of the professional life: S. Rothblatt, The revolution of the dons (1968), pp.90-1.

96. Russell, op. cit., p.497. A.D. Gilbert stresses this factor, describing a 'crisis of plausibility' for religious views in general (op. cit., pp.184-7): however formulated, the explanatory power of religion was clearly losing prominence in society at large by 1900.
Church, the relationship of clergy and laity was clearly beginning to change from one characteristic of the inclusive ecclesia to one more comparable to that existing in a denomination: from a situation in which the laity comprehended the whole community and hence was adequately represented to the Church by such inclusive institutions as Parliament, or the parish vestry, to one in which a measure of voluntary commitment had entered the definition of a layman.  

Perhaps the simplest symptom is the growth of a concern to define membership and to incorporate only 'members' into Church government. As early as 1852 Samuel Wilberforce wrote to Phillipotts of Exeter that he was prepared to give up the right of taxing Dissenters by Rates, 'if in exchange we could get the inestimable privilege of declaring who are and who are not members of the Church.' The concept was obviously unfamiliar when twenty years later a prominent layman referred to the desirability of training young men 'as "Church members" (to borrow an expressive phrase from the Dissenters) ...'; but the voluntary meaning of membership was taken for granted by 1908. The disentanglement of citizenship from membership of the Church of England has never been completed, but by 1885, 'If a man chose to be a good churchman he

97. This is the theme of M.J.D. Roberts, The role of the laity in the C. of E. 1850-1885 (D. Phil., Ox., 1974); K.A. Thompson, op. cit., is also very relevant: and the whole subject of denominationalism is discussed and described in Gilbert, op. cit., esp. pp. 132-45.

98. Quoted in G.C.B. Davies, Henry Phillipotts, Bishop of Exeter, 1778-1869 (1954), p. 353. This period saw the subject brought into prominence, with the last wave of post-Gorham secessions, efforts to revive Convocation, and Gladstone's essentially denominational view of the lay role - certainly, as applied specifically to the non-established Episcopal Church of Scotland - in his '1851 Letter to the Bishop of Aberdeen' (in Gleanings, Vol. VI).

distinguished himself increasingly from the wider society. 100

The second trend was that, faced by a Church increasingly disposed to define itself in narrower terms than heretofore and a clergy ever more concerned to stress their separation from, or at least distinctiveness vis-à-vis, the lay world, 101 a steady chorus of commentators lamented the development of a 'caste' clergy: this was a key word expressive of all that seemed to endanger the old established unity of feeling and interests between clergy and laity: the clergy 'must not be too far separated from the laity ... They must live amongst their block according to the quiet, simple, practical type exhibited in Scripture, not as a caste.' 'Of all things the most dangerous to the English Church would be for its clergy to subside into a caste', and so on. 102 The criticism is characteristic of the paradoxes of the establishment; in the 19th century no earnest man could argue against raising and defining the standards of clerical life and conduct, but the result worried many, and though the High Church received most of the blame, the separation of the clergy applied to all parties: for a start they were now set apart by their dress (in which the High Church led, but all, including most Dissenters, were following); increasingly they received some separate training; they were agitated by theological and party disputes of decreasing relevance to a growing, newspaper reading public. The clergy had become less prominent among professionals and were (if uneasily)

100. Roberts, op. cit., p.323. (Kent, op. cit., p.290, refers to the Church of England as forming 'one part of a sub-dominant religious culture' in the late 19th century).

101. The assertion of this was a basic theme of the pastoral theologians: see Russell, op. cit., esp. pp.423 and 469 on distinctive life-style: Heeney, op. cit., esp. pp.11-12, 118.

102. Quarterly Review, Vol.111, 1862, p.447, and ibid., Vol.137, 1874, p.280: both authors were High Church (W. Sewell and A.R. Ashwell) though 'caste' was more often the accusation of Low or Broad Churchmen.
far more distinctive. Tradition, social ties, and a certain attempt to follow professional standards had kept up links to the world of the higher professions; but within it, they were ever more anomalous.
Chapter two

THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE CLERGY

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the nineteenth century a substantial majority of all ordinands had graduated at one of the ancient universities; they thus constituted the nearest that the clergy had to a common background. Men came to them from widely differing milieux, and passed very different lives while at college, but the shared association, the shared collegiate and educational discipline (however feeble in fact), undoubtedly operated as a significant unifying factor in the disparate body of the clergy. Even the transition, substantially effected by 1860 and consolidated thereafter, from near-monopoly of clerical education to the position of providing some two-thirds of all ordinands, represented a far-reaching change in the position of the universities with regard to the Church of England: a university training ceased to be, in effect, part of the definition of a clergyman. Reactions to this change, either in the form of attempts to re-establish university training for all clergy, or in the form of less conservative reconsiderations of the essentials of a clergyman of the Establishment, were at the heart of most later Victorian debate about the clergy. The rethinking of the Church's relation to the universities was given urgency by the transformation of the universities themselves, which left the clerical position irreversibly weakened there. At the beginning of Victoria's reign the dominance of clergy education by the universities was reinforced and upheld by the dominance of the clergy within the universities. When this ended, the peculiar intimacy of Church and university was broken despite the continued importance of Oxford and Cambridge graduates to the Church.
The ecclesiastical nature of the two ancient universities of England was doubted by neither friend nor foe in the early 19th century; recently they have been described as 'two exceedingly strange, inward-looking, clerical republics', \(^1\) and as the century reached mid-point it was clear that most contemporaries would have agreed. The confident liberalism of \textit{The Times}, in 1856, aptly sums up the prevailing feelings, referring to the need 'to temper the exclusively clerical tendencies of [Oxford] so as to bring them into harmony with the secular and utilitarian leanings' of the public.\(^2\)

By then reforms which severely modified 'the exclusively clerical tendencies' of both universities had begun, though it was many years before the two pillars of clerical dominance were finally toppled.

Of these, the more noticeable at the universities was the simple predominance of clergymen among the fellows. The second, evident above all at times of critical decision, political or academic, was the fact that the legislative bodies of both universities contained very large majorities of clergymen; as late as 1879 they made up 58 and 53 per cent of the parliamentary voters of Oxford and Cambridge respectively,\(^3\) and the pre-eminent importance of religious issues in university elections until at least the 1860s is well known, particularly through the career of W.E. Gladstone.

The number of fellows who took orders varied greatly between colleges, some of which enjoined ordination on all or most of their fellows.

---

fellows, others of which had no such explicit rule; even at the latter, however, there was often a majority of clerical fellows. 4
A sample of fellows holding college office at Oxford between 1813 and 1830 shows that 92 per cent were ordained; of Cambridge fellows who graduated in 1841-3 and 1851-3, and who taught at the university, 17 out of 20 and 18 out of 22 respectively were ordained. 5 Almost certainly these proportions are higher than those for all fellows, many of whom held no academic posts, 6 but the prevalence of clergy among those teaching at the universities is clear and massive.

The number of fellowships was large; at Oxford there were, according to the Oxford University Commission, 542 in all, and the Report on Cambridge reported 356 (excluding the 70 at Kings); 7 not surprisingly, with sufficient fellowships to accommodate up to one in eight of the graduates at Oxford, and slightly less at Cambridge, they varied a great deal both in esteem and emolument, particularly as many colleges were cluttered with 'bye-fellowships', separate foundations often very poorly integrated into the parent body. 8

4. i.e. at Wadham (O.U.C., Report p.164) and Merton (A. Engel, 'Emerging Concepts of the Academic Profession at Oxford 1800-1854', in L. stone ed. 'The University in Society (1974), Vol.1, p.308) at Oxford. At Cambridge Downing and Trinity Hall were the only, and not large, exceptions.
5. Oxford figures from Appendix of Engel, op.cit., p.352. Cambridge figures from my samples of honours graduates (see Appendix 1). The latter thus excludes fellows of Kings, who could still proceed to a degree without examination (the first of them to take a Tripos just makes it into the latter sample, in 1853).
6. Thus, in the same Cambridge samples, 28 out of 74 and 18 out of 66 were laymen, in all: law was the most popular career (13 and 7) while those who taught still tended to teach outside the universities. (See section 3 of this chapter for more detail).
most notorious fault affecting either university was the restriction of the vast majority of Oxford fellowships to natives of certain areas, members of certain families, or pupils of specified schools; the ending of such restrictions was the major successful recommendation of the 1852 Commission, and the liberals who supported it. Cambridge did not suffer from this to anything like the same degree, and there 'the Fellowships ... are adjudged with an uprightness of purpose which has never been impeached'; but variations of standard were ensured by the custom whereby colleges elected only from their own members; this was a defensive tactic to safeguard the smaller colleges from 'colonization' by the overwhelming numbers (and talent) from Trinity and St John's (see Appendix 3). It meant, however, that unlike Oxford, where such colonization was steady (notoriously by Balliol men), at Cambridge some of the smaller colleges remained not only backwaters of conservatism, but gave their fellowships to men of considerably less academic attainment than could hope to gain fellowships at the two largest colleges.

In the early 19th century the bulk of young men attending, or at least of young men graduating from, the universities went on to ordination. All indications are that over half of all men admitted to the universities did so, and the proportion of graduates ordained was


TABLE 2.1: Careers of Samples of Cambridge Matriculants (100 from each decade)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1750s</th>
<th>1770s</th>
<th>1820s</th>
<th>1840s</th>
<th>1860s</th>
<th>1880s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble, Gentry, Independent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government, Military</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching, Academic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, Industry, Finance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professions (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Comprising: 2 land agents, 1 electrical engineer: 2 architects, 1 actor, 1 journalist, 1 mining engineer.

(2) Comprising: 1 R.C. priest (later Unitarian minister): 1 independent minister: 1 farmer, 1 Baptist minister.
TABLE 2.2: Estimates of Clergy as Proportion of Oxford and Cambridge Students

(The estimate is based on the assumption that admissions for i.e. 1830-1839 represent pretty closely the population of graduates available for ordination in i.e. 1834-43: 4 years may be slightly too short, but not substantially, as the average period from admission to ordination).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Oxford (1830-39, etc.)</th>
<th>Cambridge (1830-39, etc.)</th>
<th>Graduates Available for Ordination</th>
<th>Graduates Ordained</th>
<th>Ordinands</th>
<th>As % of Graduates Available</th>
<th>As % of Graduates Ordained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1834-43</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-53</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-63</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>4,360</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864-73</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1 - L. Stone in Stone, ed., The University in Society, Vol.1 'Size and Composition of Oxford Student Body'. Appendix IV, Table 1A and 1B: I have multiplied his annual averages by 10, so these are not exact figures.
3 - See Table 2.3.
even higher. Two tables here illustrate the situation; the first, Table 2.1, is based on six samples of 100 men matriculating at Cambridge in various decades of the 18th and 19th centuries. The figure of 64% who were ordained, for the 1820s, may be a little high. But it cannot be markedly so; indeed the fewness of other openings, for a much larger student body, makes this very high proportion quite plausible. The other table (2.2) is admittedly an estimate, but is likely to be as good a one as can be obtained, particularly for Oxford, given the lack of a satisfactory register of alumni. The two tables are only comparable at two periods, the 1840s and the 1860s, but the figures compare well: (in percentages, 54 to 57, and 41 to 40, for Cambridge).

In the 1830s and 1840s, Oxford and Cambridge men comprised over 80% of the total of new clergy (Table 2.3), though a substantial decline in their contribution was under way. It is, however, significant that the 19th century decline in Oxford and Cambridge graduates is clearly not a fall from an unvarying previous standard; that, rather, the 1820s and 1830s saw a peak in ordinands from the

---

12. Figures for Oxford are hampered by the unreliability of Foster's Alumni Oxonienses (hereafter A1. Ox.); the one attempt (to my knowledge) to use this is further vitiated by a massive time-span, and its ignoring of the cases for which no information exists (C.A. Anderson and M. Schnaper, School & Society in England: Social Background of Oxford and Cambridge Students (Washington, 1952)). For Cambridge, H. Jenkins and D. Caradog Jones, 'Social Class of Cambridge University Alumni of the 18th and 19th Centuries', British Journal of Sociology, 1, 1950, p.99, is more useful: some of their figures have been re-worked as Table 2.5.

13. The procedure was to take the first case occurring on or after page 10, 20, 30 etc. of the 6 Volumes of J.A. Venn's Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part II (hereafter Venn): to make up 100 I took 17 cases from each of the first 4 volumes, and 16 each from the last 2. The effectively random nature of the sample appears not to be affected by the changing size of the total population, which increased some 6-fold. I excluded all non-matriculants, an insignificant number, though their inclusion would have slightly raised the unknown and gentry categories both of fathers, and of sons' careers.
older universities, though unfortunately, it seems to have established a norm to which churchmen continued to refer throughout the 19th century. In the 18th century there were many non-graduate clergy, at least where stipends were poor and status was low. In the diocese of Chester, which then extended to the Lakes in the north, and across to include the North Yorkshire dales of the ancient (and anomalously autonomous) Archdeaconry of Richmond, there were 45 non-graduates ordained in 1757-60, to only 32 graduates; in 1800-02, there were still 21, though now graduates just out-numbered them, at 24.\textsuperscript{14} The college of St. David’s, Lampeter, eventually begun in 1822, was to replace the licensed grammar school at Ystrad Meurig, which had previously supplied many of the clergy for the diocese.\textsuperscript{15} Some idea of the extent of non-graduates can be gained by looking back at Oxford and Cambridge, in the later 18th century: even if one reckons on the generous figure of 60% of all their students going on to ordination, no more than 250 men a year can have been involved, and in the 1750s and 1760s many fewer: if the figure of 10,000 clergy is approximately correct for the whole 18th century, this is certainly below the 275-300 per annum required to keep up the number.

The great rise in numbers at both universities which doubled the total attending at one or other between the first and the third decades of the 19th century, was bound to have a notable effect upon the clergy. Had alternative occupations multiplied to absorb the increase, men intending ordination would have been at once transformed into a

\begin{enumerate}
\item F.W.B. Bullock, A History of the Training for the Ministry of the Church of England in England and Wales, from 1800-1874 (St. Leonards, 1955), p.28-9. Conybeare mentions other such schools in his 'Church of England in the Mountains' article, Edinburgh Review, Vol.97, pp.348-9, 359, 372. (Bishop Warburton, ordained after training as an attorney, was perhaps the most notable 18th century non-graduate).
\end{enumerate}
minority at the universities; this did not occur. Instead, with the universities stabilised in numbers until about 1860, they continued to be educators, first and foremost, of the clergy of the Establishment, with all that this involved for concepts of their own function. Furthermore, it is clear that the expansion of the universities was the precondition for the rapid increase in ordinations, during the third and fourth decades of the century particularly, there being as yet only few and scattered alternative places of clerical education. It is probable that in the 1820s a higher proportion of ordinands were from the universities than at any other time in the 18th or 19th centuries; in 1827-8 the proportion was 91%. Looking back to the 1780s, Henry Gauntlet recalled that 'a University degree was not at that period considered so essential a qualification for holy orders as at present it is'.

This early nineteenth-century growth poses one major question, which unfortunately does not admit of a definite answer; whether the growing number of university men who were ordained took this course for lack of alternatives, or whether they went (or were sent) to the universities because they positively desired a career in the Church (or because such was desired for them). Was the expansion of the clergy the incidental result of the growth of a class able and willing to expend the time and money necessary for a degree, or was the desire for a son's career in the Church the reason why more parents countenanced the necessary expenditure? Naturally, there was no such single dichotomy in the minds of contemporaries: factors which might support either answer doubtless operated upon all, if in varying degrees. The growth

16. See below, Chapter three.
### TABLE 2.3: Educational Backgrounds of Clergy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDAINED IN</th>
<th>OXFORD</th>
<th>CAMBRIDGE</th>
<th>DUBLIN</th>
<th>DURHAM</th>
<th>ALL OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL &amp; (annual average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1834-43</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>183(1)</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>5,350 (535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-53</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>6,656 (666)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-63</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>6,009 (601)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864-73</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>5,990 (599)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872-91</td>
<td>4,142</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>4,342</td>
<td>14,204 (710)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-1901</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>6,762 (676)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902-06</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>3,027 (605)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1872-1901: calculated from figures in the Church of England Year-Book, 1892, 1902.

1902-06: calculated from 'The Supply and Training of Candidates for Holy Orders: Report ... to the Archbishop of Canterbury ...', 1908, Appendix XVIII.

(1) Given as 83 in original, though the total was still 5,350: B.F.W. Bullock suggests this is the probable source of error, and I concur (op. cit., p.74).
of the universities can be seen in the light of rapid demographic growth, and the wealth accrued in the War years; but the end of wartime opportunities meant that, as before, there remained professional positions for only a small minority of graduates, who thus almost inevitably looked to the Church.19 The Church did however have its own attractions; not only were there signs of increased vigour in pastoral duty, backed by a renascence of political churchmanship, but also the material prospects of the clergy were manifestly better than they had been.20 The result, whatever the balance in individual motivations, was the continued prominence of the needs of the Church in all debate on the universities, well into the second half of the century.

The ideal, and norm, of a graduate clergy had several elements, illustrated in the debates and developments discussed below. But first there was simply the tradition, a power in its own right among essentially conservative churchmen; yet it was not, as I have argued, a merely static or dying tradition. Rather, it was revitalised in the early years of the 19th century. In the 1820s, when Oxford and Cambridge were probably more dominant in clergy supply than for many years, the universities were themselves flourishing. As yet untroubled by the liberal and dissenting political criticism of the 1830s, revivified by prestigious examinations, and offering new fields for public display of talents both oratorical and sporting, they were healthier than they had been for at least a century,21 although the most important element in this revival was the rise in the number of students. This led to

20. See above, Chapter one, p.19.
TABLE 2.4: Careers of Graduates and Non-Graduates in Cambridge Samples (100 per decade)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADUATES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>1750s</th>
<th>1770s</th>
<th>1820s</th>
<th>1840s</th>
<th>1860s</th>
<th>1880s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Church (% of all graduates)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82(1)</td>
<td>82(2)</td>
<td>81(3)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820s</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unknown</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Noble, Gentry, Independent, Military</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teaching, Academic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes 7 noble MAs: all in group 3
(2) Includes 3 noble MAs: 2 in group 3, 1 ordained
(3) Includes 2 noble MAs: both in group 3
confidence in the ability of the universities to supply the clergy; without such confidence it would have been mere folly, for instance, for C.J. Blomfield to have attempted the tightening up of standards which he imposed in his brief tenure of the diocese of Chester (1824-28); and indeed in 1841-2 the diocese ordained only 17 non-graduates to 119 graduates.\textsuperscript{22} Certainly the expectation of a graduate clergy was to have serious effects on efforts to train non-graduates, throughout the century (see Chapter three).

There were two more specific lines of argument in defence of the graduate clergy. First, there was an intense concern with the retention of clerical influence in the intellectual world, and as intellectual leaders in the society as a whole; this will be discussed in the context of fears which developed, particularly in the 1860s, of declining intellectual standards among the clergy, and the loss of such influence. Second, there was the somewhat vaguer, but probably more powerful concern, that the clergy should continue to be educated with the laity, as citizens and gentlemen; this will be discussed in relation to the growth of feeling in favour of some more specifically clerical training for the clergy, where it will be seen that such newer ideas took over only very slowly, and in practice still had far to go in the early 20th century. A final point, simple but basic, was the vested interest of the universities themselves, certainly until well after mid-century, in maintaining a tradition which assured them of students. The Oxford commissioners explicitly saw this as a bar to reform (in reducing necessary expenses):

\begin{quote}
... while the Universities have what almost amounts to a monopoly of the education of the Clergy, and while the Colleges and Halls have a monopoly of the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{22} A. Blomfield, A Memoir of Charles James Blomfield ..., (1863), Vol.1, 102-3; and R.B. Walker, loc. cit. (see note 14).
Students, and are, therefore, tolerably sure of keeping up their numbers ...22a

The changed attitudes of the universities to the necessity of educating for the Church were to be underpinned, later in the century, by the new assurance that their numbers would keep up, indeed grow, with or without their old monopoly.

A vital background element in any consideration of the Church's relation to the universities was the influence of liberal and secular ideas on and within both universities. This topic is naturally a major theme in histories of the universities,23 but I wish here only to make some very basic points. The original liberal critiques had much to do with the church, and its injurious influence upon the orientation of the universities. 'We educate for only one profession', Southey had a Cambridge man say in 1807; 'when colleges were founded, that was the most important; it is now no longer so; they who are destined for the others, find it necessary to study elsewhere ...;24 As the tide of reform feeling swelled, an article in the Edinburgh Review, of April 1849, was heavily ironic about the value of university for clergymen, or gentry.

But this is not the destiny of many Englishmen. Comparatively few are, or ought to be, clerical sinecurists; fewer are born to the acres and dignity of country squires. A more rugged and not less useful road lies before the majority of them when they leave college. They have to be fashioned into lawyers, doctors, schoolmasters, journalists, merchants, agents, actuaries, and government clerks ...25

22a. OUC, p.32. Cf. Ewart S.C., Appendix 2; '... the education of the clergy which has been from time immemorial the work of Oxford'. (p.272).

23. D.A. Winstanley's view being openly 'Whig' on this, while W.R. Ward (Victorian Oxford) is considerably less kind to the liberals at Oxford. (D.A. Winstanley's two volumes remain basic: Early Victorian Cambridge (1940) and Later Victorian Cambridge (1947): hereafter referred to as E.V.C. and L.V.C.)


He would appear to be predating the dominance of such secular professions and livelihoods by at least 10 years, but the sentiment was typical; the urge was to make the universities 'national', and the first step was to make them more useful to professions other than the Church. The development of large areas within the universities dedicated to genuinely secular studies, however, was extremely slow; for the liberals were almost as loth to abandon the ideal of a 'liberal', non-specialised education as the most ardent conservatives; they stressed utility, and service, but always asserted the importance of the general and moral factors of a university education. Another article in the Edinburgh Review, strongly in favour of better provision for professional training, yet ends by asserting that universities are 'not institutions for communication of knowledge only; but also, and much more, for education, for the formation of character, for the training of habits and sentiments, for the modelling of men'. Pattison in 1855 almost echoed Pusey, with his 'The products of a University are not inventions, improvements, discoveries, novel speculations, books, but the fully educated man'; and it was the support of such sentiments (abandoned by Pattison, but influentially championed by Jowett) which ensured that the liberals could never develop a really anti-clerical line of university reform, even had this been their aim, for the Church was firmly entrenched in the traditional 'liberal' studies. Finally, as will be seen, the Liberals were in fact consistently in favour of educating the clergy.

26. Ibid., Vol.96, p.284.

27. The classic statement of Pusey's position (from his 1854 Collegiate and Professorial Teaching and Discipline ...) is quoted in H.P. Liddon, Life of E.B. Pusey, D.D. (4 Vols., 2nd ed., 1894), Vol.3, p.390. The Pattison quote is from the Essays, ed. R.L. Nettleship (1889), Vol.I, p.439. The premises were of course very different, but the generalist results were not dissimilar.
at the universities, to avoid the evil of their receiving a wholly separate and clerical education.

Thus, while it is undeniable that the strong and on the whole successful tide of liberal academic reforms transformed the universities in the second half of the 19th century, it was far from entirely destructive of the Church's position in them. It was the enormous growth in entries, which from the 1860s left the provision of clergy as a minority function of the universities, and the specialisation led by churchmen themselves, which were most significant in reducing the place of the Church in the general life of the institutions; and it is these factors which will be looked at more closely below. The outline of the succeeding sections will be: first, an examination of the backgrounds of students at Cambridge, in order to establish some comparison of the future clergy with their fellow students: this will extend to the influence of schools, and to the development of the secular teaching profession, and its implications, including the more general question of the clergy's place in the intellectual world. Following sections will look at efforts to help poor men to ordination as graduates; and at the development of graduate theological colleges; and the debates which they aroused.
2. BACKGROUND FACTORS AND ORDINATION

A full study of the backgrounds of Oxford and Cambridge students, and of their future careers, remains to be undertaken, and is not attempted here. Two studies which have long held the field are far from satisfactory to the historian, though by no means without value. That by Anderson and Schnaper is vitiated by its enormous time-span (1752 to 1886), and their information on Oxford is limited by the inadequacies of its source, as well as the authors' misunderstanding of it. Lawrence Stone's recent work on Oxford is more useful, but the status descriptions in the registers render all work on Oxford alumni extremely tentative. The existence of the magnificent volumes of Alumni Cantabrigienses inevitably means that accurate results are far more easily obtained for Cambridge, and in this section all the new quantitative evidence is for that University (though see Appendix 2). The figures obtained by Jenkins and Jones provide a useful background guide, supplemented by a further sample (see Table 2.5, and above, note 13).

Any attempt to draw conclusions about the social or occupational backgrounds of the students, and of the future clergy in particular, faces one obvious handicap from the start. This, as is immediately apparent from Tables 2.5 and 2.6, is the large number of parents of unknown occupation, and particularly so in the case of the parents

29. i.e. their 'military' is clearly 'armiger' in the original.
30. Stone, op. cit., 37-81, and the appendices and tables which follow.
31. I have reworked their Table 1 (op. cit., p.99) to make it comparable with my tables, mainly by including the 'unknowns'. The reconstitution of the figures could not be exact, but the totals reached were only once out by more than 1, and the percentages can be presumed correct.
TABLE 2.5: Reworking of the Figures in Jenkins' and Jones' Table 1

Absolute comparability with my tables is not possible: i.e. 'Military' is apparently included in 'Miscellaneous', as are all 'other professions'. I have also combined their two groups into my single 'commerce, industry, finance' classification. Teachers I have kept separate in both tables. Figures in brackets represent the totals involved in the re-working, which involved working back to numbers from their percentages, and then recalculating percentages from the full 500, i.e. unknowns included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clergy</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Noble, Gentry</th>
<th>Administration, Govt.</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Commerce, Industry, Finance</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FATHERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752-99</td>
<td>No 99</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(502)</td>
<td>% 20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-49</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(501)</td>
<td>% 20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-99</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(501)</td>
<td>% 22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752-99</td>
<td>No 253</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>% 51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-49</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(499)</td>
<td>% 51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-99</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(501)</td>
<td>% 32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of unknown occupation, and particularly so in the case of the parents of men who were ordained. It is this latter fact which makes it unwise to simply ignore the unknowns, as Jenkins and Jones did, for in itself it argues against a merely random basis for this large group. There are, of course, obvious prima facie reasons for doubting such randomness. Given Venn's thoroughness, and the nature of sources open to him for the 19th century, a man of unknown occupation is exceedingly unlikely to have been any of the following: noble, or of the substantial gentry, an officer of the armed forces, or a clergyman of the established church, and by the later part of the century medical doctors and barristers may perhaps be added. Having excluded these, however, far more remains than can usefully be characterised in one description: all men involved in the commercial, industrial and financial fields, the mass of minor gentry and bond-holders, most professional men, and most obscure of all, the poorer men, farmers, shopkeepers, artisans. Much must unfortunately remain obscure, but by testing the unrecorded parents against various criteria it is hoped that at least a considerable weight of probability will emerge as to which type was most significant within the broader group of 'unknowns'.

There is one small body of corroborative evidence, which it will be useful to bear in mind; this is formed by the 17 cases, in my samples of clergy ordained between 1841 and 1873, where the occupations of the men's fathers are not given by Venn, but are indicated in their baptism certificates (which are usually with the ordination papers). Essentially this group seems to confirm the

32. The 17 consist of 12 men ordained in the diocese of Ripon, and 5 in Oxford. As such they are far from a 'random' sample, of course, though the results seem plausibly applicable.
TABLE 2.6: a) Occupations of Fathers of Cambridge Samples (100 from each Decade)
b) Of whom, Numbers Ordained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>1750s</th>
<th>1770s</th>
<th>1820s</th>
<th>1840s</th>
<th>1860s</th>
<th>1880s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble, Gentry, Independent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government, military</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Medicine (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professions (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, Industry, Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Divided as follows (law:medicine):- 3:1, 5:3, 4:1, 5:5, 5:8, 5:3.
(2) Includes teachers, of all sorts (1, 1, 4 and 4 per decade), literary men (3 in all), artists (2 in all), engineers (4 in all), an architect, and a nobleman's agent.
(3) Farmers or artisans, and 1 Methodist minister; except in one clear case of poverty (but with wealthy patronage) all the sons were sizars.
exclusions mentioned, there is one military officer, but he was only a lieutenant in the Indian Navy, and naturally, as with all use of baptism certificates, there is no guarantee that the man was still in that occupation at the time of his son's admission to Cambridge. Two are of the awkward group who call themselves 'Esquire' or 'gentleman' in the certificates; in neither case is it possible to add much, but they do appear to have been reasonably well-off. Interestingly, no less than five are revealed as medical men (usually surgeons or apothecaries); medical men, at least before about the 1860s, were both numerous and mostly of low social status, and it is thus not wholly surprising to find an indication of their being possibly much commoner among parents of Cambridge men than the records show at first sight. The remaining nine were not professional; most being tradesmen or in commerce. Exceptions were men described on the certificates as 'servant' and 'cook', the former from Yorkshire, the latter from Cambridge; the rest were described as follows: 'fancy woollen manufacturer' of Almondbury, 'dealer in metals' of Aston, 'corn factor' and 'traveller', both of London, 'tradesman' of Lancashire, 'tailor' of Cambridge, and 'merchant' of Huddersfield; in several cases these were (or became) men of substance. It must be repeated that these merely provide an indication of what lies behind Venn's lack of information; but the suggestion here of a group largely consisting of men in trade or commerce and of modest professionals, with a few men both humbler and richer to round it off, will be seen to be broadly plausible.

33. There is one rather unnerving case of a clergyman father described in Venn as 'Esq.', but this is unique, and otherwise clergy fathers are always corroborated by Venn, and indeed even by Al.Ox.
There remains one basic aspect of this evidence which must be noticed: that its value (like most things at either university) varies from college to college, for their admission registers provided basic information for Venn. Fortunately the variations are not on the whole extreme, and for the crucial evidence of fathers' occupation most colleges fall around the average. (Most references hereafter are to my 'Honours sample'.) Only two colleges are consistently well above average in their proportion of 'unknown' fathers, and only one is consistently below. It is again an indication of the make-up of the 'unknowns' that in these cases there is a discernible inverse proportion between the 'unknown' and fathers from business, finance, or non-professional occupations.

The most significant of such indications emerges from St John's; but the position of this college, which with Trinity towered over the mass of smaller colleges in size, wealth, and academic reputation, demands further background information, before going into details. The effect of the joint dominance of the two great colleges upon the election to fellowships has already been referred to (above, p.35, and Appendix 3), and it was evident in most other spheres of university life too, largely due to their enormous numbers in the

34. This consists of all those taking Honours degrees at Cambridge in the years 1841-3, 1851-3, 1861-3, 1871-3; referred to hereafter as the Honours sample. For details, see Appendix 1 at end of this chapter.

35. Viz. Corpus Christi and Emmanuel; and Caius, which was J. Venn's college, and whose alumni he had traced separately in his Biographical History ... 1349-1897 (3 Vols Cambridge, 1897-1901).

36. The figures are, in the form of business, finance, miscellaneous (columns 4 and 6 in the tables): unknown (column 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th>1881-3</th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th>1871-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caius</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>10:8</td>
<td>10:5</td>
<td>2:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus</td>
<td>0:13</td>
<td>0:9</td>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>0:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>0:14</td>
<td>2:13</td>
<td>2:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke, a smaller college, is not unlike Caius, with figures of</td>
<td>6:7</td>
<td>4:2</td>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>4:4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
university's legislative bodies. The position of their men among honours men as a whole was even more dominant than it was in the university at large, and it was not until 1871-3 in my sample that they ceased to provide a majority of all honours graduates (see table 2.7A). The two were, inevitably, great rivals, but on the whole the mid-century saw Trinity consolidate a position of academic and social superiority. The returns in 1871 to the Cumberland Commission point to its major underlying advantage, sheer wealth; its total expenditure of nearly £62,000 (£69,000 including trust funds) made it the undisputed giant among Oxford and Cambridge colleges, though St John's (£49,000 all told) was still a massively wealthy foundation. Trinity had not always held this advantage over St John's; according to its historian, St John's lost its eighteenth-century pre-eminence largely because archaic local restrictions forced the migration to Trinity of Thomas Jones, whose period of 20 years as Senior Tutor at Trinity saw it expand beyond its old rival for the first time. Certainly Trinity was building up both an impressive string of academic successes, and more specifically a social desirability which set it increasingly apart from St Johns.

37. Winstanley's volumes are full of examples: in politics, see E.V.C. 98ff (the 1840 High Steward election, esp. for Whewell on p.103, and conclusion p.105), and 108ff (the 1848 election of Prince Albert as Chancellor, whose opponent Lord Powis was, among other things, the Johnian candidate). The two colleges' complex relationships with endowed professorships form the subject of Chapter XIII. Among both the total and the resident members of the Senate, some one-third belonged to one or other college. (ibid., 47n.1 and 48n.2).

38. The figures are from the Synopsis lables B to E, in the 'Report of the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the Property and Income of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and of the Colleges and Halls therein ... P.P. 1873, vol. XXXVII, Pt.l. The figures were widely criticised later, but as indications of scale are indispensable.


40. Winstanley, E.V.C., p.384-5.
St John's had been the resort of many nobles and greater gentry, and around 1800 was recruited more from such ranks than in either earlier or later years. Walter Besant recalled a mid-century cabinet which 'had half its members on the books at St John's'. He goes on to add, however: 'In these days [c.1890] all the noblemen who go to Cambridge flock like sheep to Trinity'. In both types of sample that I have taken the strong preference for Trinity among nobles and gentry is manifest; in the 'decade' samples, the figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1820s</th>
<th>18403</th>
<th>1860s</th>
<th>1880s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and among the honours sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th>1851-3</th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th>1871-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distinctiveness of St John's intake was now, indeed of an opposite nature, and lay in its encouragement of poor men (particularly from the North country). The stereotype was sufficiently established for:

41. Miller, op. cit., p.71 and p.80.
42. W. Besant, Fifty years ago (rev. ed., 1892), p.143. The changing prestige of colleges, nationally, is nicely illustrated by the choices of Sir Robert Peel for his sons: the eldest went, as he had, to Christ Church, but it was a disappointment; the second, in 1845 to Trinity, Cambridge; the third, in 1848, returned to Oxford, and the rising Balliol. N. Gash, Sir Robert Peel, 1972, p.175.
43. To be comparable with the honours sample I include here only gentry andnobility, excluding the category of 'independent' (see Appendix 1, b), 1.
44. This was largely due to traditional links with some schools, notably Sedbergh and Pocklington (Miller, op. cit., 32, 59; c.1800 he describes the college as 'still a haven of north countrymen', p.69). In the honours sample men from Lincolnshire, Yorkshire and Cheshire and northwards make up somewhat above the average proportion (usually 27-28%, vs. an average of less than 20%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>ORDAINED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The youthful Bagehot to generalise airily that a 'mathematician - the son perhaps of a blacksmith - goes to St John's'; and a sermon in 1881 by C. Pritchard (an ex-fellow, now Savilian Professor of Astronomy at Oxford), entitled *Gifted Men the Gifts of Christ to the Christian Society*, saw this as the glory of the College in the earlier decades of the century: then

the traditionary spirit of the College was habitually exhibited in a fixed intention and a constant endeavour to hold out the right hand of benevolent aid to such poor but truly deserving students as were found in their society. I never heard of an instance where a young man of true intellectual promise, and of virtuous character, was allowed to leave the College for want of the necessary material means of support.

Some were wholly supported by the College's 'generous yet always discriminating aid.'

This distinction between the two great Colleges inevitably springs to mind when it becomes clear that St John's men were also far more likely than those from Trinity to be ordained; indeed, and particularly in the first two periods, St John's men were well above average in this respect, while Trinity men were even more clearly below it (see Table 2.7,A). How far was this a reflection of the social differences between them? To answer this in the affirmative, it is necessary to show, first and foremost, that in general terms


45. (The sermon was preached at the Commemoration of the Benefactors Service, 6 May 1881), p.7. J.A. Venn thought that St John's, more than any college of either university, 'laid itself out to aid and to educate the really poor student.' (From the Descriptive Text to accompany his 'Statistical chart to illustrate the entries at the various colleges ... 1544-1907 ... ', 1908, p.14).

46. The difference is as clear in the 'decade' samples, though the numbers of St John's men are unfortunately too low in the later decades (1860s and 1880s) to be much help. At Trinity laymen were a solid majority in all four 19th century decades (and increasingly so after the 1840s). At St John's this was not the case. (Figures quoted by Winstanley from Romilly's diary show one-third of Trinity men matriculating 1831-41 and 1853-62 as ordained: the date of the diary entry, however, appears inconsistent with this information. *E.V.C.*, p.416, n.3).
### TABLE 2.8: Father's Occupations, For Honours Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1 Gentry and Aristocracy</th>
<th>2 Clergy</th>
<th>3 Established (1)</th>
<th>4 Business and Finance</th>
<th>5 New and Minor (2)</th>
<th>6 Miscellaneous (3)</th>
<th>7 Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Law, Medicine, Government (including Indian) and Military Services.
2. Lay teachers, all technical and scientific professions (esp. engineering, architecture), literary and artistic.
3. See note in Appendix 1.b), 2.
the status of a man's father affected whether or not he was ordained; then, that some such effects are evident in the two colleges, and finally the whole must be qualified by reference to differences of character between the colleges. Further, in order to avoid cluttering the argument, I will concentrate on the first two periods (1841-3 and 1851-3); my conclusions can then be the reference point for a discussion of the changes which took place in the later periods, in reducing the proportions of clergy among the whole sample.

That the frequency of ordination varied with parentage is not hard to establish; it is inevitably clearest in the extremes of the social range as represented in the samples, as only there is it substantially probable that the labels applied represent real differences of wealth and culture. At the top, there are the gentry and aristocrats, and men of independent means. Table 2.6 shows that the sons of such men were notably less likely than any other group to be ordained, as one would expect; they had usually little need to take up any profession, least of all one with the irrevocable character of ordination. Many of these did not take their degrees, as may be inferred from Table 2.4, for most of the non-graduates who were to lead 'independent' careers were sons of men of the same type. Some, of course, took their university careers more seriously, and they formed a small but steady number of those who took honours degrees (Table 2.8). Among these men, ordination was significantly more likely than for the larger group (see Table 2.10): the percentage varies quite widely, as it tends to with such small totals, but not overmuch - between a quarter and two-fifths, roughly, well above the one-sixth for the broader sample.

Moving to that group of 'miscellaneous non-professionals' that represents, with some anomalies, the humbler parents of Cambridge men, the contrast with the gentry is clear enough. The figures in Table 2.6
# TABLE 2.9: Occupations of Cambridge Honours Sample (4 major categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total of 4 Groups</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Academic/Teaching</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-3</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other categories which reached double figures were:

- **1840s**: none.
- **1850s**: gentry (13).
- **1860s**: gentry (18), government service (17), business and finance (11).
- **1830s**: government service (11), medicine (14), technical (14), business and finance (13).
are tiny, but 4 out of 5 of such men's sons were ordained in the 1840s and 1860s. The numbers among honours men are also small, but show conclusively that all but a handful were ordained: probably in both the first two periods the figure was well over 80%. The table (2.8) shows only 6 in 1841-3, but it is almost certain that at least 20 more are hidden among the 'unknowns'; this inference is based on what was evidently a change in recording policy at St John's. In 1841-3, 45 of the College's sample of 95 had unknown parents (of whom 38 were ordained), as against only 11 from business, financial or non-professional homes: in 1851-3 the respective figures were 19 and 40, the latter including no less than 23 non-professionals, as against 3 a decade before. In fact the whole sample of non-professionals is dominated by St John's men, and the bulk of the most modest, the artisans and tradesmen, are from the College (see Appendix 1,b), 2 for details). It is impossible to prove that the 'unknowns' of other colleges included, as those of St John's clearly did in 1841-3, a substantial number of needy men, but the supposition is hard to avoid, particularly in relation to the sizars among them (48 in 1841-3, 20 to 25 thereafter). The sons of recorded fathers in the classes which probably represented the core of the unrecorded cases (i.e. men in business and finance, or minor professionals) were ordained rather less frequently than the sons of the unrecorded, but this is to be expected if, as I suggest, the latter are weighted with a proportion of sons of poorer men, whose demonstrably high likelihood of ordination would raise the frequency among sons of unrecorded fathers as a whole. Moving still further from the assumed 'bottom' of the social range, the sons of men in law, medicine, or the civil or military establishments were least likely of all groups bar the gentry to be ordained. The clergy, of course, are exceptional;
they always provided sons who were ordained at well above the average rate, and do not fit even such a qualified pattern as I suggest here.

The question inevitably arises as to what profession, if any, was the obverse of the church in these terms: favoured by the upper ranks, relatively closed to the lower. The answer appears to be the law (which until the 1861-3 period means the bar, among my honours sample). It has been referred to above (in Chapter one) in terms which indicate its status; its great barrier to needy men was simply that a living at the bar usually took years to materialise, and it was this rather than particular expenses of entry (which were greater for solicitors) which was to maintain its somewhat exclusive character. William Johnston (a barrister) wrote in 1851 that the profession 'holds a very high rank, if not the highest' among civil pursuits; H.B. Thomson (also a barrister) referred to it as 'perhaps the most engaging of professions. It is the chivalry of peace'. The descriptions are the more relevant in that neither man was particularly happy with the state of the profession. Johnston, an anti-Peel Tory, lamented a lowering of the social level, from the influx of mere practitioners:

Thirty or forty years ago gentlemen used to be called to the Bar without any view to practice or to any pecuniary advantage. It was simply the rank or honour of the degree of barrister which was sought.

Thomson, an altogether more liberal man, agreed, observing that the bar 'has become more than ever a profession of the middle classes';

47. The heavy stamp duty of £120 on articles, plus the requirement of a five-year clerkship, were described by J.C. Hudson as 'a barrier ... obviously intended (and [which] does in a great measure fulfil this intention) to keep out needy persons'. The Parent's Hand-Book ..., 1842, p.119. A preliminary examination of 1860 was described as intended 'to exclude from the profession all who are not gentlemen by birth and education'. (Quoted from Solicitors Journal, 29 Aug. 1863 in B. Abel-Smith and R. Stevens, Lawyers and the courts ... (1967), p.67,n.6).

TABLE 2.10: Honours Sample: Parentage of Sons Entering Church and Law (% of Parentage Groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th></th>
<th>1851-3</th>
<th></th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th></th>
<th>1871-3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENTRY, ARISTOCRACY</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CLERGY</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ESTD. PROFESSIONS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BUSINESS AND FINANCE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NEW AND MINOR PROFESSIONS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS, NON-PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Fathers occupations as in Table 2.8).
(his complaint was about drastic oversupply and underpayment in the profession).\textsuperscript{49} Yet the evidence from Cambridge suggests that there were still a considerable number of men whose commitment to practice at the bar was not powerful; among the many sons of gentry or of other obviously wealthy men who were called to the bar, Venn records many who seem not to have practised. In the light of this tradition, it is no surprise to find that the law was much favoured by the gentry sons in the honours sample; in the first two periods more of them took it up, at least formally, than were ordained, whereas the average proportion was but one lawyer to four clergy. Not far behind were men with fathers from the established professions; to some extent variations are masked here, in that sons of lawyers entered the profession consistently more frequently than did sons of the others, but the picture is not wholly distorted.\textsuperscript{50} A significant number of lawyers were men of unknown parentage, probably representing the better-off among them;\textsuperscript{51} but other groups contributed very few.

But probably the clearest evidence of the difference between men entering the law and those who were ordained, is in the figures relating to position in the family (Table 2.11). The contrasts could hardly be greater, and the fact that men who became lawyers were so much and consistently more likely to have their position in the family recorded, itself is strong evidence against the assumption that such information survives on a random basis. Clearly, position in the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{49} Johnson, op. cit., p.149: (he also had a tirade against the profession of advocacy itself, comparing cross-examination to medieval torture, p.161). Thomson, op. cit., p.93 (and pp.95ff).
\item \textsuperscript{50} Numbers are too small for % figures to be more than a guide: but whereas 9 (53\%) and 12 (41\%) of lawyers' sons followed that profession too, the figures for the rest are 6 (24\%) and 12 (22\%): these are still well above average.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Not that poor men did not embark on the law, as many (oft-repeated) examples attest (i.e. Lord Tenterden, or Sir John Rolt). (Bagehot's blacksmith's son he sees as a future equity draughtsman, inaccurately it would seem, but presumably upon some basis in experience: see note 44a above).
\end{itemize}
family was more important among families of high status, where the distinction between (at least) eldest son (and heir) and younger sons was of obvious significance. In the first two periods the paucity of future lawyers among those whose position was unrecorded is at its most striking. The extremely marked preference for the law among eldest sons is equally striking; the result was that, among this sample, the law was largely recruited from eldest sons, while only about one-tenth of men ordained are known to have been eldest sons. An abstract of these figures (Table 2.11b) clarifies the position further by excluding the sons of clergy. In all periods more of the eldest sons of laymen took up the law than were ordained, while the position for known younger sons was reversed; and again, among men whose position is not known, the majority in favour of the Church was overwhelming. In keeping with the old stereotype, this contrast between the careers of eldest and younger son was strongest among sons of the gentry.

If, then, it seems that the likelihood of ordination increases as we go down the social scale, it remains to be seen whether this was the major source of difference between St John's and Trinity Colleges, in respect to their rates of ordination. The answer appears to be affirmative; in the first two periods Trinity had a much higher proportion of gentry, and lower proportion of non-professionals than St John's; and these were the major determinants of the difference in

52. i.e. R.L. Edgworth, quoted above (Chapter 1, note 33). Mandell Creighton said in 1900 that 'the class which [earlier in the century] most reinforced the Clergy consisted of the younger sons of county families' (Ch.C. 1900, p.360), a characteristically broad (but probably inaccurate) statement.

53. The figures are (shown as eldest : younger)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th>1851-3</th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th>1871-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>2:8</td>
<td>3:14</td>
<td>2:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>6:8</td>
<td>6:8</td>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>9:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Eldest Sons</td>
<td>Younger Sons</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(18.1)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>(19.6)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>(23.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(17.5)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>(26.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>(18.6)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>(28.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns represent:
1 - % of the men entering church or law who were eldest sons, younger sons or not known.
2 - number
3 - % of the eldest sons, younger sons, or not known, who entered the church or the law.

b) Numbers of eldest and younger sons (and not known) of non-clergy parents, entering the church and the law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Eldest Sons</th>
<th>Younger Sons</th>
<th>Not Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
terms of ordinations. In 1851-3 (to take the example where the
description of St John's men is more accurate), 81 of the 113 men
from St John's were ordained, to 67 of Trinity's 140. Trinity's
advantage in numbers was almost entirely based on its 52 sons of
gentry and of men from the established professions, compared to
only 20 at St John's; yet the figure for ordinations among such men
was 15 at Trinity, 11 at St John's. On the other hand, the latter
had 40 sons of mercantile and non-professional fathers, of whom 31
were ordained, to the former's 11, of whom 7 were ordained. This was
the pattern in all periods: Trinity contained a large proportion
of the class of men who were ordained relatively rarely, St John's
a large proportion of the men most likely to be ordained.

The point gains extra emphasis when examined in terms of the
careers of the sizars, men who received financial aid specifically
on account of their poverty. At the time of the Royal Commission,
in 1852, there were reported to be a total of 143 sizars, very
unevenly spread through the colleges; St John's and Trinity, which
had the only specific foundations for their support, had 54 and 32
respectively, and Queen's 24; no other college had more than 6.54
It will be seen from Table 2.7.B that among honours men the
predominance of sizars from the two great colleges is faithfully
reflected. There can be no doubt that the sizars included many men
from homes well below the average in wealth and status; in the
detailed list of all the miscellaneous non-professionals given in
Appendix 1 to this chapter (at the end of Section b) it can be seen
that among the sons of men most evidently poor-artisans and small

54. C.U.C.; 'Report', pp.195-6; details, varying in value
somewhat from college to college, may be found in the Evidence
of the colleges, between p.310 (Peterhouse) and p.438 (Downing).
tradesmen - the great majority (27 out of 35) were sizars. It is such men, denizens of 'the labyrinth' at St John's, whom Samuel Butler so memorably describes in Chapter 43 of The Way of All Flesh: 'a gloomy, seedy-looking confrerie', 'a class apart' - and 'Destined most of them for the Church', which, Butler unkindly emphasises, was to them 'the entree into a social position from which they were at present kept out by barriers they well knew to be impassable': they were mostly 'Sims', Evangelicals. The picture rings largely true, but equally it is impossible to be quite sure how far caricature has coloured it. Not all sizars, evidently, were of this type. In my samples, there were always several sons of clergy (varying from a seventh to a quarter of the total), and usually as many again from professional and business homes. Two notable churchmen are examples of men whose poverty cannot be easily equated with social standing. E.W. Benson's father had failed in business, and died young, leaving the family perilously dependent upon his mother's life-annuity; his sizarship at Trininity was absolutely necessary, and he lived a life of real poverty in college until rescued by Mr. Martin, the college bursar (who became a generous family benefactor); nevertheless his biography makes it clear that he had relatives, descendants mostly of Yorkshire yeomen who had successfully gone into trade or manufacture, who were comfortably established, and that his own social and cultural background was, if straitened, gentlemanly. 55 A.M.W. Christopher, in later years the bulwark of Oxford Evangelicalism, was the son of a man who had inherited family estates in Durham, which however he sold

55. A.C. Benson, Edward White Benson (2 vols., 1899), Chapter 1, passim, and Chapter 3. (Characteristically Benson later deprecated attempts to reform away the last vestiges of menial status, eating the remnants of the fellows' dinner: Vol.1, p.254-5).
after moving the family to London; he was for some years a wine-merchant, that most gentlemanly species of 'tradesmen', and was a keen sportsman. Yet the sending of Christopher (the twelfth child) to Cambridge required the selfless work of his eldest sister as a tutor, as well as the help of another brother; it is also noted that the Master of St John's, Dr Ralph Tatham, was the father's second cousin.56

According to D.A. Winstanley, the stigma of poverty which had once blighted the social life of the sizars was passing away by the mid-century, and their academic successes helped to raise them in the estimation of all.57 Through the whole period their numbers slowly decreased, and they came to form a smaller proportion of the whole (from one-fifth to one-tenth; see Table 2.12). The most notable fact about the sizars of the first two periods was the extremely high proportion who were ordained, around 85% as against about 60% of the rest. Butler was clearly right in this point. In both periods the church was benefiting, to the extent of some 20 honours men a year, from the endowed and customary support of these needy men at Cambridge. Applied to the two great Colleges (see Table 2.7.B) it can be seen, first, that it was its sizars which gave St John's overall such a high percentage of clergy, though the rest were still slightly above the average for non-sizars in this

56. J.S. Reynolds, Canon Christopher (Abingdon 1967), pp.1-19. He was up from 1839-43. In Romilly's Cambridge Diary, 1832-42 (ed. J.P.T. Bury, 1967), there is a nice description of a 'Gentleman Farmer', not a poor man, bringing his son up to be a sizar at St John's; p.141.

57. Winstanley, E.V.C., p.415-6. There is however a certain complacency in the assumption that sizars 'were quite content with the society of other reading men ... and found consolation in honest work and in the hope of the reward of a fellowship'; p.416). Benson, for one, later spoke 'feelingly of the miseries he endured through living with a large circle of more or less wealthy friends'; op. cit., vol.1, p.74.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SIZARS</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Total of These Three</th>
<th>Sizars as % of Men entering:</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Rest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>SIZARS</td>
<td>74 (21.3)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>SIZARS</td>
<td>72 (16.3)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>SIZARS</td>
<td>64 (14.6)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>SIZARS</td>
<td>53 (9.1)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respect. At Trinity, on the other hand, the non-sizars who chose
to be ordained were always a minority, a unique distinction:
instead, the Trinity non-sizars became, predominantly, lawyers. 58

It would be wrong, however, to suggest that only social
differences lay behind the aggregate differences in their men's
careers, observable between these two and indeed among all the
colleges. Colleges had a certain tone or ethos, often explicitly
religious. This may of course have been connected to, in some
cases perhaps dependent upon, the social tone of the college;
it is impossible to divide, for instance, the influence of the
wealthy young men with independent or lay careers ahead, at Trinity,
from a certain independence of mind which the College seemed to
foster; 59 or the existence even of the 'labyrinth' sizars from a
more conservatively Anglican tone at St John's. 60 There is no
reason to doubt that fathers could to a large extent choose colleges
for their sons which corresponded to their family's position on
church matters; and there seems little reason to doubt that such
factors, rather than merely deterministic material ones, were
responsible for some of the finer distinctions visible in the
figures. At St John's sons of gentry and of men from the

58. Among non-sizars, the numbers being ordained, as against
those entering the law, were for Trinity: 1841-3, 40:35; 1851-3,
56:42; respective figures for St John's were 34:10 and 42:9.

59. Appropriately it was the centre of the Apostles; and Trinity
men dominate among the 'Scientists and Broad Churchmen: an
early Victorian intellectual network' described by W.F. Cannon
description, see R. Robson's 'Trinity College in the age of
Peel', in R. Robson, ed., Ideas and Institutions of
Victorian Britain (1967).

60. Miller, op. cit., pp.68-83. J.P.C. Roach characterises it as
'the most conservative of the colleges' prior to the master­
ship of W.H. Bateson in 1857 (V.C.H., Cambridgeshire, Vol.3,
p.257).
established professions did indeed go on to ordination less often than the College's poor men, but this was still considerably more often than among men of the same class at Trinity; the same was true among clergymen's sons.

This sort of distinction between colleges has accounted for this section's formal concentration upon the two great Colleges; it is all too easy to become bogged in the minutiae of college histories. J.A. Venn, for instance, long ago pointed out the influence on the fortunes of the lesser colleges exerted by the presence of well-known Evangelical Masters or tutors. Some colleges did seem to provide more clergy than others; a group of 6, comprising Clare, Corpus Christi, St Catharine's, Christ's, Emmanuel and Sidney Sussex produced honours men of whom 88% and 84%, respectively, were ordained in the first two periods (and well above-average figures thereafter).

Most suffered various vicissitudes, and changes of direction, in the course of the century; thus Magdalene, a centre of Evangelicalism in the early part of the century, was renowned as the most raffish of colleges by mid-century, and the change of Master or tutor could have large effects. Yet the overall pattern is reasonably stable in the years before the reforms of the 1850's; with all variations, it

62. Of these, only Corpus Christi seems particularly renowned as 'a training college for priests', as Rothblatt put it (perhaps inaptly: the College was Evangelical) (op. cit., p.65). The trend is the same in the decade sample, where the 6 colleges produced, in the 1820s, 1840s and 1860s, 40 clergy to 20 laymen, against totals for all colleges of 159 to 141.
63. Winstanley, E.V.C., p.18, and p.418. Sir F.C. Burnard recalled it as being, in the mid-1850s, the centre of the hard-living fast set, and described it as 'a kind of Liberty Hall [to which] not a few men, for whom the restraint of Trinity was irksome, had migrated.' Records and Reminiscences, personal and general (1917 edition), p.89.
was evident that the Church tended to be the destiny of the poorer
men, or of younger sons; with that proviso, however, the fact
remained that the Church was the majority choice of all graduates,
and that, as will be seen below, such men were as good academically
as the laymen. The Church, in short, was still well served by the
university; but in the next twenty years the Church was to lose most
of its advantages, and to find itself ever less likely to recruit men
of the highest intellectual quality from the university; it is this
qualitative factor, and not the purely quantitative failure only,
which I now wish to consider.
3. ACADEMIC AND INTELLECTUAL FACTORS

The third quarter of the century was a period of reforms, legislatively imposed and internal, which both enforced and embodied the universities' transition from archaic to relatively modern institutions. Constitutions were amended to give more power to those undertaking what was now seen as the primary work of the universities, their teaching; colleges were however to continue to vary considerably until the Commissioners of 1877-82 reduced differences on most substantive matters. By 1873, with these last reforms still to come (though clearly foreshadowed), the universities had already been affected deeply by the reforms of the 1850s, and as much, perhaps, by the rapid growth in their under-graduate populations; this growth had only got into its stride in the 1860s, but had already raised numbers by about one-half over the past 20 years. 65 Subjects taught multiplied faster still, and by the early 1870s natural and moral sciences were well established at Cambridge (though history still struggled in bondage to law), and theology was to gain full tripos status in 1874; at Oxford, where classical Greats embraced much that in Cambridge might be found in the moral science courses, law, history and theology had separate honours examinations by 1872. At Cambridge it seems that still only about one-third of all students took a tripos, however; the main

64. A recent description of New College, Oxford, in 1850 has wider applications: the income was burdened with several non-educational functions, such as the care of parishes, or the upkeep of the choir. 'These obligations were felt every bit as acutely as were the obligations to educate undergraduates and keep up intellectual standards among them and their seniors.' New College Oxford, 1379-1979, ed. J. Buxton and P. Williams (Oxford 1979), p.80.

65. The matriculations at Oxford and Cambridge in the 1870s were, respectively, 178% and 155% of the figures for the 1850s (Stone, op. cit., Appendix IV, Table 1A and 1B).
The various forms of evidence are consistent in tracing the changes that occurred in the occupations of Cambridge men in this period. The actual number of them who were ordained remained fairly steady for the 70 years after 1830, some 2,000 to 2,300 per decade, with a solitary peak of nearly 2,600 ordained between 1844 and 1853 (Table 2.3). For the most part, therefore, changes are relative, not absolute; the one exception being the decline that occurred after the peak, a decline which saw ordinands from Cambridge diminish by over a quarter in two decades. More will be said on this subject later (in the following section of this chapter), but it can be seen that the result of this was to reduce the proportion of graduates who were ordained, just at the time that the universities began their late-19th century growth; the church faced this growth weakened both institutionally and in terms of its attractions for graduates. By the 1880s only about a third of all Cambridge men were ordained (see Tables 2.1, and 2.4), and the proportion fell ever further as total numbers continued to grow. For the earlier period, however, there is a point worth emphasis, if not capable of absolute proof. This is that in the 1830s and 1840s as high a proportion of graduates were ordained as ever had been: it is difficult, in fact, to conceive that a higher proportion could be ordained without the universities' losing altogether their positions as places of education for the secular ruling class. Yet the numbers of ordinands thus educated remained simply inadequate for the Church's needs. Instead, the demand was met by the growth of non-graduate clergy, men unable to afford the

66. See table in Appendix. Rothblatt (op. cit.) notes that the proportion reached one-half in 1885, but was still only 53% in 1902 and 62% in 1913-14 (p.185).
traditional education. Had the universities been cheaper, and hence larger, this would not have occurred; but both their cost and their size remained stable for the crucial 40 years before 1860, and thus the clergy lost its graduate character, this time for good.

The pattern seems to be reflected very faithfully among the honours men (Table 2.9); there was a substantial absolute fall in numbers of men going on to ordination, which occurred before the total numbers began to rise again; when this rise occurred, over the last ten years covered, the number of ordinands rose only negligibly, leaving them a smaller proportion of the whole. The increase was absorbed, overwhelmingly, by teachers and academics, a development which will be discussed shortly: first, it is necessary to look at the most important single change revealed by the figures, which involves the marked decline, absolute and relative, in the likelihood that first class men (i.e. men with a first-class placing in any tripos) would be ordained (Table 2.13). The figures show, first, that until 1861-3 first-class men were almost as likely to be ordained as not; the percentage of clergy with firsts is close to average. If the whole sample is divided into first-class men, and others, the numbers and percentages are:

In short, while the Church always drew steadily but not significantly fewer ordinands from among firsts than from the rest, by 1871-3 the difference has quite suddenly become very large. And the contrast with the other two professions which were the choices of most honours men, the law and teaching, is strong; the law was throughout very near to average in terms of first-class men who chose it, and the last 10 years saw no change in this: teaching, on the other hand, always
TABLE 2.13: First Class Degrees: and Professions Chosen by First Class Degree Holders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. % of all Firsts in these 3 professions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: % is of all men entering that profession
2: % is of all firsts
attracted a greatly disproportionate number of first-class men; the remarkable fact was that when the total number of men who entered this career increased by some 250% in the last ten year period, the academic quality of the teaching group was barely affected, and still some 70% were first-class men.

Two essential factors were at work, to some degree independently, but certainly mutually reinforcing. First there was the undoubted loss of confidence in the orthodox Christian verities, which became increasingly overt from the 1860s. The second was the rise of a teaching profession (in the loosest sense) to meet the demand for secondary and advanced education among a growing middle class, and for an increasingly education-conscious society and government. The point connecting the two was that the formal and traditional links which bound teaching to the clergy were successively broken, as a growing tide of laymen pressed into the various levels of education, starting at the top, and moving inexorably from the universities through to the grammar schools.

The first and more general development is well known, although of its nature it requires generalisations which can never approach definitiveness. The subject of 'doubt', or 'secularization', or 'infidelity' is covered in every treatment of the period, and what follows is merely an outline of the major features. The first of these, in time and in importance, was the steady growth of what amounted to a scientific cosmology that could be seen as an

alternative and rival to the traditional religious one. Such a process was naturally far from uniform. The mere awe and wonder at the marvels of science which co-existed with unshaken religious faith, was as old as the industrial age, and found a perfect symbol and focus in the 1851 Great Exhibition. A letter of Queen Victoria's expresses this well.

The sight as we came to the middle was magical - so vast, so glorious - one felt, as so many did whom I have since spoken to, filled with devotion - more so than by any service I have ever heard.68

To many science continued to be seen as a support for their religious faith, nature a testament to God's wisdom and power;69 the scientific community itself was far from being free, in mid-century, from such views.70 For most people utilitarian interest, however, was probably the dominant feeling: 'to the world at large', wrote Walter Bagehot in 1868,71 "science" is one entity; it is the force which sends quick messages, which makes fast trains, which helps ships to sail safely. All the world wants to know about science ....'


Science inevitably affected the intellectuals also. It has recently been persuasively argued that the 'conflict of science and religion was one of the by-products' of the internal growth process of the scientific community, its 'professionalization'; the community sought to become both self-defining (hence free of religious interference) and accepted by the public as the fund of trustworthy and unique expertise in a wide range of social and practical matters (including health, which sparked the famous controversy over the physical efficacy of prayer in relation to illness). This line of argument, viewing 'science' as asserting an alternative expertise (and elevating an alternative body of experts) to those expounded (and supported) by the churches, seems the best explanation of the form of the well-known conflict. On a more purely intellectual level, there is no doubt that scientific advances, and above all the hypotheses of Darwin, had profoundly disruptive effects upon the established cosmologies and views of 'truth'.

Another author sees Darwin as having 'shattered' a 'truth-complex' which involved not only an ordered hierarchy of sciences (which he upended) but theology and philosophy also, which became largely separated in the aftermath of the Darwin debates: 'Their most immediate and most important result ... was to effect a separation

---

74. There is a massive literature on Darwin, on which I claim no expertise; however Morse Peckham's 'Darwinism and Darwinisticism', Victorian Studies, Vol.3, No.1, remains very helpful in pointing out the difference between what Darwin said, and what he was widely taken to mean.
between truth in moral science and truth in natural science'.

The important point in relation to this discussion is the timing of the debates. 'Somewhere about 1860 a rift opens in the English intelligence', wrote G.M. Young, in a characteristic, sweeping generalization. And the 20 years that followed were 'the halcyon years of scientific naturalism', before dissatisfactions with the arid insufficiencies of that creed were to issue in new channels - but not necessarily Christian ones. It was a period when certain scientists were notably successful in managing to argue a view of the universe in terms entirely their own; Gladstone analysed the process shrewdly, writing in 1874 to Herbert Spencer, of the wide-spread practice

of first unduly narrowing the definition of Science, and then as unduly extending it to all the opinions which those persons think fit to hold, and all the theories they erect or the subjects they turn scientific. With this there is an appropriation to themselves of the phrase 'scientific men' ...

76. Ibid., p.275-6. Huxley's agnosticism has also recently been described in the context of the fact that 'Science and philosophy had parted ways', in J.G. Paradis, T.H. Huxley: Man's place in nature (1978), p.101, and ff. See also, Munby's 'The moral world, then, shall for me be cut loose from the physical' - his reaction to the famous British Association meeting at Oxford in 1860. Derek Hudson, ed., Munby: Man of two worlds (1974 ed.), p.64.

77. These words are from Daylight and Champaign (1948), p.100, but it is a theme of his works, and is argued in Portrait of an age (1960) ed.), esp. p.100-2.

78. F.M. Turner, Between Science and Religion (Yale, 1974), p.17; Chapters 1 and 2 provide an excellent account of the decline of scientific naturalism. J. Tyndall's Fragments of Science, Vol.2 (6th ed., 1879) includes many expressions of the creed at its most confident, esp. Chaps. 1, 2 and 9 ('The Belfast Address' of 1874).

Until religious spokesmen began to question the criteria by which these 'scientific men' presumed to criticise metaphysical and religious concepts, they had a free run. While they had, George Eliot was probably correct when she wrote, in 1865, of 'the gradual reduction of all phenomena within the sphere of established law' (determined by 'the development of physical science'), as being 'the most potent force at work in the modification of our faith.'

The arguments about science perforce operated somewhat indirectly in the lives of universities where the study of natural science was still on a very small scale. Of more direct concern were two other subjects whose study seemed to threaten orthodoxy, Biblical criticism, and modern philosophy. Biblical criticism inevitably meant different things to different people; as the scientific study of the text, it was widely accepted as valuable - the researches of the famous Cambridge trio of Lightfoot, Hort and Westcott were not controversial, and so doughty a conservative as J.W. Burgon gave an enthusiastic catalogue of basic scholarly work to be done in the manuscripts, in a pamphlet of 1875. But to 'advanced Criticism' he was an uncompromising foe, for reasons which are shown in a characteristic aside on its proponents, described as '(chiefly I suspect [...] those who are only imperfectly acquainted with their Church Catechism).'

In other words, to such a man the 'Scientific Knowledge of Divine things' (as he phrased it) must rest on a ground of faith, and authority; the Bible could be studied, but emphatically not like 'any other book.' Among religious people, this was almost

80. These words are from the concluding paragraph of her review of Lecky's history of rationalism, reprinted (from the Fortnightly) in Essays and leaves from a Note-book (Virtue and Co.'s Illustrated Copyright Edition: n.d.), p.187.

certainly still the majority view at the time, though not by 1890.\textsuperscript{82} Thirty years previously, however, with the storms of controversy that surrounded \textit{Essays and Reviews} and the work of Bishop Colenso on the Pentateuch, the issue had become thoroughly publicised; the heterodox then were a minority, but there can be little doubt that the airing given to their views unsettled the convictions of many, and as important, that the statements and actions of the prosecuting churchmen ultimately did their own cause little good, and stored troubles for the future; so moderate and tolerant an evangelical as George Venables told his parishioners in 1862,

\begin{quote}
If the Pentateuch [is] to be banished from the Bible, as not being the word of God, Christianity itself and all the Bible must certainly be banished also.\textsuperscript{83}
\end{quote}

This was dangerous ground to stand upon, for it was a self-fulfilling prophecy; the new ideas could not be silenced, and yet the orthodox themselves recognized that even vague suspicion could be dangerous.

As Pusey wrote in 1870,

\begin{quote}
The Bible, more than the Church, holds the masses of Englishmen to Christianity ... If their confidence in the Bible is shaken, so will be their Christianity.\textsuperscript{84}
\end{quote}

At the universities, where the champions of either side were gathered, the theological bitterness of the 1860s cannot have gone unnoticed by the students.\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{82} Chadwick, op. cit., on the reception of \textit{Lux Mundi}, p.101-4, et seq.

\textsuperscript{83} Fourth Pastoral letter (1862); these were written for his parishioners at Friesland, Lancs, p.109. A sermon at one of the great evangelical occasions, the annual meeting of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, which acknowledged geological time, firmly stated that if O.T. prophecies were but pretended fore-tellings, 'Christianity ... must be one system of immense delusion', etc. (Report, 1861, p.13: Rev. T.R. Birks).


\textsuperscript{85} The 'Lives' of Jowett and Temple, as also of Tait, Stanley and
The impact of philosophy, above all of that of John Stuart Mill, is equally impossible to pin down in terms of how it actually influenced the ordinary reading men of the 1850s and 1860s; nor of course can it be seen as independent of the previously mentioned influences, with which Mill's philosophy was very much in tune, and which - in the case of scientific naturalism - he seemed to support. 86 Noel Annan's description 87 of how and why Mill's thought became so influential, and how it was used by the agnostics, makes it clear that so long as a system such as this, based firmly on ascertainable and 'scientific' fact, held the philosophical field, all religious teachers were at a great disadvantage. A large part of their problem was that the traditional defensive stance, based on the argument that unorthodoxy led to ethical failure, was patently not working to their advantage, indeed it tended to favour the agnostics: for these were able, in effect, largely to annex that most central of Victorian ethical values, truthfulness. In the early years of the reign, Thomas Arnold typified the confidence of Protestant Christianity that it could make this a central plank of a revitalised faith; as David Newsome has written, 'It was in defence of truthfulness, then, that the advocates of 'godliness and good learning' most delighted to stand.' 88 The intellectual struggles of the 1850s and 1860s were, however, fought precisely 'for social recognition of the right to follow the argument wherever it goes', 89 the often frightened

F.n. 85 continued.  
Pusey, are all evocative of this. A.U.J. Cockshut's Anglican Attitudes (1959), Chaps.4 and 5, and M.A. Crowther's Church Embattled (1970), Chaps.3-5, are useful (the latter generally on the Broad Church), together with the relevant parts of Chadwick. 86 Thus C.C.J. Webb in his Religious Thought in England from 1850 (1933) goes from Mill to 'the scientific reign of law', in his discussion of developments at Oxford (pp.64-5, et. seq.).  87 In Leslie Stephen (1951), esp.pp.144-8, and 152.  88.D. Newsome, Godliness and good learning (1961), (a central interpretation of Victorian religious idealism), p.47. 89 G.M. Young, Daylight and Champaign (1948), p.159.
and apparently unreasonable reaction of religious leaders, who distrusted almost every direction to which untrammeled argument might run, seemed all too like the attempt to restrict this right. 'The real point of the conflict was not the challenge of science but the response of religion', as J.L. Altholz describes it; the challenge was necessary to the intellectuals' retreat from orthodoxy, but the reaction of the churches, who put themselves ethically on the wrong side of the great (Protestant) arbiter, the individual conscience, was what gave the conflict its real flavour.

The effect was a flight from dogma, or else (as Catholic, Roman or Anglo-, or as part of a reviving evangelicalism) a turning back to its certainties, but too often away from the concerns of ordinary 'honest doubters'. At the important Church Congress at York in 1866 W.C. Magee (then Dean of Cork) spoke cogently on the subject, pointing out

that dogmatic teaching is at present largely unpopular, and that it is specially unpopular with the liberally educated and thinking classes ... There is nothing they resent and disapprove of more than the assertion by the preacher of distinctive essential truths. The model sermon in their eyes is that which contains the least amount of religious doctrine, with the largest amount of religious sentiment ....

Doctrine, he says, 'they resent as an impertinence.' From an opposite viewpoint, George Eliot contemporaneously wrote of the

90. J.L. Altholz, ed., The mind and art of Victorian England (Minnesota, 1976), editor's paper 'The warfare of conscience and theology' (p.60, and passim). Paradis, op. cit., describes agnosticism as 'not so much a theory as an attitude, seeking not truth, which was an absolute, but truthfulness ...', p.106.


92. J.C. MacDonnell, Life and correspondence of William Connor Magee ... (1896), p.146: the next two pages are an interesting development on the subject.
average book-reading person as 'fond of what may be called disembodied opinions ... an undefined Christianity which opposes itself to nothing in particular ... His only bigotry is a bigotry against any clearly defined opinion ...'. But while dogmatic belief was thus assailed, character, or more properly sincerity, was a virtue which rose in esteem, and it was a virtue which no one could deny to many of the new breed of agnostics. Perhaps even more dangerous, ultimately, to Victorian religion was the beginning of a new rejection of religious concerns altogether. This is reflected in the rise of self-consciously vernacular and secular architecture and decoration; they were in clear reaction against the religious seriousness of the early Victorian artists, and helped to make this reaction acceptable.

The intensity with which the various anti-orthodox influences struck most undergraduates remains, of course, unknowable. One qualification to the whole picture must be made, however: that the virulence of the conflict was greater at Oxford than at Cambridge. Oxford was the scene of a whole series of crises which simply have no

93. G. Eliot, op. cit., p.166. The liberal Congregationalist, J. Baldwin Brown, thought in 1877 that the hostility to the pulpit was mainly the preacher's fault: he treats subjects 'as from a superior height; and this is what the scientific mind can never endure ...'. Nineteenth Century, Vol. 1, March 1877, pp.109-110.

94. P.T. Marsh, op. cit.; 'thoughtful Victorians were exchanging certainty for sincerity as the chief virtue in intellectual questions' (p.42). Munby's reaction to Ruskin's loss of faith is a perfect example of this (D. Hudson, op. cit., pp.141-2), admiration for Ruskin's 'manly and sincere' speech overcoming his sorrow at its religious content.

95. The most succinct argument of this point is in M. Girouard, Sweetness and Light ... (Oxford, 1977), Chaps. 1-2, and p.63.

counterpart at Cambridge - the election campaigns of Peel and Gladstone, the series of Tractarian crises between 1836 and 1845, and thereafter a steady crackle of mostly theologically based minor outbursts; the contrast between both the texts and the histories of the reforming commissions of 1852 is sharp. Partly there seems to have been a real difference of intellectual style; Cambridge prided itself upon its cultivation of mathematics and 'the sciences which are of all others exact and severe', Oxford upon its philosophy, its speculative genius.\(^\text{97}\) It was far more fecund as a breeder of movements, from the Oxford Movement, through its positivists and liberals and Pre-Raphaelites, to the aesthetes and the Idealists of the 1860s and 1870s. The distinctly calmer Cambridge air, though, probably owed as much to a more specific cause; this has been analysed by Christopher Harvie in terms of the differences between Oxford's open migration between colleges largely comparable in size and wealth, and the variations between Cambridge's colleges, which drew fellows from their own ranks largely to avoid domination by Trinity and St John's: at Oxford, therefore, the great struggles were university-wide: whereas

The reforms of the 1850s at Cambridge guaranteed a partition between liberals and conservatives, with the latter retreating into the colleges they could still hold. At Oxford this security was denied them, and their reaction was predictably desperate.\(^\text{98}\)

---

\(^{97}\) Quote from Conclusion of C.U.C. 'Report', p.202; Annan (op. cit., p.136-41) discusses this polarity, as idealised by Leslie Stephen. At Oxford the finals in Literae Humaniores were given over to history and philosophy by the 1850 examination statute (Ward, op. cit., p.213-4), and these remained formally dominant despite criticisms (ibid. 279). M. Richter, in *The Politics of Conscience: T.H. Green and his age* (1964), esp. p.138-9, qualifies Annan's contrast somewhat.

\(^{98}\) C. Harvie, op. cit., p.57. J. Venn, in his recollections of the 1860s in *Early Collegiate Life* (1913) confirms this (p.267f).
Among churchmen, those most prominent at Oxford on the conservative side, headed by E.B. Pusey and H.P. Liddon, revelled in a sense of crisis; in 1867, when there was apparent a distinct High Church revival, his friend and colleague William Bright had gently to suggest to Liddon that his constant doom-saying might even be counter-productive. At Cambridge only Christopher Wordsworth, not a resident, seems to reflect a similar apocalyptic view, and the tone was set by the scholarly optimism of Lightfoot, Hort and Westcott, while Evangelicalism, never negligible, was to undergo a real revival from the 1870s. Still, bearing the differences in mind, the overall effects, in so far as they are reflected by the declining popularity of ordination among their students, seem to have been similar; and, in whatever form, there can be no doubt that by 1870 non-orthodox opinions were visibly current at both places, and held by 'good' men (of whom T.H. Green and Henry Sidgwick were the best known). By the 1880s the religious forces had regrouped, if no longer as guardians of assured and formal dominance, and the 1860s and 1870s were seen retrospectively as their worst years.

100. This is well described in O. Chadwick, Westcott and the University (1963), pp.12-14 (on Wordsworth) and 14ff.
102. Perhaps expressed most clearly by Edward King, C.C.R. 1883, who saw 'the scare of unbelief' as passing: 'We are becoming
These general influences have been emphasised because they appear to be necessary to an understanding of why the turn away from ordination was so notable among first-class men. It showed up even more strongly among college fellows, the pick of each college's men (Table 2.14). In 1851-3 the colleges were still operating under their pre-reform statutes, most of which involved an expectation of ordination for most of their fellows; the next major formal change did not come till the operations of the Statutory Commissioners between 1878 and 1881, so that the latter two periods of the sample reflect a genuine swing of opinion or preference. The figures make it clear that already the Church simply was not attracting the best men; in many cases, men whose fellowships obliged them to take orders after a certain period held them for the duration of this period only. In some respects this might be seen as an advantage to the Church, which had long had to rebut the charge that clerical obligations resulted in many unsuitable (and essentially non-clerical) clergymen, ordained merely to secure their endowment. In 1883 William Ince, Regius Professor of
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accustomed to the consideration of these great truths' (pp.322-3). The crisis is a theme of the biographies of all Oxford men, and is admirably described in Richter, op. cit.; even Moule was affected (Harford and Macdonald, op. cit., esp. pp.34 and 48).

103. For whom see D.A. Winstanley, L.V.C., pp.307-359.

104. Ward, op. cit., p.300, refers to this practice as 'well-known in Oxford and general in Cambridge.' J.W. Burgon (op. cit., p.39) complains about its prevalence. (A Times leader of 11 April 1854 had already referred to clerical fellowships as virtually equivalent to lay fellowships of limited tenure).

105. A typical description was of 'nominal clergymen, whose fellowships are in truth their only call' (Edinburgh Review, Vol.88, July 1848, p.180). Leslie Stephen later, perhaps overstating, wrote (privately) 'My real motive [i.e. for ordination] was that I was very anxious to relieve my father of the burden of supporting me': Leslie Stephen's Mausoleum Book, ed. Alan Bell (1977), p.5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Overseas Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Rest*</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Lay Academic</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3+</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ in first column, is of whole sample: thereafter refers to total of fellows.

* mostly parochial.
Divinity at Oxford, thought that though far fewer than before, the present clerical fellows were of a 'nobler and truer' type.¹⁰⁶ This was a consolation, but the fact of decline remained. And the decline in the number of clerical fellows meant more in terms of university life than it would have in the 1850s and 1860s; for these decades had been the great period of the non-resident lay fellows, who flourished in the hiatus between the pre-reform concept of a fellowship (largely clerical, with little emphasis on academic duties), and the more distinctively modern one that had emerged by the 1870s and was enshrined in the work of the Statutory Commissioners (mainly lay, and mainly teaching).¹⁰⁷ By the 1870s the non-resident fellows (though championed by Jowett) were widely criticised.¹⁰⁸ In my sample they remained still a large majority, but (see Table 2.15) there were signs of change: of the 1861-3 fellows, only 19 out of 74 taught at the university, in the 1871-3 group the figure was 25 out of 63. Thus 55 and 36, respectively, were non-residents - in the teaching sense, at least - or approximately 75 and 60%:¹⁰⁹ more ominously for the Church, whereas in the earlier group clergymen were still a slim majority of the resident teaching fellows (11 to 8), in the later they were a very distinct minority (8 to 17). In short, while non-residence was widespread the clerical fellows preserved a

¹⁰⁷. C. Kent, Brains and Numbers ... (1978), Chapter 1 (esp. pp.11-13 and 19): Harvie, op. cit., esp. pp.53 and 68 ('The non-resident Fellow was a product of the semi-reformed university').
¹⁰⁸. Ward, op. cit., p.276-7; Winstanley, 'L.V.C.', pp.270-1. Two articles in the Contemporary Review are useful: Vol.26, June 1875, contained a defence of non-resident fellows by George Brodrick (pp.79-82), and Vol.27, April 1876, contained Henry Sidgwick's definitive critique ('Idle Fellowships', p.679ff).
¹⁰⁹. A parliamentary return of 1886 (P.P. 1886, LI, 'Universities (Oxford and Cambridge): Return ...'Part B. Fellowships) allows the calculations of minimum and maximum figures for non-resident fellows; unfortunately overlapping of categories
TABLE 2.15: Teaching Fellows, Lay and Clerical. Where They Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Oxford &amp; Cambridge</th>
<th>Other Tertiary</th>
<th>The(1) New Public Schools</th>
<th>Old Grammar Schools</th>
<th>Other(2)</th>
<th>Theological Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The 'Clarendon Schools', i.e. the major endowed public schools.

(2) For Fellows, this means mostly inspectors for the government (HMI's).
disproportionate majority among those who taught in the colleges;\footnote{110} as it declined, this advantage ceased to be a buffer against the general rise in lay fellows.

In the 1871-3 sample, however, the outstanding fact is the vastly increased number of teachers, particularly among the first-class men; (among fellows, who were already mostly teachers in the previous sample, the outstanding change was from clerical to lay teaching). But there are other suggestive changes. Thus, of the 1861-3 sample (see Table 2.15) the total of teaching fellows engaged in tertiary education (columns 1 and 2) was 25, out of 49 in all: in the 1871-3 sample, the proportion had risen to 36 out of 46 (i.e. from one-half to three quarters). In part this reflected the clear rise in demand, both from Oxford and Cambridge and from other universities (often outside England\footnote{111}) for teaching staff, a growth now met by laymen. It also reflects a distinct decline in the occupational (and geographical) diffusion of fellows brought about by the decline in clerical fellows: of the 1861-3 group, 17 were

\footnote{F.n. 109 continued.}

\footnote{109. Forbids precision: at Oxford, the result is 118 to 151, of 276 (43 to 55%): at Cambridge, 144 to 194, of 326 (44 to 60%).}

\footnote{110. This was explained by G.E. Baker, lay fellow of Magdalen, Oxford, as 'because, apart from private means, the profession of a college tutor could only be adopted by those who could find a retiring pension in a college living' (P.P. 1881, LVI, p.130): also by Brodrick, op. cit., pp.79-80. (See also A. Engel in L. Stone, ed., op. cit., on the subject of 'the academic profession' before 1854.)}

\footnote{111. Of the 10 lay fellows (1871-3) who taught outside Oxford and Cambridge, 6 spent at least part of their careers overseas (4 in Australasia, 2 in North America). English institutions taught at by the fellows (and by the 8, out of the 11 non-fellows with 'tertiary' careers, who taught in Britain) included London, Aberystwyth, Durham (2 each), Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield; Cork; Guy's Hospital, and Woolwich (Army) and Greenwich (R.N.) colleges.}
clergymen whose teaching careers were outside the tertiary area: of the 1871-3 group, only two were of this type. The lay fellows thus seem here to be considerably more specialised, less likely to teach in schools, than their clerical predecessors; and if they did, it was almost always at the great 'Clarendon' schools.

The whole process can be abstracted from the growth, and the directions of growth, reflected in the careers of the teachers in the whole sample. The explanation that follows is based on, and is a commentary upon, the information in Table 2.16, which condenses the major facts and trends. The first point to emerge is that (see Totals) the first three periods showed a steady, but by no means explosive growth in the number of lay teachers; by the 1861-3 sample, they were more than half as numerous as the clerical teachers (whose numbers were reasonably steady throughout), and made up almost one-fifth of all the laymen. At first they were a majority only in the small 'miscellaneous' category (col.6), where their growth was steady in an area where there was little formal clerical dominance (private and preparatory education). In all other areas, however, laymen had to make their way against the established position of the clergy, and the order of their gradual take-over is interesting. First, there was the area of non-Oxbridge tertiary education: non-English universities, or English training colleges of one sort or another, gradually supplemented by a growing number of new British universities; although until the 1870s only the still struggling Owen's College, Manchester and University College, London, offered English careers.

112. The position of Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools (H.M.I.) was in practice largely a clerical preserve at first, but clergy were not appointed after 1870 (A. Tropp, The Schoolteachers ..., (1957), esp. pp.111 and 119-20: the lay inspectors were not apparently popular). Their work, backgrounds etc. are described in J. Hurt, Education in Evolution (1971), pp.39-67 and 174-85.
### TABLE 2.16: The Teaching Careers of the Honours Sample: With First-Class Men Bracketed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lay</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford and Cambridge</td>
<td>Other Tertiary</td>
<td>Clarendon Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>17(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>24(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>5(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>19(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>21(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>8(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>13(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>32(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>19(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>13(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) All teachers: % figures are of all laymen and of all clergy men in the sample (and, in the Total row, of the whole sample).

(2) Includes tutoring, preparatory schools and government inspectorships.
genuinely open to men outside the established church. Laymen were a majority, just, of those teaching in this area, in the sample of 1851-3, and their lead was to become overwhelming over the next 20 years. Meanwhile, as has been discussed above, Oxford and Cambridge were themselves slowly taking more laymen.

The number of first-class men who, for whatever reasons, were not ordained, continued to grow; they found places, by the 1861-3 sample, in the great Clarendon schools above all; the clergy were left still in a clear majority of those teaching in the new public schools, and especially at the old foundations, most of them still untouched by internal reform, and yet to be forced into it by the government. Then came the explosive growth, over the last ten years, of lay teachers, including among their number a solid core and majority of first-class men. The trends already visible were consolidated and continued; the pattern of a spread from the upper reaches of education through to its more modest regions is clear. At the top, the lay take-over of tertiary education was completed; though the few clerical fellows now elected tended to stay at Cambridge, and so prevented the swamping that occurred in the newer tertiary institutions. Of men teaching at the seven great public schools, lay men were even more firmly in the majority. But all this could not contain the numbers now involved; the new public schools suddenly became substantial employers of lay teachers, taking 10 first-class laymen, where they took none in the previous sample; it

113. E. Fiddes, Chapters in the History of Owens College ... (1937): until the virtual second foundation of 1867, the College never had more than 50 full-time students (pp.51ff, and 65ff). At U.C.L. the students' 'dominant feature was that they were too few to start with, and that they got fewer' (till the mid-1860s); N. Harte and J. North, The World of University College London 1828-1978 (1978), p.64. W.H.G. Armytage, Civic Universities (1955) provides a basic survey of the new institutions.
seems that there were simply not enough first-class clergymen to challenge the lay influx into the most prestigious areas of school education. Only the older foundations still absorbed a steady number of clerical teachers, but even here laymen were beginning to intrude. In short, as first-class men ceased to be ordained, but still sought teaching careers, they steadily challenged clerical dominance in the upper levels of the academic profession, where their quality could not be gain-said; and the Church, starved of the top-class brains who had once been the justification of its educational dominance, was forced to cede its dominance steadily, till by the later years it was retained only at the lowest level of secondary education: even here it was to be challenged as reforms raised the standards of the schools, and the flood of bright young laymen continued to flow from the universities.

The rise of the public schools, incorporating the reform of the old-established 'public' schools, the foundation of new ones, and the upgrading of many previously local grammar schools, is too well known to require summary here; but clearly it underlay the expansion of teaching as an option for graduates. Among the 17 lay teachers at 'Old Grammar Schools' in the 1871-3 sample, 8 taught at schools with at least pretensions to public school status: City of


115. The best books on the subject are: C.E. Mack, Public Schools and British Public opinion 1780-1860 (1938) and idem., Public Schools and British opinion since 1860 (1941); T.W. Bamford, The rise of the Public Schools (1967), and J.R. de S. Honey, Tom Brown's Universe (1977).
London School (3; admittedly not 'old', but hardly a 'new public school' in the same sense as Cheltenham and other mainly boarding institutions\textsuperscript{116}), Dulwich (2), and one each at Bedford, Sherborne and Repton. Clerical teachers, on the other hand, were mostly at smaller grammar schools; of the 41 clergymen in the same column, only two taught at major schools (one each at City of London and King's, Canterbury: see Appendix 4 for classification of schools).

Not surprisingly, the education received by the Cambridge samples reflects the growing concentration of prestige in schools of the emerging public school type: a highly simplified tabulation (Table 2.17) indicates not only the rising importance of the wholly new schools, but also the steady fall in the proportion of men whose school was not recorded: it was becoming an important matter, and although the full paraphernalia of Old Boys' Associations was a largely post-1870 development, Archdeacon Sandford, in his widely-read Bampton Lectures of 1861, thought that

\begin{quote}
the attachment of so many of our young men to the place of their earlier education and to their former teachers, is one of the most hopeful and exhilarating features of the age. \textsuperscript{117}
\end{quote}

It is a nice indication of this that whereas over 20% of Trinity men's schools were unrecorded in the 1851-3 sample, less than 5% of them had similarly unrecorded educations ten years later. It was probably a matter of college policy, in that the change coincided with a very sharp rise in the number of men from the less prominent

\textsuperscript{116} It was thus appropriately one of the 22 interested schools which Thring contacted for the first Headmasters' Conference in 1869, a group which included none of the Clarendon schools, and only Marlborough and Lancing of the new foundations; most were boarding Grammar Schools, like Uppingham, Sherborne, Repton, Felstead: Honey, op. cit., pp.247-8.

schools (unlikely, one would imagine, to have spontaneously pressed
the information on the college).\textsuperscript{118} This is also probably a fair
indication that men from unrecorded schools did tend, as one would
expect, to come from the lesser schools. On this subject (i.e. in
terms of unrecorded cases\textsuperscript{119}), unfortunately the variations between
colleges tend to be greatest, but the general development is
reasonably clear: a steady proportion (usually 16-19\%) came from
the Clarendon schools, which thus kept up with the burgeoning under­
graduate numbers: the new foundations very rapidly grew to prominence,
while numbers from the greater grammar schools (here including some
established proprietary schools) also more than kept up their place.
If, as seems likely (the publication of school registers, used by
Venn, favours more famous schools) the unrecorded cases were mainly
from the lesser schools, it is these which declined to make way for
the new and the reformed schools: or more correctly, it was the
latter which expanded to provide the university's growth.

While the additional evidence on schooling cannot (due to the
unrecorded element) support any great weight of conclusions, it should
be noted that it tends to support previous generalisations. As
regards parentage, it is no surprise to find that the gentry and

\textsuperscript{118} The figures (using the categories given in Appendix 4) were:
1851-3 1861-3 1871-3
New schools (4 and 5) 6(4.3) 10(7.0) 24(16.9)
Lesser schools (3 and 9) 3(2.1) 26(18.3) 21(14.8)
Unknown 32(22.9) 7(4.9) 5(3.5)
At St John's, interestingly, unknown schools remained a high
proportion (36.3, 53.1 and 34.1\%, respectively).

\textsuperscript{119} The extreme is illustrated in the 1871-3 sample, when 7 colleges
(Trinity, Sidney Sussex, Magdalene, Christ's, Jesus, Caius and
St Peter's) provide only 12 unrecorded cases (4.4\% of 271):
whereas 7 others (Clare, Pembroke, Queen's, St Catharine's,
St John's and Emmanuel) provide 108 (40.9\% of 264).
TABLE 2.17: Schools Attended: Honours and Decade Samples (percentages only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Unknown</th>
<th>2 Greater Grammar Schools</th>
<th>3 New Public Schools</th>
<th>4 Lesser Grammar Schools</th>
<th>5 Other</th>
<th>6 Other*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix 4 for categories: the columns here correspond as follows:

- Col. 3 = 2 and 3
- Col. 4 = 4 and 5
- Col. 5 = 9
- Col. 6 = 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13.

This last hides some significant changes (in the Honours Sample):

a) Private and home education declined from 8.3% of 1841-3 sample to 2.9% in 1851-3, and did not recover thereafter.

b) King's College, London, educated the following %: 6.6, 8.4, 3.4, 1.0 - a clear victim of the Public Schools' victory.

c) Men from other universities rose rapidly in the last 10 years, rising from 5 (1.1%) to 24 (4.1%).
aristocracy tended to go to the Clarendon schools (and mainly Eton and Harrow), which educated one-third to a half of them; and that they gradually started to go to the new public schools, the 7 from these, among the 1871-3 sample, almost equalling the 8 attending 'greater grammar schools'; in the same sample, only one attended a 'lesser grammar school.' The clergy appear as the most likely to have sons educated at the 'greater grammar schools'; in general they and other 'established professionals' were very similar in their choice of schools, though the latter's proportion of sons at the Clarendon schools was always higher, due entirely to the propensity of lawyers to have sons there. Both groups strongly patronised the new public schools, sending 20% of their sons to these schools in the last period. The sons of 'miscellaneous non-professionals' present a clear and predictable contrast: in the whole 30 years, not one (of the 100) attended either a Clarendon school or one of the new public schools; and while one must allow for the influence here of college bias (many being from St John's, which recorded schools badly) this result is unlikely to be inaccurate; overall the schools of 41 are unrecorded, 31 attended a 'greater', and 17 a 'lesser grammar school.' Men of unknown parentage tend to be of unknown schooling also, again largely due to college variations; one can thus only usefully note that sons of 'unknown' fathers attended the Clarendon schools with considerably less than average frequency (overall, just under 10%).

120. All of these 8 came from schools invited to the 1873 H.M.C., i.e. from category 2 in Appendix 4.
More striking is the confirmation of the contrast between men going on to ordination and to the law. It shows up most clearly among alumni of the Clarendon schools, among whom the majority who were ordained is consistently slight, in contrast to the overall picture. Put another way, the proportion of future clergy who had attended these schools was usually only about a third of that among future lawyers;\textsuperscript{121} while a distinctively greater proportion of clergy than of lawyers had attended a grammar school, or had unrecorded school educations. (The proportions from the new public schools were, however, almost indistinguishably close).

The take-over, particularly at the 'public school' end of the scale, by lay teachers, brings out something of the change and specialisation described above (in Chapter 1). At the beginning of this period school masterships could accurately be described as 'so intimately connected with the church ... that they may be fairly considered among the prospects to which, on entering the church, a young man has a right to look forward';\textsuperscript{122} and in the later 1850s the respected educationalist R.H. Quick, then a young clergyman, turned to teaching not as a conscious vocation, 'but rather as an obvious alternative, the second string, so to speak, that every English cleric has to his bow.'\textsuperscript{123} Teaching was not only a natural choice for a clergyman, it was also, for a man of talent, the most

\textsuperscript{121} The figures are (Numbers, and % of all clergy and all lawyers):

\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
  & 1841-3 & 1851-3 & 1861-3 & 1871-3 \\
Clergy & 26(11.1) & 43(15.4) & 27(11.5) & 27(11.1) \\
Lawyers & 24(36.9) & 21(28.8) & 21(33.9) & 29(30.2) \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{122} J.C. Hudson, Parent's Hand-book ... (1842), pp.15-16.

\textsuperscript{123} Life and Remains of the Rev. R.H. Quick, ed. F. Storr (Cambridge, 1899), p.10 (memoir by Storr); as J.B. Mozley wrote in the Quarterly (Vol.93, 1853): 'The office of teacher has generally been looked upon in this country as quasi-clerical' (p.211).
potentially lucrative form of clerical employment: indeed J.F. Stephen, in 1864, thought teaching to be 'the only temporal attraction which the Church, considered merely as a profession, holds out in the present day to men of great ability', referring to work in the great public schools.\textsuperscript{124} The most lucrative and powerful positions of all, the headmasterships, remained clerical preserves longer than the junior positions, probably largely because, as Nathaniel Woodard wrote to Lord Salisbury, ordination underlined the master's moral acceptability: 'This is a guarantee to society, and is so generally regarded.'\textsuperscript{125} Also the upper ranges of the profession inevitably continued to reflect the patterns prevailing among new teachers of a generation before; but clearly by 1900 this was no longer a sufficient explanation.

Based upon the evidence of the Cambridge honours men, it has been argued above that the declining position of clerical teachers at the leading schools was largely due to the fact that the best graduates simply were not being ordained; that if, as T.W. Bamford wrote, clerical headmasters, 'in the appointment of staff had little

\textsuperscript{124}. Cornhill, Vol.9, June 1864, p.758. Archdeacon Sandford had indeed bemoaned the fact that teaching ('which offers a more easy and direct path than parochial services to the highest dignities of the Church, and is much more lucrative') was tempting away too many good clergy: op. cit., p.159. The very poor position of most assistant masters is emphasised by Bamford, op. cit., pp.126-132; but their financial position, though poor, was arguably no worse than that of curates.

\textsuperscript{125}. B. Heeney, Mission to the Middle Classes (1969), p.110: see also the Saturday Review, in 1880, quoted in W.J. Reader, Professional Men, p.187. Isaac Todhunter implied, in an interesting passage, that a clergyman teacher ought not to need experiments to teach science, as his position should be authoritative; The Conflict of Studies (1873), p.17. (On the 'laecisation' of the profession, particularly of its last clerical bastion, the headships, see Honey, op. cit., pp.308-14).
faith in the quality of their own cloth', they were in fact quite correct, academically. But there was more at work here than the general current of intellectual opinion away from orthodox Christianity; the Church's own development discouraged clerical teachers, paradoxically enough considering the concern this caused. This emerged most clearly in debates late in the century, when the problem was plainly visible. At the Reading Church Congress in 1883 a session on 'The Church and Public Schools' brought out the problem. The leading speaker was Rev. E.C. Wickham, Master of Wellington, who addressed the fact of declining clerical representation on the staffs (which he saw as less a decline than a failure to keep pace 'with the rapid expansion of the profession of schoolmasters'). The reasons he gave were three: first, standards of motive for ordination had risen, excluding the merely customary or half-hearted; second there was the idea that 'the lay master can do more good', his intercourse with the boys being untainted by their feeling that he was 'professionally bound' to take a certain line; third and most important, was the feeling 'that their calling does not give scope enough for what is called par excellence "clerical work"', meaning parochial work; and the rest of his paper was devoted to the argument that teaching was indeed a suitably clerical work. After a debate dominated by unease as to whether 'the present healthy, practical, religious tone' at the schools was sufficient counterbalance to the influence of the lay teaching, the host Bishop Mackarness interestingly confirmed Wickham's last point about teaching and 'clerical work.'

He was explaining his own practice, which was felt to be rather favourable to teachers who sought orders on the title of their school posts: yet he qualified this by saying that he felt it his duty to ascertain

that the men admitted to priests' orders have by that time gained some acquaintance with the ordinary duties of a clergyman, and have learned something of a clergyman's life. [My emphasis]

The growing independence of the teaching profession thus owed at least some of its impetus to trends within the Church. The results were, however, to be deplored. In 1900 and 1901 the Convocation of Canterbury received and debated an important Report on the 'Supply and Training of Candidates for Holy Orders.' In the final debate of the bishops, concern about the public schools came to the fore; Bishop Ryle of Exeter was 'certain' that the recent fall in ordinations 'arises chiefly from the diminution of supply of the material from the public schools.' The most telling explanation came from Randall Davidson, Bishop of Winchester, when he spoke of the loss of the 'natural lead ... in the direction of Holy Orders, given to boys who are full of admiration for their masters': or as Bishop King of Lincoln summarised it, 'the hero of the modern schoolboy is not

128. Ibid., pp. 382-3. An almost exactly contemporary example of Mackarness' refusing to ordain to the priesthood without parochial experience is cited in Honey, op. cit., p. 312 (the man was S.R. James): his attitude dated from the beginning of his episcopacy, judging from a letter to E.D. South - a Wellington teacher - in the latter's ordination papers (MS. Oxf. Dioc., c. 254, Sept. 1873; Bodleian).

129. Ch.C. 1901, p. 146. (The problem is noticed in the Report (No. 343), p. 17). The paucity of Eton boys intending ordination was twice referred to in the debates, Ch.C. 1900, p. 371, Ch.C. 1901, p. 146.
connected with the ministerial life as formerly. ¹³⁰ There were of course other influences at work in the public schools; but the loss of this perpetual reminder to the richer youth of the country, of the pervasive position and authority of the Church, must have been a considerable factor.

The clergy were to some extent the losers in the rather shuffling progress of teaching towards autonomy as a profession. 'It is clear', as the Rev. G.W. Kitchin wrote in 1881, 'that education tends more and more to become an independent profession, it grows less clerical in all its branches ....'¹³¹ As teaching became the life-career of laymen, the clerical teachers became increasingly anomalous; apart from anything else, they were often not life-long teachers, and passed on into parochial (or dignified) church work (18 of the 48 clerical teachers of the 1871-3 sample taught for less than 10 years, whereas lay teachers who went on to other careers are not included here). F.M. Turner has described the way that the scientific community, as was 'commonplace ... within emerging professional groups', sought to cut out clergymen of 'dual loyalties', and merely 'amateur' interest;¹³² within teaching it would be ludicrous to press the analogy too far, but there were signs of similarly exclusive attitudes at work, in schools as well as at the universities. H.W. Eve, headmaster of the traditionally undenominational University College School, went on from describing


¹³¹. P.P. 1881, Vol.LVI ('Evidence' taken by the University of Oxford Commissioners, Part 2), p.157. He was noting also the relative closure of the old route from college tutor to school positions: schools now looked to their own staff.

to the Bryce Commission the extent to which 'the profession has actually very largely become a lay one', to advocate that all ministers of religion be barred from teaching; while this was undoubtedly an extreme position, the modestly factual Guide to Professions and Business (1898: H. Jones) noted that ordination was rarely required for grammar school headships, 'and is often a disqualification.'

The major question begged so far is whether the new breed of lay teachers differed in background from the clergy when they seem to displace, and so whether their rise can be explained by the influx of a new sort of honours graduate. It is necessary to be cautious, but the evidence does in fact suggest that the teachers and the clergy were very similar in background, and hence that the lay status of these men can be seen as a genuine 'loss' to the Church: in previous years one would have expected many of these men to be ordained. The evidence presented here (Table 2.18) adds up to no more than an inference, but on other grounds it is plausible, as will be argued shortly. The figures are adduced because they seem to suggest that a fairly steady proportion of these graduates went on either to ordination or to lay teaching, though the proportions for each changed markedly. In all the selected parentage groups (which between them constitute some 60% of all the graduates, and over two-thirds of those later ordained) there is a sharp fall in the proportions ordained; balanced in varying degrees by a rise in those becoming

133. P.P. 1895 (Bryce Royal Commission on Secondary Education), Vol.44, q. 2391, after which he received quite hostile treatment from several commissioners. The only other person to press the same point was the Huddersfield dissenter, the Rev. Robert Bruce, qs.6789-6819.

134. P.58.
TABLE 2.18: Ordination and Lay Teaching, as Careers of Selected Parentage Groups (and Sizars): Numbers and %*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 % of whole sample</th>
<th>2 Clergy</th>
<th>3 Misc. non-professionals</th>
<th>4 Unknown</th>
<th>5 3 combined, as % of rows, and % of whole</th>
<th>6 Sizars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>68(74)</td>
<td>28(88)</td>
<td>92(69)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51(85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6(7)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>7(5)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>74(80)</td>
<td>29(91)</td>
<td>99(74)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67(93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>69(65)</td>
<td>22(65)</td>
<td>67(57)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42(66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>11(10)</td>
<td>4(12)</td>
<td>8(4)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>80(75)</td>
<td>26(76)</td>
<td>75(64)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50(78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>72(52)</td>
<td>10(36)</td>
<td>89(47)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31(59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>25(18)</td>
<td>10(36)</td>
<td>34(18)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>97(70)</td>
<td>20(71)</td>
<td>123(55)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42(79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All % figures in brackets are of the overall total in each parentage group.
teachers. The evidence does not suggest that the teachers were from a new sort of background (see especially column 5). On the contrary, it is striking that among the groups already noted as most likely to become clergymen (sons of non-professionals, and sizars) it is clearest that teaching replaced ordination as the career chosen; though among the sizars ordination remained relatively common. The schools' evidence is somewhat similar: ordination, as we have seen, was always relatively uncommon among men from the Clarendon schools, and declined over time; but teaching was also relatively uncommon, indicating that both were largely careers for men of more modest background; men from the greater grammar schools did go into teaching markedly more often in the last period, but the biggest rises are from the new public schools, and the lesser schools.

The pattern which I see here is based on the hypothesis that ordination and teaching were, in important practical aspects, not dissimilar as career choices for graduates. Above all, having once paid for a degree, both were, conventionally, the cheapest professions to enter: neither required capital sums at the start and both yielded at least some income from the beginning, conditions which contrasted very markedly with those in the legal, medical or military professions.\(^{135}\) (The one comparable profession was the still small one of government service, which as yet attracted barely a tenth as many as became teachers). Lay teaching seems thus to have been the clear alternative to ordination for men of modest means, and this is what the figures indicate. A last piece of evidence suggests that the sizars tended to teach whether as laymen or as

---

\(^{135}\) The expenses of the various professions are given in the professional advice literature cited in Chapter 1 above (i.e. by Hudson, Thomson, Davenant and Jones).
clergymen, the change being that they ceased to be ordained; and that, if the last sample is typical, teaching was also ceasing to be a normal option for the less well-connected clergy, possibly because by then its prospects were no better than those held out by ordinary parochial work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sizar's teaching</th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th>1851-3</th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th>1871-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as: laymen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clergymen</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers/total:</td>
<td>28/74</td>
<td>40/72</td>
<td>29/64</td>
<td>19/53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, one may instance Jowett's defence of non-resident fellowships on the grounds of their helping poorer men start their professional lives, which is given point by his warning that otherwise 'you compel them all to become schoolmasters, whether they are fitted for the occupation or not.'

Just as the causes for changes visible at the universities must be traced to more general sources, so must their effects be sketched on a wider field, that of the clergy's position as learned men in the society at large. Naturally the accepted opinion of the later nineteenth century, that the clergy had lost a great deal of their intellectual influence, did not discount the fact that the clergy of earlier periods had contained at least as many (probably far more) ill-educated men than at present. The problem lay in the growing divergence between clerical standards and lay expectations, which was to result in a clergy far more widely respected for their activity and zeal, than they were as teachers of truth.

136. P.P. 1881, Vol.LVI (see note 131), q.2702. (It is quoted in the Life, Vol.2, p.131; cf. also W.M. Campion, in 1867: 'poor men, having taken a high degree ... would be obliged to go out into a school or take private pupils ...'). (P.P. 1867, Vol.XIII, Ewart S.C., q.3878.)
To some extent this rested on the perception of the changes which have been described above. In 1873 Dean Howson of Chester, comparing the ordinations in the tripos lists of 1835-40 and 1860-65, had said, 'If the failure as to quantity is serious, the failure as to quality is more serious still', and this situation was the implicit background to the concerned debate of the period. But while most could deplore this, there were differences seen in the attitudes of the various church parties. The party which placed most store upon the maintenance of intellectual parity with the lay world was the Broad. It was they who tended to be most critical of the stances taken by the other parties. The reasons were classically put by Archbishop Whately, in a sermon of 1857. Learning was both necessary, as 'the best means [i.e. of expounding the Gospel] which Providence has placed within our reach' in this post-miraculous age, and attractive in its own right: reason may be only a part of what is required from a Christian, but 'it is an indispensable part; and it is also the first part.' The rest is taken up with an exposition of the argument that this truth must be protected, as it was at the Reformation, from the twin dangers of Protestant private judgement and Catholic infallibilism. On the effects of the former, there appears to be general agreement that Anglican Evangelicalism did tend to be somewhat anti-intellectual, and certainly the manifestation of it that appeared so strongly in Cambridge from the mid-1870s was hearty and holy rather than learned; their conservatism in matters theological and critical was perhaps a matter of strength internally, but among the uncommitted intellectuals they were not notably successful.

137. C.C.R. 1873, p.127.
139. See references note 101 above: a perfect example of the type
Ill.

The difference between Broad and High attitudes to learning are more interesting, and of greater relevance to the intellectual world. Mark Pattison's 1863 essay 'Learning in the Church of England' is the best-known and clearest of the Broad Church statements on the topic. It is coloured by the circumstances of the time (Essays and Reviews was still before the courts) and it is largely a tract against what he calls 'the Bishop of Oxford's party.' But characteristic concerns emerge: that the Church is losing the best young men and being recruited from the undistinguished, that both approbation and endowment are being diverted from the learned to the 'active' clergy, and that party spirit has led to a degradation of debate and to a cheap following of uninstructed lay opinion, to whose level all discourse has declined. Like Jowett, he thinks it essential that some freedom of thought be allowed in theology, if only to retain the respect of the young. The essential concern of the Broad Church was that the Church should remain national, and in this age of intellectual advance that meant keeping up with, and on top of, current intellectual questions. The High Church concerns were built upon a fundamentally different principle. The contrast can be seen in a lesser-known pamphlet of

F.n. 139 continued.


141. Ibid., esp. pp.273-6 and 299-306. For Jowett's views at the time, see esp. two letters to Dean Elliott, Abbott and Campbell, op. cit., Vol.II, pp.345 and 348.

1862, by R.St.J. Tyrrwhitt. He starts from the fact of the clergy's lack of standing among the educated classes, particularly the young; a major argumentative point is that a wholly unreasonable amount is expected of sermons, on whose failings the clergy are too often judged; whereas the true function of the priest is sacramental; and he should preach to a congregation who possess 'a certain preparation of mind.' The deeper contrast between the two thus seems to be that while Pattison urges a church able and willing to move with the national mind, Tyrrwhitt posits a church to witness to and heighten the faith of believers: the latter has within it the seeds of the acceptance of denominational status, the service of the faithful (plus missionary effort) rather than the service of the nation with full acceptance of credal diversity.

Spokesmen from both sides, however, agreed that the best of intentions were being endangered by the sheer work-load of the clergy. Pattison caricatured the new stereotype of the 'active clergyman': 'He is not idle, as he can truly boast, for indeed he has not spent an hour a day in solitary and studious retirement since he was ordained' ... Others were simply worried: Rev. F.H. Thicknesse, at an ordination sermon in 1870, recalled the old boast of Anglican clerical learning as 'stupor mundi', and went on:

143. Published anonymously, identified in Bodleian's copy: The Clerical question: a letter (1862). Tyrrwhitt appears, as a bitter opponent of J.A. Symonds, in P. Grosskurth's John Addington Symonds (1964), pp.170-3: also in D.N.B.

144. Ibid., pp.3-5, 14-18, 22. (A witty reminder that, on the other hand, sermons were not taken 'literally' like lectures, is the reaction of Lady Ambrose to Herbert's major speech in W.H. Mallock's, The New Republic (Leicester 1975, reprint of 1879 ed.), p.365).

Might we not now astonish the world if it knew the multiplicity of duties (useful duties, honourable duties, not our own duties) which we undertake, and which have cut us off from learning? 146

Frederick Temple's charge of 1875, to his diocese of Exeter, also drew attention to the problem, and noticed 'that this difficulty presses most hardly upon those who are really in earnest', so that the best of the young clergy were most affected. 147 Later there were signs that activity was being seen as not only harmful in excluding study, but too often ill-thought out and unproductive to boot: 'When a young curate who wants to read', protested Canon E.R. Bernard in 1891,

tells me that his time is taken up with half-a-dozen feeble societies or branches of this or that, which he can hardly keep alive, I feel something very like indignation. We have to bring about nothing short of a complete change in clerical opinion as to the relative claims of study and active work ... 148

So once again what looked like improvement could be seen also to have harmful side-effects. The damage, in this instance, had probably been done. In the same debate as Howson's in 1873, Edward King, pleading for better clerical education, made an extraordinary confession as to the effect too many clergy had on educated congregations; without being trained merely as controversialists, he


147. Quoted in E.G. Sandford, ed., Frederick Temple (1906), Vol.1, p.439: S. Yeo quotes from the British Weekly of 31/12/1891 'the best men in the Church are already overtaxed by the multifarious character of their duties. They are bustled out of their spirituality.' Religion and Voluntary Societies in Crisis (1976), n.2, p.368; also p.163.

said, 'I do think that with due preparation they might, if not convince, at least offend less, the most intellectual in their congregations ...'. 149 In 1881 his Oxford colleague William Ince was to refer to the discouragement naturally felt by young undergraduates 'accustomed to hear clerical scornfully employed as a synonym for unintellectual.' 150 Yet perhaps even worse than open contempt was the growth of an almost pitying courteous refusal to raise important issues. Bagehot described part of the reason, the simple inability of too many clergy to answer questions with decision; 151 E.W. Benson described the effect:

> even now an ominous kindly silence too frequently closes a discussion begun in the presence of a clergyman. His character commands regard; he has credit for sincerely believing what his friends might equally accept, if the living speech of the teacher defended or even clearly stated his truth.

A major difficulty, meanwhile, for the harassed clergy was that theology itself was changing and becoming even more specialised, so

---

149. C.C.R. 1873, p.143.
150. The Education of the Clergy at the Universities (1882), p.6.
151. In an article in the Economist of 18/7/1874 (the clergy are 'not only conscientious but indecisive', and refuse to follow the inferences of argument): N.St.J. Stevas, ed., op. cit., Vol.7, p.317. W.R. Greg that year described the attitude of the intellectuals to Christianity as 'not so much ... hostile as ... isolated, neutral, almost supercilious', in the Contemporary Review, Vol.24 (Aug. 1874), p.345.
152. The Cathedral (1878), p.124. The Broad Church clerical journalist C.M. Davies referred to the 'widespread idea' that clergymen are usually 'fatally uninteresting'; Orthodox London (1874), Vol.1, p.49. See also Nineteenth Century, Vol.32 (1892), 'Some talk about clergymen' by C.M. Gaskell: 'We never talk out quite openly before them .... They dwarf our minds, and we treat them as a race apart' (p.493). Creighton in 1900, criticising the clergy for cultivating 'an abnormal sensitiveness', described them as looked upon by many laymen 'as exceptional persons who have to be kept in a sort of cotton-wool condition in a museum, and not to be allowed to face the actual facts of life' (Ch.C. 1900, p.361).
that even if they would, they were often simply unequipped to keep abreast of it. 153

It may be that such a change in the clergyman's relation to the educated laity as a whole was not an influence upon graduates of as early as 1871-3; and that, rather, the influence was still the other way, in that the trends discernible at the university were slowly affecting people's perceptions of the clerical body, and its intellectual standing. Certainly the changes were now clear enough at Cambridge. 154 In society non-believers were again acceptable, indeed often honoured; 155 clergymen were rarely the subject of direct hostility from their social peers, but they had to live with a new position in which their assumptions were no longer shared as they had been, at least outwardly. Most clergymen undoubtedly preferred, in social life, not even to attempt to rouse argument; Rev. John Gott, the romantic Vicar of Leeds (later Bishop of Truro) advised as much in his very widely-read course of lectures, delivered in 1885 as The Parish Priest of the Town. He referred to upper-class unbelief and its proponents;

Some of them we meet at every dinner party.
In our presence it is generally concealed out of courtesy, and in public there is little use in drawing it out of its retirement. Unless you

154. In 1870 at Cambridge, according to David Newsome 'the brilliant young men ... were wholly different from their predecessors of thirty years before': Godliness and good learning (1961), p.228 (et. seq).
155. N. Annan sums up Leslie Stephen's significance thus: 'Stephen justified before the sight of man the non-religious' (op. cit. p.191). A very indignant reaction to this lionising of non-believers was expressed in Bishop A.C. Hervey's Charge of 1876 (Bath and Wells diocese), p.12-3.
are a master of your subject, and skilful in arranging your arguments, it is wiser to let it alone.156

Thus extreme positions were avoided and social harmony was preserved. It would have been hard to feel strong opposition to men like the Darwin brothers (sons of Charles); Christian in ethics but quite unable to believe the dogmas, they have been characterised as 'Christian parasites', a phrase which undoubtedly bears far wider application: but they did not go to church.157

156. 1887 ed., p.158.
157. Gwen Raverat, Period Piece (1960 ed.), pp.188-9 (and 26, when George is persuaded to go to chapel for the first time in a dozen years: other agnostics did go to chapel, 'but only for the music.').
4. AVENUES FOR POORER MEN

The presence at Cambridge of men from modest backgrounds has been referred to several times, and some details are given in Appendix 1 to this chapter. The manner in which such men were supported at the universities, and debate on the issue of providing them with greater opportunities there, require some further discussion. There was considerable debate, accompanying significant reform in the mid-Victorian period. Rothblatt's arguments on this subject (in the first two chapters of The Revolution of the Dons) are 'revisionist', and while no major modification of his position will be advanced here, it is worthwhile to test his views against the samples used in this study, and to place the issue more specifically in terms of the concerns of churchmen. Rothblatt's main arguments, in summary, are that, first, 'the poor' had long ceased to find, by 1850, an avenue to higher education by way of the endowed grammar schools, which were largely moribund; if functioning they were essentially not free, and in practice open only to people of at least artisan status. Thus the widely-accepted notion that the poor were deprived of this avenue by university reforms which severely curtailed closed school or local awards (a notion ascribed by Rothblatt largely to the influence of Albert Mansbridge) cannot be accepted. That access for poorer students was in fact essentially a product of late-nineteenth century reforms; and that references to 'poor men' throughout this period must be taken to refer very largely to men of similar status to other students, but merely of more straitened means. In general these points are accepted, but Rothblatt's

158. Rothblatt, op. cit., Chap. 1, passim.
159. Ibid., p.75-86.
detail is more questionable.

The main point which remains to be stressed is that, far from being a creation largely of Mansbridge, his formulation of the disadvantage suffered by the poor because of scholarship reforms was merely the end of a (largely High Church) line of such complaints, going directly back to the 1860s; and indeed to the 1840s, if one considers the Tractarian idealisation of the poor student intended for the Church as essentially similar in outlook. As will be seen later, one direct consequence of the perceived threat posed by open scholarships was the formation of the Ordination Candidates' Exhibition Fund (O.C.E.F.), from whose roots in the Oxford Anglo-Catholicism of Liddon and King it is easy to follow the tradition through to Gore and hence to his admirer Mansbridge. They were not, however, the only people concerned with the subject; with the costs of a college education running at at least £100 p.a., and usually £120-150 for even frugal students, the issue of scholarships was part of the broader concern with 'opening' the universities. The results of the first period of reform, in the 1850s and 1860s, brought scholarships into growing prominence, as they were consolidated and their values rose, in a brief hey-day of intercollegiate free competition, towards and sometimes beyond the limit that was set in 1881 of £80 p.a.

In the original Royal Commissions of the early 1850s this result was not apparently contemplated. The Commissions did not

discuss the possibility that their reforms might exclude poor men by making awards tempting objects for the expensively educated. The aim was simply to raise standards, and the Oxford Commissioners expressed what was to be the common view for the rest of the century: they rejected the 'almshouse' form of aid, and went on: 'We have no wish to encourage "poor scholars" to come to the university merely because they are poor.' They favoured the removal of educational impediment, but not the creation of a new student class. At the time of the Ewart sub-committee of 1867, which went widely into the question of how best to encourage and enable poorer students to come to university, there was little mention of scholarships as having exclusive social effects. On the High Church side, Pusey and Montague Burrows made little of the argument, and only the Oxford sub-committee chaired by the (Evangelical) Provost of Worcester (R.L. Cotton) produced the argument in full, declaring that the poor 'had much once in the university, and now have next to nothing': scholarships went 'often' to men who did not need the money, and thus excluded deserving poorer men. A dozen years later the complaint was more widely expressed at Oxford, but the main objection was to the size of the awards, and their tendency to raise levels of

165. Ibid., p.283. Leaders in the Times perhaps point to changing views: on 11/3/1856 the first dismissed the conservative plea for poverty as a qualification for awards, as 'at best ... only so much taken from merit and given to misfortune': the second, of 1/9/1868, admitted that awards were gained by the rich 'because to be well-educated means to be well-to-do.'
166. P.P. 1881. Vol.LVI, Evidence, and Answers to circulars, received by the University of Oxford Commissioners (hereafter referred to as 1881 Oxford Commissioners): i.e. Pt.1, qs. 633, 660, 1957-60; Pt.2, pp.157, 164. Unfortunately the Cambridge
expenditure in the colleges generally. The Bryce Commission heard more complaints about the waste of endowments on rich men, but at least as many witnesses testified that most scholars did need the help. Thus these official documents supply only a little evidence of widespread prefiguring of the 'Mansbridge' thesis, outside High Church circles. It may well be, however, that the first 20 or so years of the new open awards constituted an exceptional period: this was the opinion of the 1922 Royal Commission Report, which draws most of its optimistic conclusions about greater access for poor men from the recent past and the increased local and county assistance that was then provided. They note however that one of the effects of the original opening of awards 'was to reduce substantially for a time the assistance available to poor boys from the smaller Grammar schools.'

The prizes were for a period extremely large, up to £150 p.a., with school awards. One recipient of such awards, writing in 1916, recognised that attitudes were then relatively unaffected by
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Commissioners did not publish, though Winstanley's L.V.C., Chapters 7 and 8, provides a very full description of their activities.

167. Ibid., i.e. Pt.1, qs. 2911, 4121, 4193; Pt.2, p.128.
168. P.P. 1895, Royal Commission on Secondary Education (hereafter referred to as Bryce R.C.) (9 vols.). Vol.43, pp.221-2 and 224-7 provides a very full digest of the evidence on the matter.

168a. P.P. 1922, Vol.10, Royal Commission on Oxford and Cambridge Universities: Report, pp.131-2, 24-5 (they note that the reforms of the 1850s had aimed 'to raise the intellectual level by free competition', in which they had succeeded 'to the great advantage of the nation, and to the particular advantage of the cleverer sons of professional men of small means' (p.25). The Bryce R.C. was told, in an important submission by T. Fowler (President of C.C.C. Oxford) that the general complaint about awards favouring the rich was less valid now than immediately after the reforms, though the lesser grammar schools had suffered (Vol.47, p.154).

168b. 1882 Oxford Commissioners, esp., qs. 1968/- and 2911.
considerations of the financial aptness of the awards. The future Lord Kilbracken was at Balliol between 1866 and 1871, and held exhibitions from Rugby as well as from the College, which, with other prizes, he reckoned to have been worth £175 p.a.; he introduced these facts with the remark that it would 'seem strange to modern readers' that there was then no limit to the accumulation of money in this way, and 'that no questions were asked as to the private means' of the prize-winners. 168c

There is no doubt, however, that the Church benefited far less than it used to from the endowment of awards at Cambridge (and probably at Oxford). Table 2.19 provides a general picture of developments which is as expected: sizarships became progressively less significant, while scholarships, having failed to expand with the first, early 19th century boom, later increased sufficiently to cover an enlarged proportion of the students of the later growth period. The overall proportion of students aided may have been less in the 1880s than in the 1820s, but most would have been receiving more money for the awards. 169 This substantial expenditure was not, as it once had been, almost entirely an aid (or prize) for future clergy. The proportion of ordinations among award-holders declined even faster than among the rest, which can be put in two ways: first, that award-holders (scholars, increasingly) passed from being disproportionately likely to become clergymen to being merely


### TABLE 2.19: Scholars and Sizars: Total Numbers, and Numbers Ordained, for the Decade Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1750s</th>
<th>1770s</th>
<th>1820s</th>
<th>1840s</th>
<th>1860s</th>
<th>1880s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIZARS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOLARS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sizar-scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scholars only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All individuals in above groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Out of total Clergy)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
average in this respect; second, that whereas the future clergy had, particularly in the 18th century, been very disproportionately the objects of endowed aid, this again was not so by the 1880s. Overall then, the role of these endowments had in the past been largely that of aiding clerical education. But by the latter part of the 19th century the Church could no longer rely upon them for such aid.

The process can be seen in more detail for the honours men of the critical mid-century decades. Table 2.20 supports the conclusions from the broader sample very closely, and allows additional ones. Thus, there was always a difference between the sizars and the scholars; in these samples the 'scholars only' were ordained throughout at about average frequency, while sizars remained considerably more likely to be ordained than any other group or type. But as they declined so did the advantage to the Church, and sizars provided less than half as many ordinands in the last as in the first period (31 as against 64). To some extent the sheer growth in the number of scholars offset this: future clergy were a smaller proportion of the aided group, but their actual numbers remained stable. Consequently the proportion of the clergy who had received some assistance was also steady, but there was by 1871-3 very little difference between future clergy and future laymen in this matter. Thus, whereas in the 1851-3 sample 60% of the future clergy had benefited from awards, and only 40% of the laymen, twenty years later the respective figures were little different, at 53% and 50% (see Table 2.20, bottom 2 rows).

The reason for the change, above all, was the previously discussed turning away from ordination by first-class men. The details can be seen in Table 2.21. Among sizars, pure and simple, of whom a solid majority were not first-class men, it is still evident that the overall high proportion of future clergy was disproportionately drawn
TABLE 2.20: Honours Sample Award-holders (Sizars and Scholars): Total Numbers, and Numbers and % of Each Group Ordained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th>1851-3</th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th>1871-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sizars (all)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scholars</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Sizar-Scholars</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Scholars only</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: All</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All individuals in above groups</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These comprise:</td>
<td>% of all clergy</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of all laymen</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* % figures in 'total' rows are of whole sample: whereas % figures in the clergy rows are of the figures in the 'total' rows.
<p>| TABLE 2.21: Honours Sample Award Holders: First-class Men and Ordination, Compared to Rest |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1841-3 | 1851-3 | 1861-3 | 1871-3 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>%*</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%*</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%*</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firsts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sizar-scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firsts</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firsts</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* %figures refer to: in 'total' rows - % of all firsts, and of all rest in Clergy rows - % of the 'total' row figure. These are rounded to nearest 1.
from the non-firsts. Among the sizar-scholars there is a similar
trend; among these students the proportion of first-class men to the
rest is almost exactly inverse to that among the pure sizars until
the last period, when there is a sharp decline in the number of
sizar-scholars gaining firsts: at the same time the number of those
firsts who were ordained drops to two, out of ten, while as before
the great majority of those without first-class degrees continued to
be ordained. Among scholars the pattern is the same: the first-class
men - and scholars made up some four-fifths of all firsts in the last
two periods 170 - turned from ordination very markedly in the last
period, while the rest remained very likely to be ordained. The
Church's 'loss' of endowments was thus the direct result of the
growing concentration of awards on the academically able, the least
likely group to enter the Church's ministry.

One point of some interest here is that the sizars appear to
have lost, by the 1870s, something of their academic distinction:
between the last two samples the proportion of first-class men who
were sizars fell from over 20% to less than 8%; conversely the
proportion of sizars with first-class degrees declined precipitately
to a figure below the general average, after having always previously
been well above it. 171 This must be related to the rising value of
the scholarships. Sizarships, if combined with awards, could provide
a virtually free education; at Trinity in 1867 the sizars 'now very
often can put money by', according to the Bursar (and ex-Tutor)

170. The figures for all four periods are (rounded)
(a) % of scholars with firsts: 53 51 66 59
(b) % of firsts who were scholars: 65 65 84 79

171. The % of sizars who had firsts, as against that among all
others, were as follows for the four periods (sizars:rest):
50.0 : 34.7 48.6 : 32.9 46.9: 31.2 28.3 : 33.8
J.L. Hammond.\textsuperscript{172} For the ordinary sizars however the normal benefit, made up in various remissions and small payments, was 'about 80 l' p.a.; comparable, in short, to scholarships which now by no means always connoted poverty.\textsuperscript{173} Hammond was worried by the decline of sizars at Trinity, and recorded his impression that parents disliked the label.\textsuperscript{174} Given the availability of scholarships, the parental preference for them is understandable.

More generally, the evidence of the samples in this study cannot really support the thesis that awards moved away from the poorer to the richer students; though it must be emphasised that 1873 may be too early a cut-off date for such a question at Cambridge.

The occupations of the scholars' fathers are illuminating only insofar as they show a remarkable lack of bias in almost any direction: the only consistently low proportion of scholars is among gentry and aristocracy; but conclusions about unwillingness to give awards to rich men are prevented by the fact that this group also produced a uniquely low proportion of first-class men.\textsuperscript{175} Sons of the clergy...

\textsuperscript{172} Ewart S.C., q.987: he referred to some making 'as much as 200 l a year', with school awards as well. At St John's it seems that if a sizarship was combined with awards the whole costs of education would be covered (qs. 571, 585-7: Henry Latham referred to sizars at 'some colleges' being 'fully maintained', q. 1921-2).

\textsuperscript{173} The Cambridge Commissioners had made it clear that they wished the scholarship to bear a 'distinctive character ... as a reward for merit alone', and to be 'the result of merit alone'. P.P. 1861, Vol.XX, Report of the Cambridge University Commissioners, pp.27 and 9.

\textsuperscript{174} Ewart, S.C., qs. 988-9. His wish to maintain the sizars on the traditional lines is illustrated by Rothblatt, op. cit., p.76.

\textsuperscript{175} The \% figures (rounded) for the four periods are: 29 19 19 25
were usually slightly more likely than average to be scholars, but
the difference is not great. Other small groups fluctuate some­
what more, as one would expect from their small numbers, but patterns
are elusive. In all the conclusion must be that, on this criterion,
there is no substantial evidence of a leaning toward poorer or
richer; the sons of 'miscellaneous non-professionals', were, by the end,
rather more likely that not to be scholars - but as with the gentry,
this is as easily explained by reference to their academic record as to
their presumed poverty.

The evidence about schools attended, which must be important in
a debate largely about the effect of awards restricted to the lesser
grammar schools, is not much more informative. Again, in the
aggregate figures the tendencies are slight: after the first period,
men from the Clarendon schools obtained awards with slightly less
than the average frequency; those from the non-H.M.C. schools who
sent pupils to university (i.e. group 3 in Appendix 4) did gain more
scholarships than most, but their numbers were not great. A more
detailed count of the schools attended by the 1851-3 and 1871-3
samples indicates the growing number of recorded schools, but is
difficult to use to support a general thesis. In both periods, a few
major schools sent a large minority of all scholars: in the earlier
period Eton, Rugby, Shrewsbury, St Paul's, Repton, King Edward's
School Birmingham and Christ's Hospital sent 59 of the 199 scholars,
or 30%: all of these sent between 6 and 11 scholars each, and were
quite distinct from the next 16 schools in the list which provided

176. In 1851-3 53.3% of clergy sons had scholarships, as against an
average of 44.9%, and in 1861-3, the figures were 48.1% to
42.4%: in the other two periods clergy sons were almost
exactly average in this respect.

177. Thus in both the last two periods exactly half of them had
firsts.
2 or 3 scholars, a groups mostly of old grammar schools with a few more modern institutions (but none as yet of the 'new public schools'). In the later period, apart from the leading trio (again Eton, Rugby and Shrewsbury, with 9 to 13 scholars each), there is a more even spread: there follow 11 schools with between 4 and 7 scholars to their names: Harrow, St Paul's, Christ's Hospital, Repton, Oakham and Perse (Cambridge), of the older schools; City of London, Cheltenham, Marlborough and Wellington of the newer foundations. In all these top 14 schools sent 88 scholars, some 34% of the total; below them were a further 21 schools sending another 53 scholars. Thus the number of schools sending 2 or more scholars had risen from 23 to 35. But while the most obvious change was the rise to prominence of the new foundations, it is not entirely easy to argue for growing exclusivity; many of the leading schools, in the later as in the earlier period, were either day schools or, like Marlborough and Wellington, gave help to the sons of professional men (i.e. the sons of clergy and of military officers, respectively); in both periods, moreover, despite the prominence of the few larger schools, a significant minority of all scholars came from local schools (and those from unrecorded schools can probably be assumed to have mostly attended such lesser schools). Two prominent Cambridge men

178. Three scholars each from Liverpool R.I., Bury St. Edmunds* and Sedbergh; 2 each from Merchant Taylors*, Sherborne, Uppingham, Clapham, Sheffield Collegiate*, King's Canterbury*, Manchester G.S., St Peter's York*, Leeds G.S., Blackheath*, Ipswich*, Derby and Huntingdon (those marked * were also in the 21 schools with two or three scholars in 1871-3: see next note).

179. Beyond the 8 marked above, the 21 comprised: Felsted, Dulwich, Highgate, Aldenham, Durham, King William's College (I.O.M.), the University of London School, Kensington and Newark: there were four new foundations, Liverpool College, Clifton, Taunton and Brighton.
told the Ewart Committee that the public school men were if anything rather unsuccessful in the open scholarships; W.H. Bateson, Master of St John's, thought the public schools did 'not show well in competition', though he excepted Rugby, Marlborough, Cheltenham and Shrewsbury. J.L. Hammond thought the same, and pointed to what he called 'the best middle class schools' as producing the most distinguished scholars (he instanced King Edward's Birmingham, St Peter's York, and City of London); he qualified this by noting that Cambridge got only 'the picked men' from those schools, while receiving 'something really below the average from the public schools'.

The survey of schools does however point up one useful difference between types of school, that relating to the subject taken. Rothblatt thought Mansbridge's suggestion of a lower-class bias towards mathematics could be 'instantly dismissed', but it seems clear that this was a view widely held by contemporaries. Rev. Robert Burn (Tutor of Trinity) thought 'that the students who are derived from the poorer classes are chiefly mathematical students', and the Oxford mathematical professor Rev. Bartholomew Price was of the same opinion, both agreeing that this tended to give the middle classes a preference for Cambridge. George Brodrick pointed, as one of the differences between Oxford and Cambridge, to the fact that at the latter 'it is no rare occurrence ... for the first place in the

181. Ewart S.C., Bateson qs. 756-763, Hammond qs. 1097-8 and 1128-9. Honey (op. cit., p.152) points out that in the 1880s grammar and day schools were more successful with scholarships than the public schools. The survey undertaken by the Bryce R.C., however, makes it clear that even at Cambridge the Clarendon and the H.M.C. schools not only provided some 64% of all scholars, but did so while providing only 53% of all pupils, Vol.49, pp.426-7. (Rothblatt's gloss on these figures (op. cit., p.59-60) contains inaccuracies).


Mathematical Tripos ... to be won by a young man of humble birth from a cheap grammar school in the north of England, who never even held a scholarship or exhibition till he reached the University. 184

There was certainly a difference between the schools attended by the top ten classicists and the top ten mathematicians from each of the years 1871-3: of the 30 top classicists, 9 were from the 7 boarding Clarendon schools, 10 from new public schools (Haileybury, Rossall, Marlborough, Wellington), and only 2 came from non-H.M.C. local grammar schools (St Bees and Bishop's Stortford, of which the former at least had long university connections). The mathematicians included men from 8 such schools, as against only 2 from the 7 Clarendon schools, and none from the great new public schools; 8 came from other universities (mostly Scottish, or London) and one from the Royal School of Mines. The classicists, in short, were predominantly from the old and the new boarding public schools, or from established older grammar schools; the mathematicians came almost entirely from day schools or other universities. 185 This was not new, for the pattern had been the same for the 1851-3 sample.

An approach to the problem of opening the university that received considerable attention was that of allowing students to live outside the colleges, either as members of a college still or as unattached

---

184. In Contemporary Review, Vol.26 (1875), p.64; he had come to this specifically from noting the relative lack of mathematics at the great public schools. The young F.D. Maurice, 50 years earlier, made a point of defending the university from the reputation given it by such as the 'regular northern plodder' who toils and gains 'a good mathematical degree', and becomes a 'hardhead curate.' F. Maurice, Life of Frederick Denison Maurice (2 vols.), 2nd ed., 1884, Vol.1, pp.49-50.

185. Ordinations were very rare among these men, though interestingly there were 7 from the mathematicians and only 4 from the classicists: further, only 1 of the 19 top classicists from the Clarendon or the major new public schools was ordained.
students. At Cambridge there never seems to have been as much debate on this topic as at Oxford, for two main reasons. First, the system of students' lodging out was very well established,\(^{186}\) and while its rationale was simply a lack of intra-mural accommodation, it certainly already provided an environment where frugality could be practiced by the poorer men. Viscount Cranborne found it difficult to accept the fact that already in 1867 there were students in the poorer Cambridge lodging-houses who 'almost dispense with service'; when he pressed W.H. Bateson on this point, the latter replied that

Those persons who have been pupil teachers in schools, or certificated school masters, can hardly be expected to have a man-servant wait up on them; I mean as society is at present arranged.\(^{187}\)

Second it was felt that Cambridge, far more than Oxford, attracted students to its individual colleges, rather than to the university: 'you cannot attract persons to the university as such; you must try to attract them to the colleges.'\(^{188}\) There was a strong practical aspect to this, in that the colleges did have awards to offer, so a non-collegiate body would almost by definition be comprised only of less able students.\(^{189}\) The need was not however completely denied, and there were several attempts to provide cheap accommodation, though

---

186. Winstanley, E.V.C., pp.58-60 and 263. In 1867 over one-third of the undergraduates lived in lodgings (Rothblatt, op. cit., p.238).
188. Ibid., q.828. The Oxford High Churchmen who planned what became Keble College had written that 'the prestige of Oxford, unlike that of Cambridge, attaches far more to the university than to particular colleges.' Their plan is printed in Ewart S.C., Appendix 2, 1, p.274(-5).
189. Ibid., qs.587, 1712 (a gifted non-collegiate 'would necessarily be drafted off into the college ... it is very unlikely that any of these non-collegiate students should remain non-collegiate if they are men of ability'). Bateson's comments on what sort of men he expected might become non-collegiate are interesting: qs.563, 624, 819).
usually in halls or hostels rather than in terms of wholly unattached students;\(^{190}\) in the early 1880s these attracted a considerable body of students, but their success was precarious.\(^{191}\) One account illustrates the common practice of migration to the old colleges.\(^{192}\) G.M. Davies, son of an Evangelical clergyman, was unable to enter a college (in 1877) while his elder brother was still being supported as a sizar of St John's. However he persuaded his father to let him spend his first year as a non-collegiate student; he spent only £63.1.7 all told for that year, after which his brother graduated, and he entered Corpus Christi.\(^{193}\)

At Oxford the issue was always somewhat more heated and prominent. The situation there, until the 1860s, was fundamentally different in that there was sufficient accommodation in the colleges, so that while there were many complaints about their cost, alternative schemes found it very difficult to receive a serious hearing.\(^{194}\) It

---

\(^{190}\) Fitzwilliam House (1869) was the institutional title of the unattached students at Cambridge: it was a moderate success, largest in the early 1880s. C.J.B. Gaskoin and J.L. Kirby in *V.C.H.* (Cambridgeshire), Vol.3 (1959), p.497: J.A. Venn, *op. cit.* (1913), pp.13-14 and 19.

\(^{191}\) Of the hostels of the 1880s, Cavendish and Ayerst's soon failed, while Selwyn developed into a college in all but name. (On Cavendish, see Honey, *op. cit.*, pp.75-85; and also the article on J.L. Brereton by P. Searby, in the *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, Vol.11, January 1979). The Bryce R.C. was generally told that the effects had not been great, because colleges were offering cheap schemes (Vol.47, pp.143 (Oscar Browning), 170 (T.F.C. Hudleston, Censor of Fitzwilliam), 219-20 (G.W. Prothero): see also Rothblatt, *op. cit.*, pp.69-70, and Heeney, *op. cit.* (1969), pp.120-24, whose discussion is useful generally on High Church efforts in this area.

\(^{192}\) Migration took from one-third to one-half of the unattached Cambridge students (Gaskoin and Kirby, *loc. cit.*). At Oxford migration had by 1895 fallen to a third, from a high of 60% (Bryce R.C., Vol.47, p.131; on p.170 Hudleston describes the practice at Cambridge).

\(^{193}\) G.M. Davies, *op. cit.*, pp.13-16.

\(^{194}\) See below, note 228, on The 1845-6 proposal.
was no help that, certainly at the time of the first Royal Commission, the existing Halls not only had a poor disciplinary and academic reputation but were also if anything more expensive than the colleges. There was also a rather hysterical opposition among high churchmen to lodgings on the grounds of their moral risk. The first attempts as founding halls (under the new legislation of 1854) were brief and unsuccessful. By the mid-1860s, however, renewed pressure of numbers led to a burst of schemes for 'extension' which, under the threat of possible parliamentary interference, led to the University's agreement to both the lodging out of collegiate students and the creation of a new class of non-collegiate or unattached students; this latter scheme succeeded beyond many expectations.

By 1880 the Halls were felt, even by their staffs, to be running out of useful life. Evidently since the first Commission the two largest ones, at least (St Edmund and St Mary Halls) had become quite largely devoted to the provision of cheap residence, for students of modest ambitions. But the unattached had 'produced a considerable disturbance of the position of' the Halls. There was a certain resentment about this; a widely-signed memorial protested against the proposed creation of awards restricted to the unattached, and asserted that the latter body did 'not consist at all exclusively' of needy men.

195. O.U.C., Report, p.21. Ward, op. cit., p.204-5 (Magdalen Hall, later the basis for Hertford College, was an exception).
196. V.H.H. Green, op. cit., p.179.
198. Ibid., pp.264-70.
199. See especially evidence to 1881 Oxford Commissioners from D.P. Chase, qs.615-8 (the halls 'should be endowed or suppressed') and E. Moore q.682. Their evidence is also instructive on the operation of St Mary and St Edmund Halls, respectively, of which they were the principals.
200. Ibid., q.631: see also qs.671 and 744 (E. Hatch, on the halls as in danger of being 'crushed out' between the unattached and cheaper college residences).
and that there were 'many other needy students (especially at the halls ...)' whose needs were as great. 201 It was freely admitted that the men were of low academic abilities. Lord Selborne perhaps somewhat rashly pressed the Principal of St Mary Hall, D.P. Chase, on this point, questioning the value of bringing up men of mediocre talents and no social advantages; eventually Chase had to respond that in his experience 'these men come up chiefly with the idea of taking holy orders afterwards, and that they make extremely useful clergymen ...' 202 Not surprisingly, given the tenor of the evidence presented to them, the Commissioners brought the Halls' independent existence to an end, leaving the non-collegiates as the major body of poor students. 203 There was, despite the qualification quoted above, little doubt that most of them were poor; 204 indeed Montague Burrows, who in 1868 had been extremely opposed to the non-collegiate idea, largely on moral grounds, admitted to the Commissioners that his worst fears had been unfounded; 'I did not anticipate', he explained, 'that the great poverty of the unattached students would much protect them from the evils which beset undergraduates belonging to colleges who live in lodgings.' 205 This latter insistence upon the dangers of lodging out was a throwback to the old High Church fears, still

201. Ibid., Appendix to Pt.1, p.396.
202. q.s.653-7.
203. Ward, op. cit., 202-3. L. Stone's figures show that the unattached took over from the halls in comprising some 10% of all matriculants, with a regular annual intake of some 80-85 from the 1870s onwards: in L. Stone, ed., op. cit., pp.34 (graph), 66 and 100 (tables).
204. 1881 Oxford Commissioners, esp. qs.2620 (B. Jowett), 2746 (G.W. Kitchin, Censor of the Unattached: 'the number that are not poor are a small proportion of the whole') and 5585 (Lord F. Hervey, M.P.).
205. Ibid., q.793: his opposition in 1868 was in a Quarterly Review article (Vol.124) in which he had referred to 'the lodging-house system, with its isolation, its sordidness, its reserve, and its espionage' as likely to eventually infect the colleges and cause 'deterioration' of the college men (pp.419-20).
anachronistically fuelled by J.W. Burgon. In fact many of the collegiate lodgers were also poor men; Jowett pointed out that a scholarship, which covered about half the cost of a man in college, could cover the whole expenses of 'an out college resident', whose costs were as little as £75 p.a. (i.e. £50 for living expenses, as for an unattached student, plus tuition); among these were the unattached students drafted to Balliol on awards.

That many of the unattached were intending ordination is clear; from the early years it was noted that they were admitted free to their lectures by Balliol and 'by the theological combination.'

The Bryce Commission was given a table of the honours degrees taken by the non-collegiates, including those who had migrated to colleges, and the theological bias is evident.

Honours degrees: first-class passes and others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Collegiates</th>
<th>Migrants to Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>Other subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

206. Ward, op. cit., p.270 (with references to Burgon's publications). The Censors defended themselves against his charges, 1881 Oxford Commissioners, qs.2806-11, and Jowett said firmly that 'the unattached students are as orderly a class as are to be found in the university' (q.2611).

207. The poorest lodgings cost as little as 8/- a week, and 'there are many from that up to 12s a week', inhabited by the unattached 'and also a considerable number of the poorer members of the colleges.' (G.S. Ward, q.2805). Jowett, qs.2604, 2618 and 2623.

208. Ibid., q.2726.

Given that those doing theology honours would almost certainly not be the whole proportion who were ordained, these figures indicate a frequency of ordination far higher than was usual at this time. It is also interesting to see how the best men in other subjects tended to migrate, probably often with college awards; the non-collegiates had not a single first in Literae Humaniores or Mathematics, and only two in Natural Science, whereas those who migrated included 23 who obtained firsts in these subjects.

Churchmen continued to feel, however, that the facility offered by the system was under-utilised. In the Upper House of Convocation in 1901, Bishop Edwards of St Asaph stressed the potential of the system, particularly for men studying theology, and asked why it was yet so little used; his own answer, and without doubt the correct one, was 'the name the system bears', with its purely negative connotations. 'You can imagine', he went on, 'when a young man goes down from the university, English customs being what they are, that perhaps the first question he is asked is, "what college do you belong to?".' Shyness at having to divulge their position accounted for the urge to migrate.

The evidence received by the Bryce Commission, did however strongly suggest that most respondents thought of 'poor students' in relative terms, and that there was no great difference between the backgrounds of the scholars and unattached, and those of college men. The Censor of Non-collegiate students, Reverend R.W.P. Pope, said that his students as a rule are poor. They are drawn from all classes, that is a point of great importance. The great majority, however, are the sons of professional men whose means are limited.

210. Ch.C., 1901, p.141-2; Edwards, speaking from his own experience on the Delegacy, thought 'the average cost of an ordinary student who is not particularly economical' to be £60-70 p.a.

Others, describing the scholars, similarly qualified their attribution of poverty by reference to their status; Thomas Fowler, President of C.C.C., went so far as to ask how it was possible fairly to compare the claims of 'a country gentleman, with diminished rental, many calls, and a large family, with those of a small tradesman, prosperous for his class, but unable to find a sufficient allowance for his hopeful son to enter a college?' More commonly, however, it was 'professional' and 'middle-class' parents who were singled out as particularly worthy of help (clergy and ministers especially). It is consistent with this understanding view of the troubles of the middle-class that the 'Recommendations' of the Report suggested an income of £500 p.a. (which would safely cover most clergy and many professionals) as the upper limit of eligibility for the proposed local authority awards to aid in higher education.

As mentioned above, one of the issues raised by the Commissioners of 1877-81 was that of providing awards tenable only by unattached students. It was stated then that they already received a certain amount of aid from outside the university. According to one of the Censors of the unattached students, Reverend G.S. Ward, 'a very large proportion' of them received aid from such sources as the London Companies and the Cholmondeley charities, to the extent that he thought that 'hardly anything more was required on the special ground of

212. Ibid., p.156.
213. See esp. the evidence of J.L. Strachan Davidson, ibid., p.149 (clergy and ministers were the largest class of scholars at Balliol); W.W. Jackson, p.176 (Rector of Exeter; 'A professional man with a large family and no private means is poor even if he makes a fair income'); and J. Wells, p.259 (Wadham: it is 'middle-class parents ... who most need scholarships, and who get most real advantage from them').
214. Ibid., Vol.43, p.302.
poverty. Pope told the Bryce Commission that school awards were relatively rare, presumably because most of the students were from 'grammar schools and private schools', but among the other sources of funds was the O.C.E.F. This, and other similar bodies warrant some description as being the only voluntary bodies created by churchmen specifically to support deserving men who sought, but could not afford, preparation for ordination. In 1883 they gave at least partial support to over 150 young men; by this period, however, much the largest societies were less than a dozen years old; the older ones were always on a smaller scale.

The oldest of them, with a distinguished early history as part of the Evangelical revival in the late eighteenth century and the early years of the nineteenth, was the Elland Society, which had begun the work of supporting young Evangelicals in 1777. For the first 40 odd years of this work it was without competition and by 1820 had given grants to 114 men. Its policy had varied somewhat.

215. 1881 Oxford Commissioners, q.2795. Rothblatt cites the foundation of 6 exhibitions at Cambridge by the Clothworkers' Company, specifically for non-collegiates intending ordination (op. cit., pp.63-4). The Cholmondeley Charities disposed in 1888, of the interest of some £168,000 (Church of England Year-Book, 1888, p.433), though exhibitions were but a part of its activities. The Sons of the Clergy (E.H. Pearce, 2nd ed. 1928) records a growing involvement in the field by this largest of clerical charities; in 1901 they provided some 80 small (£13) exhibitions (pp.176-7).


217. Church of England Year-Book, 1883. The newer societies were O.C.E.F. and the London C[lerical] E[ducation] S[society], founded in 1877 - though it was in fact a refoundation of a society originally dating from 1816. The older ones - the Elland, Bristol and Cambridge - had aided some 830 men by 1883.

218. The sources for a history of the Elland Society, as well as brief outlines of its early history, are given in B.F.W. Bullock, History of the Training for the Ministry of the C. of E. in England and Wales from 1800 to 1874. (St Leonard's on Sea, 1955), pp.24-5, and in A.T. Yarwood, Samuel Marsden: the great survivor (Melbourne, 1977), pp.4 and 7ff. The Society's papers are now deposited in the West Yorkshire County Record Office, at Wakefield.

219. This is the total to 1820 in a list of grantees given in the Society's Minute Book, pp.43ff.
At first help was sometimes given to men who had little or no other support, like Sammuel Marsden, but by 1803-4 detailed enquiries were made about the contribution of family and friends, and the granting of exhibitions (in effect) was firm policy by 1812, and remained so. Help was not confined, in the early years, to the university course of the 'pensioners' (as they were usually referred to), and the earliest Regulations also included provision for ordination without a degree; but in the mid-1820s a decision was made to support only men studying for a degree. It is interesting to note, too, the hardening of denominational boundaries reflected in the strengthening of the earliest rule about attendance only at the Church's worship.

After 1815, and particularly after 1820, the Society entered upon a period of relative inactivity; in the 40 years 1821 to 1860 only 59 new grants were made, and for the 15 years after 1830 the average was barely one a year. The decline was attributed, probably correctly, to the competition for funds offered by other Evangelical societies with similar aims, which clearly reduced the Elland Society's to a

220. Minute Book, July 1803 and July 1804. The change in policy is described in the earliest Report among the papers, that of 1812, pp.1-2.

221. In 14/3/1794 the undertaking signed by the young men ceased to refer to their maintenance 'at School or College' (Minute Book). The original Rules of March 1777, mostly printed in the Rules, Regulations and Forms of Prayer for the use of the Elland Society (Leeds, 1933), pp.65-7, include discretionary support for non-graduates; on the change, see Report, 1833, pp.2-3, and Minute Book, April and October 1824.

222. The original Rules, in the Minute Book, included one enjoining worship of the Church during vacations (M.S. Rule No.6). In October 1810 a stronger rule was inserted, requiring a declaration that the grantees would attend no other services. (The 1812 Report contained a characteristic paragraph upon the blessings of the 'Established Church', as perceived by all good 'Friends to the British Constitution', etc.; p.2).
local rather than national function: these were the Bristol (1795), Creaton (1812, for the Midlands) and London (1816) Clerical Education Societies. The last of these disposed of a large income through the middle of the century, but its policy remained one of large or total support for its pensioners; thus in 1847 the Society reported an expenditure of £2666-15 on grants to 26 students (this was a record year), whereas the Elland Society now granted exhibitions of £30 or £40 p.a. (very rarely more).

The late 1840s were probably years of increased activity for all the Societies, following a burst of debate in 1845; the year saw a weighty open letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury from three Evangelical leaders (Sir R. Inglis, Lord Sandon, H. Kingscote) which pressed the desirability of an extended diaconate, and further use of lay agents, to meet the need for more pastoral care. Perhaps in response to the cautious and discouraging reply from the Primate, a much more broadly-based group, again headed by Sandon, memorialised the Hebdomadal Board at Oxford on the desirability of increased access.

223. Report, 1816, p.1, and (Canon C.A. Hulbert) A Review of the Origins and History of the Elland Clerical Society ... 1767 to 1868 (Huddersfield, 1868), p.5. This is the basic source for all other narratives.


225. The Reports of the London C.E.S., for the years 1837, 1847 and 1867 have been consulted. The 1847 expenditure, however, required the sale of some stock; the 1867 expenditure was barely half that of 20 years previously. Numbers aided appear to have been: 67 to 1837 (21 years), 35 more to 1847 and 55 more to 1867 (157 in 51 years).

226. Except the Creaton, largely a one-man operation whose founder died in 1845, and which lasted only to 1850 (Bullock, op.cit., p.41).

227. Both the letter and the reply were printed in the Times of 30/7/1845.
for poor men. Meanwhile, Ashley had set on foot 'The Clerical Education Fund' which sought to complement the work of the existing societies, with their 'private and quiet course', by having clergy actively seek out promising candidates whose education was to be supported by public appeal. Over and above this general concern with clergy supply there were the dramatic events at Oxford to spur on the Evangelicals. Certainly there was a flurry of activity from the Elland Society; between 1846 and 1849 it made 13 new grants, as many in four years as in the previous eleven; at least four were for Oxford students, as against only two for Oxford men between 1830 and 1846. As so often, however, the rise in donations which seems to have made this possible tailed off, and the 1850s were relatively lean years. A new treasurer and a slightly less retiring approach resulted in a more sustained growth after 1860, and despite a couple of crises of over-commitment later in the century the Society settled down to a fairly regular level of work, averaging five new grants a year.

Between 1830 and 1873 the Society's records list 89 grantees; 10 of these could not be found in the Oxford or the Cambridge registers, 55 were students at Cambridge and 24 at Oxford. Their


229. A pamphlet on the first meeting was produced entitled *On the best means of increasing the number of fit candidates for the Ministry* (among the Elland Society's papers). T.L. Espin, in *Our Want of Clergy ...* (1863) wrote that its income was then £4-500 p.a., it maintained 6 students, and had so far helped 51 to ordination (p.23); Ashley had hoped for £5000 p.a.

230. This outline is based upon the list of pensioners (see note 218 above), and the Reports, which are held reasonably fully after 1862 among the Society's papers. (The worst financial crisis was in 1889-91).

231. The names were taken from the list of pensioners, which in some cases was almost illegible.
destinations both reflected the Society's traditional links with Cambridge and, more specifically, confirm the conventional channels open to poorer men at the universities. Up to 1865 the 38 Cambridge men consisted of 17 sizars (including 11 at St John's and four at Trinity) and 21 pensioners; of the latter, 8 attended St Catharine's College, while the rest were scattered in small numbers among the other colleges. Sizars became much less prominent after this and comprised only three of the 17 Cambridge pensioners between 1866 and 1873; five others had scholarships. In an interesting development, these last years saw a sharp rise in the number of Elland pensioners at Oxford; with 14 grants to Oxford students in this period the Society was as near to parity between the universities as ever before or since. The reason is immediately clear, for 10 of these men were at Halls (8) or were non-collegiate (2); moreover the only Oxford college consistently favoured by the pensioners was Pembroke (4 over the whole period) which was notable for its conscientiously low costs.232

The surviving records are unfortunately of very little use in determining the previous circumstances of the pensioners; none of the Society's questionnaires, which asked very specific questions on such matters,233 are preserved. As might be expected, from previous arguments, a very high proportion of the fathers' occupations are unrecorded in Venn (26 out of the 55, nearly one-half). Equally predictable is the solid proportion (20 in all) who were clergymen.

233. i.e., the questions to be answered by clergy recommending young men, codified in 1830, included 'What was his parentage? What has he lived? What has hitherto been the nature of his employment? (3) 'What is the utmost sum his parents, relations, or friends can annually contribute towards his education?' (14) (Minute Book, July 1830).
The remaining 9, while too few to be statistically significant, probably indicate the range of parental backgrounds hidden in the unrecorded group: they consisted of a 'lawyer', a school master and a 'Supervisor of Excise'; one man from a family company in Manchester, business unspecified; a printer, a linen-draper, a confectioner, a mercer, and a farmer.

For the 24 Oxford men the evidence is scanty: 7 were the sons of clergy; 13 were the sons of 'gents', as opposed to only 3 sons of 'armigers', which is predictable; while one was, unusually for such a late date (1866), recorded as son of a 'pleb', and his clerical career was indeed particularly humble. Evidently the pensioners were far from destitute, as a group. But awards were important; in 1874 four of these six new pensioners had awards of £30, £50, £60 and £70 p.a. It is not possible to abstract a clear policy on what amount constituted a positive bar to the Society's aid, but there are indications that a total income of about £100 was the norm. In 1866 it was decided that an applicant who had £60 p.a. from an award, and whose father could contribute £15 more would receive 'a smaller grant than usual' if successful (in fact he failed their examination).

In 1862, the application of a man who had £110 p.a. from exhibitions was not considered. About half of all the pensioners, however, had no awards, and must have found the majority of their financial

---

234. In Stone's sample years, there was only one 'pleb' in 1835, none in 1860, and one in 1885 (ed. Stone, op. cit., Appendix 4, Table 2, p.93). This man, George Pring Quick, came from Crewkerne, and attended St Mary Hall (Scholar 1867-71); he held curacies, and chaplaincies in South America, before becoming an incumbent in Ireland in 1885.

235. Report, 1875, p.3. Hulbert, op. cit., stresses this also (p.6).

236. Minute Book, September 1866 and April 1867; and April 1862. In the 1891 Report it was said explicitly that applicants were required to have at least £60 p.a. in addition to the E.C.S. grant (p.4).

237. Although they may have held school or London Company exhibitions which Venn does not, of course, record.
support within their family. That this excluded some of the poorer men who also sought ordination is indicated by the case, in 1865, of one Welbore McCarthy: in April, after looking over his testimonials, 'the Treasurer was instructed to direct him to come up for examination provided he be able with the Society's Exhibition to meet the expense of an education at Oxford or Cambridge.' In September it was recorded that he had withdrawn his application 'having gone to St Aidan's, Birkenhead', a non-graduate college whose costs were some £60-80 p.a. (Minute Book).

It seems that the Elland Society, by sticking to its university orientation, was by the end of the century unusual among the Societies; certainly in comparison with the two major Evangelical societies, the London and the Bristol, which sent a majority of their men to non-graduate colleges. \(^{238}\) By the early years of the 20th century the Reports had become quite explicit. In 1908 the Society drew attention to the difference between its approach and that of the new High Church colleges for poor boys, Mirfield and Kelham. Its policy was to concentrate upon that 'class of youths, many of them sons of Clergy, who have received a liberal education at some of our recognised Public or Secondary Schools. These are of a social and intellectual standard eminently suited for the Ministry of the Church of England ...' In 1910 the Report stated that the Society stood 'for two things - (1) increase of numbers; and (2) maintenance, as far as possible, of social and intellectual standards': \(^{239}\) Samuel Marsden would not have been

\(^{238}\) The London C.E.S. had 20 of its 37 grantees at theological colleges in 1883, and 23 of 34 in 1888. The Bristol C.E.S. in 1883 supported 7 of its 11 grantees at theological colleges (Church of England Year-Books, 1883 and 1888).

\(^{239}\) Reports, 1908, p.5 (and p.6); 1910, p.3.
accepted. Nevertheless, there was no doubt that the applicants were relatively needy men; the lists of applicants, given in the Reports of the late 1860s and early 1870s, show two main types of case. First there were the sons and orphans of poor clergymen (and occasionally other professional or business men), often also from painfully large families: in 1875 the nine sons of clergymen on the list included five whose families were detailed, being one of 13, two of nine and two of seven children each (another was just 'large'). Second were men whose parentage was not mentioned, but whose jobs were: a dozen such cases were given in the Reports of 1869, 1870 and 1875, and they came mostly from clerical posts in business houses and banks, or from teaching; one had 'commenced life as a mechanic', but was at the time of his application 'a Scholar of his College.' Unfortunately it is not possible to determine whether any particular type was at an advantage with the Society.  

Most of the pensioners passed through the hands of the Society without incident and left little trace. The Minutes record the receipt of the application (which came with testimonials and descriptions from clerical referees), the examination and election; thereafter the pensioners usually merely remain in the annual list until their degree is recorded. At college they were under the eye of a 'guardian', though what this supervision entailed it is not easy to see. Inevitably there were occasional ruffles. James Ridgway, son of a Huddersfield wool-stapler, was granted the

240. These examples are from the Reports of 1869 (pp.5-7), 1870 (p.4) and 1875 (pp.3-4): other Reports do not give similar lists. The previous jobs included 6 'assistants' or 'clerks' (or just 'in') business houses, banks or warehouses, a chemist's assistant, 2 'in business' and two ex-schoolmasters.
unusually large sum of £50 p.a. to assist in his course at Lincoln College, Oxford; in October 1851, after he had taken his degree, he was the subject of pained discussion for having 'lately accepted a Title for Orders under a Clergyman of very Tractarian tendencies'; he indeed went on to become a trusted servant of Bishop Wilberforce. A few years later, in an exchange which casts credit upon the applicant, an undergraduate of St John's Cambridge was eventually declined a grant because he could not satisfactorily affirm the correct doctrine on Baptismal Regeneration; this despite the fact that at the first meeting he was told that if, after a few weeks' thought, 'his decision should be satisfactory to the Society, he should be allowed £40 per annum.' A little later again the Society clearly 'lost' one of its most distinguished pensioners, Elias Robert Horton, who had gained a classical first and a fellowship at Peterhouse, but who was never ordained and indeed spent most of his life teaching at University College School, which indicates a thorough break with his Evangelical past. Teaching became something of a problem in the 1850s, and in 1859 it was decided to insist upon a pledge that the grant would be repaid to the Society if the pensioner were to 'devote (his) time to scholastic occupations, or any other, than the Parochial work of the ministry.' (The centenary history of 1868 reported that this 'has been honourably done in some cases'). On the whole the Society did an increasingly conservative job quietly and effectively; the

241. (Baptism certificate in his ordination papers at Oxford, for father's occupation). See V.H.H. Green, op. cit., p.131, which shows him as having been a devoted pupil of Mark Pattison. He was Principal of Culham Training College (founded by Bishop Wilberforce) 1862-73.

242. Minute Book, September 1855 and April 1856.

243. Details from Venn only; there are no clues in the Minutes.

continual excess of applications over resources suggests that it was not wrong in thinking that there were always many men on the edge of being able to afford a full university education; men who would otherwise be obliged to resort to the non-graduate colleges discussed in the next chapter.

In 1863 T.E. Espin remarked the criticism that all the Societies 'are in the hands of Churchmen of one school of opinion only. If so', he went on,

> let such Churchmen have due honour and credit for their wisdom in devising, and their well-directed liberality in supporting, those associations, and let High Churchmen follow so good an example.

Six years later C.A. Swainson, Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge and Principal of Chichester Theological College, foreshadowed such an attempt when describing, first, the diversion of awards from the poor (particularly instancing 'the son of a poor clergyman') to those who could afford a good education; and second, an advertisement placed by a friend asking for applicants for aid at university, which had resulted in an overwhelming 120 replies and the abandonment of the plan. It was still another four years, however, before the Ordination Candidates' Exhibition Fund (O.C.E.F.) was set up, by members of the Committee of the Additional Curates Society (A.C.S.), prominent from the start being Canon Robert Gregory. Appeals for the O.C.E.F. invariably stressed the argument that the opening of endowments was a major reason for the necessity of

---

245. C.C.R., 1863, p.75.
246. C.C.R., 1869, pp.82-3.
247. A.C.S. Report for 1873, pp.19-20 (and 23, 'Explanatory Paper', with objects and rules). The information appropriately followed a description of the first findings of the 'Committee of Convocation on Deficiencies of Spiritual Ministration', which was chaired by Gregory, and it was explained that the shortage of curates thus revealed spurred the foundation of O.C.E.F.
their Fund. After three years their report stated that their experience had 'confirmed the anticipation' that the opening of awards had 'deprived the Church of many Candidates for Ordination'; genius still had its reward, 'but with men of average ability the scale will be turned by possessing or wanting the special instruction which can only be obtained by a liberal outlay of money.' Men who would previously have been aided are thus now 'displaced by the sons of the wealthier, who have been trained for the competition.' The position seemed the more serious because, in the view of another supporter, H.P. Liddon, there was a growing number of men from humbler circumstances desiring ordination, to offset the generally remarked 'failure of the old sources of clerical supply.' 'The men of whom I am thinking', he wrote, 'are clerks, masters in small schools - above all, the sons of poor clergymen.' The O.C.E.F. did not in practice confine its grants (which were not to exceed £60 p.a., and usually ranged from £15 to £40 p.a.) to supporting men at the ancient universities: in 1876 their 73 grants to date included only 36 for such men, with 22 at ordinary non-graduate colleges: by 1883 there had been, of a total of 230 grants, 143 to Oxford and Cambridge, and 67 to theological colleges, indicating a higher proportion recently at the universities. They were sensitive to criticism on this point, however, and in their 1879 Report


249. This letter of Liddon's, originally published in the Guardian of 12/7/1876, is also printed with the 1876 Report, p.56. Robert Gregory, The Church's need of more workers: a Sermon ... in behalf of the (O.C.E.F.) (2nd ed., 1876) made the same points.

250. Report, 1876, p.55, and (1883 figures) Gregory's The need of more clergymen to make Church work more efficient: a Sermon ... in behalf of the (O.C.E.F.) (1884), Appendix, p.20. An example of criticism can be found in the magazine of the Curates'
had emphasised that their 'original idea', to which they stuck wherever possible, was to help men at university; two years later Gregory met the criticism directly, stressing that many of their men were from public schools, again making the point about their object being to replace diverted endowments. 'Professional men, and especially clergymen', he continued, 'if they have large families, are compelled to avail themselves of such openings for their sons in trade or the Civil Service as may offer themselves', who are thus lost to the Church unless aided. 251 As with the Elland Society their main function was to provide the little that allowed marginally insufficient family funds to be made up to adequacy. 252

The Fund found it difficult to keep up its early momentum, despite its links to the A.C.S. (which was the largest non-Evangelical home church society). In the late 1880s it was disposing of an income of only some £800 p.a. as against its brief peak, from 1879 to 81 of over £2000 p.a.; but in 1907 it was helping 100 men and its expenditure of £3400 was three times that of its nearest competitor, and half the total granted by the Clerical Education Societies. 253

A rare glimpse of an applicant occurs in The Letters of Lewis

F.n. 250 continued.


252. The point is clearest in Gregory's 1876 Sermon (see note 248). 'It is often for want of an additional 40 or 50 for two or three years that all private efforts prove ineffectual': this is where O.C.E.F. comes in (p.19).

253. Gregory's 1883 Sermon (see note 249) had been an attempt to avert a severe crisis, as the Appendix made clear. The income is given in various Church of England Year-Books for the 1880s. I have not unfortunately ascertained when the upsurge took place; the result is recorded in Appendix XVII of The Supply and Training of Candidates for Holy Orders Report ... presented to the Arch-
Carroll. 254 A well-liked cousin of his had died in 1876, leaving a widow to support at least two sons, the elder of whom, William Melville Wilcox, was Dodgson's godson. The family lived at Scarborough, supported by a small private income supplemented by the mother's keeping a school, as well as by a regular £30 p.a. from Dodgson himself. In 1885 Dodgson approached Liddon and Edward King 255 about obtaining a grant for William, who at this time was apparently hoping to attend a theological college; William seems to have had some doubts about the conditions of the grant, presumably referring to repayment if he was not ordained, but the issue did not arise because his application failed. He went up nevertheless to Selwyn College, Cambridge (founded as a sister society to Keble at Oxford for economical churchmen 256), helped instead by an additional £30 p.a. from Dodgson. In the event he was not ordained, but became a schoolmaster and later Secretary to two hospitals; a younger brother was a year behind at Selwyn, and also, after some difficulties, became a teacher. The family was perhaps better off than most O.C.E.F.

F.n. 253 continued.

254. Ed. M.V. Cohen (2 Vols., 1979). The account that follows is taken from many letters (they are comprehensively indexed under William E., William Melville, and Fanny Wilcox): the letters bearing directly in the O.C.E.F. are on pp.563-4, 602 and 612. Not surprisingly the incident is not illuminated by references in any of the standard works on Carroll.

255. The O.C.E.F. is never named; but King was on the Committee, and Liddon (a fellow Canon at St Paul's with Gregory) was (see note 248) closely interested. There is no other possible reference.

256. On Selwyn, see Rothblatt, op. cit., pp.70 and 240-1. There is an account (rather lightweight) of Selwyn's first decade in Edward Talbot's 'Memoir' of A.I. Lyttelton, the first Master, in Modern Poets of Faith, Doubt and Paganism and other essays by Arthur Temple Lyttelton ... with a memoir ... (1904), pp.10-18.
grantees', but the general impression of an educated but hard-pressed middle-class environment fits the other indications of the type of man involved.

The means of aid so far mentioned appear to be most of those available; there were more, doubtless, from localities other than London, but they are not easily traced. One such, however, £50 for two years from Hull, enabled Samuel Cooper Scott 'to leave Cambridge free from debt'. Scott is an interesting case on two grounds. First, he is an example of the difficulties of judging a man's circumstances by his family and connections: he was a great-grandson of 'the Commentator' Thomas Scott, and his father was 'one of the leading representatives of the Evangelical party in the Church', Vicar, like his father before him and his son after him, of St Mary's Lowgate in Hull. His mother's father was a successful shipowner and ropemaker, and her brothers included a Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College Cambridge, later Archdeacon of Westmoreland and Canon of Carlisle, and a successful Hull physician knighted in 1854 as Mayor of the city for the Queen's visit. One of his mother's sisters married Charles Perry, then Fellow of Trinity, and later Bishop of Melbourne, through whose good offices during a visit to Cambridge Samuel owed invitations and introductions to the Whewells, the Master of Downing, and J.B. Lightfoot; he more regularly dined with the Dean of Emmanuel. But the family was extremely hard-pressed financially; educating the children was a struggle, and clothes were a constant worry to their mother. Hence the second interesting part of Samuel's career;

257. This paragraph is based on Scott's autobiography, Things that were (1923) which is quite exceptional among such works in style and informativeness. The main information on the families (Cooper and Scott) is from pp.9-13 and 29ff, and 107-10, respectively.

258. Scott's life at Cambridge is described in ibid., pp.173-83.

for, though his older brother was sent to Rugby and Trinity, Cambridge, Samuel's progress at Rugby did not seem to justify further expense, at a time (1853-4) when the family finances were particularly shaky. So he entered a bank in Derby, and worked there as a clerk for nine years before paying his way through Trinity, living with great frugality (his bills were less than £300 in all). His next brother followed a very similar course, like him going through his Cambridge course (at Jesus) after several years in the same bank; the fifth brother was able to attend Charterhouse on a nomination from Archbishop Musgrave, and he too went to Jesus and into the Church. The fourth and sixth brothers became solicitors in Hull. Among other things Samuel's story is a reminder that by no means all graduates were direct from school; among notable clergy one may instance W.D. MacLagan (later Archbishop of York) who had been a soldier, F.W. Robertson of Brighton (in a solicitor's office) and J.W. Burgon and Robert Gregory (both in business offices).

No easy conclusion emerges. The Cambridge evidence suggests that throughout the century the great majority of students came from professional or business backgrounds, with a solid minority of gentry and aristocracy balanced by another of less well-off men. University awards were traditionally given with some eye to need, but need might bear little relation to status; like the Elland Society's and the

260. His father could only offer £50 to add to his own £150 savings (p.167); it appears that when his first application for a Hull scholarship was refused he was saved by an offer of £50 p.a. for two years from an old family friend (p.168). Of his Cambridge life, he writes that 'going to the University on the cheap is not a pleasant experience' (p.174). (The Hull scholarship is noted on p.182).

261. In the honours sample, although exact ages are by no means always recorded, and in some 10% of cases no age is obtainable, in 1851-3 and 1871-3 the proportions of men of at least 24 when taking the B.A. were 12.2% and 11.0%; virtually none can have
O.C.E.F.'s awards, their main use must always have been the encouragement of men whose parents could afford the requisite school education, but only part of the costs of university. The opening of university awards led to a period when well-off boys were seen to gain an advantage but they never had a monopoly. The concern of churchmen was largely misdirected: their problem was not so much the social as the academic bias in the giving of awards.

F.n. 261 continued.

come direct from school. (All the four men mentioned here have Lives, but may also be found in the D.N.B.).
5. THE QUESTION OF THEOLOGICAL TRAINING

The mid-century years were notable for the steady growth of the idea that a clergyman needed something more than his B.A. degree; after about 1860 the question seemed to be when and how this would gain universal acceptance but, as will be seen, the first and most basic difficulties proved the hardest to overcome, and it was not to be until after the First World War that specific training was demanded of graduate ordinands. The whole subject has been described in the works of F.W.B. Bullock and elsewhere; what follows therefore is not exhaustive, but is a necessary link between a discussion of the universities, and the next chapter on the training of non-graduate clergy.

The starting-point of the argument is inevitably the inadequacy, and the contemporary criticisms, of the universities' training of the clergy, although it is necessary to acknowledge the fact that their provision for training other professionals was even worse, and much criticised also. Even J.B. Mozley, in a spirited defence of Oxford against the 1852 Royal Commission, was forced, in effect, to qualify his description of Oxford's capacity for professional education to the point of meaninglessness: and of course a basically non-

262. Bullock, op. cit., and also his (posthumously edited) History of Training for the Minister of the C. of E. in England and Wales from 1875 to 1975 (1976); M.A. Crowther, Church Embattled (Newton Abbot, 1970), Ch.9; B. Heeney, A different kind of gentleman, (Hamden, Conn., 1976), Ch.5.

263. To cite only a few examples from the Edinburgh Review, Vol.59 (1831), p.484, (part of) Sir W. Hamilton's famous attack; Vol.89 (1849), esp. pp.506-8 (C.J. Bayley); and Vol.99 (1854), pp.186-7 (A.C. Tait) - the latter not surprisingly very similar to the O.U.C. opinion, (Report, pp.70-3).

264. In the Quarterly Review, Vol.93 (1853), p.169. He argues that the university can only educate vocationally clergy and schoolmasters, who can be taught from books - but immediately admits that 'for peculiar reasons their theological [training] is a meagre one', which leaves very little.
professional ethic was powerfully argued by both liberal and conservative thinkers with great effect throughout the century. The clergy, however, were not in a position to snipe at the ancient universities from the outside; they were too closely involved, too dependent, and too closely tied up with the defence of their own privileges at the universities to effect more than slow and halting reforms in a matter which really seemed to demand more. It was almost a tradition that a university education might yield remarkably little by way of scholastic attainment. George Eliot's depiction of Amos Barton is an amusing example; his scholarly accomplishments were virtually non-existent, a fact surprising to 'the young ladies of his parish', but 'the persons least surprised at the Reverend Amos's deficiencies were his clerical brethren, who had gone through ['the Eleusinian mysteries of a university education'] themselves.' It was correctly asserted in 1832 that the 'clergyman is the only member of any of the learned professions who has strictly no regular provision for an education suited to the office, to which he aspires.'

Complaints about the lamentable inexperience and incapacity of freshly graduated clergy turn up through the century. High Churchmen bemoaned the impossibility of spiritual preparation in the unsuitable atmosphere of the colleges. Broad Churchmen regretted the lack of

266. (Anon.) On Clerical Education: a letter ... [to Edward Copleston, Bishop of Llandaff] by a Clergyman (1832), p.6. As another anonymous author put it, We serve our time to every other trade, Parsons alone can spring up ready-made. Today and Yesterday - A Satire (Chiswick, 1824), lines 143-4.
267. In 1845, the young J.W. Butler (shortly to begin his famous incumbency at Wantage) wrote to Keble on this: Life and Letters of William John Butler, late Dean of Lincoln (1898), p.35; cf. Pusey to his brother Philip, also in 1845, H.P. Liddon, op. cit., Vol.3, p.80.
intellectual training to combat modern arguments, and the lack of simple help with sermons.\textsuperscript{268} Evangelicals agreed with the last point, and also asked for some training in the directly pastoral work of visiting and advising:\textsuperscript{269} in 1873 the Dean of Chester (J.S. Howson) referred to the 'average cricketing or boating man, whose character, no doubt, is good, but whose mental and spiritual furniture is somewhat scanty', and to the fact that such men could too easily soon be found in charge of large parishes.\textsuperscript{270} In 1891 an experienced teacher described the sheer theological ignorance of many 'rank and file candidates ... the low honour man, the ordinary passmen', and said 'I own that I should sometimes be in despair', if it were not for the assurance that many of the men grew in the work.\textsuperscript{271}

The problem posed by the Church's unique ties to the universities did not escape the notice of churchmen. The problem, within institutions largely dedicated (as they were till the 1870s, and indeed much further) to a general and 'non-professional' education, was well stated as early as 1832. Reasonable men saw, wrote an anonymous author, that special instruction for the clergy could not be expected at the university:


\textsuperscript{269} E.A. Litton and Hugh Stowell, at successive Church Congresses (C.C.R. 1862, pp.16-7 and C.C.R. 1863, p.62).

\textsuperscript{270} C.C.R. 1873, pp.129-30. Ironically Howson had himself left two curates, still only in deacons' orders, suddenly in charge of the large and important parish of Wisbech, when he was preferred to his deanery (S.C. Scott, op. cit., pp.204-5).

The attempt to furnish such instruction, if made at all, must either be confined to those, who are under training for the service of the Church, or extended to all, who seek the advantages of an university education.272

The complaint of inadequate clerical training, he writes a little later, 'when directed against an university, misses its aim. But in application to an ecclesiastical system, I do not see, that it is capable of any reply.'273 There was, however, a continued unwillingness on both sides to face the facts: the Church continued to look to the universities, while they vacillated between on the one hand disavowing clerical education as their specific function, and on the other claiming, if alternatives were suggested, that they were in fact (or could easily be made) sufficient for the purpose.274 In 1862 the position was well summarised by Rev. E.A. Litton (a leading Oxford Evangelical).

The anomaly consists in this: - that [the universities] have never yet openly disclaimed their former function, and consequently both they and the Church are in a false position. The academical career is supposed to imply what it does not.275

Clearly there were two possible responses to the situation: one was to improve the universities' clerical training to the level of sufficiency, the other was to admit that the work needed to be done elsewhere or by other than academical means. The latter response came prominently into the public domain with the advocacy of cathedral

273. Ibid., p.5. (The inclusion of a minimal theological test in the ordinary degrees of both universities was never seriously supposed to provide for clerical needs).
274. This is the argument of James Mozley in 1846, neatly summarised by O. Chadwick in The Founding of Cuddesdon (1954), p.7. (Mozley's pamphlet is described in Bullock, op. cit., pp.75-6). Chadwick's Westcott and the University (1963) is useful on the whole topic of the universities and clergy education.
275. C.C.R., 1862, p.17. In his evidence to the O.U.C. he had
colleges for post-graduate professional training by E.B. Pusey in 1833, and by the proposal for such a college floated by Bishop Henry Phillpotts in his Charge of the same year. The plan for theological colleges was thus early associated with the High Church, and indeed every graduate, and most mixed (graduate and non-graduate) diocesan colleges were to be High Church foundations for at least thirty years. The first two, both owing much to the energy and contacts of H.E. Manning, were at Chichester (February 1839) and at Wells (May 1840); the former particularly, having Charles Marriott as first principal, was closely identified with the Oxford High Churchmen, while J.H. Pinder, first principal of Wells, had been won to the Tractarian cause when Hurrell Froude had met him in Barbados (where Pinder was Principal of Codrington College up to 1837). Once these two were established, even if at first on a very small scale, their presence and examples affected all future debate.

An important and influential early reaction was an 1841 pamphlet by Charles Perry (the future Bishop of Melbourne, then a Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge). It is clear that its motive was largely the presentation of an alternative to the new colleges. The point made was that clerical education 'ought to be confided by the Church
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described the lack of clerical training at the universities, as 'a crying evil, which nothing but the acquiescence in anomalies, characteristic of the people of this country, could have suffered to remain.' (Evidence, p.177).


279. Clerical Education: Considered with an especial reference to the Universities ... (1841): it was addressed to James Bowstead, Bishop of Lichfield.
to the existing universities, as being the most appropriate and trustworthy institutions for the superintendence of this duty; and that they in turn ought to at once set about rendering their existing 'machinery' effective for the purpose. His reasons for the first and basic point are twofold; the first, which was not to stand the test of experience, was that the universities afforded the best security against the inroads of 'false doctrine, heresy, and schism.' The second reason, however, was based upon criticisms of the theological colleges that were to be standard for the rest of the century; these were that the 'character' of the colleges, however pure the intentions of their founders, 'will obviously depend entirely upon the opinions of the few individuals, by whom they may be for the time conducted': in short they would be extremely vulnerable to the danger of partisan allegiance. And also that there was 'the danger - less obvious indeed, but no less real - the danger of acquiring narrow and contracted views of human nature, and of the object and duties of the Ministerial office.' A little later, in urging the universities to action, he posits the alternative that their inaction might lead to the work's being 'committed to other institutions recently founded for this special purpose of whose stability and permanent usefulness a reasonable doubt may be entertained.'

The argument, that the universities should and could provide sufficient training for the clergy, was constantly put forward in the 1840s and 1850s. The tenor of the argument, however, varied somewhat between the two universities. At Cambridge, following Perry's

---

280. Ibid., p.11.
281. Ibid., pp.13, 15-7. (Perry's motivation being to counter the new colleges is also clear from his letter to G.E. Corrie, of 9/3/1841: Memorials of the Life of G.E. Corrie ..., ed. M. Holroyd (1890), p.157.)
pamphlet and several other influential calls for action, the university created a theological examination, soon universally known simply as 'the Cambridge Voluntary', to be taken by graduates in the October following their degree. Whewell, who originally voted against the proposal, was responsible for the crucial step of ensuring episcopal support (in requiring the examination of their Cambridge candidates), so that within ten years of its institution it was, despite its name, effectively a compulsory step for ordinands.\textsuperscript{282} Originally Oxford seemed to be ahead of Cambridge in this respect; G.E. Corrie had indeed feared that Cambridge would 'have only the second rate praise of reluctantly copying the example of her Sister University', but in the event Oxford's scheme had fallen foul of the personal and party tensions within the professoriate to whom the plan was entrusted.\textsuperscript{283} Thus by the time of the Royal Commissions the respective situations of the universities were quite different. At Cambridge the Commissioners found widespread satisfaction, despite a lack of endowment and professors, and a quite general feeling in favour of an honours component for the Voluntary; they indeed suggested the more radical step of using the university to teach non-graduate ordinands, a proposal which never materialised. But both Report and Evidence testify to the general opinion that the university was a capable if not yet perfect trainer of clergy.\textsuperscript{284} At Oxford this was not the case; but the presence of the Tractarian element, known to

\textsuperscript{282} It is described in Winstanley, E.V.C., pp.169-74, Bullock, op. cit., pp.70-2. Professor Blunt's evidence to the C.U.C. ('Evidence', pp.88-9) is basic. Holroyd, op. cit., has detailed accounts of the proposal, pp.156-8, 161-5, 175-7, 180-91.


\textsuperscript{284} C.U.C, esp. 'Report', pp.26, 89-90, 'Evidence', 77 and 88-9. The proposal for non-graduate 'licentiates' was in the 'Report', pp.31-2; its failure is described in Winstanley, E.V.C., pp.245-6, 268, 270.
favour the cathedral colleges, seems to have left virtually everyone else in the awkward position of acknowledging the total failure of their recent attempt while resolutely asserting that the university was the only appropriate place for the work. There was thus a characteristic emphasis on the general virtues of university, as against independent college, training:285 not surprisingly, lay feeling was firmly in favour of the former, as preventing, in the words of Bonamy Price, a 'one-sided feeling and a one-sided cast of mind ...[which] in the clerical profession, is a vast evil.286

The difference of feeling was even clearer in the replies received from the universities by the Cathedral Commissioners, printed in their first Report of 1854.287 From Cambridge the replies, to the question as to whether the universities supplied 'all that is wanted for the preparation of candidates for holy orders, or whether it will be desirable to institute theological colleges in connection with some of the Cathedral Churches', were short, moderate, and remarkably similar. The respondents (Heads and certain Professors) mostly admitted to some shortcomings of the present provision at Cambridge, but were absolutely firm in rejecting outside colleges. They opposed any education separate from that of the laity, and the new colleges were described as at best unnecessary and at worst as risky and

286. Ibid., 'Evidence', p.195; also Travers Twiss (p.157) and R. Phillimore (p.234). Price, in the Edinburgh Review, Vol.96 (1852) wrote more forcefully that 'of all institutions for exclusive professional training ecclesiastical seminaries are the worst', making men 'one-sided' and encouraging 'a distinction of caste', etc. (pp.276-7).
potentially divisive. The only even slightly approving replies came from Professors Jeremie, Mill (the one High Churchman recognisable as such by Oxford standards, but whose habitual caution meant that his reply was extremely brief) and W.H. Thompson. This last, recently appointed Regius Professor of Greek, spoke from a small (but rare) experience of theological colleges; his comments were a damming with faint praise - the colleges might help unsatisfactory candidates attain adequate standards of preparation, but he ended with the usual words in praise of the mixed education of clergy and laity, an education that rendered 'our clergy ... more tolerant, our laity more religious.' The whole series covered 12 pages.

The replies from Oxford filled over 40 pages, and this prolixity probably owed something to the plans of Bishop Samuel Wilberforce (who was one of the Commissioners) to build the first college with full buildings at Cuddesdon, seven miles from Oxford and site of his episcopal palace. E.B. Pusey contributed, as was his wont, by far the longest paper and, in keeping with his stated position of over 20 years' standing, he argued carefully (mixing prosy detail with occasional eloquence) both the need for and the practicality of cathedral colleges: his support among Heads and Professors was, however, minimal, being provided only by Liddon's Pusey, esp. Vol.3, p.418 (on his death): his influence was weakened by his preaching 'in a medley of stutter and bellow' (Chadwick, V.C., Pt.1, p.532).

288. The Cambridge replies are printed on pp.827-39. The replies are so similar that it is hardly worth particularising, though those of Philpott, Cartmell and Whewell were perhaps the most weighty.

289. Professor Jeremie acknowledged the need for an additional year, but was wary about theological colleges and preferred a course run by the universities (p.836). On W.H. Mill (whose passing reference is on p.837) see Liddon's Pusey, esp. Vol.3, p.418 (on his death): his influence was weakened by his preaching 'in a medley of stutter and bellow' (Chadwick, V.C., Pt.1, p.532).

290. Ibid., pp.838-9. (Thompson was to be Master of Trinity after Whewell).

291. Chadwick, Founding of Cuddesdon, pp.9-16.
by L. Sneyd of All Souls, and J. Wilson of Trinity. The normal response was a complete rejection of the clergy's training away from the university, on the basis that anything which served to weaken the links between laity and clergy was deplorable, and that theological colleges presented grave dangers. The only qualification was that several made the same exception as did Thompson of Cambridge: F.C. Plumptre (Master of University), J.L. Richards (Rector of Exeter), Edward Hawkins (Provost of Oriel), Richard Harington (Principal of Brasenose) and James Norris (President of C.C.C.) all agreed that there might be some use for the colleges, for, as the last-named wrote, 'the withdrawal of a certain class of idle, careless young men from indifferent connections which they may possibly have formed ...'.

The universities were not quite wholly representative, however, The evidence from the various cathedral chapters and bishops indicated how widely the issue had spread. The great majority of replies were unfavourable to the colleges; but it appeared that the question of founding them had been raised at Canterbury, Bangor, Exeter, Lichfield and Lincoln cathedrals (as well as at Chichester and Wells). And although most of the bishops were hostile or at least gave only highly qualified support, the Commissioners themselves were to come out cautiously in favour of the establishment of at least

292. Cathedrals: 1854 Report, pp.788-94, 807 and 811-2; and neither of the latter were very enthusiastic.

293. Ibid., pp.798, 801-3 (Richards, the kindest to the colleges), 804, 810 and 811.

294. Ibid., pp.11, 93, 194-5, 249, 265. Exeter was the scene of very public disagreement between Phillipotts and his chapter: the latter's arguments against a college are in pp.194-5, the former's arguments in favour are in pp.569-71.

295. Only the bishops of Exeter, Lichfield, Wells (the aged Bagot) and Salisbury were simply in favour: those of Hereford, Llandaff and Worcester gave qualified approval.
some cathedral colleges; though their desired type, including pastoral training, and servicing several dioceses, was never a reality.\(^{296}\)

The argument about weak men needing the colleges was as much as was admitted, in January 1858, by R.H. Cheney, in an article for the *Quarterly Review\(^{297}\)* which precipitated the most serious and most publicised scandal of any graduate college, 'the troubles' of Cuddesdon. The real thrust of the campaign that followed was Protestant; but Cheney's most telling image - that of the inoffensive young man turned unnaturally sacerdotal because he has, 'like a plant in a hothouse, been over-stimulated by a "forcing system" of training\(^{298}\) - encapsulated many of the general points of aversion to the system, and its contrast to the (idealised) openness and naturalness of the university training. In the event, although it was not the last of Protestant attacks on the colleges,\(^ {299}\) it is from soon afterwards that one finds a new tone of acceptance in debate and discussion about them. It is not hard to see why. First the colleges were, after all, a fact of life; Chichester, Wells and Cuddesdon were joined by Lichfield in 1857 and Salisbury in 1861 (both also took non-graduates).\(^ {300}\) Second, the universities could hardly go on

\(^{296}\) P.P. 1854-5, Vol.15, Third Report [etc.], p.XIX.

\(^{297}\) Vol.103 (1858): entitled 'Church Extension'. His elaboration of the argument is clever and effective; pp.260-2. (Cuddesdon's crisis is minutely described in Chadwick's Cuddesdon, Chapter 3).

\(^{298}\) Ibid., p.262.

\(^{299}\) Cuddesdon again came under attack in 1878: C.C. Mackarness, Memorials of the episcopate of J.F. Mackarness ... (1892), pp.22-30.

\(^{300}\) Phillotts finally started a college in 1861, but it never flourished and ceased in 1867. Bullock, op. cit., pp.113-4.
carping at men prepared to voluntarily engage in such training when their own provision remained inadequate; this was of course mainly true of Oxford. A partial reform of the virtually untaken Voluntary Theological Examination in 1863 was followed by a Theology Honours course set up in 1869, but this never succeeded in attracting the best men. At Cambridge too, the 1860s saw growing dissatisfaction with the Voluntary; it was last taken in 1873 and replaced by a combination of the Poll degree Theology 'special' and a new Theology Tripos. In the meantime, the proponents of the colleges kept repeating a theme that must have seemed increasingly persuasive: that the universities were necessary, but not sufficient, that clergymen needed some preparation not only of mind but of spirit, and that such - particularly with the present trends in the universities - simply could not be expected there, for the majority. Samuel Wilberforce, when chairing the session on 'Clerical Education' at the Church Congress in Oxford in 1862, presented a typically skilful summary of the case at the close, concluding that 'the intention is to found upon the highest academic character the best professional clerical development (Cheers).'

At the 1865 Cuddesdon festival the Archbishop of York, William

Thomson (no High Churchman) testified to his own change of mind about the College, a change which he thought was reflected by other Oxford men: 'Cuddesdon was now established beyond all cavil as a real working place, and as a true handmaid to the University.'

Yet, while a few colleges survived and did useful work, there was nothing approaching a system and no great press of students. Before looking briefly at the fortunes of one particular college (Chichester) it will be as well to have set out the major reasons for the failure of the Church to provide training for its graduate clergy. Major ones have already been alluded to: the traditional feeling that the universities were sufficient: the fear of narrowness and 'party', especially on the part of Evangelicals and Broad Churchmen: and the long-standing allegation that the colleges 'furnished a good machinery for raising dullness to mediocrity' but little more. (This was based on the fact that talented men, if they could afford it, would usually prefer to stay on at university and benefit from the libraries and the professional teaching.)

Two further complementary reasons were probably more important still: the additional cost, and the purely voluntary nature of the college courses. The two were admirably put together by the Bishop of Worcester (Henry Pepys), writing to the Cathedral Commissioners.


306. The quoted jibe was apparently coined by W.H. Thompson, in his (above-cited: note 289) evidence to the Cathedral Commissioners; C.J. Vaughan quoted it exactly (as 'cheap and easy sarcasm') in 1879 (C.C.R., 1879, p.536). See also Times, leader on Ridley Hall, 20/10/1879 (and note 345, below).

307. The problem of cost as preventing further residence, was described clearly by R.W. Browne (O.U.C., 'Evidence', p.8), and Bishop Phillpotts, who thought extended residence ideal: 'But these cases are rare. The expense of a protracted residence at Oxford or Cambridge are commonly decisive objections.' Cathedrals 1854 Report, p.570.
When we have the extreme difficulty that parents often have, and especially those who are clergymen, in defraying the expense of educating their sons for the profession of the church, it would hardly be fair to make education at these colleges a necessary preliminary to ordination, and, should this not be done, the numbers who would voluntarily incur such an expense would probably not be very large ... 308

The point was often repeated. In the early 1870s Edward Steere, an uncompromisingly radical high churchman, was asked by Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln for his advice on setting up a new college; he wrote that no existing college provided a model, and that the scheme of the graduate colleges 'has broken down under the burden of expense and delay which it imposed upon the candidates.' 309 Pusey had argued that the costs were little greater than those attendant upon a similar period spent in any other form of study (and certainly less than those faced by post-graduate law and medical students). He had also urged that if the students came up a year earlier than usual the cost would be balanced by the saving of school expenditure. 310 These were quibbles; clearly for men of modest means the £100 or so 311 required for a full year's course was a heavy burden. Further, the mid-century years saw a steady rise in the age of the under-

308. Ibid., p.597; c.f. also Ellicott (C.C.R. 1862, p.6) and P. Freeman (quoted in B. Heeney, op. cit. (1976), p.102).
311. The costs are shown in the Handbook of the Theological Colleges of the C. of E. and the Episcopal Church in Scotland; the first ed. (1884-5) shows annual costs of about £110 or £120 at Wells, £120 plus at Cuddesdon, £120 at Salisbury, £100 at Ely, £105-120 at Leeds. Gloucester, Lincoln, Lichfield and Chichester - which took non-graduates - cost £80-90 p.a. Bursaries were not numerous.
graduates,\textsuperscript{312} so that some continued even to 23, the minimum age of ordination, which had always previously presented ordinands with an enforced break from the university.

One possible answer was a shortened university course. In 1833 'a Late Fellow of Balliol College' had proposed this as a way of making Pusey's college scheme practicable, as he thought that for most it was financially out of the question. 'The expense of a clergyman's education', he argued, 'is already great enough and requires to be reduced, rather than increased.'\textsuperscript{313} His plan was over-ambitious, and was in effect a proposal to create a new and better-educated class of non-graduates, as was the Cambridge Commissioners' Licentiate scheme. The Cathedral Commissioners were offered an even more radical plan by T. Briscoe (Vice-Principal of Jesus, Oxford) who suggested a degree comprising two years of residence at the university and a third at a theological college.\textsuperscript{314} In 1862 this idea was again put forward by C.J. Ellicott (then Dean of Exeter, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol from 1863), although in his plan the residence at a theological college, while desirable, was optional; and without this element it in fact was very similar to the reforms of the Poll degree passed at Cambridge in 1865.\textsuperscript{315}

\textsuperscript{312} Stone's figures for Oxford show a rise from 19\% to 50\% of men entering at 19 or 20, between 1835 and 1885, and a decline from 27\% to 6\% who entered at 17 or less. (Stone, ed., op. cit., Table 6, p.98). Many witnesses before the 1881 Oxford Commissioners regretted this: see i.e. q.s.1433, 1974, 2202, 2709: Pusey pointed out the fact that men went on often to 23 or 24, so that 'this preliminary study ... jostles out the other studies which are to be the occupation of a person's life' (q.4585).

\textsuperscript{313} Suggestions relating to the professional education of the clergy ... (1833), esp. pp.5 and 15-9: (as against Pusey, he tries, he writes, to avoid the danger, 'more specious but not on that account smaller, of optimism'; p.13).

\textsuperscript{314} Cathedrals 1854 Report, pp.814-6.

\textsuperscript{315} C.C.R., 1862, p.8. The revised Poll degree involved two years of general studies and a final year doing a 'special' (Winstanley, L.V.C., pp.150-7).
A year after Ellicott's speech the famed Evangelical, Canon Hugh Stowell, speaking at the Church Congress held in his home territory of Manchester, suggested the further refinement of theological colleges at the university towns, where this third year could be passed; the plan bore no fruit, perhaps because the High Churchmen, led by the formidable Archdeacon G.A. Denison, raised such a row over an earlier reference (to relaxing subscription) that this part of the speech was not heard. 316

The three main colleges founded before 1870 for graduates only, were Chichester, Wells and Cuddesdon. The latter had the most violent problems, but it also had the strongest support and the only full collegiate buildings, and it entered upon a respected career as an admittedly High Church college from the early 1860s. Wells, whose reputation was undoubtedly the highest of the three while its first Principal (J.H. Pinder) was alive 317 evidently suffered a decline under his successor C.M. Church (Principal from 1866 to 1880), an indication of how great was its dependence upon the character and fame of one man; and Pinder's fellow canons had in 1854 been at pains to stress that the Chapter as such was not officially connected with the College, and indeed that as a body they opposed the widespread foundation of new colleges. 318

The first college of all, Chichester,

316. C.C.R. 1863, p.67. T.E. Espin wrote in 1863 that the course of two years of Arts and a third year of Theology 'has often been suggested': he disliked it (Our Want ..., pp.5-6).

317. Wells was used as a favourable example in pressing the case for both Lichfield and Cuddesdon (Bullock, op. cit., pp.85-6 and 95). Pinder was fulsomely praised in 1862 by E.H. Browne (C.C.R. 1862, p.50), and was used in 1863 by Archdeacon Allen as a stick to beat St Aidan's with; J. Baylee, Archdeacon Allen's strictures on Theological colleges (1863), p.8. Retrospectively, W. Ince attributed the change in the general estimation of theological college men to 'the strong, personal, glorious influence of Mr Pinder at Wells ...' Report of the 7th Conference upon Training (1899), p.96.

318. The decline is clear enough in Elwes, op. cit., pp.14-6 and 24-4; though Elwes points out his difficulties. The attitude of the Chapter is clear from the Cathedrals 1854 Report, pp.105 and 603.
had a quiet but none the less instructive history until 1870, which well illustrates the sorts of problems that the colleges faced. Its foundation was the result of the work of Bishop William Otter (who had been Principal of King's College 1830-36 and was aware of the Church's educational needs), the young H.E. Manning, and the Dean, Dr George Chandler. Chandler was an active High Churchman, considerably older than Manning and Charles Marriott (the first Principal), with contacts in leading metropolitan high church circles (he was Rector of All Souls, St Marylebone, from 1825 to 1847); a wealthy bachelor, Chandler was long remembered for his generosity in gifts for the cathedral fabric, although ironically the spire's famous collapse came only two years after his death. He was instrumental in having Manning appointed Archdeacon of Chichester at the end of 1840, and an 1842 sermon shows a moderate but distinct Tractarian viewpoint.


320. Chandler was born in 1778 (or 1779), son of John, of Witley, Surrey 'gent'; he was at Winchester and New College, B.C.L. 1804: R. of Southam, Warws., 1815-30, of All Souls 1825-47, of Felpham Sussex 1832 to his death; installed Dean of Chichester 18/3/1830; died 3/2/1859, aged 80 (Al. Ox., M.E.B.). He was a regular and leading early committee member of the A.C.S. (Home Mission Field, April 1859, p.l.; in the A.C.S. Minute Books he features often in the early years; in the earliest meetings he was the only Dean involved). See also B. Heeney, Mission to the Middle Classes (1969), p.15; George Sturt, William Smith, potter and farmer: 1790-1858 (1978 reprint of 1919 ed., Firle), p.123. L.J. Hodgson, typescript 'History of the Diocese of Chichester 1829-1929' (in W. Sussex R.O.), pp.135-40.

321. Newsome, Parting of Friends (see note 21), p.268. S.F. Wood described him to Manning as 'your round-headed little Dean, rubbing his hands pleasantly, promises everything, but does nothing' - but he was Manning's best ally in the early 1840s: E.S. Purcell, Life of Cardinal Manning ... (2 Vols., 1896), Vol.1, p.(170-)179). The Seamless Coat of Christ: a Sermon ... (Chichester, 1842), passim. C.M. Duncan-Jones, The Anglican revival in Sussex (Chichester, 1933) has a portrait, and cites his 1832 Charge as evidence of his pre-1833 churchmanship; she also records that he rushed to shake the hands of the Proctors after their famous veto in Convocation at Oxford, 13/2/1845 (p.21).
Marriott's Tractarianism was never in question, and a lecture delivered in 1840 has characteristic emphases. The point is made that the 'circumstances and practice of the Church of England demand that we should consider the preparation for the office of Deacon, as requiring many steps to be taken which are properly preparatory to the Priesthood', a stress on the latter state revived by the Oxford men. There is a heavy stress on the need for remorse and self-vigilance, not of course unique to High Churchmen, but later references to Absolution, and the emphasis placed on the priest's 'duty to the Church in general' as well as 'to the Church of his own country in particular', were clear pointers. The lecture ends with an exhortation to the duty of training through a comparison with the secular professions. The Rules appended show that the College was for candidates 'between the degree of B.A. and the office of Deacon'; they were to live with the principal, paying £50 p.a. for tuition, and not more than £50 in addition for living expenses; the lecture had mentioned 'habits of self-denial [necessary] to keep up an acquaintance with the common feelings of the poor and distressed', a theme of communal and frugal life later to be pressed in Marriott's unsuccessful scheme for the Poor Scholars' Hall in Oxford. Marriott's tenure of office was two and a half years, after which his health forced a return to Oxford, and he was succeeded by his assistant, the Cambridge man Henry Browne; by this date (October 1841)

322. A Lecture delivered at the Diocesan College, Chichester ... with the Rules of the College ... (Chichester, 1840), p.6. In one of the letters previously alluded to, Lewis Carroll described to his godson how Liddon had explained that it was perfectly acceptable to take deacon's orders experimentally 'and that a Deacon [was] in a totally different position from a Priest.' Cohen ed., op. cit., p.603.


21 students had been received, 16 of them from Oxford. Browne's principalship seemed prosperous at first, but evidently there were serious problems developing. Otter had died in August 1840, to be succeeded briefly by P.N. Shuttleworth, Warden of New College, Oxford and a Liberal Whig whose 16 month episcopate is notable paradoxically for his elevation of Manning to Archdeacon. On his death in January 1842 another Oxford Head, Ashurst Turner Gilbert (of Brasenose) was appointed, and was to preside over the diocese for 28 years. Neither was likely to favour the college; Gilbert, while a tolerant man, had been a leading figure in the famous 1841 Poetry Professorship election, being both Principal of the anti-Tractarian candidate's college, and his personal friend. Browne's Cambridge contacts kept up numbers in 1842 and 1843, but it seems that from this period dates a memorandum of his, in which he cites, and then tries to meet the Bishop's criticisms. These were twofold: first, a college was unnecessary 'inasmuch as the Universities have supplied the want which led to the establishment of this College', (presumably a reference to the Voluntary Examinations): second the college

325. Haslehurst, op. cit., pp.89-90. Brown, b.1804, son of a Norfolk Rector, C.C.C. Cam., B.A. 1826; held a series of Sussex livings, dying R. of Pevensey in 1875 (Venn, D.N.B.). The original list includes a double-counting in 1840: this scrap-book includes entries and comments by all the principals until 1873 (referred to hereafter as 'Green Book'); the list follows the record of Browne's departure.


327. On Gilbert, see D.N.B.; L.J. Hodgson, op. cit., Chap.4 (esp. pp.70-9); his appointment was announced on the day after Isaac Williams withdrew (Chadwick, V.C., Pt.1, p.204). No Tractarian, he nevertheless supported N. Woodard and clearly tried for peace in a diocese much afflicted by ritual problems; he was remembered as of the old-fashioned type of bishop (Daily News obit., quoted in T.G. Willis, Records of Chichester (Chichester, 1928), p.329.)
does not, and cannot be expected to, attract to it men of a high order of ability: but will naturally become the resort of persons deficient in attainments or capacity ... 328

Browne's memorandum is interesting mainly for the fact that it shows him as hoping for a much more ambitious institution, with a body of Fellows, and that it is the diocesan advantages of this body (rather than the College's training functions) that he most stresses.

Nothing more, however, was heard of this plan, and the College declined in 1844 and 1845; one major problem, clearly, was that the establishment set up by Marriott had to be abandoned in early 1844, as it 'had never paid its expenses', and the students were now to reside in licensed lodgings 329 - the system which continued for the rest of the century. Browne resigned his post in November 1845, and the College was in suspension for five months before a successor was appointed. Some 45 men had attended it so far, of whom a third had been ordained at Chichester. 330

Gilbert's choice, Philip Freeman, was another High Churchman, though like Browne a Cambridge man. In 1851, when Manning's conversion might have made others more cautious, Freeman published a provocatively High Church pamphlet in favour of theological colleges, which possibly accounts for the year's very low entry of three students. 331 But on the whole his principalship was successful.

328. This memorandum is the Green Book, after the 1844 'Rules'.
329. Entry in Green Book after Lent Term, 1844; this was the main reason for the new 'Rules'.
331. Freeman is also in D.N.B.; he became Archdeacon of Exeter in 1865, under Phillips, to whom the 1851 pamphlet was addressed: he left 'under 25,000 l.' Bullock, op. cit., pp.88-9. The intake in 1851 was 3, as against 9 in the previous and 8 in the subsequent years.
Numbers in residence varied usually between 6 and 10 during each year (apart from 1851), and in 1852 a Vice-Principal was appointed, William H. Davey. (He is of some interest as apparently the first example of a man both trained in a theological college (Chichester, 1849-50), and who made a career very largely teaching in theological colleges). There was one significant development however, the first appearance of non-university students. The Rules had in fact first made allowance for such students in 1844, and Browne clearly wished to have them, but none such were received in his time. The new Rules of 1846 ("Approved by the Bishop, Oct. 1846") had incorporated a careful qualification, in that such men had to be approved by 'the', not 'a' Bishop; a hand-written note explained that Gilbert was 'determined to limit the admission of literates to persons approved by and thereafter to be ordained by, himself only.' The first of them entered at the beginning of 1848, but he was followed still by only two more before Freeman himself left the College in 1854.

Under his successor, Charles Anthony Swainson, ex-Tutor (and future Master) of Christ's, Cambridge, the College passed its most critical years. Despite Freeman's relative success, it had been so doubtful whether the College would continue after his resignation that Dean Chandler had by codicil revoked the bequest of his library to the College; indeed in 1854 the College nearly did cease, for all but

332. Who Was Who, 1916-28; O. Chadwick, in Founding of Cuddesdon describes him as 'a man best characterised as solid-solid in piety, churchmanship, and physical stature' (p.101). He went on to be Vice-principal of Lampeter 1872-96, and was Dean of Llandaff (succeeding C.J. Vaughan) 1897-1913; he died in March 1917.

333. 'Rules', 1844, and also his Memorandum ('Green Book').

334. Ibid., 1846.

335. Swainson, born in 1820, came of 'an old Lancashire family', his father being a merchant and alderman of Liverpool; in 1852 he married a daughter of Charles Inman, Director of the Bank
one of Freeman's students had left at the end of 1853, and only four new ones arrived that year. The death of Dean Chandler in February 1859 was to reveal the College's fundamental problems. Intake had been fluctuating, and had fallen as low as five in 1857; Chandler's death gave Swainson the opportunity to express his case in writing. Chandler had left £2,000 to be given, at the discretion of three trustees (the Dean, the Archdeacon of Chichester, and the Prebendary of Wightering), to the College, towards the beautifying of the cathedral, or to a church in the city. At a meeting of the College Council, held on the day of W.F. Hook's installation as Chandler's successor (13 March 1859), Swainson put forward a case for the College's receiving some of the money. First he pointed to his own salary; over the last five years it had varied between £88 and £189 (gross), averaging £128, which he reckoned should be reduced by £30 p.a. (for the expenses of the house) to produce his net receipts. The principals of Wells and of Lichfield received £400 and £450 respectively; in short 'he is not and has not been adequately remunerated for his services'; (the Vice-principal had £80 p.a., guaranteed by the Bishop). His requests were: first, a general declaration of support, without which he would resign at once; second, support for his application to the legacy trustees; and third, a guaranteed £200 p.a. for himself. The Bishop's reply was

F.n. 335 continued.

of Liverpool, and thus became brother-in-law to Thomas, the mythologist, and William, founder of the Inman Line (D.N.B., Venn).

336. The story of the codicil can be gathered from the Green Book; first, after the (grateful) record of Chandler's help, written at his death in February 1859; second, in Swainson's letter to the legacy trustees (see next note), dated 18/3/1859. The entry and residence facts are also obtained from the Green Book.

337. The whole affair is recorded in the Green Book: being comments on Chandler's death, a record of the Council meeting of 13/3/1859, a copy of Swainson's letter to the trustees of the legacy, and Swainson's final comment; all in Swainson's hand, and very full.
reassuring, Swainson withdrew the threat to resign, and went ahead with his application for funds, which was the very modest request for £300, which he would meet with an equal sum, to provide a house for the principal with lecture room and library; he even suggested a house to purchase.

His application was rejected, in a manner that evidently gave no joy to Swainson. A heavily scored-out comment in the College note-book follows the news, given by Hook, that the whole of the money was to be spent on the cathedral; in it he asserted that the decision was taken by the trustees 'before the Principal of the College had had an opportunity of communicating with them.' Certainly Swainson's application was dated the 18th of March, which was also the date of the decision. A letter to Swainson from Hook, in June, indicates that he was not much involved; he wrote that 'the step was taken before my appointment, and I can only go on with it.'

Given that Archdeacon Garbett was one of the trustees, it is not difficult to see here that Swainson, probably quite rightly, had feared such a move when he tried to line up the Council behind his application. It is possible too that the mysterious 'causes which had injured the College', twice alluded to by Swainson, were connected to hostility, or at least lack of support, from influential quarters around the cathedral.

339. Garbett's hostility is admittedly conjectural; but he was by all accounts an obstructionist conservative, and he was certainly an Evangelical, who had been 'mouthpiece' of the defenders of Pusey's suspension in 1843 (R.W. Church, The Oxford Movement ... (1970 ed.), p.225; his brother Edward also edited the Record (1854-67) which in 1856 had editorially described Gilbert in very insulting language; Heeney, op. cit. (1969), p.79. (D.N.B., Hodgson, op. cit., pp.87-8, and W.R.W. Stephens, A Memoir of Richard Durnford, D.D., sometime Bishop of Chichester (1899), pp.56-7 and 158-9).
The College now reached its nadir. Davey was invited to the vice-principalship of Cuddesdon, which he accepted. Three students entered in 1859, and four in 1860, while the number actually in residence fell to two in Christmas term 1859, and one for the last half of 1860; after briefly reaching five in the second term of 1861, it seems that there were none at all for the Christmas term that year. The extent of the problem can be gauged by comparing the length of time spent at the College by men under Freeman, and under Swainson: the figures for university men were as follows. 340

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms at college</th>
<th>Freeman (1846-53)</th>
<th>Swainson (1854-56)</th>
<th>Swainson (1857-Easter 1861)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 [Full course]</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this it can be seen that in Freeman's time a clear majority completed a four-term course, or more; and that while this was still just true in Swainson's first three years, the course discipline almost totally broke down in the next four and a half. For the rest of the 1860s the College merely staggered along, with numbers in residence at three or four until the end of 1864, after which they varied about an average of six or seven. But by now Swainson, who was elected Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in 1864, was often non-resident - although ironically, in 1863 he had benefited from the archaic process of the co-option of canons by the prebendaries of the cathedral, who had elected him to a residentiary

340. The number of terms in residence was only recorded for men entering between 1846 and Easter 1861. The figures for non-graduates show a similar trend, though there are very few; only one of the 8 in this period of Swainson's principalship resided the full 8 terms.
Meanwhile, the student body had continued to change: in the ten years from Lent 1860 the entries totalled 52, of whom only 28 were B.A.s from Oxford or Cambridge (which provided 20 of them); 18 were 'literates'. In 1869 the vice-principal, G.W. Pennethorne, wrote a small pamphlet on Theological Colleges and Cathedral Reform; he asked why 'have so few availed themselves of the facilities thus offered?', and answered 'Mainly, because of the expense', which, while voluntary, constituted 'a heavy pecuniary fine.' The only solution was for the Church to shoulder the expense, and then training 'might be compulsory.' This was not to be for over 50 years.

The future history of Chichester illustrates the uncertainties of its position. In 1870 the new Bishop, Richard Durnford, appointed A.R. Ashwell to both the principalship and to a vacant canonry, and there followed ten years of growth and vitality; in this period there were two literates to every university man (and of the latter, less than two-thirds were Oxford or Cambridge graduates). The College continued to flourish for some years, but was less healthy in the 1890s. In 1899 when the principal since 1886, Canon J.S. Teulon, resigned, he refused to resign his canonry; once again the College's weakness was shown, and only by one individual's generosity was its imminent closure prevented. By this date, however, its history is

---

341. He had also taken on the small (and not valuable) Chichester livings of St Bartholomew's and St Martin's in 1861.
342. There were also 3 men from Oxford and one from Cambridge who had not graduated, and a graduate and a non-graduate from T.C.D.; one of the literates came on from St Aidan's College.
344. Ashwell, a prominent High Churchman, was editor of the Literary Churchman and of the Church Quarterly Review, as well as author of Vol.I of Bishop Wilberforce's Life. There is more on the students of this period in the next chapter (see pp.221-2).
345. Haslehurst, op. cit., pp.94-8. The benefactor was the vice-principal, Herbert Richard, who was then appointed principal, which he remained for 19 years.
more properly that of a non-graduate college. It was the only graduate college to follow this development, an indication that until the 1870s a graduate college needed the exceptional support of Cuddesdon, or the reputation of Wells, to survive the clearly inadequate flow of graduates prepared to pay for voluntary training. Even Wells took non-graduates in the 1870s, although when its fortunes were revived under a new principal in 1880 it was able to revert to accepting only graduates. 346

After 1870, however, there was a major growth of graduate colleges. Colleges which accepted both graduates and non-graduates were opened at Lichfield (1857), Salisbury (1861), Gloucester (1869), Lincoln (1874) and Truro (1877); in every case except Salisbury it appears that graduates were always a minority. 347 Colleges for graduates only were founded at Ely and Leeds (1876), and the two major Evangelical initiatives in this area, Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, and Ridley Hall, Cambridge, were opened in 1878 and 1881 respectively. 348 Apart from Lichfield and the two last named, all

346. Elwes, op. cit., pp. 24-5. In 1873, the year after the non-graduates were first accepted, Principal Church rather gloomily spoke of how too much of the College's work was that of teaching 'the first elements of religious knowledge' to pass men; and of how all too often their course was reduced by 'the impatience of students, or the necessities of parents, or the pressure for curates ... to six months ...' (C.C.R., 1873, pp. 139-40). In 1881 E.C.S. Gibson, the new principal, still pointed out that his men were 'mostly passmen or low Honour-men, for the Universities could best supply the higher education required by men of higher attainments.' Report of 1st Conference Upon Training (1881), p. 25.

347. Church of England Year-Book, 1888, tabulated summary pp. 4-5, shows that to date graduates made up between one-quarter and one-sixth of their total admissions; at Salisbury the figure was one-half.

the colleges (of both types) were High Church foundations. Until Leeds, which was set up by John Gott when he was Vicar of Leeds (thus extending the previous less formal work of his predecessor J.R. Woodford),\textsuperscript{349} all were the foundations of particular bishops. Interestingly no Evangelical bishop founded a college in his own diocese, for, as M.A. Crowther has written,

\begin{quote}
by the middle of the century [the Evangelicals] were asserting that only the universities were capable of providing the right education for the ministry, such was their fear of the power of ritualism to penetrate any closed group.\textsuperscript{350}
\end{quote}

Ridley and Wycliffe were thus well supported, and were successful from the start.\textsuperscript{351}

On the High Church side, the arguments for post-graduate training were so established as to be stereotyped;\textsuperscript{352} but they were boosted by the enthusiasm for cathedral colleges which was exhibited by E.W. Benson and B.F. Westcott in the 1870s, who thus brought the leading non-Evangelical churchmanship of Cambridge into supporting the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{350} Crowther, op. cit., p.234. There was one attempt (not episcopal) to found an Evangelical graduate college outside the universities, at Hull; its planning and failure are recorded in the Reports of the Elland Society, for 1894-8. It was clearly spurred by the success of the Leeds C.S., as probably was Bishop Carpenter's 'Ripon College', a Broad Church attempt to counter clericalism, first started in 1898 (H.D.A. Major, The Life and Letters of W.B. Carpenter ... (1925), pp.158-68).
\item \textsuperscript{351} See note 347: the official - and probably correct - reason given for the failure of the Hull scheme was that all the Evangelicals who could, wanted to go to Ridley or Wycliffe (Elland Society Report, 1890, p.3).
\item \textsuperscript{352} For examples: W. Ince, The education of the Clergy at the Universities: a Sermon ... (1882); Theological Colleges: Their aim and spirit. Illustrated by two Sermons [by R.C. Moberly and E.S. Talbot; see esp. the 'Prefatory Remarks' by E.R. Ottley, Principal of Salisbury] (Salisbury [1881]); H.M. Luckock (Principal of Ely) An appeal to the Church ... A Sermon (1882) and Preparation for Holy Orders (reprinted from the Literary Churchman) (1887).
\end{itemize}
colleges. Their belief in a previous university education remained unshaken, unlike that of Liddon who in June 1868 had gloomily described Oxford as nearing the positively irreligious, and floated the idea of a complete five-year arts and theology training given at the theological colleges; and their insistence upon additional training was not now publicly queried, as an ideal, in the debates of Church Congresses or Convocation. Perhaps the most succinct expression of the High Church view was given by C.W. Worlledge (principal of Truro), who wrote in 1886 that the university course 'is of the utmost value in forming the mind and developing the intellect; but it does not form the ecclesiastical spirit' [my emphasis]. Not all churchmen liked the result; W.C. Magee, when bishop of Peterborough, complained that the colleges turned out 'young seminary priests; all moulded on the same pattern', and bid fair to produce 'a rapid growth of young, hot-headed, and ignorant sacerdotalism, to be followed ultimately by sceptical reaction.' In 1889 he was sufficiently irritated to contemplate a boycott 'of one of two of these Theos [sic] - Ely especially'; he probably did not have time to do more, before his


354. Sermon, 'The work and prospects of Theological Colleges' (1868), printed in Clerical Life and Work... (1895), pp.65-70. Pusey of course felt the same at this time, as he wrote to Liddon 3 months previously (Life, Vol.4, pp.199-200), complaining that 'it is a little hard upon the Church to wrest from her the only places of education which she has for her clergy...'

355. A few thoughts on Ecclesiastical Training and the Sacerdotal Life... (1886), p.5. (The formation of the esprit ecclésiastique was the overriding purpose of later 18th century French seminaries: T. Tackett, Priest and Parish in 18th century France... [Princeton 1977], p.83).
death in 1891, soon after his elevation to York.  

At this date, there appear to have been about 180 graduates in residence at the various colleges, or not far short of one-half of the annual total of graduates ordained.  

For the five years between 1902 and 1906, it was found that graduates with and without further training were almost exactly equal in number, although a majority of Oxford and Cambridge men now had theological college training.  

One of the very few diocese where there were more untrained than trained graduates from these universities was Canterbury, whose Archbishop was no particular favourer of the colleges.  

A few years before, however, he had indicated that while he did not require a theological college training, 'in default of it, substantial evidence must be forthcoming of some systematic preparation under proper guidance.'  

This gives a hint of a large area of informal training, upon whose

356. J.C. MacDonnell, Life and Correspondence of W.C. Magee ... (2 Vols., 1896), Vol.2, pp.60-1 and 268. (If the account of Ely in The Treasury, Vol.1 (1903), pp.354-61, is typical of earlier years, it was certainly a college bound to upset even moderate Protestants). Magee was of course an Irishman, with experience of Maynooth: in 1960 the Irish image of seminaries was expressed by 'an archdeacon', who told Paul Ferris, 'People want us to be spiritual and earthy - not little Mulrooneys, come out of a seminary ...' (The Church of England, 1960, p.20).

357. An estimate from the figures given in contemporary Year-Books.

358. 1908 Archbishop's Report, Appendix XVIII. In these five years, the ratio of Oxford and Cambridge graduates who had been to a theological college to those who had not was 915:720, the ratio for all other graduates was 218:414 (the totals thus being 1133:1134).


360. Ch.C. 1900, p.384.
extent it is extremely difficult to give even an approximate estimate; C.J. Vaughan's 400 or so are the best-known examples of men who studied informally with an experienced clergyman, but this form of study was always mentioned, and usually very favourably, in debates upon the subject of training; clearly it provided an informal and flexible opportunity for many graduates, but little more can be said with certainty about it.  

The one major college that grew out of such a situation, the Leeds Clergy School, showed few signs of its origins 25 years after its foundation; by then it had moved to a large house 'on the brow of a hill overlooking the town' with 'spacious grounds', and its vice-principal was at some pains to counter the image of it as excessively practical in approach.  

One passing comment is revealing, when he refers to the 'reality' of the practical experience at Leeds, and contrasts the inhabitants of the busy streets with 'the dear old ladies, familiar figures in theological college stories, who cheerfully accept the post of subjects with which "the young gentlemen" may try pastoral experiments.' For there was now a 'community' of theological college men to whom these stories might make sense; many of

361. Examples include On Clerical Education (1832: see note 265) which proposed requiring a year's work with an active clergyman (pp.8-10). The Dean of Canterbury strongly urged such 'a proper apprenticeship' (C.C.R., pp.202-3) and Canon Girdlestone described his own work (ibid., pp.221-2). The important Report on The Supply and Training of Candidates for Holy Orders (No.343 of Convocation Reports, 1900) "heartily recommend[ed] this method, and this easily passed into Convocation's final Resolutions: Ch.C. 1901, pp.156-7. B. Heeney (Different Kind of Gentleman, op. cit., note 261), pp.100-1.


363. Op. cit., p.309. At most graduate colleges 'practical' training was virtually non-existent. There is no sign of it at Chichester, at Wells it was confined to some almshouse visiting until the 1880s (Elwes, op. cit., p.49), at Cuddesdon there was insufficient scope at the small village (Cuddesdon College 1854-1954: a Record and Memorial (1904), p.44), etc. It was, as Heeney points out, a 'low priority' for High Church thinkers (op. cit., pp. 101-3).
them held 'festivals'; and as the principal of Ely (H.M. Luckock) wrote in 1887, among the advantages of the colleges 'there are the traditions, of which men became rapidly so jealous ... the esprit de corps is a wonderful help.' Ely was then 11 years old, but the habit of mind already exemplified by the creation (from scratch, almost) of public school 'traditions' was clearly at work.

In 1900 and 1901 the Canterbury Convocation received and discussed a substantial report on the training of the clergy; at the end of this, after discussions which admitted problems of narrowness in the colleges but were generally favourable, the Resolutions passed did no more than 'cordially acknowledge' their work, and affirm the need for close episcopal supervision. It was not until the 1908 Lambeth Conference took up and adopted the principles of the 'Archbishop's Report' of that year, and called for a mandatory year of theological training, that Convocation moved at last to compulsion: cautiously, they adopted January 1917 as the date by

364. Games were also flourishing by the end of the century - at Cuddesdon they had started soon after Liddon's departure (Chadwick, Founding of Cuddesdon, p.104). The account of Ely (see note 354) moves, with revealing ease, from a description of a hooded outdoor crucifix 'as in the gardens and lawns of Oberammergau', to the generous sporting facilities (op. cit., p.358). By 1890 some 3,300 graduates had passed through theological college (Church of England Year-Book, 1890, pp.4-5), including over 1,000 from Wells and 700 from Cuddesdon.


366. Report No.343 (see note 359); there were extensive debates, Ch.C. 1898, esp. pp.450-3, 1900, pp.195-231 and 348-96, 1901, pp.48-77 and 126-56. Contemporary debate in the Northern Province was briefer, as was their comparable 'Report': J.C. 1899, Appendix pp.XVI-XXV: after debate in 1902 they rejected, on financial grounds, the 'Report's' proposal of compulsory theological training (J.C.), 1902, esp. pp.19-20.

which the resolutions should be in force\textsuperscript{368} (the War pushed this on into the 1920s). It was extraordinary that after so many years it could still be asserted in 1909 that because training was not seriously required it was regarded as a luxury by parents.\textsuperscript{369} At least it was now acknowledged that finance was the essential desideratum.\textsuperscript{370}

The whole story of post-graduate training can be seen to reflect a fundamental organisational problem in the church: the lack of ability to take and enforce central policy decisions. The need for something more than the bare B.A. was widely accepted by 1870. There were differences about the type of training, but all involved additional expenditure, and all were thus handicapped by their voluntary nature. Further, the lack of policy meant a free rein for bishops, especially, to put into practice their particular nostrums, so that inevitably the colleges tended to reflect the zeal of the committed, and gained a reputation for extremism. And there is little doubt that the dislike of non-graduate training (discussed in the next chapter) was a far stronger and more widely felt sentiment than unease about untrained B.A.s in the clergy. And this brings up the basic point underlying the confusion of this development. Post-graduate training implied specialist skills; with doctors, or engineers, these skills were explicit, and in the 19th century clearly demanded an increasingly complex and specific training. Barristers, on the other

\textsuperscript{368} See Ch.C., Report No.433 (1909) and 436 (1910), and debates 1909, pp.198-202, 224f and 1910, p.73.

\textsuperscript{369} Ibid., Report No.433, p.3.

\textsuperscript{370} This point was not now seriously challenged, though the bishops (clearly following Davidson and Temple here) had rejected the original Report's proposed central church agency to co-ordinate finance and organisation (the Lower House had agreed to this very easily): Report 343, pp.22-3; Ch.C. 1900, pp.230-1, 1901, pp.26-7.
hand, whose work seemed little different, in quality, in 1900 from what it had been in 1800, were exceedingly slow and inefficient in the reform of their educational institutions. This points to the Church's problem: a general growth of activity, a general acknowledgement of a more complex task, these might suffice to make a churchman to admit the need for something more than of old (even if the excellent example of so many clergy educated the old way might act as a brake on such an admission). But when it came to what was required, different concepts (of 'priesthood', or of 'ministry') were to the fore: there was little experience of what actually could be taught or learnt: in short, over and above the problem of expense, there lay the problem posed by the lack of any accepted test of competence for the role to be played. It was an issue made more explicit in relation to the non-graduate clergy, discussed in the next chapter.

371. B. Abel-Smith and R. Stevens, Lawyers and the Courts ..., esp. pp.63-7, 75-6 and chapter 7 passim. Bagehot's 1876 article 'Bad Lawyers or good?' makes it clear that the Inns still provided a spectacle of extravagance and inutility unseen in the church since the cathedral reforms of the 1830s and 1840s (printed in N.St.J. Stevas, ed., op. cit., pp.249-65).
Appendix one to Chapter two

The Cambridge Honours Sample

a) Criteria. Essentially my aim was to include all men taking honours in the chosen years (see Table 1 and notes). This meant the inclusion of steadily more subjects, though the original 2 (Classics and Mathematics) still covered some 80% of the 1871-3 sample. In taking the sample I also made two fairly arbitrary minor decisions.

The first concerned Theological Honours, the takers of which I have included. This involved, in 1861-3, the inclusion of 9 men who took no tripos (as well as 18 who did); in 1871-3, the numbers were 13 and 19 respectively. As in both periods all of those who took only the theology exams became clergymen, this may be seen as slightly overstating the clerical element.

The second concerned the law exams. The takers of the Civil Law exams I excluded, as it is highly doubtful whether this can be seen as an 'honours' examination. The exclusion of the Law tripos (for 1861-3) is less straightforward, but I justify it on the grounds that it was so cut off from the other triposes (only 3 out of 23 men appear to have sat for any other), that it was too exclusively the realm of 2 colleges (21 were from either Trinity or Trinity Hall) and that on top of this it was too clearly vocational: whereas many takers of the old Civil Law classes became clergymen, or entered other non-legal professions (19 out of 20 and 36 out of 46 for 1841-3 and 1851-3 respectively), by 1861-3 none entered any other profession. Perhaps more arbitrarily, I also excluded all those who sat (only) for the new Law and History tripos in 1871-3, on the basis that it is clear from Winstanley's account (L.V.C., pp.208-10)
that the tripos was a failure, with most of the men still in effect studying law alone. Again very few men sat it who also took other triposes (11 out of 67). If included, the proportion of lawyers would naturally have been substantially higher.

Finally: the sample inevitably cannot claim to include all the most academically distinguished men of these years, but it is unlikely to exclude many after 1850, when it became possible to sit for the classical tripos without also having obtained a place in the mathematical honours. Before 1851 King's College men not only retained their privilege of passing to their degrees without examination (the first in my sample appears in 1853), but they were taught no mathematics, hence being effectively excluded from the tripos lists; apparently this position of freedom from the triposes paradoxically contributed to the College's high academic reputation (Rothblatt, op. cit., p.221). Two notable high churchmen, W.J. Butler and J.M. Neale, both took poll degrees in 1840 due to inability to clear the mathematical hurdle, though both probably would have figured high in the classical list (Life and letters of W.J. Butler ... (1898), pp.4, 16: A.G. Lough, J.M. Neale - Priest Extraordinary (Newton Abbot, 1975), pp.27-8). Noel Annan writes that 'It was no surprise to see able men take the poll examination ...' in the early 1850s; and instances James Fitzjames Stephen, who took it after his failures to gain a Trinity scholarship put a fellowship out of reach, thus rendering the tripos valueless to him. (Leslie Stephen (1951), pp.22-3). Sickness claimed a few, but it seems that after the 1850s the honours men pretty closely correspond to the more academically able and ambitious of Cambridge men.
b) Classification of occupation. The classification used was intended to be as simple as possible, but ambiguities remain, apparently inevitably. The categories are: nobility: gentry: officials of the government (home, colonial, or Indian): clergy of the C. of E.: military officers: lawyers: medical doctors: merchants, manufacturers, traders: finance (banking, stock-exchange): teaching (all types): technical and scientific (largely engineers and architects): literary and artistic: miscellaneous non-professional: and unknown.

Some of these are very straightforward, but a brief note on some is in order.

1. Gentry: this is fairly rigorous, intended to cover only men who seem to have been genuinely landed gentry; where a case was doubtful I have followed up the Burke's Landed Gentry reference (if there was none, I excluded the case); certainty remains elusive, but probably a substantial number of lesser gentry, or men of independent means, were excluded, and thus swell the ranks of the 'unknowns'. For the smaller 'decade' samples (see note 13 above) I used a loose but useful 'independent' category to cover cases where it seemed reasonably clear that independent means were the most important determinant of a man's career.

2. Businessmen etc., and miscellaneous non-professional: this was impossible to systematise wholly, as the latter was intended to include poorer tradesmen. It was necessary to use discretion and have regard to other factors than merely the statement of occupation: so, i.e., a tanner who sent 3 sons to Cambridge as pensioners was classified in the former, one whose only son at Cambridge was a sizar, in the latter; other pieces of evidence (school, address,
later career of student or of brothers) might also be taken into account. The final result, it is hoped, is that the 'business' category should include all manufacturers and merchants, and substantial (especially wholesale) tradesmen.

The 'miscellaneous' category is just that. Of the 100 altogether (and 98 fathers, there being 2 pairs of brothers), over two-thirds were (at least originally) at St John's, and half were (or had been) sizars of that College; the category is thus either largely a tribute to the recording care of this College, or a reflection of the College's unique intake - most likely, a combination of the two. Not all the fathers classified here were poor, evidently: thus there are 34 farmers or yeomen, of whose sons only 12 were sizars (still a high proportion, however): there are also 11 sons of 10 non-Anglican ministers (the fathers being 6 Wesleyans, and one each of Baptist (two sons), Congregationalist, German Protestant Reformed, and Unitarian); 4 were sizars. The rest, largely St John's men, provide the only evidence of genuinely humble parents, and thus rate some detail. They may be divided into the following rough categories (figures in brackets after the totals represent sizars: pensioners).


Tailors (5), drapers (3), hosier, hatter; butchers (2), miller, baker; innkeeper, shopkeeper; builders (2) = 19 (13:6)

Printers (2); glaziers (2), plasterer, bricklayer, labourer; saddlers (2), cordwainer, shoemaker; cork-cutter; tanner, cloth-drawer, wool-sorter = 16 (14:2)

Organist, parish clerk; butlers (2), college steward, cook (1, with two sons at Cambridge, one a sizar) = 7 (3:4)
c) Graduate and non-graduate, pass and honours (see also table). As it was clear (see Tables 2.2 and 2.4) that a sample that excluded non-graduates must raise the prominence of clergy, it seems worthwhile to pursue the question of whether an honours sample furthers this bias. The table that follows is avowedly no more than an estimate, but it indicates that the bias is probably not excessive. It may be reasonably assumed that the passmen included somewhat more men who led financially independent lives, as there are relatively few of these among the honours sample. It may be further thought that an honours sample is likely to generally underrepresent men of means, for whom hard reading was an unnecessary exertion, and hence to underrepresent the sons of rich men who were ordained. This is probably true; the same, however, applies presumably to other professions, so that the contrast between the Church and the law as future careers, which is frequently drawn, should remain valid.

The one visible difference, which seems clearest, between pass and honours men, is that the latter included the great majority of award-holders and sizars. The decade samples show totals (hence %) of 27, 23 and 27 for the last 3 decades (1840s, 1860s, 1880s); the figures for the honours sample (%) are 57, 53, 50 and 51. An estimate from these figures, combined with those of the table attached,* suggests that about two-thirds of all scholars and sizars took honours, and that therefore those who did not probably made up only about one-fifth of the passmen.

* The estimate, as applied to the table, would be roughly: 1840: c.100 scholars and sizars: if 50% of honours men were of these, that accounts for 60, and leaves 40. 1870: c.140 scholars and sizars: 50% of the honours men (90) leaves only 50 among the rest.
APPENDIX: TABLE 1: Estimates of Laymen and Clergymen Among Honours and Passmen, 1840, 1870

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1840</th>
<th></th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>Lay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graduates</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          | 420         | 220      | 60          | 560         | 200      | 360         |

It is stressed that these are merely estimates: they are essentially worked back from the rough totals available for a) matriculations; b) number of honours men (my honours sample); c) clergy in that sample; d) figures for non-graduates are based on 77% estimates of degree-taking, see Table 2.2: (it has been assumed that no non-graduates became clergy, though some clearly did; but I have no means of estimating this number, and it was certainly not large); e) figures for clergy are estimated from average intakes - these are not intended to represent specific years, merely the situation in the two periods.

* These percentage figures apply only to graduates. It can be seen that, if non-graduates are excluded, future clergy and laymen took honours in very similar proportions. (All the % figures read in columns).
Appendix two to Chapter two

Oxford honours men

My original intention was to carry out a similar programme for Oxford men; the names of all honours men were collected in a similar way, but it became clear very quickly that Foster's Alumni Oxonienses was wholly inadequate for such a task. But in order to have at least some basis for comparison, I have analysed what information I could glean from Volume 1, covering names beginning with A to D; this represented proportions of the total for the four periods respectively, of: 99/339 (29.4%), 108/370 (29.2%), 84/325 (25.8%) and 174/732 (23.8%). With such a sample, all figures can only be a rough guide.

Of these men, the numbers who were ordained were (with % in brackets):-

63(64): 65(60): 34(41): 71(41)

The figure for the last period, however, is inflated by the presence of 30 men who took (only) the new Theology honours school (on which, see Ward, op. cit., pp.250-2) - a much higher proportion than that of men taking only theology honours in the Cambridge sample; if these, all of whom went on to ordination, are excluded, the figure would be 41 out of 144 (28%). If this is at all typical, it would appear that at Oxford, conformably with the publicly-expressed fears of churchmen there, honours men had largely ceased to be ordained, and the problem was greater than at Cambridge; it also seems plausible that the change should have gone further by the 1861-3 period, notable for the bitterness of the struggle around Essays and Reviews at Oxford.

The only other worthwhile information relates to the level of
degree, as against ordination. Numbers, at the level of first-class degrees, are very small, so these figures are to be treated with even greater caution: they are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th>1851-3</th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th>1871-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firsts: ordained</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They are in fact quite plausible, in terms of, first, the upheaval following the Tractarian crises of 1845, the (above-mentioned) circumstances of 1861-3, and the revival of churchmanship, headed by the High Churchmen, of the 1860s.

On fellows, a letter to the Times of 1/11/1865, from 'A London Incumbent', gave the following figures, for fellows in 1852 and 1864.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1864</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordained</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures from my sample are again extremely small, but are at least consistent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th>1881-3</th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th>1871-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fellows: ordained</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix three to Chapter two

Colleges and Fellows at Cambridge

It is perhaps worth noting that the custom among Cambridge colleges of electing only their own graduates to fellowships grew if anything more marked, according to this sample. Instances of men taking a degree at one college, and being elected at another, are only 6, 4, 4 and 1 for the four periods. Clearly it was mainly a way, in the earlier periods, for men of reasonable, but not the highest talents, to gain a prospect of a fellowship which was unlikely if they were to stay at St John's or Trinity - 8 of the 10 in the first two periods migrated from these two to lesser colleges. In the same samples, 9 of the fellows had migrated prior to their degrees - as against only one in the two later periods. It would thus appear that migration, either before or after the degree, was becoming less common. Perhaps the success of Balliol at Oxford added urgency to the traditional small college concern.

The practice nevertheless throws a small side-light upon the Victorian route to academic success. The basic point was that men from Trinity and St John's would be unlikely to gain a fellowship if their place was much lower than 10th in either of the major triposes, and often higher places still were insufficient; whereas at smaller colleges, with few candidates, a relatively modest place could be sufficient to gain election. The taking of men from the two great colleges implied a real inability to fill the fellowship internally, though college policies clearly varied, with a few (Clare, Queen's, Christ's, St Catharine's) appearing more than once, others never.

As a possible illustration, it seems plausible to see Leslie Stephen's choice of Trinity Hall as partly a sensible reading of
opportunities. His brilliant brother had preceded him, to Trinity, where however he had failed to win a scholarship, thus losing all hope of a fellowship; Leslie's concern with relieving his father of the burden of his support was strong, and (naturally) shared by Sir James. In the event Leslie's 20th in the Wrangler list was creditable enough to gain him a fellowship at Trinity Hall; but his was the lowest place to lead to a fellowship that year (among men without classical honours), and two Trinity men with higher places went down unelected (as also did three Johnians). If not prudential, his choice was providential.

The subject is also mentioned several times in the official evidence. The Graham Commissioners had wished to open all fellowships, but found such solid opposition - only Graham's own college of Christ's agreed - that a purely permissive clause was all that they inserted into new statutes (P.P. 1861, Vol.XX, Report of the Cambridge University Commissioners, pp.12-3, 14, 16-7). In 1867 W.H. Bateson, Master of St John's, referred to the habit of taking 'strangers' when small colleges had no obvious candidate, but thought these exceptions to the general rule of intra-college election 'not worth considering.' (P.P. 1867, Vol.XIII, Ewart Select Committee, qs. 713, 717, 720, 723). Apart from one man who appeared to have the subject as something of a hobby-horse (W.M. Campion: ibid., q. 3878) the only other comment was from H. Latham, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity Hall. After describing how the smaller colleges elected their own men, he told how ten years ago he had strenuously opposed the opening of fellowships; he had feared that the larger colleges would attract all the best undergraduates, 'and that they would issue forth from Trinity and obtain the prizes of the smaller colleges' (ibid., 1834, 1836; though J.L. Hammond of Trinity wanted
open fellowships for the opposite reason - 'what we wish is to have the best men out of the whole university' - a rather threatening ambition, one would imagine: ibid., q. 1046). Interestingly, however, Latham said that his fears had decreased. 'The small colleges now occupy a very much stronger ground than they did 10 years ago, and I think that they are in a position to hold their own.' It may be that Latham was biased by the success (largely due to Leslie Stephen) recently experienced at his own college; but it may be worth pointing out that the growth of numbers in the university may have itself favoured the smaller colleges, as it was simply impossible for the two great colleges to absorb even a proportionate share of the increase. The figures in Table 2.7 give some credence to this, as the numbers from 'the rest' grew in the last 10 years by a full 50%, whereas Trinity was stable, and St John's numbers grew only some 30%. The 'decade' sample shows that the share of the big two, which peaked at 54% for the 1840s, fell to 47% in the 1860s and 33% in the 1880s, indicating that the majority of the post-1860 growth was absorbed by the smaller colleges. This may supplement the causes for the revival of the small colleges adduced by O. MacDonagh, in his essay on St Catharine's in the 19th century (St Catharine's College Quincentenary Essays, ed. E.E. Rich [1973], pp.248-65).
Appendix four to Chapter two

Schools

After the salutary work of J.R. de S. Honey on the classification of late nineteenth-century schools (Tom Brown's Universe, Chapter 4) any earlier classification must be presented with considerable caution. The form of the one used here is crude, but any single form which must cover the mid-century years, when many schools underwent major transformations, is bound to be unsatisfactory in some details.

The original lists were drawn up to cover the schools attended by the honours and the decade samples; for the schools taught at by the teachers in the former sample, a much simpler classification was used from the start. The schools are listed at the end of this appendix; the criteria for the classifications were as follows:

1. the 7 major 'Clarendon' schools, excluding the mainly day schools St Paul's and Merchant Taylors;
2. the two above-named, plus 45 schools which attended the 1873 Headmasters' Conference, and which had been founded before 1840;
3. schools which were in the list, given in the Schools Inquiry Commission (Vol.1, pp.164-5), of those with 4 or more undergraduates at Oxford or Cambridge, again excluding new public schools. In the list I include only those which feature in my samples;
4. 14 new public schools which attended the 1873 H.M.C., plus Rossall, which had more pupils at the universities than any of the others (except Marlborough and Cheltenham) on the S.I.C. list;
5. all other new public school foundations;
6. King's College, London. This was kept separate as in the earlier years it featured so largely as the school of the honours men. Unfortunately it was not possible to ascertain from Venn whether the men had attended the School itself, or the College. (Harvie, Lights of Liberalism, notes the attendance at the latter of many of his future liberals; p.61). Consequently all King's College men are included;

7. all other universities;
8. technical colleges, or teacher training colleges;
9. all other schools - in effect, the mass of smaller grammar and proprietary schools;
10. private;
11. not known;
12. previous adult employment;
13. home.

For the purpose of adult teaching careers (i.e. Table 2.16) the division was very much simplified, and the divisions correspond simply to sections 1: 4 and 5: and 2, 3, 6 and 9: it can be seen that 'old grammar schools' is thus rather a typical than an exact description of these.

The schools involved are as follows:-


2. St Paul's, Merchant Taylors', Abingdon, Bedford, Berkhamsted, K. Ed.VI, Birmingham, Blackheath, Blundell's, Brentwood, Brewood, Bromsgrove, Bury St Edmunds, Christ's Hospital, Cowbridge, Cranbrook, Derby, Dulwich, Durham, Elizabeth College Guernsey, Felsted, Giggleswick, Guildford R.G.S., Hereford Cathedral School, Highgate, Ipswich, King's Canterbury,

3. Walthamstow (Forest), City of London, St Peter's York, Leamington College, Liverpool Royal Institute, Aldenham, Torquay, Canterbury Clergy Orphans', Newark, Sedbergh, Windermere College, Bath (Somerset College), Bristol, Clapham, Pocklington, Beaumaris, St Bees, Heversham, Sheffield Collegiate, Boston, Cheltenham (Berkeley Hall), Exeter, Islington Proprietary, Marlborough (G.S.), Kidderminster, Ruthin, Wakefield, Wimbledon (Kier Ho.).


5. Glenalmond, Taunton School, Llandovery, Hurstpierpoint, St John's Leatherhead, Bath College, Loretto.

8. Includes the military colleges at Woolwich (Artillery) and New Cross (R.N.), the Royal School of Mines, and any teacher Training college.
Chapter three

THE TRAINING OF NON-GRADUATE CLERGY

1. INTRODUCTION: DEMAND

The training of non-graduates for ordination was effectively a 19th century development.\(^1\) Both in its effects on the Church then, and in the light of 20th century experience, the provision of such training may be seen as one of the most significant facts of 19th century Church history; yet, unlike many other more ephemeral effects of Victorian religious zeal, the colleges have never been adequately studied.\(^2\) There can be little doubt that this reflects what remains perhaps the essential fact about the non-graduate colleges: that, on the whole, the Church at the time was ignorant about them, and was so because their existence was regarded as cause for shame or regret rather than for pride. The Church's 'official' reaction, when it came, was reluctant and inept.

This was not entirely wilful blindness; the geography and chronology of the colleges explain much. Until mid-century, the only colleges were on the periphery of the Church's vision and

---


reach: Lampeter was always a little more than a purely Church institution, and was to develop into a Welsh university: St Bees, founded in 1816, was isolated, and its institutional character and apurtenances were modest: St Aidan's, in Birkenhead, did not gain its impressive buildings until the mid-1850's until which time it was but an ambitious and energetic private venture. In the south, theological colleges meant the new graduate colleges, which provided congenial sites for ideological warfare, but hardly constituted a response to the sheer pastoral necessities which underlay the foundation of the non-graduate colleges.

Yet, as was clear to a few contemporaries, and is quite clear from an analysis of ordinands' educations, without the influx of non-graduates the drop in clerical recruitment in the mid-century would have been far more drastic, and the rise that peaked in 1886 far less notable. The numbers involved were considerable; by 1890, the colleges had admitted some 5,300 non-graduate students, and even allowing for a substantial drop-out rate, at least 4,000 clergy

3. Its foundation is described by Bullock on pp.28-9: there are scattered references thereafter. (There is a history, by H.K. Archdall, 1952).

4. There is no official history. The Rev T. Park is working on a history now: he possesses some papers, others are in the County Archives at Carlisle.

5. There is a history by F.B. Heiser: The Story of St Aidan's College, Birkenhead: 1847-1947. (Chester: n.d. [1947]). There are papers in the Archives of Liverpool University, which were used in Heeney, op. cit.

6. Notably T.E. Espin: see i.e. 'The Supply and Training of Ministers: a Paper read on October 14, 1863 [at the Church Congress]' (1863); pp.6-7.

7. See Table 2.3 above.
appear to be involved,^8 with over 150 more being added each year (about one-quarter of the total ordained). This proportion, or something very like it, had obtained since about 1860.

Clearly, there was a steady and substantial demand for the colleges. One can see this under three heads: demand for clergy, not otherwise supplied by the universities, from the towns and the North: demand on the part of the prospective students: and a general demand for higher levels of clerical training. They are connected, but the first is the dominant and necessary factor; in it may be seen two major elements.

The first is that discussed above,^9 the simple inflexibility of the universities at the crucial time, 1840 to 1860; when, while the Church was maintaining a rapid growth of clergy, the universities, static or only growing slowly in number, perforce provided a lesser proportion of the new clergy. The number of non-graduates rose steeply. Manning appears to have seen the problem with unusual clarity, when he wrote to Bishop Phillpotts, on 23 December 1842, that 'the two Universities will not be able to fulfil the function of preparing the Clergy of the Church for Holy Orders ...': the demand he estimated at 500 to 600 a year, and the target some '20 or 25,000' clergy in all. By this multiplication

the number demanded for ordination every year will be raised so far beyond the power of the Universities to supply that there seems no alternative between founding 4 or 5 new Colleges in each province, or in certain well chosen Cathedral cities.\(^{10}\)

---

8. Figures calculated from the Church of England Year Book, 1890, return pp.4-5: with my own calculation of St Bees and Highbury numbers (some half of the total).

9. Chapter 2, Section 3.

Had the need been more equitably distributed and felt, action might have been forthcoming; in fact, however, until at least 1870 the need was both geographically and demographically limited, and further, rural preferences remained dominant among the better educated clergy. The North generally, and large urban areas generally, faced a constant struggle to obtain sufficient clergy. Wales was always sui generis, with enormous and distinctive problems for the Church there, problems reflected in (and not helped by) the Welsh Church's continuing inability to recruit more than a small proportion of graduates, though the supply of Lampeter men slowly improved this situation.

The intense reluctance of most young university men to go North was, of course, merely a reflection of the widely-held prejudice of the educated southern classes; but it undoubtedly acted as a constant brake on the efforts of the Church in the North, reinforcing differences that seemed to exacerbate the problem. Samuel Wilberforce's well-known reluctance to go to Leeds in 1837, is at least matched by that of his son, who wrote to his wife, prior to taking the new See of Newcastle in 1882:

I cannot bear the thought of the black, black north - the separating from all the old ties of the south - the leaving that sweet home. 

And in 1874 an influential Church reformer had written:

In the pleasant Southern dioceses, with which our educated gentry are best acquainted, there is no shortage of clergy.

There were, in addition, quite specific problems faced by the Church of England in the North: these are reducible to the fact that a parish structure evolved to serve a small and scattered population was rendered wholly obsolete by the changes (demographic and social) accompanying industrialisation. The Church's work, quite simply, was usually harder in the North.  

A set of figures of ordinands' education for 1865, a year which fits as entirely typical in its general distribution, illustrates the basic point well. The difference between North and South is glaring: in the South, very nearly 4 in every 5 new clergymen (78%) are from Oxford or Cambridge, in the North, well under half (46.4%): in the South, men from theological colleges were barely one-sixth of those from the universities, in the North the proportion approaches two-thirds. The difference is accentuated by the variation between Oxford and Cambridge men: not only did one quarter of men from Cambridge - which traditionally drew more heavily from the North, particularly Yorkshire, and traditionally also educated more men of modest backgrounds - go North, as opposed to less than 15% of Oxford men; but also, according to the commentator on the figures, few of the Oxford ordinands came 'from the Colleges more especially frequented by the wealthy classes ....' The large proportion (a fifth) from other universities who were ordained in the Northern Province confirms the picture, particularly as the majority came from Trinity College, Dublin (T.C.D.) which, despite its many distinguished scholars and its

15. In Rivington's Church Year Book (1865), p.213: see Table 3.1.
### TABLE 3.1: 1865 Ordinations: Numbers and %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Wales</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>1,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Canterbury Province</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>12.776</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>York Province</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6.139</td>
<td>1,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>346</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>20.210</td>
<td>1,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. London, Rochester, Lichfield, Winchester &amp; Worcester</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6.527</td>
<td>1,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other English Sees in Canterbury Province</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>6.249</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated from Rivington's Church Year-Book, 1865, p.213.
solid Divinity teaching, was certainly regarded as providing graduates of lower social standing and lesser cultural attainments than the English universities. William Connor Magee, a T.C.D. man who rose to be briefly, Archbishop of York, wrote, within a year of his death:

I am only a poor wild Irishman, and they [are] learned and wise and thoughtful Englishmen, who look down with all the fine contempt of an English University upon the man whose degree is not of Oxford or Cambridge. 17

As the century went on, the disproportions in terms of Oxbridge men continued, though becoming less marked: figures (see Table 3.2) covering 1876-1889 show southern England still ordaining two in three of its clergy from the two ancient universities, to one in two in the York Province; slightly lower fractions, though still in similar proportions to each other, apply for 1902-06. 18 Even by the earliest period (1876-89), however, the previous large difference in terms of theological college men ordained in the two provinces had nearly closed, the figures being then 22.9% for southern England, to 26.6% for the North. There are thus two stages to note: the first, from about 1840 to 1870, saw the combination of desperate need for more clergy in the North, and the inability of university men to meet the need, leading to a rapid growth in theological college-trained clergy: in the South, meanwhile, traditional sources were only gradually proving inadequate. In the second period, from 1870, the background of ordinands in the northern province remained fairly stable, but the


TABLE 3.2: Ordinations 1876-89, 1892-1901, 1902-06: Numbers and %, for York Province, Wales and English Canterbury: With Some Sub-Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. 1876-1886:</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>258</th>
<th>30.9</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>468</th>
<th>56.0</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>7.7</th>
<th>836</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>5,661</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>apparently</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Canterbury*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(- TC dioceses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,701</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>12,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 1892-1901:</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 1902-1906:</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>414</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Group†</td>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Group‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* i.e. dioceses with diocesan TC's - Chichester, Truro, Lincoln, Lichfield, Salisbury, Gloucester & Bristol - all of which were at least partly non-graduate.
‡ i.e. Lichfield, Lincoln, Truro; and (largely urban), Bristol, Rochester and Southwell.
insufficiency of men from Oxford and Cambridge was shown up during the increased intake of c.1870 to 1886; it was in this period that men from theological colleges ordained in the south increased to a proportion of ordinands rivalling that of the northern province; but these men were largely from the second, episcopally-supported, and southern wave of colleges.

Evidently, there was more to the difference between North and South than latitude; it was at least as much an urban-rural division. A simple re-classification of the 1865 figures, into three very similar population-size groups, shows that already the most urban areas of the southern province took a proportion of theological college men very close to the proportion taken in the North (26.1% to 29.4%): while both were in marked contrast to the rural South, where such men were less than 5% of the total, (see Table 3.1.B). The urban South still attracted more Oxford and Cambridge men than the North, but very many fewer than the rest of the Province. It is notable that the urban South and the North shared, not only the intake from theological colleges, but also a high ratio of population to clergy. A retrospective explanation of 1892, in a well-informed unofficial church publication, was quite blunt:

The difficulty of finding university men for work in the poorer and ruder parishes led to the foundation of Theological Seminaries ... 19

By the mid 19th century 'the poorer and ruder parishes' certainly referred mainly to urban ones; not entirely, for in 1853 W.J. Conybeare wrote his well-known Edinburgh Review article, 'The Church in the Mountains', depicting the distinctly poor and rude condition of the clergy in Wales and the mountainous areas of

northern England, and implying that St Bees still mainly supplied these barren regions; and there were many poorly endowed rural parishes elsewhere. But their existence only highlights the general position, for in 1874 Ashwell estimated that 15½ million townspeople were provided with 5,800 clergy, endowed with £750,000 p.a. - or about £130 each; while 7½ million rural dwellers were ministered to by over 13,200 clergy, each endowed with over £200 p.a. and having on average little over one-fifth as many parishioners as their poorer urban brethren.21

Archdeacon Sandford, in his influential Bampton Lectures of 1861, had no doubt of the connection between poverty and the type and quality of clergy.

As one consequence [i.e. of the poverty of urban parishes] we have a lower type of man and feeble ministrations, where ability and energy are most required ... Our town parishes are often inadequately served.22

Robert Gregory, later Canon and Dean of St Paul's, and the highly respected and successful incumbent of a Lambeth parish, trying in 1865 to persuade Cuddesdon men to town work, admitted his problem, with barely-concealed irony;

... but the cool shadows, the flowery meadows, and the limpid streams where battle can be done without diminishing the enjoyment of life, have attractions which the many cannot resist. Literary leisure, or pleasant sports on grassy lawns, or frequent social intercourse with their fellows, are conditions in the service upon which many insist, and they will not be stationed where these cannot be enjoyed.23


23. Quoted by J.G. Talbot, in J.J. Halcombe ed., The Church and her Curates (1874), p.44.
It appears, however, that one of the major shifts of the late 19th century taste was to favour men like Gregory, so that by 1900 the old stereotype of rural ease and urban slavery was materially modified, and the new stereotype of rural stagnation and urban life and excitement, was widely accepted. It probably was affecting ordination figures by 1870, as a town curacy became the fashion as a first post; but Archbishop Thomson pointed out the limitations of this, writing in his Charge of 1870 that

> After two years' probation, it is common for Curates to seek a change in the south, where the nearness of London, or of the family roof, or the smaller amount of dissent, or the more agreeable climate, or the more liberal stipend, or the less independent demeanour of the people may seem to tempt him.

If this was the background to the Church's demand for the men from theological colleges, it is worth making the basic point that without a steady supply of prospective students, the colleges could not have existed at all. I will be treating the students in detail below, so will only note here that the supply, which was always adequate or better, does appear to have been a concomitant of the growth of a respectable lower middle class. To some extent adequate recruitment - notably for St Bees in its early years - was a continuation of a supply which had kept the 'Church in the mountains' manned, in the 18th century and before, by a steady flow of farmers' and tradesmen's sons. By mid-century, however, it is clear that the problem - the explosive urban population growth - was providing,

---

24. This question is discussed more fully below, Chapter seven, sec.1.
as a side effect, at least part of the Church's desired antidote. Mature men, often with some experience of lay work, were making themselves available. It is one of the more weighty charges against the organisation and leadership of the 19th century Church that, despite consistent pleas to act, it largely ignored this demand, and only seemed to wake up to its potential early in the 20th century. This late recognition of facts well known to the theological colleges meant that the 19th century passed without the Church having ever exploited, except informally, the zeal created by its Victorian revival; a revival far from complete, but whose extent stood out when seen from beyond the Great War.

The third form of demand was the general demand in the Church for better training of the clergy; St Bees, founded in 1816 by Bishop Law, was in a diocese (Chester) chronically short of university men; if such could not be attracted, at least the rest could be trained. Without training, such men were 'literates', whose existence became increasingly embarrassing to the Church, as their numbers, almost certainly, decreased. Bishop Wilberforce, writing of the costs of education for the Church, was cutting, in 1867:

We say nothing of the 'literates', - who are still in well regulated dioceses received as candidates for Orders only in rare and exceptional cases, and with regard to whom it is almost as impossible to calculate the costs of production as it is of the wares of 'cheap Johns' of other trades ...

The nastiness was hardly necessary by then, when, outside Wales, literates were few, remaining a steady 3-5% of the total; their continued acceptance was an indication, in most cases, of personal

27. i.e. the 1908 Archbishop's Report; esp. pp.12-13 and 38-9.
28. 'The word literate had come to have a somewhat contemptuous meaning ...'; C.E. Whiting, The University of Durham 1832-1932 (1932), p.140 (of the '70's). See below, Chapter four, n.106, on Bickersteth's abolition of the term at Ripon.
worth, or trust by the bishops; opinions in the Church and in society at large would no longer tolerate such men as other than exceptions. More positively, men like Baylee of St Aidan's or Espin of Queen's College, Birmingham, saw their training as uniquely practical and useful, of real worth in its own right.\textsuperscript{30}

The following sections of this chapter will be concerned with the non-graduate theological colleges, and the Church's reactions to them. Overall this study will thus have concentrated upon the upper and the lower ends of the spectrum of institutions which educated the Victorian clergy, and while it has not proved possible to subject the intermediate institutions to similar scrutiny, it is necessary to comment briefly upon them. It is hoped, however, that the greater detail entered into concerning both the ancient universities and the cheapest of non-graduate colleges, may also by implication be informative upon the conditions at, and the students of, the lesser universities and semi-university institutions.

Of the former (defined here solely in terms of contributions to English clergy training), the most important until at least 1870 was Trinity College, Dublin (T.C.D.: see Table 2.3). Magee's attitude, in the quotation already given, reflected his perception of both long-established prejudices and of the downright unfairness thus done to T.C.D.'s relatively full and competent clergy training provisions. The prejudice had been very open in the earlier part of the century; C.J. Blomfield, when Bishop of Chester, did his best to keep out Irishmen whom he apparently feared would otherwise 'inundate a diocese

\textsuperscript{30} Brian Heeney, op. cit., refers to Baylee's 'remarkable program of supervised pastoral training' as foreshadowing 'much modern theory concerning the way a pastor would learn the skills of his vocation': p.104.
so conveniently situated', while Phillpotts in 1831 wrote simply: 'I dislike Irishmen settling as clergymen in England.'\textsuperscript{31} Much later, there were wide variations in the number of T.C.D. men ordained in the various dioceses, indicating that some bishops continued to discourage them; thus in the 14 years to 1889, when T.C.D. men still made up some 4\% of all ordinands, at Canterbury, Lichfield, Norwich and Salisbury they were but 28 out of 1660, or 1.7\%. Ironically the smallest representation of all was in Magee's own diocese of Peterborough, where only two out of the 271 ordinands were from T.C.D.\textsuperscript{32}

Yet since 1833 T.C.D. had provided a two-year post-graduate theology course, which was rendered effectively compulsory through its requirement by the Irish (and apparently the English) bishops.\textsuperscript{33} This was not above criticism,\textsuperscript{34} but it compared excellently with contemporary efforts at the English universities. The university's reputation, however, was probably not helped by its allowing what one English commentator called (in 1873) 'that tedious and senseless resort to Trinity College, Dublin, by men living in England, but paying heavy fees to the college, and resorting to its examinations two or three times a year, for a few days;'\textsuperscript{35} the result was a degree

\begin{itemize}
\item 31. A. Blomfield, A Memoir of C.J. Blomfield, D.D., Bishop of London (2 Vols., 1863), Vol.1, p.103: and Davies, op. cit., p.122. (The prejudice probably was felt more keenly by such High Churchmen, as the Irish church was notoriously Protestant in tone).
\item 32. Figures from the Church of England Year-Book, 1890, p.520.
\item 34. i.e. by C.P. Reichel, alluded to by Magee in a letter of January 1865; he noted that 'first, it is the only divinity school worthy of the name in the three universities, and is in the main a very good one.' (Macdonnell, op. cit., Vol.1, pp.110-1).
\item 35. T.P. Boultbee, in C.C.R., 1873, pp.150-1. An example was F.H. Arnold, of Chichester: with the help of a clerical god-father he was able to pass through the teacher training college there, and he became in 1853 Master of the Choristers' School; while at his post he obtained his B.A. from T.C.D. (in 1859) and was immediately ordained by Bishop Gilbert (T.G. Willis, Records of Chichester (Chichester, 1928), p.338).
\end{itemize}
but one perhaps devalued in the eyes of Oxford and Cambridge men. From the 1860’s it seems that T.C.D. was subject to a decline in graduates seeking the divinity 'Testimonium', disestablishment doubtless accelerating changes partly attributable to wider intellectual movements. For most of the Victorian period T.C.D. provided about one in twenty-five of the English clergy, and only in the 1840s and 1850s, when the demand for clergy was not met by the English universities or by alternative English sources, did its contribution reach a significantly higher level.

The university which took over T.C.D.’s place as third supplier of graduate clergy was Durham. Established largely in the hope of deflecting radical attacks levelled at the wealthiest chapter in England, it was for most of the century a rather struggling institution. Despite some quite ambitious plans for technical education in its region, it remained very largely an appendage to the chapter, and its main work was always the training of clergy. By 1860 it was in a parlous state, and even after a Royal Commission it recovered only slowly. Since 1834 there had been provision for non-graduates to obtain in two years the Licence in Theology (L.Th.), which was also obtainable by graduates in one year. The arrangements

36. Charge of Archbishop Trench (Dublin, 1875), pp.21-4. As well as falling 'Testimonium' numbers, he noted that in the 10 years past not a single fellow of T.C.D. had been ordained.

37. There is a nice example of a rather hare-brained Irish curate in B. Webb’s My Apprenticeship (1926), pp.110-1; while possibly not a T.C.D. man, the national stereotype thus illustrated was evidently an important, if implicit, consideration.

38. C.E. Whiting, op. cit., passim. (Bullock summarises Whiting on its clergy training). Durham’s early history appears to require more research.

39. Whiting, op. cit., pp.90-114, describes the crisis of 1861-4. A leader in the Times of 9 Nov. 1869 was still very scathing about the university; but a letter from the new Dean, W.C. Lake (15 Nov. 1869) presaged the improvements which began under his rule.
for residence were notably economical, but apparently the poor theology students suffered some social discrimination; and as late as the 1880s a Durham B.A. was more acceptable to some bishops than the L.Th., despite the former's relatively insignificant theological content. Throughout, Durham was evidently not largely patronised by men who could afford Oxford or Cambridge, but its status was at least higher than that of the pure non-graduate colleges.

The same was true of King's College, London, which set up a Theological Department in 1846, also providing a two-year course for non-graduates, leading in this case to the A.K.C. (Associate of King's College). Its fortunes fluctuated somewhat; after a very successful start, the hostel opened for Theology students was found not to pay, and had to be closed in 1858. Later, numbers fell as low as 24 in 1875-6, though they were rapidly to reach new heights (79 in 1880-1). Inevitably it never challenged the prestige of the older universities, and the theology students were seen as the poorer section of the whole College's intake. The training given, however, was generally

40. Whiting, op. cit., pp.49, 53-4, 61. Hatfield Hall, the major example of economical arrangements, is described on p.88. It was described to the O.U.C. by David Melville, the Principal, and by J.D. Collis, whose evidence was largely cited in the 'Report', pp.34-5. The discrimination is described by Whiting, pp.103-5, and the B.A.-L.Th. difference on p.261.

41. Bullock, op. cit., pp.32, 62. (He relies wholly upon the Centenary History by F.J.C. Hearnshaw).

42. Ibid., pp.83 and 108. H.B. Thomson gives what is virtually a paraphrase of the prospectus, from which it can be seen that the cost at the hostel was, for residence the whole year and most meals, £50-55 p.a., on top of which the non-graduates paid 36 gns. p.a. in fees. They were required, on entry, to pass tests in Latin, Greek (and the Hebrew alphabet), and to possess the recommendation of a bishop and a moral testimonial from their local clergyman (The Choice of a Profession ... (1857), pp.82-5).


44. W. Johnston, England as it is ... (2 Vols., 1851), writes that despite its 'plenty of good rules ... its name [does not have] very much weight with the public', because it can only produce 'the ordinary range of scholarship and science, without the thousand little things and matters of tact which fit a man to
praised by churchmen and bishops, and was quite uncontroversial once F.D. Maurice had been sacked, in 1856. Clearly the College was immune from the general criticism of non-graduate colleges, that they were too narrow, secluded and closed to wider influences. A somewhat similar but very much less successful institution was the Theological Department at Queen's College, Birmingham, which never greatly flourished despite the (part-time) presence on the staff of John Sandford and of T.E. Espin, both well-known as commentators upon clerical education. Even less significant as a source of clergy in this period was the University of London, apart from its King's

F.n. 44 continued. carry on the world's work in the higher ranges of it.' (Vol.2, p.123). R.W. Browne, Professor of Classical Literature at the College, told the O.U.C. that while all the rooms 'are furnished plainly and comfortably ... those of the Theological Students, whose means are generally scantier than those of the others, are furnished even in a more economical style than the rest.' ('Evidence', p.5).

45. Crowther, op. cit., p.230. Examples of approbation, from representatives of two very different church view points, came in 1862: in February Bishop Tait referred to 'the admirable men who come up from King's College and similar places' [it is not clear exactly what he meant in the last phrase] (Ch.C., 1862, p.894): in July G.A. Denison said he thought King's College men the best of all candidates, in his experience as examining chaplain (C.C.R., 1862, p.27). In 1873 Liddon saw a great future for King's College and its ilk, for 'their poverty will be their protection against the religious ruin to which ancient wealth now exposes' Oxford and Cambridge: Love and Knowledge: a Sermon ... (1873), p.(25-)6: he thus reflected the fear of state greed shown by Keble, A few very plain thoughts on ... admission of Dissenters to ... Oxford (Oxford, 1854), p.11.

46. This was the point stressed in Canon Barry's report as Principal, in 1869, quoted by Bullock, op. cit., p.108.

47. Ibid., pp.84, 108, 129. The Department was set up in 1848. Queen's College Birmingham: Prospectus and rules of the Theological Department ... (1853) stated that its 'object ... is to afford, at a moderate expense', theological training over two years: lodgings were provided at £50 p.a., and fees were £15. Espin (who was associated with the College from 1853-73, latterly as Warden) gave the fees, in 1863, as £21, or 15 gns for resident students: Our want of Clergy ..., Appendix G., p.27. Sandford was Espin's predecessor as Warden (1853-65).
College component. Edward Steere, who took his B.A. at University College in 1847, and was a very active High Church layman in the 1850s, held back from ordination partly from modesty and partly because he felt keenly the slight cast upon his University by the terms upon which alone the Bishops would then accept its graduates as candidates for Orders. In 1902-6 London still provided only a very small number of clergy. By the end of the century there were also the new universities to consider, but they will be mentioned in a later section of this chapter.

Thus it can be seen that there was no simple distinction between graduates and non-graduates, based on the obvious difference between the ancient universities and colleges like St Bees or St Aidan's; there was a continuum, and on the whole it must be assumed that the major factor deciding a man's choice of institution was financial. The intermediate options attracted a significant number of aspiring clergy: in 1861, for instance, Durham with King's and Queen's Colleges combined supplied slightly more ordinands than the total from St Bees, St Aidan's and Lichfield. The concentration on the latter type is thus not comprehensive, and admittedly adds up to a depiction of one extreme; but insofar as all non-graduates shared the vital lack of a degree, and instead had behind them only two years of purely theological training, the depiction must to a large extent be typical.

48. R.M. Heanley, A Memoir of Edward Steere ... (1888), p.44. He was ordained by Phillpotts, who 'refused to recognise' the London degree (Davies, op. cit., p.155), but who allowed Steere a shortened diaconate of only two years in view of the quality of his examination (he generally demanded up to 5 years from 'literates': Heanley, p.45).
49. 1908 Archbishop's Report, Appendix XVIII: there were 76 London graduates in all, compared to 232 from Durham and 199 from 'other' universities.
50. Bullock, op. cit., p.100. But in the three years 1863-5 the proportions were reversed, according to figures given by E. Bartrum in Promotion by Merit essential to the Progress of the Church (1866), p.10.
2. THE NON-GRADUATE STUDENTS

Before discussing reactions to, and debates about the colleges, it seems appropriate to outline in some detail the evidence that does exist concerning their students. It imposes its own limitations; the colleges do not appear to have kept their records well, and virtually all that will follow, for the period prior to 1870, concerns St Bees College, and to a lesser extent, St Aidan's. This is a serious limitation, but not so great as may first appear; even in 1890, when a large number of newer colleges were taking non-graduates, St Bees had still admitted very nearly half of all the non-graduates who had attended a college (over 2,500 out of about 5,300); to 1870, the proportion would have been considerably greater, roughly three in every four. Between 1842 and 1891, with fluctuations but no serious crises, it admitted an average of over 40 men a year to its two-year course; in its most prosperous period, the 1840s and early 1850s, the average was over 50. Until its demise in 1896, it was consistently the largest college (graduate or non-graduate), in terms of students enrolled; in the North, particularly, it supplied a significant and steady proportion of clergy ordained. Yet its generally 'low profile', and quiet demise in 1896, seem to have preserved it from serious enquiry.

The records of the College are scanty until the late 1840s. There is a register, giving some information on the students, for the late 1830s; this was a poor period for the College, and one

51. At the time of my research in England I was informed that there were no useful papers (beyond those used by G.C.B. Davies in his Men for the Ministry ..., 1963) at St John's Nottingham - previously the London College of Divinity, usually known as 'Highbury'. I gather that since then papers have been found, and are being worked on by the Rev. Noel Pollard.

52. See note 8 above: unless noted otherwise, all the St Bees papers referred to hereafter are from the County Archives at Carlisle, catalogued as Dec.3/1-7.

53. St Aidan's, in its most prosperous periods, and Highbury too,
### Table 3.3: St Bees College

No's etc., by 5-year periods, 1817-1895

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total Entrants</th>
<th>Average Entrants</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Total Output</th>
<th>Average Output</th>
<th>Annual Dropouts</th>
<th>Average Rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1817-21</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822-26</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827-31</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837-41</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842-46</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847-51</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-56</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-61</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862-66</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-71</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872-76</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877-81</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882-86</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887-91</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50 years exactly in which time:—
2,073 admitted (av. 41.5)
1,624 out (av. 32.5)
449 dropout (av. 9: or 21.7%)

Calculated from Calendars and college Registers.

Notes: * Output is number of men passing final examination.
† 'Dropouts' are the difference between Entrants and Output.
surmises that the reign of the first Principal, William Ainger, had gone on too long. It is impossible to say much about the students from this evidence. They seem, however, to fit the description implied in Conybeare's article of 1853; he wrote, of the English 'mountain' clergy;

They were formerly educated (as in Wales) at licensed grammar schools scattered over the country. These have now been superseded by the college of St Bees ...

In other words, these were the old literates, local and relatively young. Of the 41 students admitted between 1835 and 1837, 26 were from the northern Province, 13 from Yorkshire, 6 from Lancashire, and 7 from the N.W. counties; (none was from the North-east; perhaps this reflects the influence of the new Durham University?); they were on the whole young, only 15 being 24 or over, of whom but four were over 30. More interestingly, the older men tended to be those from further afield - all four who were over 30 were southerners (2 from London, 1 each from Kent and Bedfordshire) and so were 5 more of those over 24: so, of the northerners, only 6 of 26 were over 23, while of the rest, only 6 of 15 were under 23. Of the 26 who were ordained, 24 were so in the northern Province, 13 of them at Chester; in one case, the diocese is not shown, and only one man was definitely ordained in Canterbury Province - a Norwich man, ordained at Norwich. The picture is of young local men, probably much as Conybeare described, for whom St Bees was just the end of a modest education; supplemented by men from further afield, older and seeking a cheap entry to Holy Orders.

F.n. 53 continued.

may have sometimes had more students. For St Bees figures, see Table 3.3.

It is immediately apparent, in the fuller records of the 1840s, that it was growth in the latter group which underlay the College's leap to prosperity (entrants rose steadily from 11 in 1838 to 52 in 1843); they were apparently attracted by the reputation of the second Principal, R.P. Buddicom, a noted Evangelical. The entry of 26 for the Michaelmas Term of 1846 includes only 9 men from the northern Province, compared to 12 from the rest of England, 3 from Wales, and 2 from Ireland; 16, a substantial majority, were over 23, and 7 were 30 or over. Consistent with this appearance of the College having become mainly a training-ground for men coming in from other careers, only 4 or 5 appear to have had no previous work experience, while a further 4 or 5 came from teaching or tutoring. There was, of the remainder, only 1 professional man, a 35 year old surgeon, previously in general practice in Cornwall. The great majority came from mercantile and commercial fields. Most (at least 18 of them), had 'read with' a clergyman prior to entering the College, usually for 3 to 6 months; clearly they were getting some classical cramming for most had relatively little schooling, and that some time ago: only 6 or 7 had been educated to more than 16 years, and at least as many had left school at 14 years old, or younger.

In Michaelmas 1848, the Register begins to show the occupation of the father, and this, together with the information previously

55. A substantial notice of his death (2/7/1846) is in the Gentleman's Magazine of September 1846. On his Evangelical influence at the College, see G. Huntington, Random Recollections ... 'Old Church' at Manchester (1893), p.266; an example of an older Evangelical attracted to his teaching was F.B. Ashley, who described it briefly in his Pen and pencil sketches (1889: as 'Nemo'), pp.133-6. His views were so extreme that the Bishop of Carlisle and the Archbishop of York did not accept his students: F.R. Raines, The Fellows of the Collegiate Church of Manchester (Manchester, 1891), Vol.2, p.370.

56. Information for 1830s, from Dec.3/1, and for the 1840s and thereafter Dec.3/3 (the Archives' classifications of the Registers).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Michaelmas 1848 to Easter 1850</th>
<th>Easter 1859 to Michaelmas 1860</th>
<th>Easter 1868 to Michaelmas 1869</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Landed or independent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gentlemen&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professionals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Dissenting Ministers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Farmers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Agents, clerical, minor officials</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Mfg. and Mercantile</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail etc.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan trades</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Labourers etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For % figures 2 categories have been in certain cases combined: i.e. first 2 and last 2 in section a), both in section b), and latter 2 of section e)).
given, provides as clear an indication of social background as one is likely to find. The fathers' occupations, however, granting the obvious reservations and qualifications that must apply when discussing men of largely mature age, remain the single most revealing indication of the men's social provenance. The first two years for which the information is available saw an intake of 107 men. In 8 cases the father's occupation is not given - perhaps indicating that they were deceased; fortunately this is not enough to seriously distort the rest.

The occupations of the fathers of these men, as well as those of 2 further groups of students, from 1859-60 and 1868-9, are summarised in Table 3.4. It is extremely difficult to offer a satisfactory classification of these occupations at all levels, but particularly when dealing with the commercial and artisan occupations. I will, therefore, give a commentary on the tables, illustrating the sorts and conditions of men that the bare occupations seem to indicate; this will largely be done from examples drawn from men entering in 3 terms (Easter 1849, Michaelmas 1859, and Easter 1869) whose lives and careers I have followed up.

The range of social background indicated is large; at the 'top' it reached to the eminences of the occasional Baronet (one in each of the samples, though the middle one was a clergyman too, and is so categorised): here, as elsewhere, I have found identification of 'gentry' extremely problematical, but have followed a policy of sticking to a count of those who seem only to have been living as independent, landed, gentlemen: even so, one of the 3 in the first sample was a retired Indian civilian, now of landed estate in Cumberland, and another was an 'Irish Country Gentleman', a classification that
perhaps not all contemporaries would have taken on trust.\textsuperscript{57}

Those identified only as 'gentleman' or 'esquire' cannot be certainly placed; at Oxford matriculations, 'gentleman' was a modest description, applied to professional and businessmen who could not aspire to 'armiger';\textsuperscript{58} two of the three cases in my sample terms, however, appear to be gentry, so something more substantial than at Oxford may be indicated here.

The clergy, and 'other professionals', present the usual problems; on the one hand, there is the clerical Baronet, a Major-General, a couple of barristers; on the other, there are clear cases of poor clergy, though the very few lawyers or medical men in my sample terms seem to have been able to educate their sons reasonably well: probably, apart from the poorer clergy, most were reasonably well-off, but, for what it is worth, the medical men tended to be surgeons, not physicians (12 to 2, respectively) and the legal men, attorneys or solicitors, and not barristers (6 to 2).\textsuperscript{59} The Dissenting ministers and teachers may have been men of some standing, but certainly their status was not assured in the way vouchsafed to members of the older professions and military officers.

Of farmers, it is again hard to generalise; a few of the students called their fathers 'gentlemen farmers', and such men could at least aspire to near-gentility: one recalls the Lookalofts at Ullathorne.\textsuperscript{60} Most of these men were apparently much more modest.


\textsuperscript{58} i.e. in Al. Ox.: see below, Chapter four, note 90.

\textsuperscript{59} See, i.e., H.B. Thomson, The Choice of a Profession (1857): on lawyers, see esp. pp.129-135, on the rising status of solicitors (now holding 'a position in society only one half-pace lower than the bar'; p.135): on the leading rank of physicians, see pp.146-7.

\textsuperscript{60} Barchester Towers, Chap.XXXIX, passim: the Pullets (of 'Garum Firs') in The Mill on the Floss are examples of the 'gentleman-farmer' proper, freeholders of substance.
however; the farmers' sons in the sample terms tended to leave school early, and go farming with their fathers, and if they did other jobs, they were not such as required expense to enter; and many were Welsh. 61

The category of 'agents etc.' is arbitrary, and all that is really shared by these fathers is a subordinate but at least partly clerical job: a list of the occupations involved serves to indicate, however impressionistically, a certain 'lower middle-class' stratum: 'officer of the Excise', 'of the Post Office', relieving officer, clerk in the Bank of England, agent to a private gentleman, bank cashier, coal agent, canal agent, house agent, book keeper, Post-master, an Excise supervisor and a 'Customs official'.

The rest, aside from the few labourers and wage-earners, were involved in some level of trade or manufacturing; there are insuperable difficulties in classifying many of these, and my classification here is no more than a rough attempt to make some sense out of a group extending from a banker and several 'merchants' and 'manufacturers', to saddlers and butchers. The manufacturing and mercantile section thus contains manufacturers, the banker, a man on the Stock Exchange, chemists, and those who appear to have been in wholesale trade; some cases might be questioned, but examples from this section do seem to be all men of education and respectable backgrounds. The next two sections are perhaps superfluous, or at least, not to be taken as implying necessary social or economic levels. It is possible that all of the 'artisans' were in fact masters, but the main difference in this

classification is that in the 'retail' section all were, by
definition, independent, on however small a scale.62

The main pattern can be seen to have been fairly consistent
over the 3 periods: the only possible change to note here, is the
greater number of tradesmen, artisans and labourers in the last
period, when, with the farmers they made up nearly one-half of the
total; this, I will suggest later, probably reflected a trend towards
a Welsh and Irish intake. The only descriptions of the College that
I am aware of, all date from around 1850, or the period when, under
Dr Richard Parkinson, Canon of Manchester, popular author, and a
moderate High Churchman, the College was at its most prosperous;63
using them, and the College records, a picture can be drawn up of the
student body in the middle of the century. They confirm the
impression that St Bees' students were of three basic types: first,
there was, all agree, a small proportion of wealthy students; in the
colourful but apparently fairly reliable reminiscences of Robert
Roberts (a bright and poor Welsh student and an ex-National School-
teacher), a friend tells him of

The Pendennis or swell party, kidgloves, gorgeous
apparel and wine parties ...;64

62. In the 'retail etc.' there were one or more of the following:
builder (3), carrier, cattle dealer, grocer, silversmith,
factor, coal-trader (2), flour-seller, draper (3), iron monger
(2), tea-dealer, pawnbroker: in the 'artisan etc.'., there
were one or more of: butcher (3), saddler (2), tailor, basket-
maker, cooper, cabinet-maker, carpenter, lace-maker, machine-
maker, printer, joiner, harness maker, quarryman and one
chemist's assistant. The labourers were: mechanic, mariner,
soldier, coachman: 2 labourers, 2 mechanics, a forgeman and
a haymaker.

63. He is the only Principal to be noticed in the D.N.B.: he was
author of the popular The Old-Church Clock, and was for many
years one of Manchester's most respected Churchmen; but his
acceptance of St Bees in 1846 caused considerable scandal and
unrest, and precipitated the reform by Parliament of Manchester
Cathedral. See Raines, op. cit., pp.XI-XII and 361-77: W.R.

he himself described them as being largely
men who had been ploughed at Oxford, had migrated to
Halls, had been ploughed again, and had come to
St Bees as a last resource, generally to be ploughed
finally and altogether.

And he goes on to give an amusing description of a man whom he
coached, a man of noble connections, with 'a fine family living
waiting for him', but hopelessly stupid. Just such a case is
documented in the records; in Michaelmas 1849 there entered Lawrence
Woollaston Fowke, fifth son of the first Baronet (who had been a
friend of the Prince Regent's, and dubbed by him 'Fred Fun'). The
older sons had not been to university (either studying for the Bar,
or having no profession); Lawrence had been at Christ's, Cambridge -
a fact of which he failed to inform St Bees, as he had been rusticated
thence, and when the fact became known, he lost his first term: he
persevered: he lost the Michaelmas term of 1850 'for irregularity':
Easter 1851 and Easter 1852 'from inability to pass the exam'; 'and',
the Register records, 'finally withdrew considering himself and being
generally considered unfit for the Ministry.' He died in 1860, having
embarked, it seems, on no other profession. The evident toleration
of such a man at St Bees suggests that the College was prepared to
accept his £20 a year for as long as he or his father wished to keep
paying. Quite how many comparable cases there were, I cannot be
sure - Roberts implies 4 or 5 every term, though in the three
terms which I have looked at the ex-university men were 1, 4 and nil,
respectively. One doubts that they fitted very well; another
description of St Bees in about 1850, talks of 'harum-scarum

65. Ibid., p.360 and seq.
66. From the Register (Dec. 3/2), Venn, and Burke P. & B.
Oxonians', ejected from university

who persisted in wearing the Oxford instead of
the St Bees gown, scoffing at the notions of
St Bees men proper being 'men' in any legitimate
collegiate sense.\(^68\)

Such snobbishness could be acquired later too; Charles John Armistead,
first son of a Bradford merchant and a man who left over £40,000 at
his own death, was at St Bees from Easter 1849: but before he was
ordained - by the Archbishop of Canterbury - he sojourned briefly at
Magdalen Hall, Oxford, in 1854, and in his Crockford entries referred
only to this, not to St Bees; the address that he gave, during his 34
years of doubtless comfortable retirement, was the United Universities
Club.

These men were clearly only a small proportion of the whole;
for the bulk of students, St Bees was an economic necessity. A
university course, without the scholarships that interest, or,
increasingly, merit could bring, would cost at least £300, and most
estimates were £450 and upwards.\(^69\) St Bees might cost, in theory, as
little as £100, for two years; the fees of £20 per year were all,
except from a 3 guinea library fund charge on entry, that had to be
paid to the College as such, for the students lived in approved
lodging-houses, and the College Calendars always said that 18/- to
24/- a week was a reasonable expectation of cost. Thus a year's
statutory residence - i.e. about seven months - would cost £20 plus
£30 to £40 for living expenses; travelling, and living expenses for the
other 5 months, would be unlikely - given the 'moderate economy'
postulated by the Calendar - to bring the total cost to much more
than £150 for the two years.\(^70\)

\(^{68}\) Author Charles Camden - an unidentified cutting in the
possession of the Rev. T. Park.
\(^{69}\) See Chapter two, section 4.
\(^{70}\) Roberts paid 9/- a week for two 'small rooms, not very well
There seem to have been very roughly, two classes of men for whom such a cost was an acceptable burden: the first consisted of men with respectable but not wealthy homes, for whom St Bees was the end of their education. Perhaps the best indication of the type is given by looking at the 8 men who, in Easter 1849, came up to St Bees educated to 17 years and over: one was 20, the rest between 23 and 25: their fathers were respectively, three of the sample's four clergymen, an Irish 'gentleman', a Major, a schoolmaster, a druggist, and a farmer. Four of them had been taught at home by their fathers, one by a private tutor, one by a neighbouring clergyman and only two at Grammar schools. Five of them had apparently not worked previously, and the three who had had all been teachers or tutors. They were, then, men of reasonable (though usually cheap) education, for whom the universities were presumably out of the question financially. In the 1859 and 1869 samples, the size of this group varies in clear relationship to variations in the fathers' occupations; in 1859, there were seven (of 17) with no previous work experience, the fathers being four clergymen, a banker, one (probable) man of independent means and the one exception, a cabinet-maker: in 1869, when the sample (of 17) included only two clergy, but six farmers, all but three had previously worked, and the exceptions were, both the clergy sons, and the son of a surgeon.\footnote{Information for 1858 and 1869 is from the Register Dec. 3/3.}

The second class of students, who seem to have been self-supporting, were older men coming in after some years in some trade or profession. Most of these were sons of professionals or merchants;

\footnote{F.n. 70 continued. furnished, certainly, but conveniently situated, and there were no children' (op. cit., p.359). He only afforded the course, though, by taking pupils, some school-teaching, and by a few small loans. It is implied that he had about £80 to start with (p.352), and he admits he did not live as economically as some did, all of which roughly confirms these estimates (p.373).}
thus, in 1849, there were: the 35 year-old son of the retired Indian civilian, who had been a solicitor: a 25 year-old clergyman's son, who had been in a bank and on the Stock Exchange: a 24 year-old whose father was 'of the Stock Exchange', who had been in business in London: Armistead, the wealthy Bradford Merchant's son, who had been in business with his father: and a 22 year-old from Penrith, who had spent five years in a Liverpool office - his father's occupation is not shown, but he had a clergyman brother. As with the previously-noted group of young men finishing their education at St Bees, there was a notable drop in 1869, when only one man came in from a previous career in a profession, a Scotsman, son of a brewer, who had been an accountant in Edinburgh. The only man who seems to have been both son of an artisan and in business or a profession, was one Adam Wright, a 33 year-old son of a white-cooper, who had been in business since he was 16; for the last four years he was managing the Sydney business of 'Ede Bros. & Co.', a Manchester house, in which time he might well have saved sufficient to pass through the College course.\footnote{72}

Finally, there were all those for whom it is evident that even the cost of St Bees was a struggle. Probably many of the farmers' sons were in this group, but two sorts of men stand out, both in descriptions and in the letters among the records: Welshmen - often sons of farmers, but if not, usually sons of artisans - and ex-Scripture Readers, or lay helpers with the Church of England. The Welsh came, as Conybeare said, because their own Church needed men and had to forego the luxury of restricting ordination to graduates. Thus, the brother-in-law of one William Lloyd (a case of particular pathos, documented in letters through the middle 1860s), wrote to

\footnote{72. Ashley (see note 55) had been for 10 years in the army; his father was a once-wealthy W. Indian plantation owner, fallen on harder times in the 1830s (op. cit., pp.8, 126-9).}
Ainger, the Principal:

I will assure you that he wont [sic] disgrace your College by going to an English Bishop, his place is ready in Wales as soon as he will have your certificate. 73

A disproportionate number of letters revealing poverty are from Welshmen; Lloyd it emerged, had 'impoverished' his family in unsuccessful efforts to pass; John Hughes, son of a master mason of Bangor, had to drop out after one term, when an aunt, on whom he was relying for £100, unexpectedly refused him her aid: he wrote to Ainger,

To you I feel I can express my real reason for my absence: to others I might possibly assign other reasons less humiliating to my pride, perhaps in their estimation [sic].

It appears though, that, helped by £5 from the Bishop of Bangor, he was able to take a curacy

the duties of which are almost exclusively comprised [sic] in the Welsh language.74

Roberts records that the Welshmen 'are mostly kept back by want of English ...', an observation given backing by the poor syntax and vocabulary of some of the Welsh letters in the records.75 The Welsh element appears to have risen, after the 1840s: in the 1860s, the proportion of Welshmen was well over 20%, and the combined Welsh,

73. In the bundle of letters, Dec. 3/5, to Ainger. On 19 Dec. 1867 the Bishop of Llandaff wrote to Ainger proclaiming that his diocese was not to be a dumping-ground for stupid men - but he was only drawing the line at St Bees' failures, a line most or all English bishops would hardly feel it necessary to make explicit. And Roberts had been persuaded to go to St Bees by a conversation in which he asked, if a degree was not worth something? Not very much for a Welsh parson. Our bishop is quite partial to St Bees men, and you will get on just as well without the little letters. op. cit., p.353.

74. Dec. 3/5; letters of 28 Jan. and 5 Feb., 1867.

75. Roberts, op. cit., p.355: and see i.e., a letter of the unfortunate Lloyd's, of 23 Jan. 1968. I am only a poor Welsh man to be treated any how. I fully convince [sic] that one of you must have a spite against me ...
Irish and Scots intake was about one third, occasionally even higher. Judging from one later sample, in Easter 1879, when only eight out of 20 students admitted were English, there seem grounds for believing that the apparent decline in St Bees' standing may be related to its becoming (probably under pressure from the new English colleges) increasingly used as a means of entry to the English Church for Irishmen and Welshmen.76

The second prominent class of evidently poor men, the ex-lay helpers, are distinguished by the bad press they received. Roberts and Huntington both commented on them as notably ignorant and as 'bitter' or 'ultra' Calvinists; they, together with ex-Dissenting ministers, seem to have kept a life rather apart, cut off by age, theology, and the fact that many were, it seems, married men with families.77 Looking at the samples, it becomes apparent that teaching or working as a lay assistant were the two most common preludes to St Bees for men of farming, artisan or lower commercial backgrounds: of 19 farmers' sons in all 4 samples, 6 had taught, 5 had been lay-assistants, Town Missionaries or Scripture Readers, and one was an ex-Presbyterian minister. Four of these twelve had previously farmed; five of the remaining seven had also farmed, without additional experience, prior to their entering at St Bees; the remaining two had been, a chemist's assistant, and a butcher. Of 8 sons of artisans and small tradesmen, 3 had taught, and 2 had been lay-workers: of the others, two had worked with their fathers (a carpenter and a harness-maker) and one, son of a Welsh shoe-maker, had been a clerk at various

76. The last sample is from the Register held by the Rev. T. Park. Further, of the 11 Welsh and Irish, apart from one son of an Irish M.D., all the rest were sons of farmers or artisans.
quarries, and 'Station-master at Nantlle (L. & NW Railway) for 7 years.'

For other colleges, there is virtually no hard evidence before 1870, and not much more thereafter. At St Aidan's, the most interesting non-graduate college in many ways, no record of students survives before the College's virtual re-founding in 1869, and it is far less full or useful than the St Bees Registers. Prior to that, there are only the defensive and rather implausible declarations by the combative founder-Principal, Joseph T. Baylee, that 84% of his students were sons of clergymen, dissenting ministers, or 'Gentlemen of private fortunes' - the latter supposedly 51½%. Taking the first 60 students of the new dispensation (October 1869 to January 1873), their fathers appear quite otherwise: 6 claim 'gentleman' fathers: 16 were professional men - of whom there were 11 Anglican clergy, one dissenting minister, a doctor, 2 soldiers, and an Indian civil servant. There were only 5 farmers: 8 in various forms of commerce: 13 in artisans trades, or manual workers: and 9 clerical or 'white-collar' salaried posts: (in three cases the fathers' occupations are not shown). The impression is of a group more solidly urban than at St Bees, and generally with more men of modest parentage, certainly more than St Bees had had in its best days of the 1840s and 1850s. A solid majority were 24 or over, including 11 of over 30.79

Chichester, a college interesting for having started as a graduate college and developed into one mainly for non-graduates, has a Register covering the late 1870s, which though scanty on the

78. From a pamphlet of his, St. Aidan's Theological College, Birkenhead. Archdeacon Allen's Strictures on Theological Colleges, summarising an epistolary contest in the Guardian of 1863: see pp.1 and 8. Also, Heeney, op. cit., p.106, who also mentions the later list of students' backgrounds.

79. Register, catalogued D.44/31/1, at Liverpool University Archives. A later sample, for 1880-2, has 24, of the 61 identified, from
fathers' occupations, has much else of interest; and though 67 of the 110 have no entry for the father's occupation, it is clear from their education and ages that they were of a distinctly higher social rank than the students at St Bees and St Aidan's: Chichester's two-year course was somewhat more expensive (£31 p.a. and living expenses which 'can be kept within £50', for the 7 months' residence), but probably it was more a matter of its prestige and position. Thus, if one isolates, from the 67 who have no father's occupation shown, 15 men who stand out as having had notably modest and short educations, the other 52 are, in education, age, and proportion ordained, very similar to the 33 whose fathers are identified as gentry, clergy or professional, and it is reasonable to assume that most of these 52 were of similar backgrounds. Many of these men came to the College without having worked for a living previously (53 out of this 85), while all of the other 15 had worked (8 of them in business or trade of some sort, compared to only 10 of the 43 others with work experience). Seven of the 15 were over 30, compared to only 12 of the 85; as at St Bees, where teaching or lay work were the most common preliminaries to college for the men of most modest backgrounds, of this 15, five had been full-time lay workers, two others had done substantial part-time work - and two had been Dissenting ministers. In short, these men resembled the intake of the northern colleges; but here, they were a small and probably carefully-selected minority.

F.n. 79 continued.
artisan or manual backgrounds, but as a further 20 are not shown, it is impossible to be precise using this sample.

80. See above, Chapter two, section 5.

81. Titled 'Chichester Theological College Register 1876': with the other papers, at the College.

82. From the entry in the Handbook of the Theological Colleges of the Church of England and the Episcopal Church in Scotland, in 1884, the first year of publication.
The proportion of the students who were ordained has been mentioned; this is interesting, for the facts are that at Chichester and at St Bees, the better-educated and 'better-bred' were the least likely to be ordained, or if ordained, were the most likely to lead the careers least useful to the Church. The reason for this, one imagines, is that such men had money sufficient to allow inactivity: it was the poor men who plodded on to ordination and a lifetime of pastoral work. At Chichester, where we can postulate a certain social attraction missing from the other colleges, the difference is quite startling: of the 85 apparently relatively well-off students, 43 appear not to have been ordained from the College (8 of them were later ordained, but not directly from the College, which they had left for various reasons, including dismissal). Of the 15 more modestly circumstanced men, however, 12 were certainly ordained, and two more probably were - and the last, a notable exception, was dismissed, but managed to be ordained too, in the end - at Nassau, in the Bahamas.
In turning to the reactions of contemporary churchmen, the first point to emphasise is the depth of feeling in favour of a university education for the clergy. It was this feeling, buttressed not only by habit but also by the extraordinary significance which Victorians attached to Oxford and Cambridge, which coloured most thought and opinion in regard to the theological colleges. On top of this, there was—largely through the differences in geographical distribution of graduates and non-graduates—simply a lack of normal contact between the theological college men and the traditionally-trained clergy; many of the latter, resident in the rural parishes of the South, perforce relied on report rather than personal experience for their knowledge of non-graduates. Not surprisingly, in 1854 it was noted that

> Probably few persons are aware of the very rapid increase of the non-academic clergy during the last few years.  

There was, certainly, nothing to prevent a theological college student, once ordained (usually in the North), from moving southwards, or to rural areas; a speaker at the 1869 Church Congress put it well: he admitted that the Church had of necessity to ordain men of inferior quality, to send

> into portions of her vineyard which must otherwise run wild: [but they might] vanish, and reappear in the educated quarter of a wealthy town ... Men may ask to be sent to a village in Pisidia or Galatia, hoping to make it a stepping-stone to Athens or Corinth.

But on the whole they seem to have stayed rather outside the traditional haunts of the university clergy; the men from the sample terms at St Bees tended to find uncumbencies in urban areas or in the North, and this applies particularly to men from the North

---

A table of the locations and status of 295 ordained alumni of St Aidans, as of February 1864, confirms this: for, while southern England contained as many of them as the North - though naturally constituting a smaller proportion of the southern Province's much larger clergy population - they were heavily concentrated in the industrial or urban dioceses. And while Chester contained 48 St Aidan's men in a total clergy strength of less than 600, only half that number were scattered over the dioceses of Bath and Wells, Chichester, Ely, Exeter, Gloucester and Bristol, Hereford, and Salisbury, whose total clergy strength was over 4,700: ratios in the order of one in 12 compared to one in 200. As late as 1882, the conscientious Tractarian Vicar of East Dereham in Norfolk, B.J. Armstrong, noted with interest the non-Oxbridge hoods worn by 'some curates unknown to me', at the re-opening of a neighbouring church.

The geographical differences were maintained in part by the quite conscious policy of many bishops; in 1872 the Bishop of Ely stated categorically that he accepted for ordination none but graduates of Oxford, Cambridge or Durham; the only non-graduates accepted by the Bishop of Bath and Wells were the few who passed through the College at Wells, and the influence of Tait as Archbishop was conservative. Elsewhere, inclinations might conflict with

85. Thus, in keeping with all other tests, the distinctly 'higher-class' 1859 sample had several men going South - but the 6 who did were the sons of 4 clergymen, a merchant and a banker.

86. St Aidan's Prospectus for the year 1865, in the records of the College: figures for clergy in the diocese from Rivington's Church Year Book of 1865.


88. Ch.C. 1872: Upper House, 12 Feb., p.196. Even as Bishop of London, Tait had been very reluctant to accept non-graduates; see the debate, 10 years before to the day, Ch.C. 1862, p.894. Also, Chadwick, V.C., Pt.2, p.246. At Ely the prohibition on non-graduates extended at least to 1888: at which date Canterbury
necessities: Robert Bickersteth, sturdily evangelical bishop of Ripon from 1857 to 1884, could not escape the fact that, as his son and biographer put it,

it was not possible to maintain so high a standard ... [of ordination examinations as in dioceses] ... nearer the Metropolis, which naturally attract the abler University men. 89

But the fact 'was to him a matter of great regret', and he tried to attract as many graduates as he could, and 'to make the admission of men from Theological Colleges who are non-graduates, the exception.' In his Charge of 1876 he expressed his preference for graduates clearly, and was not a little critical of the colleges, but his remarks were prefaced by the admission that the ordination of non-graduates was 'simply a necessity', in light of the lack of graduates. 90 It was the massive prejudice in favour of university education that lay behind much distrust of the colleges, and provided the impetus for the consistent efforts to make universities more accessible. 91

In the face of all this, it was not possible to pitch claims for the colleges very high. Defenders, as a matter of course, proclaimed their allegiance to the ideal of an Oxbridge-trained clergy. 92 Two sentences spoken by a hard-headed and respected defender of the colleges, T.E. Espin, suitably enough in a sermon

F.n. 88 continued.

and Bath and Wells also confined their candidates to graduates or A.K.C.s (or Durham L.Th.s, at Canterbury). Church of England Year-Book (1888), pp.634, 638, 640.

89. M.C. Bickersteth, A Sketch of the Life & Episcopate of ... Robert Bickersteth ... (1887), p.163.

90. Ibid., pp.164, 165 and 168-70.

91. See Chapter two above, and p.235 below.

92. See, i.e., J.T. Baylee, Theological Colleges: their true use and bearing upon the Theological education of the clergy ... (Birkenhead, 1855), p.4: or, at the Congress of 1862, CCR, p.19: or T.E. Espin, who always makes such qualifications (despite his
preached before the University of Oxford in 1865, probably best sum up the most that Church opinion would grant of the colleges, and the conventional opinion of their relationship to the universities: he refers to them as 'other and inferior clerical seminaries', but says that they ought to be improved and extended, and they would then supply, as it were, the rank and file for a vastly increased clerical host, for which the one thing wanted is the men. It is to this place, and to the sister University, that we chiefly look for those that should be qualified to bear rule and occupy the leading areas of our Church.93

The colleges were thus faced with dislike based on a deep reluctance to abandon a fading but treasured tradition. They faced more specific criticisms as well, however; criticisms of their academic and scholastic standards and of their recruitment from lower social strata than was normal, and criticisms based on scandals in which the colleges could be seen as implicated, if only as the educators of the scandals' subjects: in every instance, the colleges felt themselves to be on the defensive, and were unable to convince their detractors that a little help from the rest of the Church would improve matters, and that destructive criticism itself compounded the problems.

I will take the lines of criticism in the order given above: the first being, criticism of the colleges' academic standards, for objections to the colleges were often rationalised in terms of distrust on this point, which appealed to a criterion (i.e. of scholarship) very generally accepted by churchmen, even though it

F.n. 92 continued. Low opinion of the universities' treatment of the colleges, for which see below, p.243), i.e. Supply & Training ... (1863), pp.6 and 8: Our Want (1863), p.5.

93. Espin, The Claims of the Church upon the University ... (1866), p.16.
can now be seen to have begged some important questions. The arguments of Baylee, writing in 1855, were never fairly faced in the 19th century: he wrote to justify the colleges (and St Aidan's particularly), as forming a system supplementary to the universities, and as serving a quite distinct educational function, for a distinctly defined student body - essentially older men, with experience of lay life:

To such a man a judicious course of theological training, including a fair knowledge of the Hebrew Bible and the Greek Testament, is far more congenial than a course of heathen classics and natural science.

And he went on to persuasively describe the futility of forcing such a man to cram up his rusty classics, and plod to a degree, at the end of which he is not in the true sense educated. In the meantime he has acquired little or none of the knowledge needed for his profession, and he feels that his studies might have been better directed.94

The problem, however, was that the prejudices of most churchmen were constantly reinforced by the examples of some of the colleges' students; in this, as in every other respect, and in a way common to all struggling and marginal bodies, the colleges were exceedingly vulnerable to criticisms based, however unfairly, on a few individual students. Baylee was involved, in 1863, in a controversial correspondence with Archdeacon Allen of Salop, who, on the basis of experience examining candidates for the Bishop of Lichfield, trumpeted the ignorance of St Aidan's men, making much of one particular case. As Baylee said, even allowing this man's ignorance,

does it follow that a Public Institution should be judged by one student? Would Oxford or Cambridge come creditably out of such an ordeal?  

The latter was a shrewd but vain hit: clearly, the same standards simply did not apply. Soon afterwards, the Archdeacon similarly attacked St Bees, and an unsympathetic commentator wrote, in justification of his aspersions on the standards at both Colleges, that

the replies sent to the public prints by some 'St Bees men' were such as schoolboys might be ashamed of with good reason.

An important point, however, was made by Ainger in a spirited reply to Allen, in a letter to the Times of 18 October 1865. He took the attack directly to Allen, saying bluntly that he 'himself is the main cause of the lowness of the standard which we can practically insist upon.' The reason, as he explained in one effective sentence, was that 'Practically the examining chaplains' minimum standard is forced upon the Theological Colleges, and Archdeacon Allen's is notoriously the lowest.' This was vital: realistically the colleges could not attempt to enforce standards higher than those known by their students to be necessary: their standards were thus not in their own hands.

Much naturally came back to the entrance policy of the colleges, and this posed very basic questions: the bishops, however sympathetic, had some threshold standards in terms of education, and, as Thomson of York wrote to W. Saumarez Smith, then Principal of St Aidan's,

95. Baylee, op. cit. (note 78), p.3.
96. Rivington's Church Year Book, p.215.
97. A letter of Allen's had appeared on 13 Oct. 1865, followed by a very moderate reply from E.H. Plumptre of King's College on the 17th. A nice footnote comes in a letter from 'Nemo', who wrote on the 20th to point out that Chichester literates were also being failed regularly - three of the last four, in fact. 'It is only fair to add', he wrote, 'that one of the three has since passed at Lichfield.'
Bishops will scarcely consent to receive students from St Aidan's unless their being at that institution is a sufficient guarantee that they have received the rudiments of an ordinary education...  

The problem was particularly notable with Welshmen; I have referred above to William Lloyd, a sad case of a poor and not academically successful St Bees man; in relation to his case, an old St Bees student, the Rev. Richard Roberts, wrote to Ainger, the Principal, in March 1868:

I think it is a mistake on the part of St Bees College authorities to admit young men so insufficient as Mr Lloyd - they ought to be rejected when presenting themselves for examination at entering; such is the feeling of all the clergy in this Country [Salop - Allen's archdeaconry]...

and in Convocation, in 1872, the Bishop of Llandaff opined that the colleges 'are doing the greatest possible evil to the Church in Wales'. His reason was interesting; in England, he thought, such colleges could be very useful, for there existed a substantial class of men educated reasonably, to at least 15 or 16 years of age. In Wales, such was not the case and the basic groundwork had not been laid; but the demand for Welsh-speaking candidates is so great that the Bishops are compelled to accept them.

T.P. Boulbee, a well-known evangelical, and articulate first Principal of the London College of Divinity at Highbury, referred to St Bees thus, in 1865:

the fatal idea ran through the whole transaction that men (if not immoral) were to be pressed through the Bishop's Examination, if the intellectual seive would in any way permit the passage.

100. Ch.C., 1872: Upper House, 12 Feb., p.197.
The problem was reasonably straightforward: at what point did lack of scholarship or attainments disqualify an earnest man? To the sort of extreme classicists so prominent in the period, the question had but one answer; they were, however, somewhat losing ground, and in 1884 Archbishop Thomson candidly admitted, in Convocation at York, that

The knowledge of the learned languages that is exacted from some candidates for Holy Orders is very slender indeed, and necessarily slender, and he went on to make it clear that he referred to men from the colleges. Inevitably, some fell below even relatively tolerant standards. Failure moved at least one man to a significant complaint: he was the son of a Clitheroe grocer, an ex-shoemaker himself, and had been a Methodist Local Preacher for 10 years before entering St Bees when 35 years old, in 1863. In 1865 he failed at Lichfield, and wrote to Ainger,

it is of no use for me to continue spending my time on subjects which I do not think are looked upon by other communities has been [sic] of much importance in fitting a man for preaching the Gospel, such as Greek, and a knowledge of the historical part of the Bible.103

Perhaps the best illustration of the dilemma, though, is the case of a Mr Collins, who was admitted to St Bees at 28, after a life spent, since leaving school at 12, in the potteries at Burslem, apparently as a small master. After one term he was advised to withdraw for 'incapacity', but he then went to St Aidan's, and managed to pass the course there. Having difficulty in obtaining a curacy, and convinced

102. J.C., 1884, pp.45 and 46. See also, the Dean of Durham, in 1869, at the Church Congress. 'We hear a vast deal too much about Latin and Greek being really the essence of the human mind. I believe some people deem it as necessary that the mind should be dressed up on Latin and Greek, to turn out anything, as that the body should be dressed in clothes.' CCR, 1869, p.77.

that St Bees had a better reputation than St Aidan's, he then tried to re-enter there. Baylee's comments, in a letter to Ainger on his case, end with these words;

The poor fellow's perseverance deserves a better reward. He is one of that class of cases who neither you nor I would wish to have, for they only bring our teaching into question.

And whereas the old universities could live with alumni who might equally 'bring [their] teaching into question', the colleges, whose regular successes at bishops' examinations were rarely mentioned, could scarcely afford to. And as one more discouragement, even if they did consistently well in their specific training, this was not accepted as a worthwhile achievement. W. Hayward Cox had remarked to the Oxford Commissioners that, in terms of technical theological preparation, men from Oxford and Cambridge compared badly with those from King's College or London University. A leader in the Times of 2 January 1864, provided a discouraging commentary: of course, it admitted, in examinations literates may often do better than graduates; indeed, 'taking the mere theological qualifications of the mass of literates and the mass of University men, we have little doubt that on the whole the literates are superior.' But this was only a test of knowledge at one moment, not of potential - and if the latter was considered, the leader argued, graduates must be accepted to have the overwhelming advantage. Further, an education only in theology was dangerously narrow, and risked the loss of that balance fostered by the traditional university education.


105. At St Bees the students received a day's full-holiday whenever one of them 'read the Gospel' - i.e. topped the exam - at an ordination. Letters make it clear that this cannot have been rare. (Ashley was an example, op. cit., p.136).

106. O.U.C., Evidence, p.95.
The colleges could not win.

Brian Heeney has pointed out that the pastoral relationship of the clergy with the 'intellectual élite' was a particular concern of liberal churchmen. Clearly, this was based as much on social as on academic grounds: T.T. Carter, the prominent Tractarian, wrote in 1877, that disestablishment means the lowering of the social standard of the clergy, and so the diminishing of their influence with the higher classes and the leaders of thought.

The fear of a social degradation of the clergy did not need such supports, however, and constituted a strong, independent source of dislike of the colleges. The 'gentlemen heresy', as Hurrell Froude had dubbed it, is a well-known element of 19th century Anglicanism; it was not possible to ignore it in discussing the colleges, whose students were so clearly precisely those 'sons of farmers or young men from towns' whom Froude's father, the Archdeacon of Totnes, found so unsatisfactory as clergy. Trollope was quite explicit, and in the course of his essays, Clergymen of the Church of England, several times referred gloomily to the probable effects of theological colleges, and the consequent arrival of

the man who won't drink his glass of wine, and talk of his college, and put off for a few happy hours the sacred stiffness of the profession and become simply an English gentleman ...

The result of such an influx will be a change in the character of the parson: he will be

107. Heeney, op. cit., p.31: his section in the social standing of the clergy, pp.22-32, is most useful on the subject.
- in one significant word, less of a gentleman,
- that such will be the result of theological
  colleges and the institution of 'literates',
  no one who has thought of the subject will
  have any doubt.111

The colleges might seek to instil doubts on the subject;
Baylee - himself, as son of an Irish Quaker schoolmaster in Limerick,
perhaps sensitive on the issue112 - consistently took a defensive,
reassuring line. He was at pains to point out that one reached the
stratum of society providing students for the colleges 'Without
descending [...] to the uneducated classes'; they were ex-military
men, professionals, or merchants.

It is a great mistake to suppose [he said, at the
1862 Church Congress] that Theological Colleges
are intended merely for a lower class of students,
or for persons seeking a cheaper education. If I
may judge by the College over which I preside, we
have the same rank of life as the men who come to
the Universities.113

There is little doubt that Baylee 'protested too much'; equally, he
was probably bound to fail; many of his students doubtless were, as
Boultbee later claimed for his at Highbury

often the brothers, the cousins, the kinsmen of
your old University friends, whom you accept so
unhesitatingly.114

But there is much to suggest that the simple fact of not having gone

111. A. Trollope, Clergymen of the Church of England (1866: facsimile
    ed. 1974), pp.48 and 60 (see also pp.52 and 58-60, especially).
112. See notes in the St Aidan's papers, D44/23/1 and D44/43/23;
    and E.H. Bennis, Reminiscences of Old Limerick (Limerick 1940),
    pp.27-8.
113. Baylee, op. cit. (1855), p.5: CCR 1862, p.20. As previously
    noted, he asserted, implausibly, that 84% of his students were
    the sons of 'gentlemen', in his conflict with Allen. It is
    worth noting his qualification, barely noticeable, that this
    referred to the 'ordinary' students, thus, for a start,
    excluding the controversial and numerous 'missionary students',
    who had advantageous terms.
114. CCR, 1873, p.149.
to the university was a major social crime; a fact which qualifies the simple picture of merely snobbish objections to the student. Thus the Rev. W. Pollock at the 1863 Church Congress spoke, to considerable applause, of the taking of men from a stratum of society, both as regarded social position and education, which they had not called upon in former days at all to the same extent. He was persuaded that this was at any rate a great misfortune, if it was not also a great mistake.

Yet his proposal was for cheaper university courses, or even external students as at T.C.D.; either he quite illogically thought that this would attract a body of men too sensitive to attend theological colleges; or more likely, he hoped to attract men now going to the colleges, and, by giving them the 'education of a gentleman', assure their acceptance as gentlemen.

In less guarded moments, however, Baylee himself could be more aggressive: at an Interdenominational Missionary Conference at Liverpool in 1860, he had repudiated his 'prudent friends' who had remonstrated with him 'for taking men of low social station in society.' After pointing out that such friends would have rejected St Peter, he ended, When they said that gentlemen would not like to associate with St. Aidan's students, he replied, 'Then let the gentlemen stay away!'

The argument that clergy of good rank would not associate with clergy of humble backgrounds was indeed put, and thus reveals in the clearest possible way the assumption that the clergy shared not only the rank but the prejudices of their upper-class laity; E.H. Browne, a

115. CCR, 1863, p.82.
117. The account is quoted, unidentified, in a letter sent to Heiser when he was preparing his history, from E.[?]C. Dewick. It also reveals that Baylee had been rejected by the C.M.S. in his youth, a fact which still rankled with him (D44/23/1).
consistent arguer for lower-class sub-deacons, but in defence of a high-rank priesthood, said in 1862:

it is certain that, just in proportion as you fill the ranks of the clergy with men of less refinement and lower education, you repel those of higher position and higher cultivation; and, what is almost worse, you tempt those of higher birth to keep aloof from their brethren ...

The aggressive line of attack on such opinions and fears is best illustrated by the experience of Lichfield College, founded in 1857 amid controversy about its feared High Church influences, to educate both graduates and non-graduates for the curacies of this difficult diocese. The first Principal was G.H. Curteis, who ran the College for 23 years, and was well known outside for his writings. Under the vigorous if tactless direction of the great former Bishop of New Zealand, G.A. Selwyn, who was Bishop of Lichfield from 1867 to 1878, he introduced the 'Probationer scheme', to allow men to be supervised as external students for 2 years, then to have one year's residence. This was the earliest conscious and self-conscious effort to train the increasing number of young men who were anxious to take Holy Orders, but who had not the means of supporting themselves during two years at the Theological College.

And in 1879 Curteis vigorously and inhesitatingly affirmed that at Lichfield the gentleman heresy had no place, ending powerfully,
surely it were cruelty, irony, folly, to turn round and tell these people [i.e. lower rank candidates] that the Church of England has no room in her ministry for other than graduate and gentlemen clergy, - in other words, that she is dying (or is dead) of dignity ...

The probationer scheme appears to have survived the century, but without much support. Revealingly, Curteis himself later had his doubts; his Bishop Selwyn expresses the opinion that Selwyn probably underestimated the aristocratic feeling which seems to be ingrained [sic] in the English people, and which makes them always prefer a 'gentleman' to lead them, whether in spiritual or in temporal matters .... And perhaps the experience of more than fifteen years has led a good many Churchmen to modify their first ardour for a presbyterate drawn from all orders of society indiscriminately ...

and to prefer 'lay-agency' as a channel for lower class energy.

The fear, always, was that entry to the clergy would become a social temptation to men of humble birth. E.H. Browne, by now respected elder statesman and Bishop of Winchester, again provided a succinct description, in 1887; he noted that the clergy of the Church of England were unique in being 'drawn solely from the upper classes of society', but then qualified his statement thus:

when we enlist into the ministry any person who has been drawn from the humbler classes of society we immediately think it necessary to let him pass into what are called, in common parlance, the upper classes of society. The moment such a one is ordained clergyman it is necessary to call him 'gentleman' ...

121. CCR 1879, p.551: it is probable that Curteis was under some pressure from his new Bishop, W.D. Maclagan, and he left the College next year: see R. Bickersteth's letter to his brother, the Dean of Lichfield, in M.C. Bickersteth, op. cit., p.165.


123. Curteis, op. cit., p.271.

124. Ch.C. 1887, p.120: also, CCR 1862, p.53 and see Kitson Clark, op. cit., pp.258-60. S.C. Scott (whose history has been referred
A friend of Roberts, who was like him an ex-National School-teacher (from Manchester), referred to this criticism of social climbing, when he said that

they are constantly throwing it in the teeth of us churchfolk especially men like me who get a rise in the world by becoming a parson. 125

And, rather confirming the criticism, Thomas Hardy in his story 'A Tragedy of Two Ambitions', portrays a man, son of a millwright, who 'entered the Church' through a theological college, aware that this made it unlikely that he could ever go far, but fortified by the feeling

That, in old-fashioned country places, the Church conferred social prestige up to a certain point at a cheaper price than any other profession or pursuit ... 126

Espin had vigorously pointed out, in 1863 - somewhat to qualify the officers and men analogy, perhaps - that the poor prospects of men from the colleges were putting off many desirable potential students, particularly the sons of the poorer clergy. 127 The poorness of these prospects, however, seems mainly to have activated the constant fear of traditionalists, succinctly expressed by Conybeare thus:

Secular motives are not excluded by small emoluments, but only brought to bear upon a lower class. 128

F.n. 124 continued.
to above, Chapter two, section 4) was evidently suspected somewhat, by his employer at the bank, of seeking social advantage, when he told him of his plans for ordination; Things that were (1923), p.168.

125. Roberts, op. cit., p.370 (see also pp.365-6).
To whom, in the words of J.B. Mozley,

The simple ministry of the Church is ... what to others it is not, a great addition of worldly rank. 29

To a large extent the conservation of many clergy was clearly a simple dislike of change, and an expression of widely-held social prejudices. But their fear was a little more specific: a non-graduate clergy was a gamble, and they had quite clear ideas about what the Church stood to lose. The argument can be seen quite clearly in the statements of two moderate High Churchmen. The first is J.H. Blunt, author of, among many other works, a successful manual of pastoral theology, the Directorium Pastorale, which first appeared in 1864. 130 At the start of this work 131 he firmly defends and justifies the 'gentleman heresy', arguing that high social status is essential to the clergy's influence among both rich and poor. Among the latter their influence for good is often unique, and must be maintained; but it is

also necessary that they should be capable, from education and social training ... of taking their place without embarrassment to themselves or offence to others on those higher levels of society which are occupied by their rich parishioners, that their office may be respected through the respect won also by their persons. 132


130. Blunt's own background was not traditional; a Londoner, he was, after leaving his private school, 'For some years ... engaged in the business of a manufacturing chemist'; but at 26 or 27 he gave this up to attend Durham, where he obtained a L.Th. in 1852, and was ordained that year. He was a voluminous High Church author; he died in 1882 as Rector of a crown living given him by Gladstone in 1873. (The edition here cited of Directorium Pastorale: the principles and practice of pastoral work in the Church of England is that of 1880, though its contents seem not to have substantially changed). In D.N.B.

131. 'Preface' to 1864 ed., pp.III-VII. (For others on the question of 'gentlemen' and the poor, see note 199).

132. Ibid., p.6. A contemporary leader in the Times opined that 'The
He does not advocate worldly sentiments, but argues simply that the 'social and educational position of the pastor is, in fact, a most important element in the pursuit and development of his proper work.'\textsuperscript{133} This point is taken up by William Stubbs in 1872; if, he says, the clergy are to be sought in a lower grade . . . that very large sphere and those many ways of usefulness which are now utilised by the clergy, as leaders of country society, and prominently interested in all social movements must be given up; their sole means of influence being the sacerdotal, their spiritual or ministerial influence. This is not desirable at all.\textsuperscript{134} He goes on to argue that the maintenance of the requisite social standards is to a large extent a function of the universities, and states quite plainly that 'the social position of the clergy and their university education must vary directly together, must stand and fall together.'\textsuperscript{135} Thus the argument is complete. What emerges most clearly is that the rise of the non-graduate clergy posed a central question to churchmen: what was it that made the English clergy effective? As with the issue of post-graduate training, a collective answer was extremely slow to emerge; in the meantime social observation seemed to confirm many churchmen in the belief that, whatever might be theoretically desirable, the clergy's social influence was a known fact, to be risked at their peril.

F.n. 132 continued.

Established Church depends, perhaps more than any other religious body in the world, upon the social position of its clergy for its influence' (7 Jan. 1864).

133. Ibid., p.7. (Just before, while disclaiming worldly ambitions, he had however noted that it 'is certainly no part of the Church's intention that her clergy as men of the world should be below men of other professions in their acquirements of social status ...').

134. C.C.R., 1872, p.308: ('We do not want men who will altogether sink the citizen in the minister').

135. Ibid., pp.308-9.
4. INTERNAL PROBLEMS AND SCANDALS

The colleges and their students were thus subject to a great deal of by no means wholly consistent distrust; with most thoughtful men, however, accepting their necessity (at least for the North and the great towns) it is probably fair to say that most Church opinion would have been happy enough had the colleges remained in decent obscurity. The problem was that attention tended to be of precisely the wrong sort: on the one hand, when the colleges insistently pleaded for recognition, help and authorisation, from the bishops and the universities, they met, till the 1880s, with a minimal and grudging response: on the other hand, scandal of any sort brought them, unprotected, before the public eye. The great feature at the graduate colleges, of controversy along ideological lines, was largely absent, or certainly of secondary importance; partly, one imagines, because the colleges were not 'high', which was what raised popular wrath at the time. Admittedly, the High Church Church Times gloated when St Aidan's was closed in 1868, referring to its 'Puritan, partizan management.' But that was the least one could expect, given Baylee's extreme Protestant views, and such opposition seems to have done the College no harm. Boultbee was, 3 years later, sufficiently annoyed by the reputation of Highbury for 'narrowness', to attempt to refute the charge at some length, but there is little to suggest that its reputation in any way held back the College. St Bees was different, for though generally lumped with these other two as evangelical, it appears that, Buddicom aside, it was generally the home of a moderate and non-party churchmanship, though its links

136. Undated cutting, St Aidan's papers, D44/43/11-27 [1 envelope].
137. Davies, op. cit., p.29.
were certainly 'low' rather than 'high'. As noted, it was fear of 'high' proclivities that led to riots and the delay in the founding of Lichfield. Instead of a specifically party hostility, the colleges suffered more from a general suspicion that, small and autonomous as they were, their tone would inevitably be limited and overly swayed by the opinions of their principals.  

Belaboured constantly on academic and social grounds, if less so for party reasons, the colleges were intensely concerned at the lack of protection afforded to them by bishops or by the universities; their contribution, in simple quantitative terms, was considerable, but their degree of recognition still varied with individual bishops, many of whom, as previously noted, were extremely cool towards the colleges. The dependence upon individual bishops was largely a reflection of the lack of centralised policy in the Church and the level of autonomy enjoyed by bishops in all areas; and it could be very helpful. J.B. Sumner is reported to have ordained St Bees men with willing trust, and he was a supporter and patron of Baylee's; his brother C.R. Sumner had a significant number of St Aidan's men in his diocese, too. Still, however, in the 1870s, when they spoke with a greater confidence, the principals had to make basic points: in 1873, Boultbee called for

... RECOGNITION. Mere toleration, a grudging reception in some dioceses, and in a few cases (three dioceses, I think) an absolute exclusion, is working evil. It is a very serious and a very damaging thing that from one-fourth to one-third of the clergy now ordained should, rightly or wrongly, feel or fancy a kind of slur upon them ...

138. i.e. Espin, Our Want of Clergy ..., pp.9-10: Bickersteth, op. cit., pp.169-170: Ch.C. 1900, pp.215, 396: and - both these latter refer to both sorts of colleges, graduate and non-graduate - A.C. Headlam, Theological Education at the Universities (Oxford, 1921), pp.4-5: the arguments had not changed in 80 years, since Perry (see Chapter two, note 278) - and were inevitable, having prima facie force.

139. Huntington, op. cit., pp.266-7: St Aidan's Prospectus, 1865,
and in 1878 W. Saumarez Smith appealed again:

- treat us fairly - do not give us a bad name, yet expect us to turn out a very good article. We need support and encouragement, and, of course, with this, wholesome criticism. But why should some bishops, for instance, draw a hard and fast line of demarcation between theological college men and university men? 

To the bishops, the colleges appealed for a fair trial, understanding and recognition, and they did so in face of the normal prejudices already outlined. There were also appeals to the universities to allow their name and prestige to be used as guarantees for the colleges; Baylee and Espin both publicly requested such co-operation; Ainger of St Bees was at least privately involved, for it was to him that Espin wrote a letter that probably illustrates the general feeling of impotent frustration on the part of the colleges: dated 6 January, 1866, it began:

I quite agree with all you say about the behaviour of the Universities to the Theological Colleges. At bottom the motive is a sort of fear lest if the Colleges should be improved, and made thoroughly efficient, and provided with a University Testamur for their men, - men shd. go to them who would if the Colleges were little thought of prefer the Universities. The Universities, with more of nature than of grace, think of their own interests first; and think of them in a very narrow spirit. There is room enough and to spare for all the men that the Universities could possibly supply to the Church, and for all that the Theological Colleges if greatly enlarged could supply also.

F.n. 139 continued.

and Baylee's last Report, 1868, etc. The Prospectus showed 14 St Aidan's men in each of Canterbury and Winchester. At Highbury, the list of bishops willing to accept its students in 1866 was a reflection of its evangelical tone, and included C.R. Summer, Bickersteth, and Waldegrave of Carlisle (Davies, op. cit., pp.24-5).

140. CCR 1873, p.150: CCR 1878, p.531: (see also CCR 1879, when W.H. Barlow of C.M.C. Islington 'anxiously plead[ed] that some recognition may be granted from high quarters ...' to worthy alumni: p.548).


142. In Dec. 3/5. He specifically mentions, before moving to other
As will be seen later, however, when the universities and the bishops moved, the colleges had little cause to be grateful.

It is in terms of this lack of help and recognition, and of the prejudices which already coloured the opinions of many churchmen, that the scandals, and various individual instances which reflected badly on the colleges' discipline or on their students in general, must be weighed. One may note, too, that the double standard which largely immunised the universities from attacks based on individual students, applied at least as strongly in the sphere of morals as in that of scholastic standards; for the colleges it was different. The St Bees papers provide a unique picture of the struggle to defend a vulnerable reputation, while also throwing light on the less happy aspects of life at the College.

It is clear that discipline, unaided by collegiate residence, was a problem, and the more so as numbers increased; Table 3.3 shows that when numbers were high, so too was the proportion who never passed the final examinations, though that proportion was above 20% over the whole 50 years covered. The Registers show in brief comments the causes of failure; some died, or left for health reasons; others were caught at all the predictable offences of student life: 'Rebelled and was dismissed': 'Absconded after one term': 'Drunk': 'Withdrew, to avoid expulsion, April 1852, after a very unsatisfactory course': 'Expelled for general profligacy', these being some of the

---

F.n. 142 continued.

142. topics, the 'false position' in which he felt himself as examiner of his own students. He mentioned - and dismissed - the argument that reformed colleges would attract men away from the universities, in Supply and Training, p.9.

143. The figures assume that men took their final examinations in their fourth terms: the loss of terms, and the postponement of final examinations, are known to have occurred, and it is this that must account for the anomalous results in 1867-71.
cases among men coming up in Michaelmas 1849 and Easter 1850, and which are matched at all periods covered by the Registers. Simple ignorance, on the part of the staff, doubtless saw at least as many as were caught go undetected, which perhaps explains Ainger’s unbending attitude when wrong was discovered: a 49 year old ex-Independent minister was eventually refused his testimonials in 1869 (though not before very nearly getting ordained) when his habitual drunkenness emerged from outside sources; it was only then that his fellow-lodgers confirmed that he had been ‘frequently excited and occasionally intoxicated’; as one of them wrote, we felt it very hard to say anything against him on account of his family.  

Sometimes the information was about past misdeeds: Baylee informed Ainger of one man’s previous connection with a brothel, and Espin of another’s two illegitimate children; a third, whose conduct at St Bees had been ‘silly and frivolous if not worse’, was dismissed when it became known that he had been imprisoned in Cambridge for obtaining money by false pretences. His case interestingly revealed the character of his father, a clergyman, who wrote several angry letters to Ainger, accusing him - apparently counting on Ainger’s ignorance of his son’s offence - of unfairly blighting the boy’s career: Ainger, in the end threatened with press ‘exposure’, made his own enquiries, and a letter from a clergyman whose curate the father had been made it clear that the father was himself a ‘bad egg’, who had been dismissed from the curacy.  

---

144. Case of T.W.P. Taylder: information from Register (Dec. 3/3), two letters from Bishop Trower (25 Sept. and 2 Oct. 1868), and from the student, Spence (18 Feb. 1869); all in Dec. 3/5.  
146. Register, on J.F.E. Barnes (Michaelmas 1863): letters from Barnes senior, in Dec. 3/5, of 19 May and 14 Dec., 1864, and 2 Jan. 1867.
the occasional 'sneak letters', notes denouncing fellow-students; two anonymous ones relate the obviously bitterly resented behaviour of a student who cut his lectures to concentrate on private reading, with the aim of obtaining the Librarianship, a post of honour instituted by Parkinson which also carried exemption from half the fees: one is left hoping that their author never became a clergyman. 147

More serious problems were presented by students who had left the College; we have seen how the failure of students at episcopal examinations could damage the colleges' reputations, but the damage need not stop there. Charles Suttle, who had come up to St Bees in Michaelmas 1860 after being 'dismissed for irregularity' from Emmanuel College, Cambridge, was asked to withdraw after being warned 'that it would be useless for him to return unless he could do better papers esp. Bible.' However, evidently he persevered in trying to be ordained, attempting to get in as a literate - for Bishop Phillpotts had no high opinion of St Bees - at Exeter, after some coaching with a 'Holy Orders Tutor.' This Tutor wrote an amusing and increasingly indignant (and illegible) letter to Ainger later, describing his dealings with Suttle, who did no work and left with bills outstanding; while there he had spoken of St. Bees as a frightful place, and useless theologically ... [and said that] he should, as soon as in Orders, write to the Times about the College, and your supervision!!!

Suttle was clearly not bright, and was a boaster; two letters from an old St Bees man revealed that he had later been trying to take in pupils; at first he had not revealed his connection with the College:

147. i.e. Dec. 3/5, January 1862, from Michael Haslam, son of an Irish farmer, and previously a Scripture Reader in Liverpool for 5 years. The anonymous notes are loose in the Register Dec. 3/2, and are from April 1851.
He was evidently very 'hard up' in fact without a decent shoe or hat and although I know that some clever men are very negligent about their personal appearance, yet I did not feel flattered by walking down Oxford St. (for he would not let me go into his room) with such a decidedly shabby person.

His talk was, in compensation, ambitious and dogmatic. He had eventually admitted his having been at St Bees, which he again calumniated, as well as the Holy Orders Tutor, whom he called a 'rascal'. Extraordinarily, he was ordained later, in 1864 (at Lichfield), but after several curacies over a dozen years, he held no further charge, living the last 11 years of his life in Bayswater.148 Another case, this time of an ex-Wesleyan preacher, William Lane, with a weakness for drink, shows the same problem of defending the College's reputation from its distant obscurity, for Lane had been telling people in Bristol that the College was 'fearfully high church', and had come within an ace of dissuading a young man from going to the College;149 the letters in both cases show that Ainger was obliged to write busily to all who might have a connection with the men involved, giving warnings and soliciting further information; but he cannot possibly have prevented harm being done in these and other cases, by sheer malice on the part of men with grudges.

Other men were simply insufficient or worse as clergymen, and gave the College a bad name by association; two long letters, both from old St Bees men who had taken St Bees curates, reveal, apart from anything, a multitude of ways in which the careful work of


years could be endangered by the actions of a curate. One of them also shows the difficulties of matching curate with incumbent; in this case Ainger had recommended a man as a curate, in the process wildly underestimating the theological chasm that separated him from his incumbent; within months the curate was preaching violent anti-Roman sermons in an area of high (and tense) Irish settlement, and openly associating with Dissenters, while his Tractarian vicar sadly kept on his daily services. And there were the simple scandals: a St Bees man who had contracted a bigamous marriage with a woman who had £5,000, after his first wife had left him when his drunken mistreatment became intolerable: another, who had fathered an illegitimate child in Preston.

There is an interesting contrast between St Bees and St Aidan's. The former was always institutionally slight, and ran for all practical purposes as a private coaching establishment: the Principal was incumbent of the parish, the buildings were part of the old church, supplemented by the Principal's imposing house: there appear to have been 3 trustees of the College's small property, but in ordinary management it seems that the Principal had complete control. With
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scrawled note of 2 Feb. 1867, address and signature illegible, reading 'I am much obliged to your cautionary letter respecting Mr. W. Lane.' Rev. Mr. Downing, of Wells, Norfolk, 9 Jan. 1869 (the story of Lane's drunkenly making a fool of himself: a pitying, not an angry account): and from the Bishop of Ripon, 24 Feb. 1869.


151. Respectively, H.L. Bickerstaffe: unidentified cutting, originally from the Leeds Mercury, from c.1860: in Register Dec. 3/2, by his name (entered Michaelmas 1848): and unidentified cutting in Register Dec. 3/3, for C. Benzing (entered Michaelmas 1869), from c.1873: apparently the case 'created considerable excitement in the town'; Benzing had to pay costs plus 10/- for the advocate, and 5/- a week till the child was 16.
costs of about £500 p.a., for the Tutor and Lecturer, the rest was profit, and with about 100 students in residence at its best period, the profit must have been something like £1,500 p.a., while even with only 50 students, the gross of £1,000 p.a. would comfortably provide for all. Certainly after Parkinson's death, in 1858, the College kept a low profile; there never appeared any man from St Bees, to my knowledge, at the major debates in the Church Congresses, nor did St Bees later send representatives to the important 'Conferences Upon the Training of Candidates for Holy Orders'; its end was quiet. St Aidan's was very different: it was the creation of Baylee, and far more ambitious, both in its methods and in its character as a major institution, with a large block of Tudor Gothic buildings set in one of the fastest growing urban areas of England, Birkenhead; where St Bees gave a conventional course of theological instruction, St Aidan's used a unique integrated practical training, its students giving their time to the local incumbents as visitors and parish enumerators.

The closure of St Aidan's in 1868 showed that, despite Baylee's own ambitions to found a great public institution, complete with peer-packed Council and an income and expenses of over £3,000 p.a., his personal domination remained the weakness of the whole. The

152. St Bees Calendars (Dec. 3/7): trustees appear at the demise of the College, but nowhere else. (Fees were £20 p.a., so gross of c.£2,000 p.a. with 100 students). Even the one plan to give the College a larger institutional character, would have involved an outlay of only £5,000, when St Aidan's was costing £22,000 at the same period. F.R. Raines, op. cit., pp.368-9.

153. Heeney, op. cit., describes this training, pp.104-6.

154. It is not unreasonable to compare this with Sewell's Radley: W. Tuckwell, Reminiscences of Oxford (1900), pp.134-42: C. Kegan Paul, Memories (1899, 1971 reprint), pp.146-9. The College Council included, in 1860, the Duke of Marlborough, the Marquis of Westminster, the Earls of Shaftesbury, Harrowby and Denbigh and Earl Vane, Lord Robert Grosvenor (later better known as the Protestant Church reformer, Lord Ebury), as well as Shaw-Lefevre,
apparatus of the Council was set up when the buildings were opened in 1856, having cost some £22,500, of which £10,500 remained as a mortgage debt; if full, with 76 students paying £63 p.a., 155 the finances would have been secure; with about 50 students most of the time, finances were a continual worry. Heiser, the College's historian, avers that financial problems were the main cause of the College's collapse, but the reports and minutes of the Finance Committee show that, on the contrary, a major reform in 1862-3 had set the College on a course of stability, though the debt remained a potential problem. 156

When the crisis struck, Baylee was in complete control of the running of the College, all but financial oversight having been stripped, in 1859, from the 'Liverpool Committee', leaving Baylee answerable only to the Council, which met twice a year (once in London, once at Birkenhead). 157 The Council never queried Baylee, except when the Finance Committee 158 pointed out the dangers in Baylee's 'missionary student' scheme, by which favourable terms were offered to intending missionaries, most of whom, it transpired, did

F.n. 154 continued.
Sidney Herbert and 3 other MP's, and a clutch of Archdeacons and Canons and other prominent Evangelicals (list drawn up by Heiser, in College records).

155. Plus a 2 guinea entrance fee, and £21 caution money.

156. The minutes of the Liverpool Committee, or 'Finance Committee' from 1859, 1858-65 (D44/2/1): and Council Minutes, with regular financial reports (D44/2/2): (D44/25/1 is Heiser's summary of finances, fairly sketchy). Heiser's account of the crisis is on pp.28-31.


158. L. Gladstone, W.P. Watson and W. Balleny - the latter largely replaced after 1863 by George Edwards, the architect of the financial reforms of 1863.
not in the event go overseas at all. The exact details of the crisis are not clear; but it seems to have begun with a campaign, apparently approved by the Council, to recruit Wesleyan ministers. Perhaps piqued by the hasty denial which Baylee put out after a particularly crude and 'sheep-stealing' first advertisement which he had drafted, H.S. Ireson, an ex-Wesleyan and now chaplain of the College, seems to have commenced a virulent public campaign against Baylee, aided by a certain proportion of the students; local broadsheets were published, old students were circularised, and so, finally, were all the bishops and many clergy; and in March and May of 1867, a Memorial of complaints was presented to the Council.

The campaign was vicious; in this, Baylee was undoubtedly unlucky. But there was fire beneath the acrid smoke, and a Report by a special committee set up under the Bishop and the Dean of Chester evidently confirmed many of the criticisms made in the Memorial; those confirmed include criticisms of his son (who had been on the staff since 1857), 'the mode of conducting examinations' (criticised as open to Baylee's personal bias and temper), and the College testimonial, which was baldly academic, leaving all comments on moral fitness to Baylee's private letters to the bishops concerned, a proceeding again excessively open to personal animus. A criticism

159. Minutes of Liverpool Committee, 6 Nov. 1858, and of Finance Committee, 4 July 1861, 25 June and 29 Oct. 1863 and 3 March 1864: Council Minutes July 1863: Baylee denied the extent of abuse, but the Council backed the Finance Committee: at that time a third of the students were benefiting.

160. Sources for this are: Council Minutes: Baylee's (printed) last Report: the Memorial presented by the students: Heiser's account, marked 'Not for publication', but still discreet (D44/43/1). (There is also an extraordinary letter in the St Bees papers, from Christian Benzing (Dec. 3/5, dated 1 Dec. 1869), which gives an account of the whole affair, and seems to be reasonably accurate). On Methodist resentment, see R. Currie, Methodism divided (1968), p.176; it caused Shaftesbury to resign from the Council (Times, 26 and 29 July and 1 Sept. 1864).

161. Heiser could not trace it, and it is not in the records.
in the Memorial, that Baylee's teaching was both unorthodox and idiosyncratic, concentrating on the Old Testament prophecies referring, not to Jesus, but to 'obscure historical events', is rather confirmed by an extraordinary 26 page exposition of 'Revelations' by Baylee (dated 1870) which he concludes with a prediction of catastrophe in 1897 and 'the restoration of the purified Jews A.D. 1927.' Baylee's last appearance at the Council was pathetic; he read a long Report in which he emphasised the achievements of his rule, and the infamous nature of the conspiracy against him: on the points above, however, he merely threatened to produce 'abundant documentary evidence' in his own defence: when he tried to go on, the meeting 'declined to enter into the question', and the decision was taken to wind up the College.

There are two small footnotes to this story in the St Bees papers. First, Ainger was advised in July 1866, by a correspondent in Liverpool, to follow Baylee's example in attempting to recruit Wesleyans by sending them prospectuses: whether this was advice in good faith, or some underhand temptation, cannot be known, but there is no evidence that Ainger was involved in scandal on this count, though he seems to have been interested. Second, a suitably seedy note involves two old St Aidan's men who came up to St Bees; one, who had been a leading anti-Baylee conspirator, and who was son of a Dean of Carlisle, was discovered to have spent 2 days 'with prostitutes in

162. Clause VII of the Memorial.
163. In D44/23/1.
164. Baylee's last Report, and Minutes of the meeting of Council at Willis's Rooms, 17 July 1868.
165. Dec. 3/5: letters of 1 (or 7) and 20 July 1866: from W. Aul or Ail.
Whitehaven just prior to his ordination, which was prevented in the nick of time; the other had been on Baylee's side, and was ordained - but he it was who later fathered an illegitimate child, by the 18 year-old sister of the parish clerk at Preston.

166. Register (Dec.3/3) for Herbert Cramer, entered Easter 1869: and a letter from the Bishop of Glasgow, Dec. 1870 (Dec.3/5). Cramer was accompanied in his Whitehaven escapade by another student, H.E. Cass, who was obviously led astray by the older man, and was later touchingly penitent: though his shame was not only religious - he wrote later of his having forgot himself 'I will not say as a Christian but as a gentleman ...': Register, Mich. 1868, and letters of 19 Aug. 1869, 4 Jan. (quoted) and 10 September 1870 (Dec.3/5).

167. See above, notes 151 and 160.
At this time, however, a new period is beginning. St Aidan's was reconstituted in 1868, under a more strictly diocesan plan and constitution, and grew to prosperity and success under W. Saumarez Smith, a distinguished scholar from Trinity, Cambridge, and a moderate Evangelical with strong missionary interests; he was Bishop of Sydney (Archbishop from 1897) from 1890 to his death. St Bees worked on, barely noticed it seems. But the trend was towards control and authorization; Highbury, product of the generosity and great wealth of an evangelical parson, was the last college not founded by a bishop; there were diocesan colleges partly or mainly for non-graduates at Lichfield, Salisbury, Lincoln, Truro, Chichester and Gloucester by 1877, in addition to the Theology Departments of Queen's College, Birmingham, and King's College, London. Non-graduates could no longer be ignored, and slowly they began to be covered by new rules and regulations. As might be expected of this period, the two most significant impositions were examinations, and both illustrate the difficulties of legislating for a type of education that most of the legislators but little understood.

The first examinations grew out of the increasing desire to see some uniformity in the various dioceses' ordination examinations, and at the same time to allow the period immediately prior to ordination to be devoted to spiritual as against academic concerns. In 1870 it was suggested that an examination should be run by a 'Board of Theological Examinations', appointed by the universities: and

168. On St Aidan's, see Heiser, op. cit., pp.33-49; on Highbury, Davies, op. cit., pp.50-1, estimates that Alfred Peache and his sister gave £120,000 to the College.
the next step would be to require every Theological College student to pass that examination...169

So the idea of using such an examination to impose standards on the colleges was also an early feature. The examination itself took shape in 1871 and 1872, largely under the inspiration of Westcott, then recently returned to Cambridge; he had, as usual, large and general aims, and was mainly concerned with assisting graduates, particularly now that the old Cambridge Voluntary was to be abolished in 1873; the proposal submitted to the bishops did, however, refer specifically to the past requests by the colleges for university help. Seven bishops accepted the proposal in June 1872, and with their support and that of a growing number of other bishops, and aided by the Oxford professors, the Universities Preliminary Examination (U.P.E.) was first held in April 1874, and twice a year thereafter.170

The examination failed in its object of replacing the old (effectively compulsory) 'Voluntary', and never attracted many graduates, certainly not from Oxford and Cambridge: the numbers from these two universities who passed, in sample years (every fifth year) between 1879-80 and 1899-1900, were 27, 24, 18, 17 and 4, falling steadily as a proportion of the passes from 23% to 4%. Graduates of other universities and men from Durham, King's College and Queen's College, made up a rather larger proportion: the numbers being 20, 28, 30, 38 and 31.171 But clearly the examination had its greatest

169. CCR 1870, pp.58-9 (Dr Fraser). (As noted above, Espin et al. had long wanted a university-supervised exam): see also CCR 1869, pp.53-5 esp.

170. A. Westcott, Life & Letters of B.F. Westcott ... (1903), Vol.I, pp.377-81. Bullock, op. cit., pp.123-5. It was often known as the Cambridge Preliminary: 14 bishops supported it at its inception, and the number grew steadily. For a critical view - because the examination took too much from the discretion of the Bishop, and might seem to confer 'a right to claim ordination at his hands' - see R.F. Wilson, The examination of candidates for Holy Orders ... (1874), pp.13-4.

171. Figures extracted from the Papers and Regulations for the UPE,
significance in relation to the theological colleges; and it appears that it was by no means universally welcomed. The examination was discussed several times at the 'Conferences upon the Training of Candidates for Holy Orders' which were held periodically from 1881 onwards, and to which representatives of universities and colleges were invited, as well as examining chaplains. The case against the examination was always the same: that it was inappropriate for non-graduates, certainly as a Pass examination.

W. Saumarez Smith was the most consistent opponent of the examination; at the first Conference, there was a lively debate, in which Smith made the points which he was to repeat consistently, but largely in vain: at St Aidan's, he argued, he was dealing with good and practical men, but men who cannot be regarded as likely to join what must always form a small but picked corps in the clerical host. I mean those who are really entitled to be called 'learned clergy' in a scholastic sense ... I would state my conviction that there is sometimes a danger of the scholastic ideal putting unduly out of sight the variety of tests which should be considered applicable to the question ...

The U.P.E. created uncertainty, as being required by some bishops, ignored by others: it narrowed the teaching of the colleges, 'has intensified the desire for cram', and discouraged men who could not pass it. Yet this same year, a motion calling for the examination's being made compulsory for college men only narrowly failed; the whole debate testified to confusion about what exactly the examination was

F.N. 171 continued.

published annually at Cambridge till 1884, and thereafter jointly with Parker of Oxford.

172. The Reports of these Conferences, endorsed 'For Private Circulation only', were printed at various places: the first 7 Conferences were in 1881, 1882, 1884, 1887, 1891, 1896 and 1899, in rotation at, respectively, Cambridge, Oxford and King's College London.
for, and what exactly it revealed about non-graduates. 173

Smith returned to the attack in 1884, but he could not reverse the general trend towards requirement of the examination; in 1888 his own Council had formally recommended that the U.P.E. examinations be compulsory at St Aidan's; he still opposed the overly scholastic emphasis of the examination, but noted in 1889 that

The compulsory application of the 'Preliminary Examination' to all cases of non-graduate students had, in many dioceses, become a fact and a resolution of that year, while not recommending compulsion, stated that the requirement of the U.P.E. by many of the bishops 'has, on the whole, been productive of the best results.' 174 This year saw the height of approval of the examination in this influential forum, and in the remaining Conferences of the century criticism becomes the dominant note, as it was increasingly felt that the U.P.E. dictated the teaching of the colleges themselves. 175 From a distance, the U.P.E. certainly seems to have been inappropriate; the examinations tended to remain the same year after year, and in April 1890, of the 6 examiners only one had examined less than 12 times, and 3 had done so 20 times or more - with Westcott doing so now for the 32nd time; the list had been unchanged for five examinations. The examiners' reports are strictly academic, and bemoan academic and scholastic failings. Most striking of all, perhaps, are the failure rates: for 3 of the years sampled it is possible to distinguish

175. See 1891 (5th Conference) Report pp.31-3, criticism from Wace of King's College, and Maclear of St Augustine's - who had praised the examination in 1889: 1896, esp. pp.70-3 (Waller of Highbury), pp.75-8 (a devastating critique of the subjects offered, by E.C.S. Gibson, Vicar of Leeds and later Bishop of Bath and Wells), and p.81 for an admission that the U.P.E. had not, as requested by a previous resolution of 1891, been
imbalance was lessening, non-graduates had little better than a 50% chance of passing. In 1908 the Principals were still calling for changes in the examination. The story of the U.P.E. might be summarised thus: it was introduced to help produce uniformity, and to take from the bishops the more strictly academic or scholastic testing, leaving to them only doctrinal and spiritual tests: when not adopted by all, it caused confusion, but tended to force the colleges to base their instruction upon it, for safety, and gradually it became general: thereafter, though heavily criticised by those whom it most affected (the colleges) it survived, as far as one can judge, because it was convenient for the bishops.

Inevitably, the question of entrance examinations for the colleges was also much discussed: again, it can be traced through the Conferences. It was the topic of the first debate of the first Conference, and the general feeling was in favour of an examination, to ensure 'a fair standard of general education' for all college students: a sub-committee was set up to report, and at the second Conference several resolutions were passed on the various elements desirable in such an examination - not surprisingly, the Resolution in favour of a Latin paper was subject of the highest and closest vote (21 to 14, in favour). At the fourth Conference in 1889

F.n. 175 continued.

better integrated with the colleges.

176. All from the Papers and Regulations (as note 171). The figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Non-Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-90</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894-95</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-1900</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

177. 1908 Archbishop's Report (see note 18), Appendix XIII, p.61: see also p.51 and p.24. There was no kind reference to the U.P.E. in this Report.

the feeling was all in favour of insisting upon a 3 year course, but
in 1891 this was revised. 1891 was the crucial year. After Arch-
deacon Watkin had declared that

The universal imposition of a Three Years' Course
appeared to be impracticable, while on the other
hand, everything pointed to making the entrance
examination more of a reality,

things moved quickly; a Resolution in favour of an examination passed
'nem.con.', and a fourth Resolution gave the opinion that such could
only be

satisfactorily secured by the institution of an
Entrance Examination conducted by a Central Board
of Examiners, which shall be required in the
case of non-Graduates ... 179

The suggestion was taken up by the bishops, and the first examination
was held in September 1893, involving translations of Latin and Greek,
as well as questions on the Bible, English History and either Euclid
or Elementary Logic. 180

The effects of the examination (known as the Central Entrance
Examination, or C.E.E.) were vigorously debated at the 1896 and 1899
Conferences. Certain facts were indisputable, notably that the C.E.E.
had, at the least, precipitated the closure of 3 colleges, St Bees,
Gloucester, and Truro, and all agreed that the imposition was a major
'scare'. But it is clear, both from the debates and from the careful
figures produced by E.E. Harding, then Principal of St Aidan's, that
the effects of the C.E.E. varied markedly from college to college,
and, moreover, that it was not perhaps wholly to blame for the
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Resolution, of Canon Barry - sub-committee's report is with
2nd Report, and the resolutions are on pp.19-20.
179. Ibid., 5th Report, pp.16-29 (esp. 24-29).
180. Details from the Handbook of Theological Colleges ... (see note
82), 1893 ed.: the examination was virtually the same in 1900:
a fee of 15/- was charged, and names had to be given through the
Principals of the various colleges. Men were exempt if they had
passed certain other examinations, mainly the Oxford and
Cambridge Locals or the London University Matriculation.
falling intakes. To take the latter point first: his table of students attending the colleges, which covered all the major colleges and King's College, London, but not St Bees (which consistently failed to send returns to the Year Book), showed that the drop had already begun before the imposition of the examination. The average numbers of students attending these colleges, for the three three-year periods preceding the introduction of the C.E.E., and for the first 3 years of its operation, were 368, 323, 291 and 273, so that the drop in the last 3 years was in fact considerably less than that over the previous periods. He himself approvingly quoted 'a correspondent' who put this down mainly to the depression in 'the general state of business in the country and clerical incomes'; for the students involved are the sons either of poorer clergy, or of the class which feels most directly the pinch of hard times. Our members are paid for by hard-won savings, and will I think at once increase with brisker times.

Harding went on to plead, as had Principal Southwell of Lichfield before him, for endowment for the colleges, comparing them with the heavily-supported new universities, or training colleges for teachers:

But our Theological Colleges, many of which are supposed to meet the needs of those who cannot afford to go to our Universities, are left to depend for their support upon the fees of students, who are largely drawn from a class of the community poorer than that from which our School-masters and School-mistresses are taken.

The varying effects of the C.E.E. were evident from the start; the colleges at risk were the smaller ones, particularly if without strong support from their bishops. Truro had been in decline for

182. Harding, ibid., pp.86 and 91: for Southwell, who was less sanguine about the C.E.E. than Harding, see pp.37-41.
several years, Benson's successors clearly not having his driving interest in it. Gloucester was the creation of Bishop Ellicott, by now an old man. And St Bees, it seems, had simply grown old with its staff; the Principal, Knowles, was over 70, and his assistant, Smallpiece, had been at the College for over 30 years. An ineffectual attempt was made to start a preparatory class, and at the end of 1895 Knowles announced the closure of the College; in a statement, he blamed the C.E.E., and said that he had closed 'to avoid personal ruin'; the villagers lobbied the bishop, but without success. The last public action in connection with the College was the raising of over £1,200 to help Knowles and Smallpiece, while the Trustees devoted most of the money left to endowing the parish. The biggest losers must have been the villagers, particularly the owners of 'the smart new terrace of lodging houses', which had struck Roberts many years before.

The scare, having performed its 'social Darwinian' function, soon passed; in the first year of the C.E.E., only 98 men sat for it, 70 passing, and 3 years later 173 sat, 130 passing. Its main effect seems to have been a certain centralising of the colleges, with 90% of all C.E.E. passes going, in the last years of the century, to men entering King's College and Durham (nearly half the total), and the five largest colleges (Highbury, St Aidan's, Lincoln, Manchester and

183. Bishop Gott, commenting upon the problems posed for such colleges, as Truro by the C.E.E., wrote that such colleges (i.e. mixed graduate and non-graduate) never worked well; it was clear that he favoured larger colleges, preferably in towns and in connection with one of the new university colleges: The ideals of a parish: Charge ... 1896 (1897), pp.17-8.

184. The end of St Bees can be traced through the last Register, and cuttings from the Whitehaven News, all held by the Rev. T. Park. It was noted that the examination was 'too stiff to take without "coaching"' - the expense of which was a disastrous deterrent: also, that the endowment of the parish - only £101 p.a. - was far too little to allow upkeep of the large vicarage, expanded in the heyday of the College. The quote from Roberts is from op. cit., p.357.
The debate on the qualitative effects of the examination continued; Harding, who rather favoured it, had nevertheless been able in 1896 to quote only one favourable opinion, to 3 unfavourable ones; and the 1908 Report said bluntly:

There is a strong feeling amongst the Principals of Theological Colleges that these examinations [i.e. the C.E.E. and the U.P.E.] are not satisfactory, and that some modification is desirable here ...

Very slowly, there were developing means by which the colleges could influence policy; there was some form of association of Principals dating back to the early 1860s, but it seems to have left no records, and one can only conjecture on its influence. It was not formally the forerunner of the 'Conferences upon the Training of Candidates for Holy Orders', which seem to have arisen out of informal gatherings, with a strong representation of Cambridge (particularly Trinity) men, and a certain Lincoln base - where Wordsworth was Bishop, and where Benson, friend of Westcott and other Trinity College luminaries, had set up a theological college in 1874. The Conferences undoubtedly improved the corporate

---

185. From the list of passes given in p.30 of the 7th Report (1899).
187. The Theological Colleges Association apparently first met at King's College London in June 1862 (Ellicott, at 1862 Congress: CCR 1862, p.10): Espin refers to it (Supply and Training, 1863, p.8), and Baylee reported to his Council, in July 1863, that he was on a Committee set up by the Association to liaise with the universities (D44/2/2, July 1863): Espin was the Secretary, and other members were the Bishops of Bath and Wells and of Lichfield, and Dr Jelf, Principal of King's College. A successful link with the universities seems to have been its main aim. E.H. Plumptre of King's College described the attempt, and its failure, in a letter to the Times of 17 Oct. 1865. (Espin's letter to Ainger (see above, p. 243) presumably refers to these negotiations).
188. 'Explanatory Statement' at beginning of 1st Report (1881): the 11 men at the crucial meeting included 3 current fellows of Trinity, one of whom (Meyrick) was also examining chaplain to Wordsworth, and two influential Benson connections (Whitaker,
capabilities of the colleges, and certainly by 1908 there was a Principals' Conference which apparently regarded itself as an offshoot of the larger one. With the recommendation of the 1908 Archbishop's Report for a Central Candidates' Council, the centralisation formalised in the 20th century became official policy, and the extraordinary lack of co-ordination which marked the 19th century colleges was seen to be over.

The Report recognised other realities, though there was irony in its warning against 'two standards of preparation for the Ministry', which was a fact, by then, of some 60 or 70 years' standing. Now, however, a wholesale up-grading was sought, and it was hoped that by using the increasing nationwide facilities for tertiary education, it would be possible to return, by this new route, to a wholly graduate clergy. Recognition of the potential of the new universities, however, had come slowly. In 1884 the Third 'Conference' had received a report which expressed the opinion that the Church should utilise 'the immense development of means for Higher Education in recent years.' But no action followed. The important 1900 Convocation Report on training essentially just repeated this opinion, though noting the efforts of
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and Worlledge of Lincoln who was Hon. Sec. of the organising committee). Boulbee of Highbury was the only representative of the main non-graduate colleges.

189. 1908 Archbishop's Report: Appendix XII is an extract from Resolutions passed by the 1908 Principals' Conference: they refer there to 'the General Conference' and 'the larger Conference.'

190. It was also foreshadowed by the recommendation of the weighty 1900 Report to the Convocation of Canterbury, Supply and Training of Candidates for Holy Orders (Report No.343), pp.22-3.

191. The lack of co-ordination, but particularly the sheer number of foundations, criticised as too small and inefficient, was noted constantly, from Espin - who wanted 4 or 5 big colleges (Our Want ..., pp.28-9) - onwards (i.e. Ch.C., 1901, Upper House, pp.57 and 60-2).

G.H. Rendall to encourage hostels at the new universities. In the debates that followed, there were a few favourable references, but again no action ensued; and E.S. Talbot’s cautionary note was much the most specific contribution. He spoke from his experience of Leeds, and pointed out that the new universities included few arts students, that the ‘great bulk of the students were already pledged to their future occupations in life’, and that ‘they have very little corporate life, and it is very difficult to approach them.’ The breakthrough came with the foundations of Mirfield in 1902, and St Chad’s Hostel in 1904, which provided a theological education of which degrees (at Leeds and Durham respectively) were an integral part. It was their example which was cited in the 1908 Report, one of whose recommendations was the encouragement of hostels at the new universities. There seems little doubt that the existence of the new universities was a significant factor in the decision to enforce the requirement of a degree; as Bishop Winnington-Ingrams of London said, ‘the growth of modern Universities pointed to a way of escape from the pressure of the [current] difficulties.’ Even so, the aged Edward King, while far from hostile, did stress that they had as yet little knowledge of the value of these new degrees. That probably


194. Ch.C., p.140: also pp.134-5 and 143.

195. 1908 Archbishop’s Report, pp.17, 21 and 48-50. The recommendations are on pp.25 and 34. The Report showed that a total of 199 graduates from universities other than Oxford, Cambridge, T.C.D., Durham or London were ordained 1902-6: Appendix XVIII. (Whiting records that many of the non-graduate colleges were associated with Durham, from 1876, in a scheme which allowed their men to go on to a B.A. in one year, after their two years at college. While a possible precedent, it seems to have had little impact: op. cit., p.309.

196. Ch.C., 1909, pp.198-9. (King thought that ‘the idea of requiring
should not have been so; but no substantive measures followed, and since the 1917 deadline disappeared in the War, the requirement of an all-graduate clergy has never been imposed.

The policy represented a high ideal, but there was a defensive element in it too; Archbishop Davidson, ever alive to the lay world's view, defended the policy by implying that, as it was becoming rarer 'for a young man to proceed to a professional life of any sort without some kind of a degree', the Church was in danger of becoming the shameful exception. But in its most significant point - its strong emphasis on the need for regularised, large-scale financial aid to the candidates - the 1908 Report, and the Church in its acceptance of it, had already made it clear that they at last accepted that the Church was in a substantially 'lower market' than were most professions.

The change can be traced, or at least confirmed, in the 'professional advice' literature; Thomson only briefly mentioned the colleges, in 1857, and his advice was clearly aimed at a graduate audience; Davenant, in 1870, refers a little tartly to 'the quasi-collegiate establishments that have been founded rather liberally of later years', so that a degree (if still a considerable advantage) 'is not essential'; lack of 'opportunity or means' to obtain one does not actually preclude one from the Church. Jones whose 1898 book was aimed at a
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that a man should be a graduate of some University was that he certainly would know something of Latin and Greek' - which was not certain at new universities).

197. Ch.C. 1909, esp. pp.198-202 (Davidson quote, p.200), and the Report No.433, on The Standard of Qualifications for Candidates for Holy Orders, which they were discussing. For the 1917 deadline, see Conference of the Bishops of the Lambeth Communion ... [Lambeth 1908 ...] Encyclical Letter ... Resolutions and Reports (London, 1908), Report No.2 (pp.80-93 and Appendices pp.94-100) and Resolutions 3-10 on pp.47-9. (The first serious recommendation that I am aware of, of a wholly graduate clergy, was made by Canon Crowfoot of Lincoln in 1896: Report of the 6th Conference, pp.31f).
more modest readership than the others differed:

The profession is open to all, a degree is not absolutely necessary, and the cost comparatively little ...

He was not referring to financial aids; the costs he gave were no less than those of previous authors; the change was in comparison with other professions. 198

The story of the Victorian Church's slow and unwilling recognition of its non-graudeate clergy can, finally, be seen as reflecting the social concerns of most Church leaders; in summary, they applied thus: on the one hand, there was the constant fear that an uneducated clergy would be unable to hold the allegiance of a disturbed educated class; hence the emphasis on maintaining high social and scholastic standards: on the other, was the concern about the masses, and their evangelisation; here, the debate may be simplified as being between those who thought that the poor always preferred a gentleman, and those who thought, on the contrary, that a working-class ministry - admittedly, preferably not ordained - was the only way to reach the poor. 199 Such concerns, for the intellectual leadership, and for the masses, were traditional concomitants of a concept of a national Church: neither had very


199. See Heeney, op. cit., pp.22-6: Mackenzie and E.H. Browne both argued that the upper-class clergy did not reach the poor: while Sewell ('The poor themselves definitely prefer to be ministered to by a gentleman') and S. Wilberforce ('... there is nothing they more appreciate in their pastor than the character of an English gentleman') might represent the very common opposing view (respectively, Quarterly Review, Vol.111 (April 1862), p.412, and ibid., Vol.123 (July 1867), p.228). A characteristic and related view was that of Archdeacon Utterton, who said, in 1870: 'I believe that a gentleman - the man of gentle blood - makes his way far better among the middle and lower orders than a man of inferior position ... [the former] has no question about his position, and feels no difficulty in condescending ... [to
much to do with a whole new social world, the fully-fledged suburb, which lacked the romance to attract most Church idealists; and the fact that it was in terms of this world that Waller of Highbury gave one of the most honest justifications of the non-graduate clergy, perhaps illustrates the difficulties which traditionalists had in coming to terms with them. He said, in 1896,

The non-graduate student, as I contemplate him, is above all things a business man, and a practical man ... He has an understanding of the layman's mind ... By the layman's mind I mean the mind of the man who daily travels in our suburban trains to his London business, reads his daily paper for fifteen minutes on his way there, and an evening paper on his way back, and very possibly does not open another book except his Bible from one week's end to another, unless he has work to prepare for a Bible-class, or the Sunday lesson. That man and his wife and children make up the larger portion of the town members of the Church of England, and a good sprinkling of the country members besides ... This is the kind of person whose religious wants [the non-graduate] understands, and to whom he is preparing to minister. 200

Trollope, of course, would have shuddered; but equally so, almost certainly, would the bright young Churchmen of the time, Gore, Holland and others, with their anti-materialism, and their mission to the working class of the towns.
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the lower orders, whereas the latter] stands somewhat more on his dignity [and] does not always show the same tact ...

Ch.C. 1870, pp.66-7.

200. Conferences, 6th Report (1896), p.71. A very evocative description of the suburban milieu emerges in a newspaper debate, quoted in Davenant op. cit., pp.195-8, about clerks in private business: this, in 1870, seems to be the milieu from which many college men were drawn.
Chapter four

DIOCESES AND ORDINATION

1. SAMPLES AND THE DIOCESES

Thus far the focus of study has been the backgrounds and the education of the Victorian clergy. In the chapters that follow an attempt will be made to relate these to their careers. This is not, however, their whole aim; inevitably the broader issues of the problems and structures of clerical life are raised by this narrower exercise. Consequently various of the major issues will be discussed; to give them substance, supporting evidence will be used, drawn from a sample of clergy ordained between 1841 and 1874.

No small sample can hope to render a result that might be called 'typical' of the Victorian clergy. Such is probably impossible anyway. The interesting questions refer to the extent to which their backgrounds relate to their careers: to how far, in effect, there were different careers for men of different background. The sample was chosen to throw light upon such questions. Various methods of selection might be used, ranging from a random sample taken from a clerical directory, to an approach based upon the clergy of a particular area. The sample used here is closer to the latter. The starting point in the selection was the diocese of ordination. The previous chapter indicated how greatly the dioceses varied in the make-up of their ordinands. The place of ordination thus provides for a variety of background, together with the advantage of obtaining lists of names with (usually) supporting documents, in a single place.

The major decision therefore lay in the choice of dioceses. The first chosen was Oxford for these main reasons: first, this was a
diocese famous for its reformed and revivified administration under Samuel Wilberforce (Bishop 1845-1869), though it remained one of the most rural of the English diocese: second, it provides the opportunity to sample the lives of Oxford graduates, and more particularly of Oxford fellows. The second was Ripon, chosen mainly because it was the first of the new sees, set up following the first great reform surveys of the early 1830s; it included (until the diocese of Wakefield was formed from it in 1888) the whole of the major industrial area of the West Riding of Yorkshire, as well as the western parts of the North Riding, an area of thinly-populated upland; it is thus representative of both the prominent parish types of the northern province. The third diocese chosen was Chichester, representing a southern diocese, largely rural but with significant urban concentrations, and not subject to any very evident reforming processes. This does at least involve most of the characteristic milieux of Victorian church life.¹

The names taken were of every other ordinand in each diocese, for the same years as for the Cambridge honours sample.² The

1. The most obvious exception is London; which, however, deserves a more detailed study in its own right. The choice of Chichester was over Bath and Wells; the latter is a purer example of the rural southern see, but would give no such example as Brighton to the areas covered: also, the papers preserved seem not to be significantly fuller, and, as at Chichester, the ordination papers are missing.

2. The names were taken from the following papers. Oxford: Ox. Diocesan Registers (Bodleian, Western Mss) Ms. Oxf. Dioc. Papers, b.22-3; ordination records, c.267-8, 890 and 940; also Canon Oldfield's manuscript volumes 'Clerus Dioc. Ox.' Ripon: episcopal Act Books, held by the Registrars, Booth and Co. (solicitors, of Leeds). Chichester: ordinands subscription books (West Sussex Record Office) Ep.1/4A/1-3, and the episcopal Register (held by the present registrar, read at W.S.R.O.). The every-other-name method was chosen because there appear to be no inherent biases, and indeed a genuinely random one-in-two sample seemed more likely to generate such bias. Numbers in the samples are:
timespan is thus not large, but it covers the critical years during which the numbers of clergy grew fastest, and the career structure changed most radically. Moreover the longevity of the clergy meant that the ordained lives of many of these men extended to 1914, and in a few cases much further. As a sample this is unsophisticated, but its main purpose was to yield a body of clergy whose lives and careers could be traced, in sufficient detail for the purposes of basic quantification. From these a smaller number were chosen who have been followed up a little more closely, in the hope of providing illustrative examples.

As will be seen, most of the sampled clergy moved, sooner or later, away from their diocese of ordination. These dioceses however remain sufficiently significant to warrant brief descriptions; for there, at least, these clergy received their first experiences of the clerical life. It is not without value, either, that the various histories may indicate the diversity of conditions in the Church.

The diocese of Oxford is outstanding in the historiography of the Victorian Church, as the scene of what Gladstone called 'that
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th>1851-3</th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th>1871-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The bulk of the tracing was done through issues of the Clergy List and Crockford's, with considerable help from Venn and A1.Ox. (the copies held in the Bodleian, annotated by J. Foster and J.E.B. Mayor), M.E.B., D.N.B., various editions of Burke's Landed Gentry and P. and B.

4. Approximately 30 cases were traced in more detail, i.e. involving obtaining their wills, and the looking up, where possible, of references in diocesan papers, obituaries, local Directories and census enumerators' books. Unfortunately in no case was private correspondence found, although my search for this was relatively cursory. These cases were chosen from the somewhat limited number whose careers were passed mainly or wholly in their dioceses of ordination, to facilitate the search for diocesan papers and local sources.
truly great episcopate', the nearly quarter of a century of Samuel Wilberforce's occupancy of the see. The diocese became the exemplar of what episcopal energy could accomplish. The achievement was the greater in that when he began his episcopate, Wilberforce was faced with 'virtually a new [diocese, and] was the first bishop of the See to have Diocesan rather than University responsibilities': Berkshire had been taken over by his predecessor, Bishop Bagot, only in 1836, while Buckinghamshire, 'long ... the neglected outpost of the Lincoln diocese', and with virtually no traditions of episcopal rule or supervision, was only brought in to complete the diocese at Wilberforce's own accession. The diocese was almost entirely rural, despite its proximity to London, and remained so throughout the century (see Table 4.1); apart from Reading and Oxford itself, its towns were small, and it contained a high proportion of very small parishes. According to figures calculated by F.M.L. Thompson, the whole area was notable for land-ownership, in estates of the 'greater gentry' scale, 3-10,000 acres, while there were relatively few


7. Ibid., pp.(80-)84. (Legendarily, Bagot refused Bucks. when Bishop Kaye described its clergy: 'Oh! top boots or Exeter Hall': Ashwell and Wilberforce, op. cit., Vol.1, p.341. References in the Letter-Books, indicative of the problem, can be found in Nos.205, 244 and 466).

8. From Tables III, IV and V (pp.113-5) of English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century (1969 ed.). The figures are (showing % and ranking in the list of counties with such estates):
TABLE 4.1: Benefices, and Resident and non-Resident Clergy, in Dioceses of Chichester, Oxford and Ripon: 1838, 1848, 1888 (Numbers and %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chichester</th>
<th></th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ripon</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-RESIDENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: On other benefits</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Licensed or Exempt</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Neither</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. doing duty</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: In Parsonage</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENEFICES</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENT OR DOING DUTY</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*In the first 2 years, this explicitly covers vacancies, sequestrations or 'no return'; in 1888 it is merely the difference required to make up the total, though it may be assumed to cover similar cases.
larger estates. Only in Buckinghamshire was there a significant presence of Dissenters, and the 1851 Religious Census revealed the diocese as well up to southern average in both church attendances and accommodation.\(^9\) In short, in terms of demographic factors and of religious conformity, Oxford was not a disadvantaged diocese. But the clergy included many non-residents, and there was much that to Wilberforce seemed intolerably lax, including insufficient services, poorly maintained churches and a lack of parsonages.

Wilberforce's response was energetic and evidently largely successful. First, he took immediate steps to get to know the conditions of every area, and if possible every parish, by summoning the rural deans to Cuddesdon, beginning a custom of annual conferences with them that was to become standard episcopal practice. He was to use these unpaid officials to disseminate his views and to enforce his plans, the former by means of appointments and the annual conferences, the latter by making their annual tours of inspection a reality, and insisting that they could not be legally refused.\(^10\)

Wilberforce's Letter-Books show his persistent correspondence to clergy demanding the fulfilment of their duties; clearly only the exceptionally obstinate or hostile could long withstand this forth-
right (but usually considered) epistolary battering. Residence was enforced, parishes divided and curates appointed, services brought up to full legal requirements, and disputes mediated by letter. Meanwhile Wilberforce created a full range of diocesan organisations; in his farewell Charge he was able to point to a total expenditure in excess of £2.1m. which had been 'catalysed' [sic] by the Diocesan Board of Education, the Diocesan Church Building Society and the Diocesan Society for Augmenting Small Benefices by way of Endowment. The result was a diocese with an exemplary 'machinery' (including colleges for teachers and for ordinands, at Culham and Cuddesdon), and a clerical provision that was outstanding.

Ripon faced difficulties of a different order of magnitude when it was founded in 1836, under the rule of Charles Thomas Longley (whose successive sees were: Ripon, 1836-56, Durham 1856-60, York 1860-2 and Canterbury 1862-8). The West Riding of Yorkshire was an area that, all churchmen agreed, stood by 1830 in desperate need of improved episcopal care; at that time the great wool towns formed part of the diocese of York, benignly but loosely ruled by Archbishop Edward Vernon Harcourt, while the unwieldy and almost equally large diocese of Chester extended into Yorkshire's North Riding as successor...
to the ancient Archdeaconry of Richmond. The joining of these two areas was doubtless seen as the simplest way to relieve both the parent sees of onerous outposts, but the result was a diocese which could never attain homogeneity. Leeds and Bradford were cities with powerful (and contrasting) traditions of churchmanship, and rule from Ripon was never easy; even after the Wakefield diocese had taken off the industrial south-west of the diocese (including Huddersfield and Halifax) in 1888, Bishop Carpenter continued to bemoan Ripon's apparently permanent lack of 'inner cohesion.'

Longley inherited more specific problems also. First, there was his cathedral: it had long been a collegiate church which provided small additional incomes and a certain dignity to pluralists appointed by the Archbishop of York, and it was many years before the old chapter died off and allowed the creation of a more helpful body; in 20 years Longley had the opportunity to appoint to a canonry only once (when he collated Lewis Carroll's father, his close friend Charles Dodgson, Archdeacon of Richmond). It can have helped little that Ripon was evidently regarded as among the least important and desirable of the sees and cathedrals to which the Crown appointed. Much more

15. H.D.A. Major, The life and letters of W.B. Carpenter ... (1925), pp.27-31 (and Stephenson, op. cit., pp.62-3: the two parts of the diocese more or less corresponded to the two archdeaconries, of Richmond and Craven, the latter covering the southern urban areas: Longley found the former provided with about 110 places of worship for some 110,000 people, whereas the latter, with a population of 780,000, had only 220: ibid., p.92).
17. Bickersteth's appointment - he was not widely known, and then largely as a strong Evangelical partisan - evidently could not have been perpetrated on a more fashionable see: see Bickersteth,
serious, however, was the inheritance of church disorganisation and weakness in the area. The West Riding was one of the heartlands of Methodism, as the 1851 Religious Census showed; in its largest towns the Church of England's attendances were outnumbered by the Methodists' alone, and in Bradford the Church had barely a quarter of all attendances. There was a general lack of church accommodation in the towns, but the problem was more serious than that; for in both Leeds and Bradford even the morning attendances filled only half the available seats. Longley's efforts to stimulate church building and the provision of clergy for the diocese were admirable, and were continued by his successor, but the population increase allowed only the most marginal gains, and it took extraordinary efforts
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op. cit., pp.85-6 (he himself was not aware till almost appointed that Bradford was in the diocese): Sir J. Graham referred to him as 'Bickerstaffe' (quoted in G.I.T. Machin, Politics and the Churches ... (1977), p.272); D.W.R. Bahlman mentions this, and two other cases where Ripon was used to accommodate relatively undistinguished political churchmen, in 'Politics and Church Patronage in the Victorian age', Victorian Studies, Vol.22, No.3, pp.270, 288-9 and 290-1.

18. Using the Index of K.S. Inglis in 'Patterns of Religious Worship in 1851', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol.2, No.1; again J.D. Gay's maps are useful. Leeds Methodism, however, suffered from schisms in the 1820s and 1830s, and never regained its old position: W.R. Ward, Religion and Society in England 1790-1850 (1972), esp. pp.144-7: on p.258 he describes Leeds as 'that decaying Methodist Eden of the North' ...

19. This was less than the total of appropriated seats alone, so the free seats were probably much less than half full; 1851 Religious Census, Tables L and F. The other towns were not so bad for the Church, Halifax, Huddersfield and Wakefield all filling well over 60% of their Church of England seats at their best services. (Leeds and Bradford were both the scenes of political defeat for the Church at the hands of mainly Dissenting Liberals, who retained political power for most of the century: D. Fraser, Urban Politics in Victorian England (Leicester, 1976), esp. pp.31-6 and 124ff (on Leeds) and Power and Authority in the Victorian City (Oxford, 1979), pp.130-9 (Bradford): there is further detail on Leeds in E.P. Hennock, Fit and proper persons ... (1973), Book II, esp. pp.183-6.
to stimulate the necessary bursts of enthusiasm and generosity from the diocese's churchmen.²⁰

Church life was active, among both High Churchmen, for whom Leeds had become a great symbol and example, and Evangelicals, the traditionally stronger party in the West Riding, who were boosted by the long episcopate of Robert Bickersteth (1856-84). But the diocese remained one of the major 'home mission' areas of the Church. In 1887 it was pointed to by a member of the committee of the Additional Curates Society as one of the dioceses (Manchester was the other) which drew most heavily upon the resources of the Society; it showed an imbalance between receipts from, and contributions to the A.C.S., of £1,400. 'The only way we are able to meet this burden', he went on, 'is through the liberality of the people of the southern portion of the kingdom': not surprisingly, the most prominent case of the net donor diocese was Oxford, with a net contribution of some £1,800 p.a.²¹

Ripon was not the most depressing diocese in the Church, for the zealous clergyman; but, despite the activity there, it remained a sharp contrast to the south, a diocese where the church came from behind and made ground slowly.

²⁰ Stephenson, op. cit., Chapter 6, passim: Longley estimated that in 20 years churches had increased from 307 to 432, incumbents from 297 to 419, and assistant curates from 76 to 146: p.126. Twenty years later, Bickersteth reported totals of 472, 456 and 252, respectively: the number of clergy in the diocese had grown, he wrote, from 373 to 708 in the whole 40 years (Charge, 1876, p.16). The MS. 'Volume Archives of the See of Ripon', written by the bishops, contains Bickersteth's records of his two major campaigns for church building in Leeds, in 1863 and again in 1875 (pp.97 and 110-1). Church extension in Leeds and Bradford is described in G. Huntington's The Church's work in our large towns, 2nd ed., 1871, Chapter XV.

²¹ Fiftieth A.G.M., reported in the Home Mission Field, July 1887, speech by Rev. L.E. Shelford, p.61. In the same year the (Evangelical) Church Pastoral Aid Society (C.P.A.S.) sent grants to Ripon of over £6,000, and received from its 'auxiliaries' there less than £2,500: 'the auxiliaries' provided three-fifths of the Society's total income. Report of the C.P.A.S., 1887, p.275.
### TABLE 4.2: Curates (to Non-Residents, and as Assistants) in Dioceses of Chichester, Oxford and Ripon, and in all Dioceses: 1838, 1848, 1879. With incomes (£ p.a.)

(All % figures, except rows 8 and 17, refer to total curates of each type - i.e. the totals in rows 7 and 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. TO NON-RESIDENTS:</th>
<th>Chichester 1838 1848 1879</th>
<th>Oxford 1838 1848 1879</th>
<th>Ripon 1838 1848 1879</th>
<th>All Dioceses 1838 1848 1879</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCOMES 1: to 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: to 79</td>
<td>32 19</td>
<td>27 28 2</td>
<td>26 9 1</td>
<td>1400 625 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: to 99</td>
<td>41 36</td>
<td>31 24</td>
<td>41 26 6</td>
<td>45 33 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: to 119</td>
<td>13 13 1</td>
<td>18 27 1</td>
<td>10 8 2</td>
<td>506 361 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: to 149</td>
<td>16 25</td>
<td>20 23</td>
<td>16 24 11</td>
<td>16 19 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: 150 plus</td>
<td>21 14 1</td>
<td>22 23 2</td>
<td>10 3 2</td>
<td>527 417 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Other</td>
<td>27 26</td>
<td>25 20</td>
<td>16 9 11</td>
<td>17 22 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 8</td>
<td>8 14</td>
<td>14 18 22</td>
<td>10 13 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 3 2</td>
<td>14 16 3</td>
<td>5 4 9</td>
<td>223 170 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>16 14</td>
<td>8 12 50</td>
<td>7 9 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 6: Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>- 7 2</td>
<td>3 4 -</td>
<td>125 82 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>5 12</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: TOTAL</td>
<td>79 53 5</td>
<td>88 117 11</td>
<td>63 34 18</td>
<td>3078 1908 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: As % of grand total</td>
<td>66 41 4</td>
<td>61 47 5</td>
<td>51 23 7</td>
<td>64 39 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) Other: 'whole income of benefice', or 'no return'. (2) Nominal: includes 'nil' (row 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. ASSISTANTS:</th>
<th>Chichester</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Ripon</th>
<th>All Dioceses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANTS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOMES</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(% of</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>row 16)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: to 119</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: to 149</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: 150 phs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 14: Nominal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 15: Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: TOTAL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: As % of</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>18: Average No. of</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parishes per</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>19: GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chichester has already to some extent been described, in relation to the story of its theological college. The diocese was virtually coterminous with the county of Sussex. Samuel Wilberforce, who was doubtless biassed by his own enjoyment of being 'a Sussex squire' at Lavington, called it 'the nicest diocese in England', but it was not a peaceful one. Its rural areas were certainly (on the surface) extremely 'nice'; but the atmosphere at the populous watering-places in the eastern half of the country was often extremely bitter, with extravagant High Churchmen under sporadically violent attack from Protestant churchmen, and Protestant mobs; it was no help that the cathedral town was at one end of the diocese, connected with the rest by a notoriously slow and unreliable railway service. Gilbert's long episcopate was clearly not a period of advance for the Church in terms of organisation. The Diocesan Society (which assisted and encouraged the provision of churches and schools, and helped poor benefices), set up in the brief but impressive episcopate of William Otter (1836-40) was kept functioning, but at a low level, and required a major revivification by Richard Durnford when he arrived in 1870. The great parish of Brighton remained undivided, and as has been seen, the theological college merely struggled along. After 1870 the

---


23. Ibid., pp.112-4: J.B. Atlay, The life of Ernest Roland Wilberforce ... Bishop of Chichester (1912), pp.222-5. The problems of violent church partisanship were prominent for both these bishops, as also for Gilbert (Bishop 1842-70); L.J. Hodgson, typescript 'History of the Diocese, 1829-1929' (at W.S.R.O.), and C.M. Duncan-Jones, The Anglican Revival in Sussex (Chichester, 1933). J.M. Neale, Nathaniel Woodard, A.D. Wagner and John Purchas were perhaps the most prominent Sussex High Churchmen, at least in terms of the abuse they received.

24. Stephens, op. cit., pp.145ff. (Hodgson, particularly in Chapter 5, draws a sympathetic picture of Gilbert, and extols his quiet work, but it seems to amount to no more than stable administration and good personal relations with most clergy and laity).
The diocese was brought more nearly to the standard of organisation and supervision set by Wilberforce, under the remarkably active Durnford; he was nearly 68 when he was offered the see, and remained Bishop till his death at 92 in 1895, increasingly something of a curiosity - still vigorous but becoming more and more set in his tastes and opinions. Each diocese thus had a certain character; but no generalisations can be pushed too far in this context. Young men seeking ordination may have been drawn by the reputations of particular bishops, or the churchmanship of particular towns, but often, as will be seen, it was not entirely within their choice. Nevertheless, though their freedom of choice was circumscribed, certain types of men tended to end up in certain dioceses; I wish now to look at the process of ordination by which they became clergy.

25. Stephens, op. cit., pp.260-1, 297, 322, and Chapter 6, passim. (Perhaps in reaction to the problems thrown up by Brighton, he seems to have often recurred to the country clergy as the ideal type of English church life: i.e. pp.338-9 and 347).
2. ORDINATION

It is well known that the Victorian period saw a great change in attitudes towards ordination, and a general revival of emphasis upon its spiritual importance and function. This will be touched on later in this section. First, however, it is worthwhile to emphasise its less exalted aspects; for it was, for everyone, at least incidentally a practical and even bureaucratic process, by which the ordinands were brought together, with the correct papers, to face a largely academic set examination. The outline of the process was as follows: first, there was the preliminary contact with the bishop, or his secretary, and the receipt of instructions and requirements: there normally followed an interview with the bishop: then, if accepted, the candidate's papers were sent to the secretary, generally a month before the examination. These papers were: academic—evidence of the Cambridge Voluntary, or attendance at the Oxford Divinity lectures, the T.C.D. 'Testimonium', or certificates from the theological college or department attended: moral—'letters testimonial' (testimonials) from the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, or from three beneficed clergy, countersigned by their bishops: formal—a Baptism certificate (as evidence of age mainly), and the Si Quis, evidence that the candidate's intention to present himself for ordination had been read publicly in his home (or habitually attended) church; this, like the banns of marriage, theoretically gave objectors the opportunity to speak out: finally there was the nomination, by which an incumbent formally offered a title to orders.

26. The only detailed description of the whole process, that I am aware of, is in Pugh, op. cit., Chapter 7 passim. Consequently in this section the Ripon ordination papers will be used more than the Oxford. The papers used are: for Oxford, MS.Oxf. Dioc. c.234-6, 242-5, 251-4. (There are no surviving papers for 1831-45): for Ripon, the papers are catalogued as RO/RO, but no detailed cataloguing has yet been done. (At both dioceses the great bulk
in the form of a curacy with specified stipend.  

The organisational side can be traced for several of the Ripon ordinations in the early 1870s, which are evidently representative of the routine. The first stage was the approach to the bishop, and an interview with him. Bickersteth apparently kept a book in which he recorded the answers made to fourteen questions, ranging from details of parentage and past experience, to motives for ordination, and 'Fundamental Doctrines:- Human Depravity, Atonement, Justification, Sanctification'. These interviews provided the first opportunity to sift out unsuitable men. They were held wherever the bishop was; although in one case a man who had seen Bickersteth one night at Ripon, and had received 'a down-right good dressing' for appearing at such an hour, found that the interview so clear in his memory was not remembered by the Bishop, and considerable correspondence ensued.

F.n. 26 continued.

of the information used here is from the 1861-3 and 1871-3 periods, when the formal papers are supplemented by correspondence).

27. Fellows of colleges did not require a Si Quis, and neither they nor men ordained to teaching posts required the normal nomination forms.

28. Several bundles of miscellaneous correspondence are fortuitously preserved among the ordination papers. The procedures are very similar to those at Oxford (similarly recorded in at least two cases in 1861 and 1863) and described by Pugh, op. cit., esp. pp.243-6).

29. M.C. Bickersteth, op. cit., pp.162-4, and 173 (an interview in London), and Chapter X passim. The Bishop's forgetfulness was in the case of Thomas R.H. Sturges (letters of S. Wise, 28 Nov. 1872, J.B. Lee, 30 Nov., Sturges 1 Dec., and correspondence of Wise and Lee, 3, 4 and 6 Dec.). Wilberforce's interviews were evidently usually less substantial, and occasionally may have been missed altogether, Pugh, op. cit., pp.242-3: the ordination papers include several letters from men recounting their inability to catch Wilberforce: for instance one was asked to see the Bishop after a meeting which he chaired 'but as the Bishop seemed rather pressed for time, he was unable to speak to me on the subject' (letter of George Wharton, 23 Nov. 1862).
As the ordination approached, a routine procedure began; the bulk of this was in the hands of the Bishop's secretary, J.B. Lee, in London, who corresponded with Samuel Wise in Ripon, the latter seeing Bickersteth regularly and relaying his instructions and queries. Two months before the event Wise would tell Lee to insert a notice of the forthcoming ordination in the Ecclesiastical Gazette, with its date and place and the normal list of required papers. These were supposed to be in a month before the ordination (candidates correspondenced now only with Lee); then, usually a few days after the closing date, Lee would send to Wise a list of candidates, with notes as to missing papers or queries about their qualifications. Once Wise had been over the papers with the Bishop, and answered all Lee's queries, the papers were sent back to Lee 'so that you may prepare their Letters of Orders and Licences etc.' These, with the necessary forms of declaration and subscription, were then dispatched (by 'railway parcel') in time to reach Ripon before the candidates arrived for the examination. As this progressed, Wise would write to Lee, informing him if any men looked like failing, and as soon as the ordination was over he sent down the fees (£3.00 for each deacon). Only very rarely was the correspondence anything other than business-like, as when Wise wrote, after one ordination, that it 'passed off satisfactorily and appeared to create considerable interest at Bradford and the old Parish Church was crowded.'

30. The three ordinations represented by preserved Wise-Lee correspondence were Feb. and Dec. 1872 and Sept. 1873. There is no evidence of confusion such as occasionally reigned at Oxford (as in March 1863, or at several of the September ordinations, which Wilberforce, who was usually then resting at Lavington, avoided if he could: see letters of candidates for September 1861). Pugh notes (op. cit., p.91) that the Oxford secretary John Davenport, was occasionally inefficient in his later years, and errors are recorded in the papers, for instance, of Frederick Sparks (June 1871) and John Pickford (Sept. 1872): equally the candidates could be careless - Henry Scott Holland's papers (also Sept. 1872) show him to have been notably inefficient.
bureaucracy throws some light upon the concerns and the backgrounds of the candidates. Most of the papers needed gave little or no trouble to the normal graduate candidates; the papers at Oxford include very little to indicate such problems, but at Ripon the situation was different. The academic documents required from Oxford and Cambridge men were almost invariably sent in as requested. The same applied to men from T.C.D., who nearly always sent evidence of having the Divinity 'Testimonium'; the only query from them was whether they had actually to send the 'huge parchment' itself (it appears that they did, and some remain incongruously in the papers). With many of the non-graduates, however, the Bishop had to exercise his discretion. Men who completed their theological college course presented printed certificates, but some were less easy. One case is recorded of a man whose early ordination was a sheer necessity; Joseph Allott was 33 years old, an ex-National school teacher, who had completed three terms at St Bees. In August 1863 he wrote several letters to Ainger explaining that he could not afford the last term. Ainger apparently offered a loan, but Allott had three children to support, and in the end the Bishop accepted him without the need of a testimonial. Other cases probably reflected similar financial exigencies.

31. At least one of Wilberforce's candidates was told that as he had not taken the Voluntary he would have 'an extra stiff exam: for Orders so that I shall have to read very hard ...'. E.C.J. Bowen, letter of 18 October 1861. The Ripon papers for 1871-3 show clearly, however, how the 'Voluntary' ceased to function once the passmen could sit a 'Special' in theology: for instance, in September 1872 at least three men wrote to say that having taken the 'Special' they thought the Voluntary unnecessary (W.T. Pratt, F.M. Vipan, T.M.Ward), and it was increasingly uncommon.

32. Robert Linklater, letter of 8 May 1863; he was also considerably exasperated by his difficulties in obtaining his testimonials, but he was not the only one to express disbelief at the necessity to view the original T.C.D. degree.

33. Letters in St Bees papers at Carlisle, Dec. 3/5, of 9, 18 and 22
The moral testimonials required were more problematic, though in this case the issue was general rather than one which particularly affected individual candidates. The theory was expressed by J.B. Lee: 'In the case of a Candidate from any College except those in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the Certificate given by the College Authorities is not regarded as a Testimonial relating to moral character', and instead a testimonial from three beneficed clergy must be produced.\(^3\)\(^4\) In fact the 'moral' value of the university testimonials was widely seen as no more than theoretical. In 1833 a 'late Fellow of Balliol College' referred to 'the present unsatisfactory character of testimonials for Orders, so much and so justly complained of'; in 1857 H.B. Thomson dismissed the college testimonial scathingly as 'little better than waste paper, as far as regards its being any real test of character or piety', and criticisms were widespread.\(^3\)\(^5\)

These criticisms were based on the sheer lack of real knowledge, on the part of the college authorities, of that to which they testified (the

\(^{3}\)\(^3\) continued.

August, 1863; one letter to Lee in his ordination papers (for 20 Sept. 1863). A case where poverty is also probable was that of Lewis Jones, a 37 year-old who had completed only 4 of his 9 terms at Highbury (papers, for 22 Sept. 1872). A similar case at Oxford concerned a very bright Irishman, James Horan, who was clearly unable to complete his London B.A., and had already had to forego a T.C.D. education 'owing to the nature of my occupation [a tutor, and] the slenderness of means.' Letter of 10 Sept. in papers of Dec. 1863 ordination.

\(^{3}\)\(^4\) Papers for ordination of 25 Feb. 1872, letter to Walter Goold of Queen's College, Birmingham; letters of the same sense were sent to John Harper (a B.A. from Durham) and Edward Hicks, from King's College.

wording was formulaic, and some were printed). By 1889 the bishops perceived an even more basic threat, a trend (illustrated particularly by Christ Church) to give testimonials which were purely ethical, expressing no opinion whatever upon the men's suitability as ordinands. By then, it emerged, several bishops in fact did not even request the formal document before receiving private assurances from trustworthy individuals. For graduates, then, these were largely meaningless documents; the only difficulty they ever involved was that of obtaining the fellows' signatures during the long vacation. The testimonials of the other men, however, probably often signified little more, being equally formulaic, and were equally criticised in Convocation (see note 35).

Revealingly, the single most common cause of difficulty at Ripon was the need to produce a certificate of baptism. This was required mainly to establish that the candidate was of canonical age (23 years old), but baptism itself was also a prerequisite. The reason for

36. The Ripon papers include a printed testimonial from St Catharine's College, Cambridge, from as early as 1853 (E.J. Ramskill, ordination of 22 May). By the 1870's printed testimonials were given by at least Corpus and St John's, of Cambridge, and by the Non-collegiate Censor at Oxford.
37. Report No.240, 'Letters Testimonial' (Ch.C. 1889) and the discussion of it by the bishops (Ch.C. 1890, pp.7-12). Christ Church provides other examples: Dean Gaisford refused to give testimonials to a man he suspected of 'Romanizing' tendencies, though Wilberforce tactfully persuaded him to relent (Letter-Books, No.232): and in 1875 Liddell was able to 'set all rules at defiance' and have Francis Paget accepted by Bishop Mackarness without the usual document (S. Paget and J.M.C. Crum, Francis Paget, Bishop of Oxford ..., 1913, p.45).
38. At Ripon, with large September ordinations, this was a regular problem, and letters from tutors could suffice until the fellows met again in October.
39. 'As a rule the Baptismal Certificate furnishes both proofs', but where it does not, both must be certificated (J.B. Lee to J.C. Blackmore, 9 Aug. 1872, from Sept. 1872). (My impression is that at least one-quarter of Ripon candidates did not have normal certificates, whereas at Oxford virtually all did).
the problem in most cases was a nonconformist background, particularly if also a poor one. In some cases there were specific causes: one man's age could not be established exactly, wrote the Irish Presbyterian minister who had baptised him, 'in consequence of my baptismal register having been destroyed by my son who is weak in mind': two converted Jews, natives of Russia and Hanover respectively, presented different problems. The normal solution was to obtain a statutory declaration, often from the parents. Thus, at the ordination of September 1872, Lewis Jones originally sent in a simple statement from his father, a Cardiganshire farmer, but Lee wrote back to inform him that a proper statutory declaration was required. (These, incidentally, needed a 2/6 stamp; not a few came without, but appear to have been accepted). The same ordination, however, contains a nice illustration of the exercise of politic discretion. William Luther Leeman, a non-graduate from T.C.D., was the son of George Leeman: a letter from Wise to Lee of 20 August, put the case simply (if ungrammatically):

Mr. Leeman is a son of the Lord Mayor of York and who is also one of the MPs for York and he is a Dissenter; hence we must not give the father unnecessary trouble and perhaps you will accept the Certificate he has given as to his son's age as he was not baptised till 1864.

40. Cases of: T.K.M. Morrow; there are several notes and letters on his baptism, on, one of which an exasperated Lee had scrawled '?crazy -' (ordination of March, 1862): Nahum Nurnberg, the native of Russia, wrote that 'I could easily convince you that I am unhappily above the canonical age, if I could but have the pleasure of making your acquaintance today'; he was 'either 38 or 39 of age [sic] (there are no register offices there) ...' (Sept. 1863 ordination): Menachem N. Walde (Sept. 1871: letter 23 Aug.). In at least one case the explanation is distinctly dubious, as when a man elaborately explains that he was baptised by 'a Socinian minister ... introduced into the house by mistake' - his family being C. of E. 'from time immemorial.' (J.S. Gregory, loc. cit., letter of 26 Aug.).

41. See note 33.
So, in this case, a simple statement was accepted. This was exceptional, however: a year later the son of a well-off Halifax woolmerchant was exasperated by having to send a statutory declaration to his father, then 'on a tour' in the Highlands, when, as he wrote, 'I can bring 100 witnesses to prove I am 25 years of age if that will do.' (Apart from the occasionally revealing correspondence, and the evidence that so many of the men were from dissenting backgrounds, the statutory declarations have the advantage of giving the father's occupation at a more recent date than do the baptism certificates).

The Si Quis was a mere formality, and caused no problems.

42. A later exchange of letters between Wise and Lee refers to Leeman's having appeared before the magistrates two years before, but a satisfactory explanation was given (27 Aug., Lee, and 3 Sept., Wise). George Leeman was a wealthy solicitor, three times Lord Mayor of York, chairman of the Yorks Banking Co. and of the N.E. Railway, and Liberal M.P. 1865-8 and 1871-80 (succeeded in the seat by a son, Joseph J. Leeman).

43. J.W. Hall (for ordination 21 Sept. 1873). Hall seemed to fear that he might miss the ordination through this delay, writing (26 Aug.) 'I must be in for the next ordination, as my Church has been waiting for me two years': his title was to St. Mary's, Halifax, where he was to serve for a nominal 5/- p.a.

44. They also provide incidental pleasures, like the statement produced by one St Bees man, from a Lancashire farmer, who described how, on 13 Aug. 1848 'I was assisting [the father] in getting in his hay and was then told by him that he had a son born on that day.' (James Greenhall's papers, from Sept. 1871). Or the unavailingly sarcastic John Chesman, who sent a copy of the entry of his birth in the family Bible 'countersigned this day by those who of all others should know best my Father and my Mother: if such evidence be not conclusive as to my birth-day, I shall be glad to know how I may arrive at better' - but a statutory declaration was demanded (papers for Dec. 1872).

45. Though one man was worried that it was meaningless to have it (quite legally) read where he was then residing, he being 'unknown here', and he insisted that it be read also in his home parish (G.N. Ash, from Sept. 1873); such scruples were unique in the sample.
The title, however, was basic; but unfortunately the ordination papers are of relatively little help on the subject. There were two main forms of title: to a teaching post, or to a curacy. On the former, something has already been said of Bishop Mackarness' attitude at Oxford, which was distinctly less favourable to teaching titles than that of his predecessor Wilberforce. Nevertheless schools provided the title for eleven of the 113 men ordained by Mackarness in 1871-3. University titles were more numerous, still accounting for 20 of the men; but this form of title had declined steadily from making up the great majority of cases under Bagot in 1841-3, to only a third by 1857-8, and less than 20% by Wilberforce's last two years. The claim of fellows, and of some scholars, rested upon their assurance of support; a candidate (R.E. Sanderson) who wished in 1851 to be ordained on a Lincoln College Exhibition wrote:

I am aware that it is unusual - but not altogether without precedent for anything short of a life interest in a College to give grounds for a title ...

but Wilberforce was firm, and Sanderson took a curacy at St. Mary-the-Virgin's at £20 p.a. as his formal title. All this was of very

46. See above, Chapter 2, note 128. For Wilberforce, see Letter-Books No.342.

47. This is fully discussed in Pugh, op. cit., pp.246-52, and Table B, p.284 (for numbers of Fellows). The figures are not clear for 1841-3, as the Register is not explicit about titles, but there were 89, of a total of 129 ordinands, who were Fellows or Scholars or Chaplains; the Scholars doubtless included some whose awards were temporary, but others certainly were ordained on scholarships which carried the right to fellowships; the overall proportion was thus almost certainly well above the 57% of Wilberforce's first two years.

48. R.E. Sanderson (undated letter, in papers for June 1851): he very soon became Headmaster of Bradfield, and was to be Headmaster of Lancing from 1861-89, harassed by but loyal to the School's founder, Woodard (B. Heeney, Mission to the Middle Classes ... (1969), esp. pp.32, 47, 85 and 111). Conversely, in at least three cases men were ordained on fellowship titles but were in fact to serve as curates in other dioceses: T.H. Hunt (March 1861) and W.W. Jones and A.H.A. Morton (both Sept. 1861, for London curacies).
little relevance at Ripon, where teaching titles were few.\textsuperscript{49}

For most men, a title required finding an incumbent who needed
and could pay a curate. This was not easy for men without connections;
there were no official central or diocesan registries, so advertisements
and clerical agents largely serviced this need.\textsuperscript{50} Even well-connected
men had to take what was available; Samuel Wilberforce himself had
been unable to find a suitable title in the diocese of his father's
friend C.R. Sumner, who reluctantly advised him to take the offered
one of Checkendon in Oxfordshire, as 'it is so difficult to find what
is suitable at the precise time when it is wanted.'\textsuperscript{51} Such men could,
however, refuse undesirable posts. William John Butler, requiring a
title with some urgency at the end of 1840, was offered a curacy at
£70 p.a. in Halifax: 'but', he wrote to his mother,

\begin{quote}
I think this will not be worth my while, without
the certainty of two or three pupils at £200
a-piece, and Halifax is so disagreeable a town,
that I should not get them.
\end{quote}

Thus Ripon missed a man who was to become one of the foremost clergy
of the Oxford diocese.\textsuperscript{52} There is little doubt that for many men such

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{49} Of the one-in-two whose ordination papers were checked, only
one of the ordinands in the first three samples had a teaching
title (J.C. Wood, Feb. 1861). In 1871-3, of the whole number
(112) there was only one further case. (At Chichester the title
is in many cases unclear, but there were certainly several men
ordained on teaching titles at Woodard's schools).
\item \textsuperscript{50} (In the 18th century the difficulties had been even greater: see
N. Sykes, Church and State in England in the XVIIIth century
(1934), pp.198-200). Men without contacts were allegedly subject
to virtual blackmail by some agents and incumbents (Hastings
Robinson, 1833, quoted by D. Bowen, The Idea of the Victorian
simply to obtaining a title 'by means of a clerical agent, or
private interest' (p.86). (In 1882 a young Evangelical received
40 replies when he advertised for a title, though in the end he
took none of these: G.M. Davies, A Chaplain in India (1933),
pp.18-20).
\item \textsuperscript{51} Ashwell and Wilberforce, op. cit., Vol.1, pp.40-1.
\item \textsuperscript{52} Life and letters of William John Butler ... (1898: edited by 'a
member of his family'), p.19: aptly enough his eventual title
selectivity was out of the question. Joseph Allott (already referred to above, p. 283) evidently had no real choice in accepting a curacy at £70 p.a. in September 1863, 'Tho', as he wrote to Ainger, 'the stipend is not good. In my emergency I scarce know how to proceed.'

Another poor man (his father held a small Leicestershire living in the Lord Chancellor's gift) had problems after he failed the examination in September 1873, and so lost a curacy worth £110 p.a. He managed to pass at his next attempt in December, his title being to £40 p.a. with board and lodging; he explained to Lee that another incumbent would have accepted him, 'but the stipend he gives is so small for a man who has absolutely no money of his own' that he could not take it; 'The obtaining a title has been a great anxiety to me.' It seems clear that the bishops themselves played an increasing role in obtaining titles for men who applied to them for ordination, but the evidence is elusive and allows no firmer statement than this.

With their papers in order, the candidates now had to attend and pass the episcopal examination; in the period here covered, the
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was obtained after receiving an introduction 'Through a cousin' ... (p.21). (As Vicar of Wantage (1846-80) he became a High Church exemplar, widely known as 'the Hook of the south. ')

54. Hugh B. Jones, letter dated 'Nov. 1873', in papers for Dec. 1873. (In the event he succeeded his father in 1877, and held a further 3 livings, the last two of which were well endowed; he lived to August 1939).
55. i.e. M.C. Bickersteth, op. cit., p.173 (the Bishop 'was kind enough to mention my name to several incumbents in the diocese, so that I soon received four different offers of a title' ...): Pugh, op. cit., p.251 ('he took an active share in finding curates or curacies according to need ... [but] generally the candidates had made their own arrangements': Letter-Books, Nos. 218 and 342, also 25). As late as 1855 Bishop Murray of Rochester ordained the Hon. E.V. Bligh 'upon no bona fide Title at all' (E. Wingfield-Stratford, This was a man ... (1949), p.143).
examinations usually took place from Thursday to Saturday, with the ceremony itself on the Sunday. The men were put up in lodgings when ordained at Ripon, or, for ordinations in other towns (introduced by Bickersteth) they stayed with local churchpeople. At Oxford, on the other hand, one of Wilberforce's many reforms was the insistence (by the mid-1850s) that candidates stay with him at Cuddesdon; this was felt to be a considerable improvement over the widespread practice - still operative in 1886 at Worcester - of putting the men up in the hotels of the cathedral town.

It is, however, impossible to mention the ordinations of Wilberforce without reference to the wider area of ordination reform; for 'his ordination policy', as Pugh has written, 'is probably the most famous part of his work', and was an extremely influential example. The importance of his policy lay not so much in the details

56. Lodgings in Ripon were arranged by Wise - for as one man wrote, doubtless typically, 'I know nothing of Ripon' (Henry Clark, Feb. 1861: March 1863 papers contain other letters on the subject). All of Longley's ordinations were held at the cathedral (Stephenson, op. cit., p.191) whereas Bickersteth, as well as holding some in other towns, or even outside the diocese altogether, often held his in the Palace chapel (M.C. Bickersteth, op. cit., pp.171-2, and 'Act Books').

57. Pugh, op. cit., p.264.

58. Both Bickersteth himself (at Peterborough in 1841) and W. Walsham How, first Bishop of Wakefield (at Worcester in 1846) were put up at hotels as part of ordinations which they recalled without pleasure (Bickersteth, op. cit., p.38, and F.D. How, Bishop Walsham How (1898), p.29): Mandell Creighton discovered the survival of this custom at Worcester in 1886, was very surprised, and promptly reformed it: L. Creighton, Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton (2 vols., 1904), Vol.1, pp.353-4.

59. Pugh, op. cit., p.235 (and Chapter 7, passim); the description of Wilberforce's ordinations by J.R. Woodford well illustrates the perceived importance of this work (Ashwell and Wilberforce, op. cit., Vol.1, pp.330-9. Pugh points out that the well-known letter of Wilberforce's (ibid., pp.322-3) describing the procedures under his predecessor was somewhat exaggerated, but it was in essentials accurate).
as in the integrity of his concept: that ordination should be a period of intense contact between bishop and ordinands, when the seriousness - indeed awesomeness - of the step being taken was stressed continually, so that the question of a true vocation (or 'call') was prominent (though it is clear from all accounts that Wilberforce's great charm and social gifts considerably relieved the tension). There was great room for improvement. Accounts of ordinations from as late as the 1850s - admittedly usually written with the inbuilt bias of men proud of their modern superiority - generally depict formalised examinations, minimal episcopal advice and contact, and a prevailing lack of reverence: the result of such experiences was to ensure that the ordinands who rose to positions of influence became firm reformers. A great deal of this was a matter of style, and of care; in many ways Bickersteth's ordinations were very old-fashioned, but the preparation, and also the importance attached to the episcopal address to the candidates, ensured a very different ethos and made a new impression upon the men.

Certain changes of organisation could be made, though they took a long time to become general. Of these the most significant was the separation of the examination from the ordination itself. In his first flush of enthusiasm in 1845 Wilberforce had intended 'to have a

60. Wilberforce's well-known Addresses to the Candidates for Ordination ... (1860, in ninth edn. by 1885) are a basic text on the revival of a doctrine of vocation in Victorian England, esp. Address 1 'The Inward Call'; J.R. Woodford's Ordination Lectures ... [Cuddesdon, May 1861 ] (1861) are similarly basic. See B. Heeney, A different kind of gentleman (Hamden, Conn., 1976), esp. Chapters 2 and 3 on this whole topic. (Wilberforce's successor at Oxford, the conscientious but by no means sparkling J.F. Mackarness, seems to have had ordinations of unremitting seriousness, in contrast to Wilberforce's: C.C. Mackarness, Memoirs of the Episcopate of J.F. Mackarness ... (1892), pp.48, 51).


62. These addresses are almost always mentioned in episcopal
preparatory examination some months before', but this he never did. 63

The objection to the proximity of examination and ordination was expressed by W.F. Hook in 1865.

For three or four months before, [the candidate's] whole mind had been occupied with the thoughts of this examination ... [During it] At night he compares his answers with those of the other examination candidates; he awaits with trepidation the result of his labours; he receives the intelligence that he has passed with feelings of triumph ... He contemplates his ordination with feelings of exultation rather than of awe. 64

R.F. Wilson, an examining chaplain, put this criticism convincingly and at length in 1874, concluding that the resulting 'frame of mind ... is that with which men pass through their schools at the University, or a Civil Service examination. The lesser but more immediate interest tends to absorb the greater.' 65 These criticisms are not conclusive, but they are reasonable and informed; and a little evidence from the St Bees' papers lends them support. Just before his ordination (indeed probably within 24 hours of it) at Chester in December 1850, William Chaplin wrote a long and apologetic letter to the principal
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biographies, which at least indicates that the ability to impress the ordinands was felt to be a necessary attribute by the end of the century.

63. Ashwell and Wilberforce, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 312 (in a letter inviting R.C. Trench to be his examining chaplain, 24 Oct. 1845). Mackarness did make this change (C.C. Mackarness, op. cit., pp. 47-8), but had not done so by the end of 1873, as is clear from the papers. (Bullock, op. cit., pp. 29-30, cites the preliminary examination instituted by Bishop Thomas Burgess at Salisbury (1825-37), which seems however not to have been imitated by his contemporaries).

64. CCR 1865, p. 104. In 1878 one of his successors at Leeds, John Göt, was even more forceful: 'There is nothing so secular as an examination ... I am at a loss to find any preparation for Holy Orders so thoroughly mischievous as an examination' (CCR 1878, p. 526).

65. The examination of candidates for Holy Orders ... (1874), pp. 7-9.
(Parkinson): he had been the best pupil of his year, holding the Librarianship, but he had only come second in the examination: he explained why:

... my over anxiety to do well coupled with the excitement, caused me to feel quite exhausted by 3 o'clock - the last hour I sat in perfect agony from bending over the table so many hours - It was during this time the two last questions were being answered ... [he wishes that he had done those first] and then I could have turned to the historical and matter of fact questions.

He consoled himself by noting that the Gospeller (i.e. the man first in the examination, who traditionally read the Gospel at the service) was from Trinity, Cambridge, and that he had still beaten the men from Durham and St Aidan's. A later student, who was Gospeller at St Asaph in December 1868 was wholeheartedly proud that 'a St Bees man should have compelled a Cambridge Wrangler and a man Honours [sic] from Oxford to do obeisance to a Licentiate in Theology ...'.

The first pressure in favour of a separated examination thus flowed from a perceived need to allow time for devotional preparation prior to the ordination itself; and this evidently remained a central concern. But there was also a growing feeling for the standard-

---

66. St Bees papers at Carlisle, Dec. 3/2; letter inserted loosely by entry of W. Chaplin, entered Easter 1849.
68. Bullock cites W.K. Hamilton of Salisbury (in 1864) and G.A. Selwyn as early cases of leaving the Saturday, and the Friday and Saturday respectively, free from examinations: the latter custom was strongly urged by W. Walsham How in 1878 (CCR 1878, 538). The first full-scale separation was introduced by Wordsworth of Lincoln at the beginning of the 1870s. J.H. Overton and E. Wordsworth, Christopher Wordsworth: Bishop of Lincoln (1888), pp.302-3). The conservative line was expressed by J. Fraser, of Manchester, who doubted whether the men would profitably use the time (How pointed out that such a failure might in itself be immensely useful and instructive) and made only grudging changes; account by Archdeacon Norris, in T. Hughes, James Fraser: second Bishop of Manchester (1887), pp.222-4. Other Broad Church bishops, however, were separating their examinations from their ordinations, i.e. F. Temple at Exeter
isation of at least the purely academic parts of the examination; the most prominent stages of which were the U.P.E. (described in Chapter three) and the agreement of most bishops from 1884 to set a standard selection of 'special subjects'; (this latter was largely the work of W.C. Magee of Peterborough). In the early 1860s there had been meetings of examining chaplains in attempts to reduce the diversity of subject-matter and standard. Standards inevitably continued to vary, but as in other matters the vastly increased level of discussion, official and unofficial, created an environment in which standardisation progressed: though the very urge of every bishop 'to improve on the ordination of his predecessor' delayed anything like uniformity of approach. Thus by the 1870s the combination of concern for increased spiritual preparation with that for greater uniformity of standard and subject-matter, had created a definitive movement away from the old concentrated ordination process.

At Oxford and Ripon, the actual examinations were at least seen as being of very different standards. Those at Oxford were regarded as difficult; how far this was counterbalanced by Wilberforce's
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70. CCR 1862, pp.10, 21 and 32; but in 1870 the problem of wide variation in practice and standards was stated as forcefully as ever, with no reference to the meetings of the chaplains (Ch.C., 1870, p.69).

71. This fortunately allowed the young J.R. Illingworth, then an overworked Oxford tutor and later a leading theologian, to be ordained at Lichfield after failing his papers at Oxford in 1875: The Life and work of John Richardson Illingworth, ed. A.L. Illingworth (1917), p.31. (Before Creighton's reforms - see note 58 - Worcester was a notoriously easy diocese).

72. Phrase of Archdeacon Ady (Ch.C. 1870, p.62).
lenient discretion is unclear, as there appears to be no way of
distinguishing those who actually failed from those who dropped out
for health and other reasons. Candidates were sent a booklist of
10 books, including the Bible and the Greek Testament. The reaction
of the candidates was generally nervous, as far as can be judged:
perhaps Cambridge men were more easily scared off, as unaware of
Wilberforce's actual leniency, but at least two seem to have thought
better of appearing in 1862. One, J.V. Durell, wrote with trepidation
on 24 November; he had been accepted by the Bishop, but went on:

I doubt however whether I shall be sufficiently
qualified to pass his severe Examination ... he
requires a great many books ... I hope that I
shall be able to pass, but I am rather afraid.

The irony is that Durell was Fourth Wrangler in 1860, and was a Fellow
(later Tutor) of St John's: (he was ordained at Ely in 1863). A less
distinguished man altogether, J.A. Jamieson of Emmanuel, provides a
nice link with Ripon; on 27 May he had written that

I have studied very hard, hoping to get [the
examination subjects] up and continued to do so
until I saw it was hopeless ...

and he deferred; in fact he abandoned Oxford for a title in
Bradford, and was ordained by Bickersteth at Richmond parish church
on 21 September.

73. Pugh, op. cit., p.261: his description of the examination itself is
very full, pp.257-71, and appears definitive.
74. Ibid., pp.257-60: the list included Hooker, Pearson, Butler's
Sermons, and Wall (on Baptism); Wilberforce's own Addresses were
later a specially recommended item. In 1862 G.A. Denison argued
strongly that candidates should be tested only on their Bibles and
Prayer Books, but Wilberforce defended the requirement of getting
'three or four thoroughly good books well studied and mastered'
(CCR 1862, pp.26-7 and 35: Denison was unconvinced, and put the
same argument in later years, i.e. Ch.C., 1870, p.57).
75. Both letters among miscellaneous bundle for December 1862
ordination at Oxford: other details from Venn (and Jamieson
is one of the Ripon sample: he was obviously an Evangelical - he
was 'Association Secretary' of the C.P.A.S. in the South West,
1872-6 - and thus was probably more at home with Bickersteth
anyway).
Bickersteth's memorialists are at pains to refute the suggestion that his examination was excessively easy, but there is no doubt that it was relatively so, and was thus perceived.\(^76\) It was never, however, a pure formality. Apart from those who baulked even at the prospect of the firmly Evangelical orthodoxy espoused by Bickersteth's senior examining chaplain Charles Clayton, men regularly failed the examination itself; and though 'the experience of rejecting men was the most painful', recalled one of the examining chaplains, 'it was a satisfaction to my mind, as proving the reality of the test ...'; other chaplains recorded a similar 'melancholy satisfaction.'\(^77\)

It is not intended, by drawing attention to the small problems and organisational realities of the occasion, to deny that ordination itself was for many a reverent and spiritual experience. But the Victorian church allowed this possibility to be very much a matter of chance and circumstance. The examination was so placed as to overshadow the ceremony; the ceremony itself was often conducted in a manner that seemed cold to the young men, who might anyway be out of sympathy, in terms of churchmanship, with the bishop who ordained them;\(^78\) especially if they had little real choice in the matter of

\(^76\) M.C. Bickersteth, op. cit., pp.163-4 and 170.
\(^77\) Ibid., pp.99 & 170. Clayton - to whom Bickersteth gave his one real 'plum', the rectory of Stanhope in Durham - is presented as something of a caricature Evangelical by Winstanley (E.V.C. p.405 and esp. L.V.C. p.68); but to his fame J.A. Venn attributed the prosperity of Caius in the mid-century years (and this was Venn's College): Descriptive text [accompanying] Statistical chart of Cambridge College matriculations (1908), p.10. (He succeeded the distinctly High Church Charles Dodgson, who examined throughout Longley's episcopate, sometimes offending Evangelicals as he did so: Stephenson, op. cit., pp.191-4).

\(^78\) Thus Sabine Baring-Gould found no joy in his ordination by Bickersteth in 1864; Early Reminiscences, 1857-1864 (1923), pp.336-7 and 340. Men tended to have to be ordained where they found a title, which was also an argument for the standardising of examination subjects between dioceses: in 1881 E.R. Bernard described how examining chaplains 'know too well the frequent appeal, "I did not know until a month ago that I was coming to
where they were ordained. The gradual reforms, which were a matter of individual action by bishops (apart from the U.P.E. and the 1884 'special subjects' reform), nevertheless illustrate the changing conception of the Victorian clergy. First, there was the acknowledgement of the importance of the spiritual role, implied in the greater allowance for private prayer and in the emphasis of the bishops upon vocation. Second, the very fact that the examination was retained and strengthened illustrates the 'professionalising' aspect of the Church's development: as with the Civil Service, a new or reformed examination testified to the passing of a world of pure patronage, where such tests had been simply irrelevant. 79
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this diocese" ...' (Report of the 1st 'Conference upon Training', 1881, p.39). (Ordination by 'letters dimissory', i.e. by a bishop other than him under whom the deacon was to serve, was increasingly rare, and was felt to be unsatisfactory).

79. This point is touched upon by W.J. Reader, Professional Men (1966), p.47.
3. THE ORDINANDS

Enough has already been said to indicate the ranges of background among mid-19th century ordinands. In this section it is intended to introduce the samples to be used with a brief look at the major differences between the dioceses; and to go into a little detail on the small but interesting group of ex-Dissenting ministers, who were well represented at Ripon.

The basic information about the ordinands' education is set out in Table 4.3. In this table the whole set of ordinands is illustrated, as well as the sample used hereafter: this allows it to be seen here for the sample, at least on this major variable, corresponds with the larger group. There are one or two cases when the sample is not strictly representative, but on the whole it is reasonably so: thus there are grounds for drawing some larger conclusions from the sample. The most obvious fact that is illustrated by the table, however, is clear from the total figures, the marked (and expected) variation between the education of men in the southern diocese and Ripon. Oxford remained very largely dominated by candidates from the neighbouring university (as was Ely by Cambridge). There are signs that Wilberforce broadened this intake somewhat, but even in 1861-3 his choice was distinctly cautious. His non-graduates, for instance, did not include a single man from St Bees' or St Aidan's; indeed, the most prominent group here was that comprising nine non-graduates who had attended Cuddesdon College, who were of a rather different type. Five were ordained in 1863; two of them had been at Oxford colleges, without taking their degrees; and the three ordained in December (probably after a full year at the College) included the 33 year-old Lord Francis George Godolphin Osborne; and Arthur Brinckman, the fourth son of a Yorkshire baronet; (he had been a soldier for five years, joining in
TABLE 4.3: Educational Backgrounds of Ordinands, All Cases and Sample
(Entered with all Cases Above Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1841-3 All cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>91:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>83:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>88:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 440</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. All cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 219</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Oxford</td>
<td>2 Cambridge</td>
<td>3 T.C.D.</td>
<td>4 Durham</td>
<td>5 All Others</td>
<td>6 Totals</td>
<td>Ratio of Cols. 1 and 2: Rest (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. RIPON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 All cases</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>47:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>42:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>43:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. All cases</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sample</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. CHICHESTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 All cases</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3 All cases</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>T.C.D.</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. All cases</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sample</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: 1 - Samples in all cases exclude cases in which nothing was traceable after ordination: hence samples are usually a few less than half of all cases.

2 - The sample for Oxford, 1871-3, was selected with a slightly erroneous technique, hence is actually over half: the error should not, however, have introduced any consequent errors in the use of this sample.

Overall it can be seen that despite some predictable anomalies for a few periods in the smaller samples, none appear to be serious, and overall the samples fall within the normal ranges of error.
1855, and went on to become a stalwart High Churchman, serving for
17 years as curate at that most fashionable Tractarian Church, All
Saints, Margaret Street; he also married the eldest daughter of the
principal of Cuddesdon).  

Two years before, Constantine Griffith
Wodehouse, then 34 years old, had also been ordained as a non-graduate
Cuddesdon man; second son of the second son of the first Baron Kimberley,
he had been at Exeter College Oxford 15 years before, without taking a
degree, and when he came to Cuddesdon was already a married man; (he was
to spend the last 31 years of a long life in two small Oxfordshire
parishes, and will be mentioned in other contexts).  

Three men (one in each year) were students of the High Church missionary college,
St Augustine's Canterbury, and were ordained for missionary service.  

Two more came from King's College London; both were just 23 years old,
and as the sons of a solicitor and a 'Captain' were evidently of
respectably middle-class backgrounds.

---

80. There was one other university man without a degree. It is clear
that none of these men were poor, and they were well up to the
social level of their graduate colleagues. (Osborne renounced
his orders in 1875).

81. Wodehouse's family (as traceable in Burke P. and B.) is a nice
eexample of the careers considered suitable in an upper-class
family: his father's generation were, the second baron, a
Rear-admiral (his father) and a clergyman: the second baron's
sons were, the heir, an Admiral, a Major, and a clergyman:
Wodehouse's own elder brother was a soldier, and his younger
one was also a clergyman: while the family of his clerical
uncle consisted, in the next two generations, of soldiers and
sailors in the senior line, and clergy in the junior. (His wife
was the daughter of Rev. Edward Sawbridge, of East Haddon Hall,
Northants).

82. They were ordained for work in Tasmania, Singapore and British
Columbia: the first man (Alfred Nathaniel Mason) was evidently
aware of the disrepute caused by men who received a free training
as missionaries and then worked in England, writing on 16 Jan. 1861
to reject the idea of a year's work in England ('I think it will
only do harm to the College at Canterbury if I do.' Letter in
papers for June 1861). The third of them, however, never did
leave England, instead spending almost the whole of his career
in the service of the Oxford diocese.
Thus the 19 non-graduates can be narrowed down to four who make up the exceptions to the prevailing social tenor. One of them has already been mentioned, the Irishman James Horan (see above, note 33). Another, Robert James Ives, had been trained as a teacher at St Mark's College, Chelsea, whose Principal explicitly (and conventionally) wrote of teachers as socially inferior to clergyman. Finally there were the genuine 'literates'. The first, Thomas Hancock, was 29 and the son of a Gutta Percha manufacturer; a Londoner, his testimonials included one from F.D. Maurice; his career was modest, and he never held a living. The second was 31 year old George William Palmer, ordained as a 'Deacon schoolmaster', with High Church support. Given that Mackarness if anything reduced the non-Oxbridge element among his candidates, it is clear that the ordinands at Oxford were almost entirely what churchmen could gratefully recognise as 'gentlemen': the devotional atmosphere was thus perhaps buttressed by social homogeneity.

At Ripon the situation was very different. Had the diocese tried to rely upon graduates it could never have supplied its parishes; Oxford men in particular were exceedingly rare, even in the episcopate

83. Rev. Derwent Coleridge, who in a pamphlet of 1862 referred to teachers as working 'in subordinate but harmonious co-operation with their pastors, and other social superiors who may be engaged with them in the same work ...' (quoted by P. Horn, in Education in rural England 1800-1914 (New York, 1978), p.97. Ives' ordination was marred by a bad error of Davenport, who failed to inform him of the time of the examination; he had to be telegraphed and only arrived half-way through the first day (letters of Davenport to Archdeacon Randall, 19 and 20 Feb. 1863, and letter of Ives 18 Feb.: March 1863 ordination).

84. Ordained Dec. 1861 and June 1862. Palmer was the son of a 'Lodging House Keeper' (baptism certificate); his testimonials were headed by W.J. Butler, and he was being advised by Rev. Thomas Chamberlain (an 'advanced Tractarian', not always on the best terms with the Bishop: see Letter-Books, Nos.109n, 362, 597 and 662).

85. The reduced level in 1871-3 as against 1861-3 is continued in the years 1880-2, when of 94 ordinands there were only 10 non-graduates, of which only 2 were from a theological college (Lichfield). (In
of Longley, a man of considerable reputation at Christ Church (his
examining chaplain, Dodgson, bore a high repute there also). Already
by 1851-3 less than a half of the ordinands came from the traditional
sources, and Bickersteth was never able to reverse this development.86
Predictably, Ripon took a lot of St Bees men; the numbers in each
period were 8, 20, 9 and 12 - 49 in all, and two more than the total
from Oxford.87 Furthermore, as had been pointed out in 186588 there
were relatively few men from the fashionable colleges: in the first
two periods no men came up from Christ Church or Balliol, and a third
of the Oxford ordinands were from Halls: whilst among the Cambridge men,
there was a noticeable predominance of Johnians, whose 36 was double
the number of men from Trinity.89

F.n. 85 continued.
1870 Wilberforce said that he had kept Literates to 'The smallest
possible' percentage, though his statement that all had to have
had 2 years at theological college appears inaccurate: Ch.C.,
1870, p.508).
86. (Oxford men in fact decreased after a reasonable early represent-
ation at Ripon: there were 19 of them ordained, with 18 Cambridge
men, in Longley's first two full years, 1838 and 1839, far out-
numbering 15 from all other sources). In 1881-3 the percentage
of Oxbridge graduates had fallen to 36 (act Books). Once the
diocese was split, however, losing much of its industrial area, the
position changed considerably: in 1888-9 31 of the 42 ordinands
were Oxbridge graduates, and the 1908 Archbishop's Report shows
that they still made up over half the ordinands of 1902-6
(Appendix XVIII).
87. St Aidan's provided (from 1851-3) 5, 10 and 5: in 1881-3 it
overtook St Bees, with 15 (to 13). (The low figure of 1871-3
clearly reflects the closure and new start of the College in 1868-9).
88. See Chapter three above, note 16.
89. The Trinity figure is only so high due to an exceptional number
(8) in 1851-3; in other periods (including 1881-3) there were
always 3 or 4 only. At some periods certain colleges came to the
fore: thus in 1871-3 22 men came from three Evangelical colleges -
6 from Wadham, Oxford, and 8 each from Corpus and Christ's,
Cambridge.
### TABLE 4.4: Breakdown of the Non-Oxbridge Ordinands at Ripon:
% Figures 1-% all Ordinands: 2-% all Non-Oxbridge Ordinands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BAs</th>
<th>Univ. Non-Graduates</th>
<th>L.Th., A.K.C. Colleges</th>
<th>Theol. Literates</th>
<th>All Durham Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1841-3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1851-3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1861-3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1871-3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1881-3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. All from T.C.D. or Durham except 2 in 1861-3 and 2 in 1871-3: T.C.D. figures 12, 9, 11, 8, 9 respectively.
3. Mostly Durham L.Th's. Also includes men from Queen's College, Birmingham, who are very rare: Durham component 4 in 1871-3 and 23 in 1881-3.
4. In first 3 periods St Bees and St Aidan's only: thereafter they made up 17/21 and 28/43 (Chichester and Highbury 4 each).
5. All others: includes occasional Missionary College students and most Dissenting ministers.
6. Total of Durham B.A.s, non-graduates and L.Th's.
At Ripon one can also see a certain shift in the balance of the non-Oxbridge men (see Table 4.4). In 1851-3, almost 40% of all the ordinands were from St Bees or St Aidan’s, or were literates; there were 14 of these last. This was, however, the peak of their incidence; after making up 10 and 14% of the ordinands in the first two periods, they thereafter comprised only 4 to 6%; and as this included many of the ex-Dissenting ministers, the 'true' literates - the men with no formal training or experience - can be seen to be a negligible part of the whole. The proportion from theological colleges, on the other hand, remained very steady. Men with B.A.s, however, while a very stable absolute number, fell proportionately when total ordinands increased in 1871-3 and 1881-3. As the two extremes of the non-Oxbridge component (i.e. B.A.s and literates) proportionately declined, a new type of ordinand took their place. Put another way, while the non-Oxbridge B.A.s and the literates were at best steady in their number, the growth which occurred after 1861-3 was mostly due to the new group: non-graduate university men, and men with diplomas from Durham or King's College, London. It is thus the middle of the range - men

Summary table, from Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th>1851-3</th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th>1871-3</th>
<th>1881-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cols. 1 No.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 5 % 1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 73</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cols. 2 No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 3 % 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

able to consider but not complete university, for reasons financial or intellectual, and men able to complete the relatively well-regarded two-year courses of Durham and King's College - who became increasingly important; and Durham was by 1881-3 at last playing a really significant role in supplying at least this northern diocese.
necessary to enter into detail on the differences between the social backgrounds of university and non-graduate ordinands. The results from the ordination papers, however, are worth looking at, because they are largely based on the baptism certificates of the candidates (or declarations in their stead). It hardly needs saying that these are very far from perfect evidence, and are much less useful than an accurate contemporary register would be: but only Venn (partially) qualifies as such. Not only do the baptism certificates refer to at least 23 years before the ordination, but they also are sometimes uninformative, giving the non-committal status titles of 'Esquire' or 'gentleman'. Nevertheless, they do provide some evidence in cases where, often, none otherwise exists; and in cases where the university registers are silent they throw some light on their registration practices (particularly at Oxford). They also allow some effort to differentiate between groups of particular educational backgrounds - notably Oxbridge graduates - who were ordained in different places.

The main results are set out in Table 4.5. None of the numbers involved is very large, and conclusions must be drawn with caution. One may start with the gentry and aristocracy fathers. At first sight there seem to be very few, at least if it is expected that the clergy were largely younger sons of the gentry. In fact there are almost

90. The Cambridge evidence has already been cited (above, Chapter two, p.50-2). At Oxford, where 'arm' or 'gent' are the two most common descriptions, I have put together the 14 cases from Ripon with 45 cases from Oxford (1851-3 and 1861-3) where baptism certificates can be used for comparison. The result is of some help: first, fathers described as 'Esquire' or 'gentleman' on the certificates split very evenly between the two Oxford classifications, though 'Esquires' are slightly more likely to be 'arm' than 'gent' (5/9 to 4/10): second, most professionals were described as 'arm'; only 3/15 lawyers, doctors or schoolmasters were 'gent' - and all 11 military officers were 'arm': third, and in marked contrast, 10/11 traders and merchants, both farmers, and a 'shoemaker', were described as 'gent'. On
TABLE 4.5: Father's Occupations, in Cases Where Ordination Papers Survive: Oxford and Ripon Diocese Samples

Oxford and Cambridge Graduates (1), and Rest (2): (with significant % figures in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Aristocracy and gentry</th>
<th>Clergy Professions</th>
<th>Estd. Trade &amp; Finance Professions</th>
<th>Minor Professions</th>
<th>Status Title only</th>
<th>Misc. Non-Professional</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20(33)</td>
<td>15(25)</td>
<td>7(12)</td>
<td>12(20)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19(36)</td>
<td>10(19)</td>
<td>4(8)</td>
<td>13(25)</td>
<td>4(8)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22(42)</td>
<td>7(13)</td>
<td>6(11)</td>
<td>9(17)</td>
<td>4(8)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19(36)</td>
<td>10(19)</td>
<td>4(8)</td>
<td>13(25)</td>
<td>4(8)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(18)</td>
<td>3(27)</td>
<td>2(18)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2(18)</td>
<td>3(27)</td>
<td>2(18)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Classifications are as for tables in Chapter two: see Table 2. Bracketed figures show number with ordination papers, out of total cases.

RIPON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Aristocracy and gentry</th>
<th>Clergy Professions</th>
<th>Estd. Trade &amp; Finance Professions</th>
<th>Minor Professions</th>
<th>Status Title only</th>
<th>Misc. Non-Professional</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4(22)</td>
<td>2(11)</td>
<td>3(17)</td>
<td>2(11)</td>
<td>4(22)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6(38)</td>
<td>6(38)</td>
<td>2(13)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7(37)</td>
<td>5(26)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7(29)</td>
<td>5(21)</td>
<td>2(8)</td>
<td>2(8)</td>
<td>1(4)</td>
<td>4(17)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5(17)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>4(13)</td>
<td>2(7)</td>
<td>11(37)</td>
<td>4(13)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
certainly more than are shown here, hidden among the 'Esquires' and 'Gentlemen': but probably not very many, for evidently many of these were not gentry.\textsuperscript{91} That there should be more gentry fathers at Oxford than at Ripon is no surprise; though it may well be that neither diocese is a very good one in which to seek the stereotypical younger sons destined for family livings.\textsuperscript{92} But on the whole it seems a reasonable inference that sons of the gentry were at this period no more than a small minority.\textsuperscript{93}

Sons of clergy, on the other hand, were a significant and probably growing proportion of all ordinands. At Oxford they certainly became a larger proportion in Wilberforce's episcopate, and the rise seems to have been continuing under his successor.\textsuperscript{94}

\textbf{F.n. 90 continued.}

this evidence, if Al. Ox's 'gents' were not necessarily non-professionals this is very probable, and it is even more so that such men were described as 'gent'.

\textbf{91.} This can be assumed from the fact that many of them (see last note) did not claim armigerous status. There is also one fortuitous piece of evidence in the papers: in the Sept. 1862 Oxford papers the certificate of F.R. Michell covers him and a brother, and the father is shown respectively as 'Esquire' and 'solicitor'.

\textbf{92.} In 1887 H.P. Thomas wrote, for instance, that 'in Lincolnshire, perhaps more than elsewhere, it used to be a matter of course for one of the younger sons of each of the county families to take Orders ...' (The Church and the Land ..., 1887, p.27: unfortunately J. Obelkevich throws no light on this in his recent study of part of the county, Religion and Rural Society, 1976).

\textbf{93.} This of course ignores the question of less direct gentry links: for instance, many of the clergy or professional fathers may have been younger sons of landed families, or there might be collateral connections. In my opinion such links were probably common; but there is a need for studies of the diffusion of the gentry.

\textbf{94.} For similar evidence, see Pugh, op. cit., Table F, p.288, which shows a rise from 24.5\% of 1845-7 ordinands to 41.3\% of the 1867-9 period. The only qualification to this picture is that in my 1841-3 sample sons of clergy make up 38.1\% (relying on Al.Ox. and Venn), a proportion of the whole not passed until the 1871-3 sample.
can be usefully illustrated by some figures from the Cambridge honours sample. In this, sons of the clergy grew as a proportion of the whole sample; this fact is attributable to the growth of university-educated clergy that occurred with the first expansion of the universities, for these clergy in turn sent their sons to the universities, so echoing their own growth, a generation later. The effect in the sample was that while the sons of clergy steadily moved toward careers other than the Church, those that were ordained remained a larger proportion of all those ordained. This is illustrated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parentage:</th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th>1851-3</th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th>1871-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>No. 1 - 2</td>
<td>56 77 24</td>
<td>68 74 24</td>
<td>69 65 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>No. 1 - 2</td>
<td>179 65 76</td>
<td>212 60 76</td>
<td>155 47 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that while the percentage of clerical sons being ordained dropped overall by 25 (from 77 to 52), they still made up more of all men ordained (30, as against 24%). In other words, the rising proportion of ordinands who were sons of clergymen did not necessarily mean that the sons of clergy were immune from the attractions of other professions: there were just more of them.

Another point about the sons of clergy is that they still seem to have mostly been educated at Oxford or Cambridge. In the Oxford diocese this was almost uniformly true, and the exceptions are
negligible. At Ripon there is evidence of a change, but it cannot be pressed too far: of the five sons of clergy ordained in 1871-3 who were not Oxbridge graduates, two had been at Cambridge colleges, without taking their degrees, and two more were from T.C.D.; the one who had attended theological college only was the 33 year old son of a Kent rural dean, who had been at St Aidan's, and had probably chosen this course with the aim of a quick, rather than of only a cheap training. More generally, however, it seems that the sons of clergy were little better than others in terms of responding to the needs of the north; in these samples, at least, they showed a distinct preference for ordination at Oxford.

The results for most of the groups need, or can sustain little elaboration. At Oxford there are signs of the narrowing of intake implied by the growing proportion of clerical sons: fathers in the 'established professions' (civil and military government officers, legal and medical men) became rarer, and even if the 'Esquires' and 'gentlemen' hid others, they also did not grow. Little else, however, can be said; the 'non-professionals' increased slightly, but remained a real minority, most of whom had anyway been through Oxford or Cambridge. There is thus little to qualify the picture of Oxford's ordinands' being a representative sample of graduates: a few gentry, a few poorer men, with a large majority being the sons of clergy or of professional and,

95. The one case in 1851-3 was a 24 year-old who had been teaching for 5 years at the new High Church foundation, Glenalmond (J.M. Tayler, ordained May 1853). The 1861-3 cases were a 45 year-old D.Med. (Edinburgh) and a 27 year-old non-graduate of New College, Oxford).

96. Francis G. Deedes; he returned to Kent after 3 years and passed the rest of his life there. (It is assumed that money alone would be unlikely to prevent the son of a rural dean from graduating: also he had evidently been long away from school, and indeed only passed in the 3rd class at St Aidan's, so presumably his scholastic ambitions were not great).

97. In 1871-3 the two non-Oxbridge men were the son of a Darlington tailor, who had a B.A. from Durham, and one literate, Robert
to a lesser extent, business men.

At Ripon the numbers of graduates are too small to allow a
detailed analysis, but they are for the most part not unlike their
Oxford counterparts. The exceptions, however, are worth notice. The
lesser proportion of sons of clergy has been mentioned; this was
balanced by more 'non-professionals'. The numbers are tiny; but
whereas, in the three latter periods, the Oxbridge men ordained at
Oxford included only 10 'miscellaneous non-professionals' in a total
of 166, the same group at Ripon included 10 such men out of only 58.
Among the non-Oxbridge group at Ripon, the non-professionals were at
least a third of the total, and were quite evenly spread among the men
from other universities, or from none. The overall picture is
similar to that gained from St Bees. It is again clear, for instance,
that age was one of the major differences between the Oxbridge
ordinands and the rest (see Table 4.6). At 23 or 24 years old, a man
had had time to finish his degree, and prepare himself for perhaps a
year: this was the pattern for the majority of Oxbridge graduates,
at both dioceses. (This is consistent with the conventional opinion,
expressed in 1863; in this case the age of the incumbents of Lord
Chancellor's livings was being calculated by assuming that they were 23
when ordained deacon. 'In the majority of cases', wrote the anonymous
author, 'this will be found true to the very year, as it is seldom
that any but regular men have been preferred by the Lord Chancellor'.

F.n. 97 continued.
Blythe; he was an exceptional case: the 41 year-old son of a
Windsor 'shoemaker', he was ordained to work as chaplain to a
Windsor school (he had probably taught there) and was eventually
rewarded by the Dean and Chapter of Windsor with a rural Wiltshire
living.

98. i.e. the literates and men from non-graduate colleges were no more
likely than men from Durham, T.C.D. and King's College (or
university non-graduates) to have non-professional fathers (though
they were a little more likely to leave no evidence on their
fathers).
### TABLE 4.6: Ages of Oxford and Ripon Ordinands at Ordination

(Oxford and Cambridge Graduates, and all Others; Excludes Colleges Fellows): With Rounded % Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>23 or 24</th>
<th>25 or 26</th>
<th>27 to 29</th>
<th>30 plus</th>
<th>Not known</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>12(67)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4(22)</td>
<td>2(11)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12(67)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4(22)</td>
<td>2(11)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>27(63)</td>
<td>12(28)</td>
<td>2(5)</td>
<td>2(5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29(59)</td>
<td>12(24)</td>
<td>4(8)</td>
<td>2(4)</td>
<td>2(4)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>26(79)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>4(12)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>3(27)</td>
<td>4(36)</td>
<td>2(18)</td>
<td>2(18)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29(66)</td>
<td>6(14)</td>
<td>3(7)</td>
<td>6(14)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>26(65)</td>
<td>7(18)</td>
<td>5(13)</td>
<td>2(5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28(61)</td>
<td>9(20)</td>
<td>5(11)</td>
<td>3(7)</td>
<td>1(2)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not given where row total is less than 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>23 or 24</th>
<th>25 or 26</th>
<th>27 to 29</th>
<th>30 plus</th>
<th>Not known</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIPON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>9(47)</td>
<td>3(16)</td>
<td>1(5)</td>
<td>5(26)</td>
<td>1(5)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(18)</td>
<td>3(27)</td>
<td>3(27)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3(27)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11(37)</td>
<td>6(20)</td>
<td>4(13)</td>
<td>5(17)</td>
<td>4(13)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>12(57)</td>
<td>3(14)</td>
<td>3(14)</td>
<td>3(14)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5(18)</td>
<td>5(18)</td>
<td>7(25)</td>
<td>8(29)</td>
<td>3(11)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17(35)</td>
<td>8(16)</td>
<td>10(20)</td>
<td>11(22)</td>
<td>3(6)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>14(82)</td>
<td>1(6)</td>
<td>1(6)</td>
<td>1(6)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6(30)</td>
<td>2(10)</td>
<td>2(10)</td>
<td>10(50)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20(54)</td>
<td>3(8)</td>
<td>3(8)</td>
<td>11(30)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>13(54)</td>
<td>8(33)</td>
<td>3(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5(17)</td>
<td>5(17)</td>
<td>6(20)</td>
<td>14(47)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18(33)</td>
<td>13(24)</td>
<td>9(17)</td>
<td>14(26)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the exceptional cases it is unfortunately rare for the papers or the directories to reveal the intervening employment. Looking only at men who were over 30 when ordained, they fall into two groups. The smaller consisted of men who had taken their degree at the normal age, and so had several years after their degrees before ordination: two were at the bar, but the employments of the others are not known. The larger group consisted of men who had come to the university late; the papers are no more informative, and only two of these fourteen cases are clear, one having been in East Indian Army, the other in business in Singapore. It can only be inferred that these men were both financially better-off and socially more assured than the larger numbers of older men who trained at theological colleges.

99. _The Lord Chancellor’s Act for the Sale of his Livings; with a full account of each ... ‘By a Clergyman of the Church of England’ (1863); prefatory note._

100. This is out of five (at Ripon and Oxford): Bagehot had described the giving up of the bar for ordination as ‘an event of extremely common occurrence with Oxford men’, so this perhaps accounts for a considerable share of all graduate ordinands of 25 and over (Collected Works, ed. N. St.J. Stevas, Vol.7, p.351, on ‘Oxford’, 1852).

101. Henry Hubert Cornish was 30 when ordained in May 1842: his family were minor Devon gentry with an exceptional tradition of careers overseas, especially in India (4 of the 6 sons of his father’s generation went to India, and he was one of 3 of his own father’s 5 sons who joined the Indian army): he was last principal of New Inn Hall, and a conservative (Burke, LG, W.R. Ward, Victorian Oxford, p.229 and n.116, J.W. Burgon, Lives of Twelve Good Men (1891 ed.), p.378). Arthur John Empson went to Singapore after Rugby: he married a daughter of W.F. Hook, who used often to stay with them (Venn, Stephens’ Life of Hook, Vol.2, pp.382 and 465).

102. One obvious shared characteristic of the Oxford men in this group was that 7 out of 8 of them had graduated from Magdalen Hall. Of the 6 Cambridge men 2 had been at St Catharine’s, but the others had all been at different colleges.
Among men with other educational backgrounds, the importance of the older men is clear: there can be no doubt that this factor highlighted the educational distinction between the traditionally-educated and the non-graduate clergy. It was almost a defining characteristic of these latter that they had considerable previous employment experience. There is here no evidence on this matter comparable to that on the St Bees men, but what little there is indicates a comparable range of experience. At the bottom of the scale, there was a man whose father was a labourer, and who had himself been apprenticed to a hairdresser; he came, at 26 years of age, from St Aidan’s; two men had been teachers. These are three of the four cases where previous secular employment can be identified: There were probably many more of similar backgrounds.

In at least occasional cases, the literates were of a different

103. His life story is illuminated by interesting papers generated by his having changed his name after, as he wrote, by an unspecified 'act of my Father's disgrace was brought upon the family - placing us in circumstances by no means to be desired ...' (John Anker Scott, formerly Sopps: papers, March 1862).

104. One was the Russian Jew Nahum Nurnberg (described on his own baptism certificate: Sept. 1863), the other was Samuel Crawley (33), ordained in Dec. 1873, who had been at St Mark's College, and apparently taught thereafter: unusually, he already possessed a Lambeth M.A.

105. In two cases (apart from those mentioned below, where other information also exists) ordinands are known only to have been Licensed scripture Readers, i.e. lay parish workers (both cases were in 1852). There may well have been more - in 1847 Longley had offered to ordain Readers of 2 years' standing (Charge of 1847, cited by R.A. Soloway, Prelates and People (1969), p.325), though apparently a 'preparatory examination' was required (letter of W.T. Grear to J. Burder, June 1852 papers).

106. Interestingly Bickersteth discontinued the use of 'literate' as a formal description of ordinands (as such it was used on the 'orders' themselves): letter of Wise to Lee, 9 Dec. 1872; thereafter the space was left blank.
kind, men of means and experience for whom it was evidently felt that no training was necessary. In December 1871 35 year-old Thomas Ivens was ordained to serve in the parish of Heaton, Bradford; his stipend was a nominal 5/- p.a., and according to a letter from his incumbent he had 'been gratuitously labouring in my parish for about twelve months as layman ...'. There are two cases, however, which fortunately can be seen in some detail, mainly because of the autobiographical urges of one of them. William Henry and John Edwin Brigg were first cousins, descendants of long lines of dissenting and Wesleyan merchants and large tradesmen of both Leeds and London; the two joined in a partnership with their fathers, ('Brigg and Sons, Woollen Manufacturers and Merchants'), which lasted from 1857 to 1871. When it broke up both cousins were a little over 40; they were married to two sisters; thus the following account by John very probably describes a process both went through, for William was ordained in November 1871, and John in September 1872.

In 1872, being out of business, and it being necessary that I should again have a vocation, I was led to examine the Book of Common Prayer and to read Dr Boultbee's "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles", which showed me that the views I held had a recognized place in the Church of England. At this time the Rev. Edward Jackson, of St. James's, Leeds, offered me a title for orders ...

107. The family, in all its branches, is exhaustively described in J.E. Brigg's (Memorials of the Family of Newsom and Brigg (privately printed, Huddersfield, 1898). It provides an artlessly fascinating glimpse at the solid dissenting piety of the late 18th and 19th centuries. Among the ancestors were Rev. James Bowden, a leading London Congregationalist minister 1776-1812 (one of whose sons is described simply as: 'George. He was very good, and was drowned in Hull Docks in 1824'), and substantial London tradesmen (cordwainers and apothecaries, including Masters of their respective Companies). The Briggs had been Leeds woollen merchants since the early 18th century, though not of the first rank, and mostly Methodists since Joseph (d.1790) contributed to the first Leeds chapel; see esp. pp.17-20, 33-44, 57-64.

His views were those of a devout Wesleyan class leader, supporter of the Evangelical Alliance, and a man steeped in the canny piety of his forbears. Both he and his cousin took merely nominal stipends, being in possession of capital of some £10,000 each.

The connection with Edward Jackson is interesting, for Jackson had himself been ordained at the age of 33 in 1845, thus abandoning a prosperous business career (to the chagrin of his father). He went on to become the best-known churchman in Leeds; he is also a salutary example of the difficulty of labelling men by party: he was always a High Churchman (he was Hook's right hand man in the late 1840s) and retained distinctive 'High' sacramental doctrines and the characteristic love of the Church's seasons - yet in his later years he 'became ... a sort of leader of the Evangelicals', was chairman of the 'Craven Evangelical Union' and was even a member of the Elland Society.

F.n. 108 continued.
Bradford Directory was 4 Park Lane, though most of their work was apparently done on the suburban 'estate' at Carlton Hill).

109. Quotation from p.8 of A parting memento from John Edwin Brigg ... (Huddersfield 1904); in this, as in the Memorials there is much evidence of his strong identification with the traditional family piety - if not necessarily of the Calvinism of some sections; later he and his second wife twice attended Keswick Conventions (p.9). Brigg's own father remembered on his tombstone an episode in his youth when he had inadvertently sold cloth of lower quality than contracted - and was saved by the illness of the buyer, who had sworn serious consequences (Memorials, p.62).

110. William's personal estate was proved in 1878 at 'under £10,000' and John's in 1920 at just under £10,500. John was businesslike - he was executor of no less than three family estates in 1878 - and lived a married but childless life, so his estate probably represented roughly what he started with.

111. Sketches of the life of Edward Jackson of Leeds ... (ed. L. and K. Sykes: 2nd ed., 1913), pp.7-16. He 'inherited means sufficient to admit of an independent life', but spent generously and 'died a comparatively poor man' (p.8).

112. Ibid., esp. pp.19-22 (his early semi-monastic life at St Saviour's), 30-9 and 98-9; yet he also disliked Eternal Punishment, and had friends of all denominations, from Roman Catholic to Quaker and even Unitarian (133 and 246-7); his background was apparently dissenting - certainly his mother was a Moravian, and he attended their Fulneck school (pp.8-10): his honorary canonry was from
The last honour may have been an acknowledgement of his constant efforts to choose and support through university poor men who wished to be ordained. In the Briggs he seems to have attracted men of a different sort; and within a couple of years Jackson and William Brigg appear separately as instrumental in the ordinations of two members of another group deserving some closer examination, ex-Dissenting ministers.

Instances of ex-Dissenting ministers have already been noted at St Bees; they do not appear in any great quantity at Ripon, but that may be partly a matter of the papers themselves. Still, in 1871-3 four of the sample of 30 non-Oxbridge ordinands were of this type (and one from outside the sample was noted in passing); and there is some reason to believe that churchmen in this period saw significance in such cases. George Huntington's popular and journalistic *The Church's work in our large towns*, in its second edition in 1871, remarks in a footnote that '25 per cent. of our clergy are the sons of Dissenting and Wesleyan ministers, and 6 per cent. of the candidates for Orders at the last Ordination were Dissenting ministers'; he added that St Bees had received 30 applications from such men in one year. There is no supporting reference, and the whole is difficult to believe, particularly the first part; Dissenting ministerial fathers appear in the St Bees, Cambridge and ordination samples, but

---
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Bickersteth in 1875, and his election to the Elland Society was in 1881 (for latter, Elland Rules of 1933, p.76, and Minute Book September 1880 and April 1881).

113. Sykes, op. cit., pp.40 and 250: In 1886 he said that his (large and important) church schools had educated 'forty or fifty ordained ministers' (p.82: these may have included the 12 missionaries sent out by 1872, pp.74-5). (His connection with the Briggs is further attested by the fact that he officiated when William was buried: Memorials, p.61).

114. P.274, note 'c'.
rarely: 25% seems to be simply an outrageous exaggeration.\textsuperscript{115} The second figure, however, may not be so far out. The phenomenon of Dissenters crossing to the ministry of the Church was not new;\textsuperscript{116} and there were certainly stories current in mid-century about both Bishop Burgess of Salisbury and Bishop Sumner of Chester having been approached by many Dissenters for ordination.\textsuperscript{117} More to the point, Bickersteth's son recalled his father telling him 'that he believed that he had applications from Dissenting ministers seeking Orders in the Church, on an average once a fortnight.' Many were unsuitable from their age, or lack of education, while others 'were apparently only anxious to share the social position of the Established clergy ...'; but he adds that his father did ordain 'many ... who brought into the Church intellectual and spiritual qualifications of the highest order.'\textsuperscript{118} It may be that his episcopate saw an unusual number of such cases: in 1861 it was suggested that the shortfall in clergy supply 'might be easily supplied from dissenting ministers who were desirous of coming over to the Church without bringing their

\textsuperscript{115} Kingswood, the Methodist school which mainly educated ministers' sons, had by 1906 educated some 5,000 boys, of whom about 500 'have filled their father's profession, while over one hundred have taken' Anglican orders. (The Public Schools from Within ..., 1906, p.246).

\textsuperscript{116} In 1837 Jabez Bunting was told of two Leeds local preachers who were going over to the Church, one to a curacy - though he was 'a vain pedantic schoolmaster' according to the writer: Early Victorian Methodism ..., ed. W.R. Ward (1976), p.199.

\textsuperscript{117} The Times, in a leader of 10 Sept. 1856 recounted how Burgess had been approached by an 'incredible number - we are afraid to say how many' - Dissenting ministers seeking ordination; they had, however, withdrawn upon discovering the poorness of the pay and conditions they could expect. Dr Hume told a story of Sumner's having had an entire batch of 30 ordinands supplied by ex-Dissenting ministers. (CCR 1861, p.121): neither tale, of course, is trustworthy in detail.

\textsuperscript{118} M.C. Bickersteth, op. cit., p.164.
congregations with them'; there was the St Aidan's scandal described in Chapter three, and in 1870 Archdeacon Emery cited an ex-Dissenter clergyman who had told him that 'there were several hundreds' of ministers and ministerial students willing to be ordained if the Church would make it easier for them.  

What motivated those who wished to come over, must remain largely obscure. Bickersteth referred to men attracted by social advantages, and it is inconceivable that such considerations did not count for something with many. The notorious and appalling snobbery with which churchpeople regarded dissent as a whole clearly engendered in most a justified anger, but cannot have failed to engender in some the wish to be on the 'superior' side of the divide; what attracted so many of the Dissenting

119. This was Dr Hume, CCR 1861, p.121 (as note 117); Hume was an exceptionally conscientious (and statistically-minded) Liverpool clergyman, helped by the St Aidan's students in his surveys (Heeney, op. cit., esp. pp.19, 26, 88-9, 106 and 122).

120. Ch.C. 1870, pp.60-1; typically, this was part of an argument in favour of opening ordination to a broader social range, with the implication that Dissenters represented a lower social background. For a nice qualification to such views, in 1868 it was observed that a leading objection of Methodists to reunion was the Church's 'lax preparation and easy admission, without their strict preparation ...' (G.H. Curteis, Bishop Selwyn (1889), p.200); E.E. Kellett, in As I Remember (1936) described the considerable learning of the Wesleyan ministers (pp.208-10 and 212-3) - though he thought them not comparable to the Scots ministers (p.219).

121. This hardly needs illustration; it ranged from the 'cultural' disdain of Matthew Arnold, through the cruder but similar prejudices of the Cambridge man of the mid-1860s who blamed Dissenters for lowering 'the Physique of the University' and hence for the loss of the boat-race (C. Smythe, Simeon and Church order, 1940, p.105, n.3), to the theological - or quasi-theological: i.e. the clerical meeting that agreed in 1857 that the 'primary' cause of Dissent was 'the proud, sensual, and rebellious character of the natural mind ...' (Eighteen years of a clerical meeting ..., ed. R. Seymour and J.F. Mackarness, 1862, p.232).
laity cannot have left the ministers untouched. 122

On the other hand, it is clear that ordaining bishops were intensely aware of such possible motives; but patently 'inferior' men were by no means the only problem. If Bickersteth (and doubtless others) rejected some for lack of education, those otherwise qualified faced (as the Burgess story indicated) a career that in worldly terms was probably worse than that which they had as Dissenters. The subject was raised in the Upper House of Convocation in 1872, when Bishop Ellicott (of Gloucester and Bristol) asked the advice of his brethren on the educational qualifications to be required of Dissenting ministers; he noted that such men, if not only possessing experience but also 'competently instructed in the Holy Scriptures in their original languages, as many ... now are', could justly plead for relaxation of 'the rules which at present obtain in most of the dioceses of the Southern Province.' There followed some characteristically perceptive comments from Magee of Peterborough: by accepting such men a bishop brought into the Church men who were often of some distinction and standing in their previous communities, who expected more rapid promotion than the raw young curates. 'These persons', he continued,

are placed in an invidious position towards others if you promote them rapidly, and in an awkward and humiliating position if they are kept long as curates. [While for the bishop the difficulty was that] by rapidly promoting such men, it might be said that you were making Nonconformity a back door to the Church. 123

122. Again the flight of the rich to the Church is confirmed in any history of Dissent or Dissenters. A nice case of the movement from Dissent to Church via money is given by Brigg in his Memorials: one line of the great James Bowden's family descended thus: son - another Congregational minister: grandson - married a Bristol heiress: great grandson - C. of E. clergyman, married a Worcestershire heiress (pp.21-2).

123. Ch.C. 1872, pp.197-8: Jackson of London also noted that experienced Dissenting ministers 'enter the ministry of the Church of England under great disadvantages.' R.C. Nightingale, one of the applicants to the Curates' Augmentation Fund (see Chapter five,
Dissenting ministers, then, had neither easy access to ordination, nor particularly good prospects after it. There seems little reason to doubt that in most cases their main motivation was a conviction that the Church of England best allowed the carrying out of their religious vocation. In two cases the process can be seen a little more clearly, and both show also that an inability to avow the distinctive positions of their denominations was a leading factor. Thomas Knox Magee Morrow was ordained in March 1862, after having ministered in the Irish Presbyterian Church for over 20 years. A full statement told how in 1858, after a particularly virulent attack by another Presbyterian upon the Church of Ireland, Morrow had been suspected of writing an anonymous reply; certainly he was sympathetic. Harassed by official prosecution and unofficial 'persecution', he retired in July 1861, and sought ordination, as being 'still desirous to devote all his energies to the service of God, though not as a minister of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland ...'  

The other case involved Thomas R.H. Sturges, a 27 year-old who had been trained as a Baptist minister in Spurgeon's Metropolitan College (though he was baptised originally as a Wesleyan). Spurgeon himself
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section 2) wrote in 1891. 'Before my ordination I was a Nonconf. Minister. My income was about £350 with a prospect of its being £700 in a short time'; after 16 years as a curate he now earned less than £150 p.a.

124. Morrow had spent five years at the Royal Belfast College, from the ages of 14 to 19, and was ordained at 21; he had spent his whole ministerial life at Muckamore, hear Antrim (papers March 1863).

125. Spurgeon wrote in his Autobiography that the College never refused men on account of poverty, and that they 'placed the literary qualifications of admission so low that even brethren who could not read have been able to enter ...' (Vol.2, pp.148-9, quoted in J. Briggs and I. Sellers, ed., Victorian Nonconformity, 1973, p.112). Sturges probably was not, however, of this class, his father being a 'Commission agent' and thus evidently literate.
wrote in a testimonial that 'His views upon Baptism were I think never very settled', and thought he would be 'most at home with Methodist friends'; in the event, after a pastorate of six months in Hertfordshire he had resigned, and had spent the intervening year at Lichfield College before ordination in December 1872.126

In the other cases there is no such evidence. Only one was of the type Magee had described, Thomas Dunkerley, a Wesleyan Methodist. A letter from an ex-colleague of his, now a clergyman of the Church of Ireland, makes it clear that Dunkerley was a considerable catch; he had been for six years Superintendent of two London circuits, and had then 'transferred to Leeds first circuit which was in itself a great honour for one of his age' (about 32). What caused his change of allegiance, after five apparently successful years, is not known, but it seems that the Vicar of Leeds, Dr Woodford, was probably involved; and it is an indication of Bickersteth's trust in Woodford (despite his being a very high Churchman) that his name was sufficient on the testimonial, the normal requirement of three beneficed clergy being dispensed with.127 This was in fact not wholly unusual in the case of these ex-Dissenters, who had rarely been known to any beneficed clergymen for the formal three years;128 evidently much depended upon the character of the main supporters of the candidate. Thus a man ordained with Sturges, also after a year at Lichfield (Henry Edwards, 126. Papers Dec. 1872: the note from his chapel described how 'toward the latter end of his time, he appeared very unsettled, and his views of the rite of Baptism, having apparently changed, he resigned ...' (dated 2 Nov. 1871).

127. Papers Feb. 1872: the letter was from John Stokoe, who had once been Superintendent of the Irish Mission - which would please Bickersteth, who was prominent in the Irish Church Missions (M.C. Bickersteth, op. cit., pp.49-54: the largely negative effects of the I.C.M. are a theme of D. Bowen's The Protestant Crusade in Ireland 1800-70 ..., Dublin, 1978).

128. None of the seven cases examined could produce formally correct testimonials, though they usually did have three signatures.
30, an ex-independent minister) knew only one beneficed clergyman, but had William Brigg (still then a curate) sign the testimonial too, in the belief that 'the latter will answer the denomination of a grave minister.' Another ex-independent, William Aston (34), was ordained a year later; in his case Edward Jackson was his main contact in the Church, reading his Si Quis and being the only signer of his testimonial who had known him for more than six months: but, as Wise explained to Lee, Bickersteth was 'satisfied with Mr. Aston's Testl. ... his Lordship can depend upon Mr. Jackson ...'

The careers of the four ex-ministers in the 1871-3 sample are consistent with the remarks quoted earlier. Sturges, the ex-Baptist, had a very modest career, holding 8 curacies (seven in the north and a last in London) over 22 years, after which he disappears from Crockford. Edwards, who was the son of a Huddersfield merchant, had a very local career: before his ordination he had worked as a Lay Agent for the Vicar of Almondbury, C.A. Hulbert; in the next six years he held three curacies in the Huddersfield-Almondbury area, before being presented by Hulbert to the small living of Linthwaite, an industrial village in the same area; he died in the post 13 years later. William Aston similarly remained very local; his last four

130. Papers Dec. 1873, letter of 10 Dec. Aston had attended Spring Hill College 1863-6: he had previously been a solicitor's clerk in Birmingham (from his will): at baptism his father was a 'weaver', of Brick Kiln Lane, Coventry.
131. Sturges' career is taken from Crockford: he was a C.A.F. grantee in 1892 (C.A.F. Report, p.15). The details on Edwards are taken from his ordination papers (nomination by C.A. Hulbert) and Crockford; various local directories describe Linthwaite and his previous parishes. He died at Harwich after a rough trip from Antwerp, where he had gone in an attempt to benefit his failing health (Yorkshire Post, 29 Aug. 1891, which described him as 'of a homely, unassuming nature'). The previous day's edition, under 'Ecclesiastical News', noted a recent 'flow of 'verts from Nonconformity to the ministry of' the C. of E.: it commented that they rarely got livings, which is clearly only half-true.
years as an Independent minister were in Leeds, and he spent the first 17 years of his Anglican ministry in Bradford: five years as a curate, then 11 years as Vicar of St Thomas's, to which he was presented by Bickersteth. A hard-working and evidently intelligent man, he took a B.A. from T.C.D. in 1877 (and his LL.D. in 1880), and became a leading figure among church educationalists. In 1890 he was rewarded by the Bishop with a rural living, but died suddenly within the year.\(^\text{132}\)
(The net estates of these two ex-Independents were £388 and nil, respectively). The only exception to this pattern of modest and local usefulness was Dunkerley's. A year after his ordination he was presented to the small rural living of Hoar Cross, Staffordshire, by the wealthy landowner Mrs Meynell-Ingram, whose seat this was. After nine years he was presented to St Thomas's, Toxteth Park, by W.E. Gladstone (it was the last church built by his father), and he benefited from his patron's brief spell in office in 1886 by being appointed to a very good Crown living near Hull, where he lived out his days.\(^\text{133}\)
The overall importance of the contribution of ex-Dissenters to the Church cannot be easily judged: at the least they were a useful supplement of tried men,\(^\text{134}\) at the most, as one prominent Dissenter

---

132. Ordination papers, directories, Crockford: obituaries in the Ripon Diocesan Calendar, 1892, pp.117-8, and Yorkshire Post, 1 June 1891: he had been 'a promoter and one of the secretaries of the Northern Church Educational Union', and an active member of his School Board; he 'gave evidence before the Royal Commission on Education in 1887, and was looked up to by Churchmen as an authority on educational matters.'

133. Crockford; Mrs Meynell-Ingram probably knew of him in Yorkshire, for she had lands worth over £30,000 p.a. in the N. and W. Ridings. Dunkerley's last living was worth £750 plus the proceeds from 115 acres of glebe, all to serve a population of 762: he was there till 1898.

134. Though in 1898 Archdeacon Sandford of Exeter thought that 'A man could not grasp the tone and temper of the English Church in a less period than five years' - hence, he thought, the failure of many ex-Dissenters as clergymen (Ch.C., 1898, pp.402-3).
wrote in 1902, half the truly active clergy, teachers and visitors in the church were 'Dissenters by origin.' Huntington almost certainly had written rather wildly; but, at Ripon at least, and quite possibly in the other northern dioceses also, the Church evidently did draw largely upon the sons - if not of Dissenting ministers - at least of Dissenting laymen, and the crossing over of ministers was far from unknown. This was thus part of the pressure exerted upon its rivals by the reviving Victorian Church of England.  


136. This is well known: it can be illustrated by two leading Independents: Henry Allon, in 1874, wrote of 'a wonderful quickening of religious life, a wonderful development of spiritual service' in the C. of E., traceable to both the Evangelical and the Oxford movements (Within and Without ..., 1874, pp.22-3): and J.G. Rogers described the revival at length in his Church Systems of England ... (1881), writing 'As a State institution it was never so weak as it is to-day, as a Church it was never stronger ... it never gave more evidence of spiritual life' (p.95).
In the remaining chapters the subject of the clergy’s ordained lives will be examined, if inevitably rather briefly, with an emphasis upon the patterns of career which emerge from the study of the sample of clergy already introduced. No careers, perhaps, present more obvious obstructions to the quantitative approach than those of the clergy: every parish has its own character, and the quality of each clergymen’s work was largely determined by the personal and spiritual (as well as material and political) relations between him and his parish. All of this, vital to the individual clerical biography, must be put aside in the clerical prosopography. On the other hand, the clergy have certain very simple advantages as the object of a quantitative study, primarily the public nature of their lives, and livings: their patrons are (on the whole) on record, as are their professional incomes, and the basic facts about their parishes. These are the elements of the study that follows, though it is hoped that individual examples and use of a wider selection of materials will soften the angularities of a merely statistical approach.

In this chapter, two of what might be (though were not always) the extremes of the clerical career, college fellowships and curacies, are looked at.

1. THE FELLOWS

The livings in the gift of the university colleges were the only substantial reward that most of their fellows could aspire to; college teaching usually occupied only a small proportion of the
fellows, and the rest, if ordained, had only to please themselves, and stay unmarried, as they waited their turn of a college living. (When a living was available it was offered to the fellows in order of seniority; therefore generally, the longer one waited the better the chance of receiving a good living). It was a system that few appeared to find satisfactory, but only the development of a genuine career structure in the colleges and the universities could replace it; though the increased reluctance of fellows to take orders after about 1860 added a new urgency to the quest for an alternative form of reward.

The main criticism of the existing system came down to the palpable incongruity, in many cases, between the services or the aptitudes of the fellow, and the reward of a parochial cure. Liberal critics never tired of an easy target offered by the spectacle of aged bachelors sitting out years, all too often of inactivity, in expectation of the 'plum livings' they desired; the O.U.C. contained definitive statements of this criticism, memorably phrased in terms of the older fellows being, by the time their livings were obtained, 'fit neither for the post which they have coveted, nor for any other.'

1. It has already been seen that most were non-resident still in the 1880s: see above, p.90. In 1854 the Times, in a leader opposing the requirements of residence and teaching from fellows, averted that more resident fellows would just fill up college rooms and consume college provenance, while having no sufficient teaching work to do (11 April): most colleges had only one or two tutors.


3. O.U.C., 'Report', p.171; the phrasing itself seems to have been F. Temple's ('Evidence', p.130), though Jowett used almost the same words too (ibid., p.36). Roundell Palmer recalled the situation in these terms also, in his Memorials: Family and Personal
The comment by an Edinburgh Reviewer in 1848 that 'The most melancholy thing that can possibly happen to a parish ... is the arrival of a senior fellow as its incumbent', had reason as well as party feeling on its side: Constance Lady Battersea (nee Rothschild) recalled a succession of elderly Welshmen who filled the valuable local living of Aston Clinton, invariably taken by the eldest fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. Apart from illustrating the predictable unsuitability of these men as village pastors, her account usefully points up the importance of their bachelorhood: these men came as bachelors or newly married, without families - but in 1881 Jesus appointed a man who arrived with five daughters and three sons, and immediately fell into a better relationship with the village. Others lamented the sheer waste of talent that this siphoning off from college to rural parish represented, bad for the colleges, often sad for the men themselves.

The position was not unchanging, however. Nor could all fellows follow this stereotyped path of the long wait and the good living: not all livings were good, not all fellows could wait. The change that came about in the patterns of the lives of clerical fellows can
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(Vol.2, 1896), p.194, noting that 'the most jealous Churchman might doubt whether' the system answered its ends, of benefiting the Church and encouraging theological learning.

4. Edinburgh Review, Vol.88, 1848, p.181; the basic unsuitability of fellows for the actual work which went with their comfortable parochial incomes was the theme of Trollope's critical essay on them (No.7) in his Clergymen of the Church of England (1866, reprinted Leicester 1974, ed. R. apRoberts).

5. Reminiscences (1922), pp.133-4: the wives of the first two she recalls as quite unsuited to parish life. (The appointment of 1881 reflects the new situation, from the 1870s, of the colleges not having sufficient ordained fellows - or ones willing to leave college - to fill even their good livings).

6. This was part of the criticism of the O.U.C.: 'That a College should be deserted by any of its abler men in their full strength, for a country living, in which they are for the most part lost to learning, is a great evil ...' ('Report', p.171). Augustus Jessopp described these ex-Fellows, immured in country parsonages and weighted with worldly cares, as 'like the ghosts of the heroic dead ...' (The Trials of a Country Parson, 1890, pp.90-1).
be illustrated from the following set of figures, relating to the fellows ordained at Oxford in the sample years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16 plus</th>
<th>No livings</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures indicate the major changes that occurred. The overall process is one characterised by increased academic specialisation: by 1861-3 half of the fellows never held a living at all, and the large number who had in previous samples taken livings very quickly, had almost disappeared. In fact it was those that may be called the 'pastoral' fellows who had so largely diminished. In the first period, such men were prominent. For instance, of the 17 fellows who became incumbents within five years of ordination, only two are recorded to have held any college position apart from their fellowships - and one of these, E.M. Goulburn of Merton, was incumbent of a small living in Oxford itself, which allowed continued work and residence at his college. Of the whole 41, only 11 held college posts at all: most of the others lived as parochial clergy, with the difference that they need not rely for support on curacies (though it seems that many probably did hold them) and that they were assured of patronage.

Most of them, as is evident, preferred to take a living quickly, and became incumbents of small college livings: ten of the 17 who took early livings had college livings, of which six were worth less
than £150 p.a. (and four, less than £100).\(^7\) These men thus served their parochial 'apprenticeships', not in curacies, but in the colleges' smaller livings. Usually they moved on within a few years to better things; Goulburn and his Merton colleague Edmund Hobhouse passed beyond the need for further college assistance by becoming respectively, Headmaster of Rugby and Bishop of Nelson, New Zealand; one other appears to have retired from active clerical life after only four years; and another died young. The remaining six follow a clear pattern: three of them, who all first held very small livings of less than £100 p.a., held these for no more than three years before moving on, to be rewarded with better college livings.\(^8\) The other three, however, seem to illustrate one of the dangers of the college patronage system: in 1866 Edward Bartrum wrote\(^9\) of fellows who 'wait for good livings, while those who accept the small livings are condemned but too often to a life of penury'; and he instanced a friend who, having been 'I believe Tutor, of, perhaps, the most distinguished College of the time', married, and accepted a living worth less than £200 p.a.; there his growing family 'dispersed his pupils' and he was left only with his benefice income. The three in this sample all similarly accepted small but not tiny livings - the incomes were £141, £231 and £243 - and there they remained: one died in his after 17 years, the second was eventually preferred to a

\(^7\) One other was probably also very poor, but no income was shown in Clergy List: the remainder were all worth less than £250 p.a.

\(^8\) One of them, William Bousfield, spent 5 years at St Helena after his first living, but then returned to settle permanently at Cublington Bucks., a middling Lincoln College living of £289 p.a. (see also V.H.H. Green, Oxford Common Room (1957), p.133).

\(^9\) Promotion by merit essential to the progress of the Church (1866), note, p.25.
moderately good living (£320 p.a.) by another patron; the third, although in the end given a good college living, had waited 36 years for it and probably only obtained it because of the lack, by that date (1881) of resident ordained fellows at his college. It was thus something of a gamble to accept these modest livings, as it seems that the colleges felt no obligation to offer better livings except to men who had taken the patently insufficiently endowed ones which acted as mere stepping-stones.

As well as these recipients of college patronage, there were many who benefited from outside patronage. Three of the fellows were clearly exceptions, in that they smartly moved into excellent livings either in the gift of their own families or, in the case of Arthur Henry Anson, Fellow of All Souls and first cousin of the Earl of Lichfield, that of the Lord Chancellor. Fourteen of the fellows who held livings, in this 1841-3 sample, not far short of one-half, were first preferred by patrons other than their colleges; with declining numbers, the proportion who obtained preferment outside their college diminished also. Their lives became more narrowly bound up with the colleges in this sense too.

10. He in fact succeeded Thomas Williams when the latter was preferred to Aston Clinton (see note 4 above). Two of Jesus College's best livings were thus filled by men who had long ceased to actually hold fellowships. (In the Oxford sample of 1871-3, 5 of the 29 non-fellow Oxbridge graduates who obtained livings got them from their old colleges, usually the less good ones; by then there were not enough fellows to fill them, or even ex-fellows).

11. The others were: the Hon. Edward Harbottle Grimston, younger brother of the Earl of Verulam, who held two Essex livings, in the Earl's patronage, for 40 years; and Thomas Knox, great-grandson of the famous Vicesimus, who succeeded his father in another very prosperous pair of Essex livings. (These three, at a conservative estimate, drew a total of some £60,000 from their respective livings, in the course of their lives - and Anson died after only 12 years in his parish).

12. A few - 3 in 1841-3, and one each from the two next samples - later received college livings.
### Oxford Fellows: First Patrons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Crown</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Crown:** includes Lord Chancellor;
- **Church:** episcopal, capitular, mother church, etc. (i.e. any ecclesiastical person or body, in his or their official capacity).
- **Private:** includes Trustees.

The change is clear by the 1861-3 sample. Of the 18 fellows, only nine ever held livings; and of these, three at the most could be described as 'pastoral fellows', men whose major interest and work lay in pastoral work: only one of these was a straightforward case, holding no teaching position at his college before his becoming an incumbent. Most of those who obtained college livings did so after long service as tutors or lecturers (and two fellows who held small livings in or near Oxford in fact continued to teach actively).

There are a couple of signs of the decreased pressure for college patronage. In 1873 Thomas Douglas Page, who had been a lecturer, bursar and dean of Pembroke, was preferred to the Leicestershire living of Sibstone, which, with a population of under 500 and a net income of

---

13. David Thomas, Fellow of Trinity, who held a poor and populous S. Welsh living (in private patronage), with his fellowship, 1864-71, and then was presented to the very good college living of Garsington (£700 gross, population 636). A.B. Webb is almost as clear cut a case, though he was Tutor of University College 1865-7, before going to a comfortable private living (and thence to a colonial bishopric - Bloemfontein - when only 40). The third, uniquely in the sampled fellows, settled voluntarily into the curacy of a rich E. Anglian living, after 7 years as Tutor of
£1,000 p.a., was a plum which almost certainly would not in earlier days have fallen to a man who had only been a fellow for 11 years. And there was an unusual episode in 1887, when J.R. Magrath, already Provost of Queen's College since 1878, took a comfortable college living in Buckinghamshire, which he held for barely two years: perhaps he took it to avoid the lapse of patronage rights that occurred if no appointment was made within six months. 14

For the rest, the fellows were a reasonably varied lot: among the academics who never held a parochial cure, were C.L. Dodgson and C.H. Hoole, both of whom were lifelong residents of Christ Church, and C.H.O. Daniel, who became Provost of Worcester in 1903. A couple of them appear to have been almost wholly inactive - in any sense that might appear in Crockford's, at least - and there were also a couple of 'renegades': R.F. Clarke of St John's converted to Rome and became a Jesuit of some note, while A.H.A. Morton of King's, Cambridge, renounced his orders in 1891 and went on to become an active Conservative M.P. and even, oddly enough, an Ecclesiastical Commissioner in 1904. 15

The small band of clerical fellows in 1871-3 confirms the changes. Six obtained livings, certainly, but two of them returned in a few years to continue their teaching careers at Oxford, and one of the other livings was a valuable sinecure rectory given to a fellow of
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St John's (J.S. Cattlow, curate of Framlingham from 1871 to his death in 1885).  
14. Magrath showed no other signs of ever wishing to leave Oxford, where his position was that of a respected and established academic 'liberal'; and his health was good - he was formally Provost until 1930, though in retirement from 1912. (R.H. Hodgkin, Six Centuries of an Oxford College, Oxford 1949, pp.182-3 and 209).

15. On Clark, see Times, 11 Nov. 1900 (p.7). Morton was M.P. for Deptford 1897-1906, and is described by J.P. Cornford as 'one of the Tory philanthropists', led into politics via social and charitable concerns (in R. Robson, ed., Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain, 1967, p.288): see also Who Was Who and Venn.
Jesus College after 24 years' college work. The three remaining cases comprised two of fellows whose main interests clearly were pastoral (and who appear to have benefited from the new patronage 'market', getting good college livings in relatively short times), and one of the traditional pattern, 15 years of college work being followed by a comfortable college living. Of the six who never held benefices, two died young (though one was a London curate at his death); one, Reginald S. Copleston, became Bishop of Colombo at 30, when still Fellow of St John's; he was so far from having pastoral experience that he was only priested in the same year as his consecration; but he went on to become Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India in 1902. The remaining three had purely academic careers. By a nice chance, one of them, Arthur Herbert Dyke Acland, like Morton renounced his orders and also became an M.P.; he was in the 1892-5 Cabinet and was a prominent educational expert on the progressive wing of the Liberal party.

The most obvious element of the change that had come about with regard to the parochial lives of the clerical fellows, and the most important, remains the simple fall in numbers. As against 32 who at some point took livings in the 1841-3 sample, only nine and six did so in the last two periods; and these were increasingly unusual, just

16. One of the two who returned was Aubrey L. Moore, the theologian and philosopher, who had taken a comfortable college living (£480 gross, population 1,060) after only 3 years as Fellow of St John's. (The other, G. H. Gwilliam, retired from Oxford at 58, with another college living).

17. R. Abbay, Fellow of Wadham, presented to an Essex living of 400 souls, worth £584 gross, 7 years after ordination; and G.W. Jeudwine, of Queen's, a parish of 426 worth £300 gross, after only three years in orders.

18. As third son of Gladstone's old friend Sir Thomas Dyke Acland he had far better contacts than Morton; although according to J.B. Haldane, Gladstone never forgave his renunciation of orders (cited by C. Harvie, Lights of Liberalism (1976), note 158, p.280).
half of a distinctly minority body in the whole fellowship. Probably in many ways this was no loss to the Church: an unreformed fellowship was no guarantee of intellectual or moral qualities, and with the effective end of the old system of offering the livings by seniority, the colleges may well have ended up appointing men rather better qualified for pastoral work. But a powerful link between the Church and the universities was broken. Not only had the ruling bodies of the colleges to a large extent lost their personal stake in the patronage (and the general welfare) of a large number of livings, but also the patronage had largely lost its very important role as the means of providing vacancies in the fellowships (for a man's acceptance of a living usually involved the vacation of his fellowship).

Fellows were always, if not marginal, certainly rather exceptional in the types of parish which they held: no other major group was so consistently rural and southern in their benefices, or had such a high level of beneficed income. These facts can be seen from various of the tables in the appendix, which can be introduced here. In no matter were fellows more fortunate than in the incomes which they achieved as incumbents, as can be seen in Table 12. Some 40% of those who were beneficed at all at some point had incomes of

19. University and college patronage applied to some 770 benefices throughout the second half of the century, thus representing a proportion of all livings that fell gradually from 6.6 to 5.5%. (Figures based on the Clergy List (1853, 1878 and 1901, summarised by Dr. M.J.D. Roberts, to whom I owe them: the figures were given out at a seminar in Oxford in 1979).

20. This is made very clear, in relation to Trinity, Cambridge, by D.A. Winstanley, in L.V.C., pp.336-8.
over £500 p.a.;\(^21\) it can thus be seen that there were more fellows who achieved this level of income, than there were who achieved only incomes of less than £300 (38%): an extraordinary contrast with all the other groups, among whom the smaller incomes were far more numerous than the larger. Generally the larger livings went to men who had served longest - subject to the changes already mentioned - so that the material prospects of a reasonably conscientious (and patient) college fellow were distinctly good: a fellowship income of (usually) £250 to £300 p.a. while a bachelor, with college rooms, and if sufficiently able and willing an additional £300 plus as a college tutor, followed by a rural living of £500 or more to marry on.\(^22\) This was not the stuff of which fortunes were made, but it added up to a comfortable and highly respectable form of life.

That fellows very largely held benefices in country areas is not of itself worthy of note: the territorial parish system of England continued to mean that a vastly disproportionate share of the Church's benefices were rural.\(^23\) Nevertheless the fellows were,

\(^{21}\) All income figures are from Crockford's or Clergy List, taken from as near as possible to the year of institution. There are manifold problems of interpretation with these figures: often the entries remained unchanged for years, or were clearly only averages - and above all, some gave a 'net' figure, some a 'gross', and most left this unclear. In the first and last cases, the income was entered as given, if a 'gross' figure only, 10\% was subtracted - arbitrary, but reasonable judging from the few cases where both 'gross' and 'net' were given. The whole subject is discussed further, below in Chapter seven, section 2.

\(^{22}\) Tutorial incomes depended upon fees, and so varied very greatly: in 1881 £6-900 seems to have been thought a normal income (1881 Oxford Commissioners, Evidence, pp.121-2 and 235). 'A Resident Fellow' - an idealist who wished for more research - wrote in 1868 that the aim of 'every prudent man' at Oxford was 'to make as much money as he can by education during about 10 or 15 years in order that he may be able to retire at 40 or thereabouts with enough to marry on and begin life anew as a clergyman, or a school inspector, or a private person.' (Times, 4 Sept. 1868, 8f).

\(^{23}\) This is discussed more generally below, Chapter seven, section 1.
to a significant extent, the group of clergy least likely ever to hold non-rural benefices (see Appendix Table 11.1 and .6: 77% of those who held livings did so only in rural parishes). Given that relatively few of the fellows held curacies, which might give them experience of town life, it becomes clear that as a body they were uniquely cut off from professional experience in the large towns. When looked at in greater detail, moreover, the non-rural incumbencies of the fellows become even more insignificant. Thus, the three whose only incumbencies were in large towns, in 1841-3, were: William Jackson, who held a chapelry in Exeter for four years, and then retired from parochial life: Edmund Hobhouse, 15 years in Oxford before going to New Zealand as founding Bishop of Nelson; and E.M. Goulburn, who was vicar of St John's, Paddington, for eight years before becoming Dean of Norwich in 1866. The only two with experience of smaller town incumbencies both held them for less than four years. 24

The only cases of fellows who had urban pastoral careers are among the 1851-3 sample. Three of these men spent long incumbencies in London parishes; in only one of these cases was the patron (of both his London livings) the man's college, which is a pointer to the simple fact that the colleges had little town patronage to give. Three others were incumbents in lesser towns, none of which were wholly without attractions: J.L. Randall's 21 years as Rector of Newbury, a town whose previous church life had been very far from satisfactory, were a notable success, and as son of a close friend of Samuel Wilberforce, and brother of another, he was in touch with a wider, 333.

24. Jackson who held no formal cure or position after 1851, was nevertheless sufficiently respected as a theologian to give the 1875 Bampton Lectures at Oxford (The Doctrine of Retribution, which was in its third edition in 1884). (The two small towns were Writtle, Essex, and Hitchin, Herts. - minor country towns).
congenial world: the other two were incumbents in Bath, and in Hastings then Brighton, all of which had well-known social amenities. None of the six, in short, ever faced the sort of isolation involved in many an incumbency in northern or midland industrial towns: London presented enormous pastoral problems, but then the East End was not far from the West End. A last point which emerges from the Table is that only one man (in 1871-3) moved from a rural to an urban parish: the other four who held both urban and rural incumbencies moved from the former to the latter, and in three of these cases (the fourth was J.L. Randall), after less than eight years in their urban cures.

A last broad measure of their careers lies in the areas where their livings lay (see Appendix, Table 9.1 and .6). It is at once apparent that only a tiny proportion of the fellows ever held livings in the north, a proportion significantly less than even the other Oxford and Chichester ordinees. They were concentrated, and to an increasing extent, in rural livings in the southern (and sometimes the midland) counties: furthermore those that held livings outside the south tended to end up there.

25. Randall's father, James, was Wilberforce's chaplain, at both Oxford and Winchester, from 1846 till the Bishop's death in 1873, and was Archdeacon of Berks. from 1855 to 1869. His brother Richard William was appointed by Wilberforce to the family living of Woollavington in 1851, after the previous rector, H.E. Manning, had seceded. James was Canon of Bristol 1867-75, Richard was Dean of Chichester 1892-1902, and James Leslie himself was suffragan Bishop of Reading from 1889 to 1908. (On Newbury under Randall's predecessor, see Letter-Books of Samuel Wilberforce (Oxon. Record Society, 1970), ed. R.K. Pugh, esp. Nos.105, 125, 130-1).

26. The Sussex man, moreover, was R.E. Sanderson, whose livings followed his 28 years as H.M. of Lancing; he was also a canon of Chichester.

27. The move, by Robert Ewing, seems to have been a purely selfless one: he took a good college living (net £600, population 864) after 15 years' teaching at St John's, and after 5 years gave it up to move to a poorer (net £320) living in nearby Trowbridge, where he had care of nearly 5,000 people till his death 15 years later.
Thus far the fellows have been described mainly through statistics. Three of them may now serve as examples of the detail which can flesh out the figures. The three were undistinguished men, fellows of pre-reform Oxford, who held middling Oxfordshire parishes between 1856 and 1889; none made a great mark, or apparently left much record of their lives, but they help to throw a little light on the lives of ordinary fellows. They were John Murray Holland, Fellow of New College 1838-61, who was ordained in December 1841; Thomas Knapp Chittenden, Fellow of St John's 1836-59, ordained in May 1842; and Thomas Childe Barker, Student of Christ Church, ordained in December 1851.

Holland and Chittenden waited till 1860 and 1858, respectively, for their first and only livings, and they filled this period largely with country curacies. Holland's father had come up to Oxford from an apparently humble Birmingham background, and had become a modest clerical pluralist in Kent and Sussex, holding three small livings (total value some £425 p.a. in the early 1840s), all in the gift of the Dean and Chapter of Chichester, in whose cathedral he was a minor canon. For at least ten years Holland was curate-in-charge of the largest of these, Bapchild in Kent, which had a population of less than 340. In 1853 he returned to Oxford, and held several college posts until appointed to the rectory of Stanton St John, five miles outside Oxford. Described in an obituary as 'a very popular member of his college', who often visited the city and had been in Oxford only two days before his sudden death in 1877, it is fair to surmise that he took the living, with its relatively modest income of £287, largely because of its proximity to the university.28 Chittenden similarly

28. Holland's father Thomas, according to Al.Ox., was son of a 'pleb'
kept up his links with Oxford, by serving as unlicensed curate to Wilberforce's friend the Warden of All Soul's, F.K. Leighton, in the tiny but richly-endowed rural parish of Harpsden Bix. Barker, the only one of the three to show any scholastic leanings, held a tutorship with the wealthy Glamorgan Talbots, and was allowed a year's non-residence by the Bishop so that he could fulfil his obligation there. Between them they thus represented several thoroughly traditional occupations for fellows without academic pretensions - country curacies, minor college posts, tutoring the children of a great landowner.

When they took up their posts, the three parishes were very similar in their quantifiable characteristics; all with incomes of £2-300 p.a. and populations of between 520 and 720, very much 'average' village parishes. This similarity makes it particularly appropriate to note the detailed distinctions between them. Holland's Stanton St John was thoroughly dominated by the university. New College was the largest single landowner and lord of the manor; the rector's 274 acres made him apparently the largest resident landowner in the parish; and at
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from Birmingham: Thomas was evidently a musical man, and was Vicar-Choral at Chichester from 1809. Other information from Clergy Lists; Obituary in Oxford Chronicle and Berks. and Bucks. Gazette, 1 Sept. 1877. (Holland inherited sufficient musical interest to be secretary and treasurer of his college's Glee Club in 1841 and 1842; New College Oxford 1379-1979 (Oxford 1979), ed. Buxton and Williams, p.279).

29. Harpsden Bix was worth some £700 p.a., to serve a purely rural population of little over 200; not surprisingly it was something of a model parish (i.e. Wilberforce's 'Diocese Book' 1854-64 entry: Ms. Oxf. Dioc. d.178). Barker later published Aryan Civilization ... based on the work of De Coulanges (Chipping Norton, 1871), and Why not baptise an Infant, or, the earnest question answered (1873), a brief and moderate paedobaptist pamphlet. In the same 'Diocese Book' (under Spelsbury) Wilberforce notes that he had been 'pleased with' Barker at his ordination; also, that his 'very pleasing wife [was] formerly governess as he Tutor' to the Talbots.
Woodperry House, with the grandest establishment in the parish (including, in 1871, its only butler) resided John Wilson, President of Trinity College. Holland himself paid for over half of his first church restoration in 1867-8, and the next and larger instalment was subsidised by £500 from New College; several university figures gave smaller sums; within the parish Holland and Wilson gave £125 between them, so that the rest of the parish provided just £130 of nearly £1,100 collected in all. In parish affairs, the vestries were small, often attended only by Holland and the two churchwardens: the 'rector's churchwarden', throughout, was Mr F. Adams, tenant of the glebe farm and head of the largest household (Holland and Wilson excepted) in the parish. In temporal terms, then, this was a secure and cosy oligarchy.

There were no signs, however, that this was ever translated into spiritual success. To some extent, as so often, this can be blamed on the past: the rectors had only begun to reside in the early part of the century, and Holland's immediate predecessor, rector from 1835 to 1859, was according to Wilberforce 'mad during his latter years, or so nearly mad with jealousy etc. as to be scarcely responsible', and certainly the parish was a backwater in church terms. But Holland, despite his

30. V.C.H., Oxfordshire, Vol.5, pp.282-92 passim. Local Directories and 1871 Census enumerators' books: Wilson kept a butler, a groom, and 3 female servants, Holland had a gardener and a housemaid (brother and sister, from Sussex) and a local cook. (When the small endowed school was reformed in 1873, the three trustees elected were all New College officials: Vestry Minutes, 16 April 1873).

31. Parish papers in the Bodleian, Mss. D.D. Par. Stanton St John, d.1-2 (Vestry Minutes from 1834), d.3 (notebook by Holland and his successor, largely antiquarian and on the church, and c.l, papers largely on the restorations). Among university contributors the most generous was C.P. Golightly, with £25, and contributions from Dr Cotton of Worcester and Professor Heurtley also indicate a rather anti-tractarian acquaintance. (Adams' household consisted of 3 female servants, including a 'governess': 1871 census, op. cit.).

32. Henry Stonhouse; Wilberforce's first impression was that he was
generosity in gifts to the fabric of the Church, seems to have done little for church life in the parish. Holy Communion was more frequent, though still only about nine times a year throughout, and the numbers of communicants remained extremely low; in 1866 Holland had no more than 25 at the great festivals, and his successor found no more than 35 communicants in all. There is little evidence that Holland was of an evangelical bent. In 1866 he responded, in answer to a question about 'impediments' to his ministry, 'The old Adam: and the evil examples of former generations.' Perhaps he was simply realistic; where his successor complained of the 'great apathy of the labouring population in respect of religion', Holland had written that 'most of the inhabitants religiously disposed are regular or occasional attendants at the Church', thus apparently accepting that many were not 'religiously disposed.' It may be that the labourers' 'apathy' by 1881 was connected to the failure in 1875 and 1876 to break the closed circle of the vestry, and elect a new 'parish' church warden. But these attempts - almost certainly a consequence of the agricultural trade unionism of 1872 onwards - were foiled by the old guard's demand for a poll, and their successful mobilisation; in 1877 the vestry meeting was down to the rector and the two churchwardens.

F.n. 32 continued.
'a good serious man, very nervous, does little duty' (first Diocese Book, Ms. Oxf. Dioc. d.550) - the quoted comment is from the second (loc. cit., d.178). By 1854 his visitation return was unhelpful and rather despairing (Bishop Wilberforce's Visitation Returns for the Archdeaconry of Oxford in 1854, ed. E.P. Baker for Oxfordshire Record Society, 1954: otherwise all returns cited are in Mss. Oxf. Dioc. b.40 (1838), d.179-80 (1857 and 1860), and later series under c.333ff).

33. V.C.H., op. cit., pp.291-2: visitation returns for 1866 and for 1881 (his successor was W.E.C. Austin-Gourlay). There was a small and struggling Primitive Methodist chapel in the parish; also some of the population apparently attended the nearer church of neighbouring Forest Hill.
again, who went through the farce of proposing and re-electing one of them as warden 'for the parish.'

If Stanton St John represents the spiritual failure of a parish dominated by the university, the other two are examples of the problems possible even in parishes of the type most favourable to the Church, those dominated by a single large resident landowner.

Barker's parish, Spelsbury, contained Dytchley House, seat of the Anglo-Irish Dillon family; the family had come into possession of the estate by marriage in the eighteenth century, but it was not until the 14th Viscount that any of them became heavily involved in Oxfordshire life; he was resident for Barker's first nine years. He seems to have been an affable, generous sporting man, remembered affectionately by the villagers; according to one old inhabitant 'it was only through the kindness of Lord Dillon that people weathered the winter - he gave blankets, soup, rabbits, etc.' He supported and

34. Vestry minute books, Oct. 1875, April 1876 and 1877. See Agricultural Trade Unionism in Oxfordshire (ed. P. Horn, for the Oxfordshire Record Society, 1974), Introduction, for the background: there are, however, no references to the parish in this source.

35. Important recent discussions which have emphasised this are: Alan Everitt, The pattern of rural Dissent: the nineteenth century (Leicester, 1972), esp. pp.20-2, 42, 54-5, 59-60; D.M. Thompson in G.J. Cuming and D. Baker, eds., Popular Belief and Practice ... (1972), pp.269-70; A.D. Gilbert, Religion and Society in industrial England (1976), esp. pp.103-5, and J. Obelkevich, Religion and rural society ... (1976), esp. pp.10-14, 155 and 162-4. (It is however true that on prima facie grounds a resident small squire might have greater direct contact with and influence upon his parish than a very large landowner, as both these two were).

36. G.E.C., Complete Peerage: his grandfather had been mainly involved in Irish affairs, and his father is described as 'a rather crack-brained literary man, in poor circumstances, and living mostly abroad.' The 14th Viscount, who succeeded in 1832, married the daughter of a clergyman resident in the county and was High Sheriff in 1857.
trained a choir of children to sing in Dytchley Chapel, and also paid for the school, which he often visited.  

Barker was evidently a more active and conscientious clergyman than Holland, and something of a High Churchman: he increased services and 'caused quite a sensation' by introducing surplices for his mixed choir, itself a notable draw for the congregation. He carefully set down in his visitation returns the difficulties of the parish. Above all, it was an awkward size and shape, with a population scattered between Spelsbury and three other substantial hamlets, up to three miles from the church; twice he noted the effect that bad weather had on the attendance of this dispersed congregation. And possibly partly for the same reasons, many of the parishioners attended Dissenting chapels, outside but near the parish boundaries. These factors were clearly more significant in pastoral terms than the presence of the great house, and anyway there were signs that Dillon was not much direct help. But the big house was not insignificant;
this became clear in 1878, when the 16th Viscount succeeded to the title and estates. He was 67, and possibly the estate was in financial difficulties, but he shut up the house and the chapel. In 1881 Barker noted that his communicants were only 45, and commented that 'Dytchley House used to furnish 20 communicants on Easter-Day'; three years later he attributed a falling congregation to 'agricultural depression and an unpopular landlord ... .'42 It was in these gloomier times, with increasing expenditure falling on him personally, that Barker accepted from his College a larger but richer Yorkshire parish, where he ministered from 1885 to 1905.

Chittenden's parish of Kirtlington was the largest of the three (its population was a little over 700); it contained Kirtlington Park, seat of (from 1861 to 1889) Sir Henry William Dashwood, fifth baronet, Lord Lieutenant and Sheriff of the county (in which he owned over 7,500 acres, worth some £12,000 p.a.). The family owned most of the parish, and only the vicar and the land agent headed other households with more than one female servant.43 In 1872, explaining the reduced collections at church that year, Chittenden wrote that this was due to 'the absence of the Family' for most of the year, and the parish's 'being a 'close one' and the population entirely agricultural.'44 Sir Henry was not unsympathetic to the Church; in the early 1870s he bought the advowson of the living from St John's College, which had persistently refused to repair the chancel, and

42. Ibid., 1881 and 1884. His fears that Dillon would cut off his £80 p.a. school subsidy were not, however, realised.
43. Directories, G.E.C. Complete Baronetage, 1871 census enumerator's book. (The Dashwoods at that time had a resident staff of 22, including 5 male indoor servants; Chittenden's, the next largest household, consisted only of three female servants).
44. Visitation return.
spent £2,000 having this restored by Sir Gilbert Scott ('beautifully', according to the grateful vicar). 45

With these advantages, the parish was yet not successful for Chittenden. His congregations seem to have averaged about 100, and his communicants not more than 30 at any one time, and this figure decreased in later years. Only very tentative answers can be advanced as to why this was so: Chittenden's personality may have been partly responsible; he appears from his visitation returns to have been earnest but rather colourless, and perhaps a little morose, but these are very little to go on. Otherwise, there are three possibly significant factors. First, Chittenden wrote in his first return (1860) of 'the neglect of years long gone by when the people were left entirely to themselves ...', and the attitude of the college to the chancel seems to confirm that they were not attentive rectors: though his immediate predecessor, James Guillemard, was not inactive. 46

The second factor was Dissent. In 1860 the Wesleyan and Reformed Methodist chapels in the village had the allegiance of 'a considerable proportion of the parish.' This seems to confirm the past neglect, and also indicates a difference between Kirtlington and the two previous parishes: that it was, though possessing only a few inns and merely local tradesmen, a village of some significance, compact and thus more likely to support independent, non-deferential

45. The state of the chancel had been a complaint in virtually every previous visitation return; Wilberforce had noted it as exceptional after the rest of the church had been 'very well restored tower built and bells moulded' in 1855 ('Diocese Book', d.178). Visitations, 1872 and 1878.

46. He appears to have been a rather highly-strung man of somewhat High Church leanings: he had claimed a congregation of 250 and 350. Wilberforce had described him as 'a little priggish and formal [finical? - barely legible] - likely to get into trouble' (Diocese Book, d.560), and his 1854 return had hinted at disagreements with certain parishioners; in 1855 the Bishop had to reprove him, quite affectionately, for 'the exaggerations with which your fancy had mixed' a minor problem about his curate (Letter-Books, No.614).
initiatives than a smaller or more scattered population. In the event however both chapels foundered in the 1860s, and the vicar was able to largely dismiss Dissent throughout that and the following decade. The third factor, which only became explicit with the trade union campaign of the 1870s, was the basic lack of contact between church and labourers: Chittenden certainly felt that the union had greatly disrupted his work. This of course is a very general point, but it is not entirely conjectural. First, it is notable that after years of apparent quiescence, in the early 1880s Dissent suddenly became again a major concern to the vicar, while his communicants shrunk to barely 20 (mostly women) at his Easter Communions of 1884 and 1887. Second, there is a hint, much earlier, of a lack of direct clerical influence on the labourers: in 1860 Chittenden complained of 'Want of co-operation on the part of the laity in as much as the farmers seem quite indifferent to whether their labourers attend church or not.' The religious obligations of the labourers were thus seen as partly to be enforced through the (supposed) secular authority of what was revealingly called 'the laity', and not by direct appeal and influence; when the farmer-labourer link was strained, so was that of the church and the labourer.

These three parishes cover only a very small range of parish

47. In the 1852 Directory it was described as an 'extensive and respectable' village, which lay on the main road, between Woodstock and Bicester; there were four 'shopkeepers' and at least 15 other retailers and independent artisans. (The 1853 Directory describes the new Wesleyan chapel as 'a very neat stone building'). D.M. Thompson's study of Leicestershire rural parishes showed that a population of over 600 was closely correlated to poor church attendance (in G.J. Cuming and D. Baker, ed., op. cit., p.269: see also J. Obelkevich, op. cit., pp.154-5).

48. He referred to the union in his returns of 1875, 1878 and 1881 ('The Parish has never recovered the effects of the Labourers' Union'); these replies are printed in P. Horn, ed., op. cit., pp.133,135-6.

49. Visitation, 1860. Almost identical sentiments were expressed by
types, and represent some clearly perceptible temporal dominance. The evidence is not meant to be definitive, but it indicates the sorts of factors which, in individual parishes, determined the quality and the success of incumbencies: types of laity, particularly of powerful groups of people, size and geography of the parish, past customs and standards: and then the most difficult of all, the characters and ways of the clergy themselves. They also prompt the observation that even in a well-run diocese, at the height of the Church's revival and at its maximum in terms of sheer coverage of rural areas, the clergy often had very modest success; that is, in terms of congregations and communicants.  

In conclusion, it is difficult to see that the Church received great benefit from its ex-fellow clergy. Until about 1870 certainly, some hundreds of livings, including many very good ones, were cut off from the bulk of the parochial clergy, and given over to men who, as a class, were not highly thought of as pastoral ministers; and whose best talents were very far from being necessarily conducive to pastoral success. In the event, however, this was to a large extent balanced by the fact that most pre-reform fellows, and many thereafter, were not college teachers and in both ambition and aptitudes probably differed little from most other clergymen. There were few complaints
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the vicar of Knowl Hill, Berkshire, in 1854: 'I think the laity should assist us more than they do - by urging their labourers to attend church etc.' (Visitation return).

50. See also below, Chapter seven, section 1.

51. A well-known example is R.W. Church, a notable Dean of St Paul's after 1870, but for 18 years previously pastor to a population the bulk of whom, he candidly admitted, he could not comprehend at all (C.M. Church, Life and Letters of Dean Church, 2nd ed., 1897, p.179): the advantage to the Church here was clearly the leisure that he had for his literary and journalistic work, rather than the specific good of his parishioners.
as well as being valuable in the very practical terms of providing a comfortable income for several hundred clergy. From the 1870s this large patronage began to be given outside the old ranks, as these ceased to be adequate to fill it, and so the potential grievance died a natural death; and it was left to the universities to make their own provision for pensions and rewards.

52. In 1883 Canon John Wordsworth said that the new college statutes represented a loss to the Church of £40,000 p.a. 'in clerical offices alone'; probably an exaggeration, but not absurdly so (C.C.R. 1883, p.317).
2. PRE-INCUMBENCY OPTIONS

The achievement of incumbent status was undoubtedly the normal desire of the clergy, representing their establishment in life and in the Church. But for all clergy there was at least some period – usually at least one year, as incumbencies could not be held before ordination as a priest – when some other specific occupation was required. In the mid-century years this gradually emerged as a serious problem, as it came to be realised that the necessary period between ordination and incumbency was increasing, and that more and more clergy seemed to have less and less chance of obtaining a living within, say, fifteen years; many waited much longer. The main element in this change was the rise of the body of assistant curates, and they will be the focus of most of this section. First, however, it is worthwhile to note some of the lesser, but not wholly insignificant options by which an unbeneficed clergyman could make his living.

These are summarised in Table 1 of the Appendix. The main results are very simple: that for a large majority of the sample, curacies were the sole employment before their first benefice, but that this was, significantly, more true of men ordained at Ripon than of those from the two southern dioceses. Most of the difference, certainly between the Oxbridge graduates of the latter dioceses and all others, lay in teaching: over one-fifth of these men did some teaching, and they included 17 of the 20 full-time teachers among the whole sample. Clerical teachers have already been discussed,\(^5\) this result merely confirms the expectable conclusion that teaching was a far more likely option for university graduates than for others; and if one looks back at the Cambridge honours men (Table 2.16) it can be seen

\(^5\) In Chapter two, section 3. On numbers, see Chapter one, note 5.
that these were more likely to teach than the general run of graduates represented by the Oxford and Chichester ordinands. The very small number of teachers among Oxbridge graduates ordained at Ripon, however, indicates that education was not the only factor—although it may be largely explained by lack of academically distinguished men among this Ripon group. The main difference can be described, and probably explained, by the geographical factor: there were simply a lot more school places in the south, and this shows up in the numbers ordained to a school title.\(^{54}\) The two Ripon men who taught full-time are also rather borderline cases, in the sense that both also held curacies or assisted the local incumbent at some point, while teaching; only one of them made a whole career from teaching, without ever holding a living.\(^{55}\) The Oxford and Chichester cases ran the whole range from several who had careers at Oxford (though not as fellows) and a few others who taught in other less exalted colleges; through a solid centre (about half) who taught in public schools (established or aspiring) and large grammar schools, to a group of nine who taught only at small local schools.\(^{56}\)

\(^{54}\) In 1851-3 (information on titles for 1841-3 is very poor at Oxford and Chichester) there were 23 men ordained to a school title among Oxbridge graduates in the two dioceses, some 14%. In the whole Ripon sample there were only ever 2 such titles (to Richmond and to Wakefield Grammar schools).

\(^{55}\) Clement Thomas Hales: son of a Wesleyan minister, he graduated from Christ's College, Cambridge, and had been teaching at Richmond for 3 years before he was ordained. After a further 6 years he opened a preparatory school (Aysgarth School) with great success (Venn). The other man took a poor living after 6 years and the headships of two small schools.

\(^{56}\) The only obvious pattern was that 4 of the Chichester men taught only at Woodard's Lancing or Hurst, and none at the greater schools like Eton, Westminster, Christ's Hospital, Merchant Taylor's or Wellington. (The difference in income alone between those men who attained the heights of house-masterships at the great schools, and the assistant masters of small grammar schools, was not far short of that between a bishop and a curate).
A much less important option lay in the field of chaplaincies. Again these varied considerably in type, and in their prominence in the clergy's careers. Thus most of the southern Oxbridge ordinands had only brief spells in chaplaincies, between curacies or livings: only two spent any length as chaplains, and they seem to illustrate the different circumstances which could accompany the work. James Hibbert Wanklyn, son of a Manchester merchant and graduate of Trinity, Oxford, briefly held a Scottish episcopal living, but gave it up to spend the rest of his life in the south, for 21 years being 'chaplain of the Bournemouth Sanatorium'; his health may not have been good, but this looks like the part-time work of a man of some means.  

For Henry Sylvester Alison, on the other hand, a man who had graduated from Keble after matriculation at St Alban Hall, the thirty-three years which he spent as chaplain to two asylums look much more like the result of sheer necessity; at the end of this period, when well into his sixties, he went on to hold four more curacies, retiring only at 74 years old, never having been beneficed at all. It is not easy to be at all specific about the conditions and rewards of chaplaincies. Full-time chaplains, excluding the growing but still small Forces' establishment, seem to have numbered no more than three to four hundred; probably most were paid comparably to curates,

57. That Wanklyn was not poor is inferred from his father's status (a merchant, described in A1.Ox. as 'arm.'), his retirement to a respectable Bayswater address at 60, and his brother's beginning his ministerial life as a curate on only £30 p.a. (his own title is not known): both obtained livings within four years, though James gave his up in a year.  

58. Alison was the younger son of a 'gent.', and was 21 at matriculation. He held 4 curacies in 6 years before his first chaplaincy, and four more in the 11 years after his leaving the Kent County Asylum.  

though the extremes certainly ran as low as £65 p.a. and as high as £250. The posts seem to have been either restful berths for men who had no need for concern at their small incomes (and lack of status), or modest jobs akin to curacies but with a certain degree of stability, taken by men of few means or connections.

The latter fact seems confirmed by the predominance of non-Oxbridge men among those who held chaplaincies for significant periods. Not only did thirteen of the 130 of these men hold chaplaincies, compared to thirteen out of 291 Oxbridge graduates, but they also held them longer. Among all men ordained at Ripon, seven of the eleven chaplains held their posts for over three years. Two Cambridge men who were, respectively, a chaplain in Archangel, then Moscow, for ten years, and chaplain of Dartmoor for five years, were the only graduates of the old English universities among them. The other five, who all held positions of some obscurity, were from St Bees or St Aidan's, with one from T.C.D.61

In one case at least, a chaplaincy provided a steady and respectable livelihood, with the income if not the status of a reasonable benefice. Charles Stuart was ordained at Chichester in 1843 as a literate, and spent the next fourteen years as curate of a wealthy non-resident's neglected rural parish; he was also chaplain of the

60. £65 was the stipend of Rev. G.L. Wilson, chaplain of a large (553 patients) private lunatic asylum (Times, 1 August 1868, p.9). £250 was earned by Charles Stuart (see next paragraph but one). (In the Forces, where there were also a few senior posts, pay was often higher).

61. Three were union chaplains (for 9, 21 and 40 years, the latter two never holding benefices, the former obtaining a small Cumbrian parish, at 38 years old): another was chaplain to a large Nottingham company for 9 years, and the last was a junior army chaplain who died young.
Rye union for the last five years. He then obtained the post of chaplain at Kensal Green cemetery, one of London's largest, and held this £250 p.a. post till his death 22 years later, being also for most of this period chaplain of Paddington workhouse, at £100 p.a. He was thus able to bring up a family in modest respectability, and to leave nearly £4,000 to support his widow and four unmarried daughters. He had also obtained a B.A. from London University, and so was able to describe himself in his will, in good Protestant fashion, as 'Bachelor of Arts a Presbyter of the Church of England as by law established.' But his position was that of a salaried functionary, very different from the boasted independence of the parson in his parish. Chaplaincies in European towns, while doubtless some were fashionable, and others taken for health reasons, seem not to have been particularly desirable posts. In these samples only

62. Playden with East Guildford; rich arable and grazing land in Romney Marsh. The patron and rector held the neighbouring and even richer living of Iden, where he resided (the gross income of these parishes was some £1,200 p.a.). There were services once a Sunday in each of Stuart's two churches, with small congregations and very few communicants; there were no schools, and no dissenters. (V.C.H. Sussex, Vol.9, Directories, Visitation Return 1856; also Chichester Diocesan Clergy Lists (1900) compiled by Rev. G.L. Hennessy, of which there is an interleaved and annotated copy in the West Sussex Record Office).

63. In 1871 Stuart resided in '48 Leamington-Rd. Villas, Paddington', with 3 sons, aged 18 to 24, all commercial clerks, and 4 daughters; they kept only one domestic. The surrounding 10 houses were occupied by 4 widows or retired people, 2 young families, 2 elderly Post Office Clerks, and 2 foreigners (a Bavarian 'Professor of Music' and an Australian 'Doctor of Philosophical Literature'): 8 of these kept 2 servants each, and there were many grown-up children: archetypical London middle-class residential (Census enumerator's book; will; Crockford indicates that his salary varied somewhat, which evidently increased his dependence).

64. There was an informative, though ill-attended discussion of these chaplaincies at the 1884 Church Congress (C.C.R., pp.256-75; see esp. the lay view, by A.H. Hallam Murray, pp.265ff). There is a description of a fashionable spot for consumptives (Pau) and its troubled chaplaincy, in Nemo [Rev. H.B. Ashley] Pen and Pencil Sketches ... (1889), pp.233-7. The S.P.G. and the Colonial and Continental Church Society provided grants for most of the 83
five cases appear; for what it is worth, apart from the Russian chaplain already referred to, and an Oxford man who was chaplain briefly at Le Havre (where he had retired), the other three were not Oxbridge men.

The remaining options need little comment here. Those who went overseas beyond Europe were not noticeably distinctive in terms of superficial background factors; half of them returned to England, though only men who went to India came back as a rule (six of seven did). Nine went to Canada, South Africa or Australia, four to the West Indies, and only two to a genuine 'missionary field', Zanzibar (which killed both within three or four years of their arrival).

There were eleven college chaplains at Oxford, who all moved on within a few years; perhaps rather surprisingly, given the increased availability of college patronage in the later periods, only the four in the first period were looked after by their colleges with small livings; both those in the 1871-3 sample held mixtures of teaching posts and curacies for over 35 years and died unbeficed. A handful held minor canonries in cathedrals, or paid secretaryships.

F.n. 64 continued.
permanent (and a greater number of seasonal) posts in northern Europe which from 1884 came under their own co-adjutor bishop (Mediterranean chaplaincies had been served by the Bishop of Gibraltar since 1842): basic information and lists in most C. of E. Year-Books (from 1882), and a brief account by W.M. Waddams is in pp.98-101 of The English Church and the Continent (1959); see also articles by J.E. Pinnington in Church History (Vol.39, 1970), pp.327-44 and Journal of Ecclesiastical History (Vol.45, 1976), pp.277-84.

65. One of the chaplains in the 1861-3 sample did eventually obtain a college living, but only after 20 years as a minor canon of Durham; whereas the 1841-3 group all received small college livings within 3 years of ordination.

66. Those who held minor canonries (with the exception specified in the previous note) were always rewarded by a living from the Dean and Chapter. Only 2 men in the whole sample held secretaryships, perhaps a low figure, for in 1898 there were 194 'Secretaries and paid officers of societies and institutions' (ref. as for note 59).
There were, then, some alternatives to a succession of curacies, but the latter course remained normal for the majority. The position of curates, however, was not stable in the Victorian period. Changes and developments will here be examined mainly through events in the 1860s, and in particular with reference to the foundation (in 1866) and history of the Curates' Augmentation Fund; among other things this produced or stimulated much informative debate. (Perpetual curates, despite their title, are no part of this debate; humble though they usually were, they were in all important respects incumbents).

The first and basic point made by commentators was that the term 'curate' had largely changed its meaning in the past 30 years. This was the first point made in the important pamphlet put out by the C.A.F.'s provisional council in 1866, The position and prospects of stipendiary curates: 'It is of the utmost importance to the right understanding of the present movement', it began (after a brief explanation of and appeal for the Fund),

   to set forth clearly the fact that Assistant-Curates, holding the position and performing the duties which they now do, are, as a class, the creation of the present century.

And it went on to outline briefly the development that had converted the curates from a body of some 5,000 men who did duty for absentee and pluralist incumbents, to a body of similar or greater number now

67. This was clearly the work of J.J. Halcombe, the originator of the whole scheme. After Charterhouse he had been a sizar and scholar at Magdalene, Cambridge, whence he had taken his (poll) B.A. in 1855: he held 2 London curacies 1857-60 and then returned to Charterhouse as Reader and Librarian from 1862-74.

68. Op. cit., p.4; it was generally felt that the work of the two great Societies, the Church Pastoral Aid and the Additional Curates' (C.P.A.S., 1836, A.C.S., 1837) had stimulated the development: both operated by giving grants to incumbents for the employment of curates, on the criterion of pastoral needs (the C.P.A.S. also funded lay helpers): by the late 1860s they each funded some 500 curates (Reports: those for A.C.S. appear in July issues of Home Mission Field).
for the most part serving as assistants to residents. The growth in the overall number of active clergy had thus taken the form of a great rise in incumbents, accompanied by the creation of this new class of assistants.

Not surprisingly, this could be disconcerting. J.H. Blunt, in an 'Appendix' to his pastoral manual Directorium Pastorale on 'Assistant Curates', wrote of their 'sudden and embarrassing increase'; after outlining some of what he felt were the disadvantages of this, he (rightly) noted that 'The office of Assistant Curate has come upon us unawares', and went on to conclude that 'neither the legal nor the spiritual provisions in respect of it are of a character to bring it into analogy with the true system of the Church of England.' His appears to have been an unusual attitude, but no one disagreed that the financial provisions of the Church were quite unsuited to this development. The traditional finances of the Church were based upon endowment: the working of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had broken the purely local application of endowments, but they were fully occupied trying to raise the stipends of incumbents. Curates - in the new sense - were 'entirely unprovided for by the ancient endowments

---

69. The development is clear from Table 4.2, which can be supplemented from figures shown at the end of this pamphlet (p.30), to give this table. 5,000 was, incidentally, an exaggeration: in 1812 there were some 3,694 curates to non-residents: P.P. 1812, Vol.10, pp.157 and 159.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1838</th>
<th>1848</th>
<th>1853</th>
<th>1863</th>
<th>1879</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curates to non-residents:</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant curates</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>2,998</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>4,183</td>
<td>4,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>4,906</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>5,166</td>
<td>5,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70. 1880 ed., pp.403-6: it is rather extraordinary that his expressions of surprise survived as late as this.
of the Church'; the first aim of the C.A.F. was to remedy this, and as a prominent early supporter put it, the proposal was 'that our generation, the Laity especially, should do in our day, for the Assistant-Curates, what our fathers did for the clergy in theirs ...'.

For two years all efforts were to be devoted to the gathering of a large capital sum, and only then would the grants begin; the grants were intended to raise the stipend of every curate of fifteen years' standing by £100 p.a., not as charity, but as a right.

The form which its proposed grants took underlined the fact that the C.A.F. felt itself to be tackling a question, in essence, of career structure. Pay alone, as we shall see, was not the issue: what was to be challenged was the present situation, whereby the length of curacies was growing, apparently inexorably, thus condemning an increasing proportion of the clergy to a life of static subordination and dependence. The clearest depictions of this situation, and its causes, were contained in the book edited in 1874 by Halcombe, The Church and her curates, particularly in essays by A.M. Deane on 'The rate of promotion' and 'Statistics of the Church of England.' In the first of these, he begins by laboriously calculating the average time to first incumbency, coming to the answer, twelve years. He then goes on to explain how this has come about - it being assumed that such a figure would be surprisingly high to most readers. The whole

72. Archdeacon Freeman (see above, pp.174-5), in his address to the meeting at Lambeth, 12 Feb. 1866, that formally launched the C.A.F.: appended to Position and Prospects, p.29 (see also p.26).
73. A. Mackreth Dean; had been a scholar of Emmanuel, Cambridge, and 8th Sen. Opt. in 1859: held four curacies 1860-70 before becoming Rector of E. Marden in Sussex: spent the rest of his career in Sussex, and was Canon of Chichester from 1895: 'known as a composer of chess problems' (Venn). (Essays 5 and 6, pp.66-86 and 87-110).
74. pp.69-75.
position, he stresses, had been quite different at the beginning of the century: then,

In point of fact a rate of promotion did not exist, for we may almost say that, as a rule, the clergy were divided into two classes, incumbents and curates, at the time of their ordination, and remained as such for the whole of their lives.

But, as Halcombe also tended to do, he stressed that the old-style curates had the compensations of stability in their posts, and an accepted position.\(^{75}\)

The change had come with the Pluralities Act of 1838, and the consequent enormously increased number of incumbencies effectively open to the clergy, while the creation of new parishes supplemented the process: for a while, prospects in the Church were uniquely good, in terms of gaining a benefice.\(^{76}\) But there was a countervailing influence, growing ever stronger; this was the overall growth in the number of clergy, which rapidly went beyond the number of benefices (whereas for at least 100 years the two were very similar)\(^{77}\) and made lengthening curacies a simple mathematical necessity. Deane's fear was that unless new parishes were created fast enough to absorb the growth

\(^{75}\) pp.76-7: i.e. he made the good point that in those days 'it was not taken for granted [as it is now] that, if they failed to obtain preferment, it was through their inefficiency or indolence' (p.77). Halcombe had written in 1866 that 'the position of the Assistant Curate was formerly in every way much better than at present', mainly stressing the prevalence of long and settled sole charges (Position and prospects, pp.4-5). This was thoroughly Arcadian, but the contrast was not wholly absurd.

\(^{76}\) The same point was made in a Quarterly Review article of January 1868 (Vol. 134) on 'Church progress', pp.253-4: this writer, however, was clearly sceptical of the C.A.F.'s claims about worsening prospects.

\(^{77}\) By about 1860 the number of beneficed clergy had roughly caught up with the number of benefices, so that further clergy growth could no longer be absorbed (the most convenient summary of figures is in Currie, Gilbert and Horsley, Churches and Churchgoers, pp.196-7; though the obviously anomalous figure for 'total beneficed clergy' in 1875 is based on a misreading of Deane, op. cit., p.105).
in the clergy, the position would simply get steadily worse. He did not take into account one obvious ameliorating factor: that as the surge of clergy ordained from the mid-1830s aged, so wastage from natural causes would rise and the rate of growth of the clergy would (as it did) slow substantially. But his fears were to be justified, if not permanently, by the rising level of ordinations in the late 1870s and 1880s. And more importantly, these publicists of the C.A.F. had exposed a genuine dilemma of Church growth: as Halcombe had written in 1866, the need for more clergy was universally acknowledged among churchpeople, 'but', he went on, it is impossible that any increase at all can take place without making the prospect open to stipendiary Curates more discouraging...

The object of the C.A.F. was to counter the anomalies inherent in the fact that the position of assistant curate involved only minimal internal ranking for experience and skill, and hence minimal potential for advancement: the position bore the marks of its origins, first as an often permanent berth for the less well-connected clergy, then as a relatively brief 'apprenticeship', for it was in the period

78. Op. cit., pp.77-81: Deane also produced a most valuable table, based on 1,000 clergy taken at random from a clerical directory; they were divided by date of ordination and tabulated by years to their first living: this showed very clearly that men ordained in the early 1830s still tended to have very long waits (52% were over 15 years), that prospects had markedly improved for men ordained in the late 1830s and 1840s, and that they were again slipping for more recent ordinands (pp.83-4).

79. According to the figures given annually in the Church of England Year-Book, 1886 was the peak year for ordinations, with 814: the five-year moving average of numbers ordained rose from 655 (centred on 1876) to 789 (1885), before beginning a steady decline. (The effects of sudden growth on the age-structure of the clergy is discussed in Chapter one, above).

80. Position and prospects, p.9 (his emphasis). Halcombe was still making the same point in his 1880 Church Congress address, printed separately as The clergy: too many and too few, passim.
of best opportunities that the new assistant curates had become numerous. As it became increasingly common to be an assistant for long periods, it became patently unsatisfactory that curacies offered so little opportunity for improved status and pay: worse, as curates grew older, their stipends actually tended to decline, and jobs became more difficult to find. The provision by the C.A.F. of a guaranteed supplement to their income should they spend 15 years unbeneficed, would create the essential element of security which, if only actually realized in a few hundred cases, would 'be a stimulus to the whole body of Curates, and will materially strengthen their position.'

Pay was among the most prominent of the conditions of a curate's life in the debate of the period. It was undeniable that it had improved greatly since the 1840s. According to calculations from the advertisements in the Ecclesiastical Gazette the average curatal stipend had risen from £79 in 1853, to £97-10 in 1863, and was £129-5-8 in 1873: while according to Parliamentary returns, in 1848 51% of assistant curates received less than £100, and only 15% over £120, and in 1879 the figures were 10% and 74% respectively. The

81. Ibid., p.2: based (clearly) on an analysis of C.A.F. applications, it was found that the stipends on average reached their maximum (£140 p.a.) after 20 years, and thereafter declined at about £5 for every additional 5 years. Deane had pointed out that sole charges were usually very poorly remunerated, and these tended to be held by older men (op. cit., esp. pp.91-3).

82. C.A.F. Report, Jan. 1875: 'Old curates: by one of themselves', stressed that 'mere age, apart from declining health, is in itself a disqualification' in competing with younger men. The unwillingness of incumbents to employ older men was noted at the 1867 Church Congress; C.C.R. 1867, pp.90 and 102 ('an old Curate can seldom work satisfactorily under a young Incumbent').

83. First Report, p.13: it was also hoped gradually to reduce the qualifying period. In his 1869 Curates Augmentation Fund: a letter Halcombe wrote that while actual recipients might be few, there were many 'whose course would be made clear, by the knowledge that, failing preferment, they could rely on such an increase, though they might never be obliged to avail themselves of it' (p.8).

84. Deane, op. cit., p.96: and figures from Table 4.2.
stipend for a newly ordained curate was clearly now at least adequate; a man who needed or wanted £120 p.a. could go to a manufacturing district and should certainly be able to count on £110 p.a. There was an element of choice, in the limited sense that one could choose a lesser income with a more pleasant environment: in 1871-3 the starting stipends of men ordained at Oxford and Ripon were as follows:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal (up to £10)</th>
<th>£11 to £79</th>
<th>£80 to £99</th>
<th>£100 to £119</th>
<th>£120 plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford: No. (85)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon: No. (109)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So at Oxford - and stipends had risen substantially since 1861-3 - 60% of men still started on less than £100, and a full fifth took no more than nominal stipends; while in Ripon, where almost all titles were in manufacturing towns, 74% had £100 or more, and many already had at least £120. For all curates (see Table 4.2) there were similar differences: in 1878, in Oxford over 40% earned less than £120 p.a., and only 18% had over £150 p.a., while at Ripon the respective figures were 16% and 43%.  

85. W.S. Smith, in 1878, pleading for a better-paid clergy, said that 'Provision is not so much wanted for the opening of a clergyman's career - (Curates now-a-days are fairly paid so far as the first few years of the ministry are concerned)' ... C.C.R. 1878, p.530). J.F. Stephen had stressed that the relatively large and steady income of the young curate was unusual in the professional world and formed 'a better prospect than any other liberal calling opens.' (Cornhill, Vol.9, June 1864, pp.756-7).

86. These figures are for all ordinands, not just the 50% sample: they cover only men ordained to curacies.

87. The Chichester figures, with 32% of curates earning at least £150, reflect the position in the large coastal downs, which contained many curates.
These stipends were perhaps sufficient for young and single men, but they seemed to most commentators inadequate for married men with families, with a position to keep up; as Archdeacon Freeman said, their difficulty was
to hold in matters temporal and social, the social status which the Church assumes that they do maintain ... The world expects them to keep for themselves and others the rank and the education of gentlemen.⁸⁸

In fact there was considerable poverty among long-service curates. Among the case-histories given in W.G. Jervis's *The hardships and sufferings of the poor clergy* (1862) were many of poor curates; the last one given, that of a well-educated curate, 17 years in orders, supporting a wife and seven children on £145 p.a., included a comment from his Rector; he described him as a worthy example of 'those who are struggling well and manfully against difficulties, and keeping up the character of clergymen and gentlemen with means entirely inadequate ...' ⁸⁹

Curates were by no means the only clergy who suffered from the disparity between means and expectations. It was indeed pointed out that their stipends were often such as to attract the incumbents of poor livings.⁹⁰ But pay was merely one part of the curates' problems. There was a linked group of grievances, reducible to the basically dependent position of the assistant curate. This was not new, but one aspect of it had worsened; this was the constant moving, which

---

⁸⁹. P.16. The examples were drawn from the cases before the 'Poor Clergy Relief Society.' The issue of clerical poverty is discussed further in Chapter seven, section 2.
⁹⁰. Ch.C. 1879, pp.104-5 (and when the agricultural depression hit home this became a commonplace).
curates. Halcombe referred to 'the nomad life of a curate', and reckoned the average length of curacies at two years;\textsuperscript{91} while this was probably a little too low, it was not impossible. The average length of each curacy for the 30 non-Oxbridge graduates in the 1871-3 Ripon sample was 2.6 years; and though three to four years seems a more likely general average,\textsuperscript{92} if one leaves out of account exceptional cases who had long and stable posts, it is clear that most curates would be moving house at least every four years, in many cases much more frequently. There was no form of help with removals, and usually accommodation had to be rented; Halcombe, pleading for curates' houses, thought that housing problems, particularly 'in very poor districts', were themselves a cause of constant movement.\textsuperscript{93}

There was also a more traditional complaint of the curates, which related to their general insecurity of tenure. This can be seen to emerge in occasional publications and bursts of activity through the century, and may have been a commonly-felt grievance. In 1819 a florid and lengthy pamphlet had protested against

\textsuperscript{91} Clergy: too many and too few, pp.2 and 6. See also Position and prospects, pp.11-2 and 13.

\textsuperscript{92} Averages of between 3.5 and 4 years per curacy obtain in 3 other sample groups tested: i.e. all Oxford ordinands of 1871-3 (except fellows, teachers and those with overseas careers), all Ripon ordinands (with the same exceptions) of 1851-3, and 16 applicants to the C.A.F. in 1890-1, whose careers were followed to 1908.

\textsuperscript{93} Clergy: too many and too few, pp.6-7. In their rules the C.A.F. accepted £80 plus a house as equal to £100 p.a., though Halcombe suggested in Position and prospects that the cost of a curate's house 'cannot, considering the position which he has to keep up, fall much below £50 a year ...' (p.10): but this was clearly unrealistic. (The expense and trouble of constant moves had also been emphasised in The whole case of the unbefited clergy (1842), pp.6-7).
legislation allowing the bishops to remove curates at their discretion; the 1842 Whole case of the unbeficienced clergy went so far as to propose that curates be appointed by bishops, thus breaking the direct and allegedly degrading employer-employee relationship between the incumbent and his curate. Its anonymous author covered other topics; as well as advanced proposals for a fixed share of parish incomes for the curates, and for guaranteed use of episcopal patronage for deserving curates he touched on more emotive matters: he strongly objected, for instance, to the use of the possessive pronoun by incumbents in relation to 'their' curates, he waxed bitter about the division of labour which reserved the light and prestigious work only for the incumbent, and he fulminated against the style and tone of 'Wanted a curate' advertisements. Discontent among curates was certainly not unknown, or unheard of.

Such discontent was very public just at the time of the C.A.F.'s foundation. It appears to have been at its height in 1867, when a Church Congress session was devoted to the position of curates, and a weighty memorial was submitted for the consideration of the first Lambeth Conference. The normal complaints were made, about

94. The curates' appeal to the equity and Christian principles of the British Legislature ...: perhaps its most interesting feature is the use of the then-conventional arguments for the political utility of the Church as a bargaining point ('It becomes, then, the most evident duty and interest of the Legislature to secure our affections and to encourage our efforts:' pp.140-2).

95. P.27.

96. pp.21-6. This passage clearly influenced the author of a set of satirical verses, Wanted a curate, or, a peep into Clerical Advertisements ... (1853) - indeed it was very likely by the same author: see also below, note 100.

97. G. Best, Temporal pillars, pp.207-9, gives a little background, and W.R. Ward describes an interesting upsurge of discontent among curates and the ministers of district churches, in 1848 (Religion and society in England 1790-1850, pp.226-7). The almost wholly derivative The curate's lot, by A. Tindal Hart (1970: Chap. VI) appears to be the only modern work on the 19th century curates.

98. Hart, op. cit., pp.137-42, quotes extensively from both, but makes little comment.
insecurity, insufficient pay, and lack of patronage. Not all the protest, evidently, was so official. On 3 September 1867 a letter from an outraged 'Old Incumbent' informed the readers of the Times of moves for a curates' union, and recounted the proceedings of a recent London meeting: the gravamina there presented were radical and comprehensive, as were the suggested solutions, which included permanency of curates' posts, promotion by seniority, and equalisation of incumbents' stipends according to population - as well as a guaranteed equality of curates with their incumbents in the spiritual affairs of their parishes. At the Congress a month later Rev. Walter Blunt pleaded for an end to 'all this talk about "Curates' unions" and struggle about "curates' rights"', calling it 'utterly wrong and deeply degrading'; and he deplored the extensive correspondence in the religious press on the subject which had 'only tended to estrange the sympathies of the laity.' The agitation does seem to have died down, and was perhaps always only ever a minority concern; but in 1896 another Congress heard a paper from Dr Samuel W. Thackeray, chairman of the Curates' Union, which showed at least that the grievance about insecurity and dependence upon the pleasure of the incumbent was by no

99. (Page 5f): the author was horrified that 'such wild, revolutionary propositions, or such ridiculous complaints as these' could be uttered by curates; not surprisingly, at the end he provided a perfect example of the patronising attitude which so rankled them.

100. C.C.R. 1867, pp.102-3. (On 16 June 1868 there appeared a letter in the Times complaining bitterly of the terms of clerical advertisements, p.5f: it may even again have been by the author of The Whole case and Wanted a curate, but if not it certainly reflected the same grievances).

101. Trained originally at St Mark's Training College (as a National schoolmaster) Thackeray later went through Trinity Cambridge as a sizar, and (at 30) was 34th Wrangler in 1872. Held teaching positions, curacies and chaplaincies in and around London, but no livings; he became LL.D. in 1889 (Venn: under 'Thackrah', which he later changed).
means dead. Thackeray, however, damaged his case by rash overstatement about unemployed curates, and allowed a Committee of Convocation to demonstrate this with ease. 102

Probably the most significant theme to emerge, as it did throughout, was the fear that the problems of curates, and the prospects of the clerical career more generally, were adversely affecting ordinations - at least of the right sort of men. To a large extent this concern was based on the poverty of livings, a perennial problem, not destined to be solved. But there was a new emphasis upon the badness of the promotion structure. In 1854 W.J. Conybeare was probably correct in rebuking the Times for perpetuating a myth about permanent curates, and curates as 'a separate class', which he clearly saw as applicable only to the passing regime of the non-resident pluralists and their perpetual deputies; to him curates were now analogous to midshipmen - in a humble position, but at the foot of a ladder, on which 'promotion is the rule.' 103 But in 1860 E.L. Cutts - who was in a good position to know, from work with the A.C.S. 104 - was writing of parents starting to have doubts about the Church for their sons: was the expense of educating a boy worthwhile 'when all the prospect before him is a curacy of 100 l. for an indefinite number of years' and the likelihood of a very poor benefice to follow? Only

102. Ch.C. 1896, pp.244-9; Report No.318 (1898, on 'Assistant Curates'), and Ch.C. 1898, pp.223-4, 383-94, and 396-421 (Lower House), and 177-82 (Upper House): by this time Convocation was considering a broad range of actions to help, and was not unsympathetic - but the bishops, as so often, argued that their individual attention was preferable to corporate action. (For a clear statement of the conservative reaction to the new complaints, Visitation Charges ... Chester and Oxford, by William Stubbs, ed. E.E. Holmes, 1904, pp.265-70; 1896 Charge).
104. Cutts was a local organising secretary; later he was (1865-71) full-time secretary of the A.C.S. He was a notable antiquarian - and as such is in the D.N.B.
the social prestige of the Church kept up its recruitment of well- educated men, he thought. 105

The importance of prudential considerations was stressed, largely because it was well understood that whatever motivated the individual youth, the decision as to career was very largely that of parents or guardians. One clergyman, in a combative paper to the Liverpool Clerical Society in 1863, described his own position as that of a man forced to support himself ('like any mere layman') as a private schoolmaster, having no useful contacts and unable to subsist from clerical work: 'It is hardly likely, therefore', he added, 'that I should be encouraged to recommend any son of mine to select the Church as his profession, with no better prospects before him than this.' 106 T.E. Espin stressed the same point that year, seeing the increasing relative poorness of the prospects of a clerical career as a leading cause of declining ordinations, for 'such a spectacle has a profound effect upon the heads of that class of families to which we should mainly look to replenish the numbers of our clergy.' 107 At the end of 1865 it was asserted that the grievance of the curates' insecure tenure was not only 'a constant subject of discussion when among ourselves [but also it] becomes as well known to young men, generally, as any other social grievance whatever.' 108 Early in 1866 both Edward Bartrum, in his important pamphlet Promotion by merit

106. The deficient supply of well-qualified clergymen for the C. of E. at the present time ..., Birkenhead, 1863, p.10: for the most part, however, he was criticising the repellent effects of 'what may be called the Ultra-Protestant notion of a Clergyman's duties.'
107. The supply and training of ministers (1863), p.4: he further wrote that with parents 'it practically rests, under God's providence, to decide whether they will devote their young charges to the ministry or not.' (B.F.W. Bullock makes this point clearly, A history of the training ... 1800-1874, p.144).
108. Letter from 'Presbyter' to the Times, 4 Nov. 1865, p.10f.
essential to the progress of the Church and Anthony Trollope, in his paper on 'The Curate in a populous parish', saw a direct connection between prospects and recruitments; and both pointed to the dangers (and the signs) of an enforced lowering of social and educational standards. 109

In this context it is not surprising that much was made by the C.A.F.'s spokesmen of their scheme's probable influence in halting this dangerous trend. Halcombe wrote of the very reasonable desire for a guaranteed income, of say £200 p.a., by men who now knew that they might remain curates all their lives; and the influence that a lack of such a prospect had upon parents, 'especially professional men and others who cannot afford to give their sons an independent income.' 110 And, countering the possible objection that such a guaranteed income might merely attract 'a lower class of men', he replied that, on the contrary, as candidates increased the bishops could once again raise standards, 'especially in the case of those who had not had a University education.' 111 The Report read to the first Annual General Meeting in June 1867 had three separate references to the problem of falling numbers and declining standards among ordinands; 112 and at that meeting Dean Stanley

pointed out the importance of offering inducements to the enlightened and educated portion of the rising generation to enter the Church by making the profession as attractive as it was in former times;

adding that 'nothing would be more fatal' to the Church's prospects

109. Bartrum, esp. pp.7 and 22-3: Trollope, op. cit. (note 4), pp.98 and 103-4 (the former passage was added between January and March ('Bibliographical note', p[62]), and so may directly reflect the reports of the first Lambeth C.A.F. meeting, held 12 Feb.; though Trollope was already well aware of the general problem).


111. Ibid., pp.13-14.

112. First Report, pp.6, 11, 12-3.
than the loss of the 'intelligence and activity of those who in former years were attracted towards it.'

The C.A.F., however, never fulfilled the sanguine hopes of Halcombe and his backers. Halcombe had first published his idea of a great central fund which would give security to the curates' careers, in November 1864, and over the next year he gathered the support of both Archbishops and of several others of the most influential figures in the Bench, including Sumner of Winchester and Wilberforce of Oxford. The list of Vice-Presidents and of the Provisional Council of February 1866 included churchmen as diverse as the Earls of Shaftesbury and Harrowby, and the Rev. Messrs Cadman and Champneys on the Evangelical wing, and the Earl of Shrewsbury, A.J.B. Beresford Hope, and the Revs. C. Wordsworth and Robert Gregory on the Tractarian. So far as I am aware there had been no comparable voluntary movement started, for the Church at home, since at least the 1830s, in terms of its projected scope, and its weighty support.

As an organisation which absolutely rejected the label of a charity, had it succeeded it would have become a major semi-official arm of the Church's financial establishment. The minimal starting aim - to provide an additional £100 p.a. for an estimated 400 eligible curates - postulated an income of £40,000 p.a., and it was hoped to

113. Times, 18 June 1867 (7c); this was also a major theme of S. Wilberforce's very favourable review of Position and prospects in the Quarterly Review Vol.123 (July 1867), esp. pp.227-9; and there was an unashamed assertion of the 'gentleman heresy', and of the fear that poor prospects were endangering standards, by G.K. Rickards, late Prof. of Political Economy at Oxford, in his essay 'Church Finance' in The Church and her curates, esp. pp.54, 58-9, 61.

114. Names at the front of Position and prospects; there were 13 bishops as well as the Archbishops, and 6 peers: among other well-known names were Gathorne Hardy and J.E.D. Coleridge. (Halcombe's originating of the plan is described in the first Report, pp.6-7).

115. A not dissimilar organisation, 'the Marquis of Lorne's fund' -
incorporating the archdeans and rural deans but, it was hoped, manned mostly by laymen, was proposed.\textsuperscript{116}

The Fund made a good start, but probably, far below the hopes of its founders; at the first A.G.M. it reported receipts of over £23,000 and another £6,000 in promises. The Report suggested that this was very good considering the commercial and agricultural distress of the year,\textsuperscript{117} and undoubtedly in this unfortunate coincidence lay some of the blame for ultimate failure. For the Fund clearly needed momentum: after all, no grants were to be made for two years, so there would be for this period no results to point to beyond those of the fund-raising venture.\textsuperscript{118} Disproportion between means and ends was to be the major cause of the Fund's early and ultimately fatal stumble. One aspect of this was the problem of organisational expenses. In July 1866 it was decided, after considerable debate, that a purely honorary organisation was out of the question, but at the same time there was a full awareness of the dangers of

\textsuperscript{F.n. 115 continued.}
later the 'Incumbents' Sustenance Fund' - was set on foot in 1873, with the aim of raising all livings to £200 p.a.: it failed more completely than the C.A.F. - see below, Chapter seven, section 2.

\textsuperscript{116.} Position and prospects and first Report, passim.

\textsuperscript{117.} pp.9-10 (agriculture was suffering still from the effects of the 'Cattle plague', and commerce from the series of bankruptcies precipitated by the failure of Overend and Gurney).

\textsuperscript{118.} Wisely no target seems to have been published; but if the capital fund was to guarantee the grants, as Halcombe intended, and was important enough to absorb 2 years, it must have been hoped to raise a fund capable of producing several thousand pounds p.a., and it is probable that a six-figure sum was hoped for.
extravagance. In fact, however, the organisation decided upon, of three travelling secretaries (at £300 p.a. each) plus a central office with a secretary, could only seem small in the light of a very large annual income. The total expenses of the first year were over £2,700, of which £1,700 was accounted for by the running costs of just six months; the first Report was already a little defensive about this. Within four months it was moved and accepted in Council (by Gregory) that the 'present system of organising ... being very costly and the results not being commensurate, it is desirable to adopt at once a less costly one'; but a fortnight later, on the grounds (in essence) that the large organisation should at least be used, while it existed, to complete a national canvass and the network of local organising committees, action was postponed till June 1868.

By the spring of 1868 they were already being warned by Thomson, Archbishop of York, about 'the questionable position' in which the C.A.F. was placed 'by the fact that our office expenses were very great while our expenditure on the great objects of the Charity was nil. By now, however, the critical moment had arrived. Grant policy was to be announced at the June A.G.M., when the two years were up. In January - and it seems unwise that it was left so late - meetings

119. C.A.F. Council Minute Book, 1866-9:9 and 23 July, and 21 Aug. 1866. (Interestingly one of the secretaries - for the North - was a St Aidan's man (Trendell), though they were not aware of this until the interview. He turned out to be their best man - but when later choosing a secretary for London, they were firm that the man must be an Oxbridge graduate: 21 Aug. and 5 Nov. 1866).

120. pp.10 and 25 (financial statement).

121. Minutes, 21 Oct. 1867 (the resolution followed presentation of a report by Halcombe), 4 and 18 Nov.

122. From Thomson's later letter, copied in Minutes 15 Feb. 1869. His use of the word 'Charity' indicates the problem Halcombe faced in insisting that the C.A.F. was not a charity: see further below, pp.372-3.
began on the subject: only now, for instance, was the survey carried out which would tell them how many eligible curates there actually were, though by luck or skill the number turned out to be 435, very close to their original estimate.  

At this point began debilitating divisions on two major questions. First, there were problems defining eligibility: the seesawing debates are tedious and dispiriting to read, as for the next four years the Council struggled to decide whether, for instance, a period in a small living (or service in the colonies) could be counted towards the 15 years' service, or whether teaching or taking pupils disqualified an applicant. The original intent was simple - only curacies counted, without other employment, past or present - but the untidy careers of so many curates made it increasingly difficult to resist the plea for simple fairness: the subject was tangled and contentious, and the cause of much trouble. It also presented many targets for external criticism.

The second critical question was a direct consequence of the failure of the fund-raising effort. In March 1868 it was decided that the Fund would have an annual income of £10,000 to distribute, among 400 curates. Clearly either the grants must be lower than planned, or there must be a form of selectivity. At a meeting on 14 May it was decided to give grants of £25 to all eligible curates: but the decision had been painful. Halcombe wrote two years later of

123. Minutes, 21 Jan., 2 and 23 March, esp.: the survey had started with 855 men prima facie eligible, whittled down in two stages (account in 1868-9 Report, p.7). It seems that Trendell urged a clear policy, and it must have been increasingly difficult for him to work without such a clear policy to outline to the public.

124. The Minutes are full of these debates: eventually after very heavy pressure had been applied, the Council agreed in principle to accept small incumbencies and colonial service (7 July 1869), but it was nearly 3 years before they put this into effect, at meetings of 30 May and 27 June 1872.
how this decision caused 'a serious division in our Council and an
ultimate secession of some of its most active members', among whom
were T.F. Stooks and Robert Gregory, both prominent London clergy:
he saw this as essentially because the decision was so far below
the original intent as to seem almost a different scheme.\textsuperscript{125}

The C.A.F. thus began its career as a grant-giving body with
neither the wealth nor the united backing which had seemed possible
in 1866. It was vulnerable, and in this state it felt the lash of
the Times. There was a brief exchange of letters in early August,
when Halcombe had to defend the eligibility rules and their exclusion
of an asylum chaplain on £65 p.a.: for it was a basic rule that
grantees must be in receipt of £100 p.a., which the C.A.F. saw as an
effective guarantee that their aid went only to men doing worthwhile
work: and the Fund was 'to stimulate, not to supersede, local
efforts.'\textsuperscript{126} Then on 16 October appeared a notice on the C.A.F.,
pointing out that it was cutting its organisation, because that had
already eaten up a fifth of its receipts, and seemed set to take a
quarter of its income; also, that eight bishops had refused to join
their episcopal colleagues as Vice-Presidents. Five days later the
treasurers, the Revs. C.F. Few and J.C. Miller, responded to the former
point by making the analogy with a man starting a great business - 'His
first outlay must be large, even bold. False economy is suicidal ...';

\textsuperscript{125} Minutes, 23 March to 14 May, esp. (pp.177-212); Halcombe's
letter was considered 31 March 1870, see esp. p.17 (new Book).
The letter of Thomson (see note 121) asked, 'will the donations
come in as rapidly, when the result is seen to be raising of
[sic] each stipend by £25 a year instead of £100, and with a
reduced working staff.' James Moorhouse described the grant in
1872 as 'so small as to be nothing better than a dole, involving
thus all the inconveniences and none of the advantages of a
substantial grant-in-aid.' (Times, 28 Oct., 11a).

\textsuperscript{126} Times 1 Aug. 9f), and 5 Aug (8c), 1868: this £100 rule was
defended particularly by Halcombe in his later letter of 1 Jan.
1869.
and they stressed the necessity of a nationwide organisation, if the income was to be regular, as it had to be. But as another response, the Council very soon afterwards decided to reduce its central expenditure by a further £450.127

The main blows, however, came in the form of two leaders, on Christmas Day, 1868, and New Year's Day, 1869; in each case there was a long letter of Halcombe's in the same issue - the first leader was a comment on the first letter, the second took its criticism onto new grounds, so that Halcombe's reply to the first was not allowed even one day in possession of the field. The criticism was root and branch. Halcombe's first letter was a strong protest against the resort to charity as a response to the plight of the poor curates, and a plea for help instead through the C.A.F. The accompanying leader was not kind to the curates: why, it asked, a Fund for them, and not for military or civil officers? - these latter were no better off. Then, in a line of attack that seems now both unfair and extraordinary in its view of the clergy, but which probably had considerable argumentative value then, it denied that any tolerably competent curate need remain poor at all; he could always teach, or write - and if he could do neither 'it is not improbable that he will have very indifferent qualifications as a clergyman.' And finally the heaviest gun was brought into action: the C.A.F. interfered with the 'law of supply and demand.' The recent rise in curates' stipends was taken as evidence that this was already in operation, and that therefore there was no need for interference; indeed, it concluded, in this respect curates were better off than incumbents, and the C.A.F. was retrograde in making them approximate more to the latters' condition, by protecting them

127. Minutes, 2 Nov. 1868 (following a report from the Organising Committee: they were to dispense with their secretary - at £350 p.a. - and take smaller offices).
'from the wholesome influence of competition.'

Halcombe's reply was, as his writings always were, clear and to the point. As he had in Positions and prospects, he argued that the law of supply and demand was in effect suspended, because the incumbents' incomes were inelastic and insufficient: they simply could not pay the fair price. Furthermore they should not be asked to shoulder the whole burden of a payment necessitated by the growth of population, and hence the responsibility of the lay public; physicians in growing hospitals would never be expected to pay a burgeoning staff of assistants from their own salaries. Then he pointed out the advantages of other professions over the Church, in terms of certainty of promotion, certainty of income, and pension rights. And finally he pointed out that the recent rise in stipends more probably reflected a declining supply of curates, than a perception of their increased worth; he thought this was partly because so many were being forced to abandon strictly parochial work.

The leader of that day took new ground. And it early gave a shrewd and largely correct description of the C.A.F.: it had no intention of discouraging either zeal or charity in the cause of the poor clergy, but the C.A.F. seemed quite the wrong method. This was because it is neither one thing nor the other - neither charity nor business. It is an ingenious and well-intentioned effort to combine the two. It is an attempt to disguise charity under the semblance of justice, and to do a good stroke of business for the Church through the powerful influence of charitable feelings.

128. pp.6-7.

129. This argument, in various forms, had been basic from the start of the C.A.F., but was by no means new - the 'home missionary' societies, the A.C.S. and the C.P.A.S., had always argued thus.
There is no doubt that Halcombe, particularly, did his utmost to avoid the charitable approach, but equally there can be little doubt that what appealed to the public was the picture of the poor and deserving curate; given the nature of the problem it was impossible to disentangle this from the appeal to ecclesiastical efficiency. And this raises the more basic question still, of how far it was realistic to attempt an essentially organisational object by means of a voluntary agency: none of the precedents really fitted - the support of the overseas or the home missionary societies, or of the National Society, was justified clearly by reference to the necessity of the work they did, their agents being necessary but secondary: with the C.A.F. the agents were in the foreground, the effect on their work secondary. Once the grand original intent had failed, the C.A.F. was indeed uneasily poised between charity (in which role it was at least plausible) and an organisational aim that seemed, in its truncated form, a rather weak focus of attraction. The Times leader, meanwhile, ended by urging its readers either to support the A.C.S. and the C.P.A.S., or to give money to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to increase the endowment of poor parishes.

The C.A.F. never managed the major revival it needed. In the immediate aftermath of the Times attacks there were worried meetings, and protracted efforts to meet the strong private criticisms of Thomson.

130. In the third Report Halcombe balanced precariously between the two: he emphasised that to curates with no private means even £25 'may be of the very greatest and most timely service, but [my emph.] the aim of the Fund has not been so much to increase the resources of Curates who may happen to be poor, as to provide a sufficient remuneration for every Curate's work' (pp.6-7).

131. It also asked, 'can any man suppose it would be a material attraction to University men' to have the assurance (health permitting) of £150 or £200 p.a.? - effectively scorning the idea: it was livings, and the status they carried, which attracted such men, it declared.
of York and Browne of Ely. In an attempt to prevent a further fall in income Halcombe put out a public letter on the Fund, but to no avail: in 1870 the grants were reduced to £20. In 1872 it was decided to make new grants only of £50, thus accepting the principle of selection and leading to a new burst of support for the Fund. But it did not last, and 1872 had also seen further ructions in the Council, with angry resignations over Halcombe's and his supporters' refusal to accept the criterion of private means as relevant to eligibility, insisting as before that to admit this would destroy the whole basis of the 'non-eleemosynary' nature of the C.A.F. In the midst of the temporary revival, in 1874, Halcombe published The Church and her curates and was presented by his life-long patrons, the Governors of the Charterhouse, to their best living, Balsham in Cambridgeshire; but he remained Honorary Secretary of the C.A.F. to his death in January 1910. The Fund's work became a routine; by 1876 only a little over 20% of their grants were of £20, the others all being £50; and after the stabilisation of their income, grants from

132. Minutes, esp. 21 Jan. and 15 Feb. 1869, and thereafter 19 May, 7 and 14 June, 7 and 12 July, 9 Dec., and 31 March 1870.

133. The Curates' Augmentation Fund - a letter: this was notable for its honest admission of problems (pp.1-2), and for an admirable argument that low curates' stipends kept down the endowments of poor livings, and therefore that to raise the former would have a favourable effect also on the latter (pp.4-5); it seems that this had been prominently urged when the plan was first canvassed.

134. Decided at meetings of general subscribers, 22 July and 6 Aug. 1872: income rose from £8,000 to £14,000 in two years, and maintained this level at least to 1877; but (after a gap in the Fund's collection of Reports) grants were down to about £8,000 p.a. by the mid-1880s, at which level they stayed.

135. 'Minutes of Special General Meetings' (10 March and 7 April 1870 and) 30 May and 27 June 1872: Times 14 June, 1 July and 28 Oct. 1872 (the last a letter from J. Moorhouse, then Vicar of St James Paddington: the C.A.F. 'has resolved to make one more vigorous attempt to attain the object of its creation. That effort must, I believe, be its last ....': 11a).
the mid-1880s ran at 150 to 160 a year, all of £50 p.a.\textsuperscript{136} This was a substantial contribution, in a palliative sense: it meant that a selected minority of curates were given an income of about £180 p.a.\textsuperscript{137} But it was very far from the founders' comprehensive hopes: the number of curates over fifteen years in Orders was over 1,000 by 1875, and was estimated at 1,300 in 1902; grantees applied to the Fund, and were judged on the 'principle of detur digniori' - preference being given to men whose lives had been passed in the harder parishes, though curates with rural careers would 'eventually' have their claims recognised ahead of 'younger men, although they may be engaged in more populous places.\textsuperscript{138} As a result, grantees in mostly urban dioceses tended to have served considerably shorter terms than those from rural ones.\textsuperscript{139} It is no surprise to find a disproportionately small number of Oxbridge graduates among them.\textsuperscript{140} From being an organisation intended partly to raise

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{136} Reports: by keeping grants at this level they steadily built up a capital fund, which in 1904 stood at nearly £46,000, and produced over £1,600 p.a. - enough to cover running costs. (About this time they began to ask recipients to raise part of the grant locally, thus allowing the numbers aided to rise to nearly 200, until the War).
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{137} Every year the Reports gave the average stipend, and the average length in Orders, of their grantees: in the 1880s and 1890s the averages were always in the range of 28 to 29 years, and £125-130 p.a.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{138} Report, 1892, pp.4-5. Only one set of application forms (for 1890-1) survives: the form gave detailed information on every post to date - including population, stipends and whether housing was provided. All applications had to be countersigned by the incumbent, the rural dean and the archdeacon.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{139} Ibid., list of grantees, pp.14-15: i.e. 10 of 11 in Manchester had served 16 to 21 years, 4 out of five in Bath and Wells had served over 30. More usually, the parish names show that older recipients tended to be in villages.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{140} No full follow-up was carried out: but a count of the 84 (of 154) men who survived to 1908, shows that only 22 were Oxford or Cambridge graduates: none came from Trinity, Cambridge, nor from any of the more fashionable Oxford colleges - 5 of the Oxford 10 were from Halls. Other substantial groups were, 8 from T.C.D. and 5 from Lampeter: 11 from St Bees, and 32 more from St Aidan's, Lichfield, Highbury, K.C.L. and Q.C.Birmingham; and 6 literates.
\end{quote}
(conventionally defined) social and academic standards, the C.A.F. had become a charity - if a 'rational' one - largely devoted to helping men of the type it had originally hoped to see disappear.

By 1874, doubtless aware that the C.A.F. would never be the engine for a substantive transformation of the curate's careers, Halcombe himself was becoming concerned to press for an increase in incumbencies, and by 1880 he put this at the forefront of remedies for the curates. But he recognised that this was a minority view, that 'public opinion has distinctly declared itself against the subdivision of parishes, and in favour of one man working a large parish with a staff of Curates.' One of his co-authors was an enthusiastic exponent of this new orthodoxy, and in his paper quoted the Vicar of one of the great High Church 'staff' parishes, Great Yarmouth, on the fact that the average stay of curates there was five years: they were attracted by the parish's 'increased opportunity for promotion', allowed by the number of men (eight) and differentiation of posts within the single parish. Halcombe was not satisfied that this sort of micro-structure was sufficient, but

141. The Church and her curates, esp. pp.15-16 and 26: Clergy, too many and too few, p.2 (he was evidently influenced strongly by Rickards (see note 113), whose essay Halcombe reprinted with this piece: he argued that there had to be a large increase in permanent posts, and that it was dangerous simply to let curates increase disproportionately - summarised by Halcombe, pp.3-4.

142. The Church and her curates, p.115. The acceptance of the 'staff' idea is discussed by B. Heeney, A different kind of gentleman (Hamden Conn., 1976), pp.56-9: see also Chadwick, V.C., Pt.2, p.243, and K.S. Inglis, Churches and the working classes in Victorian England (1963), p.27.

143. Other notable examples (outside London) were Leeds, Wantage, Clewer, Frome, and A.D. Wagner's St Paul's, in Brighton.

the arguments on the other side were firmly based on pastoral experience and needs, and were not likely to be overturned. 145

Some indication of the spread of 'staff' parishes (here meaning incumbent plus two or more curates) can be gathered from Table 5.1. In the towns illustrated here, the greatest development was in Leeds: in 1865, apart from the parish church's staff of seven curates, there was only one other parish with more than one curate, and it had only two: 40 years later, again leaving aside St Peter's, there were 17 other 'staff' parishes, including seven with three or more curates. Over two-thirds of the town's curates worked in these parishes. At Brighton the domination of 'staff' parishes came earlier, with the wealth and reputation of the Wagners (particularly at A.D. Wagner's ritualist imperium in imperio of St Paul's) to support the trend. In the smaller towns the trend was less striking: in the relatively unfashionable area of Huddersfield, curate-less parishes continued to dominate, and 'staff' parishes were few and small: at Reading, under the eye of Samuel Wilberforce, 146 there were already in 1860 three parishes with three curates each, and 45 years saw only a further two such parishes added. These are only examples; it is not known what proportion of all curates worked in large 'staffs' at particular periods. Probably it remained small, though clearly it grew, and so the clergy did come to have a somewhat greater opportunity of specialised, settled work.

It is interesting to note the tendency for a separation between graduate and non-graduate clergy, as well as the more predictable

145. Beyond the references given by Heeney, one may instance two influential Church writers on this: J. Sandford, The mission and extension of the Church at home, 1862, p.95, and G. Huntington (a classic formulation) in The Church's work in our large towns (1871), pp.345-51. 'Staff' parishes were advocated at the 1867 A.G.M. of the A.C.S. (Home Mission Field, July 1867, p.39): Thomson of York was evidently years out of date when he referred to the idea, 20 years later, as though it were new (ibid., July 1887, p.53).

146. He had himself headed a team of curates at Alverstoke: D.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Total Parishes</th>
<th>2 Parishes with 1 Curate</th>
<th>3 Parishes with 2 or more Curates</th>
<th>4 Total Incumbents</th>
<th>5 Total Curates</th>
<th>6 Av. Curates in each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Leeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9(1)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Huddersfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Brighton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23(2)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Reading(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Diocesan Calendars (earliest and 1905).

Notes: 1. The parish church (St Peter's) had 7 of the 9 in 1865: in 1905 it had 10, but that still left 17 other parishes with 2-5 curates, av. 2.8 each.
2. In 1874 the Anglo-Catholic A.D. Wagner had no fewer than 14 curates, though at least 4 were attached to mission churches: these were all separate parishes in 1905, and no parish had over 5 curates.
3. There were considerable boundary changes here, as is evident, the deanery losing several rural parishes; so the final averages (Col.6) are not really comparable.
subordination of the latter to the former. In Leeds in 1865, for instance, 38 of the 43 graduate clergy were in parishes without non-graduates: only five of the 35 parishes had a 'mixed' staff, and in all only two graduate clergy served under non-graduates (one of whom was Edward Jackson). In 1905 the separation was not quite so extreme: 21 parishes contained both Oxbridge and other clergy, though again two-thirds of them were under Oxbridge incumbents, and the seven others contained only eight Oxbridge curates: at least half of the Leeds clergy worked either alone or only with other Oxbridge, or other non-Oxbridge men. In Huddersfield, in 1865, eight of the 16 graduate incumbents had curates, whereas only four of the 18 non-graduate ones did: there were only five graduate curates, and none served under a non-graduate, so the only parishes in which the two types mixed were the five where graduates employed non-graduate curates. By 1905 the non-graduates had declined to a much smaller level in the town; but their separation remained, eight of the 12 being incumbents alone, and only three employing graduate curates (2 in four of whom were not Oxbridge graduates, at that). In the other towns, Oxbridge men were a very solid majority in both periods, and the rest were firmly subordinate.

F.n. 146 continued.

147. In the 1865 Calendar, men are shown only as 'M.A.', etc.: in 1905 the university is given, so that it is possible then to distinguish Oxbridge from other clergy.

148. 48 out of 82 Oxbridge men, 29 out of 58 others - the remaining 29 included 17 working as curates to Oxbridge incumbents.

149. In 1865 there were 28 non-graduate to 21 graduate clergy in the town: in 1905 the latter were only 12, the former 57.

150. At Brighton, in 1874, there were 10 non-Oxbridge clergy: 8 were curates to Oxbridge clergy, two were curate-less incumbents: in 1905 there were 6 non-Oxbridge incumbents: only 2 had an Oxbridge curate - while 4 had non-Oxbridge curates: in 9 parishes (out of 33) there were 'mixed' staffs, and thus 7 were headed by Oxbridge men.
The general accuracy of the picture given, particularly by Halcombe and Deane, of a necessarily longer curacy for men without influence, cannot be doubted: certainly until the 1890s the growth in the number of clergy outstripped that of new livings, so that the pool of unbeneficed grew steadily. When analysing various samples of clergy, however, the picture is not quite so clear as it is with the averages and totals. One very small sample, of men from St Bees, does indeed conform admirably, and as one would expect a growing proportion of these men served over 15 years as curates.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as curate (with occasional chaplancies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entered:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter 1849 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M'mas 1859 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter 1869 (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers are very small, but the pattern is evident.

A much larger sample is that of the Cambridge honours graduates (Appendix, Table 2). These are at the other end of the spectrum from the St Bees men. The numbers serving over 16 years were always small, though by no means negligible: because of the low number for the 1861-3 sample one cannot point to a definite rise in this proportion, but the 1861-3 figure does seem unusually small. The trend is clearer in the less extreme cases. There is a clear cut decline in the number of men with short (up to five year) curacies; they

151. This table excludes 3 men (2 from 1849, 1 from 1859) who died within 10 years of ordination: and 4 (2, 1, 1) who never obtained livings and spent largely inactive careers (in clerical terms) - 3 clearly possessed means, the other probably did.

152. One possible explanation - unless the result is simply a freak - is that because these men were ordained at a time of relatively few graduate ordinations, they got on better, in a thinner field.

153. For this purpose I include the 'no curacy' columns; this may overstate slightly the early figures, but not significantly.
GRAPH: ADAPTED FROM APPENDIX TABLE 2.
CAMBRIDGE HONOURS GRADUATES: % SPENDING VARIOUS PERIODS AS CURATES

Columns Represent, Left to Right
1 - Up to 5 years (plus 'no curacy' column in table)
2 - 6 to 10 years
3 - 11 to 15 years
4 - over 16 years
went from 54% to 36%, dropping slowly but steadily for the last three periods. As this proportion dropped, so the numbers in the intermediate classes rose: till the 1861-3 sample the rise is mostly in the next class - those serving six to ten years - but with the 1871-3 sample the numbers there have also started to decline, while those serving over ten years continue to rise. The accompanying graph perhaps shows this most directly.

If both these samples at least roughly confirm the overall trend, the diocese samples present a more complex picture. First it must be said that percentages with such small numbers can very easily mislead; but nevertheless, it is clear (Appendix, Table 3) that in all groups bar the smallest (No.2) the trend to longer curacies seems to be reversed in 1871-3. Two factors may have combined to make it somewhat easier for men ordained in the 1870s. These were, first, the beginning of a higher level of natural wastage as the surge of the 1830s and 1840s clergy grew old and started to die or to retire: and second, that the reduced level of ordinations in the early 1860s meant a somewhat less overcrowded curate body. After the early 1870s, with ordinations again rising curates as a whole were again to grow faster than livings became available. This may partly explain the 1871-3 results; but probably they are best approached in a more detailed way.

Perhaps the most striking turnaround is that of the Ripon non-Oxbridge men: in 1871-3 75% of them had livings within ten years, none had to wait over 15, and only three never obtained a living at all, all in contrast to the same category ten years before. It is not at all easy to see why this might be. But there are certain characteristics of these men's lives and careers which may help. First, there are indications that age may have been a factor: of ten who were between 23 and 26 years old at ordination, only four were incumbents within ten years, as against 17 of the 20 older men. Of the 13 men ordained at
over 30 years old who obtained livings, 11 were between 36 and 42 when they did so - and the other two were the Brigg cousins, who were already over 40 at their ordinations. From this one surmises that, rationally enough, when patrons were looking for incumbents, it was age rather than years in orders that they looked to, in suitable curates: perhaps they now appreciated their pre-ordination experience, too. Of the eight men, 154 of those still in their 20s at ordination, who were incumbents within ten years, seven had at least attended a university; only four of the other eight had, so a university connection probably still tended to accompany success.

The major reason for the difference, however, seems to lie in a shift in the balance of attractiveness between town and country parishes. This will be further discussed below, 155 but cannot be ignored here. It is only necessary to point to the figures in Appendix, Tables 8.5 and 9.4. In the first table it can be seen that, whereas of the 11 who obtained livings in the 1861-3 sample, only four were first incumbents in rural areas, in the 1871-3 sample 16 out of 26 were. In the second, that the number whose first parish had a population of less than 600 rose from two to ten respectively. 156 Until this last period, a high proportion of Ripon's non-Oxbridge clergy were never beneficed: now they were, and largely in country areas. It is doubtful if this was, in many respects, a great improvement: they were able to take these parishes because others no longer wanted them.

154. Strictly, 9 - but the ninth was a St Bees man who obtained a tiny living, held (necessarily) with a neighbouring curacy-in-charge.
155. See Chapter seven, section 1.
156. The change among the Ripon Oxbridge graduates is not dissimilar, these also showing a very sharp increase in the proportion taking rural first livings.
They took them, despite isolation and poor incomes, presumably for
the reasons that Halcombe constantly stressed - for stability and
independence, however meagre the returns. ¹⁵⁷

There is one further point that deserves comment. The figures
in Table 3 indicate that there was a considerable proportion of Oxbridge
men, in the Oxford and Chichester sample, who never obtained livings,
or who did so only after more than 15 years. Yet, as has been seen, such
men were little represented in the lists of C.A.F. grantees. A look at
the men ordained at Oxford after 1851 provides a fairly predictable
guide to the reasons. First, there were some who, though not always
solely teachers, evidently saw themselves mainly as educators;¹⁵⁸
this accounts for at least a third of the possible cases, and a further
quarter were men who died young. At least a similar proportion emerges
having been either voluntarily inactive, or voluntarily curates. This
must usually be inferred, but in these cases the inference is not risky.
As examples, one may instance the following: from 1851-3, Henry
George Rolt, son of an Irish Lt.-Colonel, who after a year in his first
curacy took no further clerical work, and was never priested.¹⁵⁹ From
1861-3, John Henry Jenkinson and Edward William Gordon, both ordained
in their later 30s after having been at Christ Church and the Bar;

¹⁵⁷. This was the argument (referred to above, note 133) of his 1869
Letter, particularly: hence the lack of incentive for patrons
to improve endowments (pp.4-5). In the 1868-9 Report of the
C.A.F. the main reason given for men's remaining curates was
not for lack of offers, but 'because they are not possessed of
sufficient private means to enable them to accept livings' (p.9):
it was thus often a choice between the relatively good stipend
but insecurity of curacies, and the stable penury of a living
(see also Chapter seven, section 2).

¹⁵⁸. Apart from the normal school and university teachers, this would
include John George Wood, who held various curacies and
chaplaincies before becoming for ten years a fulltime popular
botany lecturer: D.N.B. (and D.E. Allen, The naturalist in
Britain, 1978 ed., pp.79 and 139: one of his books sold 100,000
copies in one week).

¹⁵⁹. Neither was William Henry Gibson-Carmichael, also ordained in 1852
each held single curacies, followed by a dozen or so years of clerical inactivity. From 1871-3, Edward Purcell and Thomas H.G. Watson, both ordained to curacies which they served gratis, and both of whom left these after less than four years to spend long lives without further clerical work. Men who voluntarily remained curates are rather less easy to pick: but there appear to be at least five such men in the 1861-3 sample. Apart from the sort of sheer conscientious one-mindedness that drove the most famous of Victorian curates, Arthur Stanton, there were, after all, curacies and curacies: before he passed on to 30 years of London curacies, Wyndham Arthur Shakespeare had seven years at Peasemore in Berkshire, curate to a wealthy squarson who had a parish of barely 300 souls which yielded some £800 p.a.: and this squarson's brother was later served in his home parish (worth over £500 p.a.) by John Julius Baker, who had spent 19 years as a curate, 13 of them quietly as a curate-in-charge of a Staffordshire parish. And so on: such men, it need scarcely be said, did not

F.n. 159 continued.
but at Ripon; in 1855 he succeeded two elder brothers as 10th Bart., and spent the rest of his life looking after the estate (worth over £10,000 p.a. in Bateman's Great Landowners).

160. Jenkinson was son of a Bishop of St David's (nephew of the Tory Prime Minister Lord Liverpool): he at least held his curacy for some ten years (without stipend) while Gordon held his for only about 2.

161. Purcell was never priested; he did a little academic work at Oxford in the early 1880s, but otherwise was apparently without occupation for over 50 years. (These examples are about half of such obvious cases).

162. Son of a substantial cloth-merchant, Stanton declined the valuable (£1,000 p.a.) advowson bought for him by his father: Arthur Stanton. A memoir, G.W.E. Russell, 1917, p.26. (One of the five mentioned was Arthur Brinckman, see above Chapter 4, p. 299, also a voluntary High Church London curate).

163. Both men are of the above-mentioned five. The link between them was the Archer-Houblon family: Thomas, the squarson, was the brother of landowners holding estates of some £27,000 p.a. See also below, p.419.
apply to the C.A.F. The Church left its clergy largely free to choose their work: for those of means the choice was real: if they chose inactivity, their superiors were probably usually relieved: better to have unwilling clergy supported by private means than forced by poverty to continue in pastoral work.

There remains a small number who may have been poor men, though it is not always safe to infer poverty merely from the details of background, or the type of a man's career: of the 48 men, ordained at Oxford after 1851, who either never held livings or waited over 15 years for their first one, a maximum of 14 appear to have had genuinely and involuntarily 'poor' careers; in some cases there is hardly any information to go on, and others may well have had means.

In the event only one man with an apparently 'poor' career was followed up, and he was from Chichester. John Moore Fincher, a non-graduate who had attended Salisbury Theological College, was ordained in May 1863. He was 39 years old; unfortunately nothing is known of his previous life. His churchmanship is evident from his six-year service under A.D. Wagner at St Paul's in Brighton, 1865-71. From there he moved on to spend a further ten years at St John the Evangelist, a plain mission church built in a poor area of the town in 1840, and constituted a separate parish in 1872. The priest in charge

164. As in the case of Charles Richard Powys, ordained Dec. 1851: the third son of an established Oxon. gentry family (of Hardwick) he was without a clerical post from 1859-82. In 1877 he published a letter to the Lord Bishop and clergy and the Diocese of Oxford, which is a very odd work: perhaps to forestall his threat to call and preach at every church in the diocese, in 1882 he was presented to the minute living of Yelford, which had a population of about 10. At his death in 1914 he left over £14,500.

165. The choice of cases to follow up was largely dictated by the possibility of tracing careers in the one diocese, sources otherwise becoming unprofitably time-consuming.

166. No register survives at Salisbury at this date. The account that follows is based upon Directories and Visitation Returns (1875, 1878, 1881); also Venn, and Hennessy's Chichester diocese Clergy List, 1900; probate registers, and his papers of administration.
since 1862, A.A. Morgan, was an old-Etonian and a Cambridge man, all of whose ministerial life apart from his 17 years at St John's was spent in villages: he was conscientious, but clearly found the area depressing. There was no vicarage, and the church itself was badly built and in constant need of repair; he wanted to demolish it and start again. There were nine beershops and four inns in the immediate vicinity: in his Visitation Return of 1875, in reply to a question on pastoral problems, Morgan wrote simply 'Drunkenness'. In a population of some 5,000, and with 1,225 free seats, attendance was low - in 1878 'it seldom exceeds 200', he wrote, and there were only about 40 communicants. There was then a recently opened Baptist chapel, 'Fairly attended - chiefly by the middle classes.'

In such a parish, after so many years of unrewarding work, morale cannot have been high. But Morgan praised Fincher, who taught at the school (which was in effect turned over to the local School Board between 1875 and 1878), and was 'most diligent in his attention upon the Sick; and keeps a register of his visits.' He was paid £110 p.a. plus one-third of the offertory (which added an average of £34 p.a.); but the parish had in 1878 recently lost a long-standing grant of £90 p.a. from the A.C.S., and Morgan felt that there was simply too much work for the two of them; both were in their late 50s. How far Fincher shared his vicar's gloom is not known. But by 1881, with both gone, the parish was clearly looking up; under a new and energetic vicar

167. Since 1867 there had been a major policy shift at the A.C.S.; after years of the routinised renewal of grants, it was decided that it would be more effective, and more healthy, to encourage local participation by steadily reducing grants, and having the sum made up locally: it marks a significant stage in the trend towards insisting that parishes had financial obligations. In 1859 central grants were still double local contributions; by 1873 they were less. Home Mission Field, April 1867, pp.22-5, and A.G.M.s (reported in July issue) thereafter, esp. 1867 and 1887 (50th anniversary).
attendances were up to 700, money had been raised for the church, and Dissent seemed on the retreat: it was typical of the change (and the time) that the new vicar's reply to 'problems' was not drink, but the 'miserable and disgusting condition of the tenements in several streets ...'.

Fincher, meanwhile, had just been presented to a superficially attractive rectory, Pett, east of Hastings; its net income was some £450 ('not deducting school expenses'). It was not an easy parish, however; Fincher laboured on there till his death, at 85, with an income latterly reduced well below £300 p.a., great calls on his purse (the population was poor, wage-earning), uncooperative churchwardens, Dissenters who poached his Sunday school children, and no lay support, the farmers being Dissenters or uninterested. His lines had not fallen in pleasant places. He had married a woman some 35 years his junior, but she predeceased him by six years, leaving him with a young daughter, still a minor at his death. His wife left £2,742: his net estate was £1,633, so quite possibly he had little or no capital of his own: he died intestate, his daughter his 'only next of kin.'

It would doubtless be wrong to argue that this was in any way a 'typical' life; and these known details are but a guide, at best. With an active incumbent - and good health - a curacy might be, and must often have been, very satisfying. Nevertheless, the uncertainty, the lack of standing and the lack of assured prospects, must have been depressing to many. The Church had not coped well with its new order. Yet, admittedly, there had been a sort of muddling through: for the crucial period of growth, between the 1830s and 1870s, incumbents - out of habit, and often out of their private means - had continued to pay
their curates. From the 1870s, as both the official and the private means of many incumbents fell, and as it was more and more realised that there was no inherent reason why incumbents alone should support the curates, public generosity was brought into play. The great societies (the A.C.S. and the C.P.A.S.) were to the fore, but by the 1890s the trend was general: between 1891-2 and 1895-6, while the incumbents' contribution to the stipends of their curates was steady at about £270,000, that of 'other parochial sources' rose from nearly £255,000 to over £360,000, a clear majority. Typically, the lay share was largest in the most urban dioceses, and smallest in the most rural; it was in the towns that the new quasi-voluntarism was developed, not least in response to the curates, also a town-bred phenomenon.

168. Position and prospects, pp.5-6: Clergy, too many and too few, p.7 - that no cause is 'so fruitful of evil [to the position of curates] as the over-generosity of incumbents in taking upon themselves a burden which they cannot bear, and thus removing all sense of responsibility from those to whom it would be no burden at all.'

169. The C.P.A.S. was slower to take up this policy: in 1871 local contributions were £13,290 to central grants of almost £56,000 (Report, 1871, p.22), but by 1887, with central grants down to under £53,500, local contributions had reached £32,760 (Report, 1887, p.275).

170. Church of England Year-Book, 1897, p.XVIII. The response to the questionnaire on which the table was based had, furthermore, risen from 90% to 98% in this period; while this must account for some of the rising lay contribution, it also means that the average clerical contribution must have fallen ('Report on statistical returns', ibid., 1893, pp.XII-IV, and 1897, pp.XIV-V). (By 1900-1 the incumbents' share had actually declined to about £253,000 and that of the parishes had reached nearly £429,000: ibid., 1902).

171. At one extreme were the half-dozen comprising Chester, Liverpool, Llandaff, Manchester, Ripon and Wakefield, where the clerical contribution was 27.8% of the total: at the other was another half-dozen, comprising Ely, Hereford, Lincoln, Oxford, Salisbury and Truro, where it was 63.1%. In the largely metropolitan London and Rochester, the figure was 38.7%.
PATRONAGE

Every benefice in the Church of England had a patron (or patrons); appointment to a benefice thus involved catching the attention, by one means or another, of some one of these very various people or bodies. Patronage can hardly be called a system. There were benefices in the gift of the Crown, church dignitaries, colleges and public institutions, trustees, London companies and guilds, and an enormous range of private citizens; their motives for preferring particular men ranged from the impeccably disinterested to the frankly (and legitimately) mercenary. Patronage decisions are thus not easily explicable, and without minute research their processes must at best be inferred. But such inference is not without value, and does yield results.

The distribution of patronage rights from 1821 to 1901 has recently been traced:

1 in this period the number of benefices grew by some 3,500 to over 14,000. Throughout, benefices in the gift of private individuals, or of trusts, made up between 48 and 52 per cent of the whole; 2 Crown livings, whose number dropped slightly, declined from ten to seven per cent. The major change was the growth of episcopal patronage, which (in more than doubling) grew from 12 to 20 per cent of the whole between 1835 and 1878, and continued to rise more slowly thereafter.

1. M.J.D. Roberts, 'Private patronage and the Church of England, 1800-1900', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol.31, No.4, Oct. 1980; the figures are in Table 1 (unfortunately printed to show 'Other' as 1,000 too high in both 1853 and 1878). I am most grateful to Dr Roberts for showing me a pre-publication copy of this paper, and of a more detailed table produced for an Oxford seminar in 1979.

2. Ibid. The importance of trust patronage was growing; there were well over a thousand parishes in this patronage by 1907. Apart from the
The first question that arises, is whether the different sorts of patronage were evenly represented in the careers of the various groups of clergy in the sample of ordinands. A rough answer is given by the summary of patrons, shown in Appendix Table 6.6: it is clearly, no. The major division is between the Ripon ordinees and those ordained in the two southern dioceses. The latter groups (rows 2 and 5) tended to be presented to their first living by a private patron, and this was considerably more likely than preferment from a Church source. The Ripon groups (rows 3 and 4), on the other hand, were more likely to find advancement from a Church rather than from a private patron; this was emphatically so for the non-Oxbridge group. The difference is even sharper in the case of those who had only one sort of patron in their careers: of men ordained at Oxford or Chichester, less than one-fifth were preferred only by Church patrons: in the Ripon non-Oxbridge group the proportion was over one-half.

There is no doubt that this was largely related to the fact that many of the Ripon ordinees - particularly the non-Oxbridge ones - stayed in the north and were beneficed there. Taking all the first livings of all the groups in the diocesan sample, one finds that in the south, 66 out of 234 (or 28%) were in Church patronage; in the north the figure was 59 out of 97, or 61%. This is a striking difference but

F.n. 2 continued.

party-affiliated Simeon's Trustees (Evangelicals) and Church Patronage Society (High Church), who held no more than 200 livings, most were bodies set up at the formation of new urban parishes.

3. i.e. the 'Whole' rows of the table. (This of course includes many who held only one living: see Appendix, Table 5).

4. This is very clear in Appendix Table 9.6 (Summary). Over half the Ripon non-Oxbridge group (row 5) were never beneficed outside the north; 63 per cent held their first benefice in the region, only 22% in the south - the Ripon Oxbridge group's figures were 48 and 33%, while the Oxford and Chichester Oxbridge groups were 13 and 80%. 

391.
requires qualification: it will be seen that the regional difference varies with the category of clergy involved, so that undoubtedly this sample's northern parishes are weighted heavily towards the type of parish (urban, not in private patronage) of which the Ripon ordinands tended to become incumbents. Nevertheless, there almost certainly was a significant difference between the distribution of patronage rights in the north and in the south. This rests on prima facie grounds. First, in the north, parishes were traditionally large, embracing often several scattered 'townships', whereas in the south particularly in the classical 'lowland' regions, parishes tended to be small and nuclear. The result was that when the population of the north expanded, and was concentrated increasingly into urban areas, the large old parishes needed enormous subdivision to provide any semblance of parochial care.

Such subdivision created a host of new parishes, which were not likely to be in private patronage; they were, only if a single layman contributed very substantially to the parish endowment. It was much more common for the patronage to be vested in the mother church, to go to the Crown and the Bishop alternately (such being mostly 'Peel parishes'); or, if in lay hands, to be vested in trustees. Thus, for instance, in the enormous rural deanery of Leeds in 1905, out of 57 parishes only three were in private patronage; the great majority

6. This was legislated for in the vital New Parishes Act (6 & 7 Vict., cap.37) which created the 'Peel parishes'; normally, however, their patronage was exercised by the Crown and the Bishop alternately: Roberts, op. cit., note 51: R.A. Soloway, Prelates and people (1969), pp.343-5. (Leeds, however, subdivided under its own Act in 1844, was less than usually affected by this general Act).
7. All with representatives of two of the great - if not the greatest - Leeds-based fortunes of the industrial period; the Becketts (2) and the Marshalls: details from Ripon Diocesan Calendar (1905): similar situations existed in all the diocese's major towns, and notably also at Halifax, by now part of Wakefield diocese.
were in the patronage of the Vicar (15), the Bishop (13), Crown and Bishop alternately (6), and trustees (16). The 66 southern and the 59 northern parishes in Church patronage, thrown up by the diocesan sample, indicate the regional difference: of the southern, only 19 were in the gift of mother churches, and two in that of Crown and Bishop alternately: of the northern, 32 were in the gift of the former, and ten were in that of the latter. (In the south, Church patronage was usually in traditional hands, those of the Bishops, and of the chapters). 8

The distinction was thus based upon geographical and historical factors, interacting with the progress of urbanisation. And, though in the south the existence of a reasonable cover of small parishes (often in private patronage) meant less wholesale parish creation, it was recognised that private patronage was basically a rural phenomenon. In 1868 a commentator in the Quarterly Review cited figures showing that little over a quarter of the nearly 2500 parishes of over 2000 population were in private patronage, as against well over a half of the smaller parishes; 9 he also made the point that poor urban parishes were of so little value to private patrons that they were usually made over to a public patron anyway. 10 The first parishes of the diocesan sample clergy, which form a sample admittedly biased towards towns of the north, show strong contrasts in this respect: of

8. 45 of the southern (Church-patronage) parishes were in such hands, and only 17 of the northern ones.

9. Vol.124 (Jan.1868), esp. pp.242-3. The figures cited were from an analysis published in the Times of 4 Sept. 1867 (4a), which found that, as well as the 657 private benefices among these large parishes, there were 560 in the gift of the bishops and 480 in that of mother churches; this last figure meant that nearly half of all such patronage was concentrated in this one-fifth part of all English parishes.

10. Similar assumptions about private patronage and towns can be seen in E. Bartrum, Promotion by merit essential to the progress of the Church (1866), p.6, and in A.M. Deane's 'Statistics' chapter (p.98), in J.J. Halcombe, ed., The Church and her curates, 1874.
79 parishes situated in towns of over 20,000 population, 50 were in Church patronage, and only nine in private (the rest being mostly Crown and Trustee livings): for the 49 situated in towns of 2-20,000 people, the figures were 25 and 14: while for the 214 rural parishes they were 62 and 111.

This point helps to clarify the distance between town and country parishes, which Geoffrey Best has described as possibly wider than ever in the middle of the century. For it was a commonplace that private patronage was largely inaccessible to clergy without connections or contacts. It is the question of the connections between clergy and their patrons which I now wish to discuss, as it was the nature of these, and their variations, which largely determined a man's clerical life.

The first and most straightforward of connections was that of blood or affinity, which had permeated all forms of patronage. But by mid-century it was an influence felt to apply mainly and most significantly to private patrons. The would-be reformers of the 1860s could hardly skirt the subject, and their opinions were very similar. T.E. Espin spoke bluntly on the issue in 1863: if the Church was to have prizes - he thought it should - they 'must be open to merit, and should be actually achieved by merit. It is hard to say', he went on, whether the Church is more hurt when she has nothing to give, or when what she has to give is bestowed not on hard work, long service and fitness, but from nepotism, or favouritism, or caprice.

11. The total was in fact 256; but this included 42 rural college livings received by fellows. They are excluded here because they are greatly disproportionate in this sample, for obvious reasons, and their inclusion would definitely understate the normal proportion of rural livings held by private patrons; the result given in the text closely approximates to the half of rural livings in private lands, calculated by the Times (see note 9).

12. Temporal Pillars (1964), p.412: he suggests that the decline of pluralism accentuated the separation.

13. The Supply and training of ministers (1863), p.3. On the
Edward Bartrum, clearly taking his cue largely from Espin, expanded on the point; private benefices were usually given away 'from interest, as the first and chief consideration. Would it be natural were the case otherwise?\textsuperscript{14} He estimated that, with 1,290 cases of patrons and incumbents of the same names, and making due allowance for cases 'where the relative is not of the same name', and for purchases of next presentations, 'at least one-half of the livings in private patronage are obtained by purchase or given away from interested motives.' This state of affairs he saw as central to the dangerous decline in the eligibility of the Church as a profession, and his suggested remedy was also predicated on it - he argued for the abolition of private patronage altogether, by its being steadily bought up by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.\textsuperscript{15}

An angrier note had been struck in the previous year by another clerical pamphleteer, the Rev. John Wild, whose starting point was, again, the declining desirability of the Church to well-educated young men.\textsuperscript{16} 'Is it right', he asked, 'that nearly seven thousand livings should be regarded as private property - destined either for the Son or the Market? ... in any effectual reform in the Church, these close livings must be abolished ...'; and he wrote, almost with despair, of the effective loss to the Church of so many of its best livings, which

\textsuperscript{13} continued.

F.n. 13

\textsuperscript{14} Op. cit., p.5 (he quotes Espin in a note on this page).

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., pp.15-17 (et seq). (One writer suggested that the curates form a corporation to purchase patronage: but this was a jejune pamphlet, and I am not aware that the idea was elsewhere canvassed: Every curate his own patron. An adaptation of Lord Westbury's Act ... By a Candidate for Orders aided by a layman, 1863).

\textsuperscript{16} Remarks on the clerical supply and demand in the Church of England, (Stamford, 1865).
ought to be its rewards for virtue, learning and long service. Rickards, the political economist, wrote less emotively but just as clearly, a few years later, that benefices in private hands were forbidden ground to those who have neither wealth to purchase preferment nor interest with the patrons of livings. These benefices are part of the heritage of private families, and do not enter into the speculations of unprivileged aspirants.

To all of these commentators (to Bartrum most explicitly) the lack of 'promotion by merit', the closure of whole areas in the Church to unaided talent, was contrary to the tendencies of the age, and the practice of the other professions. With the abolition of purchase in the army and the virtual end of direct patronage in government service (1870-1), the Church stood alone in continuing the appointments by direct, personal patronage: it became the last bastion - in the professions and services, at least - of an order of things in which, as Bartrum said, 'incompetence backed by wealth prevails over merit backed by talent.'

The stereotype had the private patron presenting to his younger son, and doubtless this occurred in hundreds of cases. But this can never have been general. The problem of inconveniently-timed vacancies was catered for by the resignation bond, a device by which a patron could instal a clergyman to hold a benefice until such time as a member

17. Ibid., pp.7-8: his suggestion was the ban of all sales of patronage (pp.8-11).

18. From The Church and her curates, p.58.


of the family was ready to take it;\(^\text{21}\) even so, not all patrons had sons, or sons willing to take orders, and my samples suggest that a direct family link was becoming rarer. In Appendix, Table 7, it can be seen that Oxbridge graduates (Sub-titles 1 and 3) ordained in the first two periods quite often had such a link - 18 of the 44 who were presented by private patrons: but among the same groups ordained in the latter two, family links are traceable in only four out of 46 cases.

There must have been more than this, if only for the reason given by Bartrum, of differing names disguising a family link. The point is brought home by the fact that four such cases were discovered among the men ordained at Oxford. In one case the link was simple; in 1877 William Percy Powys succeeded his elder brother as Rector of Thorpe Achurch in Northamptonshire, the parish containing the seat of the patron, Lord Lilford: Powys was the family name of the Lilfords, and W.P. Powys was the baron's first cousin.\(^\text{22}\) The others all involve collateral relationships, which were found only by more or less arbitrary use of Burke's genealogies, but they are - perhaps because involving men of rank - good examples of the family living at its most comfortable. Henry Hanmer, fourth son of the heir of the second Baronet, succeeded in 1844 to a living worth over £500 p.a., with a population of similar number; he had been in orders less than two years, and was to be Rector for sixty; his elder brother (later created Lord

\(^{21}\) Their development is described in detail by Best, op. cit., pp.53-9; they were not abolished until 1898 (Chadwick, op. cit., p.213). An account of a bond imposed by the patron as a species of insurance, to cover the possibility that a son might tire of Army life and need the living, is given in A.T. Hart and E. Carpenter, The Nineteenth Century country parson (Shrewsbury, 1954), p.130.

\(^{22}\) Al.Ox., Venn, Burke P. and B.: his father, the Hon. Horatio, had been Bishop of Sodor and Man.
Hanmer) was married to a daughter of the patron, Sir George Chetwynd. Maynard Wodehouse Currie, whose mother was a Wodehouse (the family of the Lords Kimberley), graduated in 1873 to a living with a gross value of some £1,250 p.a., in the gift of his cousin Lord Kimberley, though he had a more protracted wait of 21 years; (during this time he had held several curacies and two livings, the first being Mentmore, to which he was presented by the patron, and builder of the great house there, Baron M.A. de Rothschild). Finally there was Frederick John Ponsonby, brother of the long-serving royal secretary Sir Henry, who was presented to the Rectory of Brington six years after his ordination; it was the church and burial place of the patron, Lord Spencer's family; Ponsonby's grandmother was a Spencer.

Such cases of good families and good livings, were few but prominent. The list of all new incumbents for the year to September 1873, published and analysed by A.M. Deane in The Church and her curates, shows that of 389 private livings bestowed that year, 34 went to men bearing the patron's name (eight being their own patrons), and two more are clearly connected by family. The value of 34 of these livings was given: 14, a very high proportion, were worth over £500 p.a. and furthermore six of these 14 went to men in orders for less than five years. It was in fact one of Deane's major points that private

23. He is recalled at some length by Rothschild's niece, Constance Battersea, in her Reminiscences (1922), pp.124-5: he had been 'warmly recommended ... by our mutual friend, Mr. John Abel Smith', and was 'cultivated and agreeable, a Whig in politics, and certainly not extreme in his religious views ... he was constantly dining and spending the evening with' the Rothschilds.

24. He was not content in this post, however; he was a strong High Churchman, and after 9 years at Brington he succeeded Edward Stuart in the latter's London parish (M.E.B., Crockford). The provision of livings by fathers for their sons-in-law was well known, i.e. P.P.1880, Vol.18, Q.1212 (2 examples).

25. One, J.M. Lowther, preferred by the Earl of Lonsdale (family name, Lowther) to a £500 plus living: and W.E. Gladstone's son Stephen, who, after only four years in orders, was presented by his uncle Sir S. Glynne to the living of Hawarden - worth over £2,800 p.a. gross, though containing 8,000 people as well.
patronage had a strong tendency to go to very young men, and that this often involved many of the best livings. He pointed out that the average value of the private livings bestowed on 33 curates of less than three years' standing was £306 p.a.; that of the benefices gained by 26 C.A.F. grantees in the same period, after an average of 24 years' service, was £198.26

Two other factors must be mentioned, if briefly. The first was churchmanship. The only patrons who explicitly made churchmanship the basis of their choice were the party trusts (the Simeon Trustees and, much later, the High Church Church Patronage Society).27 Beyond this very limited number of livings, however, there is little doubt that Churchmanship was often an essential consideration: this was particularly true where a parish had a noted character one way or the other - so, after Hook's great High Church pastorate at Leeds, it became almost inconceivable that the living should ever go to a pure Evangelical: equally, a marked High Churchman knew that he had no chance of preferment from the many Protestant squires and other patrons - usually including, until Gladstone's time, the Crown.28 Political considerations seem not to have been much talked of, beyond the understood political bias of the Crown patronage of the day.29

26. pp.99-102: (from his figures it can be calculated that the average value of the livings gained by all other curates, from private patrons. was £273). He went on to show that, in general, the longer a curate had been in orders, the less valuable was his first living, 'a result that probably could not be paralleled in any other service or profession' ...; pp.103-4.

27. Roberts, op. cit., pp.11-12 and 14-15 (but the Simeon Trust still only had 122 livings by 1901).


29. H.B. Thomson said of Crown livings that they 'are, in fact, given in support of political partisanship; and the best chance of preferment on the Queen's list is by aiding the country member in his election.' (The choice of a profession ..., p.90). Churchmen did not have a high opinion of the resulting appointments: see, i.e., the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol on his (Lord Chancellor-appointed) canons, P.P.1854, Vol.25 (Cathedral Commission Report), pp.577-8: and Canon Williams, P.P. 1880, Vol.18, q. 611.
clergy were notoriously Conservative in their politics, and perhaps this led Liberals (like Baron Rothschild of Mentmore) to be more careful than Tories. But local and individual factors must have been important; not all patrons were strong partisans, and in any case a patron might feel very differently about the importance of the politics, respectively, of the clergyman who preached at him personally, and of one who ministered in some distant part of his estates. One imagines that on the whole political questions tended to decline in importance, as the clergy's individual votes lost their (often considerable) weight.

Given that most churchmen accepted private patronage in principle, and that standards of appointment were felt to be rising, the (apparently decreasing) incidence of the traditional family patronage was not very controversial. Most of the controversy was aroused by the sale of patronage rights, which usually took the form either of the outright sale of the advowson, or that merely of the right to the next presentation. Within certain bounds saleability was defended, and was held to have a positive function. The Earl of Harrowby expressed this conventional justification in a rhetorical question to the 1867 Church Congress:

30. As they had been traditionally since Queen Anne's days: in Victorian England the Church's personnel provided the single most rock-solid block of Tory votes (J.R. Vincent, Poli-books: how Victorians voted, 1967, esp. pp.15 and 18: all political and religious histories attest to the fact).

31. As in the Oxfordshire examples cited by D. McClatchey, Oxfordshire clergy 1777-1869 (1960), p.205, where clergy were the only voters from their parishes.

32. Chadwick, op. cit., p.207: private patronage was defended - indeed lauded - particularly for its ensuring a lay voice in church appointments, and its guaranteeing of theological diversity, appropriate to the national Church: Edinburgh Review, Vol.99 (Jan. 1854), p.125; P.P. 1874, Vol.7 (S.C. on Church Patronage), pp.iii-iv. The Royal Commission on 'the Sale, Exchange and Resignation of Ecclesiastical Benefices' expressed similar, conventional approbation - followed significantly by its noting 'that a large amount of property has been invested under existing laws in private patronage' ... P.P. 1878-9, Vol.20, p.vii (hereafter, 1874 S.C. and 1878-9 R.C.).
How is a man of property with no patronage of his own, who happens to have a son of good disposition, of steady and approved life - how is that man to place his deserving son except by purchase of a living?\(^33\)

The assumption here that, other things being equal, money should and did properly confer advantage upon a clergyman's career, is particularly explicit; but the argument was not without reason. It was often pointed out that without power of sale, patronage would of necessity merely continue in families, regardless of aptitudes: and 'the disadvantages resulting from making the right of advowson an absolutely inalienable property' were the reasons for the 1874 Select Committee's rejection of a ban on their sale.\(^34\) Others simply argued that advowsons conferred a pecuniary advantage and had long been transferable, and therefore could not justifiably be prevented from attracting a money value.\(^35\)

That purchase could indeed introduce excellent men into particular parishes cannot be doubted, and by definition most such men were not of traditional patronage-owning class; W. Walsham How, son of a wealthy Shrewsbury solicitor, established his reputation as an author and a notable pastor during the 28 years he spent as Rector of the Shropshire parish of Whittington, worth over £1,000 p.a., whose

---

33. C.C.R. 1867, p.85: he and the Rev. Lord Sidney Godolphin Osborne made the same point in their evidence to the 1874 S.C. (qs. 203, 598f and 821-3, and 1156, respectively; see also, 1878-9 R.C., para.14, and 'Reservation' of Earl of Devon). Cecil Torr recalled two friends of his father's who had bought livings; both were learned, men of means, and good clergymen: 'They deserved the fattest of Livings, and yet they had to buy', and he opined that while 'the traffic in Livings' was 'indefensible in theory', its results were often good. (Small talk in Wreyland, 2nd Series: 1921, republ. Bath, 1970, p.88).

34. 1874 S.C., p.vii: there was also, of course, the question of the moral fitness of patrons generally; only Roman Catholics were legally disbarred from presenting. Not surprisingly most churchmen left the subject in peace, though Magee raised it in his 'Evidence' to the 1878-9 R.C., P.P. 1880, Vol.18, q.1786 (hereafter, 1880 R.C. Evidence).

35. i.e. Archdeacon Lord A. Compton, and the Prolocutor
next presentation his father had bought for him. But it was increasingly difficult to ignore the scandal that the purchase of livings occasioned. It was an easy target for Dissenters, and it embarrassed churchmen; it was less and less defensible, particularly as it combined a certain underhand secrecy with sufficient publicity to be ever visible to those who were critical. Morals apart, the whole business showed the Church as hopelessly inefficient in self-regulation: bishops were virtually unable to prevent the whole series of shady resignations and exchanges which usually accompanied sales, certainly those of the less reputable kind. In some ways the scandal was exacerbated by the very process of revulsion and attempted reform which was under way by the 1870s. In a debate in Convocation in 1881, following the publication of the Royal Commission's evidence,

F.n. 35 continued. (E. Bickersteth), in Ch.C., 1879, pp.102 and 104. The pure property right view was of course very strong: see, i.e., the blunt 'Reservation' of Lord Justice James, 1878-9 R.C.

36. F.D. How, Bishop Walsham How (1898), p.41. (See also the case of A.H. Stanton: Chapter 5, note 162). There is a most revealing letter, by a patron who had lost his chance to place his son in a family living and thus had to resort to the market, in V.H.H. Green, Oxford common room (1957), p.232, n.1.

37. These points emerged very clearly from the 1874 S.C. and the 1878-9 R.C. (Auctions were particularly unsavoury manifestations, and were also liable to disruption by opponents: see i.e. Times, 17 Dec. 1868, 4d; also a subsequent and unintentionally amusing letter seeking to reassure purchasers, 23 Dec., 7c). As an illustration of what an easy target all this made, see The cure of souls by purchase: four letters ... (Manchester, 1873: mentioned as widely read, at least in the Manchester area, in 1880 R.C. Evidence, q.1223).

38. Chadwick, op. cit., pp.210-3, summarises all this. Bishops found it almost impossibly hard to refuse institution to a benefice, as the process of appeals was expensive and uncertain: Magee, who moved the 1874 S.C. and was prominent in patronage reform (Roberts, op. cit., between notes 67 and 80), had to threaten publicity to stop one man, while admitting that the law was probably useless (J.C. Macdonnell, Life and correspondence of William Connor Magee ..., 2 vols., 1896, Vol.2, pp.20-1).
Prebendary Salmon made this point: 'I am afraid', he said,
that the traffic is becoming still more iniquitous, for
the very reason that good, honourable men are keeping
more and more aloof from it, and it is therefore falling
year by year more and more into unscrupulous hands.\(^{39}\)

Purchase can be very arbitrarily divided into that on behalf of
clergymen, usually by their families, and that by clergymen themselves.
The former was on the whole less criticised by churchmen; obviously it
was impossible to criticise provision for a son by a parent compelled
to purchase patronage, and yet fail to criticise similar provision by
those fortunate enough to have inherited it. Almost certainly there
was a great deal more of such purchase than is traceable now; for this
purpose a next presentation was perfectly adequate, and there had to be
a good reason for a father or relative to pay some half as much again
for the advowson;\(^{40}\) but the right to the next presentation left no
trace in the normal public records, the clerical directories. There
are three cases of men ordained at Chichester in 1841, 1842 and 1852,
which show pretty clear evidence of bought livings.\(^{41}\) For the rest, it
can only be said that purchase of a next presentation was an obvious
step for a parent with means, and probably accounts for many of the
cases where clergy in my samples were presented to good livings, with
whose patrons there was no obvious link.\(^{42}\) But, with the growing feeling

\(^{39}\) Ch.C., 1881, p.35.

\(^{40}\) 1874 S.C., esp. qs. 252ff, and 422ff. Prices varied according to
the prospects of early possession, but averaged 10 years purchase
(1880 R.C. Evidence, Appendix M). Mr A.J. Day clearly
distinguished the main classes of purchase: 'I think that in
most cases the intending purchaser of an advowson or next
presentation, destines it either for himself, in the case of
an advowson, or in the case of a next presentation, for a son, as
a family provision' (1874 S.C., q. 1166).

\(^{41}\) In all these cases, the patronage (is recorded to have) changed at
about the time of the men's taking up the livings: the livings
involved were all worth over £500 p.a.

\(^{42}\) By chance one such case emerges in the samples: John T. Shaw, son
of a Captain, R.N., of Norwich, became Rector of Bedingfield (a
living of £400 p.a.) seven years after his ordination: its next
against purchase, it was believed that by the 1870s this type of purchase was declining. Increasingly the problem was felt to be clergy who bought for themselves.

No clergyman could buy a next presentation and use it to present himself, but it was legal to use an advowson in this way; this legal position dated from the reign of Queen Anne, and was based on the distinction between the purchase merely - in effect - of office, and that of a perpetual trust, such as the advowson represented. It was widely felt that purchases of advowsons had increased by the 1870s, and the reasons were not far to seek, given the problems of advancement by normal channels, and the prevalent desire by clergy to be established in a living, even if the income was small. The phenomenon of the patron-incumbent was by no means new, but it seemed increasingly inapt and unfair, as well as being accompanied by some highly questionable dealings. J.J. Halcombe stressed also the sheer waste of it, in the
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presentation was for sale in January 1873, with an incumbent aged 64; Shaw's predecessor was clearly this man; advertisement No.53 in the list in Appendix to 1874 S.C.

43. i.e. Archdeacon Ady, in 1879; 'Many fathers who in times past would have bought without scruple livings for their sons now prefer that they should work their way until they attract the notice of their Bishop or some other patron'; Ch.C. 1879, p.92. Certainly the largest agent in such matters, W. Emery Stark, had only about a fifth as many next presentations as advowsons to sell (1880 R.C. Evidence, q.1984).

44. 1878-9 R.C., para.15-6; (see note 40 above, Mr A.J. Day).

45. This is well covered in Roberts, op. cit., Sec. III.

46. C. Linnell describes the descent of the benefice of Letheringsett in Norfolk through four generations of the Burrell family, the last three of whom inherited the advowson and presented themselves; the first of them had bought the advowson shortly after (by arrangement?) his institution, 1705-6 (Some East Anglian clergy, 1961, pp.116-29); see also 1880 R.C. Evidence, qs. 1650-1, a classic case of the benefice qua family estate (Sutton Coldfield).

47. The major abuse was that advowsons were usually sold on the understanding of early possession, brought about by an arranged resignation on the part of the current incumbent, or by the appointment of a very aged cleric, bound to die shortly (1874 R.C., Report pp.iv-vi, also p.viii, and Evidence qs. 77-80, 262, 553 and
Church's terms; indeed it was one of the recommendations of his (or any) plan for a more rational career structure in the Church, that it would tend to lessen such purchases. He argued that if curates did not feel compelled to take even the poorest livings, these would either have to be augmented, or be taken by clergymen of private means: this was much preferable to the payment by such clergy of large sums (usually to laymen) to purchase livings; for it was usually the position, not the income, that well-off clergy sought most. There was one form of purchase not open to Halcombe's charge of pure waste: this was the situation in which a clergyman (or his family), by providing all or a substantial part of the cost of a new church, obtained either the patronage or at least the first incumbency. A lot of churches were built in West London on this principle, and were 'familiarly termed ten thousand-pounders, that being about the qualification which was required to enable a clergyman to acquire the incumbency.'

It was never possible to quantify the extent of the trade; in 1878 there were estimated to be about 750 patron-incumbents, accounting for one in nine of all private livings, but how many of these were inherited, and how many more were hidden from the records, is not

---
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48. The Curates' Augmentation Fund: a letter (1869), pp.4-5, and The Clergy: too many and too few, pp.5-6: he suggested that incomes to the extent of £700,000 p.a. were thus purchased, but his use of the figure is vague. The point was clear, though; this was 'a prodigious waste ... entailed by clergy buying the preferential right to what already belongs to the Church at large.'

49. C.M. Davies, Orthodox London: or, phases of religious life in the Church of England, Series 2 (1875), p.42 (also Series 1, p.37): see also 1874 S.C., qs. 244 and 531, both very critical, as was the description of the system in H.B. Thomson, The choice of a profession (1857), p.89: 'There are few of the new churches round London that are innocent of this system.' E. Ker Gray rather
known. The 1874 Select Committee published details of all livings advertised for sale in the Ecclesiastical Gazette for the months of January 1872, 1873 and 1874; the Rev. Lord Sidney Godolphin Osborne thought that there was a lot of puffing and false advertising, but the lists may be of some value. The number of advertisements were 88, 89 and 106, those respecting advowsons accounting for a little under half of the total in each case; another third were for exchanges (which were widely believed to offer some cover for what were in essence sales); only a small proportion, ranging from a ninth to a quarter, were for next presentations. In each month, at least three-quarters of the advowsons for sale offered immediate or early possession, or else specified the age of the incumbent as at least 65. It was this emphasis upon the immediacy of possession that gave the lie to the theory that an advowson was primarily a perpetual, responsible trust.

But so long as the clergy themselves had so little prospect of benefiting from private patronage by mere service, it was their support

F.n. 49 continued.

ingenuously describes how his father, for the cost of £4,300 on a new Kensington church, became its patron and appointed him to it (1870-1); Thirty years of the lights and shades of clerical life ... (1902), p.11. The economics of this are described briefly by W.R. Ward in 'Some reflections on Church building in Manchester', Studies in Church History, Vol.III (Leiden, 1966), pp.282-3.

50. Chadwick, op. cit., p.209: one estimate suggested that about 15% of all private livings had been subject to sale since their last presentation (1880 R.C. Evidence, Appendix A), but it was very tentative: going by the agent Stark's figures, it would appear that sales were as few as 60 a year by 1878, but a low figure was in his interest here (ibid., qs. 1984 and 2078-9). (Hidden transactions included especially the sale of a vacant living, when the actual conveyance was done quietly after institution; 1874 S.C. q.765).

51. 1874 S.C. Evidence, qs. 1104f, and 1154. The Gazette was posted to every clergyman in Clergy List, monthly; by 1879 it had ceased to carry such advertising (Ch.C., 1879, p.92).

52. Exchanges required the consent of both bishops and both patrons, and served a useful function in many cases; but abuse (i.e. the acceptance of money by one of the parties), was not unknown, and was suspected not to be uncommon: see esp. 1880 R.C. Evidence, qs.23 and 60 - exchange was the preferred medium of the almost fantastically disreputable clergyman and agent, J.M.R. Rawlins, alias Workman.
which upheld the system, as reforming bishops recognised full well. It has been noted that of Deane's list of church preferments in 1872-3, only eight were clear cases of clerical patrons appointing themselves. This almost certainly understated: for instance, in three of the six cases of patron-incumbents among Oxford ordinees of the first two periods, the patronage is not recorded as having changed to their hands for some years; in the context of the practices and attitudes outlined, it is a fairly safe inference that the change of ownership was at least arranged at or before their taking up the parishes. The number of patron-incumbents, all told, is very small in the clergy sample, too small to be a basis for much generalisation: the figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordained in</th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th>1851-3</th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th>1871-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With such small figures, only tentative observations may be offered. The first is that cases do appear to have become less common. Given all the concern being expressed at least as late as the 1870s, it would be rash to suggest that the incidence of clergy buying livings for themselves had markedly declined; though it is possible that the heightened concern about purchase in the 1870s was more a reflection of the heightened sensitivity of observers than of actually increased transactions. All the clergy involved who were ordained before 1863

53. The importance of patron-incumbents in the opposition to Magee's attempted reforms in the 1870s is stressed in Roberts, op. cit. (notes 76-80): Frederick Temple wrote in 1879 that 'the real strength of the present system is in the support which it receives from the clergy' (E.G. Sandford, ed., Frederick Temple Archbishop of Canterbury, 2 Vols., 1906, Vol.1, pp.[425]-428; and the agent Stark warned that 'The restrictions [i.e. on sale] must not be too great, otherwise you raise up the whole body of the clergy against you' (1880 R.C. Evidence, q.2213).

54. All three showed no signs of wanting to move on, so that ownership of the advowson was of no immediate advantage: while a patron would be most unwise to sell just after the arrival of a young man -
were Oxford or Cambridge graduates; most of their livings were good ones. But there was only one such case in the 1861-3 sample, and thereafter no more. Of the two from the 1871-3 sample, one was a highly respectable clergyman who presented himself to a small country living in 1919, clearly using the opportunity to spend a useful retirement (and at the same time probably supporting a poor parish from his own means). The other case was that of an ex-doctor, Henry T. Scott, ordained when 36 at Ripon, who presented himself to a comfortable Cheshire living six years later (net £350 p.a., with a population of less than 400, and a house). He may have been a good example of a type of man who might well feel that purchase was his only chance in the Church. But when he gave it up and retired, after 19 years, in 1896, there are distinct signs of shady dealings and the activity of a clerical agent: the patronage was for some years given as belonging to 'Messrs. Brown', and the living was held briefly by a man who seems to have facilitated at least two other such transfers; by 1899 there was a new incumbent, who in 1903 was recorded as the new patron too.

F.n. 54 continued.

sales, as noted, almost always took place when incumbents were old, or vacancies otherwise expected.

55. Roberts estimates that patron-incumbents declined by about a third between 1878 and 1907: op. cit., note 22.

56. He was a good example of 'to him that hath shall be given', in the Church: John B.M. Butler, son and heir (his elder brother died young) of Charles Salisbury Butler, a wealthy Liberal Londoner, M.P. for Tower Hamlets 1852-68. The son possibly inherited the living, but certainly in 1872, after 10 years in orders, he presented himself to a living worth some £700 p.a.: he hardly needed this, when he left over £45,000 at his death in 1897.

57. Frederick Ferdinand Martin Schleicher Thornton: though not a graduate (he passed through Chichester) he clearly had good contacts and within two years obtained a small rural living from Sussex landowner and M.P., W.L. Christie: after two more important livings he held no post from 1907 to 1919, then presented himself to a living worth less than £200 p.a. (From 1923 it became impossible to present oneself: Chadwick, op. cit., p.213, n.2).

58. The details are complex and tangled but between 1892 and 1898
In this sample, then, there seems to be a move from fairly widespread purchase by clergy of respectable backgrounds, towards a much lesser incidence, with some evidence of underhand dealing: which may support Salmon's view, \(^59\) that the problem was a change for the worse in the sort of clergyman involved.

There was one other traditional link of clergy and patron, that constituted by family connections, though not of the most direct kind. For instance, where the patron was a public body, but certainly open - as Crown livings were acknowledged to be - to personal and family influences; it is easy to find examples of this sort, and there are several in the clergy sample. \(^60\) There was also, as a sort of hybrid of the family and the service connections, the link constituted by family service. There are at least half-a-dozen cases of clergy in the samples who succeeded their fathers in livings, with patrons as various as the Lord Chancellor, the Bishop, the Vicar of the mother Church, and the freeholders of the parish. Roundell Palmer unselfconsciously recorded the proprietorial feelings of his family towards a parish long held by one of his uncles. On his death they hoped it would go to his son: 'the thought of a stranger at Fringford, which had been like a second home to us ... was more than we would well endure.' But the patron, a Tory Lord Chancellor, faced a more importunate form of family

---

\(58\) continued.

Rev. Robert Whinery held three livings, all of whose patronage was in the process of transfer - in the other two cases, to the wives (almost certainly) of the new incumbents. Crockford's entries on Tuddenham St Martin, Rowlestone with Llancillo, and Swittenham (Scott's parish).

\(59\). See note 39 above.

\(60\). There are for instance members of the Anson, Tollemache, Maitland and Molesworth families in the samples, all of whom received Crown (or Lord Chancellor or Duchy of Lancaster) livings, three of them rich ones, and the fourth still £400 net p.a.
pressure, and just managed to appoint the son-in-law of a Cabinet colleague before the government fell. 61

All these forms of familial and financial links to patronage were considerably more likely to affect Oxford and Cambridge men than the rest: in fact the case of Scott, the ex-doctor, is one of only two such links that were found between non-Oxbridge men and their first patrons (the other was a T.C.D. man appointed by a relative who was Vicar of Birkenhead, to a Birkenhead living). Both these were Ripon ordinees of the 1871-3 sample: until then there was no such case, while eight Oxbridge men had bought or inherited livings, and family links were clear in a further 22 cases. If men from outside the traditional ranks were to obtain livings at all, it had to be without such aid. And it is clear that a significant proportion did achieve benefices as a direct result of clerical service. Appendix, Table 7, illustrates this point: at one extreme, there are the Ripon non- Oxbridge clergy, nearly half of whom (30 out of 64) obtained their first livings from patrons on whom they had a clear claim of service: moving back through the table, the proportions decrease: 23 out of 67, 11 out of 31, and finally, for Oxford and Cambridge men ordained in the two southern dioceses, 38 out of 151.

The case of the first group mentioned, the non-Oxbridge ordinees of Ripon, is the most striking. Up to the sample of 1861-3, exactly half (19 out of 38) of all these who got livings, had them from Church sources, to which they had a service link; of those ordained in 1841-3

61. Memorials: family and personal (2 vols., 1896), Vol.2, p.110 (this was 1852: Palmer tried to be fair, noting that the father-in-law Mr Henley's 'virtues ... (public and private) gave him a just claim to the Chancellor's consideration'). When Handley Moule's father, the notable and long-serving Vicar of Fordington, died, the parishioners unanimously petitioned the patron to appoint one of the sons - 'but the Patron had other designs ...' (J.B. Harford and F.C. Macdonald, Handley Carr Glyn Moule, a biography (3rd ed., 1922), p.76.)
who got livings, the proportion was as high as three-quarters (6 out of 8). Here, it appears, was at least a rudimentary 'system of promotion.'

There are two major reservations to this, however. First (as discussed in the last chapter) all too many clergy remained curates for much or even all of their careers. A related factor was that this became rather harder than otherwise, with time, at least to the 1870s. Still with the same Ripon group, the five (of 11) ordained in 1841-3, who were beneficed within five years, all had their livings from episcopal or capitular patrons in the dioceses of Ripon or York. It was never again so quick for so many. The second major reservation relates to the quality of the reward, when it was achieved. The livings of these five, for instance, ranged in value up to £130; four were in towns or industrial townships, and had no house. They were livings, with a certain independence and status, but otherwise they were not attractive.

Nevertheless, the careers of these men do indicate that service was not wholly without reward; and overall a pattern emerges which largely explains the differences already noted between the patrons of the various groups. To return briefly to the differences between the first patrons of the various groups of sample clergy (Appendix, Table 6) a very broad, but clear distinction can be drawn. On the one hand, there are the 151 Oxford and Cambridge graduates ordained in the south, and on the other, all the rest, 162: and in terms of patronage, on the one hand there are those types most open to the influence of family and social connections - the patronage of the Crown, colleges, and private

62. See Table 3.4, bottom line; of the 'Ripon: Rest' group to 1861-3, 18 out of 55 never obtained livings, almost one-third, and another fifth had over 10 years in curacies.
individuals, and on the other, those types most common in towns, and most open to the claims of service - the patronage of the Church and its officials, and of trustees. Two-thirds of the 151 began with a living from one of the former type of patron: of the other 162 clergy, however, 60% were first preferred by these less privileged patrons, and only 40% by the Crown, colleges, or private individuals.

Thus the Oxbridge men, if ordained in the south, tended to be beneficed first (and usually thereafter) in rural areas, in the south, and through the good offices of a private individual: men ordained in the north, or not Oxbridge-educated, tended to work in towns, and advance by service to Church patrons. On all the major criteria - region, urban or rural, type of patron - the extremes are securely held by the southern-ordained Oxbridge men, and the Ripon-ordained non-Oxbridge men.

This pattern was clearest for the samples ordained before 1871-3. The town type could produce careers of admirable rationality. Such was that of William Pering Lampen, son of a Devonport Inspector of Shipwrights, and a trainee missionary for some terms at the C.M.S. College at Islington. He was ordained in 1851 at 23, to a curacy under a prominent Evangelical of the Huddersfield area, C.A. Hulbert; he was to be paid £90 p.a., dependent upon £80 from the A.C.S. He served at Slaithwaite for five years, a township (like most in that area) largely devoted to woollen manufacture but still containing many upland farms (though it was unusual in having flourishing spa baths). Then, after a year as curate in Huddersfield, he was appointed by the Vicar there to his first living, Scammonden, a mainly agricultural upland parish; his stipend was £194 p.a., as Perpetual Curate. In 1865 (just when he had had Scammonden church rebuilt) he received a clear promotion,

63. This account is based on ordination papers (March 1851), Directories and Crockford.
becoming Vicar of the Leeds industrial suburb, New Wortley; the patronage was with the Crown and Bishop alternately; for 15 years he filled this responsible post, with charge of two curates, and an income of £320 p.a. In 1880, he received a final promotion, becoming a Rector at last, of the Crown living of Tempsford in the diocese of Ely, where he spent his last 12 years ministering to a population of little over 500, and enjoying an income of £350 net.

Lampen's career may stand as a modest ideal; it certainly was modest in comparison to those of men whom interest or money catapulted into livings of £500 p.a. or more within a handful of years, but it was thoroughly respectable, and in it cause and effect are gratifyingly clear. Lampen was, however, evidently more than averagely competent, and he was unusual in having so clear a progression of livings. For most Ripon non-Oxbridge clergy, particularly the non-graduates, an incumbency tended to close off, rather than form a step in, their careers. Thus a more common career was that of Robert Gill Irving, son of a poor Cumberland cleric, who had come to ordination from St Bees, after previously working in a bookshop and teaching. Ordained in 1863 to the curacy of Elland (again on £90, based on an A.C.S. grant) he served there seven years, and two years more in Halifax, before the Vicar of Halifax appointed him to be Perpetual Curate of Rastrick; and there, on £300 p.a., he remained, so spending his whole clerical career of 39 years within four miles of where he began it. It would be tedious and unnecessary to give more examples; but there are many, and they illustrate a type of career based on solidly localised service, and

64. Ordination papers, March 1863, Directories, Crockford.
65. The careers of Henry Edwards, Richard Judd and J.E. Brigg, recounted in Chapter four, are similar.
almost invariably rewarded by livings from either the Bishop (alone
or alternately with the Crown) or from the holder of one of the
major mother churches, among whom the Vicars of Leeds, Bradford,
Halifax, Elland and Kirkburton were most prominent. Whether in the
diocese of ordination or elsewhere, stability, and probably patience,
were of the essence in this sort of life. For a man without
connections the constant mobility of a curate's life, of which
Halcombe complained, could only add to the problems of finding a patron.

With so many, mostly quite unquantifiable factors at work,
naturally the pattern was far from rigid. But it is not difficult to
see that, for instance, a first living in Church patronage tended to
be part of careers that were usually urban, generally northern, and
rarely involved private patronage: and that this was the more true
of non-Oxbridge men. The case of the Ripon ordinees who were first
beneficed by Church patrons provides a good example. The pattern was
clearer for those seven ordained in 1841-3, all first preferred in
Yorkshire; three never left their first town livings, and of those who
moved, two went to similar, poor and urban parishes. Only two ever
held rural livings, one a very poor Welsh benefice in the gift of the
Bishop, the other - a clear exception, with money - ended in a rural
living in the gift of the Archbishop of Canterbury; none of the seven
ever held a rural living in private patronage. Nor did any of the 11
such clergy ordained in 1851-3, whose general tendency again was to
hold urban livings, in Church patronage: of seven who held more than
one living, in only one case was there not a clear service connection
with the later patrons. Those of the Oxbridge men ordained with them
who also started with Church livings, were less clearly limited in their
future careers; they were more likely to be benefited in the south, or
or in the country 66 - but again, only two (both ordained in 1841-3) of the 18 involved were ever incumbents of rural livings in private patronage, and both had small incomes.

That the picture was rather different for Oxbridge men, ordained in the south, is I hope already clear. Two small illustrative figures may perhaps be added. Forty-eight of these men were first beneficed by Church patrons: but almost half (23) had second benefices from some other sort of patron. Church livings, then, were for these men commonly only a stepping-stone, whereas for men ordained at Ripon they were usually either the only living or the prelude to others from Church patrons also. 67 Second, when the former group of clergy came to livings in the north, they were likely to have private patrons. Hence, the necessary reservations about using figures from these samples to indicate the distribution of patronage in the north: for, if one looks only at Oxford and Cambridge men ordained in the south, particularly to 1863, one finds that four of those beneficed in the north had Church patrons, and five had private ones: whereas, if one looks only at Non-Oxbridge men ordained at Ripon, the respective numbers are 20 and three. 68

On the whole, then, there were clergy who looked to the claims of service, and usually to Church patrons, and those who had a better than even chance of obtaining a private living, or one from the Crown or

66. Thus, putting both periods together, 5 of the 18 Oxbridge men never had an urban living, as against only 2 of the 18 others: 8 of the former had careers mostly spent in the south of England, to only 4 of the latter (3 being in large towns).

67. These figures are easily seen in the bottom lines of the sub-tables of Table 6. (Thus, from sub-table 2, 25 men had only Church patrons, while 23 only started with one). From sub-tables 3 and 4 it can similarly be seen that, by contrast, of 71 Ripon-ordained clergy who started with a Church patron, only 11 ever had another type.

68. (See p. 392 above). If 1871-3 men are included, the contrast is less total, though still clear: 8 Church, 7 private, and 31 Church, 7 private.
their old college. Hidden purchase, family links less obvious than a shared name, and of course the unknown factor of each man's qualities and personal recommendations, affected many, indeed in the last case of all, careers. But before returning briefly to the general, two other aspects of the operation of patronage, not wholly invisible at this distance, may be mentioned. First, private patronage was not immune to the claims of service; as can be seen in Table 7, ten men, at least, had their first livings from patrons in whose parishes they had served as curates: (indeed, three of the only six Ripon non-Oxbridge men from the first two periods who had private patrons, had earned their livings this way). But it was not common. Occasionally too an important patron could provide a sort of career on his own account; examples are again rare, but they include men who had two or three successively better livings from the noble families of Downe, Fitzwilliam, Northumberland, Brownlow and Leconfield.  

Second, there was the simple influence of proximity (see notes to Appendix, Table 7); probably there were more cases than the 30 noted, which represent a bare minimum. But evidently when a man had worked in a particular area and was then preferred by a local patron, there is a real link. (H.B. Thomson also described a similar but less obvious process, that whereby curates in large towns, and London preeminently, could usually be assured of catching the eye of a patron in their congregation). 

69. The most modest progression was from a tiny (£60) living to one of £170 gross, three years later: the best took Edward Malleson (B.A. of Queens', Oxford) through three livings of the Downes', of roughly £100, £300 and £600 p.a., which he held for 3, 17 and 25 years respectively.  

70. There were at least three cases where the sons of well-established local clergy were preferred by private patrons to livings nearby; and in all cases the sons had also been curates in the area.  

Neither the distribution nor the exercise of patronage continued unchanged in this period, however. The most significant development, as noted, was the growth of episcopal patronage, for this represented something very like a move towards extending rational promotion. Already by 1840 it was the explicit policy of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Samuel Wilberforce had, from the very beginning of his Oxford episcopate, a clear view of the necessity to increase his meagre patronage, 'since it is only thus that the Bishop of Oxford can have any means of rewarding meritorious curates ...', and he succeeded to the astonishing extent of raising his patronage from 14 to 103, including 95 of the benefices (over one-seventh of the total) in his own diocese. As the century progressed, it became one of the marks of the active bishop to use his own patronage to reward clergy of the diocese; Archbishop Thomson of York made nine-tenths of his appointments from within his diocese, Magee of Peterborough an even higher proportion, while Wilberforce's son Ernest, when Bishop of Chichester (1896-19) made only one appointment that was not one of 'his own clergy.' In 1900 Mandell Creighton

72. Best, op. cit., pp.326-8: he makes the point, always to be borne in mind, that the self-esteem of the Bench was no small element in this ostensibly rational process.


75. H. Kirk-Smith, William Thomson: Archbishop of York ... (1958), pp.59-62; Macdonnell, op. cit., Vol.2, p.271; see also p.46, for a statement of his rational intent, which was to fill 'my best livings with middle-aged or elderly men, and my poor and toilsome ones with young men, to be moved on in their turns ... and thus to increase greatly the circulation of the diocese': J.B. Atlay, The Life of Ernest Roland Wilberforce ... (1912), p.240.
described his policy in London: 'I have to look to private patrons, the Crown and trustees to bring in new blood. But I feel that the curates are left to my care.'

Earlier in the century, episcopal patronage had been regarded as at least as subject to the influences of family and friends as that of any other type. The outcry over Bishop Villiers of Durham's 'celebrated nepotistic faux pas' in 1860 indicated that by then bishops could not expect to get away with blatant favouritism. The old critical attitudes lingered, doubtless with some cause; but most observers appeared to accept, by about 1870, that episcopal patronage was that to which, above all, the curates could look for advancement. But observers also pointed out that such patronage was still too limited to provide for all; even the Archbishop of Canterbury, with 200 odd livings to dispose of, could not satisfy all claims, and (as A.M. Deane noted) by no means all of a bishop's patronage was suitable for curates.

76. L. Creighton, Life and letters of Mandell Creighton ... (2 vols., 1904), Vol.2, p.265; but note that he thought men generally not eligible until they had been 16 years in orders, and had worked 9 or 10 years in the diocese. At Peterborough he had already had a very strongly diocesan view of his patronage duties; in 1893 he had told a clergyman 'that if you leave the diocese you begin your career afresh'; op. cit., p.40 (see also p.58).

77. Best, op. cit., pp.406 and 412: he appointed his son-in-law, Edward Cheese, to a particularly fat living. The name Cheese became a bye-word; see i.e. The deficient supply of well-qualified clergymen for the Church of England at the present time (Anon., Birkenhead, 1863), p.10; the Times, 8 Nov. 1862 (12 b).

78. Bartrum, op. cit., p.17 (on why his plan did not propose a great increase in episcopal patronage); A. Trollope, Clergymen of the Church of England (1866, reprinted Leicester, 1974), pp.28-30 (another Cheese reference, too). That year (1866) Samuel Wilberforce appointed his son Ernest to an episcopal living of £500 p.a., with only 300 people; Ernest had been ordained for less than 2 years.


80. 1880 R.C. Evidence, qs. 1725-6 ('very few other patrons promote curates from the diocese, who therefore all look to the Archbishop for appointments'): The Church and her curates, pp.102-3.
Still, the number of such livings grew steadily, and by 1900 there were over 3,000; and clearly bishops often had a considerable measure of influence in the disposal of private patronage. 81 Relations with other Church patrons were certainly improved: where Wilberforce had had to use hard words in trying to awaken certain chapters to their responsibilities, 82 his successor was able to come to an amiable arrangement about one of the most significant livings in his diocese. In 1881 the Dean and Chapter of Windsor had to appoint a successor to the famous William John Butler of Wantage (whose appointment 35 years earlier had been purely a result of family ties). 83 In the event, however, they ceded their rights 84 to the Bishop, who appointed Thomas Henry Archer-Houblon, a young man who had succeeded his father in the wealthy family living of Peasemore in Berkshire a few years before. Archer-Houblon was evidently able to persuade his uncle (and patron) to forego his rights for a turn - for it was the living of Peasemore that the Dean and Chapter were offered in exchange, and to it they duly appointed one of their minor canons. The bishops were far from having the sort of control which they increasingly desired over appointments; but, both by the direct extension of their own patronage, and by gradually bringing to bear some measure of influence on the exercise of other -

81. Letter-Books of Samuel Wilberforce, Nos.458, 466 and 568, examples of advice proferred by or requested from the Bishop; M.C. Bickersteth, A sketch of the life and episcopate of ... Robert Bickersteth ... (1887), pp.279-80. (At East Retford, Notts., the bishop appointed both in 1839 and in 1875, 'by arrangement with the patron': A.A. Kidson, A History of East Retford Church, Retford, 1905, pp.98-9).

82. i.e. Letter-Books, nos.140, 146, 155.

83. The life and letters of William John Butler ... (1898), p.36 (and 56).

84. The bare facts are clear from the 'Diocese Book', MSS. Oxf. Dioc. d.761, entries for Peasemore and Wantage.
even private - patronage, they had by 1900 created a substantial
degree of professional, diocese-based promotion. But also by this
date the changing relative attractions of town and country were
modifying traditional patterns in the exercise of patronage. It is
to this question, and to matters relating to the conditions of benefices,
that I now wish to turn.

85. Roberts' concluding paragraphs elaborate this point. It is,
however, worth noting that in 1923 the position had hardly
changed overall, and that bishops had actually lost a little
ground (though mother-churches continued to increase their share,
very slightly): the figures are given in Crockford prefaces.
Chapter seven

BENEFICED, AND BEYOND

1. TOWN AND COUNTRY

No characteristic more pervasively affected a parish than its being either urban, or rural. Other factors might challenge this, in extreme cases - a very large, or a peculiarly small income, for instance, might loom over all other matters in the mind of an incumbent. But in most cases the clergyman's work, society and leisure were largely determined by whether his parish was situated in a town or in the country. This is a simple idea. The difference between town and country, however, was not stable in the years from 1850 to the First War: and it is the shifting balance of attraction between the two which I wish to focus on here.

The change that occurred was not complete, or uniform: but it involved the decline of the rural parish as the more or less unchallenged beau ideal of the English Church. Its heyday was probably brief, briefer than the late Victorians themselves thought: in the eighteenth century, and well into the nineteenth, rural parishes were more noted for their poverty and their non-resident parsons than as representations of a bucolic pastoral ideal. It was really only in the mid-nineteenth century, when the rural areas supported more clergy than ever before or since, and when money for churches and parsonages flowed amply (both from private means and from stable, commuted tithes and prosperous glebes), that the ideal approached realisation.¹

¹ The ecclesiastical improvement of a rural county is well illustrated in D. McClatchey, Oxfordshire Clergy 1777-1869 (1960), and the heyday of men and material is portrayed also in J. Obelkevich, Religion and rural society (1976), esp. pp.103-27. On the economic position of the rural clergy from the eighteenth century, E.J. Evans, The contentious tithe (1976), esp. Chapters 1 and 5.
To a large extent, undoubtedly, the pleasant image of mid-century rural parishes was a straightforward reflection of the general prosperity of rural society (above the labouring level), in the age of high farming, steady rents, and the accessibility created by railways.\(^2\) It remains a moot point whether the rather rosy image of the mid-Victorian rural parish is a product more of general prosperity than of real, pastoral successes;\(^3\) if the latter, it must be judged as somewhat fleeting, for there is much to suggest that the Church in rural areas was widely unpopular in the early years of the century,\(^4\) and by the end of the century it was again finding the going hard, as we shall see. Nevertheless, the idea of the peculiar aptness of the Church in rural society, and the notion that

The country parson - the country parson with pleasant parsonage, pleasanter wife and plenty of children - is the true and proper type of an English clergyman ...\(^5\)

were widely (and probably generally) held. Sometimes they were expressed in terms both secular and sentimental, as in the very

---


3. Obelkevich, op. cit., found very poor communicant figures even in 1873 (pp.139-40) and concluded that despite its efforts in South Lindsey, this was no 'golden age' for the Church (pp.176-82). See also, D.M. Thompson, 'The Churches and society in nineteenth century England: A rural perspective', in G.J. Cuming and D. Baker, eds., Popular belief and practice, 1972, pp.267-76.


successful The recreations of a country parson; more seriously, Walter Farquhar Hook, who as Vicar of Leeds did so much to popularise the Church's urban ministry, still used to say that a country parish was the best training for a young clergyman. 'The strong pastoral feeling is generated in the country, and I attribute what little success I have had entirely to my country breeding.' J.H. Blunt wrote that there had 'always been a preference for country parishes among the clergy', and had to urge the importance of town work.

This was not of course the whole picture; no one, for instance, could deny that many clergy preferred a fashionable town church to rural work, as those 'ten thousand pounders' in West London (and their like in towns like Brighton and Cheltenham) amply illustrated. Nor can the Church be accused of ignoring the towns: on the contrary, the whole great enterprise of 'home mission work' was infused with a sense of the importance, indeed the necessity, of 'reclaiming' the towns for the Church. There was a distinctly 'political' flavour to the efforts made earlier in the century to increase the Church's presence in urban areas, and this could come to the surface at later times of stress: the Church Pastoral Aid Society (C.P.A.S.) approvingly printed a letter in 1848 from the incumbent of a large Manchester

6. First Series, Popular Edition, 1864. The first chapter, 'Concerning the country parson's life', is a clever extended exploitation of the rural pastoral ideal (and though specifically Scottish, is clearly aimed, like Good Words in which the essays appeared, at audiences on both sides of the border).


8. Directorium Pastorale (1880 ed.), pp.92-3: this was reviewed in the Christian Remembrancer with J.W. Burgon's A treatise on the pastoral office, which was chided for its assumption that there was one type of parish 'an agricultural [sic] of about 400 souls' (Vol. 49, April 1865, p.414: see also Chadwick, V.C., Pt.2, p.172).

parish, which noted how employers were beginning to appreciate that

The patience and subordination exhibited in these most trying times by the formerly disaffected and violent operatives, can only be attributed to the spread of religious principles ...

After citing other similar examples, the Committee pointed explicitly to 'the support [the religion of Christ] ministers to social order, and the stability it confers on government and laws ...'\(^{10}\) Equally conventional was the argument of Rev. J. Hughes, expanding upon the influence and energy of the great towns, neglected by the Church: 'this neglect is perilous to the nation, because towns have a preponderating influence upon the country. It is cities that have ruled the world ...'\(^ {11}\) The towns were certainly important: but not attractive.\(^ {12}\)

The first clear sign of the change, perhaps, was the growing chorus of comments from about 1870 on the preferences of curates. There was plenty of room for change. In 1867 curates were distributed with very little reference to the apparent urgency of pastoral care, but much to the desirability of particular dioceses. Chichester, with some 380,000 people, had 281 curates, while Manchester, with 1.5 million more people, had 50 less.\(^ {13}\) A man like Kilvert was evidently far more

10. Report, 1848, pp.18-20: in 1862 it again adverted to 'the value of pastoral visitation in allaying the spirit of murmuring and discontent, and inducing a feeling of acquiescence in God's corrective discipline' (Report, pp.20-1).


13. John M. Clabon, The Church rights of the laity ... (2nd ed., 1869), figures pp.89-90: in the Canterbury province, excluding Wales and London, Winchester and Lichfield, there was one curate to every 2660 people, in the York province it was one to 6325. See also Table 4.2.
at home in the countryside, and he cannot have been wholly untypical. But in 1870 W. Walsham How noted, as 'a most hopeful sign', that difficult as it is to meet with curates now, it is far more difficult to meet with curates for small and easy parishes than for large and laborious ones.14

In the early 1880s E.C. Wickham made the same point, and saw that though the fact did credit to the zeal of the young clergy, it portended ill for the country areas.15 In 1891, by which date the distress of rural parishes was a constant topic among churchmen, it was asserted that country curacies were 'largely supplied by non-graduates, who are, often, unable to obtain anything better.'16

The elements producing this situation were partly in the realm on attitudes and ideals, and partly based on hard economic realities. These latter will be dealt with more specifically in the next section, but they formed a constant undertone, and must ever be borne in mind.17

The new attitudes were not, however, merely determined by the material facts. What did create them, hardly admits of a simple answer; but part of the explanation lies in an upsurge of romantic enthusiasm, which doubtless affected relatively few in its full intensity, but which altered the ethos of the Church, and indeed of much of the middle class. It issued in 'slumming', the settlement movement, and the revival (rather respectably) of Christian socialism.18 Some of the

15. C.C.R., 1883, p.365; in 1884 old Canon Trevor of York described how he could not get a curate for the last year, 'it being now the fashion for young men to prefer towns' (J.C., 1884, p.36).
17. Chadwick's section on 'The country parson' (V.C., Pt.2, pp.151-81) memorably evokes this, and much else relevant to the whole subject.
18. Inglis, op. cit., Chapter 4 (esp. F.W. Farrar quote, p.149) and Chapter 7; G. Kitson Clark, Churchmen and the condition of England (1973), Chapter 10; Chadwick, V.C., pp.269-86 (more general).
sentiment involved was almost ludicrous - Henry Scott Holland's youthful rhapsodies about 'the fullness of the new life ... actual living, actual dying, actual sinning, real good hearty vice, naked sin ... [etc. etc.],' or 'that thrilling sight of the black and brutal streets reeling with drunkards', read very oddly now; but the sentiment was new, and increasingly common.  

A work that was undoubtedly romantic, though without the overlay of 'socialism', was John Gott's famous pastoral lectures of 1885, The parish priest of the town (of which Cosmo Gordon Lang said that the book 'might almost be called an idyll of the Leeds Parish Church'). The first lecture was a hymn to modern urban life, in effect: 'The age is exquisitely sensitive, and it is not the sensitiveness of delicacy, but of intense and quickest life, more expectant and more conscious than common ages' and this all 'rises to its strength in our towns.' The good is better, the evil viler ('on both sides life is more intense'). He described excitedly the growth, the 'social friction, the contrasts': 'great towns represent a great impulse that is moving our race ...' What a prospect for the Church, if it can become their 'living, lifegiving soul'; and he launches into the prophetic:

19. S. Paget, ed., Henry Scott Holland: Memoir and letters (1921), pp.61 and 88; these passages are not of course fair to Holland, and he soon recognised that he and his friends had been (in general) rather blinded by the 'cock-a-hoop' stage (pp.92-3). But they are indicative of the feelings of those who 'felt all the fascination of [the East End's] strong pulse of life' (H.O. Barnett, Canon Barnett; his life, work, and friends, 1921 ed., p.303).

20. Quoted in the Yorkshire Post obituary, 23 July 1906: the edition cited here is that of 1887. (Gott was a grandson of the great pioneer of factory manufacture in the wool trade, Benjamin Gott, and was a man of considerable means: it was thus almost a family reference when he began, 'The parish church of today differs from that of the beginning of the century, as much as the factory differs from the old hand-loom chamber'; p.6).
Some new beauty of Holiness, or attribute of God, or gift of the Holy Ghost will renew the Church. How grand and Eucharistical a day is ours or our children's.

This, then, is the field of the town clergyman. How does he 'differ from his brother in the country villages?' He answers briefly under four heads: organisation, high pressure, 'the intricacies of conscience' (created by trade, theatres, factory life, Dissent), and The indifference of a hostile character easily developed into active agencies of unbelief, through which a young man has daily to run the gauntlet. On the other hand, the country Rector has his advantages, and contributes to the Church of the land gifts as costly and great, if not more so, than his brother of the city. Surely a holiness is given him, hard to win in the spiritual fuss of town life; a well-filled leisure is his, out of which he comes forth to conduct Missions and Retreats with reserves of calm strength which are above all price.

But of that I know little ... - clearly, as most country clergy probably commented. Thereafter he develops and illustrates his themes, but the tone has been set: throughout, the town is alive, testing, exhilarating, a field for action, and for the clash of ideas.

Four years later another pastoral divinity lecturer at Cambridge undertook what was, in part, a reply to Gott; this was Herbert James (Evangelical Rector of Livermere), in his The country clergyman and his work. Most of the lectures, like Gott's, were on the conventional topics of pastoral guidance, and were sound, conservative and unexceptionable. But at the beginning he directly faced the issue. He

23. 1890: James had just ceased to be one of the examining chaplains to J.C. Ryle of Liverpool, the strongest representative of the Evangelicals then on the Bench; also, ironically, the author of probably the best-known attack on the deadness of rural parishes (Chadwick, op. cit., p.159).
did not wish to belittle the work of towns, which had had plenty of attention, but rather to point out the importance of country work. 'I know very well that some have an impression that the Towns are the best place for a first Curacy if a man wishes to see "work", and have guidance and training in that work';

but the country may provide both. He then urged that, even if the towns were 'springheads of influence', that was no cause to neglect the rest - and, he continued,

Furthermore ... a very large percentage of Curates will eventually be drafted into the Country as Vicars or Rectors. It behoves you therefore to have some regard to this possible sphere of the future.

This, as he must have known well, was a vital point, though he did not labour it: it will be discussed in due course. His argument thereafter was as indicated by this defensive beginning: he had to convince his hearers, not that country work made for a pleasant life, but that it provided hard work, and plenty of it. He had little difficulty in conjuring up a convincingly bleak picture.

In arguing that the country still presented work, he was indeed tackling a widespread criticism: that there was nothing to do, and that country clergy 'stagnated.' This was partly a matter of isolation, which was hard to avoid: 'Your Vicar may not be quite congenial [said James]. Your nearest like-minded neighbour may be miles off. Your Squire or Tenant-farmer is not always the person to whom you would open your mind'; you will be 'pretty nearly alone ...'

The flight of

24. As Gott had said: 'In choosing your first curacy your first main requirements will probably be, - a town population, Weekly Communion, Daily Services and a congenial Vicar, who is a master of curates ...' (p.22).


the depression-hit squires only served to make things worse.27 As Leslie Paul wrote, the country clergyman had been used to a society, not of other clergy mainly, but of 'his social equals, albeit laity, in his neighbourhood ... It is this social support for the rural parson which has so often melted away ....';28 the problem became serious in the late nineteenth century.

The 'mountain' clergy had always been in this position, and so they largely remained. The life was described by J.C. Atkinson in his Forty years in a moorland parish,29 who found on his arrival in 1847 at the North Yorkshire parish of Danby a wholly neglected church and a general level of manners and morality that was crude and largely untouched by 'civilised' values; he responded wonderfully to his surroundings - but his descriptions of what it meant to be snow-bound in a moor winter are particularly memorable: not everyone can have enjoyed this as he did. Two more ordinary men who served in the uplands of Yorkshire were ordained by Longley in 1851, and the pattern of their lives was very similar. Henry Kershaw was 28 at his ordination; a Leeds man (son of a 'house, sign, furniture and ornamental painter'), he had been serving as a Scripture Reader; his nomination was from Edward Jackson, and W.F. Hook was among his testimonialists.30 He was

27. J.C. 1893, p.28 (Bishop Boyd Carpenter of Ripon). G.H. Summer (Suffragan Bishop of Guildford) put it well in his last Charge (c.1900), discussing the sad plight of the country clergy: it was hard to keep up morale 'where you have only the support of your wife and family, if you are blessed with one or both. In a town it is different. There are always a certain number of friends, both of the upper and middle classes ...' (Memoir of George Henry Summer, D.D., Winchester, 1910, p.109).


29. 3rd ed. 1891 (1st also 1891); Venn, D.N.B., for biographical details (he was son of a modest cleric, and had been a sizar at St John's: an exceptional antiquarian and naturalist).

30. Details from his ordination papers (Sept. 1851); the description of his father is from Parson and White's 1830 Directory of ...
curate to Jackson and to Hook until 1856, and then (after a brief
curacy in Cumberland) he was appointed by the Dean and Chapter of
Ripon to be the first incumbent of Greenhow Hill. The church was
built in 1857, and the parish formally constituted in 1860; Kershaw
had an income originally of only £60 p.a., but that later reached
£295 and was still £243 at his death in 1898. It was (and is) a bleakly
beautiful area, but fertile in the valleys; there were also flourishing
lead mines in the middle of the century which, however, declined
drastically from the 1880s, so that the population was less than half
its original 765 when Kershaw died. The area thus reverted to being
pure upland agricultural, dotted with stone farms, and dominated by a
few landowning families (the richest of whom were the Yorkes of
Bewerley Hall, who had some £11,000 p.a. from W. Riding lands, and
partly supported Kershaw's school). Kershaw led a quiet bachelor
life; his neighbours were miners and farmers, and apart from his
housekeeper there was only one servant (to an old corn-dealer) in the
village. When he died, he was described as 'emphatically one who
dwelt among his own people ... [serving] with a quiet and unremitting
devotion.' He published nothing. His net estate was £1463; with
unusual generosity he left 100 guineas each to his housekeeper and his
gardener; the rest went to a nephew.

F.n. 30 continued.
Leeds ... York, and the Clothing District: according to
Directories, he was at a different address in 1826, and also in
1834, though within a small locality. There were many other
Kershaws in Leeds, tradesmen and heads of small commerical
operations.

(The Leeds Central Library, Local History Section, has several
small works and indexed articles on the lead mines).

32. Obituary notice in the Ripon Diocesan Calendar of 1899; will.
(His deceased brother was probably the Joseph Kershaw, 'painter
and gilder', who first appears in Leeds Directories from the
1840s, a borough and municipal elector).
Robert Pinck's life was similarly unremarkable, except in its length (when he died at the end of 1913 he was the diocese's 'senior beneficed clergyman', with 59 years of service in the one living). He was a St Bees man, the son of a Chichester grocer, who had been trained as a National schoolmaster and had taught for six and a half years before going on to St Bees. He was ordained to a curacy in Hunslet, the rapidly growing industrial suburb on the south side of Leeds, and served there for three years. Then in 1854 he was presented by Lord Wharncliffe to the Perpetual Curacy of Hardraw; the income of £109 p.a. was a slight improvement on his £80 p.a. as a curate, but it was a remote parish, far up the Ure at the head of Wensleydale, its last substantial village. Within a few years the chapelry of Lunds, five miles up into the hills to the north, became part of a new combined Vicarage, and it was in this form that Pinck held it for the next 55 years. His income was £190-200 p.a. now, and in 1864 a parsonage was built, for £950: he had over 11,000 acres to cover, with a scattered population of 5-600 (which fell in later years), and on Sundays his work 'was often only performed with difficulty as it involved a drive over the moors of five miles' to Lunds, 1,100 feet above the sea. Pinck raised three sons and a daughter, the last of whom was the main beneficiary of his modest estate, nearly £2,000 (which included two life assurance policies of £500 each with the Clergy Mutual Assurance Society). Like Kershaw, he never appears to have published anything, nor did he

33. Details from ordination papers (Dec. 1851), St Bees Register, Crockford, local Directories.

34. Obituary notice in Ripon Diocesan Calendar, 1914. The church at Hardraw was rebuilt by Lord Wharncliffe in 1879-71, a memorial to a dead brother; at Lunds the chapel was only 24 by 14 feet - and 'was completely restored in 1894 at a cost of £92 ...'
make a mark in local history.  

The 'mountains' seem always to have been staffed largely by such men. Richmond West, the rural deanery adjacent to Pinck's, had 16 parishes. In 1865 ten of them were worth £150 p.a. or less; eight were held by non-graduates. Of the six richer parishes, five were held by graduates. There were four curates in all; two graduates, one serving a relative (apparently his father), and the other assisting the wealthy (£1000 p.a.) Rector of Gilling; the two non-graduates served (under graduate incumbents) in the deanery's major townships, Richmond and Catterick. Forty years later, the picture was similar; there were less clergy (17, not 20), of whom only seven were Oxford or Cambridge men: two of these were Cambridge men, serving incumbents from that University, and four of the five who were incumbents held the only livings worth over £250 p.a. The poor livings were not so poor (the minimum income now was £145, and most had £150 to £200), and the rich ones were less rich - Gilling was down to £630 p.a. Such areas, then, with many poor benefices and little society, remained as ever largely the preserve of the less privileged clergy, bolstered by the Oxford and Cambridge men who continued to fill the better livings. In 1879 the Archdeacon of Richmond (which covered both Kershaw and Pinck) moved to Convocation that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners should pay more heed to parishes like many in his jurisdiction, which had scattered populations, but insufficient income to support 'a horse or carriage of any kind.' The incumbents, he went on, 'had hardly any

35. Will: one son was a clergyman, another a doctor; the eldest had been drowned in 1865 - rushing water is a motif in his ill-recorded life: 'Hardraw Force' is a well-known waterfall, even then a small tourist attraction: and in 1889 Pinck's graveyard was seriously damaged by a great flood, which washed away many grave-stones (among much else): V.C.H. (North Riding), Vol.1 (1914), pp.201 and 212.

36. Diocesan Calendars, 1865 and 1905.
society to comfort or support them; and in fact nothing but hard work and very little pay.' His fellow Ripon archdeacon, Canon Boyd of Craven, spoke in his support:

such a man had none of the benefits of residence in a town; no society, no books, and only very few people capable of subscribing for the poor, the schools, and other matters, so that the strain came very heavily upon him.37

But the problem of isolation was now felt in all country areas. Augustus Jessopp's essays, *The trials of a country parson* (1890), constitute a solid (but very readable) effort to make clear the many problems of his subjects. Immobility was one of the worst; he exaggerates, but not without point, in writing: 'The rule in country parishes is that where a man is put down at first, there he dies at last', having given up all hope, in the meanwhile, of ever finding something else: 'That which really makes the country parson's position a cheerless and trying one is its absolute finality ... he is a shelved man.'38 This was, allowing for some journalistic licence, a fair statement of the traditional situation: as Bartrum had noted, an incumbency was not regarded as part of a promotion-system - there was no reason to expect a 'promotion' for working a parish well; on the contrary, once a man was established, a further move was unlikely.39

Certainly, in the case of the ordinees traced in this study, a majority of those beneficed held only one living (Appendix, Table 5). But there had been a change, and there are clear signs that clerical mobility was increasing, if slowly. The proportion of men holding

37. J.C., 1879, pp.70-1. The isolation, backwardness and occasional scandal of the Cumberland clergy c.1870 is described in H.D. Rawnsley's *Harvey Goodwin, Bishop of Carlisle* (1896), pp.133-6 and pp.145-50 (but at the end it is noted that Goodwin's Cambridge reputation attracted many university men and allowed him to raise previously low ordination standards).

38. Pp.xviii-xix, and 86(-8).

only one living fell steadily from 58 to 49%; while that of men who held three or more livings rose, and was a fifth for the two later samples.  

It might be thought that a growing proportion of urban livings was the cause, for these - or specifically, the newer, poorer ones - were commonly regarded as posts that could not be expected to support a clergyman for more than a few years.  

The evidence of the men ordained to 1853 bears out this observation: taking all types of clergy together, 61% of those whose first living was rural held only that one living, while the same was true of a significantly lower 49% of men who were first beneficed in a town.  

But this was no longer true of men ordained in the latter two periods, when less than half of those first beneficed in the country remained in the one living, and slightly over half of the town incumbents did.  

The evidence about the length of first incumbencies is similar; in the first two periods, those in towns were clearly more likely to last less than ten years, and less likely to last over twenty, than those in the country: in the later two, the differences were appreciably less.

40. A.M. Deane, in J.J. Halcombe, ed., The Church and her curates (1874), p.103, gave almost exactly comparable figures (half in one living only, about a quarter 3 or more).

41. W.F. Hook thought that every Peel parish should be 'regarded as a missionary station and a temporary appointment' (quoted in J. Sandford, The mission and extension of the Church at home, 1862, Note 32, p.247): for similar views, see B. Heeney, A different kind of gentleman (1976), pp.115-6 and G.H. Curteis, Bishop Selwyn (1889), p.463. The confusing effect of clerical mobility on the parishioners, on the other hand, was well expressed by C.F.G. Masterman in 1904 (quoted in E.R. Wickham, Church and people in an industrial city (1957), p.174).

42. The numbers were: rural, 81/132; urban, 33/68.

43. 59/124 (47.6%) of rural first livings: 34/60 (56.7%) of urban.

44. 1841-3 and 1851-3: incumbencies of less than ten years, urban 45%, rural 32%; of over 20 years, urban 33%, rural 44%. For the later periods the urban figures were virtually unchanged, while 38% of rural incumbencies were of less than ten years, and long ones had declined to 33%. In fact the highest incidence of short urban incumbencies is disguised here - in both 1851-3 and
variations in the pattern, as between the various categories of clergy, but none was very striking. The trend towards both shorter rural incumbencies and longer urban ones was in fact clearest in the largest category, the Oxbridge graduates ordained at Oxford and Chichester: the only development which needs further explanation concerned the Ripon ordinees of 1871-3, which relates back to the wider question of changes in the relationship between town and country parishes.

Until this last sample, men ordained at Ripon were marked out by the strongly urban character of their benefices (Appendix, Table 11.6); and this was so almost equally for the Oxbridge clergy and the rest. Those that got rural livings tended, in both groups, to stay in them for long periods. This was particularly the case with the non-Oxbridge men (in this they seem to conform to the 'shelved men' idea of Jessopp's, being prima facie cases of men likely to be ignored by patrons once they had been beneficed). The change, in both categories of Ripon men, in the last period, is quite startling, and is so consistent (Table 11.4 and .5) - in both cases reversing strong previous trends - that it cannot be dismissed. As many Ripon ordinees (31) were first beneficed in the country from this one sample as from all three previous ones, and rural livings suddenly became the dominant characteristic of their careers. The turnaround for the non-Oxbridge clergy becomes even clearer when the population of their parishes is looked at (Appendix, Table 10.4): in the first three samples, only six

F.n. 44 continued.
1861-3 samples just one-half were of less than 10 years: this fits with the fact that urban livings were most generally poor and hard c.1840-70, a period of widescale parish formation while the Ecclesiastical Commissioners' aid programme was yet to make its full impact: see also next section.

45. 8 of the 14 non-Oxbridge men whose first livings were rural remained in them for over 20 years (compared to 7 of the 24 who started in urban livings).
of them had begun with parishes of less than 600 people - and there were ten such parishes among the first livings of the last sample. Given that their previous urban bent seems so well to illustrate the relatively humble nature of the Ripon ordinees' careers, and that there is certainly no reason to think that their backgrounds had radically changed in ten years, this change is significant corroborative evidence of the decreasing attractions of rural parishes.

Immobility became a problem because the clergy were felt to be underworked: hence, 'stagnation'. C. Kegan Paul, who had been a country clergyman in Oxfordshire and Dorset, wrote simply that 'most assuredly the work of a small country living is not enough for an active-minded man';\(^46\) and when S.C. Scott took a country clergyman's duty in 1874 after working several years in London, he found it a pure holiday: after the morning prayers 'it was plain that my kind hostess was at a loss how to dispose of me for the day, for there were no sick people to visit, nor any special duties to perform'; so he went sight-seeing instead.\(^47\) It needed exceptional resources to remain fresh, not to sink into ruts. The problem may well have been exacerbated in the last decades of the century, by an ageing of the clergy; the thousands ordained in the 1840s and 1850s were now growing old in their country livings, often obtained when they were quite young. They were probably not the best people to minister to a rural society undergoing difficult social and economic changes.

Sometimes they represented survivals from an ecclesiastical world that had passed elsewhere. James Webber Miller succeeded his father in 1861 as Rector of Birdham, a comfortably-endowed (£400 p.a.) small


\(^{47}\) Things that were [1923], pp.297-9: it is worth noting, however, that the clergyman he replaced (John Ellerton, Vicar of Hinstock, Salop.) was off conducting a town mission - so Gott's image was not without its examples.
living a few miles south-west of Chichester; apart from two years near Lewes after his ordination (1843-5) his whole clerical life was passed within five miles of Birdham. His father was an old-fashioned pluralist, a 'singing man' (son of a Northampton 'pleb') who had come to a minor canonry in Chichester cathedral from Magdalen college chapel; he lived in the close and kept a mild eye on his two nearby livings. J.W. Miller had a new parsonage built when he arrived at Birdham, but otherwise changed little; he was never happy with the state of the church, but the churchwardens were no help at all; so his successor found a church still featuring gallery, three-decker and high pews.

In his later years he was depressed about the people: they moved about more, and deferred less: the parish, he wrote in 1878, 'has become a Republic, instead of an oligarchy: and socially speaking has very much degenerated.' In his last Return, in 1887, he wrote a long complaint about the state of affairs: only two resident employers ('and both are of the baser sort'), the people 'frequently shifting, the importations being the offcasts of other places', and all 'too South Saxon' to allow of a temperance effort: the children left school far too young, for the farms or service in the towns. His successor at once restored the church, increased services (and raised the congregation): but he too found 'a vulgar and generally low tone prevalent in the neighbourhood.' Not far away, at West Wittering, the son of a poor

48. Details from Al. Ox., Crockford. Hennessy's Chichester Clergy List, Directories, and Visitation Returns, particularly 1875, 1878, 1887 and 1884. (Miller senior's career is remarkably similar to that of J.M. Holland's father: see Chapter five, note 28: they must have been colleagues for many years in the musical staff of Chichester cathedral).

49. Reminiscences of his successor's daughter, Miss Katherine Espinasse, quoted in W.R. Read, Birdham: notes on its village life and natural history (Chichester, 1935), p.45. She added that 'it is difficult in these days to realise how isolated the place was 45 years ago, the only public vehicle was the carrier's cart and everyone used it in wet weather.'
clergyman, W.D. Underwood (a St Bees man) was more active and less lugubrious.\textsuperscript{50} but he too was depressed by the lack of help from farmers, and of interest from the labourers: a small but persistent chapel run by a blacksmith refused to go under, as he sometimes hoped, and his last years seem to have been marred by hurtful quarrels and defections. It was not enough to give out soup every winter, and distribute the parish charities 'with his own hand.'\textsuperscript{51} In a third case, the incumbent (for 51 years) of two small parishes seems to have been satisfied with his work to the end, reporting good communicant numbers, and success in keeping his confirmands: but his successors painted a picture of decay.\textsuperscript{52} Evidently things had quietly slipped.

Towards the end of his life old Bishop Durnford of Chichester 'observed with great regret an increasing reluctance on the part of the younger clergy to take work in country parishes, and too many instances among the older country clergy of indolence and neglect of duty.'\textsuperscript{53} A correspondence in the Guardian at the end of 1900 indicates the reasons. The correspondence began with a leader (on 24 October) on 'The

\textsuperscript{50} Details from Hennessy, op. cit., Crockford, Visitation Returns, Directories: his father (John) was a 'Ten Year Man' at Cambridge, and was curate of Uckfield, Sussex from at least 1831 (the son was born there: Census enumerator's book, 1871) to 1848; he only obtained a living - a Staffs. Perpetual Curacy - for the last two years of his life: he was 64 at his death (Venn).

\textsuperscript{51} Visitation Returns, esp. 1878, 1881, 1884 and 1887: obituary in the West Sussex Journal of 16 April 1889.

\textsuperscript{52} James Munro Sandham, a well-connected clergyman of moderate Tractarian tendency: Visitation Returns to 1893, and those of his successors (at Hardham and at Cold Waltham), 1898 and 1903.

\textsuperscript{53} W.R.W. Stephens, A memoir of Richard Durnford ... (1899), p.338.
stagnation of the clergy', which argued that too much was made of this, and that much remained to be said for the virtues of stability and experience - but it admitted that a ministry of a dozen years or so in a country parish tended to drain a man's energies, 'and gradually reduced him to a state bordering on inertia.' The solution suggested was conservative: better use of episcopal patronage. In the ensuing letters, the theme emerging most strongly was that of the problems experienced by town-bred and town-trained clergy in country parishes. It was established by the first correspondent who portrayed the young cleric, 'moved from a large, well-worked town parish, where he has been in touch with every branch of Church work, to a remote country living': the town methods cannot be applied, enthusiasm flags, interests contract: 'is it surprising that the result is "stagnation", and that on the rare occasions when he emerges from his retreat he shows himself to be that poor, pitied creature, a "country parson".' A connected point was the sheer waste involved.

Not surprisingly, some still felt that only a countryman born and bred could understand and rule a country parish: 'The countryman should work in the country and the townsman in the town.'

---

54. Bishop Carpenter of Ripon always tried to use a vacancy in his own patronage to make a series of changes: 'he often lay awake at night thinking how he might make one move which would lead to another, as a chess-player tries to foresee his game ...' (H.D.A. Major, Life and letters of W.B. Carpenter, 1925, p.43). When Gore was Bishop of Oxford he did the same, sometimes getting four of five moves out of one vacancy: G.L. Prestige, The Life of Charles Gore (1935), pp.327-8.

55. 'Presbyter Rusticus', 7 Nov., p.1557.

56. i.e. 'A Wold Rector' (28 Nov., p.1658) noticed several neighbours like himself, 'in the prime of life with valuable town experience behind them ... "marking time" in little parishes': the next letter on the page asserted that 'Our laity will not believe in the dearth of clergy as long as they see young, strong men eating their hearts out as incumbents or even as curates, in little villages ...'

57. 'Twenty years in Essex', 12 Dec., p.1739: his preceding words were:
recollects Trollope's 'Parson of the Parish': 'Throughout his whole life he has lived in close communion with rural affairs and has of them that exact knowledge which close communion only will give';\(^{58}\) but in 1906 a stalwartly low church small squire and Tory activist, John Bridges, wrote in disparaging terms of the new country clergy, as being ignorant of rural affairs, and as only too obviously awaiting the chance to get away from their hateful surroundings.\(^{59}\) The root problem, however, was simply that the livings available remained overwhelmingly rural. In 1867\(^{60}\) just over 80% of all livings had populations of less than 2,000: the great majority of these were rural. By 1892,\(^{61}\) when their number had declined marginally and that of the larger parishes had substantially increased, they still made up 72% of all livings - indeed 45% of the whole number still had populations of less than 600.

The situation was delineated by one of the Guardian correspondents\(^{62}\) thus. He believed in the necessity for long personal experience of rural conditions, but recognised that

the supply of men with [these qualifications] is a limited quantity. On the other hand there is a large number of men of the town, towny, who have put in their town service - say, of ten or twelve years - who are not fitted for the "commands", so to speak, of the town campaign, who have done good work as "subalterns", who have to be moved from town work to make room for the energy of younger men, who besides have to be provided for, and for whom the country parishes alone remain as a provision ...

F.n. 57 continued.
'... our tastes and our upbringing are a Providential guide to us as to our sphere of work. "Man's nature is God's oracle."'

58. Op. cit., p.61: he took the man to be a squire's younger son, or a son of the manse.


60. Figures adapted from the Times, 4 Sept. 1867 (4a).

61. See Appendix, Table 15. 62. 'Cestriensis', 14 Nov., p.1595.
James had rejected the current idea that the country was 'the proper and legitimate sphere for "town-failures"', but this explanation rang true. The life and work of the country parson, simply, was different to that of the town clergyman, and alien to the experience of most of the younger clergy. 'Another Wold Rector' wrote in rejoinder to one of his neighbours, who had eloquently described the troubles of a townsman suddenly deprived of all his previous activities: he had never found the work insufficient or dull: 'The country parson is the pivot on which so many items of the village life turn ...' Herein lay the difference, I think. The country parson retained to a far greater extent the 'diffuse', unspecialised functions of the pre-industrial clergyman: his influence was not mediated through specifically ecclesiastical activities and organisations, but through a general involvement in the life of his community, as agricultural land-owner, almoner, educational provider, and representative of an authoritative (if often somewhat distant) culture. The town clergyman was busy, but he was busy because towns were busy, and in a town he was only one small element in the life: he could choose his interests, pastoral or intellectual, and be immersed in them. In the countryside the clergyman had to be all things to all men, and his life and his person were to a far greater extent public property - he knew the parish, it knew him. The position was closer to that of the squire than to the developed privacy and individualism of modern town life. The unhappiest period in the life of Charles Gore, theologian, Christian socialist, later a bishop, was the eight months he spent in

63. Op. cit., p.18: Jessopp, op. cit., pp.92-4, is also good on the sheer disorientation evidenced by the young city clergyman, 'pitchforked into a rural benefice.'

64. Guardian, 12 Dec., p.1739 (and see note 56).
1893-4 as vicar of a rural Oxfordshire parish; his biographer shrewdly noted that there he had to deal with 'a mixed body, restricted in number and therefore universally interested in all its members' business', whereas in all his other work (at Oxford and at Liverpool) he had dealt with individuals who chose to respond to him: 65 the others could be worked for - but on his terms, not theirs: but a village had expectations.

Thus by the end of the century the Church had a problem in its rural parishes; the transition to a rural life was neither welcome nor suited to a growing proportion of its clergy, yet it remained a structural necessity. The exciting work seemed to lie in the towns; the pastoral theologians had a defensive and saddened tone in their references to country work, and it was evident that they wrote mostly about work in towns. 66 The last words on the subject should be those of Frederick Temple, now (in 1900) Archbishop of Canterbury, old but still worth listening to. The bishops were debating in Convocation the problems of clergy supply: the Bishop of St Alban's had drawn attention to the difficulties of attracting younger men to country work: 'Men who come forward showing a spirit of self-devotion are more inclined, at any rate for a time, to throw themselves into the work of the towns than to settle down into what they consider the quieter work of the country.' 67 Temple agreed: he pointed out 'the

65. G.L. Prestige, op. cit., Chap.IX, esp. pp.160-1: Gore of course was far from typical, but the difference between the by now essentially denominational position of the Church in the towns, and its residual community commitment in the countryside, is the point here.


67. Ch.C., 1900, p.367. (Much earlier the Curates' Augmentation Fund had noted that one of the major reasons why men remained curates was that they preferred, ' "for the work's sake", remaining as Curates in a large town population, to undertaking the duties of some small parish': Report, 1868-9, p.9).
increasing amount of excitement in the world-at large. People are much more alive, as it were, intellectually and morally, than they were half-a-century ago,' and he referred to St Alban's' remarks.

There is a dislike of dullness anywhere [he continued], and that has very much increased. To live a dull life as a Clergyman was not so very repellent half-a-century ago as it is now.68

68. Ch.C., 1900, p.368.
When a clergyman took up his position as incumbent of a parish, he was first 'instituted' by the bishop, by which ceremony he was entrusted with the cure of souls; he was then 'inducted', usually by a local clergyman of standing, into (to quote the words used) 'the real and actual possession of the [rectory or vicarage of X] with all its profits and apurtenances.' By this latter, he became in effect the owner of an ecclesiastical income: owner, not merely recipient, because the 'parson's freehold' gave a beneficed clergyman a great measure of freedom as to how he used and managed the 'apurtenances' of his living, and a title to ownership that was difficult to challenge even in cases of blatant immorality, let alone ordinary incompetence.

There were several major sources of parish income, whose respective importance altered over time. Basically, however, parish tithes and glebe (land) provided the bulk of all church income, and overwhelmingly so in rural areas; while in towns, land and some sort of tithe-charge were often important, but there were also sometimes substantial contributions from 'surplice fees' and especially pew rents. There was also the steadily growing contribution of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, who managed the estates originally belonging to bishops and cathedrals, and channelled the proceeds to needy parishes; they helped poor country parishes, but the bulk of

69. Entries in A Dictionary of the Church of England, by E.L. Cutts [1887] (induction was often by the archdeacon).

70. Chadwick, op. cit., pp.169-70: it took years (1882-92) of parliamentary mishaps to legislate for a modified and simpler procedure to deprive clergy convicted of moral offences in secular courts: R.S. Withycombe, The development of constitutional autonomy in the Established Church ... (Cambridge Ph.D., 1969), pp.113-25. (Perpetual Curates could be deprived by simple withdrawal of their episcopal licence, so did not possess the freehold).
By about 1850 tithes had almost ceased to be collected in kind; in the previous hundred years many tithes had been converted into land holdings (above all in the midland counties), and the rest had been commuted under the provisions of the 1836 Tithe Commutations Act. Country clergymen thus found themselves relieved of the unpopular work of collecting tithe, and were to experience nearly 50 years of stable income, which required only the collection of a known sum of money, or the letting of the glebe. These mid-century years were without doubt the most prosperous in the Church’s history, for its rural clergy.

From the late 1870s, as is well known, the country clergy began to feel the effects of the ‘agricultural depression’ precipitated by the arrival of plentiful and cheap corn (and to a lesser extent meat) from overseas. The clergy’s sufferings were of course matched, and often exceeded, by those of the farmers and some landlords: but they had a great impact nonetheless. Partly, this was because the clergy’s income was often directly linked to the most vulnerable areas and features of the rural economy: the tithes were commuted on a grain-based scale, so that all tithes fell with the prices of grains (by a third by 1901), whereas at least some sections of the farming community had abandoned arable and gone into pasture or dairy-farming, less seriously hit by the depression. Further, the areas most drastically

71. Full figures do not become available until the 1890s, with the publication of ‘Statistical Summaries’ in the Year-Book[s] of the Church of England: but these well indicate the variations between regions, and between town and country areas. Thus, the contribution of glebe and tithe to parochial incomes, in 1895, ranged from nearly 90% in Norwich, to less than 15% at Wakefield – which depended for 63% of its income upon the Ecclesiastical Commissioners (1897 ed., p.xviii-xix: Church finance in the late nineteenth century is being presently researched by Ms. K. Orr of Nuffield College, Oxford).


73. Ibid., pp.161-3; Best, op. cit., pp.465-8. (The point about the
affected of all - the arable 'cold clays' of the midlands - were precisely those in which the Church had most glebe, its legacy from the great enclosure periods of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It was here, all agreed, that the effects of the depression on the clergy were worst, with widespread and dramatic declines in income; many clergy, unable to find tenants for their glebe, were forced to take them in hand, and this often proved a disastrous course. Their failure as farmers underlined the fact that most clergy, while for long happy to benefit from the land, were not trained, and did not expect, to play an active role in agriculture; their connection with it became an incubus. If their complaints riled the farmers - who had to pay their tithe, whatever their own returns might be - they were not without cause: yet another of the anomalies in the clergy's position was highlighted: no profession, no service, no other denomination, was subject to such a painful financial reversal, and for reasons wholly unconnected with the discharge of the duty for which they were paid.

This last fact, of course, merely reflected the greater fact that the income of the clergyman bore no necessary relation to the work of the parish. But before looking at this matter, it will be well to set out the range of incomes involved. It was always well known that the Church's benefices comprehended incomes from the negligible to the really substantial 'prizes' of over £1,000; but
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Church's prosperity is not explicit in these: but no other period can possibly challenge the claim).


75. In 1887 two excellent surveys were published, both of which made this point very fully: R.E. Protheroe, The agricultural depression and the sufferings of the clergy (2nd ed.), and H.P. Thomas, The Church and the land (based on series of letters to the Guardian and to the Morning Post, respectively).

76. This was particularly stressed by Thomas: op. cit., pp.9 (that
as churchmen never tired of pointing out, the former were legion, the latter rare. The Ecclesiastical Revenues Commissioners had found some 3,500 benefices of less than £150 p.a. (c.1830); if the proportions observed in his sample of benefices which were filled in 1872-3 were generally applicable (see Appendix, Table 8), A.M. Deane calculated that there were even more such incomes by this date. Two thirds of all benefices yielded less than £300 p.a. (and then there were the curates). So clearly, a majority of clergy received professional incomes that were quite modest (and with claims upon them, as we shall see, that seemed to them disproportionately large).

As would be expected, the size of the clergy's incomes varied markedly from category to category. Appendix, Table 12, indicates these variations, and shows that the proportion of clergy who never obtained livings of over £300 p.a. ranged from 54% of the southern-ordained Oxbridge men, to 73% of the non-Oxbridge men ordained at Ripon. Further, 72% of these latter had first livings worth less than £200 p.a., and over half were less than £150 p.a. Such very poor first livings do seem to have declined, however (see Appendix, Table 13): the peak figure of 55%, for the 1851-3 sample, was boosted by 25 Oxbridge men ordained in the south, almost certainly men of means for the most part (as described later in this section); thereafter the figures were much lower. The proportion of Ripon non-Oxbridge ordinees who started with

---
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most hopeless and ruinous occupation, amateur farming'), 19-20, 29, 36-40, 47.
77. Jessopp, op. cit., p.60.
78. Best, op. cit., p.407, n.2 (whereas there were only 618 of over £700 p.a.).
79. In Halcombe, ed., op. cit., p.101. See also Appendix, Table 14, for 1891-2 figures: these were after the agricultural slump, and were also strictly net incomes: but over 5,500 had less than £200 p.a.
80. This was consistently found: the 1835 figure was 65.5%, Conybeare
such an income declined sharply from 19 out of 27 in the first two samples, to 14 out of 37 in the later two. Instead, the proportions of medium incomes - particularly those of £2-300 p.a. - rose; of all the 1871-3 ordinees, over half began with a living of between £150 and £300 p.a., about double the proportions of the 1841-3 and 1851-3 groups. Altogether, if one includes the clergy who never obtained livings at all, not many ever received (even nominally) over £300 p.a. Assuming that none of those who remained unbenefticed ever made this amount (at least from the Church: some of the Oxford ordinees who became teachers probably did), the figures are:

Number and per cent ever receiving over £300 p.a.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford and Chichester: Oxbridge</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: Rest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: Oxbridge</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: Rest</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The low figure of this last category also reflects the fact that in the first three periods very many never achieved a living.

Benefice incomes were so determined by the individual topographies and histories of the parishes\(^81\) that a correlation between the parochial work required in the nineteenth century, and the income provided, was at best coincidental. Trollope satirised this state of affairs in a famous passage in *Framley Parsonage* (1860), finally characterising it as one of those 'time-honoured, gentlemanlike, English

---

\(^80\) continued.

broadly estimated two thirds in 1854 (Edinburgh Review, Vol.99, Jan.1854, p.101), Deane's figure was 65.8\% (see Appendix, Table 8): the 1891 figure was a little higher, 71.2\%.

\(^81\) History determined, inter alia, whether a man was Rector (possessing all the tithes), Vicar (only the lesser tithes, the greater being held by an impropriator) or Perpetual Curate (no tithes at all). Taking all first and last parishes in the sample (558), there was a straightforward progression from Rectories (richest: 19\% less than £200, 59\% over £300), Vicarages (54 and
and picturesque' customs adhered to 'by the force of our prejudices, and not by that of our judgement.'\(^{82}\) Perhaps in direct response, the prominent High Churchman and M.P., J.G. Hubbard, next year restated the conservative case:

> Any attempt to re-distribute upon a more equable level the emoluments of the Clergy would operate unfavourably upon their social position; and the same result would ensue from an attempt to "establish a proportion between the work of a clergyman and his income."\(^{83}\)

It would not be quite true to say that there was no relationship at all between the size of a parish's population, and the income of the clergyman who served it. Deane worked out the average income, in his sample, for various sizes of parish: the results were that, except for the parishes of over 5,000 population (average £462 p.a.), the highest average income was for those of 600 to 1,000 people (£355 p.a.): next were parishes of 1-2,000 (£328) and then those of 2-4,000 (£319). Very small parishes were appreciably poorer.\(^{84}\) The figures obtained from the 558 first and last livings held by my sample clergy confirm the picture: apart from the fact that the largest parishes (over 4,000 population) had fewest incomes of below £200 (28%), the most favoured parishes were definitely those of 600 to 2,000 people - and especially those of less than 1,000.\(^{85}\) In other words, the richest benefices tended to be those of large agricultural parishes, large enough to provide substantial tithes or a large glebe. But there were

---
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24%, respectively) to Perpetual Curacies (85 and 6%). Not surprisingly there was also the usual correspondence of clergy categories, from Fellows (most Rectories) to Ripon non-Oxbridge men (least: and to 1861-3, over half their first livings were perpetual curacies).

82. 1961 (Everyman) ed., pp.137-8. (See also Clergymen, pp.93-4).

83. C.C.R. 1861, p.118. (See also Best, op. cit., esp. pp.410-1, a good summary).


85. The 600-1,000 population range (88 parishes) had the highest
so many exceptions that this cannot be taken as more than a general
tendency.

The only area where rationality of reward clearly advanced was
in that of the largest town parishes; this was due to the Ecclesiastical
Commissioners who, from 1863, made it their aim to give all livings with
populations of over 4,000, £300 p.a. if they were not in private
patronage: for these, they met benefactions pound for pound, not
being prepared to increase the value of an advowson which might then
be sold at the patron's profit.\(^{86}\) The results for such livings in my
samples were:

Parishes of over 4,000 population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (£)</th>
<th>Under 200</th>
<th>2-300</th>
<th>3-500</th>
<th>Over 500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 1841-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commissioners had nothing to do with raising the larger incomes,
but they helped to nearly eliminate the smallest: Deane's average of
£462 p.a. for livings of over 5,000 population thus included a few of
less than £300 (in private patronage), 12 livings of £600 and more, and
no fewer than 37 of £300 exactly.\(^{87}\)
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proportion (43%) of incomes over £300 p.a. (closely followed by the
1-2,000 range, with 41%, of 87), and the lowest proportion (38%)
of incomes below £200 p.a. (excepting, as noted, the biggest
parishes).

86. Best, op. cit., pp.446-7 (on previous policies, pp.353 and 442-4).
The problem of augmenting livings in private patronage was
expressed definitively by Peel in a letter to Bishop Phillpotts,
in Jan. 1835, quoted in G.C.B. Davies, Henry Phillpotts (1954),

87. Worked from the Appendix listing the livings: there were eighteen
others (i.e. between £301 and £599).
This brings the matter back to the difference between town and country parishes: in terms of income, what was clear by 1900 was that town parishes were far more likely to have a certain flexibility, and to retain a capacity for improvement. Country livings were at the mercy of general agricultural trends. From the 1890s the Oxford Visitation Returns contain detailed breakdowns of benefice incomes: they show that most parishes remained dependent upon tithe or glebe, outside the few major towns, although some of the poorer rural or suburban parishes also received substantial aid from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Otherwise, they had no alternative sources of income. Pew-rents were of negligible value in the whole diocese: they had rarely been applied outside towns, and were certainly not likely to be introduced for the first time, after 1880. Fees were virtually insignificant in a small parish. If the parish had property or income resulting from an augmentation by Queen Anne's Bounty, this usually indicated a still very small income (made up from a tiny one before). There was little room for improvement.

88. This is impressionistic, though some half-dozen parishes were looked at more closely: the 1895 Year-Book figures (see note 71) shows that for the whole diocese, 73% of all parochial income came from tithe or glebe.

89. They provided some 22% of the whole diocese's parochial income. Examples: Little Brickhill, a decayed post-town on the old Watling St.: the Commissioners were rectors and major landowners, so were responding here to 'local claims' (see Best, op. cit., pp. 354 and 445); they provided £100 p.a. in the '90s, over half the total. Knowl-Hill, Berks, a new parish (on the Maidenhead-Reading road) of the 1840s: nearly £80 of its £120 or so p.a. was from the Commissioners.

90. The Year-Book return for 1895 showed that pew-rents were insignificant in all the rural dioceses, being less than 1% of the parochial income of Ely, Hereford, Lincoln, Norwich and Oxford (but a quarter of London and Rochester's). The later decline of pews is described in K.S. Inglis, op. cit., pp.48-57. See also below, p.462.

91. Hardham in Sussex, held (see note 52 above) by J.M. Sandham, had an income of £64 p.a., entirely derived from £1,800 from the Q.A.B. (Visitation Returns).
A perennial problem for all clergy was the extent of the calls on their incomes. One that particularly worried country clergy was the extent of their rating and taxation burden, which has been described as the 'most pressing financial question' facing the clergy until the agricultural slump.\(^\text{96}\) The major difficulty was that the Tithe Rent Charge (T.R.C.) into which tithes had been commuted, was rated as though it were land: this was clearly unfair. There were three main grounds of complaint. First, there was a general grievance, that the clergy not only paid income and indirect taxes, like other professional men, but were also rated on their professional income as well: 'All other professional labour is exempt. This is an anomaly.'\(^\text{97}\) Second, to make this worse the clergy were allowed very little by way of deductions for necessary expenses: most inequitably and expensively, the stipends of curates were not deductible.\(^\text{98}\) The unfairness of all this was manifest when it was considered that lay tithe-owners, who had no professional obligations, and whose tithes were a heritable freehold, paid virtually the same rates as the working clergy.\(^\text{99}\)

The third point was, it seems, the most fruitful of discussion and complaint: this was the actual process of valuation, which was always mentioned in discussion on rates. The basic problem was that the T.R.C. was publicly known, while the 'rental value' of other lands was assessed by overseers who were usually farmers themselves. The situation was graphically (if prolixly) described by 'A Country Rector'

96. The general issue is excellently and succinctly described by Best (op. cit., pp.468-70): what follows is largely a filling out of his passage.

97. Rev. J.R. Jones before 1850 Lords' Committee on Parochial Assessments, quoted in Convocation's 'Report on the Rating of the Property of the Clergy' (Ch.C.1871, Appendix 5, p.10: the Report is a useful summary). As one clergyman argued also, people in towns knew little of rate burdens - they paid only on their houses, the clergy paid (as well) on their incomes. ('An Essex Rector', Times, 10 Feb. 1869, 3e).

98. Except between 1858 and 1867 (Best, p.469, n.4). W. Wigan Harvey's
in a lengthy pamphlet published in 1866. The points that emerged most clearly from the detailed description of this old man's struggles were: first, the ease with which the farmers (almost invariably the holders of the main parish offices) consistently undervalued their own property; and second, the ill effects of clerical resistance (however correct in law and equity), on pastoral relations. The legislative clauses on the matter of deductions were described by one clerical commentator as 'so obscure that I do not think anybody can positively determine their meaning', and evidently a great deal rested upon local conditions, personalities, and doubtless, animosities. The result could sometimes be a very serious impost, particularly upon the less wealthy clergy. Examples were given of rates and land
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The assessment of the Tithe Rent Charge ... (1863) set out the allowable deductions in considerable detail (summarised pp.28-30). (Clergy were also rated on their houses - farmers were not: Convocation 'Report', p.12).

99. Times, 31 Oct. 1843 (5b), letter from 'J.S.'.

100. Unfair assessment of the clergy: a letter to Rt. Hon. C.P. Villers ... (1866; 78 pages, 100 with appendices).

101. Ibid., esp. pp.5-12 and 14; on the farmers and their parish posts, pp.19-20. Two specific points he was making were: that the appeals system was weighted to the farmers, as well as being expensive (esp. pp.10-11: the whole pamphlet testifies to the difficulties of the process, being mainly the story of his two appeals): and that the Union Assessment Committee Act of 1862 greatly aggravated matters by insisting that all property be rated at its full present value; previously parishes had usually underrated, and were able to include the T.R.C. in this - now the T.R.C. had to be fully rated (being known), while farmers still tried to keep their own rates low (esp. pp.13-14).

102. Ibid., esp. p.39: as the Convocation 'Report' said, 'the personal and universal irritation he must produce among his parishioners by appealing against their individual ratings [the only line of appeal] is a consequence to which a clergyman would rarely desire or venture to expose himself ...' (p.6).

103. Canon Hopkins, Ch.C. 1871, p.381 (see also the aggrieved letter of 'Another Country Rector', who resented paying much higher rates than some wealthier clerical neighbours: Times, 25 Jan. 1849, 3f).
tax taking between a quarter and a third of modest gross incomes. Jessopp described the situation as being still very serious in the 1880s, and concluded dramatically, but not altogether implausibly, that 'in many a needy country parson's household the rates make all the difference whether his children can have butter to their bread or not.' What particularly annoyed some clergy was the fact that this burden was laid upon a class of men whose outgoings were already so largely directed towards the temporal relief of their parishes. The final of Twelve queries on the assessment of clerical incomes ... was whether or not the unfair rate burden was not injurious to the poor: the answer of course was yes, implicitly. It was so, 'not only by crippling the resources of the resident incumbent', but also by victimising the man in the parish least able to alleviate poverty (particularly in winter) by employing the labourers.

Do not Incumbents in rural parishes [he further asked], where there are no resident landlords, often with great difficulty employ labourers on their patches of glebe, and dispense relief to the poor ... Is it one of the triumphs of modern political economy to throw the heaviest burden on resident Incumbents, who cannot see the poor starve out of the Union House, and also must contribute unduly to their maintenance within, [and] who have no land whereon to employ them ...?

Such efforts by the clergy were well described, by yet another clergyman who offered his budget to the readers of the Times, as 'the many incidental expenses which fall upon the clergyman, and which it is absurd to call optional, because if he does not bear them no one

104. i.e. the cases of the authors of three Times letters cited above, notes 97, 99 and 103.
106. By 'a College Incumbent', 1863: the previous 11 are mostly quite technical points relating to valuations, etc.
107. Ibid., pp.7-8: also, the 'Essex Rector': 'Nobody is expected to give like the clergyman, and nobody is so heavily taxed' (Times, 10 Feb. 1869, 3c), and John Pickford, A letter to the Premier on the present condition of the clergy of the Church of England, 1881, esp. pp.4-5.
The extent of such expenses cannot be measured now, and must have varied enormously; but there is no doubt that the charities and the schools of the parish were seen to be supported largely by the clergy. In poor urban parishes, 'the whole machinery required for the efficient working of a parish, must come from, and for their permanency depend on, the poor incumbent', and these expenses materially reduced the real value of clerical stipends. As the depression set in the countryside, the burden increased there: speaking of poor rural parishes in 1887, Canon Hayman (a Cumberland rector) said that it 'should be remembered that a clergyman's income was always worth 20 per cent less to him that it would be to any other person who had the same sum. Further, he was expected to marry and bring up children ...'

This last point was important, for there is no question that it was the expectation that a clergyman should be a family man that

108. 'A Vicar', 13 Sept. 1856 (8f): John Moore, in 1819, had similarly referred to 'the numerous expences from which others may excuse themselves, but to which they, from the nature of their calling and office, are particularly liable.' (Observations on the provision intended for the clergy ..., 1819, p.23: these were his concluding words - the idea was of course a commonplace throughout the century, and probably throughout history).

109. B. Heeney, op. cit., pp.87-9: John Richard Green found himself, when Perpetual Curate of a poor Stepney parish in 1868, left 'simply ... without a penny' when faced with a school deficit of £43, after a year of much local distress (L. Stephen, ed., Letters of J.R. Green, 1901, pp.202-3).

110. Home Mission Field, April 1859, p.9: E.L. Cutts, On Church extension and new endowments (1860),p.16. In the early 1850s Edward Stuart, incumbent of a poor new district in London, reckoned that 28 per week was necessary just to keep up basic church services and local charities (Joyce Coombs, One Aim. Edward Stuart 1820-1877, 1975, p.18). J.A. Munby's work for the Ecclesiastical Commissioners brought home to him 'the great amount of sorrow and distress among the clergy. Their incomes have not risen along with the others, but their obligations have ...' (in 1860: D. Hudson, ed., Munby, Man of two worlds, 1974 ed., p.58).

underlay much of the problem of clerical provision. That the clergy should marry was held, not only for the complex of reasons that might be called 'protestant' - the defiant assertion of down-to-earth manliness as opposed to the sinisterly asexual separateness of the Romish priesthood\textsuperscript{112} - but also for connected reasons of social propriety: 'only a married man can without awkwardness perform some of the duties with which a clergyman is charged at the sick-bed and elsewhere in relation to the female members of his flock ...',\textsuperscript{113}

In fact it seems that a surprisingly large proportion of the clergy were bachelors.\textsuperscript{114} But most were married men. The upkeep of a family and the maintenance of a respectable middle class appearance, required an income, by contemporary estimates, of about £300 p.a. (in town, at least): and there was general agreement that standards and costs were rising in the mid-Victorian years.\textsuperscript{115} In his well-known article, 'Life at high pressure' (1875), W.R. Greg adverted to this fact, and commented that 'Plodding clerks, Government officials, retired officials, clergymen, and scientific and literary students -

\textsuperscript{112.} Geoffrey Best's 'Popular Protestantism' (in R. Robson, ed., Ideas and institutions of Victorian Britain, 1967) is excellent on this, esp. pp.124ff. Shaftesbury, typically, supported the C.A.F. largely because he thought it vital to maintain a clergy which could 'participate of [sic] those domestic joys which were the mainstays of the social virtues and of man's happiness on earth': the clergy's marriage was the 'security, the honour, the glory and the strength' of the Church (Times, 18 June 1867, 7c).

\textsuperscript{113.} H.P. Thomas, op. cit., p.5: there is an account of such motives at work in O. Chadwick's Victorian Miniature (1960), pp.25-6. (H.B. Thomson, as usual, was business-like: 'Society and the dictates of morality enjoin the English clergyman to marry; and as that, therefore, becomes part of his duty ...'; The Choice of a profession ..., 1857, p.70; the other profession that virtually required marriage, for similar reasons, was medicine, p.162).

\textsuperscript{114.} Obelkeyvich found that 46 of the 142 South Lindsey clergy whose marital status could be determined, were unmarried (op. cit., p. 121). (8 of 27 sampled clergy whose wills etc. were followed up, appeared to be unmarried - the rest definitely were married).

\textsuperscript{115.} J.A. Banks, Prosperity and parenthood (1954), passim (esp. pp. 40-7, on the 1858 Times correspondence on suitable marrying incomes - about which G.A. Sala was dashingly rude in his Twice around the clock, 1859, reprinted Leicester 1971, p.114).
men of moderate fixed incomes in short - all find their position sadly changed for the worse. Reliable figures simply are not available for the purpose of charting the course of mid-Victorian clerical incomes; but Greg's putting the clergy with men of 'moderate fixed incomes' is clearly correct in the sense that the clergy lacked the certainty of a steadily rising income which tended to underpin middle-class respectability.

'The money question, after all', wrote J.F. Stephen, 'resolves itself into the question, "When shall I marry?" and many observers thought the clergy sadly imprudent in this regard. When W.J. Conybeare was attempting to banish the image of the 'aged and exemplary clergyman, starving on a miserable stipend with a sickly wife and ten hungry children', he admitted that some 'starving curates' might be found; 'but', he roundly asserted, 'they are the victims of their own imprudence'. Indeed he went so far as to claim that a man so foolish as to marry unwisely was unlikely to deserve success in the profession.

J.G. Hubbard, in the speech which asserted the necessity of wide inequalities of clerical incomes, bemoaned the clergy's 'disposition to improvident marriages, which does not exist in any other class'.


117. A slight qualification - aside from the steady augmentation of the poorest town livings by the Commissioners, particularly from the 1860s - is that tithe values rose quite substantially from the early 1850s to the mid-1870s: the T.R.C. index (based on a par of 100 in 1836) was at 89.79 in 1855, and 11.278 in 1875 - but this 25% rise was of course relative only to the previous decline which led to the 1855 low point (Evans, op. cit., p.161).


120. C.C.R., 1861, p.116 (he had just expressed the conventional opinion that the English clergy 'are as a class not remarkable for prudence in worldly matters').
given the pressures on the clergy to marry, this was not really so surprising.

In the 1880s and 1890s the question of marriage was again much in the air, as part of the general discussion about clerical poverty; it was a subject sure to be raised in Convocation. 'Imprudent marriages', felt Canon Hinds Howell in 1891, 'were at the root of the poverty of the greater portion of the Clergy, for men would marry, whether they could afford to keep their families or not.'\(^1\) It was noted in 1898 that marriage also had a bad effect on the prospects of curates: 'It was hard', as Canon Durst explained, 'for an Incumbent to introduce into a parish a family concerning whose future he could not feel confidence, a family that might be involved in debt or in poverty' - making the latter sound distinctly disreputable.\(^2\) The most pertinent comment was that of Dean Butler in 1893, who concluded a speech critical of the poor clergy for rushing into matrimony, by remarking that

\[\text{Any effort that could be made could not possibly provide sufficient means for a body of married Clergy, who should live like gentlemen, and bring up their children in a gentlemanly way.}\]

If this meant a provision, as Bishop Stubbs put it, sufficient to allow a clergyman 'to keep house, and to bring up his children and to educate them in the same way that other middle-class people bring

\(^1\) Ch.C., 1891, p.282: he was supported by Dean Butler of Lincoln (ex-Vicar of Wantage); though the incomparable Dean Hole of Rochester (whose Memories, a Christmas-season publishing hit of 1892, were mostly of cricket, hunting etc.) adopted a 'boys will be boys' tone redolent of the understanding schoolmaster: p.285.

\(^2\) Ch.C., 1898, p.409 (they were discussing Report No. 318 on 'Assistant Curates', which had noted the disadvantage of married curates, and was very critical of 'ill-considered and improvident marriages'; p.6, and Resolution 5). Archdeacon Kaye had, however, then pointed again to the moral difficulties of the clergy which led them, like doctors, to marry; p.411.

\(^3\) Ch.C., 1893, p.247.
up and educate theirs', then Butler was surely right. High churchmen had been (usually rather quietly) suggesting the spiritual virtues of celibacy since the 1830s, but even now, when worldly prudence was such a powerful ally, they faced an uphill battle. As one of them wrote in 1903, the ideas and associations which had clustered about the marriage of the clergy had 'become so much a part of the ordinary English attitude towards the clergy that to question their perfection would seem to incur the deadly guilt of being "un-English" ...'

If Stubbs was - and this is very probable - typical of his idea of sufficiency, then obviously the poverty of the clergy was essentially relative, not absolute; but this, particularly in an intensely status-conscious age, was not much consolation. A distinguished man who knew too well the problems of straitened means, Charles Dodgson, declared in an 1839 sermon on behalf of clergy orphans and widows 'that Poverty and affluence are in fact relative terms ... The circumstances of birth and education, the position in society which the individual occupies, all these must be taken into account, before one can rightly estimate the proportion which his means bear to his wants, in other words, the degree of his wealth or poverty.' A few years later the Times carried a

124. Visitation Charges delivered ... by William Stubbs, D.D., ed. E.E. Holmes, 1904, p.88 (1890, Oxford diocese): he usually mentioned education in the context of the trials of clerical poverty; he regarded the ability to educate their children in the same way that they were educated themselves as 'surely ... the minimum that an average professional life should offer' (p.278; also p.311).


126. Whitham, op. cit., p.173: among the conventional ideas enumerated were, the eligibility of the clergy as husbands, 'the ordinary assumption that a benefice will entail marriage as a necessary consequence; the conception of a clergyman's wife as a parochial visitor and organiser ...' (p.172).

127. Quoted in A. Clark's Lewis Carroll: a biography (1979), p.23: Dodgson had taken a poor Christ Church living very young, and was stuck there, making up his income by taking pupils, for 16 years (to 1843). The taking of pupils was then still common, and could be
leader on the 'Peel parishes'; it evinced considerable doubt about the practicality of setting up parishes endowed with only £150 p.a., basically on the grounds that men with the backgrounds and expectations of the clergy could not settle for such an income: '... 150 1. a year is not an income which, by its own inherent power, will induce a poor gentleman, the class of which our clergy is perhaps principally composed, to plant himself permanently.' In 1867 Bishop Wilberforce referred to the clergyman's finding himself 'commonly in that poorest of all positions in a wealthy society - that of a poor gentleman', and others agreed in emphasising the peculiar pains of 'genteel poverty': none so memorably as Trollope in his depiction of the Crawleys in The Last Chronicle of Barset.

With the Crawleys, however, one approaches the sort of poverty which might sometimes be 'absolute', the poverty which prompted the efforts of the very large number of clerical charities. The profusion of usually small organisations, many of them local (also often

F.n. 127 continued.

128. Leader, Times, 8 March 1843.
129. Quarterly Review, Vol.123 (July 1867), p.225. Espin had written that 'the hardship and the cruelty lie in combining slender incomes with the position of the parish priest, in plunging a sensitive man into the bitterness of genteel poverty' (Our want of clergy, 1863, pp.8-9).
130. [1867], World's Classics, ed. 1951: esp. pp.91-2, on 'the peculiar bitterness' of being 'poor gentry': they were never actually without food, 'But there are pangs to which, at the time, starvation itself would seem to be preferable ...' - the scorn of servants and tradesmen, the inability to maintain appearances, 'the neglected children, who are learning not to be the children of gentlefolk; and, worse than all, the almost doles of half-generous friends ...' (M.K. Ashby also finds a mid-century vicar of a poor rural living warning his successors of social difficulties with well-to-do clerical neighbours: The changing English village, Kineton, 1974, p.305).
131. List of charities, general and diocesan ... (1859): this
overlapping by giving their small 'doles' to the same recipients) seems to defy a reasonable quantification; but in 1883 there were found some 227 separate agencies in all, with a total expenditure of about £150,000. As had been pointed out nearly 30 years before by W.G. Jervis, who made the relief of clerical poverty his life work, this was neither efficient, nor worthy of the established church of a wealthy nation. Jervis's own pamphlets are replete with cases of dire need, and it it not necessary to particularise: but evidently there were hundreds of clergymen - usually with large families and small or non-existent private means - who simply could not feed, clothe and educate a family on net incomes of well under £150 p.a. (Incidentally, Dean Butler in 1893, describing the typical recipient of the charities' aid, said he was not a university man).

F.n. 131 continued.

admittedly incomplete work listed 71 general and 134 diocesan ones: the former varied from the tiny to the very large, notable the Sons of the Clergy Corporation (grants of over £15,500 p.a.): the latter were mostly small, though most dioceses had one large (over £500 p.a.) charity. There were wide variations: Chichester had only 3 small charities making grants of £306, whereas Norwich's 2 largest charities both had incomes of over £1,000 p.a.


134. Clergy charity societies, their condition and insufficiency reviewed (1854): he was particularly critical of the small proportion of the large incomes of the 'Sons of the Clergy' and the 'Friend of the Clergy' Corporations which actually went to grants, as well as these grants' insufficiencies (pp.7-18).

135. The poor conditions of the clergy and the causes considered, with suggestions for remedying the same,1856 (see esp. pp.6-16); his The hardships and sufferings of the poor clergy (1862) is a long catalogue of cases from the books of the Poor Clergy Relief Society (it followed a successful similar volume of Starting
Jervis was concerned to create a national scheme of insurance and pensions, but he very quickly found that the poor clergy were too straitened to make even the smallest regular provision for old age, or for their families; and so the 'Poor Clergy Relief Society' took its place as yet another charity, dealing out sums usually of £5-15 to clergy who were desperate for immediate relief, and also running a large clothing department which sent out secondhand and donated clothing and material. When in 1891 there was criticism of the charities on the lines of the Charity Organisation Society - too much in 'doles', not enough to encourage 'self-help' - they were forcefully repudiated by Archdeacon Smith: he objected to this wholesale denunciation 'of what had been termed doles, for those who did not really know what straitened circumstances were little imagined the wonderful alleviation this assistance meant to the poorer Clergy, whom they frequently saw struggling with undeserved poverty.'

F.n. 135 continued.

facts ...): the P.C.R.S. was advertised also in a quite stringent pamphlet [by A.J. Penny] A neglected line of study strongly recommended to the rich (1860).

136. Ch.C. 1893, p.247: this is the only such explicit reference that I have noticed, though I imagine it was largely true.

137. Jervis's proposed Fund was outlined at the end of the 1856 pamphlet: he described the abandonment of the Fund and the charitable work in 1861 (C.C.R. 1861, pp.124-5, and prefatory note to Hardships and sufferings).

138. In this it was paralleled by at least one other society, 'The clothing society for the benefit of poor pious clergymen and their families' (100 years in the P.P.C. 1820-1919, Worcester, 1920). By 1897 Jervis's 'Society' was a 'Corporation', very highly patronised, and had an income of £10,000 p.a. - though that year they discovered near-peculation in the clothing department, at a rate of about £400 p.a. (Report, 1897, esp. pp.10-11, and balance sheets for next 2 years).

139. Ch.C., 1891, pp.282, 284 and 285.

140. Ibid., p.284.
Jervis was one of many who saw the problem in the context of the need for a larger scheme, and this will be discussed more fully below in relation to the issue of pensions. But by the 1890s, as would be expected, there was a growing feeling that rural poverty was here to stay, and that radical measures might be needed. In 1902 a strong Committee of the Lower House of Convocation suggested that in many areas benefices should be united, and the pastoral load rationalised, thus at last grasping the nettle of country parishes both too small to provide full work and now too poor to support clergy; though the bishops were sceptical about the success of this policy. The only purely urban problem of the moment, which somewhat qualified the general picture of the growing advantage of the towns, was the diminution in pew rents as city areas lost their middle-class inhabitants to newer suburbs. It was ironic, after decades of vocal opposition to pew-rents on grounds both practical and theoretical, to find the 1902 committee rather regretting their wholesale abolition, and writing that the 'penny-a-seat system of continental churches has much to be said in its favour.'

What kept the clergy - and hence the parochial system as a whole, to a large extent - afloat financially, was the amount of their

141. Convocation Report No.369, 'Clerical Poverty', pp.5-7 and 12-13 (its predecessor of 10 years earlier, No.269 on 'Diminished incomes of the clergy', 1892, had dismissed this option, p.2). The suggestion was easily accepted by the Lower House (Ch.C. 1902, pp.268-70), but not by the bishops (ibid., pp.289-92): unions were not substantially eased until 1919 and 1923 (Best, op. cit., p.509).

142. Examples through the century include: John Moore, op. cit. (note 108), esp. pp.11-16; J.W. Bowden, A few remarks on pews, 1843; H. Clark, The pew system in the National Church ..., 1869. They were strongly criticised also, inter alia, by W.J. Conybeare in his 'Church Parties' article (Edinburgh Review, Vol.98, Oct. 1853, p.309), and by Sandford in The mission and extension of the Church at home (1862), pp.176-80 (with supporting Note, pp. 322-40).

143. Report No.369, pp.10-11; see also debates, Ch.C. 1902, pp.273-4, 296 and 300.
private means. The fact was generally acknowledged in the mid-century years. Indeed it was asserted that the official incomes of the clergy were less in total than their private incomes; W.J. Conybeare was able to duplicate in his own neighbourhood a little experiment of Sydney Smith's and also found that the clergy had as much (or more) of their income from their own as from ecclesiastical sources. It is of course highly doubtful if the experiment would have revealed a similar result in a large town, but Conybeare's general conclusion seems to have been broadly accurate: he reckoned that few clergymen lived on less than £500 p.a., largely their own: 'Thus', he went on, 'the clergy, while poor as a profession, are rich as a class; a fact which goes far to account for the popular notions of "the vast wealth of the Church".' Arthur Ashwell, in 1874, wrote that the greatly increased number of livings available, through both new parish creations and the freeing of pluralities, 'had induced vastly more laymen of some private means to seek Holy Orders than otherwise would have done so. This is practically a supplementary endowment ...' These men included, perhaps most obviously of all, the curates who served on nominal incomes. It was evidently seen as a positive attraction that such men could give their time and work free from the constraints of formal

146. Ibid., p.105: Edward Steere, a critic of the clergy's worldly standards, opined that 'an average English clergyman cannot live comfortably on less than £400 or £500 - and can easily spend £1000 in merely maintaining his position': R.M. Heanley, Memoir of Bishop Steere, 1888, p.93 (and 94).
149. Many took 5/- p.a., which saved the stamp duty on the licence
reward; the future rector of one of them thought that 'It would be a discouragement to men of fortune were this impossible.'

The large incidence of private means both reflected and reinforced a distinctly old-fashioned view of the Church as a profession. This was classically expressed in a Times leader of 5 September 1867. It had argued that incumbents, being now much more hard-working than of yore, ought to be better rewarded; but it was 'an idle speculation' to think of all livings being raised to a level sufficient to fully support their clergy:

> the church will always remain more or less like the Army. The value of a living is like the value of a commission. The standing, the authority, the opportunities which are given by an incumbency or a captaincy are actually worth the sacrifice of money ... officers do not expect to live upon their pay, and incumbents, in the same way, do not expect to live upon their tithes or stipends. So long as the Church, like the Army, is an honourable profession ... there will be plenty of men to enter the ranks of each for the mere sake of the profession, and bringing their private means to its service.

Town livings ought indeed to be brought up to, say, £300 p.a. ('a sort of minimum captain's pay'), but not all need to be so augmented: its comment here is again worth quoting:

> Many a little country living is like a little estate, and there are plenty of people with money of their own who will always be only too glad to play the spiritual country gentleman at their own expense. It is an excellent employment for their time and money ...

---

F.n. 149 continued.

(G.W.E. Russell, Arthur Stanton. A memoir, 1917, p.37: they still had, however, to solemnly pledge to receive it quarterly in equal instalments, as examples in the ordination papers show).

150. There are letters from men anxious to ensure the correct paperwork for gratuitous service in the Oxford ordination papers (i.e., 'Is it necessary for me to receive some stipend and would a merely nominal one suffice?', E.R. Massey, in Sept. 1871; and several others).

151. Case of A.N. West, who thought his not taking a stipend meant that he needed no nomination either ('I am simply going ... as
In the 1920s and 1930s the passing of the view that the Ministry was 'a partly paid profession only' was often referred to by the editor of Crockford, who (rightly) saw this as presenting a new and heavy problem of Church finance.\textsuperscript{153}

In a discussion, in August 1854, of the Alcester Clerical Association, a 'difference of opinion was expressed as to the degree of estimation in which honest poverty was held, some contending that it raised, others that it lowered the clergy in public opinion.'\textsuperscript{154} All the evidence suggests that the latter was the realistic view. Material substance was regarded as a valuable, almost a necessary prop to the clergyman's authority - and those who lacked it felt this most strongly of all.\textsuperscript{155} The results were twofold: first, there was the loss of usefulness and influence among the poor incurred from their inability to support the upkeep of the Church, and the charities and the destitute of the parish; and second, there was the 'loss of influence in society' resulting from their inability to take their places, with comfortable equality, in the social and intellectual life.

\textsuperscript{F.n. 151 continued.} a volunteer': letter to Davenport, 28 Aug. 1872): his Rector seemed concerned that West and others like him might be put off by the paperwork (Sept. 1872 ordination).

152. The occasion was its publication of figures for stipends and population on the previous day (see above, note 60).

153. Crockford prefaces: the editor looks back (1947), esp. pp.78, 117-8 and 135: he was very worried about the strain of having to make every post in the Church carry 'a living wage.'


155. To cite two of the clergy's shrewdest delineators: George Eliot, in Scenes of clerical life (People's Library, ed., 1909), stressed Amos Barton's lack of authority as largely due to his poverty (p.57), and later nicely described the present (i.e. c.1858) Rector of Milby as appealing 'to the consciences of his hearers with all the immense advantages of a divine who keeps his own carriage ...' (p.242): and of course, Trollope's Josiah Crawley, who could have borne the scorn of the unfaithful 'if only the faithful would have believed in him, poor as he was, as they would have believed in him had he been rich!' (Last Chronicle, p.118).
of their better-off neighbours. 156

Given such conditions, it was natural to find that the possession of private means was becoming, certainly after the 1860s, to be seen as almost a **sine qua non** for the acceptance of a benefice. It has already been noticed that the Curates' Augmentation Fund found that lack of the means necessary to accept livings was the major reason for clergy's remaining curates, 157 and A.M. Deane wrote that livings of less than £200 p.a. 'cannot be accepted with prudence by men without private means.' 158 In an 1876 sermon Bishop Mackarness of Oxford waxed rather bitter on the subject:

> Our idolatry of wealth imposes on those who have to choose the minister of a parish a new necessity. The patron must find a pastor of souls whose worldly substance is sufficient to enable him to spend freely ... he must prove to the satisfaction of a hungry society that he brings with him private resources sufficient to enable him to save their pockets and command their conventional respect. 159

By the 1890s this was a commonplace. Introducing the Report whose findings are summarised in Appendix, Table 14, Frederick Temple emphasised the need to bring all the livings of between £100 and £200 p.a. up to the latter figure - the poorer ones already relied upon men

156. Both points well put in E.L. Cutts, On Church extension ... (1860), p.18, and [A.J. Penny], op. cit., pp.13-17. It is hardly necessary to say that clerical poverty seemed to endanger standards of entry too: in 1880 E.R. Wilberforce, after some nice comments on 'This miserable cant and hypocritical twaddle about the necessity of poverty for developing the virtues of the clergy', continued: 'It would be a fateful day for the Church of England when she should be obliged to recruit her ministry from men of lower education or social standing. Hence this question of clerical incomes was one of really pressing importance ...' (A.G.M. of A.C.S., in Home Mission Field, July 1880, p.82).


158. In The Church and her curates, p.83.

159. 'The dangers of wealth', the Commemoration Sunday sermon before the University, 1876: quoted in C.C. Mackarness, Memorials of the episcopate of John Fielder Mackarness (1892), p.226.
of private means; and as the Archbishop (Benson) said, you could spend a lot of money raising all such to £100 p.a., 'and still you would be obliged to find a man with means to undertake the living.' In 1901 two of the Welsh bishops made it clear that virtually all private patronage depended upon private means, and for the simple reason that without them neither the parish 'machinery' nor the parsonage houses could be kept up. A.R. Whitham, in a book largely aimed at young men intending ordination, wrote in 1902 that 'it is only those who have incomes of their own, and are willing to spend them, who can accept [the Church's] benefices.'

There was considerable unease at this situation, both on the grounds of its theoretical unattractiveness, and of its practical dangers. The theoretical difficulty was obvious enough: it was distasteful, at the very least, to have financial considerations loom so large in questions involving the cure of souls. W.A. Whitworth, in an 1897 sermon, was unrestrained in his denunciation: 'Already it has come to this, that the most influential positions for spiritual work are necessarily reserved for men with an ample patrimony ... It seems very like selling the pastoral office', and he repeatedly

160. Ch.C. 1893, pp.277 and 281. 3 years before, 'A Curate' had set off a correspondence in the Times by putting some of the blame for clerical poverty on the bishops, whom he accused of recklessly appointing men without means to their poor livings (7 April 1890, 1ld).

161. Ch.C. 1901, pp.141 (A.G. Edwards) and 148-9 (W.H. Williams). By this stage it was widely-recognised that the over-large parsonages of many parishes were a growing burden: in the Oxford diocese, 88 of the 363 parsonages built between 1840 and 1876 had cost £2,000 or more, including 12 of £4,000 plus (P.P. 1876, Vol.58, Church-building return, pp.601-7). A. Savidge records a revealing incident in 1900 when the Q.A.B. were persuaded to allow additions to a house already too large for the living, by the argument 'that the patron would always appoint a man with private means' (The parsonage in England: its history and architecture, 1964, p.153, and Chap. 4, passim).

emphasised the danger of restricting ordination to the well-off.\footnote{163} And even where a poor man took a living, if his predecessor had been a man of means he faced great difficulties: either he threw out the parish finances by drying up the flow of funds, or he straitened himself by attempting to maintain them.\footnote{164} Mackarness, for all his obvious dislike of this enforced limitation on free choice, must have had it to the fore in his appointment of T.H. Archer-Houblon to Wantage.\footnote{165} Butler had spent most of the large income (some £800 p.a. in the 1840s) on curates, schools and charities, and 'had he been destitute of private means he could not have carried out his work.'\footnote{166} Wantage had become a model; its work could not be allowed to slip merely because the new Vicar needed more of its income for himself. Archer-Houblon was not nearly so distinguished a man as Butler,\footnote{167} but he was able to keep up the staff despite the declining income of the living (the net proceeds gradually sank to less than £400 p.a.).\footnote{168}

\footnote{163} The claims of religion and charity. A sermon, p.10: the whole is useful on this subject. (He also had a nice line in page top summaries: 'Shall the Rich only be Ordained?' 'Shall Celibacy be required?' 'Grotesque Schemes of Philanthropy compete with the Support of Religion', etc.).

\footnote{164} The Church and her curates, pp.108-9: Convocation Report No.369, 'Clerical poverty', p.4. The process is well described in Flora Thompson's Lark Rise to Candleford (1973 ed.), pp.424-6 and 525.

\footnote{165} See above, p.419.

\footnote{166} As he recalled later: Life and letters of William John Butler (1898), p.354: at least in his early days - his father had gone bankrupt, though he later regained prosperity - the money must have been mostly his aristocratic wife's (pp.19 and 26).

\footnote{167} Though he became Archdeacon of Oxfordshire and Canon of Christ Church on his resignation of Wantage in 1903, and held these positions until 1921, when he retired. His only publication, apart from a memorial sermon for Butler, is most unimpressive (Chapter 67 - on schools - in N. Keymer, ed., Workers together with God, 4th ed. 1900); but he was obviously personable, and devotedly conscientious (obituaries, Oxford Times 25 Nov. 1933, and Times, same date, 19b).

\footnote{168} Visitation Returns, 1893-1902: almost the entire income was from T.R.C., which was yielding little over £500 p.a. by 1902: rates and taxes of over £100 headed the list of deductions. The Vicar
The cost of the four of five curates alone far exceeded this sum, and it was explicit that he himself paid for them. There is no shortage of similar examples.

But the situation was dangerous, too, for it also became customary to note the decline in the number of wealthy men taking orders. This was remarked in the sober paragraphs of a Convocation Report in 1887, and in 1893 Prebendary Salmon, speaking in that assembly, expressed concern for the consequences: 'It was not desirable that the acceptance of the small livings should be dependent on men with private incomes. The number of men with private incomes now being ordained was not so great as it used to be.' Bishop Stubbs, although grateful for the fact that at Oxford much of the work was carried on through the expenditure of private means, yet cautioned his clergy that 'it is not fair that we have to depend on this. And it is not wise to depend upon its continuing to be

---

F.n. 168 continued.

was helped by contributions from the Sisters and £50 p.a. p.a. stipend as workhouse chaplain (such small chaplaincies held with livings were not unknown. Though in the samples clergy there are only a dozen or so known cases).

169. Especially clear in Returns of 1899 and 1902.

170. To name only men already mentioned here: S. Wilberforce reckoned he had drawn no more than £400 p.a. from the nearly £1,300 income of Alverstoke (Ashwell and Wilberforce, op. cit., Vol.1, pp.273-4): the Wagners at Brighton virtually financed its church extension: when John Gott was Vicar of Leeds 'it was generally understood that more than the income [c.£1200] which he derived from the living was dispensed in charity ...' (Yorkshire Post, 23 July 1904): and Walsham How was effectively independent of his episcopal stipend at Wakefield (F.D. How, op. cit., pp.319-20).

171. No.219, on 'Clergy Pensions', referred to 'the fact [that] the Clergy ... bring much less private wealth into the Church than they did fifty years ago ...', p.6.

172. Ch.C, 1893, pp.240-1: see also Reports No.369, p.3, and No.383, ' Readers and Sub-deacons', 1904, p.3.

And he recalled how, 50 years before, the Church was largely recruited by men of fortune, attracted by its relatively good remuneration - a state of affairs that had passed, and was unlikely to return.

No attempt has been made here to calculate the wealth of the clergy; but a brief survey of some examples may shed light on the standards and scales that are involved. First, however, there is one small but useful study, which analysed the fortunes left in Cambridgeshire, 1848-1857. In this study Vincent showed both the extreme concentration of capital, and the fact that the concentration was in the hands overwhelmingly of the 'genteel', rather than in those of the day-to-day producers and dealers. The figures are presented very simply; but they yield some relevant results. First, the 39 clergy involved had both the highest average size of fortune (£10,600) and the highest median (£2000) - with the small exception of the Cambridge Heads of Houses and Professors, the ten of whom left fortunes averaging over £25000, and who were as a group by far the richest of all. The difference between the clergy's median and average fortunes were also the largest (with a ratio of 1:5.3), which indicates the widest disparity in any group between the modest majority and the wealthy few. It meant that 18 clergy died leaving less than £2000, a sum that, invested normally, would yield about £60-£90 p.a., barely

---

174. Ibid., p.271 (1896). D. Maclean, 'The Church as a profession', National Review, Vol.33 (Aug. 1899): 'a state of things under which the clergy support the Church is not defensible, and cannot be relied upon to continue' (p.952). It was most unfair of all when men of modest means were virtually trapped in small livings, which just enabled them to survive, but made it quite impossible to use their own money to provide for their families: A.R. Lloyd, Church of England Vicarages (1873), passim, and J.C, 1902, p.101 ('Our private means ... are practically impounded by the Church').

175. Such a task would, its own difficulties aside, be somewhat pointless unless other groups were analysed also, for comparison.

176. By J.R. Vincent, in Pollbooks. How Victorians voted,
sufficient to provide for a respectable widowhood. On the other hand, the 18 who had over £2,000 shared a sum that gave them an average fortune of over £21,000; and, unless the distribution was very odd, that group in turn probably contained several relatively modest fortunes, as well as a number of very large ones indeed. If one recalls that most if not all of the Heads of Houses and Professors from the University would have been clergymen too, it is clear that ordained men made up a considerable proportion of the wealthiest men in the county. This sample cannot bear too much extrapolation; but it may be a guide to the position in the agricultural areas, in the early part of the reign, indicating that most clergy were men of only modest means, but also that the clergy were substantially represented in the ranks of the rich.

The largest fortune among the 27 clergy followed up, was the £45,533 of J.B.M. Butler, already noted as a man who presented himself to a comfortable Sussex living in 1872. But before looking further, sufficient to provide for a respectable widowhood. On the other hand, the 18 who had over £2,000 shared a sum that gave them an average fortune of over £21,000; and, unless the distribution was very odd, that group in turn probably contained several relatively modest fortunes, as well as a number of very large ones indeed. If one recalls that most if not all of the Heads of Houses and Professors from the University would have been clergymen too, it is clear that ordained men made up a considerable proportion of the wealthiest men in the county. This sample cannot bear too much extrapolation; but it may be a guide to the position in the agricultural areas, in the early part of the reign, indicating that most clergy were men of only modest means, but also that the clergy were substantially represented in the ranks of the rich.

The largest fortune among the 27 clergy followed up, was the £45,533 of J.B.M. Butler, already noted as a man who presented himself to a comfortable Sussex living in 1872. But before looking further,
it is important to note the possibility of being misled by the simple probate figure; it must be remembered that until 1898 the figures only took account of gross unsettled personalty and freeholds, with unsettled land also from then to 1925: this therefore excluded most landed estates, and much money held in trust. 183 One glaring case of the distortion this could lead to is that of Constantine Griffith Wodehouse, whose aristocratic background has been described. 184 He was the conscientious, if autocratic ruler of two small Oxfordshire parishes, Mongewell from 1879 to 1892, and Langford from then till his death in 1911. 185 At his first two parishes he restored the church; he was a strong High Churchman, and his intimate friends included Butler of Wantage and Edward King, Bishop of Lincoln from 1885 to 1910. 186 He left only £444 in 'effects'. Evidently he was not so poor, and doubtless he had possessed either real property, or at least a life interest in trusts or property; his widow later left £4,714.

In other cases, the will makes the position clear. Richard Collins was a distinguished scholar and linguist, one of the five clerical sons of the prominent West Riding Evangelical Richard Collins, whom he succeeded as Vicar of Kirkburton. He left only £208; but his

183. W.D. Rubinstein, 'British Millionaires, 1809-1949', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, Vol.47 (1974), p.204. In Bateman's Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland (1883, repub. Leicester 1971), there are a total of 76 'Rev.'s shown with over 3,000 acres and £3,000 p.a. and a further 48 with over 2,000 acres and £2,000 p.a. (out of 2,500 and 1,320, respectively): though Bateman gave the prefix to all denominations (pp.526-7) it is certain that virtually all of these were Anglican. In 1856 there had been 10 titled clergy with seats in the Lords, and 29 clerical baronets (Times, 8 Jan. 1856, 10b).

184. Above, p.300.

185. Mongewell was a tiny Thames-side parish wholly owned by the Price family (the patrons): there were no inhabitants (of 160) to remotely challenge the sway of Rector and Patron; the Vestry Book (Mss. D. Par Mongewell d.3) shows that parish and church affairs were conducted entirely by a tiny group of farmers under the Rector. Langford was a more scattered parish, with considerable
will refers to other 'estates vested in me upon trust or by way of mortgage.' Perhaps some of these were from a marriage settlement, for these certainly were not included in the probate sum, a fact clear from two other cases. In the clearer of these, that of Frederick Campbell Barham, the probate figure was under £1,500 (he died in June 1920): but his will mentions £6,133 in 3% London and Northern Western debenture stock 'to which I am absolutely entitled under or by virtue of' the marriage settlement. As his wife was the eldest child of John Walter of Bear Wood, the massive pile not far from the poorly-endowed parish (Knowl-Hill) which Barham held from 1884 to his death, it becomes clear that it would be most misleading to take the probate figure as a true guide to his financial state.

Having said this, it must not be thought that these figures are worthless; in fact, apart from the exceptions noted, there seems little reason to doubt - given the evidence of their wills, and of the other biographical evidence - that the rest give a reasonable idea of the wealth of these clergy; they just must not be taken as absolute. And judging from contemporary comment, money by virtue of marriage is the most likely hidden component. To be borne in mind, as a qualification to the disapproving chorus of comment about 'imprudent
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Dissent, but again parish affairs remained the preserve of a very small group (Visitatio n Returns, Directories). From 1863-9 he had held a Rectory in Norfolk, the Kimberley's county.

186. He died 7 March 1911; there is an obituary in the Guardian.

187. He was the eldest son: his father was Vicar from 1843-82, a long-time member of the Elland Society, and constant provider of titles to ordination. Richard junior spent many years in India and Ceylon; he was a skilful painter and sculptor, an antiquarian and a Past Provincial Grand Master of the W. Yorks. Freemasons (Venn, M.E.B. Vol.4, Yorkshire Post, 2 Nov. 1900).

188. The other, that of William Bickham Banting, does not specify the amount of the settlement (which was his, after his first wife
marriages', are statements like that of a commentator who wrote in 1854 that 'Since Waterloo ... the black coat has had the pick of the matrimonial market ... Clerical matches in England are invariably, in some or other of the matrimonial eligibilities, in the gentleman's favour.' And when H.P. Thomas was explaining, in 1887, why the clergy were not wholly dragged down by the disasters of their glebes, he pointed to the 'one fortunate circumstance in the condition of the clergy, namely, that so very many of them who have badly-endowed livings have well-endowed wives.' Not all the wives of the sample clergy were followed up, but, with the possible exception of Fincher, none of the poor men appear to have been made substantially less poor by marriage. The contemporary comment cannot be ignored; but it is not improbable that the best of these clerical matches were made by clergy who were not wholly without advantages, social and financial, in the first place.

Two of the better-off clergy in this small sample seem to be typical of the use of private means to support poor parishes. The first is James Munro Sandham, whose long tenure of two small Sussex parishes has been mentioned. He was the third son of a wealthy

F.n. 188 continued.

189. Marriage details from Burke L.G., sub Walter: also Barham was of a distinguished family (both father and grandfather are in D.N.B., the father being a prominent Truro physician, antiquarian and geologist): he had himself taught for 4 years at Epsom College, the school founded for doctors' sons, before going on to Cuddesdon, and ordination (at 27) in 1872 (Venn).

190. Quarterly Review, Vol.96 (Dec. 1854), p.127; H.B. Thomson, op. cit., p.75. In Barchester Towers Bertie Stanhope maintained that 'wives with money a'nt so easy to get now-a-days; the parsons pick them all up' (Everyman ed., 1975, p.118).


192. See above, pp.386-8.

193. Above, n.52.
soldier, of Rowdell House, near Pulborough in Sussex. Sandham spent his whole career, bar a few months in Oxfordshire, in his home county; his two livings, from 1846, were also near Pulborough, so that he was within a couple of miles of the family home. Their combined acreage was less than 1,900, their population below 600, and the income was only £122, gross. Sandham was the ideal man for such livings. He built a parsonage (a relatively modest Gothic house which cost about £1,000), bought a little land, and lived quite simply with two women servants, and employing a gardener. He left over £14,500, as well as some land - including, oddly, the freehold site on which stood the once-notorious Crockford's Club in Piccadilly.

Sandham was not a nonentity, but he lived a very quiet and unspectacular life. Rather more controversial was William Charles Macfarlane, son of an East India officer, who was ordained at the age of 36, in 1853. Three years later he was appointed to the decayed market town of Dorchester, a poor living whose previous incumbent had

194. The father, Major Charles Freeman Sandham, died in 1869, leaving 'under £30,000' - he was succeeded by the eldest son, George (an honorary General: M.E.B. Vol.3) who left over £60,000 in 1887: the second son died young (Venn).

195. Directories, Crockford, will (his parish property consisted of a fir plantation and 2 houses - known as 'Church House' and 'Church Cottage': details of the parsonage in W.S.R.O., Ep.1/41/72).

196. He had a B.A. from Oriel, but I have not found out his intervening employment. He was to leave over £11,900, and he had at least one (clerical) brother who died shortly after he did, leaving over £8,000 (and he was not a beneficiary of William's will).

197. Excellently described in the V.C.H., Oxon., Vol.7 (1962), pp. 39-64; though the town was decayed, the parish included good land, well farmed. By 1874 St John's College, Oxford, was the largest owner, with some 1,000 acres. The population rose from 900 in 1801 to nearly 1100 in 1861, then declined again to be less than 950 by 1907 (pp.48-51).
been over-generous to Church causes and had got into the hands of money-lenders. Macfarlane had no such troubles, and he raised (and obviously largely gave) some £15,000 for the restoration of the great church. He was an uncompromising and combative High Churchman, and had troubles with protestant church-people; but he did build up a large congregation, and he established Dorchester as a centre for Anglo-Catholicism in the area; he also was largely responsible for the foundation of Dorchester College, which trained missionaries. He was said by an admiring obituarist to be 'on principle simple in his habits and frugal in the management of his household' - but his was by far the largest and wealthiest household in the parish.

198. The living was augmented piecemeal during the century, but was still only £100 p.a. when Macfarlane took it (Crockford, V.C.H. p.55). The story of his predecessor is given in the 2nd 'Diocese Book' (d.178) (he had liabilities of £6,000, and an estate of £600 p.a.).

199. One of these disputes is well documented, and it shows both how obviously offensive Macfarlane's innovations in the church were, to protestants, and his high-handed way with opposition (dispute in 1861 with W.S. Blackstone, ex-Protectionist M.P. for Wallingford: cuttings in 3rd 'Diocese Book' (b.70), and a pamphlet by Blackstone, The chancel and the surplice, with their abuses ... (Oxford, 1861)). Macfarlane also appears in Walter Walsh's Secret history of the Oxford Movement (3rd ed., 1898), discussing the confessional with other members of the Society of the Holy Cross (p.74-5).

200. V.C.H., p.56: Visitation returns (his congregation was over 500, and communicants totalled well over 200).

201. In his will he left £500 and most of his books to 'the College established by me at Dorchester' (it became a well-known Anglo-Catholic centre under Darwell Stone).

202. Guardian, 25 Nov. 1885. He had built the parsonage in 1857 for £1,750 (3rd Diocese Book). In 1871 he lived there with 2 female relatives (both 'annuitants'), served by a staff of 3 female and 1 male resident servants (Census enumerator's book). In his last years Macfarlane abandoned the Liberal Party and gave 'valuable aid' to the Tories (Oxford Times, 21 Nov. 1885).
The last of these examples of wealthy clergy, Edmund Savory, is a case of a man whose means (he left nearly £17,900) helped him to keep up a parish that, not unlike Wantage, had something of a reputation to sustain. This was Binfield in Berkshire, to which Savory was ordained in 1853, and where he spent his whole clerical life, six years as curate, 44 years as Rector. It was the parish of James Randall, Archdeacon of Berkshire and one of Bishop Wilberforce's best allies and friends, and in 1859 Savory, who had married a daughter of Randall's, became Rector on his father-in-law's resignation. Randall had many years to live, and presumably had assurances that his son-in-law would be the new Rector of this quite valuable Lord Chancellor's living (over £600 p.a. gross). Savory built a mission church, and laboured hard to maintain a Tractarian model; over the years one sees from his Returns how he seemed slowly to lose his buoyant hopes. The poor he never really reached, the major part of the congregation was from the large residential houses which were a notable feature of the parish. From the 1880s these began to fail him, and in the later years he always complained of the 'bad example of the gentry' in reducing Church

203. Crockford; James Randall is in M.E.B., Vol. 3; b.1790, he had been a barrister before taking orders: 'His legal training was invaluable from a business point of view ... He was one of the few among the Bishop's advisers who could provide the wisdom of comparative old age' (Pugh, The episcopate of Samuel Wilberforce ... , D.Phil., 1957, p.119). On Binfield as a model parish, 'Diocese Book', d.178.

204. The pubs and their associated activities (including Sunday gambling) were a constant source of complaint. In 1875 he wrote that 'The Poor are very rare attendants'; later the parish was encroached upon by brickfields, with 'a consequent influx of people who go nowhere' (1884).

205. The parish was only enclosed from Windsor Forest in 1817, and all Directories emphasise the presence of a large number of big residential houses. In the 1899 Kelly's Directory of Berks, Bucks and Oxon no fewer than 9 of Berks' 250 or so 'Principal Seats' were in the parish.
attendance, and of the growing tendency to devote Sundays to amusements. Clearly he carried the cost of the parish: it yielded, after necessary expenses, only about £230 in the 1890s. Like Archer-Houblon he could not keep up the standards set by his predecessor; changing middle-class habits and mores defeated them both.

These three were all men whose means made possible their parochial work. Others might be cited - J.E. Brigg, for instance, or the largely non-active C.R. Powys. All these clergy, who possessed at least £10,000 at death, were men whose (usually inherited) means alone could support a respectable independent life, and who could thus afford to take any living they were offered (or could purchase). There was a further number who left £2-8,000, sums which could at least sustain a widow or a sister, and provide a most useful supplement to the income of a living. Several of these men have been mentioned already: the college fellows, J.M. Holland ("under

206. Part of the problem was a high turnover - few of the houses seemed to hold the same families for long. There was also a problem when the neighbouring Easthampstead Park, seat of the Downshires, was let during a long minority to 'a Romanist' (Return, 1884). Complaints about upper-class slackness of attendance begin in 1890.

207. Return, 1893 (thereafter he tended to leave out the taxes: that year, rates, taxes and costs of collection took over £190 of the £645 gross: curates took another £218).

208. Archer-Houblon, whose returns were rather terse, similarly remarked a declining sense of obligation about church attendance (1899, 1902) - and both of them particularly referred to people coming only once, not twice; so it was the most respectable church-goers who were falling away, rather than any great loss of total attendance.

209. Above, pp.311-2 and 386 (n.164), respectively.

210. See Chapter five, end of section 1.
Chittendon, left less than £2,000 (net only £573); perhaps his troubles with the glebe (it was unlet at the end of his life) depleted his means. S.P. Lampen, whose career took him steadily to the modest comfort of a country rectory of £350 p.a., left over £6,000, more than he could have saved, so presumably he inherited or married at least some of this. Edwin James Ramskill, who lived very quietly, first as curate and later as Vicar of Holy Trinity, which served a poor area of Knaresborough, left some £3,432 when he died at 73 years of age: son of a modest 'Chemist and Druggist' in Leeds, he had a B.A. from St Catharine's Cambridge; for 37 years he received £300 p.a. from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and as he was certainly childless, and probably a bachelor, such a sum might have been saved by him. Overall it is difficult to see that any but the most dazzlingly fortunate of Victorian clergymen made much money from the Church; no family man can have set aside much, given his expected style of life and outgoings, on £300 p.a. or less. Most of the wills were businesslike and hardly described the goods involved: but a few were more forthcoming, and these help to remind one that even men leaving a fairly modest fortune might have led a life of cluttered middle-class comfort; and that though not much might be saved, a beneficed clergyman who was not burdened with too large a

211. Visitation return, Kirtlington, 1887: at that time his 176 acre farm had already been on his hands unlet for 9 months (previously let at £297 p.a.).

212. Above, pp.412-3. His father left 'under £300' (Francis Lampen, proved 1871).

213. Venn, Crockford, will.

214. The wills of Banting and, especially, Robert Gill Irving (see above, p.413), are the most evocative: the former's goods were dignified - stuffed birds, a good library, sets of silver - the latter's thoroughly middle-class: odds and ends of silver, lots of presentations from parishioners, albums of 'photographic views'
family, at least led a life of fair material comfort, both in absolute terms, and relative to the great bulk of the population.

The bulk of the aid given by clergy charities actually went to widows and orphans, and despite a great and often well-founded concern for the circumstances of the poor clergy themselves, these appear to have been the real problem. Schemes of life insurance and pensions often went together, and will be discussed together in the next section: but it is perhaps worth enumerating very briefly some cases which illustrate the problem of dependants. W.D. Underwood, whose undistinguished but steady career has been described, left under £1,900: it is probable that his life was largely determined by the presence of a spinster sister and an aged mother; the latter lived with him in the unassuming household at West Wittering, the former was the major beneficiary of his will; it is not difficult to believe that his duty to these women had much to do with his quiet bachelor life. But those who died with very little, leaving widows, must sometimes have left them to lives of real insecurity. Richard Judd was 44 at his death in 1873; he left 'under £1,000' to his widow - it is not known if he had children. He had had little chance to provide for his family; son of a Lincolnshire butcher, he had attended St Aidan's, and was 33 at his ordination in March 1863. He was evidently a man of some will and talent, for he gained his B.A. from Corpus, Cambridge, while serving as a curate in the town, and in
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...from tours (very conventionally) in Switzerland, Scotland, and 'Cornwall, Bournemouth and the neighbourhood'; the list covers 1½ typed folio pages. His is also the only will to begin with a profession of faith, ending, 'I thus die in communion with the dear old Church of England'; fit language for a man who supported the Primrose League, as 'something more than a political organisation ... [aiming] to support Church, Queen and State' (R. Mitchell, Brighouse: birth and death of a Borough, Driffield 1976, p.66).

216. Crockford, Venn, ordination papers (Ripon) March 1863, and will.
1870 he was appointed first incumbent of an expensive new church, St Mary's in Halifax. In three years he 'succeeded in gaining a very large congregation who during his ministry have built commodious day and Sunday schools, having also nearly completed the erection of a vicarage ...'; the obituary made it clear that he was a respected figure, and commented that he had 'fallen a victim to overwork', succumbing to a brief illness. A promising career cut short, and little financially to show for it. Two other cases have been mentioned already, the two ex-Congregationalists, H. Edwards and W. Aston, who both died in 1891, leaving net estates of £388 and nil, respectively: both left children, as well as widows.

As the century drew to a close, the call for greater assistance to the clergy from the laity grew more insistent; it was not that lay help was not already substantial, but it tended to flow into church building rather than church endowment, as was often noted. This could be approached in two ways. One was by large schemes of re-endowment; there was never any shortage of such schemes, and two were set up, with royal patronage. The first, the Marquis of Lorne's Fund, started in 1873 with the aim of raising every living in the Church to £200 p.a. It was an almost total failure; it raised some £28,000 in its first few years, but virtually nothing for years

217. It cost its sole benefactor £9,000 (P.P. 1876, Vol.58, Churchbuilding Return, p.93).

218. Yorkshire Post, 21 April 1873.


220. J. Sandford, op. cit., p.81: the C.A.F. Report of 1900, with - in the circumstances - a telling restraint, drew a contrast between the expenditure on buildings and on men, ending, 'there are indications of luxury and even extravagance of expenditure in many well-to-do parishes which may not unreasonably call for some curtailment' (p.10).

221. There seemed to be a particular flurry in the early 1860s, clearly sparked off by the apparently huge possibilities of the careful use of benefactions met pound for pound by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners (Robert Gregory's scheme at Lambeth was the oft-
after. In 1897 another major fund was launched, the Queen Victoria Clergy Sustentation Fund, but it too completely failed to live up to expectations. The second approach was the more general one of seeking methods by which the laity could contribute directly to their clergy's upkeep. An obvious one was the offertory, increasingly common as a general method of church fund-raising, and by the end of the century becoming more widely used, in the form of 'Easter offerings', specifically for the support of the clergy.

The failure, or at least the slow and halting advance of these direct appeals, was based both upon unease among the clergy, and

F.n. 221 continued.


222. Its history can be followed from references in Convocation: i.e. Ch.C., 1873, pp.411 and 444-5; 1879, p.105 and Report on 'Sale of advowsons and the augmentation of small livings', pp.6-7 (its history) and 9-11 (Rules, etc.): it had then invested for endowment £28,151 - and according to the Year Book of 1888, it had only added £600 to this sum (p.428, as 'Incumbents' Sustentation Fund') though it also made 26 grants to poor incumbents: J.C. 1893, pp.28 and 31.

223. As is clear from Report No.369, p.11 (and Resolution 1), and Ch.C., 1903, pp.259-65. (In a comment reminiscent of those on the C.A.F., Canon Clayton of Peterborough said that people were somewhat confused by the Fund - was it charity or justice? - he pressed the latter case; pp.263-4).

224. Discussed in M.J.D. Roberts, The role of the laity in the Church of England, c.1850-1885, (D.Phil., 1974), pp.177-85: the offertory was pushed particularly, as he notes, by High Churchmen 'of a Gladstonian kind' - i.e., who wished for greater lay participation in Church life - but was also increasingly seen as the most effective form of fund-raising (pp.183-5).

225. Chadwick, V.C., Pt.2, p.169: A.M. Deane (by now Canon of Chichester) was apparently responsible for their first widespread revival, in the diocese of Chichester from 1891 (J.C., 1905, p.69). In the Year-Book's analysis of parochial income for 1895 (see note 71), 'Church collections and Easter offerings' made up 8.6% of Chichester's total, the highest proportion, just ahead of Liverpool, with London, Rochester and Chester not far behind: as would be expected, in the most rural dioceses it was still a negligible quantity, 1% or less in Ely, Hereford, Lincoln, Oxford, Peterborough, Salisbury and Truro (the figure for all dioceses was 2.8%).
uncertainties among the laity. The clergy simply were not (unless dependent upon pew rents) at all used to, or warm towards, the idea of any diminution in their independence of income. As the thoroughly sensible Miss Dunstable said to Mark Robarts (in Framley Parsonage), 'you clergymen are so proud ... that you won't take the money of common, ordinary poor people. You must be paid from land and endowments, from tithe and church property.'

It should be said that Trollope himself seemed to share the normal clerical prejudice in favour of the clergyman's 'essential' independence from his flock financially. Then, the clergy were said to lack the courage to broach the subject to their people. At least as serious, however, was the laity's apparent inability to realise their 'obligations' in this respect. 'The Laity of the Church of England had not been brought up to support their Clergy', as the Dean of Windsor (P.F. Eliot), succinctly put it in 1902. And their inability to learn the habit, as he had just pointed out, was largely because 'wealthy laymen ... did not in the least believe in clerical poverty.' This was, as Conybeare had long ago written, because the clergy, supported by their private means, simply did not seem poor. Furthermore, the very existence

227. Clergymen, pp.76-7: the offertory was seen as almost degrading by many clergy (i.e., C.C.R. 1864, p.164).
230. Ibid., p.259.
231. Above, p.463: D. Macleane had made this point in 1893: 'Many people indeed, looking round them on a fair amount of clerical comfort among the clergy, are sceptical as to the inadequacy of Church endowments', adding significantly 'and no figures convince the poor.' (National Review, Vol.33, Aug. 1899, p.952).
of endowments whose sheer size seemed to make it impossible to persuade the general public that they might yet be insufficient, 'had', a Westmoreland clergyman said in 1905, 'in many cases been a curse rather than a blessing. They closed pockets which would willingly be opened ...' At the senior level, certainly, the clergy seemed to have a clear view of the need for lay help by the beginning of the 20th century. But to little effect. Still in 1939 H.H. Henson, after over 20 years on the Bench, wrote that endowment 'had almost destroyed the sense of financial obligation in the parishioners. From time immemorial the parson's income has not entered into the sphere of the Anglican layman's recognized responsibility': hence their 'impressively small response' to appeals for clergy support.

The Victorian age had been exceptional. Before the great reforms that began it, the insufficiency of the Church's endowments was doubly obscured: by the wealth of those clergy who engrossed them so spectacularly, on the one hand; and by the acceptance, as normal in all history to date, of the poverty of most other clergy, incumbents and curates alike. The general improvement in benefice incomes resulting from enclosure and agricultural improvements, the augmentation work of the central Church finance bodies, and the influx of wealthy men into the Church, all raised expectations, and together created a plausible picture of a basically well-off clergy. Perhaps as important, the freeing of the pluralities, and the new conception of curacies as 'apprenticeships' which led in a reasonable time to

232. J.C., 1905, p.69 (Canon Trench, a strong supporter of direct local support). In 1853 the Times had called endowments 'in one sense [the Church's] greatest misfortune, for the reputation of wealth damps the generosity of those who are able and willing to aid it' (Leader, 22 June).

livings, made it at last seem possible - and hence right - that all
clergy should be rewarded sufficiently to maintain the now conventional,
gentlemanly status of their profession. Later, the Church ceased to be
so attractive to the educated and wealthy, and ceased to draw into
itself so much private wealth; a poorer clergy were left with a legacy
of lay disbelief about their needs, and of expectations (both lay and
clerical) as to their own social and material standards, which have
dogged them ever since.
3. RETIREMENT AND PENSIONS

Few of the Church’s problems exposed the ambiguities in the position of the clergy so clearly as that of providing for clerical retirement. With the possible exception of the plight of the curates, no other practical issue so clearly raised the question of how far the Church was corporately responsible for the welfare of the clergy. The Church fudged the issue of the curates, and the same may be said of pensions.

Until 1871 there was no provision at all for the retirement of beneficed clergy; it was in fact legally impossible for the clergy to resign on the assurance of pecuniary advantage. There were only the options of retirement upon individual means, and the recourse to charities: so the last years of the clergy were often spent 'either in unbeficed poverty or in beneficed senility', because, naturally enough, the beneficed clergy were accustomed to shelter behind their 'freehold' rather than cast themselves adrift from their assured incomes. W.G. Jervis’s two pamphlets of the mid-1850s argued that the Church was radically deficient in this respect:

---

234. Above, Chapter five, second section.

235. Pensions, given in the Middle Ages, were thus outlawed by this Elizabethan Act. Convocation Report, 'Pensions for disabled incumbents', Appendix 4 in Ch.C. 1868, p.2: the Act was 31 Eliz. cap.6 (sec.8).

236. B. Heeney, op. cit., p.116; the whole issue is also treated in an excellent brief survey by G.F.A. Best, op. cit., pp.505-6.

237. Hence not infrequent cases of immensely long incumbencies: H.P. Liddon was baptised by a man who held his living for 69 years, in succession to his father who had held it for the previous 70. (J. O. Johnston, Life and Letters of H.P. Liddon, 1904, p.3, n.2). The longest incumbency in my sample of clergy was 64 years.

238. See notes 133-5, above: both are relevant passim, though the opening paragraphs of the 1854 pamphlet are particularly clear on their general scope.
other professions (or rather, services, for it was the military, civil and East Indian establishments, as well as the Scottish Presbyterian churches, to which he mainly referred) had schemes for their aged servants, and particularly for widows and orphans: the Church, which had the means, had nothing but its unsatisfactory and wasteful scatter of charities. But as has been seen, his own great scheme for a compulsory contributory fund to provide pensions for widows, and in emergencies for the clergy themselves, became instead yet another charity; it came to the relief of clergy and their families who were too poor to make individual provision against accidents or death, or to withstand the debilitating effects of their chronically low incomes.

Jervis's was by no means the only voice raised in favour of some such scheme, but nothing was done. Individual provision for one's family by means of life insurance was rapidly becoming normal for the middle classes in the mid-century, and it was on this that the clergy had to rely. Barry Supple's description of the sort of person whose needs fuelled the growth of life insurance in Victorian Britain would apply to many, if not most clergy; he had 'an urgent need to fill the income gap which would be created by [his] death', and received 'a steady income but with his principal capital embodied in individual skills which would die with him.' He then cites the Clergy Mutual (1829) as the earliest of the profession-specific offices which were set up during the century. But as Jervis pointed out, many of the clergy could not afford the premiums, which accounted for its relatively small

---

239. He quoted several weighty names himself in the 1856 publication, pp.47-50: in 1864 two separate fund schemes were described in succession at the Church Congress (C.C.R. 1864, pp.225-7 and 230-2).

240. In The Royal Exchange Insurance. A history of British insurance 1720-1970 (Cambridge 1970), pp.113-5. Life insurance was the major concern at this time: 'assurance' proper was a later development, presumably a reflection of the late growth of a general expectation of retirement. See below, n.261.
small success in building up clerical policyholders. 241

Retirement was in effect one of the prerequisites of wealth, something that only men of means could consider. It is probable that this was true generally at this period. Only the government (and particularly in India) then offered a genuine pension scheme, though the military services' half-pay was often the same in effect: outside these areas, individual provision was expected - the alternative might have been seen as demeaning.

But, as the great growth of endowment assurance later in the century indicates, retirement was steadily becoming a normal middle-class expectation. The beneficed clergy in the samples analysed provide some indication of a partial change in this respect. (The unbeficed are not here considered, because it is not possible to distinguish between voluntary and involuntary lack of employment at the end of their careers: whereas any beneficed clergyman who gave up his living can be safely assumed to have done so voluntarily, and to be retired, rather than unemployed). The full figures would be redundant, for with three of the categories normally used, the results were so similar that they can without distortion be combined and summarised. The numbers of beneficed clergy who retired, among those ordained at Oxford and Chichester (except Fellows), and the non-Oxbridge Ripon ordinees, were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>11/37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>18/72</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>26/56</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>37/81</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

241. Clergy charity societies ..., pp.27-9: the premiums were gradually reduced, by way of bonus, but at 31 a man had to begin at £11-17-6 to assure £500. (The possibilities of life insurances - taken out on the lives of incumbents - as an aid to parish endowment excited some commentators in this period: both Cutts (op. cit., 1860, pp.30-1) and Bowditch (op. cit., 1864, pp.8-12) sketched large plans of this sort).
The change towards a fairly widespread retirement occurred most markedly among the Oxbridge graduates of the 1861-3 sample. Not surprisingly more of them retired than of the non-Oxbridge clergy, but the difference was not large in the last sample. 242

The remaining categories do not show quite the same pattern. The beneficed fellows exhibited an almost exactly opposite tendency; those of the first two periods quite often retired (23/57 did so), while only one of the fifteen in the two later periods died unbenefficed. The former result is predictable: fellows had the richest livings, and the best chance to save money before becoming incumbents, and hence it was easiest for them to retire upon their private incomes. The latter result is not so simply explained: but it may be suggested, first, that as less of these men were pastoral fellows such as had been common in the early years, most of them perhaps regarded their livings as in a sense pensions after their academic work: and second, that being now (though fewer) at least voluntary clergymen, not ordained merely as a concomitant of their fellowships, they may well have had a higher degree of commitment to their religious and pastoral duties than their pre-reform seniors. The other group, the Oxbridge graduates ordained at Ripon, differed from the rest by virtue of showing a consistently high rate of retirement in all periods (around one-half): the only oddity therefore is the relatively large number who retired, from the first two periods. There is no obvious explanation; a check of the men involved shows a number who were evidently well-off, while most of the rest were very old at retirement. The only thing that might account for the difference between this group and the Oxbridge

242. Then, 48% of the Oxbridge and 43% of the non-Oxbridge men retired from their livings. In 1861-3 the figures had been 59 and 23% respectively, the only really large difference in the four samples.
graduates ordained in the south, is that several of them retired from urban livings: perhaps men of similar means ensconced in rural livings (as the southern ordinees tended to be) preferred to live out their days in the quiet of their parishes, not feeling the need for change.

At any rate, it is worth noting that occasionally a rural living was used as a pension of sorts, for men whose life work had been in more strenuous posts. This, for instance, was evidently the case for two men ordained at Ripon within two months of each other in 1871-2. Ebenezer Bacon Rand, a son of the National schoolmaster at Haworth (and baptised by Patrick Bronte) spent much of his own life teaching and tutoring; but at 58 he began a dozen years as curate in two of the Oxford diocese's larger towns, Reading and Banbury; when he was 70 the Bishop presented him to the vicarage of Southleigh, which had an income of less than £200 p.a., but also a population of less than 300; he died as its vicar 15 years later. A much more distinguished man was Daniel William Barrett, who had written a successful account of his Life and Work among the Navvies (4th ed., 1885) and for 23 years held the Crown living of Chipping Barnet, where he ministered to over 3,000 people. At the age of 70, after many years as a rural dean, and five as an honorary canon of St Alban's, the Crown preferred him to the quiet rectory of Holdenby in Northamptonshire; there he had a net income of over £400 p.a., and a population of only 170; he too died in his post after 15 years.

243. Details from ordination papers (Dec. 1871), Crockford, Venn.
244. A T.C.D. man, son of a Bucks. 'farmer': ordination papers, Feb. 1872, and Crockford. (These two are not, incidentally, the only cases).
The Church took in all some sixty years to develop anything like to the 'Compulsory Clergy Pensions Fund and Clergy Widows and Orphans Fund' requested in a well-supported petition presented to Convocation, in May 1866. The committee set up in consequence reported in February 1868, and did not recommend anything so radical as a compulsory fund; it turned instead to the solution favoured by the bishops in 1857, of providing pensions from benefice incomes: the conservatism of this course lay in its continued reliance on endowment, with all its anomalies of distribution, and worse, its total inadequacy for the purpose in most cases. The committee was aware of the probable objections to its scheme - that it would face difficulties with patrons, whose livings would be reduced in value by the subtraction of a pension, that it would merely multiply 'the number of insufficient livings'; and that it was effectively irrelevant to holders of benefices 'too small in value to admit of their being divided so as to provide an adequate income for two persons ...'. But on this last point it merely appealed for some better system, and made no recommendations.

It was thus clear from the start that the relief of poverty was not a major consideration. 'The whole object', as one well known cleric said bluntly, 'is to provide the means of getting rid of incumbents who, by reason of physical or mental debility, have become incompetent.' Yet it was true to type that when the Bishops sent down

---

245. Convocation Report No.219 ('Clergy Pensions'), pp.1-2 (the first pages are a useful summary of developments to date - 1887).
246. See note 235 above: as well as the 1857 suggestion (Heeney, op. cit., p.116) this course was suggested in the comprehensive unofficial church reform proposals of 1835, quoted in Best, op. cit., p.292.
248. Lord A. Compton, Ch.C. 1868, p.1585: another aristocratic bishop-to-be, Lord A. Hervey, made a very similar remark the next year (Ch.C. 1869, p.134). It was also recognised, and
their draft bill the Lower House amended it to withdraw the power of
the bishops to remove an incumbent for any reason other than
imbecility: and when even this provision was dropped because of
drafting difficulties, the result was a completely voluntary scheme.
This despite the sensible warning of Archdeacon Utterton in 1869, that in
the case of a merely voluntary system the effect would be 'to get rid
of the best and retain the worst men': for only the most conscientious
would voluntarily accept a large reduction of income for the sake of
their parishes' efficiency.

The Incumbents' Resignation Act (34 & 35 Vic. c.44) eventually
passed in 1871, after parliamentary delays in 1870; it authorised the
appointment of a Commission empowered to decide the amount of pension
to be granted, up to a maximum of one-third of the benefice income.
The Act was never very popular. It was objected that the Commission's
full discretion meant that an incumbent wishing to retire had no
certainty as to what he might obtain: that it was confined in practice
to livings of over £300 p.a., and that even so its operations tended to
cripple the incoming incumbent. The broader issues remained: as
Bishop Magee said in 1873, 'Ours is the only public service that has no
half pay ...'. This would remain true so long as compulsory
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often pointed out, that the retirement of elderly clergy would
improve the prospects of the curates: see esp. Ch.C. 1876,
pp.57-61 (Magee and Tait).

249. Ch.C. 1870, pp.423-6: a statement by Bishop Wilberforce's close
friend Sir George Prevost well illustrates the difficult balance
to be struck: 'I fully sympathise with Chancellor Massingberd's
regard for the Clergy, but I think there ought to be some
consideration for the parish' (p.425) - usually, with whatever
reservations, Convocation came down on the side of the clergy.

250. Ch.C. 1871, p.163 (part of an eloquent speech by Wilberforce,
who was the main mover behind the Act on the Bench: Ashwell and

251. Ch.C. 1869, p.131.

252. See, i.e., J.C. 1874, pp.29-36 (a good discussion), and 1885,
participation was ruled out, and all depended upon the merely arbitrary distribution of local endowments. But attempts to tackle the question in Convocation floundered. The York Convocation, after a vigorous debate in 1874, set up a committee on the subject. It reported rather feebly in 1877 and then appears to have become moribund. An impressive committee was also set up after a critical discussion by the bishops of the southern province, but that seems never to have reported at all. 254

The agricultural crisis, however, made some action necessary, for the original Act contained no provision for changes in the award; with incomes falling, it was becoming clear that in some parishes the fixed pension was taking most of the income. 255 More generally, the new uncertainties about tithe and glebe made resignation seem too risky to contemplate. The solution was unfortunate; an amending Act of 1887 (50 & 51 Vic. c.23) varied the amount of any pension from a benefice with a tithe component, according to the movement of tithe values. This, as was promptly pointed out, might be very unfair where tithe was merely one part of an otherwise stable income. Worse, the element of uncertainty now introduced was sure to count against the basic aim of the whole system, which was to encourage resignations. 256 But despite its deficiencies, the Church was stuck with the new Act, for the simple reason that it had no chance of obtaining more legislative time on the subject; 257 until the Church obtained some measure of

F.n. 252 continued.
pp.31-6: Ch.C., 1876, pp.57-62.
253. C.C.R. 1873, p.152. (See also p.27 above).
254. J.C., 1874, p.36; 1877, pp.52-3; 1883, p.64: Ch.C. 1876, p.62.
257. Ch.C. 1888, pp.170-1.
freedom from this sort of consideration in 1919, it tended to have to live with its legislative errors.

The failure of this approach to the problem led to a growing interest in something like the fund proposed earlier. The scheme that emerged combined self-help with charity. The self-help element was both necessary and practical, as the now long experience of contributory schemes in other careers attested. Clerical attitudes also had to be taken into account. William Boyd Carpenter, when newly appointed Bishop of Ripon, spoke of the necessity to provide 'an honourable retiring pension for those who have done good service during their lives': but he noted as an obstacle the clergy's own prejudice against this, their 'feeling that a pension or retirement allowance casts a kind of slur upon previous character and work.' The 'slur', presumably, lay largely in the admission that the clergyman's work had become ineffective; but part of it too was doubtless that implicit in the words of Magee, nine years earlier:

In a profession there are no means of retirement because a man has entered it for what he can make of it, and if he fails it is his own fault.

He added that 'With the members of a service it is a different matter', but one wonders how many of the older clergy accepted that distinction. Then of course there was the matter of example: 'Everywhere we are preaching against the sin of improvidence to our people. Let us set an example of thrift and provident habits ourselves...', as one senior clergyman put it.

258. J.C. 1885, p.31: Carpenter's concern about this problem led him to set up the 'Victoria Pension Fund' for his diocese in 1887, interestingly recorded by him in the Ms. 'Archives of the See of Ripon', p.127 (also H.D.A. Major, op. cit., p.41).
259. Ch.C., 1876, p.58.
260. Prebendary E.A. Salmon, C.C.R. 1885, p.433: the same point was made by Archdeacon Sheringham, Ch.C. 1888, p.67.
The new scheme was embodied in the Clergy Pensions Institution. It had two parts: first, it sold the clergy deferred annuities, at ordinary actuarial rates: second, these were to be augmented by donated funds. As it was actually established, the C.P.I. offered annuities of 15 guineas (or multiples thereof) at 65 years old, augmented to £30 (in 1894) and after regular rises, to £50 p.a. in 1899. Compulsion was carefully considered, and rejected, although the machinery was specifically designed to be adaptable to compulsory participation, if this were later to be enforced. There were several reasons for the voluntary start. The major one was simply to avoid the delay which compulsion must entail: 'Are all the anxious men, who long to secure a pension, to be condemned to do without it, till all who do not need it, or desire it, are compelled to pay their contributions?', asked one of the scheme's founders. In the same discussion the Institution's Honorary Secretary argued simply that 'it [was] no time to impose a new tax upon the clergy', which probably implied a realistic view of the foreseeable reactions to any such

261. Its foundation was described very fully at the 1885 Church Congress (C.C.R., pp.408ff): G.B. Howard, Secretary of the Clergy Friendly Society claimed credit for suggesting (in 1883) the plan now followed (p.435). As Supple makes clear, 'endowment assurance' - often called 'old age policies' - grew enormously in popularity in the last decades of the century (op. cit., pp.221-2), so such provision was 'in the air': it was also offered by the 'Clergy Mutual', as is clear from Bishop Stubbs' advice to his clergy in 1893 (Charges, pp.219-20).

262. Its workings and history are clearly set out in Convocation Reports Nos.318 and 335; it also published informative summaries in the annual Year-Books of the Church of England. (The augmentation was given at the same rate to all, so that proportionately it was far more substantial for the poorer clergy who only had the basic 15 guinea annuity).

263. C.C.R. 1885, p.410.
but this discussion was notable for strong feelings from the floor about the desirability of a comprehensive, compulsory system covering widows and orphans too, so clearly there were many clergy impatient with the sensible caution of the new Institution. There was however no question that, given the complexities and variations of benefice incomes, obligatory contributions would be difficult to organise and collect. And at least one canon thought that 'the clergy had too great a love of freedom and of individual action ever to consent to it."

The C.P.I. quite rapidly built up a respectable number of members, though growth seems to have slowed by the late 1890s, when the number stood at nearly 4,000. There were affiliated diocesan institutions, several of which ran very useful schemes to help raise the premiums for needy older men, and to supplement the pensions granted. The feeling in favour of compulsion continued to grow, but failed to overcome the practical problems of enforcement and collection.

No attempt has been made to trace the full history of the C.P.I., but the results were probably disappointing; certainly it was originally hoped to give pensions of £100 p.a. 'without delay', and it may be that, as with the Curates' Augmentation Fund, the failure of over-sanguine early hopes reacted harmfully on the fortunes of the Institution. Also it is clear that a great deal depended upon

264. Ibid., pp.419 and 428-37.
266. Ch.C. 1888, p.68 (Canon Rawlinson).
267. Reports 318 and 335, and discussions thereon (Ch.C. 1897, pp.178-81 and 183-4; 1898, pp.314-20 and 146-8; 1900, pp.22-8 and 37-9). Hon. A. Legge, Bishop of Lichfield, was the major figure in this round: his ideas on church property in general were quite radical, but the end result of the reports was merely approval of the C.P.I., and no action followed.
the dioceses, some of which (Bangor was outstanding) already possessed well thought-out measures to assist their clergy to assure their lives. Such help was evidently necessary for the older men; most clergy of 23 should have had little trouble in meeting premiums of two guineas a year (and many could have paid the lump sum of £55.7s. in lieu of all premiums); but at 50 the premium was £8.7s p.a., and the lump sum over £100, amounts which the poorer clergy could not pay unaided.

In 1907 there was a significant development, when the Ecclesiastical Commissioners began to take a hand. Their intervention was intended to help in cases where the Incumbents' Resignation Act would not otherwise apply, or else did so only at the cost of producing minute pensions and inadequate stipends. They now made grants, usually of £50 p.a., which could be distributed in various ways to ensure that neither income was left wholly insufficient; the grants, in a clear effort to encourage C.P.I. membership, were conditional upon an 'equivalent provision' by way of an assured income for the retirer - the Commissioners had no intention of taking up the role of full-scale pension-providers. When the scheme was reported to Convocation, the first point stressed was that it would help to counter the 'mistaken sense of duty' which impelled elderly clergy to hold on rather

269. Report 219, pp.10 and 18-9; Ripon and Lichfield were noted in Report 335, Appendices B and C.

270. For older men still, the premiums became very high (over £20 p.a. at 59); the Lichfield branch of the C.P.I. had helped pay the £152-5 needed to buy an immediate annuity for a man of 65 (ibid.).


272. Some worry was expressed about the definition of the 'equivalent provision', but Convocation was assured that it was interpreted with considerable freedom, and should not cause unnecessary problems (Ch.C., 1908, pp.15 and esp. 114, the Archbishop's assurance).
than impoverish their successors by taking a pension.\textsuperscript{273} Certainly
the impression was given that resignations were still much too rare;
there were references to the harm done to the Church by 'very old men
quite unable to do their duties [...] holding on to their positions'
in important parishes; and to the work in some important posts 'going
to ruin simply through the age and inefficiency of the Incumbents.'\textsuperscript{274}
Retirement was more than ever desirable: not only was it no longer
acceptable to have an incumbent, however 'excellent' he might be,
who was 'no longer physically fit for his duties': but the old
solution - the employment of a curate - was becoming difficult, as
the number of new clergy declined.\textsuperscript{275} Even so, the principle of a
retiring age was rejected.\textsuperscript{276} The central problem thus remained, and
E.S. Talbot, Bishop of Southwark, could only hope that the new measure
might (indirectly) lead the clergy 'to question a little more
narrowly their right to hold on to the freehold of a position which
involved such great pastoral responsibilities.'\textsuperscript{277}

Eventually, in the 1920s, the Church did adopt a comprehensive
pensions scheme, which imposed a 3% tax on all clerical incomes. It
is not insignificant that this raised protests from at least one
influential source, which were a reminder that clerical independence

\textsuperscript{273} Ibid., p.14.
\textsuperscript{274} Ibid., pp.16-17.
\textsuperscript{275} Report 419, pp.1-2. (Legge also argued strongly in 1898-9 that it
was unfair to legislate for compulsory resignations on various
grounds, as an aid to pastoral efficiency, without a pension
scheme: see esp. Report 323, p.5).
\textsuperscript{276} Ch.C. 1908, pp.15-17.
\textsuperscript{277} Ibid., p.111.
was far from dead. The editor of Crockford was consistently hostile, describing the scheme as expensive, inefficient, and ungenerous (it allowed for £200 p.a. at 70 years old). Almost every year he returned to the attack. Most of the criticisms were at least ostensibly on the grounds of inefficiency or unfairness (on which he appeared often to have good justification), but the hostility was clearly more general: that of the independent (if struggling) professional man to a scheme which reduced his chances of making an individual provision for his family, and subjected him to the oversight of an expensive bureaucracy. The procedure for exemption was castigated as involving 'an inquisition into the private affairs of the applicant, which in the case of any other body of men of professional status would be regarded as impertinent and intolerable.' The 'deduction at source' of contributions by clergy whose incomes happened to come from the Commissioners or Queen Anne's Bounty was regarded by the clergy as 'a gratuitous insult', with its implications of employee status. Somewhat inconsistently, however, the editor appeared to favour a wholly non-contributory pension; independence had its limits.

Throughout the long period involved, the emphasis of would-be reformers was on the efficiency of the pastoral system, rather than on the relief of clerical poverty: after all the poorest clergy, the curates, were quite unprovided for before the C.P.I. was established, and no one could regard its £50 p.a. pensions as more than the

278. Crockford Prefaces. The editor looks back (1947): his opposition is noted in K.A. Thompson's important Bureaucracy and Church reform (1970), pp.185-6, which brings out clearly the general problems of trying to 'rationalise' so resolutely 'independent' a body as the clergy.

279. Quotes, pp.65 (1927) and 92 (1930).

280. Ibid., p.131 (1933).
barest minimum, particularly for a married man. Curates were exhorted to self-help, and given charity if necessary. Incumbents were encouraged to resign, but not compelled. In neither case was it possible to strike a satisfactory balance between the vaunted independence of the clergy, and the corporate responsibilities of the Church - either, in the first case, to its poor servants, or in the second, to the churchpeople in the parishes. It was never easy to regard the Church as conforming to the sort of rationale that underlay the superannuation provisions of the services. In these, for a start, it could be predicated that a man had a right to retire at a certain age, or after so many years of service: if his health was good, he was a lucky man. This sort of argument sat ill with the clergyman's presumed vocation and the actual indelibility of his orders. And the work was so various, its worth so difficult to measure, that the largest degree of discretion had to be granted in deciding when a priest's labours ceased to be of value.

The lack of 'rationality' in the Church's structure also presented problems, both practical and theoretical. In practical terms, the collection of any impost from the thousands of incumbents, with their widely differing incomes and outgoings, presented problems unknown to the paymasters of a rational hierarchy like the civil services. Then the theory of the equality of all priests (at least up to the level of cathedral dignitaries and bishops, who were treated differently), meant that the 1926 Measure allowed the same pension for all: the most

281. Clerical valetudinarians were sarcastically described in 1900, with reference to 'the numbers of cureless, but scarcely incurable, clergy to be found at so many of our seaside places and health resorts'; the author clearly thought that a clergyman able to work should do so (Guardian, 28 Nov. 1900, p.1658, letter entitled 'Dearth or waste?').
distinguished incumbent and the most incompetent curate, both had their £200 p.a. But this was not only correct theology: there simply was no way of fixing upon a graduated pension with fairness, because there was no merit-based hierarchy in the Church to which such a graduated reward could be related.  

Nevertheless, by 1926 the clergy's position had altered considerably, and the full range of anomalies and ambiguities which characterised their Victorian status and organisation was much modified. By the development of autonomous legislative machinery, and the steady growth of centralised and rationalised funding, the Church had taken on the lineaments of a recognisably modern, at least semi-bureaucratic structure. The clergy did not necessarily, like this fact, but corporate responsibility for both finance and policy had emerged as necessary aims in the Victorian age; the old 'parochial individualism' was revealed as manifestly inadequate for the fulfilment of the Church's national functions, or even for the more restricted purposes of maintaining itself as a healthy denomination. One condition of both, it became clear, that it should be possible for elderly or disabled clergy to leave their posts, with some financial security:  

282. With the vagaries of patronage even the distinction between curate and incumbent might not fairly reflect individual merits (though this became less true as numbers declined and curacies shortened, in the 20th century). And no more than about 15%, judging from my samples, ever achieved even the (unpaid) honour of being rural dean, the next formal 'step' above a simple incumbency (see Appendix, Table 15). For the rest, the incumbents, it is hard to see any criteria relating to the characteristics of parishes which could fairly be used as a mark of merit.  

283. Besides Thompson, op. cit., whose Part Three is very good on both the organisation of the Church post-1919 and the attitudes of the clergy, A.J. Russell has recently stressed the unwillingness of the clergy to depart from a self-image of 'professionalism' which (he argues) was stabilised in the 19th century: The clerical profession (1980), esp. pp.270-4.  

284. The expression of this view attains its characteristic 20th century form in the 1908 Archbishop's Report on The supply and training of candidates for Holy Orders; the question of 'supply'
individual provision failed, and a mixture of individual provision and lay giving (the C.P.I.) clearly proved inadequate: but only after decades of painfully finding this out could the Church impose a system which some had urged for over 60 years.
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is there described as 'intimately associated with the financial questions of training, maintenance, and superannuation; these are, in fact, component parts of a single problem ...' (p.11: also pp.29f).
CONCLUSION

The background and point of reference for developments affecting the clergy in Victorian England was the Church revival of the century's second quarter. It may well be, as W.R. Ward has argued¹, that the crucial moment had already passed and that the Church had lost forever its chance to be an effective 'establishment'; but there was no question that in both organisation and zeal the Church now underwent a major regeneration. With regard to the clergy, the importance of this lay in the expectations it fostered.

The Church in the 1830s and 1840s possessed advantages both traditional and new. It retained, if not with absolute security, a dominant position in the universities, at a time when these institutions were larger and more active than they had been since the mid-17th century: the public and grammar schools were yet to stage their Victorian revival, but the clergy were preponderant both in them and in the most popular upper and middle-class alternative, private tutoring. The clergy were passing the peak of their direct involvement in the government of the country, as magistrates, and as leaders in the large amount of administration which fell to parishes and vestries. But they retained strong links to government in the broad sense, both through the residual continuity of traditional roles, and especially through their leading role in the provision of public education; institutional and later military chaplaincies also testified to their place in national life.

More important was the Church's own growth and reform.

¹ In Religion and society in England 1790-1850, 1972, esp. chapters 2 and 3.
Ordinations attained high levels, and the conformation of the clergy was quite radically affected; it was at mid-century a young and vigorous body, at a time when only the most obtuse can have failed to respond to - or at least to notice - the excitement of the age, in politics, social movements, and religious developments. Meanwhile, the invigoration had other manifestations. The Church had been the target of many critical attacks; in the 1830s it was guided by pragmatic conservatives (notably, Peel and Blomfield) who saw the necessity to respond constructively to the criticisms, many of which were irrefutable. Many vital reforms resulted. Above all, by the ending of pluralities, and by the large-scale creation of new parishes, the whole shape of the clerical career was modified. It had presented a largely static pattern, dominated by the difference between those with access to patronage, and those without. Now a new type of career became normal - preliminary service in the suddenly common post of assistant curate, followed by an incumbency, an apotheosis which it seemed for a while that all could expect. And of course, though many of the new town livings were poor, they were no poorer than the old pauper benefices which Queen Anne's Bounty had been slowly working on for over a century, and the desperately poor stipends of the old deputy curates were no longer common. Moreover in the countryside, where most parishes still were, and where most clergy must end up, the Church had benefited enormously from enclosures and improvements; the benefits were secured, and much cause for rancour shut out, by the 1836 commutation of tithe.

Finally, there still was not a great deal of competition from other, eligible careers. The Bar expanded rapidly in the 1840s, but remained a precarious profession for most, while attorneys (as they still legally were) had yet to consolidate their new
respectability. The same went for the developing breed of 'general practitioners' in medicine. Government employment was, as a life-long career, ill-rewarded, slow in promotion, and not well regarded by most prudent men - the military arms being expensive, the civil bearing an unenviable and well-founded reputation for monotony and pointlessness. The Church, in comparison, presented the largest opportunities, in a form which combined clearly improved prospects for its less privileged clergy, with a very large (and purchaseable) system of patronage: it could thus plausibly attract both men seeking a career open to talent, and those possessing the more traditional aids to a position of comfort and standing.

At the same time, however, the Church's hardest tasks were revealing its weaknesses. In London and the major industrial areas of the midlands and the north the Church had to play a missionary role. 'Home missionary work' was very far from being ignored; and there were parishes where active clergy used well-organised staffs of curates, or (if Evangelicals) large teams of lay-helpers, and were able to approach the coverage traditional in the parish system. But the system was not well suited to the new task: the expectation remained (and the inertial weight of the patronage system largely ensured this) that a man should take a parish and work it for many years, if not for life. The prospect evidently held no attractions for most clergy from the universities, who showed a strong general tendency to work in the south, and usually in the country. Bishops, faced with urgent pastoral needs in the less-favoured areas, ordained a growing number of non-graduates. The universities were anyway an inadequate source of ordinands: they were not and never could be mere seminaries, and already a large majority of their graduates were ordained - but these were still manifestly insufficient.
A significant part of the problem was that the clergy had always been to a large extent the beneficiaries of endowed and conventional awards, being often men of relatively humble backgrounds: when the universities underwent their first great increase in size in the second and third decades of the century, these awards remained virtually static. Thus they were of help to a smaller proportion of university men, at the same time as their values (often set in the 16th and 17th centuries) were rendered less and less adequate by the increased costs of university residence.

In the 1860s, there was a renewed tone of concern about the Church's progress, and about the problems of the clergy. Three main areas of concern are of particular relevance here. The first related to the rise of the non-graduate clergy. The matter was brought into prominence by a series of particularly poor graduate intakes (especially from Oxford) about the years 1860-2. Archbishop Longley produced figures in his Primary Charge of 1864, which indicated the steadily increasing proportion of men who had not attended any of the four major Church universities. The general publication of these facts combined with fears for the orthodoxy of the universities themselves. Churchmen worried now whether institutions which harboured the likes of Jowett and Pattison, (or a little later, at Cambridge, the more apologetic but nonetheless non-orthodox agnostics like Henry Sidgwick) were safe and reliable trainers of clergy. As it became clearer, too, that the universities could not escape unchanged in the post-Palmerston political climate, it seemed increasingly evident that the Church must seek a more specialised

2. These figures (the core of those in Table 2.3 above, p.41) made a considerable impression, and were often cited. Longley had been Bishop of Ripon and of Durham, so knew the extent of non-graduate clergy first-hand.
position in them; the results were to be, in the 1870s, plans for denominational colleges, and special theology courses. But there was little effort as yet to follow the promptings of those engaged in the training of non-graduates, and to supervise and regularise their position.

Second, and a connected issue as many saw it, there was once more concern about the 'structure' of the clergy's careers. The curates were not becoming incumbents as quickly as had been thought, and it was starting to be realised that this was a problem likely to get more serious, paradoxically, the more the clergy expanded. The decades of optimism and good opportunities meant that a return to the pre-Victorian curates' status and prospects was unthinkable. But the steps taken were too hesitant, and the issue was not thoroughly understood: the Church seemed not to be ready to face an organisational challenge that went beyond the traditional questions of parishes and their incumbents. Then, too, the poverty of many clergy was again a matter for comment; and when an attempt was made to create means for retirement and pensions, this once more revealed the inadequacies of the Church's endowments in the light of its modern obligations, both to its clergy and to its parishioners. Meanwhile it could not but be seen that opportunities and rewards in the lay world were multiplying. In 1866 a Times leader declared that not only were there now nearer thirty than the original three 'liberal professions', but,

what is of still more importance, any one of these is thought just as 'liberal' - that is, just as becoming to a gentleman - as any other. Nowadays young gentlemen go into counting-houses as readily as they would go into the Guards ... The necessary consequence is that all old callings suffer a little, and those most in which there was least natural attraction.

The clergy (whose official resources were stretched ever more widely

3. 29 Sept. 1866.
and could scarcely begin to make up for rising-living standards) were the exemplary case.

The third cause of concern was a perennial one from well before the 1860s, but was thrown into stronger relief by the new sense of crisis. This was the problem of authority, or of policy, in the Church. On a day-to-day level, the generally greater vigour of episcopal administration, and its more effective oversight, were probably the most significant levers of church reform in the country. But the church had to be more than a collection of dioceses, ruled with varying degrees of efficiency, as well as with varying biases of churchmanship. There was more and more central finance, provided by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners (and the Commissioners' work really 'took off' in the 1860s) but their relationship to the Church was never wholly easy: the Commissioners were very much a creation of the State, and never ceased (even in their post-1948 guise of the Church Commissioners) to be somewhat outside the Church's direct control. The revived Convocations\textsuperscript{4}, were major forums of debate: but their powers were limited and their constitutions unsatisfactory. Their existence raised the morale of at least the High Churchmen, who welcomed this sign of the Church's independence, but the story of the Public Worship Regulation Act is sufficient to indicate that Parliament remained quite capable of legislating upon even the most emotive and divisive issues without consulting Convocation. The bishops thus remained the critical element in policy-making, but they made up a most inefficient body for continuous

\textsuperscript{4} Canterbury's conducted business from 1855: that of York was not reactivated until 1861, after the death of the obstructive Archbishop Musgrave, and during Longley's brief tenure of the northern archiepiscopate (D.A. Jennings, The revival of the Convocation of York, 1837-1861, Borthwick Papers No.47, 1975).
policy-making: there was no agreed way of resolving their inevitable disagreements, beyond informal discussions: further, as the convolutions of ritual litigation showed, their authority over their own clergy was uncertain and vulnerable. The situation was the more unsatisfactory in that the institution of, particularly, Church Congresses and Diocesan Conferences (both started in the 1860s) meant that churchpeople were undoubtedly better informed and more self-conscious than before. This made the absence of effective policy-making the more galling.

The 1870s and 1880s present something of a paradox. Ordinations rose to a level which was certainly a post-Reformation record: yet - and with due allowance for the less detailed level of research on the later period here - the fact seems to have caused very little joy or optimism. One of the reasons may have been that the educational backgrounds of the ordinands remained pretty steady, on the pattern set by the 1860s; there were rather more Oxford and Cambridge men absolutely, but less proportionately, and there were even more non-graduates (see Table 2.3, page 41). To many churchmen this was a problem in itself, and no cause for satisfaction. The main reasons, however, seem to have been the distractions afforded by the virulent internecine struggles which centered on the ritualists, and the external threats which loomed large at this time. These included the political pressures exerted by the disestablishment campaign, as well as less specifically hostile developments (particularly in education) which weakened what was left of the Church's monopolistic pretensions: and the intellectual assaults on Christianity as a whole, whether from the hard men of scientific naturalism like Tyndall and W.K. Clifford, or from a reviving popular irreligion (which probably seemed unrealistically powerful
at the height of Bradlaugh's fame).

Many of these factors probably help to explain the rising ordinations. The 1830s and 1840s were also years of controversy within the Church, and of 'Church in danger' politics: such excitements may well have intensified interest and loyalty among the young. More specifically, there were powerful new religious currents at both universities. At Oxford there was a revived High Church movement, its philosophical confidence bolstered by the adoption of much of T.H. Green's idealism, and with a social mission invigorated by the absorption of Green's (and many others') urgent but optimistic social and political concerns. At Cambridge there was both a fresh wave of Evangelicalism, and the scholarly confidence created by the acknowledged achievements of the great Biblical scholars Lightfoot, Hort and Westcott: 'liberal' perhaps, but of no narrow party. It was the heyday, too, of the Victorian non-graduate theological colleges, before harder times and heavy-handed regulation thinned them out in the 1890s. Also, it may be that career prospects seemed briefly better; the Commissioners were in full swing raising town stipends, voluntary funds were flowing in, and life for the curates - with better pay and more chance of working in desirable 'staff' parishes - perhaps seemed more attractive.

The turn came in the late 1880s; in 1901, just 15 years after the peak intake of 814 in 1886, ordinations fell below 600 for the first time since the 1860s. The timing suggests that the apparent collapse of the Church's rural income was a major factor. A living

5. Augustus Jessopp thought that 'since the Curate Market rose, as it did some fifteen or twenty years ago' [i.e. c. 1870-5] there had been a regrettable influx of ill-educated and underbred clergy: snobbery aside, this is not wholly unconvincing (The trials of a country parson, 1890, p.78).
in the country had always been the expected fate of most clergy, sooner or later. Many may have been inadequate, but a generally tolerable level of income, and the illusive effects of much private wealth, had meant that the prospect formed a sort of guarantee for the clerical career. When this guarantee failed, the prospects of a clerical life were exposed as simply poor. None of the fundamental problems had been solved: it took declining numbers to improve the chances of the curates, and patronage was reformed only slowly and piecemeal. Meanwhile, wider social developments were, at the least, not favourable to the expansion of religious organisations (certainly Protestant ones): beneath surfaces that often exhibited great activity, most churches were being forced into the position of slightly beleaguered sub-cultural associations.

The Church of England was not immune from these general pressures. Complex and slow to change as it was, it had undoubtedly altered very significantly, and had moved closer to the denominational type which, by the end of the century, characterised its major rivals. Traditional connections were weakened. The connections with the State remained many, but the relationship was very different: many privileges had been taken away by the State, and the dominant clerical feeling was in favour of much greater autonomy for the Church - 'the nation represented in Parliament' seemed no longer an

6. This picture emerges, with varying degrees of emphasis, in several important recent works - all of which, however, make full allowance for the elements of strength and vigour in pre-War religion: S. Yeo, Religion and voluntary societies in crisis, 1976; J.H.S. Kent, 'The role of religion in the cultural structure of the later Victorian city', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th Ser. Vol.23, 1973; H. McLeod, Class and religion in the later Victorian city, 1974; A.D. Gilbert, Religion and society in industrial England, 1976, and also C. Binfield's So down to prayers, 1977.
appropriate arbiter of Church law and affairs\textsuperscript{7}. The connection with landed society had been transformed, first by the substantial takeover of Church lands by the central administration of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and second, by the decreased importance of agricultural landed revenue to the parishes: it remained very important but, especially after the 1880s, the Church was keen to find alternatives, either from other forms of capitalist investment, or more radically, from an increased dependence upon voluntary lay contributions. The Church had lost its leadership in education, particularly at the higher levels\textsuperscript{8}. And in the vastly more specialised world of scholarship the clergy tended to be marginal except in those studies with religious or ecclesiastical relevance: apart from theology itself, it was in philology and ancient or medieval history that they still made a mark; though they did remain also well represented in classical scholarship, which probably constituted their most important link to the education experienced by the upper and middle classes.

The clergy were, despite the increasing self-consciousness of their 'apartness', on the whole very aware of their position as citizens. They were men with many secular concerns, and their way of life both was and was expected to be broadly similar to that of other middle-class people - their houses, servants and children ensured that separation could only go so far. One of the reference points in their relationship to secular society was their

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{7}] Though clearly a considerable proportion of the laity supported the protestant erastianism of Sir William Harcourt et.al., which had a strong anti-clerical tinge.
\item[\textsuperscript{8}] The insistence on clerical headmasters at the public schools was crumbling by 1914; it was the last major bastion of clerical dominance in education.
\end{itemize}
conventional standing as 'professional men'. This grouping was vaguely and conventionally defined in the early 19th century; occupation was anyway a less important criterion of status or income then one's family or patronage connections - natural enough when success in one's occupation need bear little reference to skills that were only vaguely defined. By 1900 there had been great changes. The professions had consolidated a position of assured respectability by carefully fostering their claims to specialised skills, while combining these with a studious cultivation of the mores and social standards of the upper middle-class (particularly as embodied in and inculcated by the new and reformed public schools). Notoriously, traditional and customary attributes are lost slowly in England. But clearly it was a question now, whether the clergy fitted so unquestionably into this much-altered professional context.

They were certainly not easy to classify in terms of the characteristics of other professions. They fitted neither of the two major patterns, of the 'free professions', whose members worked typically in private practice, and of the services. The only points of comparison with the former were partial at best: there was an expectation of specific skills, whether legal, medical and so on, or theological and pastoral. But the Church was far behind the other professions (with the partial exception of the Bar) in clarifying and enforcing its entry requirements: it was, however, moving

9. Soldiers, clergy and physicians needed only slight specialised skills - in each case it was generally felt that the specialist knowledge required was slight, and such as a well bred or liberally-educated man could master without difficulty. The law was the exception, but the status of the Bar rested as much on its traditions (what more splendidly useless than the Inns?), its state connections, and its close intertwinement in property (particularly landed) affairs.
steadily but slowly in this direction after 1890. The comparison with the services was in some ways more plausible\textsuperscript{10}. Like them, the Church had specified posts to fill, and a certain structure of ranks: a clergyman served in a Church that had some of the characteristics of an organisation offering a structured career. But the analogy, at least in Victorian England, went little further. The Church's system of patronage was only incidentally 'rational' as a means of promotion: endowment income was largely arbitrary in its incidence, and bore little relationship to the task performed: moreover, as their history in this century has revealed, the clergy have been extremely unwilling to accept the corollaries of service-like employment - the salaried status and the loss of the 'freehold' of their positions. They have always tended to see their position as requiring individual talents, freely exercised, rather than the performance of authoritatively ordained and supervised duties\textsuperscript{11}.

The incompleteness of the clergy's separation from the lay world has been stressed. But its extent cannot be ignored either, in discussing points of comparison with other professionals. They were after all set apart in terms of their acceptable 'off-duty' activities, and indeed it was hard to say when a clergyman was strictly 'off-duty'. They wore a distinctive dress (and it became steadily more distinctive, with High Church fashions

\textsuperscript{10} It is significant that when Leslie Paul compared the Church to free and to institutional professions, the latter were typically 'the caring professions' - which, with their relatively low status and difficult career structure, are now much closer to the clergy; but naturally, they are irrelevant much before 1945. (The deployment and payment of the clergy, 1964, p.186).

\textsuperscript{11} i.e. the classical defence of the freehold by that doughty defender of traditional clergy status, the editor or Crockford: 'It is impossible to have a system which will give a competent man a fair chance of saying and doing what he deems to be right without fear or favour which will not also shelter an incompetent one'. (Crockford Prefaces. The editor looks back, 1947, p.198).
in the van). They lived in special (and again—often distinctive) houses. Some of these points applied to military men as well. But the latter embodied an ideal which applied less and less to the Church: service to the nation as a whole, without partisan interest. However much many churchmen sought to emphasise and shore up the Church's national ties and obligations, it self-evidently served only a part of the nation. By 1900 it was clearly more accurate to say that it served mainly one part of one (the religious) part of the nation. The truth of this was exposed painfully by the experience of the First World War: not only were the troops revealed to be largely without formal religious affiliation or interests, but the very scale of the War's destruction, and of the mobilisation of the state which it called forth, made the Church seem more marginal to national life.

The ambiguities of the clergy's position can be seen also in relation to the other 'religious specialists' of the period. The ministers of old Dissent - and classically the Independents or Congregationalists - were not unlike the 'free professionals' in their ministerial lives (except for the modest village ministers, often without formal training and called from the flock to the pastorate). They were well-educated men who sought or were offered posts ministering to particular congregations; there, somewhat like a doctor taking a practice, such a man served a 'clientele' whose involvement and commitment was voluntary - as was its financial contribution, upon which depended the minister's stipend. This was the point at which the clergy jibbed. The great argument for the freehold and its accompanying endowment was that the clergyman was not dependent upon his people: he could play a prophetic role, 'without fear or favour'. Of course it was increasingly admitted that this independence was often abused, and that there should be a better
balance struck between ensuring clerical independence and shutting the laity out of parish government altogether. But there were few who ever proposed that the clergy should follow the dissenting example in this, even if some clergy with pew-rented town churches or proprietary chapels came very close to this position in fact.

Much closer to the 'service' pattern was the Wesleyan ministry, with its centralised postings, standardised payments and careful provision for old age, widows, and the education of children. But such an organisation was quite incompatible with the parish and patronage structure of the Church; and it was far too centralised for the tastes of a clergy often unwilling to submit even to their bishops, and widely hostile to the rather skeletal central bureaucracies that the Church developed after 1919. The one example from other churches that was implicitly held up as an exemplar by many clergy, was the Roman Catholic priesthood. Apart from the theological appeal of this 'model' to sections of the English clergy, it provided the only radical solution to the problem of social standing - ignoring it. In the 30 years before 1914 there was a growing, but still small number of 'clergy houses', in which staffs of unmarried curates lived under the supervision of a senior curate or incumbent. But in the English context, such were no more than temporary phenomena: most of the clergy still expected to marry eventually, while the declining numbers of clergy generally meant that the 'clergy houses' disappeared rapidly between the wars. Clerical marriage, as well as the widespread protestant dislike of any form of 'priesthood', ensured that this example remained of minority and party interest only.

The problem of the clergy's appropriate status and maintenance
thus remained. The frame of reference that dominated thinking about this well into the present century (and arguably still does) was set by about 1860. In the pre-Victorian period poor and low status clergy were an accepted element in a Church which merely reflected the realities of a relatively poor and very unequal society. Between the 1830s and the 1850s the clergy seemed to be moving towards a new ideal and standard. They would combine a social standing based upon the most honourable of educations, with a level of conduct and conscientiousness which must ensure general respect: there would be a hard-working 'resident gentleman' in every parsonage in the land. But the ideal was never reached. At a time of rising material and educational standards, churchmen had to face the fact that, by 1900, the clergy had distinctly lost ground. (The higher level of self-consciousness and the stronger feelings of corporate responsibility in the Church, meant that these facts could not be ignored, especially as the Church's actual policy and administrative machinery was so weak that problems tended to be widely talked about, rather than briskly acted upon: a recipe for the frustration which has been the motive power of Church reform in this century). Briefly the clergy had seemed to be among the leaders in the socially rising professional world. Perhaps the crucial point in the halting of this momentum was that the Church could not - in honesty - restrict its entry to retain exclusivity, as most professions clearly did. The Church responded to overwhelming pastoral needs and, in so doing, 

12. In a different but contemporary context one writer writes aptly of 'this insistence on the gentleman as the ideal administrative unit' (J.M. Compton, 'Open competition and the Indian Civil Service, 1854-1876', English Historical Review, Vol.83, April 1968, p.270).
perforce recruited from outside the restricted circles which guaranteed 'gentleman' status. But this meant that the Church could not keep up with the standards being set by other leading professions; for whereas they could make up for any social disadvantages of their practitioners by the prestige and standing of their expert skills, the clergy's skills were neither self-evidently expert, nor - increasingly - of generally accepted efficacy or desirability. Tradition and the aspirations fostered in the early Victorian years identified the clergy with the professions in their own and others' eyes. But by 1914 they were already well on the way to their modern position as rather awkward and shabby professionals, too poor for their social expectations, yet unable wholeheartedly to reject the expectations which have defined this image.
## APPENDIX: TABLE 1: PRE-INCUMBENCY OPTIONS (FELLOWS EXCLUDED)

### 1: Oxford and Chichester, Oxbridge Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Curacies only</th>
<th>Teaching¹</th>
<th>Chaplaincies²</th>
<th>Overseas³</th>
<th>Misc.⁴</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8(4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12(3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11(5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15(5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>46(17)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2: Oxford and Chichester, Rest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Curacies only</th>
<th>Teaching¹</th>
<th>Chaplaincies²</th>
<th>Overseas³</th>
<th>Misc.⁴</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3: Ripon, Oxbridge Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Curacies only</th>
<th>Teaching¹</th>
<th>Chaplaincies²</th>
<th>Overseas³</th>
<th>Misc.⁴</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5(2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4: Ripon, Rest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Curacies only</th>
<th>Teaching¹</th>
<th>Chaplaincies²</th>
<th>Overseas³</th>
<th>Misc.⁴</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Figures in () are those who were teachers only, either up to incumbency, or for whole careers.
2. Includes European cities, hospitals, Unions, prisons etc.
3. All non-European posts.
4. Minor canons etc. at cathedrals, college chaplains, or full-time 'secretarial' work (i.e. for large voluntary Church societies).
APPENDIX: TABLE 2.
CAMBRIDGE HONOURS SAMPLE. YEARS SPENT AS CURATES, BY THOSE WHO HAD ONLY PAROCHIAL CAREERS
(THIS IS DEFINED MORE NARROWLY THAN IN TABLE 3: IN EFFECT INCLUDES ONLY THOSE WHO
HELD NOTHING BUT CURACIES.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Curacy</th>
<th>Up to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>Over 15</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1i.e. No known curacies, but no other activities recorded: usually can
be assumed to mean brief period as curate: the early size of this class
reflects the inadequacies of the Clergy List, and its decline, the coming
of Crockford.

2% figures here are of the total, teachers etc. included.
APPENDIX: TABLE 3:
YEARS BETWEEN ORDINATION AND INCUMBENCY. FIGURES EXCLUDE CLERGY GOING OVERSEAS, SERVING AS CHAPLAINS WITH THE FORCES, OR TEACHING (SOLELY) - ALL TENDED TO HAVE LONGER PERIODS TO A LIVING.

1: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER: OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>Over 15</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 No.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3 No.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3 No.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3 No.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No.</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers excluded, each period: 6,9,8,9.

2: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER: REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841-3</th>
<th>1851-3</th>
<th>1861-3</th>
<th>1871-3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3 No.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3 No.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3 No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers excluded: 0,1,0,1.
APPENDIX: TABLE 3: (Cont'd)

3: RIPON: OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>Over 15</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 No.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3 No.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3 No.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3 No.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers excluded: 0,2,0,3.

4: RIPON: REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>Over 15</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 No.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3 No.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3 No.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3 No.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% to

|          | 1861-3 | 22     | 25      | 16       | 4       | 33    |

Numbers excluded: 0,2,2,2.
### APPENDIX TABLE 4.
**NUMBERS WHO OBTAINED LIVINGS IN EACH TYPE**

In the following tables, relating to characteristics of Parishes (Income, population, patron etc.) those not obtaining livings have been excluded. The totals for each period, then, are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oxford and Chichester</th>
<th>Ripon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fellows</td>
<td>Oxbridge Graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Beneficed (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:**
- BENEFICED - 385 (72.5%)
- NEVER BENEFICED - 146 (27.5%)
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APPENDIX, TABLE 5:  
NUMBER OF LIVINGS HELD BY EACH CLERGYMAN

In all the following tables, information about Parishes relates only to the first and last livings held; information about the livings of men who held 3 or more altogether, is therefore not complete. As can be seen here, this only affects less than 20% of the total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Livings Held in Whole Lifetime</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: FELLOWS</td>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER:</td>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXBRIDGE GRADUATES</td>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER:</td>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: RIPON:</td>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXBRIDGE GRADUATES</td>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX, TABLE 5 (Cont'd)

5: RIPON: 
REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6: COMBINED TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX: TABLE 6:
PATRONAGE: NUMBERS HOLDING BENEFICES IN VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF 
PATRONAGE FOR THEIR WHOLE BENEFICED CAREERS, AND FOR PART:

i.e. Those who held livings from more than one type of Patron are shown 
under both, so that the 'Part' row totals exactly twice the number of 
men involved (the actual number of men is shown in the 'No.' column). 
Bracketed figures in the 'Part' row are the numbers of men whose 
first-rather than last-patron was of each type. 
(A similar format is used in several of the following tables.) 
(For a summary, see sub-Table 6)

Notes on categories:
1 - College: includes collegiate bodies such as Winchester and 
    Eton, or non-diocesan chapters like Windsor or Westminster.
2 - Crown: includes Lord Chancellor and Duchy of Lancaster.
3 - Church: all patronage by Ecclesiastical persons or bodies, 
    acting in their official capacity: includes Bishops, Chapters 
    incumbents of 'Mother Parishes'; also crown and episcopal 
    alternate patronage, which almost universally implied poor 
    'Peel Parishes'.
4 - Private: includes cases where a clergyman was his own patron.
5 - Trustees etc: includes a small number of various forms of 
    alternate patronage, and 2 cases of patronage in the hands 
    of the parishioners.
### Appendix: Table 6 (Cont'd)

1: FELLOWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Crown</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Trustees etc.</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>10(6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7(1)</td>
<td>8(6)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER: OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Crown</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Trustees etc.</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>8(7)</td>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>8(4)</td>
<td>7(4)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6(4)</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>17(10)</td>
<td>11(5)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>11(6)</td>
<td>8(3)</td>
<td>37(23)</td>
<td>27(11)</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3: RIPON: OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Crown</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Trustees etc.</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>9(6)</td>
<td>9(5)</td>
<td>7(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4: RIPON: REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Crown</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Trustees etc.</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>5(2)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>5(2)</td>
<td>6(5)</td>
<td>8(3)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix: Table 6 (Cont'd)

#### 5: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER: REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Crown</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Trustees etc.</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>7(4)</td>
<td>6(2)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix: Table 6 (Cont'd)

6: SUMMARY, IN %, SHOWING:

a) % of each group (Numbered as in Tables: 1 = Fellows, etc.) preferred only by each particular type of patron.

b) % of each group whose first patron was of each type.

c) % of each group whose last (or only) patron was of each type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Crown</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Trustees etc.</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. a) Whole</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Start</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) End up</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Whole</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whole</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Whole</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table shows the major, connections. These are:

Service: cases where a clear link exists between clergyman and patron, based upon the former's service either in a particular parish of the patron's or - with bishops' or capitular patronage - service in the diocese.

Family: where the name of patron is the same as that of the clergyman, or where other family connections are known.

Not Known: all cases where no positive link could be established or inferred.

The only omission (apart from the link of graduates to their college) is the category of 'neighbourhood' connections, in which it is reasonable to infer some knowledge of the clergyman by the patron, an account of geographical proximity: this was used with some caution, being inference only, however plausible. Total numbers, for the respective tables, were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total: including Private: Church patrons*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The other 3 were trustees.
Appendix: Table 7 (Cont'd)

1: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER: OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) ALL</th>
<th></th>
<th>b) PRIVATE</th>
<th></th>
<th>c) CHURCH</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Fam.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Serv. N.K.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Serv. N.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serv. N.K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. N.K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>25 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER: REST

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>35 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix: Table 7 (Cont'd)

3: RIPON: OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) ALL</th>
<th>b) PRIVATE</th>
<th>c) CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Serv. N.K.</td>
<td>Total Fam. Serv. N.K.</td>
<td>Total Serv. N.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4: RIPON: REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) ALL</th>
<th>b) PRIVATE</th>
<th>c) CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Serv. N.K.</td>
<td>Total Fam. Serv. N.K.</td>
<td>Total Serv. N.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>- 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>- - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1 3 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To 1861-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) ALL</th>
<th>b) PRIVATE</th>
<th>c) CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total Fam. Serv. N.K.</td>
<td>Total Serv. N.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX, TABLE 8.
PATRONS AND THE VALUE OF THEIR LIVINGS, 12 MONTHS TO SEPT. 1873. CATEGORIES AS IN TABLE 6:¹ NUMBERS AND %²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values: p.a.</th>
<th>Patronage</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Trustees, etc</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 150. No.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 to 300</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 to 600</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No. 45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1 - This table is calculated from the figures given by A.M. Deane in his 'Statistics of the C. of E.', from J. Halcombe, ed., The Church and Her Curates (1874): His own figures (p. 100) have however been extensively reworked using the full list given in his Appendix, pp. 123-45, to make them comparable with mine, and various clear anomalies have been corrected. (There were also 54 more with no value given, not here considered).
2 - % figures run in columns, except in the bottom (Total) row, where they refer to the overall total of 823.
### APPENDIX: TABLE 9:
CLERGY BENEFICED FIRST AND LAST, OR PARTLY IN THE VARIOUS MAJOR REGIONS.*

Part rows double-count, as in Table 6: Bracketed figures again represent the first livings.

1: FELLOWS (EXCLUDES ONE SINECURE RECTORY, 1871-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Midlands</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 Whole</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>5(2)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Midlands</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 Whole</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>9(5)</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>8(3)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>5(4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Midlands</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 Whole</td>
<td>21(11)</td>
<td>7(2)</td>
<td>10(6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Regions Wales: includes 1 Irish and 2 Scottish livings. North: Yorkshire, Cheshire, and all counties northward. Midlands: Staffs, Derbs., Notts., Leics., Northants and Warws. South: Rest of England. London is included, but the figures are small: for all tables they are: 1: 2 and 2(-); 2: 6 and 3(1); 3: 3 and 1(1); 4: 1 and 2(1); 5: 2 and 0.
### APPENDIX: TABLE 9: (Cont'd)

#### 3: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER, REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Midlands</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6(2)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8(3)</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4: RIPON: OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Midlands</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td></td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3(-)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3(-)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11(1)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>7(7)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX: TABLE 9: (Cont'd)

5: RIPON: REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Midlands</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 Whole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(-)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8(2)</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>9(6)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix: Table 9 (Cont'd)

6: SUMMARY, IN %, SHOWING:
a) % of each group (Numbered as in Tables: 1 = Fellows, etc.) spending whole beneficed life in each area.
b) % of each group whose first benefice was in each region.
c) % of each group whose last (including only) benefice was in each region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Midlands</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. a) Whole</td>
<td>73 7 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Start</td>
<td>77 14 6 3 71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) End up</td>
<td>85 8 6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Whole</td>
<td>73 4 9 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>80 5 13 2 151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>79 7 11 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whole</td>
<td>61 - 6 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>71 13 10 6 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>77 - 10 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Whole</td>
<td>31 12 37 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>33 16 48 3 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>46 12 37 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Whole</td>
<td>19 9 53 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>22 14 63 2 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>28 11 58 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX: TABLE 10.
POPULATION OF PARISHES HELD BY CLERGY.
(Whole and Part, as in Tables 6 and 9)
Summary in sub-table 6.

1: FELLOWS (Excludes 1 Sinecure, 1871-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Up to 600</th>
<th>601 to 1000</th>
<th>1001 to 2000</th>
<th>2001 to 4000</th>
<th>Over 4000</th>
<th>(No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>5(3)</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7(3)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>14(8)</td>
<td>12(6)</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>6(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER, OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Up to 600</th>
<th>601 to 1000</th>
<th>1001 to 2000</th>
<th>2001 to 4000</th>
<th>Over 4000</th>
<th>(No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7(6)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>5(-)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8(3)</td>
<td>8(4)</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10(7)</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>6(3)</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>28(17)</td>
<td>17(8)</td>
<td>19(9)</td>
<td>12(4)</td>
<td>8(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX: TABLE 10 (cont'd)

#### 3: RIPON, OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Up to 600</th>
<th>601 to 1000</th>
<th>1001 to 2000</th>
<th>2001 to 4000</th>
<th>Over 4000</th>
<th>(No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 Whole</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>6(2)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(-1)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>1(-1)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals Whole</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>11(4)</td>
<td>8(4)</td>
<td>7(4)</td>
<td>9(6)</td>
<td>7(3)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4: RIPON, REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Up to 600</th>
<th>601 to 1000</th>
<th>1001 to 2000</th>
<th>2001 to 4000</th>
<th>Over 4000</th>
<th>(No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 Whole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(-1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>4(-1)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>1(-1)</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(-1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>6(4)</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals Whole</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>10(4)</td>
<td>10(4)</td>
<td>5(2)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>8(6)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX: TABLE 10 (cont'd)

#### 5: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER, REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Up to 600</th>
<th>601 to 1000</th>
<th>1001 to 2000</th>
<th>2001 to 4000</th>
<th>Over 4000</th>
<th>(No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 (Nil)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3 Whole 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(1) 1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals Whole 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3(2)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX: TABLE 10 (cont'd)

6: SUMMARY, IN %, SHOWING:

a) % of each group (numbered as in Tables) beneficed only in each range.

b) % of each group whose first benefice only was in each range.

c) % of each group whose last benefice only was in each range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Up to 600</th>
<th>601 to 1000</th>
<th>1001 to 2000</th>
<th>2001 to 4000</th>
<th>Over 4000</th>
<th>(No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. a) Whole 34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start 45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End Up 42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. a) Whole 42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start 53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End Up 49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. a) Whole 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start 36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End Up 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. a) Whole 19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start 25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End Up 28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. a) Whole 48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start 55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End Up 52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX: TABLE II.

NUMBERS OF MEN WHO SPENT WHOLE OR PART OF BENEFICED LIVES IN LARGE TOWNS (OVER 20,000 POP.), SMALLER TOWNS (2-20,000 POP.) AND RURAL AREAS.

(Part rows as in Tables 6, 9, etc.)

1. FELLOWS (EXCLUDES 1 SINECURE, 1871-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large towns</th>
<th>Smaller towns</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 Whole</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3 Whole</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3 Whole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3 Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS Whole</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5(4)</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER: OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large towns</th>
<th>Smaller towns</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 Whole</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>5(3)</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3 Whole</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3 Whole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>3(-)</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>7(4)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3 Whole</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>5(3)</td>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>7(5)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS Whole</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>11(5)</td>
<td>17(7)</td>
<td>20(12)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix: Table 11 (Cont'd)

#### 3: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER: REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large towns</th>
<th>Smaller towns</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>4(-)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS Whole</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>7(1)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4: RIPON: OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large towns</th>
<th>Smaller towns</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 Whole</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS Whole</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>8(8)</td>
<td>9(4)</td>
<td>11(2)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5: RIPON: REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large towns</th>
<th>Smaller towns</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>4(-)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS Whole</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>8(6)</td>
<td>7(5)</td>
<td>9(1)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix: Table 11 (Cont'd)

6: SUMMARY, IN %, SHOWING:

a) % of each group (Numbered as in Tables) Beneficed only in each type of setting.
b) % of each group who were first beneficed in each setting.
c) % of each group whose last (or only) living was in each setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large towns</th>
<th>Smaller towns</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.* Whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.* Whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End up</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures to 1861-3 only

4. 25 16 33
   40 23 35  (48)
   25 25 50

5. 24 13 34
   37 26 37  (38)
   29 18 53
APPENDIX, TABLE 12.
LARGEST INCOMES OBTAINED BY CLERGY FROM
(FIRST OR LAST) BENEFICES.

1: FELLOWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under £300</th>
<th>£3-500</th>
<th>Over £500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER, OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under £300</th>
<th>£3-500</th>
<th>Over £500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3: OXFORD AND CHICHESTER, REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under £300</th>
<th>£3-500</th>
<th>Over £500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX: TABLE 12 (cont'd)

4: RIPON, OXBRIDGE GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under £300</th>
<th>£3-500</th>
<th>Over £500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5: RIPON, REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under £300</th>
<th>£3-500</th>
<th>Over £500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In the great majority of cases where a man held more than one living, the income of the last was greater than that of the first: but merely to take the former would include certain cases where a small living was taken as a virtual pension, and so would distort the picture.
APPENDIX: TABLE 13.
VALUE OF FIRST (a) AND LAST (b) LIVINGS
(ALL CLERGY COMBINED, EXCEPT FELLOWS)
NUMBER AND %.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Up to 150</th>
<th>151 to 200</th>
<th>201 to 300</th>
<th>301 to 500</th>
<th>Over 500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-3 a) No.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) No.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-3 a) No.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) No.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-3 a) No.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) No.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-3 a) No.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) No.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX: TABLE 14.
NET INCOME, BY PARISH POPULATION: ENGLAND AND WALES, 1891-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARISH POPULATION</th>
<th>Net Income (£)</th>
<th>Under 600</th>
<th>600 to 999</th>
<th>1,000 to 1,999</th>
<th>2,000 to 3,999</th>
<th>4,000 to 5,999</th>
<th>Over 6,000</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. UNDER 200</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>3418</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>5552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 200-299</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>4386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 300-499</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>3105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 500-699</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OVER 700</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TOTALS</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>6320</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>14018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Row 1 includes 1379 parishes with net incomes of less than £100 (average, £65)

Source: Convocation Report No. 269 on 'Diminished Incomes of the Clergy' (1893), p.11
APPENDIX : TABLE 15

LEVEL OF CHURCH 'RANK' OBTAINED BY MAJOR GROUPS, INCLUDING CAMBRIDGE HONOURS SAMPLE (Number and %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishops</th>
<th>Dignitaries</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major*</td>
<td>Minor†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cambridge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sample</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Ordinand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sample</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other Oxbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cambridge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sample</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Ordinand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sample</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-Oxbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ordinand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1†</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sample)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: * Deans, Canons and Archdeacons
† Honorary posts, i.e. honorary canon, rural dean.
‡ A marginal case - a Durham graduate who was Dean of the Scottish See, Argyll and the Isles - a post not really comparable in dignity (or reward) with the English equivalent.
1: REFERENCE WORKS AND DIRECTORIES

As a great deal of my research involved the collection of biographical detail certain works were regularly used, or consulted. In a few cases recourse was had to directories of particular Oxford colleges, or of particular schools. Most of the information, however, was obtained from the following standard works:

Alumni Cantabrigienses. A biographical list ... to 1900: Part II, 1752 to 1900, by J.A. Venn, 6 vols., Cambridge, 1940-1954 [Venn].

Alumni Oxonienses. The members of the University of Oxford, 1715-1886, J. Foster; 4 vols., 1887-8 [Al.Ox.]. (Supplemented occasionally by the same author's Oxford Men, 1880-1892): the Bodleian has 2 copies of the former, annotated respectively by the compiler and by J.E.B. Mayor, which often provide additional information, particularly dates of death and references to obituaries.


Burke's Peerage and Baronetage [Burke P. and B.], and Burke's Landed Gentry [Burke L.G.], various editions (used with Burke's Family Index, 1976). The Complete Peerage and Complete Baronetage by G.E.C. were also consulted.

Dictionary of National Biography [D.N.B.].


Who Was Who (from 1897).

Clerical Directories: The Clergy List (from 1841) mainly superseded by Crockford's Clerical Directory (first pub. 1858).

2: DIOCESAN PAPERS (AND LOCAL SOURCES)

Oxford

In the Western Mss. of the Bodleian Library are deposited almost complete diocesan records, catalogued as Ms. Oxf. Dioc. Papers. The major items used were:

Diocesan Registers, 1802-78; b. 22-5.

Act Books, 1830-68; d. 109 and c. 760.

Ordination books, 1836-83; c. 890, c. 940, c. 267-8.

Ordination papers, with some correspondence; c. 234-6 (1851-3), c.242-5 (1861-3), c. 251-4 (1871-3).

Visitation Returns; b. 40-1 (1838), d. 701 (1854), d. 179 (1857), d. 180 (1860), and c. 330ff (1866 onwards).
Diocese Books; d. 550, d. 178, b. 70-2 and d. 761 (scrapbooks of Wilberforce and Mackarness).

Canon W.J. Oldfield's Mss. volumes 'Clerus Dioc. Oxon.' (R. Top. 726) provided useful checks. Some parish papers were also consulted, viz. (Mss. D.D. Par.) Stanton St. John, Dorchester, Mongewell.

Ripon

The Bishop retains the Mss. volume 'Archives of the See of Ripon', with entries by the first 3 bishops.

The diocesan records appear to have suffered from the see's various permutations: thus no Visitation Returns could be traced, after Bickersteth's accession in 1857. Records used were:

Act Books: held by the Registrars, Booth and Co. of South Parade, Leeds.

Ordination papers (with some correspondence), deposited at the Leeds Archives Dept.; part-catalogued as RD/RO (1841, etc.).

Parish papers of Rastrick (D-52 and D-65-76) and Hepworth (D-92) were consulted at the County Record Office, Wakefield.

Chichester

Most papers are in the West Sussex Record Office, Chichester, though Bishop Gilbert's 'Register' is still held by the Registrar: it is however available to be read in the W.S.R.O. Other items mainly used (all E.P.I.):

Ordinands' subscription books; 4A/1-3.

Visitation Returns; 22A/1, 2 and 4.

Typescript 'History of the Diocese', by L.J. Hodgson; 53/9/1.

Some use was also made of collections relating to local history, at the Oxford Public Library, the Local History section at Leeds Central Library, and at the Public Library in Chichester. Runs of local Directories were used, from the Leeds Central Library, the Bodleian, and the W.S.R.O. Where relevant volumes existed, the Victoria County Histories were also consulted.

3: CHURCH PUBLICATIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL RECORDS

(a) Publications - General

The two major series, as in any study of later 19th century church history, are

Reports of the Church Congresses (C.C.R.) published annually after the Conference, from 1861.
Chronicle of the Convocation of Canterbury (Ch.C.); the Journals of the York Convocation (J.C.) are less comprehensive and organised: use of the Ch.C. is greatly facilitated by J.E. Stocks, D.D., A chronological list of Reports of Committees of both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury 1847-1921 (1921), which has a useful 'Preface' and also locates debates on Reports. Consulted from 1857, when the 'Chronicle' proper begins.

Preliminary Examination of candidates for Holy Orders. Papers and regulations. These were published from 1875 to 1884 in Cambridge, and thereafter jointly at Oxford: gives papers, examiners (and their reports from 1889) and class lists.

Reports of 'Conferences upon the training of candidates for Holy Orders': first seven Reports consulted (1881, 1882, 1884, 1887, 1891, 1896, 1899): after the first, copies were endorsed 'For private circulation only'. Published in various cities: bound copies in the Bodleian (Per 26332.e.21).

Church of England Year-Book (title varies in earliest editions); first published 1882, with increasingly comprehensive parochial statistics, among much else.

Handbook of the Theological Colleges of the Church of England and the Episcopal Church in Scotland, published from 1884; brief guide to costs, bursaries, entrance details.

The supply and training of candidates for Holy Orders. Report, with notes, appendices, and recommendations, presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury ... (printed in Poole, not formally published, June 1908).

Conference of bishops of the Anglican Communion ... [at Lambeth, 1908] ... Encyclical letter from the bishops with the resolutions and reports, 1980.

(b) Publications and papers of societies and institutions.

Additional Curates' Society (formally the Society for the Employment of Additional Curates in Populous Places). Apart from Home Mission Field (see Periodicals), the first Minute Book was consulted: this covers the years 1837-51, and with the subsequent books is located at the Society's office.

Chichester Theological College. Some papers are held by the college. The two major items are:

Scrap-book kept by Principals, from Marriott in 1839, till 1873 (the 'Green Book', for convenience).

'Chichester Theological College Register 1876': contains biographical information on students entering, 1876-81.

Curates' Augmentation Fund. The Fund holds reasonably full records in terms of Reports and Minutes from its inception, though there is a gap in the Reports (1877-84): these are in a monthly format from the early 1870s. There is, however, no correspondence, and only one bound set of application forms, for 1890-1. The Fund office is located at Fulham Palace.
Church Pastoral Aid Society. Reports from 1836 (the first) were consulted: see also Coombs ('Theses').

Elland Clerical (Education) Society. The papers have recently been deposited at the West Yorkshire County Record Office in Wakefield, catalogued as C 84/1-24. The preserved correspondence is miscellaneous and not extensive. The papers mainly consulted were: C84-1, Minute Book 1795-1898; C84-5, Account Book 1836-77; C84-16, Reports (1812, 1816, 1833, and 1862 onwards with minor gaps): also useful is the 1933 Rules, Regulations, and forms of prayer. (Leeds, for the Society): the papers also contained:

London Clerical Education Society, Reports, 1837, 1847, 1867.

Clerical Education Fund, preliminary paper of 1845.

Poor Clergy Relief Corporation. Report, 1897. (As the P.C.R. Society this was started by W.G. Jervis, whose 1862 publication - under 'Books and Pamphlets to 1920' - was inter alia an account of its work). This is the earliest Report held at the Corporation's office; in 1919 it absorbed the 'Clothing Society for the Benefit of Poor Pious Clergymen of the Established Church and their Families', whose reports are almost complete: its history is summarised in 100 Years in the P.P.C., 1820-1919 (Worcester, 1920).

Queen's College Birmingham: Prospectus and rules of the Theological Department ... [14 Jan. 1853].

St. Aidan's Theological College. The papers have been deposited with the Archives of Liverpool University, where they are catalogued under D44, but appear not to have been seriously sorted: therefore relevant papers are scattered through the collection. Major items are: D44/2/1 and 2, Minute books of the Sub- or Finance Committee and of the council, 1857-68; D44/13/1, admission register from the college's recommencement in 1869: D44/23/1, various papers on Baylee and his period. Other useful papers are in D44/24/1, /25/1, /33/1, and /43/1, /12 and /23.

St. Bees College. Most of the papers are now deposited at the Record Office in Carlisle, catalogued Dec/3/1-7: /1-3 are Registers covering 1835-40, 1846-50, and 1850-59: /5 is a large bundle of correspondence to the Principal, G.H. Ainger, 1861-71: /6 is a memorandum relating to the winding up of the college property: /7 covers Calendars 1854-9, and 1867.

Rev. T. Park (Dalton-in-Furness) possesses some later papers, including a later Register and the 1883 Calendar; also a small collection of cuttings and copies from newspapers.
5.

4: OFFICIAL AND GOVERNMENT RECORDS AND PUBLICATIONS

a) Parliamentary Papers

PP 1850, Vol. 42 (364): Abstract of the number and classes of Non-resident and Resident Incumbents in England and Wales; of the number of curates ... and amount of stipends ... [etc: for 1838 and 1848].

PP 1852, Vol. 22 (1482): Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State, Discipline, Studies and Revenues of the University and Colleges of Oxford, together with the Evidence and an Appendix.

PP 1852-3, Vol. 44 (1559): Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State, Discipline [etc.] ... of Cambridge; with the Evidence, Appendix and Index.


PP 1854, Vol. 25 (1821): First report of Her Majesty's Commissioners ... the State of Cathedral and Collegiate Churches in England and Wales, and matter connected therewith.


PP 1873, Vol. 37 (856): Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Property and income of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and of the Colleges and Halls therein; together with Returns and Appendix [Cleveland Commission].

PP 1874, Vol. 7 (289): Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Church Patronage together with ... [proceedings, evidence and appendix].

PP 1876, Vol. 58 (125): Return of the Number of Churches (including Cathedrals) in every Diocese in England, built or restored at a cost exceeding 500 l. since 1840: showing the expenditure in each case, and the sources from which the Funds were derived.


PP 1878-9, Vol. 58 (347): Returns of the total number of Doctors and [M.A.s.] in the University of Oxford who have the right of voting at the election of Members to serve in Parliament for such University: of the number of Electors in Holy Orders: and, similar returns as regards the University of Cambridge.
PP 1881, Vol. 56 (2868): Part I: Minutes of Evidence taken by the University of Oxford Commissioners, together with an Appendix and Index. Part II: Circulars addressed by the Commissioners to the University and the Colleges, with the Answers, or a Digest thereof.

PP 1881, Vol. 72 (116): Return ... with regard to the Curates of the Church of England, for the year 1879.

PP 1886, Vol. 51 (214 - Sess 1): Universities (Oxford and Cambridge): Return from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge of particulars with respect to each university professorship, readership, and lectureship; the fellowships of each college ... [etc.]

PP 1895, Vols. 43-9 (7862): Royal Commission on Secondary Education [Bryce Commission].


b) Other Central Records

Census: as well as the printed returns from 1841 to 1911, certain of the enumerators' books were used for some biographical details (consulted both at the P.R.O. and in local libraries).

Probate records and wills (at Somerset House) were consulted also for similar biographical detail.

5: PERIODICALS, ETC., OF 19TH CENTURY: with a list of major articles used.

College Magazine and Student's Journal, Nov. and Dec. 1849 (only numbers in Bodleian).

Cornhill Magazine
- [J.F. Stephen], 'The Church as a Profession'; Vol. 9, June 1864, p.750.

Contemporary Review
- 'Life at high pressure'; Vol. 25, March 1875, p.623.
- Sidgwick, H., 'Idle Fellowships', Vol. 27, April 1876, p.679.

Edinburgh Review
- [Empson, W. and Newman, F.W.], 'Universities'; Vol. 88, July 1848, p.163.

-[Conybeare, W.J.], 'The Church of England in the mountains'; Vol. 97, April 1853, p.342.

--- 'Church parties'; Vol. 98, October 1853, p.273.


-[Tait, A.C.], 'Education for poor and rich'; Vol. 99, Jan. 1854, p.158.


Home Mission Field: a journal connected to the Additional Curates Society, containing 'Reports' etc. of A.C.S., and some general material: used from Jan. 1859, start of 'New Series', to c. 1890.

National Review

- MacLeane, D., 'The Church as a profession'; Vol. 33, Aug. 1899, p.945.

Nineteenth Century


- Taylor, A.D., 'Hodge and his parson'; Vol. 31, March 1892, p.360.

Quarterly Review

- [Mozley, J.B.], 'The Oxford University Commissioners'; Vol. 93, June 1853, p.152.

- [Cheney, R.H.], 'Church extension'; Vol. 103, Jan. 1858, p.139.

- [Sewell, W.], 'Training of the clergy'; Vol. 111, April 1862, p.440.

- [Wilberforce, S.], 'The Church and her curates'; Vol. 123, July 1867, p.220.

- [Burrows, M.], 'University Reform'; Vol. 124, April 1868, p.385.

- [Ashwell, A.R.], 'The state of the Church'; Vol. 137, July 1874, p.246.

Treasury, The

Newspapers: The only newspaper extensively consulted has been the Times, though the Guardian and some local papers have been consulted on details.

6: BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS, TO 1920

Anon., The curate's appeal to the equity and Christian principles of the British Legislature ..., 1819

- To-day and yesterday - A satire, Chiswick, 1824.


- Suggestions relating to the professional education of the clergy, 'By a late Fellow of Balio1 College', 1833.

- Hints to young clergymen on various matters of form and duty, 'By the Incumbent of a country parish, 1835.

- Humbling recollections of my ministry - By a Clergyman of the Established Church, 1842.

- The whole case of the unbeneﬁced clergy, or a fully candid, and impartial enquiry into the position of those clergy commonly called the Curates of the Established Church, 'By a Presbyter of the Church', [1843].

- Wanted a Curate, or, a peep into Clerical Advertisements, a satirical poem, 'By Gregory Shortcommons, Curate of Little Tithehurst', 1853.

- A few words on the transfer by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of the ancient patronage of the See of Chichester to other bishops, 'By an Incumbent of the Diocese', Chichester, 1859.

- List of charities, general and diocesan, for the relief of the clergy, their widows and families, 1859.

- Clerical papers, by one of our Club, 1861.

- The deﬁcient supply of well-qualiﬁed clergymen for the Church of England at the present time. A paper read before the Liverpool Clerical Society ... June 8, 1863, Birkenhead, 1863.

- Clerical recreations: thoughts for the clergy, by one of themselves, 1863.

- The Lord Chancellor's Act for the sale of his livings; with a full account of each compiled from the most authentic sources; Age of incumbent ... [etc.], 'By a Clergyman of the Church of England', 1863.

- Twelve queries on the assessment of clerical incomes, 'By a College Incumbent', 1863.
Anon. (cont'd), The politics of churchmen, 1863.

- The recreations of a country parson, First Series, Popular edition, 1864.

- Unfair assessment of the clergy: a letter to the Rt. Hon. C.P. Villiers, M.P., on the unjust and mischievous operation of the Union Assessment Committee Act of 1862, as it affects the clergy ..., 'By a Country Rector', 1866.

- The cure of souls by purchase: four letters reprinted from the 'Manchester Examiner and Times' ..., By "Promotion by Merit", Manchester, 1873.

Allon, H., Within and without: a church retrospect of thirty years, 1874.


Balleine, G.R., A history of the Evangelical party in the Church of England, 1908.

Bartrum, E., Promotion by merit essential to the progress of the Church: a letter to Henry Chester, Esq., 1866.

Baylee, J., Theological colleges: their true use and their important bearing upon the theological education of the clergy, 1855.

Beazor, J.A. Awake thou that sleepest [a sermon], 1872.

Benson, E.W., The cathedral: its necessary place in the life and work of the church, 1878.

Bickersteth, R., A charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Ripon ... April 1876, 1876.


Bowden, J.W., A few remarks on pews, 1843.

Bowditch, W.R., An easy method of augmenting small endowments: a letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1864.


Burgon, J.W., A plea for the study of Divinity in Oxford, 1875.


Clark, H., The pew system in the National Church: why do not the people worship: An address delivered at Sion College ..., 18th March, 1869, 1869.
[Close, F.] Dean of Carlisle, Cathedral reform, 1864.

[Cox, J., D.D.], The professions, with other pieces, 1836.

Cuddesdon College 1854-1904: a record and memorial, 1904.


Davenant, F., What shall my son be? Hints to parents on the choice of a profession or trade and counsels to young men on their entrance into active life: illustrated by anecdotes and maxims of distinguished men ..., 1870.

Davies, C.M., D.D., Orthodox London: or, phases of religious life in the Church of England, First and second series, 1874 and 1875.

Edgeworth, R.L., Essays on professional education, 1809.
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