BUTLER

THE OXFORDSHIRE RECORD SOCIETY



1969

The Oxfordshire Record Society

1969

President:

COL. JOHN THOMSON, T.D.
Lord Lieutenant of Oxfordshire and Custos Rotulorum

Vice-Presidents:

THE RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD
THE RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF DORCHESTER
THE VEN. THE ARCHDEACON OF OXFORD
THE RT. HON. THE LORD SAYE AND SELE
THE RT. HON. THE LORD ESHER
COLONEL SIR CHARLES PONSONBY, BART
BRIGADIER F. R. L. GOADBY

Chairman:

THE REV. E. P. BAKER

Vice-Chairman:

MISS M. R. TOYNBEE

Hon. Treasurer:

F. P. REDMAN, ESQ.
c/o Bodleian Library, Oxford

Hon. Editor:

DR. J. F. A. MASON, Christ Church, Oxford

Council:

J. S. W. GIBSON, ESQ., MRS. M. D. LOBEL, DR. D. M. BARRATT
DR. P. D. A. HARVEY, DR. A. H. T. ROBB-SMITH, P. S. SPOKES, ESQ.
DR. ERIC STONE, MISS M. R. TOYNBEE, H. M. WALTON, ESQ.

Hon. Secretary:

DR. W. O. HASSALL, The Manor House, Wheatley

THE LETTER-BOOKS OF SAMUEL WILBERFORCE

The Oxfordshire Record Society

THE LETTER-BOOKS OF SAMUEL WILBERFORCE 1843–68

Transcribed and Edited by R. K. Pugh
with the assistance of J. F. A. Mason

VOLUME XLVII
Issued for the year 1969

PUBLISHED JOINTLY BY THE
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE RECORD SOCIETY
and the
OXFORDSHIRE RECORD SOCIETY

1970

This Edition © Oxfordshire Record Society 1970
SBN 902509 00 4

Printed in England by
W. S. MANEY & SON LIMITED
HUDSON ROAD LEEDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
FOREWORD	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
INTRODUCTION	ix
THE LETTER-BOOKS OF SAMUEL WILBERFORCE	1
APPENDIXES	
I *Wilberforce and the Churches at Alverstoke*	411
II *Wilberforce and the 'Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society'*	413
III *Wilberforce and Bloxham School*	415
INDEX OF PERSONS	417
INDEX OF PLACES	427
INDEX OF SUBJECTS	434

FOREWORD

Only those who have seen the Letter-Books of Samuel Wilberforce in the Bodleian Library can fully appreciate the service to scholarship which Dr. R. K. Pugh has performed by the painstaking transcription of over 700 letters printed in this volume, the great majority of them for the first time. However, the printing of his invaluable text has required the co-operation of a number of organisations.

The subject which figures in these letters more than any other is the ecclesiastical history of the county of Oxford during a famous episcopate, and the Oxfordshire Record Society was, therefore, the most appropriate local society to undertake their publication. But the Society would not have been able to do this without assistance from six other bodies. Not only was the volume itself likely to prove costly, but portions of it concerned Wilberforce's activities in other counties; Buckinghamshire and Berkshire were part of his diocese, he had been Archdeacon of Surrey and Rector of a parish in Hampshire; and he was extremely active in the affairs of the Church of England at a national level. The funds of the Oxfordshire Record Society can, of course, only be spent on documents concerning Oxfordshire.

The turning-point came when the Buckinghamshire Record Society agreed to publish this volume jointly with the Oxfordshire Record Society, and the latter is most grateful to the officers of its sister Society, and particularly to Mr. J. G. Jenkins, its former Honorary Editor, for their ready co-operation. It happens that relatively few of the letters concern Berkshire; but the Berkshire County Council has generously assisted publication with a grant. The Committee for Advanced Studies of the University of Oxford, and Christ Church, Oxford, have given similar help, and the Trustees of the Greening-Lamborn Trust have again aided this Society with a most generous subvention. Finally, the British Academy marked its sense of the importance of publishing a complete edition by assisting the Society for the second time. As a result, the Oxfordshire Record Society is able to publish the complete text of the Letter-Books: it offers its grateful thanks to all those who have made this difficult enterprise possible.

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD

April 1969

J. F. A. MASON
Hon. Editor, O.R.S.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A.K.C.	Associate of King's College (London).
B.A.	Bachelor of Arts.
Bart.	Baronet.
C.	Curate.
(C)	Member of Cambridge University.
C.M.S.	Church Missionary Society.
d.	Died.
DAB	*Concise Dictionary of American Biography* (1964).
D.C.L.	Doctor of Civil Law.
D.D.	Doctor of Divinity.
DEA	H. M. Colvin, *Biographical Dictionary of English Architects* (1954).
D.L.	Deputy Lieutenant.
DNB	*Dictionary of National Biography.*
Essays	S. Wilberforce, *Essays contributed to the Quarterly Review* (2 vols., 1874).
Foster	J. Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses 1715–1884.*
Hon.	Honorary *or* Honourable.
I.o.W.	Isle of Wight.
Life	A. R. Ashwell and R. G. Wilberforce, *Life of Samuel Wilberforce* (3 vols., 1880–2).
m.	Married.
M.A.	Master of Arts.
MEB	*Modern English Biography* (repr., 1965).
n.	note.
N.Z.	New Zealand.
(O)	Member of Oxford University.
P.C.	Perpetual Curate.
Prof.	Professor.
Pugh	R. K. Pugh, The Episcopate of Samuel Wilberforce (Oxford University D.Phil. thesis, 1957; Bodleian Library MS D.Phil. d. 1912).
R.	Rector.
Rev.	Reverend.
Sec.	Secretary.
S.P.C.K.	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
S.P.G.	Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.
V.	Vicar.
V.C.H.	*Victoria County History.*
Venn	J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part II, 1752–1900.*

English counties are cited by the normal abbreviations.

INTRODUCTION

The letters published here were discovered in 1955 in the attic of a bungalow attached to Backsettown, a famous rest-home established at Henfield in Sussex by the actress Elizabeth Robbins and Dr. Octavia Wilberforce. In the same year I was introduced to Dr. Wilberforce by Dr. Owen Chadwick whilst I was working for my doctoral thesis on Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, who was Dr. Wilberforce's grandfather. Having recently retired from her medical practice in Brighton, she had moved the family archives with her; and my inquiry stimulated her into making her own researches into the contents of the dusty tea-chests which a professional career had made inaccessible to her for many years. Her own ambition, to publish a collection of the family letters, proved impracticable, but it has been realized by Mr. David Newsome in his excellent book, *The Parting of Friends* (1966). My own needs were more limited: I was concerned with the administration of the Oxford diocese. Most of the papers found were family letters, which had been utilized by the Bishop's biographers, Canon Ashwell and R. G. Wilberforce (Dr. Wilberforce's father) in the 1880s. The collection was felt to be too valuable to remain in a country attic, and it was transferred by stages to the Bodleian Library. On Dr. Wilberforce's death in 1963, it was purchased by the Library from the Backsettown Trustees, and it is still being sorted and catalogued. The papers found in 1955 may only represent part of the original Collection; nevertheless one section of them proved of outstanding interest, namely the letter-books printed in this volume.

Before the invention of typewriters and carbon paper, the copying of correspondence was a tedious affair. There was really no alternative to making longhand copies, either oneself or by employing a clerk, as happened with all Gladstone's letters, public or private, when he held office. However, during the nineteenth century, carbon paper came into use; some of the letters in this volume were copied in this way: a stiff pen was used, and the copies were very legible; they were made on to the pages of a book of tracing paper. Then a new method came into use, which lingered on well into the present century: a little of the ink was removed from a letter by squeezing it against wet tissue paper in a special press. A wide variety of business concerns made use of this messy system, but, so far as I know, Wilberforce was the only bishop to do so. As Archdeacon of Surrey he had used carbon paper and a stiff pen; but as soon as he became a bishop, he ordered one of the patent copying machines, and for several years used it to keep copies of the most important letters he wrote. Perhaps it was a new toy, and it lost its attractiveness in the later 1850s. But it was responsible for the bulk of this collection of letters.

The collection came to light in what proved to be an inconvenient order. Dr. Wilberforce first discovered what is now seen to be the sixth volume, and lent it to me for transcription. As most of the letters

were about diocesan affairs, they were most valuable for my research. Later, it was found that there were seven other volumes, some of which overlapped others chronologically. It was also apparent to the authorities of the Bodleian Library that these volumes of flimsy tissue paper were too fragile to be generally available to readers, and I was therefore invited to continue my work of transcription. This proved to be a bigger undertaking than I had anticipated, because of the illegibility of the third and largest volume: for the actual method of copying involved the hazard that the tissue might not make proper contact with the original or might get blurred when being pressed. Experiments with ultra-violet lamps (kindly lent by the science departments of Southampton University and Bryanston School) unfortunately did little to help matters. Moreover, my own time was naturally much limited when I left Oxford; however, a Bournemouth parishioner, Mrs. Wilhelmina Phillips, very kindly offered her services as typist and assistant. A set of my typescript copies of the letter-books is now in the Bodleian (MSS dep. d. 148, 204, 208–11).

My original intention was to publish the letter-books exactly as they stood. However, because of the overlaps mentioned, this would have led to numerous departures from chronological order, and Dr. Mason, the General Editor of the Society, put the point of view of the general reader so persuasively that the letters have been arranged in order of date. The italic number which has been printed at the top right hand of each letter represents the position of the original letter in the appropriate letter-book; the reader who wishes to do so can thus reconstruct the original order without recourse to my transcripts in the Bodleian which are arranged according to letter-books. It should be added that Wilberforce sometimes left pages or spaces blank and filled them up later, and that the full dates of letters cannot always be read with certainty.

The collection consists of eight volumes of varying sizes, the two largest, numbers 3 and 6, being made by the wet-press method, the others by carbon copying.

These details may be useful:

Vol.	Dates	Number of Letters	Falling in this edition between	and	Bodleian MS. Wilberforce
1	1843–5	61	1	61	d.1
2	1845–8	55	62	289	d.2
3	1845–53	264	65	472	d.3
4	1849–50	43	293	356	d.4
5	1850–4; 1861	83	357	660	d.5
6	1853–7	158	473	653	d.6
7	1862–4	53	661	713	d.7
8	1864–8	15	714	728	d.8
		732			

The highest numbered letter is no. 728; the discrepancy between this figure and the total of 732 above is due to two oversights. Five letters in the third letter-book were unfortunately at first overlooked owing to Wilberforce's habit of using more than one letter-book at one time; the omission was discovered after the rest had been numbered and actually set up in type. These five are accordingly numbered 239a-e and follow no. 728 at the very end of the text. Secondly, the number 651 is unused.

It was early decided (funds permitting) to publish the text of the letter-books in full, although a small proportion of the letters themselves had previously been printed: thus a few were published in contemporary pamphlets not now generally accessible,[1] and about 50 were included in Ashwell and R. G. Wilberforce's *Life* of the Bishop. A reference to the *Life* has been inserted in this edition wherever appropriate. However, the Bishop's biographers took certain liberties with the text of a number of these letters, in which passages were silently altered or suppressed, or names omitted; accordingly the letter-books have been printed in full to provide (it is hoped) an improved text. Wilberforce of course wrote very many other letters; but this edition presents all those which he is known to have recorded by these particular methods.

It is occasionally impossible to reproduce in print exactly what Wilberforce wrote, but throughout I have sought by as accurate and consistent a transcription as possible to reproduce the often breathless and hurried air of his letters. The beginnings and endings of letters have been reproduced as they stand, except that space has been saved by compressing the endings into one line. The original punctuation has been followed wherever it is certain that this is what the Bishop wrote; he was prone to use a dash (—) for a full stop, and what looks like the sign for 'equals' (=) instead of a colon. Words underlined by the writer once are printed in italics; if underlined more than once, the fact is stated in a footnote. The original spelling is used, in connexion with which certain peculiarities may be noted at the outset: Wilberforce frequently wrote 'alledge', 'cemetary', 'disatisfaction', 'excercise', 'expence', 'mistify' (also 'mistyfy'), 'priviledge' (even 'privilidge'), 'publickly', 'promulge', 'sanatory'; he used 'license' and 'practise' as nouns, and @ to denote 'about'. The word '*sic*' has been reserved for oddities other than these. His punctuation is often rhetorical rather than grammatical, and on occasions he fails to make grammatical sense at all; this is particularly so in the outraged and anguished letter he wrote about his son to the Headmaster of Eton (no. 617). Where the poorness of the copy has made it necessary to resort to guesswork, square brackets are used. Round brackets are in the original text.

My aim in the notes has been simply to identify as many as possible of the persons addressed or mentioned; a note is almost always provided

[1] Cf. the note to no. 348. It may be added that no. 171 was printed in C. E. K[ennaway], *The Bishop of Oxford and Dr. Hampden: with an appendix of correspondence* (1848), pp. 11–12; but my systematic search for previously published texts has been limited to the biography by Ashwell and Wilberforce.

at the first occurrence of a name. A difficulty in the case of the recipients is that the contents of the letter-books were imperfectly listed or indexed by Wilberforce himself. His chronological lists of the contents of the last two letter-books are apparently complete; but the list of the contents of the first omits the last eight letters in that letter-book, and that of the contents of the second omits eleven letters. The alphabetical index at the beginning of the third letter-book unfortunately omits over 100 letters, nearly two-fifths of the contents of that letter-book; the index to the fifth omits only four letters, but that to the sixth omits over thirty. The fourth letter-book contains neither list nor index. As the Bishop sometimes omitted the addressee's name after writing out his letter, the list or index is thus often the only available guide to the identity of the recipient; moreover the Bishop sometimes got the initials of his correspondent wrong.

For this and other reasons it has been necessary to approach a large number of persons for further information or advice, and the Hon. Editor and I are most grateful for the courtesy and ready help of the following: Mrs. Eleanor Cottrill, County Archivist of Hampshire (in connexion with nos. 2, 9, 22, 42, 60, 68); the Rev. W. E. Rees, Rector of Alverstoke (nos. 15, etc., and Appendix I); the City Librarian, Southampton (no. 18); Mrs. Kay Percy, Limpsfield (no. 30); the City Librarian, Portsmouth (nos. 57–8 and Appendix I); Dr. W. O. Hassall (no. 81); Miss Angela Green, County Archivist of Berkshire, and her assistant Miss Doreen Slatter (nos. 129, 217, 222, 342, 345, 425, 489); the Town Clerk of Oxford (no. 348); Professor W. R. Ward (nos. 354, 486); Dr. P. D. A. Harvey (no. 365); Dr. E. F. Jacob (nos. 372, 711); Mr. M. G. Rathbone, County Archivist of Wiltshire (no. 425); Dr. Owen Chadwick (no. 486); Dr. Penry Williams (no. 580); Dr. Henry Chadwick (no. 617); Mrs. I. Pritchard, Chapter Clerk of Windsor (no. 629); Mr. N. H. Wilkinson (no. 694); Dr. H. M. Colvin (no. 675); Mr. E. J. Kahn of Bloxham School (no. 675 and Appendix III), and Mr. David Newsome (no. 711). The incumbents of Wootton, Oxon. (nos. 462–3), Hever (no. 572), Bishop's Waltham (no. 573), Tisbury (no. 588), Britwell Salome (no. 669), Shalstone (no. 695), and Smeeton Westerby and Tansor (no. 726) were also most helpful, and some of them kindly supplied reminiscences about the subjects of our enquiries. Mr. J. W. Dickinson kindly made enquiries on our behalf at the Buckinghamshire Record Office. Despite this help, we have had to admit defeat on occasions; others will no doubt remedy our deficiencies. However, fewer than twenty recipients of these letters remain unidentified, and some must probably always remain so.

For identification of the clergy of the Oxford diocese, Canon Oldfield's manuscript index of the Oxford Diocesan Registers, available in the Bodleian Library under the title *Clerus Diocesis Oxoniensis*, has been invaluable. *The Clergy List* (first issued in 1841) and *Crockford's Clerical Directory* (first issued in 1855) have been other standbys; *The Oxford Diocesan Calendar* was first published in 1857. In a few cases the *Dictionary of National Biography* has been useful, but many more persons of the

generation in question are included in *Modern English Biography*, to which Dr. Mason drew my attention. For most, there was further information available in Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses* or in Venn's admirable *Alumni Cantabrigienses*.[1] (It is sad that one has to admit the incomparable superiority of Cambridge over Oxford in this respect — but Trinity College, Dublin, fares even worse.) In general, notes on well-known persons have been made as short as possible, and more space has been given to obscure ones. The existence of an entry in the *DNB* or in *MEB* is indicated by those abbreviations, and of one in Foster or Venn by the abbreviation (O) or (C). For peers or their relatives *The Complete Peerage* or Burke's *Peerage* have been used; no reference is made to these works in the notes.

In a few cases reference has been made to other manuscript material, notably the two Diocese Books (now in the Bodleian) which Wilberforce kept: the earlier (MS. Oxf. dioc. pprs d. 550) was simply a survey of the diocese made in 1846 from the reports of the Rural Deans, and is arranged by Deaneries;[2] the second (MS. Oxf. dioc. pprs d. 178) is a fat volume, arranged alphabetically by parishes, in which the Bishop recorded his later dealings with the individual parishes and their clergy after 1854.[3] In view of the recent publication of Dr. Owen Chadwick's first volume of *The Victorian Church* and of Mr. Newsome's *Parting of Friends*, general background information is given sparingly; this volume is a source book.

* * * *

What sort of man is revealed in these 700 letters? For the most part, it is the public figure, the busy diocesan bishop, the politician, and not the person of warm affection whose character was so enigmatic to his contemporaries. This is only natural. One does not keep copies of personal letters, but of those which may have material and unpleasant repercussions. Wilberforce's personal life is now admirably covered by Mr. Newsome. But it is worth underlining the general sense of personal tragedy which surrounded the glittering public figure. He was born in 1805, the third and favourite son of the great William Wilberforce; his early years were full of promise, and his rise to fame was rapid. He did well at Oriel, but failed to get a fellowship; this, however, caused little grief, for he wanted to marry, and was ordained as curate of Checkendon, near Henley, in 1828. In 1830, his cousin Charles Richard Sumner, the courtly Evangelical Bishop of Winchester, promoted him to the rectory of Brighstone in the Isle of Wight. Here he spent ten happy years, bringing up his large family and publishing his father's biography. During this period he began to emerge into prominence as a public speaker, both on behalf of the missionary societies, and also as his father's natural successor in the campaign against slavery. This attracted the attention of the Prince

[1] A wish to give the ages of the Bishop's correspondents has meant that in a number of cases dates of birth are based on age at matriculation.

[2] Cited by the recent Bodleian Library foliation.

[3] Cited by the Bishop's original (and sometimes erratic) pagination.

Consort and of Queen Victoria, and until 1848 he was in high favour at court. Sumner made him Archdeacon of Surrey in 1839, and Canon of Winchester and Rector of Alverstoke (on the Solent) in 1840. The Queen preferred him to the geologist Buckland as Dean of Westminster in March 1845, and before the year was out Peel had made him Bishop of Oxford.

Wilberforce had an outsize personality, passionate and generous, longing to be loved, sanguine to a fault. But he needed all these attributes to surmount his domestic trials: for his promotion to the Canonry coincided with the death of his wife, Emily Sargent. She came of a frail family (her two brothers and a sister were already dead) and not all her children by Samuel survived; there had been miscarriages, one child died at birth, and the eldest son was to die of consumption in his early twenties. Wilberforce was devoted to his wife, and her death in March 1841 prostrated him.

As a High Church Evangelical, Wilberforce was greatly troubled by the insecurity of his immediate family in matters of religion. Between 1850 and 1868 all three of his brothers, his brother-in-law Manning, two of his sisters-in-law, his only surviving daughter and her husband all left the Church of England in the years following Newman's conversion in 1845. These separations hit the Bishop hard. The language he used about them seems to our more tolerant age extravagant in the extreme. He feared that his separation from his youngest brother, the brilliant but wayward Henry, would become eternal if the latter's adherence to the Papacy betrayed him into further displays of his 'great want of truthfulness'. The effects of Rome upon Manning's character he felt to be more than faintly ridiculous. But when his brother Robert, the deepest intellect of the family, succumbed, it seemed as though the fight was over. For not only were these 'perversions' evil in themselves, but they exposed Samuel to unwarranted suspicion at a time when witch-hunts were conducted with a ruthless and uninformed malevolence inconceivable even in a generation which has witnessed the 'New Theology' and its repercussions.

Wilberforce never lost the basic Evangelicalism of his upbringing, but at Oxford in the 1820s he came into contact with the old-fashioned High Churchmanship which appealed to him as an expression of the faith he felt. He was a friend of the Tractarians, but only up to a point; and he reserved a special hatred for the modernizers like Arnold and Hampden. This meant that he fell out with extremists on all sides, but had a solid following in the centre of the Church, and finally he emerged as a rallying-point for fundamentalists in every party against the attacks of Darwinism and the rationalism of such men as Bishop Colenso. As a result, he spent his life in an atmosphere of suspicion and controversy. Party strife within the Church and amongst the denominations is nowadays only a pale relic of what it was a century ago. The subtleties of a central position were not appreciated. Wilberforce was reproached by Evangelicals for abandoning his father's faith, by Tractarians for being lukewarm and a turncoat, by Whigs and Tories alike for being a Peelite. Erastians deplored his efforts for the disestablished Anglican Churches

abroad; dissenters hated him for his support of the establishment at home. His skill in argument earned him the reputation of a tricky sophist. Assuredly, it was an uncomfortable time to be a bishop, especially if one's prime concern was to infuse some real life into the Church at both parochial and national level. The official biography makes the most of his national activities: his meetings, speeches, letters, intrigues, social brilliance and private alarms. But the sheer hard work involved in running a diocese has not been so well documented until more recent times, in the Rev. E. P. Baker's edition of Wilberforce's 1854 Visitation Returns (O.R.S., xxxv, 1954) and Dr. Diana McClatchey's *Oxfordshire Clergy, 1777–1869* (1960). These letter-books now provide further evidence on Wilberforce's diocesan work, forming as they do a riotous and random mixture of public issues and parochial problems.

In 1848, Wilberforce fell from favour at court because of his involvement in the agitation over the appointment of Professor Hampden to the see of Hereford. Letters dealing with this cover many pages of the letter-books, and many of them have been printed before. They fall into perspective when seen in context.

Nearly two-thirds of the first 60 or so letters relate to Wilberforce's work as Rector of Alverstoke and Archdeacon of Surrey. At that time, the diocese of Winchester covered the whole of Hampshire, Surrey, the Isle of Wight, and the Channel Islands — today the bishoprics of Portsmouth, Southwark and Guildford have been separated from it. As might be expected, there is a markedly episcopal assurance about the way in which Archdeacon Wilberforce dealt with parochial matters. The heaviest concentration of letters comes at the start of his episcopate: this was not just a new broom at work, but a new task in itself. The diocese of Oxford had been created by Henry VIII, but until 1836 it consisted only of the county and city of Oxford. However, in 1836 Berkshire was added from the diocese of Salisbury, and when in 1845 Bishop Bagot moved on to Bath and Wells, leaving a bevy of relatives in sinecure positions as registrars, and thankfully consigning the Newmanites to his successor, the diocese of Oxford was further enlarged by the addition of Buckinghamshire which was detached from the vast diocese of Lincoln. This was all part of the great tidying up of the Church by Act of Parliament, a natural result of the Reform Act of 1832, and a rather belated completion of the aims of the Protestant Reformers.

So Wilberforce found himself responsible for some 600 parishes, at a time when public clamour against clerical slackness was on his side, but the vested interests of generations and countless individuals, and the bitterness of party divisions, were against him. It is common knowledge that he inaugurated an era of vigorous episcopal activity: these letters document what this meant in practice. Patrons were harassed into promising to build parsonage houses, and the clergy were coerced into living in them. Services must be held on the statutory occasions, and sometimes oftener. They must be held at times when the parishioners can get away from their cattle or the kitchens to attend them. Clerical morals

and parish disturbances, shady deals over curates' stipends, theological thunderings over Rome and dissent, are all reflected in the pages of these letters. Some people appear fairly often: famous names like Gladstone and Bishop Blomfield of London. But most of the recipients were parish clergy, some of whom stand out for the frequency of their letters. The most colourful is Thomas Paddon of High Wycombe, who quarrelled with his organist and his curates, whose parishioners wanted to pay him to stay away from his parish, but who finally broke the law on non-residence when he betook himself to Rugby, ostensibly for his health, but in fact to educate his sons there.[1] W. S. Bricknell, vicar of Grove and Eynsham, a prominent Oxford Evangelical, is reproved for holding C.M.S. meetings in the parish of W. J. Butler, the celebrated High Church Vicar of Wantage; and later for a scheme to get a curate on the cheap by occupying both his parsonage houses alternately. In such circumstances, Wilberforce could turn a fine oratorical phrase about the way in which such shifty proceedings would appear on the Day of Judgement, and some recipients no doubt trembled. When there is any hint of party rancour, Wilberforce would express his own impartiality with warmth and a touch of grandeur. But most of the letters are businesslike in style. They were often written at speed, sometimes even in railway carriages, and their effectiveness depended on their being delivered with a speed which the G.P.O. of a century later cannot emulate. They are formal, courteous and precise, as Bishops and other busy people usually have to be. What stands out is the amount and variety of business that had to be done if a diocese like Oxford was to be welded into unity and made to run smoothly with due regard to the standards of regularity and efficiency required by Parliament and desired by most Churchmen. Hunting curates, non-resident or lazy incumbents, aged priests unaware of their need for assistance, and stingy or peculiar clergy trying to evade their legal duty to employ a curate and pay him properly — these are the stuff of the correspondence, and re-reading it in full after ten years' gradual toil has renewed one's own regard for this hard-working and idealistic man trying to bring a little decency and order into a Church torn by faction and retarded by selfishness. Of course, there is another side. Wilberforce could be over-polite to those whom he wished to please, for whatever reason: not for nothing was he called 'Soapy Sam', and pilloried as such in Trollope's *The Warden*. And his sense of fair play, which was scrupulous in the extreme, and which caused his troubles in the Hampden affair, was not always evident in his dealings with curates, who were transient and movable, whereas incumbents were not. But these letters offer little evidence to Wilberforce's discredit; on the positive side, they go a long way to support his reputation as a model administrator of his diocese.[2]

[1] The Bishop's first thoughts on Paddon were perceptive: 'Good man. Flighty beyond imagination. Clever, Eloquent. Extreme. Hard to say what he is.' (Diocese Book, I, f. 136v.)

[2] For Wilberforce's diocesan officials, see notes to nos. 81, 88 and 446; and for the difficulties they caused, no. 282.

Wilberforce was very proud of his Yorkshire descent, and would dearly have loved to be Archbishop of York. In fact, Gladstone's efforts to persuade Palmerston to make this appointment in 1862 are in print. (P. Guedalla, *Gladstone and Palmerston*, 1928, pp. 236–9.) Had the Conservative government fallen earlier in 1868, Gladstone might well have seen to it that Wilberforce, and not Tait, succeeded Longley at Canterbury. The bishopric of Winchester, though fifth in the hierarchy, and very much home ground, did not see Wilberforce at his best. His departure from Oxford in 1869 was the real end of his career: it was here that he had made his mark on the Church, by his twenty-four years of patient and vigorous stewardship, by his foundation of Cuddesdon and Culham Colleges, by his emergence as the spokesman for all shades of conservative opinion against the ravages of scholarly doubt. He went to Winchester a tired old man, taking on a huge but well-ordered diocese, succeeding the man who probably deserves the title often given to Wilberforce himself as 'remodeller of the episcopate', his old patron Charles Richard Sumner. He was now the bishops' elder statesman in the House of Lords, though on political matters he unashamedly took the Liberal whip. Sumner, in retirement at Farnham Castle, outlived him by a year; the fatal fall from his horse, which terminated Wilberforce's life on 19 July 1873, may (in the opinion of Dr. Octavia Wilberforce) have been caused by a coronary thrombosis brought on by overwork. There are no letters in this collection dating from the final years at Winchester; indeed, the frequency of the correspondence falls off considerably in the second half of the Oxford episcopate, and the sixth letter-book is half empty. Perhaps Wilberforce realized that he had established his position and his principles, and could afford to run his diocese in a less formal way.

Wilberforce was undoubtedly one of the great men in a generation of giants. The value of some of his achievements may be debatable: he lived at a time when the established church could still be thought ideally to be the church of the nation, but the tendency of some of his policies was towards the denominationalism which has accompanied the present decline; and his interpretation of the office of a bishop was a curious amalgam of the undoubted legal minimum with the personal leadership which is hard to define, difficult to practise, and impossible to impose. But of his greatness there is no question.

* * * *

In conclusion, I must express a debt of gratitude to many people, and firstly to those institutions whose financial help is acknowledged by the Hon. Editor in his Foreword, to the literary executors of Dr. Octavia Wilberforce for their ready assent to this publication, and to our printers for their constant help. I owe Mrs. Wilhelmina Phillips thanks for her invaluable assistance with the typing and with the copying of some of the letters. The Rev. E. P. Baker, Dr. R. W. Hunt, Dr. W. O. Hassall and Miss M. Barratt have helped me greatly, both with practical help and with much-needed encouragement. But in the last resort, I much

doubt whether this book would ever have reached the reader without the assistance of Dr. Mason himself. He has taken a personal interest in the operation[1] which has lifted it to a higher level. I can only hope that the result justifies and repays the kindness of so many unselfish helpers, and may fittingly mark the centenary of Wilberforce's departure from the diocese which he served so well.

R. K. PUGH

KING ALFRED'S COLLEGE
WINCHESTER

April 1969

[1] Cf. esp. his notes to nos. 150, 300, 457, 459, 556, 624, 654–5, 658, 667, 673, and 711; and Apps. I–III.

The italic numbers at the top right
of each letter denote the place of that letter in the
appropriate MS letter-book; the letter-books are numbered i to viii.
Square brackets denote doubtful readings in the MSS.

THE LETTER-BOOKS OF SAMUEL WILBERFORCE

1. To the Rev. W. Dealtry[1] (*i* 1)[2]

Alverstoke, Jan. 17, 1843

My Dear Dr. Dealtry,

I have received from Mr. Hull the enclosed letter which I wish in confidence to lay before you. Of the 'Shadow of the Cross' I know nothing but that its author sent it to me saying that it was an imitation of Agathos &c. — & that I felt something of the 'pereant qui *post* nos nostra' feeling with regard to it. The ground on which Mr. Hull is about to attack the Rocky Island is its agreement with Dr. Pusey's view &c.[3] Now of course I shall not be there to enter into a theological defence of my writings. But I should be very sorry that such charges should go forth uncontradicted; because I do not agree with those views & do not therefore wish to be identified with them. I presume that I certainly do not agree with Mr. Hull's view; but I suppose most reasonable men will not think this essential to orthodoxy. I claim to agree entirely with the offices on Baptism in our Prayer Book. That Mr. Hull's view is an incorrect one may I think be inter alia strongly suggested from the general sale of the book; & from the fact of its having been stenotyped by the Sunday School Union of New York as well as at Philadelphia: & by its translation into German also. Would you dislike undertaking to be present on the 7th of February & to speak to this effect in my defence — I should prefer your word to that of almost any other Friend: & you will see how such uncontradicted statements might needlessly detract from the just weight of my opinions in very many quarters.

Will you allow the enclosed to be posted *safely* & Believe me to be my Dear Dr. Dealtry, Ever most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

Will you give my very kind remembrances to Mrs. Dealtry.

2. To General Orde[4] (*i* 2)

Confidential

Alverstoke Rectory, Saty., Jan. 22, 1843

My Dear General Orde,

On thinking over the matter of our conversation since you left me today I do not feel easy, in a case of so much importance, without adding one or two words to what passed between us at the moment. You will I know receive them with your usual kindness.

1 William Dealtry (1775–1847), Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge, D.D. 1829; R. of Clapham, 1813–43; Chancellor of Winchester diocese, 1830–45; Wilberforce's successor as Archdeacon of Surrey, 1845–7 (*DNB*).

2 The first page of the book is missing; according to the Index, it contained a letter to the Rev. H. A. Veck.

3 For Wilberforce's relations with Pusey, see no. 74. *The Rocky Island*, a collection of eight allegories with a strong emphasis on the authority of the Church and on sacramental grace, was published by Wilberforce in 1840 and was criticized in Evangelical quarters. See D. Newsome, *The Parting of Friends* (1966), p. 240.

4 Lieut.-Gen. James Orde (d. 1850), whose first wife (m. 1811, d. 1818) had two daughters; on 17 June 1843 Wilberforce married the elder, Margaret Juliana Maria, to the Rev. W. B. Dunbar.

1. I can entertain no doubt on the first point on which you asked my judgement: viz. — that as you consented to a correspondence stating at the time in writing that it did not directly or indirectly pledge you to permitting an engagement, it cannot possibly be construed into the permission of such engagement. The engagement therefore if made on this basis must I think be taken to be *without your sanction.*

2. But I am a little doubtful on the second point of importance. You stated if I did not misunderstand you, that when he could shew a sufficient income to maintain your daughter, & a certain period had elapsed, you would not, if she were of the same mind *oppose the marriage.* If I am right in these premises you would seem to me to be bound, if that period is past; & if he can shew a reasonable income; to give them the benefit of this engagement — & I think that *not opposing* whilst it clearly does not imply *active concurrence,* does truly imply the withdrawing such parental censure of the marriage as constitutes opposition to it. What constitutes that reasonable income, you of course must judge: but you will no doubt agree with me that it must be taken to be something which it was reasonably possible for him to obtain. Should he now, with her fortune, possess such a life income as a Scotch Presbyterian minister of the better class would commonly esteem a competence; & be willing to make a reasonable insurance on his life for her benefit; I hardly see how you can by parental censure, resist the marriage. Believe me that I do not say this without feeling the greatness of the sacrifice to which it calls you. But that sacrifice was really made when to save your childs health you consented under certain contingencies to allow the marriage. Her having acted wrongly in making an engagement without your consent: *his* want of honour & Christian integrity, as well as the painful accidents of his rank in life, his peculiarities of faith & above all your doubts as to his Christian Character: all of these do not seem to me to alter *your* obligation as a Christian man to give them the *full* benefit of your old engagement.

I could not feel easy without saying this from the fear that I might have accidentally by my concurrence have added weight to one of the sorest temptations to recede in some measure from an engagement by which a father can be tried. But the 'whoso sweareth unto his neighbour & disappointeth him not though it be unto his own hindrance' is a principle of very wide extent. I cannot but feel also, that if it be too late to prevent this unhappy connection, the mode in which your unwilling assent is now given to it must have lasting consequences for life, & even beyond life, on your daughters happiness.

I will only add that it is my sincere prayer that you may be led in this matter to a right decision: that the Spirit of truth & love & holiness may direct your mind & bless your determination.

Believe me to remain, My dear General Orde, Ever Most truly yours,
S. Wilberforce

3. To the Rev. J. C. Abdy[1]

(*i 3*)
Alverstoke, Feb. 1, 1843

My dear Sir,

There can be no doubt that the practise which you mention is very undesireable — and yet I hardly see that I can at present interfere respecting it. It is scarcely possible to draw the line between the necessary refreshment — (for which every vestry must at times be used) and such an extension of this as becomes an abuse — without knowing moreover the exact powers of the Wardens of St.

[1] John Channing Abdy, R. of St. John's, Southwark, 1823–45 (O).

Olaves as to fixing the place of payments &c. I cannot take any step concerning it. The evil too is not likely to last; since the Wardens of St. Olaves are so duly impressed with it that they propose erecting a suitable room for such purposes. It was only on Saturday that I examined the designs.

This I am sure will be a great satisfaction to you. I am very much obliged to you for letting me hear from you on the subject and remain

Ever my Dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Wilberforce

4. To the Rev. A. Burmester[1] *(i 4)*

Alverstoke Rectory, Feb. 1, 1843

My Dear Sir,

I hope that by leaving your letter (which performed various peregrinations before it reached me) some little time unanswered I shall in some measure have fulfilled your wishes. I do not (of course) wish to put you to any needless inconvenience in the matter whilst I feel it absolutely necessary to remove the erection.

Will you therefore be kind enough to let me know the exact time for which you wish my order suspended — and the day on which I may calculate on all being ready for the removal of the building. I do not feel that I can accede to its remaining an indefinite time: but I have no doubt that if you will let me know your exact wishes I shall be able to fall in with them.

My address will be, 'the Close, Winchester' as I am going at once into residence.

Believe me to be my dear Sir, Ever very sincerely yours,

S. Wilberforce

5. To the Rev. A. Mangles[2] *(i 5)*

Alverstoke Rectory, Feb. 1, 1843

My Dear Sir,

I was not aware that the Bishop[3] would act upon what I said to him on the subject of your removal from Mr. Snell's[4] R. Deanery without hearing from me again: & I intended to communicate with you directly before the step was taken. If however it is disagreeable to you I will request the Bishop at once to restore you to the Windlesham Deanery. The reason for my mentioning the subject to his Lordship was this. You [*sic*] friend & neighbour Bowles[5] told me that he wished for convenience of access to be in the Guildford & not the Windlesham R. Deanery: and at the time I told him I would get Woking transferred. He added that Windlesham was an inconvenient distance from you as well as from himself. The other day I was told that you & he had both expressed some regret at the probability of the recently established Clerical Meetings connected with the Rural Deaneries interrupting your connexion with the existing Clerical Meeting of the Clergy around Guildford. This, with what had passed before, made me suppose that in common with Bowles, you would find your convenience promoted by being added to the Guildford Deanery. I therefore named it to the Bishop.

1 Alfred Burmester (d. 1867), R. of Mickleham, Surrey, 1813–67 (C).
2 Albert Mangles (1810–75), V. of Horsell, Surrey, 1840–75 (O).
3 Charles Richard Sumner (1790–1874), Wilberforce's second cousin and his predecessor as Bishop of Winchester (1827–69) (*DNB*). See no. 573. As Bishop, Sumner was Patron of Alverstoke.
4 Thomas Snell (1781–1843), R. of Windlesham with Bagshot, Surrey, 1807–43 (O).
5 Charles Bradshaw Bowles (1807–85), V. of Woking, Surrey, 1837–66 (O).

But as I said above with no idea of acting on it without the same direct expression of wish from you as I had already received from Bowles. Will you kindly let me know your wishes on the subject: & believe me to be ever very sincerely yours,

S. Wilberforce

6. To the Rev. E. Pettman[1] *(i 6)*

Alverstoke, Feb. 1, 1843

My dear Sir,

There can be no doubt that 'a sufficient stone font' can be enforced if it were needful on the parish as a subject for a rate. But certainly such a font as this, cannot as I said at first be forced on the Parish. The first point really is to settle whether the mason can prove that such a font was ordered. If he cannot prove this by far the best thing for the Parish will be to having nothing to do with it. Can this not be settled by Arbitration? If it appears that the Churchwardens are bound by their order to take the font then will come the question how they can raise the means.

Will the mason agree to such an Arbitration; will he refer this point to the R. Dean — Or the Mayor of Guildford?

If the Churchwardens prove to be liable for the cost of the font I will gladly join in a subscription to free them from their liability — & I should then propose selling the font. But I earnestly hope they are not liable. It is quite plain that a man must be able to *prove* that *such* a font was ordered before he can recover its cost.

If you will report to me on these points I will at once reply. My address will be 'the Close, Winchester'.

I am ever yours most truly,

S. Wilberforce

7. To the Rev. J. Sinclair[2] *(i 7)*

Alverstoke, Feb. 1, 1843

My dear Sir,

I shall gladly avail myself of the services of the Mistress you offer if you think her competent to the task. I fear my new Schools[3] will not be ready before next Monday week at the earliest. I think it would be a pity to have her before. Could I have her & the new Schoolmaster *on that day*? Perhaps you will kindly let me trouble you for a line in reply to 'The Close' Winchester.

Ever Believe me to be yours, My Dear Sir, Very Sincerely,

S. Wilberforce

8. To the third Earl of Onslow[4] *(i 9)*

Alverstoke Rectory, Feb. 2, 1843

My Dear Lord,

I am really sorry again to trouble you on the subject of the family vault in Merrow Church. But I trust that what I have now to ask, your Lordship may be able to grant without reluctance. It is that you will permit the mode of entrance

1 Edward Pettman (1796–1851), C. of Shalford with Bramley, Surrey (O).
2 John Sinclair (1797–1875), V. of Kensington 1843–75; Archdeacon of Middlesex, 1844–75; Secretary of the National Society from 1839 (*DNB*).
3 I.e. at Alverstoke.
4 Arthur George Onslow (1777–1870); a large landowner in Surrey.

into the Vault to be changed. I learn from my workmen that an entrance may be made through the external wall with very little trouble. The *wall* will have a door inserted; & *within* the bricks of the vault will be removed & replaced just as they now are at the East End of the South Aisle. I venture the more to press this upon your Lordship because a crack has shewn in the course of these alterations that instead of being full there is yet a great deal of room in the Vault: & every time it is opened whilst the entrance remains where it is, the interior of the Church must be greatly defaced. I venture therefore very earnestly to press this on your Lordship.

I remain my Dear Lord, Your Lordships Most Obed$^{t.}$ Servant,

S. Wilberforce

May I request your Lordships answer to be addressed to me at 'the Close, Winchester'.

9. To W. Hearn (*i 8*)

The Close, Winchester, Feb. 3, 1843

My dear Sir,

I am sorry to have been obliged by a press of business to leave your two letters unanswered. But they required a little consideration — and indeed I must now trouble you for a little further information on the subject. I shall be obliged by your informing me *1st* whether I am to consider that this is a *legal* claim or whether I am asked to pay this £10 being morally bound to do so, though it cannot be legally demanded. *IIly* I must ask if (as I imagine must be the case as to a claim for payment of a supposed obligation incurred more than 7 years ago & now first advanced) it be only a moral obligation to which you appeal, that you will make the nature of that obligation somewhat more plain. Surely you will be able from the records of the Guardians to produce some correspondence, or some proof that the ten pounds was to be & was not paid. I need hardly say that I will gladly send you the money at once if you will do this. All that I recollect of the matter is this that an apprentice was Ballotted to me! that I intended to take her — that on enquiry at the House I did not take her. I have an impression that I did not take her because she was not fit for service. But whether this was so & the fine was therefore not levied: or whether I paid the fine, I cannot now remember. I certainly imagined that I had fully settled the matter — & I can scarcely even now imagine that with such an able officer as the Guardians have long possessed in you such a claim should not have been advanced for seven years; & then on the vouchers of no certain records, unless there were some great mistake concerning it. You will not I trust at all events feel surprized at my needing this information. — If you will kindly furnish it I will gladly meet any demand which you advance.[1]

Believe me my dear Sir, To be ever very truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

10. To the Rev. H. A. Veck[2] (*i 10*)

The Close, Feb. 8, 1843

My dear Sir,

I am much obliged to you for stating to me in writing the grounds of your alledged 'disappointment' at not receiving an endowment from the tithes of

[1] This letter refers to a transaction in Wilberforce's previous parish of Brighstone, I.o.W. William Hearn, of Newport, I.o.W., was Clerk and Solicitor to the local Guardians.
[2] Henry Aubrey Veck (1786–1866), P.C. of St. John's, Forton, 1831–66 (O).

Alverstoke of £100 a year. I cannot however say that I am at all satisfied with the statement. I see nothing in it to warrant the expression of 'disappointment at not being able to carry out your benevolent purposes' which you have avowed to me as having been made by you to your Church Wardens & others. Of this indeed I am obliged to complain as being a misrepresentation of the case injurious to my character.

I *did* intend, & I told you as much, to raise the value of St. John's Forton, by allotting £100 a year to it. I *did* apply for the sanction of the Bishop to such an arrangement; and His Lordship was willing to give it. But at this time the general arrangements of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners allotted £78 to Forton. This of course altered the case. I was prepared to endow it before because it wanted endowment. It now wanted it less — and it became a grave question whether it was better for the parish that Forton should receive £100 a year out of the tithes. I was resolved that *you* should not suffer. I therefore sent you £25 myself, which with the fees I made over to you gave not £100 but £112 for last year — *you* therefore clearly could not be disappointed if you took a reasonable view of the case and I ought not to have been subjected & the Church through me, to the injury of these whispers that I had not kept to my promise to you. I had no wish in the matter except to make the best arrangement for the whole Parish.

But as I wished in the whole matter to do nothing out of regard to my own interest I thought it best to send your full statement of your case to the Bishop: with no other remark than that I begged his Lordship as Bishop & Patron of the living to consider what I ought to do, both with an eye to any supposed engagement to you personally & to the interest of the living. I told his Lordship further that I would cheerfully endow Forton with any amount of the tithes he judged expedient, as I had but one object in view, namely, to consult the real interest of the Parish. His Lordships answer is as follows. 'I have no difficulty about the case. While there was no means of procuring endowment from any other quarter, I advised you to endow Forton with £100 out of the tithes, & was willing as Patron to consent to an alienation to this extent, & no more. But when the Ecclesiastical Commissioners promulgated their proposals it was obviously desireable to obtain their augmentation as far as it would go in the first instance considering that this aid would not have been available for Forton had you endowed that Church with the £100 as originally intended. Forton therefore stands at present precisely as it would have done if you had endowed it with £100. Mr. Veck does not seem to understand this & it should be explained to him by interpreting to him the Eccles. Commers. rules. You have now a reserve fund of £75 per annum (saved from Forton) to be appropriated as may be best for the Parish — and I advise you to secure out of it in the first instance an income for the Hardway and Elson Church.

If you can assign a district of not less than 1000 to the Church you may give an endowment of £50 and apply to the Commissioners for £70 to make up £120 — and if they accede to that proposal, I shall not object to your assigning the remaining £25, if you think fit, to Forton: provided you do not alienate on the whole more than £100 between the two Churches, from the Mother Church. Beyond that I cannot consent to go'.

Now I trust, my dear Sir, that when you have read this and see how exactly the Bishop's view coincides with that upon which I have been acting, you will feel that I have not given you any cause to express 'disappointment' because I have not allotted to your church the same sum *after* it had received an augmentation to its endowment, as that which I had proposed to allot to it *before* it received that augmentation. But whether you agree in this view or not I must beg your

most serious consideration of my original complaint, namely that instead of communicating with me (or with the Bishop, if you were dissatisfied with me) upon the subject; you have made your regrets the subject of conversation with other parties, who could not know all the circumstances of the case. The effect of this must be & I fear has been already, to injure the Church through both of us. Through me, by falsely representing me as breaking an engagement with you; & through you, by exhibiting you in the degrading light of a disappointed Petitioner for an increased salary. Believe me that I feel nothing approaching to anger on this occasion; I am only most anxious that in our future intercourse nothing of this sort may recur, which must injure that blessed cause which is entrusted to us. I need not add that it is my full intention to act upon the Bishops advice; that I always did intend to make over in some way to the Northern division of the parish the £100 I had originally designed for St. Johns: & that *if I can secure £70 per annum from the Eccl. Commissioners*, for the intended Church at Hardway or Elson, I shall have great pleasure in endowing St. Johns in addition to what you have received from the commissioners with £50 per annum from the tithes of the Mother Church. If I do not secure this I can only promise £25, since the whole sum the Bishop allows me to alienate is £100.

As your Churchwardens have been made acquainted by you with the subject I shall transmit to them a copy of this letter that they may understand the matter in all its bearings.

Believe me my dear Sir, To remain ever very truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

11. To the Rev. A. Burmester (*i 11*)

The Close, Winchester, Feb. 9, 1843

My dear Sir,

I am very sorry to give you trouble as to this *building* in your Church Yard, but I cannot conscientiously accede to the request contained in your last letter. If you will refer to mine of Feb. 1 you will see that I said that I could not consent to the building remaining an *indefinite* time; & that I requested you to name a *specific* day for its removal — now your reply informs me that you have for the time quitted & closed the building; but you wish it left standing; that under certain contingencies you may resume its use for an *indefinite* time. You will I am assure [*sic*] see that with my feelings upon this point I cannot assent to this. The building is now left; it must never be opened again: & this will be best secured by its instant removal. I know but too well the difficulty of getting up a School; & I know also how honourable & delightful have been your past exertions at Mickleham. The remembrance of these makes me sure that if *your boats are burned*, (if this house is gone) you will get a School.

I shall therefore by this post write to your Churchwardens ordering the immediate *removal* of the building & desiring them to communicate with you on the subject. I shall be much obliged by your facilitating their operations & remain, My dear Sir, ever most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

12. To the Churchwardens of Mickleham (*i 12*)

The Close, Winchester, Feb. 9, 1843

Gentlemen,

I am informed by the Rev. Mr. Burmester, that on the day named in my instructions, the building in your Churchyard which I pointed out as a desecration

of the consecrated ground, was closed, but that it has not yet been removed. I must therefore request you to see to its immediate & entire removal, & to report to me that this has been done. You will of course before you take any steps put yourselves into communication with Mr. Burmester from whom you will I am certain receive all possible assistance in this matter.

I am Gentlemen your very faithful servant,

S. Wilberforce
Archdeacon of Surrey

13. To Richard Horley, jun.[1] *(i 13)*

The Close, Winchester, Feb. 11, 1843

Sir,

I am very sorry that your letter of Jan. 19 has remained so long unanswered. I put it safely away that it might receive an immediate reply & in some way it then escaped my notice.

There is no question that the general burden of repairing a Churchyard fence rests with the Parish — but that a special custom may oblige any owner of property to repair. Still the *custom*, to be pleaded, must be *precise* — and I am of opinion that no person can be compelled to erect a *fence* or *rail* or *hale*, on proof of a customary maintenance of a hedge. But I do not think that this would prove your hedge, *not* to be the Churchyard boundary fence. I should rather imagine that some past carelessness of the Church Officers had suffered the hedge to be substituted for the fence. I am therefore of opinion that you could legally be called on to maintain a sufficient hedge to form a perfect fence for the Churchyard. Perhaps however the Church Wardens might compromise the matter with you — by undertaking a share of the expence of erecting & maintaining, instead of the hedge, a sufficient rail. This would be a great improvement both to the Churchyard & your Garden — & it strikes me as being an *equitable* arrangement. If you approve of the suggestion perhaps you will talk it over with the wardens: to whom I shall be obliged by your shewing this letter.

I remain Sir, Your faithful servant,

S. Wilberforce
Archdeacon of Surrey

14. To Archdeacon Thorp[2] *(i 14)*

The Close, Feb. the 15, 1843
Wrote a different one
& sent it.

My dear Archdeacon,

I should have been quite sorry that you troubled yourself to acknowledge the receipt of my 'Charge', if it were not that it has drawn from you a far stronger expression of agreement with its tone than I should have ventured to expect. I should really have feared that *my* sentiments with regard to 'pues' would have seemed distinctly heretical to the President of the Camden Society. I have learned so to value unity that I am quite glad to have been enlightened by your letter, on this point.

I am afraid that I cannot give you any assistance in your work of restoration. My own funds as you will readily believe are more than required to meet the

[1] Of Great Bookham, Surrey.
[2] Thomas Thorp (1797–1877); Archdeacon of Bristol, 1836–73 (*MEB*).

direct calls of my Archdeaconry & my parish — where I have now two new churches in hand — and I cannot encourage your applying for aid in the quarters of which you speak. You will I am sure at once perceive that it would be impossible for Her Majesty & the Prince to give to *every* church which is in progress in these days: and that they can lay down no other general rule than that of giving to those places which, for any reason, stand out from the mass & have a peculiar claim on them. Such a claim I do not think you make out. Indeed I will honestly say that I feel a little jealousy of encouraging young men in the habit of seeming to themselves to be restorers of churches when they are only undertaking to collect other persons money & not to sacrifice their own. Is there not a danger of forming in your young men a habit of beginning undertakings without 'counting the cost' & so deceiving themselves whilst you thus 'teach them the principles of Church restoration'? This at least is the light in which it strikes me; you will excuse me if you judge me mistaken.

Believe me my dear Archdeacon to be ever very truly yours,
S. Wilberforce

P.S. Pray forgive the accident which has defaced the other side of this sheet. Are you doing anything in your Archdeaconry about Bangor & St. Asaph. I was in one of your deaneries the other day (near Swindon) & the clergyman told me he was expecting something to be done to give them the opportunity of Petitioning but believed they were waiting for you.

15. To R. Cruickshank[1]

(*i* 15)

The Close, Feb. 16, 1843

My dear Sir,

I am truly grieved that the extreme backwardness of Messrs. Coward & Wolfe has kept you so long out of the money due to you by them for the bricks of the School; as well as all of us, out of the use of the rooms. As in this case, as well as the Church, a large proportion of the money comes from public boards from whom no remittance can be obtained until certificates are received of the due completion of the work, I cannot obtain this part of the money: & I have already paid to the builders, in order that they may continue the work, more than I have altogether received towards the building. You will be sorry to hear that there is in fact a deficiency of about £100 in the whole fund as yet promised. But I am most anxious to meet your convenience and I therefore inclose in this letter to Mr. Adams a cheque for £150 which I request him to pay to you when he has obtained Messrs. Coward & Wolfes receipt for the same on my behalf. You will see at once that I must be protected by their receipt: as it would be no legal bar to their claim against me that I had paid you. I enclose the note to Mr. Adams that you may see him & urge him at once to obtain Cowards receipt & hand over the money to you. Will you kindly acknowledge its safe arrival. I need not remind you, that their slackness in payment has not originated with me, but in their own tardiness; & that I did not receive Cowards contract without your advice.

I am grieved that you think my suggestion about the Anglesey Church[2] endowment inadmissible: and I would beg you once more to consider that part of it which respects houses which may hereafter be built. Those built already I give

[1] Robert Cruickshank, founder of Anglesey-ville, on Stokes Bay in Alverstoke.

[2] St. Mark's Chapel, Anglesey, begun at Cruickshank's instance and mainly by his liberality. See further the statement which follows no. 55, and App. 1.

up. But it does appear to me that a rent charge say of £1 per house on all future houses would be an unobjectionable & very desireable arrangement. There is I fear no other chance of an *endowment* than this — & I do not think that such a Church ought to remain a permanent burden to the living. An annual collection for an endowment would I am convinced fail. I have no objection indeed to try it — but it would yield next to nothing. I have been met on all sides by the unequivocal expression of an opinion that the church should never have been begun: that it is too near the Mother Church — & that the wants of the place do not in that spot, require such an addition. That an enlargement of the Mother Church was the really desireable step — I only mention this now (which you will well remember was my original opinion) to shew the reason why I fear that a collection for an endowment would add very little to our funds. As to the reasonableness of this proposal I know so thoroughly your true liberality that I hardly like to speak about it. And yet I believe it will be best for me to say with entire openness all I do think about it. You will reply to me with the same. It seems to me that in fairness you may be expected to contribute to the Church & its endowment *what you would have been called on to make good if it had been completed & consecrated on your original plan.* This seems to me to fall upon you as the Originator of the Scheme: & that, all the more, because I, from the first, regretted that it had ever been devized; & only fell into our subsequent arrangement as the best mode of extrication from the difficulties of the case. I may be expected, I think, in fairness, to furnish either in diminution of the endowment of £1000, or to the building fund, by myself, subscriptions of friends, the grants of the Societies, & alternate endowment, whatever sum, over & above such original cost & endowment, the building as it now is, (*on our joint orders*), will cost. You mention in your letter £2400 as the sum which the Church would have cost you. I have no doubt that you are accurate, but it might be well to request Mr. Adams to give us a written & detailed statement which will ascertain the exact figures here. On my showing then £2,400 would be the sum (subject to such statement from Mr. Adams) *you* should furnish, by yourself & friends, towards the building & endowment; & whatever sum is required beyond this for the building & needful endowment, I as having led you into increased expences may be fairly called on to provide out of the living or by myself & friends — (one exception occurs to me as I write — one of the alterations (I think the external work,) adopted after much conversation between us led to your saying that you would make a special subscription for that work & this sum therefore should be carried to my favour).

If you acquiesce in this general view, we have only to add carefully the expences & subscriptions, & then strike the balance in order to see how much I & how much you, should make good towards this deficient endowment. I have not here the materials for making the calculation but perhaps you would get it done — & we should then better see how far it is reasonable to look to any such source as I have suggested for part of the future endowment. You will give me with perfect freedom your views on the subject in return. I am quite sure that there can be no misunderstanding between us on the matter. Do not for a moment imagine that I do not do full justice to your motives in commencing the plan: I only wish you to take on your side into account the difference in claim on me between a Church begun as this was, & one like Hardway & Elson which appears to me really needful for the good of the parish.

I shall be anxious to receive your answer: & very glad if possible at once to make some such arrangement as may enable me to guarantee the consecration of the Church sometime this summer & so if possible obtain the money or part of it voted by our Society.

I trust that you have not suffered from this cold weather and remain My Dear Sir with very kind remembrances to Mrs. Cruickshank & all your family most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

I enclose the cover to Mr. Adams *open*; in order that you may see exactly what I say to him.

16. To James Adams *(i 16)*

The Close, Winchester, Feb. 16, 1843

My Dear Sir,

Mr. Cruickshank wishes to receive the money due by Messrs. Coward & Wolfe to him for Bricks on account of the New School. He writes me word that it is something more than £150. I enclose herewith therefore to you a cheque for £150. But as *I* cannot pay Messrs. Coward & Wolfe's debts to Mr. Cruickshank will you kindly undertake to obtain their receipt for £150 towards the money due by my contract to them on the completion of the Schools — & then hand with their concurrence this £150 over to Mr. Cruickshank. You will understand that I advance it solely to enable them to liquidate their engagement with Mr. Cruickshank.

I trouble you with the transference of the money because all payments to Messrs. Coward & Wolfe hithertoo [*sic*] have been made on your certificate. Will you kindly acknowledge this by return of post with a memorandum stating the whole sum now received by Coward & Wolfe.

I am ever truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

17. To the Rev. H. A. Veck *(i 17)*

The Close, Feb 16, 1843

My Dear Sir,

I sent to you on the 9th instant a letter which I would be particularly sorry anyone but yourself had received. May I therefore ask you for a line at your earliest convenience to acknowledge its receipt if it has reached you. I am moreover anxiously expecting your answer to it.

Believe me to remain, My Dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

18. To the Rev. H. A. Veck *(i 18)*

The Close, Feb. 18, 1843

My dear Sir,

There are one or two points in your letter of yesterday on which I must trouble you with one or two words. 1st. You express a hope that I 'sent the *whole* of' your 'last letter to the Bishop'. If you will refer again to my letter of Feby. 8 you will perceive that I then told you I had 'sent your *full* statement of your case to the Bishop with no other remark than that I begged his Lordship as Bishop & Patron to consider what I ought to do' &c. This you will see entirely answers your question. IIly You institute a claim for £50 for *last year*, because I intend, *under certain circumstances* to endow Forton with £50 hereafter. I cannot but think that here is the root of all your 'distress' & 'disappointment'. You do not understand I think, that Forton has no *right* to any endowment whatever: & that what

I give I give of favour & not of right. It is the more important that you should distinctly understand this, because until you do, it will be quite impossible for me to add anything whatever to the endowment of Forton. I should have felt unable to send the £25 I did for last year had I been aware that you would have viewed it under this mistaken light. I am truly glad that I did not know it: & was therefore able to send it: but as I shall be absolutely prevented sending any further aid, of any amount, to St. Johns, so long as the error possesses your mind, I shall be very thankful to hear from you that it is removed.

You wish me to say from whom I heard of your complaints against me. I must refer you to your letter to me in which you tell me that 'Your Wardens & *all the Parish* know your disappointment.' and it is of this & of nothing more that I complain. I impute nothing nothing [*sic*] to you, but that thinking yourself aggrieved by me in this matter of money you made your complaints of your fancied injury public instead of coming with them to me, or if you could not trust me going with them to the Bishop. I am deeply grieved that you do not see the mistake of such conduct, because until you see this I can never be safe, upon any fancied slight or injury on your part, from its repetition & this must impede that friendly & confidential intercourse which it is so desireable we should maintain. I have no feeling of anger upon the subject: & I should catch eagerly at the first assurance that on any future occasion you would open your complaints to me & not to the parish. No one has a right to say what he will of a neighbour, (much less in our relative position as clergymen) & then say 'my conversation is sacred'. There are more wound [*sic*] inflicted by careless conversation than in any other way. There can be no 'violation of conscience' in the self restraint which will keep you from publickly complaining of such fancied wrongs, and you may be indeed sure that such complaints must injure *The Church* however little you may desire it. Perhaps you may be surprized to hear that a low attack upon the 'additional Curates fund' was printed in the Radical Southampton paper with a statement accusing me of witholding from you the money due to you as my Curate. This is the fruit of such whisperings.

Believe me my dear Sir that I most earnestly desire to strengthen your hands & comfort your heart in every way I can. I well know all your long & ill requited services in the parish of Alverstoke: & I shall be heartily glad in every way I can to support you. But to enable me to do this it is essential that I should be safe from such whispers as have been recently buzing [*sic*] about my Parish.

Believe me my Dear Sir to be ever with every kind wish most truly yours,

. Wilberforce

19. To Mrs. Westcote[1] (*i 19*)

The Close, Winchester, Feb. 18, 1843

Madam,

I shall be truly glad if I can in any way mitigate such sufferings as those depicted in your letter received by me this morning. But I have found it necessary *in every case*, as my first step to institute enquiries of my own. For this purpose I have written the inclosed note to Mr. Luney.[2] Should you wish me to go further into the case you will be so good as to forward it to him & on hearing from him I shall see what steps I can take.

I am, Madam, Yours &c,

S.W.

[1] Of Crabtree, Plymouth.
[2] A Devon incumbent (O).

20. To the third Earl of Chichester[1] *(i 21)*

Confidential

The Close, Winchester, March 16, 1843

My Dear Lord,

You will I trust excuse my troubling you with a few lines on the subject discussed on Monday at Salisbury Square. The deepest interests of the society seem to me to be in peril, and having never taken an active part in the Committee I am very reluctant to come forward in it on any special occasion; yet to do nothing seems scarcely lawful & I therefore venture to lay my views before your Lordship. I am told that the resolution of the Sub-Committee amounted to a determination to 'do nothing which might seem to interfere between the two parties in Scotland & therefore that the deputation should be sent but should not preach in the pulpits of either party.' Now surely my dear Lord this will be an entire abandonment of our principles as the *Church* Missionary Society. Only let Mr. Drummonds position be considered. He differs from his Bishop[2] on a point of discipline: & instead of submitting, under protest, or to censure, he declares himself separate from his Bishop & the Church to which he has belonged & proceeds to open an independant meeting. — Now is it possible for him more directly to do an act of Schism? and can it therefore be lawful for us to say that we will not interfere between 'the two parties' one of those parties being, in fact, the Church, & the other Mr. Drummond? Surely we are bound to take a distinct line in this matter; & so far from doing anything which may, even incidentally, afford countenance to his recent act we ought to remove him from his Secretaryship which he is just as much precluded from holding as is any other dissenting teacher. In this country I imagine no one would question that if one of our local secretaries quarrelled with his Bishop, withdrew from his communion, & proceeded to open an independent meeting, we must give up his services, and I do not see how the fact of Mr. Drummond's being in Edinburgh can make any difference, since we all publickly acknowledge the authority of the Scotch Bishops over their Clergy, as resting on the same grounds with the authority of our own Bishops over theirs.

These views I confess were much strengthened by the tone of Mr. Drummonds letters. It must I think have struck your Lordship that they strongly implied a sense of the bearing of our decision on his own case. That in fact he felt that nothing would so condemn his Schism as our taking a decided line in the matter; & that nothing would more tend to uphold him in his present course than our treating him as if nothing had occurred which seemed to us to deserve blame. Surely then we owe it to the great cause of unity in Christ's Church that we do nothing which can in any way strengthen his hands in this matter. I will venture as bearing on this matter further to request your Lordship to enquire, how many of the majority in the Edinborough [*sic*] Committee who voted in favour of the coming of the deputation, are members of Mr. Drummonds congregation, partakers in his act, & desirous of the same sanction.

Nothing but a deep sense of the importance of the question would induce me thus to obtrude my opinions on your Lordship but it seems to me that to take the line of which I have spoken in this matter will be to sin against God. Nor do I believe that this is the result of my holding any extreme opinions: first because I do not myself entertain extreme opinions; & secondly because I see it states in

[1] Henry Thomas Pelham (1804–86); see *Complete Peerage*, III, 207, note a.

[2] Of Edinburgh (C. H. Terrot). See E. Stock, *History of the C.M.S.* (1899), I, 380–1 for the clash over the Rev. D. T. K. Drummond (1805–77) (*MEB*).

much the same light others also. I will only mention one — I happened to be staying with Mr. Gerard Noel[1] at the time when Mr. Drummonds quitting the Scotch Church Episcopal, was first made public; & he though a personal friend of Mr. D's, took the same view of it with myself.

Further I am anxious on this matter, in no slight degree, because of the bearing which I think our decision must have on the interests of the Society. I have subscribed to it now for some 23 years; I have formed associations on its behalf, in three parishes of which I have been successively the Minister; &, through evil & good report, I have preached many sermons & attended many meetings for it. — I cannot therefore, I trust, be under Mr. Drummond's imputation of lukewarmness; but I am convinced that nothing, especially under present circumstances, could more injure it, both in Scotland & in England, than its seeming even to disregard openly the Episcopal Authority.

I have only further to beg your Lordship to pardon this intrusion & to express my earnest hope that God will so guide your Lordship as our president & us all in our several posts that we may indeed glorify Him & help on the salvation of men.

I remain my Dear Lord, Your Lordships faithful Servant,

S. Wilberforce

Life, I, 293

21. To the Rev. H. W. Wilberforce[2] (*i 20*)

The Close, March 17, 1843

My Dearest H,

Many thanks for your affectionate words in sending me your recent correspondence with the ArchBishop[3] &c. I perfectly understand your not sending to me before. Your letter to the Arch: is just what I should have expected you to write for its noble generosity in casting yourself into All the Blame aimed at St. John:[4] & claiming Credit for his good works. Nothing could be better or nobler than this spirit. But I could not have written it under all the circumstances. I could not I mean have seemed so entirely to justify St. John of all such leanings as they impute. For take the case in all its bearings, giving them 'their due'. They suspect St. J. of a secret leaning to Romanism, they get up an enquiry, they fix on certain facts these facts you answer; but you do it in a tone which leaves strongly the impression that you believe St. J. has no secret bias to Rome. Now is this strictly the case. Then I regret that you so strongly impute *motives* to the informants: you were of course right in stating such *facts* as rare attendance at Church &c. but I am sorry you drew the inference for the Arch-Bishop. Moreover I do not think it quite a fair inference. James for instance from what you have told me I should suppose was a strong protestant: too political a protestant I dare say but still sufficiently so on principle to be really alarmed by what he thought implied secret popery in one of our clergy: for you must remember that there is always the appearance of insincerity about this which is very *alarming*: making men feel not to know what next: & this might make a more earnestly religious man than James quake; then what could they do, certainly they ought to

1 Hon. and Rev. Gerard Thomas Noel (1782–1851) (*DNB*); see nos. 40, 711.
2 Henry William Wilberforce (1807–73), youngest brother of Samuel Wilberforce; P.C. of Walmer, Kent, 1841–3; V. of East Farleigh, Kent, 1843–50 (*DNB*).
3 William Howley (1766–1848), Archbishop of Canterbury, 1828–48 (*DNB*).
4 Ambrose St. John (1815–75), Student of Christ Church, 1834–45; C. of Walmer, Kent, 1840–5; seceded to Rome, 1845. Cf. *The Record of Old Westminsters*, II, 813.

ascertain facts before they complain: to that I think the mere fact of this hardly bears out your language. And then you do not seem to admit that there was anything injudicious or which could properly have alarmed anyone in St. John's act. Now considering the impression concerning him & *you* which it was morally sure to create I think it was strikingly injudicious & even alarming as seeming to imply that he thought there was some very peculiar merit in the practise before he would run such a risk of committing you. This you see is wholly irrespective of the abstract question of such a practice on which I will say nothing. My own impression clearly would be that *some* of these people were really frightened by having perceived St. Johns secret leaning to Rome; that this made them suspicious, jealous of trifles & not very considerate of the methods they used to detect as they thought the concealed papist. — Of course I do not justify them dearest H. but I do earnestly, more earnestly than ever, hope that you will not after this take St. John with you to E.F. Remember that this story is sure to go before him there. — That many of the good people will have been alarmed by Lutwidge's[1] teachings on the subject & that you will there erect at first a barrier against introducing truth & righteousness into the place which may withstand you as long as you live. I am clear that St. John wants the responsibility of a separate Cure to keep him right. At all events consult Robert[2] &c. before you resolve on taking St. John. Not that I know what he thinks, for I have not asked him. I left your papers for him at W's as he was to be there yesterday, & wrote to him to send them on to H.E.M.[3] & G.D.R.[4] But since I have thought you did not say R. was to see them but only H.E.M. & G.D.R. You would not however mind R. seeing them. W. who was by when they came asked for them, but I told him you gave me no permission to shew them so he must write & ask, which he will not remember to do. It is always for this cause more *private* to send letters to the Athenæum when I am at St. James Street. I am sure that you will not misunderstand what I have said about this correspondence. I Believe you wished me to tell you just what I thought of it. — I am very glad the ArchBishop has quieted matters.

[*Unsigned*]

22. To the Rev. T. Scard[5] (*i 23*)

Private

The Close, March 17, 1843

My Dear Sir,

I have only just received your letter so I must keep your messenger a few minutes while I reply to it.

I am sorry to say that I cannot at all acquiesce in the proposed substitution for the note on which I had agreed with you, as Mr. Vecks plenipotentiary — I think you will see the reason in a moment. 'The Independent' attacks the

1 Charles Henry Lutwidge (1800–43), V. of Burton Agnes, Yorks., 1833–9; V. of East Farleigh, Kent, 1840–3 (C). C. L. Dodgson was his first cousin once removed.

2 Robert Isaac Wilberforce (1802–57), elder brother of Samuel Wilberforce; himself V. of East Farleigh, 1832–40; V. of Burton Agnes, Yorks. from 1840 and Archdeacon of the E. Riding from 1841 until his secession to Rome in 1854 (*DNB*).

3 Henry Edward Manning (1808–92), son of William Manning (whose first wife was first cousin to Samuel Wilberforce's father) by his second marriage; husband of Caroline Sargent (d. 1837), sister of Samuel Wilberforce's wife; Archdeacon of Chichester, 1840; seceded to Rome, 1851; R.C. Archbishop of Westminster, 1865; Cardinal 1875 (*DNB*).

4 George Dudley Ryder (1810–80), grandson of 1st Baron Harrowby; husband of Sophia Lucy Sargent, another sister of Mrs. S. Wilberforce; seceded to Rome, 1846.

5 Thomas Scard (1797–1873), chaplain to George, Duke of Cambridge; V. of Durley, Hants., 1855–73 (O).

Church through me. It charges me, in one word, with shabbiness towards Mr. Veck. For myself I am quite content to *live down* this charge — and so, though I have the most convincing proofs of its falsehood, I am silent. I have only to publish my 2 letters to the Bishop; the first before the Commissioners Endowment; saying, I am ready to endow St. Johns with any amount of tithes you think expedient for the living: The second: asking the Bishop to consider whether this augmentation by the Commissioners (unsought by me) should make any, & what, alteration in our former intention, begging him to consider, first what was right for the living; & secondly whether I personally was bound to do more for Mr. Veck, in consequence of his previous expectations, for that I was ready to endow with any sum he thought fit. These letters, I say, I have only to publish to repel the charge at once — (and it is only today that I hear from Alverstoke that my kind friends Dr. Quarrier, Mr. Cruickshank & others have only been kept silent by my strongly expressed wishes); but I greatly dislike noticing such attacks. A denial, however, from Mr. Veck, is however [*sic*] quite another thing. Honestly, I think he owes it to me, & to himself to deny the charge. To me, because he knows it to be false; to himself, because I am sure that he would be just as unwilling as I should be, that he should be made the instrument of publishing a slander against a brother clergyman. If 'the Independent' falsely charged Mr Veck with unworthy behaviour to me, *he* might well leave it unanswered, but I should never be easy until I had repelled the charge; because my silence would imply my acquiescence in its being made. I think therefore that Mr Veck is bound simply to contradict in 'the Independant' this one charge, that I have endeavoured, as to this endowment, to treat him shabbily. This the note you agreed to did; & this Mr Veck's note does not do in the least. I cannot therefore accept it, as a substitution, for that you agreed to on Mr Vecks behalf. But I hope I can solve the difficulty. Mr Vecks only object being to prevent expressing full satisfaction with the arrangement whilst its issue is necessarily uncertain, I propose to omit altogether all notice of his being satisfied with it. The Readers of the Independant have nothing to do with this question, & I do not wish Mr Veck to trouble himself with informing them about it. I merely wish the slander which affects the Church through me as its object & through Mr Veck, so long as he leave it uncontradicted, simply rejected by him. I propose therefore the following letter which I think will entirely meet his views & *be better than that formerly proposed between us*[1] —

Sir

I have seen with great regret a Paragraph in your paper referring to myself as the Incumbent of St. Johns, Forton; & Archdeacon Wilberforce Rector of the Parish of Alverstoke. I think it right to inform you that the Rector has acted throughout in the most disinterested manner, having left it absolutely to the Bishop of the Diocese, both before and since the augmentation of the Eccles: Commiss^{rs}., to fix the amount of endowment which St Johns should receive out of the tithes of the Parish.

I am &c. H.A.V.

This you see gives the simple fact; which of course Mr. Veck's love of truth will make him wish to state; it commits him to no expression of satisfaction as to the arrangement; & it will entirely satisfy me. Since I saw you I have seen the Bishop & told him that Mr Veck would write to this effect in this weeks paper, & he is quite willing that so it should be. I feel altogether certain that there can be no reluctance on Mr Veck's part to do me this simple act of justice, & I shall

[1] These eight words are underlined twice.

gladly & thankfully resume all those friendly & confidential relations with him which, I hope, & believe, he values as much as I do. You will kindly let me have a line at once that I may write to Mr Veck as you suggested at our interview. — You will excuse haste; your messenger pressing for dispatch.

Believe me to be my dear Sir Most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

23. To the Rev. W. Young[1] *(i 24)*

Private

The Close, Winchester, March 17, 1843

My Dear Dr. Young,

I am sorely disappointed by your letter. I cannot in the least wonder at the feeling expressed by your parishioners. Though it is, of course, to any man of spiritual discernment a matter of most absolute indifference whether the table of the Lord be of Wood or of Stone, it is by no means (at this time especially) a matter of indifference whether a clergyman thinks the having it of stone a thing of such moment that he will unsettle people's minds by requesting that it may be made so. The same reasoning applies in my mind to the Fald Stool & the Eagle. Indeed unusual as these are I see no advantage even if there were no objections in the parish in attempting at once to revive them — I can only say that I should certainly not engage for myself a curate who opened the negotiation with such requests. In the case of Mr. Amphlett[2] I think such proposals imply the more grievous want of judgement from his full acquaintance with the recent melancholy circumstances of St. James' Ryde. I own I am wholly at a loss to reconcile them with the anxiety he expressed to me to avoid offending religious scruples which poor Sibthorpe's[3] fall must have painfully exasperated. I cannot but say in honesty that I think these proposals will so entirely have destroyed all reasonable hopes of Mr. Amphlett's usefulness in your parish that I think you absolutely bound in conscience to do every thing in your power to induce him to withdraw from the charge. For the future there is a little difficulty in the case: but I should advise one of two courses: either:

1. *If you can,*[4] to open it *originally* as a chapel of ease to your own Church under ye Clause (I think) of G IV's Church building act, which allows you in such cases to let the pews & appoint a licensed curate to it — I have not the act by me here. The Bishop will tell you, if you think this expedient, whether you can do it. or

IIly which I think will be the best thing under all the circumstances; to ask, as you propose, the Bishop to nominate, explaining to him that for yourself you want, a man of piety zeal judgement & Churchmanship; & for your people, besides all this, *his* expressed authority in the appointment.

The advantage of the first plan would be that you *might* give a title to a young man, or might take a curate on trial & see if he suited you. I enclose a *very promising* application from a young man in case the Bishop should allow you to give a

[1] William Young (1807–69), D.C.L., P.C. of St. Helens, I.o.W., 1833–45 (O).

[2] Martin Amphlett (1815–86), C. of Burnham, Bucks., 1841–4; C. of Mavesyn Ridware, Staffs., 1844; R. of Church Lench, Worcs., 1844–86 (C).

[3] Richard Waldo Sibthorp (1792–1879), Fellow of Magdalen College, 1818–41; P.C. of St. James, Ryde, 1830–41; seceded to Rome, 1841–3, founded the Bede Houses, Lincoln, rejoined the Roman Church, 1865 (*DNB*).

[4] These three words are underlined twice.

title. I advise you at once to communicate with the Bishop on this point. Please to return me these letters of Mr Crofts. You will see that my letter to you concerning Mr. A: is *private*; but of course you may send him a copy of it as far as it regards him. Will you add the enclosed note — I have not his present address.

Ever Believe me to be, My Dear Dr. Young, most truly yours,
S. Wilberforce

P.S. Since I wrote the above It has occurred to me that the length of time previous to the Bishops ordination may be a serious objection to your giving a title. I rather think also that under the act it might be difficult. I therefore the more advise you to apply to the Bishop. I think, if he will take it, the Rev Thomas Hatchard[1] late curate of Windlesham Bagshot would be a fit man & he is just now in want of a post — you may ask the Bishop if he thinks Mr Hatchard suitable & if so open a negotiation with him. I know Mr H: (which as I told you I did not Mr A) & think you would be safe with him.

24. To the Rev. M. Amphlett (*i* 25)

Private

The Close, March 17, 1843

My Dear Sir,

I have just received a note from Dr. Young, & I trust he will send you a copy of my Private reply to it. In such cases I am clear that honest men cannot be too open with each other. I cannot express to you, my surprize, & regret, at Dr. Youngs communication. From our conversation together here, I had believed that you were fully persuaded of the great importance of your not alarming prejudice, by attempting even such a practice as daily service, on commencing your ministry at St. Helens. I was therefore really astonished that for such absolute non:essentials as the Substance of the table of the Lord, & the place at which the lessons &c. are read, you had been willing to inflict so grievous a shock upon your future charge. Let me only remind you that the introduction of these was a prominent step in poor Sibthorpe's unhappy career: & what could the effect of such a proposal be, whilst you are yet unknown, but to convince all, that you hold all the unhappy extremes of opinion advocated by the writers of 'the tracts'; even if you are not prepared to go beyond them with Poor Sibthorpe. Of course, I know, from your solemn assurances to me, that this is not so, but the effect of such a request as Dr. Young speaks of, must be, to convince the St. Helens people that these were your your [*sic*] views. — You will I am sure wish me to deal honestly with you; & so I speak boldly in the sincerity of Christian truth: and I cannot but add that this error appears to me to be as far as St. Helens is concerned, *irretrievable* — and I would most earnestly beg you as you value the true peace & prosperity of Christs Church in that neighbourhood to write at once to Dr. Young and decline the post. I feel absolutely certain that you never would regain the confidence of the people, shocked as it has once been by Sibthorpes defection, & that the attempt would be a cause of stirring up strife & increasing Division.

1 Thomas Goodwin Hatchard (1817–70), C. of Windlesham, Surrey, 1842–4; R. of Havant, Hants., 1846–56, St. Nicholas, Guildford, 1856–69; Bishop of Mauritius, 1869–70 (*DNB*, *MEB*).

It is very painful to me to write thus & I shall be really relieved by your informing me that you receive it with the same Christian & Friendly feelings with which I trust I write it.

Believe me to be my Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

Not knowing your present direction I send this to Dr. Young for him to forward.

25. To the Rev. J. Crofts[1] *(i 26)*

The Close, March 17, 1843

My Dear Sir,

I have great pleasure in acknowledging the receipt of your very sound & sensible letter received this morning. Taken with your former it is thoroughly complete: & maintains exactly what seems to me to be the true Church of England via media between the fever of fanatics & the cold palsy of Rome. Should I be in want of a curate before the Bishops ordination (which is *not* likely) I would gladly communicate further with you: & I will if I can endeavour to find an opening for you. — What should you say to a title & £50 a year in the city of Winchester, could such a post be found.

I am ever my dear Sir Very truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

26. To the Rev. C. B. Bowles *(i 27)*

The Close, March 17, 1843

My Dear Friend,

He must be a bolder man than I am who will answer in these days of 'præternatural suspicion' such a question about the suiting of the doctrine of 2 other men — you may enquire & satisfy yourself & if you see fit send the inclosed note to him. You will see from it that I do *not* know that Mr. Jennings[2] has any wish to change. Ever in great haste believe me to be yours most sincerely,

S. Wilberforce

27. To the Rev. H. A. Veck *(i 22)*

The Close, March 18, 1843

My Dear Sir,

I have heard this morning with much pleasure from Mr. Scard that everything was finally settled yesterday according to our joint proposal, & that I may expect to receive through him in a day or 2 my letters to you, & to your Churchwardens in order that no record of this unpleasant correspondence may remain. For the same cause I send you herein your letters & the letter of your excellent Church Wardens.

I am truly happy that this matter is now closed; & I trust to our mutual satisfaction. I can assure you that I take a lively interest in your comfort & well

[1] Joseph Crofts of Queens' College, Cambridge, 1839–43; B.A. 1843; M.A. 1860. Venn gives no further information.

[2] Possibly James Knight Jennings (b. 1812), C. of Milverton Chapel, Leamington, 1842–4, Burton Latimer, Northants., 1844 (C).

doing: that I have a high sense of your long & ill-requited labours in the parish of Alv^{e}: & that it will be my constant endeavour to support you: & to promote the comfort of yourself & of Mrs. Veck in every way in my power.

Believe me, my Dear Mr. Veck, to remain very truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

P.S. I cannot forbear adding that I trust you will always freely name to *me* any matter concerning your position in the Parish in which you think I can assist you.

28. To the Rev. M. Amphlett (*i 28*)

The Close, March 27, 1843

My Dear Sir,

I have just received your note; & cannot forbear expressing to you my great regret at the resolution at which you have arrived.

If you will refer to my last letter you will see, that the ground of my strong opinion that you should at once give up St. Johns, was not that *I*[1] supposed you inclined to Romanism, but that I thought the grievous error in judgement into which you had fallen had irretrievably committed you in the eyes of your future charge; & would be a certain & complete bar to your usefulness.

This opinion was not hastily taken up, & there is unhappily nothing in your present letter to shake it.

I am ever My Dear Sir, most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

29. To the Rev. W. Gresley[2] (*i 29*)

Private

The Close, March 28, 1843

My dear Sir,

I cannot possibly misunderstand the letter which you have been so kind as to send me. Every line of it bespeaks its single hearted purpose. I wish I could say also, that I was convinced by it. But in truth, it does not touch the point on which my opinion is founded. I never have suspected Mr. A. of any tendency towards Rome. From the first beginning of our intercourse he has often & strongly expressed his repugnance to the Philo-Popish tendency of the Brit. Crit: as well as to the extremes in many ways, of those, whom for shortness let me call, the Tract party. God Forbid that I should doubt his Christian integrity. But the reason for which I thought him disqualified, *not*[3] for the excercise of his Ministry, as you represent it, but for the charge of this particular Church is this; He has by what seems to me a fatal error of judgement so prepossessed that particular congregation against him, that his coming there would certainly give rise to the most painful feuds & divisions with no corresponding advantage. How he fell into it is past my comprehension. He had a long conversation with me, in which I explained fully to him the sore & irritable State of the more religiously minded part of the parish from poor Sibthorpe's fall: so entirely did he appear to apprehend the need of extreme caution that he, on my advice, resolved not at first, to begin a daily service. Yet after this, whilst he is quite unknown, he proposes as preliminaries, the Stone altar &c: which every man knows are just the external badges of those

1 Underlined twice.
2 William Gresley (1801–76), an active high churchman (*DNB*).
3 Underlined twice.

opinions of which there was the most jealousy. — I enclose you *in confidence*[1] a letter from Dr. Young which will shew you that the mode of Mr A's request certainly did impress on the minds of all that a *Stone Altar* & not a *real table* was the Object of his solicitude. I am perfectly convinced from my knowledge of the place that no after care can undo the mischief thus done to Mr A's Ministerial position at St. Helens, & I cannot therefore but most earnestly advise him, *of himself*, to resign the post.

His *giving up* the Fald Stool &c cannot restore the confidence of the people: because it was not of having such things that they were jealous, but of that habit of mind which Mr A's proposing them, seemed to them an evidence. I really can hardly understand in a church man such a resolution as you seem at the end of your letter to imply that Mr. A. has taken. I hope I have mistaken you, for it seems to me quite shocking, that a presbyter should even intimate that he will endeavour to force himself into such a post though the Bishop of the diocese and the Rector of the Parish agree in desiring him to resign it.

Can he possibly think himself *sent* into that part of the Lords vineyard if he goes thus.

I have thus simply given you my opinion on the question, as one concerning a mature friend, but you must remember that I have nothing whatever to do with his maintaining this appointment. I merely introduced Mr. A. to Dr. Young; & with Dr. Young & the Bishop must rest the whole question of Mr. A's position should he, as I think most unfortunately, endeavour to do so.

Believe me to remain My Dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Wilberforce

30. To the Rev. T. Walpole[2]

(i 30)

The Close, March 28, 1843

My Dear Sir,

You are perfectly right in your view of the matter. The Ordinary whether Bishop or Archdeacon is invested by law with the power of visiting Churches that he may judge what ought to be done to them, in the way of restoring or repairing &c. &c. He makes *an order* to this effect; & that order he can if necessary *enforce*, by monition, citation, & the other processes of his Court. The part of the Parish is to provide the funds needful for such necessary repairs. I can feel no doubt that when this is properly explained to him Mr. Cox[3] will see that the conduct of the Churchwarden was just what it should have been. I need not add that desireable as their removal is, I would not have forced the removal of the hatpegs on a reluctant parish: but this is not the point. Mr. Cox is not aware that the Archdeacon's office is clothed by law with this authority and he therefore not unnaturally resisted it: but when he learns that by law the Archdeacon can not only (like the Rural Dean) *inspect*, but also *order*, it will alter his view I doubt not of the whole matter. Perhaps you will kindly explain this to him before the Vestry meets.

I remain my Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

1 These two words are underlined twice.

2 Wilberforce seems to give the initials of the addressee as 'W.W.', but presumably Thomas Walpole, R. of Limpsfield, 1842–6, is meant. Some internal rearrangement of Limpsfield Church was carried out in Walpole's day; he seems to have been a man of private means. Walpole (1805–81) was great-grandson of a brother of Sir Robert Walpole, and succeeded Wilberforce as Rector of Alverstoke (O).

3 Henry Cox, Churchwarden and Surveyor of Highways at Limpsfield for over 30 years.

31. To the Rev. A. Legrew[1] *(i 31)*

The Close, March 28, 1843

My Dear Sir,

I am very glad to hear of your design for the improvement of your church; & shall, I feel certain, give not only my Cordial, but joyful, assent to it.

The regular course is, (& you I am sure will see the propriety of adhering to it) for your builder to send me a plan of the elevation &c of the proposed erection that I may be assured that it is both of the eccles[l.] character & strength which it should be. Alverstoke Gosport will be my address after this week.

Believe me to be My Dear Sir most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

32. To the Churchwarden of Merrow *(i 32)*

The Close, Winchester, March 30, 1843

Sir,

I send you herewith a plan of the seats in the new built Church, with a list of names of Dwelling houses to which it seems to me most proper to apportion them. You as Churchwarden are the fit person to do this — and I trust that by following the plan I have sent you you will find no trouble & give general satisfaction. The pews you will understand are to be appointed for the use of the occupiers of the various houses named, so long as they are members of the Church of England. I have marked no name to No. 1, but there is I think an old man of 81 who is a sort of patriarch of the Parish & I leave it for him. You will of course shew Mr. Onslow[2] the list before you make it public: & I advise you to seek for Mr. Frith's help; if he will point out to the various parties the seats which are intended for them, it will save a great deal of trouble, & the danger of some confusion on the day of opening the Church.

I am ever, Sir, very truly yours,

S. Wilberforce
Archdeacon of Surrey

33. To W. Wilberforce, jun.[3] *(i 33)*

Alverstoke Rectory, May 4, 1843

My dear William

When I was last in London I found that nothing was yet settled as to the family property; and as your Father wishes to bring matters to a conclusion; and I, in common with your other Uncles, seem at least to have a remote personal interest in the questions to which its adjustment gives rise, I do not wish to advise either you, or your Father upon the matter; or, if possible, to pronounce any opinion upon it. I beg you therefore to put quite out of your mind what I have written to you on this subject. For myself, I shall be best satisfied to leave the settlement of what should be done, and how it should be done, to the Executors of your Grand Father's Will, or any one of them, to whom your Father likes to refer the matter — & by their or his advice I shall be entirely guided. I have no doubt that I shall be able to acquiesce entirely in their or his opinion of what

1 Arthur Legrew (1812–57), C. of Chaldon, Surrey, 1836–56 (C).
2 Rev. Arthur Onslow (1773–1851), R. of Merrow, Surrey, 1812–51 (O).
3 William Wilberforce (1821–1900), nephew of Samuel Wilberforce; son of his eldest brother, William.

is right. I shall send a copy of this letter to your Father, that he may if he thinks fit, & your Uncles also approve of it take immediate steps to refer the question to the Executors or one of them & so bring the matter to some adjustment.

Believe me My Dear William to be your ever affec^e^ Uncle,

S. Wilberforce

I send by this post to your Father a letter of which the following is a copy.

SW.

34. To W. Wilberforce, sen.[1]

(*i 34*)

Alverstoke Rectory, May 5, 1843

My dear William,

I feel so much difficulty in giving any opinion as to the proper mode of settling our Fathers property, from the fact, that I have a remote personal interest in the various questions to be determined, & that this, (though it does not in the least bias my judgement,) exposes me to the suspicion of a bias: that I have resolved on giving if possible no opinion on the matter. I would therefore propose to you to refer the whole question to my Fathers Executors, or any one of them you please, & by their or his judgement I shall be guided. If Robert & Henry, as well as you & Wm. acquiesce in such an arrangement, the whole matter may I hope be brought to a speedy issue. I will acquaint Robert & Henry with what I have said to you: & I send Wm. a copy of this letter. You can shew it if you please to any Exor: on whom you may determine.

I am your ever aff. Brother,

S. Wilberforce

35. To the Rev. G. M. Molyneux[2]

(*i 35*)

St. James Square, May 15, 1843

My Dear Sir,

I have in common with the Bishop looked carefully over your plans & specifications & I have much pleasure in returning the application, *signed*, herewith. There are however one or two points which I should be glad to point out to the committee for re-consideration.

1st The removal of the Font from the place marked for it in the plan, (as suggested apparently by the pencil marks) to make room for a stove is very undesireable. The Bishop especially objects to this: and thinks the place on all accounts unsuitable for the stove. If you get rid of the first Children's bench there would be no objection to placing the font where last suggested. This would be the best plan — and if so the stove might perhaps stand unobjectionably by the opposite pier marked X.

There can be no doubt that it will much improve your plan if you can place the children, with no gallery over them, on slightly rising benches in the Tower.

Believe me my Dear Sir, To remain ever, Most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

1 William Wilberforce (1798–1879), eldest brother of Samuel Wilberforce; seceded to Rome, 1863; a wastrel who outlived his brothers (*MEB*).

2 George More Molyneux (1798–1872), R. of Compton, Surrey, 1823–72 (O).

36. To the Rev. J. C. Prichard[1] *(i 36)*

Alverstoke, May 26, 1843

My Dear Sir,

Though it is not absolutely necessary that there should be two Churchwardens yet it will be more regular for you to supply the place of the one quitting office. You should nominate his successor at a vestry meeting: & he shd. present himself at the first visitation for admission.

There is some difficulty in giving a certain answer as to the expence of Bell Ringing daily. As no such question has I believe come before the courts. My own impression is that you cannot *enforce* it except for Service on Wednesday & Friday, when the canon orders it to be rung. I should certainly advise you not to attempt to *enforce* such a charge, unless the parish voluntarily undertake it. I think that the daily service being so little maintained in our parish Churches, it would have a very bad effect to make the Parishioners feel that they were unwillingly taxed for its support.

I am very sorry that your note has been several days unanswered — I was in London on Southwark business when it arrived & by some mistake it was not forwarded with my other letters.

I am ever my Dear Sir most sincerely yours,

S. Wilberforce

37. To J. W. Croker[2] *(i 37)*

Private

Alverstoke Rectory, July 21, 1843

My Dear Mr. Croker,

The intelligence which has reached you as to Richard Bingham, is in the main too true. He has been unable to meet the demands upon him & must make, what I fear will be a miserable settlement with creditors to the amount of about £6000. As this sum is for the most part due in the town of Gosport you will easily conceive that it is in a state of much and angry excitement. A few days I suppose will explain all: but as far as I have yet been able to learn Mr. B: is not chargeable with dishonesty. He settled at Gosport: where it was well known that he had no property of any sort, but was to make a fight for a livelihood by his School: his good character led to a great confidence in him & he has fought a hard fight for 18 years: I *suppose* has long been falling below solvency & hoping to repair his losses; & always doubtful about giving up & so failing those who had trusted him already. At length an angry or suspicious creditor seizes on him & the denouement is unavoidable. Altogether it is a wretched business; & absolute ruin to himself & I fear to several more. I take for granted that he will never attempt to regain his position here.

I shall be very glad to welcome Mrs. Croker here; but I trust I am not to gather from your ambiguous expression that she means to follow Lady Ashburtons example and come without her Lord.

Ever believe me &c.

[*Unsigned*]

1 James Cowles Prichard (1814–48), Fellow of Oriel, 1838–42; V. of Mitcham, 1841–6.
2 Rt. Hon. John Wilson Croker (1780–1857), M.P., Secretary to the Admiralty, 1809–30; a frequent visitor to Alverstoke at this time (*DNB*). See Newsome, pp. 296–7.

38. To the Rev. H. W. Wilberforce *(i 38)*
Private & Confidential

Alverstoke Recty, Aug. 18, 1843

My Dearest Brother,

It is a scarcely needful preface to say that I am *exceedingly* sorry sorry [*sic*] you have got the bother upon your hands with your curate. But it seems to me quite clear what you ought to do. If you break with Mr. Jenner[1] you will effectually bar your usefulness in your parish, it may be for years, it may be for life. *He* will be a martyr for one side of the truth, you a persecutor. It is rather difficult for me to say all I feel from our differing on points of doctrine connected with this unhappy set of opinions but I will try. All those persons then in your parish who are earnest followers after ye individualities of personal religion will more or less be disposed to suppose him a martyr for the Gospel: & against you these hearts will be closed if you now dispossess him. Therefore I say by all means keep him & thus *I* should try to do it. *Write* to him a letter saying that you still expect to be joined by your old curate: but not at present, that you therefore wish him to continue to act with you say for 3 months, if he will, with 6 weeks notice: & that you now only make the arrangement for his going that you may not lose your power of placing your own old curate again with you. But that if he *Mr. J.* will enter into this engagement with you so as to secure this you should be glad to retain him, & that then should you find that you both worked well together you would gladly *offer him* the Curacy in perpetuity, if your old curate did *not* come to you: & that at all events it will give him time to look about for a fit place. This will place *you* right: whether he accepts or declines. If he declines you have not expelled him. If he accepts; he will it is pretty plain abstain from what he thinks will offend you: then by his working with you, you get his testimony to your holding the essentials of the faith & so you slip without breach into your saddle. *If* it is *true* that he has preached as violently as you hear this will only be the more strikingly the case, if he now keeps to plain practical sermons & acts with you. But my strong belief is that you will not find you can substantiate such violence. It is so likely that he has been misrepresented. So likely that preaching, it maybe injudiciously, against what with him *I*[2] think the perils of our Church from the insane love of Rome which has possessed many of the followers of the 'tract movement' & then perhaps *speaking* against Puseyism the two have been put together, that I feel sure you would substantiate nothing — and then further, suppose he had preached against Puseyism by *name*, you certainly could get nothing from appealing to the Arch Bishop. Mr. J. having a brother in the neighbourhood cannot make it a fit position of Preachers to preach against the written & published tenets of a *party* under their distinctive appellation — and with so large a body of the Church conscientiously convinced, that the *tone* of the party aimed at, & very many of its leading doctrines will certainly if they obtain the pre-eminence destroy the purity of our reformed Communion, the Arch. even if were different in every particular from what he is would *do* nothing but regret your difference & think you both troublesome block-heads, for disagreeing. I doubt if even Laud would have been short sighted enough to do more. For you must remember Dearest H. that your own feelings are here a bad guide — you must remember that even men who like myself, are *not* low churchmen, that even we feel in the very centre of our hearts that the greatest

[1] Stephen Jenner (1809–80), C. of Walton-on-the-Naze, Essex, 1835–42, East Farleigh (Henry William Wilberforce's parish), 1842–4; see further in no. 196 (*MEB*).
[2] Underlined thrice.

verities of the inner Christian life are absolutely perilled by the tract system. Even then if Mr. J. has been rash, & illjudged & vulgar in his way of testifying against them, you can not get him condemned for that testimony — whilst all the stream of *natural* feelings will set against the well endowed vicar & with the poor Curate.

I do firmly believe that if you can win this man to you by extreme kindness, by confidence, as far as you *can* give it, by securing his fellowship in parish work &c. with you, that you will therein have an opportunity of making an *unprejudiced* entry on your duties which after all that is past you could scarcely have obtained in any other way whatever — and I believe this to be beyond price. Believing as I firmly do My Beloved brother that in spite of the injury which Newman's teaching & still more St. Johns influence has done to your ministerial efficiency, that yet you will set forth amongst your people the Gospel of our Only Lord & Saviour; that the fruit of our 2 fathers[1] prayers, & teaching & tone, is in you & will even beyond your speculative tenets colour your ministry, I do earnestly desire that you should enter at East Farleigh with as little previous prejudice against you as possible, and all seems to me to be herein at stake. Suppose you are away 2 or 3 Sundays & Mr J. preached by name against Puseyism; what then; if he works heartily with you, either your doctrines are not Puseyite in his judgement, or the matter is not of vital moment, or he is insincere & any how your standing in the Parish is not affected. I beseech you bear anything, suffer anything, to conciliate this man & prevent this breach. I trust too from your account that you can very soon get into residence. This is surely now of great moment — & you must, if need be, at great trouble get there for Sunday duties.

I thank God for Arthurs[2] amendment. Let me hear that nothing I have said here gives you needless pain. I could weep beloved Henry at *our* difference. But every day makes me feel more that there *is* a difference. You know my Friday's occupation & that I have not time to say more than I am ever your most loving brother,

S. Wilberforce

Life, I, 287–90

39. To the Rev. E. Hoare[3] *(i 39)*

Private

Alverstoke Rectory, Sept. 25, 1843

My dear Sir,

You understood my meaning perfectly, in supposing that I had no intention of making any use in any ulterior proceedings of your private communication to me. Indeed my earnest hope was, that I should get from you an answer which would greatly strengthen me in endeavouring to resist the taking of any ulterior measures. In this same hope I will beg you to weigh seriously a few suggestions on the subject of the 2 observances touched on in your last note.

1. The service in the School-Room. I believe that the civil & ecclesiastical law perfectly agree in this; that a Parish Priest is at full liberty to *instruct* his people in unconsecrated and unlicensed buildings as well as in the Church; but that he is not at liberty to assemble them for *public worship*, except in a building consecrated or licensed; or to use any other form of prayer than the liturgy.

1 The final *s* is underlined twice.

2 Arthur Henry Wilberforce (1839–1904), third son of H. W. Wilberforce.

3 Edward Hoare (1812–94), brother of the banker, Henry Hoare; C. of Richmond, Surrey, 1837–46 (C).

This you will, I think, find, very clearly stated, in our own Bishops (Second I believe) charge in this Diocese. Now tried by this rule there can I conceive be no doubt that your communicants meeting, & your missionary meeting would be lawful: but I fear that your other meetings would fall under the description of 'public worship'; and, if I am right in my view that these therefore would be pronounced illegal — to this I think you should not expose yourself & I would therefore strongly recommend you transferring such plain expositions to the Church.

2. On the Second point — I earnestly hope that now it has been named to you, you will at once remove the ground of objection. I understand you to have no scruple as to obeying the Rubric: & that is so very precise, & I believe so universally observed that I greatly regret you should have deviated from it. You will I hope enable me to say that on this point there will in future be no ground for the complaint now made.

Believe me my dear Sir, To remain ever most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

P.S. I greatly missed you at Morden on Friday, but I trust that you were gaining strength at Cromer.

40. To the Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel[1] *(i 40)*

Alverstoke Rectory, Sep. 25, 1843

My Dear Baptist Noel,

I cannot forbear expressing to you the pleasure which the friendliness of your tone, in the letter I have just received from you, gave to me. I thank you too sincerely for the promise of your prayers. Our early acquaintance, the affectionate intercourse of so many years, between my Father & your Grand Father, & my firm conviction of your piety & zeal, all this made the tone of your letter gratifying to me. I could not therefore receive it in silence: because this would have seemed cold, unfriendly & repulsive. Yet upon the whole it would have been far more easy for me to have received it in silence. For I cannot express to you the pleasure it gave me & be silent as to the pain. It pained me then I will say deeply to find that you had allowed yourself without foundation to entertain suspicions of the fidelity of a brother Minister of Christs Gospel; to 'judge' him needlessly and uncharitably; to harbour such suspicions & evil judgements, although the easy course of looking at my university sermons, my ordination sermon, or my last charge; all of which, in successive years, have dealt plainly & strongly with the mistaken views to which you refer, might have undeceived you; & now when accidentally you are led to perceive your want of charity, instead of feeling that you had done wrong, & fallen under the condemnation of St. James (Cap. III v. 1) & so being led to suspect the soundness of those views which had led you into this evil, merely writing to me almost to congratulate me on having been replaced in your good opinion. Indeed my dear Friend all this does look to me like a most fearful want of humility; & as there can be no safe walking after Christ our Lord without a deep & true humility I cannot but in Christian faithfulness endeavour to put you on your guard. Let me tell you also, in all kindness, that in the affectionate exhortations which end your letter, & which the pen of an aged Bishop might have written for a young Deacon, I trace, even amidst all their affection, the self same spirit. Such a spirit is ever the snare of men who, like

[1] Baptist Wriothesley Noel (1798–1873), brother of 1st Earl of Gainsborough; Minister of St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, 1827–48; chaplain to the Queen, 1841–9; an Evangelical who became a Baptist, 1849 (*DNB*).

you, are possessed of shining talents, are fond of action, are thrown into busy life & take a prominent part in their own province of society: it leads them to love singularity, to trample on rules, to have little respect for those above them, to assume a tone of superior age, wisdom & spirituality in their intercourse with others; it injures above all things the holiness & true peace of their own spirits. From Such Evils my dear Brother May God of His Great Mercy keep us ever free.

I should be truly glad to talk over with you frankly the grave points of difference to which you allude. Neither I, nor dare I say you, having time to write about them. To me your fraternizing with Arians & encouragement of division, appears to be eminently unscriptural: That which seems to you the narrowness of bigotry, I esteem the will of the God of Order. But as I know you would converse from a desire of learning the truth & not from a love of disputing I should be truly glad to talk over these things fully. Should you ever be in my neighbourhood you will I trust let me see you. In the mean time you will receive I am sure in the spirit of friendship the frank statement of my feelings.

May the God of All Grace bless & keep us both & lead us day by day into His hidden truths.

Ever My Dear Baptist Noel Believe me to be, Very truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

P.S. I should have added that I am *not* appointed Tutor to the Prince of Wales.

Life, I, 233–5

41. To Dr. John Haggard[1] (*i 41*)

Alverstoke Rectory, Sep. 25, 1843

My Dear Dr. Haggard,

Will you kindly read the enclosed paper & let me have your official judgement on this point: how far I am bound to act upon it — you will easily conceive that on all those parts which refer to the revival of obsolete customs I should gladly refuse to do anything. How far am I bound: or how far can I be compelled, if the Church Wardens are obstinate, to go. Can I say that 'as far as regards the revival of Obsolete Customs not generally enforced by the Bishops I shall take no notice of the presentment'. Can I safely say 'on the points of this presentment I must refer you to the Bishop'.

Will you further give me your judgement on Arch[n]. Hales view. The time in this matter approaches for decision. Will you also ever Believe How truly I am Ever Yours,

S. Wilberforce

42. To J. Hoskins[2] (*i 42*)

Private

Alverstoke Rectory, Jan. 26, 1844

My Dear Sir,

I have received a letter from your daughter Marianna, expressing her earnest wish to be received into the Communion of the Church of England. She appears to me to be actuated in this by a devout & intelligent desire — & being 17 years of age I should not hesitate to grant her request if she was not living as a minor in your household. *She* is most anxious to take this step with your sanction — and *I* cannot cannot [*sic*] act in it without your privity; &, at least, tacit

1 Dr. John Haggard (1794–1856), Chancellor of various dioceses (*DNB*).
2 James Hoskins (d. 1869, aged 75), of Stoke Road, Alverstoke; solicitor.

acquiescence. At the same time I do not wish to call on you for a direct permission which it may be painful for you to give.

I therefore trouble you with these few lines: should you object to the step if you will ever so briefly acquaint me with your objection: I shall take no further step in the matter. But if you do not communicate with me I shall take your silence as intended to express your tacit allowance of the step & shall receive her as she desires into the Church on Sunday next.

I *must* express the real & deep pain which it gives me to act at all in such a case in a way which I fear must be painful to the Parental feelings of one whom I so cordially esteem. But you will I am sure see, that in the discharge of the duties of my function I have no alternative. I have never suggested to your daughter that she should seek this admission. I feel sure also that your own principles will lead you to give the fullest & kindest latitude to the religious impressions of one who has reached so entirely the years of discretion & intelligent choice in such a matter.[1]

Believe me my dear Sir To remain ever very sincerely yours,

S. Wilberforce

P.S. My servant will enquire for an answer.

43. To Mrs. Agnew (*i 43*)

Private

Alverstoke Rectory, Jan. 28, 1844

My dear Madam,

Since I wrote to Mr. Kennaway[2] last Wednesday from Salisbury I have had more leisure to think over the plan opened in your letter to him: and I wish to say a few words more to you concerning it. — And first I wish to express even more strongly than I then did, my grateful welcome for any such attempt to meet the urgent wants & evils of your present moral social & spiritual state. So far from discouraging such desires by a cold or unsympathizing word, I would desire to hail them as indications of life & as containing the promise of a blessing.

For the particulars of the plan sketched out in your letter a good deal of consideration I think would be needed. Such points as these occur to me — 1st I do not see why the *various* institutions of which you speak should be essentially united. 2nd If not so united I think the expediency of starting all *at once* questionable. 3. How are the 'ladies' to be employed — would they labour in the schools — neighbourhood &c. — as desired — would they have a *common* table — would the 'Sisters' board with them — would they mix in general Society?

These & a multitude of questions of detail occur to me. Again. Would it not be more like the growth of the mustard seed, if instead of *starting* with lands Houses &c (all of which must catch the world's eye & perhaps at first cause alarm to the good from past abuses of things bearing some outward resemblance to these;) if instead of these, 3; 4, or any such number of 'ladies' were first to hire some house near a Church such as you glance at; to live in common, & *under rule* — to board with them 'Sisters of Charity' — to overlook the Schools & visit — & then by degrees to build one & another of such institutions, as they were able to add; & let the whole grow into its perfectness by gradual increment — on

[1] Wilberforce baptised Anne Mary Hoskins (b. 1827) on Sunday, 28 Jan. 1844.

[2] Rev. Charles Edward Kennaway (1800–75), 2nd son of 1st Bart.; Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; V. of Chipping Campden, 1832–72. He married firstly (1830) a niece of B. W. Noel, and secondly (1845) a daughter of Samuel Wilberforce's friend, Lewis Way (*MEB*).

all these points I should be glad to know your mind. A deep devotion — a life alienated from the world — submission — many daily prayers — self denial — & abounding works of charity; these are what we aim at producing — & no doubt God would give us hearts longing for such a service. But how to bring this good work to bear must require much thought and many prayers.

Should you think it desireable I will gladly take an opportunity of talking the matter fully over with you. On Tuesday, I am going into close residence at Winchester, & I cannot therefore offer at present to come to Brighton. But I should be very glad to receive you at Winchester — or after a few weeks I would meet you for conversation at Chichester or even at Brighton. In the mean time you will perhaps if you are not able to come to Winchester, allow me to hear something further as to the points which I have mentioned.

Ever my dear Madam, Believe me to be, Most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

Life, I, 290–1

44. To the Rev. C. E. Kennaway (*i 44*)

28 Jan., 1844

My dear Kennaway,

Will you read the enclosed letter to Mrs. Agnew & unless you see some objection from circumstances which I do not know forward it to her. It seems to me of the greatest moment to hail & encourage all real doing. If we sit still we must be lost. I do not know Mrs Agnew remember — & I need therefore as much information as you can send me. Will you do this. I gather from her letter that she is soundly & thoroughly protestant. This of course is essential — many thanks for My Dear Gartons beautiful remembrancers of his sainted Godmother. May God Bless you dear Friend.

Yours in true affection,

S. Wilberforce

(Late Sunday night Jan. 28)

45. To the Rev. J. D. Hales[1] (*i 46*)

The Close, Winchester, Jan. 30, 1844

My Dear Sir,

I Believe that the case about which you ask me stands as follows; but I always advise those who have to *act* in such emergencies to fortify themselves with a regular professional opinion from Doctors Commons.

If a husband or wife has heard nothing of their wife or husband for seven years, after enquiry, they are not liable to the penalties of Bigamy if they marry again. This is the whole relaxation of the law — and you will see at once that it is a totally different thing from a permission to marry. It is merely a sheltering them from certain penalties should after all the wife or husband first married prove to be alive. For the relaxation of the penalties is merely because they have acted on a probable belief of the death of their partner. Seven years absence is no dissolution of the first marriage — it is only a ground for suspecting the death of the party not heard of. But if after the second marriage the first wife or husband prove to be alive the second marriage is null & void: only the party cannot be prosecuted for bigamy if he can shew that he acted on the belief of death, that belief being grounded on a seven years ignorance of their life.

[1] John Dixon Hales (1800–79), V. of St. John's, Richmond, Surrey, 1837–79 (C). See J. S. Reynolds, *Canon Christopher* (1967), pp. 50 ff.

Now this seems to me to leave the clergyman who is applied to to marry, on such a ground, a married person a large & fearful responsibility — and unless he were himself satisfied that there was a strong probability that the wife who was absent was also dead, I think he could not be justified in re-marrying the applicant. In all cases of marrying the law throws on the Clergyman the duty of satisfying himself that all is correct with the applicants: & in a case therefore so full of uncertainty as this I do not think he would be held blameless of ecclesiastical censure, certainly he would not of moral fault, unless he were on good grounds satisfied that the party he was about to marry was not only protected by the Statute from the penalties of bigamy but also that he was realeased [*sic*] from the Vinculum Matrimonii by the actual death of the wife. The Clergyman must where so large a responsibility is left to him be after all the judge for himself of the amount of proof which will satisfy his own mind. But that his mind should be satisfied I am perfectly clear.

I believe that this will answer all your questions; but if it should not do so pray let me have the opportunity of supplying what I have omitted.

Ever My Dear Sir Believe me to be, Most sincerely yours,

S. Wilberforce

46. To A. Way[1] (*i 47*)

The Close, Winchester, Jan. 30, 1844

My Dear Way,

(For I cannot bring myself to adopt a distant & freezing appellation) It gave me great pleasure to receive a letter from you. Its subject too greatly interested me — & I heartily wish well to your endeavours. You are quite at liberty to make use of *my* name on your list. This I could have said to you at once; but I was anxious to ascertain if possible before I answered you whether I could obtain for you the high sanction to which your letter pointed. For this however you must wait a while. The Prince has a strong; & I think you will see a very well founded objection to giving his name to *any* infant institution: & for this reason he would not wish to be asked to do so here. But at the same time, He approves of all the Objects of your scheme, and should it be brought into successful operation He would be ready to reconsider His present determination.

Should any of your pursuits being you in this direction it would give me great pleasure to receive you & renew our ancient intercourse.

Believe me to remain, My Dear Way, ever most truly, Yours,

S. Wilberforce

47. To R. Cruickshank (*i 48*)

The Close, Winchester, Jan. 31, 1844

My Dear Sir,

I am anxious to submit to you in writing the proposal I made to you the other day viva voce respecting the Anglesey Church. I conscientiously believe that its adoption would be a great benefit to our parish: and I hope it may, after full consideration, meet with no insuperable objection from you. Should it however unhappily do so I feel that I must under present circumstances abandon the plan, & only exert myself to arrange with you for the opening of the Church as it stands. I honestly think this less adviseable for the parish: but I cannot

[1] Albert Way (1805–74), antiquary; only son of the Rev. Lewis Way, Wilberforce's friend (*DNB*). See App. II.

attempt by any means to thwart what shall be your ultimate resolution on the subject, after the combined efforts which we have made.

My proposal is briefly this: to endeavour to raise a sufficient fund, *1st* to enlarge the Mother Church by the addition of two aisles so that it shall hold at least 200 persons more than it now does, & II^{ly} to take down, remove, & rebuild at Gosport enlarged, the Chapel now standing at Anglesey. That on the obtaining of a sufficient fund, the works be begun in the Parish Church, the New Chapel being opened under the Bishop's license for service during the closing of the Mother Church.

My reasons for wishing this plan adopted are these. 1 I believe it will be greatly better for the parish to have one Church than two Churches so near together 2 I do not see how the new Church is to be endowed.

My ground for *now* proposing this plan needs a little explanation. When I first (you know how unwillingly) assented to the completion of this church it was under the distinct understanding that it should have an endowment of at least £1000 — accordingly in the *first* paper put out by us, (a copy of which I enclose) it was proposed to collect £1000, & your name is put down for £100, mine for 50 for this object — while your £851 – 7 is carried to the building account. In the Second paper (which I also enclose) at your suggestion that we should probably be more successful in collecting for *building* than for endowment this sum & our £150 are carried to the endowment which is said to be secured. These papers I think clearly imply the understanding that I consented to the opening of the Church on the condition of an endowment being provided. Now of this I think we are both hopeless: & the question therefore recurs where is the failure. Now as you have by you my letter of Feb. 1843 you will see that the principle I there laid down & to which you assented, was, that your share of the contribution was to be the sum the Church must have cost you without my additions, plus the minimum legal endowment: & that for the excess of that I was with you jointly responsible — now we have by our joint efforts raised fully this excess: the deficiency is therefore in the original expence — and this being so I feel that I may fairly ask you to reconsider the subject of this Chapel & to allow me if I have wholly to endow it to place it in that part of the Parish where it will be really useful to the Parish — nor do I easily perceive the objections to this change. The gentlemen who placed the £851 – 7– at your disposal cannot care whether the Chapel is built at Anglesey or at Gosport — sufficient Church Room will be secured for Anglesey in the Mother Church and you will have the satisfaction of knowing that the money raised as a compliment to you, has been spent in securing Church accommodation for those of your poor parishioners who the most needed it.

On these accounts I should much hope you may see right to join me in this plan: and if so I will request you if possible to let me hear by Monday next when there is a meeting of the Diocesan board for Church Building to whom I would at once apply as to the grant of £400.[1] But as I said before if after consideration you still adhere to your conclusion against the removal of this chapel to Gosport I shall acquiesce in your decision however deeply I may regret it. The question will then be how to raise the sum deficient (about £180 I believe) in the building account, & *when* to request the Bishop to proceed to its consecration.

Believe me my dear Sir to remain with very kind remembrances to Mrs. Cruickshank & your daughters, Most sincerely yours,

S. Wilberforce

1 Wilberforce's proposal was not adopted.

48. To Mrs. Agnew (*i 49*)

Private The Close, Winchester, Feb. 5, 1844

My dear Madam,

Your note reached me here (where I am now in residence) yesterday: and I hasten to reply to it.

You will be I am sure prepared by the close of my last letter for my entering in any degree upon your plan with the greatest caution, and on this account I must say that I do not think we are yet at all ready to announce the plan to friends: certainly not with my name at present in connexion with it.

You must let me remind you that we cannot now bring any such scheme into operation with the same safety that we could have had a few years ago. The strange doctrines & the startling practises which the party whom for shortness I will call the 'tract-writer-party' have brought many most unobjectionable things under a just suspicion: and we have no right to endanger great attempts by letting them come before the Church in any suspicious Garb. On this account it will be I am sure essential to our success; first, to begin with small & unobserved steps: to let all we do grow as much as possible out of what we have in the Church round us — & 2ly not only to be ourselves heartily attached to the doctrine & discipline & spirit of our own reformed Church: but to secure as our first co-operators persons of the like temper; and to let this true affection to our own Communion, its articles formularies & temper speak itself freely out in our arrangements, & never be cloaked under ambiguous disguises. If it should please God ever to bring such a Scheme to perfection, we might then hope to shew that a life of great devotion & self denial & charity, was not necessarily a copying of the blurred characters of exalted human merit, or of formal or self-righteous asceticism. But we must not disguise from ourselves the difficulty of establishing clearly this difference between ourselves & 'Solitaries' or 'Nuns' — and we must therefore walk with the utmost circumspection.

My first practical suggestion from all this, is that we should follow as far as possible the parochial system of our Church — and this would imply to my mind; *1st* That before anything is said to anyone else I should communicate upon the whole subject with the Bishop of the Diocese; & that unless we succeed in securing his full sanction to the undertaking, we proceed no further. II^{ly} That supposing all other difficulties past: & we were starting, say at Elson; that we should begin by your engaging a house; & coming as charitable ladies who wished to assist in the Parish Schools &c. . . . I will not now enter further on the matter, but with your sanction I will apply *privately* to the Bishop. You I am sure will feel that my applying to Him must itself be kept strictly to yourself in confidence, that He may feel himself at full liberty to express his unbiassed Judgement on the whole proposal: both as to its own merits and as to this being the proper time, way, & place of attempting it.

Believe me my Dear Madam, To remain ever most sincerely yours,

Life, I, 292–3 S. Wilberforce

49. To the Rev. H. Venn[1] (*i 50*)

My Dear Friend, The Close, Winchester, Feb. 6, 1844

I am very much obliged to you for your kind note; your remarks upon my charge are in the very temper of your own peace loving spirit: & I am heartily

[1] Henry Venn (1796–1873); Hon. Sec., Church Missionary Society, 1841–72 (*DNB*). Dandeson Coates (d. 1846), mentioned here, was the Lay Secretary.

glad that my pages approved themselves to you. I wish that I could consistently with truth express satisfaction at the whole of your letter. But indeed I am greatly pained by it. I deeply grieve that Mr. Coates's counsels should have at length triumphed over your wiser view in the Committee — a more unhappy conclusion I feel persuaded you could not have reached. — Depend on it that *if acted on* it will stir up a strife which will shake the Society: & grievously wound the Church. You must not deceive yourself by the name of 'neutrality'. It is the most decided step we could take. And you who heard it will no doubt remember that Mr. Coates' whole speech last year was meant to urge us *not* to be neutral. The question at issue is are Sir W D. & Mr D. to be regarded as on the same footing with Scotch Presbyters & we say 'Yes'. May God avert the Evil I foresee.

Ever my Dear Friend believe me to be affecly yours,

S. Wilberforce

50. To Mrs. Agnew (*i 45*)

The Close, Feb. 9, 1844

My dear Madam,

There can be no doubt whatever about the institutions to which you now propose our limiting ourselves at present. You may freely mention the plan with my name, if you think it will aid in raising the funds needful. I shall however earnestly desire to add at some time the other parts of the machinery: especially the 'Sisters'.

Believe me my dear Madam to be most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

51. To the Rev. H. Venn (*i 51*)

The Close, Feb. 12, 1844

My dear Friend,

Many thanks for your kind note. I have read through both it & the Resolution as attentively as I can. I will honestly confess that I am quite unconvinced as to this being the true line of neutrality. I think that *neutrality* is compromised in our prohibiting the deputation from preaching in other pulpits because they do not in Mr. Drummond's. To be neutral I think we should say 'preach in all those Churches as to which there is no doubt'. Wherever there is *doubt* as it is not for us to decide, you must abstain from preaching.

But if The Bishop of Edinburgh is satisfied with this line you will hear of no disattisfaction [*sic*] from me. May I however request you to allow me to see the Bishops letter or a copy of it: as this will enable me to *answer* the objections of others.

Ever my Dear Friend Believe me to be, Most Sincerely yours,

S. Wilberforce

52. To R. Cruickshank (*i 52*)

The Close, Feb. 21, 1844

My Dear Sir,

I have been wishing for many days to reply to your last letter on the subject of the Chapel at Anglesey, but I could not do so until I received from Mr. Adams a statement of accounts which has only come to my hands to day. I need not repeat to you how much I regret your decision as to the removal of the Chapel to Gosport: but if you are determined on that point I will as I have said give all

assistance in my power to opening it. The first point which meets us is the question of *endowment*. Towards this there is at present only my promised subscription of £50 & yours either of £50 or £100 I cannot say which — & no prospect of any more. Now I am ready first to waive the question of *endowment* & to open the Chapel if the Bishop will consent without any. A repairing fund there must I presume be: & it may be furnished by my own & your promised subscription to the endowment. Next comes the question of the Expences [*sic*] of the Chapel. The total expences in Mr Adams account now before me are stated at £2449 – 16 – 6. To which must be added the Consecration Expences &c. say £50 — or total £2499 – 16 – 6. To meet this sum required we have in all (deducting the £150 promised by yourself & me for endowment & now to be set aside for repairing fund) — a sum total of subscriptions promised & received amounting to £2078 – 8 – 0 — leaving on the whole a deficit of £421 – 8 – 6. Now the expences of the Chapel as far as our *honourable* liability goes (for *legally* I have incurred no liability except for the staining) must be divided into two classes. First those expences which belonging to the original cost of the Chapel as designed by you fall on you exclusively: & secondly, those which being the consequence of our *joint* undertaking fall on both of us together — and to see upon whom the deficiency falls whether that is on us together, or on you alone we must put the sums raised together against the expences incurred together; & the sums raised by you alone against the expences incurred by you alone. Now on doing this, I come to the following results —

Total Expences of Anglesey Chapel without additions	1522 – 9 – 2½
Add Expences of Consecration, Plate &c. (say)	50 – 0 – 0
	£1572 – 9 – 2½
Expences of addition jointly incurred	927 – 7 – 3½
Total collection putting aside as above £150 for repairing fund	2078 – 8 – 0
Now dividing this sum into the two divisions as above I find this result:—	
Total collected by Mr Cruickshank	1102 – 7 – 0
Total collected by Mr Cruickshank & Archdeacon W.	976 – 1 – 0
Joint Total	2078 – 8 – 0

Looking back then to the figures above I see that whereas on our *joint collections* (if I give up the endowment) there is a surplus over our jointly incurred expences of £48 – 13 – 8½ there is on the other hand in your own collection, as compared with your original expences a deficiency of £470 – 2 – 2½:— Now this deficiency *must* be supplied before we can legally consecrate. I must ask you therefore how you propose meeting it. *This* now *only* need stand in the way of consecration, (if the Bishop allows me to give up all endowment) & this is a deficiency in your quota of the funds to be supplied & not in mine. It will be evident to you that the money must be raised speedily. For the Societies grants will soon be forfeited if it is not. There is I see a sum of £486 – 10 – 0 charged to you for bricks in the account. Now as you never intended to charge for these in your original scheme of the Church it occurs to me that you may like by foregoing this claim to make good the deficiency which as you will observe is nearly the exact value of the bricks. This however I only venture to throw out for your consideration. All that I feel I have a right to say is this — I am now by giving up the Endowment ready to meet you more than half way & must beg your immediate

consideration of how this money is to be obtained: or I must endeavour in despair of opening the Chapel to get the Mother Church enlarged.

Believe me my Dear Sir to remain with very kind remembrances to Mrs Cruickshank & your Daughters Most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

You will I know be glad to receive a favourable report of my little girl.[1]

53. To J. Fearn (*i 53*)

The Close, March 8, 1844

Dear Sir,

Although I do not myself believe that your dedicating your work to me would be any benefit to you, yet as you thought that it would, I was anxious, if possible, to consent to your doing so. But having now looked through your work I am reluctantly obliged to say that I cannot consent to it. Of course my giving such consent amounts to this. 'I recommend this book', and honestly I cannot do so. It is most completely a religious novel — & against religious novels I have often protested.[2]

You will I trust see the ground of my decision, & give me credit for a kind feeling which nothing but the imperative commands of truth here prevent my carrying out into action.

Believe me to be, My Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

54.[3] (*i 55*)

Alverstoke, April 20, 1844

My Dear Sir,

I am much obliged to you for your kind aid in this matter: I have not another word to add as to Gosport. But I should be very glad to learn definitely what Mr Cruickshank determines to have done. As I have told him, I am ready if the Bishop approves to proceed to consecration, giving up the promised endowment. Is this Mr. Cruickshanks wish? If he resolves on this he will receive the Societies money & the Bishops promised aid &c. The money matter will then stand thus

Account rendered by Mr. Adams	2449 – 16 – 6
Expences of Consecn. say	50 – 0 – 0
	2499 – 16 – 6
To meet which we have altogether (including the £150)	2228 – 0 – 0
Deficiency	271 – 16 – 0
But suppose only £100 is put by as Endowment	100 – 0 – 0
Total Deficiency	£371 – 15 – 0

If then Mr Cruickshank wishes to proceed to consecration he will have enough to pay the builder all: & himself all save this £371:15:0 for bricks. But if he does *not* proceed to consecration then he will forfeit the £600 promised by the

1 Emily Wilberforce (b. 1830), Wilberforce's eldest child.

2 The book was Joseph Fearn's *Schism and Repentance; a subject in reason* (London, 1844). On 13 March Fearn (of Camberwell Grove) dedicated it to Lord John Manners.

3 Recipient unidentified.

societies and have this whole deficiency. I am not sure we need deduct *anything* for endowment and if so Mr Cruickshank proceeds to consecration he will then have enough to pay the builder & himself all save £271 for the bricks. All I want is a *decision* from him. You will perceive that there is no difference in our figures. If he does not proceed to consecrate what does he propose. *How* could any use of these materials in enlarging the old Church be arranged. I do not see this. There is £90 due for staining the new church to Mr. Fairs in London & he is very pressing for his money. How will Mr Cruickshank arrange for this. You will I trust understand that I want to make the best arrangement & only anxiously desire a settlement.

Ever My Dear Sir Believe me to be in haste most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

55. To R. Cruickshank (*i 54*)

Alverstoke Rectory, May 17, 1844

My Dear Sir,

I named the subject of the Anglesey Chapel to our Bishop the other day as you desired. He wished to have the whole case before him. For reasons you will easily enter into I wished to avoid stating it to him, & so biassing his judgement unintentionally. I therefore asked him to let me send such a statement in writing. I now inclose it to you — requesting you if you approve of it to add your signature to mine when I will forward it to the Bishop. Should you deem any additional remarks needful perhaps you will append them by way of Rider. I will ask you if possible to enable me to send it on by tomorrows post — as I am most anxious now not to lose a day.

Believe me to be ever My dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

Statement concerning the Anglesey Chapel to be laid before the Lord Bishop of Winchester — May, 1844

This Chapel was originally projected by Robert Cruickshank Esq. to afford accomodation [*sic*] for the inhabitants of Anglesey & the other neighbouring parts of the Parish of Alverstoke. It was to be an endowed district Chapel; consecrated; & in the patronage of Robert Cruickshank Esq; who was to build & endow the same.

To these arrangements Mr Cruickshank had obtained the assent of the Lord Bishop of the Diocese & the Rector of the Parish.

In the years 1840, 1841, The present Rector called Mr Cruickshank's attention anew to the subject of the intended Chapel which was then in progress of erection. He objected on many grounds of parochial expediency to the intended plan: to which he signified to Mr Cruickshank that he must, painful as the course was, oppose himself. Into many of his objections Mr Cruickshank so far entered as to consent to remodel the plan to the following effect. The Chapel when built should it was now determined be consecrated as a Chapel of Ease to the Mother Church: the Rector licensing a Curate for the performance of its duties: the Chapel was to be enlarged; & receive a more ecclesiastical character: Mr Cruickshank was to be aided by the Rector in raising the needful funds for the erection & endowing. In consequence of this arrangement the Rector applied to the Church Building Societies, to his own Friends, & himself subscribed to the work.

	£	s	d
The increased expences of the erection amount to beyond those of Mr Cruickshanks plan.	927 –	7 –	3½
The funds raised by the above mentioned means to	976 –	1 –	0
Collected above the building expences	£48 –	13 –	8½

Thus it appears that there is no surplus worth mentioning towards supplying the intended endowment. Various circumstances, render at this time Mr Cruickshank indisposed to carry out his original intention of endowing the Chapel — & the Rector came therefore to the conclusion that it would be best — 1st to abandon the idea of opening this Chapel — 2 to enlarge the Mother Church. 3 to remove this Chapel to Gosport. But he added that he felt so far committed to Mr Cruickshank, that should that gentleman decline this proposal, he would, in spite of the want of endowment, join with Mr Cruickshank in requesting the Bishop to Consecrate the Chapel, as a Chapel of Ease, should His Lordship as Bishop & Patron think it right to charge the Rectory with its continued expences. Mr Cruickshank declines the Proposal — and in common with him the Rector therefore now applies to His Lordship to that effect. To enable His Lordship to decide on this question they would briefly state the following points.

For the proposed consecration, they would urge these considerations — (1) The Mother Church is insufficient for the present population. (2) The probable increase of Anglesey, making it probable that this will [*sic*] want will increase, & be well met by a second Church there. (3) This Church *is* built: & there must be loss, & unpleasant remark, incurred in taking it down & moving it elsewhere. (4) Many objections from various quarters may be expected to the alteration of the Mother Church. (5) The opening of a Second Church will ensure at all times the presence of a resident Curate, which the amount of the population renders highly desireable.

Against the proposed consecration.

(1) The Bishop has never intended nor was it ever contemplated by any one that the resources of the Rectory which are greatly needed for endowments in the poorer parts of the parish, Gosport, Forton & Hardway, should be diverted to maintain a Chapel of Ease for the watering place visitors of Anglesey. Such an appropriation of its funds may seem a waste of the resources of the Church.

(2) The Chapel is so near the Mother Church as to lead of necessity to comparisons, & too probably to opposition of preaching.

(3) The increase of Anglesey is very problematical: for many years past it has never increased: & though there is not room in the parish Church at present, there is far from any such surplus as would fill another Church.

(4) The opening of this Chapel would not meet the want of the residents in the parish who lost their seats in the alterations made in the Mother Church and who would not be satisfied without receiving in lieu of them seats in the Parish Church.

(5) There is no probability of this parish being without a resident Curate, & it would be on all accounts better that its two resident Clergymen should together conduct the services of the Parish Church than that their public minstrations should be divided between two closely contiguous congregations.

Your Lordship is earnestly requested by us as Bishop & Patron to take these various circumstances into your consideration; & as the failure of the endowment leaves the whole matter de novo open for your Lordships decision to determine as you shall judge most for the interest of our Holy Church whether or not to consecrate the Anglesey Chapel.

Signed S. Wilberforce
Rector of Alverstoke

56. To R. Cruickshank (*i 56*)

Alverstoke Rectory, June 28, 1844

My Dear Sir,

I am most anxious, if I can, to prevent the disappointment of your wish for consecration of Anglesey Chapel on the 10th, and it has occurred to me that the difficulties you know to be in the way may be met thus.

Will you authorise me to propose to Mr Wolfe through his Solicitor Mr Weddell that in the event of the consecration taking place on the 10th the money granted by the Societies shall be paid over to the Bishop of the Diocese and remain in his hands until the final Settlement of the open account between Mr Wolfe & yourself shall shew to whom the money is due.

As it appears to me, this admits no claim upon you from any party beside your own Contractor & I have great hopes that it would enable me to arrange for the amicable possession & consecration of the Chapel.

Believe me to be My dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

57.[1] (*i 57*)

Alverstoke, July 6, 1844

My Dear Sir,

You will I am persuaded, feel upon reflexion that it is impossible that I can allow your conduct today at Gosport to pass without some explanation.

I shall be glad to know of what you complain. I am quite ready to explain my conduct to you. An accredited public officer & a gentleman, informs me in writing, that you refuse to receive an information laid before you by the police in consequence of my representation & that of other respectable inhabitants of the town; he begs me to ascertain your motives. I took the course most befitting a friend & a gentleman, in at once transmitting the charge privately to yourself.

I trust upon reflection you will deeply regret your conduct this morning: & I am quite ready to forget it. Such conduct can do nothing else than increase the difficulties of this perplexed question.

You are probably aware that Capt[n]. Harris[2] feels it impossible to let the imputation on his men of having made a false charge pass wholly by: And I would fain hope that you would allow me the friendly office of explaining the whole transaction: instead of forcing me to complain of insult to myself.

I am my dear Sir Most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

58.[1] (*i 58*)

Alverstoke Rectory, July 10, 1844

My dear Sir,

I gladly accept the explanation contained in your note of the 6th inst. = & can assure you that I did hold out my hand with sincere friendliness & meant heartily to congratulate you on your recovery.

As to the other parts of your note I must add one or two words.

1st my letter to yourself was strictly private. No one but myself saw one word of it.

1 Recipient unidentified; perhaps the Chairman of the local bench. Possibly the occasion was the opening of St. Matthew's School, Gosport.

2 William Charles Harris (1809–87), Chief Constable of Hants., 1843–56 (*MEB*).

Illy *I* brought no charge whatever against your conduct as a Magistrate: but I transmitted straight to yourself in a private communication, the fact which was communicated to me by the proper authority, viz the Chief Constable. In doing this I did as I always wish to be done by namely to have all supposed matters of complaint made privately known to myself — and I feel quite sure that I did right in doing so. It was a subject much better explained by letter than by word of mouth: & which could be conveyed to no one so properly as to yourself directly. The suggestion that I might have communicated upon it with your Clerk requires no comment from me — I always deal with Principals. If in the expression of the letter there was any word which gave you needless offence I am heartily sorry to have used it — but in communicating at once with yourself by letter I think that I did the right thing.

You speak of attempts to cast a slur on your reputation. No such attempt has come, or could come from me. What I did think I expressed in my letter viz that there had been 'some mistake in the matter' — your present note confirms my view: for it seems from it plain that you mistook the formal application of the Police to receive an information which they wished to lay, for an application for advice whether they should lay it. I might stop here; but I will be perfectly frank, & say that the only other conceivable solution which occurred to me as possible, was that you thought it visionary to endeavour to repress such evils as your attention was called to: & intended to discourage such applications. To meet this possible solution I added that *I* was convinced of the necessity of such efforts; & determined through you, or through some other Channel to make them.

The possibility of this solution was suggested to my mind (1) by your having in conversation with me said that 'the utmost which could be done was to confine such evils to South Street & (2) by your reported observation 'That Capt. Harris had been misinformed as to the state of the town which was never in a better condition'. But the idea of corrupt motives to which you allude had never for an instant suggested itself to my imagination — as to 'the Committee of householders'. I was as ignorant as yourself of its formation, though it resulted from some remarks of mine at a dinner held in the town a few weeks since, & though I unfeignedly rejoice in its existence.

In conclusion I will only add that I will make any communication you may wish to the Chief Constable, but that I see no reason for my attending at your office on such an occasion. *I* have brought no charge, & require no explanation, although I am free to own that I think you owe it to yourself to remove the misapprehension into which the three police-men present fell as to the supposed refusal of the information.

I trust my dear Sir That you will feel that there remains no ground for misunderstanding between *us*, & that you will allow me to reckon on your kind co-operation in endeavouring to repress what I greatly fear are the increasing Moral Evils of the Town.

Believe me to be, my dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Wilberforce

59. To the Rev. H. W. Wilberforce

(*i* 59)

Alverstoke, Sept. 15, 1844

My dearest Henry,

I thank you & beloved Mary more than I can say for the kindness of your letter on the 7th. Ever since God was pleased to strip me so bare of the dearest affections & joys which had gladdened for years so unusually my life, I have felt

to cling to her & to you my dearest brother more closely than ever. When the heart feels itself very very bare & very heavy such affection as ours from Childhood & as dearest Mary's is more to me than words can express. May God ever keep us in true love the one to the other. I should have written to you before but the last days at Lavington have not given me a moment. Croker has been over to shoot — & Herbert going out with him & I going to watch Herbert.[1] — I am now writing at midnight after a tiring day for tomorrow morning's post.

I am very sorry dearest H to have vexed you about the trip to Normandy. I mentioned it to my Mother, the closest person I know — & to Robert than whom no one can more feel the need of silence about it: I did *not* mention it to Mrs Sargent[2] — but either you or Mary and I cannot therefore believe that any family discussion can have arisen from what *I* have done; nor can I conceive that the secrets of the letter R may have written to you can have got wind. I am very sorry dear brother to have vexed you about it. But I feared you were likely to injure yourself by the step & therefore felt a strong anxiety concerning it.

As to Rogers — I *believe* I never mentioned the matter save to my Mother of whose silence I felt absolutely certain. But G. D. Ryder talked to me about it as a thing well known. I do not know whether he had heard it from you. I will certainly mention it to no one else at all.

And now dearest Henry I want to mention to you a matter which has given me deep pain, & which in honesty I cannot leave un-noticed — you know I believe the pain which I felt at your using the influence you possess with Burrows[3] at the last Oxford Election to persuade him to vote against me — on every ground I thought & still think your doing so was indelicate in the highest possible degree. Your acquaintance with B. is wholly through me — you were at that time on a visit to me — & you employed the opportunity of being my guest to persuade my curate & intimate friend to go up & vote against me. Of course such opposition between B & myself is not only very distressing to me, but very injurious to my character. It did subject me to the reproach of insincerity in my vote; & that I owed to your having employed the opportunity of being my guest to persuade him to oppose me. I would not have reverted to this subject but for the letter you have just written to him. Here you repeat the same violation of that delicate sense of what is due to brotherly affection which marked your former conduct — & I should not be honest with you if I did not tell you that this has wounded me very deeply. I fear that I shall make little impression on you. I know Newmans absolute command over your mind almost deprives you of free agency & that he uses it unsparingly. I know also that when this party feeling comes in you are quite inaccesible to any counter-influence — but still I must in honesty & love speak out. Let me only ask you to suppose that you had a Curate whom you greatly loved & respected — whom you longed to act with in everything but whose earlier bias in all these questions would lead him to take the other side from you — That he would probably take your side or at least take no side against you: that I came to visit you — was by you made known to him; got some interest over him; & then without telling you persuaded him to vote against you on one occasion; & on another when you were out unsolicited by him wrote a pressing letter to endeavour to get him a second time to take the same line. Should you in your case think that in acting so I had regarded the sacred rights of

1 Herbert Wilberforce (1833–56), Samuel Wilberforce's eldest son.
2 Mary Sargent, mother of Wilberforce's late wife Emily, who resided with her son-in-law from Emily's death in 1841 until her own in 1861.
3 Henry William Burrows, one of Wilberforce's curates at Alverstoke (O).

brotherly affection or even of friendly confidence. I would rather cut off my hand than do so; & that you should feel no repugnance in acting so by me, is one of the most painful fruits of the poison of party spirit which I have for a long time seen.

On the measure itself I have the strongest opinion. I think it as pitiful an exhibition of petulance & injustice as I ever remember to have heard of — & I deeply grieve to think of the good men who will be drawn in to support it — of its issue I entertain no doubt. The attempt will be defeated by a large majority made up of the lovers of justice & the low church party — & this last will obtain a seeming triumph in consequence. Should Burrows be persuaded again to take the other side I shall have again to feel that I owe the wound to the confidence & affection with which my brother was welcomed to my home.

Do not suppose that I am speaking hastily, or with a feeling of anger. I was deeply hurt before, & the second wound cuts deeper still. It seems to me that the sacredness of domestic affection ought to be to us far too dear a thing to be thus trifled with even to gain a vote when Newman wishes for it.

I am going tomorrow for the Ember Week into Surrey — on Monday to Cranley — Tuesday to Puttenham — Wednesday to Morden — Thursday to Oxted & late on Friday night I hope to reach Lavington. On the following Tuesday I take Herbert to School & go to spend a week with Robert at Bishops Thorpe. I hope that I may see Dearest Mary at Lavington on Monday.

Ever My Dearest brother Believe me to be your very affectionate brother,
S. Wilberforce

60. To D. Compigné[1] *(i 60)*
Private & Confidential

Alverstoke Rectory, Dec. 21, 1844

My dear Sir,

Upon my return from Gosport this evening I have found your kind note upon my table, to which I hasten to reply. I only wish that I had received it before we met today & could have spoken to you upon its subject. The course you have adopted on its subject seems to me exactly that which I should have expected from you as a right minded & attached member of our Church. The suggestions of such, I need not tell you, would always have full weight with me — & yours, from my personal respect for you, would have peculiar force. I am very sorry that your devotions have ever been disturbed by the Chanting of the Athanasian Creed; but they shall be so no more: such an objection from one such parishioner is quite enough for me; & the Creed in question shall be read in future as heretofore. You allude my dear Sir to other changes though you complain only of this. I do not know to what you allude but I shall always be glad to know on such a subject the feelings of attached members of our Church. I wish to have our common prayer as congregational as possible — to let it engage the affections of all; and I have on this account a great dislike to all changes & innovations in the manner of its performance. So strongly do I feel this, that if I were now taking possession of the Rectory when changes are being made with views & by a party which I deem it my duty to resist, I would alter in no particular whatever the existing Service. The only changes I believe which I have made, are, omitting to *Chant* the petitions 'Lord have Mercy &c' in the Communion Service, because it seems to me that prayer ought not to be sung; *singing* instead of this the Gloria Patri; and reading when 2 clergymen are in Church the prayer for the Church

1 David Compigné (d. 1863, aged 86), a Gosport solicitor.

Militant after the Sermon on the Second & last Sundays in the Month. Neither of these uses I would *now* introduce; because in this unsettled moment I would make no change — and to neither of them would I adhere if they really offended my people. I have as you well know no sympathy either with the Romanizing doctrines or absurd practises of the tractarian party; & no patience with those who would alienate their parishioners about matters of such supreme indifference. Would to God that all of us in holy orders felt this truly, & that all laymen were as considerate as you. I shall consider your letter as strictly private, & if there is at any time any point upon which you entertain any such feelings I trust that you will not hesitate to make me acquainted with them. I take the liberty of enclosing a copy of my recent charge in which you will I think find that I have been endeavouring to impress upon others the principles I have avowed for myself.

I am ever my dear Sir, Most truly yours with very Sincere respect,

S. Wilberforce

61. To the Rev. H. A. Veck *(i 61)*

Alverstoke Rectory, Jan. 16, 1845

My dear Sir,

I am very sorry that my letter has caused you any disappointment nor do I very well understand how it can have happened since on referring to my last letter to you in which the matter was settled between us I see that I used these words 'It is my full intention to act upon the Bishops advice, and *if I can secure* £70 per annum from the ecclesiastical Commissioners for the intended Church at Elson I shall have great pleasure in endowing St Johns in addition to what you receive from the Eccl. Commissioners with £50 per annum from the tithes of the Mother Church; if I do not secure this I can only promise you £25; since the whole sum the Bishop allows me to alienate is £100'.

This letter is dated Feb. last.

I am ever my dear Sir yours most sincerely,

S. Wilberforce

62. To the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval[1] *(ii 1)*

Alverstoke Rectory, Jan. 16, 1845

My Dear Sir,

If I find it possible I will be at Epsom on Tuesday the 28th at 12 o'clock. But as I cannot be secure of being there I will also beg to reply in writing to your suggestions to which I have given my best consideration.

1: of the particular value of the local Report I am not a good judge: but if, as I should fear, its discontinuance would tend in any degree to reduce the efficiency of local associations it would I think be very injurious.

2. I think the Supervision of a local Treasurer, costing the Society nothing & securing the attention of a resident friend a clear gain to the Society.

3. I do not think that matters are at present amongst us in that state that the Archdeacon of Surrey can undertake the general superintendance of all Church Societies in the Archdeaconry; & I feel sure therefore that he ought not to select some for such superintendance. So convinced am I that the work is better done by an officer of the specific Society that I must absolutely decline acting on this suggestion.

[1] Arthur Philip Perceval (1799–1853), brother of 6th Earl of Egmont; Fellow of All Souls, 1821–5; R. of East Horsley, Surrey, 1824–53 (*DNB*).

4. I am convinced of the absolute necessity of public meetings to maintain the funds of the Society; & I am equally convinced that there are no such divisions amongst us as make them impossible — against such divisions I believe our thus assembling for Common Church Objects to be one great aid & I should therefore see with great regret the adoption of any suggestion which aimed at abandoning in this respect our present custom.

I am ever My Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

63. To Messrs. Bovill and Hepworth *(ii 2)*

The Deanery, July 2, 1845

Gentlemen,

In reply to a letter received by me today dated June 30, & signed by you, I beg to remind you that it was not owing to any wish of mine, that you supplied Mr Wolfe with money to complete the Church at Elson, but that at your united urgent request, I agreed, instead of entering on the work & completing it myself, as the contract allowed, to suffer you to finish it, & engaged to pay to you two, for Mr Wolfe, at his & your joint receipts whatever money I should otherwise have paid to him for this work.

The Result of this concession has been to delay the completion of the work & expose me to great inconvenience.

I have at last received the Statement of Accounts according to the Contract, & have at once applied to the Bishop to name a day for the Consecration. His Lordship will be able to consecrate the building early in August; & within six weeks from that event, as agreed in the contract, I shall be ready to pay, to your & Mr Wolfe's joint receipts the whole balance due to him, which amounts to the sum of £528 – 15 – 2 as stated by Mr Adams.

I have the honour to remain, Gentlemen, Your Obedient Servant,

S. Wilberforce

64. To the Rev. M. Amphlett *(ii 3)*

Alverstoke Rectory,[1] Sep. 27, 1845

My Dear Sir,

I have been prevented replying sooner to your letter, partly through the press of business; & partly from my not finding it easy to reply to it as I wished. I quite enter into the difficulties of your position & sympathize with you under the pressure of them. I am very sorry that we have tenants who do not heartily use their influence on the side of what we believe to be the purest form of the Christian Faith. But both you & I have to deal as we actually find it, & not as we should wish to make it. Taking this view of matters it appears to me that whilst I have no doubt of the correctness of every word you say, as to your own influence, & your desire to avoid giving needless offence, that you did commit a mistake in removing the pew a part of which at least stood in the body of the Church; & also in resisting the allotment of another to the house of young Mr Bomford. He distinctly asserts that he does desire to have the use of one for some of his family; and I should strongly advise you as an overture of peace to endeavour to appropriate a pew for this purpose with which he will be satisfied. As to the influence used by the B's to draw persons *from* the Church, of course all that you mention has been said

[1] Although Dean of Westminster from May 1845, Wilberforce continued to reside at Alverstoke Rectory as well as at the Deanery, Westminster. The letter offering him the Bishopric of Oxford was dated 13 October 1845.

to you: but conversations of that sort are such very slippery evidence that I do not think it would be wise to enter further upon that subject. I have already spoken to Mr. B. upon it. This I think will make him more careful & I will not lose an opportunity of repeating my warning. I cannot but hope that after what has passed between me & him, that anything like a fair overture of peace on your part will be gladly received by them; & that you will thus find yourself able to pursue with increased strength & comfort your plans for the benefit of your parishioners.

I am ever My Dear Sir, Yours very truly,

S. Wilberforce

65. To E. Suter[1] *(iii 1)*

Alverstoke, Oct. [31], 1845

Sir,

The Copying Machine has reached me quite safely but not apparently by Rail Road as I directed.

I enclose a cheque for your bill, and am Yours, &c.,

S. Wilberforce

66.[2] *(iii 2)*

Alverstoke, Oct. 31, 1845

My dear Sir,

My few lines of yesterday will have shewn you that I was not unprepared for this communication.

I am ever yours most truly,

S. Wilberforce

67. To Miss Stanley[3] *(iii 3)*

Alverstoke, Oct. 31, 1845

My dear Miss Stanley,

May I ask you to be so kind as to favor me with a single line telling me the name and address of the person who executed the two side windows in stained glass at the East End of your Cathedral. If you could let me hear at the Deanery, Westminster, either on Monday or Tuesday morning I shall be very much obliged to you. I send my kind remembrances to Mrs. Stanley, the Bishop and all your family.

Believe me to be, my Dear Miss Stanley, Most truly yours,

S. Wilberforce

68. To A. Paul[4] *(iii 4)*

Alverstoke, Nov. 1, 1845

My dear Sir,

I will take the earliest opportunity of remitting you the £5. I will be obliged to you to remove my name from the list of subscribers to the County Hospital on the 30th of December, 1845.

I am yours truly,

S. Wilberforce

1 Edward Suter, Stationer and Account Book Manufacturer, 19 Cheapside. 'Sole Agent in London' for the Ritchie Letter-Copying Machine.
2 Recipient illegible and unidentified.
3 Daughter of Edward Stanley (1779–1849), Bishop of Norwich, 1837–49.
4 Arthur Paul, Surgeon, Secretary of the County Hospital, Winchester.

69. To W. C. Rhoades[1] *(iii 5)*

Alverstoke Rectory, Nov. 1, 1845

My dear Sir,

I have recently had further communications with the gentlemen who are parties to the relation against Mr. Bingham[2] in the matter of the almshouses, and I can assure you that on their part as well as on [my own] there is a strong wish to take no hostile step in the Business. But I further learn that they deem it wholly impossible to pass the accounts as set forth by Mr. Bingham; and are persuaded they would not be for an instant allowed by the Attorney General. The point to which I refer concerns the business with Mr. Colquhoun. Mr. Bingham has herein taken credit for a very questionable Mortgage-[Lease] as belonging to *him*; when in fact if such [security] can be [sustained] (which is considered improbable) the Principal and interest due thereon would be payable to Mr. Colquhoun and not to Mr. Bingham. Then further Mr. B. has agreed to compromise the claims of Mr. Colquhoun for the sum of £100 and taken credit in this accounts [*sic*] for the full balance of the money due on the security instead of the sum so agreed to be paid by him to Mr. Colquhoun.

The other items would not be disputed *provided* Mr. B. *immediately* withdraws . . . [*Last page illegible*]

70. To the Rev. H. W. Wilberforce *(iii 6)*

Confidential

Alverstoke, Nov. 2, 1845

My dearest Henry,

I have just heard from Robert that you have some idea of taking as your Curate Mr. Skinner[3] who was once with him. Now dearest Henry you must I well know choose your Curate on your estimate of him and not on mine; but still I do not think it would be brotherly not to give you my opinion and the grounds on which it [would rest] in such a case. I do not mean to say a word against Mr. Skinner's integrity and I am willing to suppose him an excellent man. I am sure he is an able man and able specially in preaching and speaking. *But* his doctrine is I [fear] thoroughly novatian.[4] When he was Curate at Windsor his then employer S. Hawtrey[5] wrote to me [and submitted for my judgement some sermons of Skinners together with correspondence which had passed between] James Stephen[6] and himself about them: he wanted my opinion as to retaining Skinner, he (S.) absolutely justifying the statements of those sermons. I was obliged to tell him that in my opinion they were distinctly heretical and destructive of the Gospel of Christ and of course that I therefore could not allow such doctrines to be preached in my Church. Skinner (who did not as far as I know) know who I was to whom Hawtrey had referred wished the matter referred to Robert. It

1 William Cobden Rhoades, a Chichester attorney (*Law List*).

2 Richard Bingham (1765–1858), P.C. of Trinity Church, Gosport, 1790–1858 (and of Great Hale, Lincs., 1796–1858) had a son Richard Bingham (1798–1872), C. of his father's parish, 1821–43, (also *DNB*), who must be meant in nos. 37 and 69.

3 James Skinner (1818–81), of Durham University; C. of Burton Agnes, Yorks., 1841–3, Holy Trinity, Windsor, 1844–5; Senior Curate of St. Barnabas, Pimlico 1851–6, and V. of Newland, Worcs., 1861–77 (*DNB*).

4 A rigorist schism of the third century, refusing to reinstate Christians who lapsed under persecution.

5 Stephen Thomas Hawtrey (1808–86), C. of Clewer, 1840; P.C. of Holy Trinity, Windsor, 1844–51; head mathematics master, Eton, 1851–71; Warden of St. Mark's School, which he founded (1851), 1871–86 (*MEB*).

6 See no. 472.

was so referred, and his reply differed so little from mine that Skinner retired. He had stirred up so great a sensation in Windsor by other peculiarities that it [smouldered] *everywhere*; and all was ready to burst into a flame. . . .
[*Remainder illegible*]

71. To the Bishop of Salisbury (E. Denison)[1] *(iii 7)*
Confidential

Alverstoke Rectory, Nov. 17, 1845

My dear Lord,

May I ask you to be so kind as to send me, or to desire your examining chaplain to send to me a sketch of the plan of your ordination examinations. I find my first Ordination just at hand and shall be most thankful for the most minute and practical sketch of that which your Lordship has aimed at and found practicable that you could give me.

There is another point of great delicacy on which I trust your Lordship will let me address you with open-ness. It is the Episcopal patronage in the counties transferred from one Diocese to another. I am now as your Lordship knows to administer a Diocese composed of the counties of Berks. Bucks and Oxfordshire; and it seems to me that the desireable arrangement for the Church would be, that with the Episcopal Charge the Episcopal Patronage in Berks and Bucks should pass to the See of Oxford; since it is only thus that the Bishop of Oxford can have any means of rewarding meritorious curates in those counties. It is of course very possible that I am deceived by self interest in this matter, but if I am not I confess this seems so plain as to excuse my asking your Lordship thus plainly whether you would acquiesce in, or still more recommend such an alteration of the Patronage of Berks. Whatever your decision may be you will I know personally feel no displeasure at my putting the matter thus openly before you.

I rejoice to hear that Mrs. Denison is convalescent, but I greatly wish that you could say that she is well.

I am ever, my Dear Lord, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon. Elect

72. To the Rev. A. Goldney[2] *(iii 8)*

Alverstoke Rectory, Nov. 17, 1845

My dear Sir,

I understand from Oxford that my election [in Christ Church][3] was to take place this morning. I avail [myself] of the very earliest opportunity in my [power] to ask you whether it will be agreeable to [you] to continue your services at Cuddesden[4] [for] the next three months. I name that term for [the duration] of your services, because it may be [more] pleasant to both, or to either, of us, to be [then] at liberty to make naturally a different [arrangement]: and if you then continue, it will be under [the more] pleasant feeling to both of us, that our [continued] communion is the result not of convenience [but of choice.] I know

1 Edward Denison (1801–54), Bishop of Salisbury, 1837–54 (*DNB*).
2 Adam Goldney (1809–98), C. of Dorchester 1832, South Moreton 1838, Cuddesdon 1839–45; V. of East Pennard, Somerset, 1845–89; P.C. of West Bradley 1845–76, and Prebendary of Wells, 1871–98 (C). Apparently Bishop Bagot had his way.
3 The left-hand margin of the letter has missed the copy.
4 The Vicarage of Cuddesdon was annexed to the Bishopric of Oxford until the foundation of the Theological College in 1854, when the living became annexed to the office of Principal.

that the Bishop of Bath and Wells[1] would be too happy to carry you off at once with him, but that his kind feeling towards Cuddesdon induces him to be willing at least for a season to spare you to me.

I hope that I am to have the pleasure of meeting you on Wednesday at The Palace.

I am ever my dear Sir, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon. (Elect)

73. To Archdeacon Clerke[2]

(*iii* 9)

Deanery, Westminster, Nov. 18, 1845

My dear Sir,

I take the first opportunity after my election to the See of Oxford to ask you whether I may hope for the advantage of retaining your assistance in the capacity of Examining Chaplain.

In proposing this to you it is right that I should add that I have secured the assistance of the Rev. R. C. Trench[3] of Trinity Coll. *Cambridge* (an arrangement I think desireable in the altered extent of the Diocese) my intimate friend in the same office; which therefore should you consent to my wishes he will share with you. I should further add that it is my intention to undertake personally with the aid of my Chaplains, the conduct of the examination for Candidates; and that with this view I propose, at least at first, conducting the examination at Cuddesden, where I should hope to receive you as a guest on the occasion.

I believe I need trouble you with no further particulars at this moment; but I cannot conclude without thanking you for the ready kindness with which you have offered to give me ye full advantage of your long and intimate acquaintance with the county of Oxford.

I am ever my dear sir, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon. Elect

74. To Dr. E. B. Pusey[4]

(*iii* 10)

Alverstoke Rectory, Nov. 24, 1845

My dear Dr. Pusey,

Your note has remained unanswered until now, from the difficulty I have felt in replying to it. I cannot reply to it without a cordial acknowledgment of the kindness of its tone towards myself, and an earnest return of its desire for our beloved Church of a hearty, faithful, truthful peacefulness of inner spirit. At the

1 The Hon. Richard Bagot (1782–1854), Bishop of Oxford 1829–45, Bath and Wells, 1845–54 (*DNB*).

2 Charles Carr Clerke (1798–1877), Student of Christ Church, 1814–37; Archdeacon of Oxford, 1830–77; R. of Milton, Berks., 1836–75; Canon of Christ Church, 1846–77. He was also Wilberforce's examining chaplain at Winchester, 1869–73 (*MEB*).

3 Richard Chenevix Trench (1807–86) had been Wilberforce's curate at Alverstoke, was V. of Itchenstoke, 1844–57; Prof. of Divinity at King's College, London, 1846–58; Dean of Westminster, 1856–63; Archbishop of Dublin, 1864–84 (*DNB*). See J. Bromley, *The Man of Ten Talents* (1959).

4 Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800–82), Regius Prof. of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, 1828–82 (*DNB*). The account of the relationship between Wilberforce and Pusey in *Life*, I, 300–9 and II, 70–116, and in H. P. Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, III, 33–49, 302–40 needs little revision. Wilberforce, as a High Churchman many of whose family were attracted to Rome, was specially conscious of the need to distinguish between the acceptable and dangerous aspects of Tractarianism; and in November 1845 the recent defection of Newman to Rome made him acutely aware of his own responsibilities as Bishop of a troubled diocese. Cf. no. 76.

same time, I cannot say this without adding what I feared might pain you (and this is what kept me silent); and that perhaps the more because anything I say must be incomplete and abrupt: since it would be plainly impossible, if it were not, as it is, unfit, that we should enter into a correspondence on the subject.

I could not then but say, how very deeply (to go no further back) the letters to which you allude had pained me; and that I cannot feel that the language there held as to the errors of the Church of Rome is, to my apprehension, to be reconciled with the doctrinal formularies of our own reformed Church. In saying this I speak, as I know you would have me, with frankness, and so I would leave the subject.

In one point at least, we can agree — in our sense of the greatness of the common danger, and of the extremity of my own; — and for the prayers and intercessions you promise me, I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

I am ever, my dear Dr. Pusey, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon. (Elect)

P.S. — I had written *Private*, but I erase it; as upon consideration I should prefer having my opinion on the subjects touched on in this letter as widely known as possible.

S.O.

Life, I, 302–3 [*Postscript not in MS*]

75.[1] (*iii 11*)

[Dec. 1845]

Rev. Sir,

[I have read with interest your letter concerning the needs of your parish . . . God thus to withhold from your field the dew of his blessing. I do most sincerely condole with you and will make mention of your people in my prayers. But knowing that God's arm is not shortened nor His ear weary I earnestly beseech and exhort you that to searching by examination you would add continual and earnest prayer that God would remove from you this . . .]

[*Badly blurred and almost illegible*]

76. To Dr. E. B. Pusey (*iii 12*)

The Deanery, December 5, 1845

My dear Dr. Pusey,

My mind has been lately so entirely occupied in ways you will easily conceive, that I have been led to postpone for a few days replying to your last letter. There is, as you anticipated, much in it which is distressing to me. But before I very lightly touch on one or two of those points, I wish to say a word on the nature of the communication itself.

It seems to me to appertain strictly to the office to which God has called me that I should seek to bear as a Father in Christ (however unworthy) the burden, not of these only, but of all the difficulties, infirmities, or temptations which may harass the minds of any who are entrusted (in whatever measure) to my charge, and who wish to communicate with me. Such therefore I would always be ready to listen to, and if possible to aid, not by controversy, but by a true sympathy and by any practical counsels which God may enable me to offer. Only this must be borne in mind, that such communications stand wholly apart from any judgment or step which I may be compelled to pronounce or take by any public act, in which these same persons may embody the difficulties or errors which they

[1] Recipient unidentified.

have communicated to me and from which I have sought by private counsel to withdraw them.

Having said so much, I would add that I am as far as possible from being unable to enter into the difficulties of which you speak. But I must also say that I trace our present evils to a different source, and look for our escape from them, if it please God, to a different quarter from those to which you point. I do not doubt that a longing after greater devotion, after a higher and more self-denying character, and after a greater life of Christian charity, than they met with around them, was the spring which originally moved many of those who have been foremost in the recent movement. But I believe that instead of seeking for these, where only they could be found, in a fuller and more personal knowledge of God and the eternal relations of the ever-blessed Trinity as revealed in God's Word, they were drawn aside by form and trappings which seemed to promise them that which they sought in a system which must really obscure the truth to all, and especially to those by whom it was self-chosen. Thus they were led from God instead of to Him. With the appearance to themselves of peculiar self-abasement they lost their humility; with great outward asceticism they were ruled by an unmortified will; they formed a party; and thus being greatly predisposed to it, the perverted bias of one master-mind has sufficed to draw them close to or absolutely into the Roman Schism, with all its fearful doctrinal errors.

I should not speak as I have said that I would, if I did not add that there appear to me to be in yourself too many traces of this evil; of a subtle and therefore most dangerous form of self-will; and a tendency to view yourself as one in, if not now the leader of, a party. This seems to me to lead you to judge the Church which you ought to obey; sometimes to blame, sometimes almost to patronize her; and hence to fall into the further error of undervaluing the One inspired Revelation of God's will given to us in His perfect Word. I would suggest to you, as instances, your abandoning what you had learned as a matter of Faith from your Church's exposition of God's Word on the evidence of an alleged vision, whereas the truth of no one of the Articles of the Faith rests on such evidence, an evidence manifestly open (as the mere facts of animal magnetism may show) to every form of unintentional deceit. Again the same spirit seems to me to be involved in your being ready to give up any one of our Formularies (which refer for their authority straight to God's Word and the Apostolical Creeds), if you, as an individual, think that you can find in early Christian writers contradictions of them.

Will you let me then pray you to weigh carefully the mere possibility of my view being right; and see as in God's sight whether you may not unawares have been led to foster the spirit of party, to shake the obedient reverence due to our Church, to lose sight in some measure of the supreme authority of Holy Scripture and so to hold great truths partially and therefore untruly. Should you admit even the possibility of this being true you will agree with me that not to take any new step, but to watch most earnestly against self-dependence and the spirit or acts of party, is at this moment your especial duty.

I have answered your appeal plainly: I believe that you would have me do so. Only let me further say how earnestly I pray that the God of Peace may Himself heal these our open wounds, and bring together into the clear light of His truth hearts which to His eye may be nearer than they seem to be to us. Should He make me His humble instrument in working such an end, my highest aim will be richly accomplished.

I am ever, my dear Dr. Pusey, your faithful friend and brother,

S. Oxon.

Life, I, 307–9

77. To the Rev. A. D. Campbell[1] *(iii 13)*

Private and Confidential Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 26, 1846

Rev. Sir,

Upon the most general principles I cannot allow you to consider my former letter to yourself as anything but *strictly private*. It would wholly destroy the most valuable [power] of my holding any fatherly intercourse with the clergy [under my charge] if I could not absolutely count upon [the power] of thus privately addressing them. Mr. Baker's[2] letter had nothing to do with my letter to you: my reply to him was that the matter required and would receive my full consideration — I feel that I cannot do less as you have called my attention to it, than say that I regret the tone of your answer to Mr. Baker as being angry and harsh. I express herein no opinion as to his or your doctrinal correctness.

I am very glad that you should take an eminent civilian's opinion as you propose on the legality of your conduct in this matter: and I shall be much obliged by your allowing me to see the opinion: and still more if you will shew me the *case* before it is put, as well as the opinion. But my letter, you will remember, did not touch upon the *legality* of the proceedings. Many things are not punished by law which are not allowed by Christian right, or, still more, by Christian expediency. I did not mean to threaten you with law; but to exhort you as under the Gospel. I wished you, and still wish you to consider, that those set over you in the Lord, as the Bishops of Christ's Church, I believe *universally*, disapprove of your conduct: that your own Bishop does: that it gives great offence or grief to the great body of your brother clergy; and that therefore there must I think be strong reason for a young man of an humble mind to be ready herein to suspect the correctness of his own judgement even where he is most clear as to the purity of his own motives. Of the purity of those motives I entertain no misgivings whatever. I do not doubt that you believe that you shall most glorify God and promote peace and concord amongst Christians. My own judgement is the direct opposite: as an argument upon the case I would refer you to the written objections of Mr. [Stowell] and Mr. [McNeile],[3] but my appeal to you is rather to the dutiful deference you owe to authority as to a line of conduct not expressly enjoined as a duty, than to mere conclusions of argument.

In conclusion I will only say that you are quite at liberty to say that I am in communication with you upon this subject; and wish you to abandon your connection with the Society; and I do not see any good reason for your stating more: this of course you may state to the Civilian.

I am Rev. Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

78. To the Rev. T. H. Gillam[4] *(iii 14)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 26, 1846

My dear Sir,

After talking with your Father over all the circumstances of your position at Wycombe I have come to the conclusion that it will be best that I should make

1 Alexander Digby Campbell, first P.C. of Walton, Aylesbury; he resigned on 2 June 1848. He disappears from the *Clergy List* in 1853.

2 Arthur Baker (d. 1868), chaplain of the Newbury Union, 1849; C. of Addington 1865, and R. 1867–8 (O). See App. II.

3 Revs. Hugh Stowell (1799–1865) and Hugh McNeile (1795–1879), later Dean of Ripon, two strong Evangelicals (*DNB*).

4 Thomas Henry Gillam, C. of Blewbury 1847–50, Ewelme 1850–62; V. of Culham, 1862–74; chaplain to Bishop Jacobson of Chester, 1865–84; V. of Weaverham, Cheshire, 1874 (O).

your case an exception to my general rule, by acquiescing in Mr. Paddon's[1] earnest entreaty and your request, and allowing you which I hereby do to terminate at once your engagement in your present curacy.

I am ever, my dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

79. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(iii 15)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 26, 1846

My dear Sir,

Since I last wrote to you I have received a letter from Mr. Gillam in which he asks me to allow him to withdraw from the curacy of High Wycombe. I find also that it is the wish of his Father that I should give him this permission. . . . [*illegible*] . . . exception to my general rule by allowing him to leave Wycombe without waiting for the expiration of the two years.

I remain, my dear Sir, very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

80. To the Rev. J. R. Pretyman[2] *(iii 16)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 31, 1846

My dear Sir,

I am much distressed at the contents of the letter which reached me from you today and whilst I value at a high rate the conscientious sincerity which induces you to determine to abandon preferment if you cannot honestly subscribe the English Articles at the same time I cannot but hope that I might be able in conversation so to satisfy your doubts as to obtain your active services for our Church, and at all events I think you would not until you have fully discussed the matter with me, have used all the means God had given you for obtaining a quiet mind. I trust therefore that you will be able to come over to me here next week. You will find me at home all Tuesday and, if you will stay and meet a few of your neighbours at dinner that day and [take] up with an attic to sleep in, I shall be truly glad to see you.

Should you be unable to come on Tuesday I expect to be at home all day Friday also.

I am ever, my dear Sir, yours very sincerely,

S. Oxon.

81. To the Diocesan Registrar (Rev. C. W. Bagot)[3] *(iii 17)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 31, 1846

My dear Sir,

I must appeal to you as Principal Registrar of this Diocese [on] a matter which I believe to be of great moment to the welfare of the Church: I mean the high charges of your Deputy Registrar for the performance of all ecclesiastical

[1] Thomas Henry Paddon (1807–87), V. of High Wycombe 1844–69, and afterwards incumbent of Emanuel Church, Eastbourne (O). See further no. 505.

[2] John Radclyffe Pretyman (1815–99), V. of Aylesbury, 1842–53, and disappears from the *Clergy List*, 1856 (O).

[3] Charles Walter Bagot (1812–84) (*MEB*) and his younger brothers Lewis Francis (1813–70) and Frederic (1822–92) had been appointed joint Registrars of the Diocese by their father, Bishop Bagot, in February 1845; they retained the office as a sinecure throughout Wilberforce's episcopate. Robert Morrell (d. 1849), was their deputy.

offices with which he is concerned. Nothing as you are doubtless aware has caused more remark in Parliament; nothing excites more discontent in Parishes than that these vast fees should be levied. There are now two cases of complaint before me. The first is from the Parish of Charney . . . A small addition, 22 square yards, is made to the burial ground at the price of £7 for the purchase money, and Mr. Morell [*sic*] runs them up a bill of £37:1:6d. for the consecration. I have applied to him through my secretary to allow the bill to be taxed: but he declines. I trust that I shall not in vain ask you to deliver us by your peremptory interference from this great Scandal. I enclose in confidence Mr. Burder's letter to me.

The second case is that of Wheatley . . . At the Personal request of the Bishop of Bath & Wells Mr. Vernon and Mr. Lee[1] applied for a faculty to change the pulpit at the Bishop's desire: and now Mr. M. charges them £17:7:2d for complying with His Lordship's wish.

I am ever, my dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

82. To the Rev. V. Thomas[2] (*iii 18*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 31, 1846

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have just signed your license for non-residence upon the living of Yarnton in consequence of their being no sufficient Vicarage House. Knowing however your zeal for our Church and your great liberality I cannot but follow that signature by expressing to you how earnestly I desire that you would take into your consideration the erection of a Vicarage which you might leave behind you hereafter as one amongst other enduring benefits to our Church.

I am ever Rev. & dear Sir, very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

83. To the Rev. A. B. Townsend[3] (*iii 19*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Wheatley, Jan. 31, 1846

Rev. Sir,

You will I am sure receive in the kindly spirit in which I intend it the application which a sense of my duty leads me to bring before you. I am informed that the present state of your health makes that continual attendance without which a Parish cannot spiritually thrive impossible to you — and I therefore would suggest to you how very desireable it would be that you should appoint a resident Curate to work with you in those exertions which you are able to make and to supply your place in those which you are compelled to omit. You will perhaps communicate to me your own views and wishes as to this suggestion, and believe me to be, Rev. Sir, your faithful friend and Brother.

S. Oxon.

1 The Curate and Churchwarden of Wheatley.

2 Vaughan Thomas (1775–1858), V. of Yarnton, 1803–58; C. of Begbroke, 1814; V. of Stoneleigh, Warws., 1804–58, and R. of Duntisbourne Rouse, Glos., 1811–58. He was an antiquary and author, and lived in High Street, Oxford; he was a notable benefactor of the United Oxford hospitals, and was consulted by the Bishop as a respected elder statesman (*DNB*).

3 Abraham Boyle Townsend (1791–1860), Student of Christ Church, 1809–27; R. of Easthampstead, 1826–60.

84. To the Rev. T. Hayton[1] *(iii 20)*

Jan. 31, 1846

Rev. Sir,

You were quite right in supposing that the letter which reached you was intended for the Rev. A. Hayton.[2]

The County of Bucks. has passed under my charge: and I shall be glad that I should see you as you propose before you resume your residence at Long Crendon.

I shall D.V. be here until Feb. 10, and after that date at 61 Eaton Square.

I am, Rev. Sir, Your friend and brother,

S. Oxon.

85. To the Rev. W. H. Cox[3] *(iii 21)*

Cuddesdon Palace, 5 Feb., 1846

My dear Sir,

I have given my best consideration to your statement respecting the present feeling as to the Oxford Burial Society but I must own that I do not [see any] opportunity [even] for the suggestion you have [last] made. Should the proposal to provide a 4th burial ground on the sanatory reasons to which you refer come before the Public, I have no doubt that many subscribers to the Parochial Burial Grounds would as individuals contribute to it. But I think that the committee or body of subscribers who have taken as their ground with the givers of £4000 that they will *simply* reproduce parochial burial grounds without the walls *cannot* in truth and honesty join with that any such modification of their plan.

I am I assure you sorry not to feel able to take any step you suggest which might wear a peaceable aspect or tend to express my earnest desire that in seeking after what we believe to be a great public Object we should say or do nothing which can wound the feelings of those who differ from us. I should at any time be most happy to consider and weigh to the best of my power any suggestions you will give me on the subject.

I am ever, my dear Sir, most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

86. To the Rev. A. B. Townsend *(iii 22)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Wheatley, Feb. 6th, 1846

Rev. Sir,

I beg to acknowledge your letter of Feb. 3, and to say that I think the account with which you have favoured me as to your apparent delay in nominating a permanent Curate is entirely satisfactory. I shall be very glad according to your suggestions to endeavour to select a suitable person and to enable me the better to do so I would request you to inform me what salary you would propose to give him and whether he could obtain at a reasonable rate a comfortable residence for a married? or a single? man.

I remain, Rev. Sir, your faithful friend and brother,

S. Oxon.

1 Thomas Hayton (1794–1887), V. of Long Crendon 1821–87, Lower Winchendon 1832–87 (O). The Haytons both came from Wigton, Cumberland, and held adjacent livings, but they were not apparently brothers.

2 Amos Hayton (1809–66), P.C. of Chearsley 1840–66, and chaplain of the Thame Union, 1855 (O).

3 Rev. William Hayward Cox (1804–71), Vice-Principal of St. Mary Hall, 1836; R. of Carfax, Oxford, 1839–52.

87. To the Deputy Diocesan Registrar (R. Morrell) *(iii 23)*
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 7, 1846

My dear Sir,

I am very anxious to obtain your co-operation, or I might more properly say, your consent, towards a reduction of the whole set of expenses which fall upon the different parishes for consecrations, faculties, etc. It is a matter, I think, of great moment that these offices of the Church should cost them as little as possible. May I ask you to give me any information you can as to the scale of these expenses and any suggestions as to diminishing their necessary amount. I am quite sure that I shall find perfect willingness in the Registrars of the Diocese to co-operate with us in any such attempt and I believe that the benefit which would result from success in it would be great.

I am ever, my dear Sir, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

88. To the Diocesan Chancellor (Dr. J. Phillimore)[1] *(iii 24)*
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 7, 1846

My dear Chancellor,

I am much annoyed at the complaints I receive of the amount of Mr. R Morrell's charges to the Parishes for the various offices of the Church with which his office has any connection e.g. the Churchwardens of Charney having at £7 expence purchased an additional burial ground are charged by Mr. Morrell £37 for its consecration. This must be an abuse. It does serious and wide spread mischief: and ought to be abated. Is the Deputy Registrar absolute, or what are the conditions and checks upon his sovereignty. Can he be removed? and by whom? what power has the registrar over him?

He refuses to have his accounts taxed.

Will you kindly give me such advice as you can upon the matter? I enclose a letter from C. Bagot in reply to an appeal I have made to him. Will you return it. My address *after* Tuesday will be 61 Eaton Place, but if you can let me hear sooner it will be here.

I am ever my Dear Chancellor, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

89. To the Rev. F. W. Cartwright[2] *(iii 25)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 7, 1846

My dear Sir,

Since I had the pleasure of receiving you here I have been thinking much over the subject of the Rural Deanery of Waddesdon; and I have come to the conclusion that it will be expedient for me to re-arrange it; dividing it into two separate deaneries according to the plain line of Territorial position. By this arrangement the Parishes of Ashendon, Boarstall, Brill, Chilton, Long Crendon, Chearsley, Dorton, Ickford, Kingsey, Oakley, Winchendon, (Nether and Upper), Wormenhall and perhaps one or two more would form one district and the parishes lying

1 Dr. Joseph Phillimore (1775–1855), Chancellor of the diocese until 1855, was succeeded by his son Robert Joseph Phillimore. He was also Chancellor of Worcester and Bristol (*DNB*). Dr. Phillimore married (1807) Bishop Bagot's first cousin.

2 Frederick William Cartwright (1818–1906), 8th son of W. R. Cartwright of Aynhoe Park; V. of Oakley, 1843–62; R. of Aynhoe, 1862–1906 (O).

north of the hills another. Of this South District I beg to offer you the Deanery, with the earnest prayer that God may bless you in discharging the duties of the office. They are such as I am confident you may most profitably and satisfactorily perform. In the event of your acceding to my wish I will hereafter send you a commission and some fuller instructions. But for the present I would say, that my great object is that the Rural Dean should form an easy and accurate medium of communication between me and the clergy of the Deanery, and still more that he should be a local centre of spiritual influence and brotherly union to his clergy: being himself a pattern of the true Spiritual Pastors life, leading all around him into more zeal and more unity, and all this I have good hope my Dear Sir that God's grace will enable you to be, to the Blessing of many other souls and to the exceeding greatness of your own rejoicing in the day of Christ's appearing.

I am my dear Sir, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

90. To the Rev. G. Chetwode[1] *(iii 26)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Wheatley, Feb. 7, 1846

Rev. Sir,

I feel it due to you that you should hear directly from myself that I have just determined upon distributing the Parishes which now constitute the R. Deanery of Waddesdon into a new and I think much more convenient territorial arrangement. This will throw together all the parishes which lie on the [Thame] side of the hills which there intersect the county. But as Mr. Cartwright's Residence as well as yours lie in this district this will lead to my wishing to throw upon only one of the present Rural Deans the burden of this particular Deanery and relieving the other from his charge. I have determined to request Mr. Cartwright to receive a new commission from me because knowing the amount of your occupations in the magisterial business of the County I think I may safely count upon an amount of service from him which I could not expect from you.

I remain, Rev. Sir, very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

91. To the Rev. J. King[2] *(iii 27)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Wheatley, Feb. 7, 1846

Rev. Sir,

I am anxious to draw your most serious and earnest attention to the state of your important parish of Henley. It is over run with Dissent and Godlessness. Its

1 George Chetwode (1791–1870), second son of Sir John Cherwode, 4th Bart.; P.C. of Stratton Audley 1816–31, Chilton 1829–70 (O). Though Wilberforce made exceptions, he disliked clerical magistrates as well as sporting parsons.

2 Letter 91 was one of the results of Wilberforce's initial conference with his Archdeacons and Rural Deans at Cuddesdon about the state of the diocese. Henley was in the gift of the Bishop of Rochester, and the living was held from 1825 to 1852 by an Oriel man, James King, son of a Bishop of Rochester; he was also R. of Longfield, Kent, from 1826 until his death in 1864. In his Diocese Book (I, f. 42), Wilberforce made the following notes about the parish:

'Henley, R[ectory]. James King R[ector] resident at Longfield Court Gravesend. Quere ground of exemption.

'F. J. Burlton curate. Hardworking overworked — sound Churchman not Pus[eyite]: married & large family. Mother lives & sister & blind brother.

'J. King promised the late Bishop a second Curate in 1845. Place overrun with Dissent. Mr. Burlton unlicensed.

'Mr. King left a Mr. C. J. Fox . . . Pus[eyite].

'Desiderata 2nd Curate & Chapel at Grays.'

population, now above 3000 souls most urgently needs the instant Care of another Curate: an assistance to the present, which if I am rightly informed you promised Bishop Bagot to furnish. Perhaps you have not yet found one suited to the place: and if this has caused delay I will gladly, should you desire me, seek out one myself. Upon this point *first* you will suffer me most urgently to press upon you the duty of immediate action. Souls committed to your charge and government, for whom you must render account at the Judgement Seat of Christ are passing daily unprepared into their Eternal State. The second point on which I earnestly desire your co-operation is as to the part of the Parish of Rotherfield Greys which [adjoins] Henley town. An attempt is now making to build and endow a district chapel for this population. If I am rightly informed £18 a year of rent charge was allowed to the Incumbent of Henley from the Tithe of Greys in consideration of the spiritual charge of the district. Will you allow that [rent] to go towards the endowment of the proposed district chapel?

I shall feel much obliged by your kind and early consideration of these matters and remain, Rev. Sir, Your faithful friend and brother,

S. Oxon.

May I ask if your present Curate at Henley is duly licensed?

92. To the Rev. J. B. Travers[1] (?) *(iii 28)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 7, [1846]

Rev. Sir,

I thank you much for allowing me to see the correspondence. I [feel] deeply the good which is to be gained from personal and religious intercourse between the clergy, and whilst I do not think that the suggestions of your papers could be easily secured yet I trust that you may see that which you regard, probably, with myself, as the most important, ere long secured.

I am Rev. Sir, Your faithful friend and brother,

S. Oxon.

93. To the Rev. W. H. Chepmell[2] *(iii 29)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 9, 1846

Rev. Sir,

I am sorry that the state of your health obliges me to have recourse to this mode of communication upon the matter concerning which I wish to see you. I have received, through the Bishop of London, a statement from a clergyman of his Diocese, whom he describes as worthy of all credit, concerning some Catechetical questions put, and answers suggested, by you, to the youth of St. Peters-Le-Bailey, on the last Sunday in January; to which I feel it my duty to call your immediate attention. The questions and answers, said both to be your own to which I wish to call your attention, are these: 1. Who was? or is? the Virgin Mary. Ans: The Mother of God.

1 Addressed to the Rev. J. Travers; Charles Henry Travers, who held curacies in the diocese 1853–8, and was V. of Stewkley 1859–70, was not yet ordained. John Benward Travers was V. of Mumby, Lincs., 1840–87 (C). The revival of rural deaneries and their chapters is probably what the Bishop had in mind in the last sentence.

2 William Henry Chepmell (1819–76), Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, 1842–76; C. of St. Peter-le-Bailey 1844–6, though not licensed until 1845.

2. Q. How is she spoken of in Scripture?

A. As the Highest of Created Beings; above angels and archangels.

It is concerning the second of these (alledged) questions and answers that I wish you to state to me; 1. whether you allow that you are correctly stated to have used the words? and 2.ly. If not, if you can supply instead of them, what you did say? or 3ly. If you wish, allowing their correctnes as reported, to offer any explanation concerning them.

I am Rev. Sir, yours faithfully,

S. Oxon.

You will oblige me by addressing your answer to me at 61; Eaton Place.

94. To the Rev. F. Reyroux[1] *(iii 30)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 9, 1846

Rev. Sir,

I have read and carefully considered your communication as well as Mr. Ninds[2] statement, and painful as it is to me to tell you so, I have come to the conclusion that it is my duty to allow him to give you notice to quit the Curacy in six months unless you arrange with him to give it up before. I am convinced that there is no hope whatever of your and his working happily and in full mutual confidence together: and this I judge to be a matter of such prime importance for the spiritual good of the Parish that I cannot refuse him the permission which he asks.

I am, Rev. Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

95. To the Rev. T. T. Coxwell[3] *(iii 31)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 10, 1846
address me at 61 Eaton Place, London

Rev. Sir,

I am led to address you by the accounts which from various authentic sources I have received of the State of the Parish of Great Marlow, committed by God's Providence to your Care and Government.

I. I find that you have only one Sermon in your Church on Sunday.

II. That from your own age it is impossible for you to give the daily, hourly, attention which such a Parish needs; and

III.ly. That you have no resident Curate.

[1] Frederick Reyroux (1801–81), matriculated at St. Edmund Hall at the age of 24, and took a B.D. in 1845, but appears never to have obtained a benefice. He was C. of Dewsbury 1829–32, Westbury 1832–6, Staines 1840–3, South Stoke 1845–6, Toot Baldon 1846–55, and was chaplain of the Wallingford Union, 1851–64. He disappears for a time from the *Clergy List*, but reappears as curate of Sutton Courtenay in charge of Appleford in 1879 until his death.

[2] Philip Henry Nind (1806–86) Student of Christ Church, 1827–31; V. of South Stoke, 1844–86.

[3] Thomas Tracey Coxwell (1779–1855), ceded the vicarage of Great Marlow in 1850 on becoming R. of Horton. He was also, according to Foster, P.C. of Eastleach Turville, Glos. The Bishop noted in his Diocese Book (1, ff. 134v, 135): 'Coxwell, very old man. One sermon. Nothing against him but the great sin of omission. All miserable. No Curate — one ought to be . . . last Confirmation he stuck on door when Conf. to be & told them to prepare themselves for the last week.'

I beg therefore, Rev. Sir, in the Name of Christ and for the sake of His Church, and in remembrance of that strict and fearful account which we shall both render before His Judgement Seat, to exhort and beseech you to set yourself immediately to the due ordering of these matters.

I am Rev. Sir, your faithful friend and brother,

S. Oxon.

96. To the Rev. G. A. Baker[1] *(iii 32)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 10, 1846
address 61 Eaton Place, London

Rev. Sir,

I am informed that you have left your Parish of Fingest for three or four months and as I do not perceive that you have any licensed curate I must request you to inform me what provision you have made for the Care of the Parish during your absence.

I am, Rev. Sir, ever yours faithfully,

S. Oxon.

97. To the Principal of Brasenose (Dr. R. Harington)[2] *(iii 33)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 10, 1846
my address will be 61 Eaton Place

My dear Mr. Principal,

I was very sorry not to have had the pleasure of seeing you when you were so kind as to call here.

Had I been so fortunate I would have named to you a matter on which perhaps you will now let me trouble you with a few lines.

[I understand] that by an arrangement with your College the Incumbent of Didcote[3] has paid a sum of money into the hands of Trustees [for providing hereafter] the building of a Rectory in lieu of dilapidations. If this Statement is correct may I ask you whether you would take into consideration a suggestion I [will venture] to press earnestly upon your Society: viz: that instead of waiting until the next vacancy of the benefice they should proceed at once to erect the intended house, and thereby secure at a much earlier date for the Parish the great benefit of possessing a good and sufficient Parsonage.

I am ever, My Dear Mr. Principal, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

98. To the Rev. W. H. Chepmell *(iii 34)*

61 Eaton Place, Feb. 14, 1846

Rev. Sir,

I am very sorry to find from your answer that you did teach your Catechumens that the Virgin Mary was 'the highest of all creatures; even above angels and archangels.' All such exaltation of the Mother of our Lord I believe to be distinctly at variance with the word of God and the authorised formularies of the English Church. It savours of that peculiarly disgraceful corruption of the Papacy: and tends to introduce a mischievous delusion into the minds of those committed to your charge. I trust that the words were used by you incautiously with no [lurking] tendencies towards errors you have solemnly renounced. But it is my

[1] George Augustus Baker (1788–1866), R. of Ibstone cum Fingest, 1841–66 (C).
[2] Richard Harington (1800–53), D.D., Principal of Brasenose, 1842–53 (*MEB*).
[3] Joseph Hodgkinson (1774–1851), R. of Didcot 1817–51 (O).

duty to set you on your guard by expressing my strong disapprobation of your conduct in this particular; and by requiring you to state to me explicitly, that I may rely upon your teaching being for the future entirely free from such errors. Seek I beseech you to exalt before your people, young and old, Christ Jesus The Lord, as their only Saviour, and beware lest you say or do anything, which may haply lead them to lose their souls by exalting any creature into His Place.

I am very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

99. To the Hon. and Rev. H. W. Stanhope[1] *(iii 35)*

61 Eaton Place, [Feb. 15, 1846]

Rev. Sir,

Understanding that the late Curate of Chesham[2] has resigned his post there, I think it is a proper time to mention to you that I must call upon you to nominate to me a Curate and an Assistant Curate for the care of your Parish; and that I shall assign to them £200 per annum with the use of the glebe house; to which I would urge you to add the Surplice fees. I shall be obliged to you for your opinion as to the best proportion in which I may allot between your two Curates this total sum of £200 per annum.

I am, Rev. Sir, Very Faithfully Yours,

S. Oxon.

100. To the Rev. W. R. Fremantle[3] *(iii 36)*

61 Eaton Place, Feb. 16, 1846

My dear Friend,

I hope to secure your services to my Diocese in the capacity of Rural Dean. My desire is that the Rural Dean should carry out through the district committed to his charge that effective parochial visitation and inspection which the size of this Diocese renders impossible for the Bishop or even for the Archdeacon. I wish that he should keep me accurately informed of all spiritual details of his Parishes; that he should visit annually all his Churches: and that he should be a centre of spiritual influence to the Clergy. This he may be, if God gives him grace to be at once active, orderly, and prudent. You will see the mention of Rural Chapters in your commission as to which I will only say here, that I should be glad if you will defer holding them until you hear more fully from me upon the subject. The Parishes which I think may most conveniently constitute your R. Deanery are

Claydon, Middle and East		
Ludgershall	Marston North	Oving
Pitchcott	Quaynton	Waddesdon, 3 portions
Wootton Underwood	Grandborough	Winslow
Edgcott	Grendon Underwood	

I am ever my dear Friend, yours very sincerely,

S. Oxon.

Life, I, 352–3

[1] Henry William Stanhope (1790–1872), sixth son of 3rd Earl of Harrington; V. of Chesham 1826–47, and R. of Gawsworth, Cheshire, 1827–72 (C).

[2] Adolphus Frederick Aylward (1822–71) was licensed to the curacy of Chesham on the 9 October 1846, obviously as a result of the vacancy noted in this letter; but he became Vicar in the following year (26 November 1847) and remained so until his death (O).

[3] William Robert Fremantle (1807–95), brother of 1st Baron Cottesloe, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, 1831–5; V. of Steeple Claydon, 1841–68; R. of Middle and East Claydon, 1841–76; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, 1869; Dean of Ripon, 1876–95 (*MEB*).

101. To the Rev. T. T. Coxwell *(iii 37)*

61 Eaton Place, [Feb. 18, 1846]

Rev. Sir,

I can of course quite enter into your difficulty as to providing an assistant from so small an endowment. Still the *first* necessity of all, for yourself as well as for them, is that the souls committed to you should be so cared for as that you may render your account with joy in '*that* day' — and I hope that this matter may be arranged if as I understand you are willing to put it into my hands. But upon this point we should be quite clear. Do I then understand that you desire me to nominate an assistant curate for Great Marlow provided his salary is secured without charge to yourself.

I am, Rev. Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

102.[1] *(iii 38)*

61 Eaton Place, [Feb. 1846]

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have not sooner replied to your last letter because I wished to support my own opinion by a reference to other [authorities] before I wrote.

My conclusion is 1) That the Churchwardens have no voice at all as to the [disposition] of the Church Yard. 2) That they can act only as representing the Parishioners. 3) That any parishioners and therefore the wardens, have a right to prevent the interment of strangers in their yard. 4) That such interment can only take place, legally, by a faculty from the Court. 5) That in this particular case therefore, the Churchwardens have passed the time when they can properly take their stand upon protecting Parish rights but that 6) the interment having taken place without a faculty it would not be competent to you to act upon that . . . [*illegible*] . . . 7) Your course therefore should be to apply to the Court for leave . . . [*illegible*] . . . parishioners to inter and that in answer to this plea the Wardens could not successfully answer that they stood for Parish rights because they have already surrendered their ground, and the faculty even though opposed would issue. But I cannot but hope that if this case is set before them the wardens would not only withdraw an opposition which they have not made in similar cases (as I am advised) and which I do not think they should by any means [press] . . . [*Conclusion illegible; almost illegible throughout*]

103. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(iii 39)*

61 Eaton Place, March 3, 1846

My dear Sir,

It is my duty to inform you that I have received an address from your Parish containing very serious charges against the doctrinal [soundness] of your pulpit ministrations. [The doctrinal points] stated are amongst others such as [this, — the doctrine that 'man is not a responsible being'], 'that it is sinful for the non-elect to pray', 'that the Holy Spirit could not add one sinner to the Family of God', and generally that your preaching is [unorthodox] in character. I shall be obliged 1. by your stating to me whether you have used or are in the habit of using such statements as these from your pulpit and IIndly by your sending me, if you have them, your sermons preached on [18 Jan. 1846] and Christmas Day 1845 and [15 Feb^{y}] 1846.

I am ever, my Dear Sir, Yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

[1] Recipient unidentified.

104. To R. Wheeler[1] (*iii 40*)

61 Eaton Place, Mar. 14, 1846

Sir,

I need not I trust assure you that it is my most anxious desire to do everything within my power to preserve the purity of the Gospel of Christ within my Diocese; and there is no more deadly corruption of that purity than antinomianism. But you must remember that I owe a duty of protection to any clergyman charged with false teaching until that charge be proved, and whilst these few general charges respectably support possible ground for *cautioning* a clergyman I am bound to require accurate statements as ground for censure. In this case the clergyman indignantly denies the charge, and he forwards to me a letter signed by the Mayor and Churchwarden; by the *three* other Wardens of the year and one Warden of last year absolutely and strongly denying the special charges contained in the memorial. Under these circumstances I feel bound to order you to substantiate by some evidence the charges made by you and on which I am to act.

I am ever, Sir, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

105. To the Rev. H. Binney[2] (*iii 41*)

61 Eaton Place, May 18, 1846

Rev. Sir,

In reply to your letter complaining of Mr. Chatteris of Sandleford Priory[3] for non-attendance upon his Parish Church; and of the Rev. Mr. Barter[4] for encouraging him in so doing; I must beg you to observe Ist that your proper course as to Mr. Barter is to make your own application to his Diocesan and II that it is your business and not mine to proceed for the common law penalties to which you allude by summons of the offender before the Magistrates.

But further I will counsel you to take no such steps. I do not consider the infliction of common law penalties the proper mode of securing a due attendance of worshippers in the House of God. The Pastors character known and felt to be that of a man of God — his Godly instructions and God's Blessing applying these to the hearts and consciences of the flock, these are in my opinion the only instruments whereby we may hope to win a reluctant people to a joyful attendance in their appointed House of Prayer.

I am no friend to civil penalties enforcing the discharge of strictly spiritual duties: and had much rather that such enactments slept in the dust of their obsolete obscurity.

I am, Rev. Sir, Your faithful Friend and Brother,

S. Oxon.

106. To the Rev. T. Silvester[5] (*iii 42*)

61 Eaton Place, May 23, 1846

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I greatly regret the improper tone of your letter of the 21st, and the necessity which it imposes upon me of taking further steps in this case.

1 Robert Wheeler, brewer, banker and Alderman of High Wycombe.
2 Hibbert Binney (d. 1857), D.C.L., R. of Newbury 1838–57.
3 William Pollet Brown Chatteris (d. 1889). The Priory is two miles S. of Newbury.
4 William Brudenell Barter (1788–1858), brother of Charles Barter of Sarsden; R. of Highclere and Burghclere, Hants., 1825–58 (*MEB*).
5 Thomas Silvester (1783–1853), C. of Buckingham 1841–52, and V. from 1852 until his sudden death in the street (C).

You write as if I wished for some further information from you: and you reply that you know nothing more about Backhouse's marriage than what the clerk told you and you believed to be true &c. &c.

Now if you will refer to my letter you will see that I ask for no information, but that I point out to you that the alledged residence upon which you performed the marriage was not a legal residence but you consequently had illegally married a non-parishioner; that you had thereby rendered yourself liable to severe ecclesiastical penalties; and I therefore urged on you the necessity of more care for the time to come. I expected from you the promise of this for the future and an expression of sorrow for the past. Nor can I receive less. The evil of such marriages is great; the law makes you responsible for them; and I cannot wink at any carelessness concerning its requirements. I am most anxious not to be forced by you into any severer methods, but you must distinctly understand that unless you at once express to me both your understanding of what was wrong in this case and your regret for it, with an assurance that you will in future excercise more vigilance you will force me to take steps of which I most sincerely wish to avoid the necessity.

I am Rev. and Dear Sir, your Faithful Friend and Brother,

S. Oxon.

107. To the third Marquess of Lansdowne[1] *(iii 48)*

61 Eaton Place, July 12, 1846

My dear Lord,

Will your Lordship allow me thus early to trouble you with a matter which greatly concerns my Diocese. In the course of this year a scheme for an order in council has been passed by the Eccles: Commrs for abolishing Peculiar Jurisdictions in the Diocese of Oxford. Against this Scheme Eton College have raised the objection that they have peculiar jurisdiction which it is important to uphold. The College failed to convince the Commissioners either that they were a peculiar or that if they were they should be so maintained. But wishing to give them every opportunity of pleading their cause *I* proposed that our scheme should be sent in to the Privy Council with a request that Eton might be heard before the Council against the Scheme. For this hearing the Scheme has waited to the surpassing inconvenience of the Diocese. The late Lord President[2] was just about to name a day for the hearing when he quitted office. My prayer to your Lordship is that you should name an early day for this case.

I am ever my dear Lord, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

108. To the Rev. J. Cole[3] *(iii 43)*

61 Eaton Place, July [ ], 1846

Rev. Sir,

I am very reluctant to have you on such a ground quit your Curacy, and I beg to ask you before I accept your resignation whether if I can arrange that my secretary should secure and pay to you the stipends granted by the Bishops of Sarum and the Sons of the Clergy you would dislike remaining at Blewbury.

I am Your Faithful Friend and Brother,

S. Oxon.

[1] Henry Petty-Fitzmaurice (1780–1863); Lord President of the Council, 1830–41, 1846–52.

[2] The 5th Duke of Buccleuch.

[3] James Cole, C. of Blewbury, 1844.

109. To the Rev. T. Chamberlain[1] *(iii 44)*

61 Eaton Place, July [ ], 1846

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I am much obliged to you for the openness which has led you to tell me the course you have felt it right in this instance to pursue. But even if you had not written I should have felt sure that no disregard of my wishes had found place in your mind.

I will not repeat my opinion upon the general question; but it is one which so long as I am not applied to for a decision I should on all accounts leave free for the judgement of the Parish Priest. I am quite sure you act most conscientiously in the matter; and I should be very reluctant to trench upon the large liberty of judgement in things doubtful conceded by the English Church to her Presbyters.

I am Rev. and Dear Sir, Your faithful Friend and Brother,

S. Oxon.

110. To the Rev. W. Sykes[2] *(iii 46)*

61 Eaton Place, [July 17, 1846]

Rev. Sir,

I venture to trouble you with an application from myself as Bishop of the Diocese on behalf of Ashampstead in the county of Berks. My recent visit to that neighbourhood having brought the matter forcibly before me. I find at Ashampstead a population of 400 souls who are in a state of great spiritual destitution and day by day are becoming more entirely lost to the Church through the union of Ashampstead with Basildon. Ashampstead contributes when the rates are paid only £3:9s. (exclusive of burial fees) and I am sure that the loss of this would be a good barter for the legal cure of 400 souls and services as this I think in age or any infirmity renders a Curate absolutely necessary, and still more for the charge of a living which would then be manageable in numbers extent and general Church tone.

I can assure you that I would not lightly trouble you on the subject but the state of Ashampstead is grievous. It would of course as a separate benefice be in the same patronage as Basildon and capable of increase from . . . [*Unfinished*] [*Pencil Note:*] End by shewing Patrons not hurt.

111.[3] *(iii 47)*

61 Eaton Place, July 17, 1846

My dear Lord,

May I understand this letter as tantamount to counter-signing the enclosed Testimonials, and would your Lordship sign them? We are threatened with a fierce opposition to the Clergy Disc: Bill which rising from Doctors Commons veils itself under the pretext of . . . [*unfinished*]

1 Thomas Chamberlain (1810–92), Student of Christ Church, 1828–92; P.C. of Cowley, 1837–42; V. of St. Thomas', Oxford, 1842–92; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, 1882. An advanced Tractarian; editor of *The Ecclesiastic*, 1846–67 (*MEB*). See T. W. Squires, *In West Oxford* (1928).

2 William Sykes (1800–75), son of the 2nd Bart.; V. of Cullompton, Devon, 1834–57; R. of Thornham, Suffolk, 1872–5 (C). Resided at The Grotto, Basildon; his son became V. of Basildon in 1859.

3 Recipient unidentified.

112. To the Rev. R. H. Hooper[1] *(iii 45)*

61 Eaton Place, July 18, 1846

My dear Sir,

I heartily congratulate you on the Bishop of Exeter's[2] reply.

I have written to His Lordship; and you shall hear from me as soon as I receive his answer.

I am ever, my dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

113. To the Diocesan Chancellor (Dr. J. Phillimore) *(iii 49)*

61 Eaton Place, July [18], 1846

My dear Chancellor,

Will you let me ask your advice on two cases in the Diocese now before me.[3]

Case 1. A.B. Rector of C. writes to complain that D. the incumbent of a district church in his town has taken into the pulpit a lecture delivered the preceding year in his pulpit and printed and published by his Curate and also alledging that D. has misconstrued and opposed the doctrine of the lecture and he calls on me to proceed against D. under the 53rd Canon.

D. responds to my questions First that he dealt with a published communication. 2 that he did not know that it had been preached. 3 that it was distributed through his district from which he is to drive away unsound doctrine.

I. Has he committed any offence. II. How can I proceed against him.

Case 2. A.B. Rector of D. refuses to marry Wesleyan Methodists residing in his Parish but never attending Church, saying the law forbids Ministers to publish banns as to the marriages solemnized by dissenting societies. . . . [*illegible*] . . . Can he justify his refusal? If not how is he . . . [*illegible*]

I am ever yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

114. To the Rev. W. W. McCreight[4] *(iii 50)*

61 Eaton Place, July 18, 1846

Rev. Sir,

There is no doubt that all 'jurisdictions of Ecclesiastical Courts' were reserved by 6 and 7 Wm. IV. cap. 77 (repeated by later Acts and by 6 and 7 Vic. cap. 60) and continue still, until dealt with by Act of Parliament, in the parties originally exercising the same. In this 'Jurisdiction' embraced whatever acts the ordinary performs through his Court, in opposition to his Acts of personal jurisdiction. Probates and Marriage Licences &c. are included in the former, visitation &c. in the latter jurisdiction. The latter jurisdiction will pass wholly from all peculiar ordinaries in the counties of Berks. Bucks & Oxon. to the Bishops of Oxford so soon as a scheme passed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and now before the Privy Council shall have passed the Privy Council and been inserted in the London Gazette. The former jurisdiction can

[1] Richard Hope Hooper (1820–99), licensed to the curacy of Littleworth 8 August and priested in December 1846; chaplain of the Faringdon Union, 1848; R. of Thornton cum Nash, 1861–77; V. of Great Coxwell, 1877 (O).

[2] See no. 159.

[3] For these two cases see nos. 116–17 and no. 115 respectively.

[4] William Walkinshaw McCreight, V. of Winslow, 1841–63.

be changed only an [*sic*] Act of Parliament. For the present it is held that the peculiars of the county of Buckingham remain in their pristine vigour, that *county* having been removed from the effect of the Order in Council of last year by its transference in November from the Diocese of Lincoln to that of Oxford.

I remain, Rev. Sir, Most faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

115. To the Rev. T. W. Allies[1] (*iii 51*)
Private

61 Eaton Place, 1846, July 18

My dear Sir,

I have waited, before I replied to your letter of July 13, until I had taken some legal opinions upon the questions it raises. I have the opinions of Dr. Lushington,[2] Dr. Phillimore, a common law barrister, and the Bishop of London. They all agree (1) that you are absolutely bound to publish the banns and perform the marriage of all persons qualified to demand the same by age and residence in your Parish, *not being ex-communicated by Sentence of Court.* (2) That you may be compelled to do so by process of Court; and (3) punished probably at the common law and certainly in the Ecclesiastical Courts for your refusal. I send you a copy of my answer to the complainant; from which you will see that I have stated the case as narrowly as truth would permit, in order to shelter you from any attempted annoyance. But to you privately I must use a different language; I earnestly entreat you to re-consider the position you are assuming. There is no doubt that our Clergy in this and in many other aspects are in a most anomalous position. They are the ministers of the Catholic Church; and they are also ministers of a church which *has been truly* a national Church; and so they have succeeded to public national offices. Now whilst the ties of the Presbyter of the Church to the people have been in so many instances relaxed or broken, the ties of the Public Officer to the population have continued — hence arises a *legal obligation* to perform offices (seemingly) not due from the Church to the Separatist. But *first* the mode of remedying this evil must be by (a) altering the law or (b) excommunicating the parties — not by holding preferment by law and then refusing to obey the law, in virtue of which we retain our benefices — *secondly* we ought to consider whether the breaking these remaining bonds is not wilfully giving up what God's Providence has still left to us whereby to win back these persons and still more their children to our spiritual charge. We never I think must forget that their practical separation from us was so greatly the fault of ourselves in our predecessors, that we ought, as far as the limits of right will possibly allow, to retain every permissive power conceded to us by the Church, to the very utmost, to retain *any* hold on those who will be so greatly injured by departing and who can be retained only by a very large admixture of a gentle and loving forbearance with any attempt after revived discipline.

I remain, Rev. and Dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, I, 411–12

1 Thomas William Allies (1813–1903), R. of Launton, who became a Roman Catholic in 1850 (*DNB*). See *Life*, II, 16–27, and Newsome, pp. 298 ('the most turbulent priest of the Oxford Diocese'), 342–6.

2 Stephen Lushington (1782–1873), a distinguished civil lawyer (*DNB*).

116. To the Rev. A. D. Campbell *(iii 52)*

July 21, 1846

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I am very glad that you have expressed yourself so openly and distinctly as to your future conduct.

Your letter leaves to me nothing to [add except] that I have an entire belief in your [honesty]. But I cannot view with at all the [same pleasure] the language in which you speak of the past. You speak of the *censure* you have forced me to pronounce as 'an accusation' which 'nothing in the tone of your letter merits' now this implies I fear that you still . . . [*second page of letter illegible*] . . . when therefore you assumed that discharge of this office you invaded my province and subordinated the law of charity to your will by making yourself his judge. I should not deal honestly with you if I did not add my own caution, as to what seems to me to be the worst of your [faults] that is a lack of humility. It is a very common and a very dangerous [practice of the evil one] to make us mistake a great zeal for our own opinion for a zeal for truth: and of this I see traces in you: leading you to hard words, rash judgements and needless imputations. My dear Sir, there is a day coming when to have dwelt in love will be found to have been better than to have been a forward setter right of others and loud maintainer of these or those views of truth. Listen I beseech you for Christs sake to my voice; pray specially and labour for the grace of humility. Be subject one to another — Be clothed with humility — Strive earnestly to maintain the unity of the spirit in the Bond of Peace. Remember that there must be matter for some provocation to your Brethren in the Ministry in [so grieveing a] position at Aylesbury; remember how grievous an injury is inflicted on the flock by every act of yours which rends and divides it and study to put no stumbling block or occasion to fall in your brothers way but to be very forbearing and gentle if happly [*sic*] upon you shall come in all its fullness the blessing of the Peace Maker.

I am ever, Rev. and Dear Sir, Your affectionate brother in the Lord,

S. Oxon.

117. To the Rev. A. Baker *(iii 53)*

Private

61 Eaton Place, July 21, 1846

My dear Sir,

I have been engaged in correspondence with Mr. Campbell on the subject of your complaint. He allows the *facts* of which you complain, but strongly asserts, that he had no suspicion the lecture had been *preached*; and dealt with it merely as an anonymous publication. I have told him that I believe him to have broken the 53rd Canon in its spirit if not in its letter; and he submits to my judgement; and promises to avoid the fault for the future. He strongly disclaims all feeling of hostility to you; intending only in what he said to maintain what he thought the truth. You [I trust with] christian charity will heartily forgive a fault committed unintentionally: and which will not be repeated. You did perfectly right in referring the matter to me instead of taking up your own defence.

I shall be obliged by your showing this letter to Mr. Pretyman.

I am, Rev. and very dear Sir, Your affectionate brother,

S. Oxon.

118. To T. S. Weeden[1] *(iii 54)*

61 Eaton Place, 27 July, 1846

Sir,

The appointment of the Parish Clerk is by law vested solely in the Incumbent of the Parish.

I am, Sir, Yours truly,

S. Oxon.

119. To the Rev. J. Long[2] *(iii 55)*

61 Eaton Place, 27 July, 1846

Rev. Sir,

If I am right in believing you merely to ask my sanction for the performance (during a temporary absence from your parish of less than 3 months) of your duty by a clerical neighbour not regularly licensed, I give it cheerfully. My desire is that all *regular* assistants be licensed, and that I be *informed* of the names of all occasional assistants.

I am, Rev. Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

120. To the Rev. W. Shirley[3] *(iii 56)*

61 Eaton Place, 27 July, 1846

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I am sorry to interpose any delay in a case you speak of as urgent, but unfortunately you do not [state] on what grounds you apply for a license of non-residence on your new living: and the Act only allows me to issue such a license after satisfying myself of the fact of the application coming under certain prescribed heads.

I am, Rev, and Dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

121. To the Rev. J. T. Drake[4] *(iii 57)*

Private

61 Eaton Place, July [31], 1846

My dear Sir,

I am about now to issue the new Commissions to the Rural Deans of the Diocese and I am anxious to take advantage of this step to say that I hope the summer may have so [prospered] you as to enable you to undertake to take continued charge of your old Deanery. In the hope of this result I have never yet proposed to anyone else to undertake this office, but I have been waiting until some occasion couples us together and give me the opportunity of speaking to you. I am however led now to wait no longer by a conversation with Mr. Harrison,[5] from which I gathered that your resignation was partly influenced by

1 Thomas Saxby Weeden, admitted at St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, 1843; born at Wendover. The curtness of this note was doubtless prudent.

2 James Long (d. 1847), R. of Maids Moreton.

3 Walter Shirley, R. of Drayton Parslow 1846–7.

4 John Tyrwhitt Drake (1791–1860), R. of Amersham 1826–60, and P.C. of Aylesby, Lincs., 1831–60 (O). His elder brother, Thomas Tyrwhitt Drake (1783–1852), was M.P. for Amersham 1805–32, and High Sheriff for Bucks., 1836 (*MEB*).

5 John Harrison (1787–1865), V. of Dinton, 1833–65; Rural Dean of Wendover I (C).

your construing my first allusion to your health as a readiness on my part to receive it. Such I assure you was not the case. It was [from the Bishop of Lincoln[1] that I heard of the probability of your wishing, for that cause, to retire, and I felt that I ought therefore to mention it as a possible contingency]. But I assure you that I would consider your withdrawal as a great loss: and should be particularly pleased if I were able to retain you here if only for a year or two until I am better acquainted with the Diocese.

I am, my Dear Sir, very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

122. To the Rev. J. A. Ormerod[2] *(iii 58)*

61 Eaton Place, Augt. 12, 1846

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I am compelled by a sense of duty to address you upon a subject and to an effect which make it deeply painful to write to you. But I have no alternative. I have received reports from your Parish informing me that whilst your kindness to the poor, your attention to the various duties of your office and your Christian deportment have [secured] you the respectful affection of your flock, yet that as to one, and that in some aspects the chief among your duties, i.e. the public preaching of the Gospel of Christ and the reading the prayers in the congregation, you are rendered by a natural infirmity in your utterance entirely ineffectual. I will not stop to shew you why in my judgement such an infirmity must be an absolute bar to your undertaking the charge of the Parish. Unless you can be heard [and understood] by your flock they must remain unawakened and ignorant of those saving truths for the dissemination of which the Ministry of Christ's Church was specially founded. As to the *fact*, I desired a clergyman who recently spent 2 Sundays in your hamlet to report to me his own observations and they confirmed in the fullest degree the statements which had reached me.

But if you doubt their accuracy I will desire the Rural Dean, on whose kindness we can both rely, to do me the favour of [attending] one of your Sunday Morning services and reporting to me his judgement. But if you not wish that he should come, it becomes my painful duty to set before you my judgement that you are not able, from this physical infirmity, to perform the duties demanded of you by the Church as Curate of Wardington, and that it is my advice to you that you should of yourself retire from this Curacy.

It would be wasting words if I were to attempt to express to you the pain it gives me to write thus to you concerning a blameless infirmity, but as charged with the oversight of these souls, how can I act otherwise. You may be very useful in other ways in the Church of Christ: you may even as a parochial minister, with another to read the prayers and occupy the pulpit do good service to our Master. But if through such an infirmity any soul was lost, think what would be our joint loss through whom that injury should have happened.

I am ever, Rev. & Dear Sir, Your faithful friend and brother,

S. Oxon.

[1] John Kaye (1783–1853), Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, 1814–30; Bishop of Bristol 1820–7, Lincoln 1827–53 (*D.N.B.*).

[2] John Arderne Ormerod (1813–64), Fellow of Brasenose, 1838–64; C. of Wardington and Claydon, 1845. The Bishop noted in his Diocese Book (I, f. 23), 'dreadful stammer, Church quite empty, from 500 to 30'; Wilberforce early determined to divide Cropredy, of which Wardington was a chapelry more populous than Cropredy itself.

123. To the Rev. A. Baker *(iii 59)*

61 Eaton Place, Aug. 12, 1846

My dear Sir,

When you applied to me for protection from an attack made upon you from the pulpit in violation of the Canon, I did not feel at liberty to say anything to you (until I had taken on your behalf where you were wronged all the steps in my power) on the subject of those publications which had provoked the assault. Now however the case is different; and before another Saints Day I am anxious to communicate with you on the subject.

Now as to 1st the particular publication objected to, I cannot at the moment lay my hand upon it. When reading it, I was struck with this, that whilst there was in it perhaps no statement which could have suggested, taking it altogether, in what it said and what it assumed, it did not keep to the true note of Church of England teaching. There was much for and nothing against the supremacy of St. Peter and there was a mention of his tombstone which you said much to support with no allusion to the corruption of that Church which *seemed* to hint at the carrying on of this supremacy from St. Peter to St. Peter's Chair. I know that this is not your view but I am speaking of the general teaching of the Sermon. I put it into the hands of the Bishop of London who read it at my desire and expressed upon it the very judgement I had formed. Now I have not read with the care needful to pronounce an opinion on them your course of lectures and cannot therefore say that this fault pervades them. But you will see that if it should be in any degree found generally in them, there will be a natural tendency from the publication of these lectures . . . [*illegible*] . . . to exalt the subject too high with some of your readers and yet more to provoke against the very truth you mean to maintain the prejudice of other readers. And the danger makes me anxious to express to you my great doubts as to the expediency of your proposed publication. Of one thing, however, I feel convinced, and that is, that if you do continue then you should not circulate them as you have done. None should be sent into Mr. Campbell's district: and I should advise you to send none except to [direct] members of your own flock who desire to read them. I have heard remarks from one of your brother clergymen in the neighbourhood who had received them which shewed that he disliked your present mode of circulation. The self same cause which had led me to speak strongly to Mr. Campbell leads me to give you this advice; namely my earnest desire to maintain peace amongst those who are brethren in the same ministry.

I am ever my dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

124. To the Rev. A. Coote[1] *(iii 60)*

61 Eaton Place, Aug. 14, 1846

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Owing to the utter failure of his health the Rural Dean of Buckingham[2] is obliged to resign his office: and I hope to obtain you as successor to him in this post. In the event of your acceding to my wishes I will at once forward to you a commission; and I shall hope in the autumn to have the [pleasure] of receiving you at Cuddesdon and conversing there with you about the administration of the office.

[1] Algernon Coote (1817–99), later 11th Bart.; R. of Marsh Gibbon, 1844–56; V. of Nonington, Kent, 1856–71. Aged 28 in August 1846; a cricketer (O).

[2] Richard Norris Russell (1809–96), R. of Beachampton, 1834–83; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, 1877. Russell lived for 52 years after this 'utter failure' of health (*MEB*).

The Parishes I would hope to get you to undertake are the following: Buckingham, Barton with Chetwode, Radclive, Edgcott, Caversfield, Tingewick, Gawcot, Marsh Gibbon, Twyford, Hillesdon, Preston Bissett and Water Stratford.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Your faithful friend and brother,

S. Oxon.

125. To the Rev. H. Binney[1] *(iii 61)*

61 Eaton Place, Aug. 14, 1846

Sir,

I have heard accounts concerning the general demeanour of Mr. Andrewes[2] your Curate, and especially as to his omitting the due visitation of the sick, that painful as it is to me to ask it and as I know it will be to you to answer it (if unfortunately you must confirm these reports) I must call upon you in virtue of your office to report to me without fear or favour as to what you can say of your own knowledge of the character, conduct and deportment of the Curate of your Parish.

I remain, Yours very Faithfully,

S. Oxon.

126. To the Rev. T. Lewes[3] *(iii 62)*

61 Eaton Place, Aug. 14, 1846

My dear Sir,

When I had the pleasure of seeing you at Cuddesdon I hoped that the wish you expressed to hand over the charge of your Rural Deanery to other hands arose from temporary indisposition: and I felt thus peculiarly obliged to you for continuing to discharge the duties of office of R. Dean. I hope that this year you are fully restored to health; and that I may count upon your continued assistance without that assistance proving any burden to you: but before issuing my new commissions it is due to your kindness that I distinctly ascertain your wishes on the point.

I am ever my Dear Sir, Ever sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

127. To the Rev. E. Walford[4] *(iii 63)*

61 Eaton Place, [20 August, 1846]

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Though I fully explained myself to you yesterday by word of mouth, yet I am anxious to repeat on paper my judgement upon your case.

1 The addressee is illegible but was presumably Hibbert Binney, R. of Newbury.

2 Possibly William Andrews, Fellow of Exeter College, 1836–55, who was made deacon in 1840, and priested in 1846; he became R. of Broad Somerford, Wilts., in 1874. The Bishop's notes on the state of Newbury in 1846 are revealing: 'Dr. Binney. He *never* visits . . . but Miss Bibby & other family females do. *Orders* his curate Do this &c. Not the slightest parochial visit.

'Curate Andrewes. Sits at home all day . . . preaches good sermons but so ill preached as to empty Church. Just ordained. Dissent becoming rampant. Though Church feeling. People cowed by him . . . He rules them with Rod of Iron . . . Shrewd clear-headed man, rough' (Diocese Book, I, ff. 116^{v}–17).

3 Thomas Lewes (1794–1873), V. of Taynton from 1819, and of Great Barrington, Glos., where he resided, from 1820 (O). Rural Dean of Witney.

4 Edward Walford (1823–97), Scholar of Balliol, 1841–6; ordained 1846; assistant master of Tonbridge. Joined the Church of Rome 1853–60, and again in 1871; classified in *DNB* as 'compiler'.

I wrote yesterday to Mr. [Wyndham][1] as I promised: but I entertain [serious] doubts whether you ought to continue this negotiation: you had marked out for yourself a different vocation, and one which would, humanly speaking, ensure you sufficient to live as a married clergyman. You are with these prospects engaged to be married. Had you been secure of a pupil at a large salary for three or four years you might have turned your thoughts to a poor curacy and pupils. But how does the case stand now? If you take this curacy (for Stoke Row is really not more), if you find that in an out-of-the way part of Oxfordshire, without a house of your own, and with curate's pay your pupils fail, what are you to do. The Wyndhams, if they send him, may speedily remove their son: other pupils may not offer: and you may find yourself [troubled] with a house which you do not want and can ill afford to keep.

I wish you calmly to weigh all this: and to consult your natural advisers before you take the step: and this for three reasons. (1st) That it is a change of the fixed plan of your life. (2nd) That I think your natural disposition likely to expose you to the danger of too sanguinely counting upon the certain result of uncertain expectations, and (3rdly) because it is likely that the prospects of coming family life may bias you in judgement in this matter. I wish you then to act in this matter *after consultation with your natural advisers* and I pray God to direct you aright.

I am ever, yours very sincerely,

S. Oxon.

128. To the Rev. A. Baker *(iii 64)*

61 Eaton Place, [20 August, 1846]

Dear Sir,

I have weighed all that you tell me in your letter and (1) I do not think that it would be best in view of all the circumstances you have stated that you should terminate the course without bringing it to a conclusion. But (2) I feel sure that your lectures would be more useful if you *did* point out where the Church view differs from its counterfeit, e.g. you would equally have established all that would have guarded alike against misconception and error, for without . . . [*illegible*] . . . or anything controversial, you would shew how primacy [of order differs from superiority of jurisdiction. But whether it is the best plan to establish the primacy of order as enough, I would have felt that the difference is putative and innocent]. You cannot but touch on such subjects as the points of controversy between Rome and the Catholic Church: and as Roman doctrine is always truth perverted silence is dangerous to some and suspicious to others. I would not have you make these lectures *controversial* but I think they should distinctly assert an anti-Roman Catholicism to do any good today. (3) I wish you to be careful that your wishes as to distribution in other parishes or Mr. Campbell's *district* are carried out. Mr. C. distinctly asserts that they have been left in houses in his district.

(4) I cannot think you must give yourself any trouble to alter your [clerical circulation].

(5) I am quite aware of the difficulties which must be met with in the most careful and judicious action upon Church Principles, even when those principles are in the true sense of the word evangelicalism: and I pray that you will never find me unwilling to support you to the utmost of my power amidst these

[1] Probably John Eveleigh Wyndham (1814–87), barrister, of Clearwell Court, Glos., whose eldest son was born in 1842.

difficulties. I am only anxious that the principles should by all be felt to be evangelical also.

I am, Rev. and Dear Sir,

S. Oxon.

129. To G. Botley and J. Darval[1] (*iii 65*)
August 24, 1846

Gentlemen,

An indisposition has prevented my sooner replying to your letter or I should not have let a single post slip by without expressing to you the high estimate of the zealous public spirit which has marked your conduct in this matter, and my earnest wish to expedite your designs to a successful issue. You will not I trust be discouraged in your good work by my saying openly to you where I think you are . . . [*illegible*] . . .

Ist as to your legal questions as to your position. There is no doubt that Mr. Blandy has a perfect locus standi for opposing your faculty if he can make good his opposition to it; it would be for the Court to determine but I am disposed to think it by no means improbable that he could. But whilst the terms of your appointment might warrant your acting in order to repewing thoroughly, *if your parish was agreed*, I do not think it is by any means sufficiently comprehensive to act when opposed, [if I am right] and I cannot doubt that I am it is clearly impossible to go on without again coming before the parish. [The amended plan] of restoration chosen by the Committee was I would say put upon them but I considered that nothing short of *restoration* ought to satisfy the parish. On this point there ought to be no question, and I think you would be quite justified in going before the county and the society for aid towards such a restoration. But that it should be a restoration worthy of our present [understanding] in ecclesiastical architecture, and of your own parish and church. I will honestly tell you that I do not think that Mr. Poulton's plans come at all up to the standard. There are many faults in them which imply to me an unacquaintance with the details of ecclesiastical restoration. I shall mention one or two. First no architect ought at the present time to have given in a plan turning so large a proportion of the sittings westward. II even in his amended plan the pews without the chancel turn most I see clearly southward. III the scheme shews pews of 34 inches high; this height and their width would alone forfeit any grant from the incorporated society by its fundamental rules. IV the whole idea of the pewing is quite unworthy. V the same remark applies to the galleries: both to the new west gallery in toto and to the new front of the north gallery. VI when I brought Mr. Poulton to book I found that the height and width of the east window as shewn in his drawings differed entirely from the old window there. VII the scheme for St. John's Chapel is quite at variance with ecclesiastical architecture.

[1] This letter is typical of the problems which could occur over the restoration and rebuilding of churches. Wilberforce shared the self-confidence of the time that the principles of Church architecture had now been definitively re-established, but more responsibly he was well aware of the dangers of capricious and shoddy work which could well remain to burden succeeding generations.

The church in question was that of St. Laurence, Reading, and the persons mentioned are a churchwarden, George Botley, who is given in contemporary directories as a watchmaker and cutler, and Joseph Darval, a solicitor; they served on a committee to repew the church. Mr. Blandy presumably belonged to the family of brewers, but he may well have been John Jackson Blandy, solicitor, town clerk and coroner. William Frederick Poulton is listed as an architect and surveyor; Charles Poulton, who rebuilt Reading Town Hall in 1786, is included in *DEA*, p. 471.

Now all these matters may be amended it is true, but their having to be amended throws to my mind great doubt upon the competence of the architect for the work he has undertaken; and this doubt is increased by my finding that Mr. Poulton has *never* been engaged yet in building any church. He was merely in the House (as a young man) to which the restoration of St. Saviour's was committed. You will see at once that any parishioner would have very strong grounds for going before the courts if he could shew that the architect, employed in works which might shake the fabric, was inexperienced in that particular work.

The question then is what you are to do. Your sole object is I well know the worthy restoration of your Church. Now, even if your powers sufficed to force this through, against opposition, I am sure you would not desire so to effect it if you could amicably obtain the same result: and this I think you may do. I would propose that you met Mr. Blandy and any friend who agrees with him at my house, not to explain what is past, but to determine on what is to be done for the future. And I will propose to you the following scheme for your consideration. That it be resolved:

First that it is desireable immediately to repew and restore St. Lawrence's Church. Secondly that it being doubtful whether the former parish vote conveyed sufficient powers for this purpose, a vestry be called to appoint a committee with full powers to collect subscriptions and obtain plans for this purpose. Thirdly that Mr. Blandy heartily co-operates with the present committee in obtaining this vote of vestry and be requested himself to act on the committee. Four that a difference of opinion having arisen upon the plans already submitted Mr. Poulton be re-imbursed for his trouble; and plans invited by public advertisement without confining the competition to the Town of Reading. The advertisement and the plan submitted before final selection being submitted to the Bishop of the Diocese for advice.

I think that there is every hope that this scheme would enable you without the pain of local disagreement to carry out your great and good purpose.

I am, Gentlemen, yours most Faithfully,

S. Oxon.

130. To the Rev. H. W. Majendie[1] *(iii 66)*
Confidential

Lavington, Petworth, Sep. 11, 1846

My Dear Sir,

I wrote immediately after your last communication to Mr. [Pinnegar][2] & after some days received from him an answer in which he said that he *knew* nothing himself but that Mr. A. was generally unpopular, the Church ill-attended &c. &c. This of course was quite insufficient for me to do more shan write to Dr. Binney concerning it. This I did. He [does a little protest against application to Mr. P.] and denies that he is the parish warden as you said — & on this repeats the charge that my informant (whom he takes for a parishioner) was either grossly ignorant or maliciously false. Of course I have given him no clue to my informant, and you know the man, i.e. Dr. Binney. He admits Andrewes's many imperfections, laments the state of Newbury; attributes it to being a dead time in the church &c. &c. would gladly have a man of more

1 Henry William Majendie (1791–1869), V. of Speen, 1819–69 (C).
2 Browne Pinneger, Esq., Market Place, Newbury.

[fitting] godliness &c. &c. but I plainly see will do nothing. Nor do I see that I can do much but wait my time. Newbury is just one of the places to lack [a proper head.] I thank you however for telling me at all about it. I will beg you if anything practical occurs you should suggest it to me.

Meanwhile I do beg you to be careful of yourself. I do not wish more positively to *inhibit* you . . . [*Remainder illegible*]

131. To the Rev. H. Binney (*iii 67*)

Lavington, Petworth, Sept. 11, 1846

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter and its enclosure which I hope here to have time to read and consider. The paper to which you allude I did read. But I did not see that there was anything in your argument which touched the great question of ordination. [A thing must always be, before its name and form are fixed, and will therefore frequently exist for some time before it acquires a special name. But the writers of the New Testament were understood by our great reformers to have used various words to denote that setting apart for an office which now the one word *ordination* signifies: and they therefore rendered the various words denoting then the single act by the single word now applied to it.]

There is much in your letter of today to which I do not think it needful to make any reply. I agree far more with your general principles than with many of their particular applications. I agree, e.g. with your Statement of its being the Bishop's duty jealously to uphold his Presbyters in their rights and honours. I do not agree that he is therefore not to communicate with the laity freely. But upon these points I see no expediency in entering. One right I certainly wish to maintain for the Presbyters of my Diocese & that is that they should (with the respect due to the office which has been committed to me) speak openly their minds to me in private. I shall, when I cannot at all adopt their views, always listen with respect to what is respectfully urged.

This I do in the present instance. Though I am very far from being convinced that the party who originally communicated with me was actuated by any evil motive or was one to whom it would have been fit not to have listened. Even the most sagacious when they set themselves to find motives for the actions of others are often not a little at fault. How little can we penetrate into the secrets of another's heart. How little speak of one as marked out for smiles, success &c. when it may be that God by sifting the power of his affections has inflicted on his spirit an unhealed wound which turns all that seeming prosperity into what is tasteless or even bitter: into that which he would most cheerfully barter for the lowest estate with his former happiness.

But my dear Sir I turn to my immediate business. I greatly mourn before God over the state of Newbury as you depict it to me. I cannot acquiesce in your solution. But there is a *general* withholding of the means of God's Grace — I would beseech you to seek more and more earnestly that these gifts be not withheld from your parish. I would beseech yourself to seek for an assistant of whom you can speak confidently, with all the confidence of charity, that he is a man of God and if it should be within my power to suggest to you such an helper as you have described I will be glad to recommend him to you.

I am, my Dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

132. To the Rev. S. M. Barkworth[1] *(iii 68)*

Lavington, Petworth, Sep. 17, 1846

My dear Sir,

I am sorry to have so soon to write again to you about parish troubles which I trusted were all averted: but I have received a complaint and memorial, as to the hours to which you have altered the daily services. These I am told are from $7\frac{1}{2}$ and 8 in the morning and evening, when the Service could be well attended by persons in trade and labour, you have altered to 10 and 4, which amounts to virtual exclusion of the class from whom the whole number of the former attendants was formed. I greatly hope that this may be mis-stated: since I cannot but think that such an alteration would *virtually* be a breach of the understanding on which I licensed you to the Curacy namely that you should *continue* the services. I have not yet replied to the memorialists and shall not until I hear from you. If unhappily you have thus altered the hours of service I should much wish you to restore the old times without any formal communication from me. It will be *now* in your power to do so saying no more than that you found I thought the alteration inexpedient; and this will be much better for your ministry than that there should seem to be compulsion, or yielding to, or pressure of a memorial in the matter. However untrue the imputation, you will I think see on reflection that it can always be suggested that you have fixed these hours when some people cannot attend . . . [*illegible*] . . . and from any such imputation I pray you most earnestly to free your Ministry!

I am, my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

133. To the Rev. J. Beauchamp[2] *(iii 69)*

Lavington, Petworth, Sept. 22, 1846

Rev. & Dear Sir,

There are I am sorry to say one or two parts of the arrangement proposed in your letter of the 18th as to which I must trouble you for a little fuller information. First, why is there only single duty at Crowell & Shirbourn. The population of Crowell now not much under 400, and the income of Shirbourn, seem to me to warrant my requiring double duty at each of any new incumbent and this present application seems to put your brother very much into the same position. Secondly, I should under the circumstances consent to a salary of £120 per annum: but this is reduced to £80 by the proposed charges for furniture & the Close. I should therefore wish to know the estimated value of the Furniture and the extent of the Close before I sanctioned those reductions. You will I am sure see that I am only anxious to secure according to my bounden duty those general interests of the Church which can have no other guardian than the Bishop.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

134. To the Rev. W. James[3] *(iii 70)*

Lavington, Petworth, Sept. 22, 1846

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I scarcely know how to answer your letter received today. I am [sorry] thus to cause you anxiety of mind by listening to me. But whatever I do I have a strong

[1] Shadwell Morley Barkworth (1819–?), D.D., was C. of St. Peter le Bailey, Oxford, 1846; P.C. of Southwold, Suffolk, 1860, Greyfriars, Reading, 1864–74 (O).

[2] James Beauchamp (1804–91), half-nephew of 2nd Bart.; C. of Crowell, 1829–30; R. of Crowell, 1830–74; V. of Shirburn, 1832–74 (C).

[3] William James (1788–1855), Fellow of Exeter, 1810–15; chaplain, 1839–45; Vice-Principal of Magdalen Hall, 1813; R. of South Moreton, 1814–55.

belief that to hold preferment in Christ's Church with its cure of souls; and to leave that cure of souls to others is a great injury to the Church; and a fearful peril to your own soul. I feel sure that needlessly to hold such preferment [is an] aggravation of the peril, and in this peril I should be a partner if I did not plainly state to you my view of truth; or if from easiness or indolence I did not act upon it: I cannot doubt that you ought, if you can live without the [£70] per annum, to give up the benefice. What becomes of it afterwards is no part of your responsibility: but I see no reason why the present Vice Principal of Magdalen Hall[1] should not reside ½ the year upon it, & so fulfil its duties in a way which your health renders impossible to you. Should you resolve on this I feel sure that I could arrange for you the matter of the lease; and of the Tithes; and I would very gladly undertake to do so, if I could thereby save you any anxiety. Yet to cause you the anxiety I feel to be unavoidable in speaking thus plainly is I assure you a matter of grief to me.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

135. To the Rev. J. A. Ormerod *(iii 71)*

Lavington, Petworth, Sept. 25, 1846

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have received the report of the Rural Dean and take an early opportunity of saying to you that whilst it confirms to a considerable extent the statement which had been made to me, yet that it leaves me a good hope that to your ordinary congregation you would be intelligible. Knowing your devotion to the duties of your office, I feel clear, if this is secured, in continuing to you your license. But I wish to suggest to you the importance of employing every means in your power of remedying what must to some considerable degree interfere with your usefulness. At Cowes in the Isle of Wight a gentleman named [Broster] resides whose skill in helping persons to overcome this infirmity is remarkable. Many friends of my own have been there. The Bishop of Chester,[2] a brother of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer[3] and two sons of the Bishop of Winchester,[4] all with great profit. I should wish you to employ some such means to endeavour if possible [to add this power to your efficiency] and with hearty prayers to God for you,

I remain, Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours most faithfully,

S. Oxon.

136. To the Rev. H. Binney *(iii 72)*

Lavington, Petworth, Sep. 26, 1846

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I return you herewith your papers which I have read with great care. I see no probable benefit likely to result from my entering at length into the points raised in them whereon my opinion does not coincide with yours. On one important

1 William Jacobson (1803–84), Regius Prof. of Divinity, Canon of Christ Church, and Rector of Ewelme, 1848–65, and Bishop of Chester, 1865–84 (*DNB*). See J. W. Burgon, *Lives of Twelve Good Men*.

2 John Bird Sumner (1780–1862), Fellow of Eton, 1817–21; V. of Mapledurham, 1818–28; Bishop of Chester, 1828–48; Archbishop of Canterbury, 1848–62 (*DNB*); brother of C. R. Sumner, Bishop of Winchester, and second cousin to Wilberforce.

3 Samuel Francis Wood (1809–43), only brother of Sir Charles Wood (1800–85), Chancellor of the Exchequer 1846–52, and later 1st Viscount Halifax.

4 C. R. Sumner had four sons in all.

point however your expressed opinions substantially coincide with my own. I mean that it would be highly expedient to make the character of the diaconate practically more what it is already theoretically amongst us. I am quite prepared myself to act upon my opinion here: by licensing at *very* small salaries young men who apply for deacon's orders competently prepared and seeming to have in them the root of the matter, who are ready to work under Priests of devout and zealous lives and asking them so to continue until having found some place for the exercise of the Priesthood they apply for that at my hands.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

137. To the Rev. W. B. Budd[1] (*iii 73*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 30, 1847

Rev. Sir,

His Grace the Duke of Marlborough, informs me that you are able to testify from personal observation to the shameful and indecorous performance of Divine Service in the Parish Church of Bladon by the Rector.[2]

I therefore beg you to furnish to me in writing with such facts as have come under your own observation: that I may be able to see what steps it is needful that I should take in so painful a business.

I am, Rev. Sir, Very Faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

138. To the Rev. J. Wilson[3] (*iii 74*)

61 Eaton Place, March 30, 1847

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I was not aware when I licensed you to Mentmore that you were also discharging the duty of Curate in the populous parish of Leighton Buzzard.[4] This is an arrangement which I cannot allow to continue: and I shall therefore call on you to resign the charge of Mentmore: as soon as I am able to make suitable provision for it.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very Truly yours,

S. Oxon.

139. To the Rev. J. Hart[5] (*iii 75*)

61 Eaton Place, March 30, 1847

Rev. Sir,

It is not to Dr. [Wilson] that the benefice of Linslade is offered. I wish to learn from you (1) what is the exact fact as to there being no residence for the minister at Soulbury. (2) whether at or since your institution any commission of enquiry

1 William Balhetchet Budd, domestic chaplain to the Duke of Marlborough, 1848–60. After curacies in London 1861–7, he became V. of Stapleford, Notts., 1867–76 (C).

2 Joseph Bowles (1799–1879), R. of Bladon, 1840–7; V. of Stanton Lacy, Shropshire, 1847–79 (*MEB*).

3 John Wilson (1814–87) was licensed to the curacy of Mentmore in 1846. He became Second Master of St. Peter's School, Eaton Square, 1848, and later Headmaster; he was V. of Holy Trinity, Knightsbridge, 1856–87 (C).

4 In Bedfordshire, four miles from Mentmore.

5 John Hart (1806–67), P.C. of Soulbury, 1845–67; R. of Adstock, 1860–7 (O). The Bishop noted: 'Service must be over by time for *cows*: second service should be here' (Diocese Book, 1, f. 69v).

had or has been issued to enquire into the subject. (3) what are the hours of your Sunday and weekday services at Soulbury.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours &c.,

S. Oxon.

140. To the Dean of Lincoln (J. G. Ward)[1] *(iii 76)*

61 Eaton Place, March 30, 1847

Dear Mr. Dean,

Will you allow me to bring before you the state of one of my Buckinghamshire Parishes of which your body possess the impropriate tithes.

The Parish of Bierton, Bucks., contains (1) . . . in Bierton proper 700 souls, (2) the hamlet and district of *Buckland* extending almost [six miles] from North to South; the population half of whom live at one and half at the other end of the parish, amounting to 537: and (3) the parish of Stoke Mandeville containing 500 souls. The whole Vicarial income for the cure of these three parishes amounts to about £270 per annum. The Impropriate Tithes were granted to the Chapter of Lincoln on condition of their maintaining Vicars for these Parishes.

It is my earnest desire to see these three parishes separated: and I trust that I may reckon upon the concurrence and liberal aid of your body in this attempt. They are charged with providing for the spiritual wants of the population and will I feel sure be anxious to discharge their obligation. The Rectorial revenues from Buckland amount to £400 per year or nearly that sum if my information is correct: and out of this I trust that the chapter will grant a competent endowment. In Stoke Mandeville the chapter possess about 150 acres of good land worth 250 per annum and a rent charge of £50 per annum. The Vicarial Tithes are £70. If the chapter will assist this income there is a strong desire in the Parish to obtain a resident clergyman and much help would be rendered toward building a Glebe House. The present spiritual condition of the Parishes is very bad. Buckland has been served by a Curate residing at a distance with a salary until very recently of £10 per annum lately raised to £40.

I shall be glad to co-operate with the Chapter in obtaining a better state of things by any means they may prefer: and I shall feel much obliged to you if you will freely communicate with me upon the Subject.[2]

I am, my dear Mr. Dean, Ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

141.[3] *(iii 77)*

61 Eaton Place, March 30, 1847

My dear Sir,

I think that you have not noticed the full force of the word *reserved* in the extract you send me. By it I intended that in all such burials, (during Mr. Paddon's incumbency,) you should *receive* for him and pay over to him the fee he and his church officers would have received at Wycombe. This is needful for this reason; that the only *security* for getting the fee at all is taking it before the funeral; and unless therefore you took it you would in fact furnish an opportunity for all who wished to do so escaping the payment to him entirely. After the present incumbency the officers of Wycombe Church would have no claim and the parish would

[1] John Gifford Ward (1779–1860), Dean of Lincoln, 1845–60 (*MEB*).
[2] The separation was not effected until 1858.
[3] Recipient illegible and unidentified.

stand in the same relation to you as any neighbouring parish. There is not the shadow of suspicion as to your motives: and I am sure if you tender the money so as to prevent your mistake being drawn into a precedent Mr. Paddon will return it if Mr. Williamson's friends did not re-imburse you.

I am most anxious to see this whole matter settled as it should be and rely on your cordial co-operation.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, With sincere prayers for your [family] and God's blessing on your ministry, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

142. To the Rev. R. F. Laurence[1] *(iii 78)*

61 Eaton Place, March 31, 1847

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I am anxious to call your attention to the amount of duty you are at present able to give to Chalgrove and Berrick Salome. The population and income of Chalgrove, justify and in my judgement require its receiving two *full* duties every Sunday; Berrick Salome ought to have at least one. It is in my power at the moment to enable you at a very small cost to afford this amount of duty. I am about to nominate a Curate to Easington, and if you were content to contribute £20 a year towards his stipend Berrick Salome might be committed to his charge leaving your whole strength free for Chalgrove. I beg therefore that you will consider this offer and report to me upon it. The Curate will be nominated by myself.

S. Oxon.

143. To the Rev. I. Fidler[2] *(iii 79)*

61 Eaton Place, March 31, 1847

Rev. Sir,

You may apply to Mr. Burder, 27 Parliament Street for your license of non-residence. I am willing if a fit man can be found to undertake the duties to allow him to receive £40 and no house under the peculiar circumstances you have detailed, for a limited time: and I will endeavour to make such an arrangement: but in the event of being unable to find such a person I shall be obliged to require the house and £50 since the duty must be the first consideration.

I am, Rev. Sir, Yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

144. To the Rev. J. Felix[3] *(iii 80)*

Confidential

61 Eaton Place, March 31, 1847

Rev. Sir,

Amongst the papers touching the sad business of your parish clerk I have received from the Rural dean your 'voluntary statement'. On this I am anxious in strict confidence to address a few words to you.

[1] Robert French Laurence (1807–85), Student of Christ Church, 1824–33; C. of Kirtlington, 1831–2; V. of Chalgrove, 1832–85 (*MEB*). The Bishop thought him 'sensible but odd . . . keeps no company' (Diocese Book, I, f. 53).

[2] Isaac Fidler, R. of Easington, 1842 (O); 'Very low origin, once missionary. Active man for serves all over the country when wanted' (Diocese Book, I, f. 54).

[3] It is not clear whether John Felix (C) was curate or incumbent of Wing; in 1851 he became C. of Great Blakenham, Suffolk.

I will not pre-judge the case of Wm. Mortimer because it is one which requires and must receive full examination. But be the issue of that enquiry what it may, I cannot but feel great pain at the low estimate which your statement seems to me indicated as formed in your mind, of the character by which the Parish Clerk and the village schoolmaster ought to be distinguished. I beg you to weigh this matter by yourself before God; and to be much on your guard lest from the fear of offending powerful Parishioners you maintain in your Parish, by closing your eyes to the evil influence and example of this man, a stumbling block which shall cause many of your charge to stumble and to fall for ever.

I desire you to consider this letter as strictly confidential, and remain, Rev. Sir, Your faithful friend and brother,

S. Oxon.

145. To Mr. Beesley[1] *(iii 81)*
Confidential

61 Eaton Place, March 31, 1847

My dear Sir,

I am much obliged to you for your aid as to the Parish of [Wing]. The more so because I feel that a removal of the evil depends entirely upon the assistance in arriving at the truth which I receive from you.

The Rural Dean has been to Wing and collected such evidence as he could. But his report to me is this. The Hart family of which Mortimer is are so influential in the Parish that it needs some moral courage for anyone to speak out on the matter: and moral courage seems grievously lacking there. Those who have privately told Mr. Wroth[2] that M. is 'a very bad man', have signed a strong memorial in his favour: the Curate also I regret to say, has given him a testimonial. The only person from whom Mr. Wroth could obtain clear and decisive evidence is Mrs. Webster who from reliance on your protection was not over-awed by The Harts. The course I should wish to pursue, under these circumstances, is this. If you would at any time within the next three weeks fix a time for meeting Mr. Wroth at Wing and conducting some previous enquiry, he has no doubt that under your protection men might be found who would speak the truth. The witnesses so obtained should then, with Mortimer, be summoned before the Archdeacon[3] when he visits in May: and if you could then once more give an hour to attend and prevent the witnesses being frightened out of their evidence; I have no doubt that the truth will be established.

I remain my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

146. To the Rector of Lincoln College (J. Radford)[4] *(iii 82)*
Private

61 Eaton Place, May 3, 1847

My dear Mr. Rector,

Will you allow me to trouble you with an application on the subject of Forest Hill. I need say nothing to you on the lamentable moral and spiritual condition to which that Parish has been reduced by the incumbency of Mr.

[1] Unidentified.
[2] William Bruton Wroth (1785–1863), V. of Edlesborough, 1815–63, of Totternhoe, Beds., 1819–63 (C); not an ideal incumbent (Diocese Book, II, p. 199).
[3] Justly Hill (1781–1853), Archdeacon of Bucks., 1825–53 (*MEB*).
[4] John Radford (1782–1851), Rector of Lincoln College, 1834–51 (*MEB*).

Mavor.[1] But I am given to understand that it is now not improbable that Mr. Mavor may speedily desire to resume the personal discharge of the duties of the Parish. This would be its utter ruin: and I cannot therefore hesitate a moment as to my duty. The living of Forest Hill is voidable at any moment, and I earnestly beg your Society to act on this liability and present to me a Clerk for institution.

I am ever, my dear Mr. Rector, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

147. To the Rev. R. Holt[2] *(iii 85)*

61 Eaton Place, May 7, 1847

My dear Sir,

I have received a note from you through Mr. Hart which is written by you in the best Spirit and with the best intentions. It has however proceeded from some entire misconception of Mr. Hart's: I did not ask him and still less you, to enter into a voluntary engagement to provide two duties at Soulbury; but I *required* him to provide them under the provisions of the 1 & 2 Vict. C. 106 S. 80.

I am, My Dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

148. To the Rev. J. Hart *(iii 83)*

61 Eaton Place, May 8, 1847

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I am sorry to find that I have not succeeded in making my meaning plain to you. I am not asking you to undertake any responsibility as to which you have any option: I cannot therefore receive Mr. Holt's letter which is nothing to the point. Nor is there any 'decisive answer' needed from you: I think it my duty to enforce two full services for the parish of Soulbury: I am very sorry that the requirement is unpleasant to you: It is very painful to me to have to require what is thus distasteful to you: but I owe a duty to God and I must perform it without fear or favour. I therefore require you to have two full services including Sermon or Catechizing at each service every Sunday at the Canonical hours of 11 & 3 so long as you continue incumbent of Soulbury or until I order otherwise. This I do under the provisions of the Act 1 & 2 Vict. C. 106. S. 80 which makes it imperative upon you and I can enter into no conditions of any sort as to the fulfilment of your duty.

I remain Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

149. To the Rev. J. Hart *(iii 84)*

61 Eaton Place, May 8, 1847

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I am sorry to find that I have not yet succeeded in making my meaning clear to you.

[1] John Mavor (1785–1853), was Sub-Rector of Lincoln College 1822, and Fellow until 1826; C. of Fritwell with North Aston 1810, Forest Hill 1821, and P.C. of Forest Hill, 1823. In 1825 he also became R. of Hadleigh, Essex (*MEB*). He was deprived of Forest Hill in 1848 in a lawsuit brought against him in the Court of Arches under a canon of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) against pluralism. In the Diocese Book he is said to be 'probably insane, in Castle' (1, f. 35), and the living to be served by Mr. Slight of Corpus. Mavor died in his cell on the debtor side of Oxford County Gaol on 19 June 1853.

[2] Robert Holt (1823–1903), C. of Soulbury 1846–9, Wardington 1849–51, Mursley 1853–60, and Adstock 1861–8; V. of Hillesden, 1868–1903 (C).

I have no wish that you should 'undertake to hold yourself responsible' for double duty at Soulbury and I can receive no pledge from your Curate: still less enter into such terms as you strangely speak of, about your holding other duty &c . . . [*Unfinished*]. [*Not sent?*]

150. To the Rev. A. D. Morrice[1] (*iii 86*)
Private

61 Eaton Place, May 12, 1847

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Your letter of yesterday has given me great pain. To do anything which even seems harsh causes me unfeigned suffering. But in advising Mr. Matthews[2] to make an alteration as to the Curate of Grove I have acted under a sense of imperative duty from which pain must not make me shrink. It is not, as your letter assumes, only because I wish Grove & Mentmore to be held together that I have recommended this step; but also because I am sure, that at Grove itself and in the immediate neighbourhood, from family circumstances well known there and to which I do not wish to allude more pointedly your influence for good cannot be what another's might be, or what yours may be in a different neighbourhood.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Your faithful friend and Brother,

S. Oxon.

151.[3] (*iii 87*)

61 Eaton Place, May 14, 1847

Rev. & Dear Sir,

In consequence of your letter I have got an opinion at Doctors Commons as to my power of commissioning Rural Deans to inspect the Churches in their Deaneries.

The opinion is decided that I can depute this power and *enforce its exercise by legal process*. I mention this to you because I think you have been probably actuated by a wish to preserve what you believe to be the rights of incumbents: and that you will be as unwilling as I should, to bring such a question to legal issue between your Bishop and yourself. Indeed, I do not see how a conscientious person like yourself can doubt that to attempt to resist such an inspection, ordered by me, would be, on your part, a breach of your Oath of Canonical Obedience.

I trust that I shall hear from you without delay that you will not attempt to place any difficulties in the way of the inspection of your Church by the Rural Dean holding my commission.

I have seen Mr. Sedgwick[4]: but find that he considered himself as having already absolutely declined the Curacy.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Addressed to the Rev. W. D. Morrice, but the recipient is difficult to identify. The registers of Grove were signed by A. D. Morrice, Curate, in 1848, 1850, 1851, and 1859 (*ex inf.* Mrs. Thompson, Grove); the Diocese Book notes under Grove: 'Morice C[urate] a sad blot — married his mother's maid' (1, f. 75v). Nobody of this name appears in the diocesan registers.

2 Henry Matthew (d. 1861), R. of Grove, Bucks., from 1837 (C); 'nearly blind' (ibid).

3 Recipient unidentified.

4 Doubtless John Sedgwick, of Magdalen College; deacon 1846, priest 1848.

152. To the Rev. T. W. Allies (*iii 88*)

61 Eaton Place, May 22, 1847

Rev. Sir,

Your letter has given me great pain, from the insight which it gives me into your mind. It is in almost every respect what a letter from a Presbyter to his Bishop ought not to be: and this is especially worthy of [rebuke] from one who professes to hold the office of a Bishop in reverence as the appointment of Christ. As having a charge over your soul it is my duty to speak plainly to you: and I am bound therefore to call you earnestly to repentance and humiliation before God for your sin in this matter. You are very little aware of the Spirit which is in you. There is a self-sufficient bitterness running through your former and your present letter. In that you undertook to excommunicate a brother presbyter, your elder [in] the ministry; in this you insult your Bishop; insinuate that he has been guilty of advising one of his presbyters to act against his conscience; as well as of a gross dereliction of his duty; and threaten, as the consequence of your opinion not being adopted, separation from the Church of your Baptism. Do you indeed believe that Christ reigneth? That you are a presbyter in His Church? and that you have in me one set over you in Christ's stead?

For the sake of your own soul, I beg you to see the state to which self confidence is lifting you up: for in truth such conduct does bespeak one, who is not far from being taken in the 'snare of the Devil'.

I am, Rev. Sir, your faithful Friend and Brother,

S. Oxon.

153. To the Rev. J. W. Watts[1] (*iii 89*)

61 Eaton Place, May 22, 1847

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have to address you on a painful matter to which I must [ask] your most serious attention. One of your brother clergy, the Rev. T. Allies, has written to me to complain that gross scandal is caused in your whole neighbourhood, and great injury done in his parish by the avowed subscription by you of a declaration by which the articles and liturgy of the Church of England are depraved.

The first part of this declaration is this: 'Ungodly persons have neither been born again of the spirit nor justified although they were baptised . . . [*illegible*] . . . in infancy &c. . . . ' Now this declaration is directly at variance with the words both of the liturgy and the articles, both of which affirm (the catechism) that being by nature children of wrath we were *hereby* made the children of Grace, and as the answer [next but one] continues, this was done for them by God's goodness on the promise of a future condition by their sponsors. The Baptismal Service takes the same ground, throwing the affirmation into the strongest form by instructing *every* minister to say of every baptised infant to the jealous God, (after the public announcement 'seeing *now* that this child is (regenerate) born again') 'We yield *THEE* hearty thanks most merciful Father that it hath pleased thee to regenerate *this* Child with thy Holy Spirit, &c.' and it follows up all this with saying 'It is *certain* by God's word that children *which are baptised*, dying before they commit actual sin are undoubtedly saved.' But how saved unless they be pardoned: and how then saved, unless by God's merciful act they be regenerated by His Spirit or as good old Baxter says, unless we be Pelagians.

Now the question for us at the moment is, not are these doctrines true, but are they the doctrines of the Church of England. If they are, you cannot as an

[1] John William Watts (d. 1885), V. of Bicester, 1843–81 (C).

honest man, eat the bread offered for her ministers and teach otherwise. It is the more needful that I should speak to you here with all plainness, because I have pointed out, and God helping me I shall point out, to those in danger of the opposite errors of the Church of Rome that *as honest men* they cannot minister in the Church of England holding the doctrines of the Church of Rome: and I must be fair, and even handed lest haply by me the truth of Christ be put in peril.

Now this language of yours is as really the language of Puritan separatists, as is the formal statement of the doctrine of transubstantiation the language of Popish separatists, from us. The Puritans denied that there was in the two Sacraments any special grace conveyed [to us] beyond that which by faithful men was always attained by Prayer and hearing the Word. The Church of England affirmed that they were not only signs and seals but also *instruments* which God so used that with the outward element was surely given to the right receiver the inward grace. Now the Puritans might be right, or The Church might be right; but both cannot, and your subscription is a pledge that as a teacher you will simply and earnestly teach, as *she* teaches, and not as the *Puritans* teach. I am bound therefore to tell you that I as a conscientious man, could not hold a commission to teach, on the terms you hold yours, and teach as this declaration teaches. Let me then call as in God's sight your most earnest attention to the question. If *your* view of truth is *not* the view of the Church of England formularies you have subscribed, you cannot without an implied falsehood, which must put your soul in peril, bear the commission of a teacher in her communion.

Of course, I am well aware that you may say 'others do so', but my dear Sir will such a plea hold before the judgement seat of Christ?

Again I am aware that there are many shades of opinion on this question: and I have not the least wish to set up mine as a law. So far from it, I believe that the Church, following herein the mind of Christ, meant to leave a large license of diverse opinion open even to her Ministers, on *each side*, and I would never narrow this license, e.g. many only mean to deny in their language against Baptismal regeneration such errors as these: first that the work of Grace is accomplished in baptism: or that souls are converted in baptism; or need no conversion by the Grace of God *afterwards*; or that if baptised and afterwards decent they need no deeper heart change; or that they have a robe of pardon and a stock of grace then given them which they are afterwards to use and to keep clean, and that these gifts if lost cannot be renewed. Now it is right to protest against these great errors, and the only fault therefore of those who meaning to protest against *them* protest against 'baptismal regeneration', is that they confound together an error their Church condemns, and a truth their Church teaches. This I cannot but hope, and nothing deeper, is your error in having subscribed this declaration: and I trust, that now that I have been called upon to bring the matter formally before you, you will so explain your subscription to it, and if it be possible, withdraw it, as to give relief to the minds of many of your brethren in the ministry who are I am assured greatly scandalized by your *apparently* signing the articles and liturgy in a non-natural, that is in a dishonest sense.

It has cost me much pain thus to address you: but a sense of duty compels me to it. I cannot effectually guard the purity of the faith, in that portion of the Church committed to me, from dishonesty of subscription on the side of Romanizers, if I wink at a like sin on the side of the Puritanizers.

Assuring you of my prayers to God for you, I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Your faithful friend and brother,

S. Oxon.

Life, I, 406–8

154. To H. R. Kingscote (*iii 90*)
Confidential

61 Eaton Place, May 22, 1847

My dear Sir,

I enclose the Cheque for £50. Will you let me know that it has reached you. We discussed the matter yesterday, meet again for it after the holidays. There was *universally* the strongest wish to meet the necessities of your population by any lawful expedient. The tone of your letter to the Archbishop was one great hindrance.[1] You remember that I honestly expressed to yourself my regret for it: and a second reading deepened my regret, that you so spoke to the Archbishop.

I am ever very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

155. To the Dean of Windsor (G. Neville)[2] (*iii 91*)

61 Eaton Place, June 8, 1847

My dear Mr. Dean,

May I beg you kindly to lay before your next chapter the case of the united parishes of Langley Marish and Wyrardisbury in your Patronage. I have received a petition signed by almost [every single] parishioner, as I am assured, praying for their [separation]. I will not dwell upon the great importance of severing two such parishes: and I am happy to say that if the Patrons approve of this step I see no difficulty in [taking it]. The Act 2 & 3 Vict. Cap. 119 Sec. VI gives full powers for such a division, and for making *any* arrangement as to the Tithes &c. The Chapter would probably deem it fit that *ultimately* the Tithes of each Parish should go to the Sustentation of its own Minister: but if the Chapter would allow the tithes *for the present incumbency* to be received as they now are by the incumbent of the united parish reserving only for the new incumbent of Langley Marish the sum of £100 per annum (being the sum now paid to the Curate) during the incumbency of Wyrardisbury by the present incumbent, then Mr. Champnes[3] has assured me in conversation that he will be an assenting party to the *immediate* severance of the two parishes.

I am my dear Mr. Dean, Ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

156. To the Rev. H. Shute[4] (*iii 92*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 8, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Your letter has given me the deepest pain: and I can far too entirely sympathise with your own wounded feelings to find fault with any of its expressions which shew that you have entertained thoughts unjust to me. I instructed Mr. Burder to prepare the commission *as sought by you.* Your engagement to pay the costs is an unanswerable proof that by *every one* it was distinctly understood that

[1] Henry Kingscote (1802–82) advocated in print (a) more deacons, (b) lay readers (*DNB*).

[2] Hon. George Neville (1789–1854), Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge, 1813–53; Dean of Windsor, 1846–54. Third son of 2nd Baron Braybrooke, he was co-discoverer of the Pepys Diaries. He assumed the additional surname of Grenville in 1825 (*DNB*).

[3] Edward Thomas Champneys, V. of Upton-cum-Chalvey, 1842–67 (C).

[4] Hardwicke Shute (1812–84), C. of Britwell Salome, 1845; P.C. of Little Milton, 1848–59; V. of Great Milton, 1859–66 (O).

the commission was of your seeking. I was prepared to write to the President of the Commission a letter to be read at the opening of the proceedings stating that I had granted the commission at your request. There can be no possible mistake in this matter nor any impeachment of your veracity. Having given Mr. Burder these instructions, and knowing that he understood them, I did not read through the formal parts of the document, or I should have been at once startled by the words of 'my own mere motion'. I thought that even this formal document would bear evidence that *you* sought, not *I* required, the commission. But I may be wrong here; and it may be necessary for a legal fiction to use these words. I take their being used or not does not alter one jot the real state of the case.

I have looked sufficiently into the matter to feel not a shadow of doubt of your innocence. I feel the deepest sympathy with you under this reproach. I am ready as I said to you on Wednesday to send for the Steven's here and to get you to meet them, with the various documents I then saw and the others you described, and to hear once more all they can say, and to pronounce my opinion. Or I am ready, if you desire it, to let the commission continue, *on your petition*. But I wholly and absolutely refuse to become in any sense your prosecutor because I am perfectly convinced of your innocence. I have at once written to desire Mr. Burder to stay proceedings till I hear your wishes. If you are contented without any further step than stating that I am fully satisfied with your conduct, and that unless the Stevens require and will apply for a Commission the matter must drop I am quite content; if you desire a commission I am ready to grant one: I advised you to apply for one, feeling sure of the issue, and fearing lest any low creeping whispers might hereafter injure your spotless character or wound your spirit; but for my own satisfaction I do not need the report of any commission: and if you are satisfied, I will write to the Stevens, tell them that I dismiss the complaint as disproved by the character and contradictions of their witnesses, and that unless they require a commission and will engage for its expence I dismiss the case.

I must call your attention in this connexion to the enclosed letter from Mr. Burder. All proceedings will now be stayed until I know your decision.

I am very sorry that you have declined Lacey Green: It is a post at which you might I believe have been very useful; and I should have had unmixed pleasure in committing it to your hands.

This letter is not fit for publication, but you are at perfect liberty to make any other use of it you please.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Ever very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

157. To Thomas Abbott[1] *(iii 93)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 8, 1848

Sir,

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of Jan. 2.

Into that part of it which concerns the civil injury which you state yourself to have received from Mr. Trotman[2] it is not in my power to enter; because I should thereby be interfering with the legal jurisdiction of the civil courts.

1 Addressed as 'Mr. Thomas Abbott, A.M.'.

2 Fiennes Samuel Trotman (1796–1863), R. of Gayhurst and Stoke Goldington, and also V. of Dallington, Northants., 1822–63 (C).

But as to the charge of immoral conduct which you prefer against Mr. Downes[1] I am ready if you wish it to state it to him and hear what answer he will make to it.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

S. Oxon.

158. To the Rev. H. Binney (*iii 94*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 8, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have a letter today from Mr. Walters[2] declining the curacy of Newbury on the ground of its narrow stipend. I believe this to be the real reason of your difficulty in filling it. But the post of today has brought me a letter (enclosed) which may possibly bring to view the sort of man you desire. I will request you to return it, stating if you would wish to negotiate with such a person.

I return you the Record Newspaper with my thanks: it is I imagine no new thing for a man to find his greatest sacrifices to honesty made the grounds for a charge of dishonesty.

I am, &c.,

[*Unsigned*]

159. To the Bishop of Exeter (H. Phillpotts)[3] (*iii 95*)

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 8, 1848

My dear Lord,

Certainly my 'Letter to Dr. —'[4] has failed of conveying what I meant it to convey. I meant it to state (1) that I thought the Censure of the University justified by the Observations on Dissent, and by the obscurity want of reverence and over-statement of the B. Lectures *unexplained*: (2) that our opposition was justified by the evils sure to spring from such an appointment: (3) that there was *ground* enough to justify my issuing letters of request but that (4) having been led to examine, and being satisfied there was not *legal* ground for a suit, the Observations being withdrawn, . . . [*illegible*] . . . the B L being explained, I could not *justly* issue them; and did not think there was ground for further resistance. I can only account for my words seeming to mean more by my writing in some indignation at the unfairness of the extracts; — an unfairness I had pointed out to Newman in 1836.

In great haste, ever believe me, yours most faithfully,

S. Oxon.

Life, I, 493–4

[1] John Watkin Downes (1805–55), C. of Gayhurst with Stoke Goldington; P.C. of St. John's, Woolwich, 1849–55 (O).

[2] Unidentified.

[3] Henry Phillpotts (1778–1869), Bishop of Exeter, 1830–69 (*D.N.B.*); the fiercest controversialist of the day.

[4] Renn Dickson Hampden (1793–1868), Regius Prof. of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church, 1836–48; Bishop of Hereford, 1848–68. Hampden's election to the Bishopric had taken place on 28 Dec. 1847; it was confirmed on 11 Jan. 1848 (*D.N.B.*).

160. To the Rev. R. Knight[1] *(iii 96)*
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 8, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have heard from [Mr. Whitfield][2] that there is some difference of opinion between himself and you as to the rate at which his stipend should be fixed for the time he served the Parish. The fixing this is as you are aware left to the Bishop. I see no reason at present why Mr. Whitfield, who I hear was four or five days a week in the parish should not receive a stipend at the rate of £120 per annum. I am sure I need not point out to you that any appearance of parsimony in such a case will injure your [character] and usefulness amongst your Brother Clergy and I would far rather that this payment came from you than was ordered by me.

I will thank you to communicate with me on the matter and am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

161. To the Rev. E. Bickersteth[3] *(iii 97)*
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 8, 1848

My dear Sir,

I will not let a post pass without replying to your friendly note. It expresses *very nearly* my views on the matter. In 1836 I voted with the others for the vote of suspicion, *mainly* from my view of the 'Observations on Dissent', which seemed to me (as they still do) to assert that all religious opinion is involuntary and Socinianism little different from Christianity. In 1836 I remonstrated with Mr. Newman on the unfairness of some of his extracts, but was satisfied that there *was* ground for expressed suspicion. In 1842 I began a careful study of the question; feeling that what had since passed had revived it; but being taken ill I could not go to Oxford and dropped the matter. When the subject of a *representation* to Lord John[4] was discussed I felt a strong opinion first on Dr. Hampden's unfitness (for *many* reasons) for the office and secondly I felt that his appointment under the censure of the University was pessimi exempli. I therefore resolved to sign with my eyes fully open to what might be the effects to me personally of taking this step. But I thought it *right*: I would not declare his *unsoundness*; but I may say to you privately that I wrote to Lord John to press *enquiry* and explanation as what the Church required. Matters going on I was asked to *allow* a prosecution on the score of unsoundness, and consented. Then followed my demand of explanation: and up to a certain point the explanation being given: I had then to weigh whether *it was enough*. I found the *Observations*, *my* strong point, *withdrawn* (both 1st & *2nd* editions) and the B.Ls. *explained*. I was convinced that there was not ground for a criminal suit; and much as I still wished for an authoritative judgement I did not feel that *I* could, believing there was *not*

1 Richard Knight, P.C. of North Marston, 1847–69 (C).

2 Henry John Whitfeld (1808–55), V. of Grandborough, 1845–55; domestic chaplain to the Earl of Mornington, died as chaplain at Scutari (C).

3 Edward Bickersteth (1814–92), C. of Chetton, Shropshire, 1838; C. of Little Missenden, 1848; P.C. of Penn Street, 1849–53; Rural Dean of Amersham, 1849; V. of Aylesbury, and Archdeacon of Buckingham, 1853–75; the first Hon. Canon of Christ Church, 1866; Dean of Lichfield, 1875–92; Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, 1864–80 (*DNB*). His brother, Robert, was Bishop of Ripon, 1857–84.

4 I.e. Lord John Russell.

ground, could [*sic*] say to the judge of the Arches Court that there *was* ground for a *criminal* information — and it was only in this way I could proceed. I therefore felt bound in *justice* to drop the suit. I felt further that if the suit was dropped, there was not sufficient ground for the Church to persevere in her resistance to Dr. H's consecration; and for peace sake I said so. I did *not* say I thought the censure of the University has been wrong. I pointed to the overstatements ambiguity and want of reverence of the B L — to the unsoundness of the 'Observations' as justifying it: I did not say the Bishops' representation had been wrong: I think it was in the main right: and that all subsequent trouble might have been stopped if Lord John had received it rightly: I *did* say what justice and the fear of God seemed to me to require that with the 'Observations' withdrawn and the 'Lectures' explained I thought no more opposition need be made. I was *sure* to please no *party*. But I thought it *just* to Dr. H. and *best* for the Church to say so. I see that my letter might much more perfectly have expressed my meaning; but I still think it was *right* to dismiss this suit which was the great question. Now surely those who must have influence with such papers as the Record ought to bring their influence to bear at such times to procure *justice*. What mean the insulting epithets of 'courtly' and the like. Anything contrary to Christian honesty is equally bad at Court or away from Court. And if God were pleased, as I believe for my sainted father's sake, to give to one so unworthy his Sovereign's favour, surely that gift alone unless it be misused is not a warrant for the abuse of Christians. Pardon my saying this much. For I do deeply enter into what you say. Such checks may be, it has been my prayer many times a day for this last week, that to me it may be, an especial blessing. If I have been content to risk the favour of my Sovereign to do what a jealous care for the truth of Christ seemed to me at first to require; if I have since been ready to meet the hostility of so *able* and warm a party as the tractarians to do *justice*, and if I meet for it with nothing but insulting sneers and obloquy, I do feel that it is not worth a sigh, if it be His means of answering my daily prayer that He would teach me to love Him better and more simply to follow Him who died for me. And if at times I can realise His 'Happy are ye' it is enough to turn all these sharp stings of natural pain at man's misrepresentations into joy itself. Pardon me that I have so run on, and Believe me to be yours, &c.,

S. Oxon.

162. To the Rev. R. J. Gould[1]

(*iii 98*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 8, 1848

My dear Sir,

I should sooner have acknowledged your note and the papers with which it was accompanied, but that I have been persistently occupied with business which I could not put aside.

I have now given my best attention to the subject. I beg to express to you and through you to the Committee my thanks for the readiness with which they have met my request that they would consider how far it is possible to bring the operations of the Church Union more entirely into the channel of our Diocesan Exertions. I have no doubt that this will be the result of the resolutions adopted by the Committee.

[1] Robert John Gould (1803–80), C. of New Windsor, 1844–54; P.C. of Trull, Somerset, 1854–8; V. of Stratfield Mortimer 1860–80 (O).

But beyond this I am anxious to express my sense of the great benefits which the exertions of the Church Union have conferred upon the Diocese during the years over which your report extends. I perceive that during 8 years you have been able to contribute no less than £2785:15:8 to the local wants of the Diocese, and when I remember that during the same period you have from the same funds been contributing largely to the general objects of the Church; and measure therefore the good you have been able to effect, not only by the positive result of your labours in money, but by the far higher results of the amount of self denial, earnestness, Christian zeal and union which these gifts of money may be reasonably hoped to imply, I do heartily thank God for what you have done and would desire by any means in my power to strengthen and extend your future labours. With the view I will take the present opportunity of expressing my hearty Sanction of your Society, and my earnest hope that the Parochial Clergy around you may be able to profit by their neighbourhood to you in stirring up their flocks to greater zeal and liberality in support of the various objects set before them by the Church.

I am, my Dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

163. To the Rev. H. Shute *(iii 99)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 19, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I received yesterday on my way home after a week's absence your letter dated Jan. 14: and found on my return last night a note (undated) conveying a copy of a note from some Solicitor who appears to be acting for the Stevens to a Mr. Cooper at Oxford.

I was sorry to find from your note of the Jan. 14 that you had expected an answer to the letter you wrote me on [Jan. 10th] — as you said in that letter that you wished matters to 'remain as they stood until you sent in such documents and proofs as would make your own statement good' I had nothing to reply to you till I received those documents. I therefore wrote to Mr. Burder to stay the commission; and to my Chancellor to consult him as to his presence at the private meeting here which the letter of Jan. 10 proposed; but I would have written to you at once had I seen anything in your letter which led me to think you looked for a reply. I have now your note of the 14th before me: and I am most ready to make the fullest allowances for your painful position: but I must not forget what is due to my office; and your letter of the 14th is written in a tone quite unfit for you to use to your Bishop. I know not what you mean by my 'in another matter illegally setting aside the express directions of the Church Dis. Act'. I am not aware that in any one matter I have set them aside: and if you thought that I was doing so you should respectfully and [discreetly] have called my attention to it, and not indulged in such an insinuation. From first to last, believing you innocent, I have sought to shield you from what I believe to be a false accusation, and you must not from any smart from false charges forget what is due to yourself and me.

I cannot allow that any real injury would accrue to you from the commission running, as legally it must, in my name, [opened] as it would have been by a full declaration from me that it was of your seeking. But as to this, I will not speak, since I understand you clearly to wish the commission suspended at present: and to this effect I will write to Stevens to day. The only practical question is, whether, when you have sent me your documents, it would be better

(in the event, which I assume, of their fully satisfying me) for you to offer to meet the Stevens here, and let me and my Chancellor and perhaps Archdeacon hear them before I give you my judgement. My own belief is that your following this course would be the best for you: but as I only offer it to you for your satisfaction, I must beg you to decide the question whether I shall adopt it. If so, I should be glad to hear from you as speedily as possible when you would be prepared to meet them that I may give the Chancellor and the Stevens full notice.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

164.[1] (*iii 100*)

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 19, 1848

My dear Friend,

Thanks for your note @ poor Shute. I feel deeply for him and I cannot but think he wants a good adviser. If you could see him and make him shew you *all* our correspondence I think that you would feel that there is about it a continually wearing suspiciousness and testiness which making full allowance for his painful situation is quite improper when my sole object has been to free him from what I believe to be a vile calumny against a holy and upright man.
[*Unfinished*]

165. To J. Stevens (*iii 101*)

The Bishop of Oxford informs J. Stevens that by the advice of the Bishop the Commission which the Bishop signed at the request of Mr. Shute is for the present suspended.

Mr. Stevens will hear again from the Bishop in a few days.

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 19, 1848

166. To the Rev. H. Shute (*iii 102*)

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 21, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have now before me your letters of Jan. 19, & 20, with which I find no fault, because they state what you consider the ill treatment you have received from me explicitly and in detail: I found fault with your former letter because it contained an insinuation which I could not understand. I have no wish to check the utmost freedom of complaint, least of all in one whom I esteem and with whom I sympathise as I do for and with you: however unjust I deem that complaint — and most assuredly I deem it peculiarly unjust from you. You have had my deepest sympathy: my tears: my prayers: my fullest consideration: my entire trust: and I receive from you in return nothing but suspicion and crimination because of the unavoidable concomitants of the course you yourself thought it best to pursue under the cruel circumstances in which you were placed.

You first named the charge to me: we talked with perfect freedom over the modes of rebutting it. I adopted your own suggestion: put 'the Statement' to the Churchwardens at your written desire that if any of its facts were controverted you might apply for the commission. The facts were controverted. You applied for the commission: it was issued in the only legal form possible. You expressed

[1] Recipient unidentified.

your pain and reluctance to proceed at the mere semblance of my originating it, which legal forms require. I signed it: I am now ready to take any course you prefer believing that my only duty is to aid you to establish your innocence. But you object to me Ist That I advised the Commission. II That I suffer you incidentally to be charged on vile evidence for an old alledged offence. III That the attorney employed by your slanderers, has without the shadow of justification in a private letter made use of my name. I believe these are all your grounds of finding fault with me. I will [attempt a] reply to them. I. I advised a commission believing it to give an opportunity of thoroughly and utterly disproving slander which another mode would not do. I expressly enquired of you if there was anything to make it expensive. You said nothing. I could not offer to pay the expence and give you the opportunity of proving the enquiry *of your sole seeking.* II. I am well aware that such evidence as that of which you complain in your letter of the 19th cannot for an instant be admitted to [bolster] up a different charge. *I should never dream of admitting it.* But you have entirely misapprehended me. I said it was not possible to refuse summoning witnesses your accusers asked for. If it appeared to the commission that the evidence to be tendered was (as what you describe plainly would be) illegal, they would refuse to receive it.

[Thus you should be safe from] the possible imputation of having feared to meet it. The conversation to which you refer, had wholly another object from that you seem to have misunderstood it to have. I suggested to you, that as, not *being acquitted of a crime,* but *putting down a set of slanders,* was your object; the positive proof of past innocence would not be complete without putting down a past scandal. I learned from you how easily it could be done: I rejoiced at learning it, and said that *I* could not receive, the evidence on oath, of such a character as that described. Now then how can I be blamed for the baseless misrepresentation of a man you describe as a 'low attorney' because he used without my knowledge and permission my name in his letter.

My dear Sir, I have said all this because [for truth], suffering as you are, I would do everything I can, to remove even the semblance of unkindness. But I do feel wounded by the spirit in which you have received my attempts to aid you. If I had at first received you, not with the Fatherly sympathy of a Christian Bishop, but with the distance of Professional form, I should have been saved this pain: and it has not been slight. I know not what more to add. I should wish to receive and thoroughly weigh your documents before I finally advise your meeting the Stevens here. If in any matter you think I can still aid you, you may count in the fullest measure on my practical sympathy. God knows how I have felt and feel still for you. I say nothing *now* of your notice of leaving this Diocese. But I most earnestly trust for your own sake and mine that you will reconsider this decision hereafter.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

P.S. I should be glad to receive you with the documents if it is not unpleasant to you to come.

167. To the Rev. H. C. Knox[1] *(iii 103)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 21, 1848

My dear Sir,

I beg to thank you for the kind letter in which you inform me of your having left Slough. The affection of those who love you for your work and ministry,

[1] Henry Carnegie Knox (1798–1854), V. of Lechlade, 1850–4 (O).

painful as it makes a parting from them, is still a deep and abiding joy, and I thank Mrs. Knox for letting me see the undercurrent of affection, of which the enclosed note is an indication.

I should be glad to find another post for you in my Diocese: but I can see no rational ground for expecting to be able to find you a benefice. The Bishopric of Oxford has practically no patronage. If you would like a district church or the sole Curacy of a parish where the Rector is non-resident I shall be glad at any time to hear from you the particulars of what would suit you.

I am, My dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

168. To W. W. Battye[1] *(iii 104)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 21, 1848

Dear Sir,

I have delayed replying to your letter till I could hear from Mr. Trench whether there was no way of reducing your expences. I find that taking a bedroom and sitting room in College your Board and Lodging will be £50 instead of £65. Thus at once saving you £15. On books again a probable saving may be expected. But this leaves a sum utterly beyond my power to raise. I never was so much pressed for means as at this moment. If however your other friends will secure you the sum needed to *complete your course* but *not otherwise*[2] I will give you £10 and lend you £10 more towards the whole deficit.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

169.[3] *(iii 105)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 21, 1848

My dear Sir,

I have given my most careful consideration to Dr. Hampden's postscript — but I cannot see that it calls for any notice from me. Had I received any private 'concessions' on the faith of which I acted the case would have been different. But as I state exactly what I consider a concession and Dr. Hampden does not contradict my *statement* in any particular I can only regard his insulting language as a part of that feeling and conduct which he has always shewn to those he esteems his enemies; and he honours me with the belief that my conduct has been pre-eminently hostile to him.

In truth he seems far better to have understood my letter than the great number of those who have commented upon it. For while they have spoken as if it retracted some opinion I had formerly expressed he sees that it retracts none.

I could not possibly be annoyed by your writing to me on the subject; and connected as you have been with it I should be even glad of the opportunity of explaining the whole of my conduct to you. It may however perhaps suffice to say, that adhering to the justice of the University Censure; and of the Bishops' representation and of the Church's opposition I am convinced that when the 'Observations on Dissent' were *legally* (under the two years' limitation of the Clergy Discipline bill) withdrawn, there did not remain ground for successful

[1] Addressed to H. Battye, Esq., but presumably William Wilberforce Battye, ordained at Chichester in 1849 after obtaining his A.K.C.; R. of Hever, Kent, from 1851.
[2] These two words are underlined twice.
[3] Recipient unidentified.

legal resistance: that without the belief that there was such ground I could not justly originate the suit, and that if there was not such ground the suit ought to drop, and with it the resistance of the Church. That I therefore believed it to be best for the Church — not to approve of the appointment — far from it — but to *acquiesce* in it; and that this therefore I councelled; and that in doing this I expressed not my own judgement alone but that of six of the representing Bishops; five of whom expressed the opinion in writing after seeing before it was sent the draft of my letter to Dr. H. My and their aim was not to retract anything that was past but to accept for the Church what we could get when further resistance seemed unavailing.

I am, my dear Sir,

[*Unsigned*]

170. To the Rev. R. Knight (*iii 106*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 21, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

As Mr. Whitfield has expressed in common with yourself a wish that I should decide the question of the payment to be made for the 17 weeks he served the Parish of North Marston after Mr. Pigott's[1] resignation, I have looked into the matter, and am of opinion that £35 to cover all charges would be a fair sum as between man and man.

I have only therefore to add to this the expression of my earnest hope that no shade of difference or estrangement may be suffered to survive this settlement between two who in the unity of the Faith of Christ and the fellowship of the Ministry of His Gospel ought to be bound together as Brethren Beloved.

I am Rev. and Dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

171. To the Bishop-elect of Hereford (R. D. Hampden) (*iii 108*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 24, 1848

My Lord Bishop (Elect),

My attention has been called to a letter bearing your signature addressed to Mr. Faulkner,[2] which has appeared in the newspapers. As no contradiction of its authorship has, to my knowledge, been made public, I imagine that I am not wrong (notwithstanding its unusual language) in attributing it to you. I beg therefore to call your attention to its 'postscript' and to request from you an answer to my concluding question.

I withdrew the 'Letters of Request' against you in consequence of an assurance from your own pen that you were not during the two years to which the Clergy Discipline Bill limits your responsibility, answerable for any circulation of the "Observations on Religious Dissent", the only work which in my judgement could have subjected you to ecclesiastical penalties for uttering False Doctrine. I must therefore beg you to inform me whether the words to which I have called your attention are intended to deny the truth of that assurance which was conveyed to me in the following words as your own, 'It is with no sanction of mine and indeed *against my wish* that any copies of the 1st Edition of my "Observations

[1] John Robert Pigott (1799–1852), was P.C. of North Marston 1825–9, and again (with Hughenden) from 1837 until his resignation on 10 April 1847 (C).

[2] Richard Rowland Faulkner, V. of St. Sepulchre's, Cambridge, 1825–73.

on religious Dissent" are now sold and circulated. In fact I have not put forth any copies of that Pamphlet; *even of the second edition*, since the time of its publication and this is out of print, so far as my knowledge goes. Someone therefore must have been giving I conceive a fresh publication of that also *without my leave*.'

I am, my Lord Bishop (Elect), Yours faithfully,

S. Oxon.

172. To the Rev. H. Walker[1] (*iii 109*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. [24], 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Your letter (dated only January) in which you express a fear that statements prejudicial to your character have been made to me has reached me today.

I am happy to be able to assure you that no such statements have been made. The Dean of Westminster has done the fullest justice to your character; but he wishes, I think reasonably, to resume the use of his own Rectory, and finding that it cannot suit your convenience to reside in lodgings he wishes to find a curate to whom such an arrangement would not be disagreeable. This is the sole ground on which he proposes a change; and I am sure from what I know of the Dean's liberality that any reasonable expense which you could prove to him it inflicted on you he would gladly discharge. I shall be glad to aid any views you may make known to me as to finding another Curacy.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

173. To the Rev. R. I. Wilberforce (*iii 110*)

Cuddesdon, Jan. 24, 1848

My Dearest Brother,

I have kept back my letter to Henry because I wished you before I tell him to read Mr. Bickersteth's letter. Send it me back at once. I did not wish you to continue to circulate your letter without giving him (which I am sure you would not wish) the opportunity of answering it. I am sure it would seem, if it come now, un-English and would damage you. I think your making one first [of all] to personal friends another matter. I have written to Dr. H. to enquire if he means to repudiate his legal irresponsibility.

[*Unfinished*]

174. To J. Stevens (*iii 111*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 24, 1848

John Stevens,

I mean to hear what you and yours wish to say in support of your daughter's charge against Mr. Shute: and unless you hear from me to the contrary you may come on Friday next Jan. 28 at 12.

I am, yours &c.

S. Oxon.

[1] Henry Walker (1820–98), C. of Islip 1846, Epwell and Shutford 1848; V. of Ludham, Norfolk, 1855–86 (C). Islip is still in the gift of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, and at this time was usually held by the Dean, who in 1848 was the geologist, William Buckland.

175. To the Provost of Oriel (Edward Hawkins)[1] *(iii 112)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 24, 1848

My dear Provost,

Upon a full consideration of Dr. H's letter to Mr. F I think that I cannot pass it by without notice. As to its unsuitable language I say nothing, but it appears to me to imply a contradiction of that, which, as you well know, was the fact (learned from you) to which the withdrawal of the 'letters' was entirely owing, namely Dr. H's present legal (and as I believe moral) irresponsibility for the 'Observations on Dissent'. I have therefore written to Dr. Hampden (a private letter) calling his attention to this point. I trust his answer may be such as will not compel me to issue fresh 'Letters of Request'.

After the few words which passed between us yesterday on this subject I do not like not to acquaint you at once with my having taken this step.

I am, my dear Provost, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

176. To the Rev. H. Robinson[2] *(iii 107)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 25

Rev. Sir,

I have heard with great grief that you have been summoned to the County Court for £5 borrowed on an I.O.U.: and that you have borrowed money in similar ways from different parties at Oxford. I must beg that you will send me a contradiction or explanation of these Charges.

I am, yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

177. To the Rev. J. Willis[3] *(iii 113)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 25, 1848

Rev. Sir,

I have well considered all that you urge. Indeed the matter has not come fresh before me because I have talked over the whole subject with the rural Dean: I am aware of the past circumstances to which you allude and also of the weak state in which you occasionally find your nerves: and I must frankly tell you that I do not *approve* either of your attempting to do service at Haddenham and Cuddington with one Curate, or of your committing Cuddington to Mr. Farley.

[1] Edward Hawkins (1789–1882), Fellow of Oriel, 1813–28; V. of St. Mary's, Oxford, 1823–8; Provost of Oriel, 1828–82; R. of Purley, 1828–82; Dean Ireland Professor, 1847–61; Canon of Rochester (*DNB*). See J. W. Burgon, *Lives of Twelve Good Men.*

[2] Henry Robinson (1819–87), C. of Didcot, 1842–9; master in Christ's Hospital, 1849–57; R. of Kilkhampton, Cornwall, 1857–9; held various curacies in Northumberland and Durham from 1859. D.D. 1871 (O).

[3] John Willis (1800–55), P.C. of Cuddington, and V. of Haddenham, 1826–55 (C). He was to be succeeded as V. of Haddenham by Henry Meeres, C. of Cuddington 1845–8, and chaplain of Aylesbury gaol 1848 (C), whom the Bishop noted as 'an excellent man'. Willis had been 'obliged to leave for immorality — married common woman a year & ½ ago; a commission for drunkenness and immorality. He suspended for a year. *Now* returned & promising' (Diocese Book, I, f. 126v). The Farley in question, noted as 'a valuable man, given too much way to Dissenters. Moderate low' (ibid.), was William Meymoth Farley, who was ordained in 1840 after training at St. Bees, and held various curacies before he became C. of Haddenham, 1845–57. Thereafter he was C. of Bexley, 1857–9, Erith 1859–63. In 1863 he became vicar of Cretingham, Suffolk.

I wish Mr. Farley to continue at Haddenham and that you should nominate another Curate to Cuddington. I greatly trust that you will at once after reflection acquiesce in what I now advise, which I am sure is equally needful for your own comfort and for the good of the Parish.

I advise you to talk the matter over with the Rural Dean, to whom you may shew this letter, before you reply to me.

I am, Rev. Sir, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

178. To the Rev. R. A. Gordon[1] (*iii 114*)

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 25, 1848

My dear Sir,

Should you be disposed to exchange Abington [*sic*] for *Aylesbury*. Aylesbury is the most important position in Bucks. The value of the living is about that of yours: the house I suppose not so good as yours: but the importance of the place great. I think that Mr. Pretyman would be disposed to an exchange.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

179. To Thomas Stevens (*iii 115*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 26, 1848

Thos: Stevens,

I shall be ready to hear what your daughter or other parties you like to bring to bear out *her* charge may have to say against Mr. Shute, *here* on Friday next, at *11* A.M.

I am yours, etc.

S. Oxon.

180. To the Rev. H. Shute (*iii 116*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 26, 1848

My dear Sir,

Your first packet has reached me in safety. Dr. Phillimore will be here to aid me on Friday morning *at 11*: in hearing anything which the Stevens may wish to say; and I have written to him to say that I will receive them and any they wish to have, to bear out *her charge* on that day and at that time.

I am, my dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

181. To G. Eyre[2] (*iii 117*)

The Bishop of Oxford presents his compliments to Mr. Eyre and begs to inform him, that he is not about on Friday to hold any commission under the 3rd & 4th of Victoria but merely to satisfy himself whether there is ground in his judgement for the issue of the commission he has suspended. For this purpose he

1 The initials appear to be 'J.A.', but the addressee was in fact Robert Augustus Gordon (1815–95) (C), R. of Avington 1846–53, Barley, Herts. 1853–90 (both livings in the Bishop of Oxford's gift).

2 George Eyre, attorney, of Watlington, etc. (*Law List*).

wishes to see Mr. Shute's accusers: but at this stage of the business he declines seeing any legal adviser of any party; which he imagines Mr. Eyre to be. The Bishop can by law receive no charge as to matters which are alledged to have occurred more than two years ago.

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 26, 1848

182. To the Dean of Rochester (R. Stevens)[1] *(iii 118)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 26, 1848

Dear Mr. Dean,

Will you allow me to ask you to lay before your chapter a proposal which I think would tend at once to the spiritual benefit of the Parish of Haddenham cum Cuddington and to the improvement of your Patronage there. It is, that the Chapter should consent to the severance of Cuddington from Haddenham, with such a share of the endowment of the two, as would now pay a curate for Cuddington, and constitute a separate benefice, allowing the Patronage so created to belong to a gentleman having property in the Parish, who on those terms would build a parsonage house and augment the endowment: himself being the first incumbent of Cuddington. The XXVIth section of the 1 & 2 Vic: c. 106 gives I apprehend ample powers for such an arrangement.

I am, Dear Mr. Dean, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

183. To the Provost of Oriel (Edward Hawkins) *(iii 119)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 26, 1848

My Dear Provost,

If I understand your letter aright, you do not impeach any statement made in my letter of Dec. 28th to Dr. Hampden, but question how far these facts can properly be called 'concessions made by Dr. H. to me'. In my letter to Dr. H. I do not so term them; but state explicitly that beyond the assurance of his Faith which I quote in his own words I received no communication from him. I do not therefore see how my letter can be fairly open to any such misinterpretation as you apprehend.

What I did state in that letter was this, that through a common friend I learned that there has been for some years no circulation of 'the Observations on Dissent' with the sanction of Dr. Hampden. Further that I was convinced by a careful study, with the text, of Dr. Hampden's explanations of the Bampton lectures (those recently given and those published in 1842 which not then voting I had not previously read) that the 'Lectures' would not support a charge of false doctrine. And as under the provisions of the Clergy Discipline bill Dr. H. could not be called to account for the 'Observations', I would not, in my office of Judge, for any secondary considerations, be guilty of the injustice of sending a man to a criminal trial when I believed there was not ground to support the charge. I hereupon withdrew the Letters of Request. But in doing this I retracted no former opinion or act of mine from the commencement of this painful business. I thought that the resistance of the Church ought not to be continued when no legal ground for it remained, and disregarding all personal consequences, I stated in full detail exactly what appeared to me to have been [gained] (since the suspicion of

[1] Robert Stevens (1776–1870), prebendary of Lincoln, 1814–70; Dean of Rochester, and V. of West Farleigh, Kent, 1820–70 (*MEB*).

the University was declared) both publickly and privately in the way of declaration and explanation and added the expression of my own conviction that the Church might acquiesce in the Consecration.

I have heard nothing to make me change my opinion: for personal abuse and imputation are not convincing arguments to a man conscious of integrity.

I am, my Dear Provost, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

184. To the Provost of Oriel (Edward Hawkins) (*iii 120*)
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 26, 1848

My dear Provost,

I would not deal candidly with you if I did not say that admitting the accuracy of your (not yet to be) public letter, I yet think the mode of its expression certain to increase needlessly the misrepresentations and calumnies by which I have been recently pursued. I was very careful in my letter of the 28th to 'insinuate' nothing. But I [said] *exactly* what satisfaction I thought I had received and *how* I had received it; whether from Dr. H's published explanations or his letter to Lord John, or to me, or incidentally from a common friend. I think that if you publish anything, it should beyond the possibility of misrepresentation shew that you mean [to rely upon] my statements whilst you guard against wrong inferences derived from them. People's minds are in the most excited state and one word from you might minister to imputations I am sure you would wish to prevent, alike in justice and in friendship. I have letters now by me drawing from the postscript to Mr. Faulkner the inference that no 'common friend' existed and that Dr. H. means to insinuate that the whole is an invention of mine. I think that I have just cause to complain of the ungenerous way in which Dr. H's friends have joined in this abuse of me, which I drew on myself by the determination in the face of an angry and powerful party to do what I thought *just* on his behalf without regard to consequences.

But with one important part of your *private* letter I am most sorry I am quite unable to agree: and I think I can prove to you the *exact* correctness of my last letter which it seems to question.

I received Dr. H's answer to my first letter Dec. 19. *The same* day I wrote to him to say that the suit must continue; this letter was taken to Cuddesdon to be copied and sent thence on the 20th. On that day I heard from you what *on reflection* convinced me that Dr. H. was not legally (and in my judgement morally) responsible for the 'Observations on Dissent'. On *them* as I had told the Promoters rested in my mind the proof of his unorthodoxy. What therefore I heard from you altered in my view the whole case. Under this impression I sent a messenger over to Dr. H. early on the 21st to request the return of my last letter which closed the correspondence with him. *You* heard nothing of this till the 24th (and heard of it then, with my other reasons, drawn from my examination of the explanations of the B. Lectures), because I was waiting for Dr. H's answer. But the Proctor of the promoters heard of it on the 21st. It was solely on this information that the question hinged. Without the Observations on Dissent I did not believe that there was legal ground to support the charge, and without legal ground I thought it unjust to send Dr. H. to trial; he reclaiming against it.

After this I read all the explanations and the B. Lectures (a great part of *them* not for the first time) to satisfy myself whether they without the Obs: would justify a suit. The result of my study was a full conviction that they would not: and I

said so & stated strongly my sense of the injustice of the 'extracts'. I have never doubted that there are propositions in the 'Observations' which would be condemned and you will remember that I pointed out to you the very passages I thought liable to censure.

I earnestly trust I need not consider as to taking any fresh step: and if the Bishop of Hereford sends me such an answer as I have a right to expect; namely that he never meant to question my facts but to guard against wrong inferences being drawn by others from them, I cannot be forced to move again. But as he is understood, not very courteously, to declare my facts false, he forces me to require some explanation.

I am, my dear Provost, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

185. To the Rev. D. R. Murray[1] *(iii 121)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 28, 1848

Rev. Sir,

I can quite enter into your wish to be saved incurring the undefined expense of building. But on the other hand I am sure that you would be anxious to avail yourself of the Patron's and of the inhabitants offer to secure a residence for your parish. May I then ask you whether you would meet his £100 by your £130 on condition of your being legally secured from any further expenditure.

I am most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

186. To E. P. Turner[2] *(iii 123)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 9, 1848

Sir,

I am grieved to say that I can give you no information on the subject of your anxious enquiry. I got on Saturday into a carriage put on for me at Paddington with Mr. and Mrs. Stonhouse: I did not observe any other person in the other

1 This letter illustrates the pastoral problems sometimes caused by plurality and non-residence. David Rodney Murray (1791–1878), nephew of the 7th Baron Elibank, was V. of Beedon, 1828–74, and also R. of Cusop and Brampton Bryan, Herefords., 1826–78 (O). He married the sister of Sir John Reade of Shipton Court, and according to the Diocese Book (I, f. 121^{v}), did not 'accord with him' and resided at the family living near Ludlow. He allowed the curate of Beedon £80 out of the £130 income of the living. The situation about the house was to be looked into. Later information was more explicit: 'Parsonage: There is nothing worthy of the name. The Curate in charge lives in a poor labouring-man's cottage, to which, in 1850, a bedroom and small sitting-room were added, at the expense of Sir John Reade, the farmers of the parish, & some few of the neighbouring clergy. The present curate has, during the 3 years of which he has had charge of the parish, at his own expense expended close upon a year's stipend, in repairs, absolutely necessary to keep the place barely habitable.' A copy of a letter from John G. King to the vicar, shows that on 28 January 1860, he was apprised of the 'present disgraceful state of the Parsonage. It is totally unfit for the residence of a clergyman, & is constantly needing repairs. I am the more justified in mentioning this', the writer adds, 'because I happen to know, that the present patron, Col. Lindsey, is only prevented doing much for the good of the Parish from the fact of the Incumbency not being vacated'.

The Bishop, told about the 'wretchedness' of the parish at a confirmation in March 1860, vainly wrote to urge Murray to resign Beedon. He received an 'affecting answer. In debt & raised money on it for sons & *cannot* though conscience stirred' (Diocese Book, II, p. 56).

2 Addressed to Edward Page Turner, Esq., perhaps in error for the Baronet of that name.

compartment: but I believe no one was in it. At Reading a young clergyman got into the other compartment and came as far as Didcot to see me on business. I left my own seat to join him. No one else was then in the carriage. At Didcote [*sic*] I resumed my own seat with Mr. & Mrs. Stonhouse: and we were joined by Mrs. Majendie of Torquay; who mentioned that she was going to Oxford to visit a son. At the Abingdon Road I left the train: I did not notice who was in the other compartment though I passed through it: but I think there were in it Three gentlemen and one lady.

I am sorry to have missed you this morning and that owing to your letter not being given to me at Oxford I could not reply to you thence.

I am Sir, very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

187. To the Bishop of Salisbury (E. Denison) (*iii 124*)
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 9, 1848

My Dear Bishop,

I have just seen at Oxford (where I have been all day presiding over Diocesan Boards) a letter in the paper touching myself and Dr. H. as to which after our conversations I must say at once a few words in extreme haste. It is written by Charles Kennaway. Its history is this. I met him last week at Romsey. We talked fully over this whole matter. He has long wished *me* to give some explanation, I gave him my reasons for not doing so: unknown wholly to me he had already sent a letter to the Guardian: he asked me whether I would correct a letter he wished to send about it to the papers. I told him I could not correct or even see anything of the kind; but I left him at liberty to do whatever he pleased. I had not time carefully to read the letter; but running my eye over it I saw one or two inaccuracies in it. In the main however it expresses my views. I looked with great anxiety to the part which concerns my expectation of concurrence from the other Bishops; and though I should (especially since our conversation) have expressed the matter differently, yet I trust that taken in its context Kennaway's statement will not appear to you to be otherwise than substantially correct. I write this in extreme *haste*. Will you communicate substance to the Bishops of London and Winchester and write to me.

I am most sincerely,

S. Oxon.

188. To the Rev. B. F. Earle[1] (?) (*iii 122*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 10, 1848

Rev. Sir,

I am ready to countersign your testimonials if they are duly forwarded to me, but it is not in my power to sign any [unusual] testimonial on your behalf since my knowledge of you is by no means sufficient to justify my taking any such step.

I am Rev. Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Unidentified.

189. To the Rev. E. J. Speck[1] *(iii 125)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 10, 1848

My Dear Sir,

I am truly sorry that you should be exposed to any inconvenience by Mr. Fry's[2] arrangements. He told me that at your desire an original clause in the agreement had been inserted by which either you or he might on 4 months notice terminate your engagement. I think his wishes in this matter are quite natural, and in assenting to them I especially stipulated that every possible regard should be had to your convenience as to time &c.: and I cannot doubt that Mr. Fry will be scrupulous in fully considering your interest and fair claims to consideration.

Will you let me know what particulars of place, stipend, house &c. you can as to your wishes, for I will very gladly aid you in finding another curacy.

I am, My Dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

190. To the Rev. W. J. Butler[3] *(iii 131)*

Private & Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 10, 1848

My dear Sir,

There is extreme difficulty in saying what is best to be done at this moment as to the Commee of Council. *I* believe that the plan you have suggested is the best: but I find that very many even of the Bishops are not convinced of its expediency. Some thoughtful laymen too have strongly urged possible inconveniences from it. I am not myself shaken by these objections, but their existence will make it very hard to contend with the government on that ground. The only safe ground seems to me the broader one, of opposing *all* dictation emanating from the Privy Council to the founders of Church Schools. For otherwise we should be found in detail divided amongst ourselves & so almost helpless. That, e.g. many say: 'Lay down fixed rules': and then say 'no rule to be altered, no teacher dismissed, nor any new one chosen except by a majority and with the sanction of the Bishop': thus making the majority & Bishop instead of the Minority & Bishop absolute. Now this last might I think answer all practical purposes in Church Schools. As to what you should do, I say at all events do not publish and do not break with the Council. It is of great moment that what they will do & will not do should be thoroughly ascertained in several instances before the matter comes before Parliament. How far you may go depends upon how far you can thoroughly trust your laity. e.g. If they will go unanimously with you, I think it would be well to prepare for them some resolution *like* this; 'that the answer of the Privy Council having been read to them, the Commee begged for further information. They had understood that the money voted by Parliament was to be apportioned between Dissenting Schools & Church Schools, conducted severally on their own religious principles, only open to inspection. That theirs was a Church School; and that they humbly represented that all they

1 Edward John Speck (d. 1883), C. of Olney 1846, Emberton 1846, Stoke Goldington with Gayhurst 1849. Subsequently Sec. of the Church Pastoral Aid Society and Evangelical Lecturer at St. Marylebone.

2 Thomas Fry (1775–1860), R. (and patron) of Emberton, 1804–60 (O). Also V. of Toot Baldon, which he resigned, making the patronage over to the Bishop, 1858.

3 William John Butler (1818–94), V. of Wantage, 1846–81; Canon of Worcester, 1881–5; Dean of Lincoln, 1885–94. A great supporter of Wilberforce: Diocesan Inspector of Schools, Rural Dean, Honorary Canon (but not until 1872), founder (1850), and Warden 1850–94) of the Convent and Penitentiary of St. Mary's, Wantage (*DNB*).

proposed was to give to their Bishop the power as Visitor which he enjoyed in most endowed Grammar schools in the Diocese and which seemed to them to belong to him in virtue of his office; and that they wished distinctly [to ascertain] whether the P. Council meant to make it a condition of receiving aid that the lay founders of a Church School should deprive their Bishop of that oversight which they believed to belong to him as Bishop.'

If you cannot trust your Commee enough for this you will yourself see how near you may go. E.g. you may ask if they will object to A. see Page I. The great point is to force them to avowing that they will *not* aid Church Schools founded on strictly Church Principles: whilst they will aid dissenting schools on Dissenting Principles. In all cases I believe where the laity have stood firmly and temperately by the Clergyman they have yielded. Write very carefully & keep copies as it may come out another day.

I have heard nothing lately from the Chapter: I did advise their allowance of the Chapel: nothing of Lockinge. It has occurred to me that it might aid your work if I could come and ordain your Deacon at Wantage: on the Ember Monday. I cannot absolutely promise this but tell me whether you would like it. My direction *after* Monday to Friday is to be Hon. E. Gough's, Perry Hall, Birmingham.

Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

191. To G. E. Anson[1] *(iii 126)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 11, 1848

My dear Anson,

I rather hoped for a letter from you this morning: but I suppose you were too busy with the Festivities of yesterday. May God long continue the great blessing He has poured upon that Royal Wedding.[2]

You will have seen a letter touching me and Dr. H. in the papers and I want you to know its history. It was written by a friend, a clergyman, the Rev. C. Kennaway who from the first being in constant correspondence with me knew the affair as it proceeded, and who from mixing much with the clergy was strongly convinced of the importance of some statement being made. I refused (as I told him on advice) to make any. He asked if he might write his own views. I told him that he might do as he saw best: but that I could be neither directly nor indirectly party to any statement; nor did I see one word of it until I saw it in the Times on Wednesday. I have seen today to my great surprize Dr. H's and my letters in the paper. I have no idea who published them; I refused to let Mr. Kennaway do so. Of course all this will stir up questions and bitter speeches, but in spite of this being for the time painful I cannot but hope that it will bring out the truth: and as I know the honesty of my own conduct, and am convinced that saving human errors, my judgement on dismissing the suit, was *just* to Dr. H. and *wise* for the Church, I hope for the best final issue.

I shall be here till Monday: am to get my letters on Tuesday at Mr. Bowles, North Aston, Woodstock; on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, Hon: F. Gough's Perry Hall, Birmingham: having put my visit thither off for a week.

I am ever my dear Anson, Very affectionately yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] George Edward Anson (d. 1849), Private Secretary to the Prince Consort.
[2] I.e. of the Queen and Prince Consort, married on 10 Feb. 1840.

192. To the Provost of Oriel (Edward Hawkins) (*iii 127*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 11, 1848

My dear Provost,

I have just seen, to my great surprize, in the St. James Chronicle the letters of the Bishop (Elect) of Hereford and myself, touching his postscript to Mr. Faulkner. I have not the smallest idea how they have reached the press. I have shewn them to several friends, and even suffered them to be copied: but never without the express condition that they should not be published. I may take this opportunity of adding that I had never seen a word of a long letter which appeared in the Times of Thursday till I read it there, though its writer, The Rev. C. E. Kennaway, had expressed to me a wish to be left at liberty to communicate his own views on the matter and I had left him at liberty.

I am, My Dear Provost, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

193. To the Rev. C. E. Kennaway (*iii 128*)

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 11, 1848

My dearest Kennaway,

You may guess how anxiously I read your letter: and on one point how anxiously I am now in suspense. The other Bishops as I found partially on Friday & Saturday and more fully on Tuesday: ground their *non* declaration on the difference between my draft letter and my actual letter. I see quite enough to account for their fully justifying to themselves their silence; I do not see any *material* difference. But of this I am a poor judge. Had it been possible I should once more have . . . [*illegible*] . . . you might write for me saying much on this head: because anything like a disclaimer from them would be either very mischievous to the Church if it led to any dissension between us, or very fatal to me, if it led to the false impression that I had misstated their concurrence. Do not therefore write to anyone on this subject till we meet.

I understand, but have not seen it, that the Morning Chronicle is very fierce on your letter. *Do not answer anything.*

I feel deeply your affection under all this: and I hope for the best: but the restirring the matter is very painful and anxious and has sent me earnestly to my knees. To my great surprize and regret I see the two letters between Dr. H. and myself in the paper today. I cannot guess how this has happened. There are one or two inaccuracies in your letter but nothing I think material to your argument. May God defend the . . . [*Unfinished*]

194. To the Rev. W. Andrew[1] (*iii 129*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 11, 1848

My dear Sir,

Mr. Burder has forwarded to me your letter of Feb. 9: and I must at once trouble you with one or two remarks upon it.

I. You must remember that I consented to your not residing in the Parsonage house, on condition of your *at once* undertaking to put it into such a state as would satisfy me. Now the proposal of your last letter leaves *the time and plan* of its

[1] Addressed to the Rev. W. Andrewes, but the Bishop must have meant William Andrew (1820–90), Fellow of Worcester, 1848–63 (Vice-Provost, 1859); R. of Maids Moreton 1847, and of a succession of other livings from 1862.

alteration altogether uncertain. I am much annoyed at the delay which has already arisen and cannot allow of any further delay. I must therefore beg you immediately to forward to me your plans &c. for this work.

II. I am not satisfied as to the long delay in your appointment of a resident curate. If your house was fit for his residence I have no doubt that you would find the *Rev. C. Fowler*,[1] who at the end of March will leave the curacy of *Cranfield*, nr. *Newport Pagnell* a very suitable person, or if he cannot take it I would on your application further assist your search.

I am, my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

195. To Sir Robert Peel (*iii 130*)

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 11, 1848

My dear Sir Robert,

After your kindness in replying to my former letter I feel it due to you to say (1) that I have not the smallest idea how the letters between Dr. Hampden & myself which I see in the paper of today got to the press. (2) That a long letter defending me which appears this week was written by a friend who had previously, without my having any knowledge of his intentions written a shorter letter to the same effect. As to *this* letter I left him at liberty but told him I could have nothing to do with any statements, directly or indirectly, and I never saw one word of his letter till I read it in the Times Newspaper.

I am, My Dear Sir Robert, Ever your very sincerely obliged,

S. Oxon.

196. To the Rev. S. Jenner[2] (*iii 132*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 12, 1848

Rev. Sir,

I gather from the enclosed letter, to which I need not allude further, that you have stated to the writers that I 'have used my influence to prevent your temporal interests.'

That such a statement was wholly unfounded I have already assured you; and was able, in the special instance you quoted, namely the reference to me made by my late revered Friend Dr. Dealtrey,[3] to tell you exactly what passed, that I had referred him to the family of your former Vicar.

It is true that (in common with every person I ever heard speak upon the subject) I believed you to be a principal 'mover of the opposition raised' against my brother. The prevalence of such an opinion can scarcely I think surprize you if you remember that you were at the time generally supposed to be the author of the letter which you now allow that you wrote for the Churchwardens, although you at that time attempted to disavow it, & wrote to my brother that '*from what you could learn* the Churchwardens acted on their own responsibility'. That opinion then I shared then [*sic*] with all, I believe, who read in the Public papers the [accounts] of the Controversy; & I may therefore as you assert, have given [attention] to it. But at this distance of time I cannot profess to recall with accuracy

[1] Possibly Charles Augustus Fowler; but he is given in the *Clergy List* for 1847 and 1848 as C. of Madley, Herefords. He became R. of Crawley, Sussex, in 1849.

[2] Jenner was Evening Preacher at St. Peter's, Maidstone, 1845; C. of Camden Church, Camberwell, 1850–7; Preacher at St. Mark's, Kennington, 1860; he held various other curacies until his death. The Bishop's comments appear to have been apposite. Cf. no. 38.

[3] I.e. William Dealtry. See no. 1.

the [exact] circumstances on which it was founded, & must refer you for them, [if you desire to renew that strife], to my brother for a more specific answer. It is as I have already told you, long since I had occasion either to hear, or to mention, your name; & I cannot allow your attempt to fix on me the justification of an opinion which I neither originated nor propagated, but only shared with all others who took any interest in the facts.

I should be most unwilling to do any injury to your interests and am glad to feel assured that I never did: but in closing this correspondence suffer me to suggest to you, that it is far more likely that any difficulty you have experienced in forming a new engagement has arisen from the following causes than from that to which you have been disposed to refer it.

1st from the fact of which you inform me that 'there had been an unfortunate misunderstanding between yourself & Mr. Lutwidge'; who is described in the letter you forwarded to me as 'our late friend & Pastor with whom it pleased God to bless us'.

II. From the public connection of your name with the troubles at East Farleigh.

IIIly. From your being commonly reported to be the author of an anonymous book, in which the clergy & many of the Laity in your late neighbourhood of every different shade of party & opinion, with many members of their parishes, female as well as male, are very indecently lampooned, whilst their names & circumstances are indicated with sufficient clearness to explain to any reader acquainted with the neighbourhood.[1]

To this last imputation which is current against you, it is I am sure the part of Christian faithfulness and goodwill to call your especial attention; because the existence of such a rumour might naturally make any clergyman afraid of the consequences which might follow your introduction into his parish.

I remain, Rev. Sir, very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

197. To the Provost of Oriel (Edward Hawkins) *(iii 133)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 12, 1848

My Dear Provost,

I much regret that you have felt it needful to publish the letters to which you refer; written as they were *after I had acted upon the information I received from you.* As I informed you yesterday I gave no permission for the publication of the Letters Between the Bishop (Elect) of Hereford and myself, nor had [I] seen one word of Mr. Kennaway's letter before I read it in the newspaper. I resolved to keep out of controversy: & in spite of no little misrepresentation I have kept my resolution. But I did not think it right to enjoin the like silence on my friends, to whom I have left & shall leave the free exercise of their own judgement on the matter.

I am, My Dear Provost, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

198. To the Rev. T. Fry *(iii 134)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 12, 1848

My dear Sir,

I think it best to forward at once to you this enclosed statement sent to me by Mr. Speck to shew that he had a direct assurance from you that you would not

[1] I.e. *Steepleton; or, High Church and Low Church: being the present tendencies of parties in the Church, exhibited in the history of Frank Faithful,* by a clergyman, 12°, 333 pp. (1847).

disturb his possession of the Curacy of Emberton. It requires I think your serious attention.

I am, My dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

199. To the Rev. S. G. Selwyn[1] *(iii 135)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 22, 1848

My Dear Sir,

I have read and prayed over your letter. It has deeply affected me; & I earnestly desire in reply to its trusting confidence to say all that I can to you, in the way of direction.

But in doing this I am met by this difficulty, that even after your letter I feel much at a loss to estimate accurately *the facts* on which my judgement must be founded. I must therefore reply in some measure hypothetically.

1. If you refer to any habits of actual sin *now* occasionally allowed I do not think you would act rightly in seeking Priests orders.

2. But if you refer to *past sins* of which you can hope you have repented truly; the acts of which you do not now allow; the moral consequences of which to yourself you lament & resist, I do not see in them a reason for witholding Priests orders from you. *For* if you have received from God the grace of penitence; if you are believing in Christ your sins *are forgiven you*: they *are not*: the blood of Jesus Christ *cleanseth*, not *will* cleanse at the Judgement Day, but *cleanseth* us from all sin.

Nor do I think that the remains within your moral nature of the bitter consequences of such sins, in doubts, fears, or again in temptations to coldness in devotion, or to impure fancies, ought to keep you from the service of your Saviour in this high office. The 'Go tell my disciples *and Peter*' 'To whom much is forgiven the same loveth much'; 'when thou art converted strengthen thy Brethren', seem to me to make this point: but this I say always supposing that there is no present parleying with the evil: that it is the swell of an old storm not the surging of a present storm by which you are shaken. This then would be my judgement upon the actual question: but there is yet another: ought you to apply for the ordination until you yourself can with a quiet mind ask for it?

Now this must be, in great measure, a question of degree. There is a *degree* of doubt & fear which I think would very seriously interrupt the offering of yourself to God: and I do not say that I would advise you in spite of that *degree*, to come without delay for Priests Orders. Yet the evils of delay are manifold: not only those to which your Father has pointed your attention, and of which I will not speak, from its bearing on others, but from its bearing *on yourself*. The mind is so susceptible of morbid impressions that there is real danger lest the craving for delay should grow with the delay, and that which seems to be a holy awe resolve itself into a hindrance of the enemy. You should therefore try every means to dispel these fears: whether opening everything to your Father would tend to do this you can judge: if so it would be well for you to do so: but there is no other reason for your taking such a step. Or if you think that your opening up your mind to me will aid you, I according to my office shall gladly receive you: & hear & weigh all & Counsel you to the best of my power. I would gladly receive you *here* on Friday if you like to come & stay till Saturday: or afterwards in London.

[1] Addressed in error to the Rev. T. Selwyn; Sydney George Selwyn, was Fellow of New College; deacon, 1844; priest, 1851; V. of Milton (near Clevedon), 1853, and Prebendary of Wells, 1860. His father was the Rev. Townshend Selwyn (1783–1853) (O).

May God Almighty direct comfort & support you and bring you safely through is, my dear Sir, the hearty prayer of Yours very faithfully,

Life, I, 413–14 S. Oxon.

200. To the Rev. H. Robinson (*iii 136*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 22, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I am very glad that the Betton Charity money is likely to prove so useful to you. There can be no impropriety in your soliciting aid towards the School from the Rector and Patrons: though the latter I believe rarely give to the maintenance of a school. As to any real assistance to yourself, I really know not what to say. I do not see any reasonable hope of giving you any permanent assistance — I may tell you in confidence that the fact of your being in difficulty came to my knowledge almost immediately after I had replied to your expressions of a wish for more work: & the impression made upon my mind by my knowing this fact, *& not hearing it from yourself* was not favourable to you. I would on this point advise you at [once] to face all the difficulty of [stating] the worst. I feel sure that if you will open everything unreservedly to the Archdeacon[1] he would aid you to put your matters in train for adjustment & if any gathering be made amongst your friends *which will relieve you entirely*, you are heartily welcome to ten pounds from me.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

201. To the Rev. E. J. May[2] (*iii 137*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 23, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have today seen Mr. Ball,[3] & I hasten to put before you the result of our conversation. Mr. Ball brings no charges of any kind against you but he says strongly that he feels that there is between you so great a mutual unfitness for combined action that he is confident that you cannot work with profit together in one parish. Mr. Ball is quite ready to allow time for you to find another curacy; & he has, in reply to my enquiries, so fully assured me that he can recommend you to one, that I am ready to authorize you to apply if you see fit, to the Rev. Dr. Silver[4] of Charlbury, Chipping Norton, on my recommendation for the curacy of Finstock in his appointment which is now vacant.

I mention this, because it is my strong advice that you resign Mr. Ball's curacy. You do so with no charge brought against you, & with a perfectly whole character. But I am so strongly of opinion that thorough harmony & a mutual good understanding is essential between a resident Rector & his Curate that I advise you for your own sake & for the good of the parish to withdraw yourself from a curacy where these conditions of usefulness would appear to be impossible.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Of Berks. See no. 546.

2 Edward John May had a varied career of curacies and scholastic appointments until he presented himself to the incumbency of St. Andrew's, Hastings, in 1869. These included his first curacy at Litcham, Norfolk; the headmastership of Kentish Town Collegiate School, the curacy of St. Laurence, Reading, 1847, and the senior chaplaincy of Clapham, 1850–1 (O).

3 John Ball, V. of St. Laurence, Reading, 1834–65 (O).

4 Thomas Silver (1776–1853), D.C.L., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, until 1828; Rawlinson Prof. of Anglo-Saxon, 1817–22; V. of Great Staughton, Hunts., 1822–53, and of Charlbury, 1828–53 (*MEB*).

202. To the Rev. A. L. Winter[1] *(iii 138)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 23, 1848

My dear Sir,

It gives me great pain to inform you that fresh charges have been brought against you. You are charged with using most improper language as to Mr. Farr: and also with having again transgressed the line I enforced upon you, as that which befitted pulpit ministrations, in a recent sermon. I have felt so much disturbed by these new complaints that I have sent for Mr. Ward[2] to talk the matter over with me. I regret to say that the result of my conversation with him has left upon my mind a painful conviction that the usefulness of your ministry *at Iver* is gone never to be recalled. He tells me that the sermon 'O Generation of vipers &c.' contained what in his judgement was most objectionable matter; & that there has been throughout this business a tone of defiance, and an assertion of worldly principles of honour &c. which are very far from that spirit which is enjoined on us in the injunction 'The Servant of the Lord must not strive'. Mr. Ward is also, I am bound to tell you, far from confirming your view, that the opposition you have unfortunately excited, is confined to those parishioners who are of doubtful character or rare in their attendance at Church.

Under these circumstances, & after my own observation of the temper of your mind at our last interview I cannot but feel convinced that your wisest course for yourself and for the Parish will be that you should tender your resignation of your curacy. If this comes from you it will have the effect of shewing that you are (in spite of what I must deem indiscretion) indeed anxious for the peace of the Church & would not intentionally become the occasion of its interruption.

I am, My dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

203. To Miss Gould[3] *(iii 139)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. [23, 1848]

Madam,

I fear that the mode you suggest is not feasible. I recommend (1) that you write to the Rural Dean, with my sanction, requesting his aid in drawing up a plan. (2) That *he* engage some architect competent to make you a plan. (3) That you then apply regularly to the National *Incorporated* Society . . . [*illegible*] . . . Diocesan Society & National Union. It is of course entirely out of the question that any money should be paid out of Mrs. Gould's funds.

I am, Madam, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[*Nearly illegible throughout*]

204. To the Rev. J. Williams[4] *(iii 140)*

Cuddesdon Palace, [*Date illegible*]

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Under all the circumstances of your former conduct in Spelsbury I am not disposed to hasten your return there so long as a really efficient curate such as

1 Alfred Litt Winter (1814–79), C. of Iver, 1845–8; V. of Oare, Kent, 1848–79 (O).
2 William Sparrow Ward, P.C. of Iver, 1835–79 (C).
3 Unidentified.
4 John Williams (1799–1873), Student of Christ Church, 1816–40; P.C. of Tring, 1839–41; V. of Spelsbury, 1841–55; lecturer at Rhayader. An 'improvident match' had led Bishop Bagot to give him a licence for 2 years' absence; and he intended 'to resign when elsewhere established' (Diocese Book, 1, f. 21v).

Mr. Casey[1] is your representative. I should therefore not be disposed to disturb Mr. Casey: nor to recall you into residence. You had better with my sanction apply to Mr. Burder for the making out of your license of non-residence.

I am, my dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

205. To the Editor of the Christian Observer (the Rev. W. Goode)[2]
Private and Confidential (*iii 141*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. [23], 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have been hurt by seeing in your present number an article headed 'Attempted restoration of popish fittings in Churches' in which you yourself editorially use these words 'These facts shew the extent to which the Spirit of Popery has revived in our Church & the countenance given to it in quarters where better things might have been expected.'

Now these words seem to me quite at variance both with truth and with that absence of personal invective and insinuation which has so prominently distinguished the Christian Observer from some other periodicals: I therefore follow the Scriptural rule of privately telling you wherein I think you have been in the wrong.

It was proposed to found an *antiquarian Society* in Bucks.[3] I was asked to belong to it; and joined it partly to foster even literary pursuits amongst a clergy too much abandoned to field sports; partly to prevent the possibility of its degenerating into the mischievous follies of the Cambridge Camden Society. The *enquiries* to which your correspondent relates are as to simple *facts* to illustrate history: & with no more idea of *restoring* Popish monuments than the enquiry as to the exact site of the burning of our great Reformers was made with [any] view to repeat such Martyrdoms.

If you will yourself look at the papers I enclose, you will I think see that simple historico-antiquarian lore is the whole purpose of the enquiry. The first perception on my part of any attempt to turn the institution to a Popish or Tractarian instrument would be met by my withdrawing from it: and it was that in great measure that I might have such a remedy in my hand that I became President.

I trust that you will feel it your duty in any way you think right to withdraw the charge which you have been led, I am sure unintentionally, but I think you will see unjustly, you have brought against me [*sic*].

I am ever, Rev. and Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

206. To the Rev. W. H. Kelke[4] (*iii 142*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. [23], 1848

My dear Sir,

After weighing carefully your letter I can see but one course for you to take. It is clear that Mrs. [Jenney] (than whom no one living would be more unwilling to encourage irreverence at Church) believes that you are deceived in supposing

[1] Charles Carey, C. of Spelsbury, 1847, R. of Kingweston, Somerset, 1859 (O), must be meant.
[2] William Goode (1801–68); incumbent of various London livings; Dean of Ripon, 1860–8; for some years editor of *The Christian Observer* (*DNB*).
[3] See Appendix II.
[4] William Hastings Kelke (1803–65), R. of Drayton Beauchamp, 1840–60 (*MEB*).

that her servants behave ill. This must be from her supposing that you cannot perfectly see what passes in your chancel *pew*. I therefore advise you to remove the pews on each side of the Chancel & to replace them by open seats, with open desks before them set Cathedral wise. There will then be no shelter for irreverent persons & the matter in dispute will at once decide itself.

I am, my dear Sir, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

207. To Dr. Reed Connell[1] *(iii 143)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. [24], 1848

Sir,

I have today received a letter from you, stating that you are a faithful man & want money & that I am rich & if I am faithful, should give it to you: & so proceeding to much that you had better have left unsaid. But how am I to know that you are 'faithful'? If I thought you so I *might* be as much mistaken as you are in thinking me rich. You referred me to some persons who knew you: I wrote at once to the one of them I knew, & I have commissioned him to minister to your wants, *if he thinks it fit*, to the utmost of my power.

More I cannot do, than earnestly to exhort you to pray for humility before God & man.

I am Sir, yours faithfully in the unity of your & my Lord,

S. Oxon.

Life, I, 356

208. To the Rev. W. Andrew *(iii 144)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 24, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I am anxious as far as possible to [fall in with] your wishes & I will therefore allow you to put the present vicarage *for the present* into tenantable repair &c., making the alterations absolutely needful for a clergyman's benefit on receiving from you the enclosed engagement. A very excellent clergyman the Rev. J. Irving, curate of Broughton near Newport Pagnell is likely to be speedily disengaged who is well worth your enquiring after.[2]

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

209. To the Rev. J. Akroyd[3] *(iii 145)*

61 Eaton Place, March 13

Rev. Sir,

I have felt it my duty to point out to Mr. Peers[4] that the notice he has given you, being without my sanction, is illegal.

I am, Rev. Sir, Yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

1 Cf. index to this letter-book.
2 John William Irving (d. 1893), remained C. of Broughton, 1843–54, and then R., 1854–93 (C).
3 Unidentified.
4 John Witherington Peers, junior (1804–76), V. of Tetsworth 1841–76 (C).

210. To the Rev. J. W. Peers *(iii 146)*

61 Eaton Place, March 13, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

The provision concerning the [dismissal] of a Curate to which I alluded in my last letter, but to which the tone of your reply now compels me formally to call your attention is in the 1 & 2 Vict: cap. 106 §95: 'It shall be lawful for the incumbent of any [benefice] *whether resident* or non-resident *having first obtained the permission of the Bishop of the Diocese to be signified in writing under his hand* to require any Curate who after the passing of this Act shall be licensed to any Curacy to quit & give up his Curacy upon six months notice [being] given to the Curate &c.'

The notice therefore which you have given is illegal. The reasons for this Act are obvious: they are found in the necessity of preserving Stipendiary Curates & the parishes in which they serve from those frequent & spurious charges to which they might otherwise be exposed from the caprice of incumbents. If therefore you wish to discharge Mr. Akroyd you must first obtain my permission in writing, and for that purpose must state to me the reasons for your application.

I am sorry to have been forced by the tone of your letter, especially after what has occurred as to your previous curates, to address you to this effect, & am Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

211. To the Rev. H. Binney *(iii 147)*

61 Eaton Place, March 13, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have no authority over Mr. Roe,[1] nor any power whatever to 'require him formally to admit his error, express his regret & promise amendment'. This or any part of it must be the doing of his own Diocesan. It is of course open to your discretion to take legal measures against him; but as I have expressed to you before I do not conceive that legal processes are the proper mode of inducing our people to seek for or receive our spiritual ministrations.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Very Sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

212. To the Rev. C. Barter[2] *(iii 148)*

Private & Confidential

61 Eaton Place, March 14, 1848

My dear Sir,

I feel strongly the difficulty of the case to which you allude, & I cannot wonder at your conclusion.

I am disposed to think that your best course would be to write to him such a letter as to kindness &c. as *you* would naturally write, saying to him (1) What was your own estimate of such fraternizing with Dissenters; (2) what you know to be the strong feeling on the subject amongst all his brethren. & (3) His bishop's also; and that of every other Bishop on the Bench. Further I should say that this had given you much pain in its relation to those meetings of the clergy which the Bishop, you & he had at heart: for that you felt convinced that the line he adopted made it impossible for you to ask them to meet him at such discussions with any

1 Charles Roe (1810–78), C. of Newtown, Hants., near Newbury (O).

2 Charles Barter (1786–1868), V. of Churchill and R. of Sarsden 1817–68, and R. of Cornwell, 1829–68 (O). As Rural Dean, a great ally of the Bishop.

hope of profit. That therefore your view of duty was to meet him privately as you always had met him, because you doubted not that he acted on a view of duty however mistaken, but *not* to invite him to the intended Rural Chapters; and that you mentioned this to him at once. 1st that he might understand your motives & IInd that if he desired it you might refer the question to me.

He proposed various modifications of the intended meetings, but as I could not assent to any one of them I did not think it necessary to trouble you concerning his proposals.

I am, My Dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

213. To the Rev. J. W. Peers *(iii 149)*

61 Eaton Place, March 14, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I wish that I could deem your note of yesterday satisfactory, but it is by no means so.

I pointed out to you in the gentlest manner I was able that in giving your curate notice to quit without consulting your Bishop you had acted improperly. Your reply was a most unseemly aggravation of your error. In my last letter I distinctly referred you to the act of parliament which your notice had violated & told you that I could not allow you to part with your curate unless you applied to me for the permission which the law required.

Your present answer is an irrelavant [*sic*] reference to some supposed judgement of the Bishop of Lincoln's.

I must now therefore require from you, *first* the distinct expression of a regret for your illegal notice, *Second* a request to issue a legal notice, with your reasons for desiring it.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

214. To the Rev. H. M. Roberts[1] *(iii 150)*

61 Eaton Place, March 15, [1848]

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I am not aware of any authority given to you to appoint your legal successor in the Curacy of Kingsey. Your best course if you are anxious to be at once set free is to see me here. I shall be at home on Friday morning till 11, & on Saturday till the same hour. Or I shall be glad to hear from you on the subject, with the present address of Mr. Jackson.[2]

I am, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

215.[3] *(ii 4)*

[1848]

My dear Friend,

If the question before me were 'Shall I answer the attacks of Newspapers' I should not hesitate for one moment as to my course. The best answer to such

[1] Presumably Henry Mander Roberts (1808–67), chaplain of Magdalen College 1836–55, and of Merton, 1852–5; R. of Saltfleetby, Lincs., 1855–67 (O).
[2] William Nelson Jackson (d. 1876), V. of Kingsey, 1833–76.
[3] Recipient unidentified. The date is uncertain.

charges is Silence, & a life. They are best met like the subtelties of the Sophist by the 'Solvitur Ambulando'. But when a friend like yourself tells me that whilst you know all the truth, you find others 'puzzled' I cannot refuse your request that I would put an explanation of what has passed into writing:

You tell me that I am blamed —

I for twice condemning Dr Hampden without having read his works

II For having at last changed my side

I will explain the ground of both objections I. I voted in 1836 (in 1842 I did not vote) for the declaration of the distrust of the University on these grounds: (a) My own reading convinced me that there was so much of overstatement & want of reverence and obscurity *in the Bampton lectures* as fully justified the university in pronouncing its distrust of Dr Hampden as a Theological teacher. (b). Beyond this 'The Observations on Dissent' appeared to me directly to contravene the 39 Articles. My judgement in both of these cases was grounded on my examination of Dr Hampdens writings. Again I joined with other Bishops in representing to Lord John Russell the evils which would result from the appointment of Dr Hampden. This also I did on what I now deem sufficient grounds, namely the censure of the University & the alarm of the Church. This was intended as a private & friendly representation; Those who made it hoped that it would lead to the institution of such enquiries as would procure an authoritative sentence on the soundness or unsoundness of Dr Hampdens writings. Had it been so received it might have remained a private representation; & would have preserved the peace of the Church. Received and answered as it was, its privacy & its purpose were alike defeated.

IIly I am blamed for changing my side. My answer is a very short one. I have never done so. I justify now as I have ever done both the Censure of the University, & the Representation of the Bishops. I blame as I have ever blamed, the selection for the Episcopate of a Divine under censure, & the refusal of full enquiry before a competent tribunal. My decision, on which depends the appearance of change of side was in a different subject matter.

I was urged to allow the impugners of Dr H's orthodoxy to bring the question to issue in the Court of Arches through the Machinery of my court. This I was assured by high authority I could do, *ministerially* and without expressing any judgement myself on his guilt or innocence. This I consented to do stating at the time in writing that I did so pronouncing no opinion thereby on the question of the unorthodoxy of the writings impugned, but merely to obtain a judgement of the courts thereon.

After this I consented to the request of the promoters of the suit to seek as Bishop of the Diocese for explanations, assurances & retractations. In doing this I discovered that the 'Observations on Dissent' *both Editions*[1] were *legally* beyond all doubt (under the provisions of the Clergy Discipline Bill) & in my Judgement morally also, withdrawn. The case of the Bampton lectures remained. As to them then I had now this question before me, *not* 'Do they justify the expressed suspicion of the University' But 'Will they *alone* warrant me as Bishop in sending Dr Hampden to trial for Heresy in the Court of Arches; Dr Hampden reclaiming against such a trial.

This question was the more forced on me by the fact that owing to a technical inaccuracy in the former 'letters of request' I must execute new 'letters' & in fact begin the suit de novo if it was to be instituted at all.

[1] These two words are underlined twice.

To determine this question then I carefully examined two points;
1st How far in the subject matter of 'false doctrine' the act of a Bishop in sending a presbyter to trial in the Court of Arches could be as it had been represented to me purely *Ministerial*
II. How far the Bampton lectures, without the 'Observations on Dissent' & *as the writer has since explained them* would warrant this extreme charge.

On the first point I found that the Judge of the Arches Court would not receive letters of request accompanied with a statement from the Bishop sending them, that he did not himself consider that there was sufficient ground for a criminal suit. His act, that is to say, could not be *purely ministerial*, but must involve a Judgement, that there was sufficient ground to support a criminal suit. I was therefore driven to the Second Enquiry; 'Do the B: lectures *without the Observations on Dissent* & *with Dr Hampdens explanations* afforded [*sic*] ground for a criminal trial.

To settle this question I studied them again; & with them Dr H's: explanations given since 1836; which I had not read before. I was not now blind to what I still deem the faults of the B. Lectures, but I was *convinced* that they would not, *alone & explained*, support a suit. I could not therefore for any ulterior end, (such as obtaining a public trial, or protesting against Dr H's consecration) say that they would. I had changed no opinion I had before expressed. But altered circumstances required from me altered action, unless I preferred apparent consistency to substantial justice. Unless I would assert to the Arches Court that there *was* legal ground, which I believed there *was not*, for trying Dr Hampden *criminally*. I *therefore* refused to re-institute the suit; & to prevent an imputation which from my knowledge of the person with whom I had to deal I expected to be thrown out, namely that I had spoken of receiving concessions which had never been made, I stated in detail in my letter to Dr Hampden the exact facts by which I was led to drop the suit. In doing this, I implied no dissatisfaction with the Censure of the University or the representation of the Bishops; for I justified both. I expressed no satisfaction with the appointment of the Dr H. or the conduct of the Minister. But I stated that I thought there was no longer a legal ground for resisting the Consecration. I hoped by this detailed statement to promote the peace of the Church; first by shewing that *some* sentence on Dr H's writings had been pronounced[1] (by by [*sic*] his Diocesan after a close study of them, & after hearing all the allegations of their impugners) secondly by shewing that some satisfaction (all I believed to be attainable) had been won for the Church: & thirdly satisfying all that in dropping farther opposition they only acquiesced in the Consecration of a Divine whose Diocesan was satisfied could not be *legally* proved guilty. It was to secure this end that I stated in detail what seemed to me to have been obtained; & that I added my conviction of the unfairness of the extracts from the Bampton Lectures; From which I am convinced that many have have [*sic*] formed an exaggerated estimate of what is objectionable in them.

One word more & I have done: for as to the despicable motives which some have imputed to me I will not stoop to notice them. But it has been taken for granted that in all this I acted *alone*. So far was this from being the case that I consulted all my Right Rev Brethren who were within my reach & acted with the advice & concurrence of five out of six of those whom I was able to consult. I as Diocesan was to lead the way & they to follow. Accidental circumstances alone

[1] Above 'sentence on' is interlined 'examination of'; above 'pronounced' is interlined 'held'.

prevented the immediate delaration of a concurrence which would have added the greatest weight to my own Judgement.

I am my dear Friend, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[*Not sent*]

216. To the Rector of Lincoln College (J. Radford)[1] (*iii 151*)

61 Eaton Place, March 22, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have received today by post what purports to be the substance of a correspondence between yourself and me; & as I can attribute its transmission to me to no one else, I presume that my acknowledgements of this attention are due to you. In making them however I am bound not to withold the expression of my extreme surprize at finding that you supposed yourself to be at liberty to publish my letters without communication with me.

I am, Rev. & dear Sir, yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

217. To the Rev. D. R. Murray (*iii 152*)

61 Eaton Place, March 27, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

At my recent visit to Oxford the case of Beedon was so strongly brought before me that I must trouble you with a renewed application on the subject. I am sure that I need not say a word as to your responsibility for the due discharge of the spiritual duties of the Parish: but I will only remind you that without a residence it will be impossible to keep a resident curate: few as are Mr. Walkem's[2] wants I cannot hope to keep him through another winter as he has spent this last.

I beg therefore to ask you to consider these two plans. 1st. Will you find £100 & borrow £200 more on the living: provided I can persuade the Patron to advance £200: & myself find £100 from Societies Friends & my own Purse. This £400 would enable us to apply to Queen Anne's bounty for £200 to meet it, & with the £200 to be borrowed on the living would thus give us £800 to build a suitable parsonage.[3] *This I think* [*will be*] *the best plan.*

Or failing this will you raise £200 on the living provided the Patron will supply out of his own pocket £150. Thus raising the £350 you deem the lowest sum needful to making the present parsonage habitable. I think I may [engage] to obtain or give £50 to meet this: & with carting &c. done gratuitously I think this may make the present parsonage habitable.

I will only add that I shall feel much obliged by your giving me as early an answer as you can to these proposals.

I am, Rev. & Dear sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Provost [*sic*] in index. See no. 271.
2 George Walkem (1808–78); C. of Beedon, 1847–51 (O).
3 The parsonage at Beedon was still 'only fit for a labourer's cottage' in 1889.

218. To the Rev. H. Binney *(iii 153)*

61 Eaton Place, April 3

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I saw Mr. Lefevre[1] last friday [*sic*] on your charity matter. He said he had not been able to make enquiries in the necessary quarters: but he promised to give his immediate attention to the matter.

I do not think that a bill on Charity Trusts, introduced by a Bishop without the full concurrence of the law Lords would have the smallest chance of passing. But if you would put into a Petition your own case I would state it to the House & ask a question as to the introduction of a Bill. Or if you like to have a Bill prepared I will at once bring it before the law Lords, & *if I can obtain reasonable support* will introduce it.

I will again apply to the Windsor Chapter touching the field &c.

You misunderstood a passage in my former letter touching Mr. Roe. I stated that *you* were at liberty (meaning of course in my Court) to proceed by legal measures against him, but that not deeming it expedient or right to do so *I* should not so proceed; & that as to any other than direct legal process I had no power of dealing with him: all such other intervention resting with his Diocesan to whom you were of course at perfect liberty to complain. I have now heard of a gentleman Mr. Tooke[2] who seems to me the very man you want, to work with you at Newbury . . . [*illegible*] . . . the highest testimonials; [distinctly] intellectual; . . . [*illegible*] . . . ; independent of Church income, & only seeking a field for labour. He had promised me to see Newbury & yourself & if you can only succeed in gaining his goodwill & finding a fit house for him you will find him I believe . . . [*remainder illegible*]

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, [*illegible*]

219. To the Rev. R. Wright[3] *(iii 154)*

61 Eaton Place, April 5, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

The state of your Parish of Steeple Barton has been brought strongly before me by some of the most important of its inhabitants; & I feel bound to call on you to provide for it a *Resident* Curate with full double duty in the Church.

I am anxious that no time should be lost in making this arrangement.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

220. To Sir W. R. Farquhar[4] *(iii 155)*

61 Eaton Place, April 5, 1848

My dear Sir Walter,

Will you let me engage your good offices with the Trustees of the late Mr. Bennett, in endeavouring to make a better arrangement for the spiritual

[1] Presumably Charles Shaw-Lefevre (1794–1888), Speaker of the House of Commons, 1839–57; later 1st Viscount Eversley.

[2] Thomas Hammond Tooke (d. 1888), C. of Iver 1848–50, Upton cum Chalvey, 1850–8; R. of St. Edmund's, Salisbury, 1858–63, Monkton Farleigh, 1865–88 (C).

[3] Robert Wright, V. of Steeple Barton 1808–50, Itchen Abbas 1803–50, Ovington, 1817–50. In the Diocese Book (1, f. 51), the Bishop notes: 'Steeple Barton: miserable thing. Oakley serves it from Enstone on stipend of £40. There is a non-resident vicar, pauper et inops.' It is not clear who this Oakley is: perhaps the aged Thomas Oakley of Brasenose, who was C. of Charlbury 1791, Ducklington 1805, Leafield 1814, and Minster Lovell 1819. He died in 1853.

[4] Sir Walter Rockcliffe Farquhar (1810–1900), 3rd Bart., banker.

necessities of the parish of Nettlebed. To Nettlebed with a population of not much under 800 is attached the Parish of Pishill [two] miles distant, the whole value of both benefices being about £130 per annum gross: & no house. I am most anxious to separate these livings & thus give to the incumbent of Nettlebed the sole charge of that parish. I have now an offer from the Rev. C. Ruck Keene[1] which may I think effect this. Mr. Keene is willing if the Trustees will (1) separate Pishill from Nettlebed, & (2) make over to him the Patronage of Pishill with (3) an endowment of only £50 a year out of the joint income of Nettlebed & Pishill, to take effect (4) at the next vacancy of Nettlebed; to undertake the present spiritual charge of Pishill: & to endow it with a rent charge of £20 a year: I can obtain a second £20 from Pyrton; & I should hope through Mr. Keene's exertions to see Pishill hereafter with a rebuilt Church and resident Minister whilst Nettlebed would benefit at once by having the undivided attention of its clergyman.[2]

It is quite plain that Mr. Keene cannot pay money to the Trustees for a right of Patronage which will be only a burden. His rent charge of £20 a year will be a full Price: & the Trustees will *alienate* no property; since on this arrangement Nettlebed will be still in their Patronage; & worth more with £50 less income & without the spiritual charge of Pishill and with that charge a £50 per annum more income. I will only add that I should be very thankful for being able to close with Mr. Keene's offer.

I am [*Unsigned*]

221. To W. W. Battye (*iii 156*)

61 Eaton Place, April 5, 1848

My dear Sir,

I shall with much pleasure fulfil my engagement: but I think that by far the most satisfactory proceeding both for others & for myself would be that you should request the Principal or one of the Professors to receive & administer this sum for you.

I am, my dear Sir, very truly yours, S. Oxon.

222. To W. Stephens[3] (*iii 157*)

61 Eaton Place, April 5 [1848]

My dear Sir,

I have been anxious to hear from you touching the Blewbury School.[4] I am very desirous to act in full unanimity with yourself & the other Trustees, whose desire to do their full duty by the School was so evident to me when we met. I quite enter into the difficulty felt by the Trustees in removing the existing master:[5] and yet I feel that you cannot have a good School without taking that step. I would therefore wish once more to press on the consideration of the Trustees the wisdom of making even a considerable effort to pension off, or give a sum to, the

[1] Charles Edmund Ruck Keene (1792–1880), Fellow of All Souls, 1814–21; R. of Buckland, Surrey, and Sub-Dean of Wells; of Swyncombe House. See *V.C.H. Oxon.*, VIII, 135.

[2] According to the Diocese Book (II, p. 383), 'Autumn of 53, C. E. Keene after years of delay obtains separation from Nettlebed and in altering the Church had let it fall down.'

[3] William Stephens of Reading, a Trustee of Blewbury School since 1830.

[4] Blewbury endowed School was founded in 1709 by the Trustees of William Malthus, a London merchant; its ample income came from 664 acres at Noke. An outline of its history is available at Berks. R.O.

[5] John Costiff.

present Master, as the best mode of making their funds really useful. I think that if nothing more were done at present than getting a really good National School master, who without aiming higher, should make the school a first rate village school that much would be done. To this also might be hereafter added a good infant school.

I should be glad to see the papers concerning the School & its management of which you formerly promised me a sight, at any time which would be convenient: & once more thanking you for your attention to the subject I remain, My Dear Sir, most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

223. To the Rev. W. N. Jackson *(iii 158)*

61 Eaton Place, April 5, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

My decision as to your Curacy would mainly rest upon the time for which you [may think it] needful to apply to me to allow your place in your parish to be filled by a substitute. If there really is good ground for hoping that you may soon be able to undertake continuously your own duty I should be very unwilling to harrass you by any requirements which were not really essential for the spiritual charge of your people. But if your absence is likely to be protracted [I should also] feel that it is my duty to satisfy myself not only that your substitute is irreproachable, but that he is the most efficient man I can find for the Post. If therefore you will write freely to me upon this point: & also fully as to the arrangement you desire to make about your furniture &c. I will endeavour at once to arrange matters for you. Mr. [Criet's] only interview with me was in a crowded committee room at Oxford for a few minutes before a public meeting.

I am, Rev. & dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

224. To the Rev. D. R. Murray *(iii 159)*

61 Eaton Place, April 10, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Your letter only expresses your dissent from my second proposal on the ground that the money so raised would not suffice to rebuild the Parsonage. But as you do not allude to the other plan I laid before you & which I think for the best, & as the objection you feel to the second will not apply to this, suffer me to call your attention to it, & earnestly entreat you for the sake of the souls committed to your charge at Beedon to assent to it, & to aid me in carrying it into effect.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Your faithful friend & brother,

S. Oxon.

225. To W. Jenney[1] *(iii 161)*

Private

61 Eaton Place, April [14], 1848

My dear Sir,

I shall gladly submit the results of your Rural Dean's visit for your final judgement as to the alterations I have proposed in your Chancel, and here under these circumstances I should let the matter rest. But you will I know excuse me if with my high estimate of you and [of Mrs.] Jenney I add a very

[1] William Jenney (1779–1859), of Drayton Lodge, D.L., J.P.; he acquired this property at Drayton Beauchamp by marriage.

few words at once upon the difference between Mr. Kelke and yourself. I will say nothing as to whether he was right or wrong as to *the facts* which he observed or thought he observed. But I am sure that you will give him credit for meaning only to promote God's honour; and will excuse a zeal for the sacredness of His Worship even though you think it has been mistakenly shewn. I can assure you that the alterations in the Chancel were my suggestion and that his only feeling about them was anxiety that in undertaking them he should do nothing which could be offensive to you: and I do truly believe that he does most earnestly desire at this moment to promote that peace and concord which Our Lord as at this time suffered so much to teach us and which is so essential to our Christian progress. May I express my earnest hope that you will meet Mr. Kelke halfway in the re-establishing of that good understanding between the Manor House and the Parson which is so essential to the well-being of the Parish.

I am, my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

226. To the Rev. R. Wright *(iii 160)*

London, April 17, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I regret to say that the funds at the disposal of the Eccles: Commissioners give no hope of their being able to meet the wants of parishes with so small a population as Steeple Ashton.[1] [*sic*]

I shall be very sorry also to put your present Curate to any inconvenience, but I must have a *resident* Curate at Steeple Ashton; & I desire to see two full duties there; I shall be obliged by your informing me that you have taken the needful steps to secure this without any unnecessary delay.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

227. To the Rev. W. H. Kelke *(iii 162)*

Private

61 Eaton Place, April 21, 1848

Rev. and Dear Sir,

I cannot doubt as to the answer you should send to Mr. Jenney. Surely it is for such a time as this that it was written 'A soft answer turneth away wrath'. Mr. & Mrs. Jenney being both careful about their household, and feeling deeply what would be the shame of conduct such as that you have observed or, as they would say think you have observed, cannot bring themselves to believe that their servants did behave so ill.

I should therefore advise you to write to Mr. Jenney and say how deeply painful it is to you to have any variance with him, that you can assure him you only noticed what you did under an imperative sense of duty; that you are as far as possible from wishing to hurt his feelings by carrying out my recommendation as to the Chancel and that you can appeal to me that your first feeling when I suggested it was an apprehension lest it might by possibility annoy Mr. Jenney.

I do not doubt that if you will shew openly and unreservedly that true desire for reconciliation which I doubt not possesses you, that all will soon be at peace.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Probably here and in no. 235 a mistake for Steeple Barton. The Rector of Steeple Aston was Joseph Burrows — see no. 506, etc.

228. To the Rev. G. W. Jordan[1] *(ii 5)*
Private

Lavington, May 1, 1848

Rev & Dear Sir,

I have been at once astonished & pained by the letter I have received from you. But trusting that I may attribute its improper language rather to the haste which seems to pervade it, than to an intention of insulting your Bishop, I try once more what may be the effect of a friendly communication.

In my former letter I gave you my judgement upon the course you had pursued; I shewed you that as to repelling Mr Lys[2] from the Communion you had the letter of the law with you; that as to repelling him from Church, you had no such authority; I quoted to you Stillingfleets Judgement (I believe that by mistake I wrote Gibsons) on the obligatory nature of Canons to set you free from any conscientious scruple; & I offered to communicate with Mr Lys & lead him to acknowledgement, if in any thing he had offended — all this I did in the earnest desire of saving you from the attempt to occupy a position which must much injure your ministry from its being esteemed needlessly offensive to a brother clergyman of inoffensive character. I have received communications from the Gentry & Clergy around you as well as from your Ecclesiastical Superior, all speaking the same language. To these I have not yet replied; & even to Mr Lys have merely acknowledged his letter; because I am anxious that the concession should appear to come from you. To you I have spoken openly. Now once more let me entreat you to seek peace in this matter. What possible evil can come to you from Mr Lys' sharing Mr Ashurst's[3] pew? How can it do otherwise than weaken your Ministry; & increase dissention [*sic*] in your parish for you to take a line which all bystanders judge to be using vexatiously an extreme right against an inoffensive man. Moreover if you continue to take the line you have unhappily announced it must become known that it is condemned by your brother clergymen, by your Archdeacon & your Bishop. And How can it but weaken your hands if you compel me to write to the Churchwardens of your parish informing them that you have no right to exclude Mr Lys from your Church & directing them to see him freely admitted. Yet on reflection you must see that I cannot allow you to infringe the just liberty of all members of the Church without pointing out their duty to your Churchwardens.

Once more then let me entreat you to reconsider this matter. If there has been any neglect of the proper respect due to you from Mr Lys, I will gladly (as I said before) give him such advice as will I doubt not lead to his seeking to set himself right with you. It is my earnest desire to strengthen your hands & those of every other Clergyman of my Diocese in his parish. But to do this effectually I must speak with plainness & openness to them if in any matter they are injuring their own usefulness.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

My address will be 61, Eaton Place.

[1] Gibbes Walker Jordan (1800–56), R. of Waterstock, 1827–56 (C). The Bishop was told that Mr. Jordan was 'a quiet man, but talker, does little. the two Miss Ashursts admirable curates' (Diocese Book, I, f. 39).

[2] John Thomas Lys (d. 1871), V. of Merton 1826–33, Waterperry, 1833–42 (O).

[3] John Henry Ashurst (1813–85) of Waterstock.

229. To the Rev. H. A. Small[1] *(ii 6)*
Confidential

Lavington Petworth, May 1, 1848
Address 61 Eaton Place

Rev. & Dear Sir,

A Rumour has just reached me which leads me at once to address a few lines to you in strict confidence. It is that you are about to contract a marriage within the degrees which our law prohibits. I most earnestly hope that you can set my mind entirely at rest by at once assuring me that there is no foundation whatever for such a report. But should there unhappily be any ground for it, let me implore you to consider before it be too late what all the consequences must be of a step so fatal to your peace of mind & usefulness: & so full of scandal & evil to the Church of which you are a Minister.

I write in full confidence & am Rev. & Dear Sir, Ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

230. To the Rev. J. R. Pretyman *(ii 7)*
Private

Lavington, May 1
Address 61 Eaton Place

My Dear Sir,

I have given my best consideration to your letter; and I think that without at all impugning Mr Bakers veracity, it does modify considerably, so far as your view is concerned, his statement. It is plain that all turns on a question of *degree*: just *the* question which never can be brought to decision. For Mr Baker states; & I do not understand you to dissent that the answering voices of the Choir were not given *in harmony*: it is therefore only a question of how far the united, & loud, & I suppose measured, responses of the choir constituted a difference *in kind* or *in degree* from your former Services. Now I agree entirely in your estimate of the injudiciousness of any such change: specially at such a time & with a half disciplined choir. But our estimate of this must not make us unjust to Mr Baker: *He* was persuaded that no change in the performance of the Service save a perfected degree of the same kind, was introduced: and he ought to have from us the full & hearty credence which his past conduct has earned for him. Thus circumstances then, whilst with *your* view some annoyance of feeling was most natural, with *his* view your language as you state it must have appeared to him to be overbearing & harsh — & I do not think that under such circumstances the *substance* of what you report as his answer was such as to merit any grave censure at all — nor has there been anything which seems to me blameable in his subsequent communications to me. The word *rude* to which you take exception must have been mine & not his. I do not remember using it: but I meant to describe the impression made upon me by the tone of your reply, to whether he was expected at Mr Tindals, & to his request of a holiday.

Upon the whole then this seems to me to be a case in which you should on no account allow the difference to grow into a permanent bitterness or ground of estrangement. It is one in which I would beg you to say that you expressed strongly your disapproval of what you deemed an alteration in the Service unallowed by you. But that you accepted Mr Bakers assurance that this was not intended; &

[1] Henry Alexander Small, R. of Haversham 1827–56, Clifton Reynes, 1832–63. See no. 607.

that with your acceptance of that assurance you withdrew from him the expressions which had pained him. It will then be for him to express his regret that his answer savoured of warmth; & to assure you that there shall be no danger hereafter of your believing him to introduce anything you have not sanctioned.

This seems to me the Christian & the true course for you to take. I cannot think (if as I imagine you have always trusted him before) it possible that your trust in him can be shaken by this occurrence; & whether his permanent stay with you at Aylesbury shall be judged expedient or not, I am sure that his leaving you on such a ground as this, with mutual estrangement would be wrong; & would most assuredly become a matter of grievous scandal to the Church of which you are a Minister.

Let me my dear Sir entreat you by the meekness & gentleness of Christ not to be too careful exactly to require from your brother all you may deem your due, but to be ready to meet him even more than half way in explanation & the search after reconciliation.

I am my dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

231. To the Rev. J. T. Lys *(ii 8)*
Private

Lavington, May 2, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have to apologize to you for having in my former reply to you addressed you as a layman; not being aware that my correspondent was a Clergyman. It has been very unwillingly that I have thus long delayed sending you a full reply. But you will I think see that I could not do so until I had completed a yet incomplete correspondence with Mr Jordan; to whom I wrote on receiving your complaint. I am still not free from this difficulty. But I may venture to say in answer to your letter received this morning.

1st That in my judgement Mr Jordan has neither right nor power to exclude you from Mr Ashursts seat nor your family from the seat of Mr Ashursts family whenever you please to attend there.

II. That he has the letter of the Canon with him in remitting you *to communicate* at Milton. But that

III. Mr Ellis[1] approving of your communicating at Waterstock & *neighbourhood* disposing you to do so, I see no real infraction of the Canon in your doing so & advise Mr Jordan to waive all objection to your doing so.

IV. As I understood Mr Jordan to ground his Objections to your continuing to attend his Church, on some want of cordiality to him manifested by you, I offered my services as mediator & expressed my readiness to exhort you earnestly to see full reconcilement.

Mr Jordan it appears to me from the letters you have now enclosed perceives the mistake he has made & is desirous of retracing his steps. I should advise you to meet him half way in this move. I should advise you to reply to this effect. 'That you could not waive your legal right to sit in Mr Ashursts seat whenever he & you pleased during the Public Services at Waterstock Church: but that as you learned that my Judgement was that he could *legally* remit you to Great Milton for the Communion, you accepted as a token of friendly feeling his waiving that right at your desire & the Bishops advice. That you assured him of

[1] Thomas Ellis (1763–1848), V. of Great Milton (O).

your friendly feeling; & should be ready in forgetfulness of all past annoyance to shake hands cordially with him whenever you might meet. As to the turning to the East my advice would be as it is a matter of entire indifference except as a decent custom that you should conform to the Custom of those around you, singularity *either way*, appearing to me more undesireable than either turning or not turning.

I should earnestly trust that Mr Gibbes Jordan would receive such an overture as this in the spirit in which it was made & I am sure from the testimony of friends & neighbours that you know enough practically of the Spirit of the Gospel rather to Win a brother by kindness; than (even if it were possible which as to *one* of Mr J's requirements it is not) to overbear him by authority.

My address will be 61 Eaton Place & I trust you will be able soon to report to me entire peace.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

232. To the Rev. T. Curme[1] *(ii 9)*

Lavington, May 2, 1848
Address 61 Eaton Place

Rev. & Dear Sir,

One of the County papers has inserted a statement to which I beg to call your attention & of which I hope you will be able to send me a contradiction.

It is that you attended a public meeting in a place of Dissenting Worship, the meeting being held to hear & consider the Statements of a Clergyman (suspended by the Courts for irregularity) in condemnation of His Diocesan.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

233. To the Rev. T. Curme *(iii 163)*

Private

61 Eaton Place, May 5, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I am very sorry that you cannot contradict the report concerning which I questioned you; and I am sorry for the tone of your reply as well as its substance. There was nothing in my enquiry which needed any reference to the 'rights of man' or of 'an Englishman'. I had no thought of any legal question, or legal penalties when I wrote to you.

But there are many things which are highly inexpedient which yet cannot be punished by law — and I feel it my painful duty to say to you with all distinctness that I esteem your conduct in this instance to be one of these.

If there is no difference between us & dissenters what can our Ordinal and all our reformed liturgy mean? How can we justify in God's sight continuing in a body which by refusing to acknowledge their ministry is guilty of the highest breach of charity if there is no sufficient reason for maintaining separation. Either we Churchmen have ground from God's word for being thus distinctively Churchmen, or we are the most miserable schismatics. If we *have* ground for such separation there must be, in a clergyman taking part (as I have since I wrote

1 Thomas Curme (1806–84), V. of Sandford St. Martin, 1841–84; domestic chaplain to the Duke of Marlborough (O). See no. 506.

seen that you did), in a meeting held for such a purpose, as that for which this was called, *in the Meeting House, and under the superintendence* of one who has himself renounced the ministry of our Church & 'caused division', the most painful inconsistency. It is one thing to have the largest charity toward separatists; another to receive the endowments attached to the office of a teacher in a church which condemns their separation and yet to join them as closely as can be done with legal impunity in the acts of their separation.

I have felt it my duty my dear Sir, to express to you my opinion on this matter; & (with no idea of doing any further than thus sending you in a friendly spirit my judgement on this case, to which I am sure you will give the weight which is due to my office), to entreat you to abstain in future from a line of action which grieves the heart of your brethren in the Ministry: which weakens their hands: which I am confident will injure your ministry, in the full prosperity of which it is my heart's desire to rejoice with you; and which is gravely and entirely condemned by him, who, however unworthy, is set over you in the Lord; and to whom therefore, in matters of doubtful obligation I know you would desire for Christ's sake to defer.

I remain, Rev. & Dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

234. To the Rev. E. P. Cooper[1] *(iii 164)*

61 Eaton Place, June 12, 1848

My dear Sir,

I am anxious as you desire to give you a perfectly independent judgement on the plan you have suggested: but I find some little difficulty in expressing on paper my exact impression of it. *If you*, whilst you were able to invigorate the whole ministry of the Parish, had proposed to me to have an able bodied assistant and half a deacon, I should have approved heartily of the suggestion. But if I understand your plan aright, you will now be able to depend little upon your own energy, and the efficiency of the ministry will mainly depend upon your chief curate and half deacon. I should not deal honestly with you if I did not say that I should not expect this to prove practically an efficient arrangement. I should have more hope almost from the *absence* of the vicar, and the exertions of 2 curates than from his frequent presence whilst yet he devolved the main charge upon the curates. For I think in this last case, that whilst all *really* rested on the curates they still would not feel that full sense of responsibility which is so essential to a thoroughly effective ministry: & so the Parish would not have the full benefit either of you or of them.

You will tell me if I have in any way misapprehended your plan: and believe me to be My dear Sir Ever very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

235. To the Rev. R. Wright *(iii 165)*

61 Eaton Place, June 13, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I beg to call your immediate attention to a letter I wrote to you on the 17th of April, and to which I have as yet received no reply. In that letter I stated

[1] Edward Philip Cooper (1795–1864), Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, 1812–25; V. of Burford 1836–50, Little Dalby, Leics., 1852–64.

to you that I must have a *resident* curate at Steeple Ashton[1] [*sic*]; and two full duties; and that I desired you to take the needful steps to secure this without loss of time.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

236. To the Bishop of Exeter (H. Phillpotts) (*ii 10*)

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, June 15, 1848

My dear Lord,

Your kind letter finds me in the midst of an ordination examination & almost too busy to reply to it. But to You I need not fear writing what first occurs; you can methodize it at once. The Meeting last week shewed a wide spread & intense disatisfaction with the Government, & specially with Mr Kay Shuttleworth.[2] The error was the application of the indignation. If (as it was with us a few months since when the late Arch B:[3] had committed us absolutely to the existing management clauses) we had no hope of improving the actual clauses I think we could *only* have contended for Absolute liberty — & *I* was then prepared to do so. But I have since seen at the Nat: Soc: that absolute liberty will in nine cases out of ten be turned against the Church: from the need of builders of Schools: their simplicity & Shuttleworths subtelty — I am therefore clear that we need clauses for the protection of the Church. All our effort should be getting safe clauses — I should think it best that you should *not* say in a charge what would be safe clauses: because I think that such a declaration might make the negotiations of the Committee of the Nat. Soc. more difficult with the P.C. But that pointing out: (1) That the Church needs fixed conditions such as safe sound clauses would be, to prevent her being beaten in detail, (2) recommending addresses to this effect to the Nat Soc to strengthen its Committee's hands; & enable it with the full concurrence of Clergy & Laity to require that Church Schools should have bona fide Church Management in *the Committee* & in *the Appeal*,[4] (the last being *the* great point of all) might be very useful.

Your Lordship will interpret obscurity & excuse haste.

I am Ever My dear Lord, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

237. To the Rev. J. Marsh[5] (*ii 12*)

61 Eaton Place, July 11, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

It gives me the greatest pleasure to feel able to assure you that I think you have *entirely* disproved the charge which was brought against you; & that the enquiries to which it has led have led to very kindly expressions concerning you

1 See no. 226.

2 Sir James Phillips Kay-Shuttleworth (1804–77), 1st Bart., as Sec. to the Committee of Council on Education 1839–49 (*DNB*), was in conflict on the question of Church schools.

3 Howley.

4 These two words are underlined twice.

5 John Marsh (1820–55), Fellow of New College, 1838–54; C. of Hardwicke, 1843–53; R. of Tingewick, 1853–5.

both from your Rector and parishioners. I believe at the same time that the charge did not originate in malice, but from circumstances which have since been explained to my full satisfaction as regards yourself.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very Sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

I return you the letters you sent me & which you may wish to retain.

238. To the Rev. C. Erle[1] *(ii 13)*

61 Eaton Place, July 11

My Dear Sir,

I return you with thanks Lord Nugents[2] letter & am very happy to be able to add, that I am entirely satisfied of Mr Marsh's innocence from the Crime imputed to him; & return him his sword with all honour. I believe that *circumstances* account for the imputation.

I am My dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

239. To T. Tindal[3] *(ii 14)*

Eaton Place, July 11, 48

My Dear Sir,

Many thanks for your note as to Mr Marsh.

I am convinced from careful enquiry that he was entirely innocent of the Charge brought against him: which originated in circumstances capable of full explanation.

I just saw Mr & Mrs Acton Tindal.[4]

I wish I had known they were staying at Oxford that I might have tried to tempt them over to Cuddesdon.

I am my dear Sir most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

240. To the Rev. T. Silvester *(ii 15)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 15, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Mr Crowe[5] has as you are aware agreed to nominate a Second Curate for Buckingham at my advice; & having left the nomination to me I have offered it to the Rev. G. Cole,[6] who has accepted it. I am now most anxious to arrange with you for such a partition of the duties as shall be at once satisfactory to you & secure the full efficiency of Mr Cole. Of course where two Curates are to act

1 Christopher Erle (1790–1870), Fellow of New College, 1812–34; R. of Hardwicke, Bucks., 1833–70.

2 George Nugent-Grenville (1789–1850), 2nd and last Baron Nugent; a Bucks. landowner.

3 Thomas Tindal (d. 1850), of the Prebendal House in Aylesbury.

4 Acton Tindal (d. 1880), clerk of the peace for Bucks., who bought the manor of Aylesbury from the 2nd Duke of Buckingham in 1848. Nos. 239a–e (p. 407) follow here.

5 Henry Crowe (1768–1851), Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, 1793–1800; V. of Buckingham, 1810–51. He was non-resident through ill-health for the last 32 years of his incumbency. Cf. also no. 291.

6 George Cole held curacies in Liverpool, Ipswich, Weymouth, and Chelsea before becoming C. of Buckingham 1848–50, and of Rainham, Kent, 1850–66; he was (at last) V. of Bethersden, Kent, 1866–9, and P.C. of St. Michael's, Liverpool, 1869–75 (C).

together & neither to be subordinate to the other some such partition of duty is essential. You will perhaps consider the subject & write to me as soon as you can. It would I think be well if you divided the public duty by some fixed rule. I know that Mr Cole wishes to take the Evening Service: and it would not I believe interfere with your just rights if you allowed him to do so, on an engagement that he would pay over to you £20 out of whatever might be the receipts of the lectureship.

You will also consider whether it would be well to divide the Town into two fixed districts so that the visiting of one district should appertain to you & of the other to him; or in what way you would this might be best arranged. Only however it was settled I think that it would be well that a full liberty should be left to Parishioners to ask for the visit of either Clergyman; since otherwise those who had during your long ministry become attached to you might be unable to send for you; & any who may grow attached to him might have a like ground of complaint.

As I am anxious to set Mr Cole to work without loss of time I will ask you to give your immediate attention to the subject — and pray believe that I am thoroughly anxious to secure your comfort in this arrangement; not only because all will depend on the Harmonious Co-operation of two Clergyman [*sic*] working together as far as regards the Spiritual welfare of the parish, but also because such consideration is your just due.

I am My dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

241. To the Churchwardens of Heyford Warren (*ii 16*)

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 16, 1848

Gentlemen,

The Rev. W. I. Baker[1] in a letter to the Rural Dean forwarded to me, complains that the Church at Heyford is disturbed during afternoon Service by riotous conduct; that he has called upon you to interfere to secure order; but that you have not done so. I beg to ask you for some explanation of this grave charge. For such it undoubtedly is — since it is one great part of your duties as Church Wardens to see that none behave without becoming reverence of outward demeanour in the House of God during divine service. I must also beg you to assure me of your attention to this matter for the time to come.

I am Gen^{tn} Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

242. To the Rev. W. I. Baker (*ii 17*)

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 16, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I learn from the Rural Dean that your afternoon Service has been disturbed by some disorderly conduct: & that you complain of your Church Wardens as having neglected their duty in interfering to prevent it. I have written to your Church Wardens for an explanation of this neglect. But I learn also that you intimate to the Rural Dean your intention (in consequence of these interruptions) of discontinuing your afternoon service. I am therefore obliged to call upon you to continue that service; since I cannot allow you to omit its regular performance.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] William Innes Baker (1779–1859), R. of Upper Heyford, 1821–59 (O).

243. To the Rev. J. Trevitt[1] *(ii 18)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 16, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have communicated your letter to Mr Curtis[2] for his remarks & he has given me accounts of a conversation before witnesses &c. which goes far to release him from the *engagement* contained in his letter to you. But beyond this he sends me an extract from a letter of yours of last May in which you say 'you may rely upon me to give you no trouble about going out at Christmas &c.' Now this letter effectually bars your pleading any earlier engagement: and I should urge in the strongest way upon you that you are clearly bound by it to give up the House & Curacy at Xmas without any six months notice. I hope that you will be, as you have been hitherto, ready to act in this matter upon my judgement of your duty and assure me by return of post that you will at Xmas next yield possession to Mr Curtis.

[*Unfinished*]

244. To the Rev. E. L. Davies[3] *(ii 11)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 18, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have received your application to be licensed to the Curacy of Stowe; & make no objection to the slight technical inaccuracy to which you very properly call my attention. But there is a more important point upon which I must request you to give me satisfaction before I license you. You will be placed if you become the Curate of Stowe in the midst of a country which is much given to field sports: & I feel it to be so important to the true efficiency of your Ministry that you should not be ensnared by the facilities which may lead you to become a sportsman that I must beg you to give me your assurance that you will not join in any field sports whilst you hold my license.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours most truly,

S. Oxon.

245. To the Rev. G. W. St. John[4] *(ii 19)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 19, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

If I understand aright your positions in your last letter, you assert an immunity from all legal charge for providing for duty in Woodstock Chapel within your benefice of Bladon. It is clearly most important that it should be settled whether such a claim can be maintained; & I presume that you have some evidence to produce in support of it. That evidence it is my duty to weigh: & I will do so carefully on receiving it from you. Since your predecessors have discharged this duty *the presumption* of course is that you are bound to provide for it: and I must beg you to lay before me as speedily as you can your grounds for supposing yourself free from this obligation. *In the mean time, provisionally*, as you think that your

[1] James Trevitt (b. 1813), C. of Padworth, 1847; his subsequent career is uncertain, but his address was Hartley Wintney, Hants., in 1868 (O).

[2] George William Curtis (1788–1865), V. of Leominster, 1819–23; R. of Padworth 1823–65, Wennington, Essex, 1826–65 (C).

[3] Edward Lewis Davies was licensed to the curacy of Stowe on 11 October 1848. He is perhaps to be identified with Edward Lutwyche Davies, who was R. of Thurrock Parva, Essex, 1860–7 (O).

[4] George William St. John (1796–1876), grandson of 2nd Viscount Bolingbroke; V. of Stanton Lacy, Salop, 1820–47 and R. of Bladon, 1847–76 (O). See nos. 239 cde.

discharging double duty at each Church might compromise your legal position, I allow you to give only one Service at Bladon Church, on condition. 1st that such service is at an hour convenient to the parishioners & when the Service need not be in any degree hurried to secure its closing in time for a Service being performed at Woodstock. & IIly that you begin the full double duty on Sunday next at Woodstock.

I consent to this as a provisional arrangement mainly from your stating to me what is quite new to me, that the Woodstock House was given by Bishop Fell for the use of the Rector of Bladon & not of the Minister of Woodstock.[1] Upon this point then I must beg you to give me as full information as you are able. I shall be glad if you can send me 1st The exact words of Bishop Fell's gift. II. The grounds of your opinion that Woodstock Chapel is not an ordinary consecrated Chapel of Ease to Bladon. II [*sic*] a statement of any payment which is made for the Service of Woodstock Chapel: its amount; the persons by whom it is paid; & the date of its commencement. IV. A Statement of the Exact Sum for which the tithes of Bladon are commuted; & whether any part of those tithes are paid in respect of Woodstock.

You will see that I am anxious to ascertain the validity of your supposed legal immunity from the duty of Woodstock Chapel: and I am sure that I may calculate upon your giving me all the assistance in your power in ascertaining the facts of the case. It is of great moment to me to be quite clear upon the point that I may be sure I am not acting wrongly in allowing the Rector of Bladon to occupy Bishop Fell's house instead of compelling him to restore & occupy Bladon Parsonage.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

246. To the Rev. J. Fry[2] (*ii 20*)

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 19, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I shall be quite ready to wait until your return home before I look for your reply upon the matters enumerated in my former letter, if your being able there to refer to others will enable you to reply more easily.

But I am bound to say to you that I have read with greatest pain your reply to my letter. It seems to me the very opposite in many respects to what I should from my estimate of your Christian character have expected from you. Let me beg you to reconsider as in the Sight of God both your answer & the circumstances of the case. I write to you, being charged by Our Lord with the heavy burden of the Care of the Churches, & tell you that complaints have been made to me of an omission of duty on your part. I give you no intimation that I believe the charges; but I request you to answer them; What under such circumstances is a presbyters plain duty? Surely it is meekly & trustfully to reply to his Bishop as to one whose duty it is to enquire, & who has a right from his office to enquire.

What on the other hand is your conduct. You reply, first with indignation, that I should expose you to 'Secret Scrutiny' & then secondly you proceed to charge me with 'sanctioning secret espionage abhorred by honourable feeling &c' & thirdly *to decide* that the charge is so evidently malicious that it does not need an answer. My dear Sir; is this 'the mind which was in Christ Jesus?' Is this

1 John Fell (1625–86) was Dean of Christ Church 1660–86, and Bishop of Oxford, 1675–86 (*DNB*).

2 Addressed to the Rev. John Fry (untraced). Cf. nos. 257, 263.

imputation of dishonourable conduct to your Bishop because he states at once to you privately the particulars of a charge brought against you, the temper which 'when reviled revileth not again'. What in point of fact did it matter whether the charge was brought maliciously or not? Suppose that it had been. Was that any reason why I should not call upon you to answer it? If it was *true* it was equally my duty to point out to you your fault, from whatever motive the teller of the truth had made it known to me.

Is it not my duty if I am to overlook my Diocese to hear all men? If indeed I had brought on insufficient grounds a *public* charge against you, you would have had cause for complaint. But how can a Bishop act more kindly & honestly than by at once enquiring privately of the party charged with any fault? Would you approve of a Bishop who said. 'No A.B. stands so high in my esteem that I refuse to ask him to explain'? Would Christ our Lord at the Judgement Day esteem such conduct 'Ruling with Diligence'? And would it even be kind to the accused? Would such a sentence be worth anything in the judgement of any wise man?

I will put your own case to you. You *assume* that I have had '*secret*': you imply anonymous, you say insufficient information; & you sit in judgement on me & condemn me. Who told you my information was secret? How can you possibly know whether it was sufficient or not. You know only that I thought it sufficient & for so thinking it you proceed to condemn me. Now I have no objection to your knowing in this case from whom the complaint came to me (Though I cannot allow that this has anything to do with my plain duty of enquiring in all cases) because I hope your knowing may tend to open your eyes to the Spirit in which your letter was written. The complaint from Lord Curzon [*sic*]:[1] he found the facts believed amongst his fathers tenants; & in my judgement most kindly & properly laid them privately before me to give you an opportunity of explaining them.

And now my dear Sir, I will say no more. Did I not believe that you are governed by Christian principles I would not have said so much: but trusting that this is so I feel it to be a duty to take any trouble in my power to win you if so it may be to a better spirit & to an acknowledgement of your fault.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

247. To the Rev. E. J. Speck (*ii 21*)

Address Lavington, Aug. 24, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Immediately upon hearing from you I put myself into communication with Mr Fry: but owing to his being ill it is only today that I have received an answer from him.

Mr Fry is willing to be entirely guided by me as to the compensation you should receive: and I had thought of naming £50–0– over & above the £43–15–0 as what he should pay you. But I grieve to say that Mr Fry complains keenly, & *if the facts are as he has stated them*, not in my judgement unreasonably of the line you have taken of late. He states that you have raised a party against him in his parish: spread an exparte statement amongst the neighbouring Clergy; & even stated at a clerical meeting that 'I had said that I was induced to give my

[1] George Augustus Frederick Louis Curzon-Howe (1821–76), styled Viscount Curzon to 1870; son of the 1st Earl Howe, whom he succeeded in 1870. The family owned land in S. Bucks.

consent to your removal by a representation I have since found to be false': this statement at the clerical meeting being made either by yourself or by some friend acting on your information. The result of all which is that Mr Fry's nephew quite shrinks from the Curacy, whilst his own mind is deeply wounded. I trust that (as is common) these reports have reached him in an exaggerated form: yet I cannot but fear from the tone of your letter to me that they are not without some foundation. I do therefore my dear Sir for your own sake & the sake of the Church most earnestly beseech you to give your whole diligence heartily to endeavour so to leave Emberton as to leave no unpleasant feelings behind you. Of course to our own evil nature the temptation must be strong to act otherwise. And it will be a *subtle* temptation also. It will be easy for a man to think, '*I* have nothing to do with this feeling as to my successor' but it can be allayed by you, & by you only; & *therefore* at the Great day it will lie against you if through the rise of such a spirit of opposition to your successor the work of God is marred for years in that Parish. You know well that I have always told you that I am sure Mr Fry never intended to practise the least deceit either towards you or me. That I esteem his fault in the matter, his having too largely promised you continuance so that when his views altered *you* felt naturally aggrieved. For this disappointment it is that I think he may fairly be called on to pay you the £50–0–0 over & above the payment of the £43–15–0, nomine compensationis, towards your expences in removal. And this I have no doubt that he will pay when you leave at Michlemas: but whether he does it readily or with pain will, I have also no doubt, depend upon the temper & spirit of your resignation.

I trust that you will allow me to re-assure his mind on this subject.

Ever My Dear Sir, Believe me to remain, Very Sincerely Yours,

S. Oxon.

248. To the Rev. T. Fry (*ii 22*)

Address Lavington Petworth, Aug. 25, 1848

My dear Sir,

I am much grieved to hear from you that Mr Speck has 'raised any party against' you at Emberton, or misrepresented your conduct & my judgement by 'an exparte statement'. I hope that these reports as is common have reached you in an exaggerated form. I am quite clear that I have said nothing which could warrant for a moment the representation that you have deceived me. I may have said that when I at first acquiesced readily in Mr Specks removal to make way for your nephew that I did not know you had raised in Mr Specks mind such confident expectations of non removal so long as you were satisfied with his conduct. I have always felt that this was *the* weak point of your case. I know you had no intention of for a moment deceiving him or me; but I think you rashly assured him of permanence at Emberton subject to your approval of him; & then that when from altered views you wished to place your nephew there you hardly enough remembered the expectations you had raised or estimated sufficiently *his* disappointment. It is because I think that he really may justly feel disappointed that I wish you besides paying the £43–15–0 for which you receive some return to give him the £50–0–0 in nomine compensationis; and I am heartily glad that you are willing in this to act upon my opinion.

I have written to Mr Speck expressing strongly my regret at what I have heard from you: & urging him once more to quit Emberton as I think he ought to quit it and I cannot but hope that my letter may be effectual.

I shall be very glad to hear from you as to the Toot Baldon matter. The money you sent & the former £100–0–0 are both invested in the $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cents.

I am my dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

249. To the Rev. J. W. Knott[1] *(ii 23)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 28, 1848

My dear Sir,

I have read very carefully through the Sermon which you sent to me: & I desire as you requested me to do to speak to you with all friendly plainness as becomes my office concerning it. You will find marked in page *3* the passage to which (doubtless) your hearer who communicated with you took objection. But I would rather speak to you upon the whole tenour [*sic*] of the sermon than on particular passages in it. What strikes me then concerning it is this: that there is so to speak in its whole construction & working out a lack of that which I should call emphatically the Christian Element. I think the Christian treatment of Pride would be to shew its contrariety to God's will; & to the mind of Christ. That *therefore* wherever it *reigned*: it was a clear proof that there was no living faith in Christ, no yielding to the influences of the blessed Spirit. That where it *remained* it was a resisting that Spirit & an endangering Salvation. Now your way of treating it seems to be rather this; we must be humble to have our good works allowed us: humility is so essential a part of that obedience which is to save us, that without we have it nothing else will be counted to us'. Now this whole scheme seems to me to be the leaving out of sight the great truth that though we cannot be saved without humility (because without we have humility which is one certain work of the Spirit we cannot really be belonging to Christ, & without really belonging to Him we cannot be saved) that we are not in any measure saved by our humility. Your tone never seems to me to be: 'if any man be in X Jesus he is a new creature &c.' 'Let this mind be in you which was also in X Jesus'. But it is, your other good qualities are not really valuable unless this is added. Weigh all this for yourself: Weigh the effect of such a sentence as that: *page 3* 'The Devils lost Heaven &c. We *are to regain* the image of God paradise & heaven *by trying*[2] to be as little children'. Not by the Working of Gods Spirit & this is one of his Works, but 'by trying'.

There is no allusion to the great Master truth that Pride as *self* dependance; is, even formally, a renouncing of Christ as our only justification; & of dependance on him for all things; no allusion to His Work who only can make us humble. And it is I think this systematic *omission* which I think must make the sermon *jar* on the thoroughly Christianized mind; & will I feel sure prevent its having the effect you would wish it to have of producing or aiding the obtaining of real Christian humility.

On the other matter which I mentioned to you I would also say a word. Those who were present certainly believe 1st That whenever you *passed* the Communion table you turned round & bowed to it. IIly that you went & knelt expressly before the Cross at the close of service in secret prayer. Now there may be too great a sensitiveness on such matters on the other side; but if it be so it is only more important that you should not give offence by actions, which, if they

[1] John William Knott (1822–70), Fellow of Brasenose, 1844–67; C. of St. Paul's, Oxford, 1846; V. of St. Saviour's, Leeds, 1851–9, Christ Church, Roxeth, Middlesex, 1864–6, East Ham, 1866–70.

[2] These two words are underlined twice.

mean nothing objectionable are at all events needless; which border at least upon trifling in most holy things & which are rather contrary to the customs of our own Church; & savouring of those of another Church; to which there have been quite enough recent defections to warrant *in sober minded Christians*, a reasonable fear as to those who take the first steps in the same direction.

I beg you earnestly to lay these words to heart. I cannot but believe that the scantiness of Christian doctrine I have above noted; the lack of bringing out the constraining motives, glorious offers, & blessed Priviledges of the Free Salvation of which we are the partakers, as the only source of a holy life, is very often connected with an over value of the *externals* of the Christian Church.

I am my dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

250. To the Rev. P. Jacob[1] (*ii 24*)

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 28, 1848

Dearest Philip,

I agree with every word of your Critique upon Knotts Sermon: & I have written to him very fully & faithfully.[2] I have also spoken to him as to the kneeling before the Cross & bowing to it. Thank you for the sight of your good brothers note: but I cannot go with him as I do with you. I think his note is conceived in the true Puritan style just as Mr K's Sermon is in the mitigated Tractarian. I think he has a most exaggerated notion of the Evil of a man finding his recollection of the presence of God increased by praying *in one place*: by looking even at a Cross & the like. Of course the *abuse* is patent to me. If the man thinks his prayer more acceptable it is all evil: if he finds that he is more self-recollected from such external aids I see no harm in it. But the notion of removing the Cross from the Church seems to me in the true Will Dowsing Spirit.[3] Some of our really good people seem to me to feel about the instruments of our dear Lords passion as they would about Juggernaut.

[*Unfinished*]

251. To the Rev. E. L. Davies (*ii 26*)

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 28, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

If you will look again at my letter of Aug. 18,[4] you will I think perceive that yours which reached me yesterday is no answer to it. I pointed out to you my reasons for thinking it peculiarly important that the Curate to be licensed to Stowe should not be a sportsman: and I asked whether you would give me your word that so long as you held my license for that Curacy you would entirely abstain from sporting. To this you give me no reply.

I must therefore once more ask you for a distinct & categorical answer to this question; whether you will or will not give me this pledge.[5]

I remain Rev. & Dear Sir, Ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Philip Jacob (1803–84), R. of Crawley, Hants., 1831–84, Canon Residentiary of Winchester, 1834. Archdeacon of Winchester, 1860 (*MEB*).
2 See no. 249.
3 William Dowsing (1596?–1679?), was a well-known iconoclast of the 1640's (*DNB*).
4 No. 244.
5 Davies complied.

252. To the Rev. G. W. Curtis *(ii 25)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 30, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Since I heard last from you I have been in close communication with Mr. Trevitt. I find in him every disposition to act upon my recommendations: but he pleads, I think with reason, that he had been led to form an expectation of remaining at Padworth the disappointment of which with any suddenness must involve him in expence: and he therefore pleads, (1) either for a pecuniary consideration equivalent to his expences or (2) to be allowed to remain till next midsummer of [*sic*] such earlier time as may have allowed him to find another position as eligible as that which he is to resign. I strongly advise you to accept this latter alternative: in which case you will meet with no difficulty in re-entering on your parish at next Midsummer.[1]

I shall be glad to hear from you your decision upon this point and remain Rev. & Dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

253. To the Rev. H. A. Small *(ii 27)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 30, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have learned with much surprize that you have intermitted for some Sundays one of the Regular Sunday duties at Clifton Reynes serving the Church yourself from a distance. I must call on you *at once* to resume double duty there; & the full duty at your other living & *immediately* to nominate a Curate for Clifton Reynes. The day of private ordination approaches & if you are at any loss for a Curate I can find an eligible young man whom I will ordain to it rather than have any further interruption of the regular charge of the Parish. I must beg your immediate attention to this matter.

I have been expecting to hear from you ever since our interview in Eaton Place.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

254. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(ii 28)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 30

My dear Sir,

I do not think that the Curates Aid Society could consistently with their duty to their subscribers allow Mr Poulter[2] to undertake the Diocesan School.

You formerly agreed to give Mr Malcolm[3] a title for Orders. If you would consent to give a title & £20 to an *additional* Curate if I can find an eligible man to aid a little in the parish & undertake this School I think you would at a very small cost greatly benefit your parish in two ways. I shall be very thankful if you will adopt this suggestion.

As to Miss Pontifex[4] it is of course impossible for me to decide without hearing her case; & I have therefore desired the Rural dean to obtain it in writing & forward it to me. But from your expressions I fear you have a little

1 But see no. 290.

2 James Poulter, of Trinity College, Dublin; C. of High Wycombe, 1847; Master of the Royal Free Grammar School, High Wycombe, 1852–79.

3 Unidentified.

4 Organist of High Wycombe Church (see no. 272).

overstepped your power. If the Vestry elected it was with your consent, or implied consent that she discharged these duties in your Church. She was then of course engaged for *a certain time*, & that with your implied consent. Without proof of great misconduct she could sustain her action for a broken contract. Again you speak of appointing a successor. I take for granted then that you mean to pay him instead of the Vestry paying: & I greatly doubt the expediency of this if they are ready to pay. I am grieved to hear of Walkers[1] affliction & with very kind remembrances am ever yours most truly & sincerely

S. Oxon.

255. To the Rev. E. J. Speck *(ii 29)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 31

My dear Sir,

Mr Foster's letters seem to me distinctly to establish the fact that his impression was derived from Mr Fry's letter & not from your representations: & I rejoice to find it so. Still I think that your *only* safety from unawares stirring up hostile feelings to Mr Fry is to be found in your *saying nothing* upon the subject of your discussion with him. My own view of the case remains unaltered. Mr Fry has meant fairly throughout: but anticipating no alterations in his plans he promised you permanence in your Curacy with a very ill judged though kindly meant absence of expressed conditions. When circumstances changed in a way he had never expected, he too easily supposed that you would feel with him that his promise had been really contingent & not absolute. For this mistake & your disappointment he is willing at my desire (as you know) to pay you £50–0–0 over & above the £43–15–0 — and these sums he has placed in my hands to be paid over to you, on your leaving the Curacy. I earnestly trust that this further concession on his part may seem to you sufficient. When you speak of the 'injustice' of his Conduct; I think you as little bear in mind the hardship he would suffer if he were held to expression he used too rashly *in another sense*, as you feel that he forgets your natural disappointment. It is a case for mutual concession & forgiveness of un-intended evil. & I trust that your Christian Spirit will allow you so to take it.

I am most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

256. To the Rev. T. Fry *(ii 30)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 31, 1848

My dear Sir,

I am very glad that you have so readily consented to act on my advice as to this additional £50: & I trust that its payment may quiet Mr Specks mind. I am bound to tell you that he solemnly disclaims any intentional stirring up of ill will against you either at Emberton or amongst your brother Clergy: & whilst I think he may have *unawares* spoken so as to produce in some measure this effect, yet he has certainly disproved what you thought him to have done in the way of misrepresenting the matter to your nephew. He has shewn me your nephews letters from first to last: & from them I find that the subject was entirely avoided in conversation & that the impression on Mr Fosters mind was made by your letters to Mr Speck. That they should have had this effect on his mind I think quite natural for as I have all along said to you; you undoubtedly did promise absolutely, in words; & then retract your engagement; and though *I* see that there was throughout an unexpressed contingency in your own mind limiting your

[1] Possibly Walter's.

engagement, yet I do not wonder at another not readily seeing this; especially the party aggrieved & the party to be benefitted by the change of plan.

I have urged on Mr Speck mutual forbearance & kindness & I hope he will act on my counsel.

I will communicate with your Solicitor as to Baldon according to your wish.

I am my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

257. To the Rev. J. Fry *(ii 31)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 31, 1848

My dear Sir,

I had hoped that your last letter had set wholly at rest the unpleasant complaints on which I had been obliged to address you: but I grieve to say that another letter from Lord Curzon obliges me to recall your attention to the subject, if it is only to enable you to prove the accuracy of your assertions to me in your last letter.

Lord Curzon most properly assures me at the outset that he would never have brought any such charge against a clergyman without as accurate an examination of all the circumstances of the case as he was able to institute: and he then proceeds to say 'that on the authority of Mr Brickwell the medical man who attended the family he distinctly denies that the girl in question died of fever; & that so far from having given such orders as you aver about the Corpse Mr B actually wrote to expostulate with you upon the subject'. Lord Curzon denies with like particularity your statement as to the second case.

The father & mother remember nothing of any offer of the corpse being interred & the service read next day. But both remember two men & two women coming in & saying 'Mr Fry insists on the body being either buried or put away in a shed' & next day no service was read in Church.

'As to the other two cases' Lord Curzon continues, 'one of them was a child of Lucy Boswell which I can prove by Medical Certificate did *not* die of fever & whose body was left outside the Church'.

I am sure My dear Sir that upon reflexion you will yourself feel, that I deal most kindly by you when I simply lay before you such detailed charges from so respectable source & beg you to reply to them.

I am my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

P.S. The point of Lord Curzons charge seems to be, that in cases of this kind you 'have trusted to reports brought to you & never from personal observation taken notice of cases like the present & so have been led to sanction acts which have cruelly' wounded the feelings of the poor.

258. To the Churchwardens of Lambourn[1] *(ii 32)*

Lavington Petworth, Sept. 1, 1848

Gentlemen,[1]

I shall cordially consent to the plan you have proposed for borrowing upon your rates so as to repair thoroughly your venerable & time worne [*sic*] Church. I quite agree to all Mr Donaldson's[2] proposals *with one exception*: namely the

[1] But addressed at end to C. E. Barnes, Esq. (see no. 268).

[2] Thomas Leverton Donaldson (1795–1885) (*DEA*), a London architect.

proposal to substitute for the *lead* roofs which are now there the slated roofs which he suggests. This would be a great evil. It would make your Church *exceedingly cold*. No slating however good ever proving thoroughly impervious to the air.

I wish that you would at the same time consider Mr Donaldsons suggestions of at the same time wholly re-arranging the interior of the Church. By a comparatively small addition to your loan this might be effected. Because towards this the funds of the Incorporated Church Building Society: or, I doubt not, private subscriptions also, would come in aid of your rates. I am sure that you would meet with all assistance in this work from Mr Hippisley[1] & Mr Thompson[2] also. The earth must *of course* be removed from your church in the course of your works of restoration.

Another point touched on by Mr Donaldson will I hope receive your most serious consideration: I mean the increase of your Churchyard; which I feel sure that health, as well as Christian honour of the dead bodies of Christs Saints urgently call for. Perhaps you will take these suggestions into consideration & then communicate with me again.

I am ever very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

259. To the Rev. J. Hanbury[3] *(ii 33)*

Lavington Petworth, Sep. 1

My dear Sir,

I quite approve of your seeking two several persons & not a husband & wife for your Schools. If you will write a line to the Rev E Hobhouse[4] Merton Coll Oxford, he will tell you at once how far we are able from the Diocesan board to aid you at this moment in finding a successor.

I am anxious to hear from you as to a successor to Mr Clementi[5]: since it is impossible that from his present distance he can give you the assistance you require. If there are lodgings to be had for a young married couple I should be glad to recommend to you a very steady right minded young man about to be married whom I would ordain on your nomination D V on the 24th of September for your charge: or I believe that I might be able to recommend you a priest.

I am my dear Sir, Yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

260. To the Rev. W. Sewell[6] *(ii 34)*

Lavington Petworth, Sep. 1, 1848

My dear Sewell,

I see no objection to your proposal & can easily understand that it would present many advantages. A license would be necessary I apprehend to be in

1 Henry Hippisley (1808–96) of Lambourn Place, J.P., D.L., T. L. Donaldson was the architect of his house.

2 Edward Thompson (1808–91), V. of Lambourn 1832–51, Chaddleworth 1851–87 (C).

3 John Hanbury, V. of Thatcham, 1842–55 (C).

4 Edmund Hobhouse (1817–1904), Fellow of Merton, 1841–57; V. of St. Peter in the East, Oxford, 1843–58; P.C. of St. John the Baptist, Oxford, 1847–54; Bishop of Nelson, N.Z., 1858–65; Asst. Bishop of Lichfield, 1869–80 (*DNA*).

5 Vincent Clementi, son of the composer; C. of Chislet, Kent, 1837, Thatcham, 1841–8; resided in Peterborough, Ontario, died in 1899 (C).

6 William Sewell (1804–74), Fellow of Exeter College, 1827–74; Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy, 1836–41; P.C. of St. Nicholas in the Castle, Carisbrooke, 1831–74; Warden of St. Peter's College, Radley, 1853–61; went abroad to avoid his creditors, 1862–70 (*DNB*). Co-founder of Radley.

strict order: & before this issues I think I ought to communicate with Mr Radcliffe[1] on the subject. I have therefore written to him.

I rejoice in your improving & growing condition & shall be very glad to be with you again.

I am ever yours most sincerely,

S. Oxon.

261. To the Rev. J. Radcliffe *(ii 35)*

Lavington Petworth, Sep. 1, 1848

My dear Sir,

Mr Sewell has applied to me, to sanction the attendance of the household of Radley House who are now growing too numerous for their own seat in their own Chapel on Sundays: of course limiting such attendance to their own household. I conceive that such a license would be unobjectionable & might be convenient; but before consenting to its issue I wish to learn from you whether you see any objection to it.[2]

I am my dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

262. To the Rev. W. I. Baker *(ii 36)*

Lavington, Sep. 2, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have heard from your Churchwardens in reply to my letter to them & they alledge that it is the great inconvenience of attending a Service at $3\frac{1}{2}$ in a cattle country which prevents their being in their places on Sunday afternoons; I wish therefore to be informed by you whether there is any reason for having the service at that hour rather than at $2\frac{1}{2}$ P M in Winter & 3 P M in Summer.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

263. To the Rev. J. Fry *(ii 37)*

Lavington, Sept. 2, 1848

My dear Sir,

I am quite ready to accept at once your apology: but I must not leave you under the impression that I think you 'did well to be angry'. You repeat in this letter that you were 'grieved & hurt to find that I had actually believed &c'. If you will refer to my letter of Aug 19 you will find that I said then to you, that 'I had given you no intimation of my belief in the charge'. Is it respectful to your Bishop to repeat this statement?

Again you say in this letter in reply to my letter of Aug 19 you 'never charged me with really sanctioning espionage' for which charge I had reproved you — and after all how far is this reply of yours borne out by facts? Your words are. 'The entertaining these charges from a concealed accuser *is*[3] virtually sanctioning an espionage, (abhorrent I am sure to the *deliberate* feelings of your L's honourable mind and against which I humbly protest as would all your clergy'.

[1] John Radcliffe (1780–1852), chaplain of Merton College and V. of Radley, 1835–52.
[2] Nos. 260–1 arose from the opening of St. Peter's College, Radley, in 1847.
[3] Underlined twice.

Now my dear Sir I must repeat plainly to you, as one set over you in the Lord that all this 'indignation' & these imputations were uncalled for & improper. *Facts* were charged against you by a person in every way entitled to credit. Without saying one word as to believing these charges I as your Bishop stated them to you & asked for your answer — your duty was plain & simple. You should carefully & meekly have answered the facts of the charge. You would then have found me your most ready & earnest vindicator. But instead of this you indulged in 'indignation'; & 'protested' against what you conceived to be my fault. I repeat this not because *I* desire any further apology, but, because I do most earnestly desire, for your own sake, whom I truly value, that you should see the fault & be sorry for it. The higher your character, the more patiently you could bear a charge which you felt to be untrue; & your past excellent conduct & many labours were no answer to this particular charge although they would have ensured from me the most ready consideration of your answer.

I trust that in replying to the letter I was obliged to send to you yesterday[1] you will bear this in mind; & I pray God to bless to you even the passing annoyance of this correspondence

I am my dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

264. To the Rev. A. A. Kempe[2] *(ii 38)*

Lavington Petworth, Sep. 2

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have carefully considered your statement with an anxious wish to aid you in the difficulties by which I perceive you to be surrounded. But I am sorry to say that the only plan of those you have suggested which I could allow is that which you mention as the least eligible. I could not allow the double duty to be discontinued; still less that you seek another parish from which to serve Wexham. But if you think, upon full consideration, that it would aid you if you obtained for a time a license of non residence, to seek other duty, & leave to me to appoint a Curate to Wexham I will allow you to make trial of that plan.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

265. To the Rev. C. Mackenzie[3] *(ii 39)*

Private

Lavington Petworth, Sept. 2, 1848

My dear Sir,

I shall interpose no difficulties whatever in the way of your resuming the discharge of your own duties at Colnbrook. But I think that you ought to offer as you propose to re-imburse Mr Butler[4] his £50 if you dispossess him. If however he is legally licensed I apprehend you may find some difficulty in parting with him without a longer formal notice. It will save much writing on this point if you will call on Mr Burder at 27 Parliament Street & explain to him Mr B's exact position & your wishes & ask him the needful steps under the circumstances to make.

[*Unfinished*]

[1] No. 257.

[2] Alfred Arrow Kempe (1814–1909), R. of Wexham 1846–1909, but continuously non-resident through debt (cf. no. 611) (C).

[3] Charles Mackenzie (1807–88), a London incumbent, held the donative of Colnbrook from 1834.

[4] George Ambrose Butler (b. 1817), C. of Barford St. John 1840, Horton 1850 (O).

266. To the Rev. J. R. Burgess[1] (*ii 40*)

61 Eaton Place, Sept. 9

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Mr Stone[2] is perfectly right in his law. A mode was afforded to the subscribers & parish of securing the house they built; the obtaining viz. a legal conveyance of the site. They omitted to do so & built on Mr Stones freehold: what they built became as entirely Mr Stones property as any other part of his possessions. Further, the original agreement would be a strong presumption that the late Mr Stone intended to retain legal possession of the property & to use it as a moral trustee for the Parish. I do not see therefore, inconvenient & little satisfactory as the status of the School is that you can do any thing but acquiesce. So long as Mr Stone merely claims the right of ownership & does not interfere injuriously with the management of the School no practical evil results. I therefore strongly advise you at once to write to Mr Stone to say, that finding from me that he has an undoubted legal title to the ownership of the School House you are ready to advise the signing of any paper which declares this ownership by the Mistress; & to allow matters to continue just as they have hitherto been administered so long as he allows the School to continue what it has hitherto been, a Church of England School under the management of the of the [*sic*] Vicar of the Parish.

It is I am sorry to say the occurrence of many such cases of past carelessness which gives such force to the requirements of the Commee of Privy Council as to Trust deeds.

Happily in your case I think no practical evil will arise at present if you conciliate Mr Stone. It will be time to set @ a new School House when the free use of this is denied to the Church.

I am my dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

This is the first post since your letter reached me.

267. To the Rev. J. Weighell[3] (*ii 41*)

Burton Agnes, Bridlington, Sep. 13, 1848

My dear Sir,

I have heard with regret that you wish your resignation of Pitstone to bear date on the 11th of October instead of the 29th of September. This I believe you have proposed from an idea that some of the annual payments are complete at the former & not at the latter date. I am however assured on good authority that this is not the case. All the payments date from Sep 29. I should be particularly sorry for this short delay: First, because I pledged myself *on your behalf*, after our interview that your resignation should bear date Sep 29. Second because I happen to know that orders have been given to begin instantly both parsonage & school

1 James Robert Burgess (1809–61), V. of Streatley, 1833–61 (O).

2 William Henry Stone (d. 1863) was the son of William Stone of Englefield (d. 1845) by his wife Mary, sister of the Rev. Deacon Morrell (on whom see no. 333), and himself married (1830) his second cousin Emily Morrell, daughter of Deacon Morrell's first cousin James. W. H. Stone later succeeded to Deacon Morrell's Streatley property.

3 John Weighell (d. 1853), V. of Marsworth, 1837–45; R. of Cheddington, and P.C. of Pitstone, 1846–53 (C). Cf. Diocese Book (1, f. 68^{v}): 'Very active man — very earnest good man, rather Evangelical School — not very extreme.'

on Sep 29: if your resignation is dated that day: & that they will be postponed to another year if it is delayed till October 11. At Lady Bridgewaters age[1] this is a *most material point* & I beg you therefore to adhere to your first day.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

268. To C. J. Barnes (Churchwarden of Lambourn)[2] *(ii 42)*

Burton Agnes, Bridlington, Sep. 13

My dear Sir,

I return the consent signed: but before I allow slate to be substituted for the lead I wish to have an accurate statement of the difference of the cost. The slate intended to be used is well known to me: & is very inferior in all respects to lead. Under the slate I must have Asphalted Felt laid down which therefore must be added to the Estimate. Would not margin of your £1000 allow for the lead?

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

269. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(ii 43)*

Private

Burton Agnes, Bridlington, Sep. 13

My dear Sir,

I hasten to tell you that the Statement of Miss Pontifex's case convinces me that I was right in my former opinion. You have put yourself entirely in the wrong by over stepping your power. The case has not yet been referred to me by the Parish & I therefore write *at once* to urge you by any means to heal the difference that I may not be compelled to give an answer to their appeal condemning you.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

270. To the Rev. G. W. Curtis *(ii 44)*

Burton Agnes, Bridlington, Sep. 13

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Your expression to Mr Trevitt was 'till Easter or till it is convenient to you'. Now to remove in the middle of a half year is very inconvenient to a person taking pupils. If therefore you will extend your time *till June*; I think you will do well & I will require Mr Trevitt to give you possession then.

I am yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

Confidential

Your expressions in your letter as to 'having sought an earlier interview with you &c.' 'Mr T's artifice &c' require from me that I should tell you distinctly why it is that as you have perceived I have *not* wished to hasten your return to Padworth. It has been from no partial feelings to Mr T: but from the belief that *your* Ministry at Padworth will not be an effectual one: That peculiar difficulties stand there in your way: That you will not there conduct a ministry of which you

[1] Widow of the 8th Earl, she was born in 1763 and died in Feb. 1849.
[2] Charles James Barnes (d. 1867).

can safely give an account at the Great Day. I beseech you weigh carefully my plain spoken words. I should indeed rejoice if you would commit the Cure of Padworth into any efficient hands. What at that day my dear Sir will it matter whether you have saved a few pounds if souls have been lost for whom Christ died.

271. To the Rector and Fellows of Lincoln College (draft) (*ii* 45)

Cuddesdon Palace, Sep. 22, 1848

As Usual The Bishop of Oxford

Having just heard from one who can hardly be mis-informed that your difficulty as to complying with the advice of your Visitor[1] & applying for the licensing of the Chaplains who offiace [*sic*] at *Coombe & St Michaels* (is it not there?) Church turns upon the idea that if licensed they would be no more removeable as it is required by your Statutes that they should be, has desired me to inform you that there is no room for such scruple, since the license of the Bishop would apply to such time only as the Chaplaincy was continued by the College. His Lordship desires me to inform you of this in the sincere hope that the unpleasant steps he may be forced to take, may be avoided.

272. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon (*ii 46*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Sep. 22, 1848

My Dear Sir,

I have just received the deputation from your Parish & gone with them through the whole question. I earnestly wish that you had been present; for I believe that if you had, the whole matter might have been adjusted to your satisfaction as well as to theirs. There was a tone of marked kindness in all their remarks about you. a wish to settle matters according to your desire which I think could not be mistaken. I told them as nearly as I can recollect it as follows: That in my judgement your unquestionable right of controuling [*sic*] under appeal to the ordinary the Musical Services of your public worship did *not* extend to dismissing the present or appointing another Organist. That it did reach to your giving full written directions what was & what was not to be played: &, subject to appeal as before, even to your preventing all playing on the organ as being an interruption of Service. That the Churchwardens had done wrong in locking up the organ against you: Miss Pontifex having a legal remedy for being kept out of her place. I strongly urged mutual concession; & I found them I am certain disposed towards it. Now my dear Sir I cannot doubt that on reflexion you will see the Wisdom & the duty of acting in a spirit of conciliation also. Suppose that you are right in your law (though my Chancellor after full examination is clear that you are not) & that you could dispossess the Organist: what should you gain but the illwill of those who for their soul sake you are most anxious should give you their good will? And if you are defeated how great would be the evil. You say that the dissenters have voted against you in this matter. Of course they will be ready to vote against you right or wrong. But this only makes it more important that you should give them no occasion of triumph. Upon the whole therefore I most earnestly advise you —

[1] The Bishop of Lincoln (John Kaye). Cf. V. H. H. Green, *Oxford Common Room* (1957), pp. 139–40, and pamphlet there cited.

1st to consent to the wish of the great majority of your parishioners & withdraw your assumed dismissal of Miss Pontifex.

II. Say that you do so on these conditions —

(1) That your directions shall be punctually carried out as to the conduct of the Services which directions you will send in writing to her by the Saturday at the latest.

(2) That if on further trial she appears incompetent as Organist that the Parish shall join with you in electing a competent successor

(3) That the regulations as to admitting female singers or others into the gallery which you think needful for decency shall be carried out fully & at once.

My dear Sir I once more entreat you by the love of our Lord Jesus Christ that you put an end to this sad division in your parish by some such accommodation as this. The enemy of souls will rejoice over the continuance of discord but Angels will weep over it, if tears could stain their faces, for it must mar your ministry & injure your own soul.

I am my dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

I am sure you will find the parties who have been here today most anxious for a friendly adjustment.

273. To the Rev. W. S. Bricknell[1] *(ii 47)*

Claydon, Oct. 4, 1848

My dear Sir,

Mr Butler has sent me the letters which have recently passed between you and himself as to the holding the Anniversary Meetings of the Church Miss^{y}. Society at Wantage; & committed the matter entirely to my decision. I have not yet replied to him; but I desire at once to communicate frankly to you my opinion & wishes on the subject; & from what I know of your principles & have experienced of your conduct I cannot doubt that you will regard it as one of those practical questions in which you will readily submit yourself to the 'Godly Judgement' of your Bishop. The state of Wantage is now very unlike what it was when you met there formerly. Mr Butler has sacrificed everything to make full proof of his Ministry. He is endeavouring to carry out fully the system of the Church of England; & amongst other things to lead his people to give systematically to Christian Missions. His own personal sympathies were rather with the S.P.G. than with the Church Miss: Soc^{y}. but upon my representation of what I thought his duty, he at once made common cause between the two Societies: & at their meetings he has invited you to attend, and represent the Ch. Miss: Soc^{y}. He is thus collecting on a system, as one regular part of his spiritual cure of the Parish. Now if other parties not charged with that spiritual [*sic*] come unbidden by him & hold similar meetings, it is a direct interference with his own Spiritual work. Such interference on the part of Dissenters we cannot avoid, but it appears to me quite unjustifiable on the part of a brother clergyman. You say that these meetings are held for the *vicinity* not for Wantage. But 1st the town of Wantage is not large enough to be considered thus metropolitically; & IInd in point of fact the great

[1] William Simcox Bricknell (1806–88), lecturer at St. Martin's, Oxford, 1840; P.C. of Grove, Berks., 1836–88; V. of Eynsham, 1845–88 (O). An Evangelical and an individualist who gave the Bishop much trouble.

majority of the audience are Wantage people & IIIrdly I do not wish you to drop such meetings, if you are convinced of their service, but to change their place. I wish you to hold them at Faringdon instead of Wantage. They will there be quite as useful for the neighbourhood, & they will not interfere with an actively worked parochial system of such exertions. I feel sure that you would be the last man to put willingly the Ch. Miss Soc^{y}. into the position (so alien to her temper & her interest) of opposing in a diocese what the Bishop felt to be an important parochial arrangement. What for instance could so weaken my own advocacy of its claims before the University of Oxford on Nov 1. as the feeling that in a matter strictly belonging to my own spiritual jurisdiction I was being thwarted by its agents & that the clergy under me were well aware of this. It is no question whether it is generally best to collect for the two Societies together. In many cases it may not be. It is a question whether that 'cure & government of souls' which in the name of Christ I have solemnly committed to Mr Butler at Wantage is to be violated by a brother clergyman on the plea of promoting the intererests of the Ch: Miss. Society.

I am my dear Sir most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

My address is to be — Aylesbury Saturday; Chequers Court Tring *Sunday*. Wycombe Monday; Park Place Henley Tuesday & Wednesday. Shiplake *Reading* Thursday.

274. To the Rev. H. Venn *(ii 48)*

Claydon, Oct. 4

My dear Friend,

I send you herewith a copy of a letter I am just sending to the Rev S Bricknell on a matter I once named to you. I earnestly hope that I may your concurrence [*sic*] in view & advice on this matter. I am sure that the maintenance of these Anniversaries at Wantage will injure my Diocese, & injure the Church Missionary Society very deeply.

I am most truly & affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

275. To the Rev. H. Venn *(ii 49)*

Private & Confidential

Aylesbury, Oct. 7, 1848

My dear Friend,

My note to you was intended to be strictly private; & I had intended to ask you for the return of my copy of my letter to Mr Bricknell. This I will now request. I have no wish to bring the matter before the Commee: but I hoped to have had your friendly sympathy; & wise advice to Mr Bricknell. I should not act openly by you if I did not say that its *tone* disappoints me as much as its conclusions. I earnestly deprecate with yourself, any discussions which will seem to place its internal administration needlessly at variance with the Ecclessiastical Superintendance & parochial system of our Church. But unless Mr B's view of his duty towards his Bishop goes farther than supposing it to be to act with him when he entirely agrees with him, I greatly fear it cannot be avoided. I do not see how Mr Butlers attendance can make a meeting which disturbs his parochial arrangements less inopportune; & I do not see what the alteration of the *name* signifies if the meetings are continued. From my knowledge of the neighbourhood I am persuaded that

except for Wantage people Faringdon would be the better place. It gives me much concern to differ from you & I am my dear Friend very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

My address will be Park Place Henley on Thames Monday to Wednesday.

276. To the Rev. J. Weighell *(ii 50)*

Private

Oxford, Oct. 12, 1848

My dear Sir,

I fully admit the validity of your plea for not coming to me at Chequers or at Wycombe: but I greatly regret not having seen you — and your letter makes me regret it the more: Because it is so much easier to give by word of mouth than by letter certain explanations which I see from it you need. The Enclosures which I return fully bear out your statement as to the unconditional character of your taking Pitstone — and I have not a word to say on that head. But I earnestly hope that you will see it to be right when you have considered what I have to say to forward me the Resignation I enclose filled up either before a notary public or before two Credible Witnesses.

I think that you owe this *now* to me: having authorized me to state explicitly your intention of resigning: this I did: & unless you make good my words you will now place me in a very uncomfortable position. For I do not think that there are any sufficient reasons for your varying from your former determination. These are as I gather from your letter 1st That Mr Burder did not communicate with you at Michlemas & II that the mention of delaying the building will prevent your resignation being as required by law free & spontaneous. As to the 1st Mr Burder was ready at any time to send you the papers but I had expected you to apply for them & out of delicacy to you *only* delayed their being sent till you applied. As to the second point there is some misapprehension. There is no idea of delaying the building one hour beyond what weather may require. It is simply that till the living is vacant they will not begin & that the building season is passing rapidly away. I entertain no doubt that if you will kindly return me the enclosed signed the building will begin *instantly*. But even if this were not so, there could be no interference with that spontaneousness of which the law speaks: for that regards merely your own personal advantage. It is a declaration that *you* have not been bribed to resign. Now in this case resignation is simply loss to you, & gain *to the Church*. There can therefore be nothing to trouble your conscience in the matter of resignation. I earnestly hope therefore my dear Sir that you will fulfil your former intention. The Church will be a great gainer by it: The souls of the dwellers at Pitstone may through Gods mercy for years bless you for the act which at this moment will secure to them & to those after them the blessing of a resident Ministry — and this I am sure will be to you motive enough for this act. I cannot but also feel that it is due to yourself as well as to me that this should after what you allowed me to write to Mr Parkinson[1] be carried into effect.

I am my dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

My address is to be — *Monday morng.* Speen Newbury. Tuesday Taplow Maidenhead. Wednesday Nuffield Nettlebed.

1 Probably Joseph T. Parkinson (1783–1855), architect, rather than his nephew and pupil F. C. J. Parkinson (*DEA*).

277. To the Rev. W. S. Bricknell *(ii 51)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Oct. 19, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have given the fullest consideration to the letters you have forwarded to me but I cannot say that they affect my judgement upon the interruption likely to result to the Parochial administration of Wantage from the continuing to hold in it anniversary Ch. Miss^{y}. Meetings, now that the interests of that Society are quarterly advocated under the Vicars Sanction

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

P.S. You ought not in my judgement to have communicated to a public body the letter which I last wrote to you, as your Bishop, without my knowledge & sanction. I wrote to you as an incumbent in my diocese.

278. To the Rev. Morrice[1] *(ii 52)*

Private

Cuddesdon, Oct. 19, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Your letter enclosing a copy of one to the Rural dean reached me on my visitation from which I have only this evening reached home.

I much regret the tone of your former letter to the Rural Dean & of the two letters you have now sent me — and I strongly recommend you to let the matter drop. I am most anxious to say nothing which can uselessly pain you: & on that account only I forbear stating to you the family circumstances concerning yourself in years past & your sons recently on which my judgement was formed.

I have acquiesced in your continuing at your present post & this ought to satisfy you.

Believe me to remain, Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

279. To the Rev. W. I. Baker *(ii 53)*

Cuddesdon, Oct. 21, 1848

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I had a conversation at Bicester with your Churchwardens, at which I should have wished for your presence, had you not left immediately on our quitting Church. The Churchwardens are ready to do their duty: but they satisfied me that the time of the afternoon service ought to be altered. I must therefore require you to have it at $2\frac{1}{2}$ from the beginning of December to the end of January; & at 3 for the rest of the year. I must further call on you to give at it either a Second Sermon or public Catechizing.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Unidentified. But see no. 150.

280. To the Rev. A. F. Wynter[1] *(iii 166)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Oct. 21, 1848

Rev. Sir,

I can in reply to your letter only say to you what I have said before, that I am convinced that you can never minister with profit to yourself or advantage to the Church in the neighbourhood of Fenny Stratford: and that you ought therefore to abandon all intention of doing so; and resolve on settling in some distant part of the country. I think that you ought either to have sought enquiry before a commission into your conduct, or not now to press for your re-admission. Of course it will be now harder to arrive at the truth, but if you formally apply for a commission I am ready to issue one: but I repeat my original advice, that for your own sake and the sake of the Church, you retire without one.

I am, Yours truly,

S. Oxon.

281. To the Churchwardens of North Leigh *(ii 54)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Oct. 23

Gentlemen,

I lost no time in requiring from Mr Gillam[2] a reply to the articles alledged against him in your presentations. His reply admits only one. He allows that Heavy beasts have occasionally been turned into the Church Yard. He alledges that the presence of pigs in it, is from your neglecting to repair the Churchyard gate & the consequent straying in of Pigs. He positively asserts that he is quite regular in beginning Service. He denies neglecting any sick people or refusing to administer the Communion to *qualified* persons: he asserts that he was diligent in attending the School till he was withstood in performing that duty. He denies having injured the Glebe — or that any son of his pursues game during the hours of divine Service. He declares that he pays to the Clerk for the land a higher rent than Mr Druce gave as its value. He further makes grievous complaints of his treatment by the late & present Churchwardens: alledging — (1) Their entire neglect of the duties of their office — neglect in supplying Sacramental Wine: in maintaining order in the Church: in attending there themselves. (2) Their disrespectful treatment of himself — amounting in the case of the exchurchwarden to absolute insult. (3) permitted abuse of a Church Charity whereby bread left for distribution at the Church is given by a dissenting Baker to parties at the School, closely adjoining his meeting house. In a word he alledges that opposition unkindness & illtreatment have thwarted uniform & earnest efforts on his part to promote the Welfare of his parish.

I must now request you to inform me whether you are prepared to tender legal proof of the Charges Mr Gillam so absolutely denies: and which he attributes to that opposition which he asserts has withstood a faithful ministry for its fidelity.

I am Gentlemen yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

[1] Abraham Farley Wynter (1811–71), V. of Fenny Stratford, 1847–51; R. of Barnardiston, Suffolk, 1851–71 (O). His difficulty was intemperance.

[2] Isaac Gillam, V. of North Leigh 1839–56.

282. To the Diocesan Chancellor (Dr. J. Phillimore) *(iii 167)*
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 4, 1848

My dear Chancellor,

Constant occupation has made it impossible for me to reply before today to your kind letter of Oct. 30th and its enclosures. I thank you sincerely for your kind aid in this matter: but I fear that more trouble is before us. I think Morrell's letter most unsatisfactory & that it is wholly impossible that we can honestly allow things to continue as they at present are. Let me beg you to look I to his First answer. 'This 7/6 is paid to me only as you *now* have received the 4/6 from each parish.' This is a full admission (1) That the old charge of 7/6 was divided between Chancellor and Registrar. 4/6 being the Chancellor's 3/– the Registrar's fee. (2) That he has this year charged *an extra 4/6* for the Chancellor & taken to himself *with no custom* the 4/6 belonging to the Chancellor in the customary fee of 7/6. On this head therefore he is bound to refund 4/6 to each parish i.e. 560 parishes at 4/6 a parish £126.0.0 — and this is specially due to *your* credit: because the occasion of this fraud is the introduction of the [new whole 'Chancellor's Fee'.

What customary rights are there 1st for the amount II for the appropriation to the Registrar of the respective fees of 4/– and 3/6 [*sic*]. This must be answered.

I cannot admit that he has made out any claim to these fees. It is true that he has 'some trouble'. But Parliament has laid the trouble on his office, as it lays trouble on other officers, thinking them paid for their trouble in other ways: & as a Visitation Court has no right to originate such charges his doing so under the pretext of its being a Visitation Fee is a threat at obtaining money under Court Certificate; & we cannot be made ourselves partakers of his Fraud. Therefore these amounts must be refunded: i.e. 560 instead of 587 parishes in my last reckoning but the return] of £2.1.0 to 547 Parishes will be £1,121.7.0. This is probably the old and only charge for the Deputy Registrar. I should like however to know its date. I do not think it can be objected to.

Now as to our course with Morrell. I would propose that you write to him Ist to require his answer as to requests 2 & 3. II to say that having consulted together we are convinced that he must refund this £2.5.6 per parish: & to enquire categorically whether he will refund it without forcing us to take the further steps we shall judge needful if he refuses. We must then await his answer. But I should say that these steps must be 1st a joint appeal from both of us to the Registrars to require this refunding on pain of quitting the office; which he holds during pleasure: & Further my advising the remonstrant parishes to begin suits against him in the County Courts for money paid to their own wrong under a false demand.

I feel sure that we may succeed in forcing him to give up these ill gotten gains: possibly we may get rid of him; though that were too much to hope.

I am my dear Chancellor Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

283. To the Rev. J. Weighell *(iii 168)*
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 4, 1848

My dear Sir,

Your letter of Oct. 25 which has by an accident of post been long in reaching me pains me greatly. I cannot forbear saying to you with all the frankness which

befits our mutual relation, that however free you are as to Lady Bridgewater I cannot but feel that *to me* you are bound to resign [Cheddington Pitstone] and that your retaining it will be a violation of your engagement to me. In the letter to which you refer you say, that you shall feel you have been led to resign on false pretences unless the house is built for the living & Mr. B[1] instituted. I entertain not the shadow of a doubt that this will be done. There is no wish whatever to turn you out: but only to secure a resident incumbent: and the reluctance is merely to beginning building until this is secured. If you will put yourself in the position of Patron you will not I think feel surprized that this *postponement* of resignation after a distinct engagement given to & transmitted by me should raise suspicions however unjust you know them to be. But my dear Sir, let me once more beg you [to reflect] upon the reproach which you will undoubtedly bring upon your religious principles [if] after empowering me to give this pledge you now violate it, whilst you are perfectly ready to fulfll your share of the engagement; & upon the certain loss you will entail upon the parish, which if this opportunity is let pass may never have provided for it the means of possessing a separate resident ministry.[2]

I am, my dear Sir, most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

284. To the Archbishop of Canterbury (J. B. Sumner) (*iii 170*)
Private & Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 18, 1848

My dear Lord,

May I ask your Grace to read the enclosed letter and give me your advice upon it. The writer[3] is an excellent parish priest, wholly devoted to his work of love: and respected by all. His only fault, & which perhaps may be seen in some of the colouring of this letter is a tendency not to distinguish sufficiently the relative magnitude of matters on which he is interested deeply. This however as a parish priest I feel to have been indeed a matter to move him. I know from other sources Mr. F. Burgess's character. He is in the highest degree unclerical; devoted to Hunting, Shooting, Fishing, Races; having stated to a friend of my own, whom he met in the Stage Coach that the one day of the year was that of Goodwood Races.

Mr. Burgess is a young man: a fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. He has set himself rather forwardly since I spoke of Hunting &c. in my late Charge to head the continuance of clerical hunting. His position, as a fellow of a college with many livings in the Diocese, makes his influence in this respect over the young men who come up to the College particularly injurious. I know nothing decidedly against his Morals. But his general unclerical conduct gives rise to great reproach against the Church. It was only last week that Lord Norreys[4] spoke very strongly to me on this point: (but in strict confidence), & told me that from his boastful stories &c. in the Hunting field he is called 'the lying Parson'.

[1] Thomas Bayley (1819–86), C. of Pitstone 1846–50, held various curacies in other parts of the country until he became P.C. of Penn Street, 1860–86 (O).

[2] Cf. Diocese Book (II, p. 382): 'All this set aside by Lady B.'s death.'

[3] Thomas Farley (1797–1870), Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, 1823–37; D.D. 1852; R. of Ducklington with Cokethorpe, 1836–70.

[4] Montagu Bertie (1808–84), styled Lord Norreys until he became 6th Earl of Abingdon; M.P. Oxfordshire, 1832–52.

This complaint of Mr. Farley's is the first time a complaint has reached me with the name of the complainant given for my use if needed.[1]

The course I am disposed to adopt is this: (1) to ascertain confidentially from his principal whether if I deem it needful he will give him notice with my sanction to quit the Curacy: (2) to send for Mr. Burgess state [*sic*] the complaint made; hear his answer; & learn whether he, if he allows their substantial correctness, promises amendment. (3) If he does not so promise; then, either to obtain his removal by his principal or if he refuses; to revoke his license. I am quite aware of the anger this last step will excite as directed against a fellow of a College, but considering the interests at stake I shall not shrink from the odium, if it appears to your Grace the right course, & I should be upheld in it, if an appeal was carried by Mr. Burgess to your Grace as Archbishop.

I am, my dear Lord, Your Grace's affectionate and dutiful,

S. Oxon.

285. To the Rev. H. Biddulph[2] *(iii 169)*

Private & Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 18, 1848

My dear Sir,

It is my painful duty to communicate to you some charges of most unclerical conduct brought against your curate the Rev. F. Burgess. The immediate complaint is from Mr. Farley of Ducklington, and is caused by Mr. Burgess having put himself forward to obtaining a beershop to be licensed in the hamlet of Hardwicke in Mr. Farley's Parish. In this Beer Shop since Mr. Farley is informed that Mr. Burgess has drunk both beer and gin. But though this is the immediate cause of the complaint it reaches far beyond this. It is a general complaint of Mr B.'s unclerical conduct: his addiction to hunting: his unclerical dress: & general behaviour. All of this I have heard before, but never from any complainant who allowed me to use his name. But it is the common scandal of the neighbourhood; it was only last week that one of the County Members[3] expostulated with me upon the allowance of such evil: but this in confidence. I cannot believe that you can be willing that such a state of things should continue. and I therefore ask with confidence your co-operation in its redress. I should propose sending for Mr. Burgess informing him of the scandal caused by his conduct and requiring him to give me his promise at once to abandon hunting; and I beg to ask you whether in the event of his refusing this promise you will join with me in requiring his resignation of the Curacy. I will request you to regard this communication as confidential because I think it important that I should know your mind before I communicate with Mr. Burgess. If you agree with me I should be obliged by your sending me signed a notice to quit the curacy in six months signed. [*sic*]

1 Frank Burges, Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, 1831–61, was P.C. of Fyfield, 1854–63. His dual character as the jovial leader of the younger fellows of St. John's in their 'jollifications (Goodwood races the day of the year!)' and as something of a model parish priest much perplexed the Bishop. (Diocese Book, I, ff. 61v, 62). At Fyfield he built 'a new and nice parsonage' and hoped after a year to restore the church, with the help of £1,000 from the College, which had also been induced to build model cottages (Diocese Book, II, p. 229). The Bishop always spelt his name wrongly.

2 Henry Biddulph, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, 1820–33; R. of Birdingbury, Warws., 1826–67, Standlake, 1832–67.

3 Lord Norreys (cf. no. 284).

This I should not produce unless circumstances require it. But it might strengthen my hands at what must be I fear a painful interview.

I am, My dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

286. To the Rev. J. Weighell *(iii 171)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 2, 1848

Reverend & Dear Sir,

Believing you to be as I am bound to believe both from the good opinion of your brother clergy & from your own parochial labours in the fear of God, I cannot forbear once more setting before you my 'Judgement' upon the question of your moral obligation to resign the benefice of Pitstone. To enable me to form a right decision I have read carefully through the letters which have passed between us & sought wisdom from him who giveth liberally. As in His sight I require you to remember that you have on 4 solemn occasions sworn to pay to your Bishop that 'Obedience'; which the Church of England defines as a Submission to his Godly Judgement; that it is not a light matter after such an oath to act upon the counsel of your private friends in open violation of your Bishop's expressed Judgement.

But then let me remind you of what has passed between us on this subject: Having heard from Lady Bridgewater's representative that you were thought to be retaining this benefice of Pitstone contrary to your promise I desired to see you. You were with me on the 22nd of August. You expressed a praiseworthy anxiety as to who should succeed you: I told you that it would be your own Curate: that all which was desired by Lady Bridgewater was to have the opportunity of providing a separate resident incumbent for Pitstone. Our interview ended in your giving me an *unconditional absolute promise that you would resign at Michlemas*: and you were then to communicate with Mr. Burder. I at once conveyed your promise to Lady Bridgewater's agent, assuring him that her Ladyship need not fear your acting conscientiously on your promise: and I prepared Mr. Burder to expect your application for a form of resignation. On the 11th of September you wrote to me to say that unless a Glebe House was built & Mr. Bayley presented you should feel that you had been led to resign on false pretences — but you intimated no intention of swerving from your word. *I*[1] should equally have felt that you had been deceived if no glebe House had been built for Mr. Bayley, but there was no ground whatever for such an apprehension.

Meanwhile Michlemas passed: & I learned with pain from Mr. Burder that you had not resigned. I heard however that some question as to the time which certain rents were due had delayed your resignation: & as my visitation was approaching when I counted on settling all with you, I forbore pressing you; which would have appeared like distrusting you. At my visitation owing to your return to an invalid family I unhappily did not see you. But I had an interview with Mr. Wroth concerning you: & I gathered from it that you were acting on some misconception. Mr. Wroth thought it very important that you should see me, and as my visitation was carrying me further from you every day, I wrote a hasty note, Mr. Wroth waiting to take it, inviting you to come to me either Sunday evening (so much did I think it concerned your ministerial character), or Monday morning. You did not come: & on the 12th October I wrote to you 'fully admitting the validity of your plea for not coming; but expressing my regret at not having been able to give your explanations I thought you needed'.

[1] Underlined twice.

& I proceeded as far as I could to give them. & to shew you that you could not without my concurrence break the promise you had given me on the 22nd of August. I waited long for your reply. Finally on the 23rd of October you wrote again simply recapitulating the conscientious obligation I had set before you. On the Fifth of November I replied to this letter: calling your attention to an unconditional promise of resignation which you wrote to Lady B. Nov. 24 1847 which her Ladyship had sent to me. Upon your simply again saying that on the Judgement of friends you declined fulfilling your engagement, I finally wrote to you Nov. 23 desiring you to meet me in London upon the 30th. Instead however of your obeying this Summons I received a note from you excusing your absence.

Now, my dear Sir, I must say one word first on your not coming to me. I chose the time & place for seeing you which I knew would give you least expence and trouble: you yourself call it my 'command' — what then could justify your disobedience to it. Is your solemn oath of canonical obedience really precious in your eyes if it does not avail sufficiently to lead you to take an hour's journey when your Bishop requires to see you on a matter deeply concerning your character as a man of truth & therefore your ministry as a Messenger of the God of truth. It grieves me to say one word of censure to you, but I must most gravely censure your wilful neglect of this summons.

2. Now finally as to your resignation of Pitstone. On the 24th of November 1847 you wrote to Lady Bridgewater: 'I voluntarily & cheerfully at your Ladyship's request engage to resign the care of Pitstone . . . about next Mich^{mas} when with the permission of my Diocesan the presentation D.V. will be again placed at your disposal.' Again on the 22nd of August 1848 when I pressed on you the duty of keeping this engagement you made me the same promise & empowered me to write to that effect to Lady Bridgewater. Here then are two distinct unconditional promises made at intervals of 9 months, one to your Patroness the other to your Bishop. She calls upon you to fulfil your promise to her. I require you to fulfil your engagement to me. As a man of truth you surely cannot hesitate? You say that it has been stated with great force of argument that the principle is a pernicious one for a patron to attempt to remove an incumbent on the plea of building & augmenting the benefice: & that such a precedent ought not to be made.' — but of this you should have thought before you made a promise: such afterthoughts cannot release you from the moral obligation of your pledged word: 'who sweareth unto his neighbour & disappointeth him not &c.' Once more I implore you act on the simple moral view of keeping your word: & do not my dear sir for any collateral advantages to the Church break your engagement; or force me to state to Lady B. that after my confident assurance of your integrity I confess with shame & sorrow that you have violated your promise.

I am my dear Sir, very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

[*According to index, not sent*]

287. To J. T. Parkinson[1] (*iii 172*)
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, [Dec. 2, 1848]

Dear Sir,

I have been and still am in correspondence with Mr. Weighill and as from what I hear of him from the clergy around him I cannot still forbear hoping that

[1] Addressed to J. Parkinson; see no. 276.

he is a conscientious man and is acting (as I think so, wrongly) in this matter, through an erroneous judgement, not from base motives, I cannot yet give up the hope that he will place his resignation in the hands of Lady Bridgewater.

The ground of his reluctance is this. He asserts that he was asked to resign not to get rid of himself; but to secure the residence of an incumbent in a Glebe House. That on this condition he promised resignation; that all his promises were *conditional*. That he found on Sept. 29 that no site had been made over for the Glebe House: that the condition of his resignation had not been fulfilled, or that he should at once have resigned.

Now can you enable me fully to answer this? Can any engagement for the securing a glebe site & House being engaged for, given & built by a certain day, be given, if he resigns by a fixed day. You will quite understand that I do not think he is entitled to ask for any such assurances from Lady B. But I find that many of the most respectable clergymen around think that he has been hardly dealt with, & I am anxious to remove all possible grounds of error of judgement on his part in the hope that he will then show at once a conscientious decision.

My address will be on Tuesday & Wednesday Sir E. C. Strode's, South Hill, Shepton Mallett, Somerset. Thursday & Friday, Palace Wells. Then for 3 days Torquay.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

288. To the Rev. W. R. Fremantle *(iii 173)*
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 2, 1848

My dear Fremantle,

Mr. Weighill did not come to me in London. I grieve for this; for it more & more looks as if he was conscious that he is not acting with entire uprightness. I cling however to the hope of his sincerity. I have hitherto restrained the indignation which his witholding his resignation has created in the mind of Lady B. But I cannot do so longer: & the result of my announcing that I cannot obtain from Mr. W: the fulfilment of his promise will I fear be very injurious to him & to the Church & above all to Christianity in his parishes. I have therefore written plainly to him in a letter which must be final; but before it goes I ask you to read it in confidence for a twofold reason:

(1) because I know not whether in consequence of my former letters any communication may have passed between you & him. (2) because I desire to say nothing which should needlessly wound one whom I would fain treat in all things as a brother in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. I wish you therefore to send this letter on at once unless on either of these grounds you think it ought not to go & if so I will request you to return it to me with your free remarks.

I am sure you will not grudge a little trouble if it can aid in preventing the stumbling of a brother.

My letters to reach me
Wednesday at Sir E. C. Strode's, South Hill, Shepton Mallet, Somerset.
Thursday & Friday The Palace, Wells.
Then for 3 days Torquay.

I am my dear Fremantle, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[*Postscript illegible*]

289. To Robert Kemp (Churchwarden of Broughton, Oxon.) *(ii 55)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 4, 1848

Sir,

I was very glad to find from your letter of Nov 18 that you were ready to carry out the legal requirements of your office; and if upon 'further enquiry I was of opinion that the partition ought to be removed my directions should be attended to in a spirit of cheerful obedience'. This was the exact answer I hoped & expected to receive from you.

I have in consequence made minute & careful enquiries both as to the effect of the alteration in making the Church cold; and also as to the expence which will be incurred in the alteration. As to the first the Rural Dean who has again examined the matter on the spot assures me on the certificate of the Surveyors that it will not in the least degree tend to make the Church cold. As to the Second point: I have an estimate before me — For removing the Tables & making good the Wainscot £2. Closing the Clock Weight £2: boarding under the floor £1–10–0 — Total £5–10–0 — & to meet this I have a letter from your Rector desiring that his subscription should be appropriated to this work. I have therefore no hesitation in directing you according to your promise at once to complete this work.

I am Sir very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

290. To the Rev. G. W. Curtis *(iii 174)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 5, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have received from Padworth a memorial of a nature painful to myself & which I fear will be painful to you: but with the existence of which I cannot but acquaint you. It is signed by the Squire of the parish and by the Churchwardens on behalf of the parishioners *generally*: and it distinctly states their conviction that your return to residence in the parish will cause the greatest evil to the Church therein. That your return would operate 'to the disparagement of the Ministerial office & Character in the estimation of the people'. It is their opinion that your return would 'lead to several of the most respectable inhabitants discontinuing that attendance at Church which they now cheerfully give'. That they are 'strongly of opinion that the interests of the Parish & of Mr. Curtis himself would be best promoted by 'your continued absence.' They 'impute no flagrant violation of the Clerical character' but assert that you have 'failed to obtain the confidence & respect of the Parishioners for your Ministry'.[1] Nor is there any special movement in favour of Mr. Bevitt:[2] they are indeed satisfied with him, but they would be 'satisfied with any clergyman entertaining the notions of Clerical duty which obtain in the present day'.

[1] On Curtis, cf. the Diocese Book (I, ff. 107^{v}–8): 'Nothing amiss, poorish house, elderly, no particular scope for activity . . . a very sensible, amiable man. No great harm about him, not much to be said about him. Quarrels.' The 'Squire' of Padworth was Christopher Darby-Griffith, later M.P. for Devizes.

[2] The Bishop may have written 'Bevitt'; but presumably James Trevitt is meant (cf. no. 270).

Now it must be for you to weigh & I hope you will do it calmly & in the sight of God, whether your return to residence in this parish must not endanger the Salvation of Souls for which Christ died, & for which you must render an account. Should you resolve on leaving the Charge in the hands of the Curate I will give you a license of non-Residence.

[*Unsigned*]

291. To the Rev. H. Crowe (*iii 175*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 6, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Mr. Cole has just sent me your letter to him enclosing one from me (a copy) dated Aug. 14, 1848, informing you that I had succeeded in obtaining a grant of £80 from the Curates [Aid Society][1] & that you therefore need only pay £40 to Mr. Cole. It appears that I misunderstood the grant of the Society, & that they granted only £50 instead of £80. This I only learned the other day. In your letter of June you say 'I concur in the proposed appointment of an additional Curate on the condition of the expected aid of the Society being given as proposed. I wait your Lordship's further instructions, the sum you name to be granted is £20 or £25.' This then was your engagement with me: & though I need not fall back on this having obtained £50 instead of £20 or £25 I must call on you to pay £60 instead of £40 per annum to meet the Grant of the Society: according to your engagement with me June 3; that you would act on my further instructions when I found out how much I could obtain.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

My address will be Tuesday morning, Bounty Board, Deans Yard, Westminster.

292. To the Rev. J. Hart (*iii 176*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 8, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

It is far from my wish to burden you with any duty above your strength; and I should gladly see your & every such benefice multiplied fourfold in income. As you tell me that your health at present makes the performance of the second full service at Soulbury dangerous to you, I assent to your intermitting it as a present arrangement between Michlemas and Lady day.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

293. To the Rev. T. W. Allies (*iv 1*)

Tusmore, March 17, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

It is with great pain that I address this letter to you. But it is a duty from which I dare not shrink. I have this day finished the careful perusal of your recent volume[2] & I must call your most serious attention to the variance which in my judgement exists between its language & the dogmatic teaching of the Church of England.

[1] Not in MS.

[2] Allies' *Journal in France 1845 & 1848; Letters from Italy, 1847* (1849).

No particular extracts can, as it appears to me, *fully* exhibit this contradiction, because the general tone of your volume is more at variance with the teaching of our church than those particular extracts themselves to which I must call your attention. Thus for instance, your language throughout as to the celebration of the Mass & as to the Eucharist seems to me to contradict the explicit teaching of our church in her condemnation in the 28th Article of the Roman dogma of transubstantiation. Thus again your whole tone as to the church of which you are a minister seeming as it does to me depreciating & even insulting implies, more than any special passage your complete alienation from her, & your addiction to the Roman Communion; whilst the contrast between this language & your unbounded eulogies of the Papal System, & your feeble & diminishing disclaimers of Her peculiarities (limited I think in your latter journals to her claim of exclusive jurisdiction for the pope, to her use of prayer in a foreign tongue & to her denial of the cup to the laity & expressed feebly & doubtfully as to these) brings my mind painfully to the same conclusion.

Yet whilst these are in my judgement the worst features of your volume, there are besides these special declarations which I deem directly contradictory of the language of the 39 Articles: & prepared as I am (believing it to be the righteous intention of the Church) to grant to individual minds a large latitude of statement it will I am sure be evident to you, that I cannot allow this liberty to extend to a categorical denial of our dogmatic Formularies. I enclose you therefore a few of these which I have extracted & as to each of which I must require from you either such explanations as shall shew that I have mistaken your meaning & that they are reconcileable with the language of the 39 Articles; or failing that, their unqualified retractation [*sic*].

Failing one or the other of these nothing will remain for me but to call upon you solemnly in the name of God to discontinue that Ministry & renounce those Emoluments which you exercise and enjoy on the condition of holding articles of religion which you publickly contradict.

I shall deliver this letter to you God willing on Monday rather than send it before since it would make your meeting me at the Confirmation before I have received your answer painful to us both.

I remain, Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours very sincerely,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 17–18

294. To the Rev. J. R. Pretyman (*iv 2*)

Tusmore, March 19, 1849

My dear Sir,

Your reply to my last letter has caused me much pain: & I believe it to be my duty to tell you plainly my opinion concerning it.

[*Letter re-starts*]

My dear Sir,

I have received & read with much pain your letter of the 13th. You I have no doubt remember exactly what passed between us some time since when you tendered to me your resignation of Aylesbury in consequence of the scruples to which you now refer. You remember the means I took to quiet those scruples. I had hoped that those means had been effectual & felt thankful for having been allowed to remove your objections to the teaching of our church. But I see from your present letter with the greatest concern that your objections to that teaching to which you have solemnly subscribed remain unabated. I feel therefore to be

myself involved in retaining you as an incumbent whilst you do not believe in that which you solemnly affirmed as the condition of your institution. Now as I feel myself no doubt that the first principle of 'Subscription' is, that we hold our office on the condition of continuing to maintain that to which at receiving that office we bound ourselves, I cannot be easy without distinctly expressing this to you. It is a principle upon which I am bound at this moment *to act* in another case: & though yours seems to me to involve no such duty on my part yet I could not let you suppose that this ground was that on which I wished you to retain your preferrment.

I am, My dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

I beg my kind remembrances to Mrs Pretyman.

295. To the Rev. W. I. Baker (draft) *(iv 3)*

Kirtlington, March 21, 1849

We Samuel by Divine Permission Lord Bishop of Oxford, do hereby require you William Innis Baker[1] Rector of Heyford Warren in our Diocese to give two full Services in your parish Church every Sunday at the hours of 11 in the forenoon & 3 in the afternoon respectively: that is to say the 'Morning Prayer Litany & Communion Office' with a Sermon at 11 in the forenoon, & the 'Evening Prayer' with a Sermon at 3 in the afternoon: and this We require of you under our hand & seal pursuant to the act of Her Present Majesty Queen Victoria in this respect provided; from & after your receiving this notice at the hand of our Apparitor who is charged duly to serve the same upon you personally. Witness our hand this twenty first day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand, eight hundred & forty nine & in the fourth year of our Consecration

S. Oxon.

296. To the Rev. W. I. Baker *(iv 4)*

Kirtlington, March 21, 1849

Rev. Sir,

I have waited until this time before noticing to you your neglect in not replying to queries which I transmitted to you touching the State of your parish, because I desired to adopt the mildest course with you & earnestly trusted that in conversation I might bring you to a better mind. Your non appearance after my summons with the Catechumens of your parish compels me now to write to you. I have taken a legal opinion & find that you have rendered yourself liable to being summoned into my court & proceeded against there by your neglect to reply to my queries. I do not wish to put you to cost & trouble by such citation & monition, & therefore I hereby once more call on you privately to make these returns which you have with-held. Further I have occasion to blame you 1st for not having obeyed my directions as to your second Sunday Service. I now send you a formal order on this subject[1] & any neglect on your part of its observance

[1] No. 295.

will compel me to proceed against you according to the provisions of the act of Parliament. It is 2ndly my painful duty to blame you for the manifest want of preparation for the holy rite of Confirmation manifested by several Catechumens appearing with your ticket of approval, whose levity obliged me to dismiss them from the Church.

I am Rev. Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

My address will be Cuddesdon Palace.

297. To the Rev. T. W. Allies (*iv 5*)

Cuddesdon Palace, March 24, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

It gives me much pain to be obliged to say to you that your reply to my last letter has been most unsatisfactory to me. Before I wrote to you I had carefully noted all the passages to which you refer me; and had formed my estimate of the real tone of your work with them in my mind. They seem to me to amount to no more than assertions of your affection to the Prayer book if it is interpreted according to your own opinions. The part of my communication which needed the most direct reply you have left almost untouched under the allegation that my letter closes with a threat. I think that if you look again at it, you will perceive that it contains nothing but a declaration that if you cannot shew that your statements do not contradict the Articles, & will not retract them, I shall appeal to your own conscience as to whether it is honest to maintain your position as a paid teacher of doctrines you formally deny.

To this part of my letter I must then recall your attention. I have laid before you a set of passages, expressing *your own conclusions*, which appear to me to contradict the dogmatic teaching of the Articles. You reply only as to two of these. As to the first I gladly accept your assurance that you meant nothing more than is meant by the expression 'pure' or chaste 'Virgin' in our collect. I only regret that your language should have been such as to suggest to my mind a wholly different sense; viz. what in a recent encyclical letter is called 'The pious opinion that the blessed virgin was conceived without the original stain'. Your answer to my second objection quite misses the point really in question. I quote words of yours which seem to assert a bodily presence of Our Lord in the Holy Sacrament, & these without further explanation you alledge are justified by the assertion in our Catechism of His *Spiritual* presence. To my quotation of passages in which you justify, (1) the Adoration of the Holy Sacrament, though it is distinctly condemned in the Articles & in the dogmatic statement appended to our Communion office; (2) The invocation of Saints (3) The use of relics &c you say nothing. You cannot, I conceive, acknowledge the authority of my office, without allowing that you are bound on my requiring it, as I again do, to explain, justify or retract distinct passages in your published work against which I except as directly contradicting the letter & spirit of our Articles & Formularies.

I now require once more from you such explanation justification or retractation — & I require you to deal directly & honestly with my charge. You must I think perceive the difference between condemning others of idolatry of which you speak, as if I required you to do that, & justifying your own your own [*sic*] adoption for yourself, of their statements though those statements are condemned by our Church.

Nothing but Truth is dearer to me than Peace; & I shall therefore be heartily rejoiced by your freeing yourself from the imputation which your published words seem to me to cast upon you.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 19–20

298. To the Bishop of Lincoln (John Kaye) *(iii 177)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, March 26, 1849

My dear Lord,

I saw Mr. King[1] on Friday; & from our interview & from the character given of him I see no reason to refuse my assent to any arrangement you may be pleased to make as to Sherington. This I believe is the amount of responsibility you intended to involve [*sic*] on me. Whether Mr. King has strength of mind & moral character sufficient to be a man, to whom I should have given Sherington is a question I believe you did not wish me to consider. I venture at the suggestion of the Bishop of London to trouble you on another matter. You have I doubt not noticed Mr. Allies recently published 'Journal'. I read it through at the earliest opportunity & finding it as it appeared to me expressing opinions directly contradicting our Formularies I wrote to him as his Diocesan stating my unfavourable estimate of the general tone of his book, giving him a list of direct extracts which I enclose, & calling upon him for explanation, or failing that retractation: adding that failing this I should have to call solemnly on him to consider whether he could retain his place amongst us.[2] I enclose your Lordship his reply. I have rejoined calling again for distinct replies to these extracts & blaming the evasive tone of this letter.

The question on which I venture to ask your Lordship's counsel is what further steps I ought to take in the (probable) event of the uselessness of my private remonstrance; and your Judgement as to the distinctness of the contradiction between Mr. Allies' statements & our Formularies.[3]

I am, My dear Lord, Ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

299. To C. H. Christie[4] *(iii 178)*

Cuddesdon Palace, March 26, 1849

Dear Sir,

I wish you, before I give any other answer to your application to consider & reply distinctly & fully to the following questions:

1. Is there in the Eucharist any propitiatory sacrifice of any sort.

[1] Alexander King (1825–84), R. of Sherington, 1849–84 (O). The Bishop secured a promise of £500 to restore the church, but had difficulty getting King to believe he had promised (Diocese Book, II, p. 434).

[2] See no. 293.

[3] Kaye had been Regius Prof. of Divinity at Cambridge, 1816–27. Wilberforce preferred not to write to Jacobson, Regius Prof. of Divinity at Oxford.

[4] The recipient is indexed as 'Christie'; probably Charles Henry Christie (b. 1820; deacon 3 June 1849, priest 1850, subsequently C. of All Saints, Margaret Street; and C. of Lewknor from 1849) (O) is meant.

2. Point out the difference between the Church of England & of Rome as to this matter.
3. How would you justify that of which you approve?
4. Is there any sense in which the invocation of Saints can be reconciled with the language of the English Articles.
5. What arguments can you adduce from Holy Scripture to confirm their Statement?

I am ever yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

300. To the Rev. N. Dodson[1] *(iii 179)*

Cuddesdon Palace, March 26, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I shall be happy to subscribe £100 to your Abingdon Scheme: i.e. £20 towards each Church to be paid on the day of Consecration & £10 on each Parsonage to be paid on completion.

There are one or two matters which need distinct settlement in our Scheme. 1st. The several districts [of Abingdon] all to be made separate & distinct parishes.

2. How is the Patronage to be arranged.
   St. Helens of course in the Crown?
   St. Nicholas in Trinity College?
   Ock Street Church, if endowed by the Crown in the Crown: if not in the Bishop?
   Drayton Do?
   Sandford Do.
   Shippon (The *last* to be undertaken I suppose) Do?[2]
3. You will not I trust think of *advertizing* for plans. None but aspirants will thus compete & we shall suffer. The safe way is to take Scott or Ferrey[3] or some established man and let them give us a design. In any way I can I shall be glad to co-operate.

Can you give me any light as to the present legal position of Drayton? I have been assured that it is really a separate parish.

I am, my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Nathaniel Dodson (1787–1867), V. of Abingdon 1824–67, Buttermere, Wilts., 1818–67 (O). 'Energetic active man. R.D. Magistrate. Kind-hearted. Perhaps a little overburthened with secular business but good and devout' (Diocese Book, I, f. 95).

[2] The history of St. Helen's, Abingdon, and its dependent districts is complicated (cf. the last paragraph of this letter). The Bishop appears to propose donations of £20 towards each of three new churches (in Ock Street, Abingdon, and at [Dry] Sandford and Shippon) and of £10 towards each of four new parsonages (one for the last two places and three in Abingdon itself), i.e. £100 in all. Eventually churches were consecrated at Shippon and Dry Sandford in 1855, and those parishes were separated from St. Helen's in 1865 and 1867 respectively. St. Helen and St. Nicholas, Abingdon, were united in 1854; Dodson built the third church in Abingdon (St. Michael, a chapel of ease to St. Helen's) in 1867, though not in Ock Street; and in the same year Drayton became a separate ecclesiastical parish. The Bishop obtained the patronage of Dry Sandford, Drayton, Shippon, and St. Helen's.

[3] George Gilbert Scott (1811–78) (*DNB*); and Benjamin Ferrey (1810–80), a pupil of Pugin; Diocesan Architect, Bath and Wells, 1841–80; restored Wells Cathedral, 1842 (*DNB*).

301. To the Rev. H. Biddulph *(iii 180)*
Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, March 26, 1849

My dear Sir,

I had on Saturday at the confirmation a painful conversation with Mr. Burgess of which I hasten to inform you. I saw him after the Service & asked him if he had now made up his mind to follow my advice & abandon his sporting habits. He said that he had resolved *not* to alter. I told him I must then look for his resignation before next autumn. He replied that he had changed his mind on this point and should not now resign. I told him that such a line of conduct could only lead either to his receiving a notice from you or having his license revoked by me: and I urged him for his own sake not to bring this upon himself. He has requested a month for consideration, at the expiration of which time if he does not offer to resign I must ask you to give the notice which you kindly promised me when we last communicated on this subject.

I am, my dear Sir, most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

302.[1] *(iv 6)*

Cuddesdon Palace, March 26, 1849

Dear Sir,

I felt so much interest in you that I resolved before I finally determined as to your application to communicate with various parties to whom you had referred me. I have now done so — and the result of these communications is my conviction that I ought not to receive you as a Candidate for holy orders.

You must receive this reply as *final.*

I am Dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

The Sermons &c you sent me to look at will be left for your call at the House of W Parker Wheatley — by the High road into Oxford.

303. To the Rev. F. Rose[2] *(iv 7)*

Cuddesdon Palace, March 26, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I am desirous of making some arrangement for the duties . . . [*illegible*] . . . of your parishes & I shall be obliged to you therefore for letting me know as soon as you can on what you determine as to residence. You heard no doubt in reply to your last letter, from Mr Burder that I should be willing to receive your resignation of your livings if you tendered it.

I have been applied to to know whether in the event of the administration of the Holy Communion *in your parish* & your presenting yourself, it ought to be administered to you. I am unwilling to believe that you could under present circumstances thank of presenting yourself — & I should be glad to be able to reply that you have no intention of doing so. There can be no doubt that failing such an assurance I should be compelled to reply that you must not be admitted.

I am Rev. Sir Yours faithfully,

S. Oxon.

[1] Recipient unidentified.

[2] Francis Rose (d. 1870), R. of Woughton on the Green and Little Woolstone, 1823–55; P.C. of Baulking and Woolstone, 1855–70. Rose was accused of adultery, but (as no. 568 shows) the Bishop later inclined to disbelieve the charge.

304. To A. Barton (Churchwarden of Winslow) *(iv 8)*

Cuddesdon Palace, March 26, 1849

Sir,

In reply to the Memorial presented to me by yourself & other memorialists requesting the restoration of the afternoon Sunday Service at Winslow I beg to reply to you & through you to them: That I am very glad to perceive from it their anxiety to attend public worship of the Church & trust that the opportunity they desire may be speedily given to them.

The result of the enquiry conducted at my request by the Rural Dean was that there was great division of opinion as to the best time for the Service: that for the poor & least instructed the Evening Service was by far the most important; whilst the convenience of a few wealthier people would seem to be more promoted by afternoon Service. Under these circumstances I desired to retain the evening & restore the afternoon service — & to this the Vicar at once consented. His illness has prevented the earlier resumption of the afternoon prayers: the Curate having with the Work House duty 3 full services already on his hands. I trust that it may please God speedily to restore your Vicars health so that he may resume his place & restore the third Service amongst you.[1]

I shall be obliged by your making the contents of this letter known to the Memorialists. With the memorial was transmitted a letter from Mr Bowen written throughout in so improper a tone that I am unable to give it any more direct reply.[2]

I am Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

305. To the Rev. W. R. Fremantle *(iv 9)*

Cuddesdon Palace, March 26, 1849

My dear Fremantle,

I think you should see the enclosed & I shall be glad to know from you the general character of the signers.

I have replied to Mr A Barton the Church Warden — That I am glad they are anxious for increased opportunities — That on your enquiry opinion seemed divided as to which service was best — the Evening seeming so for poor the other for higher people — That on this I wished to have both — That the Vicar consented & his illness alone has prevented — That I do not reply to Mr Bowen because his letter is written in so improper a tone as to make it impossible for me to write to him. You must be ready to engage him 'in The Times or County papers'.

Kindest remembrances to Mrs Fremantle.

I am ever affly yours,

S. Oxon.

306. To the Rev. W. B. Lee[3] *(iii 181)*

Cuddesdon Palace, March 27, 1849

My dear Sir,

Mr. Burder will if you will write to him at once forward a license of non-residence. It must be a formal license if it is to be a legal shelter.

1 It had been restored by 1853.

2 William Bowen lived at Selby Villa, Buckingham Road, Winslow.

3 William Blackstone Lee (1795–1874), Fellow of New College 1812–36; R. of Wootton, Oxon., 1836–74.

I have been for some time about to write to you on another matter.

Dr. Richards[1] finds that the charge of his headship with the addition of the office of Rural Dean is beyond his present strength.

In looking round the Deanery for a successor I see none who under God's blessing might be so useful in that office as yourself, should you be willing to accept it.

The visitation of Churches might be done at your own time, in the warm weather: whilst the other & more important duties of the office, the bringing the Clergy together, acting as their local head, gathering them in the Rural Chapters, & stirring them up to greater & more harmonious activity, all this would be I trust no strain on your health, whilst your means and habits of life would render it of easy accomplishment. I believe also, which in this office is a matter of peculiar importance, no other appointment would be equally acceptable to your brethren.

I rejoice to hear a better account of Mrs. Lee. I was very sorry not to see you (except from the pulpit) at Torquay.

I am, My Dear Sir, most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

307. To the Rev. F. Rose *(iv 10)*

Cuddesdon Palace, April 12, 1849

Rev. Sir,

I shall be willing to allow to you out of your livings all that remains after paying the legal Stipend of their Curacies; that is to say £180 per annum, & the expences of the Commission; provided you will fix an early day on which I can offer possession of your House to some Curate who will reside.

I would also propose that he should pay you 10 per cent for the estimated value of your furniture.

I am Rev. Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

308. To the Rev. G. W. Jordan *(iv 11)*

Private & Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, April 17, 1849

My dear Sir,

My attention has been called to two matters in which you have caused offence to your brethren in the Ministry of our Church. The one the circulation of a tract in behalf of Wesleyan Methodism, The other the published intention of preaching a sermon in behalf of their missions. Now as it is in my judgement impossible at the present day to doubt that the system of Wesleyan Methodism is a system antagonist to the Church of which you are a Minister, I cannot but agree in the opinion that your conduct in these matters is contrary to the mind of Christ — and entertaining this opinion I feel it due as well to yourself as to my office to tell you so with all Christian frankness & earnestly to beseech you in the name of Christ to reconsider & I trust to abandon such courses.

[1] Joseph Loscombe Richards (1798–1854), Rector of Exeter College 1838–54, and V. of Kidlington, 1838–54 (*MEB*).

I am persuaded that they weaken your own hands in your Ministry; that they weaken the hands of your brethren & of the Church whose bread you eat & by whose Spiritual Ministration you have been yourself grafted into Christ.

It is one thing to have the kindest feelings towards & the most charitable judgement of all our brother Christians: and wholly another thing whilst they sever themselves from us to take an active part in their acts;

I am, My dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

309. To the Rev. W. S. Bricknell *(iv 12)*

Canterbury, May 29, 1849

My dear Sir,

I think that under the act you are entitled to keep your Curate out of both houses of residence by residing yourself at each. I admit therefore that you have here under the act a means of obtaining the performance of a Curates duty at a lower scale than the act fixes.

I do not think your other plea valid. I do not allot the whole income of the living of Grove to your Curate: but I allot him say £150 as the income to which he would be entitled as the legal income of the Curacy of Ensham. Now I have every wish to meet your wishes provided I at the same time secure for your Curate his due remuneration. Will you then take £150 as the sum I allot for your interchangeable Curate: & setting that sum in one column, set down in another what you consider the value of the off-sets you propose to allow him in the way of house, garden, & service, & I shall be willing to License Dr B. at such a salary as appear to be the fair balance of these two accounts.

Great occupation has delayed this letter: but as I think it inexpedient to let your Curate continue unlicensed I will beg you to give your immediate attention to it. My address will be Cuddesdon till Monday next.

I am, my dear Sir, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

310. To The Rev. H. Biddulph *(iv 14)*

Confidential

Nr. London, July 1, 1849

My dear Sir,

I have waited much beyond the month, within which Mr Burgess was to communicate with me if he had determined to relinquish those habits of sporting against which I have remonstrated with him both publickly & privately — but I have heard nothing from him. I shall at once write to him to ascertain that he is still of the same mind: & if unhappily I find that he is, I shall not be able to allow him to continue in his Curacy. As however it will be far less injury to him to have received from you a notice to leave it in six months than to have his licensed [*sic*] revoked by me, and as I am anxious to do what I judge needful in the way least injurious to him, I trust that you will act on your original promise & forward to me such a notice for my countersignature if I am obliged to use it: unless which would be much better you can prevail upon Mr Burgess to tender voluntarily his resignation.

I am, My dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

311. To the Rev. W. S. Bricknell *(iv 13)*

Near London, July 2, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have delayed answering your last letter until I had the opportunity of consulting one of my Brethren of large experience in His Diocese as to the course which it was best to pursue as to the Curate of Grove. My conclusion after such consultation is this. As I think that in equity your Curate is entitled besides his legal salary to the use of the Parsonage house: (since you would only reside in it 4 months in order to prevent its being his under the letter of the Act) I cannot acquiesce in the principle on which you propose to deduct £50 per annum from his stipend. I must therefore require you over & above the advantages you propose to allow him to pay him £75 per annum, being the lowest money payment named in the Act for regulating the Stipends of Curacy — and I must call on you without further loss of time to nominate a Curate to me, stating expressly in your nomination this sum of £75 in money & the other advantages proposed as the Stipend you allow him.

I am my dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

312. To the Rev. F. Burges *(iv 15)*

nr. London, July 2, 1849

Rev. Sir,

I have waited much beyond the month at the expiration of which I was to hear from you if you were prepared to act upon my advice by either abandoning those sporting habits which appear to me incompatible with the due discharge of your clerical functions, or by tendering to me the resignation of your Curacies. As however I am most anxious that in the performance of what I esteem a painful duty I should as little as possible injure you I do not like to take the only step which remains for me without once more distinctly asking you in writing whether you are resolved to force me to revoke your license by refusing either of these alternatives. I shall for your own sake greatly lament your forming such a determination; & I therefore beg you once more to re-consider the whole matter & then forward to me your decision.

I am Rev. Sir, Very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

313. To the Rev. F. Burges *(iv 16)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 10

Rev. Sir,

You must have entirely misapprehended my words since you suppose me to have said that I had no objection to a clergyman hunting occasionally. What I may have said was that I should take no notice of such a case if the general tenour [*sic*] of the Clergymans life was not that of a sporting man. I cannot but consider you as distinctly a sporting Clergyman; & I cannot therefore be satisfied without your assuring me that you will not hunt when you are at your Curacy.

I must beg for your distinct reply on this point.

I am very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

314. To T. B. Horsfall[1] *(iv 17)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, July 10, 1849

Sir,

After the correspondence which has recently passed between us, it seems to me to be due to you that I should state to you, that strong Statements were made by a highly respectable witness before the Committee of which I am Chairman (since I wrote last to you) tending to establish some complicity between the direct trade of this Country & Africa with the Slave trade. Should you think it expedient to be examined on this point I have little doubt that the committee would hear you tomorrow week.

I am Sir, Yours sincerely,

S. Oxon.

315. To the Rev. G. W. Jordan *(iv 18)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 10, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I received your letters of June 16, & 25, with pain — and I have waited a few days in the hope that you would have seen their impropriety. I 'advanced' in my charge no 'claim' of any sort. I did not stop to consider whether I had a legal right to *enforce* my admission into the Churches of my Diocese: it never occurred to me that any clergyman of the Diocese who believed Episcopacy to be Gods appointment could raise so undutiful & disloyal (as to me it seems) a question. As however you require to be satisfied of my power of legal enforcement I have felt it my duty to take the best opinion I could upon the matter, the sentence of which is, that I have as Bishop by my Ordinary power, & by a multitude of Canons, & by recent enforcement full legal right to take what part I choose in the Service in Every Church in my Diocese.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

316. To C. Warren[2] *(iv 19)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 10, 1849

Sir,

On the General subject of your letter I can add nothing to what I said to you when you called on me. Dr Rose selected his own Judges: his defence was most carefully considered by them; and they, his personal friends, unanimously found him Guilty; I have never heard from any of them that they saw any reason to doubt the correctness of their verdict. I cannot therefore but treat him as Guilty. The only point in your letter which seems to me to need an answer is that in which you imply that after advising Dr R: to submit to sentence rather than carry his cause to the Arches Court, I passed on him when he submitted a severer penalty than he expected. Now the answer to this is very simple, I had told Dr Rose what the sentence which I should pronounce would be. I should now repeat the advice I gave him at first not to carry the case further.

I remain Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Thomas Berry Horsfall (1805–78), of Liverpool; M.P. for Derby 1852–3, Liverpool 1853–68; President, Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, 1849 (*MEB*).

[2] Unidentified.

317. To the Rev. F. Rose *(iv 20)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 10, 1849

Rev. Sir,

I have waited till I had ascertained what were the costs of the enquiry before I replied to your last letter. I find that they amount to £80. Thus should you resolve on residing during the period of your suspension in some other neighbourhood (a matter I believe to be of great moment for the Spiritual Good of your parishes) there would remain a considerable Balance above the Curates Stipend which, in that case, I should feel myself able to direct to be paid to you.

Upon this point I shall be glad to receive your final decision at your early convenience.

I am Rev. Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

318. To the Rev. E. Luce[1] *(iv 22)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 10, 1849

My dear Sir,

I have written to Mr Paddon my Judgement on your Sermon & have requested him to shew you my letter. In that I have told him that I think him bound to you unless you release him. But I would strongly urge you so to release him unless with a full & hearty assent he desires you to act as his Curate. I was from the first fearful that your connexion with Mr Paddon might lead to embarrassments which would impede your usefulness in the School: I feel *sure* that if you become his Curate whilst he regards you with suspicion that this *must* be the case. I must beg you to shew this letter to Mr Paddon & Mr Bickersteth.

I am my dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

319. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(iv 21)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 12, 1849

My dear Sir,

I have read carefully through Mr Luce's Sermon. My opinion of it may be given in a few words. If this were to be the tone of all his sermons I think there would be in it too much about 'The Established Church &c'. But manifestly he was led by his subject into speaking on these matters in this Sermon far more than he would do habitually. Further there are a few expressions in it, which I should prefer varying: I allude specially to those you have marked in page VII. But I can find nothing whatever to justify your charge of 'Fundamental Error'. You have specially marked p 14 — 'Nor can we meditate better on this solemn theme than by taking the prayer book as our Guide' & this is afterwards explained to be by specially pondering on the chapters selected by our Reformers as intimating or explaining the doctrine of the Trinity. I am really at a loss to see what there is to Object to in this statement.

Again you have specially scored 'Think you not that some debt of gratitude is due to Almighty God for the Established Church & her formulary the Book of

1 Edmund Luce, of Trinity College, Dublin, ordained as master of High Wycombe School, 1849; C. of Hampden and Little Kimble, 1850; Headmaster of Amersham Grammar School; Chaplain of the Amersham Union, 1855. Nothing further is known of his career.

Common Prayer' Is this 'fundamental error'. Again P xv you score 'when by Baptism we become members of Christ Children of God & inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven' Now these words are taken as you will remember from the Catechism: they therefore cannot be held to be 'fundamental error'. Now my dear Sir, I am bound in Christian faithfulness to say to you that I do not think you have made good your charge & that except with Mr Luce's free consent I cannot hold you to be at liberty to break the engagement you have entered into with him. Most assuredly I would not knowingly license a Curate who did not hold these truths. I must beg you to shew this letter to Mr Luce and to let me hear your joint determination.

I am my dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

320. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(iv 23)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 14, 1849

My dear Sir,

I have two letters of yours to acknowledge, one undated received yesterday, one dated July 13 received today. In your letter received yesterday to me, & your letter to Mr Luce you speak as if the sentiment stated by Mr L: impugned by you & in which I see 'no fundamental error' was, that 'a Christian without a book of Common prayer must be left to wander without a guide &c' Now this is *not* the proposition I understand Mr L to have laid down or defended. He is speaking of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, & he say [*sic*] as to this doctrine instead of wandering through all holy Scripture to find for ourselves the scattered intimations of this mysterious truth, let us take the Prayer book for our guide & study especially the passages of Gods Word to which on this day the Church has called our attention as specially containing proofs or intimations of this great doctrine. I cannot regard such a mode of speech as in any way objectionable. The passages in question are undoubtedly chosen for us for this very purpose, how then can it be, but that instead of a man searching for himself in Gods word at a great disadvantage from want of acquaintance with it, the passages which bear specially on this doctrine, he has in the prayer book selection of passages a guide or finger mark provided by our reformers & pointing him at once to the passages he needs. This seems to me no more to disparage the Holy Bible than the existence of an index disparages a book to the contents of which it is a guide. The case of those who have not the help of such a guide or index has nothing to do with the fact of its being so far a guide to those who do possess it.

I cannot quite assent to your denuntiation of Mr L as dishonourable for having copied or shewn my letter. He certainly erred in doing so. But it was probably only an error in judgement — unconnected with any concealment and the result of nothing worse than a misunderstanding on his part of the degree of license allowed him when you sent the letter to him, instead of merely as I desired *showing it to him.*

Mr Luce I understand leaves the matter of the Curacy to my judgement. I am clear that he ought not to accept the offer you have made him — & that he will do well not to seek to force himself on you as Curate without your full & free assent.

I am, My dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

321. To the Rev. E. Luce *(iv 24)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 14, 1849

My dear Sir,

I am quite clear that you ought not to accept Mr Paddons offer of a readership: & that as he evidently cannot with full & free assent offer you the Curacy you ought not to endeavour to press yourself upon him in virtue of his former offer. It is impossible under the circumstances that you should so work together as either to profit the parish, be at peace amongst yourselves or avoid injuring your School.

Mr Paddon feels much aggrieved at your shewing & copying my letter to him, which he, at my desire shewed to you. I think you clearly erred in doing this.

I am Ever, Yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

322. To the Rev. W. Lloyd[1] *(iv 25)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 14, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

In reply to your question, I should by no means advise you to exclude from alms which have been hitherto distributed to Church people & dissenters indiscriminately any persons simply on the ground of their own religious opinions as such. But if the distribution of the alms is left to you as *Clergyman of the Parish* to be made as you 'deem meet', I do not see how you can conscientiously deem those meet who for any reason systematically absent themselves from the public worship of the Church.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

323. To the Dean of Christ Church (Thomas Gaisford)[2] *(iv 26)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, July 14, 1849

My Dear Mr Dean,

Before my last Ordination I received an application from Mr Wilson[3] of your College, touching his refusal of testimonials by yourself. I then simply replied that the giving or witholding testimonials was within your jurisdiction & that I could not interfere. But since that time I have received further applications from the Father of the young man & from the Bishop of Ripon[4] who has been long & intimately acquainted with the young man: & I do not like not directly communicating with yourself on the case they have laid before me. That case is briefly this. The Testimonials were refused *for a time* in consequence of certain acts of Mr Wilsons creating on your mind the impression that he held

1 William Lloyd (1800–89), R. of Lillingstone Lovell, 1827–89 (O).

2 Thomas Gaisford (1779–1855); Dean of Christ Church, 1831–55 (*DNB*).

3 Arthur Charles Wilson (1826–80), Student of Christ Church, 1845–54; ordained deacon and priest by Wilberforce in December 1849 and December 1850 respectively; Headmaster of Basingstoke Grammar School, 1870–3; incumbent of two Lincolnshire parishes, 1873–80 (*MEB*).

4 Charles Thomas Longley (1794–1868), Bishop of Ripon 1836–56, Durham, 1856–60; Archbishop of York 1860–2, Canterbury, 1862–8 (*DNB*).

Romanizing tenets contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England. The Bishop of Ripon assures me that he believes there is not any foundation in fact for such an apprehension. On the strength of such an assurance from him, I have myself seen the young man and he gives me the strongest declaration to the same effect. His Father presses strongly either that some false doctrine should be established against him or that his professional course should not be inhibited.

This being the case; I am anxious to enquire of you whether you will allow me to say that if Mr Wilson conducts himself properly you will feel yourself able at the next Ordination I hold to allow him his College testimonials. You will I am sure give me credit for earnestly desiring to support to the utmost of my power your decision in the matter of Testimonials.

I am my dear Mr Dean, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

324. To the Rev. F. Rose *(iv 27)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 16, 1849

Rev. Sir,

All your letters have duly reached me: but I did not refer to the intermediate letters because as I have always intimated to you I must decline discussing with you the propriety or impropriety of the sentence under which you suffer. I have no other means of testing the accuracy of *the facts* alledged or denied but by the examination of the Commissioners. Those Commissioners, named by yourself, reported to me their unanimous verdict, after a full & patient examination of the facts; I told you what the sentence would be that I should pronounce, if you chose to submit to it instead of carrying the matter to the Arches Court; I advised you to submit to that sentence: I still think you did wisely in submitting; but after submission & sentence I cannot re-open the question, having no means for examining the facts which were patiently investigated by the Commissioners.

I greatly regret your decision as to residence; but have nothing to add to what I have already said. I will desire Mr Burder to forward you a detailed statement of accounts.

I am Rev Sir, Very Sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

325. To J. W. Whateley[1] *(iv 28)*

Private[2]

Cuddesdon Palace, July 16, 1849

My dear Sir,

Will you read in confidence the enclosed letters & return them to me. I think my nephew may reasonably object to being limited to so very small a settlement on his wife. But on the other hand I do not think he ought to be allowed to settle all on his wife. He may die without issue early: if he were to charge the whole value of the property by way of settlement on her it might for many years be kept from his own family. The estate was not left absolutely to him that he might make any capricious use of it but in the confidence he would use it fairly for my Fathers then representatives. If you will advise what would be in common cases the amount which the life owner of such a property would be allowed to charge it with for a widow I am sure my brother Robert will assent to it: & I will gladly

[1] Presumably the prominent Birmingham attorney, John Welchman Whateley (*Law List*).
[2] Underlined twice.

agree to anything which is just to him. I think however it ought to be limited in this full jointure to the time of her remaining unmarried, — & care should be taken that it is hers only during good conduct if any such provision can be properly inserted.

Perhaps you will communicate with me on the matter. My address is to be as above till Wednesday — Thursday & Friday Wood Hall Park Ware — Saturday East Sheen London. Monday till Saturday Wilton House Salisbury.

I am my dear Sir, Ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

326. To the Rev. F. Burges *(iv 29)*

Wilton House, Wilton, July 23, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Before I enter upon the rest of your letter I am compelled to call your most serious attention to some great inaccuracies in your statement of what has already passed between us.

Ist In the interview of Nov 20. I distinctly told you that my disatisfaction with you rested on the fact of your frequent & habitual hunting: (i.e. 2ce or 3 times a week). To illustrate to you how such conduct led to remark I told you that I had myself heard you spoken of as addicted also to races, shooting fishing &c. But I told you that it was not for these I sent for you: that I mentioned them to you as illustrating the impression produced upon others by your character. When you assured me that there was no foundation for these reports I said; Their assumed falsehood only confirms what I have said to you. Your allowed habitual hunting leads others to impute all the rest. It is therefore an entire misconception on your part that I 'remonstrated with you on the assumption that you were in the habit of racing &c.'

II. I did *not* decline your tendered resignation of the Curacy. You told me that you were liable for certain contracts for coal for the Poor, Rent of Land hired for their allotments, which would expose you to a great pecunary [*sic*] loss you said between £100 & £150 if you were required to act suddenly on your offered resignation. I told you that I would not allow your works of Charity to lay such a loss on you: that you should for the present retain your Curacy: that as you assured me you had resolved to diminish your hunting from 2ce or 3 times to once a week, *in consequence of my charge*, I trusted before another hunting season you would assure me that you would drop it altogether, & that I should very unwillingly see you abandon active service in the Church (of which abandonment you had spoken as likely to be peculiarly injurious to your own character). The value of which at Standlake so far as concerned the temporal interests of your parish I freely admitted.

There was therefore nothing to excite your 'surprize' when six months later I enquired whether you were prepared to drop your hunting, & on your replying that you had resolved not to abandon it, I called on you for the fulfilment of your offered resignation of the Curacy.

III. At that interview, I did *not* verbally revoke your licence. I told you that if you withdrew your promise it would oblige me to revoke your license — a license never has been revoked by me verbally nor am I sure that it can be legally so revoked. '*You* did *not*' solicit me to revoke it in writing & I refuse' you asked me to give you in writing a statement that I revoked your licensed [*sic*] for hunting. I at once refused so improper a request: especially made, as it was, in an unbecoming manner — and added that it was *needless* for me to give you the reason for my

revoking your license in writing, as I had fully explained it; & that it would be *inconvenient* because it was not the simple fact of occasional hunting, but because I could not but regard your character as that of a 'Sporting Clergyman'.
IV. I did *not* advise your resigning because 'people would think there was something behind': but because it was a prima facie discredit which I wished to save you that your license had been revoked.
V. I did not 'give you to understand that your appeal to the ArchB. would be fruitless'. I said to you — 'If you think my decision wrong you will be able to appeal to the Arch Bishop and I cannot fear His Graces decision upon the question of whether under your circumstances I have acted wrongly in revoking your license.'

It gives me much pain to have to point out to you these very material inaccuracies in your report of what passed between us.

I must ask you before I reply particularly to the rest of your letter to tell me explicitly what the 'discreet exercise of the liberty' you seek implies. You treat it as an 'imputation' & distinctly repudiate it as such that you are called 'a hunting Clergyman' Am I therefore to understand that you will *as a regular habit* abandon hunting when at your Curacy?

I am very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

327. To the Archbishop of Canterbury (J. B. Sumner) *(iv 30)*
Confidential

Wilton House, Wilton, July 23, 1849

My dear Lord,

May I ask your Grace to read the enclosed letter from Mr Burgess & a proposed answer to it which I do not wish to send if Your Grace thinks that I can take any other line, or write in any other tone. The case you will probably remember is one on which I asked your counsel before I took the first step. Mr B: is a curate who has been in the habit of hunting 3 times a week, who is in fact the leader of a knot of young men of this sort; & *he* has brought much reproach on the Church thereby. At the same time he is as he boasts very active in his parish in all temporal matters. He is I regret to say notoriously incorrect as to strict veracity. This letter is an instance of his inaccuracy of statement. If your Grace approves may I ask you to let the enclosed letter be forwarded from London. But if anything you would desire it, other than it is, may I ask you to believe that I shall rejoice to receive & act upon your advice.

I am most Sincerely, Your Grace's dutiful & affectionate,

S. Oxon.

328. To the Rev. T. W. Allies *(iv 31)*

Lavington, Aug. 27, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Owing to my not being in the habit of seeing the Tablet Newspaper I have only just become aware through the Oxford paper, of the existence of a letter stated to have been addressed by you on the Second of June to the Editor of the Tablet Newspaper containing the following words — 'I adore (at the celebration of the Eucharist) with the Adoration due only to God the Lord Jesus Christ truly really personally & substantially present under the species of bread and wine'. I shall be obliged by your informing me if that published letter is to be attributed

to yourself & if you adhere to the doctrinal statement contained in the words above quoted. & (3)rdly if so, whether you consider them as reconcileable with the doctrine of the Prayer book & the articles of the Church of England taken in their strict literal & grammatical sense.

I must further request you to inform me who is supplying your place at Launton during your absence.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 27

329. To the Bishop of Ely (Thomas Turton)[1] *(iv 32)*

Private

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 27, 1849

My dear Lord,

Will you let me ask you to read the enclosed extract from a letter addressed by Mr Allies to the Tablet Newspaper, & give me your opinion, whether (1) it does not in the words '*substantially* under the species of bread & wine' contain a direct contradiction of the doctrine of the Church of England: and (2) Whether you think it most for the interest of the Church of England considering the difficulty & nicety of the point at issue that I should endure the scandal of leaving Mr A: uncensured or should proceed against him in the Courts.

The letter was written apparently about the beginning of June, & published in the Tablet June 2, *before* my published letter to my Archdeacon touching Mr A's book. But I have not seen it until last week extracted in an Oxford paper.

I am, My Dear Lord, Ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

330. To S. Lushington *(iv 33)*

Private

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 27, 1849

My Dear Sir Stephen, [*sic*]
My Dear Dr Lushington,

Will you let me once more task your kindness as to Mr Allies. I have *just* seen in the Oxford paper an extract from a letter of his to the Tablet of *June 2*, published therefore before my letter to the Archdeacon touching his book. It appears to me that 'substantially under the species of bread & wine' is a direct assertion of Roman doctrine: & not capable of admitting the excuses & solutions which applied to his book of his being a mere detailer of what was held by others &c. Will you tell me whether in your judgement this is so clear as to leave no reasonable doubt of the Court of Arches condemning him. & (2) whether this publication in a Newspaper brings him under the provision of the Clergy Discipline bill under me for the same.

My address is to be here till Saturday inclusive. Ryde Isle of Wight Sunday. Monday Swainston Isle of Wight. Tuesday — Romsey. Wednesday Thursday — Highlands. Reading Friday.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Thomas Turton (1780–1864), Dean of Peterborough 1830–42, Westminster, 1842–5; Bishop of Ely, 1845–64 (*DNB*).

331. To the Rev. W. Bond[1] *(iv 34)*

Lavington, Aug. 27, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I greatly regret to find that after all my efforts to enable you to remain in the Curacy you were so anxious to retain your refusal of Mr Robinsons[2] conditions prevents the success of my endeavours on your behalf.

At the same time I rejoice to have made these efforts for you: because their having been thus defeated by yourself convinces me that it would have been impossible for you to have worked the parish amicably with Mr Robinson.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

332. To the Rev. H. A. Small *(iii 182)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Oct. 26, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I find that Mr. Hayes[3] is likely to refuse the Curacy of Clifton Reynes in consequence of his unwillingness to pay for Fixtures &c. with a curacy of uncertain tenure. Now I must beg you to observe that this will equally prevent any respectable Curate taking the Curacy. And therefore I cannot (much as I wish to help you) allow this charge to be made. It is strictly & entirely illegal: & if you plead custom; I must remind you that even if I did allow this new Curate to pay, his payment could only be to Mr. Evetts[4] *who has not been repaid* what he paid. I am willing to allow Mr. Hayes to pay as a rent for their use (though this is not a legal charge) to *you* a percentage say of 10 per cent on your second inventory if you write to him by the first post to say that this will satisfy you.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, very truly yours,

S. Oxon

333.[5] *(iii 183)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 10, 1849

Gentlemen,

I have read the memorial & considered the plans accompanying it, which you have sent to me touching proposed alterations of the Parish Church of Moulsford. The printed letter you have sent from the Rev. Deacon Morrell[6] is I suppose intended to shew that the alterations are required by him as 'sole owner of the Parish' & not by yourselves. This has occasioned me much surprize; because such an application from him is a direct breach of an engagement he entered into when in May 1848 I acquiesced in the removal of the Painted East Window. At that time I wrote as follows to Mr. Morrell that no future question might arise in this subject — 'I am willing in consideration of your great services in

1 William Bond, C. of Chieveley, 1847. No more is known about him.
2 John Ellill Robinson (1807–99), V. of Chieveley, 1837–82 (O).
3 Thomas Hayes, C. of Heckfield, Hants., 1841, Wargrave, 1848; R. of Duntisbourne Abbotts, Glos., 1861–73 (C).
4 Thomas Evetts (1821–98), P.C. of Prestwood, 1852; R. of Monks Risborough, 1863–98 (O).
5 The letter explains the identity of the recipients: they were two substantial tenants of Deacon Morrell at Moulsford.
6 Deacon Morrell (1775–1854), Student of Christ Church 1792–1813, student of Lincoln's Inn; Lord of the Manor of Moulsford.

building a parsonage & endowing the Church to concede to your wishes all I can conscientiously yield: and on the *distinct understanding* that their concession will secure peace to your family & that *no further change* in the Church will be desired. I am ready to withdraw my objection to the Church Wardens complying with your wishes &c.'

On these terms Mr. Morrell received this permission; and his departure from them deprives him of all claim to personal consideration in this matter at my hands: rather it appears to me my bounden duty in virtue of my office to withstand one who in virtue of his being 'sole owner of the Parish' is disposed to dictate to his 'two tenants' whom he considers 'the only material householders in the village' what alterations He [*sic*] pleases in the Parish Church. The law of the Church & of this land places that building under my Charge & as I believe the proposed alterations to be not only needless but directly injurious I absolutely refuse to allow any of them to be carried into effect, and write to the Church Wardens of Moulsford to this effect by this Post.

I am Gentlemen, Yours Faithfully,

S. Oxon.[1]

334. To the Churchwardens of Moulsford (*iii 184*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 10, 1849

Gentlemen,

A plan of certain proposed alterations in Moulsford Church having been just submitted to me by two tenants of the Rev. D. Morrell, I have replied to them that 'I absolutely refuse to allow any of them to be carried into effect' & I hereby charge you, as you will hereafter answer for the same, that you allow no alteration whatsoever of the same building or any part thereof to be made without my previous assent as Diocesan & Ordinary being thereto had & obtained.

I am, Gentlemen, Your faithful Friend,

S. Oxon.

335. To the Rev. J. P. Walsh[2] (*iii 185*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 16, 1849

Rev. Sir,

If Mr. Champnes had informed me that he had engaged your services for six months I should not have called upon you to resign your post so suddenly. I understood him distinctly to say that his engagement with you determined on Wednesday & my desire was that he should not renew it. Under the altered circumstances of your having had reason to believe that you were to remain for six months I do not desire *abruptly* to terminate your services. At the same time I do not think you well suited for the permanent curacy of Upton and I think it very desireable that a permanent curate should be appointed. Whenever therefore such Curate shall be appointed *at latest* it would in my judgement be expedient to terminate your charge of . . . [*Unfinished*]

[1] Below this signature are the words: 'Messrs. John Rowles & Thomas Howard Hodges &c. I assent to the proposed additions to your Churchyard. S. Oxon.' These must be the Churchwardens of Moulsford addressed in no. 334.

[2] John Prendergast Walsh, C. of Clerkenwell 1849, Lavendon with Brayfield, 1850. He then went to Ireland and disappears from the *Clergy List*.

336. To the Rev. E. T. Champneys *(iii 186)*
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 16, 1849

My dear Sir,

I have requested Mr. Walsh to shew you a letter I have written to him.

In your letter of July 3 you proposed to me that you should have two Curates one with house & salary of £90, and one with £60 to be ordained thereto & an house at a cheap rate if needed.

I wish to learn from you your present exact views. I have one or two curates strongly recommended to name to you: and I think it very desirable that you should at once engage a permanent Curate. Have you anyone to present to me on the title of the Second Curacy?

I am, my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

337. To the Dean of Rochester (R. Stevens) *(iii 187)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 19, 1849

Dear Mr. Dean,

I cannot forbear begging you once more to bring under the notice of your Chapter the importance of separating the hamlet of Cuddington from the Vicarage of Haddenham. Since I last addressed the Chapter painful circumstances have drawn the eyes of the whole county to Cuddington. The cholera has ravaged it: & when it was at its worst the sick were visited by no Parish Priest & the dead were interred without the rites of our holy Faith. When I complained to your Vicar, he replied that it was his Curate's charge and not his, and referred me to him. Now my Dear Sir I do earnestly trust that the Chapter will consider the evil state of things which was only shewn on this occasion in its true colours, & apply the remedy which is within its power. The population of Haddenham is almost 1600, that of Cuddington between 6 & 700 souls. I ask you to give Cuddington an independant [*sic*] responsible & resident Ministry of God's word & sacraments. I offer if you will endow it permanently with the sum to which its curate is legally entitled and which he must always receive, to secure these advantages to Cuddington if you will vest the Patronage in the Bishop of the Diocese. Haddenham will not be injured. The Maintenance of a Curate as there are two Churches is a matter of necessity not of choice. The only possible *injury* to Haddenham is that the Vicar may think himself of less consequence when he is not maintaining his vicarial power over the Curate of Cuddington. But this I am sure the Chapter will feel is not to be put into competition with the benefit which may accrue to the Souls of the Parishioners from a useful resident Ministry. If this opportunity is let slip it is most improbable that at any future time such an arrangement can be made. Since it is only through . . . [*Unfinished*]

338. To J. H. Dixon[1] *(iii 188)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 19, 1849

My dear Sir,

I think from one expression in your letter of yesterday that you must have misunderstood my last — you beg me to allow my 'determination at the Church to remain unaltered'. This is precisely what I am prepared to do. I then told

[1] James Henry Dixon of Moulsford.

you & I now repeat it: I think the proposed alterations in the Church in themselves objectionable; especially the erecting pews in a new Seated Church: But I feel that Moulsford owes so much to the Morrell family that I *may* allow the evil of these 8 pews for the sake of family peace in that family. But I must be thoroughly secure that when this concession is made another is not demanded.

There has been as I then told you a strange mistake already as to a former concession, & Mr. D. Morrell expressly justifies this decision on *his* having given no written or verbal assent to any such engagement. I must as I told you at Moulsford now be safe & I must therefore have a distinct written statement from Mr. D. Morrell that these alterations if allowed shall be the last he applies for. In this case on seeing plans for the alterations we agreed on I am ready to allow them. Though I think one South Window would be much better than those on the North Side; & though I think the Pews objectionable when they are to replace such seats as those at Moulsford, yet I will yield these for peace in the Morrell Family. But I must be assured that these requests are only [*sic*] instalments of other proposed changes. I had expected after what passed at Moulsford to have received this assurance in writing by the next Post — & I did not write till I was alarmed by your silence.

I am my dear Sir, Most truly Yours,

S. Oxon.

339. To the Rev. G. K. Morrell[1] *(iii 189)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 19, 1849

My dear Sir,

I was rather disturbed by your speaking of 'renewed expressions of interest' &c. & your 'having felt deserted'. I imagined last week that my whole conduct to you and yours was the exact opposite of that which such words would describe. The concessions I was reluctantly willing to make, were made, solely because I felt how much Moulsford owed to you & your family: & I thought that this debt of obligation would justify me in allowing what under other circumstances I could not have allowed. It has pained me to find that what I had reluctantly yielded against my own wishes for the sake of your family should appear to you 'desertion of you' — I thought too that it was what your last letter had suggested to me. But on referring to that I see I had misapprehended you.

I recommend at all events your remaining still *at present.* I should be very sorry if you left that neighbourhood: & I am not at all sure that your going now would bring peace. At present too matters are quite unsettled. In consequence of not receiving the assurance I requested as the condition of this concession that nothing further is asked, I have written to the Church Wardens to say that no alterations must be made without my *written* Sanction: & to Mr. Dixon for the 'Assurance'. Mr. D. has written wishing me to be content with *his* assurance: but this I have declined. So that unless Mr. D. Morrell sends it, no alterations of the present Church will be allowed by me.

I am, My dear Sir, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 George Kidd Morrell (1813–81), son of Deacon Morrell's only brother; Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, 1832–43, D.C.L., 1842; C. of Adderbury, 1843; P.C. of Moulsford, 1846–77.

340. To the Rev. J. P. Walsh (*iii 190*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 20, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Nothing contained in your letter to me has given me any offence.

It is my full conviction as I have before stated to you that you are not well suited to the curacy of Upton: & I have therefore felt obliged to refuse my assent to the provisional engagement made with you by Mr. Champnes. A permanent arrangement is now made & in accordance with it the duty of the Parish is provided for *on* & from next Sunday. You must therefore understand that your connexion with the parish ceases on Saturday next. It is very painful to me to do anything which even seems hard to a brother Clergyman: but I must do what I conceive to be my duty. You have mentioned the expence to which you have been put by this disappointed engagement & I hope you will receive from me as a brother in the Ministry the enclosed five pounds towards your Expences.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

341. To the Rev. J. Brogden[1] (*iii 191*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 24, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have received from the parish Church Warden of Deddington a complaint to which I must call your immediate attention. It is that 'since Nov. 1 you have been absent from your Cure & that during the whole of that time with the exception of one Sunday a new clergyman has performed the duty; arriving on Saturday night or even Sunday morning and leaving on Monday morning. The effect of this upon the attendance at Church is he tells me painfully apparent. There have been all doctrines preached & all variations in the Service exhibited.'

You will I am sure see that I cannot allow this to continue & I must require you either to return at once to your duty or to make such provision for it as I can approve of.

Have you not during the preceding part of the year been more than 36 days absent from your parish? I greatly regret that you should have burdened yourself with a parish so unsuitable to you: but so long as you retain it you must provide properly for its duties.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

342. To the Rev. H. Binney (*iii 192*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 24, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

The press of business attending an ordination has prevented my being sooner able to reply fully to your late letters. In doing so I feel bound first to express to you the pain which their tone in many places caused me. You allow yourself a license of speech & imputation which I deem entirely at variance with the Christian character. Thus in your last letter to me you charge *me* with abandoning you &c. &c. in the matter of the Litten: when the very opposite was the fact. I must beg you to confine yourself to more proper language, & to the real matter before us.

[1] James Brogden (1805–64), V. of Deddington, 1848–64; a scholarly man ruined by drink (*MEB*). For the sequel, see no. 578.

1. As to your objection to Mr. Newport's[1] title; I have weighed all you urge but do not feel that there is really weight in your arguments. I believe the restriction in the canon to be bona fide on the ordination of poor & unprovided Priests & the necessity of supporting those so ordained to be not so much a *punishment* as a remedy for the evil. The 'hereditary titles' seem to be objectionable on wholly other grounds. I regard the religious training of youth a distinct part of the Christian Pastor's Vocation: & in common with many of the most experienced of my brethren am prepared to ordain on School titles. Had Mr. Newport appeared your protest would not have delayed his ordination.

II. The Litten. I have looked carefully into all the documents I have been able to find concerning it & from these I gather (a) that it is *not* a religious foundation (b) That its 'Chapel' is only a room. That it is therefore (c) bona fide an endowed hospital with a provision for reading prayers to its inmates by a clergyman. Such foundations are very common: nor can I find that there is any instance in which the Rector of the Parish claims or exercises any controul [*sic*] over them. They are of the nature of private Chapels & all that can be required is the Bishop's license. Under this view I should be prepared to license any duly qualified clergyman presented to me by the Trustees. But I shall be ready to give my best attention to any objections temperately & respectfully urged which you may wish to lay before me: & to facilitate any arrangement which can make it parochially useful.[2]

III. I have heard of & seen a gentleman of some private fortune who is anxious for ordination & ready to take any curacy to which I may appoint him for even £50. He appears a grave worthy man: would you wish me to put him into communication with you if my own enquiries are satisfactorily answered.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours very sincerely,

S. Oxon.

343. To the Rev. J. P. Walsh

(*iii 193*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 27, 1849

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have received to day your letter requesting me 1st to back your application for a living to the Lord Chancellor.[3] I have reason to believe that if any Bishop whom the Lord Chancellor did not esteem one of his Political party was to recommend a clergyman to His Lordship it would be fatal to his hopes. I shall not therefore injure you by declining to take this step. IIly you request me not to let any parochial agitation at Upton injure you. I am sorry to have plainly to tell you that your returning to remain at Upton (apart from your own family) with which you have no connection save a few weeks sojourn, will be taken by me & by most other persons to be the cause of any parochial agitation on this subject.

Your whole language too as to this curacy as if your bread & character depended upon it is of the same cast: & will I fear deeply injure you should it be continued.

I am, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Henry Newport (1823–90), assistant master at Tonbridge, Headmaster of Newbury Grammar School 1849–52, of Exeter Grammar School, 1852–76; subsequently R. of Wormshill, Kent, and then of Tarrant Hinton, Dorset. Ordained deacon 24 February 1850, and priest on 22 December 1850 as Curate of Newbury (*MEB*).

2 This paragraph concerns the Hospital of St. Bartholomew in Newbury.

3 Thomas Wilde (1782–1855), 1st Baron Truro, son-in-law of the Duke of Sussex, was Lord Chancellor, 1850–2.

344. To the Rev. J. P. Walsh *(iii 194)*
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 19, 1850

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I return you your proposed communication to Mr. Wiggins[1] [*sic*] with a commendatory letter. I have also named you to an incumbent in Bucks, near Olney, who is looking out for a Curate for his parish of Lavendon. It is a position in which I doubt not that your earnestness may be useful, & for which I do not think you disqualified by other things: as I do think you disqualified for Upton.

I can feel and make great allowances for you under your present disappointment; but I am bound to tell you that I disapprove of the whole tone of all your letters. You speak as if the Curacy of Upton was a property from which you had been wrongfully ejected. It was no such thing: the Vicar agreed to give it subject to my approval. I could not approve: & I was bound therefore to act as I did. I have never doubted the correctness of my decision: & every letter you have written to me down to the very last strengthens, if possible, my conviction that you want the soberness & judgement requisite for that Curacy. As to Mr. Frewer,[2] neither directly nor indirectly did he communicate with me or affect my judgement on the case. I am at a loss to understand how you can, even to yourself, represent your case as if your whole fortunes turned on your possessing this particular curacy. I cannot understand a clergyman with such testimonials as yours for a moment taking such a ground. But whether that be so or not I cannot allow that you have been treated 'barbarously' in being judged unfit for a peculiar & difficult post needing in my judgement those qualifications in which you are eminently deficient. I must wholly decline making any application whatever to the Lord Chancellor, and I think that no possible good can result from your maintaining a correspondence with me.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

345. To W. Merry[3] *(iv 35)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Sept. 20, 1850

My dear Sir,

I have now read through the Minutes for which I applied to you & also the remarks made by your Chaplain thereon. Having read all these I am prepared to express officially my opinion on the point submitted to me. But first I ought to state that until I heard from Mr Field[4] in answer to a letter from me I did not rightly understand the character of your first letter to me. I understood that letter to be the Statement of a Case, & that as such it had been agreed to as a statement of the case by the Chaplain as well as the visiting Justices. Had I not so understood it I should have pronounced no opinion until I had heard the Chaplains statement also.

1 William Wiggin, R. of Oddington, Glos., 1844–71 (O).
2 George Frewer (1822–1907), assistant master at Eton 1844–73 (C).
3 William Merry (of Highlands, Shinfield, in 1854) was a Visiting Justice of Reading County Gaol. His will was proved in March 1873 (ex inf. Miss A. Green, Berks. County Archivist). See *Hansard*, 3 ser., cvi. 1368 etc.
4 John Field (1813–84), son of John Field of Wallingford, Chaplain of Reading County Gaol 1840–58; he held various Curacies and was later R. of W. Rownton, Yorks. (O).

Now however that I have heard the Chaplains statement, I have nothing to alter in what I at first said. So far as regards the proposed excercises or proofs drawn from Scripture it is my clear opinion that they ought to be prepared from plain & not from marginal reference Bibles. This was the only point referred to me in your first letter & as to which I spoke. But a wider reference is opened by your Chaplain. He desires to have marginal reference bibles for the *general* instruction of the Prisoners though the exercises which practise & in some measure test their acquaintance with Holy Scripture are prepared from plain bibles. In this I entirely agree with him.[1]

I trust moreover that the visiting Justices will allow me to notice one other point; their chaplain has evidently felt keenly that he was bound to defend the independance [*sic*] of the important office which has been entrusted to him. So far as the Religious instruction of prisoners who are members of the Ch of E is concerned, it is manifest that the trust is committed to him; & for plain reasons. The visiting Justices might be members of the Church of Rome or of any other body avowedly hostile to the Church of England. Now in ordering certain religious excercises to be performed &c. I see not how the Visiting Justices can have escaped interfering with the Chaplains trust. His apprehension on this point appears therefore to me not to be unreasonable: & from this arises the omissions which the visiting justices lament. If upon considering this suggestion the Justices see the force of it; & would thereupon withdraw their orders on this subject I cannot doubt but that the Chaplain would willingly resume what he has found so useful heretofore. It is my earnest desire to see the good understanding which has so long prevailed between the Chaplain & the Visiting Magistrates, restored & bearing useful fruit as heretofore, and I cannot doubt that this happy effect might be brought about if the Visiting Justices should take the same view which I have done of the limits of their own & of the Chaplains respective responsibilities.

I am my dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

346. To the Rev. C. Marriott[2] *(iii 195)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 23, 1850

My dear Sir,

I shall be glad to receive your four candidates tomorrow at the Confirmation.

It is difficult to speak shortly on the subject of Confession: but I will try to answer your question as briefly as I can.

There is no subject on which the difference between our Church & the Roman Communion seems to me more important than this: no religious practice as to which it is more dangerous for our clergy to trifle with Roman Tendencies. The difference as I apprehend it lies here:

The Romanists altogether in fact and very greatly in theory supersede Conscience by the Priest. They believe that none can safely manage their own conscience: that the state therefore of religious health, is to practice Confession to the Priest & to obtain from him absolution & direction. I believe that no single part of their [debasing] system has produced such deadly fruits with this. I believe it to be injurious to the moral and spiritual nature of Christians thus to accustom them to substitute confession to man for confession to God: a Priests

[1] 13 pp. of the Berks. Quarter Sessions Order Book for Oct. 1850 (in Berkshire R.O.) are occupied by reports on this dispute concerning 'plain Bibles' or 'marginal reference Bibles' (ex inf. Miss A. Green). The Gaol itself was opened in 1844.

[2] Charles Marriott (1811–58), Fellow of Oriel, 1833–58; Principal of Chichester Diocesan College, 1839–41; V. of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, 1850–5 (*DNB*).

direction for the voice of conscience, and the *act* of absolution for a true returning unto Christ. I need not say to you further that on this practice the whole vile system of priestly control & interference with the holiest family relations, and the unutterable pollutions of the 'Confessional' rest. The teaching of the Church of England on this point I apprehend to be this.

Christians ought to be so directed by God's word & the ordinary ministry of his Ministers that they can guide themselves & in this self guidance their conscience will be strengthened: the habit of opening all their souls to God, & of returning to Christ for absolution after failure will be formed: & thus the sense of His presence with them will be quickened. The confessions & absolutions of the daily Service and of the Communion office ought to be enough for the spiritual necessities of such persons — & if they are living with any watchfulness under a ministry of [holy] life this would be the state of spiritual health. Christ our Lord through the Public Ministrations of His Church, as well as in their secret approaches to Him, would hear their Confessions & be their Absolver. Their conscience instructed by His Word read and preached & quickened by His Holy Spirit would be their guide. But there are cases of Spiritual Sickness as well as health for which the Church has to provide: & for these the Church of England recommends further aids. If any one cannot quiet his own conscience she lets him go & open his grief in confession to some discreet Minister of God's word & receive counsel & absolution. But here lies the difference; this is not the ordinary regimen but an extraordinary provision for sickness: one therefore who has really imbibed her Spirit will always have before his eyes the purpose, not of forming in his Soul the habit of so opening itself to the Priest & so craving absolution & so requesting minute direction & absolute command, but the very opposite, of enabling his soul again to be at peace, opening itself only to God, & receiving strength from Him through the *common* provisions made for his Church. The question to whom the troubled soul is bound to go, seems to me of less moment. I do not think that the Church of England confines him to his parish priest — though these should be sufficient reasons for not acting on each of God's appointments & for going beyond those who are our most ordinary aids. But I suppose that every spiritually minded clergyman of whatever party would feel fully at liberty to seek to relieve any troubled soul who thus sought his aid: & I think he would do right: whilst he ought also to discourage to the utmost the morbid fancifulness which leads to this man or that becoming general Directors for those with whom they stand in no ordinary relation of Nature or Grace. But *the* principle I think is what I have stated above. Is confession used as a means to restore health, or as the normal condition of a healthy soul.

And here the subject of your letter of the 20th leads me to your letter of the 21st. I had not heard any report of Dr. Pusey being appointed lecturer; nor did I even know that he had preached for you when I wrote to him the letter which I perceive you have seen. The letter in fact had been written for some days, but I was unwilling to send it, until if possible, this present storm had passed. It is most painful to me to do anything which appears like attacking him at such a time. But with my convictions of the effects of his influence in imparting & maintaining those spiritual tendencies which have ultimately led so many to Rome, I have no alternative. This painful subject has during this summer been brought before me with a clearness which has left no doubt in my mind.[1] The effect of his

[1] Mary Wilberforce had joined the Roman Church in June, and her husband Henry in September 1850 — two of the numerous secessions for which Pusey was blamed, and which he took so much to heart.

teaching on Confession: his encouragement of persons seeking to establish the relation of director or guide & penitent as the regular & normal condition; the minuteness and details of his directions &c. all seem to me to belong to the Roman School & not to the teaching of the Church of England. The effect of this system as I have seen it is this: at first the subjected soul seems to grow in holiness; leans on its director absolutely & rejoices to have discovered that the Church of England allows of such helps. But this *is* part of a system which is Popish & not Catholic: & so after a time the soul under this treatment begins to thirst after the other parts of that System: and to fret under the System of the Church of England. Dr. Pusey, (as to whose conscientious attachment to our Church I have no shadow of doubt) begins to get alarmed: he tries to retain these souls to the Church of England, but in vain: he has given the impetus & he cannot stay them: he has no deep horror of the Popish system: none has been infused into the early beginnings of their awakened spiritual consciousness: they have practically been set by him on a Romish Course: he was all to them so long as he seemed part of that ensnaring system into which he has brought them: but so soon as he begins to thwart them, his influence is gone: they begin to pity him: (they have said to me 'poor good Dr. Pusey'! & the like). They pass into stronger hands & then to the Roman Priest. My conviction is that if Dr. Pusey were not as good as he is, as conscientiously convinced himself that he ought to stay with us, whilst yet his doctrine & system is essentially Romish upon many points & as to many of his practices, he could not have led over so many as he has. It is precisely the case of the decoy bird who leads others into the net he is not the least thinking of entering. I do not mean that he intends any such thing: I am quite sure that he does not: I do not mean that his true place is amongst the corruptions of Rome: God Forbid: I am speaking only of the conviction which has been forced on me of the practical effects of his Ministry. And with this conviction what am I to do? I have resisted the conviction to the utmost. I have (having no jurisdiction over him) only abstained from joining with him in anything: but the events of this Summer & Autumn have brought new facts & stronger convictions before me: & I see not how I can remain in future merely negative. At the same time I am anxious to take no public step whilst the present excitement lasts; to do nothing *now* which could add to the present storm which breaks on Dr. P. and I therefore have mentioned this matter only to a few very intimate friends for their advice, in confidence. Your having at once seen my letter leads me to suppose that Dr. P. has not excercised the same caution. If so the publicity of the Prohibition will be the consequence of his act & not of mine. No present reasons need be given for the pausing of his Ministry in this Diocese.

I am, My dear Mr. Marriott, Ever Yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 83–6

347. To Dr. E. B. Pusey *(iii 196)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 23, 1850

My Dear Dr. Pusey,

I return you your letters according to your desire & wait for your fuller explanation: leaving matters in the meantime on the footing you propose. At the same time I would wish that, at least until that future period, what has passed should not transpire: because I would not add anything to the bitterness of this

present storm: for I can assure you that it is with the greatest grief that I add anything to the sorrow which present events must bring on you.

I am, my dear Dr. Pusey, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

I shall gladly receive your daughter. May GOD bless her.

[*Pencilled note*] Saw C. Marriott at night & commissioned him to say to Dr. P. that it was from all public ministrations in this Diocese I restrained him except at Pusey in Berks. if he chanced to be there, believing that there his ministry would be innocent.

Life, II, 81–2

348. To Alderman Sadler[1] *(iv 36)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 30, 1850

My dear Sir,

I have just seen in a report of the proceedings of the Town Council of Oxford on Thursday last the following words attributed to you — 'He would tell His Lordship to the face that there were many in His Diocese who were teaching Roman doctrine while receiving the Church's money & that while nominally adhering to the Protestant Church they were doing all that lay in their power to send those committed to their charge to another Church.'

I shall be much obliged to you, if these words are correctly reported, if you will inform me who these Clergymen are: on what points they teach Roman doctrine: & by what evidence you can support this very serious charge; since I shall feel it my duty to take all means in my power (as I have done in any instance in which I suspected the existence of such an evil) at once to suppress it.

I am glad to leave to the Clergy on the one side or the other the full liberty allowed them by the Church; but I cannot knowingly acquiesce in the existence of such dishonesty as the words attributed to you describe.

I am, My dear Sir, Very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

349. To Lord Ashley[2] *(iii 197)*

Private & Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 3, 1850

My dear Lord Ashley,

Seeing that you are to be Chairman of Thursday's meeting at the Freemasons Hall I trouble you with this letter. Your kindness to me whenever we have met leads me to hope that I am not in doing so taking any liberty with you. I am anxious to do so 1st on my own account, II^{ly} on account of the Church.

I. For myself. At all similar meetings the conduct of the Bishops has been (as is natural) considered, & *I* have been very generally blamed for encouraging Romanizing opinions. The alledged proof has been mainly my toleration of Mr. Allies. Such an impression is quite natural: but it is quite untrue. So long as Mr.

[1] Charles James Sadler was elected to the Oxford City Common Council in 1823; after municipal reform he was elected to the Common Council for the South Ward and made an Alderman, 1835; he was Mayor in 1836, 1849, 1854 and 1860. Nos. 348, 352 and 356 (and another letter of 5 Dec.) were printed in *Correspondence between the Lord Bishop of Oxford and Mr. Alderman Sadler* (Oxford, 1850).

[2] Anthony Ashley-Cooper (1801–85), styled Lord Ashley from 1811 until 1851 when he became 7th Earl of Shaftesbury; the famous philanthropist and Evangelical.

Allies acted under the engagement he had formed with me I felt bound to bear this unjust suspicion in silence . . . but *now*, I believe the interests of the Church require & circumstances allow of my justification. I believe my power of justification to be complete. I have written down therefore a short statement of the case: and I trouble you with it with the request, that if the charge is again made, you would contradict it. My request is that you would state the facts, not that you would read my letter, as if I stood on my defence. You are of course at perfect liberty if you deem it needful to satisfy yourself from other quarters of the accuracy of this statement. I know of no other allegations which can be made against me of carelessness as to these matters. My clergy will know how firmly I have set my face against such views as Mr. Allies. It is however natural, perhaps unavoidable, that with such a press as we have at this time; with my poor brother's notorious course & my unknown [efforts] for years with him, & with my own distinctly High Church opinions, that I should labour under the unfounded reproach of holding secretly what I have always opposed. — and this brings me to my second head. *You* will be more than any one able to direct the current of Thursday's meeting: to settle whether it shall set against bonâ fide Romanizing tendencies in the Church (by which *I*[1] mean the revival of a system of auricular confession & sacramental absolution, the Sacrificial Character of the Lord's Supper . . . the denial of justification by Faith &c. &c.) or whether it shall be a mere attempt to brand as Romanizers all those in the Church who are of the school of Andrewes, Hooker, Beveridge[2] &c. Of this school I am a member. I make no secret of it. I have as I believe dropped no one truth of my evangelical education but I hold those truths in a more consistent & therefore a firmer grasp. But the question I am anxious you should let me suggest for your thoughts is this — can it strengthen us as a Church against Rome, against Latitudinarianism, against irreligion, against Socialism & our frightful social evils, to drive out, or render suspect all the earnest minded, & I will venture to say spiritually minded men of the School of Hooker in this our day of exceeding need of every aid.

I am ever, My Dear Lord Ashley, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 68–9

350. To the Rev. H. W. Wilberforce *(iv 37)*

Fulham, Dec. 9, 1850

My dearest Brother,

When we spoke together of Mr Bennetts doings[3] you said that the injunction of Edward VIth seemed to you to justify him legally in burning candles on the Altar at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. I have just seen a letter of Mr Vogans[4] to Mr Bennett which seems to me to advance a very strong argument against that view; & wishing to keep a mem^{n}. of it I write the heads of it to you on this copying paper. He reasons in brief thus — '*Before* the Sacrament', is a preposition of place not of time; & means 'before the Host' not 'before administring the Sacrament'. His argument is this — at the time of this injunction votive

1 Underlined twice.

2 Lancelot Andrewes (1555–1626), the Jacobean Bishop of Winchester, and William Beveridge (1637–1708), Bishop of St. Asaph, were less often cited by the Bishop than Hooker himself.

3 William James Early Bennett (1804–86), Student of Christ Church, 1823–40; a notable ritualist, controversialist and author; P.C. of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, with St. Barnabas, Pimlico, and then V. of Frome Selwood, Somerset, 1852–86 (*DNB*).

4 Thomas Stuart Lyle Vogan (1801–74), V. of Walberton, Sussex, 1843–74 (*MEB*).

candles were common as now amongst the Papists burned before images, altars pictures &c. King Edwards injunctions prohibit all these lights but bid the Priest to suffer two lights to burn before the Sacram[t] on the High Altar to signify in contradistinction to all these images &c. that X was the true light &c. Now when this injunction was issued it was and for some time after the custom to reserve some of the consecrated elements on the Altar (he quotes Wheatley Edit Oxon 1819 p 326). *Before* these Elements then so reserved partly in condescencion [*sic*] to the remaining weakness of his parishioners partly to difference off from all images of the Virgin &c the priest was to suffer two candles to burn. But since the abolition of reservation this has become impossible for there is no pause allowed for lighting them between Consecration & Consumption the only time now when they could burn 'before the Sacrament'. The force of 'suffer' is not to be lost shewing that it was a permission of the Priest to a desire of others. That this is the meaning of *before* is confirmed by the preceding words — 'no torches or candles tapers or images of wax to be set *before* any image or picture but only two lights upon the High Altar *before* the Sacrament.' This seems to me quite convincing — I shall like to have your view of it

[*Unfinished*]

351. To Lord Charles Russell[1]

(*iv 38*)
London, Dec. 9, 1850

My Lord,

I am well content to leave unnoticed the ordinary attacks of anonymous writers to which, in times like the present, all men in public situations must be exposed. But the case is widely different when one bearing your name is pleased to make a public attack upon me in my absence. This I understand Your Lordship to have done last Thursday at the meeting over which Lord Ashley presided at Freemasons Hall. The newspaper report gives your Lordships speech with so little clearness or connection that it is not always easy to gather a distinct meaning from it; it may therefore appear to attribute to you what you did not say, but as far as the report is intelligible it represents you as saying that a recommendation of 'Father Ignatius' to an Irish meeting that menial servants should enter the Houses of Protestant Noblemen with a view to the perversion of the Faith of the family, is countenanced by some connection of mine with some 'Full blown Archdeacon'. As I am entirely ignorant of anything to which Your Lordship can refer, & had not the advantage of being present when you condescended to attack me I venture to ask you to inform me whether your words were rightly reported, & if so to do me the favour of explaining to me to what they referred.

I have the honor to remain, My Lord, Your Lordships Obedient Servant,
S. Oxon.

My address will be Cuddesdon Palace, Wheatley, Oxon.

352. To Alderman Sadler

(*iv 39*)
Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 11, 1850

My dear Sir,

My object in first addressing you was perfectly simple. You publickly charged many of my clergy with conscious perfidy & challenged my attention to the charge.

[1] Lord Charles James Fox [*sic*] Russell (1807–94), half-brother of Lord John Russell; Serjeant-at-Arms, House of Commons, 1848–75 (*MEB*).

If such a charge could be substantiated by facts it was of the utmost moment to the Church that I should know those facts: it was due to my clergy that it should be known if those facts could not be substantiated. In your first letter you named Dr Pusey has [*sic*] being the proof of your words. In reply I explained to you that he was not one of my clergy; being not only (as you understood me) as Professor of Hebrew but also as Canon of Ch: Ch: not under my jurisdiction but under the visitation of the Crown. In your present letter you further name; Mr Allies, Mr Pollen[1] & Mr Marriott. Only the last is one of my clergy: & as to him though I consider his words highly objectionable I do not think that they establish your charge of perfidy. I gather therefore that you are unable to establish the charge you made by any allegations capable of legal proof. Here therefore so far as I am concerned this correspondence closes — only before I lay down my pen I will say thus much on certain other points touched on in your last letter — and first for the frequent attacks it contains upon myself. I did not commence this correspondence with any view of justifying my own conduct — I should think this is a most improper mode of doing so. If I did not, I could answer all your charges as easily as the one you have adopted from Mr Bricknell viz that I had consecrated many chapels with Stone Altars & was about to consecrate another: whereas I never knowingly consecrated any, nor I believe ignorantly more than one, & I ordered that in St Georges removed the very day I learned it had been erected almost a fortnight before Mr B wrote — or the other that I tolerated Mr Allies, when I took every step I could with regard to him immediately on the publication of his book[2] acting throughout with the full concurrence of the present Arch Bishop & under the legal advice of Dr Lushington. But I do not feel it right even to enter on such matters.

Secondly I did not intend to charge you with being a slanderous calumniator. I believed you to have spoken under the influence of warm feelings on a most important subject without due caution: & I desired to remind you how easily such general assertions might lead a man into the sin of evil speaking.

I have myself a vivid perception of the dangers to which our Church is exposed from the fearful tendency towards Rome which has manifested itself amongst us. I neither deny nor undervalue the evil. To deal with it aright has been my greatest trial for years past. I have striven & please God shall strive with all lawful weapons against it. But I cannot take part in persecution: I cannot allow Church of England Principles to be lightly branded as Popish: I cannot bring sweeping charges or admit them: I cannot because the perverseness instability & duplicity of a few has roused the heart of England suffer the principles of Her Hooker & Beveridge & Andrewes to be condemned in their living maintainers. I believe that the main hindrance in the way of a real separation of Romanizers from us is to be found in the violence & unkind & unjust judgements which abound amongst us & which such sweeping censures as I regret in you tend to multiply. In concluding this correspondence let me remind myself as well as you that the work of God must be done in meekness & that the 'Spirit of a sound mind' is also the 'Spirit of love'.

I am, Dear Sir, Very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] John Hungerford Pollen (1820–1902), Fellow of Merton 1842–52. Seceded to Rome (*DNB*).

[2] In 1850 Allies published *The Royal Supremacy* and *The See of St Peter.*

353. To the Rev. C. Forbes[1] *(iv 40)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 11, 1850

My Dear Sir,

I have two letters of yours to acknowledge. I have written to the Ch Building Commissioners & by word of mouth explained to the Bishop of London the greatness of our Banbury need. They were to take the matter into consideration yesterday.

I was yesterday at the Eccles Commn. and I find that under the present Act of Parliament if the district of S Banbury is ever to be altered it must be altered within the next four years. This leaves me no option as to my course. I shall state plainly on paper the reasons why I think the district should be altered. Of this Statement I will send you a copy. You will be if you dissent from it called on officially to state in writing the grounds of your dissent. Those grounds will be weighed with my Statement by the Commissioners & they will then decide the question. It is very unpleasant to me to have to oppose your wishes in this matter but the lasting interests of the Town seem to me so much at stake in this decision that I cannot justify to myself the taking no step concerning it. I give you the earliest information of my purpose (I have not communicated upon it formally with Mr Wilson)[2] that you may not be involved in any negotiation for a site unsuitable to the district if it should hereafter be altered.

I thank you for bringing to my notice the litany in the Ch of E tracts. I entirely agree in your estimate of it & will bring it at once under the notice of the publishers. I have not myself been able to read the tracts for lack of time.

I am, My dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

354. To the Editor of 'The Oxford Herald'[3] *(iv 41)*

Dec. 12, 1850

Sir,

Having seen it stated in the Guardian Newspaper of Dec 11 that 'Dr Pusey will henceforth preach the four o clock Sunday parochial Sermon at St Marys Oxford with the sanction of the Bishop' I shall be obliged by your inserting in your paper an authoritative denial of the statement. It is absolutely untrue.

The same paper further states that 'Both the Bishop & Dr Pusey preached at Littlemore on the 24th ultimo': thereby suggesting that Dr Pusey was by the same 'sanction' joined with me in the services of Littlemore on the 24th. This also is untrue. I held a confirmation at Littlemore Church on Sunday morning the 24th & another that afternoon elsewhere. It is true that Dr Pusey who was staying at Littlemore & whose daughter had that morning been confirmed had been engaged by the incumbent to preach for him that afternoon; but this had been done without any sanction or inviting of mine.

I am Sir, very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

[*Second half thoroughly erased and rewritten*]

1 Charles Forbes, P.C. of South Banbury, 1846–69; Chaplain of the gaol 1849, and of the union, 1855.

2 William Wilson, jun. (1822–60), P.C. of Nether Worton and R. of Over Worton, 1846–9; V. of Banbury, 1849–60 (O).

3 *The Oxford Herald* was at this time managed by Philip Bliss.

355. To the Rev. C. Marriott *(iv 42)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 12, 1850

My dear Marriott,

I have been greatly pained by seeing in the Guardian a statement @ Dr Pusey & myself which is calculated to give the exactly opposite impression to the truth — & yet so far as it respects Dr P's preaching at Littlemore the same day as myself can hardly have reached them save through some private friend. There must be an *immediate* & authoritative contradiction of this statement in the Oxford Herald, Journal & Chronicle of tomorrow as well as in the Times & next weeks Guardian. Such a denial if it comes from *me* may wear a more unfriendly appearance than if it comes from you. Will you therefore turn the inclosed letter[1] into the third person so far as it concerns *me*, & into the first as it concerns yourself & sign it & send it to these 5 papers: or shall I do so? I must have your answer by return of this messenger.

I cannot allow myself to think that any one really knowing how matters stand can have even permitted such a suggestio falsi to pass without his interference.

I am, My dear Marriott, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

356. To Alderman Sadler *(iv 43)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 14, 1850

Dear Sir,

I must adhere to my resolution of not being drawn into a correspondence on other points than the one on which I originally addressed you. But I must note 3 points in your last letter.

1. I have seen no second letter of Mr Bricknell's nor was I aware when I wrote to you that he had written one.

II. I am entirely ignorant of Mr Pollen's have [*sic*] preached in this Diocese

III. I did not charge you with 'calling on me to take part in persecution &c. &c.'. I only indicated the principles & limits by which I should be guided & restrained in dealing with men of whose opinions I disapproved.

I am Dear Sir, Very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

357. To the Rev. J. H. Pollen *(v 1)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 26, 1850

Rev. & Dear Sir,

The Bishop of Ripon has been so good as to allow me to see a sermon preached by you at St Saviours Leeds on the feast of St Simon & St Jude; because from your residence in my diocese & occasional services in it he judged that it concerned me as well as himself. It is with great concern that I inform you that the sermon appears to me to contain matter distinctly contrary to the teaching of the Church of England.

I refer especially to the following passages.

'The Sacraments by which it (the Church) sustains Christian love & life in us,' followed by an enumeration of the seven so called Sacraments of the Papacy of five which the 25th Article of the Ch of E. says 'Those five &c. are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel'

[1] No. 354.

And, as showing the same spirit, I refer to the concluding pages in which you seem to intend to contrast the religious life of England under the Papacy with that which has resulted from our deliverance from Popish corruptions & to give an unbounded preference to the former. 'Then was this Island called the Island of Saints — then Bishops & Priests *Monks & Hermits* went forth from our shores & carried the faith to surrounding Nations'

The first of these passages directly contradicts the dogmatic teaching of our Church in those articles in accordance with which you are bound as an English Clergyman to teach, The Second suggests necessarily the painful conviction that remaining a Minister of our Reformed Church you lament that Reformation which has parted her from the corruptions of Rome. Such teaching appears to me to tend directly to wean those who listen to it from the Church of England & to lead them to Rome. But before I take the only step in my power to preserve my own diocese from this evil I shall be glad to receive from you any explanation you may wish to send me.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

358. To the Rev. W. Firth[1] (*v 2*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 27, 1850

My dear Sir,

I greatly regret to find that you have again changed your mind & will not now nominate Mr Smith,[2] whom you requested me to take as your Curate, for a license. Now my dear Sir it is impossible that I can allow you to continue to discharge the duties of your parish without a Curate — and I trust therefore that you will at one act upon your former resolution & fill up the nomination I enclose of Mr Smith & return it to me signed. Otherwise I shall be compelled to take the necessary legal steps to obtain this result. This I shall be grieved to do since the investigation of a Commission must be painful to you.

I am my dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

359. To the Rev. G. W. Curtis (*v 4*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 27

Rev. & Dear Sir,

A letter from Mrs Curtis received this morning tells me that an address has been presented to you praying you to discontinue preaching in a Surplice: & that such petition is likely to be forwarded to me. As I think it of the greatest importance if possible to support the Clergy of my Diocese, I think it better at once to tell you what I should be able to do if I am thus compelled to act.

I I should state that where the Surplice was adopted for preaching in order to support or indicate certain religious opinions I thought it most objectionable.

II That where it raised such a suspicion or was even objected to in the Parish I strongly advised its discontinuance

[1] William Firth (1788–1857), Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 1819–30, City Lecturer, 1821–51; C. of St. Peter in the East, 1821; R. of Letcombe Bassett 1830–57.

[2] See no. 415.

III But that I did not conceive that I had power to order this because the letter of the rubric favours its use & that except as marking certain opinions it was wholly immaterial. From this statement you will gather, that I advise you if it is desired by your parishioners to abandon the custom.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

360. To the Churchwardens of Wigginton (*v* 3)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 28, 1850

Gentlemen,

I have seen Mr Gilkes[1] of your parish touching his claim to a certain pew in your church. The case he has stated to me is this. In 1778 certain premises with a pew attached to them by prescription were purchased by Mr Richard Hall. In 1810 — This property was sold to Mr Gibbord: & let by him to Mr Flanakin who as tenant sat in the pew till 1816: when his Landlords son wanting a pew he allowed him & his family to use this pew. In 1826 the Widow of Mr Flanakin purchased the premises to which this pew was attached; but did not then claim it. In 1832 the premises passed to Mr Gilkes, who did not at first, but afterwards did claim this pew as his right. Now if this case is rightly stated it would be very difficult to disprove the legal right of Mr Gilkes to this pew. But be that as it may, it appears to me that there is hereby shewn so great a probability of right that the most equitable course would be to let Mr Gilkes occupy this seat & for the Church Wardens to place the family now using it in some other. I have no doubt that if the Church Wardens will consult their rector Mr Williams[2] will be able to suggest some mode of peaceably effecting this: & I shall be glad to sanction any scheme which & the Ch Wardens [*sic*] agree on for that purpose. It is one of the greatest duties of the Church Wardens to prevent all quarrels & ill feeling as to seats in the House of God, & I would earnestly entreat them to endeavour to arrange this matter to [*sic*] as to cause Peace & unity.

I am Gentlemen, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

361. To the Rev. C. P. Eden[3] (*v* 5)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 28, 1850

My dear Eden,

It is quite true that this unhappy excitement has called my attention to the Stone Altars in the Cemetaries Chapels. I had never before known that any but that at Holy Well was of Stone: & when I first learned that fact I expressed my desire (I thought that it was to you) that a Wooden Communion table should be substituted for it — & I believed that this had been done. I entirely acquit *you* of any Romanizing intention in choosing these Altars: but I think that with the Judgement of the Arch Bishops Court recorded against them; they ought not to be erected: and with such papers as that quoted by Dean Elliott from the Ecclesiastic of last February[4] saying '*We* are not to forget our own power of sacrifice

[1] A substantial Wigginton farmer?

[2] John Williams (1810–72), Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, 1834–44; R. of Wigginton, 1843–72.

[3] Charles Page Eden (1807–85), Fellow of Oriel, 1832–51; V. of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, 1843–50, Aberford, Yorks., 1850–85; Prebendary of York, 1870 (*DNB*).

[4] Cf. no. 362. Gilbert Elliot (1800–91) was Dean of Bristol 1850–91 (*MEB*).

for the departed & the refreshment we ought to [render to] them' neither you nor I can wonder at its being felt of importance to clear Cemetary Chapels of all that can favour such false teaching: especially when as here the Clergy are instructed how to perform such rites without its being suspected what they are really doing.

I heartily wish that these had been removed before because I dislike noticing the subject at a time of excitement like the present — yet now that my attention has been called to it I see not how I can avoid enforcing the law & ordering their removal. I shall be glad to hear from you on the subject: & to receive any suggestions you may be able to send me as to the best & quietest way of removing this cause of scandal.

I am ever, my dear C Eden, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

362. To the Rev. T. Chamberlain (*v 6*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 29, 1851 [*sic*]

My dear Sir,

My attention has been called to what purports to be a quotation from 'the Theologian & Ecclesiastic' of February last in a publication of the Dean of Bristol touching 'sacrificing for the departed' &c. and I have been further informed that this periodical is currently reported to be under the direction of one of the Parochial Clergy of Oxford City — and on enquiry I am told that you are the person intended. Now the passage I have seen appears to me so exceedingly objectionable that I cannot do otherwise than ask you whether there is any truth in the allegation that you are editorially responsible for it, or whether you will authorise me absolutely to contradict the assertion. I should mention to you that I am able to Judge of the passage only from the alledged extract. For I have tried in vain to obtain the number in Oxford & today have heard that it is out of print in London. But as it appears in the extract it in my judgement (1) contradicts the dogmatic teaching of the Church of England & (2) counsels the doing secretly what would if done publickly excite instant condemnation — & in my judgement this is wrong & mischievous in no common degree and I should earnestly desire to see you cleared from all suspicion of connexion with it.

I am, my dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

363. To the Rev. C. Forbes (*v 7*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 3, 1851

My dear Sir,

Any surprize your reading of my letter caused you was fully equalled by my surprize at the statement contained in your reply, & I am grieved to add at the tone you have adopted in it. I have however learned so far to distrust my own recollection that I would not reply to you till I had requested Mr Wilson to state to me in the most explicit terms he could his recollection of what passed between us. Mr Wilsons statement agrees entirely with my own impression of what passed. It is this: I stated to you that I did not wish to enforce on you, even if I had the power, any rearrangement of the parish of which you disapproved: that I should therefore be satisfied with making a prospective arrangement to take effect after your incumbency, but that I greatly desired your acquiescence, because I thought that making such a future arrangement would be an injury to your Ministry by raising the question, 'why, if this is the best arrangement, should it be delayed till the expiration of Mr Forbes' Ministry?'

This as you say I pressed more than once upon you: but never said that I could for it give up the permanent welfare of Banbury: but intended to imply that I should be compelled by my sense of what was due to the Parish to propose such a future arrangement even at the risk of raising such questions, if you withheld your consent. What incidentally confirms the correctness of mine & Mr Wilsons impression of what passed is this: that I had previously stated to Mr Wilson that this was the course which I intended to pursue. You no doubt understood me in the sense you now express, & therefore so stated it at the time to the friends to whom you allude: but their testimony can, of course, only prove that you at that time so understood me, not that I had so expressed myself. I certainly never intended to promise to yield what I deem the best interests of the Parish hereafter, to your present wish: & as a competent witness assures me that I did not so express myself, I cannot in fairness be held to be in any way bound by your misapprehension of what I did surely mean, & of what I cannot doubt that I said.

The only change in my intentions lies in what I have already stated to you. Upon examining the act I found that the change of district, if ever made, must be made within four years, & must take effect at once. Upon finding this to be the only mode of acting I felt that I could not, as I had wished to do, await the termination of your incumbency for proposing a re-arrangement: & I gave you the first information of this change of my views.

But I still desire, as far as I can without giving up the future good of the parish, to avoid interference with your wishes. I am ready therefore, if you desire it, to wait for three years before I propose to the Commissioners to alter the district, on one only condition viz. that you will select a site for the new church which shall suit an alteration of the bounds of the parish if it is hereafter made.

I am my dear Sir, very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

364. To J. Masters[1] (*v 8*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 3, 1851

Sir,

Circumstances have called my attention to an article of February last in the Theologian & Ecclesiastic on the Burial of the dead. There are some expressions of that article which appear to me objectionable. It has been publickly stated that some one of the Parochial Clergy of the City of Oxford is responsible for it. I have reason to believe that this is not the case. But I shall be obliged to you as the Publisher of the Periodical will give me a statement to that effect which I may use publickly.

I am Sir, Yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

365. To the Ecclesiastical Commissioners (*v 9*)

District of Banbury

MY Lords & Gentlemen,

In the year 1845 the Town of Banbury was divided into two districts under Sir Robert Peels Act: called the district of South Banbury (the new district) & Banbury. The division then adopted appears to me inconvenient, & I desire

[1] Joseph Masters (1795–1863), publisher, of 33 Aldersgate Street and 78 New Bond Street. He published *The Ecclesiologist*, 1842–63 (*MEB*).

your Board to revize it. The Vicar of Banbury the Rev W Wilson agrees with my view: the incumbent of South Banbury the Rev C Forbes dissents from it. Mr Forbes's objections do not convince me, but they are entitled to all consideration. I have therefore sent him a copy of this paper & begged him to lay before your Board his views that they may meet with the most impartial consideration.

My reasons for thinking that the limits of the parish should be changed are these — I by the present arrangement the limit of South Banbury runs close to the old Church so that a population of @ 700 poor & 300 hundred [*sic*] of the more wealthy class closely adjoining the old Church are placed in the new district — and if the intended new church for South Banbury is built as it is needed, in the heart of the Poorest population, that also will have close adjoining it a large number of persons allotted to the old Parish. The division now suggested will give the inhabitants of the districts most nearly adjoining each Church to it.

The change will take from South Banbury about 1000 — in one direction; (700 poor & 300 better off) & add about 500 in another (400 poor 100 better off). This will leave to S Banbury a population of 3,500 — to Old Banbury 4.500. *But* 1st the increase of the town is to be expected in the new part adjoining the station of the London and Banbury Rail Road; & next the proposed alteration is to be accompanied by building a third church[1] in Banbury which constitutes the II great reason for the alteration of the district. It is proposed to build a new church at Neithrop in the North West part of Banbury amidst a large poor population & to provide thus, in connexion with the old church, a place of worship for a population of 1600, all poor to a man, close to their own doors.

The Provision for the population would then stand thus Old Banbury Church — Population about 2,900 — Its Chapel of Neithrop 1,600 — New Banbury 3,500.

The accompanying map will I trust fully explain the proposed alterations.

I am My Lords & Gentlemen, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

I should have added that the pews in old Banbury Church being freehold property under a local Act of Parliament & there being seats in it for only 300 poor in the aisle & under the galleries, the building of this Chapel for the poor is of the utmost importance.

366. To the Churchwardens of Holy Trinity, Windsor (*v 10*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 3, 1851

Gentlemen,

A letter of complaint has been sent to me by Miss Charlotte Raine touching the mode of conducting the services at Trinity Church Windsor: & seeking for my interposition therein. I have been grieved to receive this letter, because I am no stranger to the pecuniary sacrifices which Mr Hawtrey makes to maintain the efficient services he has provided for Trinity Church, & its Schools: & because from my knowledge of what he had done for the poor of the district; from the reports given by Her Majesty's inspectors of his Schools; & from his having secured, to my great satisfaction, the energetic services of His venerable Father,[2] whom no

1 Christ Church, South Banbury and St. Paul's, Neithrop, were erected in 1853.

2 John H. Hawtrey (1781–1853), R. of Kingston Seymour, Somerset, 1850–3; first cousin of E. C. Hawtrey (see no. 479). He was known for his work among the troops at Windsor. For his son, see no. 70.

one can suspect of any leaning towards what are commonly called tractarian opinions I trusted that he possessed the confidence & affection of his Flock. Still a complaint having been sent to me I think it right to enquire of you
1st whether in your judgement there is any cause of complaint?
II Whether it is the desire of Mr Hawtreys flock, or whether it would be a grief to them if I interfere between him & them.

I am Gentlemen, very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

367. To the Rev. G. W. Curtis (*v 11*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 6, 1851

My dear Sir,

The address of your parishioners to you & your reply have now reached me. I have replied to it, telling Mr Griffith (1) that you had a legal right to the use of the surplice — & (2) that an alteration of the reading Desk which he describes as leading to your reading the prayers with your back turned to the Congregation & your face to the Communion table is not legal, I not having been consulted on such a change & the law allowing of no change in the Church without the sanction of the Ordinary. As to this point, therefore, I shall be glad to hear from you at your earliest convenience. I can easily conceive that your old Reading Desk (like so many others) may have been a very bad one; but I could not allow one to be placed instead of it in which you knelt with your face to the East & your back to the congregation: for you do not pray there, as an intercessor for the people; but as leading their prayers & it is a great assistance to them in joining with you to see you, as well as to hear you distinctly.

And now my dear Sir as to your preaching in the Surplice. Is it, let me first ask you, unreasonable, that at this time, when so many have gone over from us to Rome there should be a wide spread jealousy as to any changes in the ritual of our public services. Is it unreasonable for our people to say, Our Pastor would not alarm us needlessly, there *must* therefore be some important meaning in a change at such a time. Now then if this is so, can it be right in one who is labouring for immortal souls to run the risk of weakening his ministry with one for whom he will have to give an account at the Judgement day, that he may preach in a white Surplice rather than a black gown, or that he may take off his surplice in a vestry rather than in his Chancel. I beseech you, my dear Sir, to look at this question as you will see it before the Judgement Seat of Christ. I have stood by you with Mr Griffith: I have told him that you have a legal right to preach in a surplice in the morning. Thus I have left the ground clear for you to concede this as a mere act of Grace. I earnestly beseech you to write to Mr Griffith, that though you could not yield this as if allowing that you had acted illegally in doing it — yet that now when your Bishops sentence has justified you, you willingly give up to the wishes of your people a matter in itself indifferent.

[*Unfinished*]

368. To the Rev. J. H. Pollen (*v 12*)

Address, Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 9, 1851

Rev. & Dear Sir,

There are many topics in your letter of the 4th on which I do not think it needful to dwell. (1) The Bishop of Ripon needs no defence at my hands either for 'justice or kindness'. That subject therefore I pass wholly by: and (2) I shall say little in reply to what you advance or insinuate against myself. Indeed I need

do little more than correct your mistated facts. *First* I have not 'decided &c without asking what you meant or stating wherein your ignorance consisted' for I have as yet done nothing but write to you stating such ignorance or inviting explanation. *Secondly* I have said no one word tending to 'urge you' to the sin of quitting the communion of Christ's Holy Church of which you are a Minister. *Thirdly* — I have, I trust, shewn openly before the whole Church that none of the reproaches which you insinuate have moved me can lead me in this day of her rebuke to abandon one unpopular doctrine of the Church of England. Had such been my course I should not be marked out as I am beyond almost all others for every calumny & insult which a ribaldrous [*sic*] press can heap on those who are felt to be the real opponents of the party which it espouses. But the more I feel in such a day the duty of maintaining the distinctive teaching of the Church of England on the one side the more evidently is it my duty at the same time to seek to guard her from any real approximation on the part of her authorized teachers to those errors of the Church of Rome which at her Reformation she through Gods mercy renounced. *Fourth* I have not 'charged' you with 'heresy'. But what I did charge you with you have not answered & to that I must bring you back. The Church of Rome teaches that there are 'Seven Sacraments of the Gospel'. The Church of England teaches that there are 'two Sacraments of the Gospel' & that those five commonly called Sacraments are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel &c' Further she gives the reason why they have not *the like nature* of Sacraments with Baptism & The Lords Supper — 'viz that they have not any visible sign ordained of God. But you have asserted that there are Seven Sacraments. This is my charge. Now what is your answer; 'That you do not say that they are of Universal Obligation'. But who does say so? Certainly not the Romanist — & what therefore is your answer worth? I say to you; at a time when there have been many perversions of members of our Communion to Rome I charge you with using either wantonly, carelessly, or mischievously upon an important point on which our articles speak distinctly one way, & the Church of Rome the other way, the language which the Church of Rome uses, & which the Church of England condemns. You reply that you have *not* taught a third thing which is held neither by Rome nor by England. Now what answer is this. I further point out to you that in another part of the same sermon you contrast the State of Religion when England sent out 'Monks & hermits' with the State since the Reformation; and give the most distinct preference to the former over the latter. As far as I understand your answer you justify such an estimate of the Spiritual State of England before & since the Reformation. You then assert that you have preached those doctrines on which Rome & England agree. Now what is this answer worth. In my judgement Nothing. I therefore once more call on you for some explicit reply to my charge. It is this. The Church of England does differ from the Church of Rome. She declares that 'the Church of Rome has erred in matters of Faith'. In this day not a few & those amongst our best people have been seduced to Rome by being gradually accustomed 1st to her language then to her usages & then to her thoughts; by hearing her grievous corruptions palliated & excused; & whilst every defect in the Church of England is dwelt on and aggravated to the utmost; at such a time I charge you with what I must regard as a very blameworthy carelessness of expression or with direct & conscious unfaithfulness to the Church by whose commission you teach, because that you have knowingly or carelessly used the language of the Church of Rome in opposition to hers, in your public preaching concerning the Sacraments; & have insinuated that the Reformation which parted her from Rome was a great spiritual injury. How is it possible but that such teaching should weaken the

confidence of her members in her & dispose them to seek communion with Rome? — or how can I (believing that in seeking such communion with that corrupt form of Christianity as wanderers from our reformed Church, they would put their Souls in deadly peril) allow you to continue (without some explicit expression of sorrow & promise of carefulness) to teach in my Diocese. Believe me that as no imputations of favouring popery, or tractarianism, or what is most odious of all, of dishonesty, have hindered me (so far as I know) from advocating in this day of rebuke all that the Church of England *does* teach, so neither shall your taunt that I am moved by the clamours round me to question you, nor the pain of taking such a step at such a moment, lead me to forbear from inhibiting your preaching in my diocese, unless you can give me the assurance I require that you will not in so doing be insinuating the Doctrinal Corruptions of the Papacy.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

369. To Miss Charlotte Raine[1]

(*v 13*)
Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 11, 1851
Not sent

Madam,

Having now finished the enquiries which in consequence of your letter of Dec: 9 I felt it my duty to make touching the ministry and services of the Revd. S Hawtrey & the Church of the Holy Trinity Windsor, I am able to send you my judgement upon your complaints.

Those complaints were in your first letter of Dec. 9 (1st) That 'the high Altar was about 2 years ago raised and disrobed of its red covering.

II. That the rails round it had been made moveable.

III. That 2 stalls had been substituted for the reading desk in order to insinuate the Popish doctrine 'that the Priest was only the mouth piece of the people, and was not to be exalted above the congregation.

IV. 'The preaching in white surplices under which is another doctrine exalting and setting forth the ministers &c: above and before Christ'

V. Intoning the service.

VI. The circulation of papers urging Christians to pray for the dead. auricular confession &c. &c.'

To these you add in your letter of Jan 6 the following —— 1. 'The choristers with white surplices' 2. 'The chanting of the beautiful Psalms' &c: 3 'The real Presence in *the* Sacrament is another dangerous doctrine I fear is held & taught as a book came under my notice containing it left in my district by *one* of the curates some 2 or 3 years ago.'

These were your complaints & with these I will first deal in order.

First the raising & disrobing of what you term 'the high altar'.

I learn that there is no high altar in the Church but as ordered by the Church of England a communion Table, & that the whole change made with regard to it was, that having been left rudely and poorly finished by the contractor with a mere deal table & in hangings of the poorest description, an oak Communion Table with appropriate hangings was substituted and that the floor of the Apse was raised to the usual height of the East End of English Chancels above the floor of the Church.

II. I am informed that the rails were made moveable because the fixed rails interfered with the convenience of the worshippers. I am not aware of the fact

[1] A resident of Windsor.

of the communion rails being moveable has ever been associated with any point of doctrine.

III. The alteration of the reading desk. I understand that the present arrangement is most convenient for the congregation & the clergy. and as I believe that the doctrine you consider it to favour, namely that the Ministers are only the mouth piece of the people & not to be exalted above them, is exactly the doctrine of our Church in opposition to Rome, which sets them up to intercede for & to be above the congregation, I as a staunch member of our reformed Church, see nothing to object to in it. These three complaints then touching the arrangement of the Church, I dismiss as unfounded. The two next complaints in your first letter, & the two first in your second, concern the conduct of the Service they are these: 1st The preaching in white surplices in the morning under which is set forth another doctrine &c. Now since the rubric seems clearly to prescribe this practice, any clergyman may lawfully adopt it: it is moreover in itself a thing of entire unimportance, but it is in my judgement highly inexpedient that he should adopt it if it has not been the custom in his Church & is unacceptable to his people, & it is most improper if it is adopted as a badge of peculiar doctrine. As to this therefore I am glad to find — (1) that the practice was adopted for convenience by Mr. Hawtrey's venerable Father, whose religious principles were mainly formed & still greatly symbolize [*sic*] with those of the Westleyan body; and who cannot therefore in adopting it be suspected of having intended to favour any peculiar doctrine, & (2) that upon this holy & venerable Pastor's removal to a benefice, Mr. S Hawtrey has abandoned the practise. This complaint therefore is dismissed.

Your next complaint is that the service is intoned.

This also I learn that Mr. Hawtrey has abandoned to meet the wishes of his congregation. This therefore is dismissed.

Your next complaint is that the choristers wear white surplices. This is a comely, decent, & usual custom. This complaint I dismiss as frivolous.

Your last complaint as to the conduct of the Service is that the Psalms are chanted. This is a matter left by the Prayer Book to the discretion of the Minister, subject to the consent of the ordinary. I should myself for the reasons stated by you think the singing of the Psalms inexpedient in a mixed congregation. But it is a matter upon which I should not interfere with the responsibility of the clergyman, unless at the general wish of the congregation. I now gather from the replies of the Churchwardens of the Parish that such interference is not desired. There remains for me to notice the more serious complaints as to Mr. Hawtrey's doctrine. As to this you bring two specific charges. First that on the last national fast day Mr. Hawtrey circulated papers urging Christians to pray for the dead — auricular confession &c. To auricular confession of which I entirely disapprove, I cannot find that the paper made any allusion. As to the prayers for the dead, Mr Hawtrey explains to me that a passage from our burial service *was* so quoted as to be liable to such an unintentional misrepresentation: that upon its being pointed out to him he at once suppressed the paper, & explained the matter to you at the time. I do not think therefore that this ought to have been revived as a charge against him.

Your other specific complaint is that 'you fear that the real presence in the Sacrament is held'. I take for granted that you mean the words 'real Presence' in their Roman or substantial sense, not in their spiritual sense as taught in the Catechism. Now this would be a most dangerous error; but as I never had any reason to suppose Mr. Hawtrey was infected by it, so I am bound to say that the evidence you prefer against him goes far to clear him from any such imputation — for what is that evidence. Though he is constantly preaching you can refer to no

instance of false teaching, in his sermons, but you say that 'a book' (in your judgement, for you do not name the book, or give me the words) 'containing it, was left in your district *by one of the curates*, some two or three years ago.' It would be absolutely repugnant to my notions of English Justice to entertain against an exemplary clergyman a charge which was advanced on such evidence. But besides these specific complaints you charge Mr. Hawtrey *generally* with Romanizing teaching. Now if this were proved against him my course would be a plain one. However exemplary he might be in life or charitable action, he could have no part or lot with us. But what proof do you tender of this charge — none whatever — nay, the mode in which you bring it, goes for itself to deprive it of all weight whatever, for when you speak of being by such matters as I have already disposed of, deprived of the priviledge of protestant worship, you plainly use the exaggerated words of one speaking under violent excitement.

Against these unsupported charges therefore I must set the fact, (I) that Mr. Hawtrey's ministry has been shared by his venerable Father, who is certainly as free as any man living from Romanizing opinions. (II) that the whole conduct of his Parish, his school (pronounced by the Government inspector the most perfect he knows) his promotion of the social welfare & enjoyment of his Flock, & his general conduct, all shew him to be no party man; whilst his unsparing labours & his great liberality in supporting this poor Church out of his earnings, as an Eton Master have won for him the attachment & confidence of his flock. This is clearly shewn by the letters of two Church Wardens of whom the one, whilst the utmost he can say for your complaints is that he does not think them altogether without foundation tells me that he believes Mr. Hawtreys 'views entirely coincide with my own' & that he himself entirely concurs in my opinion of his excellence' whilst the other declares 'that Mr Hawtrey has always been anxious that the services should be conducted in the most edifying way', & states that 'in his judgement there is no cause of complaint', and that 'any interference of mine between Mr Hawtrey & his flock would grieve & annoy them sadly.'

Here then is your whole case: and as I am just as much bound to shield 'an excellent man' from the unjust reproaches to which the present state of public feeling must expose one who without any sympathy with Rome or Romanizers holds the good old fashioned Faith of the Church of England, for defending which Richard Hooker & many more have been reviled in this life & honoured since their death, as I am to discourage & resist all doctrines & practises which do not really belong to the Church of England, I cannot do less than say that in my judgement formed after the most patient examination of your complaints, you have not substantiated your charges against Mr. S. Hawtrey.

I am, Madam, truly yours, S. Oxon.

370. To the Churchwardens of Holy Trinity, Windsor (*v 14*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 13, 1851

Gentlemen,

I have tried to thank you for your letters of last Thursday. It would indeed have been much more satisfactory to me had you agreed upon a common answer. For as, in such Parochial questions, I must receive the official reply of the Church Wardens as the answer of the laity of the parish, my course would in that case have admitted of no doubt. Had you agreed in absolutely contradicting altogether the complaints sent me, I should have dismissed them entirely; had you given the weight of your official sanction, I should have named a day for visiting your

parish in person, & hearing & deciding the complaints upon the spot. This I am still ready to do if the Church Warden who thinks the complaint 'not altogether without foundation' is able to state any distinct grounds of complaint & is prepared to establish them. Meanwhile if no such distinct charges are brought, I can only act upon the conclusion you reach in common, though on somewhat different grounds; (since the one 'sees no advantage that would arise from 'my' interference;' whilst the other thinking 'that there is no cause for complaint, firmly believes that any interference between Mr Hawtrey & his flock grieve & annoy them sadly;') & take no further step in the matter, until some specific charges are before me. The complaints sent me by Miss C Raine are such as I cannot entertain, against a clergyman, of whom both His Churchwardens speak as you speak of Mr Hawtrey. Some of these complaints are frivolous, some concern usages which I understand Mr Hawtrey to have discontinued, at once, on learning that it was the wish of his people that he should do so; whilst others, of the most grave & serious character, are absolutely unsupported by a tittle of evidence. I must request you, Gentlemen, the proper representatives of the laity of your parish, to convey to her this answer to complaints which she sent to me as 'the sentiments of the Parish generally'.

And now gentlemen, before I close, let me state to you my pleasure in reading the expressions of both of you as to Mr Hawtreys excellence: knowing much of his services, & sacrifices for his parish, I was grieved to find that any disatisfaction existed as to his Ministry: knowing moreover the character of His Venerable Father, whom he has selected as his Assistant, I could not readily believe that his own views were really extreme, or such as *ought* to expose him to any suspicion of sympathising with those misguided men who are ashamed of owning the blessings secured to us of Gods Mercy at the Reformation, and who desire to introduce into our Reformed Church what we and our fathers have believed to be the corruptions of Rome.

You cannot, in your post, be too vigilant to detect & bring before me any matter of doctrine or ritual which *really* tends that way: nor can my brethren of the clergy be too watchful either, 1st & chiefly, against any possible leanings that way, or secondly against any thing, which being obscure in doctrine or unusual in practice, can alarm the most sensitive Church of England man. But I must remind you that you have another duty also. In the present excited state of mens minds, weak or designing persons, may easily raise suspicions against, or bring reproaches on, faithful Clergymen, who hold no more than the Church of England has always allowed & than her greatest divines have taught. It is the duty & privilidge of your office, whilst you jealously guard the truth, to prevent such persecution — & you may feel assured that, as reaction always follows excess, you will best defend what is *really* our Protestant truth by such evenhanded justice.

I shall send a copy of this letter to Mr Hawtrey, & he & you can make any use of it you deem expedient.

I am Gent$^{n.}$, Yours faithfully,

S. Oxon.

371. To the Rev. J. H. Pollen *(v 15)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 17, 1851

Rev. & Dear Sir,

It gives me great pain to be obliged to tell you that your last letter is quite unsatisfactory to me.

In your Sermon you say that by 'the Sacraments the Church sustains life in us' & you then proceed to enumerate 'the Sacraments' & you make seven

propositions concerning them. My charge against you here, is that you speak of 'the Sacraments' as Seven. I do not enter into your propositions concerning them —— I say, that inasmuch as you know that the Articles of the Church of England, by which you are bound to teach, expressly state that five of these Rites are not Sacraments, & condemns the Church of Rome for calling them so, you have used Roman language. Further I say that you have done this either through a culpable carelessness or through wanton-ness, or in mischief. I said so for this plain reason. Either you meant your people to believe that there were Seven Sacraments, or you did not. If you did not, it was either a culpable carelessness or a more culpable wanton-ness which must have led you to use to a mixed congregation language in direct contradiction of the 25th Article of your Church which could not fail to be so interpreted: or you meant your people to believe that there were seven Sacraments, & if so you intended to teach them what your Church had condemned. Now to this plain charge you make no answer, but you wish me to discuss with you your seven propositions. This I decline doing, because such a discussion would be irrelevant. One mistatement however of your last letter I must correct. You say that I declare that 'I do not think what I charge you with Heresy' [*sic*]. I said nothing of the kind. In answer to your own words I said 'I have not charged you with Heresy'. I pronounced then that is, as I pronounce now, no opinion on your propositions.

My second charge was, that you spoke of the Reformation which parted us from Rome as a great spiritual evil. As to this charge; you claim for yourself full liberty of Thought upon the subject. You have previously quoted alledged words of mine to you to the effect that 'the Ch: of E allowed to Her Children great latitude of thought' 'so long as they do not contravene express assertions'. I think so still; & I rejoice in her liberty. But your first statement does, as I have shown you, contravene her express assertions & your second is wholly incompatible with our standing place as a reformed Church protesting against the errors of Rome. It is therefore wholly impossible that consistently with my consecration vows I can allow such 'erroneous & strange doctrines' to be taught in my Diocese, & as I have been wholly unable to obtain from you any expression of sorrow for your past error or any real assurance that you will not repeat it, or others like it, I have no option but to inhibit your preaching or performing any ministerial acts in my Diocese until you have satisfied me & I have removed this inhibition. From these therefore (with much pain that you should have rendered such a step needful) I now inhibit you.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

372. To the Rev. E. B. Dean[1] *(v 16)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 17, 1851

My Dear Sir,

I have just heard, with great pain, that you have recently been the guest of Mr Scott Murray[2] to meet Mr Allies: & that you actually met Cardinal Wiseman[3]

1 Edward Brietzcke Dean (1814–?), Fellow of All Souls 1836–55, D.C.L., 1843; V. of Lewknor, 1842–55.

2 Charles Robert Scott Murray (1818–82), of Danesfield, in Medmenham, Bucks.; M.P. for Bucks., 1841–5. He seceded to Rome.

3 Nicholas Patrick Wiseman (1802–65), Bishop of Melipotamus, 1840; Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, 1850. His appointment precipitated the storm leading to the passing of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act in 1851. His character is satirized by Browning in 'Bishop Blougram's Apology' (*D.N.B.*).

remaining for that purpose. What my dear Sir can be more offensive to all right-minded men than such conduct in a Parochial Clergyman of the Church of England. The circumstances of the present time, the facts, (1) that your host was himself a renegade, (2) that Mr Allies is a Clergyman who has broken his vows & renounced his most solemn engagements & that (3) the Cardinal is leading a new & audacious attack upon our Church & Nationality wholly remove this case from that ordinary intercourse with those who differ from us & in the faith which I should be the last to proscribe: & mark your conduct herein with a peculiarity of character which compels me to express to you my strongest disapprobation of it.

How can your own people or your clerical neighbours fail to suspect you of having no strong objection to the corruptions of Rome, when at such a moment you, who ought to lead them to oppose its efforts, are joining yourself in needless social & friendly intimacy with those who have just adopted its superstitions & are endeavouring to establish them throughout this land.

I am, My dear Sir, Yours faithfully,

S. Oxon.

373.[1] *(iii 198)*

Cuddesdon Palace, [Jan. 18, 1851]

My dear Sir,

I cannot let a single post pass without expressing to you the pleasure which your kind, frank & Christian letter received this morning has given me. Of whatever else advancing years may have robbed you they have not touched the tenderness, truthfulness or manly fidelity of your heart. Would that the younger men who are ranged nominally under your standard had more of this spirit & we should have less suspicion less evil speaking & more union, more strength against evil, & more above all of the manifested presence of the Holy Spirit amongst us, in a day when the Hosts of the Evil One seem to me evidently gathering for the great battle with those who will cleave to the Son of Man.

Now my dear Sir when I wrote to you before I felt that I could explain nothing, as matters then stood between us. But now my heart is open & it will be a relief to me to speak, rather as a younger clergyman to a venerable Father in Christ than as a Bishop to a Presbyter of his Diocese. Believe me I know that I am full of faults: I try to confess them before God & look for cleansing in that only blood which cleanseth any sick soul; I know that I am constantly making mistakes & I pray earnestly & constantly that [His Holy Spirit] would guide & direct my erring steps. But these things which are laid to my charge with such keen and calumnious hatred in the Record, the Daily News, & the Examiner (what a concord!) & the Church & State Gazette, are absolutely false & I appeal with calm confidence to the judgement of the unerring God & the Day of Revelation for my acquittal as to them.

The occasion of my being *first* taunted with uncertainty &c. was in the case of Dr. Hampden. It was thus (1) I joined the other Bishops in protesting against his appointment. That protest I have never qualified. (2) I . . . [*illegible*] . . . soundness of doctrine, on a united legal opinion that in giving that assent *I* gave no decision even prima facie against him. I believed that a case could be maintained against him; from extracts from his Bampton lectures & from his pamphlet on admitting Dissenters to the University. The assent to his trial was found to be informal & had to be *re-granted.* Before this was done I had learned on higher

[1] Recipient unidentified, perhaps Vaughan Thomas.

authority that my assent *did* imply a prima facie condemnation of Dr. Hampden: before therefore I would sign I required to satisfy myself, not only that his appointment ought not to have been made but that his doctrine was sufficiently bad to justify me in sending him to trial. I therefore read for myself his Bampton Lectures, and his pamphlet again. His pamphlet appeared to me to justify anything; but I found it had been recalled. His Bampton lectures I thought had been grievously misrepresented by Mr. Newman. I felt convinced that justice required me *not* to send him for trial. I knew that in protesting against him I had for conscience sake set myself against those upon whose favour my worldly interests depended; but that had not hindered my protesting; in refusing now to proceed further I laid myself open to the charge of inconsistency &c. But I would do justice & I have ever since paid the price. The Tractarian party were the warmest. The Record which hated me on other grounds eagerly took it up & printed in their leading article every piece of ribaldry they could find either in infidel or Tractarian journals.

There came last year our sad troubles about Baptism. I took the side as to doctrine which seemed to me true always protesting against any party attack on the Evangelical body. This stirred up all the animosity of the Record again. Then followed my cutting family griefs in the perversion of my poor brother &c. It was easy & unscrupulous to suggest that we agreed secretly, & it was done. Though God knows that for years I had secretly laboured to change in him the extreme opinions which have at last naturally landed him in Rome. My opinions which are those of Richard Hooker were unpopular; & away with such a fellow from the earth is the cry which religious newspapers re-echoe, till their readers begin to believe there *must* be some foundation for what so many repeat. These persons are found amongst my clergy whom I have offended e.g. by wishing them to pay a Curate better to assail me with calumnious slander in Radical & dissenting papers: because they know that a Bishop cannot answer such charges so brought — and what can be the result but such a state of the public mind as you describe: & so if there be of God's mercy nothing more substantial to fix upon, they 'who wish me evil', seize on such impalpable imputations as that of . . . [*illegible*] . . . , [favouring in my Diocese those who are in sufficient agreement with my views & practice. I have always been a High Church Evangelical in doctrine . . . [*illegible*] . . .] and, as I believe I ought, I encourage to the utmost of my power good humble & earnest men whether they are considered to belong to this party or that. For this, extreme men on each side will reproach me; but I hope that God approves: & on my knees before Him I seek, & of his Mercy often find, a resting place from the Strife of Tongues. My heart is often wounded to the quick by suspicion & misrepresentation: for though I know that in a time of extreme views like the present one who will not be a party man must be suspected, yet I crave with a strong natural earnestness the sympathy of the good & feel the smart of meeting instead with suspicion & coldness. But it little matters. The Judgement Seat & the Face of Our Dear Lord are very nigh: I may be nearer to Death than you: & I would fain, infinitely above all . . . [*illegible*] . . . I sincerely ask your prayers . . . [*illegible*] . . . [*Unfinished*]

374. To the Rev. T. H. Tooke (*v 18*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 20, 1851

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have received with peculiar pleasure the address which you have forwarded to me from so very large & influential a number of the Parishioners of Upton

Cum Chalvey. Matters now happily disposed of, in which I felt it my duty for the sake of the poor to oppose some of those who fill the chiefest place in your parish might still have rankled in ungenerous minds & made them ill affected towards me. At a time then like the present, when misrepresentations of all kinds have so much abounded, it has been a peculiar pleasure to me to receive from so large a number of your parishioners a hearty & unsought expression of their confidence in me, their kindly feelings towards me, & their readiness to join with me in resisting this last act of Papal Usurpation by which our Nation has been insulted in her Queen & Our Church invaded in its Sees. Heartily Praying God to have you now & ever in His Holy Keeping I am ever Rev. & Dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

375. To the Dissentient Clergy of the Oxford Diocese[1] (*v* 17)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 21, 1851

MY Reverend Brethren,

I have read your Reasons for not subscribing 'the Protest' agreed to by the clergy of this Diocese with the attention to which such a document so signed is entitled: & I feel it due to you to state as briefly as I can why those Reasons appear to me to be insufficient to justify your refusal. I. Your first 'reason' is that the Protest is insufficient in Scriptural teaching to instruct ignorant Protestants, to confirm waverers or convince Romanist. To this I must reply that it was not the object of the protest to convey Scriptural instruction, but to make a public Protest on behalf of this portion of the Church. II. Your second reason is That the Schismatical Character of the late act, rather than the corruptions of Rome were put primarily forward. I reply that it was against that schismatical conduct & not against the deep corruptions of Rome that this Protest was primarily directed. The Corruption of Rome had been the same when supported by the Bishop of Melipotamos as they were when supported by the so called, Arch: Bishop of Westminster: our Protest then being called forth by the Schismatical act must *Primarily* address itself thereto. But having done this it spoke in no faltering accents of Roman corruptions: for first, it embodied & repeated the whole Protest of the Articles of the Church of England — next it stated the teaching of the Church of Rome to be on *many* points of *Faith* 'contrary to Gods Word'; & thirdly it declared her 'practices' to be 'Idolatrous'. I cannot understand how any one who had read these allegations could conceive the doctrinal condemnation of Rome to be so insufficient that they could be justified in violating the great law of Unity by refusing to sign it. But III You object to the Reference to the Judgement of the Universal Church if it could be obtained; & you endeavour to justify this objection by saying that *a general Council* may err. There is no reference to a general Council for this very reason in the Protest which refers to such a Judgement of the Church as would include the first four centuries to which our Church special [*sic*] refers. This objection therefore is *not* to the Protest, but to that which was carefully excluded from the Protest. IV. You object that the Protest does not acknowledge that Romish leanings amongst ourselves had encouraged the Papal Aggression. Had we been writing a history of the Aggression & therefore tracing its causes I should not differ from you. But in a Protest against an aggression from without, I feel such a Statement of Causes would in my Judgement have been misplaced, whilst since to be complete it must have included the Acts of the Government which had tended to invite the aggression, it would assuredly have

[1] They had met on 22 Nov. 1850.

introduced division, where Unity was next to Truth and Charity of supreme importance. V. Your last reason is that in warning your flocks to yield no obedience to these so called Bishops of New Sees they are urged against the Schism of such an act rather than against the doctrinal corruptions to which such conformity would expose them. This objection would have much weight if this warning stood alone. But as in the preceding sentence The Church of Rome has been stated to teach as matter of Faith what is contrary to Gods Word, & to practise what is idolatrous, I can see no objection to warning them in this paragraph against the schismatical act which would expose them to what we have already declared to be corrupt in doctrine & idolatrous in practice. For these reasons I am led to the conclusion that you had no sufficient grounds for refusing to join with your Bishop & your brethren in common action against the common enemy; thereby weakening the effect of the resistance made in this Diocese to Popish usurpation; tending to divide those who ought to be united; & so giving strength to the watchful enemies of all religion in their warfare against Christ & His Church. You would I am sure my Rev Brethren be the first & amongst the most earnest to deprecate, what yet has been & I fear must be the result of your mistaken movement. I have further only to say that I pray God to avert from us these & all other evils to which our human infirmity exposes us & to have us & our work for Christs Sake in His Holy Keeping.

I pray you to strive earnestly for the Common faith and withal to follow after Charity. I beseech you to remember the blessedness of being of one mind; the grievous Sin & danger of harsh judgements, intemperate words & a lack of Love — and may the blessing of God rest upon you.

I am, My Rev. Brethren, Your Faithful friend & Brother,

S. Oxon.

P.S. I request you to give the same measure of publicity to this answer which you have given or may give to your 'Reasons'

Life, II, 60–2

376. To the Rev. W. T. Eyre[1]

(v 19)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 23, 1851

Rev. & Dear Sir,

In reply to your first question I must call your attention & that of any of your Parishioners for whose satisfaction you have applied to me to the rubric before the Venite; which states 'Then shall be said *or sung* this Psalm following'. This Rubric marks distinctly that to sing the Venite was not in the Judgement of our Martyred Reformers a Popish thing. Nor is the singing the Venite 'an innovation'; for it is a common custom in a very large proportion of Parish Churches. Nor is it in my judgement other than a laudable custom. I should object to Chanting the Psalms in a mixed congregation because many would be unable to follow them & so would lose one of the most delightful parts of public worship to every spiritually minded person: but this objection does not apply to a canticle which is repeated so frequently that all are thoroughly acquainted with it & can follow it if distinctly chanted. Being freed from this objection the custom has this great advantage that it engages & interests a number of the congregation in the Worship of God; & is a protest against that mischievous delusion of the Romanists that the Priest offers up the Service as an intercession for the People

[1] William Thomas Eyre (1795–1868), V. of Padbury and P.C. of Hillesden, 1830–68 (O).

The same rule applies to the 'Glorias' which I have laid down for the Canticles.

But I must not leave this subject without adding, that the law vests in the Clergyman of the Parish the whole arrangement of the singing, in the time of Divine Service, subject to an appeal upon any point from any Parishioner to the Bishop.

II. Your second question is, 'is it wrong to preach against Dissent'. The Dissenters from the Church of England are many — 1st The Romanist Sectarians who dissent from Her in consequence of their love to the various & fearful corruptions of doctrines & practice which at the Blessed Reformation Our Church was by Gods Grace enabled to cast off & return to the purer worship, practices & doctrine which Holy Scripture teaches & the Primitive Church practised. For this reformation The Roman See renounced communion with the Church of England, & those who are so blind as to follow her corrupt teaching dissent with her from the Church of England.

II. The Protestant dissenters, dissent for various reasons from the Church of England though with us they *protest* against Rome. Thus some of them deny that Our Lord Jesus Christ is God; some of them renounce altogether Holy Baptism & the Lords Supper. Some of them deny Baptism to infants; some of them deny that the Christian Ministry comes from Christ & say that anyone can be or make a Minister; some of them say that *they* are as much inspired as the Holy Apostles; some say that the Elect of God cannot Sin, some say that they themselves are perfect; some deny Our Lords atonement & the like. Now all these points the Church of England declares from Gods Word to be errors; some more, some less dangerous; & it is the duty of Her Minister to shew her people that these are errors, & so save them from them. But in preaching against these errors & in teaching the truth instead (e.g. That Our Lord Jesus Christ is GOD, & that he died to make atonement for us, & gives us The Holy Spirit & appointed Holy Baptism & a ministry &c.) the Minister *is* preaching against Dissent — & therefore if he does his duty he *must* preach against *Dissent*, I say, *Dissent* not *Dissenter* for he will do a very wrong & uncharitable thing if he preaches against *the men* who hold the errors, & not against *the errors*; & again, he must preach in a loving Spirit & not in an angry way; & again he must prove his points from Gods Holy Word, & again he should preach according to the proportion of Gods Word dwelling most often & most earnestly on the most important things, & then on those his own people most need to be taught; & moreover he will do better to teach them the contrary of the error, than to be always dwelling on the error; (e.g. he will best preach against the error of denying Christ to be God by building up his people in faith & love to Him as God). But still with all these safeguards of love & charity, he must preach against Dissent, & his doing so is His duty, so that it be done in the loving way I have shewn above.

There is need, just now, of great forbearance between Clergy & people. Some of us alas have forsaken the truth & gone over to the Corruptions of Rome — & this of course makes all who seem in anything to agree with those who have gone suspected. But these suspicions are unjust. Our people should lay them aside, & *we* should be patient. Amongst the Best & Greatest men in the Church of England many have been what are now called High Churchmen. Such were the Martyr Bishop Ridley — Bishop Andrews — Richard Hooker whom all times since have called '*the* Judicious'. But for the labours & sufferings of such men & Gods blessing on their labours we should not now have 'The Church of England' for Puritanism would, as it did for a time, have subverted it, & with it the Crown of our Monarchs, our civil liberties, & above all our hereditary faith. And if now

all those who believe & labour & pray as Hooker did are to be cast out of the Church, The Church of England will not long survive their expulsion & then must come first the War of All Sects & then the End of All religion. May God then of His Mercy for Christs Sake give us a Spirit of love & Peace one to the other, of mutual forbearance & kindness; that through His Great Grace we may maintain The Unity of The Spirit in the Bond of Peace.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

377. To the Rev. J. H. Pollen *(v 20)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 23, 1851

Rev. & Dear Sir,

Your letter of yesterday does not alter my view of my duty.

1 As to the first point — I was perfectly familiar with all that you alledge & do not consider it as bearing at all upon the point at issue. Indeed your own quotations shew that the authorised language of the Church of England has always been held by her great Divines to be, that there are 2, of the Church of Rome 7, Sacraments. If, as you alledge from Bp Andrews, the whole is a question of words, it makes the case stronger against you that in what you knew to be a contention of words you should have chosen the words of Rome & rejected those of England. II on the Second point I need say nothing for you only justify what I have already condemned.

At a time when the Ch of England is attacked by Latitudinarianism on the one side & Popery on the other, I cannot, (where it rests with me to prevent them) allow in my Diocese Ministrations which appear to me to be so likely to lead some astray into Popery & to repel others into Latitudinarianism.

You speak of yourself as 'a defenceless Stranger' over whom my power is irresponsible. I have no wish to act in this matter by any arbitrary rule applied to a defenceless stranger. I shall therefore send copies of my letters to you to the head of your College[1] & to the Vice Chancellor of the University[2] & I shall be obliged by your informing me at your early convenience whether you wish me to send your letters with them.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Ever very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

378. *(v 21)*

St Peters College Radley.[3] Judgement of the Visitor upon the question referred to him Jan. 25, 1851

The 'Decanus' is one of the Socii, nominated, by the Custos, to that office. He is, when so nominated, a 'Socius', & something more. Remaining then a 'Socius', he is bound by All the obligations of an ordinary 'Socius'. One of those obligations is the undertaking to give such instruction as the Custos shall appoint. By this obligation of the Socius, the Decanus continues bound. But it is urged, that if the full number of Servitores contemplated at the foundation of the College are to be taught by Him, they would occupy his time so completely, that he could

[1] Robert Bullock Marsham (1786–1880), Warden of Merton, 1826–80 (*MEB*); the only lay Head of House in Oxford.

[2] Frederick Charles Plumptre (1796–1870), Master of University College, 1836–70; Vice-Chancellor, 1848–52 (*MEB*).

[3] Founded in 1847.

not fulfil the other directions of the Warden. I reply we have no right to presume that the Warden will ever give unreasonable directions. When he gives them would be the time for the decanus to appeal to the Visitor. The arguments as at present urged would release every fellow from his promise; for he might with equal justice say the Warden *may* order me to teach *all* the Pupils. I conclude, that the Decanus is bound to undertake whatever task of instruction the Warden commits to him, besides the instruction of the Servitors.

Signed. S. Oxon. Visitor

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 25, 1851

379. To the Rev. W. B. Heathcote[1] *(v 22)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 29, 1851

My dear Sir,

I have anxiously weighed all the arguments you urge against my informing the Warden of Merton & the Vice Chancellor of Oxford that I have felt it my duty to inhibit Mr Pollen from officiating in my diocese. But after the best consideration I can give to them I do not think them valid.

1. I cannot admit that my letters as Bishop of this Diocese calling upon Mr Pollen to state any reasons he might wish to urge why I should not place him under inhibition are in any sense private or confidential documents.

II If I saw any real good likely to result to Mr Pollen by my not informing the Vice Chancellor & the Head of Merton of the step I have taken, I should have given that consideration the greatest weight: but I cannot see that my silence could in any way tend to remove his strong leaning to the Roman Communion. I cannot trace that leaning to the recent Secession of his Friends — on the contrary, I think that the bitter pain caused by such losses (which are far worse than those of a Christian death) only bring more forcibly before the mind the evils of that corrupt & proselyting [*sic*] body.

But further, the law of charitable forbearance towards an offender is always subservient in those who bear the grievous burden of authority, to the law of duty as to the wider interests committed to their charge — & here I reach your 3 reason — namely 'prudential consideration for the University & Church of England'. On this point I would say 1st That to inhibit one who appears to me to be teaching distinctly Roman doctrine, & who in three long letters will not (in your judgement as well as mine) meet or answer the Charge, appears to me a plain duty at all times incumbent on a Bishop as guardian of the Faith. But that II this is an especially duty binding on one who in this day of reproach & calumny against those who are faithful members of the Church of England will not flinch from standing by & sharing the reproach of those who are charged unjustly. For to falter when such a charge is truly brought is not only to neglect his bounden duty in driving away Roman Error but it is also to give up his power of defending English truth.

This point then being to me clear the question is can I (leaving wholly out of sight the guarding myself from Mr Pollens charge of dealing harshly by a defenceless Stranger) but on other grounds can I rightly content myself with a private inhibition; for whatever is right is prudent. Now I think I cannot. I view

[1] William Beadon Heathcote (1812–62), Fellow of New College, 1832–53; C. of St. Peter le Bailey, Oxford, 1843, of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, 1850; Warden of Radley, 1851–2; V. of Sturminster Marshall, Dorset, 1858, and R. of Compton Bassett, Wilts., 1862 (*MEB*).

the case of a fellow of a college resident at Oxford under college & University Authority, as parrallel [*sic*] to a clergyman residing in another Diocese. If I am satisfied that the teaching of a clergyman is so erroneous that I must forbid his teaching in my Diocese: I am clearly bound to state to the Bishop in whose diocese he resides the fact, & the grounds of my conduct, in order to put him on his guard. The same line of conduct then appears to me to be right here. What if Mr Pollen were entrusted by College or University authority with some opportunity of spreading what I believe to be unsound teaching through my silence? Should not I be Guilty? As to any such further steps as those of which you speak, I must leave all such questions to those who will be responsible for taking them; & I do so with a full trust in their prudence — & Charity.

I shall therefore transmit by this post to the Warden of Merton & to the Vice-Chancellor copies of my letters to Mr Pollen: & if he desires it I will send his letters also.

I am my dear Sir, Very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

380. To the Warden of Merton College (R. B. Marsham) (*v 23*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 29, 1851

My dear Mr Warden,

Having come to the conclusion that it was my duty to take the painful step of inhibiting a resident fellow of your College from performing any spiritual functions within this Diocese, I feel it to be my duty to acquaint you that I have done so: & that you may know the grounds on which I have acted, I enclose copies of the letters which I have written to Mr Pollen on the subject, for your perusal

I remain my dear Mr Warden, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

381. To the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University (F. C. Plumptre) (*v 24*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 29, 1851

My dear Mr Vice Chancellor,

Having felt it my duty to inhibit the Rev J. H Pollen a resident member of the University, from the performance of spiritual functions within this Diocese, I think it due to you to inform you of the fact, & to place in your hands the letters which I have written to Mr Pollen on the subject, that you may know the reasons which have brought me to this painful decision.

I am My dear Mr Vice-Chancellor, Most Sincerely Yours,

S. Oxon.

382. To the Churchwardens of Fleet Marston (*v 25*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 30, 1851

Gentlemen,

I am very sorry to learn that there is any difference, or other cause of annoyance, between you & your temporary Curate the Rev F Cox.[1] I had never intended that Mr Cox should be fixed as the permanent Curate of Fleet Marston. But

1 Frederick Cox (1796–1879), P.C. of Upper Winchendon, 1821–79; Headmaster of Aylesbury Free Grammar School, 1840; C. of Fleet Marston, 1851 (O).

as Mr Humphreys[1] intends to come himself into residence very shortly, & has expressed his wish that Mr Cox should continue to officiate until he comes, I do not think that it would be well to place another Clergyman in Mr Cox's place for that very short time, unless there is ground of serious charge against Mr Cox. I therefore trust that for this short period you will strive to remove prejudices against Mr Cox's Ministry.

I am Gentlemen, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

383. To the Rev. E. B. Dean *(v 26)*

Cuddesdon, Jan. 30, 1851

My dear Dr Dean,

I am very glad that you frankly admit the indiscretion of your recent visit to Mr Scott Murrays. But I cannot think that you have acted rightly in replying as you have done to Mr Glanville.[2] Your admission that you have acted indiscreetly is an admission that you have done that which may naturally offend your brethren. By every law therefore of the Gospel you owe to them a frank acknowledgement of your fault. Your witholding such an acknowledgement appears to me to be a sin against Charity; & order. It is likely to break up those meetings of the Clergy which I deem very important: & to lead clergy round you to indulge thoughts of evil against you. I think therefore that you are absolutely bound, taking no notice of the 4 Gentlemen to write to the R Dean & say that *I* having pointed out to you that your conduct in this matter was calculated to give just offence to your brethren in the Ministry who met with you to consult as to the Church's Welfare you hastened to express to him your regret that you had been led into such an indiscretion.

I am &c

[*Unsigned*]

384. To the Rev. T. A. Walker[3] *(v 27)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 15, 1851

My dear Sir,

I have given my best consideration to your letter of the 6th inst. & will give you with perfect frankness my opinion upon the whole question to which it relates.

Your ministry opened at Chadlington with the brightest prospects. Your people were won to you; your Rural Dean was your friend your Squire liberal with his purse & anxious to use his influence to support you. Various causes have clouded over this bright sunshine. You gave (unintentionally I am confident) personal offence to the family of one of your leading Farmers: this led to a readiness to find fault: the excitement throughout the country caused by the Papal Aggression & Lord Johns indecent letter gave a handle for the offended, & stirred up a prejudice against your Services &c. I was asked by the Rural

[1] Salusbury Humphreys (1807–55), C. of Fleet Marston, 1848; R. 1851–5 (O).
[2] Edward Fanshawe Glanville (1807–78), Fellow of Exeter, 1830–5; R. of Wheatfield, 1836–52; P.C. of Tideford, Cornwall, 1854–6; R. of Yelford, 1869–78.
[3] Thomas Andrew Walker, C. of Chadlington 1846, domestic chaplain to Lord de Tabley, 1855–65; C. of Barkingside, Essex, 1875–9; V., 1879–85 (O).

Dean to advise; & finding that by the suspension of your Saints day Services, & the substitution of an evening lecture for them on Fridays peace & confidence might be restored I advised that step. I regard the observation of the Saints day services in Church as a great priviledge, but I do not regard them of primary importance; nor can I doubt that you might hope for more blessing on a Friday evening service *well attended*, than on Saints day services attended by '20 adults' out of a population of 800. Now on the ground of the discontinuance of the Saints day Services you propose to abandon your Curacy. As to this I must frankly express to you my entire variance from your judgement. I cannot doubt but that in retiring on such grounds from Chadlington you will be giving up a great opportunity of serving Christ's Church which HE has set before you. I believe that if, taught by the past, you would guard carefully against whatever may give offence, you would now labour on at Chadlington, you might hope to see the promise of your opening labours more than fulfilled; confidence in you growing & strengthening; & a true & deep work of Piety carried out in your Flock. I pray you therefore to reconsider from the beginning the question of your resignation; & I unless I hear again from you to the safe [*sic*] effect shall not consider what you have now said as a 'Notice'.

I am my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

385. To the Rev. R. Remington[1]

(*v 28*)

Cuddesdon Palace, March 5, 1851

Rev. Sir,

I have received your letter of March 3 with great regret. I had hoped that my pointed requirement of testimonials when you came into my Diocese might have led you to deal openly with me. But instead of this, you only revert to my having suffered you to serve without &c. &c. My having done so was entirely accidental & contrary to my usual rule: but I had at that time no ground for suspecting you of any past misconduct. I have however now learned your connection with the Cathedral Church of Manchester, & I cannot after what has passed allow you to continue at Grandboro. I have no wish for any public exposure, or any sudden departure. But I wish you to prepare to leave my Diocese at your early convenience & I doubt not that within 3 or 4 Sundays I shall be able to provide for the duty.

I am Rev. Sir, Very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

386. To Mrs. Whitfeld

(*v 29*)

Cuddesdon Palace, March 5, 1851

My dear Madam,

I am sorry to have to trouble Mr Whitfield[2] in his present state of health but I cannot allow Mr Remington to continue as the Curate of Grandborough. I find that he has left his proper diocese under circumstances which prevent his receiving the signature of his Bishop to His Testimonials. Of this I have only

1 Reginald Remington, V. and patron of Fritwell, 1876–82 (O).
2 *Rectius* Whitfeld; but mis-spelt throughout.

just become aware: & under these circumstances it would be entirely contrary to my rules to allow him to continue at Grandboro'. I doubt not that I can shortly find a Curate for it & on hearing from you which I beg that I may do at once I will set @ the search.

I am, My dear Madam, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

387. To the Rev. J. Keble[1]

(*iii 199*)

Cuddesdon Palace, March 14, 1851

My dear Mr. Keble,

Your letter has reached me in the midst of an ordination which must make you excuse a short reply. I assure you that I never could feel any letter from you to be an intrusion. My position with regard to Dr. Pusey is & has long been deeply painful to me. I am fully convinced of the loyalty of his own feelings towards the Church of England: I have no suspicion whatever that he ever will desert her. I believe that a great deal of the outcry against him arises from his firmly holding great truths which the Church of England teaches. I revere his own devoutness. With such a man I long to be able to work freely: & to share his reproach. With men *so far* agreeing with him I have worked in my own Diocese: & have rejoiced in the late storm to stand by them, shelter them, & bear many of the blows aimed at them. I mean such men as Butler of Wantage, Stephen Hawtrey &c. Indeed, that no fear of reproach keeps me apart from Dr. Pusey I think my silence as to our relations, when one word would have stilled the storm raised against me of late, may show. But here is my difficulty. 1. I believe that Dr. P's 'adaptations' have grievously injured our Church. Dr. P. knows & has known my mind on this matter & yet has published more. 2. I believe that the tone of Dr. P's spiritual directions, & even of many of his own publications, tends not to uphold amongst us Catholic truth but to create & foster a tendency to Rome. To *answer* Dr. P's writings as you suggest seems to me the duty of those who have leisure for Theological writing. My call is to action. I see a great danger of a very peculiar form, if young men, some very slightly instructed, some struggling out of gross sin; some loving novelty & excitement, were brought under his direct spiritual guidance. What in such a case can I do, though sore at heart at saying so, but say that I do not wish him to excercise his ministry in my Diocese. I believe that his influence tends as directly contrary to Prevost's (whom you name) as possible.

What seems to me my duty, now, is this: to study thoroughly his recently published statements of his own position & doctrine: (in this I am far advanced) to consider the bearing on them of his adaptations: & then to give him distinctly & in writing my conclusion. This I will do as soon as the press of business allows; & in the mean time, I think that matters ought to remain in statu quo.

I am, my dear Mr. Keble, affectionately yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 96–7

[1] The famous John Keble (1792–1866), V. of Hursley, Hants., 1836–66, who preached the sermon on National Apostasy from which the Oxford Movement is generally dated (*DNB*). He was older than most of the Tractarian leaders, and inspired confidence outside the circle because of his learning and moderation. Cf. no. 545.

388. To the Rev. E. Miller[1] *(iii 200)*

Cuddesdon Palace, March 14, 1851

My dear Sir,

I have read your letter with great pain. I feel keenly all the difficulty of your position; I long to aid you. But even for this end I dare not lay hands *suddenly* on any man: & with your son's *recent* college life known to me, & with no evidence before me of a truly penitential change in his soul; (which you do not I think feel you could aver) I dare not ordain him at Trinity. I should feel to be putting him into the Priest's office that he might eat a piece of bread. I venture to recommend that he should, when he finds a curacy, apply on that as a title to your own Bishop, if Wells is unattainable. I should fear doing him the deepest injury by ordaining him whilst spiritually unfit.

I am, My Dear Sir, most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

389. To the Rev. H. W. Wilberforce *(v 30)*

Wasing Place, March 31, 1851

My Beloved Brother,

I cannot forbear telling you of the extreme pain with which I have just read your 'letter'.[2] I am sure that anything like controversy between us would be far more than useless: & so nothing is further from my mind that [*sic*] to enter upon it with you. But the deep & unchanging love I bear you learned when we knelt as little children together in our early prayers forces me to speak. The point then to which as concerning your own Soul to which I desire as before our Common Judge to call your attention is the exceeding want of truth which pervades your 'letter'. We should I am sure agree that so to state a proposition as to make it suggest what was untrue to the party to whom it was addressed, even if in a certain way the absolute truth of the statement can be defended, is still untruth in the sight of God. Now my Beloved Henry try your letter from page 15 to the end by that rule & remember that you are not writing a clever Review of some unimportant subject, but dealing with Gods Truth & Souls for which Christ died & I think you can hardly avoid feeling what I mean. E.G. 'any Protestant Sects (& you include the Ch of E) have been set up by men who thought they could *make a new Church* &c. We will have a new Church which shall be a deal better than that which has been from the beginning' 'Each wished others to be contented with his *own New Church*' 'This is why it is necessary to *set up New Churches*' Now remember you are not saying what *you* as a Romanist think our reformers really did. You might truly, however in my Judgement mistakenly, say 'their changes amounted to making a New Church'. But you say nothing of the sort. You speak of what they professed & intended — & you say this though you *know* that the one position of our reformers & of our Church ever since the Reformation is this — we set up *no new Church*: we merely lay aside certain new & unauthorised additions to the doctrine & practice of the Church. But you reckoning, as it appears, on your letter falling into the hands of those who do not know all the history of this long controversy venture upon this most unwarranted assertion.

1 None of the various persons of this name in the Clergy Lists seems to fit, except perhaps the Rev. Edward Miller of Radway, Warws. (O), whose antiquarian son Edward Miller was a Fellow of New College 1843–57, and became V. of Butlers Marston, Warws., in 1868. An Edward Miller of New College had been ordained deacon in 1848 and priest in December 1850, as chaplain of the Boatmen's Mission.

2 H. W. Wilberforce published his *Reasons for submitting to the Catholic Church: A Farewell Letter to his late Parishioners* in 1851.

To pass over other like assertions — such as that in par: 2 & 3 4 — 5 which you must know are open by a somewhat longer proof to the same charge — look at your statements in par. 6. *You* know that *we* do not rest our claim on our peoples allegiance to the accident of our being Established: you know that the Romanists would if they could hold tomorrow of the State all the accidents of temporal rank & pay. You know that it is absolutely false to say that 'Parliament & the lawyers settle its doctrines its prayers &c.' You *know* that Parliament never settled one & cannot now alter one. Again in par. 7. & 9 you use the same license. But to pass these over, let me point out to you one concluding instance of what seems to me to be the same absolute violation of truth You account for the non-spread of Popery in England by saying that until the last hundred years it was kept down by 'sheer persecution.' You then urge the execution of Seminary Priests &c in the reign of Elizabeth though you know that they were put to death for plots against the person & government of the Queen (real or suspected it matters not) — & then you *imply* that this state of things lasted till 100 years ago. Now my beloved brother you know so perfectly that this is *absolutely* untrue that I quite tremble to read your letter.

I earnestly entreat you to try yourself on this matter before God. I cannot forget the awful threatening of His sending on men strong delusions that they should believe a lie — & knowing what follows, & being ready to bear anything rather than that our separation which now embitters my life should be Eternal I must break through all restraints & set this plainly before you.

I am &c.

S O.

390. To the Rev. W. S. Bricknell (*v 31*)

Rev$^{d.}$ Sir,

It is with much Pain I inform you that the Enquiries I have recently made have convinced me that the Spiritual Charge of your Parishioners of Grove has of late been much neglected.

This is the more grievous because the Church & Parsonage of Grove having been recently erected by the pious Zeal of the excellent Provost of Worcester & others on Purpose to secure for its Inhabitants the Blessing of a resident Ministry of Christ's Gospel, your holding it in Plurality and subjecting it to all the Evils of Non-Residence defeats the Object of a Work of Christian Charity, and must discourage others in such Labours. It was the Fear that such Results would follow which led me to represent to you two years ago, that as you could not really discharge the Duties of Grove with the Charge of the populous Parish of Eynsham with the Lectureship of Carfax, Oxford, and with your busy magisterial Life, you should either provide a competent Stipend for a resident Curate, or sacrifice for the Benefit of the People the trifling Gains you make by retaining it, and resign the Benefice. In which Case, to remove your Scruples, I had as you know obtained the Consent of the Patron either to appoint your own Curate Mr. Springett[1] to it, or to place the Nomination in the Hands of the Provost of Worcester. Such a course would have averted the discreditable Squabbles about Stipend in which you have been involved with your two last Curates and would have prevented the Neglect & Scandal of the last Months.

[1] William John Springett (1824–1918), C. of Grove and Eynsham 1846, Brightwell, 1849; V. of Dunkirk, Kent, 1854 (O).

The Letter of Mr. Caudwell one of the most respectable Inhabitants of your Parish (of which he has transmitted me a Copy) gives you his Assurance that he considers the Charge of Souls to have been grievously neglected, and mentions some cases of Neglect & Scandal; e.g. the leaving John Symonds to die without the Spiritual Offices he had sought from you; the Imputations touching the Money subscribed for the Coal Club; and the Charges against the Moral Conduct of your late Assistant (whom you employed contrary to the Rule I have laid down for such Cases).

I grieve that the attached Laity of our Church should thus be placed in Opposition to their Minister.

As your appointing your Curate inter-changeably between your two Livings gives you a legal Mode of lowering his stipend, I cannot give your new Curate all that I should desire: and I can therefore only admonish you, which I do most solemnly, to see, so far as you can, that no such Neglect or Scandal again injures the Population of Grove

In consequence of the Correspondence which has recently passed, I shall transmit a Copy of this Letter to Mr. Caudwell.

I am Rev. Sir, Yours truly,

S. Oxon.

391. To Mr. Caudwell[1] *(v 32)*

Windsor, April 7, 1851

My dear Sir,

I feel it due to you after your recent correspondence with Mr Bricknell, to which your attention to my request on behalf of the parish has subjected you to shew you the inclosed copy of a letter which I have today sent to him.

I am my dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

392. To the Rev. J. Harrison *(v 33)*

Cuddesdon Palace, April 28, 1851

My dear Friend,

I am much obliged to you for your discreet conduct & kindness (which has been unceasing) towards myself in sending me Mr Ishams[2] letter & taking no public notice of what in these inflammable days would have been so sure to do mischief: I greatly regret that Mr Isham should in a brother clergymans parish have put any questions to the Clerk which, as his answer shews, instantly suggested evil to his mind.

I cannot agree with the view which you take of the matter if as I understand you to do you approve of Mr Ishams Statements. The rule by which *I* should try the act which he condemns so strongly is a simple one: it is what has the Church of England said on the Subject. Now in the Rubric at the end of the office for Holy Baptism I find these words, 'The true explication of the use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism & the just reasons for retaining it may be seen in XXXth Canon'. Then turning to the XXXth Canon I find that there were those who, like Mr Isham, felt their consciences aggrieved by any use of the Sign of the Cross

[1] Of Grove.

[2] Arthur Isham (1809–92), nephew of the 8th Bart., Fellow of All Souls, 1832–7; R. of Weston Turville, 1837–76 (*MEB*).

& desired it removed from our Services. But the Ch of E. did not yield to these Scruples. On the contrary the Canon declares Ist that it is Jews & Ethnics who did deride the use of the Cross; but that Apostles rejoiced & triumphed in it & that this was encouraged by the words put by the Holy Ghost into the mouths of the Apostles. II That this led to a reverend use of the Cross in early times after them. III That the Papacy had greatly abused this Sign of the Cross — but that the abuse of a thing does not take away its lawful use & that the Church of England had no purpose to separate itself from the practices of the Churches of Italy France &c. except in points in which they had fallen from primitive usage & introduced hurtful superstition The Canon then proceeds to shew that as the use of the Cross in baptism is not held to be of the essence of the Sacrament its use is not Superstitious & may therefore be lawfully used. 'Now applying this principle to the case in point, I should say that as it is not supposed that any Sanctity is added to Communion table by the Cross fixed on its cover, there can be nothing superstitious in its use. IIly That a readiness to take offence at & make a matter of importance of such a thing, is the very temper of mind which the Canon condemns. IIIly that to speak of it as 'teaching members of the English Church to respect Roman Symbolism' is uncharitable; & quite indefensible. For 1st the due honour of the Sign of our blessed Lords passion, when it is not used superstitiously is not a Roman but a Christian Symbolism. So our Rubric & Canon rule it for us; & the use of all Protestant States abroad which are not Socinian declares it IIly I am not aware that there is the smallest reason for believing that either in England or abroad any such custom ever prevailed amongst Romanists. IIIly Because this habit of setting down everything of which we disapprove as Roman Symbolism is helping forward the work of Rome amongst us in many ways — as — 1 by dividing ourselves 2 by sowing suspicions (as Mr Ishams question did in the mind of this Clerk) (3) by driving through a natural revulsion stronger minds either towards Rome or unbelief (4) by weakening our protest against real corruptions when we protest against things allowed & even encouraged by our Church.

For these reasons I cannot in any way censure Mr Woolley[1] for this act. But yet I regret that he did it, & should not in my own church have allowed it; simply because, though most entirely innocent, it is as far as I know quite unusual & I should object, in these days, to introducing anything unusual. I should not have feared in thus accustoming people to any Roman Symbolism; but I should have feared offending, & raising uncharitable thoughts in weak minds whom the prevalent Puritanism of the day had made preternaturally suspicious. I assure you that it will much pain me if upon full reflexion you do not in the main agree with my view in this matter. It seems to me that when (as at present suspicions & unkind thoughts & words of each other so fearfully abound it is more than ever *our* duty to labour to bear & forbear with one another for Christs Sake; to take the most charitable view of every matter, & to be as slow as possible in giving, or taking any offence one against the other. I know that this is *your* temper; & I really do not believe that if this matter had not been thus brought before you by one whom you have so many reasons for respecting & esteeming your unprejudiced mind would have attached any weight to so very trifling an indiscretion.

I am, my dear Friend, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Possibly, though not probably, Frederick Woolley (1821–77), C. of Haseley, 1847–50; P.C. of St. Paul's, Leeds, 1851–3, later R. of Lewes, 1863–77 (O).

393. To the Rev. J. Hanbury (*v 34*)
Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Oct. 8, 1851

Rev. Sir,

I have heard with great pain an account of your present absence from your parish which leaves me no option as to writing to you this most distressing letter.

I do not wish to write on this miserable subject — and I will therefore only say here, that I have been informed by respectable parties of what is charged against you as having passed between yourself & Ferris who was till lately employed in your garden: of the money sent by you through the younger Ferris, to his brother & to Smith. My course is a painfully clear one. If you are indeed conscious of innocence as to these things call on me at once for a commission of Enquiry to establish your innocence; but if unhappily your conscience condemns you *at once* resign your living & so set me free from the necessity of instituting proceedings which must bring scandal on the Church & may bring destruction on you.

I am Rev. Sir, Yours truly,

S. Oxon.

I send a duplicate of this to Thatcham.

394. To the Rev. J. H. Pollen (*v 35*)
Private & Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Oct. 8

My dear Sir,

Your letter dated Oct 5 has reached me today. I am very sorry that any act of mine should seem to you a 'gratuitous unkindness'. I have a multitude of faults, God only knows how many *I* detect; but unkindness & harshness are not amongst them. It is not as 'having done evil against me' that I have acted in anything concerning you; nor in anger, God knows but most reluctantly and as one forced to trample on private feelings which were all on your side by the resposibilities [*sic*] of a most perilous office. In my former correspondence with you I anxiously sought to use every means in my power to lead you simply to express regret at having used language directly at variance with the dogmatic teaching of the Church of England & to profess your hearty & unfeigned accordance with all her teaching. But all was in vain & you forced on me the step which in violation of every private feeling I took. I could understand only in one way your cold peremptory & formal announcement of your violation of my private injunction; no motive of necessity or charity being so much as hinted at by you — and if therefore I intended the Episcopal authority in my hands to have any weight I was compelled to enforce that which had been set at nought.

You have acted with the generous spirit I always believed you to possess when you have spoken of me as you have: but you do me injustice if you believe that there is in me towards you any feeling other than there is to those you name, or which would not rejoice unfeignedly if you by a frank avowal of fault & a frank declaration of confidence in our Church would make it possible for me to withdraw a censure which I pronounced & enforced with grief & reluctance.

I am, My dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

395. To the Rev. C. F. Chase[1] *(v 36)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 26, 1851

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I return you the correspondence which you have forwarded to me. I see in Mr Murrays[2] statement of doctrine here nothing at all at variance with that which he forwarded to me. There is a difference of *tone*, in the two Statements which is quite natural; since he was in the one case answering his Bishop who had as he felt from his office a right to ask the questions answered, & towards whom I hope & believe that he feels a personal regard; & in the other one who you feel yourself had unfortunately discharged what must always be a painful duty in a way not likely to conciliate. I feel no doubt of the purity of your motives; & I feel so strongly that a simple reference to the Bishop is *the* line of Christian duty on such occasions that I cannot say a word which should even seem like censuring your appeal to me; but I am bound to say on behalf of Mr Murray, (1) that an honest man could not but feel deeply wounded by the charge, which he knew to be unfounded, that he was teaching the dangerous error of transubstantiation to the little ones of his flock; & (2) that you have erred in the following particulars;

1st, as you admit, in the mode of your personal address to Mr Murray

IIly in not communicating fully to him the charge which you felt bound to send to me.

IIIly In your allowing, as Mr Murrays very positive evidence seems to shew that you did, the fact & subject of your complaint to transpire.

You must on reflection see that this was calculated to do to a brother clergyman who was labouring zealously in our Lords Church, The deepest, & it might prove, the most unjust injury. For how could his ministry be more deeply injured than by the spread of a whisper that he had been detected in the act of teaching in our reformed communion one of the most fatal & distinguishing errors of the Papacy?

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Very Faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

396. To W. E. Gladstone *(iii 201)*

Please excuse the extreme badness of this ink & its consequences.

Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 26, 1851

My dear Gladstone,

Ever since I saw in the paper the announcement of your Father's removal[3] I have intended to write to you. But it has been a time of peculiar occupation & I have always deferred writing. I believe I can enter fully into all the mixed feelings with which you must regard such an irrevocable close of so long protracted an actual interchange of offices of affection and duty — and I have sympathised with you in them: as I pictured them to myself.

But though I have been long purposing to write to you, I know not that I might not even yet have delayed doing so, had not Richard Cavendish[4] allowed me to see a letter he has recently received from you & on which I hope you will let me say a few words to you in the full confidence of friendship.

[1] Presumably Charles Frederic Chase (1816–86), C. of Sapcote, Leics., 1846–52; R. of St. Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe and St. Anne's, Blackfriars, 1852–86 (C).

[2] Unidentified: several clergy of this name were either curates in the Oxford diocese or beneficed in or near London.

[3] Gladstone's father Sir John Gladstone died on 5 December 1851.

[4] Hon. Richard Cavendish (1812–73), brother of 7th D. of Devonshire.

1st For the Bishop of London's refusal. If Mr. Bennett is to be prevented officiating, no man will regret it more deeply than I should. But there are difficulties in the way: and it is well that they should be met. The ground on which the Bp of London accepted Mr. Bennett's resignation I understood to be the principle avowed by Mr. Bennett of *continual progress*, combined with an assertion of his right to introduce any ceremony which had ever been used in the Church & which was not expressly condemned and forbidden at our Reformation. This principle I also esteem to be faulty, believing that our system was intended to be affirmative and not simply negative: & that it does not therefore become individual clergymen to re-store from ante-Reformation times whatever was not totidem verbis forbidden. Now I imagine that the meaning of the Bishop's refusal must be that his objection to this principle continues unabated and that until Mr. Bennett gives him some assurance that he would not resume his ministry on this basis he cannot in any consistency allow it. You will see how different a thing this is from punishing Mr. Bennett's past faults, be they what they may, by suspending his Ministry.

But I very earnestly desire that the Bishop of London should do his utmost to restore Bennett to usefulness in the Church, and I know no more likely mode of securing that good result than that you for whose judgement I know that he entertains a profound respect should yourself write fully to him on the subject.

II. Let me say two things touching the rest of your letter. I. I feel acutely its general truth to a very great extent. But I think that even you have been biassed by the incessant vituperations of the 'Morning Chronicle', &c., to deal unfairly with many of the Bishops. For you put aside Lord John Russell's miserable appointments and the fearful weakness caused by the character of the Primate[1] and you seem, having done this, to trace all the evil of the loss of influence we ought to possess to ourselves; & as far as I can read your words, you apply this to every Bishop without reservation. Now I believe that I am far from being blind to my own miserable infirmities or to those of my brethren. But is it fair in such an estimate of our relative state now and at the death of ArchBishop Howley to leave out first, the weakening of all our just influence by the introduction of such men as Lord John has put amongst us; then of such a primacy; of the prevalence of Radical attacks in the House of Commons, of the silence of so many there, under the most false and scandalous imputations, who are supposed to be ready to answer if there was an answer to be given; of the attacks of the 'Record' on all Church Bishops, of the 'Daily News', 'Examiner', 'Morning Herald' on do., and of what is perhaps more damaging still, of the habitual sneering depreciation and degrading insinuations of the 'Morning Chronicle', and the faint and contemptuous praises of the 'Guardian'?

I do not believe it possible to overrate the degree in which these causes, wholly external to ourselves, acting on the public mind when it is in a state easily to be moved against all authority have produced the results at which you point. I feel sure there are amongst us men now who would be far more ready than most of those before us with whom you seem to contrast us so unfavourably to stand by our clergy to the very last, instead of falling below the ordinary standard of official or House of Commons fidelity to associates or employees.

I believe that the administration of the Diocese of Salisbury for instance is wholly free from this fault. I do believe that amongst my many faults *I* have never erred in this respect.

[1] J. B. Sumner.

Now, highly as I value your good opinion, I do not say this in order to justify myself or others with you; but only for this practical end: I want you to suggest any mode of action whatever which can in any way act against these evils which I feel bitterly and daily mourn for, and in order to give such counsel, as few could give so well as you, you must have the real state of the case exactly before you.

For this is what I want you to come to: 2. What is to be done, what practically can I do? If I know myself, there is no sacrifice I would not make for the Church's welfare and I do not think that we should very materially differ as to what is for her welfare. But what is to be done with so utterly divided an Episcopate — with such a Primate in so many ways so mischievously good: with such men as are many of my brethren what is to be done, but to try to administer the diocese committed to me justly, soberly, lovingly and actively? Now, my dear Gladstone, I ask this of you as a friend whose fidelity and sound judgement and observation I can trust and believe me I will thank you for any plainspokenness with which you can say what you think it right to say.

I hope that Murray[1] has sent you, as I desired him, my late charge: that may if you have time to read it suggest to you what is lacking. But I do not feel that such Episcopates as are many of those around me can fairly be considered as the causes of our present troubles, especially when contrasted as you seem to me to contrast them with those of their predecessors.

I am, my dear Gladstone, ever affectionately yours,

S. Oxon.

Can you bring Mrs. Gladstone here on your way up to London. It is very little out of the way now that the line is open from Bletchley to Oxford.

Life, II, 127–9

397. To R. Cavendish *(iii 202)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 26, 1851

My dear Cavendish,

Many thanks for your letter and for your allowing me to see Gladstone's. I think there is a great deal of saddest truth in what Gladstone says and I have written to him thereon. At the same time with the deepest sense of our undeservings I do think that Gladstone in spite of his calm & powerful understanding & honest & true heart shows signs of the natural effect of such continual defamation of the Bishops as the 'Morning Chronicle' habitually indulges itself and its readers with. I mean this, first he puts aside the miserable episcopal appointments of Lord John and the effect of Sir B. Hall's[2] &c. attacks in the Commons; the silence in reply of those who might be expected to answer them; the continual vituperation of the low Church and Dissenting Papers; the more mischievous depreciation of the 'Morning Chronicle's' incessant sneers, insinuations & attacks, & the cold faint contemptuous praises of the 'Guardian'. All this he as it were puts aside and seems to say there is not one Bishop who acts to his clergy with the ordinary fairness which a principal in an office extends to his assistants, &c.

Now this I think is untrue.

You know that I have never to my knowledge failed a single clergyman under me, but have taken on myself the charges against many and borne many through in the disastrous troubles of the last 12 months. But what I really want

[1] John Murray (1808–92), the publisher (*DNB*).
[2] Sir Benjamin Hall (1803–67), Liberal M.P.; later 1st Baron Llanover.

Gladstone to do is to suggest how under the miserable present manning of our Bench any individual Bishop can mend matters.

And now for Bennett's case. I should be bitterly grieved if he were not restored. But I think he ought to give to the Bp some real assurance that the reopening of his ministry would not be the beginning of a new set of endeavours to be always doing something to restore some ritual observance, &c. which has no warrant in our Church. For I cannot admit that any individual clergyman has a *right* to restore pre-Reformation observances merely because they are not totidem verbis condemned by our Church. Now I do not think it would do any good for me to write to the Bishop of London to urge his restoring Bennett unless he had previously made some such explanation as would enable the Bishop to do so without manifest inconsistency with the fact of having accepted his resignation. I will do all that is in my power & I beg you to suggest at any time anything you think expedient. I should wish to show the Bishop Gladstone's letter and if I had permission I would gladly do so to let him fully understand how the matter strikes such a mind. But I should prefer that Gladstone wrote to him a letter stating fully all the evils he depicts in his letter to you: but more fully allowing the various causes which have brought them about.

Can you help me in a matter which I have now much at heart? I want to start *here* a College for training men for the year before their Ordination. I want this done under my own eye and I have just now a great opening for it. I want but £2,000 for it, and I think that I could repay annually 1/10th of any sums lent to me on the faith of the success of the College. I should then open it D.V. this year for 20 men. Now I cannot publickly apply for funds for this and I cannot find them without aid; but I must think that many Churchmen, if they knew of my endeavour, would would [*sic*] give me their aid. Will you undertake to try what you can do for me. Is there any chance of you & your mother being able to take us in your way South? Will you desire Murray to send you a copy of my charge from the author. May every blessing be yours my Dear Cavendish this Christmas Season.

I am ever, Very affectionately yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 125–6

398. To the Rev. T. Bowdler[1] *(iii 203)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 6, 1852

My dear Friend,

Your letter has caused me much pain: because I see in it the statement that by the decision in the Bracknell case 'the word of another person' was 'preferred to' yours. Neither I, nor, I am confident the Board, ever so understood the case. It was decided as I believe solely on the ground that the Builders of the Church had mis-apprehended your meaning at that interview & supposed themselves to have obtained a liberation of the requirement which had not been conceded to them. I do therefore earnestly trust that you will dismiss entirely from your mind, the idea that the smallest imputation of any kind rests on you from that decision. I am confident that no one person who voted for Mr. Justice Coleridge's[2] motion ever entertained the faintest shadow of such an idea.

I am ever, My dear Friend, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Thomas Bowdler (1782–1856), Sec. of Church Building Soc. 1846–56 (*DNB*).
2 Sir John Taylor Coleridge (1790–1876), Justice of the King's Bench, 1835–58 (*DNB*).

399. To the Rev. H. Roberts[1] (*iii 204*)
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 6, 1852

My dear Sir,

When I consented to allow you to take the Curacy of East Hampstead residing out of, but in the immediate neighbourhood of the Parish, I made the utmost concession I could on your assurances of your earnest desire to devote your whole strength to the discharge of its Ministerial duties. When you subsequently wished to serve the Parish from a greater distance I told you that I could not consent to allow you, with the distraction of pupils, to attempt to serve the Parish thence. But I have accidentally heard that you, even now, besides this distraction, are seen out hunting. This at once decides me to say that I cannot conscientiously appoint you to the Curacy because with such pursuits & such business I am sure the parish must be neglected.

I am My dear [*sic*] very truly yours,

S. Oxon.[2]

400. To W. Hatton[3] (*iii 205*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 6, 1852

My dear Sir,

I have communicated with Mr. Williams[4] on the subject of your complaints And in reply I have received from him 1st an assurance of his earnest wish to be on terms of kindness with you & 11nd very substantial proofs of the truth of this assurance in his readiness to comply with your wishes. He is ready to allow you (1) without any fee to put on the tomb of your Father & Mother any inscription which he has seen & approved of. (2) As to the fee for opening the family Vault he abides by my decision in 1849 that 10/6 be paid each time. (3) He is ready in any way in his power to shew his regard for you — and he refers to a meeting at the Vestry [this] year between himself Mr. Stevens & you at which he made & understood you to reject such overtures. Now my dear Sir let me earnestly entreat you to meet these friendly overtures of Mr. Williams in a like Spirit. Let me be the instrument of restoring entire harmony between you; resume your due place in your Parish Church: & Believe in the kindly feelings of your Pastor & all will be well.

I am ever very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

401. To the Rev. James Cookson[5] (*iii 206*)
Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 9, 1852

Rev. Sir,

The answer which I have received from the S.P.G. to an application on your behalf has greatly surprized me. It is that when 20 years since your connection

[1] Horace Roberts (1810–84), was ordained deacon in London 1838, and priest in 1839; he was C. of St. Botolph, Chichester, 1845–9, and licensed to Easthampstead in 1852 (C). He was assistant minister of Bedford Episcopal Chapel, 1862–76.
[2] P. 378 of letter-book *iii* is missing. A note says that it was 'sent to Burder, Jan. 14/52'.
[3] William Hatton of Aston Rowant farmed 600 acres, part of it outside the parish (*V.C.H. Oxon.*, VIII, 32, no. 12).
[4] Robert Williams (1799–1864), V. of Aston Rowant, 1845–64 (C).
[5] Perhaps fortunately, unidentifiable.

with the Society ceased your passage home even was refused (though you were allowed to resign) in consequence of the necessity of terminating your connection with the Society through *drunkenness* & Debt'.

Now I should not have thought of employing you without more testimony as to your recent conduct had I known this: & I cannot but feel that you were very much wanting in Candour in not telling me this at Reading. If a letter could be in time I should even now stop you coming to Harwell. I have not mentioned this to Mrs. Fletcher. But I must see you on Monday or Tuesday between 11 & 1 here, before you make any certain arrangement with her. Bring any testimonials with you.

I am . . . [*illegible*]

S. Oxon.

402. To the Rev. H. Christmas[1] (*iii 208*)

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 9, 1852

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have delayed thus long replying to you in the hope that I might be able to give an affirmative answer not to your last but to your penultimate offer.

I still fear that I should not have time to do the work as it should be done. But I am willing to make the attempt thus. If you will send to me the rough materials of any one life I shall be able to judge how far I can hope to execute the work. I could not agree *with any one* to [your last] proposal because it would in my judgement greatly savour of putting my name to what was not really mine.

Perhaps you will communicate this to Mr. Bentley.[2]

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Ever very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 29

403. To G. Graham[3] (*iii 207*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 15, 1852

Sir,

I am well aware that you can require from your Oxford Registrar nothing but that which the Law enjoins, but I venture to suggest that it is not clear that his interpretation of the law is correct. I would ask you to consider the inclosed statement which embodies the views of one of our best local professional men. If there be a doubt on the subject it is I think plain that the decision should turn to that side which secures the full amount of publicity which the law requires: for I have reason to believe that at present the marriages performed by the Oxford Registrar are not as was intended mainly a relief to dissenters but are what the law specially intended to prevent a means of sheltering those who are for scandalous purposes seeking concealment.

I am sir, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Henry Christmas (1811–68), editor of numerous periodicals, including *The Church of England Quarterly Review* and *The Literary Gazette* (*DNB*). Possibly this led to the Bishop's later 'Heroes of Hebrew History'. The Bishop's antipathy to 'ghosting' is interesting and creditable.

[2] Richard Bentley (1794–1871), the well-known publisher (*DNB*).

[3] George Graham (1801–88), brother of the 2nd Bart., the Peelite Sir James Graham; Registrar-General of Births, Deaths and Marriages, 1838–79 (*MEB*).

404. To the Rev. J. W. Peers, jun.[1] *(iii 209)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 15, 1852

My dear Sir,

Mr. Green called on me this day touching the £500 borrowed by your Parish for the rebuilding of the Church. He shewed me the entries in the Vestry book — & from reading them I am of the opinion that you are only entitled to claim the use of £400 of the £500 until the works are finished. When that is the case if a deficit remains you will be entitled to the remaining £100. But until then its custody is to be with someone appointed by the ratepayers: & its usufruct with them & not with you. Mr. Green was evidently *anxious* about allowing the demolition of the present Church without some *security* for the completion of the new one. I need not I am sure say to you that it is most important for you to allay these anxieties.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

405. To the Rev. J. King *(iii 210)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 16, 1852

My dear Sir,

I thank you cordially for the friendly & confidential tone of your letter. I have indeed but one object in view; the helping forward that great cause which I trust is the dearest thing to both our hearts. I felt that in pressing on you either residence or resignation, I was exposing myself to the possibility of misconception: & to the danger of shaking that kindly confidence which had hitherto existed between us. But I was so firmly convinced of the *great* evil, arising in some degree reasonably, in some unreasonably, from the present state of things at Henley; that I felt it my duty to risk all by setting it plainly before you & hoping that you might understand me aright. Your reply shews that my confidence was not misplaced.

I entirely understand your sketch of the past history & present state of Henley & admit its truth. Still it remains that matters are getting worse there: & that none but a resident Rector can as I believe set them straight. I do not believe that your son[2] as your Curate would have at all the power which you as Rector would have. Still it is natural that you should consult for his interest also: & I shall be quite ready to meet the arrangement which you propose. Always supposing that your son turns out such a clergyman as I could conscientiously prefer I shall feel that he has a future claim on me for 'a small agricultural living' if you by surrendering the provision you anticipated for him at Henley, now enable me to place a resident Rector there. To make this easier I should wish him to

[1] According to the account of Tetsworth in *V.C.H. Oxon.*, VII, 157–8, Peers took the place of the Lord of the Manor, built a new parsonage, and rebuilt the church, at a cost of £2,250. G. E. Street (see no. 462) was opposed to the destruction of the old church, but the Vicar had his way and the Bishop consecrated the rebuilt church in the autumn of 1855; the consecration day was marred by fears that Mrs. Peers was dying, but she recovered (Diocese Book, II, p. 514). When Charles Peers, the Vicar's kinsman, died in 1853, his widow feared an explosion between Bishop and Vicar at the funeral (Hallam Papers at Christ Church).

[2] James King's eldest son James Carleton King (1830–87), V. of Bury, Sussex, 1856–87, must be meant (O).

serve as Curate in my Diocese. Upon hearing again from you I will at once communicate with the Bishop of Rochester with whom I can doubtless arrange matters.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

406. To Major Court[1] (*iii 211*)

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 16, 1852

My dear Sir,

I thank you for the wise & Christian course which you have adopted as to this memorial. I can only say to you that I will do my best to second your endeavours to maintain truth & peace. My belief is that Mr. Peel[2] has been injudicious; & that he has not been treated in some quarters at all fairly. The union of these two conditions makes the Bishop's interference very difficult. Because whilst he is bound to correct such injudiciousness he is bound also to defend his clergy from unjust suspicions. I trust that there is no more in Mr. Peel's case than want of judgement: & of course without the written words complained of before me I cannot impute false doctrine. But what I will do is this. If you can for a short time longer delay the memorial I will see Mr. Peel; open to him the whole case; read to him your statements & communicate the result to you.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

407. To Major Court (*v 37*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 19, 1852

My Dear Sir,

I have to day seen Mr Peel & read to him your letter. By far the most important part of your statement is that which concerns the suspicion of *unsound doctrine*. For this is what concerns the souls of men. As to external acts they can be Objected to only (1) because they violate the rubric or (2) because they intimate unsound doctrine. With this then I will deal first. The Doctrine then which Mr Peel is suspected of holding is stated by you as touching 3 points of unsoundness. First the adoring Christ under the form of Bread & Wine. No sermons of his are delated, as stating this false doctrine & I have therefore been unable to call for any to satisfy myself as to the justice of the Charge by their perusal. Nor are any practices named which favour such an error. I have therefore been able only (1) to ask Mr Peel whether he does incline to such an error; & I have the satisfaction of assuring you that he most emphatically denies the imputation & (2) of enquiring if he, in any, the least, matter, of observance, violated the directions of the rubric as to his treatment of the bread & wine used in the Holy Communion & I find that he does not do so. The second point is his alledged 'desire that every soul should be under the direction of a priest'.

1 Major Henry Court, of Wargrave.

2 Edmund Peel (1818–77), V. of West Pennard, Somerset, 1849–50, Wargrave, 1850–4; P.C. of Toot Baldon, 1860–71 (O). He was a first cousin twice removed to Sir Robert Peel, the Prime Minister, and married (1849) a daughter of G. N. Grenville, Dean of Windsor.

Here again no words of Mr Peels being alledged I could but put the question to him, & again had the satisfaction of receiving the assurance of his entire & cordial rejection of any such wish. The third point, which is closely connected with this is that he would 'circumscribe the reading of the Holy Bible by laymen except by sanction of opportunities for interpretation from Aid of a Priest,' & generally that he 'unduly & unauthoritatively magnified the Office & duties of a Priest'. In this case, in which the charge was most definite, two Sermons of Mr Peels are referred to as establishing the complaint. Those Sermons, therefore, I have sent for & read — & in justice to Mr Peel I am bound to say that I cannot find one word in them which justifies the only definite charge, viz, that a layman should be circumscribed in reading Holy Scripture except where he had the opportunity of a Priest to interpret it. On the contrary Mr Peel urges the laity to read the Scriptures by themselves twice daily — nor can I find anything which I think could, if duly weighed by a fair person, be held as even favouring the mischievous Priest Craft which the supposed statement would undoubtedly embody. For the more general charge of unduly magnifying his office; I can only say that, whilst I think an expression here & there might be liable to misconstruction, I see nothing in the line of his argument which goes beyond the Ordination Service of the Church of England Having thus disposed of the doctrinal charges I proceed to deal with those which affect practice.

The *1st* concerns the case of the Blacksmith. Mr Peel had an undoubted *right* to demand the notice which was not given. But in my judgement it would have been more judicious to have waived the right rather than to have deferred the Baptism.

II. I think it inexpedient to refuse to bury at convenient times on the Lords day for the reason given by you; & I have no doubt that Mr Peel whose motive for refusing such burials has been not his own personal convenience but the fear of abuses will be ready to act on my advice in this matter.

The third point is the Churching of Women. This is appointed to be done 'the woman kneeling in some convenient place as hath been accustomed': that is as was the custom when the rubric was enacted — & the commentators on the Rubric point out some place near the Altar as the usual place. Mr Peel then has not done anything against the Spirit of the Rubric in introducing this custom to which he had been previously used: but I am sure that his kindly feelings would lead him at once to except from the strictness any woman, rich or poor, whose feelings were distressed by such publicity. For since the rubric allows the Ordinary to settle the place he would feel at liberty to act on the discretion which I hereby allow him.

The 4th point is the Intonation of the Prayers. This I have no doubt is quite as rubrically right as reading them: & as Mr Peel assures me that he does it solely to be heard, which he could not be otherwise, & for no sinister purpose, I agree with you in thinking that the Objection should be waived. Of course the *responses* must accord in this matter with the tone of the officiating Clergyman.

The 5th point is 'The practice of Histrionic action' — as no specific action is alledged & as Mr Peel denies the existence of any, I must with you conclude that this is frivolous.

The sixth point is the omission of the usual collect before & after the Sermon. This appears to me a decent custom, is grateful to my own mind, & is so generally adopted, that I have felt at liberty to adopt it & always practice it myself. Still I am bound to say that Mr Peels course is the more rubrically exact & I cannot in the lightest matter censure full obedience to those Rubrics which are to be my rule as much as his.

Having thus dealt with these objections in detail I will venture to express to you my general view of the whole case. Mr Peel appears to me to be a most zealous earnest laborious Parish priest. He is conscientiously exact in observing the laws & rules of the Church. No Romanizing doctrine or practice has been brought home to him. He has volunteered to me his strong assurance that he has neither leaning nor bias that way: & private matters connected with his Ministry have strongly confirmed his assertion. But the introduction of a stricter rule of literal obedience to rubrics than your parish had known; the dwelling upon truths much lost sight of at present concerning the organization & authority of the Church, his physical necessity of intoning the Service, & perhaps something in his manner & demeanour have as it appears to me in the troublesome times through which we have been passing exposed Mr Peel to suspicions for which I can find no just or sufficient grounds. You must know, which I do not, the character of those who have led & excited the opposition of which you speak, as well as the character of that Memorial to which you refer. If the memorial is the respectful, guarded, grave & religious document which alone could express in such a subject matter the opinions of pious Churchmen, & if the principles avowed in it are really those of the Church of England; & further if those who have subscribed it are really attached judicious & well informed members of the Church England [*sic*], if they are constant & habitual attendants at Church, & were so before these questions were stirred, you may then most properly receive the address if unhappily it should be presented to you & lay its statements before Mr Peel. But if on the other hand, the terms of this memorial bespeak its origin to be in violence, party spirit, & prejudice; & if it be mainly supported by those whose objections lie perhaps quite as strongly against Mr Peels earnestness, or hearty attachment to the Church of England as against any thing which is peculiar in his Ministrations, or by those who were irregular in their attendance at Church until there was as they thought something to be found fault with there, —then I advise you firmly to decline receiving what in my judgement would then be a mere instrument of division. Mr Peel seems from what you tell me to have shewn his wish to yield as far as his conscience allowed to the wishes of his flock by changing his posture at the Communion Table. I believe I am right in saying that he gave up preaching in the Surplice to which he had been before accustomed for the same reason. These concessions shew that if approached with kindness Mr Peel is ready to yield much for the sake of peace. You have shewn the same Christian feeling in suppressing for the Season this Memorial — and granting that Mr Peel may not in every instance have acted with entire Judgement I am sure that I need not remind you how much it is our duty to put the best construction upon even doubtful, much more upon merely injudicious actions (if so it be) in one in whom there is so much to be thankful for. You might have had, as a successor to your late beloved pastor, a worldly minded man, or a cricket playing[1] smoking clergyman, you have one earnest to win souls to Christ, loyal to the Church of England, & ready to devote himself entirely to his work. If there be blemishes in such an one, if he be more strictly Church than your parish was ripe for, if in anything he has given occasion to those who seek occasion, still my dear Sir it is your duty & the duty of those who like you are true members of the Church of England to stand gallantly by him. The times, you must remember have been

[1] The Bishop expressed himself more frequently on field sports than on cricket; but was equally opposed to clerical participation in either. He did not altogether share Miss Mitford's views on village cricket; to him the village priest was not a piece of social cement, but a man set apart.

greatly against such an one: & perhaps no one, *against whom prejudices had been excited before he entered your parish*, could have taken the strict line of a conscientious maintenance of the doctrine & written law of the Church of England without more or less incurring these reproaches. I earnestly trust that through Gods blessing on your endeavours, peace may be maintained in your parish; for I can conscientiously assure you that I believe your pastor to be thoroughly loyal to the doctrine, Discipline & ritual of our reformed Catholic Church

I am my dear Sir, most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

408. To the Rev. E. Peel *(v 38)*
Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 19, 52

My dear Sir,

I send you a copy of the full answer which I send by this days post to Major Court & I very earnestly trust that it may strengthen your hands in your Parish. But you will I am sure let me urge on you privately the need of seeking by all means save the sacrifice of *any* truth to conciliate your people & to make that maintenance of Church truth which alas! under any circumstances seems now so generally disliked as little unpalateable through its accidents as possible. I think that your neighbour Mr Austen Leigh[1] may be able greatly to aid you in healing all ill will & suspicion & I am sure he will be glad to do so. I shall therefore be obliged to you if you will send him or better take him the copy of my letter to Major Court which I now send you & I will add my strong advice that you confidentially consult him on the whole matter. I am my dear Sir

Most truly yours in our Common Ministry

S. Oxon.

409. To the Rev. T. F. Salmon[2] *(v 39)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 12, 1852

Rev. & Dear Sir,

It gives me much pleasure to accept at once your expression of sorrow for your past expressions in your correspondence with me. They were, I most sincerely trust, inconsiderately uttered; & if you look back on them with contrition will be dismissed from my recollection.

I am glad to find that you do not claim any power of releasing yourself from the obligation of rubrical obedience. The frequent desuetude of any observance may be a reason for a clergyman's omitting it, if not required by lawful authority to observe it; or for a Bishop's not enforcing it, but can be none for a clergyman's continuing to neglect it when he is required to observe it. As to the particular observance; important as I deem it, & small as I fear the relief will prove to you, yet I will not enforce it on you *after the next celebration*, when you request me solely on the score of physical weakness not to do so. Should you however find by trial that the relief is unimportant, it would be a pleasure to me to know that you did not avail yourself of it. But that I leave to you. I entertain a very strong objection, shared by many of my brethren, to an afternoon communion. It must

[1] James Edward Austen Leigh (1799–1874), P.C. of Knowl Hill, 1843; V. of Bray, 1852–74 (O). Rural Dean.

[2] Thomas Frith Salmon (1819–?86), V. of Bierton and Buckland, Bucks., 1851–3, Waldershare and Whitfield, Kent, 1853–6, Scalford, Leics., 1856–65, and Newchapel, Staffs., 1874–85 (C). The letter mentioned in n. 2 on p. 224 was sent to him.

be after the chief meal of the bulk of your parishioners when the bodily state would greatly tend to the diminution of the reverence & attention with which it is of such great importance that this holy rite should be approached. This subject & that of alteration in the services was discussed by the ArchBishop & Bishops last week; when it appeared that the only lawful changes were, to have 'Morning prayer' i e to the end of the three collects followed only by the prayer of St Chrysostom & the Grace with no sermon *earlier* — & then to have the Litany Communion & Sermon with or without full celebration after in the morinng: *or* to substitute the Litany for afternoon or evening prayer where both of these were used: but *not* in these cases to omit it in the morning. If *this* liberty would relieve your labours I should be glad that you availed yourself of it.

The Rural Dean reports favourably of your intended alterations & I consent gladly therefore to your carrying them out so far as you have laid them before me. I hope that you mean mere plaster on the walls when you speak of Stucco. I am very glad to hear of the scraping of pillars &c. I trust earnestly that for the future you will make it possible for me, to do, what it is always my joy to do, to aid in all matters your plans & endeavours for promoting the spiritual benefit of your parish. You will find that full & open communication with me, & a confidence in my hearty sympathy with every earnest minded incumbent & Curate in my Diocese are the great means for securing my hearty co-operation & preventing after interference which may then be painful to you but which I regard as a duty upon my part from the discharge of which I dare not shrink

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

410. To the Rev. D. B. Langley[1] *(v 40)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 12, 1852

My dear Sir,

Since I wrote to you last a full consideration of the subject of alterations in the Services has been had at a meeting of the ArchBishop & Bishops, the result of which appears to be that no more is lawful than — 1 to divide 'morning prayer' without a Sermon, ending with the prayer of St Chrysostom & the Grace after the third collect, from the Second Service i e the Litany & Communion (*with* or *without* celebration) with a Sermon. Using the 'Morning Prayer' first — e g at 8 or 9 — & the Litany &c after e g at 11 — & further where both afternoon prayer & evensong are used, using the Litany alone instead of either one or other of these two. This therefore is the greatest liberty which it is lawful for me to grant you or which it would be right for you to use.

I am my dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

411. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(v 41)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 12, 1852

My dear Sir,

Since I wrote to you the subjects of your last application letter i e afternoon communion & varied Services have been considered at a full meeting of the ArchBishop & Bishops. Many of my brethren agreed with me in thinking that there are insuperable objections to the celebration of the communion when the

[1] Daniel Baxter Langley (1797/8–1881), LL.D., V. of Olney, 1834–56; R. of Yardley Hastings with Denton, Northants., 1856–81 (according to Venn: Oldfield states that he died in 1856).

bulk of your congregation would come having just partaken of their chief meal & consequently with the disqualifying circumstances of a bodily state inapt for that full, wakeful, & earnest reverence with which that holy feast should be approached.

For variations in the Service it appeared that no others than these were lawful — I That morning prayers down i e to the end of the third collect & then ending with the prayer of St Chrysostom & the Grace, might be said, *without a Sermon*, as the first Service of the Sunday morning: if it was followed in the course of the morg by the Litany & Communion Service together, with a Sermon. & II that where both afternoon service & Evensong are said, that there the Litany as a complete service might be substituted for one & services, with, or without Catechizing or Sermon [*sic*].

III That the Communion might be celebrated *early* the Communion Service & no other being used. I think therefore that it would be expedient that you should make no further alterations than these.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

412. To Major Court (*v 42*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 18, 1852

My Dear Sir,

Immediately on receiving your letter of Jan 31 I applied to Mr Peel for the Sermons delated by Mr Briscoe.[1] Mr Peel sent for them to Glastonbury & then forwarded them to my House in London; through which mistake they reached me only yesterday — or you should sooner have heard from me.

I address myself, as I did before to the charges of false doctrine brought against Mr Peel in the first instance — because false doctrine is of far more importance than mere ceremonial. Mr Briscoe's Charges are very heavy. They impute to Mr Peel great & distinct errors; they could not be lightly put aside, they certainly ought not to be unjustly brought. I have felt it my duty to read with all care the Sermons delated to me & I will now proceed to examine them & the charges.

Mr B's first charge is; that 'Mr Peel said in his sermon Oct 6 1850. The wicked receive Christ though in impure bodies.' The passage in the Sermon is as follows — 'Exceeding great & precious promises are held out to the *faithful* (*sic*) partaker of these holy mysteries, even the strengthening & refreshing of his soul by the Body & Blood of Christ which are verily & indeed taken & received by the Faithful in the Lords Supper' 'It is not however sufficient *only* carnally & visibly to press with the teeth the Sacrament of the Body & Blood of Christ — such shall receive no benefit — such are in *no* wise partakers of Christ; they do indeed receive *It*[2] but into an impure heart & *there* Christ cannot abide.' Now you will observe that what Mr Peel asserts is this: that the impure receiver of The Sacrament is in no wise a partaker of Christ when he receives *it*, the Sacrament, & carnally presses it with His teeth. Is it possible more exactly to express the teaching of our Article; 'The wicked although they do carnally & visibly press with their teeth the Sacrament of the body & blood of Christ yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ.'

I am constrained therefore to say that this is an absolutely false accusation against Mr Peel & an attempt to fix upon him wrong doctrine which was the very opposite of his teaching.

1 Thomas Briscoe (1813–95) (one of three brothers, all Fellows of Jesus College, Oxford), who became V. of Holyhead in 1857, was inhibited for a year for this offence.

2 Underlined twice.

Mr Briscoe's second charge is: that in his Sermon on the last Sunday in Oct 1850 Mr Peel said 'Salvation cometh not by a reliance on the merit of Christ; adding but by a Spiritual Communion with him'. In this Sermon Mr Peel is most properly enforcing the great truth 'that Christs Redemption sets us free not only from the punishment but also from the *power* of Sin' & he urges on those, alas! many persons who by a nominal reliance on Christ without saving faith in Him deceive themselves to their perdition that 'the deliverance wrought by Christ was not meant for a sort of persons who should simply put their trust in Him *but in other things continue just as they were*, but for those only who by His Grace should strive to become as St Paul speaks conform to the likeness of His Sufferings . . . This is the Scripture doctrine, that we are saved not by bare reliance on the merits of our Lord but by a real & spiritual union with Him causing us to die to the world & to live to Him'. Now what one word there is here contrary to truth I cannot see. It is *the* doctrine of Holy Scripture: & of our Reformed Church. It is the doctrine of our own Homily on Faith which says 'a man may soon deceive himself & think in his own Phantasy that he by faith knoweth God loveth Him &c when in very deed he doth nothing less. For *the trial of all these things is a very Godly life*' — & again 'Deceive not yourselves thinking that you trust in God when you live in Sin' &c. So that as to this second charge also justice to Mr Peel compels me to state in the plainest language that it is a false accusation. Mr Briscoe's third charge is that Mr Peel 'broached counsels of perfection calling some persons '*perfect that is those who sell all they have & give to the poor*'. Now *first* if Mr Peel had used the words I have underlined & which are those imputed to him by Mr B: they would scarcely have sustained any charge of false doctrine seeing that they are the words of Our Blessed Lord Himself Matt. 19–21. But *secondly* they are not Mr Peels words. Mr Peel is impressing that all who would belong indeed to Christ must take up their Cross & follow him — & he then says this taking up of the Cross is enjoined 'not only on the more perfect ones' (referring manifestly to Matt 19. 21 & using our Lords own words for those who were called by to Him to more especial sacrifices for Him) 'when such as those who were required to sell all they had &c' — but on all who would follow Him. Here then again I am bound to pronounce that Mr Peels words are wrested so as to countenance a false accusation. Mr Briscoe's last charge is that 'when Mr Peel a [*sic*] great length praised the Prayer book & study of it as a safe guard against new fangled innovations he never once praised or recommended the Bible.' This charge rests on an address by Mr Peel previous to the commencement of Services in Church on the Eve of Saints days: & he is shewing the falsehood of charges which had been urged that such services instead of being in the Spirit of our Church since the Reformation savoured of 'Romish or Romanizing Superstition' — now manifestly it would be no answer to *this* charge to exalt Holy Scripture for Gods Word is appealed to by Romanists (however falsely) as well as by us: but to shew that these Services are encouraged in the Prayer book of our reformed Church is a direct answer to the Charge that they are opposed to the Reformation. *Therefore* Mr Peel argues this matter from the Prayer book & most truly & properly adds (*not* that the study of the prayer book is more important than that of Gods Word as implied by Mr B but) that the Prayer book faithfully adhered to is 'the very possible safeguard . . . against the adding any new fangled *rites or ceremonies*' — not mind *innovations* as asserted by Mr B. which might be innovations in *doctrine* but against new *rites & ceremonies* with which the Bible *does not*, & with which the Prayer book *does* directly deal. As to this last charge then I am once more compelled in justice to Mr Peel to say, it is in what it manifestly insinuates a 'false accusation'. And here I should gladly leave the matter if I could with

justice to Mr Peel simply dismiss the charges without saying more than they are unproved. But more than this is due to Mr Peel. For a clergyman may be greatly to blame for being misunderstood even when his actual words are capable of justification. Does it then appear from the Nature of this accusation that Mr Peel used words which led a discreet, candid, charitable brother clergyman in his congregation to fall into the misfortune of wrongly & unjustly accusing him of false doctrine. To answer this I must look at the Animus betrayed in the Charge: is it brought cautiously, modestly to the ear of just authority, reluctantly, with every guard of charitable secresy [*sic*] as to those who are unconcerned with the matter, & as if he who felt bound in conscience to delate his brother did the painful work with a loving saddened heart. Mr Briscoes letter shall answer these things. First he brings 4 distinct charges against Mr Peel to 'the substantial accuracy of which he is willing to testify on oath, & almost to their *literal*[1] accuracy' — & yet every one of these as I have shewn you is a false accusation.

Secondly he states that on hearing one of these sentences his 'first impulse was to take up his hat & walk out of Church' — manifestly shewing the intemperance of his mind. *Thirdly* he states that he 'has so frequently repeated these '(false charges)' to persons in College & elsewhere that they had become steriotyped [*sic*] on my memory'. Yet these 'persons in College & elsewhere' had nothing to do with Mr Peel or his teaching & if the charges had been true this tattling repetition of them would have been a Sin against Charity & marked exactly that love of gossip at a neighbours expence which makes a mans witness of little worth — & lastly Mr B. suggests as if to take away from Mr Peel the possibility of justification that Mr Peel was preaching from notes, a thing which he assures me he has never once done. I am bound therefore to add that Mr Peels having come under the suspicion of such a delator as Mr Briscoe has shewn himself to be is in my judgement no injury whatever to Mr Peels character. On the contrary I am *compelled* to say that I think Mr Briscoes conduct & spirit in this matter so wantonly injurious to Mr Peel that if I heard of his intending again to take occasional duty in that neighbourhood I should feel it my painful duty to inhibit him until he had expressed his contrition for having carelessly brought & repeated in all companies false & calumnious charges against his brother. One thing only I need add on this painful subject. Mr Peel has in the most distinct & emphatic language assured me that he never held any doctrine such as Mr Briscoe has attributed to him nor any approximation or resemblance to it.

And now having considered at such length the question of Mr Peels doctrine I need detain you but a very little longer. I apprehend that what Mr Peel meant by designating his omission of the Collect before the Sermon 'a matter of principle', was this, that he thought its introduction contrary to the rubric, exact obedience to which was with him a matter of principle. But I am happy to tell you that he feels at liberty in this matter to act on his Bishops Counsel & that on my advice he will both abandon the intoning & introduce the Collect in order to meet the wishes of his people. With these concessions on his part I feel sure that you will find it possible & therefore to you pleasant to continue those wise & charitable efforts to promote a right understanding in your parish on which under Gods blessing I greatly rely for the strengthening of Mr Peels Ministry & the restoration of harmony & mutual confidence between him & all his Parishioners.

I am, My dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Underlined twice.

413. To the Rev. C. H. Christie *(v 43)*

Cuddesdon, Feb. 20, 1852

My dear Sir,

I am not myself able to see in your misapprehension any sufficient ground for altering your plans. But it is quite reason enough for my releasing you from any engagement that you believe it to have been contracted under a misapprehension.

I am wholly unable to devote any more time to a correspondence which has proved already so copious & so little satisfactory. I have therefore requested the Rural Dean to be so good as to communicate with you & I must decline myself doing anything more in aiding you to an house than taking one of the official courses which I have explained to him are open to me.

I am my dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

S. Oxon.

414. To the Rev. H. T. Snepp[1] *(v 46)*

Swyncombe, Feb. 23, 1852

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I will gladly endeavour, as I told you that I would, to provide for you any other duty, for which you may at Henley have shewn yourself to be fit, which it may be in my power to get for you when you quit that Curacy, but I at once hasten to say, to prevent any future disappointment, that the opportunities of obtaining a house for the use of the Curate are very few amongst the Curacies to which the Bishop appoints.

I am ever yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

415. To the Rev. W. Firth *(v 44)*

Address, 61 Eaton Place, Feb. 24, 1852

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I cannot allow of the removal of Mr Smith,[2] so long as the law enables me to retain him, until another Curate approved of by me is licensed to your Cure. I have therefore this day written to Mr Smith to inform him That I do not 'release him from the Curacy of Letcombe & that if any impediment to doing his duty there is thrown in his way by the Viccar [*sic*] or any other he will duly inform me'. I earnestly trust that no attempt at interposing any such impediment will compel me to take further measures.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

416. To the Rev. E. Thompson *(v 45)*

Swyncombe, Feb. 24, 1852

My dear Sir,

I truly sympathise with you in your sad loss: and alas I have committed to consecrated ground far too precious remains not to be able to enter into your feelings as to the interment of your child. With this large excuse for kindled

[1] Henry Thomas Snepp, C. of Woughton on the Green, 1853; subsequently V. of two parishes in Bilston, Staffs., 1866–80 (O).

[2] Edmund James Smith (1823–86), licensed as a schoolmaster 1848, made deacon 1850, licensed to the curacy of Letcombe Bassett 1851, Fellow of Worcester 1853–65, priested, 1854; V. of St. John's, Bury, Lancs., 1858–84; R. of Tadmarton, 1884–6.

feelings I pass over what seems to me a very unjust warmth in your expressions as to Mr Milman.[1] He *can* have but one object: namely to do his duty by the House of His God & the offices thereof: nor do I see the smallest reason to doubt the accuracy of his declaration that when assuring you that no difficulty should be interposed by him to the Burial of any of your family at Lambourne he did not know that it was of a vault in the Church that he was supposed by you to be speaking. Further I am bound to add that your recollection is not accurate when you say that the proposal for an exchange came from him. It came from *me*, But to proceed at once to the main matter of your letter. What can I say? There can be no doubt from universal medical testimony that burying in Churches makes them unwholesome & often dangerous to the living. The burying in Leaden Coffins does not remove this evil. For these coffins are necessarily punctured somewhere to allow of the escape of the very gas which is injurious. Is it not then my bounden duty to forbid such interments? Put yourself my dear Sir in my place & say whether you as Bishop could allow of so injurious a custom out of regard to the feelings of friends deeply painful as it would be to you to wound those feelings. Yet how could I refuse another if I conceded this to you? If I broke a rule which I have required Mr M to promulge the first time that a brother clergyman was the applicant how could I refuse the like relaxation to all & every layman who might apply. I am sure that you will feel the force of this & trust that you will see the duty of readily acquiescing in what I have done myself in my own beloved burial place in Sussex, where instead of in the Vault under the Church as of old I laid remains dearer far to me than anything which was left on earth, in the Church Yard.

I would venture to suggest your fixing on some spot in the Church yard which I am sure Mr Milman will secure to you where the remains of those whom God may from time take [*sic*] from you to Himself maybe laid together.

I am my dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

417. To the Bishop of London (C. J. Blomfield) (*iii 212*)
Private

Cuddesdon, March 4, 1852

My dear Lord,

Will you read in confidence this letter of Gladstone's. I hope that you will get an early interview with Lord Derby[2] and arrange the matter with him. The management of the Bill before having devolved entirely on you and he having proposed in your debate to amend it, we stand in the most favourable position for your successful negotiation with him; and you are able further to tell him that you were just on the point of giving notice when he succeeded to power. It does seem *the* moment for a successful move which may never return, and the probable instability of the Government makes speed so specially needful. I write from the midst of an Ordination with 25 candidates, so you will excuse brevity.

Of course *you* have heard the new soubriquet for the . . . [*Unfinished*]

Life, II, 136, n. 2

[1] Robert Milman (1816–76), V. of Chaddleworth 1840–51, Lambourn (after Thompson) 1851–62, Great Marlow, 1862–7; Bishop of Calcutta, 1867–76 (*DNB*).
[2] The 14th earl, who had just become Prime Minister for the first time.

418. To the Rev. W. Rawlings[1] (*v 47*)
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, April 13, 1852

Rev. Sir,

I am anxious to meet your wishes as far as I properly can & I am therefore willing, instead of insisting on the Widow Hooper *instantly* quitting your House (1) that you should give her written notice that she should quit your service & her whole family your House in one month from the present time (2) That you should send me within 4 days from the present time a copy of such notice (3) That you write to me on the day month of the notice to assure me that they are actually gone.

I must require an immediate acceptance of these terms.

I am ever very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

419. To the Diocesan Chancellor (Dr. J. Phillimore) (*v 48*)

Cuddesdon Palace, April 17, 1852

My dear Chancellor,

The Testimonials which you have forwarded to me on behalf of Dr Rose are not such as I can accept. I have already refused to receive the signature of the Rev E Jones[2] as sufficient evidence because though I have a high respect for him, yet I consider that his age & infirmities incapacitate him from giving such testimony as in such a cause I ought to receive. Mr Hanmer's[3] testimony is one I regret to say which I should decline to countersign to another Bishop & cannot therefore accept myself. Mr Bellairs[4] Testimony also I must decline to receive first, because he has had no opportunity of knowing that which he attests & secondly because his letters to me shew him to be too eager a supporter of Dr Rose to be able to give an independent testimony.

I am my dear Chancellor, most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

420. To Mrs. Evans[5] (*v 49*)
Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, April 17, 1852

Madam,

Immediately on the receipt of your donation of £300 for the benefit of the parish Church of Chalfont I invested it in Government Securities in my own name & that of the Rural Dean of the district the Rev E Bickersteth, (1) for security in case of my death before the enlargement was resolved on & (2) that it might be increased during such delay & serve more towards your good purpose.

1 William Rawlings, V. of Fritwell, 1836–62; chaplain of the Bicester union 1839, suspended for immorality, 1852.
2 Edward Jones (1771–1857), P.C. of Little Brickhill 1821–56, and R. of Milton Keynes 1821–57; a famous cricketer (C).
3 Thomas Walden Hanmer (1780–1871), R. of Simpson 1807–71, Little Missenden, 1810–71 (O).
4 There were several men of this name; but probably the Rev. Henry Bellairs is meant: see the note to no. 568, where the Bishop later accepted Bellairs' opinion on Rose.
5 Mrs. (Isabella) Evans, whose will (proved 1861) left bequests at Chalfont St. Peter.

The Rural Dean has written to me to say that he thinks your generous gift would be most useful if it might be taken as the beginning of subscriptions for building a new Church at Gerrards Cross in the parish rather than for enlarging the parish Church. There is about Gerrards Cross a population exceedingly needing such a Church. I write therefore simply to ask your wishes on this subject & to assure you that whatever they are they shall be thankfully carried out.[1]

I am Madam, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

421. To the Archdeacon of Taunton (G. A. Denison)[2] *(v 50)*

[*First part missing*]

. . . that we ought to deem a good election the appointment, not of the best man we could name, but of one who would not use the advantage which his position must give him so as to obstruct the revival of Convocation. My own impression therefore would be in favour of communicating in a friendly way with the Arch Bishop & seeing whether a struggle could be avoided by his consenting to nominate a non-obstructive — & having been consulted some time back on the matter from another quarter I was deliberating on the propriety of my making such an application to His Grace. I shall be glad to know the opinions of your conclave on this subject. In this stage then of my opinions I scarcely like to form a judgement on the fitness of the men you name, but I think I should incline to Hussey[3] & Arch[n] of Maidstone[4] as the best — The last in a great degree from his possessing a strong savour of the last Primate. On another point I should be glad to know the opinion of your Conclave — and that is what should be our first move in Convocation. I will not repeat my arguments against your proposed management clause move: but only add that every days reflexion has strengthened my conviction of the evil likely to arise from mixing the convocation question with the troubles of those clauses. Of course I suppose our first business must be to amend the address (I do not like to talk too much of this lest no address should be proposed) but in what sense? What say you to this: [to insert a prayer to Her Majesty (1) to issue a Commission to consider & report on the alterations rendered expedient in their own constitution by the lapse of time to make the Convocations of the two provinces more perfectly able to fulfil their office of being 'the Church of England by representation' & II to lay such report before the Houses of Convocation with Her Royal license to deliberate & enact concerning the same.][5] [To pray Her Majesty that the Report of any Commission She may then have issued to consider concerning Cathedral reform may in like manner be laid before Convocation & that no measures touching the same be laid before Parliament until Convocation shall have considered the same.][5]

The recommendations of this course seem to me — *1st* that we do not risk all on the aye or no of the direct question 'Shall convocation now meet for business'

1 St. James, Gerrards Cross, became a separate ecclesiastical parish in 1861.

2 George Anthony Denison (1805–96), brother of the Bishop of Salisbury; Fellow of Oriel, 1828–39; V. of East Brent, Somerset, 1845–96; Archdeacon of Taunton, 1851–96 (*DNB*). See no. 648.

3 Robert Hussey (1801–56), Student of Christ Church, 1821–46; P.C. of Binsey, 1845–56; Regius Prof. of Ecclesiastical History, 1842–56 (*DNB*).

4 Benjamin Harrison (1808–87), Student of Christ Church, 1828–48; Archdeacon of Maidstone, 1845–87 (*DNB*).

5 Square brackets in MS.

as to which we have I fear too many against us to doubt the answer, but gain time & a hearing.
II conciliate the Crown — & the laity
III gain time for direct practical discussion on the reforms really required in convocation
IV assert the great principle of the unfitness of Parliamentary legislation without previous convocation consideration

Perhaps the fittest order would be thus — to address Her Majesty with the declaration that there were grave & weighty matters touching the reform of the Cathedral bodies, the discipline of the Clergy, the rights of Patronage, the extension of the Church, which must now be ere long brought before Parliament; that on these it was in our judgement of the first moment that the Church should previously have deliberated in her own legitimate assembly: that we therefore prayed Her Majesty to cause these to be submitted to Con: previously to their being laid before Parl$^{t.}$ & that since by the long suspension of its sittings some things were doubtful in its usages & some might be materially improved in its Constitution We therefore prayed her Majesty to issue Her Royal Commission to enquire (as above) & then (as above) that she would cause such report to be laid before Convoc.[1]

I am, My dear Archdeacon, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

422. To the Archdeacon of Bristol (T. Thorp)[2] (*v 51*)

Private

Address, Aldermaston Newbury till next Wednesday Then Cuddesdon.

Lavington, Sep. 11, 1852

My dear Archdeacon,

Your letter reached me when I could not get at some books I wished to refer to before I answered it. I hold it clear
(1) that the Lower House may elect whom they will prolocutor
(2) That before he acts he must be confirmed by the Upper [*sic*]
(3) That a disregard of the Arch B's 'recommendation' would endanger a breach between the Houses
(4) That such a breach at the outset would be *most* injurious
(5) That a bad appointment would be a great hindrance to the life of Convocation & therefore that it would be very desireable that a negotiation should be opened

[1] Wilberforce was one of the main authors of the revival of Convocation, which had been allowed to hold only formal sessions since the unruliness of the Tory High Churchmen during the Bangorian controversy had been adjudged a danger to the Hanoverian settlement. Its revival was a natural outcome of the Oxford Movement, whose members resented the supremacy of Parliament, especially when (after 1829) nonconformists could sit in the House of Commons. However, the movement was suspected both by politicians, afraid that the Church might obtain a dangerous independence, and by Evangelicals, afraid that independence would lead to a Tractarian landslide within the Church. Archbishop Sumner was particularly hesitant, and Lord Aberdeen also needed careful handling. The revival movement depended on popular publicity, provided by the Society for the Revival of Convocation led by the Bishop's schoolfriend, the banker Henry Hoare, and on Wilberforce's own tactical efforts in Convocation and behind the scenes. The elections of late summer 1852 to Convocation were naturally of great importance.

[2] A much longer letter to Thorp, written to the same effect on the same day, is printed in *Life*, II, 140.

with the Arch B. privately, deprecating all division & seeking for an appointment in which all could unite.

If no one better could be found to do it I should not be unwilling myself to communicate with the Arch B

I shall be happy to hear your further views on the matter.

I am my dear Archdeacon, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

423. To the Hon. and Rev. Lord Sydney Godolphin Osborne[1] (*v 52*)
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 1, 1852

My Dear Sir,

(For so I trust I may address you after the interview with which you some time since favoured me). My friends have told me that a communication made with your initials to the Times newspaper a few days since concerning 'one of the Ultra Bishops &c.' concerns me. I should certainly never have taken such a description to myself because I am as far as possible from being 'an ultra' except in the sense in which you are yourself eminently an Ultra, namely that you wish to make the Church a reality & not a sham. But if your words are understood by what follows to apply to me I think I have a right to ask you (1) whether you were speaking of me, & (2) if you were whether you will communicate to me 'privately the Chapter and verse proof' you promise to the Times — since I am absolutely ignorant of any such statement, & for reasons which I believe you will appreciate have always used an even unnatural vigilance as to saying *nothing* concerning Her Majestys Sentiments on any Subjects.

I remain, My dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

My address will be *61 Eaton Place*

424. To the Rev. H. G. Newland[2] (*v 53*)
Confidential

Romsey, Dec. 2, 1852

My dear Mr Newland,

I have weighed your question on all sides & will give you my opinion unreservedly upon it, so far as my knowledge of the circumstances enables me.

1 I am quite clear that you ought not to go to Plymouth unless Mr Prynne leaves it[3]

2 I am clear that you ought not to go there unless you are in such a position that you may possess some authority there irrespective of the Bishop.

3. I am clear that you ought not directly or indirectly to propose the Archdeaconry Scheme — (a) because it would be so self invented a scheme that I see not how you could feel sure that God had called you to the difficulties & responsibilities of the post. (b) Because I think you could not propose to the Archd[n] to resign *entirely*, & because I believe that an agreement in virtue of which he resigned the office & retained the property would be Simoniacal.

1 Sydney Godolphin Osborne (1808–89), brother of the 8th Duke of Leeds; R. of Durweston and Bryanston, Dorset, 1841–75 (*DNB*).

2 Henry Garrett Newland (1804–60), later chaplain to the Bishop of Exeter (*DNB*).

3 George Rundle Prynne (1818–1903) in fact remained V. of St. Peter's, Plymouth, from 1848 to 1903 (C).

(c) because I greatly doubt either the Bishop or the Archdⁿ agreeing to it.

I should on general principles greatly doubt the wisdom of the removal. You must plunge at once into warfare. The Bishop would use you as his tool. The successor of the Bishop would in all probability regard you as his enemy. I imagine you to depend in some degree on your *Sinecure* Rectory for your income. (Here I may be wrong). Have you considered whether under the present law it can be severed from the Vicarage.[1] Altogether I do not see that evident call or plain guidance which alone would seem to me to warrant a removal from an actual sphere of duty. Here is my counsel — use it as you please — & Believe me to be very sincerely yours

[*Unsigned*]

425. To the Rev. J. Gore[2] (*v 54*)

Address, 61 Eaton Place, Dec. 8, 1852

My dear Sir,

Before I enter further into the subject of your application to me, I shall be obliged by your giving me accurate information on the following points

1. What number of your parishioners live near to the spot where Mr Bevan proposes to build the Chapel.[3]
2. What is their distance from their own Church.
3. Is there room for them there
4. Can I have any assurance of any chapel being built? How will it be endowed? What the arrangement about Patronage.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

426. To the Rev. W. T. Hopkins[4] (*iii 213*)

Confidential

Dec. 13, 1852

My dear Friend,

I have no secrets from you as to the good Vicar & you have often let me freely consult you. Will you kindly herefore read the enclosed & forward it unless your better judgement suggests any better treatment & if it does give me your advice.

I am affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

427. To the Rev. R. B. Fisher[5] (*iii 215*)

Confidential

[Dec. 13, 1852]

My dear Friend,

Mr. Blomfield[6] expressed to me as his view, that there were many cases where infants were brought for Holy Baptism & Baptized rightly according to Christs

1 Newland was until 1855 both Rector and Vicar of Westbourne, Sussex.

2 John Gore (1800–71), minor canon of St. George's, Windsor, 1829–71; V. of Shalbourne, 1842–71 (C).

3 R. C. L. Bevan of Fosbury House was patron of the new church built at Fosbury (Wilts.), near Shalbourne, in 1856.

4 William Toovey Hopkins (1793–1869), R. of Nuffield, 1828–69 (O).

5 Robert Bailey Fisher (1786–1859), V. of Basildon, 1814–59 (O).

6 According to Venn, Samuel Edward Blomefield (1823–1903), son of the 2nd Bart., became C. of Basildon Jan. 1853; if the identification is correct the Bishop's doubts must rapidly have been overcome.

appointment & where yet they were taken from the Font just as they came to it, so far as their spiritual condition was in any way concerned. This appears to me to be so plain and so important a contradiction of the teaching of our Church that I can do nothing to bring such a Ministry into my Diocese. Wishing to do what was kind to him as well as according to your desires I told him that he might write to me if I had misconceived him: but I have not heard.

I am, My dear Friend, very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

428.[1] *(iii 216)*

Confidential

Dec. 13, 1852

My Dear Sir,

I have hoped daily during the few days I spent in London to call on you touching your church & Rector: but was always prevented. He has absolutely refused to agree to the placing the Reading desk &c. where I desired in the Church. Nor have I been able with my utmost efforts to bring him back to his old consent. I have no legal power to compel this assent: & my advice to you would be to allow me to propose to you an arrangement such as [I] threw out at the time by which the Reading desk should form the step to the pulpit. I think this may be well done and without any obscuration of the Chancel Arch & this I have power to enforce. If I have your general assent I will at once obtain & send you a more particular plan.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

429. To the Rev. F. M. Knollis[2] *(iii 217)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 15, 1852

My Dear Dr. Knollis,

1. I enclose you a copy of the charges & Scandals of which I made minutes from the Statement of your Church Wardens.

2. You are not bound to answer for more than two years. But another important consideration follows from this. Some of the most important matters for you to refute are charged *almost* two years back. Now it would be wrong & scandalous *by waiting* to put these questions beyond the limit. It is my deliberate judgement that there must be a due enquiry into these Scandals: they are too definite charges to be merely lived down. I have resolved therefore that a Commission of Enquiry must issue; unless you admit their truth, and the point therefore for you to consider is this: shall that enquiry be promoted by me or sought by you. I strongly advise you (1) to go at once to Penn & consult with Mrs. Knollis on this matter[3] (2) to apply to me for a Commission (3) to state your readiness to abide by my judgement after the Examination of the Commission. I must receive your answer to this on Saturday next.

I am yours very sincerely,

S. Oxon.

[1] Recipient unidentified. Padworth may be the subject. Cf. no. 367?

[2] Francis Minden Knollis (1816–63), Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, 1839–63; D.D. 1851; P.C. of Horspath, 1849–53, Subsequently incumbent of Fitzhead, Somerset, 1858 (*MEB*). A fuller account of this incident will be found in Pugh, c. VI.

[3] Knollis' father James was Vicar of Penn (see note to no. 471).

430. To Messrs. Burder and Dunning[1] *(iii 218)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 15, 1852

Gentlemen,

I returned you some of your documents on the understanding that the terms made with me last year are to be honoured, and I am ready to send you the rest on hearing from you to that effect.

I am truly yours,

S. Oxon.

431. To the Bishop of London (C. J. Blomfield) *(iii 219)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 15, 1852

My Dear Lord,

I am always ready to distrust my own judgement in matters which concern myself & I am therefore ready to suppose that I said what did not express my meaning at the meeting of the Nat Soc though [I am] unable to remember that I did so.

What I wished to express was this: There was an appearance which seemed to me to need explanation in the successful defeat of a former resolution by the raising at a small subsequent meeting the question of regularity [and] notice to those who had moved that resolution. This was merely an appearance. It was capable of a complete explanation.

The question might have arisen [because] the question had arisen at the Special Meeting. If so, though I think the decision wrong (because Special Meetings had always dealt with such matters without notice) yet I had no fault to find. But there was an appearance which needed exactly this simple explanation. For if instead of rising thus incidentally the matter had been pre-arranged by one who had been defeated on the resolution & who then came down hoping if he gave no notice to its mover to rescind it quietly by a side wind, I felt that the Committee had not been treated with that straight forward candour which it deserved. Now I imputed the want of candour to no one; I impute it now to no one; Lord Harrowby[2] seemed to me in error because he argued that I did impute it: but I did not, & I do not; I simply said there was an appearance to be explained & I stated strongly why I thought that it should be explained, because the obtaining the end by such a meneuvre [*sic*] would in my judgement be discreditable. I really cannot see how in this I impute anything to Archdeacon Sinclair: & I shall be grieved if he applies to himself what I have not applied to him.

I cannot see what I can say more. I cannot say that I think it would have been fair or honourable to try to obtain a victory by such a ruse; & it is only of this attempt that I have spoken strongly. I hope that the Archdeacon would agree with me in condemning such conduct: I have not attributed that conduct to any one. But if you can help me my dear Lord in any way to prevent what is painful to him or hurtful to the Society or a cause of division I will, so far as truth allows, heartily & gladly follow your direction.

I am my dear Lord, affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Cf. no. 434.

[2] Dudley Ryder (1798–1882), 2nd Earl of Harrowby; a prominent Low Churchman.

432. To A. J. Beresford-Hope[1] *(iii 220)*
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 15, 1852

My dear Mr. Hope,

I have read through your draft & I will tell you with entire plainness the only faults I have to find with it.

First: I greatly wish that you would add on page 1 after 'experienced at his hands' anything you can with truth add to this sort of effect —

'not only from the fear which I am bound to avow to you that the cause of this alienation on the Bishop's part may perhaps be found in language used by me when warmly maintaining in print certain views on Church matters which I deemed of the first importance & which I fear was perhaps made needlessly though unintentionally painful to him.'

Second.

I think that you must speak more distinctly your present opinion of Richards[2] & your apprehension of the evil which may probably arise from the Bishop's[3] not understanding that you cannot fully trust him & that you foresee mischief unless the Bishop & you act in this matter with entire openness & confidence the one in the other. I feel in reading your letter as if it was on this head an uncalled for & so unintelligible defence of yourself.

I am, My dear Mr. Hope, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

433. To the Bishop of Chichester (A. T. Gilbert)[4] *(iii 221)*
Confidential

Dec. 15, 1852

My Dear Bishop,

Bear with me once more in re Neale,[5] for the sake of the peace of the Church. Surely even if all that you say can be maintained, (& I think it rather severe measure to a retractor,) yet it must be severe enough to withhold from such an one a license to preach. Now I think all that is needful for peace is that you should grant *him permission* to read the prayers & administer the Sacraments to the aged people committed to his charge. He does of course really tend them spiritually now & I feel it hard to justify the refusal to let them have their appointed prayers.[6]

I am ever affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Alexander James Beresford-Hope (1820–87), M.P. for Maidstone 1841–52 and 1857–9, Stoke 1865–8, Cambridge University, 1868–87. Bought St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, as a training centre for missionary clergy, 1844; led building of All Saints, Margaret Street, 1849. Architect and author (*DNB*).

2 William Upton Richards (1811–73), C. of All Saints, Margaret Street, Marylebone, 1841–9; V. 1849–73; a leading Tractarian who founded a Sisterhood in 1851.

3 Of London.

4 Ashurst Turner Gilbert (1786–1870), Bishop of Chichester, 1842–70 (*DNB*).

5 John Mason Neale (1818–66), Warden of Sackville College, East Grinstead; a prominent ecclesiologist, today best known for the many translations of Latin and Greek hymns which were included in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*. He was a centre of controversy throughout his life, from his Cambridge days, when he founded the Camden Society, to his death at East Grinstead (*DNB*). Bishop Gilbert inhibited Neale in 1849.

6 Gilbert published *A Statement of the Proceedings of the Bishop of Chichester against John Mason Neale, the Warden of Sackville College, East Grinstead* in 1853.

434. To Messrs. Burder and Dunning[1] *(iii 214)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 15, 1852

Gentlemen,

I have returned you some of my accounts on the understanding that the terms made with me last year are to be honoured: & I am ready to forward the rest on receiving from you a line to that effect.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

435. To the fourth Baron de Blaquière[2] *(iii 222)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 16, 1852

My dear Lord De Blaquière,

I shall be delighted that you & Lady De Blaquière should go to Lavington & stay there as long as you will. I only regret that you should go there when from the State of the Weather it is seen to such disadvantage.

It may save trouble if I explain to you my views about it. *My wish* is to let it as I let it to Mrs. Byles, with a reserve, that for some 6 weeks between July 1 & Nov. 1 to be settled to mutual convenience the house should be ceded to my occupation. In such a case I would lower the rent to £250 per annum: & I shall be very happy to hear that such an arrangement would suit your Lordship's views: this £250 would be without shooting, or with it, as follows, £300. As to game my intention is this. I should be ready to give the full control of the game in the covers & land South of the Down & on the Down, to my tenant with license to exclusive shooting & to preserve as he will. I have lately built a cottage there which would do for a Keepers Lodge. And the Tegleaze is one of the best Woodcock Covers in the Country. Further I would give the exclusive shooting over the *Manor of Graffham* except the Hill Side, to my tenant & with liberty to preserve all *winged game* but not fourfooted—reserving to myself the Manor of Lavington & the Hill Side. In case I allowed this right of shooting the rent would be £350 per annum. I am obliged to reserve the Hill Side & the right of destroying fourfooted game; for the Manors are so naturally congenial to game that without this reserve, my Farms would be ruined.[3] I only wish that I were at Lavington to receive you on your visit. With very kind remembrances to my Lady. I am My Dear Lord De Blaquiere, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

436. To Mrs. J. Knollis *(iii 223)*

Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 16, 1852

My dear Madam,

I most deeply sympathise with you & enter into your sorrows. Whatever is in my power to do to prevent the full scandal I will. But I see not how the worst can be prevented except by his retiring from Horspath. It is quite impossible that his ministry there can be useful again. It would be a cause of perpetual scandal. If he will tender me his resignation of Horspath I will accept it & drop all proceedings. He may then by continuing either at home or elsewhere or College regain

[1] Cf. no. 430.
[2] John de Blaquiere (1812–71), an Irish peer. He had just remarried.
[3] For the Bishop's love of the Sussex countryside, cf. his *Essays*, II, 1–22.

his full position. But if he does not do this I must bring the matter to trial: I shall be compelled to force the attendance of witnesses. They, however reluctantly, yet must on oath speak the whole truth & it will be impossible to prevent the full & worst Scandal, & most public ruin to his Character. The question then is *can you persuade him to resign.* I have told him that I will wait till Saturday for his decision.

I am, my dear Madam, In truest sympathy, Yours,

S. Oxon.

437. To the Rev. F. M. Knollis *(iii 224)*
Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 16, 1852

My dear Dr. Knollis,

It is not in my power to allow the Commissioners to examine what happened more than two years back. I must therefore adhere rigidly to my determination of acting on Saturday unless you make it needless. But my dear Sir It is with the deepest pain that I say to you that the aspect your case has assumed since I saw you is such as to lead me to pray you to consider most seriously before you attempt to disprove the charges which have been brought against you so far as concerns their *essential* truth — probably they are exaggerated — but I do, as set over you in God, most solemnly ask you is there not a fearful foundation of truth for them. Has not weakened health led to your use of Port wine to a degree which has frequently affected your [reasonable] & moral consciousness? Has [not] this [been] brought before you by your Parents with all the loving earnestness which befits such a relation. Have they not warned you of the too probable issue of such a state of things in reproach cast upon the Gospel? My dear Sir, If these things are so, Oh as you value your salvation attempt no defence which must be essentially untrue. Even on worldly grounds I should say this to you. In one stage or other of the matter witnesses will be compelled to appear. Mr. Matton, Mrs. Warburton, Mrs. Drake & Youens[1] will be forced to say aye or no on oath to searching enquiries. But I put this view aside, & I say may not this Check be the Salvation of your Soul? My advice then to you is *go at once to Penn.* Your address to Youens is known there: consult your best & natural advisers there; ask them whether they do not advise you to resign Horspath in which case all enquiries may be stopped.

I am [ever most truly yours],

S. Oxon.

438. To the Rev. W. Cole[2] *(iii 225)*

Dec. 16, 1852

My dear Sir,

The Best Advice I can get convinces me that I have no right to license you without the written assent of the Rector. I am very sorry to disappoint you in any way, but such I verily believe is the requirement of the law.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Apparently witnesses to Knollis' alleged misconduct.
[2] William Cole, Headmaster of Newbury G.S., 1852–67 (O). Cf. no. 342.

439. To the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University (R. L. Cotton)[1] *(iii 226)*

[*First part missing*]

. . . do otherwise in the place in which God's providence has placed me than accept your proposal.

Perhaps you will let me fix *the day* in two or or three days time. Will you let me add that I am very anxious for the sake of the effect I think his preaching likely to have on the young men that T. Carter[2] of Clewer should be appointed a select preacher. I am confident that his sermons would be on great common truths & with a spirit of power & love most likely to touch hearts.

I am my dear Vice Chancellor, Yours most sincerely,

S. Oxon.

440. To the Rev. F. M. Knollis *(iii 227)*

Confidential

Dec. 18, 1852

My Dear Dr. Knollis,

I cannot alter what I have said to you. I take a very different estimate from you of the nature of the evidence against you. I feel persuaded that your usefulness at Horspath is destroyed & that I am giving you the best advice for this world & the next when I say Resign Horspath at once. Unless I hear from you to this effect today I shall instruct my Secretary to proceed at once.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

441. To the Rev. F. M. Knollis *(iii 228)*

Dec. 20, 52

Dear Dr. Knollis,

The expence of the Commission *need not* exceed £20. The Commission may be revoked by the Bishop. If you resolve before the post goes today distinctly & categorically to apply for one it shall be written for today. It would be improper for me to see any witnesses.

I am Yours,

S. Oxon.

P.S. I have sent you the volume of Statutes which I must ask you to send back with your answer.

442. To the Rev. F. M. Knollis *(iii 229)*

Private

Dec. 20, 1852

My dear Dr. Knollis,

I shall tomorrow direct the first steps to be taken as to the commission issuing.

I cannot undertake to say what evidence will be receivable but I know of no rule to exclude that you ask about.

[1] Richard Lynch Cotton (1794–1880), Provost of Worcester College, 1839–80; Vice-Chancellor, 1852–6 (*DNB*).

[2] Thomas Thellusson Carter (1808–1901), R. of Clewer, 1844–80; founder of the House of Mercy, Clewer; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, 1880 (*DNB*).

You will have 14 days notice.

It is not possible for me with a detailed & particular charge laid before me by Church Wardens to refuse to proceed. Once more I say weigh well whether resignation of Horspath would not be your far wisest course. If you do not trust your parents consult your good & wise friend the Rural Dean.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

443. To the Bishop of London (C. J. Blomfield) *(iii 230)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 24, 1852

My dear Lord,

I sincerely thank you for endeavouring to remove Archdeacon Sinclair's feeling of annoyance with me. It would give me great pain in anything were to interfere with my friendly intercourse with one for whom I have long felt so sincere a regard. With the Archdeacon's conduct as to the rescinding the resolution as he explains it in this last letter I have no fault to find: I can only wish that he had so explained it at the Committee: for I could then have assured him at the time that no words of blame spoken by me could attach to him. For I carefully abstained from imputing anything to him or to anyone. I described an appearance which the case bore, which I thought injurious to the Committee, & which required explanation. *The appearance* was, a premeditated attempt to get rid by a surprize of a resolution adopted at a very full & important meeting of the Committee. Of *this appearance* I admit that I used decisive language, & I understood the Archdeacon equally to condemn it. Sir T. Phillips & Mr. Davies at once stated that they had dealt with the question in its casually arising. I instantly & emphatically showed how free they were from the censure I had pronounced. I now understand, with the most unfeigned satisfaction that the Archdeacon was for the [same reason] equally free. No word therefore of my censure reaches him. Had I imputed to him the fault I blamed I should [then] and would at once tender him my apology; but I imputed that fault to no one; & the clearness of language therefore with which I expressed my appreciation of the fault itself cannot possibly need apology to any one innocent of the fault & to whom complicity in it was never imputed. I heartily desire that all annoyance may be dispelled from the mind of the Archdeacon & trust that this declaration may have that effect.

I cannot quite admit, though I know not that it is of moment the correctness of the Archn's statements in his letter. First Lord Harrowby did not 'call me to order'. So far from it that late in the proceedings he spoke in a way I do not wish to characterize either as to its temper or its wisdom, but which was certainly as remote as possible from a call to order. Secondly the Archdeacon says that even if there had been a planned surprize *I* ought not to complain because I had introduced the question on its 2 previous stages without notice. I introduced it so at neither. On the first occasion, the Subject being the approaching Annual Meeting Mr. Keble's letter was announced by the Secretary & the decision was taken on the answer to be given to that letter. On the second it rose on the incidental question of what steps the Secretary should take to carry out the former resolution. Had I intended any such motion I should have given notice of it. This therefore was no precedent for a surprize. *Thirdly* I contend that at what are called by us *Special* meetings everything which could be done at an ordinary meeting has *always* been done. In fact they have been treated exactly as an inter-

calary ordinary meeting. The minutes of the last ordinary meeting have been confirmed at them, & any business which has arisen & so would have come before an ordinary meeting [when] held has come before them. *Fourthly* the Archdeacon speaks as if confirming the minutes of the last meeting meant (as it does e.g. at the Eccles Commrs) that the acts of one meeting were not effectual till ratified at the next: in which case *of course* no notice of trying to upset them were [*sic*] needed. I contend that confirming the minutes with us has never meant more than [declaring] them to be a correct record of what was done. I have merely pointed out these my dear Lord lest silence should seem to acquiesce in their correctness: but I have no wish to press the matter further. I *trust* that what I have said may satisfy the Archdeacon & that this blessed season of Christian Charity may not pass without his being at peace with one to whom it is a real sorrow to have caused him pain.

I am affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

444. To J. W. Whateley (*iii 231*)
Private

Dec. 25, 1852

My Dear Friend,

I wrote to you on Wednesday last to say that Mr. Lowe required me to call on you *at once*[1] to lodge the Exchequer bills in which you invested Mr. James[2] Trust moneys in my name & his at Messrs. Smiths Payne & Smiths; & I begged you in a matter of this delicacy to let me know by the earliest post that you had done so. I quite expected to hear from you by return of Post. May I beg you to let me have by first post one line to say that this is done: for the delay places me in very uncomfortable relations to my Co-Trustee.

I am ever yours,

S.Oxon.

445. To A. J. Beresford-Hope (*iii 232*)
Confidential

Dec. 27, 1852

My dear Mr. Hope,

I believe that I *completely* understood your position with R.[3] & feelings as to the Bishop of London. Nothing can be easier than to do as you desire: & I think *the* easiest way would be if you would write me a letter which I might send to the B of London explaining in your own way (1) your desire for a reconciliation (2) allowing as far as you can that by being forced through being in a correspondence with M. C. to seem to say hard things at a time when he was being grievously pelted (3) That I can assure him of your hearty Anglicanism. I have no doubt that this would do all.

I am ever, My dear Mr. Hope, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

1 These two words are underlined twice.
2 The Bishop's brother-in-law, John James.
3 I.e. Richards (see no. 432).

446. To the Warden of Merton College (R. B. Marsham) *(iii 233)*

Dec. 27, 1852

My dear Warden,

I have today received the last assent necessary to carry out the plan which you suggested in your last, viz. to give £50 per annum more from Fingest down hill to Fingest Uphill & then let the Patronage of the united living of Fingest & Ibstone be alternately in the Bishop & the College.

This therefore I am now quite ready to carry out.

You asked also about Easington. It will be united under a recent act of Parliament quite easily. There is *one* service there at some time in the Sunday & this will be chargeable on the incumbent of the United Parish:[1] unless the Church is taken down. This can only be done by some party applying for a faculty after the Union in my Court. The application & any opposition to it will then be regularly heard & adjudicated by the Chancellor of the Diocese.

May I now *at once* instruct Mr. Davenport & Burder to proceed with the proposed Union.[2]

I am ever my dear Warden, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

447. To the Bishop of London (C. J. Blomfield) *(iii 234)*

Jan. 3, 1853

My dear Lord,

I[s]. Let my first letter of this year convey to you my hearty good wishes for you & yours in its course.

II. I return the draft of our bill with Randalls[3] amendments as we agreed to them incorporated in them. Perhaps you will at once have this reprinted & sent round to the Committee & then authorise me to call a meeting at some future day of the Committee of our assistants in the lower house: sending them at the same time your Summons & the draft of our bill for their previous consideration.

I should be very glad if I could have the reprinted draft very speedily as Baron Alderson[4] comes to me on Thursday & I might go through it again with him.

The only point to notice is in Clause VII where I propose to *restore* what was struck out *on my motion* namely, the making the previous Consent of the Clerk necessary for the private enquiry. Viewing the whole bill together I see that the power I wished to retain to the Bishops is retained under the new trial provisions afterwards enacted: & as *this* enquiry is to be *private* I believe it is best to allow the Clerk to dissent from it if he will, in order to prevent the dangerous imputation of our seeking to impose on the Clergy a secret inquisitorial power.

[1] Of Cuxham and Easington, Oxon. (1853).

[2] John Marriott Davenport (1809–82), an Oxford solicitor who was Clerk of the Peace for the County 1831–81 and Under-Sheriff 1853–75 (*MEB*), succeeded Robert Morrell as Deputy Registrar in 1849, and John Burder as Legal Secretary in 1854. Burder, of Parliament Street, Westminster, was Legal Secretary to many dioceses. Wilberforce clearly preferred to deal with a more local official, and Davenport began to replace Burder even before the latter's death in 1854. As such appointments were for life, the connexion could not be severed earlier. On relations with Burder's firm, see nos. 434 and 596.

[3] James Randall (1790–1882), father of R. W. and J. L. Randall (see no. 727), Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, 1818–21; R. of Binfield, 1831–59; Archdeacon of Berks., 1855–69; Chaplain to Wilberforce as Bishop of Oxford and Winchester, 1846–73 (*MEB*).

[4] Sir Edward Hall Alderson (1787–1857), Baron of the Exchequer; a zealous Churchman (*DNB*).

I am sure you feel with me the importance of our being perfectly ready with *report* and bill on Feb. 16 & therefore the importance of our not losing a day now.

You will I presume send copies to *each* member of the Upper House Committee.

I am my dear Lord, Affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

448. To the Rev. J. R. Pretyman *(iii 235)*

Confidential

Jan. 3, 1853

My dear Sir,

The Rectory of Barley in Herts is vacant by the death of Dr. Lee[1] & in my Patronage. The population is somewhat under 1000. 'The village stands in a fertile & gently undulating country: on a gentle eminence fairly wooded; & has a comfortable civilized look. The Church quite large enough for the population. The Rectory in the Elizabethan Style not merely substantially a good & large house but gracefully & elegantly built. Dissent widely spread amongst the small shopkeepers. The tithe commuted at £631.' Should you be disposed to exchange this sphere of work for Aylesbury I shall be happy to put it at your disposal. I shall be obliged by your letting me know your mind at your early convenience & keeping the offer as far as is consistent with forming your judgement to yourself.

I am my dear Sir, Very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

449. To the Rev. W. Wright[2] *(iii 236)*

Private

Jan. 3, 1852 [*sic*]

My dear Sir,

I have now read through your reply so long promised & so lately received. I shall be obliged to you to inform me of the exact day when you dispatched it to me & the place to which you sent it. I shall as I understand you to intend place it in the hands of the complainants and in doing so I shall endeavour to calm their minds & lead them to seek to profit by your ministry. But whilst doing so; I must *to you*, say

(1) That I greatly regret the tone of your answer in many parts, as being rather irritating than soothing.

(2) That I find upon enquiry that the names of some of the very best persons in the parish are subscribed to this Memorial:

(3) That I have great reason to believe that, your frequent absences from Medmenham: & the little earnestness & love which as they believe you have manifested in your parochial visitations have had quite as much to do with alienating the people from you as any alterations introduced into the Services.

I most earnestly entreat you therefore that you devote your energies to visiting ministerially amongst the people: & that you endeavour by your behavour amongst them to shew them that you indeed have the welfare of their souls deeply at heart.

Specially I would recommend you to seek out Mr. Hobbs & endeavour by love to win him over as one well worth the winning.

[1] Samuel Lee (1783–1852), R. of Barley, Herts., 1838–52; a great Oriental linguist (*DNB*).

[2] William Wright, V. of Medmenham 1852 until his sudden death in 1854.

I must also notice that you speak of the conduct of the Psalmody &c. as belonging absolutely to the Clergyman. But I suppose you do not mean to exclude the Bishops Jurisdiction.

Finally I would say I have desired the Rural Dean[1] at his convenience to attend one of your services & report to me thereon: thinking that the best mode of obtaining a report on which I could speak with [fitting] authority to your Parishioners.

I am my dear Sir very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

450. To W. Blackwell, W. Hobbs and P. Hobbs (Medmenham) *(iii 237)*

Jan. 3, 1852 [*sic*]

Gentlemen,

I felt it due to Dr. Wright to place your memorial in his hands & he has replied to it in the lengthy document which I now send you for your perusal. The great length of this answer & the necessity of having it copied fairly delayed Dr. Wrights sending it to me; & when it reached me it was at a time when I was so entirely engrossed by important business that I could not at once attend to it.

I have now read it carefully through: & I have requested the Rural dean to attend at the Service & to report to me on its performance. His report I have not yet received. But I trust that Dr. Wrights reply will prove in many respects satisfactory to you.

I. It plainly shews that the alterations to which you objected were not indications of leanings to anything foreign to our own Church's teaching.

II. It explains that some of the matters complained of were misapprehended. E.G. the supposed bowing to the Holy table was acknowledging the obeisance of the Children.

III. It states that some things as the Flowers on the Altar shall at once be changed.

IV. It offers, in other things, as E.G. in the rate of reading the prayers to accomodate [*sic*] his practice to the wishes of the Parishioners.

I cannot doubt from the tone of your address that you have really at heart the Spiritual Welfare of the Parish of Medmenham: & I would earnestly pray you therefore as the truest mode of promoting that end that you endeavour to strengthen the hands of your appointed Minister. Very much may be done by kindness & forbearance on your part — and if as I trust will be the case, when Dr. Wright is fully settled at Medmenham, you find him giving himself more to the Work of the Ministry amongst you, you will I trust give him with all friendly confidence the right hand of Christian fellowship.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

451. To the Rev. H. G. Newland *(iii 238)*

Private

Jan. 3, 1853

My dear Mr. Newland,

I cannot at all approve of your projected line of conduct.

1. I think you have by no means waited long enough for the answer of the Bishop[2] (and this I say not at all subscribing to the truth of your passing stab about Bishops & their silences).

[1] See no. 450 (from three young Medmenham farmers).
[2] Of Chichester.

II. I think before you take so strong a step on the ground of his silence you ought certainly to write to him: explain to him why you feel yourself compromised by that silence & respectfully ask whether it is his intention that you should take silence as his answer.
III. I cannot see why if he decides contrary to your wish you are bound to take this very violent step of signing the petition writing a public letter &c. &c. against your bishop.

The reasons against such a course are manifest
(a) It is one in my judgement of *very doubtful* duty. The Patronal relation seems to me to forbid such a line of conduct.
(b) It must inevitably destroy all your influence with the Bishop.
(c) It will have in the eyes of the great mass of Churchmen a most factious appearance.
(d) It will be perfectly useless for its aim.

And why are you bound to take this line. Neale waited on your remonstrances. Well — you have done all you could to gain the end, to see if you could gain which Neale waited. The utmost you could be bound to would be to say: you wanted to see if I could do anything: I can do no more: you must take your own line. But you say
IV. The Bishop is committing an injustice and you shall be a partner in it if you do not sign N's petition. But why so? Have you not done all which you could consistently with duty & affection do to change the Bishops mind: & should a son failing in this at once join in an open assault on his Father instead of sitting sadly by?

Neales Petition will do unmixed evil. It certainly will not be received by the Upper House: I think certainly not presented. It will do more than 100 Records to bring convocation into evil report: it will not move the Bishop. The mass of that vile ally 'public opinion' will support him. *I have done all I can with him* — & I do not believe anything will move him. He thinks he has clear right on his side: That Neale has no local standing. The false doctrine was only a strengthening of his position: & he still says how can I trust the discretion of one who can for such people [put forth] such statements. I pray you use all your influence to suppress this most mischievous way of pressing N's claim be it just or unjust.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

Were you at G.A.D.'s elbow when he wrote his late modest letters.

452. To the Rev. J. C. Blomfield[1]

(*iii 239*)
Jan. 3, 1853

My dear Sir,

Your letter does credit to your humility & so confirms me in my belief that, upon the whole, in spite of the disadvantage of age of which you speak I may hope under Gods blessing to see you fill with success the office of Rural Dean of that Deanery: & I shall therefore unless you feel that it would distress you in any way adhere to my offer of the office to you.

I am my dear Sir,Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] James Charles Blomfield (1821–95), R. of Launton, 1850–95 (after T. W. Allies); Rural Dean, 1853–95; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, 1894 (*MEB*). He was 31 at this time.

453. To the Rev. A. A. Kempe (*iii 240*)

Jan. 4, 1853

My dear Sir,

I do not think that your plan is one I could sanction. It appears to me that the scheme which was drawn up by Mr. Nash is the true one to meet the wants of the district. But as Mr. Champnes absolutely refuses his assent to this, the whole question must for the present stand over.[1]

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

454. To the President of Magdalen College (M. J. Routh)[2] (*iii 241*)
Confidential

Jan. 4, 1853

My dear President,

I thank you for Mr. Freeborn's[3] letter which I venture to return to you because I have myself one to myself in the same words. The subject is a deeply painful one. I hope that the resignation of Horspath will relieve me from the necessity of a commission as to a case in which nervous excitement & moral fault seem to me, so often, remarkably Blended: Suffer me to close my letter by respectfully but heartily wishing you all New Year's Blessings.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

455. To the Rev. J. R. Pretyman (*iii 242*)
Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 6, 1853

My dear Mr. Pretyman,

After thinking greatly over our conversation last night I have concluded that I had better write to you exactly my feelings thereon trusting to your entirely understanding me & wishing me to be perfectly open with you.

When then I proposed to you to exchange Aylesbury for Barley I was led to do so by the following considerations.

I. I was convinced that your Ministry at Aylesbury was not such as to promote your own happiness, Spiritual Welfare, or those highest interests of the Church which I know you conscientiously to value above personal considerations.

II. I supposed you to be so far dependant on your clerical income that you could not prudently resign Aylesbury without taking some other benefice.

III. I felt more than I otherwise should have done, personally responsible for your being there from my having prevented your resigning Aylesbury some years back.

IV. I was convinced of your conscientiousness & ability, & I thought that in a country cure where the people might give you their affections & draw out yours towards them your Ministry might under Gods blessing be a prosperous & happy one.

[1] I.e. during Kempe's non-residence at Wexham through debt.
[2] Martin Joseph Routh (1755–1854), President of Magdalen College, Oxford, 1791–1854 (*DNB*).
[3] Doubtless a resident of Horspath.

With this view then I offered you Barley: [not] because even then I thought it a place [fully] suited to you: but because I felt that it was far more suitable than Aylesbury.

VI. That offer so made I do not withdraw — on the contrary I leave it entirely for your own decision. But in arriving at that decision I wish you to know my whole mind & not to give greater weight than it really deserves to the fact of my having made you the offer. Now that I know all the circumstances of Barley I see some features in the cure which I think you ought thoroughly to weigh before you undertake it. Unless you can trust yourself to bear the wearing & irritating treatment which you are sure to meet with from its rough tithe paying dissenters, without losing your hearty interest in their spiritual Welfare; I do not think that it would contribute to your happiness to take it.

But I shall leave the offer absolutely in your hands only praying God to bring you to a right conclusion. I hope you will arrange to sleep here on Monday & if possible to drive Mrs. Pretyman over. You will fall in with Robert Milman & the family of Baron Alderson.[1] I can assure you a hearty welcome & I dare say you will forgive being placed in a small room in a very full house.

I am very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

456. To the Rev. J. W. Peers, jun. *(iii 243)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 6, 1853

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have been for some time past hoping that I might hear from you on the subject of the re-building of your church. The Building season will now be soon upon us; Mr. Bolton[2] I am told is at home; & it is of the greatest importance that no time should be lost in setting about the work. Mr. Bolton I am told undertakes to rebuild his Chancel; & all therefore that I as ordinary require is (1) that the plan be suitable & (2) That I be certified before the body of the present Church be pulled down that there is a sufficient sum to rebuild it.

I am most anxious as I always have been to co-operate with you in this work. And if on full consideration you think it better to change the side of the Church as you proposed formerly I will do my best to prevail on Mr. Bolton to rebuild his Chancel accordingly.

I am Rev. & Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

457. To the Prince Consort *(iii 244)*

Private

Jany. 8, 1853

Sir,

I beg to thank your Royal Highness for your very kind reply to my request. I cannot wonder at your decision and yet you will allow me to say that I regret it not only for the loss of the direct effect of your words, but also because I believe

[1] Robert Milman was Alderson's nephew. Alderson's children included the gifted daughter who in 1858 married Lord Robert Cecil, later Prime Minister (as Lord Salisbury).

[2] Of Chislehampton.

that such an opportunity of hearing them would have greatly tended to remove, from many, injurious & unjust impressions as to what are your views on this great question.

I feel deeply the degradation of my University in this disgraceful contest.[1] But Your Royal Highness will allow me to say, (1) That in the minds of the vast majority of the resident members there is not a shadow of hesitation as to supporting Mr. Gladstone, on the highest grounds: & (2ly) that the opposition from the country is to be traced, I verily believe, to one strong feeling, which the Carlton Club has worked upon with considerable skill. Mr. Gladstones old supporters would have borne from him anything except an union with Lord John Russell, who has unfortunately concentrated in himself a most unusual amount of distrust & indignation by his conduct, or supposed conduct, in administering the Patronage of the Crown.

[*Unfinished*]

Life, II, 158–9

458. To C. C. Ferard[2] (*iii 245*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 8, 1853

My dear Sir,

I beg to thank you sincerely for the kind letter which I have just received from you. I congratulate you on having so many good candidates for your patronage; for there is not one of them whom I would not gladly see occupying the new incumbency. After however weighing all things I feel no hesitation in saying that I think that Mr. Purdue[3] is upon the whole the best man for the Post. He has shewn a singular aptitude for gaining the affection of the class which will form his Flock; & he is free from all extreme views or practices; & strong in health: & provided with some small means of his own.

I earnestly hope that you may be able to secure the admirable site of which you speak.

I am my dear Sir, Congratulating you heartily on the approaching completion of this good work Most sincerely,

S. Oxon.

459. To the Lord Chancellor (1st Baron Cranworth)[4] (*iii 246*)
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 9, 1853

My dear Lord Chancellor,

There is a clergyman of this Diocese for whom I hope you will allow me to ask you, if it should be in your power, to exercise your patronage in the gift of a

[1] For the 'disgraceful contest' (the Oxford University bye-election of 1853), see W. R. Ward, *Victorian Oxford* (1965), pp. 176–9. Gladstone's opponent, whose identity only emerged at the last moment, was Dudley Montagu Perceval (1800–56), a son of Prime Minister Spencer Perceval. This particular poll remained open for fifteen days, and (voting being of course open) Wilberforce was able to canvass votes for Gladstone (cf. nos. 460, 474–5) before the poll closed on 20 Jan., with Gladstone the winner.

[2] Charles Cotton Ferard (1823–86), of Ascot Place, Winkfield, and Lord of the Manor of Winkfield, a keen supporter of diocesan conferences (C). He transferred the patronage of the united living of Challow to the bishopric 1877 (*V.C.H. Berks.*, IV, 228).

[3] George Purdue (1826–88), C. of Wantage, 1848; P.C. of East and West Challow, 1853–88 (O).

[4] Robert Monsey Rolfe (1790–1868), Lord Chancellor 1852–8, 1865–6. When Wilberforce wrote to him, Cranworth had been two weeks in office.

small living. He is really a good hard working moderate man. He has been Master of our Training School & according to his measure of attainment done good service there. In its greatly enlarged state we thought it needful to supply his place by a more regularly trained master & so he is dispossessed. My patronage is so small that I am very little likely to be able to help him: & his claim is a public one. A living of £200 a year & an house would quite satisfy him. Lord Truro kindly offered him one at my request but the population was so large that he could not combine with it as his large family requires the charge of some pupils.

His appointment would be singularly popular amongst the good citizens of Oxford who have just done *us* good service in returning Cardwell[1] as well as with the Gentry & Clergy. I inclose a printed statement of his case.[2]

I am my dear Lord Chancellor, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

460. To the Rev. T. Farley (*iii 247*)
Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 10, 1853

My dear Dr. Farley,

Your uniform kindness to me leads me to venture to address a few words to you which I beg you to treat as most strictly confidential on a very delicate subject. Mr. Whitaker[3] mentioned to me that our common friend Dr. Faussett[4] had pressed for a vote against Mr. Gladstone. Now I should not speak to you on such a subject because Mr. Gladstone is my dear & intimate friend; not on any merely political ground: but knowing that, with you, as with me, the interests of our Apostolic Church are above all other considerations. I venture to say to you, that knowing a great deal of the interior of things in this last change I am persuaded (1) that Mr. Gladstone would have preferred an union with others (2) That *they* & not he made that union impossible (3) That his serving & the serving of his friends in this Government is from the purest & highest motive of serving the Sovereign & The Church & (4) That the interests of our church are as deeply interested in maintaining him in power as they can be in any such human event. Mr. Percevals *real* supporters are the Ultra low-Church men who through the National Club sent round their Circulars to stir up our Churchwardens against their clergy & led to 'the Letter to the Bishop of Durham's' excitement against our Church. Under these convictions I would venture in spite of this counsel to hope that your vote would be for Mr. Gladstone.[5]

I am very sincerely Yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 160

1 Edward Cardwell (1813–86), later 1st Viscount Cardwell, was first returned for Oxford City (as a Peelite) in 1852.

2 John Thorp (1802–84), Principal of Summertown Training School 1840–52, was Chaplain of Oxford City Prison 1854–78, and finally R. of Noke.

3 Gascoigne Frederick Whitaker (1827–83) of Wadham College, a Gladstone supporter.

4 Godfrey Faussett (1781–1853), Lady Margaret Prof. of Divinity 1827–53, Canon of Christ Church, 1840–53 (*MEB*).

5 Farley, perhaps characteristically, did not heed this, and voted for Perceval.

461. To the fifth Duke of Newcastle[1] *(iii 248)*
Confidential

Jan. 10, 1853

My dear Duke of Newcastle,

A nephew of mine who has been two years called to the Bar, is very anxious to try His Fortune in Australia, either at Sydney or Melbourne as police Magistrate or Gold Commissioner. He is a young man of very robust health & very good parts: but has got no business in England & got into idle habits with their accompanying evils to some degree: He is thoroughly anxious to do well in a new post & I trust is likely to do so.[2] If you could give him one of the *private* commendatory letters to the Governor of Sydney & Lieut[t] Govr. of Melbourne which Secretaries of the Colonies have in such cases been wont to issue, recommending him for one of these appointments, and rather in the country than in the Town, with a hint that if he did his work well he might be put on the list of promotion I shall be greatly obliged to you.

I trust that the return to office business does not tell upon your health.

We are not yet by any means confident about Gladstone though more in hopes than we were that this threatened disgrace maybe averted from our University.

I am Dear Duke of Newcastle, Very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

462. To M. Ricardo[3] *(iii 249)*
Private

Jan. 11, 1853

My Dear Sir,

Mr. Browne[4] has raised various objections to Mr. Streets plans. Only *one* however of these appeared to me to have any weight: viz. that there was no room for the Bible on the desk. Mr. Street[5] has altered this and as you now receive them they are sanctioned by me. Mr. Browne indeed *may* yet require a faculty but I hardly think that he can venture on such a requirement: nor do I *know* that he is aware of this, as possible, so I would not have it suggested to him. Mr. Browne has raised a question as to the *material* of your new works: I replied that I understood distinctly that it was to be Oak & told him that you had pointed out the work in your own Chancel as a type.[6]

I am my dear Sir very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Henry Pelham Pelham-Clinton (1811–64); a Peelite, Sec. of State for the Colonies 1852–4. The Bishop would have preferred Newcastle to Derby as Chancellor of Oxford University at the end of 1852 (*Life*, II, 149–52).

[2] William, son of the Bishop's eldest brother William, must be meant.

[3] Mortimer Ricardo (1807–76), third son of the economist David Ricardo. On the death of Mrs. Ricardo in childbirth in 1855, the family's Kiddington estate was sold and Ricardo went to Mudeford, Hants., where he died.

[4] John Geoffrey Browne (1797–1877), R. of Kiddington, 1823–77.

[5] George Edmund Street (1824–81), moved from London to Wantage in 1850, and to Beaumont Street, Oxford, in May 1852 before moving back to London in 1855. From 1851 he was Diocesan Architect at Oxford (a position he held in three other dioceses). His most notable work for Wilberforce was Cuddesdon College, begun in 1853 (*DNB*).

[6] A restoration of Kiddington Church followed in 1853.

463. To the Rev. J. G. Browne *(iii 250)*

[Jan.] 11, 1853

My dear Sir,

I have carefully considered your objections and I admit the force of *one* of them: viz. the absence of sufficient room for the Bible. This I have had remedied. The other objections I am obliged, after consideration, to dismiss as not having weight. I have therefore determined at once to send the Plans to Mr. Recardo [*sic*] with my sanction.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

464. To the Dean of Christ Church (T. Gaisford) *(iii 252)*

Jan. 11, 1852 [*sic*]

My dear Dean of Ch. Ch.,

The incumbent of Hillesden[1] informs me that the estate of Tithe & land belonging to your Chapter in that parish has fallen in to you, by the death of the remaining life on the lease.

May I if this be so ask you to lay this letter before your Chapter in order to convey to them my respectful but most earnest request that they would at this time before granting any new lease taken [*sic*] into account (1) the present endowment of the incumbent,[2] who has no Glebe House & receives with the chapter augmentations of 1816 & 1830 only £79.6 for his Services: & (2) the present very dilapidated state of the beautiful Chancel.

There is a very strong feeling on the subject in the neighbourhood: in which so far as entertaining an earnest desire to see the Chapter discharge liberally its Pastoral duties now that the opportunity has offered I confess myself to participate.

I am, my dear Dean, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

465. To A. Hamilton-Gordon[3] *(iii 253)*

Confidential

Jan. 11, 1853

My dear Gordon,

I must not disguise from you the pain which your letter has given me: the more acute the more earnest my desire to support with all my power the Government of your Father.[4] I am however sincerely thankful to him for giving me an opportunity of speaking to him on the subject; & with the prayer which since you asked me to do so I have constantly offered for him I shall join this new subject of Petition. I greatly trust that I may at least shew him that my view is no wild or exaggerated notion; and that it is not advocated in a bigotted or arrogant tone; or aims at establishing any impossible Priestly Supremacy.

I cannot be with him before 12 on the Thursday because I have to perform a wedding on that morning: but I will postpone my return till Friday & come to him at *any* hour on Friday you may appoint. I would ask for the earliest hour at which without disturbing his arrangements he can receive me.

1 W. T. Eyre.

2 A vicarage was formed at Hillesden in place of a perpetual curacy in 1868–9.

3 Arthur Hamilton-Gordon (1829–1912), youngest son of the 4th Earl of Aberdeen; colonial Governor; created first Baron Stanmore 1893. See no. 509.

4 George Hamilton-Gordon (1784–1860), 4th Earl of Aberdeen; Prime Minister 1852–5.

A line to me at 48 Upper Albany Street Regents Park will reach me by 11 on Thursday morning as I shall have to set out hence before the Post arrives.

I am ever very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 162–3

466. To the first Earl Howe[1] *(iii 254)*
Confidential

Address, Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 13, 1853

My Dear Lord Howe,

Will you allow me to mention to you *in confidence* the following matter.

The Vicarage of Aylesbury is about to be vacant; though for very sufficient reasons the Vicar[2] (who has mentioned the matter as yet to no one) is very desirous that nothing should be said on the subject at present as to his intentions.

It has been a matter of great anxiety to me to find the fit man for this, the most important post in Bucks: & I have decided on selecting Bickersteth as the fittest for the charge. I have in the same confidence in which I am now communicating with you asked him if when it is vacant he will take it & I am glad to say that he is willing to do so. At the same time he feels a good deal of difficulty about leaving Penn & Little Missenden. He has, as you I believe know, laid out £1,000 of his own not large fortune there; he sees the work through God's Goodness prospering under his hand; & whilst he feels with the delicacy which you I am sure know belongs to his mind that he cannot say a word to you about his successor yet I can see that he longs to be followed by one who will take his own sound judicious & earnest line of true Church of England piety; a line which alas! the peculiar state of Bucks renders it most important every where to promote. I have ventured thus confidentially to state to you what I know to be his feelings in the hope that you may be able so to communicate with him, that he may undertake the greater responsibilities before him with a mind at rest as to his late Flock.

[*Unfinished*]

467. To the Archbishop of Canterbury (J. B. Sumner) *(iii 255)*
Confidential

The Rail, Jan. 14, 1853

My dear Lord,

I was so long with Lord Aberdeen that I had not an instant in which to get to you. The substance of his conversation was this.

Ist he admitted as logically true & manifest common sense the Church's claim in the abstract to internal self-government. II. That the solemn summoning of a silent convocation was a great unreality. But (3) he urged so it had been for 150 years & that any change must be made deliberately & with the assent of enlightened public opinion. (4) That we had this time made a great step: that if we could bring that step to a safe & prosperous conclusion we should have made a second. (5) That to secure this end we ought to avoid any hostile conclusion. That it would be most undesireable *for us*, to have the new Cabinet forced to consider as a Cabinet question the revival of Convocation: That this would be

[1] Richard William Penn Curzon-Howe (1796–1870).

[2] J. R. Pretyman. He had 'doubts' in 1846 (no. 80), 'scruples' in 1849 (no. 294), never took further preferment, and retired to Bournemouth.

forced on by questions in Parliament or direct motions if we adjourned for further business on the 16th. That anything we could *complete* on the 16th he thought we might do safely. Further he said he *thought* that an address to the Crown would be an unwise mode of proceeding because it would require an answer. He thought that a Resolution of both Houses would be the better course which might be founded on the report of our Comm^ee. Further that it would be better for us to agree to *heads* which should be included in a bill which you e.g. might introduce into Parliament than to the bill in extenso because in case we actually drew up the Bill & placed it in extenso in the report there would be more room for the charge of our having sought without license to *legislate*, being brought against us.

If you agree with me in thinking that we ought to adopt these suggestions I think our practical course should be this. That you should call together the Committee of Bishops at the earliest possible day in order that we may 'determine on the course to be taken in discussing the Heads of the proposed bill with the Committee of the Lower House.'

It is of such moment that we should be thoroughly prepared with our own plans that I should be very glad if you would send at once a few lines summoning us on *Thursday* next at one: if that day is open to you it being the only one I can command.

Will you excuse the unnatural writing & somewhat blotted state of these sheets. The fault of Rail Road writing & not blotting.

I am ever affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 163–4

468. To the Rev. F. M. Knollis (*iii 251*)

Jan. 15, 1853

My Dear Dr. Knollis,

I fear that I must adhere to my first engagement & receive the resignation on the day named. Of the reasons you give.

The Ist, 2nd & 4th appear to me the strongest possible for *not* delaying because they all imply delay for the purpose of re-opening the question. The 5th & 3rd seem to me to have no weight because it will be quite as easy for you to substantiate your claim to past arrears & to wind up Church & School accounts after, as before, resignation.

I am my dear Dr. Knollis, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

469. To the Warden of Merton College (R. B. Marsham) (*iii 256*)

Jan. 17, 1853

My dear Warden,

There can be no question as to *College* Patrons &c. for the clause of the Act under which we are to proceed: the XXVIth of the 1 & 2 Vict. C.106 makes no allusion whatever to Eccles[1] Patrons but extends the power without any limitation.

But there is one important misconception in your letter. I have *always* said that the annexation must be at the next natural vacancy of Easington;[1] & if you

[1] See nos. 143, 446. The date of Fidler's relinquishment is unknown: he is in Crockford for 1865, but not for 1870.

will kindly refer to your past letter you will see that this has been all along the plan. It is not at Mr. F's age likely to be long delayed but nothing at present will induce him to vacate.

I am my dear Warden, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

470. To the Rev. W. M. Beresford[1] *(iii 257)*
Confidential

Jan. 17, 1853

My dear Sir,

Your letter of yesterday gave me more pain than surprize. I saw during one brief intercourse that you were a gentleman & a sound though moderate Churchman & I felt confident that you had before you a difficult & trying post at Aylesbury. But my dear Sir I cannot agree in your conclusion that you ought to resign the post. Gods Providence has placed you in it. It is one in which your name, family, character & habits will enable you to do more than anyone else could perhaps, towards raising these poor people from their present low principles to those which really belong to the Church of Christ. Surely to fly from such an undertaking might bring upon you such a storm as overtook Jonah of old. As Bishop I could not conscientiously accept your resignation; and I beg you therefore to lay aside all thoughts of going; & to look for that success which I cannot doubt that God will give you in your work there.

I trust that the new Vicar & his Curates will work harmoniously with you & that there may be brighter days in reserve for Aylesbury than it has ever yet known.

I am My dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

471. To the first Earl Howe *(iii 258)*
Private

Jan. 17, 1853

My Dear Lord Howe,

I most sincerely thank you for your very kind letter. I grieve to hear so poor an account of your health & pray God you may be speedily better if it be His Will. I feel deeply with you the fearful responsibility of Patronage especially in these days when it is so hard to get really fixed principle & earnest men without extreme opinions on one side or the other. There was not I can assure you any wish to infringe on your undoubted right in Bickersteths feelings on the subject.

Will you let me suggest to you one name *for your own enquiry*, in the strictest confidence. It is that of Mr. Lindzee,[2] Mr. Knollis[3] present Curate at Penn, a very excellent man: now known in the neighbourhood and who is, happily, possessed of sufficient private means to be able to do great good in such a post.

1 William Montgomery Beresford, licensed to the perpetual curacy of Holy Trinity, Walton, Aylesbury, 6 January 1853. Resigned 1857. He was also Chaplain of the Aylesbury Union. His subsequent career is unknown.

2 Edward Hood Linzee (1816–94), C. of Penn, 1851; P.C. of Bracknell, 1854–61 (O). Lord Howe appointed Alfred Stokes Butler, a Low Churchman not at all to the Bishop's liking.

3 James Knollis (1776–1860), Fellow of Lincoln, 1798–1815; P.C. of Maidenhead 1819–60, and V. of Penn, 1823–60; father of Dr. F. M. Knollis.

I will gladly undertake the communication to Mr. B. which you so generously entrust to me. I am sure that he will thoroughly [appreciate][1] your unusual though wonted liberality in making him such an offer. Indeed the only difficulty I foresee is in persuading him to accept it: which I shall press him to do, because it will make so great a difference in his future usefulness at Aylesbury being able to command some resources of his own. I beg my very kind remembrances to Lady Howe & remain, My dear Lord, Most sincerely Yours,

S. Oxon.

I see on looking back at my letter that I have not *said* that Mr. B. has resolved on accepting A: It will not be vacant for 3 months during which time the resignation is to be private.

472. To the fifth Duke of Newcastle[2]

(*iii 259*)

Private

Jan. 17, 1853

My dear Duke of Newcastle,

I thank you very sincerely for your extremely kind answer to my application concerning my nephew; and as you permit me to apply again to you if the letters you have sent me are not sufficient for their purpose I shall avail myself of your Grace's permission.

Sir Jas. Stephen[3] tells me that he knows directions were sent in his time to all Colonial Governors telling them not to attend to any *formal* recommendations which were often necessarily given where no special favour was intended. He suggests that a few lines in Your Grace's own hand would do what these letters would not.

Another friend who has for years held a high place at Sydney & whom I also consulted, made me this reply 'The Commendation to Sir C. FitzRoy appears to me rather to fail in point of *explicitness*, in as much as it does not state that the wish of the Bearer is to obtain an appointment, and that this wish is supported by the Duke. You will observe that Sir Charles might, & very probably would, interpret the letter to convey no more than a request that Mr. Wilberforce might be noticed by the Governor and partake of the hospitalities of Gov^{t}. House: & the applications received by colonial rulers for actual appointments are so numerous that there is always a temptation to ignore them if it is possible. This is my opinion founded on much experience. I communicate it to you in confidence; and should say that if it can be properly asked for, it would be better to obtain a request, under the hand of the Secretary of State, that the bearer may not only receive attention, but may be considered a candidate for *such* or *such* an office if it fall within Sir Charle's power to appoint him.'

Your Grace will know whether you can give the young man this lift towards a Gold Commissionership or police Magistracy.

I am ever your much obliged,

S. Oxon.

[1] Not in MS.

[2] Actually addressed to 'His Grace the Duke of New College'.

[3] James Stephen (1789–1859) as counsel to the Colonial Office prepared the bill abolishing slavery. He was Under-Secretary for the Colonies 1836–47, Regius Prof. of Modern History at Cambridge, 1849–50. His wife was a daughter of the famous evangelical John Venn (cf. no. 485) (*DNB*).

473. To Henry Hallam[1] *(vi 1)*

Jan. 18, 1853

My dear Mr. Hallam,

You may probably have heard already from Mr. Gladstone on the subject of this note, since I was quite unable to write to you yesterday, but having promised the Senior Proctor to write I must still trouble you with a letter.

Its object is to induce you to undertake, at least for the first, and if possible for the two first times, the office of Examiner in our new History Schools. To you I need say nothing of their important bearing on the education of many of our Students who have no interest in, or secondary inducements towards Classical Literature but who might be drawn on to take an interest in these studies. If this be so, it is of the utmost moment that the honours of these new schools, having to be weighed against the old established honours of the other schools, should be augmented by all secondary means in our power. The chief of these would be the character of the first examiners who would fix the character of the examination. I need not then say to you why we wish to secure the aid of the Oxford man whose more than European reputation would most enhance the value of his decisions . . . [*illegible*] . . . Will you give your Alma Mater this benefit? The accidents and circumstances of the office are I believe these. Two times of service: payment to the Examiner £40 a time: length of time to be one day viva voce, and 3 or 4 days of paper examination of candidates. If they were few (too probable a supposition at first) one day of viva voce would probably exhaust the list, and the papers might be sent you to London if you preferred returning there. I need not further say that if the time of the Examination coincides with my being here, and you will be my guest, you will add to a favour to the University a favour to me.

I am ever, My dear Mr. Hallam, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

474. To the Rev. T. E. Powell[2] *(vi 2)*

Most Confidential

Jan. 18, 1853

My dear Mr. Powell,

I hope you will not think that I am doing more than our friendly relations warrant when I ask you to let me, in the strictest confidence, set before you the reasons why I think you ought at this moment to give your vote at Oxford for Mr. Gladstone. Do not trouble yourself to answer this letter; but only keep its having been written to yourself and weigh for yourself its Counsel.

[1] This letter shows how the influence of both Gladstone and Wilberforce was brought to bear on an eminent historian. Henry Hallam (1777–1859) was not only the most distinguished living Oxford historian, a pioneer of modern historical writing and author of *The Constitutional History of England* but also the centre of a wide social circle in London. His son, Arthur Hallam (1811–33) (also *DNB*), was the friend whose death Tennyson commemorated in *In Memoriam*, and would have been an older contemporary of many of Gladstone's Eton friends.

The connection of the Bishop of Oxford with the University was not necessarily close. Wilberforce was a Select Preacher and had been a Bampton Lecturer, though his sudden bereavement prevented the delivery of the Lectures. He had many friends among the senior members of the University, but on the whole Gladstone considered him 'wonderfully barred out' (Gladstone to Granville, 10 August 1869, in *The Gladstone-Granville Correspondence*, ed. A. Ramm (Camden Soc., lxxxi–lxxxii, 1952, letter 104).

[2] Thomas Edward Powell (1824–1901) of Oriel College, V. of Bisham 1848–1900, did not vote. Nos. 474–5 show how deeply the Bishop wished to aid Gladstone's cause, and the injunctions to secrecy may show that such aid was already thought undesirable; contrast, however. no. 460.

My view then is simply this. Mr. Gladstone has through a public life of the most stirring times, shewn as the first conclusion of academic honours, the Highest powers; the most unspotted purity of principle and conduct; with an attachment to our Church, which manifested in the worst times, has alone (as I believe) prevented his being at this moment Prime Minister. All through his Course there have been certain questions, e.g. The Jew Bill[1] on which many of his supporters have differed from him but he has been re-elected in spite of these. His election is now opposed (1) on political grounds, (2) by low Churchmen for his Church principles.

The Political charge is contained under these heads.

(1) that he opposed Lord Derby's Government. (I can assure you that he did all in his power to shelter it and promote a re-union of the Party).[2]

(II) That he has now joined Lord John Russell & Co. (to which I reply (a) that it is they who have joined him under his natural Chief Lord Aberdeen (b) that in the present State of England at home and as to foreign relations he must be a bold Man who should say that he ought to have refused the Crown his services when required.

And now for the IIIrd ground of opposition. Of course I assume that those who would vote at all for Gladstone are Churchmen and to such I would say.

1. Have we any grounds for doubting his fidelity to the Church. (It is I know alledged that 'his joining with Lord John shews an alteration in his own mind.' I must again say 'Lord John has joined him'. Lord Aberdeen — no 'presbyterian' but a churchman on Conviction who has never since his Confirmation at 16 communicated save with her, and might have been seen the Sunday after his acceptance of his present post, sitting and kneeling amongst the *poor* communicants at St. James' Church — is the head of the Government, with that influence in eccles: matters which Lord John abused).[3]

If then we have no grounds for doubting his fidelity to Her

(2) What can be more important for the Church than that he, and such as he, should be in this new Government (a) directly for their direct power and influence as members of it (b) indirectly because the anti-Church [tendencies] which would lead their present companions in office to assail the Church measures they might propose if they formed the whole government must now be kept in check by their partnership in the administration with them.

Is it not then a matter of the utmost moment at this critical time to give such a Churchman a cordial support — not only to bring him in but to bring him in with such support as shall give him a vantage ground for pleading for the Church. And to us Churchmen ought not this consideration to outweigh all others and lead us to give him at this moment all the aid in our power.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

1 The Bill to enable Jews to sit in the House of Commons finally passed in 1857.

2 This statement is more loyal than truthful. Gladstone's personal antipathy to Disraeli had made any real reunion of the Conservatives impossible, and Gladstone's speech in the early morning of 17 Dec. 1852 on Disraeli's first Budget had focused the hostility. Cf. P. Magnus, *Gladstone* (1954), pp. 102–3, 110–11; R. N. W. Blake, *Disraeli* (1966), pp. 345–7.

3 The Hampden affair of 1847–8 rankled with Churchmen and especially with Wilberforce. The replacement in 1855 of Aberdeen by Palmerston, who accepted the advice of Shaftesbury, was scarcely less distasteful. For the present, Aberdeen was far more amenable than any of the Whigs in ecclesiastical matters.

475. To the Rev. S. B. Arnott[1] *(vi 3)*

Most Confidential Jan. 18, 1853

My dear Mr. Arnott,

I hear that your vote has not been given[2] to Gladstone. I have myself the strongest convictions that the cause of the Church requires that it should be: and I cannot therefore forbear asking you to weigh the reasons which have convinced me and then acting as you see best.[3]

Only keep this communication to yourself and burn it when read.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

476. To Lord Robert Grosvenor[4] *(vi 4)*

My dear Lord Robert, Cuddesdon, Feb. 1, 1853

I would most gladly give you any aid in my power in endeavouring to rouse the Chapter of Windsor to meet with a less unworthy grant your noble munificence. But I can assure you that *any* interference on my part would I am convinced be injurious to *your* object. Though locally situated in my Diocese the Chapter of Windsor owns no relations to the Bishop and this independence is so much a matter of principle that any advice which seemed to weaken it would make the subject of the advice itself unpalateable. They are large holders in my Diocese and I have as Bishop thus frequently to press such matters on them.

There is one view which in fairness both to the institution of Chapters, and to these individual members which I think I ought to beg you to weigh. These institutions were doubtless intended by the Church to be the homes of men of thought, learning and devotion. From such an institution the members of which had been faithfully chosen in harmony with its principles you might have fairly expected a different reply: but used as these institutions have been; and *manned* as they generally are, by those who have been placed in them because a brother [had need] of services or the like and they had 'professional incomes' to be mended I really do not see how very different results than those you have experienced are to be expected. The cutting down also the numbers and efficiency of the Chapters and giving the State or some mercenary the right and power to check their Chapters has only increased the evil. Surely *the remedy* is to be found in securing the Chapters from the treatment which I am reprobating

[*Unfinished*]

477. To the Rev. W. R. Hunt[5] *(vi 5)*

My dear Sir, Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 1, 1853

I am entirely ignorant of the ground upon which your excellent Rector[6] gave you the assurance of which you speak. It could of course only be grounded

[1] Samuel Brazier Arnott (1816–76), C. of Great Marlow (O). The change in tone from the last letter is revealing.

[2] I.e. promised.

[3] According to the printed poll book, Arnott was the last St. John's man to vote; for whatever reason, he voted for Gladstone.

[4] Lord Robert Grosvenor (1801–93), later 1st Baron Ebury.

[5] Wray Richard Hunt, of Trinity College, Dublin, became curate of Witney on 10 September 1848. The right of an incoming incumbent to replace existing curates with those of his own choice would naturally lead the Bishop to advise cautiously; in fact he thought ill of Hunt (no. 484), who was never beneficed in the Oxford diocese.

[6] Charles Jerram (1770–1853), R. of Witney, 1834–53; a notable Evangelical (*DNB*). His good work at Witney explains the purpose of no. 484.

on knowing who his successor would be and how he would act. It would be quite impossible for me to say a word which should raise in your mind any expectations. I should think it wrong to do so; but under the circumstances you state so far as I apprehend them, I should in your case accept the offer which has been made to you.

I am, My dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

478. To the Archdeacon of Bristol (T. Thorp) (*vi 6*)

Cuddesdon, Feb. 1, 1853

My dear Archdeacon,

I have had no communication with members of Convocation except in the Committee of the Upper House, and replying to a letter sent me the other day by Mr. [Garbett][1] touching Mr. Massingberd's[2] proposed protest against Roman aggression.

But my own view of matters is this. If we were now to attempt by any argument over the 16th to prolong the sittings we should [probably] cause a *collision* with Parliament. The mind of the Church is not yet with us: a collision therefore would probably take from us the great advantages we have gained in this convocation. I should therefore confine my present attempts to (1) securing what we have gained, and (2) doing all that we can do on the 16th. These things certainly 1. *receiving* the Report of the Clergy [Discipline] Commee. 3. deciding on any petition from Curates refused their vote 2. agreeing to a resolution in favour of its recommendations and *if possible* (4) appointing a Commee of the Upper House to confer with Colonial Bishops on Colonial Church subjects. 5. to receive and decide on any matters sent up by the Lower House, e.g. a Committee on gravamina or what not. The important points seem to me (1) to resolve not to attempt another adjournment and so (2) to try to do all the business which can be done on that day; and therefore to endeavour in both Houses to avoid long and rambling discussions which may find us at the day's end with very little work done. I hope to be in town next Thursday for the meeting of the Committee de die in diem till our work ends.

I am ever yours most sincerely,

S. Oxon.

479. To the Provost of Eton College (E. C. Hawtrey)[3] (*vi 7*)

Feb. 6, 1853

My dear Provost of Eton,

I quite understood you as to what the points were on which the College were enquiring, but I asked you to add to that enquiry this further one — who is now legally their Visitor?[4] This question was not entered on before the Privy

1 ?James Garbett (1802–79) (*DNB*).

2 Francis Charles Massingberd (1800–72), Prebendary of Lincoln (*DNB*).

3 Edward Craven Hawtrey, D.D. (1789–1862), spent his life at Eton from 1814 to his death, becoming Headmaster in 1834 and Provost in 1853. He taught Arthur Hallam and Gladstone, carried out as Headmaster a reform comparable to that of Arnold at Rugby, and was the centre of a literary circle which included Henry Hallam, Archbishop Whateley, Dean Milman, and Guizot (*DNB*).

4 The question arose because of the transfer of Bucks. from the diocese of Lincoln to that of Oxford in 1845. See further no. 549.

Council. The point discussed there was this — whether Eton was a peculiar or subject to the Bishop of the Diocese. Now the College can of course have no object [*sic*] than to learn who is legally their Visitor; and they may be involved at any time in much trouble if they should continue to treat as Visitor one who is so no longer. I therefore venture once more to ask that some sufficient enquiry may be made into this question.

Will it suit the College as well to have the Confirmation on *Monday afternoon* as on Tuesday morning. It *may*[1] be a great convenience to me to have it at 5 p.m if that were not too late, or if it were at 3.15 on Monday instead of Tuesday; and to stay to dine and sleep afterwards (anyhow before or after I hope for that pleasure). If you will kindly send me one line to 26 Pall Mall on whether this change could be made without inconvenience, if I found it needful I would at once let you know if I did. Will you excuse the odd arrangement of this letter which is to suit writing in a Railway carriage, and ever believe me most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

480. To the Rev. E. B. Pusey (*vi 8*)

Feb. 7, 1853

My dear Dr. Pusey,

I am much obliged by your very kind letter. The principle upon which I act may be stated very briefly. Sisterhoods[2] are at present an experiment amongst us; a failure at this moment might deprive us of them permanently; I therefore am bound to use every precaution to prevent failure. I believe therefore that I do right in adopting a rule which secures us from unascertainable spiritual influence and counsels even at the risk of restricting the number of applicants, and I may reasonably ask those who engage with me in it to surrender some personal advantages (if it be such a surrender) for this work of God, trusting to Him to make up, Himself, whatever of outward aid they forfeit.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 168

481. To the Archdeacon of Montreal (J. Bethune)[3] (*vi 9*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 17, 1853

My dear Archdeacon,

I endeavoured to find you last night to learn your wishes about the petition you put into my hands under the following circumstances. I approve of the Government proposal to transfer the whole power over the Clergy Reserves to the Colonial Legislature and I think the Church efforts ought to be directed not to resisting this but to securing that the Colonial Legislature should not secularize the property. This I have great hope might be secured if with a generous yielding of the Imperial control the due use to be made of their power were pressed on the

[1] Underlined twice.

[2] The Sisterhood referred to is probably the House of Mercy, Clewer, founded and directed by Pusey's great friend T. T. Carter (cf. no. 439); but it might equally be St. Mary's Convent, Wantage. See *Life*, III, 322–37; A. J. Butler, *Life and Letters of Dean Butler* (1897), pp. 127–73; W. H. Hutchings, *Life and Letters of T. T. Carter* (1903), pp. 75–149.

[3] John Bethune (d. 1872), Dean of Montreal, 1854–72 (*MEB*).

Colony. Perhaps too a time might be interposed before the Colonial Legislature had the power. I could then heartily and as I believe most effectually speak against the secularisation of this property but I could not do other than support the justice of giving the control of these possessions to the Colonial Legislature.[1] Now not knowing whether this would meet your views and that of those whom you represent I have forborne presenting the petition that you may if you will put it into other hands. It is at 26 Pall Mall if you wish to claim it. Will you let me know early your mind. A line will reach me at Banbury till Monday inclusive. Tuesday and Wednesday Claydon Aylesbury.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 176–7

482. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon (*v 55*)
Private

Lavington, Aug. 8, 1853

My dear Mr Paddon,

Your explanation of the paper which I sent you has given me great pain. I understand you to say that you joined with one of the Dissenting Ministers of Wycombe in calling a meeting to adopt measures for the direct Spiritual care of your parish: & that you have since united with him in appointing a man to expound the Scripture to them at their houses: & that you justify this as an 'agreement through Grace to merge sectarian differences in a brotherly & Catholic effort to reach the most depraved of your parish through the daily reading of the word of God & exhortation'. Now there is no man who rejoices more unfeignedly than I do to know that in any way 'Christ is preached'. But it is one thing to rejoice in such results; & another to take part in them; and it is my painful duty to state explicitly to you as your Bishop that I conceive you in this matter to have acted in direct violation of your ordination vows, & of the solemn engagements on the faith of maintaining which inviolate you are allowed to maintain your position in our Established Church as Vicar of High Wycombe. For when you were ordained Priest you solemnly declared as the condition of your ordination, that you would 'be ready with all faithful diligence to banish & drive away all erroneous & strange doctrines' — now you know as well as I do that the Church of England has judged the opinions for the sake of which the dissenter separates from us to be 'erroneous & strange'. Now then can you say conscientiously that you are with 'faithful diligence' driving away all 'erroneous & strange doctrines' when you are taking into your counsel for your flock, — & actively uniting in combined spiritual efforts for their doctrinal instruction with, — the professed teacher of these very errors.

Of course such conduct may procure for you the applause of those who will be the gainers by your thus betraying the cause you are appointed to defend. All persons who belong to any priviledged order may obtain a little fleeting personal favour by betraying under the specious pretext of liberality the cause which they leave it to their brethren to defend, whilst they receive its rewards & yet make a merit of giving up its principles. For if there *is* no difference between you & Mr Davis why do you exclude him from the tithes & the Church of Wycombe.

[1] The issue was the transfer of land reserved for the Anglican Church in Canada to the Canadian Legislature; Wilberforce ultimately accepted the principle of transfer (*Hansard*, 3 ser., CXXVI, 436–44; *Life*, II, 184–5).

He is vastly more popular than you, & unless there be a ground of *right* on which you enjoy what is denied to him, that denial is simply unchristian: if on the other hand there be a ground of right your conduct is simply that of a traitor, who is paid to maintain the Church's cause & then is foremost in betraying it. I cannot wonder, deeply as I lament over it, at the failure of your ministry at Wycombe, & the perpetual disputes with your parishioners in which you have been involved when I find you thus openly abandoning the first principles of that Church of which you are a Minister. I do pray God for you as you desire, but it is that He may by His Grace bring you to a better mind.

I am, My dear Mr Paddon, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

483. To the Rev. C. A. Brook[1] *(v 56)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 8, 1853

My dear Mr Brooke,

I am sorry to have to make any objections to any plan for restoring a Church, but I greatly regret to say that I cannot acquiesce in the plans you sent me. It is greatly to be deplored that you did not at first apply to Mr Street for plans which would have saved you expence & secured a right result. He kindly consents without payment to correct the working drawings of the intended windows & these therefore must be sent direct to him before anything is done; as also the plans for the Chancel seats & for the Pulpit & the Prayer Desk & his alterations must be adopted in All respects. Further I must require (1) that the seats in the Chancel face East & West, & that no desk be put in front of the front desk unless a passage of 5 feet is left between the desks. (2) the Western Gallery to be taken down & the children provided with seats (which may be moveable on the floor: The intended Tower screen being thus entirely dispensed with. (3) The seats ends to be simple square ends without the projected ornament. (4) The Plans of reading desk & Pulpit (which last is far too high) to be remodelled by Mr Street. (5) The Pew *doors* to be six inches lower than the pew ends. (6) The pews are too narrow: with the intended slope of the back for kneeling. Mr Street should be consulted on this. The seats are, if I understand the plans aright, 4 feet high: they should not be more than 3 feet.

I am my dear Sir, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

484. To the Rev. R. Sankey[2] *(v 57)*

Private

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 8, 1853

My Dear Friend,

I am much obliged to you for writing freely to me touching Witney. 1 as to the division of the Parish — I am not at all sure that you may not be right in your view, thought it certainly is not my view. But what I would suggest to you is this — that you make no absolute decision until you have been 2 or 3 months at Witney when you will be better able to see the case in all its bearings. We can readily delay the new scheme so long, if you will empower me to say to Mr

1 Charles Abraham Brook, C. of Buscot, 1843; no more is known of him.
2 Richard Sankey (1802–63), Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 1828–9; R. of Witney, 1853–63 (*MEB*).

Rolfe[1] that you will acquiesce in his being paid from the date of your institution, at whatever rate he will receive when the new appropriation is made. (II) Do not you think it might be worth while to ascertain whether Venables[2] would take Trinity if made independent & aid in building the House — or if not if he would *take Curbridge* — if made independent. I should be very glad to secure him.

If we have £650 to divide — its proportions must be well settled. I had thought of £175 or thereabouts for Hailey £250 for Curbridge making £425. This would leave £225 only for Trinity if separated. But this may be hereafter settled (Perhaps it will quite suffice if you will empower me to say that Hailey cum Cradley [*sic*] shall from the date of your institution be increased £100 a year till all is settled)

Most private

As to Mr Hunt — I feel quite clear in my own judgement that he is not a man to be trusted — & that if you keep him you will live to repent it bitterly — you can *now* part with him naturally hereafter it can be only through a breach. I strongly advise you to be free of him. As to Mr Mills[3] I have merely said that as the district cannot be constituted at present the appointment rests entirely with you. I do not know enough of Mr Mills to be able to advise you with the same certainty as I feel concerning Mr Hunt but I think that if you do continue him you should in writing most distinctly express to him, & get his written acknowledgement of understanding you, that you do not intend to lead him to suppose that if the district is constituted[4] he is to have any claim for it for that you are now actually negotiating at my desire in another quarter i e Venables & that I have requested you to say this to him. Pray always consult me with entire freedom & Believe me to be ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

485. To Sir James Stephen

(*v 58*)

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 13, 1853

My dear Sir James Stephen,

You will I am sure allow me to address you with the freedom of familiar friendship on a subject which I wish to lead you maturely to reconsider, & in connection with which I believe you to have done, unintentionally, great injury to those high Christian interests which you would I know most wish to promote.

I have now lying before me a copy of letter of yours to Mr A Kinnaird dated August 2 on the Missionary Bishops Bill, which with your consent has been widely circulated & extensively read, & which powerfully tended to prevent the passing of that Bill.[5] Now what I wish first is to call your serious attention to some of the statements of that letter which appear to me equally at variance with plain

1 George Crabbe Rolfe (1811–93), C. of Witney, 1834; P.C. of Hailey, 1839–93; Chaplain of Witney Union, 1845 (C).

2 George Venables (1821–1906), C. of Nether Worton, 1850; V. of St. Paul's, Chatham, 1854–8, Friezeland, Yorks., 1858–69, St. Matthew's, Leicester, 1869–74, Great Yarmouth, 1874–86 (O).

3 William Mills (d. 1874), C. of Witney, 1847–64; Chaplain of the Union, 1855; C. of Burton Agnes 1865–70, Bempton with Speeton, Yorks., 1870–4 (C).

4 Holy Trinity Church, Witney (built 1849) remained a chapel of ease to Witney parish church, as later did St. John the Baptist, Curbridge (built 1906). Hailey-cum-Crawley became a separate ecclesiastical parish in 1854: St. John's church at Hailey was rebuilt in 1868–9 on a site given by G. C. Rolfe; St. Peter's in Crawley had been built by Jerram in 1837.

5 Arthur Fitzgerald Kinnaird (1814–87), later 10th Baron Kinnaird, was much interested in matters affecting the mission field. On this Bill, cf. also no. 501.

fact & with Christian Charity. You begin by stating that 'the professed Object of the Bill was to enable English Prelates to consecrate British subjects to act as Bishops in any Foreign or heathen country. But this was not the real & true object.' This is a grave accusation to bring against any men. It involves the charge of a crime which if they had committed it would be pre-eminently disgraceful in the Body of the English ArchBishops & Bishop. But as having been present when the ArchBishop of Canterbury first proposed the subject for our consideration & on every subsequent occasion, I can confidently assure you that your accusation is as utterly groundless as it is insulting. We had but one object in view & that object we stated in Parliament; to make it possible for the Church to head her missions to the Heathen, where it was judged expedient with English Bishops of English Consecration. But you proceed to state why you impute this duplicity to us. It is 'because the 5th Victoria Cap 6 had already given us the power we professed to want, only combined with an Oath which affirmed the Queen's Supremacy That we wished to establish an English Episcopate which should not acknowledge the Royal supremacy, & to effect this vast innovation had recourse to the acts of a Special pleading &c' Now the reason for your first charge & the inference you again draw from it are I am prepared to shew equally mistaken & uncharitable. Your reason is mistaken. For the Act 5 Vic: Cap 6 does *not* give us the power that we want. For it requires that in every case of a consecration under it The Queen should mark out the diocese in which the new Bishop was to officiate: & this She could only do in one of these ways. (1) as *in that act* giving authority to the Bishop to Minister within a certain prescribed district to her own subjects settled in it — which would not meet our case because our want was to constitute an Episcopate for Missions to the Heathen & not for British Subjects — or (II) The Crown must like the Papacy be supposed to have a power of Spiritual aggression & of mapping out Dioceses where it has no jurisdiction. We deny that any such power vests in our Crown — & *therefore* we turned to the Act of George III as coming nearer to our case. That Act allowed Foreigners to be consecrated for Foreign Service, we wished for an allowance of the consecration of British Subjects for Foreign Service. The Act of G III was therefore the most of the same subject matter & we amended *it*. Your *reason* then is untenable.

What then becomes of the *Charity* of your imputation. Is this let me ask you the temper which 'hopeth all things'. Is this the measure which you would wish meted to yourself. Is it not somewhat as if one said of you — Sir J. Stephen is the brother in law of Henry Venn — Henry Venn is the autocrat of the Ch. Missionary Society — He fears that any Missionary Bishops would supersede Ch. Missy Committees & his own secret power — He would therefore prevent an English Mission being headed by a Bishop, & he has called in Sir J Stephen to his aid to help by calumnious insinuations to defeat the Bill. I should have opposed Mr Venn & his brother in law if they had openly stated their purpose, but when they endeavour to accomplish by the Arts of the Special pleader I will oppose them more strongly than ever'. I am sure that you would feel keenly the injustice & the uncharitableness of any one imputing such conduct or such motives to you; but would it really be more unjust or more uncharitable than your imputations against the ArchBishops & Bishops of England because they sought for legal power to head a mission of their Church in Borneo with one of their own order. I speak not now of the mischief which has resulted from your movement. But I cannot but believe that the time will come when *you* at least will look with no satisfaction in the share you have had in preventing the Church of England where she desired to send her highest Ministers to spread the Gospel of Christ amongst the Heathen from obtaining the power needful for her doing so.

I ought to have said above that no one could be consecrated Bishop under this act who had not at his ordination as Deacon & Priest taken the Oath of Supremacy.

I have ventured to write to you on this matter with the perfect openness which becomes our old & I trust deep regard. I have not disguised from you that I [*sic*] I think your conduct in it wrong; but if there is one word in what I written [*sic*] which seems to you inconsistent with the regard & high esteem I entertain for you I beg you to forgive & to forget it.

I am, my dear Sir James Stephen, Very sincerely yours affly,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 201–3

486. To the Editor of 'The Guardian'[1] *(v 59)*

Private & Confidential

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 13, 1853

Sir,

I have read with great pain your article on 'Church Bills in Parliament' in your last number. You charge in it on The Bishops two faults as great reasons why our two bills failed — & you use about it *very* strong language — see the last sentence of your first paragraph. Your two charges are *first* that the Bills came into the lower house with none to answer for them *Second* That they came in so late. Now neither of these charges are borne out by fact. For the Col. Ch. Govt. bill — we were in communication with the Government as to the best mode of managing them in the House of Commons. We had actually secured Mr Walpoles consent to undertake the bill: Sir J Pakington to support: the Solicitor General to make the needful alterations[2] Lord J Russell to support it. Surely here was no neglect. But why then you ask was the bill unsupported? because unknown member unconnected with the bill moved the first reading, & fixed the second reading & managed to bring it on prematurely when both Mr Walpole & Sir J Pakington were absent from London.

Precisely the same trick was played with the Missionary Bishops bill at the very time when we were arranging according to the usual method for its parentage in the lower House.

Your other charge is that we were so late in bringing in these bills. But here too we were blameless. *We* were ready early in the Session — but it was essential that we should have the concurrence of the Government — & the whole delay was with it. I do not impute this as any fault. It was the press of Financial & Russian Matters which made the D of Newcastle, who acted heartily with us unable to obtain earlier the decision of the Cabinet. Now, Sir, it is so alien from your tone to depreciate the Bishops thus unfairly, & it must tend so much to put difficulties in the way of those amongst them who are earnestly endeavouring to get them to *act* together, if when they have as in this instance really laboriously & harmoniously acted they are to be attacked in such terms as those of your article not only by the daily news or the 'Record' but also by The Guardian, that I do earnestly trust you will in your next number undo the wrong impression you have I am sure unintentionally tended to create against them. You will not of course

1 *The Guardian* was a High Church weekly. Editorial responsibility was divided.

2 Spencer Walpole (1806–98) had been Home Secretary, and Sir John Somerset Pakington (1799–1880), later 1st Baron Hampton, was Secretary for War and Colonies in Derby's first Ministry the previous year. Sir Richard Bethell (1800–73), later 1st Baron Westbury, was Solicitor-General, 1852–6.

directly or indirectly compromise the confidence of this communication: it is an article of your own I want, as a matter of Justice. If you doubt the accuracy of my information you may test it by the opinion of the D of Newcastle or Mr Gladstone.

I am Sir, Very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

487. To the Bishop of Cape Town (R. Gray)[1] *(v 60)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 13, 1853

My dear Bishop,

I am very glad that you have sent the address to Lord A for signatures & I hope it may obtain them.

I wish I could talk to you as to this Bishopric of Grahams Town. I think Lloyds pressing family must be a hindrance & may mark out that he is not 'The Man' — & I speak therefore nothing about *him*. But I cannot help thinking that you make a great mistake in blending together the Bishops own income & the allowances for the Colonial Clergy: & then setting on the other side the sum they have to raise. The effect on my mind would be just what it is on Lloyd's that he is to go at minus £550 a year. The effect of this mode of putting it I think will be to prevent any but a rich, a rash, or a dishonest man undertaking the Charge. Nor can I think it well to subject the new made Bishop to an itineration. It is one for a Bishop known like you for his labours to come back & testify of what he has seen & gather Aid, & a widely different thing for a man going out at once to begin to collect.

I *fear* that the result of all this will be no bishops — *the* time slipping by & a heavier burden falling on you. You would I know have me speak to you with all openness & may God direct you.

I am ever affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

488. To the Rev. F. C. Trench[2] *(v 61)*

Private

Lavington, Aug. 22, 1853

My dear Friend,

I write to you again thus speedily in consequence of a statement made to me as to the gentleman who is filling your place at Reading. I do not remember your asking my leave to employ Mr Walker[3] but possibly this is my forgetfulness. I must request you however to give me the earliest intelligence as to (1) who he is (2) where he was last employed (3) whether I have consented to his taking your duty. I hear that he is an extemporè preacher: very impassioned in his action &

[1] Robert Gray (1809–72), P.C. of Whitworth, Co. Durham 1835–45, Stockton-on-Tees, 1845–7; Bishop of Capetown, 1847–72; assumed the title of Archbishop during the Colenso dispute (*DNB*).

[2] Francis Chenevix Trench (1805–86), P.C. of St. John's, Reading, 1837–56; R. of Islip, 1856–75 (*DNB*).

[3] Unidentified.

address; & exceedingly incautious in his Statements. If I have not consented already to his being employed in the Diocese I must prohibit his officiating again until I have been satisfied concerning him.

I am, my dear Friend, most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

In making any more permanent arrangement you must not forget to consult me *before* you agree with any one.

489. To John Marshall[1] (*v 62*)

Private

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 22, 1853

My dear Sir,

I thank you for your information concerning the Clergyman who is temporarily supplying Mr Trench's place. I have written to Mr Trench stating generally the fact of such a complaint having reached me & requesting information &c. I trust that it may not be needful for me to bring your name forward in connexion with this Charge & you may rely on my not doing so, unless unforeseen circumstances should compel me to produce my authority

I am my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

490. To Sir James Stephen (*v 63*)

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 22, 1853

My dear Sir James Stephen,

I only received your letter of the 17th on returning here from a day or two's excursion on Saturday after Post time — or I should sooner have replied to it. I thank you sincerely for the kindness of its tone; which induces me to trouble you with a few lines in addition on its subject.

I greatly regret that you did not obey the impulse of your feelings & send me your full answer: because that would doubtless have explained to me the reasons of your hostility to our bill; & as I cannot believe that, you, — whose opinions I so well know as to the duty & policy of Bishops acting in the foremost van of the Church's work of Evangelization both at home & abroad; — can be opposed to our *Object*, I should then have been better able, on some future occasion, to see how we might avoid, in securing what we in common desire, that which you wish to avoid. Still less can I understand how H Venn could be the main subject of your letter, since I only alluded to him & his connexion with the question to illustrate what appeared to me the unfounded charge contained in your letter to Mr Kinnaird.

As I gather from your reply that you have no copy of your letter to Mr Kinnaird I enclose a copy of it, which I will ask you to return to me. In its second sentence you will see that whilst it forbids its *formal* publication it specially permits its virtual publication 'in any other manner'. It was to this permission that I alluded.

You speak of having no intention of insulting the ArchB's & Bishops; because you did not know that any of them save the Bishop of Salisbury & myself had anything to do with it: & you could not mean to insult them; one a friend the other a stranger. As for me I am sure you meant nothing at variance with the long, unvaried, & undeserved kindness, you have always shewn me — as to the Bishop of S. you could, of course, intend nothing insulting. But *Ist* the newspapers stated

[1] Possibly John Marshall of 3 Eldon Sq., Reading, coal merchant.

that the bill was brought in by the ArchBishop who in bringing it in said that it was agreed to by All the bench — & that its sole object was to enable a Bishop of the Ch of E to head a mission. He was afterwards absent, on a confirmation, only because no opposition was expected to the Bill. All this was reported in the Papers. But further your letter to Mr Kinnaird speaks of it as having been introduced by 'the most reverend &c Person'. Further do the words of that letter justify my use of the word 'insulting' as to the way in which it speaks of the authors of the Bill?

I will ask you to weigh the words. 'Its professed object &c but this was not the real & true object'. 'Being said indirectly &c'. 'To have recourse to the arts of a special pleader' &c. 'I suppose that he was put by others into the hands of some attorney &c.' 'to aid the passage of the bill by any sort of dexterity'. Now to one who values, as I do, truth & straight forwardness far above all other things, such expressions as these do appear to be distinctly insulting, apply to whomsoever they may — nor (though you introduce a possible attorney) can I conceive that they can apply to any one else than the framers of the measure. For the supposed attorney could not desire by this detestable fraud to get rid of the subscription to the supremacy. The Record newspaper which with its accustomed vulgar effrontery of calumny (justifying your caustic remark concerning it that you preferred the Satirist because it had as much personal slander without the religious sauce) charges upon me & other Bishops that we deceived the feeble ArchBishop seems to me really only to put into plain language your insinuation. Those articles the Archbishop has characterized as 'execrable'. But I must ask you, who so well know men & the House of Commons, to weigh for yourself what must have been the effect of such a letter as this, not in the columns of an unscrupulous paper which exists by pandering to the depraved tastes of a gossip loving so-called 'religious public', but subscribed with your weighty name, handed about by a member of the House of Commons, & eagerly copied quoted & circulated by the numerous class to whom the insinuation of grossly unfair dealings against a high Church Bishop is sweet as the whisper against the virtue of an envied rival to Lady Teazle. Moreover that there was this peculiar force about such a letter, that not being published it could not be answered. But I leave this part of the subject; and once more ask you to reply to the main point of my former letter. You say that you object to this bill (I) because it allows of Bishops of English Consecration who shall not have subscribed with their Oath to the Queens Supremacy. IIly because it introduces this novelty by special pleading. Now I wish to repeat. I^st. that every one so consecrated *must* have taken previously this Oath. IIly that before he excercised any Episcopal Function *in* the Queens Dominions he must take it again. III. That out of Her Majestys Dominions She has no supremacy. IV That this bill was well weighed by *All* the Bishops, & seemed to us the only proper mode of enabling us to consecrate a British Subject to head a mission to the heathen — & as your objection lies quite aside from this our object, & is answered; I ask you (1) does your Objection to this bill cease? or if not (II) do you wish to defeat our one Object or if not will you suggest to me any way not open to such objections in which our object can be gained? We desire to send Sir J Brooke[1] a Bishop to head a Borneo Mission as Bishop of Sarawak. Is there any reason affecting Church or State why we should not have such a power? How but by our bill is it to be obtained?

I am ever, My dear Sir James Stephen, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 205–7

[1] Sir James Brooke (1803–68), first raja of Sarawak (*DNB*).

491. To the Editor of 'The Guardian' (*v 64*)
Private & Confidential

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 22, 1853

Sir,

Your kind reply of Aug 17 to my letter reached me only on Saturday night owing to my absence for a day or two hence. Believe me that I do full justice to the earnest desire of the Editor of the Guardian to be really 'true' — & that I fully appreciate the almost unsurmountable difficulties in your way. Will you let me add that if at any time you like confidentially to apply to me for information touching any such matters in progress I will always give you in confidence the best assistance I can.

I do not think that it would be at all fair in this case to transfer the blame to Walpole & Pakington. I believe they both meant fairly by us — I am sure W. did. *The* true hindrance was the lateness of the session, & that resulted solely from the insurmountable difficulty of getting the Cabinet decision sooner. *We* did not know of Brotherton's[1] having moved the bills. The ArchB: had left Town. I saw for him Walpole on *the Friday*. He agreed to take the bills (The Col Ch Gov) *if*[2] the Gover[t]. supported. *This* was only settled next day, Saty & he was out of London having heard from S Herbert that the matter might stand over for a day or two on the Tuesday. I do not therefore think that you ought to excuse *us* by blaming him. What I think you might say is this. That the Statement made in your article touching the lateness of the Session at which the two Church Bills were passed & their unsponsored state in the H of Commons as reflecting blame on the Bishops had led to your receiving full communications on the subject from quarters fully informed on the subject which had to your great gratification convinced you that what had appeared to be dilatoriness & carelessness had really not been so, but that the lateness of bringing in the bill which had led to the other confusion had been the result of causes for which the Bishops were in no sense responsible.

The real enemies of *Both bills* were the Ch. Missy. Authorities who feared that an organized Church & a presiding Bishop would interfere with their committocracy.

I am Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

492. To the Rev. C. Hewett[3] (*v 65*)

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 22, 1853

My dear Sir,

Your letter of the 13th reached me too late for post on Saturday the 20th

You have been misinformed as to the fact that I practise Table Turning. When the existence of such a power was first announced as an electrical phenomenon I in concert with many others tried whether the fact was so. But no table turning followed my manipulation — nor have I ever seen any experiment of the kind attended with the smallest effect save when it was manifest to me that the movement was the result of simple muscular power. As far therefore as my observation goes, I

[1] Joseph Brotherton (1783–1857), a pastor of the Bible Christian Church; Liberal M.P. for Salford, 1832–57 (*DNB*).
[2] Underlined twice.
[3] Unidentified.

should say that it was the work of the Evil Spirit only so far forth as all frauds are, & that this was rather a clumsy one.

I have heard nothing as to the Beckley Ghost but will enquire.

I agree with you in condemning Spirit rapping & all attempts at Witchcraft as lying impositions

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

493. To P. Rose[1] *(v 66)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 23, 1853

My dear Sir,

I have read carefully your correspondence with Mr Allan[2] & I am convinced that the engagement between Mr Allan & yourself distinctly binds him to maintain two services, a Sunday morning & an evening, by Mr Maugham[3] at Tylers Green (with the exception of the Sacrament Sunday): & make the afternoon assistance rendered at Hazlemere to be the addition, desireable if possible, to the first engagement. Mr Allan's letter to me, on the faith of which I licensed Mr M:, distinctly states the same thing. Under these circumstances, it is not possible for me to allow Mr Maugham to omit the Sunday morning service at Tylers Green (on those Sundays when the Holy Communion is not celebrated at Hazlemere) in order that he may continue to assist at the afternoon service at Hazlemere. I regret, as you doubtless do, that Mr Allan should not have this help. But this was not the ground of my licensing Mr M: & I require him to continue the full Services at Tylers Green. I shall be obliged by your shewing this to Mr Maugham as the authorized direction by which he is to act in this matter. I shall send a copy to A.

[*Unsigned*]

494. To the Rev. G. Allan *(v 67)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 23, 1853

My dear Sir,

Mr Rose has applied to me touching the Services of Mr Maugham at Tylers Green & at Hazlemere. I send you a copy of my reply to him.[4]

In your letter to me your expression is this 'It is intended that Mr M should reside at Tylers Green & *devote the whole of his time & attention to that hamlet taking two full Services on Sunday*' you then add the assistance he is to give you at Hazlemere. I regret that he should not be able to do both: but it is clear that you applied to me to license him for Tylers Green & not for Hazlemere. Moreover the arrangement as to the payment of his Salary by Mr Rose (whose sole care was Tylers Green) plainly proves that it was for Tylers Green he was licensed. I must therefore insist on the continuance of those services & cannot allow that his health not sufficing for his performing a third daily should lead to his dismissal.

I am, my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Philip Rose (1816–83) of Tylers Green, Penn, later 1st Bart.; solicitor, of the well-known firm of Baxter, Rose & Norton (*MEB*).
2 George Allan, P.C. of Hazlemere, 1851–89.
3 Henry Macdonald Maugham, C. of Hazlemere, 1853; V. of Whitstable, 1871 (O).
4 No. 493.

495. To the Rev. T. Saulez[1] *(v 68)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 23, 1853

My dear Sir,

I should wish in any such matter as that brought before me in your letter of the 12th (which only reached me on Saturday) to consult your wishes so far as I can consistently with my duty to the parish. If therefore the Clergyman to whom you refer is one whom I could originally select for Grazeley[2] I should be willing to allow of the exchange. I can say no more until I can see & converse with him.

I am, my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

496. To Sir James Stephen *(v 69)*

Lavington, Aug. 24, 1853

My dear James Stephen,

I thank you for your letter of yesterday.

Its candid admission of the liability of your words to the injurious construction which had pained me, & the fulness of your disavowal of that construction are all that I could have expected or desired from you. I could not complain of your thinking that our amending the former Act rather than the later was an error: nor of your thinking that a Bishop because he has received English consecration, ought to administer his Diocese under the Supremacy of the Crown of England, rather than under the Supreme ruler of the country in which his Bishopric is; — though I should differ from you on both points in Judgement. I only felt aggrieved at your seeming to charge us with fraudulently aiming at one thing whilst we asked ostensibly for another.

I heartily wish that we could talk freely over this whole matter: for I think that there still remains some unexplained ground of difference. For with my view of case, I do not now understand what that explanation was which you desiderated in the speech of the ArchBishop or myself or the Bishop of Salisbury (the only 3 who spoke) as to the Supremacy. We proposed to alter an act which allowed us to consecrate *non* British subjects to Bishoprics in Foreign lands so far as to allow us to consecrate British subjects, to like Bishoprics. The reason why those former Bishops took no oath of Supremacy was not because they were not British Born, for one not British Born appointed to an English Bishopric must take that Oath But because their Bishopric was not in a land where the English Crown possessed authority — & that Supremacy which in England was in the Crown would in America be in its highest Authorities.

In explaining therefore that we wished simply to extend in this one particular that Act it still seems to me that we said all. Yet your clear & subtle intelligence apprehends some great danger & a need of some full explanation on this point. Doubtless therefore there is much to weigh in it which escaped us in our frequent & very full discussions of the question. Can I persuade you to give me the great pleasure of receiving you here & letting us discuss this matter with the freedom of oral converse. I can shew you Beech woods surpassing in beauty even those which your Father so often opened at Missenden to Him whose birthday I am this day

[1] Theophilus Saulez, P.C. of Grazeley, 1850.

[2] A church had been erected at Grazeley in 1850; the ecclesiastical parish was set up in 1854.

keeping in glad & reverend memory:[1] & I hope I need not say that you shall be welcomed as your Fathers Son should be welcomed by mine, or as you should, by me.

I am sure that 2 days walks on our Downs & amongst our Woods would send you back better for your ordinary labour: expecially if as I hope you would bring Lady Stephen with you. Any days within the next *ten* would equally suit us. The S W train from Waterloo at 1 p m would bring you to Godalming: a daily Coach in communication with it bring you to Petworth 4 miles hence where my carriage shall await you on any day you will name.

I am, My dear James Stephen, Very sincerely yours affly,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 207

497. To the Rev. F. C. Trench (*v 70*)
Confidential

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 24, 1853

My Dear Trench,

I will reply to your letter with the friendly frankness for which I thank you in yours. Undoubtedly I acquit you in *taking* Mr Walker of all blame save for the unintended omission of consulting me before you introduced a stranger to officiate in the Diocese; & after your explanation of that I shall think no more of it. If I understand you right Mr Walker would naturally officiate only one more Sunday; & if so I will not put you to the inconvenience or him to the annoyance of having his intended ministrations on that day interrupted — only I must request you to communicate to him that before he officiates *elsewhere* in my Diocese I must, after the Reports of his Sermons which have reached me, have an interview with him. And further I must ask you to inform him that the reports of his Sermons which have been sent me go to prove either that he has used very unjustifiable language or that he has been much misapprehended by his Hearers. For that he has been understood to declare that 'the Ordinances of the Church are not Channels of Grace' that no special blessing rests on the appointed 'assemblings of ourselves together' for that prayer 'on the mountain top or desert' is equally effective & that the contrary of such propositions is to be condemned as 'Church prejudice' 'Churchisms' & the like

I am my dear Friend, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

498. To the Rev. F. C. Trench (*v 71*)

Lavington, Aug. 26, 1853

My dear Friend,

I did not write at once to Mr Walker because I thought it possible that you might in a less formal manner communicate with him. But in consequence of your letter received today, I have written to him; calling his attention to the matters named in my letters to you & forbidding *after Sunday next* his officiating until I am satisfied.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] The Bishop's father was born on 24 Aug. 1759.

499. To the Rev. S. Walker *(v 72)*

Lavington Petworth, Aug. 26, 1853

Rev. Sir,

I have received information that you are officiating in the Church of St Johns Reading, & on application to the Rev F Trench I find that this is the case. I trust that you have done this in ignorance of my rule that no stranger shall officiate more than three Sundays in my Diocese until he has communicated with & been approved by me. Further I am informed by a parishioner that in your Sermons in St John's Church, you have been understood to advance statements inconsistent with the Teaching of the Church of England: as for example; 'That the Ordinances of the Church are not Channels of Grace'. 'That there is no peculiar force or acceptance in prayers offered up in the Services of the Church for that solitary prayer in the desert or on the mountain top is just as good & acceptable' & that to hold the contrary of these propositions is 'Church prejudice' 'Churchism' &c. I shall be glad to hear any thing you may wish to say to me in explanation of or reply to these complaints, & also as to your unlicensed officiating in my Diocese; & I feel it my duty to add that unless & until I shall have been satisfied by such explanations I inhibit you from officiating in my Diocese after Sunday next August the 28th & until I shall remove such inhibition.

I remain Rev. Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

500. To the Bishop of London (C. J. Blomfield) *(vi 10)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Oct. 26, 1853

My dear Lord,

I venture to trouble you with the accompanying letters: one from myself to Professor Maurice, the other from him to me because I think that they have a most important bearing on the question which is to come before the Council of King's College tomorrow.[1]

My own belief has been throughout that Professor Maurice is entirely orthodox; but that (1) the wish to meet the objections of others and (2) the fear of shrinking from any personal consequences of the avowal of his opinion (3) a want of clearness of expression; has given an appearance of unsoundness to his book. It appears to me that his reply to my letter strikingly confirms my view. Now I think that his declaration of his opinions on the matter selected for reprehension ought to be in your hands before any step is taken.

I will venture to say further that I think it difficult to over-estimate the importance of any step in the matter. If Professor Maurice is called on to resign his professorship for unsoundness of teaching; will it be possible to rest there? Can an unsound man be left to lecture at Lincoln's Inn? Must not the matter be followed up in the ecclesiastical courts? Would they confirm the judgement of the Council? At least ought not the Council to appoint a committee of Divines to

[1] Frederick Denison Maurice (1805–72), Prof. of English Literature and History at King's College, London, 1840–53, was one of the most significant Anglican theologians of the nineteenth century; he lost his Chair because of his *Theological Essays* in 1853, became Warden of a Working Men's College, and finally Knightsbridge Prof. of Casuistry, Moral Theology and Moral Philosophy at Cambridge (*DNB*). His works, especially *The Kingdom of Christ* (1837) are now enjoying a belated recognition. The question raised in the *Theological Essays* was whether belief in an eternity of punishment for the wicked was really compatible with belief in a loving and all-powerful God. Modern untheological opinion would warmly support Maurice, but clearly it is not a matter on which either orthodoxy or truth can be plainly established. Blomfield was involved in the dispute as Visitor of King's College as well as Bishop.

report on the book; express its erroneous teaching in propositions; and hear Mr. Maurice in his own defence before it pronounces such a censure; a censure which will represent the Church of England as defining very narrowly in a difficult question of terms whilst it leaves open such broad questions as the doctrine of baptism.[1] I am sure that you will on so important a matter forgive an old member of the Council of King's College for taking the liberty of communicating with you freely on the subject. I will only add in conclusion that I greatly regret the publication of much in this volume because I think that it seems to unsettle what I am sure Professor Maurice would wish to have most firmly settled; but that this regret appears to me quite compatible with the doubts I have expressed in this letter.

I am, most sincerely yours, my dear lord,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 214–15

501. To the Bishop of London (C. J. Blomfield) (*vi 11*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 8, 1853

My dear Lord,

I am sincerely obliged to you for your very kind letter and for the attention you so considerately extended to the considerations I have ventured to urge on you touching this painful matter. I am sure that you will understand my saying a few words more upon it, not in the least from any desire of arguing the matter out, but simply with a view, if possible, of yet bringing it to the best conclusion possible.

But before I speak of this will you let me say a word on the matters you speak of discussing with the Archbishop — and on The Missionary Bishops Bill. I trust that you will not take for granted that the present act *is* available, without a very complete legal opinion. My objection is not to the Jerusalem Bishopric appointment. I have never joined in condemning it. I think that what the late Archbishop and you agreed to in that case was in the present state of the Church defensible because it dealt with countries in which the Queen had subjects, and by a legal fiction a Diocese might therefore in that case be defined as extending over the subjects of the Crown situated within certain limits. My objection is that this cannot apply to Missionary Bishoprics amongst people where the Queen has no jurisdiction.[2] I feel that to abandon that Bill now would be to make ourselves simply ridiculous and that we need have no difficulty as to carrying such a bill as was lost last Session through coming before the House of Commons so late.

II. As to Cathedral meetings.[3] I am engaged *daily* until the 11 Nov. — that day would suit me best and the next best Thursday 17th, but I shall of course attend any summons.

[1] A reference to the Gorham Judgement, in which the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration had been left open by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. As the latter firmly refused to define doctrine, Wilberforce's doubts were justified. But Maurice accepted his dismissal.

[2] Attempts to obtain authority from Parliament to consecrate Bishops as missionaries in areas outside the Empire failed repeatedly, either because of Evangelical suspicion that this was a move to strengthen the High Church party, or because of legal objections that the Crown could confer no jurisdiction outside its own dominions. It was ultimately the Colenso case which liberated the colonial churches from legal jurisdiction, and made missionary bishoprics possible. The Jerusalem Bishopric Act of 1842 was an attempt at ecumenical co-operation with the Prussian Church. Bishops were to receive Anglican Orders and Consecration, but were to be alternately English and Prussian subjects.

[3] I.e. meetings of the Cathedrals Commission, the report of which was well-informed on the anomalous position of Wilberforce's own Cathedral.

And now if you will allow me to ask you to weigh another word or two as to Maurice I would say (1) that I do not think that by its present step the Council *has* avoided pronouncing a theological opinion. It has declared his theological teaching 'of dangerous tendency' and that on [a] long and carefully drawn up argument of the Principal's[1] to prove his teaching on one point heretical. Now I do not wish to say how far I do or [do] not agree in what you say as to this or other parts [of] this Book: because the argument is not as [to] its truth or falsehood, but as to the rightness [of] the Council of King's College to give such a decision on a Theological point — and then (II) I would ask you to consider in what position you place Maurice. If instead of leaving Dr. Jelf's argument in the hands of the Council and deciding on that, that the teaching was of dangerous tendency, the Council had decided that it was dangerous to the College to have as a Theological Professor a man of so speculative a mind, and whom so many distrusted I should have advised M. at once to resign; because the Council is the proper judge of such questions of expediency. It might or might not be hard on one to whom the Principal had tendered (and selected by himself) the post; (he being then as well known as now) to drive him from it, but I cannot doubt that he ought to have submitted and would have done so at once. But if he now submits on a censure of his doctrine must he not (1) admit that the Council had a right to decide on doctrine to the injury of the Church of England and (2) admit that it has a right to require its Professors to accept on matters not defined by the Church of England the Principals definitions as the condition of their continuing to teach — to the great injury of the Professors.

You will see I hope that my argument does not turn upon whether the Council should or should not have retained M., still less on their motives: but simply upon this whether on the issue on which it is now placed it is not a Theological decision.

You will know whether it is now too late, if this be so, to take *distinctly* and unmistakeably the ground of saying, we do not pronounce on this point in dispute either that the Principal is right or Mr. Maurice is right; but we are convinced that the existence of such differences implies a state of things which must be fatal to the College of which we are the Council: and therefore we request Mr. Maurice for the interests of the College to resign his Professorship. I suggest this assuming your conclusion that his continuance in it is impossible.

I am thankful to hear that the non-summoning of the Bishop of Lichfield[2] has been satisfactorily explained.

I shall be very pleased to be, as you so . . .

[*Last page completely illegible*]

502. To the Superior of the House of Mercy, Clewer (Mrs. Monsell)[3]

Confidential (*vi 12*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 27, 1853

My dear Mrs. Monsell,

I have most carefully weighed and re-weighed the subject of your last letter and I have come in my own mind to the clear conclusion that if you can be happy

1 Richard William Jelf (1798–1871), Canon of Christ Church, 1830–71, Proctor in Convocation for the Chapter, Principal of King's College, London, 1844–68. A High Churchman of similar views to those of Wilberforce, and an active member of Convocation (*DNB*).

2 John Lonsdale (1788–1867), Bishop of Lichfield, 1843–67 (*DNB*).

3 Harriet Monsell (nee O'Brien) (1812–83) was Superior of the House of Mercy at Clewer, 1852–75; her husband had died in 1851 (*MEB*). For Clewer, cf. nos. 439, 480.

in your work without any habitual confessor consulting me as one who will strive to advise you to the best of his power for yourself as well as for your work, that I shall be most happy to abide by that arrangement. I am led to desire this not quite by what you express in your letter; but by what I think your woman's instinct really [needs]. For it is not because I think it can involve me in more difficulties simpliciter. For if I were sure that it were right and best for you to practise confession I think that it would be unfaithful in me for such a reason not to receive it. But the real entanglement and possible injury of my receiving it arises hence: that you would not come to it and I receive it in the same mind: and that others would naturally conclude that I received as you practised it. You would practise it in the belief that its periodical habitual use was a blessing to the healthy soul. I should receive it solely because I understood that without it you could not quiet your own conscience. When used thus I do not doubt its being a means of Grace. I feel equally convinced in my own mind that its habitual use is mischievous — mischievous in many ways and as part of a mischievous system. That it enfeebles the [moral] and distinguishing powers of the conscience — [I] say nothing about the evil of enforced confession because there I believe we agree: but if *I* were to admit you to habitual confession not because your conscience was specifically burdened and did positively need the relief of God's [ordinance] but because you thought it a wholesome habit for the soul it would become almost a [necessity] with the Sisters. Our whole system would soon come to be based upon it: and all the evils which I believe to flow from it would mark our body. *Now* without making an absolute rule against it as to those who have fallen into the practice we can do what is possible to discourage it, and the effect of your example in this direction would be greater and greater; but this would be absolutely impossible if you practised it. Moreover the difficulty of practically excluding one particular [influence] would be enormously increased. If then you can bring yourself to act in this matter [wherein you are] engaged with me I shall be most thankful: and I feel perusaded that He to whom you will make the sacrifice will even if I am wrong in my views make up abundantly to you what you will give up for His work.

Will you send me a single line by return here. I shall be able to see you after the meeting on Tuesday in any way you may fix with Carter.

I am my dear Mrs. Monsell, Very affectionately Yours,

S. Oxon.

503. To the Rev. W. R. Fremantle (*vi 13*)
Confidential

Cuddesdon, Nov. 28, 1853

My dear Fremantle,

Though I have not seen the article to which you refer, yet I will not delay a post in replying to your letter. The *information* on which the article is founded was sent by myself. I saw their paragraph stating in effect that there had been a large resignation of the Old Rural Deans of the Diocese from dissatisfaction at my proceedings when I was in Oxford one day last week, and knowing this statement to be utterly unfounded and seeing that it might be mischievous in the Diocese I at once wrote and requested the Editor to retract the statement. I have no copy of my letter; but I feel certain that I confined myself simply to a contradiction of that assertion than which nothing could be more simply false. For no one of the late resignations had anything to do with dissatisfaction.

Now my dear Friend I do not see how any of this *can* touch you.

First because you have not resigned, and secondly because you are not one of the Rural Deans referred to, the '*Old* Rural Deans' but one who kindly undertook the office at my own request. But of course what you say is quite true, and a Rural Dean must no more be compromised than a Bishop, and if you therefore will kindly state *exactly* to me anything you think needful and will send it to me I will if necessary send such an explanation: for of course if wrong statements have been founded on my communication the explanation ought to come from me.

And now my dear Fremantle let me with the freedom we have always used to each other make one or two remarks on other parts of your letter which have given me pain.

First I really do not know to what you mean to allude when you speak of 'the relation in which I stand to several Rural Deans.' If you only mean that constituted as men are it must happen that they may not approve of all that I do, or see all matters exactly as I do; of course I assent at once to the truth of the proposition. I know e.g. that neither Mr. Broughton[1] or Mr. Wroth or Mr. Harrison[2] liked the Rural Chapters — wherein by common worship and discussion I sought to bring the clergy into greater harmony.[3] I know that you dislike my helping the cause of the Colonial Church but I do not believe that such diversities of view can be avoided without the loss of that liberty which distinguishes our Church; and I do not think that their existence ought in any degree to separate us if we are only convinced that, within the liberties granted to us by our Church, we are each honestly and earnestly endeavouring to serve our common Master. This conviction has been the rule of my conduct ever since I came to this Diocese; and I think that it is the rule by which I may expect my Clergy who differ from me in many points to govern their conduct towards me. When for instance I have been with you, I have endeavoured to the utmost of my power to throw myself into your system, and to aid your plans for working your parish and (never hiding from you points of difference) I have endeavoured to give you in your work the full support of your Bishop's office.

II. What you say about my intended institution[4] here pained me.

1. You say that I know that from the first you objected to it. I really am entirely ignorant of what you refer to or how I was to know your feelings about it: I rather think that we talked about it and that you expressed some doubt of its success; but even of this I am not certain.

2. You say that nothing but the desire to maintain peace has restrained you from taking active steps to influence public opinion in that direction. Now I heartily thank you for having the peace of the Diocese at heart and for the result it has in this instance led to. But my dear friend surely other ties ought to have constrained you to the same course. If the Bishops office be of God: if the Ordination promise and Institution Oath mean anything then such passages of Gods Word as Heb. XIII. 17. Rom. XII. 19, Rom. XII, 16, I Pet. II, 13–14, must apply to the connection between a Bishop and his clergy: and if so a clergyman must *sin* who

1 Thomas Delves Broughton (1801–59), nephew of the 8th Bt.; R. of Bletchley, 1832–59 (O).

2 John Harrison, Rural Dean of Wendover I (see no. 121).

3 Wilberforce was one of the first bishops to use his Rural Deans as regular channels of communication between himself and his diocese. Differing opinions may still be held about the value of periodic meetings of clergy for discussion, but they are now universal.

4 Cuddesdon Theological College, which was resented by Low Churchmen as separating the training of the clergy from the universities, and as putting the young men too much under the allegedly Tractarian eye of the Bishop at his Palace nearby.

opposes his Bishop publickly in the administration of his Diocese on any matter which is not so vital as to suspend for the time by a direct appeal from the conscience to God all lower obligations. Now surely this rule ought to have led you to the course you have adopted. For what is the case.

If you had been called on by me to aid in establishing an institution for training men for the Ministry and you believed in your conscience that they were better untrained, or that our Church was so corrupt that to place that training in connection with her Bishops was sinful, it would of course have been a wrong infringement of your Christian liberty if *I* had expected you to aid in the work. But if I as Bishop believe it to be my duty to found such an institution, and do not ask you to help, and indeed ask for no public help at all, and you had stepped forward publickly to oppose my doing what in my province I had thought right, would not you be doing very much the same as if one of your assistants in your parish publickly opposed some scheme of yours for doing good in which he was not asked to join.

Now I have entered at length on this because your letter seems to imply 1st that no such obligations exist between us (in which case as it appears to me we should be really on a presbyterian regime of Church government only with Bishops kept not to govern the Church but simply to do certain acts viz. ordinations and confirmations); and IIly that I am on some terms of estrangement with yourself and others of which I know and feel nothing.

So entirely has your letter taken me by surprize that one of my first feelings when I read that lying paragraph which the Record had inserted, and which would have described a disorganised Diocese, and which charged me with 'ignoring the Church Missionary Society' & 'having degraded Evangelicalism' &c., I was on the point (remembering a conversation we once had about the Record) of writing to you and asking you to answer it. I should indeed be grieved if anything parted me from you or from many other good men whom I love for themselves and their works sake although there are important matters on which we differ.

I am ever most truly yours affectionately,

S. Oxon.

504. To the Rev. T. Farley *(vi 14)*
Confidential

Cuddesdon, Nov. 28, 1853

My Dear Dr. Farley,

I did not wish to mix the question of the Curate with that of Mr. Strickland,[1] and I had not time the other day to enter on the matter. But I am very desirous of speaking unreservedly to you upon the subject. It so happens that within the last 10 days Mr. Strickland had in a letter to me expressed his great regret for the terms on which he and you were now living. This had led to my offering my good offices to procure a full reconciliation, which he gladly accepted, and to put me in possession of the whole case sent me a copy of the whole correspondence between himself and you. Now my dear Sir, I am sure that you will bear with me when I say plainly to you that I think that correspondence puts you plainly in the wrong. I do not say that you had not met with vexations and disappointments at his hands; but I think that your letters were in many respects very provoking and

[1] Walter Strickland (1804–70), nephew of the 6th Bart; of Cokethorpe Park (in Standlake).

when you call upon him 'to retract the false statement that he made' you did what no gentleman will ever suffer another to do to him. It is quite plain to me that Mr. Strickland, misinformed probably by his agent, believed that you had made the demand when he said that you had; and that your proper course would have been to convince him that herein injustice was done to you. Now my dear Dr. Farley I am very anxious to bring you and Mr. Strickland to a Christian amity — your separation is a grievous injury to the parish and must lead both him and you into sin. We must remember whose ministers we are: that we represent before our lay brethren *HIM* who when he was reviled reviled not again when He suffered HE threatened not; and we must show to them a more excellent way and bear meekly with provocations and be ready rather to surrender our rights than to lose our brother.

Now then my dear Friend will you let me undertake this work of mediation?

I will propose as terms 1st that you in writing state distinctly that you withdraw the charge of wilful falsehood; II That this being done as to all the rest of the correspondence you and he regard it as never having existed. III That as to Cokethorpe Chapel he at his expence cover the windows externally with proper wirework so that no cattle can injure them, and IV It is my earnest advice that you leave other matters of [revenue] where they are. I am sure you will be happier if you let me thus act the peacemaker.[1]

[*Unfinished*]

505. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon

(*vi 15*)
Dec. 24, 1853

My dear Mr. Paddon,

Believe me that I do not doubt your earnest wish to do your duty in your parish: but I must with entire openness tell you as in God's sight that your language of satisfaction as to the state of things in it is to me the most painful voice that I can hear. Indeed, indeed this is not so. I doubt not that you have in it souls who have profitted under your ministry; — nay I doubt not you have some personally attached to you. But you have no real hold on that great Parish; the Church of which you are the Minister is barely tolerated in it; its Schools, its Ministry, its social position are all weak and tottering.[2] Since Mr. Bellis[3] went things have got worse. Mr. Poulter is not heard in Church and is not allowed to visit, so that in fact there has been but one Clergyman. Honestly and as in the sight of God I assure you that I believe the Parish to be beyond your strength. Would to God you could exchange it and place there the hardworking parochial minister who could get a real hold on the people and under God's help save their souls.

1 Farley set himself against Strickland 'as a low Churchman foe to the University &c' but in February 1854 the Bishop 'brought the quarrel to a peaceful termination and received F's thanks' (Diocese Book, II, p. 191).

2 The relationship between Paddon and his Bishop was extremely stormy. Paddon's inefficiency antagonised the Bishop more than his low Churchmanship. The number of confirmation candidates increased from 30 to 120 during his absence in 1856; in 1857 he supported the nonconformist British and Foreign Schools Society rather than the National Society, and the Bishop preached for the National Society while Paddon was away; some of the laity were ready to bribe him to stay away longer and let Wilberforce nominate curates. But things seem to have settled down by 1862. See Diocese Book, II, pp. 591, 606, 612 and insertions.

3 Richard Bellis, A.K.C. C. of High Wycombe, 1849–53; incumbent of St. James' Chapel, St. Helier, Jersey, 1853–68 (C).

The next best thing I believe would be that you should put in as you wished for 3 years a really good man: make him responsible, your responsibility, *for that period*, being exhausted in his selection; and let him work his own work. No man worth having will take such a post to be continually interfered with, and therefore I say again, for the three years, give up the matter to him. A resident incumbent ought to direct all. An absent incumbent can only do mischief by attempting to do it. He destroys his Curate's responsibility; and he thwarts his plans; without being present to work out his own.

Now once more I advise and entreat you. Withdraw *wholly* for these 3 years of necessary rest & I will suggest one more Curate who I am *sure* will suit you: The Rev. E. Geare,[1] now Curate of Abingdon. He is of the Evangelical School; a very hard working man used to a large Parish. Secure him three years possession, if all goes well; proper pay and proper help; and in death and in Judgement you will rejoice that you believed in this your Bishop's Counsel.

[*Unfinished*]

506. To the Rev. T. Curme (*vi 16*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 24, 1853

My dear Sir,

I have received from the Rev. J. Burrows Rector of Steeple Aston[2] a complaint of your interference in his parish.

He has sent me the correspondence which has passed on the subject and prays for the interposition of my authority as Diocesan. I have laid the correspondence before the Chancellor of the Diocese and desired him to state the law of the question for your guidance. He says. 'A systematic interference such as Mr. Curme seems to threaten with the ministrations of the incumbent to whom the cure of souls throughout the Parish has been confided by law would render Mr. Curme liable to be proceeded against by monition or otherwise.'

I cannot but think that on reflection you will see that such a course is really subversive of the very principle of a fixed territorial pastoral charge. For it is not by any means the mere act of administering the Sacrament which is a ministerial act: when we in virtue of our commission as ambassadors of Christ read and expound His Gospel and pray with others we are 'fulfilling our ministry'. Now *in* our parishes we have a special authority which other men have not, *because* we are invested with this character; but then it is the correllative [*sic*] of having this character that *we* cannot do these acts except in a ministerial sense. Laymen have less power and more liberty — a man clothed with any official character cannot do the acts which belong to that office with the freedom of those in whom they are not official acts. When therefore you do these acts in the Parish committed to his charge you are undertaking to do his duty and are therefore interfering with his official rights.

[1] Edward Geare (1814–?), C. of Stanford in the Vale, 1838; chaplain of the Abingdon Bridewell 1851, Abingdon Union, 1855; C. of Abingdon and Marcham 1855, Woodstock 1857–60 (where apparently he fell out with the Duke of Marlborough); V. of St. George's, Wolverhampton, 1872 (O).

[2] Joseph Burrows (1783–1862), Fellow of Brasenose, 1809–33; R. of Steeple Aston, 1832–62. The Bishop had a good deal of trouble persuading him to keep a curate (see nos. 550, 562) and no doubt his inefficiency was at the root of Curme's 'interference' in the parish.

I am most anxious that no breach of the peace and harmony which should exist between neighbouring clergymen should result from your conduct herein — and I earnestly trust that this appeal to you from your Diocesan will lead to your giving me the assurance that for the future you will abstain from what is legally punishable and in my Judgement contrary to your duty.[1]

I am my dear Sir, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

507. To the Rev. T. Farley *(vi 17)*

Cuddesdon, Dec. 24, 1853

My dear Dr. Farley,

I can only hope to succeed in my mediation between yourself and Mr. Strickland if I receive from you the fullest and most peace-seeking support.

I. Now you ask as the condition of retracting the charge of *Falsehood* against Mr. S. that he should withdraw the charge that you demanded your rent charge before he received his rents. Now I do not think this an equitable condition. Mr. Strickland says with perfect fairness, I advanced the charge on the information of one I am accustomed to believe and who offered to affirm it on oath. I do not quarrel with Dr. Farley for denying it: but I complain of the insult of being charged with *Falsehood* and I must require the withdrawal of this insult, *in limine.* This removed I am quite ready to enter on the disproof of the charge; and when it is disproved to withdraw it; but it is not just to require me to withdraw as unfounded a charge, in order to obtain the withdrawal of the insult.

Surely, my dear Sir, he is entirely right here and you will on reflection have no hesitation in withdrawing this charge of Falsehood.

II. Mr. Strickland allows that as Rector of Cokethorpe you are possessed of the Chancel in that Chapel and that you have therefore an undeniable claim on him for his occupation thereof. This claim he will gladly meet by paying any reasonable annual rent that I may fix: but he objects to paying the rent-charge and the law clearly leaves this to his own choice.

III. He disclaims all responsibility as to the public house; it belongs he says to Mr. Lee *your agent*[2] — it was licensed at his request and as he understood the license to drink beer on the premises was not to be asked for after the enclosure works were finished. Mr. Strickland wishes that the house had lost this right, but the matter rests with Mr. Lee, and he, Mr. S., has no power to compel him.

IV. He sincerely desires to be on friendly terms with you.

Now my dear Sir, all this I am bound in simple truthfulness to say appears to me to be very reasonable: and I most earnestly hope that you will see it in the same light and so enable me to succeed in the blessed attempt of making peace between two, who never ought to have been divided.

I am my dear Dr. Farley, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Curme was a vigorous Evangelical opponent of most of the Bishop's public activities (cf. esp. no. 524). In reply to this letter he 'charges the Chancellor with "lying" & me with uttering a lie, writes a most contumelious reply to my letter. God forgive him and teach me how to deal with such gainsayers'. After a long talk following a confirmation, the Bishop hoped he had restored friendly relations. Dr. Guest, a parishioner, 'speaks well of his work in the parish but says he is sadly exciteable' (Diocese Book, II, p. 420).

[2] Thomas Lee, solicitor, of Ducklington (Gardner's *Oxon. Directory* (1852), p. 630).

508. To the Rev. S. Sendall[1] *(vi 19)*

Private

Dec. 26, 1853

Rev. and Dear Sir,

I have received from your respected Vicar[2] a statement that he desires you to leave on Lady day in consequence of your being in debt to many of the parishioners and others.

I shall be happy to hear from you any counterstatement you may wish to make before I decide as to his application.

I remain Rev. and Dear Sir, Very truly Yours,

S. Oxon.

509. To the fourth Earl of Aberdeen *(vi 20)*

Cuddesdon, Dec. 27, 1853

My dear Lord Aberdeen,

May I ask you to allow me to see you as to this approaching meeting of Convocations? And may I further ask, whether it would suit you as well to see me at a little before 10 on Wednesday January 4, as at any other time; since on that day I come to London for a few hours and it would save me a special journey if the time were perfectly convenient to you.[3]

I am, my dear Lord Aberdeen, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

510. To the Rev. J. Penson[4] *(vi 21)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 27, 1853

My dear Sir,

I write to you on a subject which I approach with reluctance and only under a strong sense of duty. The information which in reply to enquiries I have received convinces me that it is essential to the highest interests of your parish that you should at once have the assistance of a Curate. The infirmities of age come through God's merciful appointment so very gradually upon a robust man that he is generally the last to perceive their increasing effect — & it is therefore highly probable that you may hardly be aware to what a degree the slow march of age has lessened your own powers of Service. But I trust that this is a matter as to which you may not be unwilling to act upon the Judgement of your Bishop.

I am my dear Sir, Most truly Yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] See no. 511.

[2] J. F. Grantham (O).

[3] A conformist himself, Aberdeen tried to heal the breach in the Church of Scotland 1841–3. He was very suspicious of the movement to revive Convocation, but Wilberforce's friendship with his son Arthur Gordon, who acted as Private Secretary to the Prime Minister, was used to smooth the way for longer sittings; and here the Bishop very respectfully seeks an opening for his own diplomacy.

[4] John Penson (1770–1858), Chaplain of Christ Church, 1793; R. of St. Peter le Bailey, Oxford, 1800–56; V. of Brize Norton, 1805–58. 'Wrote to him to urge as mildly as I can the need of a curate. I hear that all is going to ruin for want of one. He has Hallifax, who leaves him from family outgrowing house 1857 . . . He leaves it to my appointment. I offer it to numbers . . . ' (Diocese Book, II, p. 92). Joseph Hallifax (O) was presumably the curate mentioned.

511. To the Rev. S. Sendall[1] *(vi 18)*

Dec. 30, 1853

Rev. Sir,

As I find that you are quite unable to contradict your Vicar's statement that you have since you came to Cookham incurred many debts in the neighbourhood which you have no hope of paying; and as such conduct must wholly destroy your ministerial usefulness there, I cannot see that I have any other course than to acquiesce in his wish that you

[*Unfinished*]

512. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(vi 22)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 3, 1853 [*sic*]

My dear Mr. Paddon,

I am distressed in two respects by a letter which I have just received from Mr. Paul.[2]

I. Because I think he has just grounds to complain of your treatment of him having engaged him for six weeks with a promise of furnished apartments in the parsonage and then trying to get rid of him by telling him that he must have blankets, crockery, etc. This perpetual trouble as to money matters with your Curates is very distressing in one professing a high standard of personal religion. Of course Mr. Paul must be maintained for 6 weeks in strict accordance with your advertisement: nor shall I allow any other curate to interfere with him during that term. But

II. I am deeply distressed by finding that you wrote to Mr. Paul stating that you wanted a curate who would preach particular redemption.[3] Now I am so entirely convinced that this doctrine is not the teaching of the Church of England, and that anyone who took your curacy under such an arrangement would be unfit for the cure that I must decline to license any person who has entered into such an engagement; and I must at once ask you to inform me whether the gentleman you now wish to nominate is in this category.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Probably Simon Sendall (1795–1871), licensed as C. of Cookham 15 March 1853, Venn, however, states that Sendall was C. of Langham, Suffolk, 1841–5, St. John's. Portland, Dorset, 1852–4, and Scremby, Lincs., 1857–64; he became P.C. of Scampston, Yorks., in 1865 — the net income being £80. This curt letter illustrates the weakness of the curates' position compared with that of incumbents, many of whom had to leave their parishes for debt, but still retained their freehold until such time as they had cleared their debts (for an extreme case, cf. no. 611); whilst Sendall's career — if we have correctly identified him — also shows how little a clergyman without family connections or private means could hope for in terms of a career in the nineteenth century. It was in order to have means of rewarding the deserving that Wilberforce sought to accumulate patronage. His views may be studied in his *Essays*, II, 84–114.

2 Probably John Paul (1816–83), a native of Chinnor, who after holding curacies in Wilts. and Worcs. became R. of St. Helen's and of St. Alban's, Worcester, in 1870 (O). He was not licensed to High Wycombe.

3 A form of the doctrine of predestination, denying the efficacy of the atonement for all who wished to avail themselves of it, but restricting it to those elected by God. The Bishop is perhaps nearer to the mind of the Church today than he is to the Thirty-Nine Articles.

513. To the Rev. J. Paul (*vi 23*)
Jan. 3, 1854

My dear Sir,

I am much distressed by your statement. I have written by this post to Mr. Paddon to say

(1) that I think he has behaved very ill to you,
(2) That I shall allow no other curate to interfere with you during your six weeks
(3) That I will license no one who has engaged to preach particular redemption.

I shall be obliged by your taking no steps as to resigning the curacy without consulting me.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

514. To the Rev. C. W. Dinsdale[1] (*vi 24*)
Jan. 3, 1854

Rev. Sir,

You will oblige me by informing me whether Mr. Paddon has required you to preach particular redemption and if so the words of your reply to him.

I am, Rev. Sir, Your faithful servant,

S. Oxon.

515. To the Rev. W. Bell[2] (*vi 25*)
Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 3, 1854

Rev. and Dear Sir,

Before I reply positively to the question whether I will license you to Mr. Littlehale's curacy[3] I must ask you to state to me whether you will give me your word that you will not whilst resident at your Curacy indulge in Field Sports.

I am, Rev. & Dear Sir, Very Faithfully Yours,

S. Oxon.

516. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon (*vi 26*)
Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 7, 1853 [*sic*]

My dear Mr. Paddon,

You do me great injustice in supposing that I am ready to entertain charges against you, or that I do not heartily return the good will you have always expressed and shown to me. But how does the case stand? Mr. Paul sends me a whole correspondence showing that having offered him a furnished house and certain stipend you afterwards wrote to him that he will be put to great expences in hiring blankets crockery etc., keeping up fires, etc. I cannot but say that *on*

1 Probably Charles Waterland Dinsdale, of Trinity College, Dublin, who held curacies in the Manchester diocese, and at Brightlingsea, Sussex, before becoming V. of Priddy, Somerset, in 1862. He was not licensed to High Wycombe.

2 William Bell, R. of Lillingstone Dayrell from 1854 to his death in 1868 (C). He served as a magistrate, and quarrelled with his colleagues in 1859. The arrangement here was an interim one: he was licensed to the curacy in March, and instituted to the living in July 1854.

3 Joseph Gascoyne Littlehales (1775–1854), R. of Shalstone 1822–54, Lillingstone Dayrell 1840–54 (O).

this statement, as I have told Mr. Paul, I think you have used him very ill: he asks moreover what he is to do; another curate being sent down to take the place he is come to occupy; I have been compelled *at once* and without waiting as I should wish to have done to hear from you, to say to him that I shall maintain him for his six weeks; and that as to any particular requirements of doctrine, I should license no curate who had made an engagement to preach particular redemption and that he himself was to take no steps without consulting me. Now all this I say to him *on his statement*: being compelled by your sending down Mr. Hall[1] to supersede him to act, without being able to wait for your answers. Why do you force me to do what I so dislike doing? However I at once wrote to you hoping for some satisfactory explanation, but I grieve to say that your letter just received gives me none. You admit in fact all Mr. Paul's charges. It is quite impossible not to see from your second letter about the fires from sunrise to dark; and 'when do you go?' that you really did wish to drive him out. Then as to preaching particular redemption — I understand you to say that one of these curates *is* to preach it: and I can only repeat that I will not knowingly license any curate to preach that 'God's Son' did *not* 'redeem me and all mankind' any more than I would to preach transubstantiation. You may most certainly believe that I return to you every kind feeling that you express to me; but this cannot make me less than just to another or ready to admit into a parish, doctrine which the Church of England has adjudged to be 'strange and contrary to God's word' and which I have promised to drive away. You speak again in this letter as if I had refused to receive [Mr. Mangat[2]] on account of his doctrinal views; I think I have already told you that I did so because I believed him not to be up to the duties of the Post.

Believe me that I do heartily wish that consistently with truth and duty I could please you better in this matter. Mr. Hall too has written for an immediate answer 'by return of Post' and I have told him that I can allow him to officiate at Wycombe only under Mr. Paul during his six weeks.

I am most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

517. To the Rev. T. Farley (*vi 27*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 7, 1854

My Dear Dr. Farley,

Perfect openness is the only chance for an honest negotiation between others; and you must therefore let me say to you that your last letter sadly disappointed me. I will not enter upon the question of whether you might take the ground you do on the mere question of absolute right: but I am quite certain that it is one quite inconsistent with making peace; which I have all along taken for granted is your real object. For in fact you require Mr. Strickland to concede everything and to receive nothing: and no such difference was ever adjusted on such terms. For you request as the *condition* of withdrawing an insult that Mr. Strickland should acknowledge that he has not kept his word about the public house. Now *first* no conditions ought to be appended to the withdrawing of an insult: it should be a frank, general, complete withdrawal — and *second* to require Mr. Strickland to acknowledge a second falsehood as the condition of withdrawing the imputation

1 Alexander Lindesay Hall, of Trinity College, Dublin; later beneficed in Ireland.

2 The name may stand for Samuel Wareing Mangin, who was P.C. of Stoke Newington 1854–8, Headington Quarry 1858–63, etc. (O).

of the first is really only to repeat the insult. And once more in this case Mr. Strickland could make no such admission; for he distinctly says he *has* kept his word and disliked the House being licensed but submitted, hoping that Mr. Lee would consent after a time to the license dropping. He would still be pleased at such a result, but has no power to enforce it. He cannot withdraw the license. How then is his word broken?

2. You require him to pay you the rent charge. But by what right? Few landlords do. When done it is a matter of special favour. Why are you entitled to claim it? Surely the true course is to seek a full restoration of Harmony without any such conditions: and when that is restored if such a friendly act were offered to receive it as the act of a friend.

Believe me my dear Dr. Farley to be ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

518. To the Rev. S. W. Mangin *(vi 28)*

Jan. 8, 1854

Rev. and Dear Sir,

I feel that I ought without loss of time to add a line to my letter of yesterday to say that I meant to express no opinion on your actual fitness for the Curacy of High Wycombe but simply to reply to your question. I should need a distinct testimony to your ministerial energy and activity before I could approve of you. May I apply for this to your late Incumbent.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

519. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(vi 29)*

Jan. 9, 1854

My dear Mr. Paddon,

My letter of Saturday will have answered by anticipation the question contained in your last and shewn you why with the kindest feelings towards you I felt it right to reply at once to Mr. Paul. God forbid that any mischief should occur to you in your Parish from my letter to him: or that any abiding sorrow for it should rest on your mind.

I am ever most sincerely with true regard, Yours,

S. Oxon.

520. To the second Earl Granville[1] *(vi 31)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 9, 1854

My dear Lord Granville,

May I ask your attention to a scheme which seems to me of great moment: and which is stated at length in the enclosed paper. Its object, as you will see at a glance, is to bring into full harmony the Church and the State so far as concerns the Inspection of Church Schools. I believe that it is admitted by all that the great expence of the machinery would make it impossible to carry inspection on the present Privy Council method through all our Schools. *We* offer *you*, a cheap

[1] Granville George Leveson-Gower (1815–91); as Lord President of the Council from Dec. 1852 to June 1854 he was responsible for Education.

machinery: and we expect to receive from you permanence from your grants. The George Denison party on the one side, and possibly some bigots on the other, would prefer keeping our Inspections separate: but I am confident that the great majority of moderate men would rejoice at their assimilation.

I am, my dear Lord,

S. Oxon.

521. To the Rev. W. Bell (*vi 35*)

Jan. 9, 1854

Rev. and Dear Sir,

It would be far the pleasantest course to myself to say at once that I had not the least objection to license you. But what am I to do. I am convinced that a sporting clergyman is a great evil in a parish and I have uniformly refused to license as Curate anyone who intended to indulge in such amusements. Your assurance that you do not intend to be a sportsman would so far as shooting goes fully satisfy me without exacting any promise that you should never take a day's shooting with a friend. But hunting stands upon a different footing. It is forbidden to clergymen by the Canon Law: it is a recreation no man practises in the occasional way in which he may shooting, for no man will keep a horse for hunting without intending to use it: and it is in all respects a far greater interruption to the Studies, habits and society to which a Parish Priest should be addicted: and as to it I really can only say that I must refuse to license a Curate who intends to hunt at his Curacy.[1]

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

522. To the Lord Chancellor (1st Baron Cranworth) (*vi 30*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 10, 1854

My dear Lord Chancellor,

My secretary has applied to me for the ages of the Incumbents of the livings the patronage of which was a subject of arrangement between the See of Oxford and the Great Seal. It had not occurred to me to ascertain this, as I had looked, in so permanent an arrangement only at the values of the preferments. But I can send you the approximate ages of most of the incumbents and will learn from the Bishop of Chichester more exactly as to the remainder if you wish. But, meanwhile, may I make an alteration in the proposal; because one of the livings I had proposed to exchange with the Chancellor, will enable me to arrange exactly [*sic*] with the Premier whilst the more numerous benefices of the Lord Chancellor make it easier to accommodate the exchange with him.

I had proposed to *cede* to the Great Seal

Barley	worth	£631	I now propose	Rettenden	£765
Kelshall	worth	£548		Kelshall	£548
Donnington		£284		Donnington	£284
Climping		£221		Climping	£221
		£1684			£1818
					1684
					£134

[1] The Bishop licensed Bell two months later.

I propose to withdraw Barley and to substitute for it the more valuable living of Rettenden worth £765 per annum, and as an equivalent for this increase of value I would suggest Aston Rowant to be ceded to the See of Oxford.

The ages of the incumbents I believe stand thus.

Rector of St. Mary's, Reading	between 50 & 60
Aston Rowant	between 50 & 60
Rector of St. Giles, Reading	between 40 & 50
Vicar of Wallingford	between 50 & 60
Vicar of St. Ebbes, Oxford	very old
Vicar of Newport Pagnell	a little turned 50
Rector of Rettenden	between 50 & 60
Vicar of Donnington	near 50
Vicar of Climping	about 60
Rector of Kelshall	between 40 & 50[1]

I am, dear Lord Chancellor, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

523. To the sixth Earl of Macclesfield[2] *(vi 32)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 10, 1854

My dear Lord Macclesfield,

The Hamlet of Wheatley is at present bound to pay a share of our Church rate here.[3] This arrangement was, of old, not otherwise than just; because the Wheatley people buried here: but now Wheatley has its own burial ground and is entirely separated and this payment is felt to be a great hardship. At this moment we are endeavouring to get a new burial ground at Wheatley; and should succeed but for this. We have put our Church here into such thoroughly good repair, new roof &c., that for years to come our Church Rate will be most insignificant — and I have every reason to believe that the rate payers here will agree to set Wheatley free if you as Landowner do not object.

May I ask you if you will allow me to say to them that you consent.

I am my dear Lord Macclesfield, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

524. To the Rev. T. Curme *(vi 33)*

Jan. 10, 1854

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I have received today your two letters; the second with its enclosure. As to the first, I will only say that I had not much hope of my admonition producing much effect because from what I had known before of your self sufficiency I expected you to trifle, as you do, with your engagements, by satisfying yourself that every judgement of your Bishop from which you differ, is an ungodly judgement. As to the second I will only say that I trust and pray that God may in His Great Mercy shew you of what spirit you are, when upon your Bishop's

[1] For the Bishop's desire to add to the patronage of his see, cf. note to no. 511. The subject is more fully covered in Pugh, Chapter v. The exchanges here discussed came into effect by Order in Council of 21 May 1855.

[2] Thomas Augustus Wolstenholme Parker (1811–96); he owned over 5,000 acres in Oxfordshire.

[3] Payment of Church Rates ceased, and Wheatley became a separate ecclesiastical parish later in 1854: for the happy termination of this affair, see *V.C.H. Oxon.*, v, 114.

administering to you a reproof you gratify your resentment by sending him a publication which you think will wound his feelings, through a beloved but erring brother, especially with the sinful addition that you are circulating it in His Diocese. My dear Sir, may God give you such repentance that you may find mercy in *that* day when the *uncharitable* shall be cast into the lake of Fire.

I am Yours most truly,

S. Oxon.

525. To the Dean of Ely (G. Peacock)[1] *(vi 34)*
Private

Jan. 10, 1854

My dear Dean,

Many thanks for your very kind letter. You are quite at liberty to mention *in confidence* to any members of the Lower House you see fit the result of my communication to you. I see the great importance of the course you propose as to occupying the Lower House in considering Standing orders, &c. Can I in any way aid you. I think it of great moment that our plans should be as thoroughly combined as possible. The Bishop of Exeter proposes to come here for consultation on the 30th., on his way to London. Is it possible that on that day you could join us?

I am my dear Dean, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

526. To the Rev. J. Penson *(vi 37)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 10, 1854

Rev. & Dear Sir,

A fortnight ago I wrote to you concerning the inadequate performance of the duties of your Parish and have received from you no reply. If by the end of this week I receive no answer I shall understand that you wish me to act in the matter on my own responsibility and shall issue a commission of enquiry[2] accordingly.

I am, Rev. and Dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

527. To the Rev. A. L. Hall *(vi 38)*
Confidential

Jan. 10, 1854

My dear Sir,

I write by this post to tell Mr. Paddon that my enquiries as to your past ministry have convinced me that with no reference to any doctrinal views you are not the person to whom I could consent to commit as senior curate during the Vicar's absent [*sic*] the great Parish of High Wycombe.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

1 George Peacock (1791–1858), Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, mathematician and astronomer, Lowndean Prof. of Astronomy, 1836–58; a very active Dean of Ely, 1839–58. He was Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation, 1841–7 and 1852–7 (*DNB*).

2 A commission of enquiry under the Rural Dean was the necessary first stage to the compulsory appointment of an assistant curate under the Pluralities Act. The mere threat usually sufficed.

528. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(vi 39)*

Private

Jan. 11, 1854

My dear Mr. Paddon,

I take the earliest opportunity of telling you that my enquiries have convinced me that Mr. Hall is not qualified to be left in charge of so important and difficult a Parish as High Wycombe in the absence of the Vicar. I do not therefore enter into the question of his doctrinal opinions.

I trust that a few days reflection have shewn you that my answer to Mr. Paul contained nothing in fact, as I can assure you that it did not in intention, otherwise than what was entirely kind to yourself.

I shall be happy to see Mr. Dinsdale.

I am most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

529. To the Rev. P. Serle[1] *(vi 36)*

Jan. 12, 1854

Dear Mr. Serle,

I have received a complaint from a person signing himself 'R. Dodwell' that for the last 2 Sundays Divine Service has been performed at your *house* and not in the Parish Church. Probably if this is the case there was some reason of necessity for it. If so I should have been glad to have heard of it from yourself.

I am, my dear Mr. Serle, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

530. To the Rev. T. Chamberlain *(vi 40)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 30, 1854

My dear Mr. Chamberlain,

A correspondence which has recently passed between Miss [Prover], Miss Skene, and Mr. C. Houghton has been put into my hands. From that correspondence I gather that the frequent if not habitual confession of the young girls in Rewley House[2] is the practical rule of that establishment. I say the *practical* rule because I care not whether this is brought about by direct exhortation or indirectly by the religious atmosphere of the House. Habitual Confession as you know from my last charge, is in my opinion discouraged by the Church of England. And it is I think exhibited in its most objectionable form when young girls are its subjects. From Miss Skenes letter of Nov. 24 I gather that those who form the tone in such matters at Rewley consider it not as discouraged and evil; but as a great and permitted privilidge: whilst from her letter of Nov. 10 I find that the general sanction I gave to your attempting to carry out at Rewley House a charitable work of Education on the strict principles of the Church of England has led to my being quoted as approving of a system which I have authoritatively condemned

[1] Addressed to the Rev. A. Serle, probably in error for Philip Serle (1784–1857), R. of Oddington, 1818–57 (O) — 'a grumbling ill-conditioned indolent old undogmatical and I fear rather sceptical priest' (Diocese Book, II, p. 352b).

[2] St. Anne's, Rewley, was a High School for girls founded in Worcester Street by the Sisters of the Community of St. Thomas the Martyr; it was later moved to Wellington Square. For Thomas Chamberlain's great helper Miss Felicia Mary Frances Skene (d. 1899) see Squires, *In West Oxford*, pp. 144–8.

and of which I strongly disapprove. Under these circumstances I have no alternative as Visitor but to endeavour to satisfy myself as to the actual state of things in the House: and to do this I must ask and request you to answer the following questions.

1. How many teachers or assistants have you had in the House during the last year?
2. How many of these have confessed in the last year?
3. How many times has each confessed?
4. How many pupils have you had during the past year?
5. How many of these have confessed?
6. How often have they come to confession?
7. How many of them have communicated?

At the same time I wish to ask whether any and if so what alterations have been made in the oratory either as to (1) its arrangement or (2) its fitting up or 3 its employment since the objections I urged on you to it at my last visit.

I am, my dear Mr. Chamberlain, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

531. To the Superior and Sisters of the House of Mercy at Clewer

(*vi 41*)

London, Ascension Day, 1854

Dearly Beloved in the Lord,

I do not like to dismiss the questions concerning your body which have been lately before me without addressing directly to yourselves as a body a few words of affectionate greeting and exhortation.

May HE who on this Day ascended up on high draw thither after Him our hearts and desires: may HE shed on you in your labours for His sake His abundant gifts of grace.

I have already said to your superior that whilst our rule at Clewer must be understood by all to be truly and really formed on the model of the Church of Englands life and teaching as we may find it exemplied [*sic*] in such as Bishop Andrewes, that I do not wish in the particular application of that rule to bind the individual conscience by any straiter bonds than those with which our Church has bound it. Points which She has left open, we leave open in the individual spiritual life of each one of you. But our common life must be truly and honestly arranged by what you all well know to be in my judgement the Church of England type. I do not enter on the question whether I am right in my estimate; but holding it, I could not honestly preside over a Sisterhood embodying another idea. This necessity you can every one I think appreciate — and I assent gladly to a large measure of individual liberty being granted to every Sister as to the management of her own spiritual life; in the undoubting confidence that you will one and all labour to maintain with me, with all truthfulness and honesty of word and act, unaltered and simple, in your common life that which you know me to mean by the Church of England's rule: and which will I doubt not afford you every aid towards the perfection of your own spiritual being.

Believe me that as set over you in the Lord I shall rejoice in every opportunity of quickening and increasing your Love, and self Devotion, and Peace and Joy and Charity. May the Blessing of the Almighty the Father the Son and The Holy Ghost rest upon you now and evermore.

I am your Faithful Friend & [*Unfinished*]

532. To the Rev. T. Chamberlain (*vi 42*)
Private

26 Pall Mall, Feast of Ascension, May 25, 1854

My very dear Friend,

There is a tone of pain about your last letter which has gone straight to my heart with far more keenness than if you had reproached me. I am grieved to have been so busy that I could not write before and must now write very hastily. I entirely understand your view and position and I believe that I as nearly as possible agree with it on every essential point. I have, and always have had, the fullest and most joyful confidence in you. I think that my last letter did not convey to you my real meaning. I did not think that you *had* done any or tried anything contrary to what I believed to be true: but I fancied (what more natural with Devonport &c. before my eyes) that I saw a danger of a change of tone coming over the House, and in your confidential letter to me a danger of your being led *unawares* to foster it — and so writing not officially but in the fullest confidence to you poured my heart freely out to you. Forgive me if I have seemed to wrong you and believe how truly I am affectionately and trustingly yours,

S. Oxon.

533. To the Superior of the House of Mercy at Clewer (Mrs. Monsell) (*vi 43*)

London, Feast of the Ascencion, 1854

My dear Mrs. Monsell,

I send you herewith another letter to the Sisterhood which I hope will answer our purpose without the risks which would have attended that the draught of which I recently sent to you. Will you shew this to Carter and if you and he agree that it will do present it — and if not do not scruple to send it me back. I was very sorry not to send it you so as to reach you yesterday morning but it really was impossible. I only heard from Carter Tuesday: until I heard from him I did not like to write: and the last two days have left me *literally* not one minute. Ever believe me to be affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

534. To the Rev. H. Barne[1] (*vi 44*)

May 25, 1854

[*First part missing*]

. . .' of the North doorway.

Now I had no notion that anything of this sort was going on. Probably it is my fault and I ought to have known it — but I thought that your plans contemplated no such destruction of old and valuable work, and I would beg you to let me hear from you at once before any more is demolished.

I am most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Henry Barne (1814–86), V. of Faringdon, 1851–80 (O). 'A good and earnest man, though a low churchman' (Diocese Book, II, p. 213a). The restoration of churches was almost universal at this period, and as this fragment shows, enthusiasm often ran away with discretion. It is noteworthy that although the restorations often expressed the liturgical ideas of the Cambridge Camden Society, Low Churchmen were nearly as avid for restorations as Tractarians were.

535. To the Archdeacon of Buckingham (E. Bickersteth) *(vi 45)*
Most Private

Address, 26 Pall Mall, May 29, 1854

My dear Archdeacon,

I fear that I must trouble you to go over the earliest day you conveniently can to Wormenhall and inspect the Church for me and report to me officially as to these Ave Marias, *Hearts of Mary*, and Chalice painted on the Walls. I need not say to you that the more privately you can do it; e.g. by calling on Mr. Statter[1] and going with him to the Church, so as to stir up no remark or jealousy the better. I send you in confidence the correspondence which has passed. I am very uneasy on the subject. Statter is a *very* good man: but weak, impulsive and I greatly fear with a Romanizing tendency I have long been striving to check. His daughter is a very superior person. Oxenham[2] *very* clever, disputatious argumentative and in spite of the most solemn assurances on which I most doubtfully ordained him I fear Romanizing in inclination.

Perhaps besides your formal report you will send me in confidence your opinion on all you observe or hear.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

536. To the Rev. J. Statter *(vi 46)*

26 Pall Mall, May 29, 1854

My dear Mr. Statter,

I. I do not suppose that your opinion and mine as to the treatment of anonymous letters can differ much. If they state *opinions*, I throw them into the fire: if they alledge *facts which ought to be enquired into*, I send them as I have done in your case straight to the party concerned for his remarks. I expected you to answer as to them, as you have done, from regard to me and not to the nameless writer.

II. I did not put any enquiry to you as to Miss Statter's opinions. But marked the assertion that *she* had been engaged in the alledged Church decorations.

III. I greatly regret that you have suffered these decorations with Ave Marias on them to be placed in your Church. For considering how inevitable must, in the minds of all instructed persons, be the connection between exhibiting so unusual an ornament in one of our Churches, and encouraging one of the grossest of the Errors of Rome, I cannot but condemn their presence. I quite agree with you that nothing should be done in the matter which could disturb the minds of your people: and I have an entire confidence that on principle as well as I believe from kindly feelings to myself you would wish in all lawful matters to follow my advice. I think therefore that my best course will be to act on your suggestion and request the Archdeacon to take an early opportunity of inspecting the Church privately with you and sending me his report after which I will write to you again.

Private

But I must add to you with the confidence I have always used with you, that Mr. Oxenham's former conduct and opinions make me entertain much anxiety on this whole subject — and that I earnestly trust you can in confidence assure me that, in your opinion, he is free from All Romanizing influence in your Parish.

I am, my dear Mr. Statter, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] James Statter, of Trinity College, Dublin; V. of Worminghall, 1844–75.
[2] Henry Nutcombe Oxenham (1829–88), ordained 1853 as C. of Worminghall but seceded to Rome in 1857 (*DNB*).

537. To the Rev. R. Rice[1] *(vi 47)*

26 Pall Mall, May 29, 1854

My dear Sir,

There can be no doubts as to the grievous wants of your Church. But I do not think they ought to be supplied in the way you propose.

1. The people could not kneel down to say their prayers to Almighty God in your divided pews. But if once this effort had been made that new arrangement would stand for 50 years.

2. You would find in the long run that as much expence fell on *you* for doing the work badly as would with the help you could get from others for doing it well.

I therefore urge you most strongly to write to E. Street, Esq., Beaumont Street, Oxford: tell him your difficulties, and ask him to give you a plan for making the interior of your Church fit for its purpose — at the least possible cost. We will all help you to raise this Sum — so shall you be a restorer of the temple.

I am ever yours, Most Sincerely,

S. Oxon.

538. To the Rev. H. Barne *(vi 48)*

26 Pall Mall, May 29, 1854

My dear Mr. Barne,

The only thing further as to which I think I need trouble you with regard to these repairs is this: that I am not sure whether you are aware that *no alterations* are legal whether required by your architect or not without my consent has been previously obtained to them. I do not remember whether I had or had not assented to these changes in detail: but your language is not quite clear and the principle is so important that I must state it. I trust you already know me well enough to know that I should be the last person to use such a power vexatiously.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

539. To the Rev. J. Statter *(vi 49)*

26 Pall Mall, May 31

My dear Mr. Statter,

I thank you sincerely at once for the candour and for the affection of your letter. It is just what I should have expected from you. The question as to ornaments &c. may stand over until after the Archdeacon's visit whom I have requested to be careful as to giving any alarm to the minds of your people. I take entirely the same estimate as yourself as to the meanness of such anonymous communications: but when they alledge *facts*[2] I think that they should always be made known to the parties charged. Just as I should pick up some valuable thing even out of the dirt: not however thinking the dirt less dirty. As to the important part of your letter which concerns yourself I will at present say only this —

Do I understand your present position to be this. That your conviction of the reality of this alledged spiritual movement will not (1) form any part of your teaching to others so long as you continue in your present post. (2) will not interfere with your teaching *all* and *no more* than, the Church of England requires you to teach. (3) will not interfere with your observance of all the discipline of the Church? If I am right in this supposition I can safely let the matter rest as it is for

[1] Richard Rice (1793–1868), R. of Eaton Hastings 1836–68 (O).
[2] Underlined twice.

the Present: and when we have the opportunity of full conversation I may with God's help convince you of the errors of this scheme.

I am ever, my dear Mr. Statter, affecy yours,

S. Oxon.

540. To the Rev. R. C. Hales[1] *(vi 50)*

26 Pall Mall, May 31, 1854

My Dear Mr. Hales,

The enclosed letter will shew you that Mr. Turrell[2] will not go without pressure. I must therefore ask you to give me such a written statement as I can forward to him to shew of which you gave me several instances by word of mouth that he has given you grave and just grounds for parting.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

541. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(vi 51)*

26 Pall Mall, May 31, 1854

My dear Mr. Paddon,

I do not see how it is possible for me to enter upon the question of who should assist you at Wycombe until the preliminary question as to which I have been daily expecting to hear from you as to your own return to residence is settled.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

542. To the Rev. J. Statter *(vi 52)*

Private

26 Pall Mall, June 5, 1854

My dear Mr. Statter,

1. I will speak first of your own letter. *I* on my part am quite satisfied with the assurance you gave me: because I consider it to be the plain limit of my duty to see that the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England are truly taught and acted on by my Clergy: but that I have no warrant for searching into their speculative opinions. I have the fullest trust in your entire integrity and I doubt not that in what you may say concerning the Second Coming of our Lord you will say nothing but what the Church of England has always allowed to be held and taught. You on your part must remember that I give you no license to hold any strange opinions: that it will be my duty even from what you have told me, to be more vigilant that nothing but the truth is taught in your parish; and that if you doubt at any time as to your being able to teach or to do all that the Church of England requires and no more, you are bound at once to give me timely warning.

II. As to Mr. Oxenham. I understand and respect your delicacy. But I must remind you that he is nominated by you to me to serve as your Deacon: that on the faith of that nomination I ordained him to assist you, to behave himself modestly under your charge in that inferior office; and that I must look to you for a general superintendance of his doctrines and conduct, and for my own information concerning them: since from you and you alone can I receive such accounts. I would ask you if you do not dislike doing so to read this paragraph to him.

1 Richard Cox Hales (1817–1906), R. of Carfax, Oxford, 1852–60, Woodmancote, Sussex, 1860–88. Also C. of St. Peter le Bailey and City Lecturer (C).

2 Henry Joseph Turrell (1825–98), C. of St. Peter le Bailey, 1852–4; founded Turrell's Hall, Oxford, 1880 (*MEB*).

I will now add not as your Bishop but as your friend if you will let me use that freedom that I would most earnest [*sic*] counsel you to watch whether his influence is drawing any of your own family towards Rome.

III. I now come to the Ornaments of your Church. I wish most earnestly to order nothing here which shall be distasteful to you. But I must require

(1) The removal of the vases.

(2) The abstaining from putting flowers on the Altar.

(3) The painting of the Chalice and *wafer* and the inscriptions to be removed. There being no warrant for Prayer being addressed to our Lord's *blood* or any separate part of his undivided personality: I regret that *the Cross* should have been *painted* and should much wish if possible that the [paint] thereon should be removed.

I am, my dear Mr. Statter, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

543. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon (*vi 53*)

London, June 5, 1854

My dear Mr. Paddon,

Your case is one which gives me the greatest anxiety. I wish from kindly feelings to you to fall in as far as possible with your wishes. But I do not feel *clear* as to its being right to give you a license of non-residence. Your medical man says that you are and probably always may be unfit for the discharge of the duties of your great parish and harrassing Church. This I can easily believe. But then the conclusion to which this belief would bring me is that you ought to resign a charge for which you are unfit and to the income of which as you have often shown me you do not look for any support.

The arrangement which you propose to make is as I told you at first what I think the very worst for the Parish. If you were really to retire for three years; to have for that time committed the Spiritual Charge of the Parish and its revenues into my hands as Bishop to administer, the case would be different. But to have a couple of Curates who are to act under the direction of an absent Vicar is the worst possible arrangement, and I do not see how I can help doing what the Church people at Wycombe so loudly demand, i.e. saying 'come back into residence and do what you can, unless for a season or for good you resign the responsibility of the Parish'.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

544. To the Rev. R. Aitken[1] (*vi 54*)

Private

26 Pall Mall, June 5, 1854

My dear Mr. Aitkin,

It will give me great pleasure to consult with you. I am to be D.V. at Cuddesdon on Wednesday night next. I shall be there till D.V. the following Friday: very busy with my ordination candidates till Monday: on which morning or still better on the morning of tomorrow week — Tuesday — I could see and

[1] The rash Robert Aitken (1800–73), deacon 1823, priest 1824, V. of Pendeen, Cornwall, 1849 (*DNB*). We can only speculate on the subjects touched on in this letter, which may have been ill-requited. See no. 577.

consult with you. I shall be happy if you can come to dine and sleep this day week. Meanwhile I ought at once to say (1) That I am not prepared to admit [that I accept all] of your doctrinal view as to conversion.
(11) That I do not see how, practically, such attempts as to the clergy and the educated classes as from your letter to Mr. Kingscote you appear to me to contemplate can be carried out without the entire subversion of the Parochial System.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

545. To the Rev. J. Keble *(vi 55)*
Most Private

26 Pall Mall, July 3, 1854

My dear Mr. Keble,

I thank you very truly for writing to me with so much frankness of expression.[1] I assure you that it pains and alarms me to find that on any point of Christian Faith or Doctrine you think me so very wrong. But what else can I do than act on what very probably from some great [defect in me does] appear to me to be our Church's mind. Now I cannot help thinking that she in common with the Earliest Church discourages auricular confession and private absolution except in those cases in which a person is really unable without them to obtain relief from some particular burden of the soul.

Now so long as I do believe this, of course I ought not to do anything which would probably lead to the Students in my College forming the habit of that systematic confession, [an evil] which I believe our Church discourages. I know that on this point Dr. Pusey's view differs entirely from mine. He believes it to be [a great blessing for everyone] to be in the habit of regular confession. He therefore most consistently strives to lead every one he can, into the practise of what he believes would be so great a blessing to them. If then my Vice Principal was in the habit of so repairing to Dr. Pusey, in the first place it would be well known amongst the young men; and next they would naturally, in proportion to the influence for good which the Vice Principal would exercise over them follow in his steps such a practise: whilst Dr. Pusey would feel it his duty to encourage directly and through those he had already gained all the rest in a practise which he thinks so conducible to their souls profit; and thus my college would probably soon come in spite of my own view to be under Dr. Pusey's 'direction'. You would I am sure feel that in such a state of things I should really be placed in an entirely false position. What therefore I said to Mr. L was that I could not appoint him Vice Principal if he stood in that relation to Dr. Pusey. He asked me if I should feel that his asking spiritual counsels of you constituted the same objection. To which I had no difficulty in replying that if he went to you only when he had really some burden on his conscience or some point on which he needed advice that I should [feel] it no objection whatever — for that your distance would prevent misconception or the other evils I feared and that his *so* asking your spiritual aid seemed to me quite in accordance with the principles of our Church. You will I think see therefore that *I* have no sort of title to agree to such resolutions as you

[1] Keble tried to act the mediator between Wilberforce and H. P. Liddon, newly appointed Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon College. It is noteworthy that Wilberforce was willing to allow Liddon to make his confession to Keble, but not to Pusey, though Keble resented the implied divergence of opinion. See O. Chadwick, *The Founding of Cuddesdon* (1954).

speak of for that I do not enter into the questions they involve. But I do earnestly hope that you will do what Mr. L wishes for I think that he is eminently fit to serve God in this post.

I am affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

I end this July 6 having been perpetually interrupted.

546. To the Archdeacons of Oxfordshire and Berkshire (*v 73*)
(C. C. Clerke, E. Berens)[1]

Cuddesdon Palace, Oct. 14, 1854

My dear Archdeacon,

I address this letter to you with great concern: but it concerns a matter intimately relating to the Discipline of the Diocese & as to which I have previously [tried][2] every other course in my power.

Mr Dayman[3] as your representative has continuously resisted my ordinary inhibition & issued Marriage licenses, &c during the time of the Archdeacon's Suspension before my visitation. By this conduct he has exposed himself to excommunication & other penalties. I need not say to you how much it is to be desired that no such scandal should arise, as my being obliged to have recourse to legal measures to punish your officer: I therefore endeavoured through Dr R Phillimore[4] the Judge of the Archdeacon of Oxfords Court to obtain from Mr Dayman I a list of the cases in which he had knowingly & wilfully violated the inhibition & II & [*sic*] undertaking that he would not so offend again & III a payment of the fees he has illegally received to the County Hospital. To these mild terms Mr Dayman refuses to agree, & Dr R Phillimore writes that 'he can only regret that actually & contemptuously disobeys his orders'. I therefore now request you to *enforce Obedience* — which you can do by the simple course of stating to him that either he must at once conform in these three particulars to my requirement or that you shall revoke his appointment.

I appeal with the utmost confidence to you having this opinion of Dr R Phillimore as to Mr Daymans conduct & being confident that you will not allow your officer so to violate all Ecclesiastical propriety.

I am, My dear Archdeacon, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

547. To the Rev. H. N. Oxenham (*v 74*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Oct. 14, 1854

My dear Mr. Oxenham,

It would be quite irregular for me to receive you as a candidate for ordination on the title of a Curacy which you were just about to quit.

Until therefore this matter is arranged I need not enter upon any other question concerning my receiving you as a Candidate.

I am ever very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Edward Berens (1777–1859), sometime Fellow of Oriel; V. of Shrivenham, 1804–59; R. of Englefield, 1818–55; Archdeacon of Berks., 1832–55 (*MEB*).

2 Not in MS.

3 Gordon Dayman, Deputy Registrar of the Archdeaconry courts of Oxon. and Berks.

4 Robert Joseph Phillimore (1810–85), D.C.L., 1st Bart; author of a standard work on Ecclesiastical Law and a great personal friend of both Wilberforce and Gladstone. He succeeded his father as Chancellor of the Diocese in Feb. 1855.

548. To the Bishop of London (C. J. Blomfield) *(vi 56)*
Most Private and Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 17, 1854

My dear Lord,

I was aware of the 'illnatured remarks' of the Morning Herald, Record etc. when I wrote to you: and their existence so far from accounting to me for what you said only made it to me the more difficult of comprehension: because it was exactly the fact that the ultra low Church papers were making a [run] at me, claiming you on their side, and endeavouring through you to injure me, which made it seem so unaccountable to me that you should write as though you admitted their reproach of me and took to yourself their [praise] of you. This seemed to me as much at variance with the high and chivalrous feelings of a Christian friend, and with the generosity of character I have so often seen in you and maintained to be yours when your enemies were uttering detraction against you, that I could not admit it to myself as the solution of your words. For, my dear Lord, had you really suspected me of false doctrine on this momentous point, surely in our many confidential conversations you would have warned me against error; or if in the verbatim reports of my charge you had seen error you would have called my attention to it. Moreover you well know why I am now singled out for attack. You know how much the Record &c., long to see me trampled underfoot and that they now make use of my beloved Brother's fall[1] to try to pull me down. You know for we discussed the matter at Lavington how widely I have always differed from him; and it has therefore pained me bitterly to think that you could suffer yourself at such a moment to be drawn into [actions] concerning me which I thought you would have been ever eager to rebuke in another. You know for I consulted you about it, that I so fully expected the storm that I consulted you whether I could protest most to the advantage of our Church against these Romanising views by divesting myself of the temporal advantages of the office of a Bishop: and therefore from you I looked with full confidence not only for sympathy but aid in the time of trouble. I owe you too much gratitude, for many acts of love; and many lessons given me, by precept and example, and I feel too much hearty affection to you, and too much confidence in you not thus openly to tell you why I feel aggrieved in soul. Forgive me if I do wrong in speaking to you with an openness, which nothing but deep grief of soul would wring from me and which I would not now venture to use unless I had an implicit confidence in your real goodness, truth and even affection to me. I am *sure* that you would not wish me to cover up such feelings and think of you as one 'qui non defendit alio culpando'. But if I have, or think I have, anything against my Brother, to tell him of it (even though he be so much better and more worthy of honour than I am as you are) between him and me alone.[2]

Believe me to be, my dear Lord, Gratefully and affectionately yours,
S. Oxon.

P.S. Letters are to reach me at Lower Winchendon Sunday and Monday, Chesham, Bucks. Tuesday, Ashridge Park, Wednesday — Friday.

[1] See no. 567.

[2] Wilberforce was always keenly aware of his affinity with Blomfield, who was like himself an old-fashioned High-Churchman troubled with over-zealous Tractarians, and a public figure of great significance. In some respects he must have thought of himself as Elisha attending on Elijah, for he was keenly disappointed not to be promoted to London on Blomfield's retirement. In other respects this is a very Victorian letter, with its anxiety over public opinion tempered by an appeal to private confidence and personal loyalty.

549. To the Provost of Eton (E. C. Hawtrey) (*vi 57*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 17, 1854

My dear Provost,

I wrote in such haste yesterday that I did not thank you for your kind and pleasant assurance that no personal feeling on the part of the College mingled with the question between us. I assure you that with my hearty regard to its members this assurance is most valuable to me. But there is one other passage in your letter which [then] I passed over for the same cause and as to which I wish to add a word or two.

You say 'it seems to us more obvious to claim by course of law that right' ('the office of your Visitor') than to urge another which &c.

Now pardon me if I say in answer — That the sole reason for this is in the College and not in me. I have already officially declared to you; I declare it again now, that I claim to be your sole Visitor under your Statute, and that I warn you that every act you do before another as your Visitor is invalid. But you renounce that claim and tell me instead that I have ordinary Episcopal Jurisdiction over you. I have acted on your assertion — one or the other I must have; you have chosen which you admit.[1] I think you have chosen wrongly: to the diminution of your own privilidges, and I fear to your future great inconvenience when the invalidity of these acts may be urged against you: but the choice is yours. If the College admit me to be their statuteable Visitor, they will find me the warmest defender of their rights; and they would I doubt not find *no* resistance from the Bishop of Lincoln.

But it is surely unreasonable to call upon me to assume under such circumstances the odious and costly position of one claiming by legal battle a *lesser* right, when at no cost, and with no litigation in any quarter you by this simple act might settle this whole question.

I am my dear Provost most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

550. To the Rev. J. Burrows (*vi 58*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 17, 1854

My dear Sir,

I have received complaints from your parish as to the small amount of public services in the Church. I feel bound in all such cases to *require* as the law seems to me to compel me to do, a second sermon on the Sunday, and this I must do in your case. But I should venture strongly to recommend to you to secure the assistance of a regular curate who both in the Services of the Church, and in visiting the Sick would be a great assistant to you.[2]

I remain my dear Sir, Very Faithfully Yours,

S. Oxon.

1 See no. 479. There is a strong whiff of the mediaeval about this controversy, for both Provost and Bishop were more concerned for the legal welfare of their successors than for any problems of power. Indeed, as Wilberforce points out, he would have less coercive power as Visitor than as Bishop.

2 Burrows (of Steeple Aston) did not respond to this strong hint that the Bishop would like him to keep a curate: 'Dec. 55 Complaint of non-visiting. I try to get him being rich to keep a curate. He resents hotly — alas! 13 March 1855 . . . Everyone ready to complain of poor Burrows, who now disposed to give a title — gives a title Christmas 55–6 to Borrow who falls sick & obliged May 56 to resign . . . ' (Diocese Book, II, p. 30). William Borrow (1831–1902) was ordained to the curacy of Steeple Aston in 1855, but when priested was C. of Chearsley. From 1861 to 1886 he was V. of Higham Green, Suffolk (O).

551. To the Rev. W. H. England[1] *(vi 59)*

Chesham, Nov. 20, 1854

My dear Mr. England,

Amongst the parishes in which my late Visitation question shewed me that the Holy Communion was not administered monthly and in which I am strongly of opinion that there ought to be a monthly celebration stand your parish of Ellesborough. I think that the fact of your having at this moment a young Curate[2] resident makes it a good time for beginning this habit. I might order him at once to begin it. But in this, as in everything else, I so greatly prefer acting with you that I would much prefer *your* giving him this direction.

I remain my dear Mr. England, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

552. To the Bishop of London (C. J. Blomfield) *(vi 60)*

Aylesbury, Nov. 20, 1854

My dear Lord,

I thank you heartily for your affectionate and most welcome letter just received, which has entirely removed from my mind the feeling to which my last letter gave utterance — so completely indeed that I am quite unwilling to add another word, from the fear of seeming to repeat what is now wholly answered. And yet I do not think I ought to leave unexplained what I did mean and which manifestly my letter has not conveyed to you. What I did mean was certainly not that it was your duty to enter into a [painful] controversy. Far from it — I referred simply to your words in your letter to me, which raised in my mind the impression that you severed yourself from me in this question. But your truly brotherly reply has shewn me that no such thought had occurred to you; and that it was only the necessary inadequacy of a pen and ink communication for conveying the real impression of a kindly spirit which gave your words that meaning to me. In your former letter you asked me to come to you at Fulham. May I do so, if all is well on Thursday. Dec. 7. My address is Ashridge Park, Berkhampstead.

I am ever affectionately yours,

S. Oxon.

[*Postscript illegible*]

553.[3] *(vi 61)*

Near Aylesbury,[4] Nov. 20, 1854

Madam,

I do not apprehend that there would be any difficulty as to the employment of the Architect you desire to befriend in the case of many of our Churches and Parsonage houses if as I assume he is fit for the work. In ordinary cases the selection of the architect is left to the parties who originate the scheme. He furnishes a plan and this plan is submitted to our Diocesan Architect[5] before grants are made by the Diocesan Church Building Society.

1 William Henry England (1800–58), R. of Ellesborough 1832–58 (O) when he was succeeded by his son Willam Joseph England (1830–61) (O) for a mere two years.

2 Richard Thomas Blagden (1825–?93), C. of Ellesborough 1854, Little Kimble 1855, Chieveley, 1860; P.C. of Claydon, 1861–3 (C). His swift departure from Ellesborough was occasioned by troubles with the patron's wife, Lady Frankland Russell. (Diocese Book, II, p. 201).

3 Recipient unidentified: her letter had apparently been anonymous.

4 Probably written in the train, or perhaps even while travelling in a carriage.

5 I.e., G. E. Street.

I will, if you authorize me to do so, offer on your behalf (anonymous or with your name as you may direct) to the promoters of our next Building, your promised donation on condition of their employing your architect. Perhaps I may ask in confidence the name of the Architect and if you do not object, of my correspondent.

I remain, Madam, Very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

554. To the Rev. H. N. Oxenham (*v 75*)

Chesham, Nov. 21, 1854

My dear Mr. Oxenham,

I presume that I understand aright your letter received by me yesterday when I say that it contains a revocation of that declaration of your assent to the Royal Supremacy which you were required by law to make before your Ordination. You have since continued to minister in our National Church on the faith of this subscription which must in foro conscientiae be considered as a Continuous Act. Your withdrawal of that subscription makes it therefore in my judgement improper for you to do any further act as a Clergyman of the Church of England — & I hereby prohibit your doing any such act within my Diocese: & require you to return to me your Curates license, unless you prefer its formal revocation.

Letter will reach me D.V. till Saturday next, at Ashridge Park Berkhampstead.

I am very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

555. To the Rev. R. M. Benson[1] (*v 76*)

Chesham, Nov. 21, 1854

My dear Mr. Benson,

It is not possible for me to read the account you have given me of this young person without great interest & a deep sympathy in her religious desires. Gladly would I strengthen by any allowed Ministrations of mine such holy purposes and acts.

But when you ask me to give her the Apostolical benediction on her 'public resolution of chastity & devotion to Christ' you ask me to do what, with my sense of the certain danger & probable unlawfulness of vows which Christ has not appointed, it is quite impossible for me to do. Such a *resolution*, made *publickly* & in appearance & intention confirmed by a Bishops Act, is whatever distinctions may be discovered by an ingenious mind, really & bona fide *a Vow*. A *secret* resolution can only bind a person sub modo. But such a *public* & official engagement if it means anything, means that without the like sanction the engagement will not be relaxed. Now even a secret resolution of Chastity &c is what I should dissuade. No one has without Gods express appointment a right in my judgement to bind themselves for the future in such matters. Let them follow the guiding hand of God from day to day — and rely for persevering in a course of right or Service in His daily gifts of guiding enlightening strengthening Grace & not on the strength or effect of any past vow or resolution. As then such a benediction as you ask for would in my judgement seem to confirm by a dangerous vow an unwarranted resolution I must of course with real regret decline your request.

I am very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Richard Meux Benson (1824–1915), Student of Christ Church, 1846–1915; P.C. of Cowley, 1850–79; V. of Cowley St. John, 1870–86. Founder of the 'Cowley Fathers', the Society of St. John the Evangelist (*DNB*).

556. To the Hon. R. Cavendish[1] *(vi 62)*

Private

Ashridge Park,[2] Nov. 22, 1854

My dear Mr. Cavendish,

I think I had better tell you exactly what I have done and how I have succeeded as to our Nash attempt.

I. I applied Mr. Penson[3] to the sounding New College: and have got from him a kind assurance that he will state the case favourably to the College [ere] Christmas and does not doubt that they will make a Grant to us in aid.

II. I have tried in person and by letter Mr. Perceval, Russell, H. Barton; and through a friend of his to Mr. Lowndes of Whaddon. But all in vain. Mr. Lowndes will do nothing because of the law against marriage with a deceased wifes sister. Mr. Barton has still so heavy a debt on his own new Church that he cannot promise to besiege Colonel Durrant for us; and I find in other quarters a prejudice against the Scheme which no explanations of mine will remove.[4] There is a notion that your property is greatly benefitted by the removal of the Parsonage House etc., and mens givings are frozen up. I think this, as I have told them untrue and unfair in the Highest degree. But the prejudice has sunk deep and purses are readily closed. It remains that we may count on £200 from Queen Anne's Bounty; *or* a loan on the living, if it is as I fear just *above* the mark for a gift and grants towards the Church from the Societies — from the Incorporated Society and the Privy council for the School. But these will not go far. If *you* would under these circumstances resolve to do the whole thing, as Lord Howe has done at Penn Street, it may be done and every help I can get you I will: but I see no other hope; and I am sure it is best to say the simple truth as to my expectation to you.[5] I am my dear Mr. Cavendish, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

557. To the Bishop of London (C. J. Blomfield) *(vi 63)*

Confidential

Ashridge Park, Berkhampstead, Nov. 23, 1854

My dear Lord,

Knowing your respect for Gladstone I do not like to answer the enclosed letter without shewing it in confidence to you. I have not yet received your Charge and I therefore take the words only from Gladstones letter. I could not myself doubt which interpretation to put upon your words eager as the Record has been to claim them in an antisacramental sense. I cannot doubt that the *first* of the two interpretations is that which you would put upon them. For (1) if Our Lord be only present as he is everywhere else by his all pervading Deity

1 Richard Cavendish (1794–1876), 2nd son of 2nd Baron Waterpark; of Thornton House, Bucks.

2 Home of Earl Brownlow.

3 Perhaps Peter Penson (1788–1870), V. of St. Oswald's, Durham, 1819–70, or an error for the V. of Whaddon, William Pigott, who was also a member of New College.

4 William Selby Lowndes (1807–86), a great huntsman, was seated nearby at Whaddon Hall (*MEB*); Henry Jonas Barton (1797–1872) (O) was R. of Wicken 1838–72, and Col. Durrant held land there. Perceval and Russell were other local incumbents.

5 The willingness of patrons and incumbents to pay for changes in the parochial system and for rebuilding churches was a safeguard against public friction and controversy. In this case, however, disputes between Cavendish and Henry Skinner Templer (1813–77; R. of Thornton, 1853–61; V. of Gt. Coxwell, 1861–77) (O) prevented the separation of Nash from Thornton until Templer's departure in 1861.

then *all* specialty of presence is Void; (2) if his *Body* be not given taken and received how can our article stand? I conceive you to mean to deny all *material* presence; all flesh and blood presence: but to assert that the body is present though not after a bodily manner.

I have no doubt that many do mean absolutely to deny any objective presence of Our Lord, from the same hatred to Sacraments which leads them in like manner to reject Holy Baptism.

I am to be here until Monday. Could you get our next Cathedral Commission fixed for Thursday the 7th.?

I am ever affly yours,

S. Oxon.

558. To the Rev. J. Hunt[1](?) *(vi 64)*
Private

Ashridge, Nov. 24, 1854

My dear Sir,

I. Let me congratulate you on having obtained a post for permanent labour.

II. I shall be very glad to read the documents to which you refer, and if I can either by the channel you point out or otherwise to promote your object.

I am ever very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

559. To the Rev. T. B. Murray[2] *(vi 65)*

Ashridge Park, Nov. 24, 1854

My dear Mr. Murray,

I have not the least objection to your laying my letter before the Sub Committee only if you do so I should be obliged to you for adding to it what I will now proceed to say.

The more I reflect on the distinction drawn by the Sub Committee between a college for training young men for the Ministry of the Church of England, in Canada and Oxfordshire the more it appears to me to be untenable. My College is no more for gain, than that — It is given to a trust to be for ever under the Bishop of the Diocese. The great hindrance to its success is the want of Funds, and consequent expense to the young men: now I know nothing in the constitution of the S.P.C.K. which limits its grants to objects out of England. On the contrary I have in my own Diocese and elsewhere pleading [*sic*] its cause as doing for us *at home* what the S.P.G. does in our Colonies. So far therefore as I understand the matter the principle which the Sub Comm^ee^ would establish appears to me fundamentally wrong, and I would request them to reconsider it — since as at present advised I shall feel it my duty if maintained to raise a question concerning it before the Society.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Unidentified.
[2] Thomas Boyles Murray (1798–1860); Sec. to S.P.C.K. (C).

560. To Mrs. H. W. Wilberforce[1] *(vi 66)*

Nov. 25, 1854

My dearest Mary,

I am sorry that you could think I used 'violent language' in what I said concerning clergymen of the Church of England who have joined the Romish Schism in this country. What I did say was and is my deliberate opinion. I have no doubt that the Church of England is *the* great antagonist of Satan and counter worker of his purposes of evil in this land. I have no doubt that such perversions and falls from Her as you speak of weaken her power for Good; make infidels; justify men to their own consciences in living irreligious lives; and so withstand the work of Christ and aid His enemy more than any other single thing. I have no doubt that their going over to Rome in its pollution corruption and falsehood, does more than anything else to put off the day of *her* purification. I have no doubt that such a fall most grievously injures those souls. On all these and many more grounds I do calmly and deliberately believe that in thus acting they are doing the work of Satan. I will not allow myself to speculate on the questions why such men as these have been 'given over' to these delusions. Though it would be quite as easy for me to alledge reasons for their fall as for you to speak of the want of time as preventing my Apostacy. But I forbear — only I must speak the truth as you require it at my mouth — and the argument good men have done so and so would equally justify murder adultery and denying Christ by the examples of David and St. Peter.

Never does a day pass beloved Sister without my prayer for you and H. and each one of yours, and my longings for your love and for restored communion with you are unspeakable. But alas! alas! every day seems to take more completely from me the remains of hope. May our God and Father for Christs Sake forgive us both our many sins and grant us to meet at His Right hand.

My most tender love to Henry. Let me hear of your doings. I am D.V. to be at Ellers Monday to Thursday.

I am ever your most loving brother,

S. Oxon.

561. To the Rev. H. N. Oxenham *(vi 67)*

Clifton Rectory, Nov. 29, 1854

My dear Mr. Oxenham,

On the simple statement of your letter of Nov. 26, and leaving out of sight your letter of Nov. 22, I am ready to withdraw my prohibition. I say on the simple statement that 'you did not intend to withdraw and have not withdrawn any subscription which you made previously to ordination'. As to the statement in your letter of the 22nd of any particular sense you attach to your Subscription, I decline to enter into it. Every subscription required by authority as the condition of receiving its priviledges must be made by [every honest man in the known sense of the imposing power with no mental reservations in the subscriber. Such reservations seem to me to be a perilous playing with a man's conscience.]

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Wife of the Bishop's younger brother Henry William Wilberforce; the couple joined the Church of Rome in 1850.

562. To the Rev. J. Burrows *(vi 68)*
Private

Nr. Cuddesdon, Nov. 30, 1854

My dear Mr. Burrows,

I am very sorry that you should speak of my 'listening to representations and writing hastily &c.' This is not only an improper mode of receiving a Bishop's suggestions: but is after the manner in which we have formerly corresponded a real disappointment to me.

I have not the smallest objection to tell you who wrote to me: I did not name him to you because I did not wish to rest the matter at all on his Judgement, but upon my own private and friendly advice to you. Nor did I impute to you any concealment as to your second sermon.

Before however I replied to your parishioner I felt bound to ascertain the respectability of his character and referred to and obtained a favourable answer from the Vice Chancellor of Oxford[1] to whom he referred me. His name is C. J. Kilpin.[2] I *do* wish you to give your people a second sermon on Sunday: and shall be glad that you should begin the custom as soon as you conveniently can. As to a curate I can only say that I see no reason to withdraw my advice.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

563. To the Rev. H. Roberts *(vi 69)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 30, 1854

Rev. & Dear Sir,

I know not why you did not come to me as I desired after service at my visitation at Reading: and shall be glad to learn from you the reason. Had you come I should have been able to *speak* as to that on which I must now beg you to write. I have heard I. That you have hired a Manor. II. That you have received into your house sporting inmates as lodgers who pay a certain sum for the right of so lodging and sporting on your manors. III. That you are about to cease from bona fide residence in the Parish of Easthampstead. I request you to inform me of the exact facts as to these three points.[3]

I am ever, Rev. & Dear Sir, Yours sincerely,

S. Oxon.

564. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(vi 70)*

Henley, Dec. 2, 1854

My dear Mr. Paddon,

I thank God for your relief as to your child.

I have just read through my letters to you as to leave of absence. There is not a word in them which held out any hope of my giving you three years leave of absence unless on the condition of non-interference with curates responsible to me for that time which you refused. I am not therefore bound by any considerations of equity to allow of your continued absence from your parish. Your return

[1] R. L. Cotton, Provost of Worcester.

[2] Charles James Kilpin is entered in Foster as a member of Worcester College (1836) and a Student of Gray's Inn (1838). He died in 1875 at Kingsclere, Hants.

[3] Roberts' offences against canon law would probably not have shocked his neighbours at Easthampstead as much as the Bishop seemed to think. When he quarrelled with the aged rector in 1855, Wilberforce gladly allowed him to be given notice. (Diocese Book, II, p. 197).

is loudly called for by your parishioners. They say that you were well enough to superintend your hay making: that your real reason for wishing to reside at Rugby (a less healthy place) rather than at Wycombe is that you can there more reasonably educate your boys: and that a residence at Wycombe cannot injure you. As to my selecting a curate for you, after the gross misrepresentation of which, however unintentionally, you have owned yourself the cause, I must absolutely decline the task. I must therefore require you to return into residence in June: and as you demand it I shall herewith send you a legal requirement so to do.

I am, my dear Mr. Paddon, Very sincerely yours,

565. To the Rev. A. Coote[1] *(vi 71)*

Wokingham, Dec. 2, 1854

My dear Mr. Coote,

I write at once to say that I have seen Mr. Roberts and that so far as his own statement of his doctrinal views goes I should not refuse to consent to the exchange. But this is *all* I can as yet say: and you must not suppose that I assent to it. I am now making enquiry concerning him and have written to the quarter to which he referred me. You shall hear from me as soon as ever I am able to give you my decision. As I am just now very busy you will perhaps communicate thus much in answer to R. but I send letter I have just received on the subject from Mr. Plumptre.[2]

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

566. To the Bishop of Exeter (H. Phillpotts) *(vi 72)*

Address, 26 Pall Mall, Dec. 2, 1854

My dear Lord,

Shall you attend the opening of Parliament? and if so do you think it would be desireable to do anything in Convocation?[3] *The* reason for doing so, is this, Lord Aberdeen has grown to consider our doing a [stroke] of work at that time a matter of course: and the more we can establish that precedent for the future of course the better. What we mainly want I think is *time* to go through a matter. I should suppose the reform of Convocation would be our best subject — and needful before a dissolution. If we only got one day's debate and adjourned it it would be something. I hope you will excuse bad and strange writing from my carriage and almost in the dark to save time. Please to address me at 26 Pall Mall.

I am ever yours most truly,

S. Oxon.

1 See no. 124. The proposal was for an exchange of Marsh Gibbon with 'Mr. Roberts of Foots [i.e. Paul's] Cray whose wife has eloped from him. I refuse. He and His Father &c angry . . . Feb. 1856 Coote again applies to exchange with Plumtre's incumbent . . . After long negotiations I arrange that Thomas Huntly Greene should come to Marsh G. Mr. Enraght going to Leominster & THG comes to me to Lavington Aug 28 1856 for collation . . . Fear he never will stand the damp of this place' (Diocese Book, II, p. 369a).

2 See no. 575.

3 After the Gorham Judgement Phillpotts declared himself no longer in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and this may have added to his enthusiasm for the revival of Convocation, which Archbishop Sumner regretted. See G. C. B. Davies, *Henry Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter* (1954).

567. To D. M. Perceval *(vi 73)*

Nr. Sandhurst, Dec. 4, 1854

My dear Mr. Perceval,

I beg to thank you for your kind letter in acknowledgement of my charge. I took the liberty of sending it in consequence of having by accident seen your letter in the Morning Herald and admired the chivalrous integrity which led you to write as you did to such a paper. I think if you had read many of these articles; such e.g. as that on Sisterhoods and my charge you would scarcely have felt it possible or thought it right so completely to hide the lancet in the sponge in reproving them.

As to what you are good enough to say as to my treatment of the Eucharistic question I will only remark that I do not understand that there is any *real* difference between myself and the Bishop of London though my language is more that of R. Hooker and the Martyr Philpot[1] and *his* that of Waterland[2] and his school.

Of my beloved brother how shall I speak? That such a man as I know him to be should be suffered to fall so deeply is one of the greatest mysteries of our present state.[3]

Towards the fearfully corrupt and superstitious schism (for so in addition to its other evils it clearly is here) which has ensnared him I only feel a deeper aversion than I have felt before and I know not how a stronger assertion could be expressed. You may therefore conceive the additional pangs which must be inflicted upon me by the wicked falsehoods which the M. H. utters and the unwary believe.

I am, my dear Mr. Perceval, very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

568. To C. Eyre[4] *(vi 74)*

Most Private

Wiston, Dec. 5, 1854

My dear Mr. Eyre,

I should be glad if you saw fit to nominate the Rev. F. Rose, D.D., of Woughton, Bucks. to the Perpetual curacy of Baulking &c.

But before you do so I must state his case and my reasons.

Five or *six* years ago, Dr. Rose was delated to me as guilty of adultery with a parishioner. He solemnly denied the charge — a commission was issued by me under the Church Discipline Act: which reported that there were prima facie grounds for further proceedings. Dr. Rose as he said at the time fearing the ruinous expences of the Arches Court submitted, under a solemn declaration of innocence, to my Judgement; and I sentenced him to suspension for three years and until he obtained testimonials. [Under that suspension he still remains;] I am convinced that his resuming duty in that neighbourhood would be most

[1] John Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester, who was burnt at the stake in 1555. His works were published by the Parker Society in 1842.

[2] Daniel Waterland (1683–1740), Cambridge theologian; a formidable opponent of latitudinarian ideas.

[3] Robert Isaac Wilberforce had seceded to Rome in 1854 after the case of Ditcher v. Denison involving the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist which the High Churchmen incidentally won. It was the necessity of applying to a secular court of appeal which offended many consciences.

[4] Addressed to R. Eyre, but Charles Eyre (formerly Archer-Houblon) (1806–86), of Welford Park, Berks., patron of Baulking (near Uffington, Berks.), must be meant. Baulking became a separate ecclesiastical parish in 1846.

injurious: but I feel it hard that he should be permanently set aside. For first the crime was not proved: secondly: the Rev. T. Athawes[1] a very good man and one of the commissioners has since become convinced of his innocence: and the Rev. H. Bellairs[2] Father to the Queens Inspector in whose town he long lived is equally convinced. For a long time he refused to remove; but at last he assented. Has sold the advowson of his living; and is willing to take such an incumbency as this and so vacate his present living.

Should you with the full knowledge of all these circumstances and of the difficulty of finding an incumbent for Baulking be disposed to give it to him I should be glad that he should have the trial and be removed from his old sphere.[3]

Should you disapprove of this I will not fail to continue with my efforts to find an incumbent but it is a most difficult post to fill.

I am ever my dear Mr. Eyre, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

Mr. Law is promoted to a living and he writes to ask me how the duty at Baulking and Woolstone is to be provided for: the income not being sufficient to pay the usual fee to a temporary clergyman.[4]

569. To the Rev. T. T. Carter *(vi 78)*

26 Pall Mall, Dec. 6, 1854

My dear Carter,

The queries you speak of are sent round by the Committee of Convocation and I hope will be universally circulated.

Private. I have looked through a large part of the Liturgies you have sent me: and in the part I have looked through I see nothing to object to but a few words here and there. But I should not be willing to *sanction* its publication and use: because I feel persuaded that evil would result from my doing so in the present jealous and irritable state of the minds of members of our Church as to such matters. For it certainly is a liturgy of a different tone and class from our own: and a single Bishop authorising such an alteration of tone would stir up against [himself] and against the Institution a storm of opposition — nor am I at all sure that the effect of it would be good amongst ourselves. The novelty and peculiarity of this liturgy would endear it to many: and such persons going forth from our Institution and finding no gratification elsewhere in our Church for the taste which had been thus created would be exposed to a great temptation to seek in the Roman Communion the nearest approximation they could obtain to that to which it should have accustomed them.

1 John Athawes (1796–1864), J.P., R. of Loughton, Bucks., 1833–64; a barrister before his ordination (C).

2 Henry Bellairs (1790–1872), R. of Bedworth, Warws., from 1830 (*MEB*); he had been wounded at Trafalgar, and was a naval officer before his ordination. His son, Henry Walford Bellairs (1812–1900), was an Inspector of Schools, 1844–72 (*MEB*), an office which through novelty and scarcity of numbers was clearly of higher status than today (Matthew Arnold was also an Inspector).

3 The Bishop's advocacy prevailed, and Rose went to Baulking. Wilberforce may show here an interesting readiness to accept the views on an accused colleague of clerics with a wider experience of the world than usual.

4 Frederick Henry Law (1827–1907) was P.C. of Berrow, Worcs., 1854–8; he had done duty at Baulking for little more than a year, 1853–4.

My own view is that it would be a most valuable addition to our Liturgical Literature: and that Mr. Neale should publish it as such.

I grieve not in this as in everything else to yield at once to your wishes and those of others who in this think with you: but I must *act* on what at last commends itself to my Judgement. I will [deliver] the Mss. to Eton.

[ ]yours,

S. Oxon.

570. To the Hon. R. Cavendish *(vi 75)*

The Lodge, Eton (address 26 Pall Mall), Dec. 8, 1854

My dear Mr. Cavendish,

I can suggest no other course which seems to me to be so [good] as that which you propose.

I wish strongly to recommend you to apply to E. Street, [Beaumont Street, Oxford, to supply you with plans of a Parsonage and at the same time with drawings of a village school both of] which he will I am sure be happy to do at once on the understanding that there is just the measure of uncertainty therein as to the raising funds for the two last, and that he is to be paid as usual by a percentage when that money is raised. This will secure ultimate unity in the plans.[1]

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[*Barely legible*]

571. To the Rev. H. Roberts *(vi 76)*

Address, 26 Pall Mall, Dec. 8, 1854

Rev. Sir,

I can give you no name of any informant: having heard the charge which I stated to you and required you to contradict from many.[2]

I shall consider your silence as an admission of its truth unless I hear by next Wednesday that you *distinctly* deny it. I must require you also to [state to me] the *situation* and the *size* of your alledged residence in East Hampstead Parish; and whether in addition to it you occupy any other house in the neighbourhood.

I am Rev. Sir, Yours sincerely,

S. Oxon.

572. To the Rev. A. Coote *(vi 77)*

Eton. Address, 26 Pall Mall, Dec. 8, 1854

My dear Mr. Coote,

It is with extreme pain that I write to you the result of my enquiry as to Mr. Roberts. I take for granted from your silence as to the reason of his wish to leave Pauls Cray that *you* did not suppose it would prove the insuperable [obstacle it] is to my acceding to the exchange you desire. It was perhaps natural that he should evade my question on the subject: but I deeply regret that you did not mention it to me at first. That a clergyman whose wife has eloped with his Usher and who is even now seeking or about to seek for a divorce would come to

1 Presumably for buildings at Nash (cf. no. 556).

2 For the outcome, see note to no. 563. Easthampstead's troubles ended with the nomination by Christ Church in 1860 of the energetic Osborne Gordon.

any Parish, even if the result of the trial showed him to be [entirely] blameless, under the greatest disadvantage for any spiritual service I hold to be absolutely certain — and until the issue of the trial it is quite impossible to say whether on many points his own conduct may appear to be entirely without fault.

I have heard that a Mr. Battye[1] the incumbent of Hever near Edenbridge in Kent would be willing to exchange it for Marsh Gibbon and to allow you to take Pauls Cray. If you would wish for this arrangement and Mr. Roberts would assent to it I would immediately make enquiries concerning Mr. Battye. But I forbear doing so till I know your mind. For the same reason I will ask you to communicate to Mr. Roberts the substance of this note.

I am, my dear Mr. Coote, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

573. To the Bishop of Winchester (C. R. Sumner) *(vi 79)*

Eton, Dec. 8, 1854

My dearest Lord,

I trust that I am not doing wrong in asking you to notice in such manner as you may think fit the conduct of the Rev. W. Brock of Bishops Waltham[2] in coming into my diocese to deliver a lecture at Reading on Monday Nov. 27, in the course of which he is reported by the Berks. Chronicle to have said. 'This passage describes the Oxford System — sapping and mining by a secret, slow but sure approach the citadels of our Christianity &c. Truly the honoured and trusted men of the city have been found to do the digging for the Papists in our reformed Church and right skilfully have they performed it. Yea in the highest places of the Church have these men been set to work and with no change of accustomed names and no overt invasion of old attachments and no direct and distinct hoisting of the flag of the Pope. *They have spoken of the 'simple Gospel way of Justification by Faith in Christ Crucified'* whilst it was the doctrine of Justification by works that they were insinuating and seeking to establish in its stead. The 'voice was Jacob's voice but the hands were the hands of Esau'. The words I have underlined are a quotation from my Charge just delivered at Reading. As Mr. Brock in the same lecture speaks of you as 'his Revered and honoured Diocesan' and gave 'a flat contradiction to the foolish reports' of a difference with you I trust he may even yet listen to you as to such conduct as this: and what your judgement of it would be I venture to assume.[3]

I am ever my dearest Lord, Your affectionate Friend,

S. Oxon.

574. To the Rev. W. B. Bliss[4] *(vi 80)*

Cuddesdon, Dec. 16, 1854

My dear Mr. Bliss,

The chapter[5] decline assenting to the union of Lower Winchendon to Cuddington. But yet I hope that you will not give up the scheme. I will do my

1 William Wilberforce Battye, A.K.C. died as Rector of Hever in 1890.
2 William Brock (1805–91), R. of Bishop's Waltham 1833–91 (O).
3 Sumner, a broad-minded Evangelical, had made Wilberforce an Archdeacon, and taught him many useful lessons. Whatever the differences in churchmanship, personal friendship would assure Wilberforce of a sympathetic response to this letter.
4 William Blowers Bliss (1828–1915) (C).
5 Of Christ Church.

best to get Mr. Hayton[1] to appoint you Curate with say £40 per annum, and I should entertain every hope both of prevailing with him and also of hereafter prevailing with the College to agree to the union when they have seen the advantage which I doubt not will result from this practical union with you as Curate. I trust therefore earnestly that the great good I expect from the arrangement will not be lost.

I am very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

575. To the Rev. A. Coote *(vi 81)*

Cuddesdon, Dec. 16, 1854

My dear Mr. Coote,

I heartily wish that I could conscientiously approve of this exchange. It is sorely painful to me to grieve you and Mr. & Mrs. Plumptre whom I have reverenced and been sincerely attached to from my youth up.[2] But I dare not yield to these feelings. I have taken the opportunity of being in London to ask the advice of the Bishop of London and others of my brethren, without mentioning names, on the case, and they all took the same view. Nor do I think did the Arch Bishops view decidedly differ when he found that a divorce was not yet obtained. No such difficulty would apply to Hever because it is in the same Diocese: and I repeat if Mr. Roberts is favourable I will immediately take means to ascertain if P and Mr. Battye could agree to the change. You say I have 'judged harshly' of Mr. Roberts. This really astonishes me for I have not said one syllable against *him*. It is his *circumstances* to which I object.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

576. To the Hon. R. Cavendish *(vi 82)*

Cuddesdon, Dec. 16, 1854

My dear Mr. Cavendish,

It has occurred to me since I last wrote to you that I ought to have said in answer to your expressed wish for directions that it is requisite *I* should see any plans for a Parsonage before contracts are signed.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

577. To the Rev. R. Aitken *(vi 84)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 23, 1854

My dear Sir,

I was yesterday informed by one of my incumbents, that an intimate friend of his, a clergyman, lately visiting in Cornwall, was informed by another clergyman an intimate friend of yours, that you had informed him that you had recently visited me at Cuddesdon and that I had no family prayers, and that no grace before or after meals was ever said in my house.

[1] Thomas Hayton, V. of Long Crendon and Lower Winchendon.

[2] Algernon Coote married (1847) Cecilia, daughter of John Pemberton Plumptre (1791–1864), M.P., of Fredville Park, near Dover.

May I request you to inform me, as I imagine to be the case, that you have never made any such statement, that I may send your contradiction to my Friend the Rev. E. Payne.[1]

I am very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

578. To the Rev. J. Brogden *(vi 85)*

Private

Dec. 26, 1854

My dear Mr. Brogden,

With much difficulty I succeeded in getting a grant of £20 made to you from the Sons of the Clergy on my statement that it should bona fide go to meet real family needs and starting you when free from the sequestration. I must remind you that if it is not so employed my word will be forfeited to the Board: I am told that Mr. Field is your receiver of such money, Shall I send it to him? Will you explain the enclosed?[2]

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

579. To the Rev. E. Q. Ashby[3] *(vi 86)*

Private

Dec. 27, 1854

My dear Sir,

I cannot avoid mentioning to you a report which has reached me, and which I trust is incorrect. It is that you have formed an attachment for the daughter of a clergyman in Leicestershire and have made arrangements for her quitting her Father's house in defiance of his authority and remonstrances in order to marry you. Such an act would bring such serious discredit on your character as a clergyman that I cannot forbear expressing to you in friendly confidence that there is no foundation whatever for imputing it to you [*sic*].

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

580. To the Churchwardens of Littlemore *(vi 87)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 28, 1854

Sirs,

The presentments concerning Littlemore had not been brought under my notice when your letter of the 23rd reached me, though they were reserved by Mr. Davenport to submit to me hereafter.

I have carefully considered these presentments and have to observe on them as follows:—

1 Edward Payne (1810–86), Fellow of New College, 1826–38; V. of Swalcliffe, 1837–86; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, 1869 (O); Rural Dean.

2 Brogden's living was sequestered for debt, and he was trying to live on the curate's stipend; a full account will be found in Pugh, c. vi. See below, no. 594. Samuel Field was a Deddington solicitor (Gardner's *Oxon. Directory*, p. 529).

3 Addressed to C. J. Ashby in error for Edward Quenby Ashby (1805–71), R. of Dunton 1842–71 (O). His story is in Diocese Book, II, p. 193: 'Divorced from former wife after much opposition in the H. of Lords. In June 1855 elopes with daughter of Rev. E. H. Hoare & marries her the next day in London . . . She dies. He on illhealth gets dispensation for non-residence. *Her* brother C. Hoare curate'.

Presentment 4. 'No communion table; a fixed stone altar and coverings of different colours are used.'

I am not aware of anything contrary to the Rules of the Church of England in the variety of colour in the coverings — I have always been used to see a black covering in Passion Week.

As to the 'fixed stone altar' — I am informed this has been in the Church ever since its original consecration, by my predecessor. If so it can only be removed by the Parish undertaking a suit for that purpose in the ecclesiastical Courts.

Presentments 16 & 17.

I am informed that 'the statement that a rate was refused last Easter' is incorrect — no rate having been asked for. That the statement that 'a memorial to me was got up and signed' is incorrect — the memorial having been to the Incumbent: who in consequence of it (and not as is incorrectly implied to prevent its being forwarded to me) changed the chanted into a plain service. I am informed that the rate granted on the 7th of November was *not* as you assert granted 'on conditions'.

I can find nothing improper in the fact of there *being paintings introduced into the Chancel*; unless its subjects are improper or superstitious, which you do not alledge. The Chancel is *not* the proper place for the Ten Commandments but the East End of *the Church*: external to the Chancel.

As to the *place of the Minister*: I am informed that ever since the consecration of the Church he has been similarly placed: and that he is *heard* perfectly by all the congregation.

I know of no objection to the *gathering of alms in velvet bags*; provided the alms so gathered are collected into 'a decent basin' to be placed on the Holy Table: and this I am informed is always done at Littlemore.

It is your duty as Churchwardens to provide a *table of prohibited degrees* of marriage.

I cannot conclude this notice of your presentments without remarking upon the inaccuracies in them which I have pointed out above: and saying further, what I deeply regret to add, that I think there is in them a tone of hostility to your Clergyman, in presenting such matters as the use of velvet bags, etc., which is most unbecoming your position.

I earnestly entreat you by the love of our Lord Jesus Christ to seek after peace and to submit yourself gladly in all things [proper] to your lawful spiritual Pastor.[1]

I am yours faithfully,

S. Oxon.

581. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon

(vi 88)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 30, 1854

My dear Mr. Paddon,

In your letter of Nov. 23, to which I have waited till now to reply in consequence of the heavy Family Sorrows with which it has pleased God to visit you, you say, that you write 'in order to preserve a statement of facts to which you may be able to refer in case of need'. This forces me to examine how far your statement of facts is correct.

[1] George William Huntingford (1815–1900), Fellow of New College, 1833–50; V. of Littlemore, 1851–72.

Now your statement is this.

'I. Until I received your last letter I was not aware that you annexed to your consent that I should be absent from my Vicarage three years the condition that I should provide 3 clergymen.

II. 'I do not hesitate to say that no such condition was at any time made known to me.'

III. 'On the contrary what you said was this, "if you are to be absent three years you must not leave Mr. Bellis alone. Accordingly I appointed Mr. Poulter to assist him with your sanction.'

IV. 'Upon such consent I acted; and through your permission having taken a house for three years and removed my family to this place I am afraid you will have to adopt legal measures against me' to compel my 'return to residence before the expiration of two of my three years.'

Now the first time you mentioned a license for non-residence was on the 8th of August, 1853. In that letter you said: 'if it was not the Lords Will, that' (by exchange) 'I should obtain a smaller living I cannot help [but go under a licence (of non-residence) etc. for] two *or* three years accordingto my ability to resume duty'.

To this I replied Aug. 25 — & how completely I made you understand what I should require before granting you such a license is plainly shewn by your answer in which you say 'I am hoping to meet your wishes in obtaining the aid of Mr. Poulter together with Mr. Bellis and Mr. Williams during my absence'.

At this time I went abroad for a few weeks but on my return home I found a letter from you dated Sept. 9, asking me distinctly for 'a license for non-residence for three years' and adding 'I propose to visit my Parish from time to time and to control all the working of it, and also *to keep up the usual services of three clergymen*'. I leave you to compare your statements which I have numbered I, II, III with this. And now for your IVth — stated most clearly *when you wrote Sep.* 19 to *request* a license (which I *then*[1] refused except on conditions to which [you did] not assent) you had received no 'consent' from me '[on which] you acted' — and in fact in your next letter dated . . . [*illegible*] . . . you say I am so much benefitted by my visit to . . . [*illegible*] . . . as to reduce *my application for rest* to 6 months [shewing] clearly that up to Oct. 18 you had received no '*consent*' from me to a *three years* absence, when you 'reduced your *application* to 6 months' marking that it was still in your eyes only an application, and yet in your last letter you tell me that the engagement of your house for three years which you now try to fix on my 'consent' was made on the '*29th of August*' — two months prior to the time when you were making your 'reduced application'; three weeks before the time when you *applied* for the licence for non residence; and five weeks *before*[1] the time (Oct. 11) when I replied to you and told you on what conditions I would grant it. I trust that I have made plain to you the gross inaccuracy of the assertion by which you have endeavoured to fix on me the fact of your (wholly unknown to me until told of it long afterwards in your own parish) having engaged a house for three years at Rugby.

It follows from this that no such moral obligation rests on me, as you would urge, to grant you prolonged non-residence, and judging of the case on its own merits I must require you to return into residence next May: and as you intimate that legal measures only will compel you to return I shall at once serve on you a monition to that effect.

I am, my dear Mr. Paddon, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Underlined twice.

582. To Miss Hulme (*vi 89*)

Cuddesdon, Dec. 30, 1854

My dear Miss Hulme,

I am very sorry that the great occupation of my time lately hindered my replying sooner as to your writing to Mr. A. Leigh. I have ventured to make one or two suggestions in the enclosed and see no objection whatever to your sending it.

I see no objection to the nominal sale of the whole land: it is merely a *legal* fiction.

Mr. Ford has created a wrong *impression* in your mind about the school though he may have stated his facts with literal correctness. The Government get no power of interference: *but* they require the adoption of a certain form of Trust Deed, which trust deed vests the government of the school in the subscribers to its maintenance: and *this* condition is what is objected to in neighbourhoods where there are likely to be subscribers. I do not myself think the objection strong enough to refuse the aid: but I wished you to act everywhere with your eyes open.

There need with the Vicar's concurrence be no difficulty about the Patronage.

I think as to the probability of a villa population springing up round Boyne Hill;[1] and so of your primary object of building for the poor being in some measure defeated, that you hardly take a just view of the case. You must remember that spots where *only* the poor are to be found are almost always out of the way, undesireable places. Now you from circumstances were unable to build in such a place. I suggested to you more than one where you could have had the poor and the poor only: but for what I thought quite sufficient reasons you resolved not to build at them but to find a spot suitable for your sister's residence. Now it follows as a *necessary* consequence that wherever you had built a Church *so circumstanced* it was to be expected that the same features which made it suit you would make it attractive to others and that a richer population would be created round your Church. Your guard I think must be in seeing that if your population increases you have a rich man's aisle added to your poor man's church; and I should wish you to build so as to provide for this possible contingency. I *do* believe that you will thus effect your own object. Heartily praying God to bestow on you all the blessings and comforts of this holy season I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

583. To the Rev. A. Coote (*vi 83*)

Jan. 1, 1855

My dear Mr. Coote,

I am very glad that Mr. Roberts is willing to enter into negotiations which may still put you into possession of Paul's Cray. But before I take any steps to enquire about Mr. Battye I must come to a clear understanding as to your claim to satisfy yourself about your successor. This I distinctly disallow. You have *not*[2] the responsibility of the Patronage of Marsh Gibbon and I decline acceding to any change of preferment or taking any step in the matter so long as you claim in any way to exercise it. I am sure that it *is* my responsibility and *not* yours and I cannot hand it in measure over to you.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] The ecclesiastical parish of All Saints, Boyne Hill, was formed in 1858, and the new church was designed by G. E. Street. The Bishop was prophetic: the church was enlarged in 1907.

[2] Underlined twice.

584. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(vi 90)*

Jan. 2, 1855

My dear Mr. Paddon,

I cannot qualify the expressions in which I described your assertions: but if you will shew me any letter of mine which granted you the permission I will at once withdraw them. I so greatly distrust my own memory that I referred to all the records I possessed of our correspondence before I replied to you, and so far as that correspondence goes my words are fully justified.

I pass over your other improper and intemperate expressions as instances of that heat of temper which so often betrays you into what you, I am sure, afterwards repent of. You little know me when you impute to me that difference of opinion from your ultra [evangelical views] had led me to be severe with you. I have borne with and overlooked, in your case what I have never had to bear with from another: and certainly should not have borne with, from one whose opinions were as sound as to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, as I heartily wish that I could believe yours to be.

I am very sincerely and in spite of all your hard words, Affectionately yours,

S. Oxon.

585. To the Rev. Vaughan Thomas *(vi 91)*

Most Secret

My dear Mr. Vaughan Thomas,

This is a deeply perplexing case. I inclose for you to read, in the confidence which exists between us, the *confidential* reply to my enquiries which I have just received from Mr. Hobhouse: and, with this in your hands, will you allow me to ask you, as perhaps more able than any other man to advise me wisely, what course you think it would be *right* for me to take. *Legal* ground for refusing to license Mr. O.[1] I cannot of course have: for the Church Discipline bill limits all proceedings to 'within two years: and yet I feel that the ministry of Mr. O. *here* is too likely to cause injury to him [and to the Church].

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

586. To Sir H. P. Willoughby[2] *(vi 92)*

Confidential

Jan. 2, 1855

My dear Sir,

Will you once more allow me to bring before [you the] case of the Curate of Marsh Baldon.[3]

There can I trust now be no difficulty [by] the appointment of a committee to [advise] the Incumbent as to the termination of the Suit which prevents the apportionment of the Rent Charge and therefore the supply of means for paying

1 Probably H. N. Oxenham.

2 Sir Henry Pollard Willoughby (1796–1865), 3rd Bart; M.P. for Evesham, 1847–65 (*MEB*); Patron of Marsh Baldon.

3 Marsh Baldon was held from 1831 to 1858 by Hugh Pollard Willoughby, a younger brother of the patron (O). In Diocese Book, II, p. 39a, Wilberforce records doubts about the arrangements which a new incumbent might have made with the patron Sir Hugh Willoughby to reduce the real value of the living.

the Curate. He is an excellent young man and I pray you to read the inclosed letter from his Father and I cannot doubt that you will be ready to join with me in [settling the matter].

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

587. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(vi 93)*

Jan. 6, 1855

My dear Mr. Paddon,

I heartily wish that consistently with my sense of duty I could grant you the extended absence you desire. Your Parishioners require your return and *unless* you can shew me that my extracts from your letters are contradicted by some written proof of the promise you alledge I must require your return. I shall be obliged by your acknowledging the safe arrival of the enclosed document: for I would not willingly have it fall into other hands.

I am very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

588. To the Rev. P. Hookins[1] *(vi 94)*

Private

Jan. 6, 1855

My dear Mr. Hookins,

I have heard with much grief from Mr. Payne what has recently occurred touching your Curate — and I feel compelled to address you about it.

Mr. Payne having heard that it was charged against a young Curate that he had been late on a Saturday night so engaged, could not, whether the report which reached him was absolutely true or not, have acted more kindly or more properly than by bringing privately before you that you might speak to your Curate,[2] the existence of such a report. This was Mr. Payne's sole motive for naming it to you as it was to my knowledge the motive of *his* informant in *naming* it to *him*. I am quite ready to accept as true Mr. H's statement that he left Deddington *before* instead of *after* 12 on the Saturday night: and still I say that to convey privately through you such a caution when the society in which Mr. H. had been had given rise to the report, was the kindest and wisest step which could be taken and I earnestly hope that even now Mr. H. will seek to . . . [*illegible*] . . . the caution which was intended for him.

But I must further add to you, that I deeply regret the course you have taken, in divulging to other persons and making into a public scandal such a friendly and confidential communication. In doing this you have in my Judgement:—

I. injured Mr. Hutchinson.

II. Thrown difficulties in the way of the discharge of the duties of his office by Payne — as upright, highminded and chivalrously gentlemanlike a man as I ever met with — and in doing this further you have III injured the discipline of the Diocese: in maintaining which the difficult delicate too often obnoxious, and always unrewarded office of the Rural Dean is a most important instrument when administered as in this case it has been by Mr. Payne.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Philip Hookins (1803–92), P.C. of Barford St. Michael 1851–91, Milcombe 1854–60, Little Barford, 1858–91 (C). Apparently he was not very happy in his parishes and would have resigned in 1862 but for trouble about dilapidations (Diocese Book, II, p. 46).

[2] Francis Edmund Hutchinson (1831–1921) was C. of Barford St Michael and Milcombe 1854–7, Alverstoke 1857–8. He was a respected V. of Tisbury, Wilts., 1858–1913 (O).

589. To the Rev. T. Andrews[1] *(vi 95)*
Jan. 9, 1855

Rev. and Dear Sir,

My attention has been called at this visitation to the fact that you have at present only one service on Sundays in your Church. Unless there is some reason with which I am not acquainted why there should not be two I feel it my duty to require that there should be. I shall be glad to hear from you at your early convenience on the subject.

I am very faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

590. To the Rev. A. Coote *(vi 96)*
Jan. 9, 1855

My dear Mr. Coote,

I hasten to say to you that the result of my enquiries as to Mr. Battye is that though an excellent man he is not a person who possesses the Peculiar qualifications which in its present condition, I believe Marsh Gibbon to require in its Rector. I am very sorry that this should be so.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

591. To the Rev. P. Hookins *(vi 97)*
Jan. 10, 1855

My dear Mr. Hookins,

I am of course anxious to listen to any explanation or statement of yours, but I am perfectly unable to understand *what* you want *enquired* into. I know *all*, about what I have written to you about. The Rural Dean[2] told you, to have it repeated to your Curate, for his warning, a statement which had been made to him for the like purpose, viz. that he (the Curate) was reported to have been till late on Saturday night at the house of a Deddington parishioner for social purposes. It matters not, so far as regards the Rural Dean and his informant, whether this was true or false: it was believed and talked about; to the young man's injury; and the best and truest and kindest thing which could be done was what the Rural Dean and his informant did, to convey it through you straight to the young man. There it ought to have rested. There it did *not* rest. You have taken it up; and have required the R.D. to give his informant's name &c. For this I censure your judgement; and must repeat and not 'unsay' my words.

I have seen the case and evidence collected by Mr. Hutchinson: and all the correspondence. What then can I 'enquire into'. I will allow that the report which stated Mr. H. to have gone back at 12.30 on the morning of Sunday was an

1 Thomas Andrews (1776–1856), P.C. of Coggs 1810–56 (O). 'Old and nearly imbecile: to be two services on Sunday after Easter' (Diocese Book, II, p. 150).
2 Edward Payne.

exaggeration of Mr. Gulliver's[1] servant — and that instead, he was home by 11; and fell asleep trying, after his social evening, to read over his sermon. But what then? How does this affect the question at issue between you and me. Was it better for Mr. H's good repute to have received privately a word of caution from you, or to have it brought out that he was shooting and dining with these parishioners . . . [*illegible*] . . . For his sake, for your own sake; for our Church's sake I beseech you seek, even now, peace in this matter. Depend on it, nothing but harm can come to all these from going on in your present line.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

592. To the Dean of Ely (G. Peacock) (?) *(vi 98)*
Private

Jan. 13, 1855

My dear Dean,

1. We are *certainly* to have one day of free discussion on Feb. 6. The Archbishop and the Government assent.

2. I greatly hope that no difficulty will be raised against such prolonged debates as may be needful to accomplish any actual business.

3. I should suggest the Priviledges report — the Reform report — the Church Rates report — as best. There is *one* objection to the Church Services, that we report the House to need reform and so give Denison ground for troubling us. But it is the most popular subject of all. The [Joint] commee on Church Rates meets Feb. 1 to sit de die in diem.

Most Private

4. Will you, if near the time it appears necessary join in a representation to Lord [Aberdeen][2] of not prematurely terminating the discussions of the Houses. It would be intended to strengthen *his* hands against suggestions of the importance of stopping us. (Nos. 1 2 3 you may use at discretion — please to consider 4 as strictly confidential.) Poor Lord Blandfords[3] blundering reachings out after good [standing] illustrate the want of convocation for business.

I am ever my dear Dean, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

593. To the Rev. A. Coote *(vi 99)*

Jan. 13, 1855

My dear Mr. Coote,

Since I wrote to you Mr. Battye has been here. I do *not* regard the matter now as absolutely closed with regard to him: or another change for Mr. Roberts

1 Frederick Guiliver, of Porch House, was a farmer at Deddington in 1852 (Gardner's *Oxon. Directory*, p. 530).
2 Not in MS.
3 John Winston Spencer-Churchill (1822–83), later 7th Duke of Marlborough; styled Marquess of Blandford, 1840–57; M.P. for Woodstock, 1844–5 and 1847–57.

which I have been trying to bring about. But I consider the case of Mr. Roberts coming to Marsh Gibbon as absolutely closed under all circumstances.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

594. To the Rev. W. C. Risley[1] *(vi 100)*

Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 22, 1855

My dear Friend,

Your letter this morning has greatly pained me from the pain which it shows in you. I assure you that you have quite mistaken what passed on Friday if you suppose that any impression to your injury was made on me by what was said by Mr. Hookins or Mr. Brogden.

I understand Mr. Hookins allusion to the Bishop's presence to refer quite as much to himself as to you; and to mean that the reconciliation took place in a sort of solemn way. I quite understand that there have been faults in H's management and I am sure that if *you* could have been prevailed upon to take Great Barford all would have gone well there. You know how much I wished it. As to Hall and Austin[2] all that I desired was that you should use that influence you so justly possess in favour of Hookins who with some evident peculiarities is I am convinced a good and right minded man. Do not I pray you doubt that I appreciate all your trials at Deddington; all the ingratitude you have received and are receiving there; or all your labours, services and help given so freely to our beloved Church. I know that men who are blessed with warm and generous hearts like yours, *must* by a law of nature be exposed to times of depression, and are liable to temptations to unguardedness of expression from which colder natures are exempt. But my dear Friend as you would not allow the latter in yourself so you must not give way to the former, and when you speak of maintaining for the future an obstinate silence, you must consent to exclude *me* from that rigorous law: for I am certain that you do not mean that any word you have ever spoken to *me* [h]as ever brought trouble to you: and I should feel that one of my truest, most faithful, most trusted, and oldest friends in the Diocese was shutting himself up against me if you altered toward me.

I do earnestly desire to see you trusting Mr. Hookins and feeling and acting towards him accordingly. I feel sure that *he* would repay such confidence: and I really think that you mistook on Friday the expression of *pain* which I saw in him, for 'ungraciousness'. I say nothing about poor B. You know what I think of him, and I only desire that whilst you live in his parish there should be no rupture. I should be truly thankful if *you* would tell me the whole case of the schools and the feoffee question. I want no other informant. I shall not be easy till I hear from you again. I beg my kindest remembrances to Mrs. Risley and am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

1 William Cotton Risley (1798–1869), Fellow of New College, 1816–29; V. of Whaddon, Wilts., 1829, Deddington, 1836–48. He continued to reside at Deddington (in Deddington House, New Street), but as this letter shows was not altogether successful in his efforts to smooth out the harm done by the drunken Brogden (cf. no. 578), and it was proposed that he should replace Hookins at the Barfords in 1862. As a man of independent means, in favour with the Bishop, Risley must have caused considerable irritation to some of his neighbours. See H. M. Colvin, *A History of Deddington* (1963), pp. 99–101.

2 Richard Hall, of Buttermilk Hall, and William Austin were farmers at Great Barford in 1852 (Gardner's *Oxon. Directory*, p. 662).

595. To the Rev. C. Alcock[1] *(vi 101)*
Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 22, 1855

My dear Mr. Alcock,

I have lately seen Mr. Hookens and find him much distressed by the opposition he meets with in the parish of Great Barford from your tenant Mr. Hall. I greatly wish that you would use your influence with Mr. Hall as his Landlord to bring about a better state of things. I think it important that you should not allude to *me* in the matter.

Heartily wishing you God's blessing in this New Year, and thanking you for your generous contributions to Milton Church.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

596. To Messrs. Burder and Dunning *(vi 102)*

Jan. 22, 1855

Gentlemen,

I have to acknowledge your sheet of accounts — and to make one or two remarks thereon to which I beg to call your attention.

1. July 11. Making abstract of Visitation Queries. £3: 3: 0.

I have referred to Mr. Burder's account of 1851 when the same thing was done for me and find that then no charge was made: such assistance having hitherto been considered as paid for by the advantages accruing in virtue of the Secretary's office. If I am to understand that this is to be revised under the new firm, I shall feel it my duty to revise all these advantages which have heretofore covered such incidental charges.

2. Aug. 30. Abstracting Visitation Queries. £4.

I make the same remark — only adding that this seems a second charge for the same work done.

3. Oct. Hotel expences on your Lordship's visitation. £8: 10: –.

As Mr. John Burder was with me only for a day or two on his own account and Mr. Davenport paid my charges, I do not understand this article and shall be obliged by a statement of its items in detail.

4. Messrs. Davis & Saunders. Bill for Valuation.

(I thought that this had been included in last year's account which Mr. Burder had to correct and never returned me. I beg again for a copy of that account). Amount £56.2.7.

5. April 7. Convocation Fees. £4: –: –.

Paid to Whom? By whose order? for what?

I am ever yours truly,

S. Oxon.

597. To the Rev. T. Chamberlain *(vi 103)*

Lavington, March 15, 1855

My dear Mr. Chamberlain,

I think it right to tell you that I have been informed by one who knows it to be a fact that a sermon you preached a few weeks back on the wrong use of Holy

[1] Charles Alcock (1795–1858), resident in New College, Fellow of New College, 1814–35; V. of Adderbury, 1836–58.

Scripture and the danger of private interpretation has led one young man in one of our Colleges to abstain from reading them at all. I am not at liberty to mention more of the matter to you: but I have been so urgently pressed to mention this, from a most [unexpected] quarter,[1] in order that you may seek to remove such an impression that I feel [bound in confidence to do so].

Whilst speaking on subjects of this disagreeable nature I think I ought also to say that I have long had a disagreeable apprehension in my mind that you do not discourage at the celebration of the Holy Communion very extreme postures and prostrations in your Church. I have *now* no scruple in saying to you that my impression was derived from what my elder Brother Robert observed when he last officiated for you . . . [*Remainder illegible*].

598. To Mrs. Sidney Herbert[2] (*vi 106*)
Confidential

Aug. 16, 1855

My dear Mrs. Herbert,

I will not waste time in saying how I have longed to write sooner, but try to put down what I want to say: how I wish I could *speak* instead. Could you and Sidney come here any time in the next month?

I *did* call habitual confession a great snare and a great danger and I do indeed believe it to be so. But I must first limit and define. I speak of the *habit* of confession and that further habit of submitting to the *Direction* of [another to] which more or less it must lead. I do not speak of confession used when there is a sufficient cause for it: that is to say when there is (1) the consciousness of some sin burdening the conscience and which a [general confession and absolution do not remove] (2) when there is some real question as to duty which another can help us to solve. In either of these cases, confession and absolution in the first, confession alone in the second, are God's ordinance: the power of the keys. This is the Primitive use of confession.

Now I think you will see at once that thus treated confession is a medicine provided by God's love for a disease. It is therefore to be used as a medicine for that disease — and this will lead straight to the *danger*. When a man is really sick he ought to call in a physician and give the care of his body up to him. But if in ordinary health, though no man's health is perfect, a man consults his doctor at every mouthful he eats he becomes a hypocondriac [*sic*]. And it is just the same as to the soul. God means us in ordinary cases to manage our own conscience with the aid of his Word, the public ministrations of it and of his Sacraments in the Church. If on the contrary we grow to depend on another for constant direction we perfectly weaken conscience. And even this is not all. The great trial perhaps of our [moral] probation here is the truly wholehearted realizing the presence of God and of Christ. Now the occasional use of this ordinance of confession &c. sends us back more able to commune with Him. But when once we have formed a constant habit of confessing to another, of receiving his direction, of restraining ourselves from the fear of his reproof or chastisement, when we act on his direction of us: we *do* get to [trust] him instead of Christ. The truth of

[1] John David Macbride (1778–1868), Principal of Magdalen Hall, Oxford, 1813–68 (*DNB*). Diocese Book, II, p. 369b, gives the story.

[2] Mary Elizabeth (1822–1911), wife of Sidney Herbert (1810–61), later first Baron Herbert of Lea. Her husband was a pronounced High Churchman; she became a Roman Catholic in 1862.

Christ's presence retires from us whilst the conscience is growing weaker as the effect of the fuller development of the *habit* of unquestioning obedience; we sin, growing to lean on the creature instead of the reality of the presence of the Lord and Redeemer.

And what makes this all the more dangerous is that as it is an assistance in overcoming [direct] evil &c. (as you describe) the subtilty of the temptation is almost sure to escape our notice. Hence we seem to ourselves growing in Holiness whilst in truth the great foundations of the truest Christian character are subverted. Now against this the Primitive Church guarded carefully never *allowing* for more than 300 years private confession and absolution except in the rare cases to which I have alluded: *this* is what the Roman Communion has developed and systematized *as the corner stone* of a System of Priestcraft: and this is what has made it with all its high development of *Devotion* lower the *moral tone* because the conscience of its people.

This is a sketch: will you write and tell me if it suffices to explain my view or ask any further questions . . . [*illegible*] . . .

I am very affectionately yours,

S. Oxon.

599. To Miss Paddon[1] (*vi 107*)
Confidential

Aug. 16, 1855

My dear Miss Paddon,

Your letter has found me here and I will answer it at once. The history of affairs at Wycombe is short and painful. Two years ago he asked me to allow him three years non-residence to recover his health. I consented *if* he would appoint a head curate whom I approved or let me do so and an assistant, and, not interfere again till he came back to reside. He refused. Still I let him continue away. He gave me increasing trouble as to curates and abused me most grossly, alternating with most affectionate language. I thank God my patience never failed. But his parish grew exceedingly discontented at its Vicar being non-resident. They declared it was *not* for health but because he had hired a house for 3 years for educating his boys at Rugby and did not mean to sacrifice the rent. From the highest to the lowest they memorialized me on the subject. All save a little clique by whom unhappily he judges of his parish. Unfortunately he raised these . . . [*illegible*] . . . by coming home to superintend his Hay Making and appearing particularly well. I was forced to interfere. He pleaded health and sent me a friendly certificate from a Rugby [doctor].[2] I told him that more was necessary and offered if he would go for the examination of Dr. Acland, Dr. Alderson or Dr. Watson[3] and their pronouncing (after hearing from me on the subject they were to investigate) absence needful to give him a licence. He refused. I told him that unless he withdrew his refusal I had no option but to summon him by legal process into residence. He refused to withdraw his refusal. I summoned him into residence. He disregarded the summons and I sequestered the living: and unless he returns within the time stated in the Act shall declare it void. Meantime I am about to license another Curate. I am convinced that by far the happiest

1 Sister of T. H. Paddon?
2 Not in MS.
3 Three well known doctors of the day: Henry Acland (1815–1900) of Oxford; James Alderson (1794–1882) and Thomas Watson (1792–1882), both of London (*DNB*).

thing for him and for all would be that he should resign the living. Nothing can exceed the utter neglect of the parish save one small clique which has [desired his return].

I am ever yours truly,

S. Oxon.

600. To the Rev. R. J. H. Rice[1] *(vi 104)*

Aug. 22

My dear Sir,

I am now prepared to allot you [a salary at the rate of] £70 and the use of the Vicarage House at Wycombe and shall be glad to know how soon you can take possession. I have through my man of business written to the Vicar to know whether he wishes the furniture removed or will let you use it for 10 per cent on its value as ascertained between two valuers.

I shall be glad to hear your wishes on this subject.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

601. To the Rev. B. L. Poyntz[2] *(vi 105)*

Aug. 22, 1855

My dear Sir,

You were licensed under other circumstances as Senior Curate: for Mr. Paddon retains as Vicar his chief responsibility and refused in writing to me to entrust you with it.

By the sequestration of the living this oversight of the Vicar is for the time removed: and I am by the Act of Parliament chargeable with the duty of providing a Senior Curate. This I am about to do. Your income will still be as now £100 and I will make myself responsible for £10 a year more in lieu of Lodging if you wish to remain as I hope you may under the new Curate.

You ought to take into account in settling this the probability of Mr. Paddon's return next year and your continuance under him. I shall be glad at your early convenience to receive your decision as to remaining as I wish to fix the day for the new Curate's coming.

I am yours ever,

S. Oxon.

602. To Major Coker[3] *(vi 108)*

Lavington House, Petworth, Aug. 22, 1855

My dear Sir,

I write at the request of Mr. Davenport to state to you (1) that I have no intention of letting this House to any tenant.

(2) That what you allude to as 'the Rectory House' is let till Christmas next.

1 Richard John Howard Rice (1828–1902), C. of High Wycombe, 1855; V. of Sutton Courtenay, 1855–1902 (O).

2 Benjamin Lucas Poyntz, of Trinity College, Dublin, held the curacy of High Wycombe 1854–5, and thereafter held only curacies in various parts of the country. He is not in Crockford for 1890.

3 Major Lewis Coker (1820–58) of Bicester House, Oxon.

But that at that time I shall be happy if it suits you to let it to you. It contains — a good Drawing Room with folding doors to a second: a good Dining Room and Library, W.C., and servants rooms on ground floor — 8 rooms over on first floor with servants rooms in attics — good stabling — and two men servants rooms over — garden: & good kitchen garden — furnished. The rent is £150 per annum. There is a large field close to the House which may further be rented for cows, &c., if desired by the tenant at the usual farmers rent.

Should you like to inspect the House my present tenants will be glad to shew you over everything. We are reached either by a fly from Arundel or Chichester Stations in 11 miles: or by Rail to Godalming: by train from London (1 p.m.) and Coach thence daily from Godalming by Coach to Petworth which leaves Godalming at 2.20 p.m. Petworth is 4 miles distant. I shall be happy to hear your wishes at your early convenience.

I am ever yours very truly,

S. Oxon.

603. To the Rev. B. L. Poyntz *(vi 109)*

Aug. 24, 1855

My dear Sir,

I have received a complaint that you have refused before burying in the recently consecrated cemetary to accompany the body into the Church and use there the appointed service. I apprehend that there must have been some special ground for such refusal which I shall be glad to know: since when I consecrated the cemetary I did so on the distinct understanding that till a Chapel was erected in it the Church should be used as heretofore, and the [funeral conducted thence to the burial ground].

I am . . . *[Unfinished]*

604. To the Rev. S. T. Adams[1] *(vi 110)*

Aug. 24 1855

My Dear Mr. Adams,

I have received yours of the 22nd and hasten to reply to it.

I at Mr. Templers request named in my first letter the general scheme which the Committee were to be requested to carry out and I stated that I should be personally obliged to the gentlemen he had named as willing to do so if they would undertake the task of carrying it out. But I never presumed to dictate to them what should be their line of conduct as to adding to their number. It is of course undesireable to make such a body too large: whilst it is also important not to shut out any who would add strength to its deliberations.

I may perhaps take this opportunity of saying that I shall be happy to subscribe £15 towards the Church and £5 towards the Parsonage to be paid on the day of Consecration.[2]

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Simon Thomas Adams (1807–89), R. of Great Horwood 1839–89 (O).

2 This letter concerns the separation of Nash from Thornton (see no. 556).

605. To the Rev. B. L. Poyntz *(vi 111)*
Aug. 28, 1855

My dear Mr. Poyntz,

I by no means wish you to expose your health to risk: when therefore the weather is wet or stormy I do not require you to go into the Church. But when the weather is favourable and no such danger to your health exists then I must require you to give the parishioners the full burial service going into the Church for it until the Cemetary Chapel is built. This I hope speedily to see effected. I must beg your *immediate* answer whether you will retain the Second Curacy of Wycombe with the stipend of £100 (to which I will secure the addition of £10 for lodging) under the first Curate whom I am about to license loco vicarii or whether you adhere to your resignation of the Curacy.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

606. To H. Hoare[1] *(vi 112)*
Aug. 28, 1855

My dear Hoare,

I have not time to enter fully by letter into the subject of your kind letter: but one or two things I must say as you are so kind as to ask me.

I. I object, as I have always done, to your remarks in note on P.8 of [correspondence] on the second paragraph of the 'report' as dangerously mystifying a very simple question. What that paragraph meant in all our mouths was simply this. There is a great cry abroad that no mere clerical assembly shall act for the Church. That Convocation therefore must be so remodelled as to contain with the Bishops not only as now a representation of the Clergy but also a representation of the Laity. Into this question we decline entering; not because we undervalue its importance for we think it of the very highest importance, but because we conceive our business to be to reform the actual convocation which is essentially a clerical body, not to make a new one which it would be if it included laity. Now in this statement I maintain there is nothing rash, obscure, or doubtful. We are giving the reason why we declined entering on a great question which many would have thrust on us: that question was the *representation* of the laity in convocation. If we had spoken about the lay question in any other relation it would *not* have been the question thrust on us; we gave the true reason why we refused to consider it — and in saying we had not considered it we could give no intimation of our having an opinion about it. *You* have mistyfied the matter till you seem to me unable to bring your usually clear sense to bear upon it.

II. I cannot but object to your P.S. by H. Hoare. (a) I think that nothing could be more fatal than convocation beginning to discuss 'the lay question'. (b) I think that '*the* lay question' is *not* either what the Bishop of Adelaide[2] is concerned in, or what Mr. Tooth's or your plan relate to: and I think it wholly misleading and

1 Henry Hoare (1807–66), the London banker and advocate of the revival of Convocation. A schoolfriend of Wilberforce, his London Society for the Revival of Convocation was one of the main motive forces for the renewal of regular business in 1852. (*MEB;* he is unaccountably not in *DNB.*) The proposals Hoare made were not put into effect until the Enabling Act of 1919 established the Church Assembly and the Diocesan and Ruri-decanal Conferences — thereby largely duplicating the work of Convocation.

2 Augustus Short (1802–83), Bishop of Adelaide, 1847–81 (*DNB*); see F. T. Whitington, *Augustus Short, First Bishop of Adelaide* (1888), c. viii.

confusing to speak of it as if it was. 'The lay question' as to which people are interested in *this*.[1] The Convocation (acting with Royal License &c.) has certain legal powers: it can make rules &c. which (when legally confirmed) can be enforced *by law*: and it is not a voluntary consultative body but a legal body with legal powers. 'The lay question' means whereas *now*[1] those legal powers are limited to the clergy: will you share *them*[2] with the laity. Your plan and Mr. Tooth's propose no such thing: they are schemes for enabling lay people to consult with those clerics who are *to keep* their legal powers still in their own hands exclusively. The Australian question does not touch it, for there no such constitutional powers exist to be imparted and the only question is how can the Bishop call together his clergy and laity to advise him. . . . I say then that such a P.S. as yours would utterly deceive men because they would understand by 'the lay question' one thing and you another. Pray [consider] this.

I am ever affectionately yours,

S. Oxon.

607. To the Rev. H. A. Small (*vi 113*)
Aug. 28, 1855

Rev. Sir,

It is impossible for me to do as you desire. You appeal to my feelings but it is a matter into which feelings cannot be allowed to enter. The union you have contracted is branded by the Church of which you are a Minister,[3] as incest: and a Bishop who from false notions of humanity suffered one living in incest to minister in the sanctuary would in my judgment deserve deprivation. No such step as you propose can alter your position: the law being that one bona fide and permanent resident in a foreign land may contract a marriage according to its laws; not one who goes there to evade the laws of his own land.

I am yours ever,

S. Oxon.

608. To the Rev. B. L. Poyntz (*vi 114*)
Aug. 31, 1855

My dear Sir,

I am not sure from your letter whether you quite understand the effect of your decision. You hold my license as first curate of Wycombe under the Vicar who was then only temporarily absent and who superintended as first Clergyman the management of the Parish, i.e. you were licensed as senior assistant curate. It is now my duty to appoint a senior curate to take the Vicar's place. I ask you if you will retain under him the post you have till now held under the Vicar. You refuse to do so: that is, in effect, you resign the curacy. I wish before I order your license to be cancelled accordingly, to be sure that you are aware of the consequences of your refusal, and I will not order it to be cancelled until you shall have had time *by return of post* [to] have told me whether this is your intention.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Underlined twice.
[2] Underlined thrice.
[3] See no. 229. Small married (incestuously) Miss Greaves of Haversham (Diocese Book, II, p. 270).

609. To H. Hoare (*vi 115*)
Aug. 31, 1855

My dear Hoare,

I. I do not differ *at all* from you as to the importance of securing lay co-operation or the strength so essential to us which it would give us.

II. I do *not* see how convocation can take up that subject: it seems to me a matter for Diocesan consultation and action.

III. I feel confident that every member of the reform committee who thought at all about the matter meant the same thing. As to the question of joining a lay element to the old convocation of the clergy, whilst we think it a question of life and death, we do not think it our question, have not discussed it, and give no sort of opinion express or implied about it.

IV. I did not mean to say that your view about lay co-operation was not clear, but that you had mistyfied the simple meaning of the Reform report till you had confused yourself about it. Pardon me my dear friend for still thinking so.

V. Now I ask you most earnestly to tell me who the man is to whom you allude as coming to me etc. I will burn your letter or the separate piece on which you send me the name at once and no one living, without your leave, shall hear of it. But it is *essential* to my security to know that I may be on my guard. The all-seeing God knows that I hate all deceit. I never have I trust deceived [any]. God knows I would rather [suffer than deceive anyone]. My danger is too great openness, and a man who so comes to me is one as to whom I ought to be as much put on my guard by such a friend as you as against an assassin.

I am ever affecly yours, S. Oxon.

610. To G. Hodges (Churchwarden of St. Martin's, Oxford) (*vi 116*)
Sep. 10, 1855

My dear Sir,

I have made enquiries into the subject of your letter of Sep. 1; The result of which is now before me. I find (1) that there are *afternoon* services in the following Churches near to St. Martins. All Saints, St. Aldates, St. Michaels, St. Mary Magdalenes, St. Giles, and no evening service. (2) that there is a good and regular evening congregation at St. Martins. (3) That at present it is marked by strict propriety of conduct. (4) That the alteration of this service would break up this congregation and cause distress to its Members. (5) That there are comparatively speaking very few *children* in the Parish. 18 out of the 62 householders comprising most of the largest families reside out of St. Martins. Of the remaining 44, 2 are Jews, 4 are [fixed] members of dissenting bodies. The young shopmen and apprentices on the other hand who constitute a large part of the Population are regular attendants at the Evening Service.

Under these circumstances whilst I sincerely regret that the arrangement of the hours of Service is not that which best suits your health, I do not feel that I should be justified in interfering for their alteration.

I am most truly yours, S. Oxon.

611. To the Rev. A. A. Kempe (*vi 117*)
Sep. 10, 1855

My dear Sir,

I fear I did not make my meaning clear in my last.

As to a living sequestrated for debt, the Bishop has power to appoint to any Curate, *not being the incumbent*, such stipend, according to the Curate's stipend as fixed by the Residence Act, as he shall see fit. The rest belongs to the Creditor

who has obtained the sequestration and the Bishop has no power to retain any of it for the incumbent. If the Incumbent does his own duty the Bishop has no power to grant him any stipend. The expences of collection &c. depend on the sequestrator.[1]

I am yours truly,

S. Oxon.

612. To the Rev. R. E. Wyatt[2] *(vi 118)*

Sep. 14, 1855

Rev. & Dear Sir,

My agent Mr. Garrett has communicated to me your note of Sept. 8: and to save time I reply to it at once.

The House[3] as to which you enquire contains on ground floor, cellars under, 1 Drawing Room, 1 Dining Room — both good sized rooms — a good Study, W.C., Kitchen, Servants Hall, Scullery.

First floor, 4 larger Bedrooms: 4 smaller: 1 W.C. and one Nursery.

Second floor . . . servants bedrooms.

Stables &c. and 2 men servants rooms over — a good and sufficiently large kitchen garden — a small, very pretty, and inexpensive flower garden round the house. The House is let furnished: I pay for all the landlords repairs: and taxes. The Rent is £150 per annum. There is a field contiguous which may be rented at Farmers rent. It may be had at Christmas or somewhat sooner.

I remain most truly,

S. Oxon.

613. To the Rev. B. L. Poyntz *(vi 119)*

Sep. 14, 1855

My dear Sir,

I was about to write to you as I promised, to say that Mr. Rice has made arrangements for taking *at once* possession of the Curacy of Wycombe; and as you persevere in your resolution not to continue in your Curacy under him, and I cannot consistently with what I deem the interests of the Parish place you in loco vicarii, I have desired the Registrar to cancel your license on resignation at the same date with the licensing of Mr. Rice. In this case therefore there is no 'notice' needful: and as the bringing of the Second Curate depends upon my at once establishing Mr. Rice in the Curacy I think it best that you should resign it to him whatever day next week he is able to take possession. Though I think that your decision about burials was [deficient] in judgement I have no fault to find with your conduct as Curate of Wycombe: nor does my feeling it necessary to put another into the very responsible post which the Vicars conduct leaves open imply on my part any blame of you. I should be very happy to find you if I can another post in my Diocese. There is one now vacant at *Edgcott* in your own County of £90 a year to which I shall be happy at once to license you.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Kempe's living of Wexham was sequestered for debt in October 1855, a method which hitherto had allowed the incumbent to serve his own church whilst receiving the stipend granted to the curate. Wilberforce would not allow this, because it was a direct incitement to dishonesty and debt. The curate was maintained in his post, but adjustments in his stipend were made to enable Kempe to pay off previous arrears (Diocese Book, II, p. 549b). He died at Hove in 1909, still nominally rector of Wexham, at the age of 90.

2 Perhaps the Robert Edward Wyatt who moved to Haywards Heath in 1855.

3 The subject is Lavington Rectory House.

614. To the Rev. J. Guillemard[1] *(vi 120)*

Sep. 21, 1855

My dear Mr. Guillemard,

I have carefully read through your former letter and can see no other meaning than the plain one I at first attached to it: viz. that whilst you were very anxious to see no change which could agitate your mind or endanger your furniture you were willing to leave the matter in my hands only begging me to have regard in any arrangements to these matters. If by this you meant to explain that you refused the assent I asked for the arrangement I only wish you had more plainly stated your real meaning, as I should not have thought of even temporarily removing your licensed Curate without your concurrence. As to the amount of object there is in placing Mr. Turton at Wycombe, *I* and not you must be the judge.[2] But as to his quitting for a season your Curacy, *you* shall still absolutely decide. I believe Mr. Turton's motives in the matter to be far purer than you give him credit for and am convinced that whether at Wycombe or Kirtlington his single aim will be God's Glory.

I wish you once more and without the exaggerations with which your fancy has mixed it up to weigh the matter and send me your simple 'Yes' or 'No'. If without distress and agitation you can lend for a season Mr. Turton's services to me for Wycombe: his servants remaining in charge of your property and waiting on his locum tenens: that locum tenens being a single man of quiet gentlemanlike habits and efficient as a clergyman: I shall be glad if this arrangement is to involve you in 'a single' much more 'in great difficulties' I give it up at once. You know me I think well enough to know my care for your comfort, only I must beg at once [an answer on it].

I am ever truly yours,

S. Oxon.

615. To the Rev. W. A. Scott[3] *(vi 121)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 27, 1855

My dear Mr. Scott,

The subject of your letter divides itself into two parts entirely distinct from each other. The first is the expediency of the lectures &c. for which you are using the Schoolroom; and the reasonableness of Mr. St. Johns objection to the course you have followed. The Second is the legality or illegality of his 'Objections'.

For the first I would only say; (1) That from your statements I should entirely approve of the lectures. and (2) That the only mistake I think you have made is in *not* previously consulting Mr. St. John. I think that whatever *ought* to be its effect, your knowledge of human nature will probably suggest to you on reflection, that the *probable* effect on a Rector's mind of leaving another to pay his Curate and his Curate to do his work would be to make him more jealous of his authority over that Curate and of anything like independant action on his part than another man would be.

[1] James Guillemard (1808–58), Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, 1829–39; P.C. of Summertown, 1835; V. of St. Giles, Oxford, 1836, Kirtlington, 1838–58.

[2] Henry Meysey Turton (1825–84), was C. of Kirtlington, 1854; V. of Great Milton, 1856–9 (O). He was C. of Wycombe 1855–6.

[3] William Armstrong Scott, of Trinity College, Dublin, C. of Bladon with Woodstock, 1851–7; V. of New Seaham, Durham, 1857. A colourful character who tried to get rid of an unwanted helper by recommending him for preferment although mad, and who finally had to leave the parish for philandering (Diocese Book, II, p. 70).

But for the *Second* part of the subject, namely the legal force of Mr. St. Johns objections, I think that he is right. The deed so strictly ties up the *employment* of the Schoolhouse that I think *any* party with a local standing might stop its being used as you use it.

Now this being so; and it being very desireable that your plans of usefulness in this and other matters should not be impeded, I advise that you write to me a brief letter which I may send to Mr. St. John, saying that you at once acquiesce in the legal right I had as I so decide it to object: that you regret that owing solely to his absence you did *not* consult him first and that you trust you may now proceed with his sanction in a use of the buildings which I deem expedient. With such a letter from you I will write myself one which I hope may bring about an amicable settlement of the question.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

616. To the Rev. J. Burrows (*vi 122*)
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 27, 1855

My dear Mr. Burrows,

I send you the names of the memorialists as you desire it: but not without full consciousness of your being able to alledge much of what you intimate against many of them. I trust that I have never failed in any one parish of this Diocese to maintain the just authority of the clergyman. Indeed the charges which have been brought against me are of the exactly opposite character.

But this does not prevent my urging as strongly as I can upon a clergyman the duty of removing all occasion of complaint even from those who 'seek occasion'. In this case too you must remember that while I left you free to act I *advised* you not to drop the Sermon. I shall be glad to hear from you *when* you propose to resume the Sermon as I am very glad to find from your letters that it is during the Winter: and I shall not reply to the memorialists at all until you have had time to write to me.

I am, my dear Mr. Burrows, most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

617. To the Headmaster of Eton (C. O. Goodford)[1] (*vi 123*)

Dec. 29, 1855

My dear Dr Goodford,

I feel it to be a painful duty from which I must not shrink, to appeal to you against Mr. Russell Days requirement[2] that I should remove my son[3] from his House. *For* Mr. Day has required this with threats of exposing his character, if I do not comply, which if I comply must leave his character under most serious imputations; and as I believe that Mr. Day has allowed himself to employ those threats with no means of proving any sufficient crime in the boy to justify their use, my duty to my son, and my duty to every other parent who has a son in Mr. Day's House or I may say in any Tutor's house at Eton, requires *me* to bring the matter under your notice.

[1] Charles Old Goodford (1812–84), Headmaster of Eton 1853–62 (*DNB*).
[2] Russell Day (1828–1904), Fellow of King's, 1848–56; assistant master at Eton, 1851–74. No. 617 well shows the great freedom of Eton housemasters.
[3] Albert Basil Orme Wilberforce (1841–1916), the Bishop's fourth and youngest son.

The first day on which Mr. Day *required* my son's removal was Friday the 7th of December. He had, as I must state to you hereafter, first *recommended* it on the 21st of November. When on the 7th he *required* it, this requirement was based upon vague insinuations of misconduct which I told him I could not admit as sufficient grounds for my acceding to what would amount to my son's private expulsion from Eton: and that if therefore he persevered in his requirement I should appeal to you. He replied that he had abundantly *sufficient ground for requiring his dismissal* and had only withheld it from tenderness etc. etc.

I in vain begged him to communicate these *facts* to me, as the boy's father. But I could obtain none. I therefore told him that I hoped he would reconsider his course and not force me to appeal to you; and begged him to inform me in the morning of his decision. The morning brought me this note. 'After much consideration I have resolved to abide by my former resolution. *I am very sorry that this is so unwelcome to your Lordship*'. I must in passing beg your attention to the concluding words of this note: as illustrating the unconcern with which Mr. Day has throughout treated the virtual expulsion of a boy for misconduct from Eton. I trust he is the only [Tutor who could consider thus writing to tell a Father that the expulsion of his son from Eton 'was unwelcome' to the Father.] But I was uncertain upon what steps to take, and on December 8 I had an interview with you on the subject: and on the 11th you kindly wrote to me stating that you had informed Mr. Day as soon as you could after our interview and that Mr. Day had told you that 'he recommended [Basil's removal] from Eton as a friend' (You will notice that he *had* at this time required it under the threat of exposure) 'but that if the case is referred to me for arbitration he is prepared to *state facts* to me which would quite justify him, in declining to keep the boy in his House that his Object has been to prevent any exposure of and stigma upon your boy etc.' Upon receiving this letter on the 12th of December with the deepest anxiety to know what these '*facts*' were I wrote to Mr. Day (twice) and to you.

Of Mr. Day I as a Father [requested to be told] of these '*facts*' which thus required my son's expulsion and which were thus [tenderly] withheld; to you I wrote asking you to be so kind as to use your influence with Mr. Day to obtain this statement.

You, as I was sure you would, thought and *told Mr. Day* that my 'desire to have the grounds for removal clearly stated to me as Parent before they came formally before the head Master was fair and reasonable'.

Your influence compelled Mr. Day to state his facts and on the 13th he writes as follows. 'My Lord, The things I allude to are, bad language as complained of by parents and reported to me at different times by Mrs. . . . [*illegible*] . . . and by my servants, and a case of dishonesty in paying a tradesman in the place'. Here then are the 'facts' on which Mr. Day required on the 7th of December to me: and on the 8th of December to you that Basil should be removed I Bad language and II A case of dishonesty.

I must deal with each of these separately: but first I must call your special attention to a remarkable fact with regard to the bringing of the second charge as one of the *facts* which [justified] Mr. Day's dark threat of exposure to *me* on the *7th* and to *you* on the *8th* of December

Mr. Day's letter to me stating this fact is dated December *13* . . . and on December 19th Mr. Day writes to me 'I only knew the affair' (i.e. the dishonesty) 'a few hours before I wrote to you on the 13th'. That is say 'The things to which he had alluded' on the *7th* to me and on the 8th to you were I Bad language II dishonesty, which dishonesty he had for the first time learned on the 13th, six days *after* he had employed the threat [to justify a demand to expel my son. Now]

I beg to call your special attention to this, not for the painful inveracity which it exhibits but for these two reasons

Ist being *a fact* which Mr. Day had discovered *after* he had alledged to you his knowledge of facts to justify his decision it ought, by all rules of evidence, not to be received in proof of the assertion made before it was known.

IIly Because it proves incidentally that Mr. Day had, when compelled by your remonstrance of the 12th to state facts, gone to his servants to get up a case against my son, for he says it was from the servants that he 'learned' it *on the 13th* and that it had happened about a year ago.' Now this I hold to be most important. In the facts . . . [*illegible*] . . . *first* charge[1] — which rests mainly for its proof on the result of a like attempt to that here disclosed to make use of a case to justify threats previously used.

But I must now ask you to bear with me whilst I examine the two charges themselves, and *first* of the charge of '*dishonesty*'. It was mainly Mr. Day's bringing this charge which has compelled me to appeal to you. For, after it was brought, had I allowed him to dismiss my son he must have rested for life under the horrible imputation of having been sent away from Eton for dishonesty.

The charge then is this — 'Your son bought of Smith the fishing tackle seller something costing 6d and paid for it with a Post Office order for 6 shillings receiving the change 5/6. On presenting this order it was informally signed and therefore returned by Smith to your son who got it changed and kept the money. Smith came to my servant and asked him to speak to Basil for the money. On doing so he was told by Basil to tell Smith that he might go to hell for the money. 'The money was eventually paid after several months but that of course does not alter the original *want of honesty*.'

Here is the whole charge of 'dishonesty' which is to justify the expulsion of a boy from Eton. I will give you my son's own words to whom I at once transmitted it the answer to the charge. 'Smith changed the P.O. order giving me 5/6 change. About 3 days after he came to me to ask me to get the order changed at the Office, as there was some mistake. I changed it and left the money in my desk some time without thinking of Smith, and after a time by degrees I spent it forgetting it was his, but I give you my word of honour as a Christian gentleman that it was all carelessness and I meant no deceit. I remember to my shame having said that to the servant, a year ago. I was ill in bed and the servant came and asked for the money and I fretfuly told him what you know I said: but I am heartily sorry for it'.

I cannot doubt that you will in a moment discharge an imputation of *dishonesty*, from a boy who has been nearly two years at Eton with an untarnished character, and which (raked up after a year) rests on so manifest a piece of boyish thoughtless carelessness as this. I could if need were declare on affidavit that never from his birth has he been known to do a mean action or to violate truth. But I must ask you to bear in mind in weighing the second charge the further evidence afforded by the first, of (1) the pains Mr. Day has taken to find matter which would substantiate his threats and (2) the sort of evidence on which he has brought a charge which would for ever ruin the character of one of his pupils.

I turn now to the first charge of 'Bad language'.

With the truthfulness which belongs to him my son at once on my speaking to him, said: 'I *have* when angry used bad language' and on further questioning, 'I learned it from others in Day's House' but 'I have not used it commonly'.

[1] Here the Bishop inserted 'This should be (2)'.

On this part of the charge then I would say that admitting these are *facts* to justify its truth I must submit to you that those *facts* do not justify Mr. Day in requiring me to remove my son: and I submit to you the following reasons why I think so and why I trust you will confirm my view.

I. There is no proof that my son was a leader in this sin.
II. That he has never been warned by his Tutor that this would be the consequence of his continuance in it.
III. That no such warning was given to me under which I might have brought Parental influence to bear upon him.
IV. That to a very recent date Mr. Day saw in this fault no reason for his removal.
V. That I have reason for believing and will tender proof that this is not *now* the real reason why Mr. Day has made this demand.

I. Mr. Day has not attempted to prove, though by mentioning 'Parents of other boys' he has *insinuated* that my son was a leader in this sin. I need not say to you with what pain and shame I learned from him that he had fallen into it. But I venture to submit to you its sad commonness among boys; and to ask whether it can be said that every boy who can be proved to have used in anger bad language either is or ought to be sent away from Eton. Being very desirous of learning *the truth* of this part of the charge I wrote to ask an elder boy who (as I found by mere accident) had just left Eton and Mr. Day's house, with a high character, and as I told him without my son's knowledge to tell me confidentially (I) whether Basil had ever been known to use bad language (II) whether if so he had been at all a leader of others in such a fault. His answer, by its silence, admits, that my son had used bad language; but adds 'I do not think that your son was ever a leader in bad language'. I am ready in confidence if you require it to give you the name of the writer and I venture to hope that you will value such a testimony at a far higher rate than answers obtained by Mr. Day from his domestics to questions which I have shown were put to obtain facts to substantiate threats previously made which had gathered up the gossip of more than a year.

II^{y} I alledge that

II. My son has never been warned that a continuance in this fault would lead to his being sent away. I could quote his assurance on this; but I prefer giving you Mr. Day's own account of how far he has brought his influence as Tutor to bear on the correction of this fault before resorting to the extreme of dismissal. 'I have *several times* spoken seriously to Basil first when he spoke *indecently*' (I pray you to note the word) 'to my servant *twice* certainly, thrice I think since'. The '*indecent speaking*' was *a year ago*, his calling in anger the maid names; for which he was, I rejoice to know, flogged by you. Of the other '*twice* or *thrice*' my son remembers '*twice*', once when he was reported to you on the 19th of October for abusing a woman and her daughter and flogged (of which presently) and once when Mr. Day spoke to him on Monday *Dec. 10 after*[1] his removal had been desired.

III. I alledge that Mr. Day had never given me the slightest intimation of Basil's erring in this respect (far less as to his removal) except on the two occasions Ist of abusing his maid IInd the woman and her daughter.

IV I alledge: that till a very recent date Mr. Day saw in this fault no reason for removing my son. *For*, first if he had seen any such great evil in him he should have given his father *some* hint of its existence and he never did; though he was loud in complaining of his attending more to natural history than Latin verses; and told me that he would disgracefully lose his last remove, which he creditably took etc. etc. etc. So that his reticence on this bad form of a vicious habit had he so

[1] This word is underlined twice.

esteemed it, is incredible. But IIly as late as in the October of this year he thus expressed himself to my son; whose letter I quote written to me on the day. 'My tutor called me into his study this morning after prayers, and told me he was quite satisfied with my conduct and that he had heard from Mathematics that I was getting on very well and he wished to tell me how very much he saw the improvement in my character and he hoped I would keep it up (which I *will* try to do). He told me all that strictly confidentially but I am *very* glad of it indeed'.

I venture to submit to you that no tutor could speak thus to a boy as to whose remaining in his House he entertained the slightest suspicions.

I offer to your consideration my reasons for believing that Mr. Day was led by reasons entirely different from those which he has alledged to require me, to remove my son from his House.

The real reasons I believe to be Mr. Day's sensitiveness under my condemnation of his conduct in convicting my boy on the 19th of October.

It will be needful for me as briefly as possible to state to you what passed between us touching this.

On the 20th of October Mr. Day wrote to me to state that my 'son' was 'in disgrace on a charge of using *indecent* language to a child of 12 years old and to her mother'. It is impossible to express the pain which the charge of *indecent* language to a child caused me.

I corresponded with my son upon the matter and found:

(1) that the charge had no relation to *indecent* language but was a charge of *abusing* the trio.

(2) that the woman had charged him in common with another boy, with committing this offence on one specified occasion and at other times.

(3) that the boys both denied the charge and offered to prove that they were in another place at the time named in the only specified occasion, but that they had not been allowed to prove this: but were both reported to you as having after 'careful investigation' of the circumstances been found by their tutor guilty: and by you most properly, if I may venture to pronounce an opinion, on the Tutor's statement, flogged.

On finding this to be the state of the case and on my boy, who had never in his life told me a lie, asserting to me solemnly and on cross examination maintaining his innocence I wrote to Mr. Day; telling him that I believed the boy to have been by him wrongfully condemned, [begging] him not now to run the risk of injuring his moral . . . [*illegible*] . . . by treating him as continuing to assert a falsehood [Mr. Day] replied with great warmth and required me to come [and] investigate the affair on the second of November. Accordingly I came and saw him. I said 'I am satisfied you meant fairly: I think you acted hastily, let the past be forgotten and only treat the boy now as if he were not maintaining a falsehood'. Mr. Day got very angry: he insisted on my being convinced of my son's guilt. I replied: Where is the proof. 'The woman said so'. 'Did not she name time and place?' 'Yes'. 'Did not the boys offer to prove that they were elsewhere at that time' 'Yes'. 'Did you examine their allegation' 'No'. 'Why did you not?' 'Because the woman said he had done it on other occasions also, and disproving the one would not disprove the others'. 'But would it not have thrown discredit on the whole if the only specific charge was disproved?' 'I do not see that it would'. I expressed my conviction that no one was safe on such principles of 'careful investigation' and Mr. Day was much annoyed and begged me to 'investigate it for myself'. I said 'Most gladly, but how can I' 'Why ask Dr. Goodford and the woman'. I said 'Ask them what? I am quite satisfied with what Dr. Goodford

did he acted on your report'. 'Then ask the woman if your son did not do it?' I in vain tried to represent to Mr. Day that to ask the accuser sometime after the offence had been punished was not the ordinary way of conducting investigation. He further said upon my asking whether the other boy did not equally deny it and whether his father was not equally dis-satisfied, that there was a difference between my boy and his. I asked what difference? He said that your boy was the leader. I asked what ground he had for saying this. He said my son was guilty of *indecent* language before. I said 'When'? He said with my maid. I enquired when and how and found that this was Mr. Day's mode of describing his having called her names in anger about a year before. I urged that he should not charge a boy with a far greater moral sin of using indecent or lustful language with a girl when he meant that he had been angry and had called her a bad name. To my great surprize he told me that he could not make these nice distinctions. In fine I left having attained no result. But no hint of Basil's leaving was uttered.

On the *21st* of November I again saw Mr. Day and he reverted to the old subject of my conviction of my son's innocence. On that occasion for the first time he alluded to his leaving Eton: in this way. He said that next half he would be one of his head boys, that already he was 'Cock of the House', and that when a head boy he should expect from him more than he thought he would be able to do in the way of keeping order etc. I combatted the idea of his leaving; and he said 'I only speak from a desire to promote his good!' I said 'But what harm has Eton done him?' He said 'I do not speak from the harm it has done him: but from my fear that in the upper part of the school he will be exposed to more temptation, and I think it best to forestall evil — (N.B. I think it best to tell you that I recall the conversation from notes I made the same evening). I still dissented and he said 'you understand it would be an injury to me for Basil to go'. 'I only advise as if I was his elder brother'. I told him frankly that I saw he really wished him out of his house: that he had never liked him: that the very high character Mr. Nind had given him had led him to expect great things from him in the pupil room: and that being disappointed he had always disliked him: and that this in my judgement had been a disadvantage to the boy. He asked in reply 'Do you mean that you wish he was in another House?' I tried to turn the question aside but he insisted on an answer, and I then said: I wish that from the first he had been in another House (and if need be I could abundantly justify that).

On the 30th of November and on the 5th December [I] had very similar conversations with Mr. Day: only that on the 5th were some to me astonishing instances of [Mr.] Day's facility in throwing out imputations e.g. suddenly in the midst of a conversation in which he was pressing on me how dangerous Eton would become [for] Basil he said 'You know about Basil's debts?' I disclaimed all knowledge, he said 'Well I would strongly urge you to enquire' and again 'You know that Basil drinks'. 'Drinks?' I said with Horror, 'How can I believe it for a moment', I saw Mr. Day again on the 7th and then said 'I have enquired as to debts and drinking and I find that he owes nothing and is wholly free from any tendency to drink'. 'Well' was the reply 'I did not say he was in debt I only said you had better enquire'. In this conversation *for the first time* he gave a hint that he required me to move Basil, and I told him as I have said above that I should appeal to you.

Now the whole of the treatment of the case, by gradual increase of requirement, insinuation etc., convinces me in the retrospect that had I not impugned the justice of the sentence of Oct. 19: and honestly expressed afterwards to Mr. Day my regret that Basil had not gone to another house, not one word would have been heard from Mr. Day as to the necessity of removing him.

On the whole therefore I fearlessly appeal to you not to allow so great an injury to my son and through him to Eton to be inflicted on such grounds by the partial sentence of one of the Tutors: who has exaggerated a trivial act of carelessness as to money into 'dishonesty' and magnified an *occasional* angry fall into abusive language, as to which he had used no sufficient efforts with the boy and given *no* warning to his father, into a crime justifying expulsion.

I am My dear Dr. Goodford Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

618. To the Headmaster of Eton (C. O. Goodford) *(vi 124)*
Private

Dec. 31, 1855

My dear Dr. Goodford,

I felt sure that you would not allow so great a wrong to be perpetrated as that for so common, alas! a fault in which my poor boy has been no leader, as to which he had little and *I no* warning whatever, and of which I believe there will be no repetition, he should be virtually dismissed from Eton. I felt that the matter could hardly rest till the 9th and I have therefore written my complaint at length.

I am most sincerely yours

S. Oxon.

619. To the Rev. W. W. Walton[1] *(vi 125)*

Cuddesdon, Dec. 31, 1855

My dear Sir,

I am grieved to hear of these Quainton revels and cannot doubt that you have done your plain duty in trying to stop them. I think however that on every account you should *first* name the matter to Mr. Young[2] and see whether without any reference to me he will exert himself to stop them. I of course could only act through him: and he would be far less likely to be hurt by a direct appeal from you than if he thought you had complained to me needlessly of his neglect. Should he be unwilling to take proper steps you will do rightly in communicating with me.

The anger of the apparitor in dealing with loiterers is to be greatly regretted: but as owing to the illness of my apparitor he employed 2 or 3 deputies in different deaneries I must request you to inform me in what churchyard it happened that I may know who was the offender.

I am very sorry that you could not write on this subject without falling into so grave an impropriety as your language exhibits when speaking of the two clergymen who smoke and fish:[3] and whom I preferred. I must call on you to furnish me with the names of the offenders, since no man is at liberty to scatter such charges.

I am, my dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] William Williams Walton, C. of Lee, Bucks., 1848–50, and C. of Waddesdon from 1850 until he died of typhus in 1859 (C): at Waddesdon. 'Active zealous devoted to his work . . . Oh how I wish he was not so vehemently a party man' (Diocese Book, II, p. 539a). At Quainton Walton 'complains that after my last confirmation here disgraceful public-House entertainments. At my advice he speaks to Young who seems helpless' (ibid., II, p. 392b) — hence this letter.

[2] Edward Newton Young (1796–1885), R. of Quainton, 1822–85 (O).

[3] The Puritanism of these complaints does not necessarily mark Walton as an Evangelical.

620. To the Headmaster of Eton (C. O. Goodford) *(vi 126)*

Private

Jan. 1, 1856

My dear Dr. Goodford,

This morning's post has brought me the enclosed note from Mr. Day. I reply to it that I will send an answer in 2 or 3 days.

Meanwhile I venture to ask your further advice. I could not as it seems to me accept Mr. Day's offer without leaving Basil under a stigma which I believe to be unjust and which might at any future time of his life be revived as a ruinous whisper. But if you were able to decide that Mr. Day was *not* at liberty to dismiss Basil nothing would more please me than *then* to remove him to another House.

If then this could be brought about better by any shorter statement than that I yesterday troubled you with; I will gladly make it; and beg you to regard that as a confidential communication.

I have no wish to bring charges against Mr. Day. All that I do wish, is to do my duty in protecting Basil, *through you*, from a gross injustice.

I am my dear Dr. Goodford Most truly yours.

S. Oxon.

621. To R. Day *(vi 127)*

Jan. 1, 1856

Dear Sir,

Your letter finds me leaving home on urgent business for 2 or 3 days: and circumstances require me to defer till the time of my return home my reply.

I request you to retain Basil's things until you hear from me again.

I am faithfully yours,

S. Oxon.

622. To Henry Hoare (?) *(vi 128)*

Jan. 1, 1856

My dear Friend,

I have not heard of any circulation of the document to which you refer: nor have I any means of ascertaining whether there is any truth in the rumour you have heard concerning it. I took charge gladly of the former *Caution* to which you refer from affection to Monro:[1] but I have no right to question anyone as to this alledged circulation; the fact of which from Mr. Hope's very straightforward character I should greatly doubt. I should advise you to enquire through the bearers of the rumour. May all blessings be with you and yours in this New Year.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

623. To R. Day *(vi 129)*

Jan. 5, 1856

My dear Sir,

Your letter received this morning entirely changes the nature of your 'charges'. You began by insinuating to me that my son was in debt drank &c, & had better be removed for his good. I had the courage to enquire and found that your insinuations were utterly groundless: you sheltered yourself by the plea that they were only insinuations. You then tried to frighten me by *threatening* if I did not

[1] Edward Monro (1815–66), divine and author (*DNB*).

remove my son to expose him to the head Master as guilty of crimes which would require his judicial removal. I again had the courage to go before the head Master and he has 'relieved my son from the stigma' you sought so cruelly to cast on him. Foiled in these attempts: you now [throw] off the cloke and say openly that the *real* reason why you wished to get rid of him was my distrust of you. I knew this from the first: and only wish you had possessed the courage to state it instead of trying to ruin the poor boy. Ever since on the 2nd of November I distinctly stated to you that you had on the 19th of October convicted him *in the teeth of all evidence* of a fault of which I believe him to be innocent, you have wished, and gradually determined, to part with him.

I would, for no earthly consideration, trust him again in your house: but I shall, before I reply to your letter further, ascertain from the Head Master, whether a Tutor has the power, by thus shifting his ground, to set aside the Superior Authorities of the College.

I am yours Faithfully

S. Oxon.

[*Not sent.*]

624. To Lady Young[1] (*vi 130*)
Confidential

Jan. 6, 1856

My dear Lady Young,

I trouble you with a few lines in consequence of a letter I have received from Mr. Stillingfleet,[2] and at the request of your dear Sister Blanche.

Mr. Stillingfleet writes to me as his Bishop under whose direction and counsel he went out with you, to ask my advice as to his own course. The facts he tells me are these. That you are continually in the company of the leading perverts from our Church. That you and your daughters communicate most freely with them on the matters on which Our Church Condemns their teaching. That you have declined to communicate any more with him on these topics. And He asks me what is *His* duty under these circumstances. As to that I will write to him. He does not ask me to write to you.

In family: and the deep sympathy I have felt for you with the prayers and the love for you it has engendered force me to do so, in order to entreat you to reconsider your present condition. I know that you were abroad heartily attached to that Church in which Gods providence granted you the new birth and a Christian training. Now *must* it not be trifling with God's Grace for such an one untaught in the depths of the controversy between Rome and us to seek (for no object of direct duty) close and constant intercourse on these questions, with those whose *faith*, whose *instincts* and whose *inclinations* must lead them to strive to pervert you: who are *primed* by the most subtle disputants with objection, cavil, gloss and every other instrument for *unsettling* your faith and perverting you. Must it not be a *sin* to expose yourself and your daughters to such arts, and *not* even to allow Mr. S. whom you took as your Priest to *expose* to you these delusions. If your girls are deceived and lose their souls, how can you meet them in judgement. Must it not be a *Sin* for you to run the risk, by letting your son see you or your daughters perverted, of shaking his faith in *everything*. Have we a right to go

[1] Caroline (d. 1871), daughter of John Norris of Hughenden, widow (1842) of Sir W. L. Young, 4th Bart. Two of her three sons died in the Crimea in autumn 1854 — hence, no doubt, her difficulties and the Bishop's sympathy.

[2] Henry James William Stillingfleet (1827–87), C. of Wantage 1851–9, Clehonger, Herefords., 1859–68; R. of Hampton Bishop, Herefords., 1868–87 (O).

(with no direct call from God) into temptation and expect Him to keep us from falling . . . must it not be a Sin to have led an English clergyman to go with you by promising *to act* on his direction, and then in a self willed way to throw him aside. Is not this likely to lead to your being given up to a spirit of delusion? Is it not most unfair to Him. My dear Lady Young I implore you . . . [*Remainder illegible*]

625. To the Rev. W. W. Stoddart[1] (*vi 131*)
Jan. 10, 1856

My dear Mr. Stoddart,

I deeply lament the illness which you report to me and pray God, if it be His will, speedily to restore you. Your license of non-residence shall issue immediately and if you will direct Mr. Davenport he will forward it wherever you desire.

The only point which it is my duty to arrange with you is as to the provision made to supply your place during your year of absence. I do not think that Mr. Cross[2] is up to the post of Senior Curate with only Mr. Fordyce[3] to assist him during your absence. I would suggest to you to place a senior Curate in the Parsonage and to let Mr. Cross assist him and take Finstock. There is an admirable man for the purpose, Mr. Travers[4] Curate of Wolverton just about to be at liberty through a vacancy in that living, and it would be [good] if you could secure him. If in your present state of indisposition I can save you any trouble in this matter it will give me sincere pleasure to do so.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

626. To the fourth Baron Lyttelton[5] (*vi 132*)
Jan. 10, 1856

My dear Lord Lyttelton,

There is hardly a man in my Diocese whom I shall miss so much as Edmund Hobhouse. He is one of the truest gentlest most humble minded most unselfish and pure minded men I ever met with. He has very good abilities without being strikingly clever: Par negotio nec supra. He never flinches from adhering to a principle but is most winning and full of love to all. No one can know him without loving him. His judgement is clear and unswerving. He has had large experience of an Oxford Parish and never had a real trouble from his judicious administration. His health is *not* strong: i.e. he *was* overdone and subject to a rush of blood to the head: but his activity and power of work and walking are immense. I should have no doubt of his doing admirably in the post. He walks over here after his afternoon service next Sunday: will you come and stay with me from Saturday to Monday and judge for yourself.[6]

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 William Wellwood Stoddart (1810–56), Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, 1828–53; V. of Charlbury, 1853–56. His sleepiness at the Bishop's previous confirmation had caused alarm, and he died during a year's leave of absence.

2 John Cross, R. of Mursley, 1860–85.

3 Arthur Thomas Dingwall Fordyce (1821–60), ordained to the curacy of St. Giles, Oxford, 1849; apparently not priested; died at Exeter (O).

4 Charles Henry Travers (1821–84) went to Deddington instead, and was V. of Stewkley, 1859–70 (O).

5 George William Lyttelton (1817–76).

6 Hobhouse became Bishop of Nelson, N.Z., in 1858; Lord Lyttelton was a prime mover in the colonization of the South Island — hence, no doubt, his letter to Wilberforce.

627. To the Rev. J. Skinner (*vi 133*)
Private

Jan. 10, 1856

My dear Mr. Skinner,

I most heartily wish you God Speed in your endeavour: and though there are probably some points of difference between us yet I can not think that there are any of such magnitude as would prevent my joyfully sharing in your intended course if I were a mere Priest. But you know well how far more my taking part as Bishop of *another* Diocese (for if it were in my Diocese I should rejoice to take a part) would be understood to imply and I believe after the best consideration I can give to the subject that I should best promote the cause which we both value beyond anything beside by *not* taking a share in your course.

Will you convey, with my fraternal regards, the enclosed £5 to your Eastern friend.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

628. To J. J. Chalk[1] (*vi 134*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 12, 1856

My dear Sir,

In reply to the two points of your letter of the —th in respect to commuting the Stanton Harcourt &c. estates; I should propose [ ] as the sum to be paid in lieu of the present fine, that the case be laid before Mr. Morgan the Actuary to ascertain the fine which ought now to be paid for putting in a life and that such sum be paid to me.

I should much prefer that at the dropping of future lives if in my incumbency a like course be adopted and the annual payment system begun at the dropping of the third life. I should be glad to hear at once as to this.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

629. To the Rev. Z. Nash[2] (*vi 135*)
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 2, 1856

My dear Mr. Nash,

I have endeavoured in another quarter to test the grounds of Mr. Dunning's[3] opinion that no lapse has occurred at Langley, and the answer I have received tends to confirm his view.[4] I have also received from Mr. Batchelor[5] a formal notice of the intention of the Chapter to present so soon as the living is constituted. The more I reflect on this state of things the less I like the prospects. If I were clear that the living had lapsed I should without any hesitation collate you. But

1 James Jell Chalk (1803–78), Sec. to Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 1850–71.
2 Zachariah Nash (1816–83), C. of Denham 1843–4, Langley Marish 1847–56, Christchurch, Hants., 1857–71; V. of Christchurch, 1871–83 (C). For the position at Langley, see no. 155.
3 Of Messrs. Burder and Dunning.
4 The Bishop had applied to Dr. Addams, but decided that although legally he was entitled to present, because the vacancy had occurred through the taking of his advice to separate the parish from Wyrardisbury, the Chapter of Windsor had an equitable right to present. He was not apparently pleased with the choice of Seymour Neville (Diocese Book, II, pp. 334, 596).
5 Thomas Batcheldor, the Chapter Clerk.

it is a very different thing for me to catch at, and for you to accept a *doubtful* collation. I think the trial of such a question would be mischievous and our defeat in some degree injurious to our characters. I deeply grieve that the extreme doubtfulness of my having any right to collate to Langley should have been brought before me at so late a period. For had this been clear to me at the first I should have told you that I could act only under a good legal opinion from some really eminent lawyer. This I should exceedingly wish you to obtain if you resolve on risking the expences of what I now fear must be a certain lawsuit of very doubtful issue. You can I doubt not on Monday obtain such an opinion and yet be with me on Monday night. *I* am clear that without some such distinct opinion I ought not to act — and so doubtful do I feel myself on looking into the question whether I *can* possess the right, that I certainly should not under any circumstances claim to exercise it, had I not under the idea that my possession of it admitted of no question committed myself to you so far as I have done. You must communicate your decision to Mr. Neville[1] and he and you must act accordingly. I understand that the chapter will sign their presentation on Monday.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

630. To the Hon. and Very Rev. the Dean of Windsor (G. V. Wellesley)[2] *(vi 136)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 5, 1856

My dear Dean,

When I wrote to you last I could not say more than I did because I felt that I had given Mr. Nash such reason to look for his collation that I was bound to offer it to him subject to his defending it. But I accompanied and followed that offer by explaining to him my reasons (which were much the same as yours) why I wished not to have the matter litigated. He has behaved as well as a man can do. He at once undertook the defending the collation if I thought it best to collate him: but left the settlement of the question to depend absolutely on my judgement of what was right. *You* know that I have never wished for the lapse; but have felt distressed by the possession of the legal, and I think equitable, power; of making the appointment the chapter itself contemplated till it was overruled by the obstinacy of one of its members, and thereby securing a very efficient in the lieu of a very inefficient parish Priest for Langley. If therefore the Patronage be found not to be in me I shall be relieved from all responsibility and thoroughly pleased. I *had* taken the opinion of my Chancellor[3] before I thought of acting. But I entirely accede to your proposal — nay I will go further: if the Chapter will allow me to see the case they propose to send so as to be satisfied that in my judgement it raises the whole question; and will then send it to any Civilian of good repute; *I* will be guided absolutely by his opinion. God forbid that there should be any Litigation between us. So far from wishing to snatch at doubtful Patronage I would far rather *not* have the responsibility of it; but if it *has* devolved on me I fear not to excercise it aright, because you are all my good Friends and I wish to keep you so.

1 Seymour Neville, or Neville Grenville (1823–1905), son of the Hon. G. Neville (see no. 155); C. of St. John's, Windsor, 1847, minor canon of St. George's, Windsor, 1848–67, V. of Wraysbury (or Wyrardisbury) 1856–69; R. of Ockham, Surrey, 1869–99.

2 Gerald Valerian Wellesley (1809–82), 3rd son of 1st Baron Cowley; Dean of Windsor 1854–82 (*DNB*).

3 Probably Joseph Phillimore, before his death (Jan. 1855).

As to the question of *equity* I must add a few words. I do not see how Mr. Darvell's failure affects *me*:[1] and as to the causes of the delay, Mr. Davenport assures me that *he* did not stop the proceeding of the Business at all; and the two inclosed notes which I have found in my correspondence at the time the scheme went formerly to sleep seem to me to confirm the statement of the Burders that John Burder in arresting it acted under the Chapter's Order. I felt easy in not acting until 'the Scheme' was law: because if I had acted before it must have set aside the scheme to which I had assented; and if you can shew me that in waiting for it to become law I have lost the right to appoint, you will cause me the greatest pleasure.

I had no wish to touch Wyrardisbury only I feared from what you once said that the Chapter would feel bound to Mr. Proby[2] to give it to Mr. S.[3] if he lost Langley and so I might have injured S. Neville if I did not collate him also.

I am, my dear Dean, most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

631. To the Rev. G. E. Biber[4] *(vi 137)*

Cuddesdon, Feb. 5, 1856

My dear Dr. Biber,

I have the strongest conviction that the real and deepest struggle in which the Church is engaged is for the ultimate possession of the Fabrics of the Churches. I believe that with the most far seeing Dissenters *this* is the real object — and nothing in my judgement could more fatally promote this object than any proposal to separate the rate for maintaining the fabric, from the rate for maintaining the Worship: as if the first was a national possession and the second a sectarian object. Any measure therefore which contained this provision I should feel bound to oppose.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

632. To the Rev. S. Neville *(vi 138)*

Private

Cuddesdon, Feb. 5, 1856

My dear Neville,

I was not aware of any 'altered tone'. I wrote in haste: and I did not like your talking about 'telling the Dean' &c. as if *I* was capable of any concealment from him. I thought too that there was rather a lecturing tone in your letter which was misplaced. But there was nothing whatever which altered my strong impression of the integrity and good feeling you have throughout manifested; or my kindly regard to yourself. I am quite ignorant of what you see irreconciliable in my letters. *I* had reason to fear that the Chapter *might* feel bound if Mr. Scoone lost Langley to offer him Wyrardisbury, and therefore offered if I collated Mr. Nash to collate you also. You said that you were in no danger and I replied that I gladly washed my hands of your Collation. I am ever my dear Mr. Neville,

Very Sincerely Yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Presumably (Sir) Henry Darvill (1812–83), solicitor at Windsor 1834–83, Town Clerk of Windsor 1854–83, is meant.

[2] Charles Proby (1771–1859), cousin of 1st Earl of Carysfort; Canon of Windsor 1814–59.

[3] William Dalton Scoones (1821–91), V. of Langley Marish, 1856–91 (O).

[4] George Edward Biber (1801–74), a Ph.D. of Tübingen and copious author, V. of Holy Trinity, Roehampton, London, 1842–74 (*D.NB*).

633. To J. Walter, M.P.[1] *(vi 139)*
Confidential

Cuddesdon, Feb. 7, 1856

My dear Mr. Walter,

Since I corresponded with you touching Hurst I have communicated with Cameron[2] and got our good friend the Archdeacon to go over to the Parish and see Mr. Barker of Standlake[3] [*sic*] and others on the matter.

The memorial which you hoped to prevent was presented to Mr. Cameron almost immediately after the date of our letters; and with circumstances which shewed in a few of Cameron's parishioners a resolution *not* to avoid any such extreme measures. For he on hearing of it proposed instead a friendly conference with the dissatisfied which was refused.

The memorial has the names of scarcely any resident parishioners who are members of the Church and frequenters of Hurst Church save the immediate followers of the Garth family &c.[4] Its allegations are materially incorrect. There is *no* intoning of the service nor has there been any since the first Sunday after the re-opening. There is no great increase of music. The 'Te Deum' and Canticles are sung to a plain chant and many of the congregation already join. The surplices of the Choir are not generally disliked. They are valued by Cameron as a means of maintaining decent behaviour in the boys: and are valued by the grown up choir an important class in the parish. The hanging at the East End is a perfectly plain and decent covering of a cold wall. The new Communion cover has no symbolic adornments on it. Cameron is ready to do anything I advise. But I see not what to advise him to alter. It is not I believe at all a parish movement. In fact I believe that it is *really* confined to Mrs. Garth: who would be *satisfied* only by restoring the old chancel and removing good Cameron. I believe that any change would only make the discontented turbulent, and annoy the now contented majority. I will not write my final judgement to Cameron till you have had time to tell me, *in confidence*, anything you think I should know. I find that Mrs. Garth has for more than a year withdrawn from the Communion at Hurst which seems to me to mark these last changes to be only the opportunity not the cause of the present expressions of dissatisfaction.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

634. To the Rev. Z. Nash *(vi 140)*
Private

Feb. 7, 1856

My dear Mr. Nash,

On Tuesday came the enclosed note of the 4th: to which I replied by telling the Dean what has passed between us: your readiness to defend my collation or to resign as I thought best for the Church: and that we should be quite contented with the opinion of *their* civilian if the case satisfied us. Yesterday came the letter of the 5th & today that of the 6th. I answer today, that I wish they would wait a day or two till I have your assent to my view which is to acquiesce in Dr. Haggard's

[1] John Walter III (1818–94), chief proprietor of *The Times*. He lived at Bearwood, in Hurst (*DNB*).
[2] Archibald Allen Cameron (1810–80), V. of Hurst, 1832–80; he came from Cape Town (O).
[3] George Barker of Stanlake Park, J.P.; d. 1868.
[4] Thomas Colleton Garth, J.P., M.F.H. (1822–1907) lived at Haines Hill, Hurst.

opinion. His giving such an opinion startles me. For I had understood you to say that he had given the very opposite to you.

I am now again in your hands. If you think it best to acquiesce in Haggards opinion I am content.

If you like to get as the Dean suggests to be best any other opinion I will wait for it and lay it before the Chapter. You will let me hear as soon as you can.

I am ever most sincerely Yours,

S. Oxon.

635. To the Hon. R. Cavendish *(vi 141)*

Confidential

Feb. 7, 1856

My dear Mr. Cavendish,

There came before our Church Building Committee on Tuesday the question of consenting to substitute Brick for Stone as the Tracery of the Nash Church and Schools. To this we are unwilling unnecessarily to consent. Mr. Streets plans were originally intended for Stone and not for Brick and will look far handsomer, and that permanently, in Stone. I believe that the real reason for this application is *not* the money the substitution will save if you allowed them freely to dig the needful Stone in the *best* pit, but disatisfaction at some refusal of this liberty on your part, and I undertook to see whether I could gain such permission from you before we decide. Will you grant it to me? With very kind remembrances to Mrs. Cavendish,

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

636. To the Rev. H. Randolph[1] *(vi 142)*

Feb. 7, 1856

My dear Mr. Randolph,

I would by no means choose 'a party man' for any post in my choice. I am for the party of The Church of England and nothing narrower. I trust that you have been misinformed about Mr. Hodgson.[2] His testimonials being from two Rectors of opposite views led me to think he could not be extreme on either side.

My only objection to Mr. Williams[3] is his not being in orders.

There is an excellent man in Priests orders a batchelor: of Magdalen Hall and now for more than 2 years Curate to Mr. Campbell[4] of Great Tew to whom I name your Curacy and who would I think take your Curacy if you offer it to him: The Rev. W. H. Hewett,[5] Great Tew, Enstone.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Herbert Randolph (1789–1875), Student of Christ Church, 1806–19; V. of Marcham, 1819–75.

2 Unidentified.

3 Perhaps Thomas John Williams (1832–?), P.C. of Upper Winchendon, 1879–98; R. of Waddesdon, 1881 (O).

4 John James Campbell (1814–82), V. of Great Tew, 1844–77 (O).

5 William Henry Hewett (1820–?), C. of Great Tew 1854, Banbury 1857, Milton 1860; Minor Canon and Precentor of Carlisle, 1860–3; R. of Yarburgh, Lincs., 1863–71; V. of Scarle, Notts., 1871 (O).

637. To the Hon. and Very Rev. the Dean of Windsor (G. Wellesley) *(vi 143)*

Feb. 7, 1856

My dear Dean,

I will ask you to wait a day or two before you act. *I* am quite ready that you should act at once. But after all that has passed with Mr. Nash I wish him to be an assenting party. I write to him today.

I am ever most truly Yours,

S. Oxon.

P.S. I have no wish to interfere as to Wyrardisbury

638. To the Hon. and Rev. L. C. R. Irby[1] *(vi 144)*

Confidential

Feb. 8

My dear Irby,

I should not dream of addressing you with this letter if you had not opened the subject of it to me at Bray with such friendly frankness.

I am earnestly desirious that you should be at one with Howard Rice.[2] I think that if you knew *all* you would be ready at once to allow that the greatest allowance ought to be made for acts of which in themselves you do not approve; and in which he was scarcely a free agent. Having heard fully your statement and his; and with no small affection for you and yours I am convinced that if you knew everything you would acquit him of dishonourable purposes. Do let me have the great pleasure of acting as a mediator. With kind remembrances to Mrs. Llewellyn Irby, I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

639. To R. Gibson[3] *(vi 145)*

Private

Feb. 8, 1856

My dear Mr. Gibson,

My attention has been called (by being required to swear an affidavit) to the sad difference which has broken out between yourself and Mr. Parsons;[4] and after the civilities which on several occasions I have received from you I cannot forbear trying whether my good offices may not be permitted to restore a better state of relations between you and your parish priest. I need not say to you, who have done so much for the poor Parish, how much it needs your and his zealous and friendly co-operation: or how greatly I lament its suspension.

I am sure that I may say that he will accept my mediation and act on my counsel. Will you let me mediate between you and endeavour to [bring] all matters to [peace between you] . . . [*Remainder illegible*].

1 Llewellyn Charles Robert Irby (1822–1911), fourth son of 3rd Baron Boston, ordained as C. of Hedsor, 1846 (O).

2 Rice (see no. 600), married Irby's sister. The dispute (over dilapidations) was with the previous Vicar of Sutton Courtenay (Diocese Book, II, p. 500a).

3 Robert Gibson of Sandhurst, who sold that manor to John Walter of Bearwood 'very soon after' 1854 (*V.C.H. Berks.*, III, 208).

4 Henry Parsons (1798–1878), P.C. of Sandhurst, 1850–78 (O). The dispute concerned use of the school, Gibson threatening to take possession by force if necessary. The dispute was not settled until personal mediation was successfully offered by the Bishop, Archdeacon and Mrs. Randall in March 1857 (Diocese Book, II, p. 422).

640. To the Rev. J. Gregson[1] *(vi 146)*
Confidential

Feb. 8, 1856

My dear Gregson,

I have heard with great pain that there is a dispute between you and Mr. Rice[2] as to dilapidations. And I write to implore you to let me act as a mediator. The law of dilapidations is a vile one: but whilst it is the law there is nothing but evil in kicking against it. I have seen a great deal of it and suffered a great deal under it — and above all things I advise you as the outgoing owner avoid law, for the outgoer is always victimised by the *law* of dilapidations. My strong advice would be have a *good* agent: let him meet Mr. Rice's agent. Let them agree on an arbiter *previously*; in case of difference: and abide absolutely by that decision.

Believe me I speak from a true regard to the purse, fair fame, and above all peace of mind, of one to whom, even in advising you I must say I am under many obligations for public services; unrequited labours and private friendship.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

641. To the Provost of Eton (E. C. Hawtrey) *(vi 147)*
Feb. 8, 1856

My dear Provost,

My Secretary has notified to me officially that the Patronage of Cogges lapses to me on Monday next. Will you kindly send me a line to say whether the college has any wish as to its disposal.

I am most Sincerely Yours,

S. Oxon.

642. To the Rev. Z. Nash *(vi 148)*
Feb. 11, 1856

My dear Mr. Nash,

The Dean has most considerately agreed to refer the matter to Dr. Addams on condition of our treating his decision as final of the whole question. I have gladly consented for you and myself: and sent my statement to accompany their case.

I am ever my dear Mr. Nash, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

643. To R. Day *(vi 149)*
Private

Cuddesdon Palace, April 7, 1856

My dear Sir,

I beg to inclose a Cheque for your last account. I have drawn it *including* the £9 marked xx as to which you expressed a doubt whether you had advanced them since Basil remembers nothing about receiving them: but believes he did not receive them. I have marked also the 'plated fork' with a x; because Basil is not aware that one was ever supplied him. None was sent with him to Mr. Carters.[3] He had one of mine which he used in your house and brought back here.

[1] John Gregson (1817–59), V. of Sutton Courtenay and Appleford, 1845–55 (O).
[2] Gregson's successor at Sutton Courtenay.
[3] Thomas Carter (1774–1868), Fellow etc. of Eton (C).

It is most painful to me to say another word on the subject of your behaviour to Basil — and as to its producing any effect on *you* it is of course hopeless: when you deny the truth of the head master's description of your conduct as 'endeavouring to fix a stigma on him': and assert that you brought no charge against him before the head master though you told him that you knew what must cause his expulsion: were compelled to produce your charges and had them all disallowed. I will therefore only add in finally closing this correspondence, that your last letter is to me a new instance of that want of integrity which compelled me to refuse to receive you as a candidate for orders.[1]

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

644. To the Rev. H. Fyffe[2] (*vi 150*)

26 Pall Mall, June 7, 1856

Rev. Sir,

I have received a communication from a gentleman of the name of H. G. Jukes de Styrap[3] in which he speaks of a 'College' established by you with my sanction at Langley Marish; and of your assisting the neighbouring Clergy in their duty. As I have sanctioned no such Establishment; and in fact know nothing about it; and have given you no permission to officiate in my Diocese I beg you immediately to inform me on these points.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

645. To the Rev. A. H. Wyatt[4] (*vi 151*)

26 Pall Mall, June 7, 1856

My dear Mr. Wyatt,

I cannot of course retain you at Shirburn as Curate after your distinct declaration of its being so much too great a charge for you and I write today to Mr. Beauchamp to say that I release you from your Curacy.

You will return your license to Mr. Davenport.

I could not appoint you to South Weston contrary to the strong advice of my own Local Officer the excellent Rural Dean.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

646. To the Rev. J. Beauchamp (*vi 152*)

26 Pall Mall, June 7, 1856

My dear Sir,

I have written by this post according to the desire expressed on your behalf by your brother[5] in a letter just received to tell Mr. Wyatt that I release him from his Curacy.

1 Day was ordained deacon by the Bishop of Lincoln in 1856; but was only ordained priest by the then Bishop of Oxford in 1874, the year after Wilberforce's death.

2 Probably Henry Fyffe (1816–98), Principal of St. Helen's College, Southsea (O).

3 Joseph Hordern Jukes, of Wadham College, was ordained by the Bishop of Hereford 1858, and subsequently held various curacies. It is possible that just as American degrees could be obtained for cash payments, there were doubtful colleges claiming to prepare men for Holy Orders.

4 Arthur Haute Wyatt (1830–?84), who had been ordained to the curacy of Crowell and Shirburn only in the previous December. According to Venn, he was C. of Crowell and Tetsworth 1857–65, and then went to Australia.

5 Beauchamp was the youngest of seven brothers.

The time is now come when I must call on you as I gave you notice to provide two full Services at Crowell and at Shirburn.[1] I have fully weighed the matter and I see no reason which can justify my waiving this requirement and I must beg you at once to inform me of the arrangements by which you propose to provide for this amount of duty.

I am my dear Sir, Very Faithfully Yours,

S. Oxon.

647.[2] *(vi 153)*

Private

Lavington, Petworth, Aug. 8, 1856

My dear Sir,

I know not what your objections to Culham College are and as to them therefore it is difficult to speak: but you must not misunderstand my saying that your expressing disapproval of the recent meeting at Culham when planned by your Bishop and the Diocesan Board of the Diocese, without further enquiry, appears to me to be one of those instances of opposition to what it was your duty to support to which prejudice and party spirit so often alas lead amongst us; and a head Master . . . [*illegible*]

[I asked and I again ask however] . . . [*illegible*] . . . That the Principal and all his staff were present, and that under your Bishop, Sir H. Thompson,[3] Dr. Ellison of Windsor,[4] Professor Walker,[5] the Agent of the Nat. Soc^{y} for the diocese . . . [*illegible*] . . . would attend concluded the meeting.

But I shall be obliged to you if you will tell me what it is in this proposed training at Culham of which you disapprove.

[*illegible*] . . . but to take power to find and correct it.

I am ever yours most truly,

S. Oxon.

648. To W. E. Gladstone *(vi 154)*

Private

Aug. 21, 1856

My dear Gladstone,

I think you should see this letter of W. Gresley's to H. Newland[6] in order that you may see how very high Churchmen take this matter.

The difficulty of seeing how to deal with this case does not diminish as I contemplate it more closely.

[1] The population of these two villages scarcely justified the demand. What weighed more with the Bishop was the value of the livings, which with a curate to do all the work were virtual sinecures (Diocese Book, II, p. 166).

[2] Recipient unidentified.

[3] Rev. Sir Henry Thompson (1796–1868), 3rd Bart (*MEB*).

[4] Henry John Ellison (1813–99), P.C. of All Saints, Brighton, 1840–3; V. of Edensor, Derbys. 1845–55, New Windsor, 1855–75; R. of Great Haseley, 1875–94; Reader at Windsor Castle, 1856–75; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, 1873; later a temperance advocate (*MEB*).

[5] Robert Walker (1801–65), Prof. of Experimental Philosophy at Oxford, 1839–65; V. of Culham, 1848–62 (*MEB*).

[6] William Gresley (1801–76), Student of Christ Church, 1819–28; P.C. of Boyne Hill, 1857–76; and Henry Garrett Newland (1804–60) (*DNB*).

Of course our one paramount duty is the maintenance of the dogmatic truth of the Real Presence.

Now G. A. D. in maintaining that real presence has selected a certain phraseology.[1]

It is contended that the phraseology he has chosen is condemned by the Article and the Statute of Elizabeth; but it may be condemned by the Article and Statute not because it contains the truth with which G. A. D. seeks to identify it, and for the sake of which we are contending, but for other reasons — e.g. the article may condemn it in order to condemn the ex opere operato doctrine which it imputed to Rome: the Statute, through the Article because it was the test of whether a man was a true subject to Queen Eliz. or a Popish adherent of Rome. Now if these suppositions are true a man who uses this particular language may be condemned for using it, whilst he is not condemned for the doctrine he means to teach in using it. The administrators of the law, even the Privy Council, may say, we have nothing to do with your doctrine: you may preach or teach at will that the res Sacramenti is given to and taken by the wicked as well as the faithful, but if in order to teach your doctrine you choose to use language which the Article and Statute together, albeit for a different purpose, make it unlawful to use; then you must be punished for using it. And then *we* are put in this difficulty that *if* we make common cause with him and say: if you deprive him you will censure the true doctrine, it becomes *our act* which exposes the true doctrine to appear to all to be censured when *really* the true doctrine is not touched or concerned in the matter. I do not touch on the other side, I mean on the danger to the truth [from leaving him to be deprived,] because that lies on the surface.

I am disposed to think that we must wait for sentence of deprivation to be pronounced and for the opportunity of showing how opinion is to be persecuted by the Puritans before we can move with effect.

Pray send me your better judgment on all this. I shall be delighted if toward the end of October I can get to you.

I am affectionately yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 321–2

649. To the Rev. T. Stevens[2] (*vi 155*)
Aug. 29, 1856

My dear Mr. Stevens,

I am quite unable to see what there was in my letter to cause you either 'pain or disappointment' — for I see no reason whatever why you should wish to be exempted from conforming to rules which I have felt it my duty to lay down for the good government of my Diocese.

If as Mr. Manclarke[3] states to you 'The granting a license to a Curate is considered a simple matter of Business in the Diocese of Peterborough' I see no

1 Denison's statements on the Real Presence in two printed *Sermons* were the subject of a heated lawsuit, Ditcher v. Denison, in which the archdeacon was finally (1858) acquitted on appeal to the Privy Council.

2 Thomas Stevens (1809–88), R. of Bradfield 1843–82, founder and Warden (1850–81) of St. Andrew's College, Bradfield (*MEB*).

3 Richard Palgrave Manclarke (1829–96), C. of Bradfield, 1856–8 (O).

reason why the custom of that Diocese should either govern me or be quoted against me.

I believe it to be my bounden duty to make careful enquiry before I admit Curates into my diocese: and do not, in the present laxity of all things, feel by any means satisfied by the formal testimonials which Clergymen of almost any opinions or any practise may obtain.

I therefore have required from all incumbents that, before offering to nominate a Curate to me they should privately acquaint me with their wish that I may satisfy myself of the fitness of the intended Curate for the Post.

This notice I have publickly given in two charges both of which you have heard, and both of which you may procure in print.

When therefore I received a note from Mr. Manclarke informing me that all was settled and requesting me to do what was needful, I believing you to be one who would wish to conform to rules so laid down, and knowing the faithlessness of my memory, and not having my papers here to refer to, feared that I had forgotten a matter on which you had (as you ought to have done) spoken or written to me, and I wrote in a friendly manner to you to that effect. Which of *us* has the best reasons to feel 'pain and disappointment' you at receiving my letter, or I at receiving such a censure I will not say. I am on your statement ready to license Mr. M: and am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

650. To the Rev. J. Slatter[1] *(vi 156)*
Private

Lavington, Sep. 1, 1856

My dear Mr. Slatter,

I. I quite agree in your general view of what would be the expedient report: a simple statement of difficulties and resources leaving the board to find some escape, seems the thing to be aimed at.

II. I have read with great sorrow your confidential communication: and shall much like to talk the matter over freely with you.

I cannot doubt that if the results of the unhappy Bath proceedings *were*, what you fear them to be, that very many would feel that they must publickly explain their Subscription. But *I* cannot feel that to be so at all. For after all what do they amount to? The Archbishop with three packed Assessors decide that *in their opinion* the Articles condemn Denison's propositions.

There is not a hint even in this *opinion* that they condemn the objective presence of Our Lord in the Holy Sacrament — and what is the worth of the opinion — granted that it is carried out into a Judgement. That Judgement will be appealed against: and probably at once set aside on legal grounds in the very next Court.

Then we shall stand thus: The Puritans thinking their time come, will have made an attempt to persecute: they will have extracted from the ArchB: a Socinian lawyer, a Neologian Dean and a puritan professor[2] a declaration that they think they could safely use the Article to put down an obnoxious high

[1] John Slatter (1817–99), P.C. of Sandford-on-Thames 1852–61 (O).
[2] Dr. Lushington, Dean Johnson of Wells, and Dr. C. A. Heurtley of Christ Church.

Churchman: they will have failed in their attempt, on legal grounds. The subject will have been well ventilated, the high tone of the Church of England doctors proved, & no one will venture in our day again to try persecution.

I am very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, II, 327–8

[**651.** Not used]

652. To the Archbishop of Canterbury (J. B. Sumner) *(vi 157)*

Cuddesdon, Jan. 14, 1857

My dear Lord,

I am much obliged by your kind letter about Mr. Davis: I yet trust that I may not be compelled to resort to Authority. I am going to see him here tomorrow.

I find upon further enquiry that the first business which would *naturally* come before the lower house would be the resumption of their consideration of the Clergy Discipline bill at the point where they dropped it before: that is at the provision for cases of false doctrine heresy and schism. It would therefore perhaps be best to leave them to *begin* with this.

Then there are one or two matters upon which with your Grace's sanction I should much desire the deliberation of the Upper House.

The first of these would be a Resolution bearing upon the present agitation for obtaining a new Version of the Bible. I should wish to propose a resolution discountenancing such an attempt, and limit a [commission to deciding upon only specific] variations. This would in my judgement allow of the most [gradual] introduction of a very few alterations being desireable, whilst by shewing how few they are it would [surely] tend to confirm the authority of the existing version. I would propose if this were adopted by our house to communicate it to the lower.

Then secondly I should desire . . . [*illegible*] . . . and that a new selection of lessons for days when proper lessons are not appointed should be prepared by proper authority to be used with the sanction of the Bishop in lieu of the Calendar lessons: and if the lower house resolved that it was I would propose a commee of our house to prepare such a selection for future use as directed. There is no greater positive [improvement to be desired to the usual course of lessons through] the extreme length and great inappropriateness of many of the calendar lessons; and no part of those unhappy divisions which [rushed] us last time into concessions here.

That is what I should like to do in the Upper House.

[In the lower house further a committee could be appointed] to take into consideration some [means] for providing for the fuller support of the Missionary operations of the Church at home and abroad — and if time allowed it I would propose that we in some form or other recommended that 2 collections should be made annually in every Church for these Objects; one for the general one for the Diocesan work of the Church: leaving it for the Clergyman in the first case to settle through what Society or Societies he should work e.g. whether Church Miss^{y}. or S.P.G. &c., Curates Aid or [Pastoral] Aid &c. & for the second leaving it to the Bishops by Pastoral letter or otherwise to point out the Diocesan object for which they wished the Clergy to collect the alms of their Parishioners.

It seems to me that your Grace can hardly continue *your* letter to the Bishops in lieu of the Q A letter in the face of such opposition as it will meet with:

especially now that we have on our bench one or two who have signed the memorial against such letters; and that the only mode therefore in which a [support] to Church Missions generally as before stated would be by some recommendation of two sermons to be preached *everywhere* annually; whilst the principle of the opposition to 'letters' for Societies would be met by thus leaving the allotment of the sums raised to various Church instruments in the hands of those who collect them.

May I ask your Grace's sanction or correction of these proposals.

I am most truly your Grace's affectionate [brother],

S. Oxon.

653. To the Bishop of London (A. C. Tait)[1] *(vi 158)*

Private & Confidential

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 10, 1857

My dear Bishop,

I cannot forbear calling your attention to the mode in which the Record represents you to have spoken of me in the H of L on Tuesday night. The statement amounts to this that you 'in the mildest tone' charged me with having stated a falsehood in 'saying that the Archbishop had at a meeting of the Bishops in London undertaken to endeavour to prevail on Lord S.[2] to postpone his motion'. Now I doubt not that this is an entire mis-statement of what you did say: and if so I really think you would wish me to request you to write in the fewest possible words to the Record that you did not mean to insinuate any such charge against me.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

654. To Lady Grey[3] *(v 77)*

Cuddesdon Palace, June 30, 1861

My dear Lady Grey,

It is not without great pain & hesitation that I write to you. It is so painful to write what must give pain: & pain especially to one already so much in many ways crushed already. Yet if I am to do you any Good I must speak to you with entire openness. I have received two letters from Sir George — One sent to me through the Bishop of Cape Town by the last mail for me to transmit to you: The other an answer to the Bishop of Cape Town on his repeating to Sir George some remarks of mine as to his present duty towards you. This letter you may read & copy if you will letting me have again the original. You have wished me to advise you & on these two letters therefore I feel bound to give you my counsel. But before doing it I ought to say: 1, that; whilst I do not admit for an instant that the *Sin* of infidelity in the wife is altered by the want of chastity in the husband; I do not believe the charges you have brought against Sir George. He *may* have

1 Archibald Campbell Tait (1811–82), Bishop of London, 1856–68 (*DNB*).

2 Shaftesbury.

3 Harriet (d. 1898), wife (1839) of Sir George Grey (1812–98), the colonial governor. Grey conceived suspicions of misconduct by her with Sir Henry Keppel, the captain of the ship taking them back to Cape Town, and the two parted until 1897. See O. W. Hewett, . . . *and Mr Fortescue* (1958), pp. 168–9.

sinned. But that you were second in his house: that he with cruel neglect of you maintained a Mistress in the House &c. I am bound to say that I do *not believe*. You told me it was 'notorious' & you named Dr Bickersteth as one who knew the evil rumour. I sought him out on his landing: & so far from confirming your statement he distinctly affirmed that had such a state of things existed he must have known it, & that so far from *knowing it* he never amongst the scandals of the small Cape community which made free with Sir George riding with young ladies &c. he never heard a whisper imputing to him infidelity to you. I have written to the Cape & I have thence received the same reply. I believe you then to have allowed yourself under the influence of Jealousy first & recrimination since to have allowed yourself to exaggerate (to say the least) so as really to state untruths in this matter. Now the light which this throws on the reality of your penitence before God (The matter as to which my anxiety is concentrated) is very fearful; & if there be *not* penitence what security is there for the future if guilty sympathy is offered to you. I do beseech you for your Souls sake to think & pray this deeply over. And now for the rest. These letters shew (1) the depth of Sir G's affection for you. The Bishop says 'he will talk to me for hours of Lady G weeping as an heart broken man'. They shew secondly that his mind is made up to a permanent separation. Thirdly they shew that he is most deeply interested in the life you now lead & resolve to lead; longing that it may be such as may lead you to peace & to honour.

Now this seems to mark out what your life should be. You should absolutely consult his wishes for you. You should write to him: the letter I enclose calls for your writing — fully — freely — affectionately penitently. This is the first thing. You should secondly settle yourself near these friends whose eye he evidently wishes to be on you. The Bishop of C.T[1] says to me 'Sir G would be glad if she went to live near his Uncle & Aunt in Herefordshire they are very fond of her & would at any time be glad to see her.' *This* should be in my judgement your first course. Hereafter some scheme of a life may open before you. But the root of peace must be in deep real true penitence — and Oh my dear Lady Grey does God see in you a penitent? or an angry, self justifying, self deceiving Spirit? What more can I add? Do not let this post go without its bearing to Sir George the wail of a penitent heart & a self reproaching wife.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

655. To the Bishop of Llandaff (A. Ollivant)[2] *(v 78)*

Cuddesdon, July 3, 1861

My dear Bishop,

Will you let me suggest to you for your consideration the reasons which bring me to an opposite conclusion.

I say nothing of the reasons which make me so earnest for some Synodical Act because on them I believe we are already agreed. Especially on the duty of the Church by some *public* & *official* act (if permitted) clearing herself from complicity with those who teaching in her name, teach men to give up Gods word, Creation Redemption & the Work of God the Holy Ghost. But agreeing in this you are disposed to think that the Bp. of Salisbury having begun proceedings

1 Cape Town.
2 Alfred Ollivant (1798–1882), Bishop of Llandaff, 1849–82 (*DNB*).

against R W we are precluded from action in Synod.[1] To this I say, 1. we are not proposing in Synod to act against the *men* but to condemn the book.

II. If R W *is* convicted *one man only* is touched. The Church should condemn *the book*.

III. R W cannot be convicted unless it is proved that he personally is responsible for teaching against our formularies: & as that proceeding is highly penal the accused ought to have & will have every possible loophole afforded him for escape. The question of whether *the book* is one which the church ought to condemn is quite a different question from whether one particular writer in it has made himself liable to extreme criminal proceedings by his share in it. Thus E.G. the condemnation of *the book* ought to depend on its character *as a whole*. The issue of criminal proceedings against one writer must turn *absolutely* on his own writing & on his having so written it as to express his own opinions. Again — if the Court condemns R W our having condemned the book will merely be proof of our due official guardianship of the faith having been vigilantly exercised: if the Court determine that R W is *not* liable to the extreme penalty of the law the Church will be saved the intolerable Scandal of such a book being justified & the just distinction between the condemnation of the writing & the punishment of the writer will be preserved. Again; the matter having been brought by the lower House before us the Guardians of the faith it seems to me essential that at *some* time we should synodically clear our Church from tolerating such heresy in our ordained teachers. But if this is to be done at all *this* seems to me the *best* time. For if R W is condemned there would be a certain appearance of trampling on the fallen in a Synodical Condemnation: & if he were acquitted it would certainly be held to be an appeal from the Court of law to the Synod. I do not say that these reasons would prevent my acting hereafter if we could not act now. But I think that they are strong reasons for preferring present to future action. Then again I think it of great moment for the Synod that we should get clear of this question by *present* action & not have it hang on for another session. All which is commended to your better Judgement.

There is I assure you great danger of our appearing to undervalue the Crisis. As an evidence of the wide spread feeling of the duty of Convocation in the matter there can hardly be a stronger proof than the fact that such a leading Article as that of Monday last should have appeared in the Times.[2]

I am ever my dear Bishop, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, III, 7–8

[1] Nos. 655, 657, 682, and 713 arose from the controversy over *Essays and Reviews*, which had appeared in Feb. 1861 and was 'the book' which Wilberforce here could not bring himself to name. (He had criticised it in the *Quarterly Review* for Jan. 1861.) In June 1861 the Lower House of Convocation pronounced in favour of proceeding to a synodical judgment on the book; but meanwhile two (and the most inferior) of the seven Essayists, the Rev. Rowland Williams (1817–70), Prof. at Lampeter and V. of Broad Chalke, Wilts. (*DNB*), and the Rev. Henry Bristow Wilson (1803–88), Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, 1825–50; V. of Great Staughton, Hunts., 1850–88 (*DNB*), had been prosecuted in the Church Courts, Williams by his diocesan, Walter Kerr Hamilton (1808–69), Bishop of Salisbury, 1854–69 (*DNB*), and Wilson by a fellow-incumbent in the diocese of Ely, the Rev. James Fendall (see no. 657). The Dean of Arches (Dr. Lushington) found against both writers on 15 Dec. 1862, and suspended them for one year; both appealed to the Queen in Council, and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (four lay judges, both Archbishops, and the Bishop of London) heard the appeal in June 1863, and delivered judgment in the appellants' favour — though by a majority, the Archbishops dissenting, on one charge against each — on 8 Feb. 1864. Cf. *Life*, III, 1–11; R. T. Davidson and W. Benham, *Life of A. C. Tait* (1891), I, c. 7.

[2] 1 July 1861.

656. To the Rev. D. A. Beaufort[1] *(v 79)*

The Deanery, Peterborough, July 27, 1861

My dear Mr Beaufort,

I have only just had time to think over your letter of July 21. First let me say that I see not one trace in your letter of 'clinging to this worlds pelf' & secondly that after maturely weighing the propositions which you have been so kind as to make to me I see many reasons for preferring your second. I see the advantage of the principal being kept at present in your hand: I feel sure that for the first starting this new Cure[2] real absolute strength of body is needed: I see advantages in its being maintained in Fosbery's[3] sole administration which will be easy with your annual payment. As to the Deed you propose to secure the benefaction you ultimately propose your Solicitor would probably draw it best. But my secretary & Friend J M Davenport Esq will I am sure give any assistance which may be in His power. It is important that any such Capital sum should be so settled as to enable its being offered to the Ecclesiastical Commission to draw a Grant from them.

As to the future — four or five years hence if I understand you rightly: we ought to have a distinct understanding. Your words '(if your Lordship & Mr F are then willing)' imply all that I mean — any engagement or obligation on my part or on his would savour of a Simoniacal Contract. It must therefore be quite plain that it is as if of your mere motion you now gave the Capital Sum absolutely retaining your present Cure — and that if hereafter you give up your present Cure neither I or the Vicar are under any engagement or understanding direct or implied to place you there. Many things indeed between this time & that might make such an arrangement undesireable. A Curate might have won the affections of the flock — its circumstances may point out some man, or some special gifts as specially required for the post: and if therefore I accept as I am readily and thankfully willing to do on behalf of God & His Church your noble offer, it must be with perfect moral as well as legal freedom for the future.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

Address 26 Pall Mall

657. To the Rev. J. Fendall[4] *(v 80)*

The Deanery, Lichfield, Oct. 23, 1861

My dear Mr Fendall,

I thought that it would be best to consult in confidence with Dr Phillimore before I replied to your last letter. I now send you in confidence his answer. My advice would be that you should apply to the Proctors he named stating your intention; desiring them to retain *him* & to consult him professionally as to the Steps — & adding that you wished whenever £150 had been expended to be

[1] Presumably Daniel Augustus Beaufort (1814–98), R. of Lymm, Cheshire, 1849–72 (C); of Huguenot descent.

[2] Christ Church, Reading, formed in 1862.

[3] Thomas Vincent Fosbery (1807–75), of Trinity College, Dublin; P.C. of Sunningdale, 1847–57; V. of St. Giles, Reading, 1857–70 (*MEB*).

[4] James Fendall (1801–67), Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, 1831–40; V. of Comberton, Cambs., 1833–67, and R. of Harlton, Cambs., 1839–67.

informed that you might then determine on your future course. I do not entertain any doubt of a *covering* subscription being hereafter made. You will see the great importance of having proctors used to this kind of work.[1]

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

My address till Thursday i e tomorrow *week* is to be Bishop Thorpe York.

658. To the Rev. A. M. W. Christopher[2] (*v 81*)
Private

Bishop Thorpe Palace, Oct. 28, 1861

My dear Mr Christopher,

I rejoice unfeignedly in the acceptance of your Ministry which makes the enlargement of your Church desireable & in the munificence of Spirit which leads you to undertake the work. There is only this question of the Galleries. Now you must not my dear Friend ask me to accede to them. For 16 years I have been working as hard as man can work to get rid of them from the Diocese. This I have done not to gratify a feeling of taste but because I firmly believe that they tend directly to interfere with the worship of our God. How can I then assent to them.[3] As to their seeming increase of room I do not believe in it. They destroy as much below as they create above. I feel persuaded than an Architect capable of drawing these plans would find for you some other way of enlarging the room of the Church if he was not instructed to try this most offensive mode.[4]

As to the difficulties of the surrounding obstacles I do not think that such considerations should stand in the way of the real spiritual needs of the parish. Of course Dr Jeunes Lodge[5] should not be injured; but happily neither you nor I are the proper persons to decide whether the required enlargement of the Church would be an injury to it. For such alteration as you propose could not be carried into effect without a faculty & before the faculty was issued Dr Jeune would have the opportunity of stating his objections & having them most candidly considered.

Nor do I see any reason why the Tomb house & Mr Burgons monuments should not be removed to other sites. I am quite sure that Mr Burgon would be the last man to object captiously to such a removal or to put the immoveability to a neighbouring spot of a monument to the dead against fitting a parish Church for the use of the living.[6]

Once more I must repeat my dear Friend if it was a matter of Architectural taste you should not ask twice; but do not I beseech you put me into a position in which I must either resist you or give up what I believe to be of the greatest moment for keeping alive a high tone in the Worship of God in our Churches.

I am most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

1 See note to no. 655.
2 Alfred Millard William Christopher (1820–1913), C. of St. John's, Richmond, Surrey, 1849–55; Sec. of C.M.S., 1855–9; R. of St. Aldate's, Oxford, 1859–1905 (C).
3 See J. S. Reynolds, *Canon Christopher* (1967), pp. 128–9 for the reconstruction of St. Aldate's Church: the Bishop had his way.
4 The architect was in fact John Christopher, the Rector's cousin.
5 Francis Jeune (1804–68), Master of Pembroke College, Oxford, 1843–64, Vice-Chancellor, 1858–62; Bishop of Peterborough, 1864–8 (*DNB*). The old lodgings of the Principal are meant, i.e. those disused after the later purchase from Christ Church of Wolsey's Almshouses.
6 Presumably John William Burgon (1813–88), Fellow of Oriel, 1846–76 (*DNB*).

659. To the Provost of Eton (E. C. Hawtrey) (*v 82*)
Private

Ossington, Nov. 17, 1861

My Dear Provost,

I need not trouble you with a recital of the various hindrances which have prevented my earlier reply to your letter concerning Mr Pauls Tract.[1]

I have read it carefully & it gives me great pain to state to you as you desire my Judgement upon it. I am quite unable to reconcile its language with the authorised teaching of our Church — and I lament to say that the contradiction appears to me to *pervade* the tract. From first to last it appears to assert that Our Church has no definite teaching which it lays down *as Truth*, revealed by God & to be held by man as a part of his Submission to God.

Such expressions as those in page 8 line 7, 11 &c as to laymen seem to imply so much: as to clergymen the same seems to me to be asserted page 9 line 10 & page 10 especially l 17. which is less surprizing after the Statement page 6 — line 14 that the Church is guilty of the manifest dishonesty of using intentionally words in a double sense. There is a frightfully expressed exaggeration of this sentiment at the bottom of page 7.

Nor in practise does Mr Paul at all limit the subjects which are thus left free for the action of individual opinion.

Pages 14 & 15 seem to me entirely to do away with future punishment, page 17 with Miracles & prophecy, whilst page 16 treats the doctrine of the atonement itself in the same way. This passage indeed appears to me to be such as would expose Mr Paul to legal deprivation if he held a living. For the words 'She has adopted an unfortunate expression in her Second Article' combined with the context which shews that what he considers to be the misfortune is that She condemns the Socinian gloss that there was need of something to reconcile man to God, is indeed a depravation of the Articles on a vital point. I might say the same of the condemnation of the marriage service as Jewish toned service need to be Christianized p 23 [*sic*].

I cannot tell you the pain all this gives me. For I have always had a warm regard to Mr Paul. But I am firmly convinced that if this liberty for which he pleads: to treat all our Churchs language as indeterminate p 22: To be allowed on all matters in question in this day of universal question to claim to have all matters left equally free (p 18): & to maintain as he does p 24 that there is scarce a phase of Christian Faith which *may* not be held within the Church of England (meaning as he has explained above opinions ranging from popish Rome to Socinian Geneva) — That if this be allowed, all truth will be lost amongst us — and so far from believing that this is what 'the great heart of England' p 11. desires, there is I am convinced nothing which would more alienate that great heart from us than to believe that we thus paltered with words using them in ambiguous senses meaning anything or nothing & had no fixed & definite belief on all these great points of the Faith.

[1] Charles Kegan Paul (1828–1902), C. of Great and Little Tew, 1851–2, Bloxham, 1852–4; Conduct (i.e. Chaplain) of Eton, 1854–62; V. of Sturminster Marshall, Dorset, 1862–74; he became a publisher (1877) and a Roman Catholic (1890) (*DNB*). In 'The Boundaries of the Church', contributed to *Tracts for Priests and People* (ed. M. and J. Hughes, 1861), Paul argued that the very minimum of doctrine was required from lay members of the Church of England.

I trust that Mr Paul will calmly reconsider these matters for I cannot calculate the amount of scandal & evil which seems to me certain to ensure [*sic*] if one trusted with the Cure & teaching of Souls abides by such very loose views of what revealed truth is & what are the obligations imposed by our Church upon its authorised propounders.[1]

I am my dear Provost, most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

660. To Sir R. Palmer[2] *(v 83)*
Private

Ossington, Nov. 18, 1861

My dear Palmer,

Many thanks to you for taking the trouble to look into this matter for me. Will you let me ask you for my instruction one or two questions on it. First as to Vic 6. 5. Though as you say it is quite clear that no consecration can take place under *that* act without a license, has the act any effect in making consecrations without a license, if not attempted under that act one whit more illegal than they were before? If not I suppose the matter falls back on the one question is the consecrating without a mandate made illegal by the rubrical direction 'Then shall the ArchBishop demand the Queens mandate for the Consecration and cause it to be read'? Now, can it be held that these words make the *mandate a part of the Service?*[3] Are they not a condition for using this office, but no part of the office and if they are not part of the office does the act of uniformity really apply to them? And would not the requirement of the law be satisfied by the ArchBishop demanding the Queens Mandate & receiving as an answer that in this case no Mandate could be granted?

When you speak as if no principle of the Church was violated by the Queen by her license granting Spiritual Jurisdiction out of Her own dominions will you tell me how we escape one of these 2 conclusions. If what She grants is that power of jurisdiction which in the realm we receive from the Crown for the better carrying out the powers which we receive from God, how can The Crown of England grant *it*[4] in a foreign territory without usurpation? But if it be not this jurisdiction which is granted, must not it be the pure spiritual power of the Word & Sacraments which the Crown does not grant in England & cannot grant abroad? The general apprehension amongst Churchmen in that is [*sic*] this last which the Crown is being asked to affect to give: & how wide & intense the feeling is you may gather from one or two letters I enclose for you to glance at & will ask you to return.

I am to be at Oxford on Wednesday.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Despite all this, Paul secured an Eton living (in another diocese) the following year.
2 Sir Roundell Palmer (1812–95), later Lord Chancellor and 1st Earl of Selborne. His skilled legal advice was often sought in Oxford: he was Deputy to the High Steward of the University.
3 *Service* is underlined thrice.
4 Underlined twice.

661. To the Bishop of Natal (J. W. Colenso)[1] *(vii 1)*

Secret

Chevening, Sevenoaks, Aug. 8, 1862

My dear Bishop,

I hear that you have reached London & I am most anxious at once to communicate with you. And *first* I want to express to you the unabated continuance of my affection to you, let our differences of opinion turn out to be what they may, & then, next, as to those differences. I know I believe all the generous heat of your noble nature — and I firmly believe that what you have viewed as unjust opposition, to those whom you love & admire, has driven you on to points which, but for such gales of feeling, you would never have reached. I have read over & over again your exposition to the Romans:[2] I must say to you that I think you contradict yourself in it over & over again. That there are statements in it, numerous, explicit & manifestly from your heart of hearts which are incompatible with any but the really orthodox view, as we both should of old have understood that word.

And yet there are in it passages which seem to me quite incompatible with what from the beginning has been the unbroken tradition of the Church's teaching. Over these I should greatly like calmly & prayerfully to talk with you if you will let me. They are too large for writing. But what I mainly write for now is to pray you not to take any irretrievable step until you have in free discourse with some of us reviewed the whole matter. I hope you will not think this too much for me to ask. I long so to have you with us. I so dread the evil consequences to our Church of a dissention on these matters in which you are to take a leading part. Surely the separation of Colonial life: & the autocracy of a Colonial Bishops position cannot be, with any gifts of intellect, the most favourable position for the discovery of religious truth. And if this be so, it must be a duty to review all conclusions so reached with others, if you have the opportunity, before you irrevocably adopt them & run the risk of advocating error: of clouding truth or of risking the usefulness of a life. You perhaps know that we Bishops did generally consult on your commentary; & though in different measures, yet all lamented much that we found in it. I am sure you would not deny that such a consensus of your Brethren, though it would not, of course, stand in the stead of one of your own conclusions, yet ought to be ground for carefully & with consultation of others revizing them thoroughly. All I would entreat for Love's Sake is that you rest in quietness until you have given us some such opportunity of free brotherly converse. *I*[3] am going into Wales for a fortnight: but the first week in September please God I am to be at Lavington near Petworth — & if you could come to me there to give a day or two to such a consultation you would find a warm greeting & I hope a loving & unprejudiced discussion of differences.

I have vividly before me the lines you wrote in my little visitors book when you left Cuddesdon. I have always felt the liveliest interest in your course & I would fain, believe me, only do everything which in me lies to keep in truth & usefulness one very dear to my heart & gifted by God with most unusual powers of serving Him. I pray you to believe me to be your affectionate brother,

S. Oxon.

Life, III, 117–18

[1] John William Colenso (1814–83), Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, 1837–46; R. of Forncett St. Mary, Norfolk, 1846–53; Bishop of Natal, 1853–83 (*DNB*). The combination of personal regard with public antagonism is commented on in *Life*, III, 120, in a full discussion of the Bishop's part in this famous controversy.

[2] Colenso published early in 1861 his *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.*

[3] Underlined twice.

662. To Mrs. Cotton[1] *(vii 2)*

Confidential

Chevening, Sevenoaks, Aug. 8, 1862

My dear Mrs Cotton,

I absolutely disapprove of such vows. I have no doubt that a clergyman has no right on behalf of the Church to receive them; & even if made I hold them to have been made so entirely under false pretences that I do not believe them to be in Gods sight binding on the maker.

But how to act in the case of Mr C. is a very difficult question. He is not an easy man to deal with. If I asked concerning such vows I should get, I am persuaded, from him no other answer than a request of the name of the person on whose complaint my communication was founded. Nor should I ever *persuade* him to anything which I could not by authority enforce upon him. Still the subject is so important, that I will not shrink from opening it to him, if I may be at liberty to quote you as my informant as to his practise if upon my writing to him he, as I expect he will requires from me the name of my informant.

I am my dear Mrs Cotton, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

663. To the Master of Balliol (R. Scott)[2] *(vii 3)*

Chevening, Sevenoaks, Aug. 8, 1862

My dear Master of Balliol,

I have to thank you for your kind note & for the copy of your Examination. It is exactly what I desire: only I want to see it, instead of being individually adopted by one professor & optional as to the Students, the rule of all professors & the condition of all testimonials. I was *not* aware that any alteration in the Statutes of the University was required. But there would I suppose be no objection to such an alteration if it was proposed by the Professors. I may mention privately to you that the Vice Chancellor[3] suggested to me that the Bishops might themselves secure such an alteration by the simple course of agreeing to receive no testimonial in future which did not state that the divinity student had satisfied the professor on examination by him on the subjects of his lectures. May I ask you if you see any objection to the adoption by the Bishops of such a resolution — and whether your opinion coincides with that of the Vice Chancellor that its adoption would secure the result I desire?

I am, My dear Master, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

My best address at present is 26 Pall Mall.

1 This letter was probably written to the wife of R. L. Cotton, Provost of Worcester; she was Dr. Pusey's sister, and died in 1883. 'Mr C' was probably Thomas Chamberlain, V. of St. Thomas's, Oxford, of whom Mrs. Cotton was a relatively near neighbour. However, the letter is addressed to Mrs. Cotton at an address in Freshwater, I.o.W.

2 Robert Scott (1811–87), Fellow of Balliol, 1835–40; R. of Duloe, Cornwall, 1840–50, South Luffenham, Rutland, 1850–4; Master of Balliol, 1854–70, Ireland Prof. of Exegesis, 1861–70; Dean of Rochester, 1870–87 (*DNB*).

3 F. Jeune.

664. To the Bishop of Honolulu (T. N. Staley)[1] *(vii 4)*

Chevening, Sevenoaks, Aug. 9, 1862

My dear Bishop,

Yours of the 7th has just reached me here. (1) I enclose a note[2] to Bishop Ki*p* (N B not Kipp).[3]

(2). If you find laymen who will work under you I would by all means use them — without their giving up their pursuits — in the service of the Sanctuary. *But* I would not call them deacons: Nor ordain them with laying on of hands. I am persuaded (I) That having a double order under the same name — i e deacons who have renounced all for the Ministry & those who have not, is contrary (a) to primitive use (b) full of inconvenience in practise & (c) would lead to confusion. (II) That the true mode is to have what under like circumstances the Church has already developed a minor order. Such an [order][4] therefore I should institute. I would avoid as long as I could giving it a name, because names offend when the reality is unknown — when the thing has shewn its own usefulness it will find a name. Then either Subdeacon or Reader might without alarm to any designate the familiar & useful *fact*. As to the mode of appointment of such — I should *best* like the communicants to elect or approve — but till they are organized would select them myself *carefully* & *after trial* of their soundness. Then I would set them not apart from secular pursuits but *for* their office, by prayer in the congregation E.G. *Some* of the Ordination prayers. Their work should be very much the *Catechists*. I should let them *preach* in School Houses &c. reading portions of the prayer book appointed by me *not* the absolution — no extempore prayer. I would place them with the Clergy in the Chancel in Surplices — get them to lead the Choir — & read the first lesson at times. I should employ them specially at out posts — ministering to distant congregations in Schools & bringing periodically their flocks to the Mother Church for Communion &c.

(3) *Precedence*. I would of course if possible avoid the question. But if it is forced on you. 1. If Precedence is governed there as here by the Crown I should get if possible the Crown to settle it for you & then it is a *fact*.

II. If you cannot have this help — I should assume it; on the ground that you are in your Diocese, *he* a Bishop in partibus.

(4) [*sic*] I sent to 79 a letter to you from the Dean of Windsor & a book Mrs Staley sent — I hope they have reached you. You would find me Monday at 11.10. at 26 Pall [Mall][4] if you were disengaged for a last Adieu.

I am ever affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, III, 57–8

665. To the Rev. A. C. Coxe[5] *(vii 5)*

Chevening Park, Aug. 10, 1862

My dear Mr Coxe,

I was very glad as I always am to get your letter. And yet to say the whole truth to you it depresses my spirits greatly. For if you with all your warm pro-

1 Thomas Nettleship Staley (1823–98), Fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge, 1847–50; Principal of St. Mark's College, Chelsea, 1844–50, Collegiate School, Wandsworth, 1850–61; Bishop of Honolulu, 1861 (consecrated 15 Dec.) –70; R. of Croxall, Derbys., 1872–96 (*MEB*).

2 No. 666.

3 William Ingraham Kip (1811–93), missionary bishop in California, 1853–7; Bishop of California, 1857–93 (*DAB*).

4 Not in MS.

5 Arthur Cleveland Coxe (1818–96, Rector of Grace Church, Baltimore, 1854–63; Bishop of Western New York, 1865 (*DAB*).

English feelings so utterly misapprehend us & our feelings & our conduct what must the great bulk of your countrymen do? Now really all your letter does bespeak such a misconception. Of course we cannot know as you do the full state of the case: & when for example we read such a proclamation as General Butler's[1] & read in your own Northern papers the just Judgement on it that it is a calumnious invention of the South & then find it adopted & applauded we are puzzled. We have been used in Lombardy to the trial to which you were exposed in the hatred of the Lombard ladies to the Austrians; but we never saw it however violently it was exhibited so resented. We know how lightly Soldiers may suppose an insult & we tremble at the doom pronounced. Is it wonderful that such things should lead to violent remarks on our parts? But nothing can be more untrue than the supposition that we have rejoiced or that we have not deeply lamented over your sorrows: or more certain than that we long for your peace from no selfish motives but because we cannot bear to read of this bloodshed & misery amongst nations our nearest of Kin. Then what moral support have we given to the South. You know that except as allowing her belligerent rights we could not by the law of nations have respected your Blockade of her ports. When was there really a nobler regard paid to international rights than we have shewn in patiently awaiting all the vast sufferings which have come on our manufacturing population; rather than in any way interfere with you. Then my dear friend let me remind you that your answer to my urging on you that the North had no right to take arms to force the continuance of union on Free States, was, that it was not the true states but a violent handful of traitors in them who were guilty of treason & that your armies went not to conquer free men but to liberate Loyalists. Now has the event not contradicted this. Are not the whole populations of the Gulf States against the Union. Then for the future — grant that the North can as I think it very possible it can conquer the South: how is it possible that it can hold it in subjection. We have too high an idea of our brethren in America to believe that they *will* be so held. They may be exterminated they will never be White Slaves to their Northern Conquerors. So that what is to come of it if you do succeed is our question; & how with that question unanswered can we be enthusiastic about your success. You cannot rate too highly our sympathy but that sympathy makes us long for an adjustment of the terrible struggle. I have myself ordered a prayer for your peace throughout my Diocese. It is the longing desire of all true hearts amongs us. Will you give my most affectionate brotherly greetings to your good Bishop & Ever believe me to be affcly yours,

S. Oxon.

666. To the Bishop of California (W. I. Kip) *(vii 6)*

Chevening, Aug. 10, 1862

My dear Bishop,

Will you let me commend to your most brotherly regard the Right Rev Bishop Staley going out from us to Honolulu to found as we trust there through Gods Mercy a branch of our Church which may spread her healing branches over the many islands of the North Pacific. He is a good man & true & we shall all highly esteem any acts of brotherly kindness you may be able to shew to him.

I endeavoured to raise a subscription for your work when you wrote to me: but found it at that time impossible. Accept my assurances of brotherly esteem & believe me to be most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Benjamin Franklin Butler (1818–93), Union General in charge of New Orleans in 1862: his Order no. 28 authorised his soldiery to treat as prostitutes all women deemed to have insulted them (*DAB*).

667. To M. Hopkins[1] *(vii 7)*

Private

Address, 26 Pall Mall, Aug. 12, 1862

My dear Mr Hopkins,

Many thanks for your kind note of the 9th which reached me yesterday.

It is not as personally concerning myself that I care at all about the matter named to you by the Bishop of Honolulu. My object is to get things done — not to be known to be the doer of them. But as such a book of yours is an historical document giving the narrative of what I trust may be the beginning of a great hereafter, it *is* important that it should not give an entirely wrong view of it. Now if you will refer to your volume you will see it stated that 'the King wrote to the ArchBishop of Canterbury & to the Bishop of London' & the reader is led to suppose that the result of that was the planting of the Church in Hawaii.[2] No one knows better than you do how exactly that *is* the reverse of the truth: & that if the cause had been left to the inaction of our good & beloved ArchBishop or surrendered to the opposition of the Bishop of London that the Mission would never have gone forth. Now it matters nothing whether the work be attributed to wrong *individuals*. But it *does* matter, that the readers of your book, for years to come, should not be misled as to the School of religious opinions from which such works as these proceed.

You will observe that the Quarterly Review does not notice this error.[3] But if it does help to call forth a new Edition I think that truth to important fact does demand a correction of your statement as to this matter.[4]

I am most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

668. To the Rev. H. Shute *(vii 8)*

Clifton Rectory, Aug. 12, 1862

My dear Mr Shute,

Will you kindly as Rural Dean give me your Judgement as to the plan which has been proposed: for taking down the Church of Brittwell Priors a hamlet of Newington: & attaching the population to the parish of Britwell Salome instead.[5]

Letters are to reach me at Rhwlas Bala till Wednesday Aug 20. At the Palace St Asaph till Friday the 22nd At Bangor till the 24th At Sarsden Chipping Norton till the 26th.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Manley Hopkins (1818–97), father of the poet Gerard Manley Hopkins; Consul-General in London for the Hawaii Islands, 1856–97; average adjuster and arbitrator (*MEB*).

2 Hopkins published in 1862 the first edition of *Hawaii*: . . . *An Historical Account of the Sandwich Islands*; see p. 339. Hopkins' other works were severely technical.

3 I.e. the review by Wilberforce himself in *Quarterly Review* for July 1862, pp. 219–36 ('The Hawaiian Islands'), reprinted in his *Essays*, I, 184–204.

4 The 'error' was not corrected in the second (1866) edition of Hopkins' book (p. 345); in fact the Bishop had not quoted Hopkins correctly.

5 Britwell Priors had a population of about 50, and services in the Church there had recently altogether ceased. In 1865 the churches of both Britwell Priors and Britwell Salome were pulled down, and the new and larger church of St. Nicholas erected at Britwell Salome, despite objections by G. E. Street; the Britwells were formed into a united parish in 1867. Cf. *V.C.H. Oxon.*, VIII, 52–3, for the change: the two churches had been 100 yards apart.

669. To the Rev. S. Cotes[1] *(vii 9)*

Address, Rhwlas Bala, Aug. 12, 1862

My dear Mr Cotes,

Mr Johnson[2] has applied to me for my decision as to the hamlet of Britwell Priors. I well remember your speaking to me on the subject but I have not with me the mem°. I made of your proposal & I am therefore obliged to trouble you with a line to ask.

I. What is the population of Britwell Prior
II. What is the distance of the population respectively from the existing Chapel & from the Church of Britwell Salome.
III. What is proposed to be charged on the living of Newington for the Rector of Britwell Salome
IV. What is the value of the tithes of the hamlet to be surrendered.
V. Have you any knowledge of the wishes of the population on the subject
VI. Does the Patron of B.S. consent. Do you know the view of the Incumbent of Benson on the subject, or am I mistaken in supposing that his parish will be affected by it.
VII. What provision is proposed for the necessary enlargement of the Church of Britwell Salome?

I am to be at Rhwlas Bala till Wednesday next.
At The Palace St Asaph till the Friday,
I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

670. To the Rev. C. A. Joy[3] *(vii 10)*

Address, Rhwlas Bala, Aug. 12, 1862

My dear Mr Joy,

It gives me great pain to tell you that I am so entirely disatisfied with the results of your Ministry at Grove that I have felt it my duty to request Mr Bricknell to make some new arrangement for the Cure of Souls there. I do not wish to enter into particulars though I am prepared to do so if you require it: but I should prefer *your* writing to me to say that not finding the Church full or the Communicants attend as you desire it is your wish to be released.

I am, My dear Mr Joy, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

671. To the Rev. W. T. Eyre *(vii 11)*

Address, Rhwlas Bala, Aug. 12, 62

My dear Mr Eyre,

I do not see any difficulty about the licensing of your Curate:[4] I should wish him to make trial of the post first that it may be ascertained that the place suits him and that he suits the place.

[1] Septimus Cotes (1810–93), R. of Newington, 1845–93 (O).
[2] James Thomas Johnson (1812–92), R. of Britwell Salome, 1851–92 (O).
[3] Charles Ashfield Joy, of King's College, London; previously C. of Tunstall, Staffs., 1854–60. The Bishop does not seem to have achieved his object immediately, for according to *Crockford* Joy was Curate of Grove 1860–4, and then of Hanney, 1864–8, and Charney Bassett, 1868–70, both also in Berks.
[4] Presumably for Hillesden.

But as to the House as it is *not* the parsonage you had better make him your weekly tenant of it (Mr Davenport will tell you how) & then if ever you want to re-occupy you can do so: & by returning to take charge of the duty yourself you could at any time get rid of him. It his right after trial to be licensed.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

672. To the Rev. F. Cradock[1] *(vii 12)*

Address, Rhwlas, Aug. 12, 62

Rev & Dear Sir,

The account you have seen is substantially but not accurately correct.

I have not prescribed any prayer to be introduced into the Service because under the Act of Uniformity I have no authority to do so. But under the Rubric I *have* authority to order a notice to be given after the Nicene Creed & I have ordered a notice to be given that the prayers of the congregation are desired that God would give peace to our brethren in America & that a slight pause would be made at the suffrage that it may please thee to give to All Nations Unity peace & concord to enable the congregation mentally to apply it to the case of America[2] — & the same in the prayer for All Sorts & Conditions of Men at the words for all who are any ways afflicted in mind body or estate . . . [*Unfinished*]

673. To the Hon. and Rev. Lord S. G. Osborne *(vii 13)*

Private

Rhwlas Bala, Aug. 16, 1862

My dear Lord,

When I supposed that I was communicating with you confidentially, as a friend, I sent you the only copy I had of the only letter I wrote to Mr Cecil Fisher[3] declining to receive him: and I requested you to return it to me. I repeat that request.

After the insinuations contained in your last letter to 'the Times' you do not of course expect any renewal of correspondence on my part.[4]

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

My address is *here* till Wednesday. Then Palace St Asaph.

1 Unidentified.

2 See no. 665.

3 Cecil Edward Fisher (1838–1925), Student of Christ Church, 1857–62. He held three Lincs. livings, 1865–90, and then one in Bournemouth, 1890–1904. He was a member of a notable Christ Church family; his father was William Fisher (1799–1874), Student of Christ Church, 1815–23; R. of Poulshot, Wilts., 1823–74, and Canon of Salisbury, 1834–74.

4 Nos. 673–4, 681, and 689 concerned patronage in the diocese of Salisbury: cf. S. G. Osborne's letters in *The Times* of 30 July (p. 10), 5 Aug. (p. 7), and 11 Aug. (p. 9) on 'The Ex-Cathedra Family Affair', and *Times* leader of 12 Aug. 1862. It fell to Canon William Fisher (see last note) to present to the capitular living of Chitterne, Wilts., and he presented his son C. E. Fisher, who had been ordained deacon by Wilberforce only on Trinity Sunday, 1862. Further difficulty was created at the same time by the appointment of Francis Lear (1823–1914) to a Canonry of Salisbury: for Lear was son-in-law to Canon Fisher and brother-in-law of the Bishop of Salisbury. However, Wilberforce refused to accelerate C. E. Fisher's ordination as priest, and he could not be presented to Chitterne.

674. To the Rev. C. E. Fisher *(vii 14)*
Private

Rhwlas Bala, Aug. 16, 1862

My dear Mr Fisher,

I wish I had been able to see you in London. Though indeed I have nothing to add to my last letter: except to repeat the expression of my regret that my first consent, so reluctantly given, should have led to any aggravation of your present annoyances. I have nothing to complain of in your statement to me. I am sure you *meant* to put all before me. But it never was before me until I received the letter of complaint, from the Diocese, on receiving which I wrote to you.

Events have shewn since that I was not wrong in believing that I could not grant you the exemption from Common rule which your personal merits might justly have claimed without scandal to the Church & injury to the Bishop of Salisbury — & not knowing then that S.G.O. would make it a grievance in the Times I hoped by withdrawing my consent to prevent exactly the evils which his in my Judgement most unjustifiable conduct, has since caused. Believe me that I feel most deeply for you, & have not less, but more regard for you.

I am my dear Mr Fisher, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

675. To the Rev. P. R. Egerton[1] *(vii 15)*

Rhwlas Bala, Aug. 16, 1862

My dear Mr Egerton,

Upon getting your letter I took Archdeacon Bickersteth into my council upon it — & I have been waiting for his digested opinion before I replied to you. You will remember that you took this liability upon yourself without consulting me. I was indeed very glad that you did so. I rejoiced in the nobleness of spirit which had prompted you to make such a venture for Christ and I felt sure He would bless you in it. But I should not have dared to advise another to undertake such a risk. But now that you have done it: now that you have borne the burden & heat of the day; now that you have lived down the difficulties which you inherited from your predecessor have secured a sufficient number of pupils to just maintain the School & a character in the neighbourhood which will soon in my firm belief fill the School so as to make it amply support its head master I should greatly regret on every account your giving it up. Even as a matter of mere worldly prudence I think it would be a great mistake — you would by it throw yourself back into the mere common mass of Curates, whereas now you stand on a vantage ground few can reach. I very earnestly hope that your Uncle, to whom you are at liberty to communicate this letter will allow of your marriage on your present prospects. I believe that your marriage itself would tend greatly to the prosperity of the School, as in other ways, so in shewing your fixedness of purpose concerning it & thus breeding confidence in the minds of others. If he will do so, no efforts of mine shall be wanting to bring the cause before the Diocese & the Church. I enclose you Archdeacon B's letter, which also I think your Uncle should see. I quite approve of his suggestion and will gladly be one of the Guarrantors [*sic*] of £100.

[1] Philip Reginald Egerton (1833–1911), Fellow of New College, 1851–63; C. of Deddington, 1857–9; Headmaster of All Saints' School, Bloxham, 1860–86. He married in 1862.

You will be so kind as to let me hear again from you when you have brought the matter fully under your Uncles notice.[1]

My address is to be here till Wednesday. Palace St Asaph Thursday & Friday. Nannerch Mold Sat. & Sun-day. Penmaenmawr Bangor till Wednesday. Sarsden Chipping Norton Thursday & Friday Nuffield Nettlebed Saturday & then Lavington Petworth.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

676. To G. Woodrooffe[2] *(vii 16)*

Address Rhiwlas Bala [*sic*] till Wednesday
Thursday & Friday Palace St Asaph
Sat & Sunday Nannerch Mold. N Wales
Monday to Wednesday week Penmaenmawr Bangor
Then Sarsden Chipping Norton till Friday
Then Lavington Petworth

My dear W,

I approve entirely of your proposed mode of dealing with matters (1) & (2) of Carnsews purchase.[3] Also as to (3) I think it most important to settle the matter & assent to the proposed reference. Any mode by which you can bring the matter to payment I should approve. My eldest so [*sic*] is with me here & will be with me for some weeks.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

677. To Miss C. E. Charsley[4] *(vii 17)*

Private

Rhwlas Bala, Aug. 16, 1862

Madam,

I have waited for a few days before acknowledging your letter in order to make what enquiries I could upon the Subject.

I believe that I now have the whole case before me; & I cannot doubt that I should act unjustly by Mr Major[5] if I removed him from the Curacy of Beaconsfield. He assures me that he had not the slightest intention of annoying Mr Gould[6] by his enquiry as to the Communion alms & desisted from the enquiry as soon as he perceived that it caused irritation — & that any omission of his Services was the result of very serious illness. I most earnestly desire that for the short time which in the course of nature this engagement is likely to last, the family of the Rector would use their good efforts to maintain friendly relations between him & his Curate.

I am Madam, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] All Saints School, Bloxham (motto *Justorum semita lux splendens*) was founded in 1860 by P. R. Egerton, whose intention was that the education given there should be based upon the teaching of the Church of England. See App. III.

[2] George Thomas Woodrooffe, a London attorney, of Lincoln's Inn (*Law List*).

[3] Presumably Henry Carnsew, a London attorney (*Law List*). See no. 690.

[4] Of Beaconsfield; presumably a daughter of John Charsley (d. 1855), a Beaconsfield solicitor; her brother W. H. Charsley (1820–1900) is in *MEB*.

[5] Seymour Edward Major (d. ?1873), C. of Beaconsfield 1853, St. Paul's, Walworth, 1864 (C).

[6] John Gould (1780–1866), Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, 1808–19; V. of New Shoreham, 1816; R. of Beaconsfield, 1818–66. In his later years his daughter managed his affairs and tried to dispense with curates altogether.

678. To the Rev. S. E. Major (*vii 18*)

Rhwlas Bala, Aug. 16, 1862

My dear Mr Major,

With your statement of the loss which your removal from Beaconsfield would cause you; & your assurance that you inadvertently caused irritation to the Rector & desisted as soon as you perceived it, before me, I do not think it would be just to call upon you to resign the Curacy.

Only let me urge upon you whilst you keep it to be more than ever on your guard to make your whole conduct both to the Rector & all his family as conciliatory as possible; not only making allowance for the natural irritableness of old age, but remembering that he has many causes of annoyance & that your continuance in the parish must be disturbing to his temper. I do not doubt your diligence in work. But writing to you as your bishop I cannot forbear asking you to consider whether your Ministry is as full as it should be of all the life & unction of Christ's divine gospel of reconciliation & love.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

679. To the Master of Balliol (R. Scott) (*vii 19*)

Rhwlas Bala, Aug. 16, 1862

My dear Master of Balliol,

Many thanks for yours of Aug 13 received by me to day. Could you add to your kindness by suggesting any mode in which the Episcopate could most inoffensively suggest either to the professors or the University their desire as to this alteration in the form of their testimonial?

I fear that I do not agree with you in principle as to the move in the direction of the Theological Examination by the University. The Standard of every examination must of course ultimately be fixed by the examined; if then the Theological examination were only for *a pass*; it would in my judgement (as I think the Cambridge Voluntary does) fix a very *low* standard as a sufficiency & be (as I find the Cambridge) a real hindrance to a sufficient examination by the Ordaining Bishop If on the other hand honours were attainable in the Theological School I think still greater evil would result from its infallibly leading the young students of Divinity to read it not to learn truth, but to shew their acquirements in the examination for honours.

Neither of these evils as it seems to me would result from a searching examination by the Professor in that portion of Theology on which he had lectured. Nothing I believe would more raise the learners standard — and if it be not treason to say so to a Professor I can even believe that it might tend to improve the Professors lectures.[1]

I am, my dear Master, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

680. To the Rev. D. A. Beaufort (*vii 20*)

Rhwlas Bala, Aug. 20, 1862

My dear Mr Beaufort,

You are well entitled to any help that I can give you by advice or otherwise. I only wish we could have *talked* over this matter.

I do not doubt that with a safe conscience you might allow your Father in law to purchase *an advowson* for you.

[1] Wilberforce lived to see the establishment of the Oxford Honours School of Theology in 1870.

And yet in my own case it is not a consent I should like to give without more knowledge of the matter.

If the money which would be laid out in the purchase of the Advowson would *not* come to you if the Advowson was not purchased I should be more favourable to the arrangement.

1st because it would more entirely sever you from purchasing for yourself directly or indirectly such a position

IIly Though this is quite a secondary consideration because it would not then be the bad worldly bargain which, in my opinion, the purchase of such property proves in 9 cases out of 10. But I own that I should in such a matter as the Ministry be greatly disinclined to choose so absolutely for myself my own position as the acquiescing in a particular purchase would undoubtedly make me. Herein it differs as it seems to me from a mere investment such as you speak of. For the whole success of the Ministry must be left so absolutely in Gods hands that to choose & purchase the field of labour would alarm me — nor do I think the possession of an Advowson, separate from property, as a family possession a happy one. It seems so necessarily to imply the Eldest Son seeking orders to take his earthly inheritance that I should fear it.

Thus I think you will see that though I think the course *lawful* — *I* should not, except under very peculiar circumstances deem it expedient.

I am my dear Mr Beaufort, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

681. To the Hon. and Rev. Lord S. G. Osborne *(vii 21)*

Private

Palace St Asaph, Aug. 22, 1862

My dear Lord,

It is not in my nature to part from any one whom I have once regarded as your kindness made me regard you with the ravelled edge of painful feelings without making an effort to remove it — & I therefore write once again upon this most disagreeable subject. I meant no imputation as to the non-return of my letter to Cecil Fisher, I asked the friend who copied it to write on it my request for its return. I supposed that he had done so & that it had escaped your notice.

The insinuations in your last letter (of which I now write from memory not having it at hand here) to the Times, of which I think I have great ground to complain — are — *1st* What you refer to. *I* sent you the copy of my letter to Cecil Fisher; and as I should not have withdrawn my consent *after* your first published letter I requested you to make it plain that in consequence of a private communication, I had 4 days before the public letter, done so. This fact you had under my hand. But on receiving from some rural Dean at Salisbury a statement really inconsistent with that, you without even taking the trouble to ascertain whether I had been guilty of such a mean prevarication write to the Times an utterly mistifying account of 2 stories having reached you, one that I had written before, another that I wrote from Salisbury *after* your letter had appeared. You are I should have thought far too expert in such communications not to know what must be the effect of such a Statement. And how *could* the Salisbury communication be true, without my previous communication to you being an absolute untruth? The Salisbury rural Deans communication to you was false in every particular. I had written to Cecil Fisher & sent my retractation of my

permission — when spoken to (I think only by C Harris[1] & T Popham)[2] at Salisbury on the subject I stated what *I had* done on the *26th*[3] & added that *I* had nothing more to do. I *never*[3] wrote to Canon Fisher nor could I have anything to add to my letter to C Fisher. *All* this you might have ascertained by a letter to me: but instead of doing so, with that recklessness of imputation which seems to me to amount to bearing false witness you insinuate against me what *to the public* was the meanness of yielding to your published charges & *to me* who had given you the counter statement was the charge of Falsehood. Your II insinuation is of the same class. I had told you, that I had granted Cecil Fishers request, simply on his own merits, not even knowing that the living was to be his by his Father's option, or that any other Candidate for it was to be displaced: but thinking it a small living to be given him by the whole Chapter. You speak of this in your published letter with scornful imputation of its untruth: That I must have far less discernment &c, *if*[3] I did not at once understand all. &c.

I simply ask you whether you would not consider yourself most deeply wronged if one who professed regard for you & was in confidential communication with you threw out at the same time in public such slanderous insinuations against that which must be dearest to every honest man his simple truthfulness.

I am most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

682. To the Rev. James Fendall *(vii 22)*

Confidential

Nannerch Mold, Aug. 23, 1862

My dear Mr Fendall,

1. I enclose you a cheque for £200 for the money you have already paid to Messrs. Toller. Please to let me have a line to Penmaenmawr Conway saying it is safe — I shall be ready *when required* to supply a second sum of the same amount. But I should be *very glad* that your Diocesan subscription proceeded in case of further expences beyond this £400.

II. I fear that with *this* government[4] I have not a particle of influence as to ecclesiastical appointments. *My* friends in it have *none* except in the Colonies;[5] & L Shaftesburys influence, which is the direct antagonist influence is supreme with *Lady* & Lord Palmerston. I am very sorry it is so.

3. The only *Subscription* I have from your *Diocese* is your Bishop:[6] & that given confidentially. A B Hope has subscribed.

I am ever most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

683. To the Rev. W. S. Bricknell *(vii 23)*

Nannerch Mold, Aug. 23, 1862

My dear Mr Bricknell,

I think that the writer of the enclosed letter would be a very useful man at Grove & that he might probably take it till something else offered & so be ready

[1] Charles Amyand Harris (1813–74), V. of Bremhill and Archdeacon of Wilts., 1863–8; Bishop of Gibraltar, 1868–74 (*DNB*).

[2] John Leyborne Popham (1811–72), R. of Chilton Foliat, Wilts., 1835–72, Canon of Salisbury, 1849–72.

[3] Underlined twice.

[4] I.e. Palmerston's.

[5] The Duke of Newcastle was Colonial Secretary; see no. 461.

[6] Of Ely (Thomas Turton).

to make way for your Son. He is an 'Evangelical' Clergyman. W Fremantle of Claydon is well acquainted with him & his Ministry &c can give you all particulars. J M Davenport has my daily direction.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

684. To the Dean of St. Asaph (R. M. Bonnor)[1] *(vii 24)*

Nr. Denbigh, Aug. 24, 62

My dear Dean,

The Statement in the extract you have been so kind as to send me is entirely untrue: & I should be greatly obliged to you if you would send one line to the Clerical Journal to say you had ascertained it to be so.

My[2] view on the subject is that the offertory proper is so strictly a part of the great Eucharistic offering that we violate, not only a rubric, but a principle, when we use it with no intention of proceeding to a Communion if the Communicants present themselves.

For this reason I greatly prefer on a week day morning when it is not intended to offer to the worshippers the opportunity of Communicating that Gods praises should be sung in a congregational hymn whilst the Collection is made. My own practise then is then is, [*sic*] that the alms should be brought to me & placed on the holy table & then I use one of the appropriate Collects at the end of the sentences before pronouncing the blessing.

May I hope as you have done me the honour of consulting me on this that I I [*sic*] shall not be deemed by you obtrusive if I add, that I see not how our Cathedrals can really hold their place as the Mother Church of the Diocese so long as (in direct violation of the rubric) there is not a weekly Communion at them. If this be our highest act of united Christian worship how can we look for that full effusion of the Spirit without which all is vain whilst this is omitted?

I well know, both as Canon and as Dean the difficulty of altering an established custom of omission — but I am *sure* of the blessing which waits on such a restoration. As to the bidding prayer I think it comparatively unimportant — a mere matter of strict Canonical Observance.

I am my dear Dean, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, III, 59–60

685. To G. Woodrooffe *(vii 26)*

Denbigh, Aug. 25, 1862

My dear Woodrooffe,

I have thought much of your suggestion of resettling my estates & I should wish to carry it out at once. I should wish to resettle them so far as my own children go as they are now settled, only carrying the settlement on beyond which ever of them inherited them to *their* heirs. I would settle them (first) on myself for life: then on anyone or more of them to whom by deed or Will I might appoint or leave them or if sold their purchase money — & beyond the one or more so receiving or their heirs. Failing any such deed or appointment on the Eldest & on each in succession: and if they none of them outlived me then as I by deed or will should appoint. I know the jealousy with which the law regards bargains between parents & children: But it seems to me that may fairly be met

[1] Richard Maurice Bonnor (1803–89), Dean of St. Asaph, 1859–86 (*MEB*).
[2] Underlined twice.

by my settling *with* the present settled estates, for them, my own purchases which are very considerable & vast additions to the property & which are now absolutely in my own power.

Please to let me hear if you think this would do & if so get on at once with it.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

686. To R. J. Hopkins[1] (*vii 25*)

Penmaen Mawr, Aug. 26, 1862

My dear Mr Hopkins,

I *did* write to Mr Finch[2] when you applied before & I am not at all hopeless of bringing matters in many respects to a better footing. But, I wish you would consider whether *you* could not bring things to some more friendly position between yourself & Mr Finch. So long as that irritation continues all my attempts will be thwarted. *Your* absence from the Church itself of course most irritating to him. As to the seat your first application legally should be in writing to the Church Wardens & then if they do not seat you properly you should *appeal* to me.[3] I beg my kindest remembrances to Mrs. R. Hopkins & am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

687. To the Rev. R. Finch (*vii 27*)

Address, *Sarsden Chipping Norton till Friday.*
Then Lavington Petworth.

PenmaenMawr, Aug. 26, 1862

My dear Mr Finch,

Whilst I have to acknowledge your courteous assurance that you would follow my wishes as your Ordinary in your Services, I deeply lament the tone of hostility in which you speak of Mr R. Hopkins. I am *sure* that such a state of feeling must be most hostile to the divine life in your own soul & to the effect of your Ministry on others. Kindness & a readiness to meet ½ way with no remembrance of past offence on either side might heal this sad division & give peace to yourself & your parish. Once more I offer my mediation to effect it.

As to the Services I would suggest to you I. That at Christmas Easter & Whitsuntide you should celebrate the Holy Communion twice; on the feast & on its octave so as to secure to *All* the Communicant members of each family the opportunity of communicating once at least at those holy seasons. II. I wish you would try whether if your people will not attend a Morning Service on the Saints days you could not get them to an Evening Service with a lecture upon the character &c of the apostle or Evangelist commemorated. These occasions give some most specially useful subjects for addresses to our people.

Whilst I am on this subject let me say that a parishioner, who gives his name, writes to complain that on Sunday last you omitted the Athanasian Creed ordered in the rubric to be read; & the collect for St Bartholemews day. The *proper* course would have been to have read the Collect Epistle & Gospel of the

1 Robert John Hopkins (1829–99), of Pangbourne Lodge, Berks., son of John Hopkins (1802–75), of Tidmarsh Park, Berks.; R. J. Hopkins married (1853) a daughter of the Rev. D. R. Murray (a convert to Rome).

2 Robert Finch (1829–1910), R. of Pangbourne, 1857–96 (C).

3 Both R. J. Hopkins and Finch are given a rather bad character in the Diocese Book (II, p. 377), for somewhat different reasons.

Saints day & the lessons of the Sunday. But it is a matter of obligation to use the Collect — & the Athanasian Creed when ordered — as last Sunday.[1]
(3) I am not quite sure that you have the *Monthly* Communion. If you have not, that is in my judgement the minimum provision which should be made.

I am my dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

688. To C. W. Lipscomb[2] *(vii 28)*

Penmaen Mawr, Aug. 26, 1862

My dear Mr Lipscomb,

It is very difficult to me to refuse the son of your Father & Mother anything: but how can I grant this? Would it really be a reason which I could give to the next applicant to whom it was inconvenient to attend the Divinity lectures (& more or less it is inconvenient in 9 cases out of 10) that I had allowed you to omit them because you had changed your mind as to your profession. Would he not say 'does not the fact that Mr L. did not contemplate applying for Ordination shew, that he was not preparing for it; that his thoughts of necessity *must* have been turned into other channels & consequently, that instead to [*sic*] requiring less he required more than other men the preparation you remitted in his case: & why not therefore remit it in mine'? How could I answer such an one? My rule is, as to such a change of mind, always to require either (which in such cases I prefer) residence for a time, in my Theological College; or the lectures. I am my dear Mr Lipscomb, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

689. To the Hon. and Rev. Lord S. G. Osborne *(vii 29)*

Private

Penmaen Mawr, Aug. 27, 1862

My dear Lord,

Your practical question what you can do, is all I need trouble you to answer, save to protest that you have not heard from an angry though from an aggrieved man, in me. I. I would that you would to any Salisbury informants or others who may name the matter repeat, that I acted once for all, from Cuddesdon on receiving your letter & did *not* write one line to 'the boy or his Father' on the supposed Salisbury [struggle &c]. My letter to Cecil[3] though in form suspensive was final: because it suspended it unless he could answer the allegations; & he did not answer them at all. I do *not* wish anything more published about it. II. I earnestly wish as, if so you will let it be, a friend; that if unluckily we ever meet again in print, you will not qualify any statement I have made to you, by other peoples accounts without learning from me whether there be need of qualification. And now for Luton — To which my answer is very short. It is not in my Diocese but in that of Ely & I know therefore nothing about it. If it were in my Diocese you should at once know who signed the testimonials. Doubtless an enquiry from the Bishop of Ely would at once tell you.

I am most sincerely yours, My dear Lord,

I go hence to Lavington Petworth

S. Oxon.

[1] Nos. 687, 691, and 710 are summarised in *Life*, III, 60–1.
[2] Addressed to C. N. Lipscomb, but presumably Cyril William Lipscomb (1831–89) of New College, son of Christopher Lipscomb (1781–1840), first Bishop of Jamaica (*DNB*) was meant.
[3] C. E. Fisher.

690. To G. Woodrooffe *(vii 30)*

Address, Lavington Petworth, Aug. 29, 1862

My dear Woodrooffe,

1. I send you a set of letters which seem to me to dispose of Mr Carnsews claims.

I wish you could get the money as I have £400 more to find to meet another purchase at once

III [*sic*] I am not *quite* sure that I understand the question as to the £4000. If it be that if included in the Settlement I lost all power over it — & have the power to exclude I should prefer excluding it.

I can send you all the title deeds of my purchases from Lavington if you require them or any part of each set you will describe.

I am ever yours,

S. Oxon.

691. To the Rev. R. Finch *(vii 31)*

Lavington Petworth, Sep. 4, 1862

My dear Mr Finch,

I much regret the tone & substance of your letter. In your former letter you professed your readiness to follow my wishes as to the Services of your Church. I have noted to you two points: one increased frequency of Communions: which I have in 2 charges pressed on the Diocese: The other the careful observance of the rubric as to the use of the prescribed office — you speak of this as 'a trifling irregularity'. I cannot so esteem or treat it. If you will tell me that you will be more careful for the future I shall be satisfied upon this point. Further you denounce the complaining parishioner as a 'Busybody' and ask for his name. The Spirit in which you ask it & your hasty condemnation of his Motives make it improper for me to gratify you. I have satisfied myself as to his respectability & in complaining to your Bishop he has adopted the proper course.

As to the more frequent celebration of the holy Communion. I beg you to reconsider what I have said. Yours is one of very few churches in which my public advice has not been attended to as I could wish.

I am most Sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

692. To Mrs. E. Fielding[1] *(vii 32)*

Lavington Petworth, Sep. 6, 1862

My dear Madam,

I thank you for applying to me on the interesting subject of your letter. Before replying to it I thought it best to take counsel with the Metropolitan of South Africa as knowing so intimately the whole matter. I enclose to you his answer. I feel persuaded that our first great effort ought to be to strengthen his efforts to provide this African College *at the Cape*. There is no other opportunity of advancing Christianity really comparable to this. The getting the Sons of Chiefs under a regular Christian training in their youth is a matter of such exceeding promise: as each one may return to his own people an accomplished missionary. May I ask if you would be at all disposed to turn your efforts into this channel.

I am most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Unidentified.

693. To the Rev. O. Morton[1] *(vii 33)*

Lavington Petworth, Sep. 6, 1862

My dear Sir,

I have the warmest sympathy in your *object* — but I am entirely convinced that you are pursuing it in a wrong way. The habits of English life, & especially of clerical life are all against *College* life: & especially college life for aged men most of whom have known the independance of a home however humble. To bring such men together to live in common would, in my Judgement, tend to promote neither their happiness here or hereafter. If your efforts were directed to provide annuities for such men, (1) no money would be sunk in brick and mortar (2) & they could live where they would.

To such a scheme I would gladly contribute a present donation of £25.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

694. To the Rev. W. G. Wilkinson[2] *(vii 34)*

Lavington Petworth, Sep. 19, 1862

My dear Mr Wilkinson,

I fear that my silence admits of no better excuse than that I shrunk from writing a letter so painful to me as one which should in any way accept your resignation. All that I can now say is, that believing you to be exceedingly useful at Lyford I should very deeply lament your leaving it unless health made your doing so *inevitable* & I beg you therefore not to act under any depression of Spirits in doing so. Might not a winter holiday do instead? As to the Inspectorship, I am entirely satisfied as to your having accepted it — & I shall be glad to authorise any arrangement you & Butler[3] may hereafter agree upon.

I am with very sincere regard, Yours ever,

S. Oxon.

695. To the Rev. W. C. Risley[4] *(vii 35)*

Hickleton, Doncaster, Sep. 27, 1862

My dear Mr Risley,

I greatly hope you may be able to give your services as incumbent to Kidmore End & I will gladly do all that is in my power to aid you in obtaining its better endowment. I trust that our Diocesan Society will be able to meet with a grant any sum you may obtain for this purpose & I have *no doubt*[5] that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners will make a grant equal to whatever sum you may be able to offer them. But it is of course impossible for me to give any guarantee as to their conduct though I have no question what it will be. Your offer *for this year* must be made before the end.

I am most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

1 Unidentified.

2 Walter George Wilkinson (1830–1906), Fellow of Worcester, 1853–68; P.C. of Lyford 1858–63, subsequently Principal of Aldeburgh Preparatory School.

3 W. J. Butler, V. of Wantage.

4 William Cotton Risley (1833–1908), C. of Hambleden 1858, Burford 1860, Kidmore End 1862; V. of Titley, Herefords., 1876–7; R. of Shalstone, 1878–1907 (O). For his father, cf. no. 594.

5 These two words are underlined three times.

696. To the Rev. W. Birkett[1] *(vii 36)*

Wargrave, Oct. 17, 1862

My dear Mr Birkett,

I can quite understand your feelings & have been myself quite annoyed by what you have had to communicate.

I have no doubt that Mr Lane[2] should find another Curacy. But I think it ought not to be in such haste as would cast any slur upon him. I would propose therefore that he leaves you at Christmas. There can be no reason that any direction of yours in that time should pass through your daughters: with whom he is anxious to be on friendly terms, as he is on affectionate terms with you.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

697. To the Rev. T. H. Paddon *(vii 37)*

Hughendon Manor, Oct. 31, 1862

My dear Mr Paddon,

Since I wrote to you I have visited H Wycombe and I cannot but address to you my most earnest remonstrances on the state of things I have found there. I find that you are absent leaving one only official representative in poor Mr Covey,[3] who is physically quite unequal to the Burden & who is the additional Curate provided by the Curates Aid Society on the distinct understanding that he was to be the means of providing extra services for the Parish. It is quite impossible that I should urge the Society to continue a grant used so contrary to all its conditions. For if you feel at liberty to go out for your holiday leaving no fixed representative except the Curate they provide, their grant becomes nothing else than a benefaction to the Vicar of Wycombe. As Bishop too I must beseech you to consider in what a terrible state of neglect you leave this great and important parish. Think of the sick whom you leave unvisited, the wandering unsought, the dying untended, the young untaught. It quite weighs upon my heart — and I implore you, do not force me by the continuance of such a state of things to consider whether I have any legal powers for securing its redress.

I am my dear Mr Paddon, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[*Not Sent*]

698. To the Rev. R. W. Deane[4] *(vii 38)*

Clewer, Nov. 29, 1862

My dear Mr Deane,

I have now heard from Mr Baker.[5] He says that the withdrawal of the Fingest Children from their own School threatens the continuance of their pupil

[1] William Birkett (1794–1875), C. of Haseley, 1832; R., 1846–75 (O).
[2] John Reynolds Lane (1835–1900), C. of Haseley, 1861; V. of Roxby, Lincs., 1868–79, Moggerhanger, Beds., 1879, Tatterford, Norfolk, 1883 (O).
[3] Richard Covey (1833–1903), C. of High Wycombe 1860–3, Witney 1864; he held numerous other curacies, but was never beneficed (C).
[4] Richard Wallace Deane (1820–93), V. of Turville, 1861–74 (O).
[5] See no. 96.

Teacher; & that generally he objects strongly to the interference with the strict parochial System what was never infringed in the Ministry of Mr Scobell[1] & which he desires to see maintained. He requests me to communicate this to you; which therefore I am bound to do & to say that under such circumstances it is your plain duty to confine all your ministrations most strictly to your own parishioners.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

699. To the Rev. H. Stobart[2] *(vii 39)*

Farnham Castle, Dec. 15, 1862

My dear Mr Stobart,

Your application needed no apology since I deem that your ordination by me fully entitled you to make it.

I consider the power of presenting to the Cure of Souls as appurtenant to landed property *perfectly* justifiable. The Land owners trust as to those who live on his land in my judgement reaches, most legitimately, so far. In the abstract I regret the existence of a custom which makes the possession of an *advowson* as separate from the possession of the land lawful amongst us. But I do not venture to pronounce it to be *wrong*: & where therefore I find it existing *I* should have no scruple in acting on it & trying to extract good from it. The purchase of a next presentation is still one step further. *I* could not with a clear conscience take a living the next presentation of which had been purchased for me by another, with my privity, with money which would if not so laid out have come to me. If, without my concurrence being sought, a relative bought a next presentation for me with money which I had no reason to believe would have come to me if it had not been so laid out, *I* should have no scruple in taking the benefice when offered to me — nor if consulted should I hesitate in advising another to take it when so offered to him; *unless* his own conscience was at all stumbled at the act. If it were I should strongly advise him to refrain.

If this does not meet your case do not scruple to write to me again

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

700. To the Rev. T. T. Carter *(vii 40)*

Address till Wednesday Windsor Castle
After Cuddesdon, Dec. 15, 1862

My dear Carter,

I have looked at the little book you were so kind as to give me concerning the Holy Communion; and I am sorry to say that I do not at all approve of the idea of which it is the embodiment.[3] It appears to me to be absolutely diverse from the tone of primitive Christianity & of our own Church. I remember no parrallel save in some of the most modern Romish devotions. Confraternities for living together for work; or for the maintenance of a life of devotion & prayer,

[1] Edward Scobell (1785–1860), V. of Turville, 1823–60; incumbent of St. Peter's, Vere Street, 1831–60 (O).

[2] Henry Stobart (1825–95) was ordained priest by Wilberforce in 1852, but appears never to have been licensed or beneficed in the Oxford diocese. He was C. of Burton Agnes 1849–51, and held curacies in Glos., Kent, Sussex (from 1860 to 1863) and Staffs. before becoming R. of Warkton, Northants., 1865–81 (O).

[3] I.e. the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament.

are quite another matter: but a confraternity bound together only, if *really* for anything, for the exaltation of the blessed Sacrament the common instrument of Communion with Christ for All believers seems to me either unmeaning, or unwarrantable & full of many dangers: very likely to lead to superstition, to self exaltation, & to an abuse of the blessed Sacrament in those who join it: & almost certain to lead, by a reaction, amongst others to a lowering of the true doctrine of the Church concerning the Holy Eucharist, whilst it is quite sure to stir up a vast amount of prejudice from its singularly unEnglish & Popish tone; which prejudice will address itself not merely to attack excess but to pull down Truth. Surely our own Bishop Andrews had drawn from Gods Word & Primitive Antiquity & the inner Teaching of the Spirit the Highest views of this blessed Sacrament & yet how utterly different is His tone from that of this proposal. I entreat you my dear Friend to reconsider this matter. Believing that the revival of the full Eucharistic temper in our Church, in its purity, would be as great a gift as our God could give to us I view with the utmost jealousy any tendency to ally that reviving earnestness to the unrealities & morbid developments of Modern Romanism. You may do much one way or the other. I entreat you to reconsider the matter for yourself; & as Bishop I exhort you to use no attempts to spread this confraternity amongst Clergy or religious people of my diocese.

I am always your most affectionate,

S. Oxon.

Life, III, 70–1

701. To the Rev. A. Isham (*vii 41*)

Lavington Petworth, Jan. 1, 1863

My dear Mr Isham,

The case you mention is, as all such cases are, full of anxiety. I think with you that the Marriage Service is quite inapplicable to an unbaptised person. But if the young woman is willing to be baptised & is competently instructed & there is nothing scandalous in her mode of life I think that she may justly claim baptism & afterwards marriage: nor would the apprehension you entertain alter my decision. She may have sinned alas with this man. But the best practical evidence of repentance is their desiring to be married & we may lose a soul by letting such a season as this pass.

Heartily wishing you & Mrs Isham & your daughter all blessings in this New Year, I am, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

702. To the Rev. James Fendall (*vii 42*)

Confidential

Cuddesdon, Jan. 18, 1863

My dear Mr Fendall,

It is very difficult for me to advise you in this matter. But my difficulty is not in the question itself. So far as I understand *that*, my own judgement is clear. I would not apply for a *severer* sentence[1] — but I would certainly apply to the Court of Appeal to continue the sentence pronounced, until retractation — for it seems to me absurd to suspend for erroneous teaching & allow the teacher of

[1] I.e. than that of one year's suspension pronounced upon Williams and Wilson (see note to no. 655).

error after a period of punishment to resume teaching unless he renounces his error. I do *not* therefore feel that there *is* severity in applying for this most necessary variation of the Sentence. Nor do I think it in any way more acknowledging the competency of the Court to ask it to amend than to maintain the Sentence of the Court below. This therefore would not affect my Judgement. The difficulty I feel, is, the urging you to incur the risk of further expence. You have come nobly forward, risked a great deal; & I do not dare ask you to risk more. The only question with me then would be how far is this a risk. Now I have not before me the materials for deciding *this*, by which *I* should decide the question. The materials for this decision are. (1) What is the *real* risk of your losing Costs which you would otherwise obtain (2) What increase of cost would it entail on you (3) What sum is guarranteed to you to meet your expences. The two first questions your law advisers must answer. You probably know what your Diocese &c has raised or promised. *I* am ready with £200 more if need be. If you can give *me* these materials for decision I will gladly advise further.

I am ever yours most truly,

S. Oxon.

703. To Major Court (*vii 43*)

Secret

Beckett, March 6, 1863

My dear Major Court,

I can, believe me, enter with the deepest sympathy into all your hopes & fears as to your Sons[1] Course. I have thought the matter carefully over after reading his letter (which I inclose) & the conclusions to which I am brought are these.

(1) as he says himself; that he ought *never* under any circumstances to resume his Ministry in *this* Country

(2) That looking to the long trial given him after his first fall; & the peculiar shame of the Second, it would need a very long & strict probation before he should minister anywhere — nor would I encourage the idea of his ever *anywhere* serving except amongst the laity.

But if at his earnest desire he should ever be allowed again to Minister in holy things *I* could never be a consenting party to it except under the following conditions.

I. That I fully informed the Bishop of the Diocese in which he is of everything — &

II. advised, that for three years, at the very least, your Son should live under the strict supervision of those who might closely watch the interior of his life.

I am, My dear Major Court, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

704. To the Rev. J. Jebb[2] (*vii 44*)

Globe Park, Slough, March 10, 1863

My dear Jebb,

I am very sorry that you take the view you express in your letter. Sorry every way. First because it grieves me to differ from you; & next because I am

[1] Presumably David Alexander Court who matriculated from Oriel 1850, graduated from St. Mary Hall 1855 and was incumbent of Kangaroo Point, Queensland, 1858.

[2] John Jebb (1805–86), of Trinity College, Dublin; R. of Peterstow, Herefords., 1843–86, and Prebendary of Hereford, 1858–86; ecclesiastical author (*MEB*).

convinced that your view lies at the root of our neglect of holy Seasons & that there can be no amendment whilst it is maintained.

1 You question the ArchBishops *power* to dispense. I reply: it was a power always inherent in Patriarchs: excercised down to the Reformation amongst us by the Pope; transferred by the Statute of Henry VIII to the ArchBishop of Canterbury: & constantly excercised by him. I have myself in my muniment box at Lavington such a dispensation to one of my predecessors in that property granted by Arch-Bishop Laud. I contend therefore that by Church Usage; Statute law & Custom the ArchBishop of Canterbury *has this power* But — II — I maintain, that it is impossible to maintain such Ecclesiastical Commands unless the power of dispensation is maintained. Gods law cannot under circumstances of any urgency be set aside: therefore without any dispensing power it may be simply enforced. The Rules of the Church are for Edification: they are binding on us not of moral necessity but because they are commanded. There *must* therefore be times when they cannot be enforced — E. G. Fasting *must* be suspended for health — now if the Church drops her dispensing power the result is that every one dispenses for himself & universal anarchy is the consequence. This is the state we have reached. Nor can we ever escape from it but by the law being enforced by the open assumption by authority of the duty & the power of dispensing with it on fit occasions. Then the undispensed are bound because the dispensed are released. I hardly know anything which in my Judgement could so much have *restored* the Observance of Lent as a bold & open dispensation of these days uttered by the ArchBishop & declared by the Clergy. What I did was the nearest approach to this I could obtain.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, III, 87

705. To the Bishop of Rochester (J. C. Wigram)[1] *(vii 45)*

Englefield House, March 19, 1863

My dear Bishop,

I am very sorry to have left your letter a week unanswered but a confirmation tour is as you doubtless well know an ill time for letter writing.

I am afraid that I must have expressed myself ill to Mr Butler who has himself written to me on the Subject. You have I have no doubt full power by faculty of your Court to remove the existing Church & to build another on the same or a different site in lieu of it: & if there have been no burials the ground on which the Church stood would in my Judgement become Common. But I am not aware of any power by which you could make over the actually existing Church as a building to any common purpose.

As this prior question involves if I am right in the answer to it all the others I will not trouble you with any reply to them — more especially as I could without seeing the site give but very poor advice upon them.

I have today received 'The Bishop of Rochester's Riddle' beginning 'Men cannot live without my first' Is it yours? & if so what is the Answer. Please to tell me *here*.

I am ever most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Joseph Cotton Wigram (1798–1867), Sec. of the National Society 1827–39, Bishop of Rochester, 1860–7 (*DNB*).

706. To W. E. Gladstone (*vii 46*)
Private

Englefield House, March 19, 1863

My dear Gladstone,

I cannot express to you the pain it gives me to differ from your conclusions in such a matter as this.[1] I agree with all your General principles: & I think that in two signal instances, the Oxford University Bill & the Clergy Reserves, I have shewn that no obloquy would prevent my acting on them in any case to which they seemed to me properly to apply. My doubt in this case is, whether they do apply — & I must ask you to weigh those doubts well.

I admit that there is great force in your argument from the indemnity: and I am ready to admit that I was misinformed as to the attendance with the insignia of office at meetings. For unless 5 George I, Cap 4 is repealed there is certainly a distinct prohibition of this in England. But there remains behind my main difficulty. I am ready (1) to surrender exclusive privilidges for liberty. (2) I am ready to surrender them (a) if they interfere with the legitimate use of liberties granted to others — or (b) if they gall or injure the conscience of others.

Now I do not see that this declaration does any of these: nor is any liberty granted in exchange for the surrender. The indemnity act makes it easy for any one having any scruple @ the declaration to take his office without making it. But you argue, the surrender is *nothing* because of the indemnity. Now (1) if it *is* nothing why is it so urgently sought for by a body professedly banded together to put an end to the Union between Church & State. But (2) are they not right in thinking that it is something? *For*[2] whilst it remains on the Statute book it is a declaration that it is the will of the people of England that an Established Church should be maintained though it opens all offices to dissenters from it. Now the loss incurred in taking away such a declaration which actually exists seems to me to be measureable not by the difference of its existing or not existing (which I admit is very small) but by the difference between letting it continue & removing it: The removal being certain to be urged as a proof of the Animus of the legislature being that holders of office *may* with a clear conscience use their office powers against the Establishment.

You asked me when we spoke of this if I could name one ministerial peer who would vote against the Bill. The matter came that very night into discussion at Stowe Park Lord Taunton[3] saying that he had declined moving it — & L Harrowby not at all a high Churchman argued warmly against it. To test my opinion I asked the Bishop of Salisbury what he thought of the question. I enclose (please to return it) his reply.

Now there can be no doubt I think that there ought to be some distinct right to be done, to warrant a Bishop in shocking rudely the feelings of such men as these by seeming to them needlessly to play into the hands of men banded for the eventual overthrow of the Establishment. The difference between the policy of retaining this declaration & the old Eldon Policy seems to me to be this. The dissenters were then asking for equal Civil rights & for the removal of tests injurious to their conscience. They are now professedly seeking not freedom for themselves but the Abolition of the Establishment Whenever therefore they ask what tends

1 Nos. 706–7 concern a Bill to abolish the declaration made by Mayors that they would not use their office against the Established Church. See *Life*, III, 76–85.
2 Underlined twice.
3 Henry Labouchere (1798–1869), 1st (and last) Baron Taunton; a Whig.

only to that we are bound to refuse. These are my difficulties. I need hardly say I will anxiously weigh any answer to them

I am affly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, III, 79–80

707. To W. E. Gladstone (*vii 47*)
Private

Bisham Abbey, March 29, 1863

My dear Gladstone,

I feel so forcibly the weight of your argument that we should not obtrude needlessly our objections on the sore places of dissenters, that looking at the effect of the Indemnity act in depriving the affirmation of all real practical weight, I shall be ready not to oppose the Bill, if I find it possible to bring the Church Party & especially the Bishops to act together in that sense. I fear that this will not be easy. L Palmerstons wicked appointments meet us here at every turn — to yield *anything* to a Ministry which every sound Churchman feels insults the Church almost every time it has to recommend to the Crown for a Bishopric is exceedingly hard. So far as I see at present I do not think it would be right for me to support this bill against a General Church opposition. But I will try to lead my brethren to take together the line — that as there is in this no real security to the Establishment we are willing as dissenters feel it a burden on their consciences to remove it.

I cannot admit that we *can* take the general ground 'our Strength is in the affection of the people not in the legal defences of an Establishment'. For that seems to me to Sacrifice our position. We might on that shewing be the strongest *Sect* but I do not see how we could claim to be the National Church.

I am ever, Very affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, III, 84–5

708. To the Rev. W. E. Stevens[1] (*vii 48*)
Confidential

26 Pall Mall, Aug. 7, 1863

Rev Sir,

It is with great pain that I address this letter to you. It is to remind you of the written engagement of yours which I hold in my hand & to call you to act upon it. I have learned with the deepest distress the history of the sad scandals which you have brought recently on the Ministry. I have but one offer to make you. If you will wholly retire from Salford to return no more & leave me to place a Curate in your house there I will take no legal steps in the matter, but allow you to retire & receive whatever may remain of the income above the legal Stipend of the Curate.

I trust that regard to your engagement with me: regard to your own interests; regard to the interests of the Church may induce you to accept this offer simply & at once & not force on an Enquiry which [can][2] end I fear only in your utter ruin.

I am Rev Sir, Your Faithful Friend,

S. Oxon.

[1] William Everest Stevens (1804–71), C. of Salford and Little Rollright, 1834; R. 1836–70 (C). His difficulty was intemperance.
[2] Not in MS.

709. To the Rev. F. P. Flemyng[1] *(vii 49)*

Lavington House, Petworth, Sep. 16, 1863

My dear Mr Flemyng,

Mr Cobb[2] has applied to me as to a certain small sum of money which he thinks you should account for in order to set him right in raising a Subscription for the better endowment of poor Kidmore End.[3]

I have read all your letters & I see plainly that there is a misunderstanding which I hope a few words of mine may set at rest. You say quite truly that you raised no money to offer to the Diocesan Society. But this is not really the point I want you to attend to. You You [*sic*] state in the Kidmore Parish Magazine that on the occasion of my visiting you on St Johns day 1861 the Offertories amounted to £38 – 0 – 0. These were collected for the better endowment of the district.

Of this £38 — you laid out £13.11–1 in the expences of the exchange with Mr Mackenzie.[4] This leaves £24 – 8 – 11 in your hands for the Endowment. I very earnestly ask you to send me here by return of post a cheque for this. You can hardly I think know how much in a small place like Kidmore End such an unaccounted for Balance stirs up the people's feelings — and for the sake of that fair name which my regard for you is jealous of amongst us & for the good of the Church I pray you to enable me at once to close this matter.

With very kind remembrances to Mrs Flemyng, & hopes that you can send me a good report of yourself

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

710. To the Rev. R. Finch *(vii 50)*

Swanbourne, Nov. 10, 1863

My Dear Mr Finch,

I hoped before this time to have heard from you that you would obey the requirement I felt bound as your Bishop to make. It is a great pain to me that instead of 'gladly' acting on my first advice you treat my giving it as an offence. I cannot conscientiously drop my requirement & I trust that you will not put me to the greater pain of making a more formal demand upon your obedience than this private letter does. I feel bound to require my Clergy to obey the rubrics: & when any parishioner complains of their violation I must enforce obedience. I now therefore as your Bishop require you to bid on every Sunday as is ordered in the rubric the Saints days of the week — & whenever you have public worship upon one of them to use the Collect Epistle & Gospel provided in the book of Common prayer — and I request to be informed by you whether I may reckon upon your obedience in future to what I now require.

I remain very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

P.S. That there may be no mistake I add that the Rule of the Church is: that the Collect for the Saints day be used *always* with the Collect of the Sunday if the

[1] Francis Patrick Flemyng (1823–95), Forces' chaplain in England, Kaffraria and Mauritius, 1849–57; P.C. of Kidmore End, 1857–63; he subsequently worked in Scotland and abroad (C).

[2] John Wolstenholme Cobb (1830–83); P.C. of Kidmore End, 1863 (instituted 19 Feb.) –71; R. of Great Berkhamsted, 1871–83.

[3] The church had been consecrated in 1852, and the ecclesiastical parish set up in 1853. For the financial history, cf. J. E. Smith-Masters, *Hist. of Kidmore End, Oxon.* (1933).

[4] Edward Mackenzie (1811–80), of Fawley Court, Bucks. (*MEB*) had exchanged land for the enlargement of the Vicarage grounds.

Saints day fall on a Sunday: & its Epistle & Gospel unless the Sunday is a Special Feast itself

711. To the Rev. G. A. Seymour[1] *(vii 51)*

Lavington, Jan. 2, 1864

My dear Mr Seymour,

I send as you desire the only 'document': namely the Will which is invalid because Louisa filled in Ediths name not in the presence of the Witnesses but afterwards. You speak of 'the instructions connected with the will' & again of 'the memorandum attached to it'. There is none such. She simply leaves all to Edith & she has told Edith what she wishes done with it. She intended that to be Secret. Each one to whom she wished E. to give everything will doubtless receive it & know no more. If her secret wishes were to be revised by the family; the gift would be theirs not hers. This is what I meant when I said that the only question as I apprehended it was did the Family think it right that the dead Sisters wishes should be carried out, or, as they had the opportunity through a technical error, that her wishes should be set aside & that each one should demand all that the law would give them in spite of those wishes. I happen to know that E. has a paper of Mem^{da} of her own: not attached to the Will, nor of any legal obligation had the Will been valid: but for her own private guidance; of course they do, & they only can, secure the fulfilment of L's wishes. I do not know the contents of that paper & I feel sure that E. knows too thoroughly L's wishes ever to promulge it. The members of the family who cede their claims to legal receipts must do it only from Love to L. & trust in E. & it must if done at all be done altogether: there can be no revising or reserving part of her wishes.

It may help you in deciding on the course of duty if I mention to you all that I know as to the making of the Will

Private only for near members of the Family

Louisa twice and twice only spoke to me on the subject. She had a great reluctance to approach it. This was in October. She asked if I thought there was any objection to her leaving almost everything to certain great Church Objects leaving to me & another person whom she named its allotment. I told her I thought it most objectionable. That there could be no objection to a part being so left; but that relations had a claim. She said; I have so little to leave & if I left it to all each would have so little as to be really worthless — of course I should make provision for Mrs O'Brien having something. Besides she said I am so alone no one has any *Claim* on the portion given to me'

I still pressed 'the Family' — & she I believe came into my view. She said 'I cannot make a will to be published & fixed &c &c' 'Can I leave it to one person & tell him what to do with it' 'Not so as to bind him legally'. 'No but someone I can trust'. 'Yes'. She then said 'Could you give me a form that would do' I said Archdeacon Randall can I am sure' He was asked & the Will was I believe the form he sent. She never spoke to me again on the subject — nor did I know that the Will was signed. It was it seems after I left Lavington.

This may shew you her mind — as far as it is to be known; & why if her wishes are to govern the matter it must be by simply leaving Edith to do all & each giving her a release from any legal claim. Suffer me only to add that I wrote

[1] George Augustus Seymour (1820–1909), R. of Holy Trinity, Winchester, 1854–94, who married (1853) Elizabeth Welman Noel, 5th daughter of G. T. Noel (see no. 20).

to you at first at her request & beg to withdraw from the whole affair asking you to reply to her: & that you will send J Money's letter to *her*.[1]

I am most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

712. To the Rev. W. W. English[2]

(*vii 52*)
Bampton, Feb. 22, 1864

My dear Sir,

I have given my best consideration to your letter & to its enclosures.

My Judgement on the whole case is that Mr Griffith[3] made a mistake in seeking to read prayers on the Mission Service night. But on your own shewing I think your error far more considerable: first in superseding Mr Secretan[4] in the pulpit & secondly in prefacing your Sermon with the the [*sic*] Statement you report to me. Should Mr Griffith after your departure be ill received at Shifford, I could not after this hold you acquitted of the grave charge of having made a party in the parish against the Senior Curate.

I am very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

713. To the Rev. H. J. Pye[5]

(*vii 53*)[6]
Mixbury, March 7, 1864

My dear Henry,

I have given my best consideration to your letter & if I do not assent to its ultimate conditions pray understand that it is not because I undervalue the necessity of our making every possible endeavour to clear our Church from the possible taint of this wrong Judgement;[7] but only that I conceive before we settle for ourselves or suggest to others what ultimate steps it may make it our duty to

1 The letter concerns the will of Mrs Seymour's sister, and the Bishop's great friend, Louisa Diana Noel, G. T. Noel's 2nd daughter. Noel's eldest daughter married Archdeacon Philip Jacob (see no. 250); the 3rd married the Rev. James Drummond Money (1805–75) (C), mentioned in this letter; the 4th married the Rev. C. E. Kennaway (see no. 43). Louisa Noel died at Lavington on 14 Dec. 1863; of her five sisters only Mrs. Seymour (d. 1868) and the youngest, Caroline Maria (d. 1877), survived her. 'Edith' was Edith Sophia Jacob (daughter of Philip Jacob), Louisa Noel's niece, who died in 1918. 'Mrs. O'Brien' was Louisa Noel's aunt, Emma Noel, who married Stafford O'Brien of Blatherwycke Park, Northants. Extracts from the correspondence between Wilberforce and Louisa Noel (up to 1849) were printed by Ashwell and R. G. Wilberforce; the Bishop knew her father 'long and intimately' (Preface to G. T. Noel, *Sermons Preached at Romsey Abbey*, 1853).

2 Wilberforce wrote his initials as W.E.V., but doubtless William Watson English (1832–1920), C. of Aston and Shifford, 1863, was meant (O). He presumably held this Curacy between two others named in *Crockford*, and was V. of Great Wollaston, Salop, 1868. The titles of his works are unusually lengthy.

3 George Sandham Griffith (1832–1903), C. of Steyning, Sussex 1855–8, Aston 1858, Yelford 1863; R. of Ardley, 1873–1904 (C).

4 Samuel Secretan (d. 1911), C. of Wallingford 1857–8, All Saints, Norfolk Square, 1858–70, Rotherfield Greys, 1870–2. Apparently he was never beneficed (C).

5 Henry John Pye (1827–1903), C. of Cuddesdon 1850–1, R. of Clifton Campville, Staffs., 1851–68; married the Bishop's daughter Emily Charlotte in 1851; seceded to Rome 1868; subsequently called to the Bar 1876 (C).

6 Completed at the beginning of Letter Book VIII.

7 By the Privy Council on 8 Feb. 1864. See note to no. 655.

take, we are bound to consider most carefully & ascertain most accurately what is the real extent of the matter ruled.

This then is *First* to be considered, there is neither intended to be, nor is there in fact, any alteration effected by it in the doctrines of our Church. They remain what they were: I whatever the whole Church has held & taught II Whatever the Words of our Formularies declare *affirmatively* — all that was the authoritative declaration of the Church's doctrine before the Judgement is now. The only matter ruled has been that the lay court has interfered not with the Church's doctrine at all, but with the Excercise of the Church's discipline in support of her doctrine. Nor is this interference, mischievous as we both think it any consequence of the Church being *Established*; but merely of *its holding property*. The Court of Chancery *has* actually interfered in the same way with the particular Baptists; & would under like circumstances with the Romans. Now it is quite another question when the State makes our yoke intolerable by hindering our teaching all truth; or corrupting our doctrine; or whether in its mistaken zeal for taking care of property it practically interferes with our punitive discipline. This last we have to struggle against, but long forbearance, until the yoke becomes intolerable is a wholly different thing from the unfaithfulness of tolerating any error in our Creed, or acquiescing in any maimed Gospel being taught.

Secondly — This does not make really the difference you assume in your Sermon between the old position & the new. For this unwise acting of the State is of its own profession *confined* to the inflicting punitive discipline — and this is a most important distinction. For hence it follows: that though for depriving an heterodox clerk the State Court absurdly enough requires propositions of error which shall directly contradict Articles or formularies, & ignores the whole body of the Churches Common law which exists in the Common consent of Christendom, yet she does this *only* when moved *Criminally* to convict, her whole theory being that an accused Criminal is to have every advantage. If then a clerk was presented to a Bishop & the Bishop refused him institution for unsoundness there would be allowed a larger latitude of proof than if the Clerk was proceeded against Criminally.

Thirdly The actual decision as to inspiration here is not nearly so wide as you take it. Loose as it is, it amounts to no authority for denying the Canonical Scriptures to be the Inspired Word of God: but merely to say that a clerk cannot be Criminally punished for teaching that every part of the Scripture is not of equal authority; that there may be in it e.g. as to Science & history things which God did not directly inspire but as to which He left the human element to itself guiding Supernaturally all that was for mans Spiritual teaching. Now *this* it would I imagine be very difficult to show that the Church had at any time categorically condemned. I have gone over all this with Sir R Palmer and as a layman this is His View of what the Judgement does really Settle. I am not a bit the less disposed to protest & to Act. All that I draw from this is that it makes me less obliged to take any such extreme steps as might cost the poor of this land the religious care they have from the Establishment or might force me out of it instead of staying in to try to reform & improve it.

If there is anything as to this which you doubt pray let me hear again. I suppose you have read Denisons view in the Church & State that our remedy is in the Synod undoubtedly it too must be *tried out.*

My dear love to E

I am very affly yours,

S. Oxon.

714. To the Rev. H. White[1] *(viii 1)*

Penmaenmawr, Aug. 31, 1864

My dear Mr White,

There was nothing whatever as towards myself in the tone of your letter which needed any sort of apology. I do not wonder at a certain amount of annoyance being perceptible in your reply. But I cannot with honesty say that it does remove the impression derived from very various sources, that the Ministry of the Church does need greatly distinct strengthening in your parish. At the same time I do not believe that there is such neglect as can be stated in many distinct acts of omission; or as to which I can do more than make the appeal to your own conscience which I have attempted to make.

I do wish the rubric universally obeyed which requires notification to me of Adult Baptism.

But there is one part of your letter to which I must call your immediate & most serious attention — I mean your charge against the Rev P Nind of aggravated adultery.[2] It is of course wholly impossible for me to pass over such an accusation; which having been made must be either proved, or absolutely withdrawn by you. The horrible imputation is wholly strange to me. I have not yet communicated with Mr Nind on the subject; because I wish to hear once more from you first. My letters are to reach me *here* on Friday. At Earl Vanes Machynlleth North Wales till Monday. Aberystwith Tuesday 26 Pall Mall Wednesday.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

715. To J. J. Allport[3] *(viii 2)*

Mapperley Hall, Nottingham, Friday Night, Nov. 4, 1864

Sir,

I beg to lay before you the following complaint & to request that it may be laid before the Directors of your Company. Yesterday afternoon I took tickets at Rugby (where as always I received every attention from your Station Master) through for Nottingham for myself & my servant. *He saw my luggage duly labelled for Nottingham* & put in & was told it would come straight through to Nottingham. We travelled by the 7–14 train P M to Nottingham — on arriving there all my luggage was missing, my robes — dressing clothes &c. The Station Master undertook to telegraph at once for them — and I have had to send hence to every train. This evening the Station Master announced that my luggage had reached Leicester by 3 p m & would be sent on by next train. I have sent twice since. Two trains have come in from Leicester & *nothing is come* — & now I have a second night to spend with no clothes. Tomorrow morning I have to start for Gainsborough on a prolonged journey wholly without dressing things. On public as well as private grounds I request respectfully, but firmly

1. That this gross breach of contract be traced home to the offenders & that they be so punished as to be cautioned against similar carelessness

[1] Herbert White (1795–1868), Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 1821–38; P.C. of Warborough, 1837–68; 'wholly devoted to Parish' (Diocese Book, 1, f. 39).

[2] Nind (see no. 94) was incumbent of South Stoke, a few miles south of Warborough.

[3] Addressed to J. S. Allport, but (Sir) James Joseph Allport (1811–92), the strong-minded General Manager of the Midland Railway 1860–80 (*DNB*), is presumably meant.

II. That I be informed of the result. Should the goods not appear tomorrow morning I must before I leave Nottingham replace many of the missing articles for immediate use & shall instruct my Solicitor to take the needful steps for my reimbursement.

Further I would request that some really active steps may be taken to ensure my receiving the goods if they do not reach me here; To the Lord Bishop of Oxford — At Sir Charles Andersons Bart Lea Hall Gainsborough to morrow Saturday afternoon. There must have been the grossest negligence in not forwarding them from Leicester today.

I am Sir, Your Obedient Servant,

S. Oxon.

716. To J. S. Allport *(viii 3)*

Address, Bishop Thorpe Palace, York, Nov. 7

Sir,

I regret to say, that I cannot rest satisfied with you [*sic*] reply. If it were true that my luggage had 'miscarried through not being addressed' I should not have complained. It was all duly labelled 'Nottingham' by your servants & by them so put into the train with me. I am aware that you have been informed by the Nottingham Station Master that this was not so. But on Saturday morning I requested him to re-examine this point. He did so & promised me to inform you that he had mistaken the matter — That the luggage was all duly addressed & the miscarriage the carelessness of your own servants. Under these circumstances I cannot pass the matter by; and I must request a distinct statement from you

I Whether the matter has been brought before your Board

II Whether they agree with you in thinking it notice enough of such careless breach of contract 'to regret the inconvenience &c'

III I require to be repaid 6/6 paid by me out of pocket in sending backward & forwards for the things

I remain Sir, Your obedient Servant,

S. Oxon.

I request a reply to me at Bishopthorpe Palace York.

717. To Mrs. Mangles[1] *(viii 4)*

Oct. 27, 1866

My dear Mrs Mangles,

I have seen Mr Flint[2] on the subject of your & Sir David Wood's[3] complaints; and as they have come to me together & run into one another I doubt not that you & Sir David will allow me to reply to both letters in one.

I found Mr Flint most anxious to explain everything & as far as possible fall in with your wishes — 1. as to the being shut into Church he thinks there is some mistake. The doors are never shut & any one who wishes can leave the Church before the Offertory Sentences are read. The amount collected shews that the congregation at large values the opportunity. II The notices shall never more be put in your seats or in the seat of anyone who objects to them.

1 Of Whitmore Lodge, Sunningdale.

2 William Charles Raffles Flint (1819–84), C. of Idsworth, Hants., 1843–4, Morden, Surrey 1845–50, Great Rollright, 1851–5; P.C. of Sunningdale, 1857–84 (C).

3 Sir David Edward Wood (1812–94), a Mutiny hero; of Park Lodge, Sunningdale (*DNB*).

This I must add is a very common use — practised amongst many other Churches at St James Piccadilly III. The Service morning & aft will not be intoned: & the saying of the responses by the Choir will be greatly quieted IV. I have in common with all the Bishops been so urgent with the Clergy to Catechise the Youth that I cannot object to that. As to the celebration of the Holy Communion Mr Flint assures me he has been wholly misconceived. He has adopted none of the customs of the ultra ritualists. He receives the Elements kneeling; he does not elevate or adore the Elements after consecration. He reads the Service & has for 15 years turning Eastward at the front of the Table. You are doubtless aware that many of all shades of opinion do this as a matter of obedience to the rubric. I think the rubric so fairly admits of this interpretation that I feel it to be a matter to be left to each Clergymans own conscience. As to his kneeling it is for an opportunity of secret prayer to which no one can object. And as it is before the consecration of the Elements it is impossible that any adoration *then* can be suspected as *no one* adores the unconsecrated bread & wine. I trust that these explanations & concessions will remove all your objections & those of Sir D Wood.

I am my dear Mrs Mangles, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

718. To the Rev. F. B. Boyd[1] *(viii 5)*

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 5, 1866

Rev Sir,

I have received from Mr Bland[2] copies of your and of your Solicitors letters to him. I need hardly say with what extreme pain I have read all these documents. There may be truth in the Counter Charges which your Solicitor brings against Miss Cherry. But these cannot possibly tend to vindicate you — & your Conduct had the special aggravation of being the acts of a married man; of a clergyman in his own Parish. I really do not see how if the case is made public you can ever shew yourself again either in your parish or amongst your clerical brethren.

Still as I am willing to believe your assurance that acts of impurity were neither contemplated nor committed (though the miserable course on which you had entered made only more miserable by its adoption of spiritual phrases commingled with your erotic effusions was the sure fore runner of such actual Sin), I think it would be unjust to call upon you to resign your benefice. But a certain & not short absence from it appears to me to be essential: & I therefore request you to inform me whether you will leave your living for 2 years leaving me to appoint a Curate to occupy your place & take your duties in the Parish at the legal salary & to discharge under me its duties without your presence in or interference with the Parish for that time; on condition of my taking no other steps for your correction.

I am, Rev Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

719. To the Rev. W. Payne[3] *(viii 6)*

Confidential

Eton, Dec. 8, 1866

My dear Mr Payne,

I am very glad that you have expressed to me the feelings detailed in your letter — & that for many reasons.

1 Addressed to A. F. Boyd in error for Francis Bacon Boyd (1839–73), R. of Burghfield, 1865–72 (O). See Diocese Book, II, p. 102.

2 Horatio Bland, of Burghfield.

3 William Payne (1828–92), C. of St. Andrew the Great, Cambridge, 1851–4, St. John, Reading, 1854; P.C. there 1857–92; Hon. Canon of Christ Church (C).

I I value greatly such openness.
II I am able to assure you that so far from having as you say *personally* rebuked you I did not remember that you were one of the few who refused to assist the Diocese in this matter
III I am glad of the opportunity which your openness of speech gives me of speaking with like openness on the whole subject of your letter.

I am by no means disposed to dictate to the clergy of my Diocese. During 21 years I have left them on all open questions the fullest liberty & put the kindest construction on their use of their private judgement when it led them to what I thought mistaken action. You have been no exception to this treatment. But when your Bishop & 19/20th of your Clerical brethren ask you to aid the Work of God in your own Diocese by collecting for Objects on which there cannot be two opinions & you refuse I think the refusal 'unkind'. I think it a distinct acting of an uncharitable temper — as St Paul defines Charity: & so thinking it I believe it to be my duty to say so openly. I judge no individual — narrowness of mind may blind one: invincible ignorance another & so on; I judge no man; but I pronounce the act uncharitable.

But you say further that you 'look in vain for any approval or sympathy in from your Diocesan' &c. [*sic*].

Now this is a grave charge & I can assure you an utterly unfounded one. I have marked your labours & sympathised with you in them. I have never let slip any opportunity which your peculiar views of the duty of a Church of England Clergyman permitted me of testifying it [*sic*]. But I must ask you in common candour to reflect on what your conduct has been. You have in every possible instance when not compelled by legal necessity to do otherwise stood aloof from me & marked your repugnance to acting with me. You have never asked me to officiate in your Church: when on two occasions I have endeavoured to arouse the Town of Reading to a more earnest spiritual life you have refused all co-operation though you knew that the choice of every preacher in your Church would be regulated by yourself. What must be the result of such a line of conduct but to render demonstrations of sympathy impossible. I have many clergy in the Diocese quite as openly joined to your religious party as you are; but with them the case is quite different. They know & feel & often speak of my hearty sympathy; they know that my sympathy is neither created nor destroyed by agreement or disagreement in non essentials; that I can work as freely & as heartily with them as with any one. In common honesty & plainness of speech I tell you the fault is with you. If you will sever yourself from your brethren & your Bishop: coldly assert a separate line; coldly dissent from every proposal of united action: querulously protest on every possible occasion, it must be impossible for your Bishop to shew the sympathy he longs to manifest. You have wholly wronged him in this misjudgement. If *you* will alter you shall have no ground to complain of me.

I am my dear Mr Payne, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, III, 183–5

720. To the Churchwardens of Pangbourne (*viii* 7)

Lavington House, Petworth, Dec. 26, 1866

Gentlemen,

I regret to have to trouble you on a matter which will require all your judgement, & conduct.

I have received a private request from some of your parishioners to secure for them the due services for the Saints days in your parish Church. Under ordinary circumstances as I have said in my charge I should feel bound to require these Services of the Clergyman when so requested. But I gather from Mr Finch that he regards this request as a hostile measure against him. The sad state of feeling evinced in recent proceedings at Reading:[1] gives some colour to such a suspicion: and as I should judge it most unfit that such an order from me should give any triumph to either party in such an unhappy division, I hesitate as to giving the order which under other circumstances I should feel bound at once to give. I must therefore trouble you to ascertain for me whether there are any number of the parishioners who desire to attend such Services. You will see I do not want to know whether a majority of the parishioners wish for such Services; but whether there are any who really desire themselves to attend them.

I shall be obliged to you if you will take the necessary steps to ascertain this, which your knowledge of the parish will enable you to do, & let me hear the result.

I do not name to you those who have addressed me (I.) because theirs is a *private* address & I feel it to be of great moment that members of my diocesan flock may feel able to address me confidentially — & (II) because as Mr Finch conceives the movement to be in some degree hostile to him I do not wish to give up to such a suspicion those who may for widely different reasons have addressed me.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

721. To R. J. Hopkins *(viii 8)*

Lavington House, Petworth, Dec. 26

My dear Mr Hopkins,

I have read with great pain the report in the Mercury of the proceedings at Reading.

I of course suspend my judgement on the case until your appeal has been heard & decided. But the existence of such a strife will make me pause before I issue to Mr Finch any order which could have the appearance of taking part in so sad a strife.

I have therefore written to the Church Wardens & requested them to ascertain whether any number of the Parishioners wish to attend the Saints days Services in Pangbourne Church — and I shall take no further action in the matter until I receive their answer.

Once again I earnestly entreat you be brave wise & good enough to make peace.

I am most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

722. To the Rev. R. Finch *(viii 9)*

Lavington House, Petworth, Dec. 26

My dear Mr Finch,

I have read with great pain the account of the charge before the Reading Magistrates. You would more command my 'Sympathy', if you would by any

[1] See *Reading Mercury*, 22 Dec. 1866. R. J. Hopkins was fined for misbehaviour in Church.

conciliation at my repeated entreaty have endeavoured to win your young Squire.[1] His temperament as you must know makes him painfully subject to evil influences under irritating treatment. As he has appealed against the Sentence I of course hold my judgement clear on the case till it is finally decided.

But whatever may be the final decision, the existence of this public strife requires me to suspend any order grounded on an address to which as you rightly conjecture (you are mistaken in supposing the other name to which you allude to be appended to it) the name of your chief opponent is affixed as a leading Signature. For such an order might *now* seem to be a step hostile to you. I have therefore written to the Church-Wardens & requested them to ascertain whether any of your parishioners do desire to attend these Services — & I shall take no further step till I receive their answer. If they inform me that there are parishioners who wish to attend I trust that you will without giving me the pain of ordering it provide for your parishioners what the rubric so distinctly orders.

I do not understand the close of your letter. I know not why any 'difficulties should have been embittered' by any of your parishioners asking for the Services the Church orders you to afford them. In one sense undoubtedly the address was suggested by me. For when Mr Hopkins asked me to obtain these Services; I told him that you would probably conceive if the request came from him that it was in some way hostile to you: & that I must therefore know that other parishioners wished to attend the Services before I should think it right to order them. This I dare say led to his enquiring who did wish to attend & to their stating their wish to me. But I see nothing in so simple a step to 'embitter' anyone.

The state of your relations with Mr Hopkins gives me great pain & you know how earnestly I have endeavoured to amend it. I believe that with any hearty co-operation from you I might have succeeded

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

723. To the Rev. R. W. Randall[2] *(viii 10)*

Most Secret

Lavington House, Dec. 31, 1866

My dear R Randall,

It is not without hesitation that I begin to write you this letter — not because I in the least fear its producing any estrangement between us. We know, & I believe love, each other too well for that. But I fear it may be disagreeable to you — & I hate to do anything which can add a feather weight to the load you bear, for so many. Still after hearing of the marvellous power & beauty of your Sermons of yesterday I cannot forbear doing it. In one word — there are in our Services here things which I am confident diminish the power of your great & noble Ministry *& they increase*. Let me lodge this in your hands. Do not answer it unless you wish. Forgive & weigh it 1st There is a *general* increase of *peculiarity* in the last few years. Longer pauses — more display in all accidents of ceremonial — a distinct growth in mannerism. II. There is an introduction of new things.

1 R. J. Hopkins.

2 Richard William Randall (1824–1906), son of Archdeacon James Randall; C. of Binfield, 1847–51; R. of Lavington, Sussex, 1851–68; V. of All Saints', Clifton, Glos., 1868–92; Dean of Chichester, 1892–1902; a noted High Churchman (*DNB*). Wilberforce frequently chose him as Lenten preacher at Oxford; but his fears of '*advance*' were probably sharpened by the fact that Randall's predecessor at Lavington was H. E. Manning. Wilberforce himself had presented Randall to the living.

(a) Candles lighted. (b) a procession with the elements (c) You & Curate posing yourselves in peculiar & changeing positions (d) great manipulations (covered by the Nunc dimittis — itself a great novelty) after celebration (e) a most unusual prostration with outstretched arms at the 'Incarnatus Est' — (f) a rapid kneeling down & rising after consecration, suggesting adoration.

Now my very dear & greatly honoured Friend & brother all this is a grief of heart to me.

I. I will put the lowest grounds. It is personally very disturbing to my own devotions. I cannot say how I crave for more simplicity in our services for my own comfort — in prayer.

II. I am sure it injures the full weight of your Ministry with your people: & I fear would be a hindrance to you in the higher posts to which I always trust to see you called for the use of the great gifts God has bestowed on you.

III. It is alarming as suggesting *advance* — & making me fear that step by step you may be led further.

And now I have done — & only ask you to weigh all this. Of course if you wish it, I am ready to talk freely over everything with you. I only wished you to read this first by yourself & then I am ready to drop the subject for ever or discuss it as you like.

I am most affecly yours,

S. Oxon.

724. To the Rev. R. M. Benson *(viii 11)*

Confidential

Lavington House, Petworth

My dear Benson,

The second post has brought me your letter & as you desire I hasten to reply.

I have not a shadow of doubt that reservation for any custom at all analogolous [*sic*] to benediction is most distinctly against the *letter* of the 28th Article & against the whole Spirit of our Church's teaching. I cannot therefore but say I see no way to aid you in taking any part in any service which involves such systematic disloyalty to our Church. I would do anything lawful to save East Grinstead from the sure destruction to which the Sisters are hurrying it

I am ever Yours most truly,

S. Oxon.

725. To the Bishop of Exeter (H. Phillpotts) *(viii 12)*

April 5, 1867

My dear Lord,

I beg to thank you for your letter of the 1st of April

There can be no question that the deficiency of Service which resulted from the inability of Bishops was *as an ordinary rule* supplied in the Early Church by the appointment of a Co-adjutor cum successione.

But I think it equally clear that resignations were always allowed for any sufficient reason. Bingham gives the rule: & divers examples Lib VI. Cap IV § 2. Such as Gregory Nazianzen Martyrius of Antioch & others. Bingham sums up his Statement in words which seem to exhaust the Subject. 'It was lawful to renounce . . . the Episcopal Office . . . the grand rule being . . . to do what was most for the benefit & edification of the Church & sacrifice private interest to the advantage of the public'

Our own Church has always held the same language Our law books lay down that a Bishop can resign to the ArchBishop.

It is not likely that circumstanced as our Bishops ordinarily are; & dependant as they commonly must be for the needs of themselves & their families on the income of their Sees; resignation would be frequent. But since the reformation Miles Coverdale, resigned your own See; & signed himself, quondam Exeter: Zachary Pearse of Rochester would have done so but for an ignorant question being raised about his Peerage. The Cases of London & Durham; differed from these resignations in this, that a portion of the income of the Sees was to be reserved for the resigning Bishop; *this* rendered an Act of Parliament necessary.

It remains; that in my Judgement; if a Bishop were possessed of sufficient income & residence to be able to resign; & were disabled; & knew that by resigning he would secure the appointment of a Successor who would carry out for years, if it pleased God, his own work, but that by retaining his See he rendered it too probable that he would be succeeded by one who would undo his life's work; that in such a case a Bishop who resigned, would in Binghams words 'do what was most for the benefit & edification of the Church'.[1]

I am, my dear Lord, Most sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

726. To the Rev. F. Buttanshaw[2] *(viii 13)*

Lavington, Aug. 15, 1868

My dear Mr Buttanshaw,

Your letter is a trying one to answer. It speaks a perfect purity of intention which makes it a most unwelcome duty to me not at once & entirely to express my full approval of all you have done & my resolution to stand by you in it. But I must be entirely open with you. I think that you have made a mistake in introducing these changes on your own responsibility & that you ought to have consulted with me before you made them rather than now when you have committed yourself to them & find them objected to. As to the changes themselves I would say

I. I greatly wish that the Offertory was the habitual weekly custom. But I should never advise its *individual* introduction except with the full concurrence of the parishioners.

II. As to standing Eastward before the table at Consecration. I am of opinion that the rubric will bear this interpretation; and I think it most probable that it was worded as it is with a view to introducing this use. But I think (a) that this is not so certain as to make this obligatory (b) especially when general custom is decidedly against it. I do not therefore think that such a change ought to have been introduced with-out consulting Authority.

III. The invocation of the Holy Trinity before the Sermon.

This in itself is of course absolutely unobjectionable. But *as a change* — its introduction may not be wise. If it means *nothing*; it would not be introduced: It must then mean *something*. The question which at once occurs to the Parishioners is *what does it mean*. Then they soon find that one Bishop has inhibited a

[1] Phillpotts eventually executed a deed of resignation on 9 Sept. 1869; but died nine days later before it could take effect. By that time Gladstone, not Derby, was Prime Minister.

[2] Francis Buttanshaw (1829–1917) after two curacies in Middlesex and Essex was Curate of Chinnor 1855–79, and then R. of Smeeton Westerby, Leics., 1879 (O).

Scotch Bishop from officiating in his Diocese because of that use & they suppose it to mean some Great Change, and this *unsupported by Authority* causes immediate alarm.

IV. The change as to banns was made under Authority & right. You may gather from what I have said that had you consulted me before you made these changes I should have advised you in your relation to the Parish & in the consideration of its great peculiarities not to make them.[1]

But it is a widely different question What is desireable *now*. To *recede* is very dangerous. If the request came from Mr H.[2] I think you could *not* grant it. I should say — advise *Ist* with Mr Douglas[3] freely & IIly with your R Dean — & then write to me again & I will do my best to advise you.

I am very sincerely yours,

S. Oxon.

727. To the Rev. F. T. Gill[4] *(viii 14)*

Lavington, Aug. 15, 1868

My dear Sir,

I have waited a few days before I replied to your letter of the 8th in order that I might correct by reflexion any first wrong impressions. I know too well my own deficiencies not to be very reluctant to find fault with any of my brethren in the Ministry: & I know by 18 years experience as a parish priest so many of the parish Priests *difficulties*: that I am always more ready to encourage than to spurn.

But I cannot reply honestly to your letter without saying what it is painful to me to utter and I fear must be painful to you to read. The Picture you draw of your parish is indeed melancholy — The want of all lay co-operations — The inability to get your Church restored: the dying out even of your School — the presence of a total Stagnation. You ask me to advise you how to Act. Now to make such advice in any degree useful it must be based on a knowledge of the Causes of your difficulties. Now in searching for these causes I cannot overlook the fact that this stagnation of all things & want of lay sympathy is a rare & exceptional thing in my Diocese: & further that even in your own parish under the care of the present rector of Newbury[5] everything was beginning to look different. These reflections force on me the question is there *in the Ministry* at Warfield any reason for this peculiarity of failure. Now I am grieved to say it but I cannot doubt that there is. There is in my Judgement a sad & serious lack of affectionate earnestness and care for Souls in the whole conduct of your Ministry at Warfield. I hear of you as almost always from home; returning only for the Sunday duty & frequently not even for that — casting that duty on neighbour after neighbour until they are weary of doing your duty. This course is quite

1 The 'great peculiarities' of Chinnor arose from the success of Methodism there and from the long incumbency of Sir William Augustus Musgrave (1792–1875), 10th and last Bart., R. of Chinnor, 1816–75 and R. of Emmington, 1827–72; his period at Chinnor was 'little short of disastrous'. For a vivid sketch, and the fine work of Buttanshaw as Curate (of which the Bishop was clearly here conscious), cf. *V.C.H.Oxon.*, VIII, 75–6.

2 Perhaps Halton, 'Chief Farmer' in Chinnor (Diocese Book, II, p. 135).

3 Henry Douglas, churchwarden of Chinnor (d. 1899).

4 Francis Turner Gill (1817–88), C. of Warfield, 1859; V. 1860–88 (C).

5 James Leslie Randall (1829–1922), younger brother of R. W. Randall; Fellow of New College, 1848–56; R. of Newbury 1857–78, Sandhurst 1878–80, Mixbury 1881–5; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, 1878–95; Archdeacon of Buckingham 1880–95, of Oxford, 1895–1902; Bishop of Reading, 1889–1908. For his work at Newbury, cf. Money, *Hist. of Newbury* (1887), p. 511.

incompatable with your gaining influence with your people: & at once explains to me all the difficulties which you experience & others escape.

Then as to the School I think your removing it from the convenient neighbourhood of the Church & parsonage to its present inconvenient distance from both & from a great part of its population accounts for its decrease from 70 to 30 Children & to its being in a condition which I have no doubt fully justified the condemnation of H M's Inspector. My advice then my dear Sir must go to the root of the matter. Shew the people that you have a pastors heart & I do not think they will be long in giving you the natural return the support of the Parish. I cannot tell you how earnestly I long for such a change in your Ministry in its fundamental character. I see not the love of Christ I see not the love of Souls I see not faith in your Masters Presence in it: Your Ministry looks to me like the stinted unwilling service of that fearful character the mere professional priest. God knows if this is so — I speak but of the Aspect which outwardly your Ministry wears. My *advice* for which you ask — is: *Pray*. Pray for more thorough conversion of heart. Pray for Ministerial zeal. Pray for Love to Christ. Pray for the outgoing of the Spirit on your own Soul & on your Ministry: & then live in your parish; live for your parish; work in it as a man only can work who has come to his work from intercession for his people. Do this and all 'improvements' will I have no doubt follow, & at all events you will be ready to render up your account with Joy & not with Sorrow.

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, III, 251–3

728. To the Rev. R. Matson[1] *(viii 15)*

Confidential

Coed, Oct. 26, 1868

My dear Mr Matson,

I need not tell you — for I have repeatedly shewn you — how earnest has been my wish to help you. I placed you at Piddington risking the annoyance my placing you there if you were not more prudent than at Amersham[2] must cause me, because being convinced of your zeal & feeling deeply for your needs I determined to give you a new trial. It is a very deep disappointment to me that you have so greatly failed to win the confidence of your flock.

The points of complaint I chiefly hear of are these.

I That your temper is very little under restraint.

II. That you seem to have no[3] understanding of your people & therefore most uselessly offend them. E.G. that you have set about teaching them to bow to the Holy table — a foolish thing in almost any place & most unwise in such a place as Piddington. Again that you have offended their prejudices by the use of tawdry flags &c in decorations.

[1] Robert Matson had held curacies in Devon, Lincs. and Northumberland between 1851 and 1859 before spending the years 1859–61 in the West Indies; he returned to be C. of Adstock, Bucks., 1861–2, then held two more Devon curacies before taking sole charge of Gilling, Yorks., 1864–6. He had sole charge of Piddington, 1866–9, before proceeding to yet further curacies in Falmouth and elsewhere.

[2] Probably an error for Adstock, where Matson had for a time done well (Diocese Book, II, p. 5).

[3] *Life*, III, 253, reads 'very little' for 'no'.

III That instead of your preaching prominently forward Christ & his Salvation; or even Scripture subjects you preach on mere Ecclesiastical subjects; quote fathers *& Popes*[1] when they want Gods Word & the milk of the Gospel — nay that beyond this you have preached against the Reformation.

IV. Then I hear that instead of heartily seeking reconciliation with the farmers and others who have taken offence you keep them at arms length. Now will you at once & heartily on my advice really alter all this. It will be impossible for me to retain you at Piddington unless by such alterations you can gain the confidence and affection of your flock. For great as is my feeling for you, the Souls of the people must have my first thought. And yet if you are forced to leave Piddington what can I do for you. How could I place you elsewhere or recommend you for another post with no hope but of your repeating elsewhere these sad mistakes.

I write to you now not in complaint; nor wanting any reply; but simply out of mere kindly interest in you & your family and in the hope that you may yet so amend your parish administration that with the goodwill of your parishioners generally, I may be able to continue you in your Charge.[2]

I am most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

Life, III, 253–4

239a. To Alderman Sadler[3] *(iii 165a)*

London, July 1848

Dear Sir,

I have fully considered the statement with which you have favoured me concerning the Osney ground, but see no [absolute] or sufficient reason for refusing to consecrate it as a Burial Ground. The grounds on which my decision is formed are the following.

I [I gather from the] detailed report and measurements from Benjamin Brodie[4] which I presume you have seen (1) That the [assumed] level of the ground is by no means so liable to inundation as you imagine: the surface [being] above this [totally] and the subsoil being clay is so [impervious] to the water. (2) That it is a fact that one 4th of the population of the city live on ground lower than this proposed for this Burial [*sic*]. (3) That no other contiguous site can be obtained. (4) That the Osney ground is an ancient burial ground.

II That the ground is a free gift to the Public [and] cannot now or hereafter [entail any burden on any of] the Parishes so provided, at no cost to themselves, with a new burial ground.

III That its consecration will entail no obligation on the friends of any dead to make use of this ground if they prefer using that which already [exists].

I am truly sorry to have in this matter to act contrary to the feelings of yourself or any others of your city; but after much deliberation I believe it to be my plain duty to aid in forwarding this great work of charity the increase of the parochial Burial Grounds of Oxford effected at no cost to its inhabitants.

I am dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

1 These two words are underlined twice.

2 Wilberforce clearly knew the special difficulties present at Piddington, where the incumbent himself was elected by the parishioners (Cf. *V.C.H. Oxon.*, v, 256–7).

3 See no. 348.

4 Benjamin Collins Brodie (1817–80), chemist; later 2nd Bart. (*DNB*).

239b. To General Orde[1] *(iii 165b)*

Cuddesdon, July 19, 1848

My Dear General,

In order to avoid the possibility of misunderstanding as to what you say of the paper which you have signed being final I have written to Mr. Fosbery[2] and retained your paper in my own hands till I have you sent on his reply. I now enclose it and I will ask you to return it to me with your remarks. Your object will of course be secured by the guarrantee [*sic*] that you shall be put to *no expence*, and the [investigations] which your present paper engages to execute must be a necessary part of the . . . [*illegible*] . . .

I write in great haste to save the post but am My Dear General most sincerely yours.

S. Oxon.

239c. To the Rev. G. W. St. John[3] *(iii 165c)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 22, 1848

Rev. and Dear Sir,

I fear that a letter I sent you by [Wednesday's] post desiring you to come to me here Friday or today has not reached you since I have [neither seen you] nor heard from [you. I am sorry] for this because it was my wish to see you before tomorrow. I must now require your presence here on Monday morning between 11.0 a.m. and 1.0 p.m.

I am Rev. and Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

S. Oxon.

239d. To the Churchwarden of Woodstock *(iii 165d)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 22, 1848

Sir,

I shall be obliged by your informing me by a line posted . . . [*illegible*] . . . by whom, and at what hour the [service is] performed at Woodstock Chapel tomorrow.

I am, Sir, Yours very sincerely,

S. Oxon.

239e. To the Rev. G. W. St. John *(iii 165e)*

Cuddesdon Palace, July 24, 1848

Rev. and Dear Sir,

I have received this morning your letter dated July 22 (though it bears the Postmark of July 24) in which you allow that you had on the preceding day received a letter from me requiring you to come to me. I greatly regret your neglect of that direction because it requires me to adopt measures which I am most unwilling to take. I as your Bishop am the Judge of the propriety of your appearing in person before me; and it is your duty to obey my summons. I cannot [allow] the authority which has [been vested in me] to be treated with disrespect; and painful as it will be to me to inflict upon you the consequences of your fault I shall not shrink from doing so if your continued resistance compels me to take that course.

1 Addressed to Lieut.-Gen. Orde, who is possibly Wilberforce's old acquaintance at Alverstoke (see no. 2).

2 See no. 656; Fosbery was at Sunningdale in 1848.

3 No. 245 gives the sequel to nos. 239c–e.

I now require you on your canonical obedience to appear before me tomorrow July the 25th at the house of Dr. Dowdeswell at Ch. Ch. Oxford[1] at the hour of twelve at noon: and there to remain until I have seen you; and further, I require you to bring with you for my inspection the Sermon you preached yesterday afternoon at Woodstock Chapel and I distinctly warn you that any neglect or evasion of this direction will lead to my serving on you a legal direction to the same effect under my hand and seal; which will put you to far more inconvenience since I shall have to cite you to a distant part of the Diocese which I am going to tomorrow afternoon.

I am Rev. and Dear Sir, Most truly yours,

S. Oxon.

[1] Edward Christopher Dowdeswell (1765–1849) was a notoriously absentee Canon of Christ Church.

APPENDIX I

Wilberforce and the Churches at Alverstoke

(nos. 15, 55 etc.)

When Wilberforce arrived at Alverstoke the mother-church had two dependent churches: Holy Trinity, Gosport (1½ miles NE of Alverstoke), built in 1696, and St. John's, Forton (1½ miles N of Alverstoke), built in 1831, though the former had no legal district assigned to it; the endowment of St. John's is the subject of the reproachful letters printed here from Wilberforce to the incumbent, H. A. Veck (no. 10, etc.).

St. Mark's, Anglesey, was already planned by Robert Cruickshank, a Gosport attorney; Wilberforce's letters to Cruickshank, and other correspondence of 1840–4 concerning St. Mark's, are preserved in the parish documents at Alverstoke, and with the kind co-operation of the Rector, the Reverend W. Rees, copies have been added to the Wilberforce Papers in the Bodleian Library. (These documents at Alverstoke include the originals of nos. 47, 52, and 55 in this edition.) Wilberforce's remark in no. 47, that he had had doubts about the construction of St. Mark's at the outset of his incumbency, is fully borne out by this correspondence: as early as October 1840 he had tried to persuade Cruickshank to substitute two memorial transepts in Alverstoke Church for the proposed new separate church at Anglesey. Wilberforce's doubts were justified: the chapel at Anglesey was pulled down in 1911, and the brass memorial to Robert Cruickshank (who died 13 February 1853, in his 69th year), his widow (of whom H. E. Manning was an 'old acquaintance'), and their three daughters, the last of whom died in 1898, were transferred to Alverstoke (ex inf. the Rev. W. Rees).

A fourth daughter-church, St. Thomas's, Elson (1 mile N of Forton), was built in 1845 to serve Elson and Hardway, northern suburbs of Gosport; a fifth, St. Matthew's, Gosport, was built in 1846. The latter was demolished in 1949, most of the parish which it served having been destroyed by bombing. In all, Wilberforce gave or raised a total of £7,900 towards these three new churches in his parish. (*Life*, I, p. 274.)

The news of Wilberforce's plan for St. Matthew's, Gosport, moved an anonymous correspondent to write to the *Hampshire Telegraph* (22 July 1844) to ask if the proposed new church was necessary: he alleged that the parish church was only full in summer on those occasions when the Rector (Wilberforce) preached, that St. Mark's was standing unused, that the church at Forton was filled only on summer and moonlight winter evenings, that Holy Trinity, Gosport, was 'all but deserted', and that St. Matthew's was to be 'a church exclusively for the Poor man' (extract supplied by the Central Librarian, Portsmouth).

According to Bishop Sumner's *Conspectus of the Diocese of Winchester* (1854), the populations of the various ecclesiastical divisions in 1851 were:

St. Mary's, Alverstoke	2739
Holy Trinity, Gosport	3563
St. John's, Forton	3264
St. Thomas's, Elson	1059
St. Matthew's, Gosport	1846

These figures (Anglesey being included in Alverstoke) explain Wilberforce's doubts about St. Mark's: the greatest need was in Gosport. Such issues were to

recur in his episcopate: at Britwell (nos. 668–9) he sanctioned the destruction of a church within 100 yards of another (in Alverstoke, St. Mark's was within five minutes' walk of the parish church); at Banbury (no. 365) and in the developing eastern parts of his diocese (no. 582) he showed concern for the church needs of the poor. On a different level, one piece of advice which he gave as Bishop was based on experience at Alverstoke: the advice to an incumbent in 1850 (no. 359) to discontinue preaching in a surplice if his congregation demanded it, may be set beside a passage in the *Hampshire Telegraph* for 28 December 1844: 'The Rev. Archdeacon Wilberforce has been accustomed to preach his sermons on those Sundays and Holy days in which he administers the sacrament in his white surplice, but on Christmas Day last he appeared in the pulpit in his academical or black gown. We have been told, the Rev. Gentleman still thinks the surplice the proper habiliment on such occasions, but that as such a custom in his mind assumes the signification or symbol of a party, he deems it proper thus to evince that he belongs to no party, nor does he act adversely to the feelings of his congregation'. The heading to this news can only be described as malicious, for it ran: 'Puseyism not the way to promotion'.

Nikolaus Pevsner describes the present state of St. Mary's, Alverstoke, Holy Trinity, Gosport, and St. John's, Forton (which 'looms large over a dispiriting district of Gosport') in *The Buildings of England: Hampshire* (1967), pp. 240–3. All have been completely restored or rebuilt since Wilberforce's day.

J.F.A.M.

APPENDIX II

Wilberforce and the 'Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society'

(no. 205)

It is probable that the Society for which Albert Way sought Wilberforce's aid in January 1844 (no. 46) was the Archaeological Institute, founded in the following year by Way and others.

Another new Society caused Wilberforce more serious problems in his diocese. Oxfordshire could not boast an archaeological society during Wilberforce's episcopate; the Berkshire Ashmolean Society had been founded in 1840, before Wilberforce's arrival, and was reconstituted as The Berkshire Archaeological and Architectural Society in 1871, after his departure. But the Architectural and Archaeological Society for the County of Buckingham (now normally referred to as the Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society) was founded at a meeting in the vestry of Aylesbury Parish Church on 16 November 1847. Membership of the Society was by its rules confined to those in communion with the Church of England; and the initial 'Circular Prospectus' issued by the Society shows how strong was the hold of the clergy of the county upon it. The Archdeacon of Buckingham (Justly Hill) was a Vice-President, and the Rural Deans of the county, if members of the Society, were by the rules to be *ex-officio* members of its Committee. All Churchwardens could be members without payment. The Treasurer of the Society was Thomas Tindal, whose daughter Amelia had in 1844 married J. R. Pretyman, Vicar of Aylesbury; Mrs. Pretyman's brother, Acton Tindal, married the daughter of John Harrison, one of the Rural Deans who belonged to the Society. Arthur Baker (see no. 77 etc.), Pretyman's curate, was one of the two original Joint Secretaries. In due course Pretyman himself became Treasurer, until his departure from Aylesbury in 1853.

Under its rules Wilberforce was *ex-officio* President of the new Society. He made clear his purpose in accepting the Presidency in his address at the Society's first Annual Meeting, and his views received publicity when that address was printed as *An Inaugural Address delivered by . . . the Lord Bishop of Oxford . . . as President of the Architectural and Archaeological Society for the County of Buckingham at the Annual Meeting held in Aylesbury, on Thursday, July 27, 1848* (Aylesbury, etc., 1848). The Bishop began his address by considering 'at once the dangers and the advantages of a Society like ours'; he had undertaken the Presidency, and would only retain it, to avoid those dangers and to secure those advantages. If the Society wandered into Romanising paths, he would leave it.

Such hazards have long ceased to be associated with archaeological societies; the Bishop's fears are explained by what, in letter no. 205, he called the 'mischievous follies' of the Cambridge Camden Society, more particularly the controversy over the stone altar in the Round Church at Cambridge which has recently been described by E. Rose ('The Stone Table in the Round Church and the Crisis of the Cambridge Camden Society', *Victorian Studies*, x (1966–7), 119–44).

The original objects of the Buckinghamshire Society were defined, presumably by W. H. Kelke, the scholarly incumbent of Drayton Beauchamp and the Society's Secretary, in the Report made to the Annual Meeting on 2 January 1854; they were not only to preserve and record, but also to ensure that 'a misguided zeal for restoration might not lead to the spoliation of our ancient Ecclesiastical or

other Edifices, or to the erection of modern buildings unworthy of those examples which surround us, or unsuited to the purposes for which they might be intended'; in architecture the Society's intention was to 'mark those innovations which may be more or less identified with corruptions in doctrine'. In Kelke's view, 'pursuing its labours in such a spirit, the Society will best guard itself against the abuses to which they are liable, and which are so well pointed out in the Inaugural Address of the Right Rev. the President'. (*Records of Bucks.*, I, pp. 9, 13, 14.)

The Bishop retained the Presidency of the Society until he ceased to be Bishop of Oxford. The former Secretary, Baker, left Aylesbury at the end of 1849 for Marylebone, and then spent five years (1854–9) in Canterbury, New Zealand, before returning to yet more curacies in England; when seconding a resolution at a meeting of the Society on 12 September 1867 he recalled that the encouragement and advancement of art, especially of ecclesiastical art, the collection of plans of churches, schools and parsonages, the provision of guidance to those engaged on church restoration or church building, 'or other work of a similar kind' had been among the initial objects of the Society; and he regretted the Society's departure from those ideas. (*Records of Bucks.*, III, pp. 237–8.)

Baker regretted that the Society had turned to other ends but Wilberforce did not; in his later years as Bishop of Oxford he took no active part in the affairs of the Society, in which the leading spirit, no doubt with the Bishop's full approval, was his trusted Archdeacon, Bickersteth, a Vice-President of the Society.

J.F.A.M.

APPENDIX III

Wilberforce and Bloxham School

(no. 675)

Wilberforce's biographers said almost nothing of the Bishop's interest in Bloxham School. On 7 June 1855 he laid the foundation stone of the original school, founded by the Reverend John William Hewett, of St. John's College, Cambridge. The Order of Service then used survives in MS. Top. Oxon. f. 40 in the Bodleian; this is a small volume of works by Hewett and printed ephemera concerning Bloxham collected by W. D. Macray. The volume also contains an account of Hewett by Macray. As the *History of All Saints School*, Bloxham (2nd ed., 1925) says little of Hewett, Macray's account (written shortly after Hewett's death on 20 April 1886) may be worth reproducing:

'His life was saddened with continual trials, which originated with his over-sanguine and thoughtless speculation in building a large School, with Chapel, Hall, Library &c at Bloxham, Oxon., when he had very little capital, utterly insufficient for the expenditure he incurred. Very soon there came utter failure and bankruptcy; and lifelong struggle with penury and sickness in his family for many years afterwards, as his letters to me, here included, only too sadly show . . . '

'The School at Bloxham was afterwards reopened, on the same Church lines, by the Reverend P. Egerton, Fellow of New College, Oxford, who with more means, better management and higher capabilities, has now (1886) carried it on successfully for many years'. The continuity of Church tradition from Hewett to Egerton is symbolised by Egerton's retention of Hewett's motto for the school.

The same volume also contains a mournful series of (successful) begging letters from Hewett to Macray asserting that 'rash and inexperienced at Bloxham, I now know my concerns to a penny' and that he had been 'too blindly sanguine' at Bloxham (ff. 147, 148^{v}, both 1862). Macray later contributed a note on Hewett to *The Bloxhamist*, Feb. 1914.

Wilberforce obviously deplored the collapse of Hewett's school; but Egerton bought the premises in 1859 at such short notice that he could scarcely have obtained any individual's or institution's co-operation in the venture. The suggestion in the *History* of the school (p. 97) that he consulted Wilberforce before making his purchase in October 1859 is not borne out by letter no. 675. However, Wilberforce's second Diocese Book (p. 75) does contain the following notes under Bloxham, and shows that at an early stage the Bishop (who had ordained Egerton as deacon and priest) organised a vital financial contribution to the School:

> . . . May 1856 troubles with Mr. Hewett as to the attendance of his Scholars at Church . . .
> 1859 P. Reginald Egerton takes the School. Consults me May 23(?)/60 on Cousins marriage in a letter showing great goodness. 1863 arrange to lend him [£]1,500 without interest or repayment whilst the School a Church School. (From Langston Hubbard D. of Marl. and others.)

Egerton's work at Bloxham and the financial contribution of his wife's family have been well recorded in the *History* of the School (summarised by K. E. Kirk, *The Story of the Woodard Schools* (1952), pp. 107–10); but Macray's volume

in the Bodleian contains an extract from *Jackson's Oxford Journal* of 20 March 1886 which gives the sum spent by Egerton, his wife and her two sisters (the Misses Gould) on the buildings of the School as over £26,000. Bishop Wilberforce was doubtless well aware of the future Mrs. Egerton's financial position when he wrote to Egerton of the 'other ways' in which Egerton's marriage to Miss Harriet Gould (which took place on 4 November 1862) 'would tend greatly to the prosperity of the School'.

Wilberforce was the first Visitor of Bloxham School. He preached at the opening of its new building in 1864; the first Confirmation which he held especially for the boys of Bloxham is recorded in the *History* of the School (p. 54); the next Confirmation, in 1868, is mentioned in the *Life* of Wilberforce (III, p. 243). The east window of the School Chapel was erected to the Bishop's memory after his death.

J.F.A.M.

INDEX OF PERSONS

All Arabic figures refer to the serial number of letters, not to pages. Individuals with more than one surname are indexed under the final surname.

Letters to an individual are shown in bold type; those in which he or she is mentioned in ordinary type.

Abbott, Thomas, **157**
Abdy, Rev. John Channing, **3**
Aberdeen, 4th Earl of. *See* Gordon, G. H.-
Acland, Dr. Henry Wentworth, 599
Adams, James, 15, **16**, 52, 54, 63
Adams, Rev. Simon Thomas, **604**
Addams, Dr., 629 n., 642
Adelaide, Bishop of. *See* Short, A.
Agnew, Mrs., **43**, 44, **48**, **50**
Aitken, Rev. Robert, **544**, **577**
Akroyd, Rev. J., **209**, 210
Albert, Prince, 14, 46, 191, **457**
Alcock, Rev. Charles, **595**
Alderson, Sir Edward Hall, 447, 455
Alderson, Miss Georgiana, 455 n.
Alderson, Dr. James, 599
Allan, Rev. George, 493, **494**
Allies, Rev. Thomas William, 113, **115**, **152**, 153, **293**, 294, **297**, **298**, **328**, 329, 330, 349, 352, 372, 452 n.
Allport, James Joseph, **715**, **716**
Amphlett, Rev. Martin, 23, **24**, **28**, 29, **64**
Andrew, Rev. William, **194**, **208**
Andrewes, Rev. Lancelot, Bishop of Winchester, 349, 352, 376, 377, 531, 700
Andrewes, Rev. William, 125, 130
Andrews, Rev. Thomas, **589**
Anson, George Edward, **191**
Archdeacons: of Berks., *see* Berens, E. (1832–55), Randall, J. (1855–69); of Bucks., *see* Hill, J. (1825–53), Bickersteth, E. (1853–75); of Oxon., *see* Clerke, C. C. (1830–77)
Arnott, Rev. Samuel Brazier, **475**
Ashburton, Lady. *See* Baring, A. L.
Ashby, Rev. Edward Quenby, **579**
Ashley, Lord. *See* Cooper, A. A.-
Ashurst, John Henry, 228, 231
Ashurst, Misses, 228 n.
Athawes, Rev. John, 568
Austin, William, 594
Aylward, Rev. Adolphus Frederick, 99 n.

Backhouse, Thomas, 106
Bagot, Rev. Charles Richard, Bishop of Oxford, then of Bath and Wells, 72, 81, 88 n., 91, 204 n., 388
Bagot, Rev. Charles Walter, **81**, 87, 88
Bagot, Rev. Frederic, 81 n., 87
Bagot, Rev. Lewis Francis, 81 n., 87
Baker, Rev. Arthur, 77, 113, 116, **117**, **123**, **128**, 230; App. II
Baker, Rev. George Augustus, **96**, 698
Baker, Rev. William Innes, 241, **242**, **262**, **279**, **295**, **296**
Ball, Rev. John, 201
Barham, 1st Baron. *See* Middleton, C.
Baring, Anne Louisa, Lady Ashburton, 37
Barker, George, 633
Barkworth, Rev. Shadwell Morley, **132**
Barne, Rev. Henry, **534**, **538**
Barnes, Charles James, **258**, **268**
Barter, Rev. Charles, 105 n., **212**
Barter, Rev. William Brudenell, 105
Barton, A., **304**, 305
Barton, Rev. Henry Jonas, 556
Batcheldor, Thomas, 629
Bath and Wells, Bishop of. *See* Bagot, C. R.
Battye, Rev. William Wilberforce, **168**, **221**, 572, 575, 583, 590, 593
Baxter, Rev. Richard, 153
Bayley, Rev. Thomas, 282, 286
Beauchamp, Rev. James, **133**, 645, **646**
Beaufort, Rev. Daniel Augustus, **656**, **680**
Beesley, **145**
Bell, Rev. William, **515**, **521**
Bellairs, Rev. Henry, 419, 568
Bellairs, Rev. Henry Walford, 568
Bellis, Rev. Richard, 505, 581
Bennett, Rev. Thomas Leigh, 220
Bennett, Rev. William James Early, 350, 396, 397
Benson, Rev. Richard Meux, **555**, **724**
Bentley, Richard, 402
Berens, Rev. Edward, 200, **546**, 633
Beresford, Rev. William Montgomery, **470**
Bertie, Montagu, Lord Norreys, later 6th Earl of Abingdon, 284, 285
Bethell, Sir Richard, 486
Bethune, Rev. John, **481**
Bevan, Robert Cooper Lee, 425
Beveridge, William, Bishop of St. Asaph, 349, 352
Biber, Rev. George Edward, **631**
Bickersteth, Rev. Edward, **161**, 173, 318, 420, 466, 470, 471, **535**, 536, 539, 654, 675; App. II
Biddulph, Rev. Henry, **285**, **301**, **310**
Bingham, Rev. Richard (1765–1858), 69 n.
Bingham, Rev. Richard (1798–1872), 37, 69
Binney, Rev. Hibbert, **105**, **125**, 130, **131**, **136**, **158**, **211**, **218**, **342**

Birkett, Rev. William, **696**
Blackwell, William, **450**
Blagden, Rev. Richard Thomas, 551
Bland, Horatio, 718
Blandford, Marquess of. *See* Churchill, J. W. S.-
Blandy, John Jackson, 129
Blaquière, John de, 4th Baron de Blaquière, **435**
Bliss, Rev. Philip, **354**
Bliss, Rev. William Blowers, **574**
Blomefield, Rev. Samuel Edward, 427
Blomfield, Rev. Charles James, Bishop of London, 93, 115, 123, 187, 298, 353, 396, 397, **417**, **431**, 432, **443**, 445, **447**, **500**, **501**, **548**, **552**, **557**, 567, 575
Blomfield, Rev. James Charles, **452**
Bolton (Chiselhampton), 456
Bomford, 64
Bond, Rev. William, **331**
Bonnor, Rev. Richard Maurice, Dean of St. Asaph, **684**
Borrow, Rev. William, 550 n.
Boswell, Lucy, 257
Botley, George, **129**
Bovill and Hepworth, Messrs., **63**
Bowdler, Rev. Thomas, **398**
Bowen, William, 304, 305
Bowles, Rev. Charles Bradshaw, 5, **26**
Bowles, Rev. Joseph, 137
Boyd, Rev. Francis Bacon, **718**
Bricknell, Rev. William Simcox, **273**, 274, 275, **277**, **309**, **311**, 352, 356, **390**, 391, 670, **683**
Brickwell, Dr., 257
Bridgewater, Countess of. *See* Egerton, C. C. A.
Briscoe, Rev. Thomas, 412
Bristol, Dean of. *See* Elliot, G.
Brock, Rev. William, 573
Brodie, Benjamin Collins, 239a
Brogden, Rev. James, **341**, **578**, 594
Brook, Rev. Charles Abraham, **483**
Brooke, Sir James, 490
Broster (speech therapist, Cowes, Isle of Wight), 135
Brotherton, Joseph, 491
Broughton, Rev. Thomas Delves, 503
Browne, Rev. John Geoffrey, 462, **463**
Buccleuch, 5th Duke of. *See* Scott, W. F. M.-D.-
Buckland, Rev. William, Dean of Westminster, 172
Budd, Rev. William Balhetchet, **137**
Burder, John, 81, 143, 156, 163, 194, 204, 265, 276, 286, 303, 306, 324, 399 n., 440, 446, 596, 630
Burder and Dunning, Messrs., **430**, **434**, **596**
Burges, Rev. Frank, 284, 285, 301, 310, **312**, **313**, **326**, 327
Burgess, Rev. James Robert, **266**
Burgon, Rev. John William, 658
Burlton, Rev. Francis Jenks, 91 n.
Burmester, Rev. Alfred, **4**, **11**, 12
Burrows, Rev. Henry William, 59
Burrows, Rev. Joseph, 226 n., 506, **550**, **562**, **616**
Butler, 705
Butler, Rev. Alfred Stokes, 471 n.
Butler, Gen. Benjamin Franklin, 665
Butler, Rev. George Ambrose, 265
Butler, Rev. William John, **190**, 273, 275, 277, 387, 694
Buttanshaw, Rev. Francis, **726**
Byles, Mrs., 435

Calcutta, Bishop of. *See* Milman, R.
California, Bishop of. *See* Kip, W. I.
Cameron, Rev. Archibald Allen, 633
Campbell, Rev. Alexander Digby, **77**, 113, **116**, 117, 123, 128
Campbell, Rev. John James, 636
Canterbury, Archbishop of. *See* Laud, W.; Howley, W.; Sumner, J. B.; Longley, C. T.
Cape Town, Bishop of. *See* Gray, R.
Cardwell, Edward, 459
Carey, Rev. Charles, 204
Carnsew, Henry, 676, 690
Carter, Rev. Thomas, 643
Carter, Rev. Thomas Thellusson, 439, 480 n., 502, 533, **569**, **700**
Cartwright, Rev. Frederick William, **89**, 90
Caudwell, 390, **391**
Cavendish, Hon. Richard (1794–1876), **556**, **570**, **576**, **635**
Cavendish, Hon. Richard (1812–73), 396, **397**
Chalk, James Jell, **628**
Chamberlain, Rev. Thomas, **109**, **362**, 364, **530**, **532**, **597**, 662
Champneys, Rev. Edward Thomas, 155, 335, **336**, 340, 453
Charsley, Miss C. E., **677**
Charsley, John, 677 n.
Charsley, Rev. William Henry, 677 n.
Chase, Rev. Charles Frederic, **395**
Chatteris, William Pollet Brown, 105
Chepmell, Rev. William Henry, **93**, **98**
Cherry, Miss, 718
Chester, Bishop of. *See* Sumner, J. B.; Jacobson, W.
Chetwode, Rev. George, **90**
Chichester, Bishop of. *See* Gilbert, A. T.
Chichester, 3rd Earl of. *See* Pelham, H. T.
Christie, Rev. Charles Henry, **299**, **413**
Christmas, Rev. Henry, **402**
Christopher, Rev. Alfred Millard William, **658**
Christopher, John, 658
Church Building Commissioners, 353
Churchill, George Spencer-, 6th Duke of Marlborough, 137, 232 n.
Churchill, John Winston Spencer-, 7th Duke of Marlborough (formerly Marquess of Blandford), 505 n., 592; App. III

Churchwardens of Britwell Salome, 166; Broughton, **289**; Deddington, 341; East Farleigh, 196; Fleet Marston, **382**; Heyford Warren, **241**, 242, 262, 279; Horspath, 429; Lambourn, **258**, **268**; Littlemore, **580**; Merrow, **32**; Mickleham, 11, **12**; Moulsford, 333, **334**, 339; North Leigh, **281**; St. Martin's, Oxford, **610**; Padworth, 290; Pangbourne, 686, **720**, 721, 722; St. Laurence, Reading, 129; Wheatley, 81; Wigginton, **360**; Windsor, **366**, **370**; Winslow, **304**, 305; Woodstock, **239d**.
Clementi, Rev. Vincent, 259
Clerke, Rev. Charles Carr, **73**, 163, 228, 329, **546**
Clewer, Superior of the House of Mercy at. *See* Monsell, Mrs.
Clinton, Henry Pelham Pelham-, 5th Duke of Newcastle, **461**, **472**, 486, 682
Coates, Dandeson, 49
Cobb, Rev. John Wolstenholme, 709
Coker, Major Lewis, **602**
Cole, Rev. George, 240, 291
Cole, Rev. James, **108**
Cole, Rev. William, **438**
Colenso, Rev. John William, Bishop of Natal, **661**
Coleridge, Sir John Taylor, 398
Colquhoun, 69
Compigné, David, **60**
Connell, Dr. Reed, **207**
Cookson, Rev. James, **401**
Cooper, Anthony Ashley-, 7th Earl of Shaftesbury (formerly Lord Ashley), **349**, 351, 474 n., 653, 682
Cooper, Rev. Edward Philip, **234**
Cooper (Oxford), 163
Coote, Rev. Algernon, **124**, **565**, **572**, **575**, **583**, **590**, **593**
Coote, Sir Charles, 565 n.
Costiff, John, 222
Cotes, Rev. Septimus, **669**
Cotton, Rev. Richard Lynch, 390, **439**, 562, 662 n.
Cotton, Mrs. (née Pusey), **662**
Court, Rev. David Alexander, 703
Court, Major Henry, **406**, **407**, 408, **412**, **703**
Coverdale, Miles, Bishop of Exeter, 725
Covey, Rev. Richard, 697
Coward and Wolfe, Messrs., 15, 16, 56, 63
Cox, Rev. Frederick, 382
Cox, Henry, 30
Cox, Rev. William Hayward, **85**
Coxe, Rev. Arthur Cleveland, **665**
Coxwell, Rev. Thomas Tracey, **95**, **101**
Cradock, Rev. F., **672**
Cranworth, 1st Baron. *See* Rolfe, R. M.
Criet, 223
Crofts, Rev. Joseph, 23, **25**
Croker, John William, **37**, 59
Cross, Rev. John, 625
Crowe, Rev. Henry, 240, **291**
Cruickshank, Robert, **15**, 16, 22, **47**, **52**, 54, **55**, **56**; App. I
Curme, Rev. Thomas, **232**, **233**, **506**, **524**
Curtis, Rev. George William, 243, **252**, **270**, **290**, **359**, **367**, 428 (?); App. I
Curzon, Lord. *See* Howe, G. A. F. L. C.-

Darval, Joseph, **129**
Darvill, Sir Henry, 630
Davenport, John Marriott, 446, 580, 596, 602, 613, 625, 630, 641, 645, 656, 671, 683
Davies, Rev. Edward Lewis, **244**, **251**
Davies, 443
Davis, Rev. (High Wycombe), 482
Davis, Rev., 652
Davis and Saunders, Messrs., 596
Day, Rev. Russell, 617, 618, 620, **621**, **623**, **643**
Dayman, Gordon, 546
Dealtry, Rev. William, **1**, 196
Dean, Rev. Edward Brietzcke, **372**, **383**
Deane, Rev. Richard Wallace, **698**
Denison, Rev. Edward, Bishop of Salisbury, **71**, 108, **187**, 396, 421 n., 490, 496
Denison, Rev. George Anthony, **421**, 451, 520, 567 n., 592, 648, 650, 713
Derby, 14th Earl of. *See* Stanley, E. G. S.-
Dinsdale, Rev. Charles Waterland, **514**, 528
Disraeli, Benjamin, 474 n.
Dissentient Clergy of Oxford Diocese, **375**
Ditcher, Rev. Joseph, 567 n., 648 n.
Dixon, James Henry, **338**, 339
Dodgson, Rev. Charles Lutwidge, 21 n.
Dodson, Rev. Nathaniel, **300**
Dodwell, R., 529
Donaldson, Thomas Leverton, 258
Douglas, Henry, 726
Dowdeswell, Rev. Edward Christopher, 239e
Downes, Rev. John Watkin, 157
Dowsing, William, 250
Drake, Rev. John Tyrwhitt, **121**
Drake, Mrs., 437
Druce, Samuel, 281
Drummond, Rev. David Thomas Kerr, 20, 49, 51
Dunbar, Rev. William Burnside, 2
Dunning, Simon, 629
Durham, Bishop of. *See* Maltby, E.
Durrant, Col., 556

Earle, Rev. B. F., **188**
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 10, 22, 61, 107, 114, 226, **365**, **628**, 695
Eden, Rev. Charles Page, **361**
Edinburgh, Bishop of. *See* Terrott, C. H.
Edward VI, 350
Edward (VII), Prince of Wales, 40
Egerton, Charlotte Catherine Anne, Countess of Bridgewater, 267, 283, 286, 287, 288

Egerton, Rev. Philip Reginald, **675**; App. III
Eldon, 1st Earl of. *See* Scott, J.
Elizabeth I, Queen, 389
Elliot, Rev. Gilbert, Dean of Bristol, 361, 362, 364
Ellis, Rev. Thomas, 231
Ellison, Rev. John Henry, 647
Ely, Bishop of. *See* Turton, T.
Ely, Dean of. *See* Peacock, G.
England, Rev. William Henry, **551**
England, Rev. William Joseph, 551 n.
English, Rev. William Watson, **712**
Enraght, Rev. Matthew, 565 n.
Erle, Rev. Christopher, 237, **238**
Eton, Headmasters/Provosts of. *See* Hawtrey, E. C.; Goodford, C. O.
Evans, Mrs. Isabella, **420**
Evetts, Rev. Thomas, 332
Exeter, Bishop of. *See* Coverdale, M.; Phillpotts, H.
Eyre, Charles, **568**
Eyre, George, **181**
Eyre, Rev. William Thomas, **376**, 464, **671**

Fairs (Glass-stainer), 54
Farley, Rev. Thomas, 284, 285, **460**, **504**, **507**, **517**
Farley, Rev. William Meymoth, 177
Farquhar, Sir Walter Rockliffe, **220**
Farr, 202
Faulkner, Rev. Richard Rowland, 171, 175, 184, 192
Faussett, Rev. Godfrey, 460
Fearn, Joseph, **53**
Felix, Rev. John, **144**
Fell, Rev. John, Bishop of Oxford, 245
Fendall, Rev. James, 655 n., **657**, **682**, **702**
Ferard, Charles Cotton, **458**
Ferrey, Benjamin, 300
Ferris (Thatcham), 393
Fidler, Rev. Isaac, **143**, 469
Field, Rev. John, 345
Field, Samuel, 578
Fielding, Mrs. E., **692**
Finch, Rev. Robert, 686, **687**, **691**, **710**, 720, 721, **722**
Firth, Rev. William, **358**, **415**
Fisher, Rev. Cecil Edward, 673, **674**, 681, 689
Fisher, Rev. Robert Bailey, **427**
Fisher, Rev. William, 673 n., 681
FitzMaurice, Henry Petty-, 3rd Marquess of Lansdowne, **107**
Fitzroy, Sir Charles Augustus, 461, 472
Flanakin (Wigginton), 360
Flemyng, Rev. Francis Patrick, **709**
Fletcher, Mrs., 401
Flint, Rev. William Charles Raffles, 717
Forbes, Rev. Charles, **353**, **363**, 365
Ford, 582
Fordyce, Rev. Arthur Thomas Dingwall, 625
Fosbery, Rev. Thomas Vincent, 239b, 656
Foster, Rev., 247, 248, 255, 256
Fowler, Rev. Charles Augustus, 194
Fox, Rev. Charles James, 91 n.
Freeborn, 454
Fremantle, Rev. William Robert, **100**, **288**, **305**, **503**, 683
Frewer, Rev. George, 344
Frith, 32
Fry, Rev. John, **246**, **257**, **263**
Fry, Rev. Thomas, 189, **198**, 247, **248**, 255, **256**
Fyffe, Rev. Henry, **644**

Gaisford, Rev. Thomas, **323**, **464**
Garbett, Rev. James, 478
Garrett, 612
Garth, Thomas Colleton, 633 n.
Garth, Mrs., 633
Geare, Rev. Edward, 505
Gibbord (Wigginton), 360
Gibson, Robert, **639**
Gilkes (Wigginton), 360
Gilbert, Rev. Ashurst Turner, Bishop of Chichester, **433**, 451, 522
Gill, Rev. Francis Turner, **727**
Gillam, Rev. Isaac, 281
Gillam, Rev. Thomas Henry, **78**, 79
Gladstone, Sir John, 396
Gladstone, William Ewart, **396**, 397, 417, 457, 460, 461, 473, 474, 475, 479 n., 486, 557, **648**, **706**, **707**
Glanville, Rev. Edward Fanshawe, 383
Goldney, Rev. Adam, **72**
Goode, Rev. William, **205**
Goodford, Rev. Charles Old, **617**, **618**, **620**, 623, 643
Gordon, Arthur Hamilton-, **465**, 509 n.
Gordon, George Hamilton-, 4th Earl of Aberdeen, 421 n., 465, 474, 487, **509**, 566, 592
Gordon, Rev. Osborne, 571 n.
Gordon, Rev. Robert Augustus, **178**
Gore, Rev. John, **425**
Gould, Miss Harriet, 675; App. III
Gould, Rev. John, 677, 678
Gould, Rev. Robert John, **162**
Gould, Miss, **203**
Gould, Mrs., 203
Gower, Granville George Leveson-, 2nd Earl Granville, **520**
Graham, George, **403**
Grantham, Rev. John Foyster, 508, 511
Granville, 2nd Earl. *See* Gower, G. G. L.-
Gray, Rev. Robert, Bishop of Cape Town, Archbishop of S. Africa, **487**, 654, 692
Green, 404
Greene, Rev. Thomas Huntley, 565 n.
Gregson, Rev. John, **640**
Grenville, Rev. George Neville, Dean of Windsor, **155**, 406 n., 629 n.
Grenville, George Nugent-, 2nd Baron Nugent, 238

Gresley, Rev. William, **29**, 648
Grey, Sir George, 654
Grey, Harriet, **654**
Griffith (Padworth), 367, **428** (?)
Griffith, Christopher Darby-, 290
Griffith, Rev. George Sandham, 712
Grosvenor, Lord Robert, **476**
Guardian, Editor of, **486**, **491**
Guest, Dr. (Sandford St. Martin), 506 n.
Guiliver, Frederick, 591
Guillemard, Rev. James, **614**

Haggard, Dr. John, **41**, 634
Hale, Rev. William Hale, 41
Hales, Rev. John Dixon, **45**
Hales, Rev. Richard Cox, **540**
Hall, Rev. Alexander Lindesay, 516, **527**, 528
Hall, Sir Benjamin, 397
Hall, Richard, 360
Hall, Richard, 594, 595
Hallam, Arthur, 473 n., 479 n.
Hallam, Henry, **473**, 479 n.
Hallifax, Rev. Joseph, 510 n.
Hamilton, Rev. Walter Kerr, Bishop of Salisbury, 655, 674, 706
Hampden, Rev. Renn Dickson, Bishop of Hereford, 159, 161, 169, **171**, 173, 175, 183, 184, 187, 191, 192, 193, 195, 197, 215, 373, 474 n.
Hanbury, Rev. John, **259**, **393**
Hanmer, Rev. Thomas Walden, 419
Harington, Rev. Richard, **97**
Harris, Rev. Charles Amyand, 681
Harris, Capt. William Charles, 57, 58
Harrison, Rev. Benjamin, 421
Harrison, Rev. John, 121, **392**, 503; App. II
Harrowby, 2nd Earl of. *See* Ryder, D.
Hart family (Wing), 145
Hart, Rev. John, **139**, 147, **148**, **149**, **292**
Hatchard, Rev. Thomas Goodwyn, 23
Hatton, William, **400**
Hawaii, King of, 667
Hawkins, Rev. Edward, **175**, **183**, **184**, **192**, **197**
Hawtrey, Rev. Edward Craven, **479**, **549**, **641**, **659**
Hawtrey, Rev. John H., 366, 369, 370
Hawtrey, Rev. Stephen Thomas, 70, 366, 369, 370, 387
Hayes, Rev. Thomas, 332
Hayton, Rev. Amos, 84
Hayton, Rev. Thomas, **84**, 574
Hearn, William, **9**
Heathcote, Rev. William Beadon, **379**
Herbert, Sidney, 491, 598
Herbert, Mrs. Sidney, **598**
Hereford, Bishop of. *See* Hampden, R. D.
Heurtley, Rev. Charles Abel, 650
Hewett, Rev. C., **492**
Hewett, Rev. John William, App. III
Hewett, Rev. William Henry, 636
Hill, Rev. Justly, 145; App. II
Hippisley, Henry, 258
Hoare, Rev. Charles Alexander, 579 n.
Hoare, Rev. Edward, **39**
Hoare, Rev. Edward Hatch, 579
Hoare, Henry, 421 n., **606**, **609**, **622**(?)
Hobbs, Philip, 449, **450**
Hobbs, William, 449, **450**
Hobhouse, Rev. Edmund, Bishop of Nelson, N.Z., 259, 585, 626
Hodges, G., **610**
Hodges, Thomas Howard, 333 n.
Hodgkinson, Rev. Joseph, 97
Hodgson, Rev., 636
Holt, Rev. Robert, **147**, 148, 149
Honolulu, Bishop of. *See* Staley, T. N.
Hooker, Rev. Richard, 349, 352, 369, 373, 376, 567
Hookins, Rev. Philip, **588**, **591**, 594, 595
Hooper, Rev. Richard Hope, **112**
Hooper, Mrs., 418
Hope, Alexander James Beresford-, **432**, **445**, 622, 682
Hopkins, Gerard Manley, 667 n.
Hopkins, John, 686 n.
Hopkins, Manley, **667**
Hopkins, Robert John, **686**, 687, 720, **721**, 722
Hopkins, Rev. William Toovey, **426**
Horley, Richard, **13**
Horsfall, Thomas Berry, **314**
Hoskins, James, **42**
Hoskins, Miss Marianna (Anne Mary), 42
Houghton, C., 530
Howe, George Augustus Frederick Louis Curzon-, Lord Curzon, later 2nd Earl Howe, 246, 257, 263
Howe, Robert William Penn Curzon-, 1st Earl Howe, 246, **466**, **471**, 556
Howley, Rev. William, Archbishop of Canterbury, 21, 38, 154, 236, 396
Hull, 1
Hulme, Miss, **582**
Humphreys, Rev. Salusbury, 382
Hunt, Rev. J., **558**
Hunt, Rev. Wray Richard, **477**, 484
Huntingford, Rev. George William, 580
Hussey, Rev. Robert, 421
Hutchinson, Rev. Francis Edward, 588, 591

Ignatius, Father, 351
Irby, Rev. Llewellyn Charles Robert, **638**
Irving, Rev. John William, 208
Isham, Rev. Arthur, 392, **701**

Jackson, Rev. John, Bishop of Lincoln, 549, 643 n.
Jackson, Rev. William Nelson, 214, **223**
Jacob, Edith Sophia, 711
Jacob, Rev. Philip, **250**, 711 n.
Jacob, Mrs. (née Noel), 711 n.
Jacobson, Rev. William, Bishop of Chester, 77 n., 134, 298 n.
Jamaica, Bishop of. *See* Lipscomb, C.
James, Rev. John, 444
James, Rev. William, **134**

Jebb, Rev. John, **704**
Jelf, Rev. Richard William, 501
Jenner, Rev. Stephen, 38, **196**
Jenney, William, **225**, 227
Jenney, Mrs., 206, 225, 227
Jennings, Rev. James Knight, 26
Jerram, Rev. Charles, 477, 484 n.
Jeune, Rev. Francis, 658, 663
Johnson, Rev. George Henry Sacheverell, 650
Johnson, Rev. James Thomas, 669
Jones, Rev. Edward, 419
Jordan, Rev. Gibbes Walker, **228**, 231, **308**, **315**
Joy, Rev. Charles Ashfield, **670**
Jukes ('de Styrap'), Rev. Joseph Hordern, 644

Kaye, Rev. John, Bishop of Lincoln, 121, 213, 271, **298**
Keble, Rev. John, **387**, 443, **545**
Keene, Rev. Charles Edward Ruck, 220
Kelke, Rev. William Hastings, **206**, 225, **227**; App. II
Kemp, Robert, **289**
Kempe, Rev. Alfred Arrow, **264**, **453**, **611**
Kennaway, Rev. Charles Edward, 43, **44**, 187, 191, 192, **193**, 195, 197, 711 n.
Kennaway, Mrs. (née Noel), 711 n.
Keppel, Sir Henry, 654 n.
Kilpin, Charles James, 562
King, Rev. Alexander, 298
King, Rev. James, **91**, **405**
King, Rev. James Carleton, 405
King, John G., 185 n.
Kingscote, Henry Robert, **154**, 544
Kinnaird, Arthur Fitzgerald, 485, 490
Kip, Rev. William Ingram, Bishop of California, 664, **666**
Knight, Rev. Richard, **160**, **170**
Knollis, Rev. Francis Minden, **429**, 436, **437**, **440**, **441**, **442**, 454, **468**, 471 n.
Knollis, Rev. James, 429 n., 437, 471
Knollis, Mrs. J., 429, **436**, 437
Knott, Rev. John William, **249**, 250
Knox, Rev. Henry Carnegie, **167**

Labouchere, Henry, 1st Baron Taunton, 706
Lake, Rev. William Charles, 473
Lane, Rev. John Reynolds, 696
Langley, Rev. Daniel Baxter, **410**
Langston, John Haughton, App. III
Lansdowne, 3rd Marquess of. *See* Fitz-Maurice, H. P.-
Latrobe, Charles Joseph, 461
Laud, Rev. William, Archbishop of Canterbury, 38, 704
Laurence, Rev. Robert French, **142**
Law, Rev. Frederick Henry, 568
Lear, Rev. Francis, 673 n.
Lee, George, 81
Lee, Rev. Samuel, 448
Lee, Thomas, 507, 517
Lee, Rev. William Blackstone, **306**
Lefevre, Charles Shaw-, 218
Legrew, Rev. Arthur, **31**
Leigh, Rev. James Edward Austen, 408, 582
Lewes, Rev. Thomas, **126**
Lichfield, Bishop of. *See* Lonsdale, J.
Liddon, Rev. Henry Parry, 545
Lincoln, Bishop of. *See* Kaye, J.; Jackson, J.
Lincoln, Dean of. *See* Ward, J. G.
Lindsey, Col., 185, 217
Linzee, Rev. Edward Hood, 471
Lipscomb, Rev. Christopher, Bishop of Jamaica, 688
Lipscomb, Rev. Cyril William, **688**
Littlehales, Rev. Joseph Gascoyne, 515
Llandaff, Bishop of. *See* Ollivant, A.
Lloyd, Rev. William, **322**
Lloyd, Rev., 487
London, Bishop of. *See* Ridley, N.; Blomfield, C. J.; Tait, A. C.
Long, Rev. James, **119**
Longley, Rev. Charles Thomas, Bishop of Ripon and Archbishop of Canterbury, 323, 357, 368, 655 n.
Lonsdale, Rev. John, Bishop of Lichfield, 501
Lowe, 444
Lowndes, William Selby, 556
Luce, Rev. Edmund, **318**, 319, 320, **321**
Luney, Rev. Richard, 19
Lushington, Dr. Stephen, 115, **330**, 352, 650, 655 n.
Lutwidge, Rev. Charles Henry, 21, 196
Lys, Rev. John Thomas, 228, **231**
Lyttelton, George William, 4th Baron Lyttelton, **626**

Macbride, Rev. John David, 597
Macclesfield, 6th Earl of. *See* Parker, T. A. W.
McCreight, Rev. William Walkinshaw, **114**
Mackarness, Rev. John Fielder, Bishop of Oxford, 643 n.
Mackenzie, Rev. Charles, **265**
Mackenzie, Edward, 709
McNeile, Rev. Hugh, 77
Majendie, Rev. Henry William, **130**
Majendie, Mrs., 186
Major, Rev. Seymour Edward, 677, **678**
Malcolm, 254
Maltby, Rev. Edward, Bishop of Durham, 460
Malthus, William, 222 n.
Manclarke, Rev. Richard Palgrave, 649
Mangin, Rev. Samuel Wareing, 516, **518**
Mangles, Rev. Albert, **5**
Mangles, Mrs., **717**
Manners, Lord John, 53 n.
Manning, Rev. Henry Edward, 21, 723 n.; App. I
Marlborough, 6th and 7th Dukes of. *See* Churchill, G. S.-, and Churchill, J. W. S.-

Marriott, Rev. Charles, **346**, 347, 352, **355**
Marsh, Rev. John, **237**, 238, 239
Marshall, John, **489**, 499
Marsham, Robert Bullock, 377, 379, **380**, **446**, **469**
Massingberd, Rev. Francis Charles, 478
Masters, Joseph, **364**
Matson, Rev. Robert, **728**
Matthew, Rev. Henry, 150
Matton, 437
Maugham, Rev. Henry Macdonald, 493, 494
Maurice, Rev. Frederick Denison, 500, 501
Mavor, Rev. John, 146
May, Rev. Edward John, **201**
Meeres, Rev. Henry, 177 n.
Melipotamus, Bishop of. *See* Wiseman, N. P.
Merry, William, **345**
Middleton, Charles, 1st Baron Barham, 40
Miller, Rev. Edward, **388**
Miller, Rev. Edward, jun., 388
Mills, Rev. William, 484
Milman, Rev. Robert, Bishop of Calcutta, 416, 455
Molyneux, Rev. George More, **35**
Money, Rev. James Drummond, 711
Money, Mrs. (née Noel), 711 n.
Monro, Rev. Edward, 622
Monsell, Mrs., **502**, **531**, **533**
Morgan (actuary), 628
Morrell, Rev. Deacon, 266 n., 333, 334, 338, 339
Morrell, Emily. *See* Stone
Morrell, Rev. George Kidd, **339**
Morrell, James, 266 n.
Morrell, Mary. *See* Stone
Morrell, Robert, 81, **87**, 88, 282, 446 n.
Morrice, Rev. A. D., **150**
Morrice, Rev., **278**
Mortimer, William, 144, 145
Morton, Rev. O., **693**
Murray, Rev., 395
Murray, Charles Robert Scott, 372, 383
Murray, Rev. David Rodney, **185**, **217**, **224**, 686 n.
Murray, Rev. George, Bishop of Rochester, 405
Murray, John, 396, 397
Murray, Rev. Thomas Boyles, **559**
Musgrave, Rev. Sir William Augustus, 726 n.

Nash, 453
Nash, Rev. Zachariah, **629**, 630, 632, **634**, 637, **642**
Natal, Bishop of. *See* Colenso, J. W.
Neale, Rev. John Mason, 433, 451, 569
Nelson, N.Z., Bishop of. *See* Hobhouse, E.
Neville, Rev. Seymour, 629, 630, **632**
Newcastle, 5th Duke of. *See* Clinton, H. P. C.-
Newland, Rev. Henry Garrett, **424**, **451**, 648
Newman, Rev. John Henry, 38, 59, 74 n., 159, 161, 373
Newport, Rev. Henry, 342
Nind, Rev. Philip Henry, 94, 617, 714
Noel, Anna Sophia. *See* Jacob
Noel, Rev. Baptist Wriothesley, **40**, 43 n.
Noel, Caroline Maria, 711 n.
Noel, Charlotte. *See* Money
Noel, Elizabeth Welman. *See* Seymour
Noel, Emma. *See* Kennaway
Noel, Emma. *See* O'Brien
Noel, Rev. Gerard Thomas, 20, 711 n.
Noel, Louisa Diana, 711
Norreys, Lord. *See* Bertie, M.
Norris, John, 624 n.
Nugent, 2nd Baron. *See* Grenville

Oakley, Rev. Thomas, 219 n.
O'Brien, Mrs. (née Noel), 711
O'Brien, Stafford, 711 n.
Ollivant, Rev. Alfred, Bishop of Llandaff, **655**
Onslow, Rev. Arthur, 32
Onslow, Arthur George, 3rd Earl of Onslow, **8**
Orde, General James, **2**, **239b**
Orde, Miss Margaret Juliana Maria, 2
Orde, Mrs., 2 n.
Ormerod, Rev. John Arderne, **122**, **135**
Osborne, Rev. Lord Sydney Godolphin, **423**, **673**, 674, **681**, **689**
Oxenham, Rev. Henry Nutcombe, 535, 536, 542, **547**, **554**, **561**, 585(?)
Oxford, Bishop of. *See* Fell, J.; Bagot, C. R.; Mackarness, J. F.
Oxford Diocese, Dissentient Clergy of, **375**
Oxford Herald, Editor of, **354**
Oxford University, Senior Proctor of. *See* Lake, W. C. (1852–3)
Oxford University, Vice-Chancellors of. *See* Plumptre, F. C. (1848–52); Cotton, R. L. (1852–6); Jeune, F. (1858–62)

Paddon, Rev. Thomas Henry, 78, **79**, **103**, 141, **254**, **269**, **272**, 318, **319**, **320**, 321, **411**, **482**, **505**, **512**, 513, 514, **516**, **519**, 527, **528**, **541**, **543**, **564**, **581**, **584**, **587**, 599, 600, 601, 608, **697**
Paddon, Miss, **599**
Pakington, Sir John, 486, 491
Palmer, Sir Roundell, **660**, 713
Palmerston, 3rd Viscount. *See* Temple, H. J.
Parker, Thomas Augustus Wolstenholme, 6th Earl of Macclesfield, **523**
Parker, W. (Wheatley), 302
Parkinson, Joseph T., 276, **287**
Parsons, Rev. Henry, 639
Paul, Arthur, **68**
Paul, Rev. Charles Kegan, 659

Paul, Rev. John, 512, **513**, 516, 519, 528
Payne, Rev. Edward, 577, 588, 591
Payne, Rev. William, **719**
Peacock, Rev. George, Dean of Ely, **525**, **592** (?)
Pearse, Zachary, Bishop of Rochester, 725
Peel, Rev. Edmund, 406, 407, **408**, 412
Peel, Sir Robert, **195**, 406 n.
Peers, Charles, 404 n.
Peers, Rev. John Witherington, jun., 209, **210**, **213**, **404**, **456**
Pelham, Henry Thomas, 3rd Earl of Chichester, **20**
Penson, Rev. John, **510**, **526**
Penson, Rev. Peter, 556
Perceval, Rev. Arthur Philip, **62**
Perceval, Rev. Charles George, 556
Perceval, Dudley Montagu, 457 n., 460, **567**
Perceval, Spencer, 457 n.
Pettman, Rev. Edward, **6**
Phillimore, Dr. Joseph, **88**, **113**, 115, 163, 180, 272, **282**, **419**, 446, 506, 630
Phillimore, Robert Joseph, 88 n., 546, 657
Phillips, Sir T., 443
Phillpotts, Rev. Henry, Bishop of Exeter, 112, **159**, **236**, 424, 525, **566**, **725**
Philpot, Rev. John, 567
Pigott, Rev. John Robert, 170
Pigott, Rev. William, 556 n.
Pinneger, Browne, 130
Plumptre, Rev. Frederick Charles, 377, 379, **381**
Plumptre, John Pemberton, 565, 575
Pollen, Rev. John Hungerford, 352, 356, **357**, **368**, **371**, **377**, 379, 380, 381, **394**
Pontifex, Miss, 254, 269, 272
Popham, Rev. John Leyborne, 681
Poulter, Rev. James, 254, 505, 581
Poulton, Charles, 129 n.
Poulton, William Frederick, 129
Powell, Rev. Thomas Edward, **474**
Poyntz, Rev. Benjamin Luke, **601**, **603**, **605**, **608**, **613**
Pretyman, Rev. John Radclyffe, **80**, 113, 116, 117, 178, **230**, **294**, **448**, **455**, 466; App. II
Prevost, Rev. Sir George, 387
Prichard, Rev. James Cowles, **36**
Proby, Rev. Charles, 630
Prover, Miss, 530
Prynne, Rev. George Rundle, 424
Purdue, Rev. George, 458
Pusey, Rev. Edward Bouverie, 1, **74**, **76**, 346, **347**, 352, 354, 355, 387, **480**, 545, 662 n.
Pye, Rev. Henry John, **713**

Quarrier, Dr. Daniel, 22

Radcliffe, Rev. John, 260, **261**
Radford, Rev. John, **146**, **216**, **271**
Raine, Miss Charlotte, 366, **369**, 370
Randall, Rev. James, 447, 639 n., 711
Randall, Rev. James Leslie, 727
Randall, Rev. Richard William, **723**
Randall, Mrs., 639 n.
Randolph, Rev. Herbert, **636**
Rawlings, Rev. William, **418**
Reade, Sir John, 185 n.
Remington, Rev. Reginald, **385**, 386
Reyroux, Rev. Frederick, **94**
Rhoades, William Cobden, **69**
Ricardo, Mortimer, **462**, 463
Rice, Rev. Richard, **537**
Rice, Rev. Richard John Howard, **600**, 601, 605, 608, 613, 638, 640
Richards, Rev. Joseph Loscombe, 306
Richards, Rev. William Upton, 432, 445
Ridley, Rev. Nicholas, Bishop of London, 376
Ripon, Bishop of. *See* Longley, C. T.
Risley, Rev. William Cotton, **594**
Risley, Rev. William Cotton, jun., **695**
Roberts, Rev. E., 565, 572, 575, 583, 593
Roberts, Rev. Henry Mander, **214**
Roberts, Rev. Horace, **399**, **563**, **571**
Robinson, Rev. Henry, **176**, **200**
Robinson, Rev. John Ellill, 331
Rochester, Bishop of. *See* Pearse, Z.; Murray, G.; Wigram, J. C.
Rochester, Dean of. *See* Stevens, R.
Roe, Rev. Charles, 211, 218
Rogers, 59
Rolfe, Rev. George Crabbe, 484
Rolfe, Robert Monsey, 1st Baron Cranworth, **459**, **522**
Rose, Rev. Francis, **303**, **307**, 316, **317**, **324**, 419, 568
Rose, Philip, **493**, 494
Routh, Rev. Martin Joseph, **454**
Rowles, John, 333 n.
Russell, Lord Charles James Fox, **351**
Russell, Lady Frankland, 551 n.
Russell, Lord John, 161, 184, 215, 351 n., 384, 396, 397, 457, 474, 486
Russell, Rev. Richard Norris, 124, 556
Ryder, Dudley, 2nd Earl of Harrowby, 431, 443, 706
Ryder, Rev. George Dudley, 21, 59

Sadler, Alderman Charles James, **239a**, **348**, **352**, **356**
St. Asaph, Bishop of. *See* Beveridge, William
St. Asaph, Dean of. *See* Bonnor, R. M.
St. John, Rev. Ambrose, 21, 38
St. John, Rev. George William, **239c**, **239e**, **245**, 615
Salisbury, Bishop of. *See* Denison, E.; Hamilton, W. K.
Salmon, Rev. Thomas Frith, **409**
Sankey, Rev. Richard, **484**
Sargent, Mrs. Mary, 59
Saulez, Rev. Theophilus, **495**
Scard, Rev. Thomas, **22**, 27
Scobell, Rev. Edward, 698
Scoones, Rev. William Dalton, 630, 632

Scott, George Gilbert, 300
Scott, John, 1st Earl of Eldon, 706
Scott, Rev. Robert, **663**, **679**
Scott, Walter Francis Montagu-Douglas-, 5th Duke of Buccleuch, 107
Scott, Rev. William Armstrong, **615**
Secretan, Rev. Samuel, 712
Sedgwick, Rev. John, 151
Selwyn, Rev. Sydney George, **199**
Selwyn, Rev. Townshend, 199
Sendall, Rev. Simon, **508**, **511**
Serle, Rev. Philip, **529**
Sewell, Rev. William, **260**, 261
Seymour, Rev. George Augustus, **711**
Seymour, Mrs. (née Noel), 711 n.
Shaftesbury, 7th Earl of. *See* Cooper, A. A.-
Shirley, Rev. Walter, **120**
Short, Augustus, Bishop of Adelaide, 606
Shute, Rev. Hardwicke, **156**, **163**, 164, 165, **166**, 174, 179, **180**, 181, **668**
Shuttleworth, Sir James Phillips Kay-, 236
Sibthorp, Rev. Richard Waldo, 23, 24, 29
Silver, Rev. Thomas, 201
Silvester, Rev. Thomas, **106**, **240**
Sinclair, Rev. John, **7**, 431, 443
Skene, Miss Felicia Mary Frances, 530
Skinner, Rev. James, 70, **627**
Slatter, Rev. John, **650**
Slight, Rev. Henry Spencer, 146 n.
Small, Rev. Henry Alexander, **229**, **253**, **332**, **607**
Smith, Rev. Edmund James, 358, 415
Smith (Eton shopkeeper), 617
Smith (Thatcham), 393
Smith, Payne and Smith, Messrs., 444
Snell, Rev. Thomas, 5
Sneppe, Rev. Henry Thomas, **414**
South Africa, Archbishop of. *See* Gray, R.
Speck, Rev. Edward Thomas, **189**, 198, **247**, 248, **255**, 256
Springett, Rev. William John, 390
Staley, Rev. Thomas Nettleship, Bishop of Honolulu, **664**, 666, 667
Stanhope, Hon. and Rev. Henry William, **99**
Stanley, Edward Geoffrey Smith-, 14th Earl of Derby, 417, 461 n., 474
Stanley, Miss Mary, **67**
Statter, Rev. James, 535, **536**, **539**, **542**
Statter, Miss, 535, 536
Stephen, James, 496
Stephen, Sir James, 70, 472, **485**, **490**, **496**
Stephens, William, **222**
Stevens (Aston Rowant), 400
Stevens, Miss, 174, 179, 180
Stevens, John, **165**, **174**
Stevens, Rev. Robert, Dean of Rochester, **182**, **337**
Stevens, Rev. Thomas, **649**
Stevens, Thomas, 156, 163, 166, **179**, 180
Stevens, Rev. William Everest, **708**
Stillingfleet, Rev. Henry James William, 624
Stobart, Rev. Henry, **699**
Stoddart, Rev. William Wellwood, **625**
Stone, Mrs. Emily, 266 n.
Stone, Mrs. Mary, 266 n.
Stone, William, 266
Stone, William Henry, 266
Stonhouse, Mr. and Mrs., 186
Stowell, Rev. Hugh, 77
Street, George Edmund, 404 n., 462, 483, 537, 553, 570, 582 n., 635, 668 n.
Strickland, Walter, 504, 507, 517
Sumner, Rev. Charles Richard, Bishop of Winchester, 5, 10, 18, 22, 23, 29, 35, 39, 47, 48, 52, 54, 55, 56, 61, 63, 135, 187, 211, 218, **573**
Sumner, Rev. John Bird, Bishop of Chester and Archbishop of Canterbury, 135, **284**, 326, **327**, 352, 361, 385, 396, 409, 410, 411, 421, 422, **467**, 485, 490, 491, 496, 501, 566 n., 575, 592, 650, **652**, 653, 660, 667, 704
Suter, Edward, **65**
Sykes, Rev. William, **110**
Symonds, John, 390

Tait, Rev. Archibald Campbell, Bishop of London, **653**, 655 n., 667
Taunton, 1st Baron. *See* Labouchere, H.
Temple, Henry John, 3rd Viscount Palmerston, 474 n., 682, 707
Templer, Rev. Henry Skinner, 556 n., 604
Terrot, Rev. Charles Hughes, Bishop of Edinburgh, 20, 51
Thomas, Rev. Vaughan, **82**, **373** (?), **585**
Thompson, Rev. Edward, 258, **416**
Thompson, Rev. Sir Henry, 647
Thomson, Rev. William, Archbishop of York, 655 n.
Thorp, Rev. John, 459
Thorp, Rev. Thomas, **14**, **422**, **478**
Tindal, Acton, 230, 239; App. II
Tindal, Thomas, **239**; App. II
Toller, Messrs., 682
Tooke, Rev. Thomas Hammond, 218, **374**
Tooth, Robert, 606
Townsend, Rev. Abraham Boyle, **83**, **86**, 563 n.
Travers, Rev. Charles Henry, 92 n., 625
Travers, Rev. John Benward, **92**
Trench, Rev. Francis Chenevix, **488**, 489, **497**, **498**, 499
Trench, Rev. Richard Chenevix, 73, 168
Trevitt, Rev. James, **243**, 252, 270, 290
Trotman, Rev. Fiennes Samuel, 157
Truro, 1st Baron. *See* Wilde, T.
Turner, Edward Page, **186**
Turrell, Rev. Henry Joseph, 540
Turton, Rev. Henry Meysey, 614
Turton, Rev. Thomas, Bishop of Ely, **329**, 682, 689

Veck, Rev. Henry Aubrey, 1 n., **10**, **17**, **18**, 22, **27**, **61**; App. I
Venables, Rev. George, 484
Venn, Rev. Henry, **49**, **51**, **274**, **275**, 485, 490
Venn, Rev. John, 472 n.
Vernon, Rev., Bowater James, 81
Victoria, Queen, 14, 161, 191, 421, 423, 660
Vogan, Rev. Thomas Stuart Lyle, 350

Walford, Rev. Edward, **127**
Walkem, Rev. George, 217
Walker, Rev. Henry, **172**
Walker, Rev. Robert, 647
Walker, Rev. S., 488, 489, 497, 498, **499**
Walker, Rev. Thomas Andrew, **384**
Walpole, Spencer, 486, 491
Walpole, Rev. Thomas, **30**
Walsh, Rev. John Prendergast, **335**, 336, **340**, **343**, **344**
Walter, John, **633**, 639 n.
Walters, Rev., 158
Walton, Rev. William Williams, **619**
Warburton, Mrs., 437
Ward, Rev. John Gifford, Dean of Lincoln, **140**
Ward, Rev. William Sparrow, 202
Warren, C., **316**
Waterland, Rev. Daniel, 567
Watson, Dr. Thomas, 599
Watts, Rev. John William, **153**
Way, Albert, **46**; App. II
Way, Rev. Lewis, 43 n., 46 n.
Webster, Mrs., 145
Weedon, Thomas Saxby, **118**
Weighell, Rev. John, **267**, **276**, **283**, **286**, 287, 288
Wellesley, Hon. and Rev. Gerald Valerian, Dean of Windsor, **630**, 632, 634, **637**, 642, 664
Westcote, Mrs., **19**
Westminster, R.C. Archbishop of. *See* Wiseman, N. P.
Westminster, Dean of. *See* Buckland, W.
Whateley, John Welchman, **325**, **444**
Wheeler, Robert, **104**
Whitaker, Rev. Gascoigne Frederick, 460
White, Rev. Herbert, **714**
Whitfeld, Rev. Henry John, 160, 170, 386
Whitfeld, Mrs., **386**
Wiggin, Rev. William, 344
Wigram, Rev. Joseph Cotton, Bishop of Rochester, **705**
Wilberforce, Rev. Albert Basil Orme, 617, 618, 620, 621, 623, 643
Wilberforce, Arthur Henry, 38
Wilberforce, Barbara, 59
Wilberforce, Emily (Mrs. H. J. Pye), 52, 713
Wilberforce, Rev. Henry William, **21**, 33, 34, **38**, **59**, **70**, 173, 196, 346, 349, **350**, 373, **389**, 560
Wilberforce, Herbert William, 59
Wilberforce, Mrs. H. W., 59, 346, 379, **560**
Wilberforce, Reginald Garton, 676
Wilberforce, Rev. Robert Isaac, 21, 33, 34, 59, 70, **173**, 325, 548, 567
Wilberforce, Mrs. S., 59, 416
Wilberforce, William (1759–1833), 33, 34, 40, 161, 496
Wilberforce, William (1798–1879), 33, **34**, 461 n.
Wilberforce, William (1821–1900), **33**, 34, 325, 461, 472
Wilde, Thomas, 1st Baron Truro, 343, 344, 459
Wilkinson, Rev. Walter George, **694**
Williams, Rev. James William, 581
Williams, Rev. John (V. of Spelsbury), **204**
Williams, Rev. John (R. of Wigginton), 360
Williams, Rev. Robert, 400, 552
Williams, Rev. Rowland, 655, 702 n.
Williams, Rev. Thomas John(?), 636
Williamson, 141
Willis, Rev. John, **177**, 337
Willoughby, Sir Henry Pollard, **586**
Willoughby, Rev. Hugh Pollard, 586
Wilson, Rev. Dr., 139
Wilson, Rev. Arthur Charles, 323
Wilson, Rev. Henry Bristow, 655 n., 702 n.
Wilson, Rev. John, **138**
Wilson, Rev. William, jun., 353, 363, 365
Winchester, Bishop of. *See* Andrewes, L.; Sumner, C. R.
Windsor, Dean of. *See* Grenville, G. N.; Wellesley, G. V.
Winter, Rev. Alfred Litt, **202**
Wiseman, Cardinal Nicholas Patrick, Bishop of Melipotamus, R.C. Archbishop of Westminster, 372, 375
Wolfe, 56, 63
Wood, Sir Charles, 135
Wood, Sir David Edward, 717
Wood, Samuel Francis, 135
Woodrooffe, G., **676**, **685**, **690**
Woolley, Rev. Frederick, 392
Wright, Rev. Robert, **219**, **226**, **235**
Wright, Rev. William, **449**, 450
Wroth, Rev. William Bruton, 145, 286, 503
Wyatt, Rev. Arthur Haute, **645**, 646
Wyatt, Rev. Charles Francis, 289
Wyatt, Rev. Robert Edward, **612**
Wyndham, John Eveleigh, 127
Wynter, Rev. Abraham Farley, **280**

York, Archbishop of. *See* Thomson, W.
Youens, 437
Young, Lady (Caroline), **624**
Young, Caroline Louisa, 624
Young, Sir Charles Lawrence, 624
Young, Rev. Edward Newton, 619
Young, Elizabeth Sophia, 624
Young, Sir George John, 624 n.
Young, Rev. William, **23**, 24, 29
Young, Sir William Lawrence, 624 n.
Young, Sir William Norris, 624 n.

INDEX OF PLACES

All Arabic figures refer to the serial number of letters, not to pages. The Index excludes Oxford or Cambridge Colleges of which individuals were members; it includes places from which letters were written, but not places given as future addresses. Place-names containing two words are entered under the first one.

Aberford, Yorks., 361 n.
Abingdon, Berks., 300, 505
Adderbury, Oxon., 339 n., 595 n.
Addington, Bucks., 77 n.
Adstock, Bucks., 139 n., 147 n., 728 n.
Aldeburgh School, Suffolk, 694 n.
Alverstoke, Hants., 7, 10, 15–16, 18, 20, 22, 27, 30 n., 47, 52, 54–5, 59 n., 60–1, 73 n., 588 n.; App. I; letters from, 1–8, 33–4, 36–44, 54–62, 64–72, 74. *See* Anglesey, Elson, Forton, Gosport, Hardway
Amersham, Bucks., 121 n., 161 n., 728
Anglesey (Alverstoke), Hants., 14–15, 47, 52, 54–6; App. I
Appleford, Berks., 94 n.
Ardley, Oxon., 712 n.
Ashampstead, Berks., 110
Ashendon, Bucks., 89, 90
Ashridge Park, Bucks., letters from, 556–9
Aston (Bampton), Oxon., 712 n.
Aston Rowant, Oxon., 400, 522
Australia, 461, 472, 606
Avington, Berks., 178
Aylesbury, Berks., 80, 113, 116–17, 123, 128, 161 n., 178, 230, 239 ns., 294, 448, 455, 466, 470–1; App. II; Gaol, 177 n.; Grammar School, 382 n.; letters from, 275, 552. *See* Walton
Aylesby, Lincs., 121 n.
Aynho, Northants., 89 n.

Bagshot, Surrey, 5
Bampton, Oxon., letter from, 712
Banbury, Oxon., 353, 363, 365, 636 n.; App. I. *See* Neithrop, South Banbury
Bangor, diocese of, 14
Barford St. John, Oxon., 265 n.
Barford St. Michael, Oxon., 588, 591, 594 n.
Barkingside, Essex, 384 n.
Barley, Herts., 178 n., 448, 455, 522
Barton Hartshorn, Bucks., 124
Basildon, Berks., 110, 427
Basingstoke Grammar School, Hants., 323 n.
Baulking, Berks., 568
Beachampton, Bucks., 124 n.
Beaconsfield, Bucks., 677–8
Bearwood, Berks., 633 n.
Beckett, Berks., letter from, 703
Bedworth, Warws., 568 n.
Beedon, Berks., 185, 217, 224
Begbroke, Oxon., 82 n.
Bempton, Yorks., 484 n.
Benson, Oxon., 669
Berrick Salome, Oxon., 142
Berrow, Worcs., 568 n.
Bethersden, Kent, 240 n.
Bexley, Kent, 177 n.
Bicester, Oxon., 153; Union, 418 n.
Bicester House, Oxon., 602 n.
Bierton, Bucks., 140, 409
Bilston, Staffs., 414 n.
Binfield, Berks., 447 n., 723 n.
Binsey, Oxon., 421 n.
Birdingbury, Warws., 285 n.
Bisham, Berks., 474 n.; letter from, 707
Bishop's Waltham, Hants., 573
Bishopthorpe, Yorks., letters from, 658, 716
Bladon, Oxon., 137, 245, 615
Bletchley, Bucks., 503 n.
Blewbury, Berks., 78 n., 108, 222
Bloxham, Oxon., 659 n.
Bloxham School, 675; App. III
Boarstall, Bucks., 89–90
Bournemouth, Hants., 673 n.
Boyne Hill, Berks., 582, 648 n.; App. I
Bracknell, Berks., 398, 471 n.
Bradfield, Berks., 649
Bramley, Surrey, 6
Brampton Bryan, Salop, 185 n.
Bray, Berks., 408 n.
Brayfield, Bucks., 335 n.
Bremhill, Wilts., 681 n.
Brighstone, I.o.W., 9, 20
Brightlingsea, Sussex, 514 n.
Brighton, 647 n.
Brightwell, Berks., 390 n.
Brill, Bucks., 89–90
Britwell Priors, Oxon., 668–9
Britwell Salome, Oxon., 156 n., 668–9; App. I
Brize Norton, Oxon., 510, 526
Broad Chalke, Wilts., 655 n.
Broad Somerford, Somerset, 125 n.
Broughton, Bucks., 208
Broughton, Oxon., 289
Bryanston, Dorset, 423 n.
Buckingham, Bucks., 106, 124, 161 n., 240, 291
Buckland, Bucks., 140, 409
Buckland, Surrey, 220 n.
Burford, Oxon., 234, 695 n.
Burghclere, Hants., 105 n.
Burghfield, Berks., 718

Burnham, Bucks., 23 n.
Burton Agnes, Yorks., 21, 70, 484 n., 699 n.; letters from, 267–70
Burton Latimer, Northants., 26 n.
Bury, Lancs., 415 n.
Bury, Sussex, 405 n.
Buscot, Berks., 483 n.
Butler's Marston, Warws., 388 n.
Buttermere, Wilts., 300 n.

California, 664 n., 666
Cambridge, 719 n.; App. II
Canada, 481, 559
Canterbury, St. Augustine's College, 432 n.; letter from, 309
Cape Colony, 654, 692
Carisbrooke, I.o.W., 260 n.
Caversfield, Oxon., 124
Chaddleworth, Berks., 416 n.
Chadlington, Oxon., 384
Chaldon, Surrey, 31
Chalfont St. Peter, Bucks., 420
Chalgrove, Oxon., 142
Charlbury, Oxon., 201, 219 n., 625
Charney Bassett, Berks., 81, 670 n.
Chatham, Kent, 484 n.
Chearsley, Bucks., 84 n., 89–90, 550 n.
Checkendon, Oxon., 20
Cheddington, Bucks., 283, 287
Chesham, Bucks., 99; letters from, 551, 554–5
Chetton, Salop, 161 n.
Chetwode, Bucks., 124
Chevening, Kent, letters from, 661–6
Chichester, Sussex, 399 n.
Chieveley, Berks., 331
Chilton, Bucks., 89–90
Chilton Foliat, Wilts., 681 n.
Chinnor, Oxon., 726
Chipping Campden, Glos., 43 n.
Chislehampton, Oxon., 456
Chislet, Kent, 259 n.
Christchurch, Hants., 629 n.
Church Lench, Worcs., 23 n.
Churchill, Oxon., 212 n.
Clapham, Surrey, 1 n., 201 n.
Claydon, Oxon., 122 n.
Clearwell Court, Glos., 127 n.
Clehonger, Herefords., 624 n.
Clewer, Berks., 70 n., 439, 480, 502, 531, 533; letter from, 698
Clifton, Glos., 723 n.
Clifton Campville with Chilcote, Staffs., 713 n.; letters from, 561, 668
Clifton Reynes, Bucks., 229, 253, 332, 607
Climping, Sussex, 522
Coed, letter from, 728
Coggs, Oxon., 589, 641
Cokethorpe, Oxon., 504, 507, 517
Colnbrook, Bucks., 265
Combe, Oxon., 271
Comberton, Cambs., 657 n.
Compton, Surrey, 35
Cookham, Berks., 508, 511
Cornwell, Oxon., 212 n.
Cowes, I.o.W., 135
Cowley, Oxon., 109 n., 555 n., 724
Cowley St. John, Oxon., 555 n.
Cranfield, Beds., 194
Crawley, Hants., 250 n.
Crawley, Oxon., 484
Crawley, Sussex, 194 n.
Cretingham, Suffolk, 177 n.
Cropredy, Oxon., 122 n.
Crowell, Oxon., 133, 646
Croxall, Derbys., 664 n.
Cuddesdon, Oxon., 72, 523, 713 n.
Cuddesdon College, 397, 462 n., 503, 545, 559, 569
Cuddesdon Palace, 73, 126, 577, 647; letters from, 77 and *passim*
Cuddington, Bucks., 177, 182, 337, 574
Culham, Berks., 78 n.
Culham College, 459, 647
Cullompton, Devon, 110 n.
Curbridge, Oxon., 484
Cusop, Herefords., 185 n.
Cuxham, Oxon., 446

Dallington, Northants., 157 n.
Danesfield, Bucks., 372, 383
Deddington, Oxon., 341, 578, 588, 591, 594, 625 n., 675 n.
Denbigh, Denbighs., letters from, 684–5
Denham, Bucks., 629 n.
Denton, Northants., 410 n.
Devonport, Devon, 532
Dewsbury, Yorks., 94 n.
Didcot, Berks., 97, 176 n., 200
Dinton, Bucks., 121 n., 392
Donnington, Sussex, 522
Dorchester, Oxon., 72 n.
Dorton, Bucks., 89–90
Drayton, Berks., 300
Drayton Beauchamp, Bucks., 206, 225, 227
Drayton Lodge, Bucks., 225 n.
Drayton Parslow, Bucks., 120
Dry Sandford, Berks., 300
Ducklington, Oxon., 219 n., 285, 504, 507, 517
Duloe, Cornwall, 663 n.
Dunkirk, Kent, 390 n.
Duns Tew, Oxon., 172 n.
Duntisbourne Abbotts, Glos., 332 n.
Duntisbourne Rouse, Glos., 82 n.
Dunton, Bucks., 579
Durham, 556 n.
Durley, Hants., 22 n.
Durweston, Dorset, 423 n.

Easington, Oxon., 142, 143, 446, 469
East Brent, Somerset, 421 n.
East Challow, Berks., 458
East Claydon, Bucks., 100
East Farleigh, Kent, 21, 38, 70, 196
East Grinstead, Sussex, 433, 451, 724
East Ham, Essex, 249 n.
East Hanney, Berks., 670 n.
East Horsley, Surrey, 62 n.

East Pennard, Somerset, 72 n.
Eastbourne, Sussex, 78 n.
Easthampstead, Berks., 83, 399, 563, 571
Eastleach Turville, Glos., 95 n.
Eaton Hastings, Berks., 537
Edensor, Derbys., 647 n.
Edgcott, Bucks., 100, 124, 613
Edlesborough, Bucks., 145 n.
Ellesborough, Bucks., 551
Elson (Alverstoke), Hants., 10, 14–15, 48, 61, 63; App. I
Emberton, Bucks., 189, 198, 247–8, 255–6
Emmington, Oxon., 726 n.
Englefield, Berks., 546 n.; letters from, 705–6
Enstone, Oxon., 219 n.
Epwell, Oxon., 172 n.
Erith, Kent, 177 n.
Eton College, 70 n., 107, 369, 479, 549, 617–18, 620–1, 623, 641, 643, 659 n.; letter from, 719
Ewelme, Oxon., 78 n., 134 n.
Eynsham, Oxon., 273 n., 309, 311, 390

Falmouth, Cornwall, 728 n.
Faringdon, Berks., 273–5, 534, 538; Union, 112 n.
Farnham Castle, Surrey, letter from, 699
Fenny Stratford, Bucks., 280
Fingest, Bucks., 96, 446, 698
Finstock, Oxon., 625
Fitzhead, Somerset, 429 n.
Fleet Marston, Bucks., 382
Foots Cray, Kent, 565 n.
Forest Hill, Oxon., 146
Forncett St. Mary, Norfolk, 661 n.
Forton (Alverstoke), Hants., 10, 17, 22, 27, 55, 61; App. I
Fosbury, Wilts., 425
Fredville Park, Kent, 575 n.
Friezeland, Yorks., 484 n.
Fritwell, Oxon., 146 n., 385 n., 418
Fyfield, Berks., 285 n.

Gawcot, Bucks., 124
Gawsworth, Cheshire, 99 n.
Gayhurst, Bucks., 157 n., 189 n.
Gerrards Cross, Bucks., 420
Gilling, Yorks., 728 n.
Glemham, Suffolk, 150 n.
Globe Park (Slough), Bucks., letter from, 704
Gosport (Alverstoke), Hants., 37, 47, 52, 54–5, 57–8, 69; App. I
Graffham, Sussex, 435
Grahamstown, S. Africa, 487
Grandborough, Bucks., 100, 160 n., 385–6
Grazeley, Berks., 495
Great Barford, Oxon., 594–5
Great Barrington, Glos., 126 n.
Great Berkhamsted, Herts., 709 n.
Great Blakenham, Suffolk, 144 n.
Great Bookham, Surrey, 13
Great Coxwell, Berks., 112 n., 556 n.
Great Haseley, Oxon., 647 n., 696
Great Marlow, Bucks., 95, 101, 416 n., 475 n.
Great Milton, Oxon., 156 n., 231, 614 n.
Great Rollright, Oxon., 717 n.
Great Staughton, Hunts., 201 n.
Great Tew, Oxon., 636, 659 n.
Great Wollaston, Salop, 712 n.
Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, 484 n.
Grendon Underwood, Bucks., 100
Grove, Berks., 273 n., 309, 311, 390–1, 670, 683
Grove, Bucks., 150, 278
Guildford, Surrey, 5–6, 23 n.

Haddenham, Bucks., 177, 182, 337
Hadleigh, Essex, 146 n.
Hailey, Oxon., 484
Haines Hill, Berks., 633 n.
Hambleden, Bucks., 695 n.
Hampden, Bucks., 319 n.
Hampton Bishop, Herefords., 624 n.
Hardway (Alverstoke), Hants., 10, 14–15, 55; App. I
Hardwicke, Bucks., 237–9
Hardwicke (Ducklington), Oxon., 285
Harlton, Cambs., 657 n.
Hartley Wintney, Hants., 243 n.
Harwell, Berks., 401
Hastings, Sussex, 201 n.
Havant, Hants., 23 n.
Haversham, Bucks., 229, 253, 607
Hawaii, 664, 666–7
Haywards Heath, Sussex, 612 n.
Hazlemere, Bucks., 493–4
Headington Quarry, Oxon., 516 n.
Heckfield, Hants., 332 n.
Hedsor, Bucks., 638 n.
Henley, Oxon., 91, 405, 414; letter from, 564
Hever, Kent, 168 n., 572, 575, 583, 590, 593
Heyford Warren, Oxon., 241–2, 262, 279, 295–6
Hickleton, Yorks., letter from, 695
High Wycombe, Bucks., 78–9, 103–4, 141, 254, 269, 272, 318–21, 411, 482, 505, 512–14, 516, 518–19, 527–8, 541, 543, 564, 581, 584, 587, 599–601, 603, 605, 608, 613–14, 697
Higham Green, Suffolk, 550 n.
Highclere, Hants., 105 n.
Hillesden, Bucks., 124, 147 n., 376, 464, 671
Holyhead, Anglesey, 412 n.
Holywell, Oxon., 361
Horsell, Surrey, 5
Horspath, Oxon., 429, 436–7, 440–2, 454, 468
Horton, Bucks., 95 n., 265 n.
Hughenden, Bucks., 170 n., 624 n.; letter from, 697
Hurst, Berks., 633

Ibstone, Bucks., 96 n., 446
Ickford, Bucks., 89–90
Idsworth, Hants., 717 n.
Ipswich, Suffolk, 240 n.
Islip, Oxon., 172, 488 n.
Itchen Abbas, Hants., 219 n.
Itchen Stoke, Hants., 73 n.
Iver, Bucks., 202, 218 n.

Kangaroo Point, Queensland, 703 n.
Kelshall, Herts., 522
Kiddington, Oxon., 462–3
Kidlington, Oxon., 306 n.
Kidmore End, Oxon., 695, 709
Kilkhampton, Cornwall, 176 n.
Kingsey, Oxon., 89–90, 214, 223
Kingweston, Somerset, 204 n.
Kirtlington, Oxon., 142 n., 614; letters from, 295–6
Knowl Hill, Berks., 408 n.

Lacey Green, Bucks., 156
Lambourn, Berks., 258, 268, 416
Lambourn Place, Berks., 258 n.
Lampeter, Cardigans., 655 n.
Langham, Suffolk, 511 n.
Langley Marish, Bucks., 155, 629–30, 632, 634, 637, 642, 644
Launton, Oxon., 113, 115, 153, 293, 298, 328, 349, 452 n.
Lavendon, Bucks., 335 n., 344
Lavington, Sussex, 59, 416, 435, 548, 565 n., 602, 612, 711 n., 723; letters from, 130–6, 228–32, 240–65, 328–31, 422, 482–99, 597, 600–2, 647, 650–1, 690–4, 701, 709, 711, 720–4, 726–7
Leafield, Oxon., 219 n.
Leamington, Warws., 26 n.
Lechlade, Glos., 167 n.
Lee, Bucks., 619 n.
Leeds, St. Paul, 392 n.; St. Saviour, 249 n., 357
Leicester, 484 n.
Leighton Buzzard, Beds., 138
Leominster, Herefords., 243 n., 565 n.
Letcombe Bassett, Berks., 358, 415
Lewes, Sussex, 392 n.
Lewknor, Oxon., 299 n., 372
Lichfield, Staffs., letter from, 657
Lillingstone Dayrell, Bucks., 515, 521
Lillingstone Lovell, Bucks., 322
Limpsfield, Surrey, 30
Lincoln, Dean and Chapter of, 140
Litcham, Norfolk, 201 n.
Little Barford, Oxon., 588 n., 594 n.
Little Brickhill, Bucks., 419 n.
Little Dalby, Leics., 234 n.
Little Kimble, Bucks., 319 n., 551 n.
Little Milton, Oxon., 156 n.
Little Missenden, Bucks., 161 n., 419 n., 466
Little Rollright, Oxon., 708
Little Tew, Oxon., 659 n.
Little Woolstone, Bucks., 303, 307, 316–17, 324
Littlemore, Oxon., 354–5, 580
Littleworth, Berks., 112 n.
Liverpool, 240 n.
Lockinge, Berks., 190
Lombardy, 665
London, All Saints', Margaret Street, 299 n., 432, 445; All Saints', Norfolk Square, 712 n.; Camden Church, Camberwell, 196 n.; Chelsea, 240 n.; Clerkenwell, 335 n.; 61 Eaton Place, letters from, 98–128, 138–55, 209–14, 216–27, 233–5, 237–9, 239a, 266; Fulham Palace, letters from, 350–1; Kensington, 7 n.; Holy Trinity, Knightsbridge, 138 n.; Holy Trinity, Roehampton, 631 n.; 26 Pall Mall, letters from, 479–80, 531–45, 566, 569, 644–6, 708; St. Andrew by the Wardrobe, 395 n.; St. Anne, Blackfriars, 395 n.; St. Barnabas, Pimlico, 70 n., 350, 396, 397; St. James, Piccadilly, 717; St. James's Square, letter from, 35; St. John, Bedford Row, 40 n.; St. John, Woolwich, 157 n.; St. Mark, Kennington, 196 n.; St. Mark's College, 664 n.; St. Marylebone, 189 n.; St. Paul, Knightsbridge, 350, 396–7; St. Paul, Walworth, 677 n.; St. Peter, Vere Street, 698 n.; St. Peter's School, Eaton Square, 138 n.; Wandsworth Collegiate School, 664 n.
London University, King's College, 73 n., 500.
Long Crendon, Bucks., 84, 89–90, 574 n.
Longfield, Kent, 91 n.
Loughton, Bucks., 568 n.
Lower Winchendon, Bucks., 84 n., 89–90, 574
Ludham, Norfolk, 172 n.
Luton, Beds., 689
Lyford, Berks., 694
Lymm, Cheshire, 656 n.

Madley, Herefords., 194 n.
Maidenhead, Berks., 471 n.
Maids Moreton, Bucks., 119, 194, 208
Maidstone, Kent, 196 n.
Manchester Cathedral, 385–6
Mapledurham, Oxon., 135 n.
Mapperley Hall, Notts., letter from, 715
Marcham, Berks., 505 n., 636
Marsh Baldon, Oxon., 586
Marsh Gibbon, Bucks., 124, 565, 572, 575, 583, 590, 593
Marsworth, Bucks., 267 n.
Mauritius, 23 n.
Mavesyn Ridware, Staffs., 23 n.
Medmenham, Bucks., 449–50
Mentmore, Bucks., 138, 150
Merrow, Surrey, 8, 32
Merton, Oxon., 228 n.

Mickleham, Surrey, 4, 11–12
Middle Claydon, Bucks., 100; letters from, 273–4
Milcombe, Oxon., 588, 591
Milton, Berks., 73 n.
Milton (Adderbury), Oxon., 595
Milton, Somerset, 199 n.
Milton Keynes, Bucks., 419 n.
Minster Lovell, Oxon., 219 n.
Mitcham, Surrey, 36
Mixbury, Oxon., 727 n.; letter from, 713
Moggerhanger, Beds., 696 n.
Monks Risborough, Bucks., 332 n.
Monkton Farleigh, Wilts., 218 n.
Morden, Surrey, 39, 717 n.
Moulsford, Berks., 333–4, 338–9
Moulsoe, Bucks., 121 n.
Mumby, Lincs., 92 n.
Mursley, Bucks., 147 n., 625 n.

Nannerch, Flints., letters from, 682–3
Nash, Bucks., 112 n., 556, 570, 576, 604, 635
Neithrop, Oxon., 365
Nelson, N.Z., 259 n., 626
Nether Worton, Oxon., 353 n., 484 n.
Nettlebed, Oxon., 220
New Orleans, U.S.A., 665
New Seaham, Durham, 615 n.
New Shoreham, Sussex, 677 n.
New Windsor, Berks., 162 n.
New York, 665 n.
New Zealand, 626
Newbury, Berks., 105, 125, 130–1, 158, 218, 342, 438, 727 n.; Union, 77 n.
Newchapel, Staffs., 409 n.
Newington, Oxon., 668–9
Newland, Worcs., 70 n.
Newport Pagnell, Bucks., 522
Newtown, Hants., 211, 218
Noke, Oxon., 222 n., 459 n.
Nonington, Kent, 124 n.
Normandy, 59
North Aston, Oxon., 146 n.
North Leigh, Oxon., 281
North Marston, Bucks., 100, 160, 170
Norwich Cathedral, 67
Nuffield, Oxon., 426 n.

Oakley, Bucks., 89–90
Oare, Kent, 202 n.
Ockham, Surrey, 629 n.
Oddington, Glos., 344 n.
Oddington, Oxon., 529
Olney, Bucks., 189 n., 410
Ossington, Notts., letters from, 659–60
Over Worton, Oxon., 353 n.
Oving, Bucks., 100
Ovington, Hants., 219 n.
Oxford, All Saints, 610; Carfax, 273 n., 390; City Lecturers, 273 n., 358 n., 540 n.; Holywell, 361; Martyrs' Memorial, 205; Osney, 239a; Rewley House, 530, 532; St. Aldate, 610, 658; St. Ebbe, 522; St. Giles, 610, 614 n., 625 n.; St. John the Baptist, 259 n.; St. Martin, 85 n., 540 n., 610; St. Mary Magdalene, 610; St. Mary the Virgin, 175 n., 346, 354, 361, 379 n.; St. Michael, 271, 610; St. Paul, 249–50; St. Peter in the East, 259 n., 358 n.; St. Peter le Bailey, 93, 98, 132, 379 n., 510, 526, 540; St. Thomas, 109, 530 n., 597, 662; Gaol, 459 n.
Oxford University, Brasenose College, 97; Christ Church, 72, 239e, 323, 352, 464, 501 n., 574; Jesus College, 412; Lincoln College, 146, 271; Magdalen Hall, 134; Merton College, 377, 379–80, 446, 469; New College, 556; Pembroke College, 658; St. John's College, 284.

Padbury, Bucks., 376
Padworth, Berks., 243, 252, 270, 290, 359, 367, 428 (?)
Pangbourne, Berks., 686–7, 691, 710, 720–2
Paul's Cray, Kent, 565, 572, 575, 583
Pendeen, Cornwall, 544 n.
Penmaenmawr, letters from, 686–9, 714
Penn, Bucks., 429, 437, 471
Penn Street, Bucks., 161 n., 283 n., 466, 556
Peterborough, Northants., letter from, 656
Peterstow, Herefords., 704 n.
Piddington, Oxon., 728
Pishill, Oxon., 220
Pitchcott, Bucks., 100
Pitstone, Bucks., 267, 276, 283, 286–8
Plymouth, Devon, 424
Portland, Dorset, 511 n.
Poulshot, Wilts., 673 n.
Preston Bissett, Bucks., 124
Prestwood, Bucks., 332 n.
Priddy, Somerset, 514 n.
Purley, Surrey, 175 n.
Pusey, Berks., 347
Pyrton, Oxon., 220

Quainton, Bucks., 100, 619

Radclive, Bucks., 124
Radley, Berks., 260–1
Radley College, 260–1, 378, 379 n.
Radway, Warws., 388 n.
Rainham, Kent, 240 n.
Reading, Berks., 563, 573, 719–22; Christ Church, 656; Gaol, 345; Greyfriars, 132 n.; St. Giles, 522, 656 n.; St. John, 488–9, 497–9, 719; St. Laurence, 129, 201 n., St. Mary, 522.
Rettendon, Essex, 522
Rhayader, Radnors., 204 n.
Rhwlas, Merioneths., letters from, 673–80

Richmond, Surrey, 39, 45, 658 n.
Romsey, Hants., 20, 187; letter from, 424
Rotherfield Greys, Oxon., 91, 712 n.
Roxby, Lincs., 696 n.
Roxeth, Middlesex, 249 n.
Ryde, I.o.W., 23

St. Asaph, Flints., diocese of, 14; letter from, 681
St. Helens, I.o.W., 23–4, 29
St. Helier, Jersey, 505 n.
Salford, Oxon., 708
Salisbury, Wilts., 218 n., 681, 689
Saltfleetby, Lincs., 214 n.
Sandford St. Martin, Oxon., 232 n., 506 n.
Sandford-on-Thames, 650
Sandhurst, Berks., 639, 727 n.
Sandleford Priory, Berks., 105
Sapcote, Leics., 395 n.
Sarsden, Oxon., 105 n., 212 n.
Scalford, Leics., 409 n.
Scampston, Yorks., 511 n.
Scarle, Notts., 636 n.
Scotland, 20, 49, 51
Scremby, Lincs., 511 n.
Shalbourne, Berks., 425
Shalford, Surrey, 6
Shalstone, Bucks., 515 n., 695 n.
Sherington, Bucks., 298
Shifford, Oxon., 712
Shippon, Berks., 300
Shipton Court, Oxon., 185 n.
Shirburn, Oxon., 133, 645–6
Shrivenham, Berks., 546 n.
Shutford, Oxon., 172 n.
Simpson, Bucks, 419 n.
Slough, Bucks., 167
Smeeton Westerby, Leics., 726 n.
Soulbury, Bucks., 139, 147–9, 292
South Africa, 487, 692
South Banbury, Oxon., 353, 363, 365
South Luffenham, Rutland, 663 n.
South Moreton, Berks., 72 n., 134
South Stoke, Oxon., 94
South Weston, Oxon., 645
Southwark, 3
Southwold, Suffolk, 132 n.
Speen, Berks., 130
Speeton, Yorks., 484 n.
Spelsbury, Oxon., 204
Staines, Middlesex, 94 n.
Standlake, Oxon., 284–5, 301, 310, 312–13, 326–7
Stanford in the Vale, Berks., 505 n.
Stanlake Park, Berks., 633
Stanton Harcourt, Oxon., 628
Stanton Lacy, Salop, 137 n., 245 n.
Stapleford, Notts., 137 n.
Steeple Aston, Oxon., 226, 506, 550, 562, 616
Steeple Barton, Oxon., 219, 226, 235
Steeple Claydon, Bucks., 100
Stewkley, Bucks., 92 n., 625 n.
Steyning, Sussex, 712 n.
Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, 487 n.
Stoke Goldington, Bucks., 157 n., 189 n.
Stoke Mandeville, Bucks., 140
Stoke Newington, Middlesex, 516 n.
Stoke Row, Oxon., 127
Stoneleigh, Warws., 82 n.
Stowe, Bucks., 244, 251
Stratfield Mortimer, Berks., 162 n.
Stratton Audley, Oxon., 90 n.
Streatley, Berks., 266
Sturminster Marshall, Dorset, 379 n., 659 n.
Summertown, Oxon., 614 n.
Summertown Training School, 459
Sunningdale, Berks., 239b, 656 n., 717
Surrey, Archdeaconry of. *See* Bagshot, Bramley, Chaldon, Compton, Great Bookham, Guildford, Horsell, Limpsfield, Merrow, Mickleham, Mitcham, Richmond, Shalford, Windlesham, Woking
Sutton Courtenay, Berks., 94 n., 600 n., 638, 640
Swalcliffe, Oxon., 577 n.
Swanbourne, Berks., letter from, 710
Swyncombe House, Oxon., 220 n.; letters from, 414–16

Tadmarton, Oxon., 415 n.
Tarrant Hinton, Dorset, 342 n.
Tatterford, Norfolk, 696 n.
Taynton, Oxon., 126 n.
Tetsworth, Oxon., 209–10, 213, 404, 456, 645 n.
Thame, Oxon., Union, 84 n.
Thatcham, Berks., 259, 393
Thornham, Suffolk, 110 n.
Thornton-cum-Nash, Bucks., 112 n., 556, 604
Thurrock Parva, Essex, 244 n.
Tideford, Cornwall, 383 n.
Tidmarsh Park, Berks., 686 n.
Tingewick, Bucks., 124, 237 n.
Tisbury, Wilts., 588 n.
Titley, Herefords., 695 n.
Toot Baldon, Oxon., 94 n., 189 n., 248, 406 n.
Totternhoe, Beds., 145 n.
Tring, Herts., 204 n.
Trull, Somerset, 162 n.
Tunstall, Staffs., 670 n.
Turville, Bucks., 698
Tusmore, Oxon., letters from, 293–4
Twyford, Bucks., 124
Tylers Green, Bucks., 493–4

Upper Heyford. *See* Heyford Warren
Upper Winchendon, Bucks., 89, 382 n., 636 n.
Upton-cum-Chalvey, Bucks., 155 n., 218 n., 335–6, 340, 343–4, 374

Waddesdon, Bucks., 89–90, 100, 619 n., 636 n.

Waldershare, Kent, 409 n.
Wallingford, Berks., 522, 712 n.; Union, 94 n.
Walmer, Kent, 21, 38
Walton (Aylesbury), Bucks., 77, 113, 116–17, 123, 128, 470
Walton-on-the-Naze, Essex, 38 n.
Wantage, Berks., 190, 273–5, 277, 387, 458 n., 624 n.; Convent and Penitentiary of St. Mary, 190 n., 480 n.
Warborough, Oxon., 714
Wardington, Oxon., 122, 135, 147 n.
Warfield, Berks., 727
Wargrave, Berks., 332 n., 406–8, 412; letter from, 696
Warkton, Northants., 699 n.
Wasing Place, Berks., letter from, 389
Waterperry, Oxon., 228 n.
Waterstock, Oxon., 228, 231, 308, 315
Water Stratford, Bucks., 124
Weaverham, Cheshire, 78 n.
Welford Park, Berks., 568 n.
Wendover, Bucks., 118 n., 121 n.
Wennington, Essex, 243 n.
West Bradley, Somerset, 72 n.
West Challow, Berks., 458
West Farleigh, Kent, 182 n.
West Hanney, Berks., 670 n.
West Pennard, Somerset, 406 n.
Westbourne, Sussex, 424, 451
Westbury, Wilts., 94 n.
Westcot Barton, Oxon., 172 n.
Westminster, letters from, 63, 73, 76
Weston Turville, Bucks., 392 n., 701
Wexham, Bucks., 264, 453, 611
Weymouth, Dorset, 240 n.
Whaddon, Bucks., 556
Whaddon, Wilts., 594 n.
Wheatfield, Oxon., 383 n.
Wheatley, Oxon., 81, 302, 523
Whitfield, Kent, 409 n.
Whitstable, Kent, 493 n.
Whitworth, Durham, 487 n.
Wicken, Northants., 556
Wigginton, Oxon., 360
Wigton, Cumberland, 84 n.
Wilton House, Wilts., letters from, 326–7
Winchester, 25, 711 n.; County Hospital, 68; letters from, 9–32, 45–53
Windlesham, Surrey, 5, 23
Windsor, Berks., Dean and Chapter of, 155, 218, 425 n., 476, 629–30, 632, 634; Holy Trinity, 70, 366, 369–70, 387; St. John, 629 n.; letter from, 391. *See* New Windsor
Windsor Castle, letter from, 700
Wing, Bucks., 144–5
Winkfield, Berks., 458 n.
Winslow, Bucks., 100, 114, 304–5
Wiston, Sussex, letter from, 568
Witney, Oxon., 126, 477, 484, 697 n.; Union, 484 n.; Holy Trinity, 484; Rural Deanery, 126
Woking, Surrey, 5
Wokingham, Berks., letter from, 565
Wolverhampton, 505 n.
Wolverton, Bucks., 625
Woodmancote, Sussex, 540
Woodstock, Oxon., 239c–e, 245, 505 n., 615
Woolstone, Berks., 568 n.
Wootton, Oxon., 306
Wotton Underwood, Bucks., 100
Worcester, 512 n.
Worminghall, Bucks., 89–90, 535–6, 539, 542, 547, 554, 561, 585
Wormshill, Kent, 342 n.
Woughton-on-the-Green, Bucks., 303, 307, 316–17, 324, 414 n., 419, 568
Wraysbury. *See* Wyrardisbury
Wreningham, Norfolk, 170 n.
Wyrardisbury, Bucks., 155, 629 n., 630, 632, 637

Yarburgh, Lincs., 636 n.
Yardley Hastings, Northants., 410 n.
Yarnton, Oxon., 82
Yelford, Oxon., 383 n., 712 n.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

All Arabic figures refer to the serial number of letters, not to pages.

Abduction, 579
Absenteeism, charges of, 96, 119, 134, 341, 393, 449, 505, 543, 563–4, 571, 581, 584, 587, 605, 608, 613, 697, 727
Adultery, charges of, 303 n., 316–17, 324, 419, 568, 572, 654, 714, 718
Advowsons, 568, 680, 699
Almshouses, 69
Altars, covering and rails of, 369, 580, 633; flowers on, 450; of stone, 23–4, 29, 352, 361–2, 364, 580
American Civil War, 665, 672
Anonymous letters, treatment of, 536, 539
Antinomianism, 103–4, 373
Apprentices, balloting for, 9
Archaeological Institute, 46; App. II
Archdeacons, 30, 62, 145, 163, 200, 228, 329–30, 535–6, 539, 546, 633, 675
Architects, 129, 203, 258, 300, 404 n., 462, 483, 537, 553, 570, 658
Arians, 40

Baptism, 1, 42, 153, 319, 373, 392, 407, 427, 557, 701, 714
Beckley Ghost, 492
Beershops, 285, 507, 517
Bell-ringing, 36
Benefactions by S. Wilberforce, 10, 14–15, 18–19, 52, 55, 68, 154, 168, 207, 217, 221, 300, 340, 601, 604, 627, 675, 693, 702
Benefice, collation to, 629–30, 632, 634, 637, 641–2; endowment of, 10, 15, 17–18, 22, 27, 47, 52, 54–6, 61, 91, 140, 155, 226, 245, 300, 333, 337, 464, 484, 556, 586, 669, 695, 709; exchange of, 178, 416, 448, 455, 495, 505, 565, 572, 575, 583, 590, 593; resignation of, 267, 276, 283, 286–8, 303, 436–7, 440, 442, 454–5, 468, 470, 543, 599, 694, 717; union of, 446, 469, 579; voidance of, 146
Berks. Chronicle, The, 573
Bible, 407, 412, 597, 652
Bigamy, 45
Bishoprics, resignation of, 548, 725
Bishops, position of, 76–7, 131, 133, 151–2, 163, 166, 210–11, 213, 228, 232–3, 239e, 246, 263, 273–5, 277, 286, 297, 315, 376, 394–6, 406, 449, 451, 503, 506, 510, 524, 543, 562, 569, 594, 652, 655, 719; in Scotland, 20, 49, 51; overseas, 485–7, 490–1, 496, 501, 626, 660–1, 664, 666–7. *See* Charges, Ordinary, Visitations.
British Critic, The, 29
Bucks. Architectural and Archaeological Society, 205; App. II
Burial Grounds, enlargement of, 81, 85, 88, 239a
Burial of non-parishioners, 102

Cambridge Voluntary Ordination Examination, 679
Camden Society, 14, 205; App. II
Canadian Clergy Reserves Bill, 481, 706
Candles, 350
Canons, Ecclesiastical, 36, 39, 77, 113, 117, 123, 148, 228, 231, 315, 392
Catechizing of Youth, 93, 98, 148, 279, 411, 717
Cathedrals, reform of, 421, 684
Cathedrals Commission, 501, 557
Cemeteries, burial in, 603, 605, 613
Cemetery chapels, 361, 605
Chancellor, Diocesan, 88, 163, 282, 506, 630
Chancels, 206, 225, 227, 369, 507, 580, 633
Chanting of Athanasian Creed, 60; of Canticles and Gloria, 376, 633; of Psalms, etc., 369, 376, 449; of Responses, 60, 230, 407
Chapels of Ease, 48, 52, 55–6, 245, 425, 504
Chaplains, 271; Domestic, 131; Examining, 71, 73; Hospital, 342; Prison, 345
Chapters, institution of Cathedral and Collegiate, 476
Charges by S. Wilberforce, archidiaconal, 14, 40, 49, 60; episcopal, 284, 396–7, 548, 567, 573
Charities, 19, 200, 218, 281, 322, 444
Cholera (1849), 337
Christian Observer, The, 205
Church and State Gazette, The, 373, 713
Church Building Societies, 15, 47, 52, 54–6, 62, 154, 203, 398, 553, 556
Church Furnishings. *See* Altars; Faldstool; Font; Hatpegs; Ornaments; Pews; Pulpit; Reading-desk; Stove
Church Missionary Society, 20, 49, 51, 273–5, 277, 485, 503, 652
Church Pastoral Aid Society, 652
Church Rates, 6, 523, 580, 592, 631
Church Roofs, 258, 268
Church Schools, 190, 236, 266, 520, 530
Church Union, 162
Churches, alterations to, 8, 31, 35, 225, 227, 289, 333–4, 338–9, 369, 409, 462–3; demolition of, 446, 668–9;

App. I; enlargement of, 420, 658; inspection of, 30, 151, 306; rebuilding of, 220, 404, 456; removal of, 47, 52, 705; repairs to, 534, 538; restoration of, 14, 129, 203, 205, 258, 268, 464, 483, 553, 658; App. II. *See* Benefices, endowment of; New Churches
Churching of Women, 407
Churchwardens, 6, 10–13, 18, 27, 30, 32, 36, 41, 88, 102, 104, 129–30, 166, 196, 228, 241–2, 258, 262, 268, 272, 279, 281, 289, 290, 304–5, 333–4, 339, 341, 360, 366, 369–70, 382, 429, 442, 450, 580, 610, 720–22
Churchyards, 4, 11–13, 102, 258, 281, 523
Clergy, discipline of. *See* Abduction; Absenteeism; Adultery; Debts; Field Sports; Immorality; Incest; Intemperance; Neglect; Romanism; Sermons; Services; Thirty-Nine Articles; Tractarianism
Clergy Discipline Act, 111, 163, 169, 171, 183, 215, 330, 429, 568, 652
Clerical Journal, The, 684
Clerical Meetings, 5, 92, 212, 247
Colenso Case. *See* Index of Persons, Colenso, J. W.
Collects, 407, 412
'College life', expenses of, 168, 221; unsuitable for aged men, 693
Colonial Church Government Bill, 486, 491, 503
Colonial Jurisdiction, 660. *See* Bishops overseas
Commissions of inquiry, 139, 156, 163, 174, 179–81, 280, 307, 316–17, 324, 393, 429, 437, 440–42, 454, 568; threat of, 358, 526, 708, 718
Communion, afternoon celebrations of, 409, 411; eastward position at, 717, 726, exclusion from, 228, 231, 303; frequency of, 551, 684, 687, 691; postures at, 249–50, 407, 450, 597, 717, 728; reservation of, 724; Communion Table, 361, 369, 392, 407, 580. *See* Altars; Eucharist
Confession, 346, 349, 369, 407, 502, 530, 532, 545, 598
Confirmation, 293, 296, 346, 354, 479, 619, 705
Conflict of Preaching, 55, 113, 116–17, 123, 128
Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, 700
Consecration, procedure for, 52, 660
Conversion, doctrine of, 544
Convocation, elections to, 421–2; revival of, 421–2, 447, 451, 465, 467, 478, 509, 525, 566, 569, 592, 606, 609, 652, 655; representation of laity in, 606, 609
Courts, ecclesiastical, 114–15, 215
Cricket, 407
Cross, reverence to, 250; sign of, 392
Crown. *See* Ecclesiastical Appointments, Patronage
Curates, appointment of, 23, 25–6, 28, 55, 70, 83, 86, 91, 95, 96, 99, 101, 119, 127, 131, 133, 142, 158, 177, 194, 201, 208, 218–19, 223, 226, 234–5, 240, 253–4, 259, 264, 270, 303, 318–21, 337, 342, 344, 358, 385–6, 390, 405, 504–5, 510, 516, 518, 526, 541, 543, 550, 562, 564, 581, 599, 613, 625, 636, 645, 683, 708, 718; complaints concerning, 21, 24, 38, 93, 98, 122, 125, 130, 132, 135, 141, 145, 147–9, 176, 196, 202, 237–9, 249–50, 284–5, 301, 310, 312–13, 326–7, 382, 384, 489, 497–9, 535–6, 539, 542, 563, 571, 588, 591, 603, 670, 677–8, 697, 712, 726; dismissal of, 38, 94, 138, 150, 172, 189, 198, 201, 226, 235, 243, 247–8, 252, 255–6, 265, 270, 310, 312–13, 326–7, 331, 335–6, 340, 343–4, 385–6, 508, 511, 540, 670, 696; furniture for, 133, 307, 332, 600; houses for, 86, 99, 143, 208, 217, 219, 226, 235, 309, 311, 336, 399, 414, 516, 563, 600, 671; interference with, 59; licensing of, 91 n., 96, 119, 132, 244, 251, 309, 318–21, 358, 438, 515–16, 521, 599, 649, 671; maintenance in office of, 71–2, 177, 202, 209–10, 213, 230, 290, 331, 382, 415, 512–13, 519, 677–8; payment of, 18, 22, 27, 86, 99, 101, 108, 127, 133, 140, 142–3, 158, 160, 170, 240, 247–8, 252, 254–6, 265, 291, 307, 309, 311, 317, 332, 336, 342, 390, 586, 600–1, 605, 611; refusal to license, 385–6, 399, 401, 527–8; resignation of, 78–9, 99, 108, 122, 138, 167, 202, 214, 326–7, 384, 470, 547, 554, 608, 613, 645–6; revocation of license, 554, 561; senior and junior, 240, 601, 605, 608, 613–14, 625, 712; tenure under new incumbent, 71–2, 477; other references, 484, 551, 574, 619, 624, 675.
Curates' Aid Society, 18, 254, 291, 652, 697

Daily News, The, 373, 396
Deacons, 136, 234, 664
Dead, Prayers for, 361–2, 369
Debts, clerical, 176, 264, 401, 453, 508, 511, 611
Dilapidations, 638–40
Diocesan Board of Education, 259
Diocesan Church Building Societies, 15, 47, 203, 217, 553
Dispensation, Archbishops' power of, 704
Dissent, 91, 113, 115, 153, 212, 232–3, 272–3, 281, 308, 322, 376, 403, 448, 455, 482, 631, 706–7
Dissenting Schools, 190
Ditcher v. Denison, 648, 650

Doctrines. *See* Conversion; Eucharist; Grace; Immaculate Conception; Justification; Particular Redemption; Redemption; Second Coming; Trinity
Drunkenness. *See* Intemperance

Ecclesiastic, The. See Theologian and Ecclesiastic
Ecclesiastical Appointments by Crown, 396–7, 457, 682, 707, 725. *See* Hampden, R. D., in Index of Persons
Ecclesiastical Commissioners. *See* Index of Persons
Ecclesiastical Titles Act (1851), 372 n., 374–5
Essays and Reviews (1860), 655, 657, 682, 702, 713
Essex Standard, The, 171
Established Church, position of, 115, 153, 389, 706–7, 713
Eucharist, doctrine of, 297, 299, 328–30, 350, 361–2, 369, 395, 407, 412, 557, 567, 648, 650, 700
Evangelicalism, 128, 349, 373, 503, 505, 584, 683
Examiner, The, 373, 396
Examining Chaplain, 71, 73
Excommunication, 115, 152, 546

Faldstool, 23–4, 29
Family Prayers, 577
Fees, 81, 87–8, 141, 282, 400, 596
Fellows, Clerical, 93, 98, 194, 249–50, 284–5, 352, 356–7, 368, 379–81, 412, 436
Field Sports, 205, 244, 251, 284–5, 301, 310, 312–13, 326–7, 399, 515, 521, 563, 571, 588, 591
Fishing, 619
Font, 6, 35, 43
Funerals, complaints concerning conduct of, 246, 257, 263, 407, 603, 605

Galleries in Churches, 35, 129, 272, 483, 658
Gorham case, 500
Grace, doctrine of, 153, 199, 249, 412, 499
Guardian, The, 187, 354–5, 396–7, 486, 491
Guardians of Poor, 9

Hampden case. *See* Index of Persons, Hampden, R. D.
Hampshire Independent, The, 18, 22
Hatpegs, 30
Hawaii . . . (by M. Hopkins, 1862), 667
High Church Evangelicalism, 373
Humility, 40, 116, 152, 207, 249, 373, 452
Hunting. *See* Field Sports

Iconoclasm, 250
Immaculate Conception, doctrine of, 297
Immorality, 57–8, 157, 163–6, 174, 179–81, 393, 418, 429, 615 n., 718
Incest, accusation of, 229, 607
Incorporated Church Building Society, 258, 556
Inhibitions, in Chichester diocese, 433, 451; in Oxford diocese, 346–7, 354–5, 368, 371, 377, 379–81, 387, 394, 412 n., 546, 554, 561; threats of, 412, 499
Inscriptions on Tombs, 400
Inspectors of Schools, 568, 694, 727
Intemperance, charges of, 280, 401–2, 429, 437, 440–2, 454, 578 n., 708
Interference in affairs of another parish, 105, 211, 218, 273–5, 277, 506, 524, 619, 698
Irreverence in Church, 206, 241–2, 281

Jews, Bill to enable them to sit in Parliament, 474
'Jews and Ethnics', 392
Journal in France (by T. W. Allies, 1849), 293, 297–8, 329
Justification, doctrine of, 573

Kneeling before Cross, 249–50

Latitudinarianism, 377, 659
Lectern, 23–4, 29
Lectionary, 652
Lecture on Anglican Popery (by W. Brock, 1854), 573
Lectures, 117, 128, 573, 615. *See* Ordination
Lent, observance of, 704
Letters from Italy (by T. W. Allies, 1849), 293, 297–8, 329
Licences, for attendance of Radley College at parish church, 260–1; for marriage, 546; to preach, 433, 585. *See* Chaplains, Curates, Non-residence
Litany, 409–11
Liturgy, alterations in (1852), 409–11; proposals by T. T. Carter, 569
London Society for the Revival of Convocation, 606 n.
London University, F. D. Maurice's position at King's College, 500–1

Magistrates, Clerical, 89, 300 n., 390
Mariolatry, 93, 98
Marriage, 2, 45, 106, 113, 115, 127, 150 n., 229, 403, 556, 607, 675, 701, 726
Mayors, of Guildford, 6; of High Wycombe, 104
Mediation, Wilberforce's efforts at, 225, 227–8, 230, 272, 400, 406–8, 432, 445, 504, 507, 517, 594–5, 616, 624, 638–40, 654, 686–7, 691, 720–2
Memorials (complaints) from parishioners, 104, 132, 290, 304, 333, 359,

367, 406–8, 449, 580, 599, 616, 633, 660
Missionary Bishops Bill, 485–6, 490–1, 496, 501
Missionary Work, 485, 652; in Hawaii, 664; in S. Africa, 692; by laity, 664
Morning Chronicle, The, 193, 396–7
Morning Herald, The, 396, 548, 567

National Incorporated Church Building Society, 203, 258
National Society, The, 236, 431, 443, 647
Neglect of parish, 246, 257, 263, 281, 296, 337, 390–1, 505, 697, 714, 727
New Churches, 10, 14–15, 23, 47, 52, 54–6, 61, 63, 91, 300, 353, 363, 365, 398, 420, 425, 556, 582, 604, 635, 656; App. I
Non-Residence, 82, 91, 96, 120, 143, 185 n., 194, 204, 223–5, 240, 264, 270, 290, 303, 306–7, 317, 324, 382, 390–1, 405, 505, 541, 543, 563–4, 571, 581, 587, 599, 625, 708, 718
Novatianism, 70

Observations on Religious Dissent (by R. D. Hampden), 159, 161, 169, 171, 175, 183–4, 215, 373
Offertory, 322, 580, 652, 677, 684, 717, 726
Officiating Ministers, at Reading, 488–9, 497–8
Ordinary, powers and duties of, 30, 114, 315, 367, 456, 687
Ordination, 131, 387, 417, 544; acceleration of, 673–4, 681, 689; examinations, 71, 73–4, 236; preparation for, 397, 503, 559, 663, 679, 688; refusal of, 199, 302, 323, 388, 547, 643; on school titles, 342
Organist, purported dismissal of, 254, 269, 272
Ornaments, 205, 535–6, 539, 542
Oxford Burial Society, 85
Oxford Chronicle, The, 355
Oxford City Parliamentary Election of 1852, 459
Oxford Journal, The, 355
'Oxford Paper, The', 328–30
Oxford University, Bill, 706; examinations in History, 473; Martyrs' Memorial, 205; nomination of Select Preachers, 439; Parliamentary election (1841), 44; Parliamentary election (1853), 457, 460–1, 474–5; Professors' duties, 663, 679; Professorship of Poetry, election of 1842, 59; Theological training, 663, 679
Oxford University, City & County Herald, The, 354–5

Papal Aggression (1850), 372, 374–5, 384, 485
Parish Boundaries, alteration of, 353, 363, 365, 668–9
Parish Clerk, 106, 118, 144–5, 392
Parishes, division of, 10, 15, 23, 110, 122 n., 140, 155, 182, 220, 300, 337, 484, 523, 604
Parochial system, 48, 506, 544
Parsonages, 82, 97, 139–40, 182, 185, 194, 208, 217, 224, 245, 267, 276, 283, 286–7, 300, 307, 309, 311, 333, 404 n., 418, 464, 484, 553, 556, 570, 576, 604, 671, 727
Particular Redemption, doctrine of, 512–14, 516
Patronage, episcopal, 71, 167, 298, 300, 337, 421, 446, 466, 522, 582; lapse of, 629–30, 632, 634, 637, 641–2; Lord Chancellor and, 343–4, 457, 459, 522; transfer of, 182, 220, 300, 337, 522, 582; Wilberforce's advice on exercise of, 458, 466, 469, 471, 484, 568, 626. *See* Advowsons, Ecclesiastical Appointments by Crown
Peculiars, 107, 114, 479
Pews, 14, 32, 64, 129, 206, 228, 231, 338, 360, 365–6, 483, 537, 686, 717
Pluralities Act (1838), 147, 210, 213, 311, 601
Police, 57–8
Poor, needs of, 55, 304–5, 365–6, 374, 582; App. I
Prayer Desk, 483
Prayers, Intonation of, 407
Prayers for the Dead, 361–2, 369
Presentments by Churchwardens, 580
Pride, 249
Prisoners, Instruction of, 345
Privy Council, 107, 114, 190, 236, 266, 479, 520, 556, 648, 655 n.
Pulpit, 483
Puritanism, 153, 250, 648, 650
Puseyism, 1, 38, 387; App. I. *See* Romanism, Tractarianism

Quarterly Review, The, 667
Queen Anne's Bounty, 217, 556, 652

Race-Meetings, 284, 326
'Radical Southampton paper', 18
Railways, 65, 186, 396, 467, 479, 496, 602, 715–16
Readers, 664
Reading desk, 367, 369, 428, 462–3, 483
Reasons for submitting to the Catholic Church (by H. W. Wilberforce), 389
Record, The, 158, 161, 373, 396, 451, 486, 490, 503, 548, 557, 653
Redemption, doctrine of, 412, 655
Reformation, 319, 357, 368, 370, 376, 389, 396–7, 412, 728
Registrars, of Archdeaconries of Berks. and Oxon., 546; of City of Oxford, 403; of Diocese of Oxford, 81, 87–8, 282
Religious Novels, 53
Ritualism, 397

Roman Catholics, reception into Church of England, 42
Romanism, 21, 25, 28–9, 38, 60, 74, 76, 93, 98, 123, 128, 153, 205, 293, 297, 323, 328–30, 346, 348–52, 356–7, 361, 366–72, 374–7, 379–81, 387, 392, 395–6, 406–8, 412, 535–6, 539, 542, 548, 554, 560, 561, 567, 569, 573, 597, 624, 700, 723, 726; App. II. *See* Secessions to Rome
Royal Supremacy, The (by T. W. Allies), 352
'Rubrical Obedience', 39, 407, 409, 710, 717
Rural Chapters, 100, 212, 306, 383, 503
Rural Deans, in Surrey, 5, 6, 30; in Oxford Diocese, 89–90, 100, 121–2, 124, 126, 135, 144–5, 151, 177, 203, 225, 241–2, 254, 278, 289, 304–6, 383–4, 387, 408–9, 413, 420, 442, 449–50, 452, 503, 577 n., 588, 591, 624, 645, 667, 726

St. James' Chronicle, The, 192
Saints, Invocation of, 297, 299
Saints' Days, Services on, 384, 687, 710, 720–2
Schism (in Scotland), 20, 49, 51
Schoolmasters, Clerical, 127, 260, 270, 399, 459, 675
Schools, 7, 11, 14–16, 37, 39, 48, 200, 222, 236, 254, 259–60, 266–7, 281, 318, 321, 366, 369, 505, 556, 570, 582, 594, 615, 635, 675, 698, 727; App. III. *See* Church Schools, Dissenting Schools, Visitor
Secessions to Rome, 22–3, 29, 76, 249, 351–2, 367–8, 376, 379, 548, 560, 567, 569, 624
Second Coming, doctrine of the, 542
See of St. Peter, The (by T. W. Allies), 352
Self-will, 76, 152, 202, 246
Sequestration, 578, 599, 608, 611
Sermons, complaints about content of, 103, 202, 239e, 249–50, 318–20, 357, 368, 371, 406–7, 412, 488, 497–9, 597, 712, 726, 728; infrequency of, 95, 148, 279, 562, 616
Services, complaints about conduct of, 60, 122, 135, 137, 230, 239c–e, 366, 406–7, 449–50, 687, 723; frequency of, 133, 139, 142, 147–9, 219, 226, 235, 245–6, 253, 264, 279, 292, 295–6, 303–5, 493–4, 550–1, 589, 646, 677; hours of, 132, 139, 262, 279, 281, 304–5, 384, 409–11, 446, 493–4, 610, 687, 689; intoning of, 369, 407, 633, 717; performance in parsonage of, 529; performance in schoolroom of, 39. *See* Communion, Funerals, Irreverance in Church, Saints' Days
Shadow of the Cross, The, 1
Shooting. *See* Field Sports
Simony, 276, 283, 424, 656, 680, 699
Singers, 272
Sisterhoods, 43–4, 48, 50, 433, 480, 502, 530–3, 567, 724
Slave Trade, 314
Smoking, 619
Socinianism, 651, 659
Sons of the Clergy, 108, 578
S.P.C.K., 559
S.P.G., 273, 559, 652
Spiritual jurisdiction, 660
'Sporting Clergymen'. *See* Field Sports
Steepletown; or, High Church and Low Church . . ., (by [S. Jenner]), 196
Stove, 35
Sunday Observance, 105, 211
Surplice, wearing of, by minister, 359, 367, 369, 407; App. I; by choristers, 369, 633
Synodical Act (proposed, re *Essays and Reviews*), 655, 713

'Table Turning', S. Wilberforce's views on, 492
Tablet, The, 328–30
Testimonials, 111, 145, 188, 218, 323, 385–6, 401, 419, 568, 636, 649, 663, 679, 689
Theologian and Ecclesiastic, The, 361–2, 364
'Things doubtful', 109
'Things indifferent', 231, 367, 369
Thirty-Nine Articles, 76, 80, 98, 153, 293–4, 297–9, 328–30, 357, 362, 368, 371, 375, 394, 412, 512 n., 557, 561, 648, 650, 659, 713, 724
Times, The, 192, 195, 355, 423, 673–4, 681
Tithe. *See* Benefice, endowment of
Tractarianism ('Tract party', 'tract-writing party', 'tractarian party', 'the tractarians'), 38, 48, 60, 74, 76, 161, 205, 250, 366, 368, 432 n. *See* Puseyism, Ritualism, Romanism.
Tracts for Priests and People (ed. Hughes, 1861), 659
Transubstantiation. *See* Eucharist
Trinity, doctrine of, 319–20

Vaults, burial in, 8, 400, 416
Vestries, 3, 30, 36, 254
Visions, 76
Visitations, Archidiaconal, 145; Episcopal, 30, 114, 278, 282, 286, 296, 551, 563, 580, 589, 596
Visiting, 240, 449
Visitor, acts of S. Wilberforce as, 378, 479, 530, 532, 549, 659; App. III
Vows in Church of England, 555, 662. *See* Sisterhoods

Wall-paintings, 580
Wilberforce, S., writings of, 1, 40, 402, 511 n., 667 n. *See* Charges
Wilberforce family affairs, 33–4, 325, 435, 444, 461, 472, 602, 612, 617–18, 620–1, 623, 643, 676, 685, 690
Windows, 67, 333–4, 338–9
Workhouse duty, 304

THE OXFORD ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The Society exists to promote the study of the archaeology, history and architecture of Oxford and its neighbourhood. It is also actively interested in the preservation of the buildings and monuments of historic or artistic interest in Oxford and in commenting on proposed development which is likely to affect them. It holds meetings for lectures and arranges excursions. The journal of the Society is *Oxoniensia*, which is issued free to all members who pay the full annual subscription of two guineas (a reduced subscription of fifteen shillings is payable by members who do not wish to receive *Oxoniensia*). Particular features of the journal are an annual register of archaeological discoveries in the area and a bibliography of publications relevant to the society's interests. Recent articles include:

'Excavations at City Farm, Hanborough, Oxon', by Humphrey Case and others

'Ridge and Furrow in Berkshire and Oxfordshire', by J. E. G. Sutton

'Abingdon and the Riots of 1327', by Gabrielle Lambrick

'Carfax Conduit', by Catherine Cole

'Accounts Relating to an Early Oxford House of Scholars', by A. B. Emden

'Letters of Sarah Churchill, Duchess of Marlborough, on the Column of Victory at Blenheim', by Angela Green

'Turgenev and Oxford', by J. S. G. Simmons.

Applications for membership should be sent to the Hon. Treasurer, Oxford Architectural and Historical Society, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, who also has copies of some of the back numbers of *Oxoniensia* for sale.