

do in his own parish and neighbourhood. He is indeed amply justified in that charity which he spends at home, but can he be said to have laid out his many talents to the best advantage, when he remains with his eyes closed to other and equally important claims which exist abroad? Two sets of claims demand reconciliation at the hands of those who are rich in this world, which can only be attained by acting in the spirit of Him, who said, "These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone."

J. LEE WARNER.

ART. V.—OXFORD AND REFORM.

PERHAPS there is nothing more disappointing in the work of the Commission than the very slight attention which has been paid to the needs of undergraduates. Oxford after all exists mainly for its undergraduates, yet what has the Commission done for them? It would be easy to show what has been done for other people. To please the Radicals, clerical headships and fellowships have been abolished; for professors, larger salaries have been secured, and an attempt has been made to find audiences for them; for tutorial fellows, matrimony and a career have been opened. But what has the undergraduate gained? To him it is a matter of profound indifference whether the far-off dignitary whom he so rarely sees, is a clergyman or a layman, whether the professor whose daughters are so engaging, receives £500 or £1,000 for his not very arduous duties. What the undergraduate really wants is, to be properly taught, to pay a fair price for his food and lodging, to have some one to whom he can appeal for advice, perhaps we may add to be kept out of mischief.

As to tuition, the Commissioners seem to have thought that nothing more was wanted than to increase a lecturing staff which is already large enough, if not too large. It is not from dearth of lectures that undergraduates suffer. There was a time when each college prided itself on supplying all its own tuition. Then it often happened that a tutor unfit for his work compelled reluctant undergraduates to listen to him, or at least to sit in his presence. Lectures of this description were no doubt a waste of time, and trying to the patience. But these days are past. Colleges now combine together for tuition, and it seldom happens that an undergraduate reading for honours is compelled to attend a tutor who has nothing to impart. Good lectures are abundant and easily accessible; and complaints of

being overlectured are far more common than complaints of inadequate lecturing.

But, as the unfortunate pupil's pile of notebooks rises higher and higher, an uneasy sensation comes over him that he is sadly unfamiliar with their contents; not merely lazy men, but some of the most painstaking, never learn anything from a system of lectures. While one lecturer contradicts another, one textbook prescribed by authority confutes another, and the textbooks and lecturers are at war with one another, the examination creeps on, and sheer nervousness paralyzes the minds of some who are very far from being stupid men. They are expected to display a *special* knowledge of more subjects than they could have acquired superficially in the time allowed; they are expected to show a *general* knowledge of more subjects than their brain can carry at the same time. And in the midst of all this learning, general and special, they often feel that they *know* nothing. A well-trained competitive candidate fears little, for he has learnt by experience that the secret of success lies in a little information dexterously adapted to the exigencies of the occasion. Much study of examiners' ways has taught him how to make the most of his slender materials. Even he is conscious very often that his store of real knowledge is very slender, and that he is not a well-taught man. While the patient but inexperienced plodder finds himself in a jungle from which only the mercy of the examiners can extricate him. The golden rule *Non multa sed multum* has been set aside at Oxford, and the consequence is that in spite of brilliant lecturing, and endless examining, the ordinary Oxford undergraduate is not a well-taught man.

Although we have hitherto had in mind honour-men principally, much of what has been said applies to the inferior passmen. For reasons to be indicated presently, the intellectual calibre of such men has not improved in recent years, and efforts have been made to teach them more by requiring them to learn a larger number of subjects. The effort has been only partially successful, because it has been misdirected. Had the standard of admission been raised, schoolmasters must have learnt to make better use of school-time. But this has not been done. With inferior materials to work upon, Oxford tutors have been laboriously trying to produce a better article. They have been endeavouring, upon a more insecure foundation, to raise a larger superstructure, and with the natural result in intellectual edifices, scamped work and much bewilderment. On these points the Commissioners, though warned more than once by witnesses, have not thought fit to legislate: and therefore we say that they have done nothing to secure for undergraduates better teaching.

In the same way the Commissioners, though dealing with college accounts, appear to have done very little towards ascertaining the scale of undergraduate expense at each college, and the precautions (if any) that are taken to secure a fair rate of charges. Possibly so humble a matter as this lay outside their instructions; and they argued that as nobody need go to a college unless he pleased, it was no business of theirs to protect those who might make their own terms. We have no wish at all to see college revenues diverted to pay for the board and lodging of wealthy men, who can well afford to pay for themselves. Some colleges have certainly been generous in bearing burthens for undergraduates, which they need not have borne. But in others it is assumed that all undergraduates are wealthy men, and though the authorities reap no benefit from the extravagance, there is an extravagant style of living and of charges, which bears very heavily on poor men, and specially on scholars. The chief abuse is in the antiquated system of service. A college shoe-black has been known to estimate his place at more than £100 a year, and college cooks have retired on pensions, which were certainly not merited by the dinners which they supplied. There is no question that Keble College by its fixed and low scale of charges has been a benefit to many other than its own undergraduates. Shame, and desire to fill college rooms, have led bursars to attempt feats of reduction, which used to be declared impossible. But in this matter, where simple inquiry would by itself have been beneficial, the Commission has done nothing.

There remains the question of moral supervision. Here we can hardly appreciate the purport of the proposed legislation without weighing carefully the difficulties which had to be faced. Formerly, every undergraduate on arriving at Oxford was assigned to the care of a tutor, who was responsible for his guidance to a very large extent. The tutor gave advice as to lectures which should be attended, the course of reading to be pursued, and was always expected to be ready with friendly counsel and warning as they might be needed. There was, besides the tutor, one or more deans who enforced attendance at chapel, and inflicted punishment for irregularities of conduct. The head of the college never appeared except on grave occasions. At first all, then more than three-quarters, of the undergraduates were expected to live in college. The tutors were bachelors living among the undergraduates, and not in a very different style from them. But this was not the college system which the Commissioners found, nor are parents generally aware, until their sons commence residence, how entirely the old order of things has passed away.

In the first place, many colleges have abandoned the practice of assigning each undergraduate, on his arrival, to a special tutor.

The reason given is that the assignment had become a mere matter of form, as the tutor never saw anything of his pupils except at an occasional breakfast, given often on Sunday morning, out of a sense of duty. Tutors, in fact, had become lecturers, doing a little in the way of private instruction; but all idea of moral or religious guidance had been lost. The change was due partly to the increased amount of lecturing involved by the greater severity of examinations; but we fear that other causes were not wanting, such as an undervaluing of moral as compared with intellectual training; the class-list became the goal of the pupil's ambition, and the end for which the tutor worked.

So largely had this new system been adopted that some colleges were almost deserted by their tutors except during the hours for lecturing. Long before married tutors became common there were loud complaints of the time given by tutors to whist-parties, croquet-parties, visits to London, writing for magazines. These were not, be it remembered, the incompetent idle tutors, but men who were supposed to be the best teachers of their day, because they were the most brilliant writers or speakers. Patient private work was neglected; and moral supervision was supposed to cramp the genius and individuality of the pupil.

Along with moral supervision there perished in many cases the sole relics and survivals of religious teaching. Much, perhaps too much, stress has been laid on this point. No doubt chapel attendance used to be rigorously enforced in old days, whereas it is not as a rule enforced now. But it must not be forgotten that the services were conducted with indecent haste, that irreverent behaviour was hardly checked, and that it must have required what George Herbert calls a "mountain of fire" in the worshipper's heart to receive any benefit from such attendance. Indeed, a strictly logical don has been known to answer an objector to compulsory worship by saying, "Sir, I do not compel you to worship God, but only to be in your place. What you do when you get there is not my concern." At a time when formal lifeless services were supposed to be a pious protest against Methodism, the chapel services were little worse than others. But a better tone of reverence and devoutness spread through the country at large; while Oxford, as a whole, made little change in her chapel services—services read too often by men who privately and in lectures—sometimes even in print—avowed their disbelief in the words which they used as prayers. What mockery could be more profane than that a known unbeliever in the atonement should address our Lord in prayer as having "by one oblation of Himself once offered made a full sacrifice, atonement, and satisfaction for the sins of all mankind." Yet scandals of this nature were so far from being

uncommon in Oxford that they were hardly regarded as scandals among the fellows. In the undergraduate world it was otherwise. The subtle excuses, subterfuges, and reservations which satisfied men accustomed to spend their lives in hairsplitting and metaphysical refinements were to blunt undergraduates nothing but flat falsehoods. On one occasion a lecturer, who had been meandering on to his own satisfaction about the beautiful "mythes" of the Old Testament, was suddenly interrupted by the question, "If these things are all mythes, sir, why do we say in the Ordination Service that we unfeignedly believe them?" It is said that the lecturer began to fumble about for a Prayer-book, while he muttered vaguely "historical sense, you know," and finally dismissed his too simple-minded auditors.

We have passed from chapel services to Divinity lectures, but the transition was inevitable. The two hang together, and the man who displays unbelief in his lecture can hardly hope to impress undergraduates in reading the service. The writer remembers in his college three divinity lecturers. The first kept his class in roars of laughter by quoting mistranslations that he had seen in examination papers. In the interval of these jokes a few notes were read from Alford. All that was original was sceptical. The second can hardly be called a lecturer, for he put off his first lecture, was prevented by a cold from giving the second, sported his oak at the time of the third, and finally hired a country clergyman to take his place. Curiosity brought a fair audience to the poor parson's first lecture, at the second the audience was so meagre that the good man mildly suggested that those who could not come should have sent an explanation, at the third or fourth lecture the college porter carried in a bundle of cards into the empty room where the poor lecturer was waiting. Yet no word of remonstrance was uttered, though the head of the college was a clergyman, and the tutors clergymen. It is hardly wonderful that the dean of this college *punished* undergraduates by making them attend chapels. All these circumstances happened almost twenty years ago, before the abolition of the Tests Act, while Fellows of Colleges were supposed to be all of them members of the Church of England. It was not legislation but unbelief that caused the decay of religious instruction in Oxford.

Presently, that is, some ten years ago, many colleges allowed attendance at roll-call as a substitute for chapel. How ineffective these roll-calls were even as a device for early rising! Left in the hands of a porter or some other underling they became a mere farce. To thrust one's head out of a bedroom window, or to hurry in an ulster coat and slippers across the quadrangle was no proof of early rising: bed was found to be all the sweeter for this slight interruption. A little more method has

been introduced in later years, but there is something very unsatisfactory in the mixed roll-call and chapel system. To avoid chapel is to some men all but a profession of unbelief, they call in arguments to defend what they feel to be an act of irreverence, and a well-disposed lad in his teens turns agnostic sometimes in the course of his first term, as an excuse for constantly turning his back on the chapel door.

It may be objected that all these instances are extreme and exceptional cases, and that they do not fairly reflect the general tone of Oxford. But this is not so. Perfunctory chapels, slovenly Divinity lectures, scandalous irreverence of clergymen, were quite common in Oxford less than twenty years ago, and their opposites were on the whole uncommon. Now there is an improved tone in many colleges. The Honour Divinity school has introduced a better class of lecturers; and again, little as the writer sympathizes with the opinions of Keble College tutors, it is his belief that the marked success of the college made a very decided impression upon Oxford. It was not only the gathering together of a knot of able men with strong religious convictions that gave life and vigour to their action; but, far more than this, the decided preference for religious teaching evinced by English parents was a warning to Fellows of Colleges to set their house in order. They could not afford to despise such a manifest evidence of public opinion.

To secure religious teaching and due performance of chapel services the Commission has proposed, speaking generally, to substitute for Clerical Fellows one or two men, Priests in Holy Orders at the time of their election, who shall be charged with these special duties. Being anxious to secure for these teachers the respect of undergraduates they have as a rule made the Divinity Lecturer a Fellow, or at least given him a place on the governing body. Unfortunately their doing so necessitates his election by the general body of Fellows, of which we spoke in the last Number. But what will this change do for the undergraduate? He can hardly be the loser, so far as religious instruction is concerned, and he may be the gainer sometimes. But we think that the practical value of the change will be exceedingly slight. We cannot hope for much benefit from a teacher chosen by a body utterly unfit to make the choice.

If real pressure is to be brought to bear on the colleges it must be looked for in something very different from the statute book. We have already drawn attention to the influence exerted by Keble College in lowering the general standard of expenses at Oxford, and in rebuking irreverence and slovenliness of worship. It was not, we repeat, the few tutors so much as English parents, who, by their confidence in these tutors, impressed the mind of

Oxford. Can anything more be done? Has the Commission left room for any further exercise of this wholesome pressure either by its statutes or by its omitting to legislate.

There is one direction in which this influence can be exerted. Some years ago it was made unnecessary for undergraduates to reside within college walls. They may have either no connection at all with any college, or they may belong to a college but reside in lodgings. One result of this statute has been that colleges have become very sensitive to public opinion. Any *émeute* within college walls which finds its way to the newspapers is soon felt in the matriculation lists. Tutors have been spurred on for their very livelihood to conform to the requirements of public opinion, in all matters which reach or can be known by the outside world. So far the change has been productive of good. Contempt for public opinion, which used to be considered a proof of intellectual vigour, is now more justly regarded as conceit.

On the other hand, it is greatly to be feared that undergraduates have suffered in another direction. Life in lodgings is hardly a safe experiment for grown boys. No doubt there are many, very many, respectable landladies in Oxford, who watch over undergraduates in their houses with all the fidelity of an old family servant. The writer knows many such, and honours them. But it is mere matter of common sense that many will have an eye to money-making before all other considerations, and some will be positively vicious.¹

¹ On this point Dr. Pusey's evidence before the Commission is as follows:—"Either all the founders and all the builders of our colleges have made a great mistake, or we are making a great mistake now, because the manners and morals are certainly not better now than they were when they founded those colleges, or when they built those colleges, and they had that especially as one of the objects in view. I remember in the Oriel College Statutes it was, Let everything, as far as possible, *fiat per mares*. It would not be proverbial, *solus cum sola*, unless there was a great deal in it, and yet the young men must be more or less familiarly waited upon by domestics, and of course a certain degree of intercourse would be necessary not to be uncourteous. You could not let a person come into the room, and say nothing. There is also a disadvantage about the class of servants, because the servants are only terminal servants at each place. Since our vacations are one-half of the year, for the most part they are not the higher sort of maid-servant, because if they could get a place anywhere else they would not take service in a lodging-house. It is said that there has not been any immorality. I should be glad to think that there had not. I have no ground to think that there has been, except human nature; but all the evidence which the curators of them can have, relates to what passes without, but the special danger is that which is in the house, which nobody knows anything about. I do not say that there is immorality, but I say also that there is no evidence that there is not."

This evidence was confirmed in the speech of the out-going Senior

It is here, to our opinion, that the Commission has been most to blame. Not one effort has been made, apparently, to induce colleges to increase the number of their rooms, and so diminish the necessity for lodging-house life. On the contrary, great pains have been taken to strengthen and perpetuate the system of unattached students. Money has been taken from the colleges and applied not merely for extraneous purposes, but actually to assist students *not* to enter colleges. Bribes in the shape of a library, tutors, and scholarships are to be offered out of college revenues against college interests. Apart from the unfairness of the measure, we question its wisdom. There is nothing in the system of unattached students which deserves encouragement. It is not desirable in itself that young men should live in Oxford without friends, without proper supervision, without common life, exposed to many of the worst temptations of the place, and effectually shielded from none. There is nothing to save these students from idleness and extravagance, while there is much to encourage them to far graver faults. Nor is it a sufficient answer that, on the whole, they are a well-conducted body. Of course they are. They are poor men, as a rule, who would not come to Oxford at all, unless they had a serious purpose in doing so: a very large proportion of them look forward to Holy Orders. But are these the men whom it is wise to cast unprotected into Oxford life? who are to be less cared for, less benefited by social intercourse than other men? who are to be studiously kept out of college walls? Why, they are the very men for whose benefit colleges were founded, out of pity for whom, and to make them more profitable to the Church of England, innumerable founders and benefactors piously made provision.

That provision, for the most part, has been alienated. Part has gone to support the study of Natural Science. This declining study is as much the pet of the University now, as ever Theology was in the old days. Thousands of pounds are spent year after year in the University Museum, for which there is nothing to show. No discoveries are made, very little work is done, few students, fewer now than for many years past, are being taught. But on this idle luxury part of the endowments of poor men is annually wasted. Another part has been en-

Proctor this year. While speaking well on the whole of undergraduate morals, he distinctly attributed much evil to the lodging-house system. It may be asked, "What proof is there that these evils exist?" Unfortunately, the answer is only too simple. It is enough to know the style of dress and living in many Oxford lodging-houses, and to compare this with the nominal incomes of those who keep these houses. Those who understand Oxford best as citizens, do not hesitate to admit that the evil is great and, alas! increasing.

grossed by wealthy men in the shape of scholarships and prizes. Meanwhile, with the best intentions, but by very unfortunate advice, this Commission has said to these men: "Stay away from the colleges, which were founded for your benefit. Live in dreary isolation. Unlearn nothing of your uncouth manners, and be guided by no advice from elders. Your reward shall be a paring from that which was given for your use. You shall have a bone off the plate, but you must eat it out of doors."

Surely the generosity of the English Church is not yet exhausted. Surely the dangers, may we not say the wrongs, of poor students, will not appeal in vain to the successors of wealthy men in past days. Hitherto almost every great crisis in English history has been marked by a fresh foundation for poor men intended for the ministry of our Church. Merton College and the Baronial wars, New College and the Lollard movement, Corpus, Christ Church, Trinity College, and the Reformation are not merely coincident in time. Dangers threatening to Church and State have been felt as a direct appeal to the faith and piety of God-fearing men. Or is it the case that at this crisis one section only of the Church of England is wise enough to continue, under proper modifications and safeguards, the old time-honoured policy? We are glad to think that it is not so. The munificent benefactor of Hertford College has shown that it is not Ritualists alone who are alive to the existence of a crisis in our Church History.

But we do firmly insist that enough has not yet been done; that a beginning, however modest, should be made, of gathering into collegiate homes during their Oxford life, our future clergy, and poorer laity too. Let one or two houses first of all be placed under a Master of Arts, carefully selected for the purpose. Let him take under his shelter a few poor men, who would otherwise have been unattached students, and give them the benefit of a common though frugal life of kind superintendence, and above all of faithful and scriptural instruction in the principles of our Church. We will answer for it that the attempt, however modestly begun, will meet so urgent a need, that no trumpeting of advertisements will be required to ensure its success. The few houses will grow up into a fair-sized hall, which, by being placed in the hands of trustees, will escape the political birds of prey, who are constantly hovering over the old colleges. Such a hall or halls will serve a double purpose. Not only will the actual residents be protected, instructed, helped forward as they ought to be, but the older colleges will be forced, as in part they have been already, to be less violent or flippant in their anti-religious crusade. There is a party in Oxford, not large as yet, but compact and very determined, which is seeking

to drive out clergy from all educational offices throughout the country. If our Church shows the white feather and does not build up as fast they pull down, our children's children will be educated, not by laymen merely, that were a small matter, but by materialists and atheists.

M.A. OXON.

ART. VI.—“ALMS AND OBLATIONS.”

A CRITICISM.

THE Dean of Chester contributed an article to the January number of *THE CHURCHMAN*, drawing out what he considers to be “the true meaning of the phrase” *alms and oblations* “in our book of common prayer”; and my Very Reverend friend has paid me the compliment of inviting my criticism on his arguments. We have often been antagonists in Convocation, —perhaps nearly as often have spoken and voted together—and he most good-naturedly tells me to do my worst, and the Editor, at his request, has very courteously placed these pages at my disposal for the purpose.

In my remarks I shall endeavour to keep within the lines marked out by the Dean, without touching on the doctrinal considerations that underlie the question, and “simply inquire what our prayer book says and means in this particular.”

It may be well to clear the way by explaining that the conclusions which I had arrived at many years ago, and as yet have seen no reason to abandon, must not be confounded with the opinion of those who hold that the “*oblations*” of the prayer refer exclusively to the gifts then set on the holy table. It was against them that the Dean’s argument was in the first instance directed; and though my disclaimer relieves me from the necessity of meeting a part of his argument, I have to admit that it brings me under the lash of an afterthought which appears as a note in the reprint of his essay:—“Some have thought that the “term *oblations* in our prayer book includes both the bread and “wine, and also money offerings. This seems to me the worst “theory of all. It has all the features of a helpless compromise, “and is refuted at every turn of the argument.”

This is plain-spoken. We, however, have to deal with the proofs. The Dean, no doubt, shows, with great variety of illustration, that *oblatio* in Latin, *oblations* in English, and the “collective phrase” *alms and oblations* were used, both before and after the last revision, of devout gifts for pious and charitable