

## ARTICLE V.

## MY TIME AT RUGBY (1869-74).

BY THE REV. HENRY HAYMAN, D. D.

## SECOND PAPER.

FROM what was said in my previous article,<sup>1</sup> it will be manifest, that on the soundness of loyalty in the School-house depended largely the diffusion of the same feeling in the School at large; and that, to insure that loyalty, the two School-house tutors must be of the same mind with the Headmaster and the conduits of his influence,—each, in fact, an *alter ego* to him. This the two gentlemen in question were obviously incapable of being. They had joined the league of the disaffected and cast in their lot with the opposition. If I had the power to dismiss both of them, the best course would have been to do so at once. But the senior of the two was a “foundation” master, and claimed to be only removable by the trustees who had appointed myself. I have stated the fatal weakness in their position, owing to their being a moribund body, expecting dissolution in two years’ time, which disinclined them to any energetic action, and in particular to this exercise of their authority.

This being so, it seemed inadvisable to remove at once and summarily the junior only. Besides, after the pacific offer I had held out, I felt bound in honor to give it time to work, although with less and less hope of any acceptance of it. On the contrary, I had little doubt that before

<sup>1</sup> *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. lvi. pp. 505-531.

long the junior tutor would give me some fresh ground, personal and tangible, for declaring his retention impossible ; so I waited, and took the risk of a School-house outbreak, for indeed I had still less doubt that my own relations with the boys would strengthen my position as time went on. I was therefore no whit surprised one morning to hear that the gentleman in question addressed one of his pupils in my own House as follows: "*If I was on speaking terms with the Headmaster, I should send you up for punishment.*" I invite all who read to ponder the import of these words as between teacher and boy taught; and to regard them only as a sample of the total absence of reticence, in short of the outspoken avowal of disaffection and disloyalty, by one who claimed to be my most confidential agent, with which I was now confronted. That gentleman received his dismissal not long afterwards. At once the volleys of the hostile press opened afresh upon me, charging me with dismissing a well-deserving colleague "without assigning any reason, true or false."

Later in the same year a parent known to the *other* House tutor came to Rugby, and inquired of him about the differences between the staff and myself ; and, on receiving his version of them, at once dropped the project of sending a boy to Rugby. I know this from the parent's own information. But probably not one parent in a hundred would have had the candor to give it. Here then was an influence at work among those closely associated with myself, affecting to fill posts of confidence, and abusing it as above, to the detriment of discipline and the diminution of the numbers in the School. To retain such a man was to efface myself, and to let the School go to ruin. I therefore gave him notice to quit his post. At the same time, as he was a "foundation" master, I appealed to the trustees to remove him, in case I had not the power, without any stigma on his character, on the sole ground of incompati-

bility. They accepted my view at the outset. Indeed, without stultifying themselves, they could not do otherwise. Then, on a technical punctilio, that "a foundation master was removable only at a summer meeting of their body," it stood over. Another term passed, and their own position was still nearer to extinction. They were about to be superseded in the autumn following by a new Governing Body; and I found there was not a flicker of energy left in them.

The *Daily Craze*<sup>1</sup> (March 16, 1871) published a version of the matter absolutely false, that "the charges made [by me] against Mr. ———, were shown to be utterly frivolous and groundless," and that "I failed to make a single point against him." Of course the chance of a fling at myself to the damage of the School was too tempting to be let slip. The interests of the School were as little to these *condottieri* of the press as those of truth. Faction indeed is like gambling; it tends to absorb and dry up into itself every less ignoble motive and every more ingenious scruple. Of course I could not prove that the press-gang and the recalcitrant masters were in *entente cordiale* and worked together; but it would be mere affectation to suppose that their concurrence was fortuitous.

I always endeavor, in estimating such a case as this of the House tutors, to put myself in their place. If I had been one of them, therefore, could I, after resisting and defying my chief, and impeaching his honesty, honor, etc., have reasonably expected him to maintain me in my post and its emoluments, as if nothing of the sort had occurred? So put, the question seems to answer itself. One may illustrate it by Shylock's mock-argument:—

"Fair sir, you spat on me on Wednesday last;  
You spurn'd me such a day; another time  
You call'd me dog; and for these courtesies  
I'll lend you thus much monies!"

<sup>1</sup> A pseudonym for a well-known London daily.

And yet this I found was exactly what the new Governing Body, when they became my masters, in effect called on me to do: "Here we are in office over you. Henceforth we require you to treat these two years of conspiracy as non-existent, and the conspirators as loyal colleagues, who have given you that 'cordial' and not 'nominal' support which our predecessors charged them with having withheld. Otherwise expect your own dismissal." This was the tenor of their acts translated into words. The reference to 'cordial' and 'nominal' support will be explained by the sequel.

Meanwhile, as a sample of ill-bred insolence, take the following, which reached me from more than one source, the original reporters being necessarily the boys who witnessed it. In the hours left vacant from the Headmaster's teaching the Upper boys, he would customarily teach a lesson in some one of the Lower class-rooms. This the Headmaster was doing one day, and, on his withdrawal after completing it, the form-master, who had been present, instead of dismissing his boys, exclaimed, "Now then, we'll have it over again, as it *ought* to be done!" and kept them in overtime to work through it again—for which reason, of course, they were pretty sure to remember the fact. It is so obvious that any flippant coxcomb with due conceit of his own powers could have done the same, that one wonders at any one stooping to the artifice who had the *status* and breeding of a gentleman with a brilliant academic record.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The curious fact is that the real date of this occurrence was *before* my time, and that Dr. (afterwards Dean) Goulburn, as I have reason to believe, was the Head to whom the insult was offered by his subordinate. That subordinate of Dr. Goulburn's time attained since and still holds high position. He was among the most active of my opponents outside Rugby in 1869-74. But I have heard the anecdote told more than once with *my own* name substituted for that of my lamented predecessor. That portion of it, I believe, I may safely contradict. But it suited so

The dismissal of the junior House tutor had taken place in the last term of 1870. I had thus waited a whole year before taking any decisive action. In the same term I gave notice of dismissal, as stated above, to the senior. In the very next term (1871) certain turbulent symptoms in the School-house, in which they held confidential office, drew to a head, and, stimulated by the malignant vigilance of the press, attracted public attention. This, after investigation held, drew the following official pronouncement from the trustees, which they directed to be published, coupled with the statement that it was agreed to unanimously :—

“The Trustees, having had their attention called to certain complaints of want of discipline in the School-house, met this day to consider the same. Having carefully investigated the case and taken evidence thereon, they are of the opinion that the irregularities complained of are not such as to call for any special interference on their part, or to cause alarm to the parents of the boys, being only of a character which must at times be expected in a large school. They think that no case has been made out in the matter of the complaints of the Sixth Form, and they consider that the grievances alleged in two other cases referring to the discipline of the School-house have been sufficiently explained. They think also that *the undermasters should never confer with the boys, not even with the Sixth Form, on points of school discipline, without the knowledge of the Headmaster.* The Trustees feel it now their duty, in justice to the Headmaster, to impress upon the undermasters generally *the necessity, for the good of the School, of giving to the Headmaster not only a nominal but a cordial coöperation.*”

The words which I italicize above have no relevancy, except as directly suggesting that a sinister influence had been exerted on the Sixth Form, by some of the “undermasters” referred to, behind my back ; and that the alleged “irregularities” or “grievances” were, at any rate in great part, traceable to that influence. The last sentence

closely the attitude of several on my teaching staff, that the mistake was not unnatural. The then assistant to Dr. Goulburn was himself an *alumnus* of Rugby, and the anecdote, which I believe is true, remains as an example of Rugbeian manners “of the baser sort.”

also directly suggests that a "nominal," and not a "cordial coöperation," was all that my authority had so far received from "the undermasters generally." Taken in connection with the facts which I have recited above, in evidence of the attitude adopted by some of the staff towards the boys or their parents, the pronouncement is clearly condemnatory of "the undermasters generally" and vindicative of myself. But when I urged them, as I did contemporaneously, to follow up words by action, and rid me of the one undermaster whose confidential position had stood in the most glaring contrast with the attitude he had assumed, they first assented, then postponed, and finally evaded any such action. In short they gave my authority that bare "nominal" support with which they taxed the "undermasters."

I may now expend a few sentences in explanation of "the irregularities complained of" as being "only of a character which must at times be expected in a large school," and "the matter of the complaint of the Sixth Form." It will occasionally happen that these Upper boys, to whom authority is intrusted, however individually amiable and excellent in *personnel*, are yet, collectively, below par in moral force. If this coincides with the presence, in the ranks immediately below, of brute force and rough, coltish outfling, then any Headmaster knows that he may look out for troubles. And when both these sources of mischief are aggravated by the lack of "cordial coöperation" on the part of those assistants in a large boarding-house who should be the pillars of its discipline, what wonder if ill-blood ferments quickly, and explosive forces gather head? Amidst these elements of discord a mere negative attitude is culpable. The sentinel who stands mute and gives no challenge is only less, if less, guilty than the one who quits his post to be the enemy's spy. To withhold the warning, and leave unspoken the word

which would stimulate loyalty or rekindle allegiance, is directly blameworthy in proportion as the exigencies of the situation call for such efforts. Thus, if the lack of moral fiber above concurrent with exuberant animal forces below, inevitably tends to general friction, and cannot but produce its results; yet who can doubt that active loyalty on the part of older heads would have neutralized the worst of those results; and in particular would have checked or arrested that inflammatory action of the newspapers, on the minds alike of boys and parents, which supplied the most mischievous of the *irritamenta malorum* of Rugby in the spring term of 1871?

One of the rougher colts in the troop next, or next but one, below the Sixth Form, flung out his heels against their authority in the School-house. I removed him promptly from the House as a source of danger to its discipline, but allowed him, by a private arrangement, to continue to attend the School, while I considered what further satisfaction was due to the authority he had defied. I was obliged to act thus warily, as well knowing that, whatever course I took would within a week find its way into the press with probably malignant distortion, and certainly with hostile comment, whether for or against the culprit. After some evasive shuffling, he submitted to the jurisdiction of the Sixth, and begged to be allowed "to take a licking" from them, which was, and probably still is, a tradition of discipline at Rugby—of course with the sanction of the higher authorities. To my surprise, when this submission had been made, I found that they now hesitated to inflict the penalty. This was embarrassing; because, having submitted himself to the *lèse majesté* of the preceptors whom he had offended, he could not reasonably be made the object of further penal consequences, when the *lâche* was their own. He was allowed, under the circumstances, to continue at the School until the end of the

term, but not to return. To have expelled him summarily *after* submission, would have been a glaring outrage on simple justice. But this was what the august depositories of the Rugby tradition demanded. However, I settled the matter on the basis of what was needful for the School, and least injurious to the boy-culprit. And here it would have ended, but that a Sixth-former of the School-house, against the adage which forbids carrying tales out of school, wrote home to his father a complaint that his authority was not duly supported, i. e. by me. I suppose that he was the one in whose person that authority had been defied by the aforesaid "colt," but my School diary, in which I have still a record of all the leading features of the case, has omitted that circumstance. This brought the father up to Rugby, intent, as I soon found, on laying his view of the facts, including his son's complaint, before the trustees. This explains the reference to the "parents" in the pronouncement of the trustees already given.

Another affair caused me the graver anxiety which arises when malignity and treachery combine in a criminal act against an individual; and constitute a grosser outrage than the outbreak of a school rowdy against authority. Probably in this case, also, a similar recalcitrance was the first motive; but the act took the shape of emptying the contents of a Sixth-form boy's inkstand, in his absence from his study, over his books, pictures, and papers. This was, after some slight delay, conclusively traced to three delinquents, one of whom had stood as sentinel without, while the other two wrought havoc within. Condign punishment of course followed on all. But the original victim—a rather oversensitive, but I believe conscientious and amiable, boy, who had by some disciplinal act provoked the rowdyism of these juniors—could not be prevailed upon to return next term. After this offense, but before its detection, I received a respectfully worded but



somewhat sinister memorial from, I think, nearly all the Sixth Form, inquiring whether I intended to diminish their authority. By a curious coincidence I had that very day addressed my own House in support of that same authority, emphasizing penalties against some delinquents refractory at the "calling-over" of the previous evening. (This term is given to the periodical muster of the House or of the School at large, the former intrusted commonly to a prepostor, who notes and reports absentees.) I find it on record that I spoke my mind pretty freely to the Sixth Form collectively on the receipt of this memorial, among other remarks, "that it would be a discredit to the School, wherever known; that Mr. Sargent, their own arbiter,<sup>1</sup> was shocked at it; and that if they looked for support, they must give it to me as Headmaster." These last words, implying that they had been wanting in their allegiance, were the strongest that I ever had to address to them; and were spoken under an impression of some sinister influence which had tampered with it. What that influence in the opinion of the trustees was, after "having carefully investigated the case and taken evidence thereon," their own words, italicized above, seem to leave no doubt about.

I will not dwell on the various tributary worries which fell into the main current of anxiety and made this term one of exceptional disquietude. It was the only one in which my relations with the boys under my charge were at all troubled or perplexed. Any one who has his heart in a similar charge will easily understand my feelings. For the undermasters' opposition I had less and less concern as the school terms passed on. But the possible success

<sup>1</sup> What particular had been referred to the arbitration of this gentleman, an assistant master of my own appointment, and deservedly a favorite with the boys, my School diary does not record; and as he is now deceased I cannot ask him. The words addressed as above to the Sixth appear in that diary in inverted commas, as if *ipsisima* at the time.

of their machinations in the alienation of the boys was a new chapter of acute trial.

And here I may refer to a difficulty which Judge Hughes,<sup>1</sup> in his "Memoir of a Brother,"<sup>2</sup> records as having beset Dr. Arnold in regard to some of his prepostors. It seems to have arisen from a similar disbalance of forces, as between the Sixth Form and the boys below them, to that which I experienced early in 1871; and cost that "brother" not only his place in the School, but the loss of the School-exhibition (a sort of minor scholarship or "bursary"), to which that place would have entitled him. There was a more serious disturbance, if not two, under Dr. (later Archbishop) Tait, Arnold's next successor, which may be read among the Rugby chapters of his biography.<sup>3</sup> But the art of inflaming scholastic difficulties by newspaper controversy was then unknown. I suppose that came in as part of the triumph of "popular principles" in the years 1868-69. In the times of these, my illustrious predecessors, the "windbag of Æolus" had not yet been untied, which in my own was blackening the sky with its blustering uproar, *Una Eurusque Notusque ruunt*, etc. And as the study of events would be incomplete without some specimens of this malignant influence, I will cull a few of them here. The extracts are genuine, but under pseudonymous titles.

A writer in the *Daily Craze* of March 31 naïvely confessed himself an intimate friend of some of my antagonists, claiming to be "one who, from visits to Rugby and correspondence with intimate friends among the masters, has reason to regard their attitude to their chief [myself] as unimpeachably loyal"(!). Of this "loyal attitude"

<sup>1</sup> Author of *Tom Brown's School Days* and other well-known works. A statue to his memory has lately been erected in the School Close.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 32 foll. of that work.

<sup>3</sup> See also *History of Rugby School*, pp. 294-296.

some samples have been already given; and I have also shown the judgment of the trustees upon the same. Thus the train was, by the frank avowal of one of them, duly laid between the hostile faction in the School and in the press. *Habemus confitentem reum.* There may have been a score of such, not all equally frank in their avowals. Another writer in the same print

"would advise Dr. Hayman to look to himself. The trustees who appointed him will in a short time be succeeded by a Governing Body of a very different composition. There is no doubt of their power to dismiss a Headmaster, even if no charges of incompetency were brought against him. We are not sure that it would not be a sufficient reason for his removal that he was violently altering the traditions," etc.

This last menace, as will be seen by those who read to the end, exactly foreshadows the pretext on which I was, in fact, dismissed in 1874—so closely, as to leave little doubt that the writer was "hand and glove" united with the faction which procured the dismissal.

Even the commonest incidents of School life were made subjects of malignant insinuation. Thus the medical officer's resignation was greeted as follows in a professional print:—

"Dr. F., it is announced, has resigned his position as Medical Officer of Rugby School. The prospects of the School are by no means so bright just now as they were under Dr. Temple; and we hope that it will be found possible to fill Dr. F.'s place with an equally good man."

Here "we *hope*" of course means "we *doubt*." The absolute contrary to the insinuation was the fact. I was embarrassed only by the abundance of eligible candidates. The gentleman then chosen has, I believe, retained the post ever since, and even the Headmaster changed three times over in his tenure of office.

The *Daily Craze*, not content with spiteful comment on existing facts, plunged into fiction as follows:—

"We hear that Dr. Hayman is about to appeal to the law courts, with a view to setting aside the decision of the trustees annulling his dismissal of one of the masters of the School."

This was utterly false in every particular. The trustees had not "annulled" any such "dismissal," nor come to any "decision" on any such subject; therefore any such "appeal" was impossible.

The *Vox* was

"sorry to hear that the differences, . . . in this School, have extended to the boys, and that recently a disturbance occurred in the School-house which has resulted in the expulsion of several pupils."

This was so damaging, as well as so false, that I directed a contradiction of it. The *Vox*, nothing daunted, returned to the charge with the following decorative additions:—

"Our information is that recently something very like a barring-out occurred in the School-house at Rugby, that the boys turned on the water, and turned off the gas, and that the *émeute* terminated in the expulsion . . . of several boys, whose names were offered, but not required by us."

My readers will perhaps remember the lively sallies of fictitious circumstance in a scene of the "School for Scandal"; in which, "Sir Peter's ball struck against a little bronze Shakespeare that stood over the fireplace, grazed out of the window at a right angle, and wounded the post-man," etc., etc., all equally veracious with the details of the supposed *émeute* at Rugby. They will not fail to see that the stimulative fictions about "water" and "gas" were intended to suggest methods of unruliness to the boys, and in fact to force on an outbreak. The affectation of intimate knowledge conveyed in the lines which I italicize was merely a touch of audacious mendacity, added to give *vraisemblance* to the main falsehood.

Such were the despicable weapons to which the combatants stooped with whom I had to contend. Throughout the months January to April, 1871, this newspaper "sniping" was vigorously kept up, and no chance missed of putting in a spiteful shot—careless how it might damage the School or unsettle the boys (as, I think, is evident

from the above cuttings), if it only served to discredit or annoy myself.

That, amidst such direct incentives to lawless outbreaks, for the boys of course saw all the above in black and white at once, discipline was yet vindicated and wholesome order maintained, is the best proof I can offer that discipline and order had not passed into the incompetent hands depicted by Dr. Temple in his arrogantly depreciative letter to the trustees, denouncing my appointment as disastrous, fifteen months before. He had everything at hand to convert his prediction into fulfilment—a ring of ready zealots among the masters whom he left, another of (I dare say well-earned) admirers among the boys, and a third of literary swashbucklers in the press, not scrupulous, as has been shown, about flinging mud, of any kind or color, when inspired by the cheerful hope that *some* would stick. With all these to aid him, and the first and last playing directly up to “a mutiny in the camp,” none took place. The above was the nearest approach to a nibble of verification which his words of ill omen ever received.

Next term matters settled down. Changes in the *personnel* of the Sixth Form tended to redress the disbalance of moral forces. On May 18, 1871, my diary records:—

“At 7.45 received information of boys crowding about Great Gates, and louts (i.e. town-rabble) opposite at head of High Street, and collision imminent. Went out at once—several of Sixth there—whom I bade send the boys to their houses. This they readily did. The townspeople then dispersed.”

Thus we were soon a happy family again.

When in your own neighborhood there has been a “tempest in a teapot,” and you get its facts wafted back with some preciseness of detail, not through newspapers, but by private hand, from a long distance off, you naturally suppose that some one on the spot near you has supplied the information. The more closely it tallies with local facts

not generally known, the more certain is the inference. But if the same back-waft mentions a Mr. A. B., a notorious local busybody, as having furnished the narrative, you accept this as yielding a natural explanation of the foregoing. This is a logical process complete in itself, and the particular channel through which the back-waft reached you is wholly outside it. That channel may be trustworthy or the reverse; but your conclusion rests on two facts, independent of such trustworthiness, (1) the agreement of the details back-wafted with what really occurred, and (2) their being such as Mr. A. B. was in a position to know.

This exactly represents what happened at Rugby, Mr. A. B. being represented by an assistant master. But the facts one and two being undeniable, his advocates in the press and out of it naturally fastened on what was wholly irrelevant, the channel, viz., through which it had reached me. This was denounced as being "gossip" and "tattle," as if it mattered one straw whether it was so or not! But the cry served to raise odium and throw dust in the eyes of the public. The press-gang were eloquent in denouncing me for giving credence to mere idle rumor, when the evidence lay in the cogency of the facts themselves. Mr. A. B., challenged on the subject, denied any responsibility. But there remained the ugly question, "Why then should he have been fixed on *by name*, being wholly unknown in the quarter from which the back-waft reached me?" And to this no answer was forthcoming. These were facts of 1870. In about eighteen months later a recurrence of the same symptoms took place; save that now the reporting source was an informant whom I had then every reason to trust, volunteering the statement to me in my own house, in fact springing it upon me as a disagreeable surprise, and again naming the same Mr. A. B. as the one who had supplied the information, to which my informant's statement

referred. This became the subject of an intricate and protracted controversy, conducted by the new Governing Body (constituted in office by the end of 1871) with the resolute injustice of men pledged to a persecuting policy, as will further appear. But I must first say a word upon one passage of that constitution in office.

One moiety, or nearly, was composed of the old trustees, the other of members appointed by election. Each university—Oxford, Cambridge, and London—chose one such. So did the Lord Chancellor, and so the Royal Society; and one was reserved for “the Head and Assistant masters” to choose. I held that the Head could not elect independently of the assistant masters, nor they of him, and that, whatever the strictly legal right might be, it could only be beneficially exercised by our acting conjointly. In the hope, therefore, of securing agreement, I tendered the names of the very pick and flower of Old Rugbeians then in public life, including the then Earl of Derby, Dean Stanley, and Dr. Vaughan, then Master of the Temple Church, well known as favorite pupils of Dr. Arnold, Sir Roundell Palmer, later Earl of Selborne, Canon Norris, and Mr. Theodore Walrond, who had been the candidate favored by Dr. Temple and the assistants themselves, when I was elected Headmaster. To these I added Sir Henry Maine, at once of European and Asiatic celebrity. My colleagues would have none of them. They were bent on a candidate, who, owing to his official connection with Dr. Temple, was unacceptable to me. They held a meeting of their own apart from me, and returned him as *their* representative (falsely purporting, therefore, to be chosen by the *Head and Assistant masters*); and, in spite of my protest and objection, he took his seat at the Board.

My first passage of friction with the new Body was in the spring of 1872, when, a boarding-house falling vacant, it lay with me to appoint to it from among the assistants.

I selected one, of my own appointment, on whom I could rely for loyal support, passing over several of the hostile clique, then seniors—on the staff. This of course gave umbrage to those thus passed over. Shortly after I received a letter from the chairman of the Governing Body (the then Bishop of Worcester), requesting me to make no appointment until the "Regulations" then preparing should be completed. Of course the purpose was to frame some "regulation" restricting the Headmaster's free action in such cases. I wrote back to say that the appointment was already made. A number of the assistants then addressed a memorial of grievance to them, posing as faithful men whose claims of long service had been disregarded. These were the very men whom, less than a year before, the trustees had censured as giving only "nominal support" to the Headmaster. The Governors passed a sulky minute, to the effect that "they refrained from expressing approval of the Headmaster's discretion in this case." No one wanted them to "express approval." The matter was strictly within my competency, and all they had to do was to let it alone. I may add by the way, that the "regulations" in question were not yet completed in January, 1874, and that to keep a boarding-house even half that time without a responsible head would have been absurd. The minute of course could only be viewed as hostile, and as patronizing the complaint of the hostile clique. That is no doubt why it was at once surreptitiously published in a local paper a few days later—I have reason to believe by the agency or contrivance of Bishop Temple or some other of my opponents on the Board; who, as I shall further show, stuck at nothing to damage one whom their official position enabled them to persecute with impunity. They were prepared, as I shall further show, to violate for this the rules of official honor and confidence which had hitherto always prevailed among the Rugby Governors. Possibly,



of course, some of the hostile clique of masters may have been the agents of the piracy of the minute. But no one will think it likely that they would thus have presumed, unless secure of the countenance or connivance of their patrons on the Board. Taking all the facts into view, readers will, I think, regard this minute as passed in order that it might thus leak out into publicity to my detriment. It was in itself so purely negative as to have no operative force; but, served up in the public prints with *ex-parte* comments, it had of course a disquieting character. Most certainly the Board never made any inquiry as to who thus pirated a record in their own official keeping; which exactly squares with the notion that some of them, or their creatures, contrived it, and the rest connived at it.

In the same spring of 1872 fell the public solemn thanksgiving in St. Paul's Cathedral for the recovery of the heir to the throne from a dangerous illness. We were not at Rugby, like Eton and Harrow, close to London, the former indeed under the wing of royalty at Windsor. I had decided therefore to give no leave or facilities for boys or masters to attend, but keep my school outside the show. But late one Saturday night came an official telegram that a number of tickets for the Cathedral, distributable among the public schools, were posted already to me for use on Tuesday following. This being equivalent to a royal invitation turned our disciplinal flank most suddenly. The intervention of Sunday gave time to consider, and early on Monday the needful arrangements were made. It became no longer possible to refuse leave to boys who had invitations from relatives, etc., in London, and indeed, all the higher forms being broken up, it became the policy rather to encourage these, in order that the minimum of the disappointed might be left, to give trouble in our absence. In order to insure against being too late, it was necessary to travel to London on the Monday. I made a

short address to the boys at the last calling-over, appealing to their loyalty and good order; as the fair fame of Rugby would be for some two days in their keeping rather than in mine. Some half-dozen of the number who went earned impositions by returning late; but the number who stayed, some three-fifths of the whole, gave the few masters and prepostors among them no trouble at all; and I had not, although I returned with an anxious heart after a thirty hours' absence, a single report of any misconduct. I of course knew that any lapse of discipline would be eagerly pounced upon to my discredit. And, indeed, if discipline had not been in a thoroughly wholesome state, such a strain suddenly put upon it would have revealed a flaw somewhere. Here, therefore, again I submit that, had I been so deficient in tact and judgment as malignant depreciation had represented, this was just the occasion to explode my incapacity. I will only add that I took care, among the dense throngs massed in all accessible parts of the great cathedral, to look up my own little flock, high up in a spar-built gallery under an arch supporting the dome. The greatest surprise to me was that the press-gang for once let us alone. I suppose there was too much big-game in the open, for the "snipers" to think us just then worth their powder and shot.

In the summer of this year, busy with the forwarding of the "Tercentenary buildings," including an enlargement of the School chapel,<sup>1</sup> I entertained as a guest Dr. Vaughan, of whom mention is made above. He recounted some interesting anecdotes of his own period, and of Dr. Arnold in particular, for which I regret that I cannot here find space. I rather think I discussed with him my purpose of using the restored chapel daily instead of the morning prayers in

<sup>1</sup>The actual Tercentenary of the Foundation occurred in 1867, when a large subscription was collected, under the auspices of a committee of Old Rugbeians, the proceeds of which were thus applied.

Big School—a rite scanty in reverential associations. When later, although my own mind was made up, I put this change to a vote at a masters' meeting, I found my colleagues just two to one against it, and fertile in objections which I could not regard as serious. The consecration of the restored chapel (on October 19, 1872, a Saturday) was by the Bishop of Worcester, who preached from Ex. xx. 24, "In all places where I record my Name," etc., the best address I ever heard from him. In it he referred to "the dedication of the restored building in a solemn manner to the celebration of Divine Worship *day by day*, it was to be hoped, henceforth for ever." One might infer that he would not have rated my colleagues' objections more seriously than I did myself. I had to propose his and Mr. Newdegate's (local M.P.) health, as the trustees and governors present. In their replies both alike avoided saying a word in recognition of my difficulties, or in support of my authority, or in rebuke and deprecation of the party strife of which I had been made the victim, or even of the guerilla warfare kept up by the press-gang. The plain inference was that they had been captured by the Temple faction. The assistant masters had naturally on such an occasion parties of old pupils in their own Houses. Some, however, accepted my invitation, and when the Headmaster's health was proposed, ostentatiously declined the usual compliance. One of these was Mr. J. M. Wilson; and when some one, later, challenged the fact as unseemly, he, as reported to me, said, he "was very sorry, but there was no sherry at his table." Of course he had only to ask for it. He is now Archdeacon of Manchester, but in 1872 was a layman.

On a later occasion, when I invited all the staff—I think it was to meet the Bishop of Worcester, coming to confirm the boys—only those of my own appointment accepted; the rest found some excuse and were absent. On the Sun-

day following, the Bishop of Rochester (Dr. Claughton), O. R., preached to us. He referred to "controversies about holy doctrines and matters of faith which had not in his own school-boy period shaken men's minds as to the standards of authority"—referring presumably to the then recent contest provoked by Bishop Temple and other authors of the "Essays and Reviews" volume. But he dealt in generalities only, and left the point of disobedience to authority untouched. Thus he did nothing to strengthen my hands.

This naturally leads me to give a few samples of the religious teaching which I in fact had found current in the School. I found in the hands of the Upper boys, recommended for theological study, "The Golden Treasury Psalter," i. e. the Psalms critically discussed and dished up with the mushroom-sauce of conjecture, on a supposed chronological basis for which no adequate *data* exist; and which still later conjecture has to a great extent upset and reversed. In its explanations the Christian idea is wholly struck out. If a New Testament passage is quoted in the notes, it is not as having the slightest authority in deciding the sense; but merely as one might quote Herodotus to illustrate Pindar's Odes. Take Ps. cxviii. 22, "The Stone which the builders refused," etc.,—a test passage, as being applied by our Lord to himself. But instead of referring to him or quoting his words, an exposition is adopted which exactly negatives what he affirms, and asserts what he denies, as will be seen on comparing the note with those words in St. Matt. xxi. 42, 43. Similar purely neologian expositions are given of Ps. xvi. and cx., similarly claimed for his Master by St. Peter in Acts ii. 25 (cf. xiii. 35-37), and by the Lord for himself in St. Matt. xxii. 43-44. "The Psalter interpreted without prejudice arising from Christianity" would very closely explain the exegetic standpoint of the book.

Again, I found a custom existing, and observed it,—one of inviting the clerical masters to preach in the School chapel occasionally, especially during Lent. On one Good Friday, one of these, accepting, preached from Isa. liii. (I forget which verse)—a passage time-out-of-mind associated with the Day's solemnity, as prophetic of its Divine Sufferer. The preacher, however, went off on a line of Bunsenian or Ewaldian exegesis, I forget which, and at the close of his discourse only noticed the Christian tradition to reject it. I don't think he condescended so far as to refer to the inquiry of the Ethiopian in his study of this very passage in Acts viii. 34-35, with the Evangelist's reply by "preaching unto him Jesus"; nor to the Apostle's direct reference of it to his Master in 1 Pet. ii. 12. And this *pabulum* of the dry husks of criticism was what some of my colleagues thought wholesome for the youth under their care and mine, as though regarding the boyhood of Rugby as a *corpus vile* on which to try the haphazard experiments of ephemeral criticism. I say "ephemeral," because we have had, since the Arnold-Bunsen period, Strauss and the Tübingenists, Colenso and the arithmetic school, Jowett and the amphibian, the Seven Essayists and Reviewers (among them Bishop Temple), besides Professors Wellhausen, Cheyne, and who knows how many more? As regards the third of these, my old tutor Dean Mansel once amused a theological symposium with the following *jeu d'esprit*, in the style of Lear's "Book of Nonsense":—

" There once was a Bishop Colenso,  
Who counted from one up to ten so,  
That he deem'd the Levitical  
Writings uncritical,  
And went out to tell the black men so!"

In the summer of I cannot recall which year, I received a formal complaint, from a parent, of the insidious teachings

by which another of my colleagues, a form-master, was undermining the faith of his form in a large part of the early scriptural narrative. My faithful colleague, Rev. L. F. Burrows, had had a son in the same form under the same teaching, and what I heard from him entirely confirmed the charge. Among the thanksgivings every Founder's Day, the School included one for the bringing up its members "to godliness and good learning"; to illustrate which I found a set of exceptionally talented men busy in flinging abroad the fire-brands of intellectual doubt among the intellectual weaklings committed to their teaching. The youngsters were incapable of applying any tests to these novelties of later-day creation; but quite capable of seeing their contradiction to all which they had previously been taught to believe and venerate. The only result must needs be to shake their faith in *all* authoritative teaching. If this be not to "offend the little ones," the intellectual weaklings, "who believe," I see not how the offense can be committed.

The form-master incriminated was a man of exceptional talent and winning manners, and had, after being elected fellow of a distinguished college, resigned that post, owing to his feeling himself unable to make or continue a profession of faith which that body then required of its members. We all respected the obedience to conscientious scruples which led him to make the sacrifice. But the thing to notice is that this fact, that doubts had vanquished faith, did not prevent him from being placed by Dr. Temple and continuing down to my time in charge of this form, including its "religious" teaching, with the results stated above. In my last year, as will be further seen, the interminable rasping of newspaper controversy so far diminished the numbers that it became necessary to dismiss some of the staff. Having then forced upon me the question, which to select for notice to quit, I selected this gen-

tleman; and was at once denounced by the Governors as having violated the "traditions and customs of Rugby." One of the two bishops on their Board, *the* one who best knew the facts, led, and the other joined, in this cry against me. They were both bound by their sacred office and its solemn vows, to uphold and approve my course in ridding the School of a teacher of unfaith. They took the opposite course, and dismissed *me*. These sacred "traditions," thus violated, were at most of fifteen years' standing, i.e. dated from Dr. Temple's introduction of them: "Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition." These facts suggest that my known opposition to anti-scriptural teaching and the dissemination of unfaith was the real cause, although not the avowed pretext, of my dismissal.

The boys were encouraged by special prizes to make special studies in the last term of each year of any branch which they preferred—"theology" included. One aspirant entered as a "theological" study Stanley's "Sinai and Palestine." I pointed out to him that "Sinai" and "Palestine" were geographical terms, that I heartily concurred in the interest of the book, but that it had got into the wrong column. He took it up as "geography," and I believe got his prize:—a mere straw on the current this, but still enough to show its drift.

And here, as ever, I seek to dig down to the fundamental bed-rock of first principles. Criticism, "higher" or lower (and within its limits I highly value it), is alike in this, that, being a human science, it can deal only with human thoughts clothed in human language. All science stops at the phenomenal. Let criticism do its utmost in that sphere. Who fears it? But when the Bible has been dealt with, as the cant phrase is, "like any other book," there remains that in which it is *unlike* any other book—the unknown quantity, the irreducible element of inspira-

tion, unamenable to any critical process, unaccountable to any critical canons. This may not seldom open a wide gulf between what criticism presents as its own results, and what a Christian, with faith in inspiration, can accept. To deduct those former results from these latter, and strike a balance, implies that the two are commensurable, and this is what, with all my respect for criticism, I deny. But, waiving for a moment wholly the spiritual aspect of the question, and taking merely the intellectual, the tendency of such teaching was to set young minds fishing for doubts and flaws—exactly against the primary educational maxim, *discentem credere oportet*. The critical processes on which the teaching mainly rested, were such as no average boy's mind could follow or fathom. It presented, as conclusions ascertained beyond reasonable doubt, what really rested on slender presumptions, on undue assumptions, and on the subjective processes of ingenious minds. It therefore tended, if regarded simply as a mental exercise, rather to weaken than to strengthen the faculties which it exercised. For I hold it as an axiom that the youthful mind is itself affected by, and sympathizes with, the quality of the material supplied to it. If this be unsound or unstable, then that mind's own soundness and stability is permanently impaired. When faculties are fully matured, this result need not follow; but while immature, it is, I believe, unavoidable. But when we remember that all the youngsters thus experimented upon had the *status* of catechumens in Christ, it seems to me impossible duly to characterize the wantonness of treachery which thus could deal with them; or the awful responsibility attaching to those who, being in foremost place in the church, abetted and upheld the system and the men who were engaged in the experiment.