

Chapter I

ROBINSON'S VOTE

In January 1861 Dr Philpott, who had been Master of St Catharine's College for fifteen years, was nominated for election to the See of Worcester, and as he did not resign the mastership until the following September,¹ the candidates for that office had plenty of time to weigh their chances and develop their plans. It seems to have been generally assumed that as the Senior Fellow, Joseph Milner, did not intend to stand for election, the prize would fall to one of the two Fellows next in order of seniority, Charles Kirkby Robinson and Francis James Jameson, though the claims of one of the ex-Fellows, Ralph Blakelock, may have been considered.²

Robinson could reasonably hope to succeed Dr Philpott in the mastership. He was senior to Jameson on the roll of Fellows, and moreover a St Catharine's man, which Jameson was not; and as Bursar of the college he had acquired considerable knowledge of its affairs. Yet, as he was possibly aware, he might not be personally acceptable to the Society. Though a kindly man, and much admired in evangelical circles for his piety and pulpit eloquence, he was reserved, secretive and had a somewhat furtive manner; and consequently was thought by some of his colleagues to be rather sly and underhand. Jameson was a far more popular character. He was frank and generously minded, fond of his friends and disposed to think the best of them; and though a migrant from another college, it was by no means unlikely that a majority of the Fellows of St Catharine's would prefer him to Robinson as their Master. But though the prospect attracted him, it also troubled him. It was largely due to Robinson, with whom he was intimate, that he had been elected to a fellowship of the college;³ and he might well

¹ "The Bishop of Worcester's resignation of the Mastership arrived to-day, dated September 30th." Diary of C. K. Robinson (in my possession), 1 October 1861.

² In a letter to Blakelock, dated 5 November 1861, Dr Philpott remarked: "I am very sorry that the Fellows did not take you for their new Master. It would have been so pleasant to find an old friend at the Lodge whenever we visited Cambridge." This letter is in a small collection, made by the late Mr J. W. Clark, of papers and pamphlets connected with the Robinson-Jameson controversy, which is now in the University Library. It will henceforth be referred to by its press mark, Cam. b. 861. 1. On the evening before the election one of the Fellows informed Jameson that the "election would lie entirely between myself and one of the late Fellows", and the late Fellow was possibly Blakelock. F. J. Jameson, *A Reply to a Statement* (1868), p. 8.

³ Statement by Dr G. F. Browne, 4 December 1916. This Statement is to be found in W. H. S. Jones's *History of St Catharine's College* (1936), pp. 140-143, and will henceforth be referred to as G. F. Browne's Statement.

doubt whether he could decently enter the lists against his friend and benefactor.

The resignation of the Bishop was followed by the Senior Fellow announcing, in accordance with the statutes of the college, that the Fellows would assemble for the election of a new Master at seven o'clock on the morning of Wednesday, 16 October; and when on that day Joseph Romilly, the Registrar, heard the bells of Great St Mary's ringing, he hurried round to St Catharine's to learn how the election had gone, for he was a friend of Robinson, and hoped that he would be elected to the mastership.¹ He was therefore very pleased when he heard that Robinson had been elected, and at once sent him a congratulatory note. Later in the day Robinson returned the courtesy by calling at the Registry, and in the course of their conversation Romilly unwittingly put an awkward question: he asked whether he could congratulate the new Master on "unanimity of election". His improper curiosity was baffled by Robinson's reply that the electors were bound to secrecy.²

On the following Monday Robinson left for Scotland, and three days later was married to Miss Clifford Stewart of Pittyvaich.³ But while he was enjoying his honeymoon, unpleasant stories about him were circulating in Cambridge. On Friday, 25 October, George Leapingwell, one of the Esquire Bedells, told Romilly that there was "a talk in the town of Jameson's complaint of ill usage in the recent election to the mastership of Catharine, viz. that Robinson did not vote for him [Jameson] as he expected him to do, because he [J] had voted for Robinson", and a few days later Romilly heard much the same gossip when calling on some Cambridge friends.⁴ And as stories grow in the telling, it soon came to be rumoured that Jameson and Robinson had agreed to vote for one another, and that while the former had kept the compact, the latter had broken it by voting for himself. This was a gross perversion of the facts, but many persons, and among them Dr Philpott, accepted it as true. The Bishop of Worcester, when Master of the college, must have been in close personal contact with Robinson, and it is not without significance that he was almost over-eager to believe the worst of him: "I fear that the story is too true", he wrote to a friend on 5 November.⁵

Robinson had certainly voted for himself, but so had Dr Philpott when he stood for the mastership of St Catharine's in 1845, and this practice was not confined to one college: in 1852 Dr Guest had secured the mastership of

¹ Diary of J. Romilly, 16 October 1861. Romilly was a regular attendant at Christ Church, Barnwell, of which Robinson was the Vicar.

² Diary of J. Romilly, 16 October 1861.

³ Diary of C. K. Robinson, 21 and 24 October 1861.

⁴ Diary of J. Romilly, 25 October, 3 November 1861.

⁵ Cam. b. 861. 1.

ROBINSON'S VOTE

3

Caius by his own vote. Consequently, if this had been the only charge against Robinson, he would not have been deemed to have committed more than a venial offence, and perhaps not even that; for though lawyers had ruled that electors, being trustees, could not act in their own interest, Cambridge lay opinion did not consider it very reprehensible for them to do so. Moreover, if electors to a mastership had been strictly forbidden in any circumstances to vote for themselves, it would sometimes have been very difficult in a small Society to obtain a statutable majority for any of the candidates: if, for instance, Dr Philpott had not voted for himself, no election could have been made.¹ But the breach of faith of which Robinson was accused was indefensible.

On 26 October Robinson received a letter from Jameson, in which dissatisfaction with his conduct at the recent election was expressed, and as he did not immediately return to Cambridge, it was probably assumed that he was afraid to do so, having no adequate defence.² The assumption was baseless, for he was detained by the illness and subsequent death of his father;³ but the delay was very unfortunate, as it allowed opinion to harden against him. When he returned to Cambridge on Saturday, 23 November, he found that he had been judged and condemned in his absence, and was naturally deeply distressed. He confided to Romilly "that he had been so harassed and afflicted that he had often wished that he had never been Master".⁴

¹ Romilly received an account of Philpott's election to the mastership from the latter's brother-in-law, Maddison. "Dr Procter", he recorded in his diary, "died on Monday, and the election began on Friday morning. The Junior (F. Procter) voted for Philpott, Goodwin did the same and Dr Philpott voted for himself, whereupon Corrie gave no vote but said 'I agree (or I acquiesce)'. Corrie behaved as well as possible under his disappointment: he accompanied Philpott to the Vice-Chancellor, and on the Sunday morning (which was Sacrament Day in college) preached on 'brotherly love'." Diary of J. Romilly, 17 November 1845. There were only four electors on this occasion, and if Dr Philpott had voted for the other candidate, who was Corrie, and Corrie had voted for himself or abstained from voting, there would have been no election, as the statutes then in force directed that no one could be elected to the mastership who had not received the votes of a majority of the electors.

² G. F. Browne in his *Statement*, dated 4 December 1916, mentions that Mrs Robinson told him that her husband found Jameson's letter awaiting him at Risplith Manor, and Robinson notes in his diary that he arrived at Risplith on 26 October. Again quoting Mrs Robinson, Browne describes the letter as running something like this: "Sir, as things touching your honour are being said here, it would be as well if you returned as soon as may be." Jameson, in his *Reply to a Statement* (1868), p. 12, gives a far less melodramatic, and almost certainly a more correct, description of his letter. "On the Saturday after the election", he states, "he sent me a note, returning me the warmest thanks for my 'noble act' in resigning the mastership to him. I replied, repudiating any thanks beyond what might be due to me as having, I trusted, acted towards him honourably and as a friend." Probably it was quite clear from the letter that in Jameson's opinion Robinson had not so acted.

³ Robinson's father died on 10 November. Diary of C. K. Robinson.

⁴ Diary of J. Romilly, 2 December 1861.

But he did not spend himself in idle lamentations. Believing that he had a complete answer to the accusations brought against him, he wrote an account of the election, which he certainly would have published if Jameson, on learning of his intention, had not warned him that he could not leave it unanswered, and that much scandal would be caused "if the affair was thus brought to a public, hostile discussion".¹ If Robinson had been a selfish man, he probably would have disregarded this warning, for his silence was being interpreted as an admission of guilt; but, preferring the good fame of his college to his own, he agreed with Jameson that they should seek the advice of Dr Philpott, who happened to be on a visit to Cambridge. Unfortunately Dr Philpott gave the wrong advice. The true story of what had happened might have been obtained if both Jameson and Robinson had published their apologies when the events they recorded were fresh in their memories; and the reputation of the college had nothing to gain and much to lose by ill-informed and malicious gossip being left in possession of the field. Dr Philpott however seems to have thought it better that the college linen should remain dirty than undergo a public washing; and it was at his suggestion and in his presence that Robinson and Jameson, having given their word of honour "that no document professing to give a statement of the election should be issued by either of us", signed on 12 December a statement which, far from illuminating, intensified the darkness.

"We, the undersigned", it runs, "having heard that certain rumours are abroad relative to the late election to the mastership of St Catharine's College, desire to state our belief that there was some misapprehension in the mind of each of us as to the intention of the other. Mr Robinson gives full credit to Mr Jameson's assertion that he, not wishing to vote for himself, gave his vote for Mr Robinson under the expectation that Mr Robinson would abstain from voting for himself. On the other hand Mr Jameson gives full credit to Mr Robinson's assertion that he had no intention of taking any unfair advantage of Mr Jameson's vote, but that Mr Robinson believed at the time that Mr Jameson's vote was given in his favour without the expectation that he would abstain from voting for himself."

Peace-makers, though always blessed, are not always successful, and Dr Philpott's eirenicon was met with suspicion, disgust and disappointment: "The lame statement of Robinson and Jameson", recorded Romilly, "is printed in to-day's paper, it will scarcely give satisfaction to anybody; it greatly annoys Sedgwick, who is peculiarly interested in the matter, as the Master of St Catharine's is (ex officio) Prebendary of Norwich."²

¹ F. J. Jameson, *A Reply to a Statement* (1868), p. 13.

² Diary of J. Romilly, 14 December 1861. The document was published in the *Cambridge Chronicle*. A canonry of Norwich was attached to the mastership of St Catharine's, and Sedgwick was a Canon of Norwich.

Nor was the faith of those who firmly believed in Robinson's guilt shaken.

"As it seems", wrote a former Fellow of St Catharine's to a friend, "you have not seen the manifesto to which Jameson has been kind enough to attach his name, I send it to you to read and see whether it does not leave the matter just where it was. Jameson, weak in declining to vote for himself—Robinson, with a sharpness worthy of a Yankee, taking immediate advantage of the amiable weakness—and Joe Milner weakly sanctioning a clear piece of roguery."¹

The explanation of this very unfavourable reception is that the joint statement, though correct, was incomprehensible except to the very few who knew the facts. It twitched the curtain which concealed the true story of the election, but did not lift it. Though it definitely declared that there had been a misunderstanding, it did not reveal how that misunderstanding had arisen; and it is therefore not surprising that it was generally regarded as a desperate effort to save the reputation of the college by burying the scandal alive. Even the important revelation which it contained—that Robinson had never pledged himself to vote for Jameson, and that Jameson had never believed that he had—was generally overlooked. Several years later a supporter of Robinson asserted in a letter, which was afterwards published, that he had "heard it stated frequently in Cambridge and in various parts of England that Mr Jameson and Mr Robinson had made an agreement to cross votes, and that Mr Robinson broke his promise in voting for himself"².

Thus Robinson remained under the reproach of having committed a particularly shameful deed, and was constantly reminded that he was in disgrace. Though most of the Heads of Houses called on him, William Bateson, Master of St John's, and possibly George Corrie, Master of Jesus, abstained from doing so; and though Whewell invited Robinson and his wife to dinner, he appears to have gone out of his way to be particularly rude to them when they came.³ But Robinson had to suffer more cruel and more public affronts. The famous classical scholar, Richard Shilleto, seems to have taken a malicious pleasure in holding him up to scorn and ridicule, and he wrote some particularly cruel Greek verses, which were published in the *Independent Press*.⁴

¹ F. Procter to R. Blakelock, 20 December 1861. Cam. b. 861. 1.

² Correspondence between G. F. Browne and R. Shilleto (1868), p. 15.

³ J. W. Clark was present at the dinner and reports Whewell's rudeness in a note in Cam. b. 861. 1. Corrie is reported to have said that Robinson's election "is the purest election that has taken place at St Catharine's for two centuries, but I shall not call on Dr Robinson". *Ibid.* But in a letter bound up in a copy of the *Life and Letters of Adam Sedgwick* in Trinity College Library, it is stated that Bateson was the only Head who did not call on the Robinsons.

⁴ It is doubtful whether Shilleto was responsible for the publication of these verses. Diary of J. Romilly, 17 December 1861, 28 January 1862.

But scandals tend to pass away unless stimulated, and the dark stories about Robinson might in time have been forgotten if he had not given them a new lease of life by proceeding in May 1867 to the degree of Doctor of Divinity, *propter dignitatem*. His enemies, roused into activity, decided to challenge what seemed to them an attempt at rehabilitation; and James Porter of Peterhouse and W. M. Gunson of Christ's gave notice of their intention to non-placet the Grace for his degree. If they thereby intended more than a gesture they were disappointed, for on 2 May the Senate passed the Grace by eighty-three votes to twenty-six;¹ but the fact that any votes were cast against it indicated with terrible clearness that some members of the University still thought Robinson guilty of a particularly mean fraud.

The Fellows of St Catharine's were very indignant at the public insult thus inflicted on their Master, being convinced of his innocence. But they might not have gone so far as to challenge an inquiry if they had not found a leader in G. F. Browne, who believed in Robinson's honesty with all the zeal of a convert. He has himself told the story of his conversion.

"After taking my degree in 1856", he wrote in after years, "I was never in Cambridge between June 1857 and the early part of 1863, in which last year I was elected to a Fellowship and entered upon residence. I had been very much put out by the serious discredit of the controversy about the Mastership of the college, and had taken my name off the Boards of the college, my view being hostile to Robinson. On the ground of that hostility I had refused the offer of a Fellowship and lectureship, preferring to remain at Trinity College, Glenalmond. About three months later a second offer of a Fellowship came, and as I was then in a poor state of health, I accepted it and went into residence. On my first night in Cambridge I walked till late at night on the grass plot with the Rev. E. W. Crabtree, an old schoolfellow and then Tutor of the college, hearing from him all the details of the election of the Master;"²

and it was this conversation which began Browne's conversion. The favourable opinion which he subsequently formed of Robinson's character completed it.

"I have watched the Master closely for the last five academical years", he wrote to Aldis Wright on 26 May 1868, "and I am firmly convinced of his unflinching honesty. The facts of the election are to my mind a complete exoneration when only they are fairly known."³

¹ On 16 May Robinson entered in his Diary that he had been "admitted this day to the degree of Doctor of Divinity by special Grace, Laus Deo".

² G. F. Browne's Statement, 4 December 1916.

³ This letter is bound up in a volume of University pamphlets in Trinity College Library, the press mark being 98 C. 85. 4.

Though in 1865 Browne vacated his fellowship by marriage, he continued to serve the college as Chaplain and Praelector; and in the hope of righting a great wrong, he resolved, with Robinson's warm approval, that the next time an offensive remark was made about the Master "in my presence on any public occasion, I should publicly demand an explanation".¹ He had not long to wait. He dined at King's on the night of Sunday, 19 April 1868, and in the course of conversation in the Combination Room after dinner the name of Wodelarke, the founder and first Master of St Catharine's, cropped up; and when Henry Bradshaw, correcting Browne, said that Wodelarke's christian name was Robert, Shilleto most offensively remarked that, if so, he had a worthy successor in Robinson. The pun was atrocious, though not too bad for Browne to fail to understand that his Master was being called a robber;² but, being a guest and unwilling to make a scene, he merely uttered a protest and let the matter drop. Before leaving however he cryptically remarked to Shilleto that, were it not Sunday, he would say something which would change his opinion, and on the day following sent him a letter which Shilleto characterised as "almost in the old style of 'pistols and coffee'".

"I must renew my protest", wrote Browne, "against your remarks in the Combination Room of King's yesterday, respecting the successor of Robert, our Founder. I thought it better on many accounts to say nothing more about it at the time. I have a right to ask you now on what definite ground, which you are prepared to support by evidence, you made so serious an imputation against the Head of a college in presence (*sic*) of an official of the college. Of all things I dislike personal controversy, but in the interests of truth and of my college I can never allow such words as those you used to pass unchallenged. I write with all due regard to your standing and position, and only because I should be acting unworthily if I suffered the matter to rest as it is."³

The controversy which followed this trumpet-blast does not call for a detailed description. Shilleto, who knew nothing but common gossip about the story of the election, very foolishly asserted that the statement signed by Robinson and Jameson on 12 December 1861 justified his remark, which it most certainly did not; and when driven from this quite indefensible position, he only begged the issue by saying that "if a man steals a leg of mutton and is seen doing so, there is 'definite proof'". Yet though Browne had the better cards, he did not play them at all skilfully. He was declamatory and turgid;

¹ G. F. Browne, *The Recollections of a Bishop* (1915), p. 118.

² The pun was hoary as well as bad, and of doubtful paternity. Writing to Shilleto on 17 December 1861 Romilly described himself as a whole-hearted believer in Robinson, and said that nothing would persuade him to spell Robinson "with 2 (b)s". Diary of J. Romilly, 17 December 1861.

³ Correspondence between G. F. Browne and R. Shilleto (1868), p. 3.

and his triumphant declaration that Shilleto—"the public accuser of Dr Robinson, the perpetrator of ruthless and elaborate cruelties against him—had not ventured to say that Robinson had pledged himself to vote for Jameson", was suggestive of a war communiqué making the most of a very small success. Indeed, though Browne thought it worth while to print his correspondence with Shilleto for private circulation among the members of the Senate,¹ he was quite aware that he had done little as yet to establish Robinson's innocence. He consoled himself with the thought that "opportunities may at some future time arise for advancing another step and yet another, till my full purpose is attained".²

He therefore probably played an active part in the preparation of a manifesto to members of the Senate, which is dated 10 June 1868. In this document, which he and the Fellows of the college signed, various statements were made which, if correct, proved Robinson to be an innocent and much wronged man; but as most of them were unsupported by any evidence, and none of the signatories had any first-hand knowledge of the facts, this doubtless well-meant effort to right a wrong did not carry much weight. One person who received the document wrote at the foot of it, "these gentlemen were none of them Fellows at the time of the occurrence to which the paper refers, and therefore their evidence is mere hearsay".³ But a graver objection than insufficiency of proof could be brought against it. As Robinson must have sanctioned its issue, and apparently had supplied some of the information it contained,⁴ he can fairly be accused of breaking the pledge, which he and Jameson had given to the Bishop of Worcester, not to publish any document "professing to give a statement of the election"; and though his breach of faith was defended on the ground that the "mutual agreement to abstain from putting forth any statement after the document issued December 14 1861"⁵... was practically brought to an end by the public attack made upon our Master in the Easter term 1867", the excuse was so paltry as to be hardly worth making.⁶ But the indiscretion, to give it no harsher name, at least served the useful purpose of calling forth a reply from Jameson, who however secured beforehand the Bishop of Worcester's permission to break his pledge of

¹ A copy of the correspondence received by Aldis Wright is in a volume of University pamphlets in Trinity College Library, the press mark being 98 C. 85. 4.

² Correspondence between G. F. Browne and R. Shilleto (1868).

³ See the volume in Trinity College Library, with press mark 98 C. 85. 4.

⁴ In a footnote the signatories refer to a statement in Robinson's handwriting in their possession, dated 8 December 1861: this was the statement which the Bishop of Worcester dissuaded Robinson from publishing.

⁵ The date of its publication in the *Cambridge Chronicle*.

⁶ Revised Address to Members of the Senate, September 1868. The public attack was the non-placeting of the Grace for Robinson's D.D. degree.

silence.¹ Jameson's account of the election was studiously fair and moderate; but as Browne and the Fellows of St Catharine's believed that some of his assertions were inaccurate they issued in September 1868 a revised version of their previous statement, in which they questioned the truthfulness of his account, and submitted evidence in support of their own story. To this second attack Jameson did not reply, and in a letter to a friend explained why he did not do so.

"I received this morning", he wrote, "a reprint of the St Catharine's Fellows' Statement, interlarded with comments on my 'Reply'. My own impression on reading it is that it is not worth notice. You must remember that I have not come forward with any wish to enter into a controversy with the Fellows, nor with any one else. I have simply been compelled by their gratuitous bringing forward of the question to state my view of the matter. This I did in no pugnacious spirit, and in as friendly a way as I could. These young Fellows acted pretty coolly towards me in publishing statements about my conduct and motives in a matter about which they had no independent knowledge; and when, instead of apologising now that I have informed them that their statements were incorrect, they again come forward, repeating those statements and adding somewhat impertinent criticisms on my 'Reply'—it seems to me most dignified to be silent. I feel too that this is my proper course for another reason. Dr Robinson is, I think, taking an unworthy line in not himself coming honourably forward, and in using the Fellows to do his work, even so far as *through them to give me the direct lie*. In my statement I put down what I believed to be true, and gave the impressions which the occurrences made upon me at the time and since then, with as much consideration as possible for Dr Robinson's feelings. I have always been willing to believe that he may have had different impressions from the same occurrences, and here I should have been glad for the matter to have rested in a semi-amiable way. But when Dr Robinson or his agents adopt the course of giving the lie to my statements, I must wipe my hands of the whole business, and I willingly leave them in possession of the field in that kind of warfare."²

¹ "As it appears", wrote the Bishop to Jameson, "from the note in the printed paper, dated 10 June, 1868, which you have sent me, that a statement in Mr Robinson's handwriting, dated 8 December, 1861, has been put into the possession of the persons whose signatures are attached to the paper, I consider that you are now at liberty to make any statement which you think proper on the subject." F. J. Jameson, *A Reply to a Statement* (1868), p. 4.

² The date of the letter is 5 October 1868. Cam. b. 861. 1. In the manifesto of the Fellows of St Catharine's, dated 10 June 1868, it is stated that some weeks after the election, "when Mr Robinson returned to Cambridge, he called upon Mr Jameson, and asked him whether he wished him to resign. Mr Jameson disclaimed any such wish." As Jameson does not refute this statement in his Reply, it was presumably correct. The offer was doubtless made in good faith, but Jameson could hardly accept it, unless he was prepared to assert that his vote for Robinson had been conditional on Robinson voting for him; and this he could not say.

There was a better reason for Jameson's refusal to continue the controversy than any which he advanced in this letter, for he was seriously ill, and, knowing that he had not long to live, was properly reluctant to continue what threatened to become an acrimonious dispute. From one point of view his decision is regrettable, as a further contribution from him might have thrown light upon some places which still remain dark; but from the "Reply" which he published, from the two Statements issued by Browne and the Fellows of St Catharine's, and from the account written, but not published, by Robinson,¹ it is possible to disentangle at least some of the threads of a very tangled story.

Jameson, though desirous of obtaining the mastership, definitely made up his mind not to vote for himself, and knowing, as there were only five Fellows, that the election might easily turn on a single vote, he was naturally anxious to discover whether Robinson intended to pursue the same self-denying policy. He was excusably timid of approaching his rival on such a delicate matter, but when at last he did so, he was much relieved, as he records in his pamphlet, to hear Robinson say that "he might depend on him not to take any step to procure the mastership for himself", for he interpreted the remark as pledging Robinson not to vote for himself.² But he would have acted more wisely if he had asked Robinson to interpret his own remark, for Robinson always asserted that Jameson had completely misunderstood him. According to his own account he only promised not to "canvass the electors for their votes";³ and after Jameson's pamphlet had appeared, he repeated this statement in a more elaborate form.

"I assert most positively", he wrote, "that I never gave any such general assurance as that which is contained in page 4 of Mr Jameson's 'Reply'. The only assurance which I ever gave Mr Jameson, in return for his repeated assurances that he intended

¹ This account, which appears in Dr W. H. S. Jones's *History of St Catharine's College* (1936), pp. 143–147, and is therein described as "Dr Robinson's own account of the Election (sent by Mr R. C. Wilton)", is undated, but nevertheless it is almost certainly a copy of the document, dated 8 December 1861, which Robinson wrote and would have published if he had not been dissuaded from doing so by the Bishop of Worcester. It reads as though it had been written shortly after the events it records, and there is no reason to think that he wrote two independent versions of his story. The probability therefore is that he had a few copies made of the document which he had intended to publish, and distributed them among his friends, of whom Mr R. C. Wilton's father was one. It is of course possible that the document which Dr Jones reproduces in his *History of St Catharine's College* was dated; but Dr Jones informs me that he is fairly certain that it was not, and though at my request he very kindly communicated with Mr Wilton, it was to no purpose, as Mr Wilton replied that he was now unable to find the document which he lent to Dr Jones, although quite certain that Dr Jones returned it.

² F. J. Jameson; *A Reply to a Statement* (1868), p. 6.

³ Account by Dr Robinson in Dr W. H. S. Jones's *History of St Catharine's College* (1936), pp. 143–147. This will henceforth be referred to as "Account by Dr Robinson".