Ecclesiastical Patronage in Trollope's Novels and Victoria's England

JILL FELICITY DUREY

Trollope's criticism of ecclesiastical patronage is well-known, but no-one has yet systematically compared his criticism with evidence from historical sources. I hope to begin to redress this in the following article. I will look at four main aspects: birthright versus merit; the different kinds of ecclesiastical patronage; the ramifications of patronage, namely pluralities and absenteeism; ecclesiastical patronage among Trollope's family and friends; and the question of patronage and the decline of the Church of England. The article will refer to Trollope's novels, historical secondary sources and primary material, including correspondence and ecclesiastical records, in order to place Trollope's depiction of patronage within his contemporary world, and to begin to assess the validity of his belief that the practice of patronage hastened the decline of the Church.

Patronage, Birthright and Merit

Patronage was questioned by Victorian society as a whole. Trollope was not alone among the middle classes in setting up merit against birthright, and affirming that patronage seemed to favour the latter. As early as 1836, W L Bowles, a canon residentiary of Winchester, complained about the iniquities of ecclesiastical patronage, stressing that it is not so much for himself that he is concerned but for his brethren, 'who have mostly large families to support, and for whose undeserved treatment I must feel whilst I have any sense of feeling'.[1] It is significant though that Trollope, who gained his Post Office position, albeit a lowly one, through the patronage of Sir Francis Feeling, did not believe competitive examinations in the Civil Service to be a useful means of evaluation. Yet he was adamant that ecclesiastical patronage prevented merit from being rewarded in the Church. Men should be rewarded for their endeavour, not for their family name, he believed. He cites in *Clergymen of the Church of England* the common case of a rector who has a living of £1,000 a year, does a quarter of the work in the parish and employs a curate to do three-quarters for £70

1 W L Bowles *The Patronage and Society in Nineteenth-Century England* (Bristol: Gutch & Martin 1836) p 6

a year.[2] He allows that this was not so reprehensible when the curate remained in this position for only two to three years, without a family to support, but now that the population was so large and the number of beneficed rectors and vicars could not be increased *pro rata*, 'the clerical babe must become a clerical old man on the same pittance',[3] which was insupportable. Trollope wrote *The Last Chronicle of Barset* a year after *Clergymen of the Church of England*, so it is not surprising that he should persist with the same concern in his fiction. Mr Crawley is a perpetual curate of nearly fifty years of age, earning £150 a year.[4] The doubling of income in his fiction is no doubt to avoid the kind of angry response which Henry Alford, Dean of Canterbury, made in 1866 in *Contemporary Review* to *Clergymen of the Church of England.* Alford accuses Trollope of wanting to 'tickle the public ear' by relying on 'hearsay and superficial acquaintance with facts',[5] and states that the lowest stipend for a curate is £80 a year.[6] Alford acknowledges that the curate's lot is an unhappy one and that the Church has much to do to improve their conditions, but stresses that Trollope, in having 'a popular fling at the distribution of patronage, . . has missed the evil which really wants remedying'. Alford has the greatest sympathy for the curate who is 'good and conscientious' but has 'small ability', 'without any personal claim for preferment, and unable to obtain it through connections' who has to bring up a large family and appear as a gentleman on 'the wages of a skilled stonemason'.[7] According to Alford, then, Trollope's details are not accurate and his frames of reference are suspect, but his concerns are shared by the Church itself.

The Different Kinds of Ecclesiastical Patronage

With the exception of one category, Trollope refers in his novels to several different kinds of church patronage, which accord with Diana McClatchey's pentagonal schema:[8] patronage in the gift of private individuals; patronage in the gift of collegiate bodies; patronage in the gift of bishops and other ecclesiastical dignitaries; and patronage in the gift of the Crown. He does not refer to patronage in the gift of capitular bodies but, since this mode of patronage relates to his family, I have included it in my discussion.

2 A Trollope *Clergymen of the Church of England* R apRoberts ed (Leicester: Leicester University Press [1866] 1974) p 97
3 *Clergymen of the Church of England* p 98
4 A Trollope *The Last Chronicle of Barset* (London: Pan Books [1867] 1968) p 27
5 H Alford 'Mr Anthony Trollope and the English Clergy' *Contemporary Review* June 1866 p 240
6 Alford p 246
7 Alford p 247
8 D McClatchey *Oxfordshire Clergy 1777-1869* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press 1960) p 2

a) In the Gift of Private Individuals

Patronage in the gift of private individuals was a direct result of the Reformation and the sale of church lands to laymen. The right to the presentation of livings was consequently taken out of ecclesiastical hands. By the nineteenth century this category was not only the largest form of patronage, but was still increasing, according to J M Bourne,[9] and made up half of the total benefices. Lady Lufton in *Framley Parsonage* falls into this category, and is shown to patronise Mark Robarts, whose background is modest, but who acquires very quickly a taste for worldly goods and position. Trollope comments rather acerbically that Robarts, through his early good fortune at the hands of his benefactor, had obtained his living 'at an age when other young clergymen are beginning to think of a curacy' and that the living itself was of a type that 'middle-aged parsons in their dreams regard as a possible Paradise for their old years'.[10] His youth, hints Trollope strongly, is responsible for his belief that merit, rather than luck, had placed him in such a position, which rendered his gratitude to his patron rather less than it should have been.[11] Mr Oriel in *Doctor Thorne* is also shown to benefit from the patronage of private individuals, although Trollope prefers not to name them, informing the reader nonetheless that 'his friends [had] bought for him the next presentation to the living of Greshambury'.[12]

The Rev Henry Clavering in *The Claverings* actually becomes an incumbent patron, but only by chance, for he too falls into this first category. On the death of his brother he inherits the living[13] of which he is the current holder, but being somewhat indolent by nature decides to retire. It is his wife who persuades him to present his living to his putative son-in-law,[14] the industrious and solemn Mr Saul of the new generation of clerics. M J D Roberts notes that from the middle of the nineteenth century until about 1878, the number of patron-incumbents rose, particularly in the rural counties extending from Devon to Lincolnshire and East Anglia.[15] The difference in Roberts' observation was that these incumbent patrons purchased their own livings, rather than inheriting them. This did not prevent the patron from passing on his living from one generation to the next, as Roberts remarks, in order to ensure that family members could remain within the clerical profession, more securely in fact than in any other profession.[16]

9 J M Bourne *Patronage and Society in Nineteenth-Century England* (London: Edward Arnold 1986) p 5
10 A Trollope *Framley Parsonage* (Oxford: OUP [1861] 1991) p 33
11 *Framley Parsonage* p 33
12 A Trollope *Doctor Thorne* (London: OUP [1858] 1971) p 380
13 A Trollope *The Claverings* (Oxford: OUP [1867] 1991) p 462
14 *The Claverings* p 507
15 M J D Roberts 'Private Patronage and the Church of England 1800-1900' *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* April 1981 p 205
16 Roberts pp 203-4

In *Marion Fay* Trollope raises much more specifically the question of the credentials of individuals who have the right to present livings. Lord Hampstead, knowing that it will be his task to choose the next incumbent for the living of Appleslocombe, believes himself to be unfit to appoint a clergyman since he himself does not belong to a church. If the task falls to him, he resolves to leave the decision to the bishop, 'thinking that the bishop must know more about it than himself'.[17] Trollope thus not only questions the judgment of private patrons but also predicts that there will be greater and greater risks in lay patronage as the community becomes more secular.

Lay patronage itself in nineteenth-century society became more and more associated with commercialism and simony,[18] and patronage was treated as a form of property. Marsh describes how it was 'bought and sold, and the newspapers often contained advertisements extolling the trout stream and salubrious climate of a particular benefice the nomination to which was up for auction'.[19] Despite the fact that simony was against the law, many a clergyman could overcome the problem of buying illegally the right to nominate himself to a benefice by asking a relative, friend or agent to do the task on his behalf.[20] This kind of abuse incensed the Liberation Society, although patronage reform 'which was sensitive to all infringements on the rights of property', particularly of the kind belonging to peers, failed repeatedly in the House of Lords during Trollope's lifetime.[21] The Liberation Society was founded by the Dissenters who not surprisingly loathed ecclesiastical patronage. The militant Dissenters, headed by Edward Miall, founded in 1844 the Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage and Control, which became known as the Liberation Society. The Society attempted to disestablish the Church of England in the same way as the Irish Church had been separated from the State. Miall stated that establishment weakened rather than strengthened the Church.[22]

b) In the Gift of Collegiate Bodies

The difference between the principle of accepting clergymen appointed by a collegiate body and the actuality of living with that choice is vividly demonstrated in *The Small House at Allington*. The living of Allington is shown to be in the gift of the collegiate body of King's College Cambridge, and the Dale family, we are told, while 'steady supporters of

17 A Trollope *Marion Fay* (Oxford: OUP [1882] 1992) p 292
18 P T Marsh *The Victorian Church in Decline: Archbishop Tait & the Church of England 1868-1882* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press & Routledge 1969) p 96
19 Marsh p 208
20 Marsh p 208
21 Marsh p 208
22 Marsh pp 137–9

the Church [and] graciously receiving into their parish such new vicars' as the college wished to appoint, had forever perpetuated 'some unpronounced warfare against the clergyman', once the appointment was finalised.[23] The eponymous hero's benefice in *The Vicar of Bullhampton* (1869/70) also belongs to the same category of patronage as it is in the gift of St John's College Oxford. This fact is shown to save Mr Frank Fenwick from himself, and the Established Church from being eclipsed by the encroachment of the Methodist Chapel. Mr Fenwick is informed by his barrister brother-in-law, Mr Quickenham, that it is his duty on behalf of his patrons to protect the glebe land on which the Chapel has been built, for the glebe 'was only given to him in trust', and the continued existence of the chapel would mean that the vicar's successor would be left with the task of demolishing it.[24]

c) In the Gift of Capitular Bodies

As I mentioned earlier, Trollope does not refer directly to patronage in the gift of capitular bodies, but his kinsman and friend, Sir John Trollope, had a daughter, Julia, who married the eldest son of the Very Rev Henry Lewis Hobart, Dean of Windsor. The Deanery of Windsor was regarded as a capitular body to which the living of Great Haseley was attached.[25] The Dean of Windsor thus held this living *in commendam* with the deanery. Livings of this kind were extremely valuable and influential, and even if Trollope does not allocate them to his fictional characters, he would have been all too well aware of them.

d) In the Gift of Bishops and Other Ecclesiastical Dignitaries

Trollope laments in *Clergymen of the Church of England* that patronage remains 'the private property of the bishop', and he speaks of this as having 'much of the sweet mediaeval flavour of old English corruption'.[26] Episcopal patronage did in fact double during the nineteenth century and has been seen by Alan Haig as a positive improvement on lay patronage, for bishops were now able to use patronage for promotion of deserving diocesan clergymen.[27] Howley had over a hundred livings at his disposal as Bishop of London (1813–28), and as Archbishop of Canterbury (1828–48) had a further fifty.[28] Both lay and episcopal patronage multiplied in this period. W D Rubinstein refutes the common assumption that 'Old Corruption' continued in the nineteenth century and

23 A Trollope *The Small House at Allington* (London: Dent [1864] 1970) p 3
24 A Trollope *The Vicar of Bullhampton* (Oxford: OUP [1869] 1990) p 396
25 D McClatchey *Oxfordshire Clergy 1777-1869* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press 1960) p 2
26 A Trollope *Clergymen of the Church of England* R apRoberts ed (Leicester: Leicester University Press [1866] 1974) p 28
27 A Haig *The Victorian Clergy* (London: Croom Helm Ltd 1984) pp 267-8
28 C Dewey *The Passing of Barchester* (London & Rio Grande: The Hambledon Press 1991) p 28

demonstrates that the 1832 Reform Bill and the subsequent Whig period of reform did actually put an end to the old corruption.[29] Sydney Smith, a friend of Trollope, points out in a letter of 1 May 1834 to Charles James Blomfield (1786-1857), Bishop of London, that his commendable act of dividing livings to lessen the scandal of pluralities and thereby reduce bad feeling between extreme high church and low church parties was in itself suspect, since bishops never seem to give away 'their own superior emoluments to the improvement of smaller Bishoprics'.[30] Smith does concede that the Church does not possess 'enough of property . . . to pay each man a decent competence; they must therefore be paid by a lottery of Preferment, some more, some less'.[31] A subsequent letter from Smith of 10 May 1834 continues the argument, but expresses his pleasure that his daughter has married the addressee![32] And a letter from Smith on 13 July 1835 seeks preferment from the Rev Dr Charles Wordsworth for his son in any Cambridge college, but preferably Caius.[33]

Despite his strong hostile feelings on preferment, Trollope does at times reveal ambivalence to radical change in ecclesiastical matters. He cannot help putting into the mouths of his favourite fictional characters words which sound a warning to the Church. As early as 1854 in *The Warden,* Dr Grantly advises Mr Harding, his father-in-law, not to surrender the preferment he received from his bishop, for in acting on his individual conscience he would 'inflict a desperate blow on' his 'brother clergymen', and would encourage 'every cantankerous dissenter in England to make a similar charge against some source of clerical revenue', thereby failing the Church, which if 'so deserted . . . must fall to the ground altogether'.[34] Trollope therefore clearly fears the decline of the Church. Disliking the practice of active patronage, he is nonetheless concerned that the cessation of preferment could well strengthen the Dissenters' cause at the expense of the Church's survival.

e) In the Gift of the Crown

Trollope is equally critical of royal patronage and his laconic check-list of ways and means of becoming a bishop includes being 'a charmer of the royal ear', as well as 'marrying a bishop's daughter, editing a Greek play, and becoming a tutor to a noble pupil, while quickly adopting the political bias of the pupil's father'.[35] Royal patronage, he concedes, does not

29 WD Rubinstein 'The End of "Old Corruption" in Britain 1780-1860' *Past and Present* No 101 1983 p 73

30 N C Smith ed *The Letters of Sydney Smith* vol II (Oxford: The Clarendon Press [1834] 1953) pp 585-6

31 Smith p 586

32 Smith pp 615-16

33 Smith p 618

34 A Trollope *The Warden* (New York: Dutton [1854] 1969) p 132.

35 A Trollope *Clergymen of the Church of England* R apRoberts ed (Leicester: Leicester University Press [1866] 1974) p 21

necessarily constrain one's politics, for he shows that the evangelical Dr Proudie's ascendancy to a bishopric was made possible in an age where 'high church principles . . . were no longer to be surest claims to promotion', for Dr Proudie was tolerant of 'the idolatry of Rome' and 'the infidelity of Socinianism',[36] casually informing the reader that Proudie happened to be the nephew of an Irish baron and his wife the niece of a Scottish earl.[37] Socinianism was better known in the mid-nineteenth century as Unitarianism, subscribed to by a body of people who denied the Trinity and the divinity of Christ. Trollope attributes the attenuation of high church supremacy in the 1830s to one statesman, presumably Lord Melbourne, but both D W R Bahlman[38] and William T Gibson[39] accord far more influence to Queen Victoria than to either Disraeli or Gladstone, noting that Victoria's 'female side of the question' mostly seemed to prevail, and she could be *very* fickle; although she publicly favoured the broad church, she preferred the evangelical to the high church. Thus not only is Trollope able to write in the same novel with verismilitude of an evangelical cleric being made bishop, but also, through indirect royal patronage, of the high church Dr Arabin's promotion over the evangelical Mr Slope to the position of Dean. Dr Arabin's patron, Dr Gwynne, through his own web of patronage, succeeded in his protégé's name being 'favourably mentioned . . . in the ear of a distinguished person' 'over a cup of coffee, standing on a drawing-room rug in Windsor castle'.[40]

Patronage and Dissension

Trollope suggests that the practice of patronage could easily exacerbate doctrinal struggles for supremacy. He demonstrates that Lady Lufton's continued support of the spendthrift Mark Robarts in *Framley Parsonage* (1861) is as much part of the war which she is waging against the low church bishop, Dr Proudie, as it is of her obstinate refusal to admit that she had made a mistake in her choice of protégé.[41] In *Barchester Towers* he also tells with glee of Archdeacon Grantly's patronage of the high church Dr Arabin, who had even toyed with the idea of going to Rome. Dr Arabin's new living of St Ewold, he says, will try the avowed tolerance of Dr Proudie who 'would be forced to institute into a living, immediately

36 A Trollope *Barchester Towers* (Oxford: OUP [1857] 1980) p 19
37 *Barchester Towers* p 18
38 D W R Bahlman 'The Queen, Mr Gladstone and Church Patronage' *Victorian Studies* vol III 1960 pp 349-380
39 W T Gibson 'Disraeli's Church Patronage: 1868-1880' *Anglican Episcopal History* vol LXI 1992 pp 197-210
40 A Trollope *Barchester Towers* (Oxford: OUP [1857] 1980) p 259
41 A Trollope *Framley Parsonage* (Oxford: OUP [1861] 1991)

under his own nose, the enemy of his favourite chaplain',[42] for the evangelical Mr Slope and Dr Arabin have been 'engaged in a tremendous controversy . . . respecting the apostolic succession'.[43]

In *The Last Chronicle of Barset* published ten years later Trollope again shows how patronage could provoke doctrinal dissension. Dr Proudie, furious with Mr Crawley's lack of deference to him, asserts that 'No dean should have any patronage', for Mr Crawley's patron is Dr Arabin,[44] who had even paid for his curate's son to go to Marlborough.[45] Not that his generosity as patron had succeeded in maintaining Mr Crawley's friendship, for the curate, we remember from *Framley Parsonage*, could not forgive his friend for paying off his debts and giving him a living. His friend had been dearer to him when he had been 'as penniless as the curate himself' and Crawley's advice concerning Rome had made him the creditor and Arabin the debtor.[46] Bahlman confirms the dangers for politicians of ecclesiastical patronage, 'for every friend that a single appointment could make there might be made a hundred enemies',[47] and J M Bourne corroborates that there is often an unwelcome debt stored up by an act of patronage.[48]

The Gorham case, Hylson-Smith adjudges, was not so much over Gorham's refusal to accept the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, as it was over the patron's right 'to present whomsover he liked without regard to objections from the relevant authority of the church'.[49] Hylson-Smith adds that, had Gorham lost his case, Manning and a number of other Tractarians might not have gone to Rome, but 'six thousand Evangelical clergy' would have left the Church of England,[50] and the decline of the Church would have been accelerated.

W T Gibson reminds us that, since the Reformation, the appointment of bishops within the Church of England had been 'a royal prerogative'.[51] Prime Ministers could not resist the temptation to choose men whose political allegiance would help them, and the task was to persuade the

42 A Trollope *Barchester Towers* (Oxford: OUP [1857] 1980) p 128
43 *Barchester Towers* p 126
44 A Trollope *The Last Chronicle of Barset* (London: Pan Books [1867] 1968) p 114
45 *The Last Chronicle of Barset* p 29
46 A Trollope *Framley Parsonage* (Oxford: OUP [1861] 1991) p 217
47 D W R Bahlman 'The Queen, Mr Gladstone and Church Patronage' *Victorian Studies* vol III 1960 p 351
48 J M Bourne *Patronage and Society in Nineteenth-Century England* (London: Edward Arnold 1986) p 6
49 K Hylson-Smith *Evangelicals in the Church of England 1734-1984* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark 1988) p 124
50 Hylson-Smith p 125
51 W T Gibson 'Disraeli's Church Patronage: 1868-1880' *Anglican Episcopal History* vol LXI 1992 p 197

reigning monarch to endorse their partisan decisions. Gladstone's extensive knowledge of the Church drew him into many clashes with Queen Victoria over the selection of bishops, but Disraeli, whose ignorance of the Church as a whole made his task a laborious one, was, according to Gibson, 'responsible for the advancement of some of the most eminent churchmen of the century'.[52] There were, however, some appointments which, through Disraeli's inexperience and through Victoria's intransigence, led to continued dissension in the Church at the highest levels. Victoria insisted that Archibald Campbell Tait should become Archbishop of Canterbury totally against Disraeli's advice. Tait came to be regarded as one of the most powerful and hard-working archbishops in that position, but his broad church insistence on the continued links between Church and State has been re-evaluated by Marsh, not as a mark of success as seen by his contemporaries, but as part of the Church's gradual downfall, for Tait's victory was due more to society's increasing indifference to the Church.[53] Moreover, Tait's Public Worship Regulation Act of 1875 had enormous repercussions for the Church. All hope of unity disappeared, since the Act led to a concentration in the ecclesiastical courts on the ritual offences 'leaving judicial procedure for moral and doctrinal ones untouched',[54] but causing acrimony among all factions. Thus, Disraeli's unawareness of Christopher Wordsworth's ritualism before his promotion of Wordsworth to the see of Lincoln[55] proved to be catastrophic in the light of the Public Worship Act, and fuelled even more dissension within the Church. Nonetheless, Gibson points out that, whether from ignorance or not, 'there is no evidence that Disraeli was solely concerned with using church patronage to promote partisan concerns',[56] and the varied appointments across the political and ecclesiastical spectrum tended to work out fairly well.

Patronage, Pluralism and Absenteeism

It is impossible to speak of patronage without considering pluralities and absenteeism, and Trollope's complaints about curates' stipends lead him inevitably to scorn the absent cleric. Mr Crawley's patron, Dr Arabin, as dean, had undertaken to his patron, Dr Grantly, that although he 'intended to keep his rooms at Oxford, and to have the assistance of a curate at St Ewold . . . he promised to give as much time as possible to the neighbourhood of Barchester'.[57] At the end of *Dr Thorne* Trollope makes

52 W T Gibson 'Disraeli's Church Patronage: 1868-1880' *Anglican Episcopal History* vol LXI 1992 p 197

53 P T Marsh *The Victorian Church in Decline: Archbishop Tait & the Church of England 1868-1882* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press & Routledge 1969) p 286

54 Marsh p 195

55 W T Gibson 'Disraeli's Church Patronage: 1868-1880'*Anglican Episcopal History* vol LXI 1992 p 198

56 Gibson p 201

57 A Trollope *Barchester Towers* (Oxford: OUP [1857] 1980) p 128

a point of noting that the dean, Dr Arabin, was absent at Oxford for Mary Thorne's wedding,[58] and when Dr Arabin is needed to confirm Mr Crawley's innocence in *The Last Chronicle of Barset*, he is thought to be in Palestine, not even in Europe, with his wife, for 'a dean can go where he likes. He has no cure of souls to stand in the way of his pleasures'.[59] Deanships and prebends were both notorious sinecures, and Trollope was fond of pointing this out. Mark Robarts in *Framley Parsonage* is shown almost to sell his soul to the Duke of Omnium in order to obtain a prebendal stall. Fear of simony at first dampens his enthusiasm,[60] but when this is allayed,[61] the absenteeism afforded by such a position proves too attractive to refuse. The duties might involve only Saturdays and Sundays, and possibly not even these. Lucy's remark, 'It does not seem very hard work' is countered by the rejoinder of Mark's wife, Fanny, 'But it is very dignified'.[62]

Mr Chamberlaine, the prebendary from Salisbury, is the uncle of the squire, Harry Gilmore, in *The Vicar of Bullhampton*.[63] Trollope tells us that 'his lines had certainly fallen to him in very pleasant places', for he had given up his living in the fens, 'his health forbidding him' to live there. He had given two-thirds of his income to his curate and the other third to local charities, which silenced his unhappy bishop. His prebendal stall gave him £800 a year and a house for his bachelor life.[64] Deanships and prebends, often called 'golden prebends', were actually popular for incumbent and community alike, for, as Peter Virgin says, neither required the incumbent to reside and neither required the community to pay any tithes.[65] Non-residence meant that neither required much from the incumbent; no wonder deanships and prebendaries were regarded as sinecures. There is disagreement as to whether large benefices or small benefices led to pluralities. William Mathieson does not believe that plurality was more common with large benefices than with small, and says that the smaller the benefice the more likely an incumbent was to indulge in plurality in order to make ends meet.[66] Virgin argues that statistical evidence does not confirm this and that, if anything, the larger the benefice, the more likely the incidence of pluralism.[67] He adds that patrons

58 A Trollope *Doctor Thorne* (London: OUP [1858] 1971) p 566
59 A Trollope *The Last Chronicle of Barset* (London: Pan Books [1867] 1968) p 328
60 A Trollope *Framley Parsonage* (Oxford: OUP [1861] 1991) p 191
61 *Framley Parsonage* p 201
62 *Framley Parsonage* p 211
63 A Trollope *The Vicar of Bullhampton* (Oxford: OUP [1869] 1990)
64 *The Vicar of Bullhampton* p 163
65 P Virgin *The Church in an Age of Negligence* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co 1989) p 62
66 W L Mathieson *English Church Reform 1815-1840* (London: Longmans, Green & Co 1923) p 147
67 P Virgin *The Church in an Age of Negligence* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co 1989) p 145

with more than one advowson promoted pluralism more frequently than patrons with *only* one.[68]

Reasons given for non-residence often involved the state of disrepair or the size of the domestic establishment. The diary for April 29 1839 of the Rev Francis Witts (1793-1854) mentions signing a certificate 'that the glebe house at . . . Bledington was on account of its meanness unsuitable as a residence for the incumbent, so that he might obtain from the Bishop licence for non-residence'.[69] Francis Witts, Rector of Upper Slaughter, was himself the beneficiary of patronage, having succeeded to his living on the death of his uncle, the Rev Ferdinando Tracy Travell, and his wife was the daughter of a Mr Vavasour, Rector of Stow-on-the-Wold,[70] of which Anthony Trollope's cousin, Edward, became Archdeacon in 1867, remaining in that position until he became Suffragan Bishop of Nottingham in 1877. At the same time as he was made Archdeacon, Edward also became Prebendary of Liddington.[71] Thus Edward, too, was a pluralist and provided Trollope with a real-life model for his fictional pluralists.

Patronage and Trollope's own Family and Friends

Trollope proclaimed himself to be an amateur as far as his observations on the Church were concerned and, strictly speaking, he was, for he did not take holy orders. However, many of his ancestors, relatives and friends did, so his knowledge of the Church was not confined to reading. I believe that the reason for his reticence was his wish to protect those close to him from incurring any criticism which might later devolve on him. He would also not wish to anger those relatives and friends whose illustrious positions he respected. I have already mentioned the son of the Dean of Windsor and Anthony's cousin, Edward. Trollope had seven clerical ancestors by birth, seven clerical ancestors by marriage, at least nine clerical collateral relatives by the name of Trollope and fourteen clerical relatives by marriage. These relationships were verified in *The Family of Trollope* in 1875 by his cousin, Edward Trollope. His clerical relatives ranged from the wealthy to the poor. Two of his relatives were consecrated bishop in 1877, and ecclesiastical patronage was a way of life for his family. His cousin, Edward Trollope, author of *The Family of Trollope*, the younger brother of Anthony's relative and close friend, Sir Charles Trollope (KCB), became Suffragan Bishop of Nottingham in 1877. Edward and his older brother Charles were two of the sons of Sir John Trollope, sixth baronet. Edward's patron for the living of Leasingham with an income of £977, which he held from 1843 to 1893 together with

68 P Virgin *The Church in an Age of Negligence* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co 1989) p 258

69 D Verey ed *The Diary of a Cotswold Parson* (Gloucester: A Sutton 1978) p 157

70 Verey p 10

71 E Trollope *The Family of Trollope* (Lincoln: J Williamson 1875) p 23

subsequent appointments, was Sir John Thorold, who was his maternal relative. Edward's mother was Anne Thorold. The Thorolds were connected three times to the Trollope family, for Edward's grandfather, Thomas Middleton Trollope, the co-heir of Sir Thomas Trollope, fourth baronet of Casewick, married Isabella Thorold, and his ancestor, Sir William Trollope, second baronet, married Elizabeth, the widow of William Thorold. Thus both Edward's mother and his grandmother were Thorolds, as well as an ancestor. I mention these connections because the other bishop consecrated in 1877 was Anthony Wilson Thorold, who became Bishop of Rochester, rewarded for his pastoral and educational work in poor parts of London.[72] In 1890, eight years after Trollope's death, he was translated to the bishopric of Winchester, where the writer had gone to school. It is interesting that Edward Trollope was a scholar of some renown and writer of ecclesiastical works and was high church; Anthony Thorold was so strongly evangelical that he refused to visit ritualistic parishes. Anthony Thorold, in contrast to Edward Trollope, was no scholar, but was 'devoted and faithful in the work assigned to him' according to K Hylson-Smith,[73] and, in Gibson's opinion, was one of 'the best bishops of the century'.[74] These two bishops, then, fall into the stereotypes commonly depicted of high church and evangelical clergy. Anthony Thorold's first patron to the living of St Giles'-in-the-Fields with an income of £663 was the Lord Chancellor; his second patron twelve years later to the living of St Pancras with an income of £1,150 was the Dean and Chapter of St Paul's.[75] Both bishops were pluralists. Thus Trollope had within his own family examples of pluralists of the two extreme opposing factions.

Politically, too, the Trollope and Thorold families were connected through patronage and support. Although, in 1823, Sir John Thorold (d 1831), tenth baronet, was an independent Whig,[76] by 1849 his son, Sir John Thorold, eleventh baronet, had become a Tory and had nominated Sir John Trollope (1800-1874), seventh baronet, in 1852, when the latter was re-elected MP for South Lincolnshire.[77] The Welby family is also closely connected with the Trollope and Thorold families through geographical, political and marital proximity. W E Welby, with Sir John Trollope's support, became the latter's political successor as Conservative Member for South Lincolnshire, and owned land abutting that belonging to the Trollope and Thorold families.[78] George Trollope (b 1802), great-great-

72 W T Gibson 'Disraeli's Church Patronage: 1868-1880' *Anglican Episcopal History* vol LXI 1992 p 202

73 K Hylson-Smith *Evangelicals in the Church of England 1734-1984* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark 1988) p 164

74 W T Gibson 'Disraeli's Church Patronage: 1868-1880'*Anglican Episcopal History* vol LXI 1992 p 210

75 *Crockford* (London: Horace Cox 1882) p 791

76 R J Olney *Lincolnshire Politics 1832-1885* (London: OUP 1873) p 19

77 Olney p 155

78 Olney p 29

grandson of Sir Thomas Trollope, the third baronet, married Alicia, the daughter of Walter William Welby, of St Bartholomew's Hospital. George and Anthony Trollope were cousins. Anthony Trollope, therefore, not only had family connections with some of the highest levels of the Church of more than one faction, but also with politics and land ownership. His Barchester novels and his Palliser novels all show strong interconnections between the Church, politics and land ownership, many of his relatives through blood and marriage providing actual models for his creative illustrations.

At the other end of the scale, two of the three other great-great-grandsons of Sir Thomas Trollope (third baronet) became clergymen: William Trollope (1798-1863) and Arthur Trollope (1799-1848). William and Arthur had more modest careers in the Church than their relative, Edward Trollope. William Trollope, a scholar whose patrons were the Haberdashers' Company and Christ's Hospital, became the Vicar of Wigston Magna in 1834 with the small income of £109,[79] which may have been the reason he decided to emigrate to Tasmania, where he died nine years before Anthony Trollope was to visit. Arthur Trollope remained curate of St Mary-le-Bow in Cheapside, London, for twenty-one years until his death and it is more than possible that Anthony Trollope had Arthur in mind when he wrote about curates who served in difficult and impecunious urban London boroughs. In *Clergymen of the Church of England* he notes how small is the payment and how unpleasant is the location for the town incumbent,[80] and he foresees that, if life does not improve for these unfortunate representatives of the Church of England, 'we shall hardly find that sons of English gentlemen will continue to seek the Church as a profession'.[81]

Trollope's disapproval of ecclesiastical patronage may not have extended to a general disapproval of patronage, for he openly acknowledges in his letter of 25 August 1881 that he used the name of General Sir Charles Trollope (Edward Trollope's older brother) in order to be admitted into the United Services Club, revelling lightheartedly in the fact that a general had addressed him as Sir Anthony.[82]

Nepotism within patronage is a practice to which Trollope refers directly and indirectly. Archdeacon Grantly is the son of the bishop, Dr Grantly;[83] Dr Arabin, Archdeacon Grantly's protégé, is Grantly's brother-

79 *Crockford* (London: J Crockford 1858) p 794
80 A Trollope *Clergymen of the Church of England* R apRoberts ed (Leicester: Leicester University Press [1866] 1974) p 76
81 *Clergymen of the Church of England* p 77
82 J Hall ed *The Letters of Anthony Trollope* (California: Stanford University Press 1983) vol 11 p 920
83 A Trollope *The Warden* (New York: Dutton [1854] 1969)

in-law;[84] the Rev Henry Clavering presents his living to his future son-in-law, Mr Saul;[85] and Edward Fielding, Henry Clavering's other son-in-law, holds a family living belonging to his uncle.[86]

One of the most intriguing examples of nepotism and patronage in Trollope's own family is the complex story of the three Rev John Trollopes. The first John Trollope (1729–1794) had two marriages. His second marriage produced a daughter, Anne (1765–1802). Anne Trollope married in 1793 her cousin, the Rev Thomas Daniel Trollope. The first John Trollope was presented to the perpetual curacy of Little Marcle by the uncle of his second wife, and the curacy was a springboard to the rectories of Hartford and Sawtry St Andrew.[87] When the first John Trollope died, he passed his livings to his son-in-law and close kinsman, the Rev Thomas Daniel Trollope, who also had the living of Abbots Ripton, and was in 1814 to acquire the living of Down Frome in Dorset. A year before his own death in 1827, Thomas Daniel inherited the estate of his distant ninety-eight year old unmarried cousin, Jane Trollope, daughter of the first baronet, Sir Thomas Trollope. His son, the second John Trollope, born in 1800, inherited his ancestor Jane's estate, and was presented with the rectory of Crowmarsh Gifford by his patron, Lord Barrington.[88] The first John Trollope had three sons and eight daughters. His youngest son, Rear Admiral George Barne Trollope (1779–1850), had a son, the third John (Joseph) Trollope (1817–1893), who became Prebendary of Hereford in 1870. His first two patrons were the Bishop of Hereford and Sir W Rause Boughton, and his first two livings in the 1840s were Wigmore and Leinthall-Starkes.

It is more than possible that Anthony Trollope had his ancestors in mind when he commented acerbically in *Clergymen of the Church of England* that a cleric who has an aunt highly placed, or a father well-placed and is not himself 'of too tender a conscience in the matter of simony', may well 'hope to rise' in his profession.[89] Trollope's family history may also have made him acutely aware of how confusing names can be when members of the same family take up the same vocation, for in *The Vicar of Bullhampton* he emphasises that Parson John was 'always so called to distinguish him from the late parson, his cousin, who had been the Rev James Marrable'.[90] Truth was more confusing than fiction in the case of the writer's own family, with grandfather and two grandsons sharing a Christian name as well as a surname.

84 A Trollope *Barchester Towers* (Oxford: OUP [1857] 1980) p 259
85 A Trollope *The Claverings* (Oxford: OUP [1867] 1991) p 507
86 *The Claverings* p 463
87 E Trollope *The Family of Trollope* (Lincoln: J Williamson 1875) p 30
88 *Crockford* (London: J Crockford 1858) p 239
89 A Trollope *Clergymen of the Church of England* R apRoberts ed (Leicester: Leicester University Press [1866] 1974) p 96
90 A Trollope *The Vicar of Bullhampton* (Oxford: OUP [1869] 1990) p 86

The Small House at Allington[91] has strong albeit unacknowledged links with Trollope's family and patronage through its place-name. Virgin, noting that pluralism actually increased between 1700 and 1830[92], points out that Queen Anne's Bounty 'had the ultimate effect of increasing the wealth of private patrons as well as boosting the incomes of the beneficed clergy',[93] and he cites West Allington in Devon as one of the livings whose value soared between 1710 and 1830, rising from £80 to £685 a year. George Trollope (mentioned above), cousin of Anthony Trollope and well known to him, became the Chief Clerk of Christ's Hospital after he married Alicia, the daughter of Walter William Welby, of St Bartholomew's Hospital. George Trollope is referred to obliquely by Anthony Trollope in a letter of 24 May 1864 to a Mrs George Trollope who was Mary Trollope (d 1876), wife of George Trollope (1792–1871) of the Westminster Trollopes. Anthony Trollope asks Mary Trollope to help an acquaintance of his obtain an annuity from the Governesses' Benevolent Institution, and he remarks that 'Mrs Trollope of Christ's Hospital also has a vote'.[94] The Welbys, according to *The Extraordinary Black Book*, were an influential family and were well known pluralists, West Allington being one of the rural deaneries from which they absented themselves.[95] In *The Small House at Allington*, the parish of Allington and the squire's residence are shown to be very closely associated.[96] Crockford cites two clergymen by the name of Welby, who are obviously connected with each other, since the Rev Walter Hugh Earle Welby[97] is chaplain and commissioner to the Lord Bishop of St Helena in Jersey, the Rt Rev Thomas Earle Welby,[98] and it seems likely that both are in some way related to Walter William Welby and tenuously to the Trollopes, for both at some time had been rectors in or near Grantham in Lincolnshire. In addition, as mentioned above, the Welbys owned land in Lincolnshire abutting that of the Trollope and Thorold families, and shared both their grazing interests and political connections.

Besides Trollope's relatives, there were many friends and acquaintances of his who were Church of England clerics, and there is evidence in his correspondence that he actively sought to make and maintain friendships with Church dignitaries, sometimes simply out of personal regard,

91 A Trollope *The Small House at Allington* (London: Dent [1864] 1970)
92 P Virgin *The Church in an Age of Negligence* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co 1989) p 73
93 Virgin p 69
94 J Hall ed *The Letters of Anthony Trollope* vol I (California: Stanford University Press 1983) pp 265-6
95 J Wade *The Extraordinary Black Book: An Exposition of Abuses in Church and State* (New York: AM Kelly [1832] 1970) p 128
96 A Trollope *The Small House at Allington* (London: Dent [1864] 1970) p 1
97 *Crockford* (London: Horace Cox 1882) p 1152
98 *Crockford* p 951

sometimes for verification of his fictional and nonfictional ecclesiastical interests. When Trollope was writing *The Vicar of Bullhampton*, and wanted to check details of Mr Frank Fenwick's patronage, he wrote on 16 September 1868 to the Rev Francis Hayward Joyce, Vicar of Harrow, where Trollope first went to school, seeking information as to where to locate 'title deeds and mapped definitions of Glebe lands'.[99] Furthermore, Trollope's views on ecclesiastical patronage may well have been the reason why he suggests in a letter of 6 March 1867 to the Rev Charles Burney, Vicar of Halstead and Archdeacon of Rochester (1845-1864),[100] that he look for help elsewhere for his protégé now that he is 'on the warm side of the wall'.[101] Two years later, in a letter on 22 July, Trollope urges his friend and his fellow clergymen to change the form of ecclesiastical payment from the endowment system to one which is 'apportioned to work done', not because the endowments may disappear but because they may simply 'not suffice to give you the crust'.[102]

Another of Trollope's correspondents was James Pycroft (1813-1895), an author and a perpetual curate for eleven years in Devon,[103] who would almost certainly have known the kind of financial hardships which Trollope depicted in his novels and regretted in no uncertain terms in *Clergymen of the Church of England*.[104] Pycroft wrote mainly on cricket, but also wrote *Oxford Memories* in 1886. As with a number of other clergymen, Pycroft used his writing as a means of extricating himself from the poverty of his curacy, the sort of poverty which, Trollope assesses, reduces the churchman's personal self-esteem as well as his public status.[105]

A lifelong school friend of Trollope, Sydney Smith, shared with him a concern for the ways in which remuneration for the clergy was calculated and distributed. Sydney Smith's own career in the Church was very successful, thanks to his influential patrons, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who presented him to the living of Worth with an income of £623 a year,[106] and William IV, who presented him to the prebendal stall of Mora in 1831 which he held until his death.[107] Peter Virgin's biography of

99 J Hall ed *The Letters of Anthony Trollope* vol 1 (California: Stanford University Press 1983) pp 446-7

100 J le Nève ed *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae* 1541-1857 (London: The Athlone Press 1969) p 14

101 J Hall ed *The Letters of Anthony Trollope* vol 1 (California: Stanford University Press 1983) p 371

102 Hall p 476

103 *Crockford* (London: Horace Cox 1882) p 890

104 A Trollope *Clergymen of the Church of England* R apRoberts ed (Leicester: Leicester University Press [1866] 1974) pp 61-77

105 *Clergymen of the Church of England* pp 70-71

106 *Crockford* (London: Horace Cox 1870) p 654

107 *Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense* or *London Diocesan Clergy Succession from the Earliest Time to 1898* Compiled by the Rev G Hennessy (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co 1960) p 2

Sydney Smith describes him as a man 'driven by high principle . . . very ambitious for himself and could be money-grubbing. Complete lack of vanity coexisted with enormous pride'.[108]

Patronage and the Decline of the Church of England

Marion Fay was Trollope's last novel and is well known for its pessimistic depiction of the Church, represented by the unscrupulous Mr Greenwood. The seeking and conferring of patronage through letters was common, and Trollope alludes to the practice in the novel when Lady Clara Kingsbury writes to her sister, Geraldine Persiflage, to ask if the latter's husband could find something for the indolent Mr Greenwood.[109] The petition is unsuccessful. This was not always the case in real-life matters, however. There are several letters in the correspondence from Henry Parry Liddon to Walter Kerr Hamilton, Bishop of Salisbury, which request the latter's patronage. One of these asks for the ordination of a young man whose parents happen to be Presbyterian.[110] Liddon himself was of evangelical parents but had become high church. Another letter in the same collection urges Hamilton to make Oxenham his next chaplain, now that he has lost Daubeny. Oxenham, too, has a low church mother, 'and this has caused him a good deal of anxiety'. Liddon stresses that his plea be kept confidential.[111] A letter from Thomas Arnold to Hamilton suggests a name for a mastership at Rugby, and Arnold, too, insists that his request be maintained in the strictest confidence.[112]

More indirect, but therefore more pervasive and more successful, was the kind of nepotistic patronage which did not require specific requests. Several letters from Liddon refer to Eddie, how well he is, how he has just seen him and so on. One adds a postscript saying that Eddie will be glad to hear of an acquaintance's first class honours, which will, Liddon hopes, encourage Eddie and his friends to decide 'their intellectual future'.[113] Eddie is Edward Hamilton, Hamilton's son, who was at Oxford when Liddon was at Christ Church. Edward Hamilton went on to become Gladstone's private secretary.[114] Liddon refers to Gladstone many times in his letters as the close mutual friend of both himself and of Hamilton.

108 P Virgin *Sydney Smith* (London: Harper Collins 1994) p ix
109 A Trollope *Marion Fay* (Oxford: OUP [1882] 1992) p 100
110 Correspondence from H P Liddon to W K Hamilton (HAM 6/95/99) in Pusey House Oxford 27 Jan 1867
111 Correspondence from H P Liddon to W K Hamilton (HAM 6/95/143) in Pusey House Oxford 15 July 1868
112 Correspondence from T Arnold to W K Hamilton (HAM/6/10/6) in Pusey House Oxford November 1840
113 Correspondence from H P Liddon to W K Hamilton (HAM/6/95/95) in Pusey House Oxford 16 December 1866
114 D W R Bahlman 'The Queen, Mr Gladstone and Church Patronage' *Victorian Studies* vol III 1960 p 364

There is also an abstruse allusion in Liddon's letter of 19 July 1866 to Hamilton's patronage of Liddon for a prebendal stall at Salisbury Cathedral, which demonstrates the depth of friendship between the two men and the extent to which the abuse of patronage could lead. Liddon remarks that his prebendal stall does not seem to have any preaching duties attached to it, and then he expresses the hope that 'a spiritual restoration of our Cathedrals will follow . . . in the wake of the material one . . .'.[115] Liddon's two comments in close juxtaposition strike a discordant note for the modern reader. Liddon casually refers to his acceptance of a sinecure in 1866. Sinecures were said by Bourne to have disappeared by 1835,[116] and Owen Chadwick states that the Dean and Chapter Act of 1840 'suppressed all non-resident prebends (about 360)'.[117] Yet Liddon seems, in his casual acceptance, not to realise that he is himself part of the material rise of the Church without, in this particular instance, contributing to the 'spiritual restoration', for which he hopes. Both M J D Roberts[118] and Clive Dewey,[119] on the other hand, argue that patronage did not necessarily place birthright over merit and that, even in the eighteenth century, bishops could come from humble origins through the process of patronage,[120] and Liddon is universally admired as a fine and hard-working churchman, people coming from far and wide to listen to his magnificent sermons.

Nepotism in ecclesiastical patronage was widespread. Mathieson speaks of the Marquis of Bath, who had three livings of £1,236 in his gift, all of which he gave to his son;[121] and the Duke of Beaufort had done the same with his four livings, whose value was £2,422, and two of these were sinecures.[122] Nor was nepotistic patronage less common among the Evangelicals. William Wilberforce's sister was the mother of John Bird Sumner, later Archbishop of Canterbury, and of Charles Richard Sumner, Bishop of Winchester. Charles Sumner acted as patron to both Samuel and Henry Wilberforce in their early careers.[123] Of more influence for the Evangelicals was the selective patronage by aristocrats. Hylson-Smith speaks of the patronage of several evangelical clergymen by Lord

115 Correspondence from H P Liddon to W K Hamilton (HAM/6/95/82) in Pusey House Oxford 19 July 1866

116 J M Bourne *Patronage and Society in Nineteenth-Century England* (London: Edward Arnold 1986) p 23

117 O Chadwick *The Victorian Church Part I* (London: A & C Black 1971) p 137

118 M J D Roberts 'Private Patronage and the Church of England 1800-1900' *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* April 1981

119 C Dewey *The Passing of Barchester* (London & Rio Grande: The Hambledon Press 1991)

120 Dewey p 146

121 W L Mathieson *English Church Reform 1815-1840* (London: Longmans, Green & Co 1923) p 113

122 Mathieson p 114

123 D Newsome *The Parting of Friends* (London: J Murray 1966) pp 124, 130, 155

Dartmouth, Lord Smythe and Lady Huntingdon.[124] The Second Earl of Dartmouth deliberately set about buying advowsons in order to give them to selected men, and, according to Ian Bradley, bought 'nearly a dozen livings' for this purpose.[125] The most famous of evangelical patrons was of course Charles Simeon (1759–1836), who 'used money inherited through a brother's death to buy the patronage of some livings',[126] which developed into the Simeon Trust.

Was Trollope right in his assessment of ecclesiastical patronage? His acute awareness of the gradual decline of the Church is illustrated by his increasingly pessimistic portrayal of the Church in his fiction. *The Warden*,[127] his first Barchester novel, ultimately supports the Church's strength and integrity, having initially drawn attention to the abuse of a charitable endowment, but each subsequent novel questions more and more the Church's unassailable supremacy, partly through the human failings of its representative officers, partly through its rigid structures and practices. One of the practices which nourishes his obvious fear of the Church's ultimate downfall is the question of patronage. The reforms of his century sought to eliminate the power and practice of patronage in the Church as elsewhere, so that merit could prevail as a means of advancement. Yet historians of the last decade seem to believe that patronage did not necessarily preclude merit as a determinant, and at least one historian, Roberts, argues that the reforms which modified ecclesiastical patronage, followed as they were by the agricultural depression of the late 1870s and 1880s, perhaps precipitated the decline of the Church, while not necessarily halting patronage itself.[128] The accuracy of John Wade's *Extraordinary Black Book*[129] of so-called Church abuses has long been questioned for its erroneous statistics. Virgin notes that Wade's 1822 edition conflated all Welsh clergy called John Jones into a single and mythical individual, whose income would have been £5,456 a year.[130] Yet Wade's book helped to accelerate changes in ecclesiastical patronage, among them the Pluralities Act of 1838.

124 K Hylson-Smith *Evangelicals in the Church of England 1734-1984* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark 1988) p 34

125 I Bradley *The Call to Seriousness: the Evangelical Impact on the Victorians* (London: J Cape 1976) p 60

126 K Hylson-Smith *Evangelicals in the Church of England 1734-1984* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark 1988) p 75

127 A Trollope *The Warden* (New York: Dutton [1854] 1969)

128 M J D Roberts 'Private Patronage and the Church of England 1800-1900' *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* April 1981

129 J Wade *The Extraordinary Black Book: An Exposition of Abuses in Church and State* (New York: AM Kelly [1832] 1970)

130 P Virgin *The Church in an Age of Negligence* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co 1989) p 204

Lord Grimthorpe, five years after Anthony Trollope's death, assesses that, although the Public Worship Bill of 1875 had 'excited twenty times the interest' of the Church Patronage Bill of 1886,[131] the latter bill would have 'far more alarming and injurious qualities'.[132] He notes that, owing to a number of different causes, the net value of livings had declined severely and there were far fewer 'moderately rich clergymen . . . every year',[133] and that this was sharply decelerating the influence of the Church. And at the very end of the nineteenth century, Douglas Macleane, eerily echoing Trollope's views on the importance of gentlemanly background, questions the success of the reforms and voices the very fears of Trollope concerning the decline of the Church, except that he attributes the decline to the *loss* of patronage, *not* its continuance. He observes with dismay the change in the social calibre of new clergymen. Primary school teachers, commercial clerks, small merchants, 'higher class' artisans and farmers' sons were now applying for ordination in the hope of raising their social status. Furthermore, he insists that the 'testing of motive and training of powers' be implemented, for 'it would be an ill-day for the Church of England when she ceased to have a learned clergy'.[134]

He ends on a *positive* argument for patronage, disagreeing with Sydney Smith's notion that the new class of 'wordly men' would be willing 'to enter a poorly-paid profession on the chance of one of a few prizes falling to their lot'.[135] He believes that 'an underbred priesthood would be almost as great a calamity as an unlearned one', dismissing the French policy of drawing clerics from modest social backgrounds, for their training period is much longer, their priesthood more ministerial than pastoral, and their parishioners comprise fewer 'gentlefolk' than their English counterparts. Finally he expresses his fear that the day may come when, for those attracted to the Church, £180 a year and a house may cease to be poverty and when 'the intellectual and gently-bred....ardently interested in things ecclesiastical', who are now prepared to patronise the Church with their services, will desist from doing so.[136]

A hundred years on, *The Spectator* of 6 August 1994 speaks of an uncanny living legend: the Rev Henry Croylan Thorold (b 1921),[137] direct descendant by marriage of Anthony Trollope and the bishops, Edward Trollope and Anthony Wilson Thorold. The Rev Henry Croylan Thorold

131 Lord Grimthorpe 'Church Patronage' *Quarterly Review* CLXIV 1887 p 192
132 Grimthorpe p 192
133 Grimthorpe p 190
134 D Macleane 'The Church as a Profession' *The National Review* (London) vol XXXIII August 1899 p 954
135 Macleane p 955
136 Macleane p 955
137 H Massingberd 'All Flats, Fogs and Fens' *Spectator* vol CCLXXIII no MMMMMMMMCCCCCCLXV 6 August 1994 pp 20-1

not only lives in Marston, which has remained the family seat for many centuries, but is also known as a scholarly antiquarian bachelor clergyman, whose co-patronage of five livings[138] would have made Anthony Trollope shudder that the practice of ecclesiastical preferment could so continue a century after his death. Or, with the benefit of hindsight, would it?

JILL DUREY lectures in English at Edith Cowan University, Perth, Western Australia.

Dr Durey adds this footnote:

I am indebted to Hugh Trollope's kind gift to me of Edward Trollope's The Family of Trollope, *the family tree which he is himself compiling, and for his helpful additional information. I also owe a great debt of gratitude to Peter Edwards, Darnell Professor of English, The University of Queensland, whose generous help and advice has been invaluable. Pusey House has been extremely helpful too and I am most grateful to them. Edith Cowan University has provided me with generous grants to obtain materials.*

138 *Debrett's Illustrated Baronetage* 1990 p 856