Philip Pusey / [Sir Ernest Clarke].

Contributors

Clarke, Ernest, Sir.

Publication/Creation

[Place of publication not identified] : [publisher not identified], 1900.

Persistent URL

https://wellcomecollection.org/works/bg9f3tp4

wellcome collection

Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
https://wellcomecollection.org

Walker & Boutall ph. sc.

Ph. Pusey.

From the original crayon drawing by
George Richmond R.A. at Pusey House.

PHILIP PUSEY

BORN JUNE 25, 1799.

DIED JULY 9, 1855.

BY

SIR ERNEST CLARKE

SECRETARY OF THE
ROYAL AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY OF ENGLAND.

WITH A PORTRAIT.

LONDON:
13 HANOVER SQUARE.
1900.

FROM THE

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY OF ENGLAND,

THIRD SERIES, VOL. XI. PART I. 1900.

PHILIP PUSEY.

(JUNE 25, 1799–JULY 9, 1855).

THE name of the first Chairman of the Journal Committee of the Royal Agricultural Society, and the first Editor of its Journal, may possibly be somewhat unfamiliar to latter-day readers. But in his time Philip Pusey was a great agricultural name to conjure with, and it is hardly too much to say that the Royal Agricultural Society owes more to him than to any other man for his fostering guidance of its early footsteps.

When England began to emerge, about the beginning of Her present Majesty's reign, from the acute agricultural distress into which it had been plunged after the Napoleonic wars, men began to talk about the advantages which might be gained by what Earl Spencer called at the Smithfield Club dinner of 1837 a "national society for agricultural purposes exclusively."[1] Amongst the men of mark to whom this project commended itself was Philip Pusey, then a busy and ardent Member of Parliament, known to and appreciated by the leaders alike of politics, fashion, and literature.

The particular cause of his identifying himself so closely with the national agricultural society that was being projected will probably now never be known; but he was "in the movement," in the prime of life, some of his best friends were on the list of promoters; and so he took the step which, while it brought him renown in his own days, probably shortened his active and useful life.

[1] See Journal R.A.S.E. 3rd series, vol. i. (1890), p. 2.

Pusey was present at the inaugural meeting of the English Agricultural Society, held at Freemasons' Tavern on May 9, 1838;[1] was elected a member of the original Committee; took a very active share in the preliminaries for the first meeting of the Society at Oxford, where he had spent his undergraduate days; discussed with John Murray the Second the scheme for a journal on the lines of the "Quarterly Review"; and soon proved himself one of the chief pillars and supports of the new and promising Society. He was eminently adapted for the position which he speedily achieved in the counsels of Hanover Square. Hard-working, resourceful, at once a profound scholar and a skilled farmer, he carried out the Society's motto, "Practice with Science," with unexampled devotion and ability for the first seventeen years of the Society's existence; but when he passed into the shadow, his splendid efforts were not wholly realised at the time, and to-day he is almost forgotten. It has been judged fitting, therefore, that before the nineteenth century, for whose agriculture he did so much, has come to an end, some sketch of his life and work should be given in the Journal to which he devoted so many patient years of loving voluntary labour.

Philip Pusey was born at Pusey, Berks, on June 25, 1799, and was the eldest son of the Hon. Philip Pusey of Pusey, by his wife, Lady Lucy Sherard, daughter of Robert, fourth Earl of Harborough. His father was a Bouverie, the youngest son of Jacob, first Viscount Folkestone, but had assumed the name of Pusey on April 3, 1784, as a condition of succession to the Pusey estates. The original Pusey family was a very old one, dating back certainly to the thirteenth century, and as it possessed an ancient tenure horn (still existing), with the legend "Kyng Knowde [Canute] geve Wyllyam Pewse Thys horne to holde by thy lande,"[2] it claimed an even greater antiquity. But the last of the family in the direct line died childless in 1710, and the last female descendant (Miss Jane Allen Pusey) died in 1789, when the property came by the bequest of herself and her sister Elizabeth into the hands of the Hon. Philip Bouverie.[3]

The Hon. Philip Bouverie or Pusey entered into possession of the Pusey estates in 1789, being then forty-one years old and a bachelor. He was a formal, precise, and punctilious

[1] See Journal R.A.S.E. 3rd series, vol. i. (1890), pp. 6–10.

[2] *Archæologia*, vol. iii. 1786.

[3] The whole story of the Puseys and Bouveries is told very completely and accurately by Dr. Liddon in the Appendix to vol. i. of his *Life of Dr. E. B. Pusey* (1893).

man, highly intellectual, and very benevolent and even lavish in his charities (his sons described him on a memorial window as "Philip Pusey, Pious and Bounteous"). After nine years of occupancy of Pusey, he married in 1798 Lady Lucy Sherard, widow of Sir Thomas Cave, Bart., who was twenty-four years his junior. A son, Philip, the subject of this memoir, was born on June 25, 1799, and a second son, Edward Bouverie, afterwards the famous theologian, on August 22, 1800. Subsequently five daughters in succession, and then two sons were born; but as the two elder brothers were divided by an interval of ten years from the two younger, "they thus formed a natural pair, both at home and at school, and were regarded by their parents and by the younger children as a sort of duumvirate, occupying a distinct rank in the family."[1]

In 1807, when Philip was eight years old, the brothers were sent to a preparatory school at Mitcham, kept by the Rev. Richard Roberts, where they had as schoolmates, amongst other men who afterwards became distinguished, Lord Derby and his brother, and Lord Carlisle. Mr. Roberts was a pedagogue of the old type, and a fine classical scholar. His teaching was thorough, and under him both boys laid the foundations of the real scholarship for which each afterwards became famous. From Mitcham they went to Eton, where on January 16, 1812, they were entered in the house of the Rev. Thos. Carter. Subsequently Philip went to Christ Church, where, as at Eton, his greatest friend was Lord Porchester, afterwards the third Earl of Carnarvon. On a visit to Highclere, Pusey fell in love with his friend's sister, Lady Emily Herbert, to whom he became engaged in 1818. Mr. Pusey senior (an inflexible Tory in politics) did not approve of the match, on the ground that Lord Carnarvon was a Whig, who made speeches on behalf of Queen Caroline; but also, it must be said, on the more valid ground of the known delicacy of the lady's family. Presumably on account of his father's objection to his marrying, Pusey (who was, amongst other accomplishments, a good linguist) set off with his future brother-in-law, Lord Porchester, on a foreign tour; and whilst in Spain they had an extremely narrow escape from death. In the course of their wanderings the adventurous travellers fell, near Montserrat, Catalonia, into the hands of the insurgent Guerillas, and were on the point of being shot as Constitutionalists (*i.e.* of the army of the Cortes), being only saved by the providential arrival of their carriage. A graphic account of this adventure, which happened in 1822,

[1] Liddon, vol. i. p. 2.

was afterwards published by Lord Carnarvon,[1] as a note to his book on "Portugal and Galicia," issued in 1836, and in its day a very popular work.

Pusey, his mind expanded and his interests enlarged by foreign travel, returned home at the end of June 1822, and, his father's objections being at length waived or conquered, he was married to Lady Emily Herbert on October 4, 1822. Lady Emily was beautiful,[2] graceful, accomplished, a great reader of poetry, theology and science, and an artist at least in knowledge and feeling (she was a pupil of Copley Fielding). The central feature of her character was a remarkable combination of strength and tenderness. She was throughout an affectionate and helpful supporter of her husband, and her influence for good over her brother-in-law Edward was hardly less conspicuous.

During the early years of their marriage, Pusey and his wife lived for some time at Rome, in the Palazzo Aldobrandini, where they made the acquaintance of the Chevalier Bunsen. Pusey left behind him a memorial of this sojourn in his presentation of a pedestal for the font in the German Chapel at Rome, with groups in relief by Thorwaldsen.[3]

On April 14, 1828, the Hon. Philip Pusey died, and his son came into possession of the family estate, though he did not commence residence at Pusey for two years afterwards. He appears at first to have interested himself in financial questions, for he wrote to his father-in-law, the Earl of Carnarvon, two letters on the Sinking Fund, and on Sir Robert Peel's financial statement of February 15, 1828, which were published as pamphlets in 1828. On the retirement of Mr. Henry Bonham early in 1830, he stood for Parliament at Rye, and was returned on March 1, 1830. His triumph was however short-lived, as on May 17 his election was cancelled at the instance of a Committee presided over by Lord Palmerston. The death of George IV. gave him another chance; and in the first Parliament of William IV. he was chosen (July 30, 1830) as one of the two members for Chippenham. During the Reform agitation he wrote a pamphlet entitled "The New Constitution," which was described by the "Quarterly Review" (vol. xlv. p. 289) as "one of the best both for reasoning and language that

[1] Mr. Pusey was always tenderly attached to Lord Carnarvon, and the death at Pusey of his brother-in-law and early college friend in the autumn of 1849 was one of the great sorrows of Pusey's life.

[2] Her portrait appeared in one of the Books of Beauty of the time (Burke's *Portrait Gallery*, 1833, ii. 116).

[3] A woodcut of this pedestal appears on p. 373 of vol. i. of Bunsen's *Memoirs*, and the text of the Latin and German inscriptions is given on p. 374.

have appeared at this crisis. . . . The outburst of fresh talent on the Conservative side, since these struggles began, has indeed been splendid."

At the general election in April 1831 Pusey lost his seat for Chippenham; but he returned to the House in July 1831, as member for Cashel, and it is curious that his one contribution to the debates of this Parliament was in defence of his old borough of Chippenham. In the first reformed Parliament he attempted to secure the third seat given to the county of Berks under the Act of 1832, but was unsuccessful, the two old members being returned, with Mr. John Walter; Pusey, the last on the poll, being, however, only 39 votes behind. In 1835 he became member for Berks, and retained that position through four Parliaments, up to July 1852. In his address to the electors in 1835 Pusey "thought it very important to call attention to 'the difference between the object of the Church and the form of its constitution or legal architecture.'"[1]

As already stated, Pusey took in 1838 a prominent part in the formation of the Royal Agricultural Society, with whose interests he was afterwards so closely identified, and the organisation of which, no doubt, gave an agricultural bias to his mind. At the annual dinner of the Smithfield Club held on December 11, 1837, the President (Earl Spencer)—better known as Lord Althorp—mooted the project of a new Society for the encouragement and development of British agriculture. The idea was supported by the Duke of Richmond, Mr. Handley, M.P., and others; and early in May, 1838, advertisements appeared in the morning papers calling a public meeting to consider the establishment of an English Agricultural Society. This notice was influentially signed, and the meeting, held on May 9 at Freemasons' Tavern, was crowded to excess. Earl Spencer was in the chair, and amongst the other speakers were the Duke of Richmond, Earl Fitzwilliam, Lord Portman, Sir Robert Peel, Sir James Graham, Mr. Handley, M.P., Mr. Shaw Lefevre (Viscount Eversley), and Mr. Pusey. Pusey was a member of the original Committee of Management, which at once set to work, and at the General Meeting of members, held in December, referred to the proposal to establish a Journal for

[1] He was also anxious to promote the "reconversion of Dissenters," and with this view to substitute Milman's hymns for those of Sternhold and Hopkins in the Church services. He and his brother Edward—whose sympathies were warmly enlisted on the side of Sternhold and Hopkins—had quite a controversy on this subject; and it is curious that the lay brother Philip should have set himself to write several hymns, the best known of which is "Lord of our life and God of our salvation," the authorship of which few suspect (see Liddon's *Life of E. B. Pusey*, vol. i. p. 299).

"the diffusion of agricultural information." The management of this Journal was entrusted to a Committee, of which Mr. Pusey was elected Chairman; but from the first the editorial control was placed exclusively in his hands. Mr. Pusey was already a Quarterly Reviewer,[1] and the Journal was modelled somewhat on the lines of that review, and was placed in the hands of Mr. Murray as publisher. Even as early as 1844 the Journal had made its mark, for the "Quarterly Review" (lxxiii. p. 481) said of it:—

> The Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England will be a permanent monument to the honourable member for the county of Berks, whose patriotic earnestness of purpose induced him to take on himself the gratuitous labour of its editorship. The same spirit of zealous endeavour to assist in teaching the farmers of England to meet the necessities of the times has prompted Mr. Pusey, not only to prepare for the press the contributions of others, but also to enrich its pages with several most instructive articles from his own skilful pen on the recent improvements in agriculture, and on its actual condition in some of our counties where it is most advanced.

And Earl Cathcart, Chairman of the Journal Committee at a later date, observed in 1874 that

> Mr. Pusey's agricultural life may find a fitting monument in the Journal. He edited the Journal from the first, and until his lamented and premature decease in 1855. A man of high character and sober judgment, Mr. Pusey was at once a philosopher and a man of business; a man in advance of his age. "Practice with Science," the motto of the Society, his characteristic and oft-repeated words, even he thought more desirable than probable. Pusey was a natural leader of men, endowed by nature with that indescribable essence called genius.[2]

As Lord Cathcart suggests, "Practice with Science" was, at the time of the Society's formation, more an aspiration than a reality. It is true that long before that date Sir Humphry Davy had tried to join science in close connection with the practice of agriculture; but, interesting as were the lectures of Davy, and the researches of Saussure and of Boussingault, there was only imperfect knowledge of the nutrition of plants, or even of the materials necessary for their growth. Such knowledge could not, in fact, arise until chemists had more complete acquaintance with the mineral constituents of plants derived from the soil, and other elements concerned in the nutrition of plants. It was in the year 1840 that Liebig published his famous book on the Chemistry of Agriculture,[3] a work from

---

[1] See Smiles' *Murrays*, vol. ii. p 378.

[2] Journal R.A.S.E. 2nd series, vol. x. 1874, p. 527.

[3] Liebig's *Organic Chemistry in its Applications to Agriculture and Physiology*, published in Brunswick, 1840. English edition, edited by Dr. Lyon Playfair, London, 1840.

the appearance of which, as Sir John Lawes said in 1851,[1] "we may date a spirit of investigation into Agricultural Chemistry such as had not previously been manifested in this country." On the publication of this epoch-making work Pusey, with all the earnestness of his nature, determined to make the motto of the Society not merely a name, but a reality. He cultivated the friendship of Dean Buckland, the geologist, Baron Liebig, Sir Richard Owen, Dr. Lyon Playfair, and other scientific men, and frequently gathered them together at his own house in the country to induce them to bring their science into more intimate relation with agricultural practice. He co-operated with Lord Ducie, Lord Spencer and others who were imbued with the same desire to join science and practice. It was chiefly at the suggestion of Mr. Pusey that several scientific men associated in a tour throughout the country, and addressed gatherings of farmers in such houses as those of Sir Robert Peel, Lord Fitzwilliam, and many others. As these gatherings of farmers were addressed on science in relation to agriculture by the associated tourists—Baron Liebig, Dr. Buckland, Dr. Daubeny, and Dr. Lyon Playfair—considerable interest in the subject was excited throughout the country, and the Society, which was then in its infancy, received a considerable impetus.

The early history of the English Agricultural Society (which blossomed forth in 1840 with a Royal Charter under the title of the Royal Agricultural Society of England) has already been told in its Journal.[2] So also has its first historic meeting, held at Oxford on July 17, 1839.[3] Earl Spencer was the President at this meeting, and took the chair at the Annual Dinner, when Mr. Pusey was amongst the speakers. On March 26, 1840, the Queen granted the Society a Charter of Incorporation, the Duke of Richmond being named therein as the first President of "the Royal Agricultural Society of England." But at the first general meeting held after the granting of the Charter, Mr. Pusey was nominated as President by Earl Spencer, who said: "The question is, in selecting your President, will you look to rank and station only, or will you look to the working capabilities of the individual? My opinion is that the President of the Society should be a working man." Mr. Pusey thus came into office after the Society's meeting held at Cambridge on July 15, 1840, and retired from the presidency after the meeting held at Liverpool on July 21–23, 1841, being succeeded by Mr. Henry Handley. At a later period of his

[1] Journal R.A.S.E. vol. xii. (1851), p. 1.
[2] *Ibid.* 3rd series, vol. i. 1890, pp. 1–19.
[3] *Ibid.* 3rd series, vol. v. 1894, pp. 205–234.

life (in 1853) he was again elected President, but was unable to attend the annual meeting at Lincoln in 1854 on account of the serious illness of his wife.

Undoubtedly the six or seven years following 1838 were the happiest and most prosperous of Mr. Pusey's career. He was then in the prime of his life. He met on terms of intellectual equality all the leading thinkers and public men of the time. If he intervened in a debate in Parliament, the Minister who replied paid a little compliment to his sincerity, or his ability, or his knowledge of the subject. He breakfasted with Samuel Rogers and Monckton Milnes. He entertained Lord Spencer, Sir Robert Peel, Gladstone, Carlyle, Bunsen, Whewell, Grote, the Bishop of Oxford (Wilberforce), and many more. He attended the meetings of learned societies (he became a F.R.S. on May 27, 1830). He was to be seen at the Athenæum and the 'Travellers', and was a member of the more eclectic Grillion Club. He was one of the founders of the London Library in 1840, and a member of the original committee. He discussed Plato and Demosthenes with the scholars, religion with the theologians, and agricultural improvement with the chemists and farmers. He wrote on philosophy for the "Quarterly Review," on current topics for the "Morning Chronicle," and upon farming for the Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society.

Bunsen—with whom he had already formed an acquaintance at Rome—came to England for the first time in 1838, and spent a great deal of time with the Puseys as their guest in Berkshire and in London. Bunsen's memoirs of this period are full of references to "dear Pusey." *Apropos* of a meeting between Pusey and Arnold, Bunsen writes to his wife on February 13, 1839, "I wish I could give you an adequate idea of the love and admiration I feel for Pusey; admiration for his extraordinary statesmanlike judgment, wherever he is, on the ground of his Parliamentary life and business, in which he moves as a fish in the water; not less, for his admirable temper and character."[1] Later he speaks of Pusey and himself (there being no debate in the House) "remaining together and reading Sophocles, which cheered the good friend considerably"; of a discussion between Pusey and himself, lasting all the afternoon, on the chronology of St. Paul's Epistles, and the authorship of the Acts of the Apostles; of breakfasting with Pusey upon "ham and speculative philosophy." And again: "Pusey is a most unique union of a practical Englishman and an intellectual

[1] *Memoirs of Baron C. J. Bunsen*, vol. i. pp. 504, 507, 508, 522.

German, so that when speaking in one capacity, one might think he had lost sight of the other."

In 1843 Pusey had made a visit to Scotland, to study for himself the Scottish Poor Law system, and he gained some credit by a pamphlet on "The management of the Poor in Scotland," which he published in 1844, and which criticised the recommendations of a Royal Commission appointed in 1843. He appears to have thought that a similar inquiry on the spot as to the condition of the Irish people would be useful; and in 1845 he projected with Mr. Gladstone a riding tour through Ireland. Owing to family matters, Mr. Gladstone had to break off the engagement, "thereby," as he said in a letter dated December 6, 1894, to Mr. Pusey's son Sidney, "postponing for a long time my acquiring a real knowledge of Ireland." Dr. Pusey, writing to Mr. Gladstone on September 3, 1845, spoke of his brother's bad spirits about giving up his Irish tour, and added, "I am very sorry for it, for I had looked forward with great pleasure to his having such an employment for his mind, and to his travelling with you. It is sad to think of his clear mind left without any adequate occupation, to waste itself, because it has none, and that he might do much for the moral restoration of our land, and no one employs him. I think Sir R[obert] P[eel] has made a miserable mistake in not finding out some unpaid employment in which he might turn his clear mind to good account."[1] With reference to this remark, it may be stated on the authority of an unpublished conversation which Bunsen had in 1855 with Mr. Pusey's daughter, that Peel was designing at the time he was so dramatically hurled from power in 1846 to appoint Pusey his Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Pusey did not take a prominent part in the discussions in Parliament on the Corn Laws, and, indeed, he was absent from the two critical divisions on the second and third readings of Sir Robert Peel's Bill of 1846. But as a personal friend of Sir Robert, there is little doubt that he followed him in his change of opinion; and thus, though Pusey was re-elected for Berks without opposition at the General Election of 1847, as a Liberal Conservative, he had to face a growing discontent amongst his constituents. During the first four sessions of the Parliament of 1847–52, he tried to interest the House of Commons in the subject of Tenant Right, of which indeed he became the champion. In 1843, 1844, and 1845, Lord Portman had introduced into the House of Lords Bills designed to secure for an agricultural tenant compensation for unexhausted

[1] Liddon's *Life of E. B. Pusey*, vol. iii. p. 168.

improvements; but they did not meet with much sympathy from the Upper House, so that Pusey prepared a very modest measure, which he submitted to the House of Commons. It was a private member's Bill; it was attacked vehemently by Colonel Sibthorp and other members of the same school; in 1847 it was withdrawn; in 1848 Mr. Newdigate forestalled Pusey by moving for a Select Committee to consider the whole subject; in 1849 the Bill passed the Commons, and got as far as a second reading in the Lords; in 1850 it again passed the Commons—much mutilated—and in the Upper House Lord Portman moved, not very enthusiastically, the second reading. Lord Beaumont, however, thought [1] "the Bill so objectionable that it was not worth going into committee upon," and it was resolved, without a division, that it be read a second time that day six months.

Pusey did not try the fortunes of the Bill again, but the Select Committee of 1848, of which he was Chairman, collected a body of evidence, and presented a report of great value, which, after a lapse of twenty-seven years, reaped its reward. Mr. Disraeli, in moving the second reading of the ministerial Agricultural Holdings Bill on June 24, 1875, paid a warm tribute to Mr. Pusey's exertions in the matter, observing that "Mr. Pusey was the first person to introduce into this House the term 'tenant right,'" and detailing his efforts towards legislation on the subject. The Prime Minister observed: "When he ultimately relinquished the struggle, he said to me, 'it was the only blot in the agricultural hierarchy'—the fact that the tenant-at-will had no security for the capital which he ought to be encouraged to invest in the soil." And Mr. Disraeli added—what is perhaps Pusey's best eulogium—"Mr. Pusey was, both by his lineage, his estate, his rare accomplishments, and fine abilities, one of the most distinguished country gentlemen who ever sat in the House of Commons." [2]

It is significant that the original champion of Farmers' Tenant Right should have been a typical landowner; but the fact is that at the time of the original agitation for the alteration of the law of agricultural tenures, the demand did not proceed from the tenant farmers. It is clear from Pusey's writings that the soil in different parts of the country urgently needed improvement in various directions, such as draining, marling and chalking, and that a magnificent return was anticipated for those who embarked their capital upon such operations. Indications of the groove in which Pusey's mind was running on the subject of

[1] Hansard, vol. cxii. p. 855.

[2] *Ibid.* vol. ccxxv. pp. 450–7.

Tenant Right are to be found in his early writings in the Journal. Thus he remarks in 1842: "If I were a working farmer, nothing would induce me to enter on a cold wet farm unless there were a fair prospect of its being drained either with my own money on a long lease, or with the aid of my landlord. Our Society has wisely abstained from entering into questions between landlords and tenants."[1] Giving concrete instances of the profits to be derived from chalking and marling, and referring to these and other practices, Pusey asks, "Why, then, is not each universally carried out upon every acre of land within its own limits? This is a difficult question to answer. In some degree none of us carry out all that is in our power; but want of capital and want of confidence in the tenure of farms are, I suppose, the two principal causes of this omission."[2]

And in 1844, the following reference to the subject of Tenant Right, signed "Ph. Pusey," was appended as an editorial footnote to an article in the Journal by Mr. Barugh Almack on the Agriculture of Norfolk:—

> These covenants in Lord Yarborough's agreements as to unexhausted improvements are merely just to the tenant in securing to him the money he has sunk in his farm. They have practically succeeded in producing very great improvements where they have been adopted. They are also accompanied by a clause in the landlord's favour, binding the tenant to purchase artificial manures for the whole of his turnip crop. The absence of capital from land where it might be profitably employed has been long lamented, yet few landlords have funds at command for the general improvement of their estates. I can see no means so likely to supply this old defect, and to bring England generally into the condition of Lincolnshire, as the adoption of Lincolnshire Covenants. The subject of unexhausted improvements seems to me the most important of all Agricultural subjects for landlords at present, and the improvement of our agreements in this respect to be a condition *sine quâ non* of any steady and general improvements of the soil or its cultivation.—PH. PUSEY.[3]

It is important to note that these remarks were made some years before the question of the repeal of the Corn Laws had come within the range of immediately practical politics. The sudden conversion of Sir Robert Peel on this subject (in which Pusey followed him) gave a great impetus to the question of Tenant Right, still rather as a question affecting the improvement of the land, than as a matter of abstract justice to the tenant; and landowners of Pusey's enlightenment began to feel that their one salvation from the effects of the repeal of the Corn Laws lay in the improvement of their farms through the judicious application of capital. In Pusey's own words, written

[1] Journal R.A.S.E. vol. iii. 1842, p. 172. [2] *Ibid.* p. 185.
[3] *Ibid.* vol. v. 1844, p. 348.

in 1850 : "Agricultural improvement, which might hitherto be looked on as a hobby for a few country gentlemen, is now become the unavoidable business of landowners generally." [1]

Although Pusey's early efforts to obtain legislation on the subject of Tenant Right failed, the Report of the Agricultural Customs Committee in 1848 has formed the basis of all subsequent legislation in England and Scotland on that subject, and it led almost immediately to the passing of the Landlord and Tenant Act, 1851, which permitted a tenant to either remove farm buildings or fixed agricultural machinery that he might have erected with the consent of his landlord, or to obtain from the landlord at his option the price of their value ascertained by two referees chosen from each party or by an umpire chosen by the referees. The principle of this procedure is still part of the present Agricultural Holdings Act. By the same Act of 1851, the claims of the tenant to emblements or growing crops, which formerly were determined by the death of the landlord, became practically a charge upon the estate.

Pusey's Agricultural Customs Committee was the means of giving publicity to the excellent custom as to compensation for unexhausted improvements which then prevailed in Lincolnshire. The Committee reported that the benefits arising from the Lincolnshire system of compensation were becoming more extensively known. Most of the witnesses before the Committee agreed in their recognition of the great value of the Lincolnshire custom, which in the words of one of the witnesses "sprang up voluntarily and extended from one side of that great county to the other, encouraging and materially improving the state of farms." The Committee reported that a "wider system of compensation for the outgoing tenant seems to be highly beneficial to agriculture, to the landlord and to the farmer; to lead to a great increase in the productiveness of the soil and to extended employment of the rural population." [2]

As already indicated, Pusey had previously recognised the excellence of the Lincolnshire custom; for particulars of it as practised on Lord Yarborough's estate were given by his agent in the Journal for 1845, and a letter from the Loughborough Agricultural Society also emphasised the excellence of the Lincolnshire system, stating that the Committee of that Society, "knowing the high state of cultivation to which many parts of Lincolnshire had been brought by the adoption of liberal Tenant Rights, determined upon recommending these suggestions for improved agreements as a most likely means of

[1] Journal R.A.S.E. vol. xi. (1850), p. 381.
[2] Report of Agricultural Customs Committee, 1848, p. iv.

producing corresponding improvements in the Midland Counties."[1] Pusey himself adopted the Lincolnshire custom for farm agreements on his own estate in Berkshire.[2]

At home Pusey was the ideal country gentleman. The Pusey estate consists of nearly 5,000 acres, the home farm (where he made all manner of agricultural experiments) being about 380 acres. The breeding and feeding of sheep was the point upon which everything else on the farm was made to hinge, and the great feature of the management was the system of water-meadows, introduced from Devonshire.[3] A full description of Mr. Pusey's farming will be found in the late Sir James Caird's fourteenth letter as Special Commissioner of "The Times" in 1851.[4] When in the country Pusey was up at six in the morning, supervising everything and everybody, and watching and superintending all the operations of the farm. He was an excellent landlord, and very thoughtful for the comfort of his labourers. He improved or rebuilt their cottages, obtaining the assistance of Mr. Street, R.A., in the designs. These cottages contained three bedrooms and two sitting-rooms, had a good garden attached, and were let for 1*s.* weekly. He provided the labourers with allotments; he organised works to keep them in constant employ; and on one occasion, in 1849, when the bakers asked 10*d.* for a so-called quartern loaf, he set up a bakery at Pusey House, and sold for some time an enormous quantity of loaves to his labourers at 7½*d.* per quartern, continuing this until the bakers lowered their prices and gave good measure.

His associations with the Royal Agricultural Society kept him abreast of the latest ideas as to the scientific practice of agriculture, and he tried innumerable experiments, ploughing up a part of his park for the purpose. The house at Pusey was seldom long without a visit from some agriculturist, home or foreign; and there were periodical parties of scientists. At intervals there were trials of implements on the estate, when the place was full of farmers and implement makers, and when Pusey, as organiser-general, was thoroughly in his element. The most important of these trials were in October 1845, of ploughs, drills and tile machines, for the prizes offered by the Royal Agricultural Society; in April and August 1851, of ploughs, drills, and reaping machines, &c., for the medals of the Great Exhibition, when M'Cormick's reaping-machine was first introduced into this country, and excited universal interest; and in August 1853, of reaping machines again. Mr. Pusey was a

[1] Journal R.A.S.E. vol. vi. 1845, pp. 44–48.
[2] *Ibid.* vol vii. 1846, p. 234.
[3] *Ibid.* vol. x. 1849, pp. 462–479.
[4] Caird's *English Agriculture in 1850–1*, pp. 107 *et seq.*

good shot, better (despite Dr. Liddon) than his brother Edward; he was one of the best whips in England, and drove four-in-hand over the Alps; he had a good seat on a horse, but was not a very bold rider; a follower of the hounds, though not particularly keen on fox-hunting; and fond, in his earlier days, of coursing. It may be added that he was a great connoisseur of art, and took an important share in the establishment of the National School of Art, and that he made a valuable collection of prints and engravings, as well as of autographs.

The last important piece of work to which Pusey put his hand was the organisation of the Agricultural Implement Section of the Great Exhibition of 1851. He was Chairman of this section, and as a Royal Commissioner came much into contact with the Prince Consort, who had a high opinion of his ability. On Midsummer Day, 1851, a date still green in the memories of the few surviving cottagers at Pusey, he brought some 500 of his labourers to London to see the great show. A silver snuff-box, presented to Pusey in memory of this visit, was greatly valued by him; and there is still in almost every cottage at Pusey an engraving with his portrait and autograph and a representation of the snuff-box beneath. The report which he wrote on the Implement Section of the Exhibition—printed in the reports of the Royal Commission and reproduced in Vol. XII. of the Journal—is justly esteemed as a masterly production.

It was during one of his visits to London, in May 1851, on the business of the great Exhibition, that the unpleasant rumour reached Pusey that a requisition had been made to Mr. Vansittart, a Protectionist and ultra-Protestant, to stand against him in Berkshire. After the Derby Ministry came in, early in 1852, Mr. Vansittart issued an address, to which Pusey replied by a manifesto giving his reasons for "declining to join in an agitation for the revival of protection to agriculture," and asking for a renewal of support. But a section of his constituents were out of sympathy with his views on the Corn Laws; his vote in favour of the Maynooth College grant was used against him; and his relationship to the great apostle of the High Church movement—who was just then particularly active—was thought to influence him in favour of "Romish practices." In a letter to one of his supporters Pusey says: "I hear that among electioneering tricks some call me a Puseyite. I am no more than Lord Shaftesbury is; but I will not consent to find fault with my brother in public." When Parliament was actually dissolved in July 1852, Pusey issued another address; but on the very eve of the election he withdrew his candidature, recognising the impossibility of success. He wrote on July 12, 1852, a dignified valedictory address, in

which he said:—"Protection has this year fallen ridiculously, not by the assault of its enemies, but the desertion of its supporters. Whether the dreams of other relief will be realised, a few weeks will show; but in any case the farmers will soon discover what blind guides they have followed. Improvement, on the other hand, has more resources than ever to offer: and its loudest opponents, stepping from the heights of their eloquence, must soon pay to it a silent tribute by consenting to purchase new manures and less uncouth implements. Chemistry and mechanism have beaten politics and protection."

His arduous and sustained public labours over so long a period, and his domestic troubles, began at this time to have a serious effect upon Pusey's constitution. The health of his wife had been for some years a source of anxiety to him, and in May 1852 it was made worse by her terrible distress at the painfully sudden death of the Hon. Edward C. H. Herbert, her only surviving brother, who practically lived at Pusey. Although a start was made in August 1852 on a continental tour, both Pusey and his wife were ill at Paris, and had to return. During the winter of 1852–53 he was unwell, with attacks of gout and fainting fits, and in September 1853 a tour in Scotland was spoilt by his ill-health. Meanwhile his wife, whose lungs were seriously affected, was getting worse, and Pusey was unwilling to leave her to attend his usual public avocations, no doubt recognising, moreover, that he himself was not the man he was.

Some amount of solace may have been given to Pusey in 1853 by the conferring of the honorary degree of D.C.L. upon him by his old University of Oxford, which (after a fashion not uncommon at that time) he had left in his undergraduate days without taking a degree. Moreover, his colleagues on the Royal Agricultural Society elected him for a second time as President of the Society. His spirit, however, appears to have been broken, and all energy to have left him. On April 24, 1854, Lady Emily wrote in her diary: "It is clear that Dr. Acland thinks there is no hope but of protracting my life a little longer."[1] Mr. Pusey would not leave her, remaining by her bedside, so that the Lincoln Meeting of the Royal Agricultural Society, of which he was President, had to take place without him. The end came at last on November 13, 1854, when Lady Emily "fell gently asleep." Mr. Pusey was heart-broken. He could attend to nothing. After the funeral Dr. Acland advised a change of air, but as Pusey would go nowhere without his brother, and Dr. Pusey could not leave Oxford, he

[1] Liddon's *Life of E. B. Pusey*, vol. iii. p. 411.

begged to be taken to Christ Church. The spacious drawing-room and adjoining bedroom, traditionally associated with Wolsey while at Oxford, were placed at his disposal; but he had not been more than a week at Christ Church when he was stricken with paralysis. He never left his bed afterwards, though his mind was still very active, and he took the deepest interest in the events of the Crimean war, which was then raging. During his illness several old friends came to see him, amongst them Lord Stanhope, the historian, the Dowager Duchess of Argyll and Mr. Gladstone (then Chancellor of the Exchequer). The latter questioned Dr. (now Sir Henry) Acland – the family friend and medical adviser—closely about Pusey's state, and said that in the event of there being any hope for his life, the Government would recommend him to Her Majesty for a peerage. But there was unhappily no hope, and after a second stroke Philip Pusey died, at the early age of 56, on July 9, 1855.

His long withdrawal from the public eye during his weary illness perhaps accounts for the little notice of his death that was taken at the time; but the Royal Agricultural Society, at a weekly Council held two days afterwards, on July 11, 1855, received "with deep emotion the announcement of the death of their distinguished member, Mr. Pusey, whose name and labours will remain imperishably associated with the foundation, development, and successful progress of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, to whose interests, and to those of the agricultural community in general, his whole time and energies were so entirely and successfully devoted." Subsequently, the Council, on the motion of Lord Portman (then President), seconded by Colonel Challoner and Mr. Raymond Barker, passed unanimously, on November 7, 1855, a resolution "that a letter be written to the family of the late Philip Pusey, Esq., expressing the gratitude of the Royal Agricultural Society of England for his services as Chairman of the Journal Committee, and their great sorrow for his early death. That it be engrossed on vellum and signed by the President, with the seal of the Society attached."

To Lord Portman's letter conveying the sentiments of the Council, Mr. (afterwards Sir Thomas) Acland, one of Mr. Pusey's executors and dearest friends, replied on behalf of the family in a letter dated December 12, 1855, which thus admirably sums up his character and services:

"Of Mr. Pusey himself, it will long be remembered that to practical habits of business he joined deep philosophical thought, accurate scholarship, and genial appreciation of the arts and letters of modern as well as ancient times—that he applied a powerful intellect with a keen forecast of the wants of his

country, to develop the resources of British farming—and that by a rare union of endowments he did much to render science practical and to win for agriculture a worthy place among the intellectual pursuits of the present day. How much labour he underwent, what forbearance and discrimination he exercised, how considerate he was of the feelings of others, how modest in the expression of his own, may never be known except to his personal friends; but some of the results of his unceasing exertions during many of the best years of his life are to be found in the Journal; and by that Journal at least his name will be permanently and honourably connected with the Society from the date of its commencement."[1]

Mr. Pusey left one son, Sidney (born September 15, 1839), the present proprietor of Pusey, and two daughters, Edith-Lucy and Clara, married to Captain Francis Charteris Fletcher, whose son Philip Francis Fletcher is heir-presumptive to the estates. Pusey was about five feet ten inches in height. He was fair-haired, with clear blue eyes, and had a prominent nose. His daughter, Mrs. Fletcher, has a striking miniature of him taken as a young man; there is a not very good painting of him at about the same age at Pusey, where also is a large crayon drawing of him in his prime, by George Richmond, from which the frontispiece to this memoir has been reproduced. (An etched reproduction of this on a smaller scale was done by F. C. Lewis for the collection of portraits of the Grillion Club.) Pusey appears in the large engraving of the Royal Agricultural Society made by Reynolds in 1842, from the picture by Richard Ansdell, now in the Peel Park Museum at Salford. Ansdell's original study of Pusey, which is preserved at 13 Hanover Square, depicts him facing the spectator in a characteristic attitude with a stick in his hand, and attired in the frock-coat, buff waistcoat, stock, and strapped trousers of the period.

It remains only to speak of Mr. Pusey in his literary capacity, and as Editor of the Journal. Sir James Caird, in his article on Agriculture in Mr. Humphry Ward's "Reign of Queen Victoria" (1887), speaks of Pusey as "the leading agricultural writer of his day." So, indeed, he was, although his contributions to agricultural literature took the form rather of practical articles on particular questions of the moment than of finished monographs on departments of the whole subject. In addition to the pamphlets already referred to on the "Sinking Fund" and "Sir Robert Peel's Financial Statement"

[1] The full text of the Council's resolution, of Lord Portman's letter, and of Sir Thomas Acland's reply, will be found on pp. 607–8 of vol. xxvi. of the Journal (1855).

(1828); the "New Constitution" (1831); "The Management of the Poor in Scotland" (1844); and a pamphlet of 1851 entitled "The Improvement of Farming: What ought Landlords and Farmers to do?" the only works or articles to which his name was appended appeared in the successive volumes of this Journal, though he was, as already stated, a Quarterly Reviewer, and a contributor to the "Morning Chronicle."

The total number of articles which Pusey wrote for the Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society was forty-seven, many of which were on minor questions—as to the application of particular kinds of manure, different systems of cultivation and drainage, agricultural implements and crops, the breeding and feeding of sheep, &c. His more important articles were on "The State of Agriculture in 1839," and "An Experimental Enquiry on Draught in Ploughing" (Vol. I., 1839); "Progress of Agricultural Knowledge during the last four years" (Vol. III., 1842); "Agricultural Improvements of Lincolnshire" (Vol. IV., 1843); "Theory and Practice of Water Meadows" (Vol. X., 1849); "Progress of Agricultural Knowledge during the last eight years" (Vol. XI., 1850); "Report on the Agricultural Implements at the Great Exhibition" (Vol. XII., 1851); "Source, Supply, and Use of Nitrate of Soda for Corn Crops" (Vol. XIII., 1852); and "Nitrate of Soda as a Substitute for Guano" (Vol. XIV., 1853).

If the facts recorded in these articles seem a little out-of-date now, they may still be read with pleasure for their scholarly and vigorous English. To attempt a summary of them would be to invite a comparison at every turn between the state of agricultural affairs then and now—which is not the purpose of this article. Some of Pusey's forecasts were right and some were wrong; but no one can question the pains he took to arrive at a right conclusion in every matter which he discussed in print, or the care and patience he bestowed as Editor in polishing and improving the articles submitted to him by his manifold contributors.

Perhaps his labours for the Journal are best summed up in a letter which the late Lord Playfair (who in his younger days was a friend and disciple of Pusey) addressed to me shortly before his death in 1898:

"Through the Journal Mr. Pusey always devoted his efforts to keep Practice and Science in close connection, and the pages of the Journal from that period to the present time show that it has been maintained on the lines laid down so wisely and sagaciously by its first Editor."

ERNEST CLARKE.

13 Hanover Square, London, W.