
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE

CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1901.

ART. I.—BISHOP WESTCOTT: SOME CAMBRIDGE REMINISCENCES.

THAT the death of the Bishop of Durham is a terrible loss to the Church of England, coming at a time when that Church is in urgent need of all the help and counsel that her ablest and most loyal sons can give her, none will doubt. Yet while, for generations to come, Dr. Westcott will be known as one of the greatest of the Bishops who have ruled the See of Durham, rich as the roll of the prelates of that see has been in great names, and while England at large and the Church of England will remember him mainly as the Bishop, yet by another and smaller public, older members, resident and non-resident, of the University of Cambridge, he will always be lovingly and gratefully remembered as the Professor of Divinity who for twenty years, 1870 to 1890, did so much to reshape and develop and fill with a fuller life the theological studies of this University. As one who was resident in the University during the whole of those twenty years, and had the privilege of seeing much of Dr. Westcott and receiving many kindnesses from him, I venture, while altogether disclaiming the idea of in any sense writing a formal history of his professoriate, to note down certain reminiscences which are still very fresh.

To those who are only familiar with the state of things which is largely, though not entirely, due to Dr. Westcott's initiation (for Dr. Lightfoot became Hulsean Professor as far back as 1861, when a young man of little more than thirty), the condition of affairs forty years ago would seem very strange. There were brave men before Agamemnon, and there were able and conscientious theological lecturers then and earlier, but the machine worked at less high pressure. Old Cambridge men will well remember Dr. Westcott's pre-

decessor, Dr. Jeremie, afterwards Dean of Lincoln, a deeply-read theological scholar, a preacher of rare eloquence, whose words used to suggest to us more, I think, than those of any-one the idea of *mitis sapientia*. Yet in the sixties his lectures, though very good, were very few in number; and though he was at all times very kind and helpful if he was appealed to, I do not suppose that he specially laid himself out to brace up the theology of the University generally. Still, it would be as absurd as it would be unjust to blame him; all this was but a survival, or, rather, a slowly-moving advance from an older state of things. Half a century or so earlier there would have been hardly any University lectures in theology at all. The University Calendar for 1802 now lies before me. In that year there were three Divinity professorships. Of these, the Norrisian had only recently been founded, and the Professor was bound to lecture by the founder's will. When, however, we come to the two more important professorships, the Regius and the Margaret, we read, "No lectures delivered," though it must be allowed that the Margaret Professor had made the effort for a time, but gave up the attempt "for want of a sufficient audience." It may be worth while to point out the contrast with our own generation by referring to the case of the then Regius Professor, Dr. R. Watson, of Trinity. He held his professorship from 1771 to 1816, and, being appointed Bishop of Llandaff in 1782, held the two posts together till his death, being allowed to appoint a deputy-Professor of no great utility, but drawing the bulk of the stipend himself. Yet through all these years Watson was in theory the head of the Divinity faculty in Cambridge; and we can hardly suppose that things would thrive under such a régime, any more than we can wonder at the amount of leeway the Church in Wales has had to make up, if it be true that through Watson's long episcopate of forty-five years he only visited his diocese triennially. Indeed, we may well doubt if, while he was resident as Professor, he can have been much of a benefit. The following story may illustrate this. As Regius Professor he had to preside at Divinity Acts, and mentioning once to a friend that an Act on the morrow was to be kept on such and such a subject, his friend remarked that there was a very striking passage in St. Gregory Nazianzen on the subject. "Is there?" said Watson. "I never read a word of him." "Well," said his friend, "I will send you the volume with the passage marked." The next day at the Act the Professor glibly brought out the quotation, adding, "Hæc ex Gregorio illo Nazianzeno, quem semper in deliciis habui."

Of course, the period between Watson and Westcott shows the names of not a few Divinity Professors, whom not only

Cambridge men, but all English Churchmen, must hold in honour, such as Kaye and Turton and Ollivant, Blunt and Selwyn, Harold Browne and Swainson and Lightfoot; yet none will deny that, great and continued as were the improvements, a fresh life and vigour and more perfect system were introduced by Dr. Westcott's arrival in 1870. For nearly twenty years before this he had worked as an assistant-master at Harrow, yet amid all his hard work there he brought out his "Canon of the New Testament" in 1855, a marvellous work for a man of thirty, so busily engaged in school work, to have produced, and his "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels" in 1860. I well remember, when I read this book on its first appearance, what a new world of thought it opened out before one. Thus, even though his face was familiar to but few of us, we all felt that one whose books were what they had become to us came in no sense as a stranger.

In due time the new force made itself felt. His lectures, as many will recall whose recollections go back to those rather far-off days, were to many a new revelation; to all the more thoughtful men they were distinctly stimulating, but they were not lectures to be listened to intermittently, with an inattentive break now and again. To fail to keep the attention always alert was fatal. Among the subjects lectured on there was considerable variety. Thus, in the earlier years he lectured on the Council of Nicæa; and, what was then, I think, an absolutely new departure, he proposed to set the students questions on the lectures, and to look over the papers, a matter certainly involving a very great increase of work. Lectures followed on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, on the Introduction to the Study of Christian Doctrine, on various books of the New Testament, the Gospel according to St. John, the Epistles of St. John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. These lectures were at first delivered in lecture-rooms in Trinity, then in the Arts School, but afterwards, when, mainly by the munificence of Dr. Selwyn, the new Divinity School was built, in the large lecture-room of that building, capable of holding about 300 hearers. It may readily be admitted that not a few of these hearers were not men who could appreciate the rather profound teaching offered them. It might naturally be asked, therefore, why they should attend the lectures, and one can only venture to express one's surprise that some Bishops, anxious that Cambridge graduates seeking Holy Orders should have the best theological teaching the University could give them, required that they should produce a certificate of having attended a course of lectures by the Regius Professor. The result of driving men to a lecture to which they would not naturally

go, can be guessed. Men went (that is, some men), not to listen, but to occupy the hour as best they might. It is said that some men wrote letters, or worked mathematical problems, or even read novels. Once certainly, perhaps oftener, the Professor detected one of his "hearers" employing the hour according to ideas of his own, and promptly turned him out of the room. The students who really went to hear always spoke of the lecturer in terms of warm gratitude. The outside world can join in that gratitude when they examine the three volumes of New Testament Commentaries which Dr. Westcott has left us.

But the lectures, technically so called, did not cover all Dr. Westcott's public teaching, for there were also less formal gatherings in the evening, known as "readings," when such subjects were taken up, *e.g.*, as "Some Passages of the New Testament on the Person of our Lord." These were held at first in his rooms in Trinity, then, as the numbers grew, in a college lecture-room, and finally in the library of the Divinity School. I may further mention two special short courses of lectures, to which persons other than members of the University were invited—one in May, 1885, on "Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the New Testament," and one in May, 1886, on "A General Introduction to the Study of the Bible." It is in the *general* guidance herein that the younger student so especially needs help. There was yet a more personal element in his help. Terminally a notice was issued (and this, I think, was an absolutely fresh departure) that the Regius Professor would be glad to see at his rooms and advise "men preparing for Holy Orders," a phrase afterwards altered to "any student."

This will be a convenient place for referring to a matter which lay very near Dr. Westcott's heart. From its first inception he was the president of a committee appointed to prepare a scheme for the preparation of candidates for Holy Orders in Cambridge. When the scheme took actual shape as the Clergy Training School, he was the president of the council till his departure for Durham. He lectured every term to the school on "Heads of Christian Doctrine," save when he was obliged to be in residence at Westminster. When the constitution of the school was recast in 1888, Dr. Westcott superintended many of the details of work; he attended most regularly the discussion on various points, such as the admission of students and the drawing up of the prayers, some of which were written by him. A minute of the council meeting of May 21, 1890, is a touching tribute of gratitude for long-continued, patient work, the full outcome of which no man may guess.

We must now turn to another side of Dr. Westcott's Cambridge work, the theological examinations. As far back as 1840 an examination had been started, mainly, I believe, through the endeavours of Professor J. J. Blunt, which was meant to be a good all-round general examination in such branches of divinity as it was imperative on candidates for Holy Orders to be conversant with. This was familiarly known as "the Voluntary," and as in course of time all (or nearly all) Bishops came to require a certificate of having passed it from all Cambridge graduates who sought ordination, it became a common remark that "it was called the Voluntary because men were obliged to pass in it." The examination fell twice a year, at Easter and in October; and to this in 1856 was superadded an honour examination, open to graduates only, and not serving as a qualification for a degree. It was a very respectable examination, but of rather limited scope. Dr. Westcott soon felt the importance of creating a real theological school, to be led up to by the establishment of a theological tripos, demanding a much larger amount of reading than heretofore. I suppose it must be admitted that no reform, no advance (and this was a very real advance), can be made without certain losses to be set *per contra*. So, too, here. The old pass Voluntary was abolished, and though it has been in a sense replaced by what was originally known as the Cambridge (now the Cambridge and Oxford) Preliminary, it may well be questioned whether the theological reading which had to be done in, or just after, his undergraduateship by every Cambridge ordinand, was not a boon which it would have been well to retain, seeing how few University men go in for the later examination. The old honour examination became merged in the tripos, but with the enlarged scheme the men who had formed the great bulk of the old examination, students who had taken honours in one or both of the two great triposes, were largely choked off. Still, in the lists of the first Westcottian tripos—may I call it?—which lasted from 1874 to 1884, when certain sweeping changes were introduced, it is striking to see how many familiar names occur—the Bishops of Wakefield and Exeter at home, and those of South Tokyo, East Equatorial Africa, Wellington, Lahore, Lebombo and Adelaide beyond the seas, and Professor Keith-Falconer. As all who knew Cambridge well in the seventies will avow, theological study became a living force, both in its breadth and depth, in a way which men had not before realized. If the visible output of solid theological work given to the world by Cambridge men during the last thirty years be compared with that of the preceding thirty years, the change will be apparent, and yet the earlier period was rich in

good work. The names of Alford, Ellicott, Trench and Wordsworth will at once occur.

I pass now from the case of men at the beginning of their career, taking their first degree, to that of older scholars seeking to proceed to a divinity degree, B.D. or D.D. Up to about forty years ago the form of the exercises for these degrees was an anachronistic survival. For each, besides a Latin sermon and an English sermon before the University, an Act had to be kept and two Opponencies, and a would-be D.D. had also to deliver a Determination. Forty years ago this was reduced to an Act and an English sermon. In its final form the Act was a Latin essay on some theological subject, which was read publicly in the schools by the candidate, after which he was questioned orally by the Professor in English, the whole ceremony lasting an hour. Of course, in older times there had been a disputation entirely in Latin, and a good deal of real learning and acumen had been displayed. Latterly, however, the colloquial use of Latin almost died out, and many a well-read candidate might have made an exhibition of himself. Indeed, there were curious exhibitions sometimes. In one of Professor Jeremie's later years he was presiding at an Act, when the candidate, having occasion to use the word μεσίτης, made the penultima short. The Professor's sigh was quite audible as he remarked, "May we not say μεσῖτης?" At certain colleges the Fellows were bound by statute to proceed to B.D. at the proper time, seven years after M.A., and a wicked story was current that in one of these colleges a Latin thesis was kept in a drawer of the table in the combination-room, to be used as each Fellow in his turn might require it. Here Dr. Westcott opened up an entirely new departure. The system inaugurated by him allows a would-be B.D. to keep an Act (though I do not think one has been kept for a long time), but he is rather encouraged to write and print an essay in English or Latin on some theological subject. The would-be D.D. has no choice; he must write and print an essay. In either case he has to preach an English sermon before the University. It is curious to note on this last point that, while the statute requires the sermon to be preached, nothing is said as to the quality of the sermon. A sermon is a sermon. Dr. Westcott once told me of a candidate whose sermon was such that it excited the ire of a University dignitary, who was officially present, and protested. "But," said Dr. Westcott quite gravely, and with a manner it is impossible to describe, "fortunately—fortunately we were able to reject him on other grounds." Before leaving the professorial side of things, it is well to mention an institution which I think was initiated by Dr. Westcott, the terminal

meeting of graduates in divinity, at first often held in his rooms, and associated with a gathering for Holy Communion on the following day.

We now turn to another side. In the seventies there was in Trinity, beside the late Hall, an earlier dinner at half-past four, for those who thought that that unfashionable time harmonized best with work. It was here that I first saw Dr. Westcott, and can vividly recall the impression he then made. He was about forty-five years of age when he returned here in the fullest and ripest strength of his mature manhood. How well one recalls that slight, active figure, the eager speech, the keen blue eye! He evidently worked at the fullest stretch from the first, for I remember his once telling me in those early years that he seldom could afford the luxury of a walk, save between his house and college. To be engaged, however, in hard intellectual work all the morning and all the afternoon is an immense strain on any man, and we often noticed how wearily he came into Hall, and was in the habit of drawing his hand across his forehead. He had a habit, too, both then and when making a speech on a platform, of closing his eyes, and when he suddenly opened them and looked full at someone, it was a little startling, especially if the person looked at had been broaching some disputable statement. Through all the years during which this earlier Hall lasted, the head of the table was taken by Mr. C. W. King, the Senior Fellow of the college, one of the most learned of old-fashioned scholars, as many generations of Trinity men know. I venture to give the following illustration. Many years ago, when reading Clement of Alexandria, I was puzzled to find that, in referring to the Good Friday fast, he spoke of Friday as ἡμέρα Ἀφροδίτης, day of Venus. I could not understand whence Greek-speaking pagans had got the idea of the sevenfold division of days. Happening to come across Dr. Westcott and Dr. Lightfoot in the college library, I consulted them on the point. Neither, however, could throw any light on the question. I then applied to Mr. King. "Oh," said he at once, "it was the Magians who brought the idea into Alexandria from the East. You'll find all about it in Dion Cassius, book so-and-so, and about chapter so-and-so." And so it was.

As I have said, Mr. King presided at the table, and, as a rule, the two Professors sat on either side of him. The jest very often cropped up of the "divinity that doth hedge a King." To Dr. Westcott's marvellous intellectual qualities and the singular charm of his conversation the fullest recognition was given from the very first; but there was a side which, I think, comparatively few realized even up to the

very time of his leaving Cambridge for Durham: his astonishing power of—shall I say?—higher statesmanship. To illustrate this, I venture to tell the following. One day both the Professors were absent from Hall, and Mr. King suddenly remarked in the middle of dinner: "Both those Professors have missed their vocation in life." We eagerly demanded the grounds for this startling paradox. "What ought they to have been?" "Well, Westcott should have been a Gnostic heresiarch in the second century, when he would have devised a scheme of theology which no one, perhaps not even himself, could have understood." "And Lightfoot?" "Well, Lightfoot should have been the chairman of a thriving railway company, and I should much like to have some shares in that company." This, I think, testifies in its way to what was at one time a widely-felt view in Cambridge as to Dr. Westcott. That he was a profound scholar, a theologian of exceptional grasp, a saintly mystic, went without saying; but I think comparatively few recognised the power on the practical side. Even when his appointment to the See of Durham was announced, the remark was not unfrequently heard: "What a pity it is to send Dr. Westcott away from Cambridge, where he is doing work that hardly any other living man could do, to Durham, for which half a dozen men could be found as good!" One man went so far as to say in print that the real justification for the appointment to Durham was to give some éclat to the English episcopate, by setting on the bench one of the profoundest scholars and theologians in Europe. How wrong we were, what powers of coping with difficulties were shown, difficulties only to be successfully grappled with by one who united a heart filled with the deepest love of Christ and a head worthy of a statesman handling great questions of policy—how Bishop Westcott succeeded in composing the troubles between the miners and the masters, succeeded where good Bishop Walsham How, with all his knowledge of working men, failed—is written large in the chronicles of the last Durham episcopate.

There were one or two things which always impressed me much. Of course, to all who are acquainted with Dr. Westcott's critical writings, what I am about to say is simply a matter of course. No one with eyes to observe can read any of them, whether book or short article, without being aware of the absolute thoroughness of the work. Such an article, for example, as that on Origen in the "Dictionary of Christian Biography" represents an astonishing mass of labour, enough of itself, if issued as a separate monograph, to have insured a scholar's fame. Yet it simply stands where it does, just as part of the day's work. The labour, too, required for many

a humble-looking short note may be out of all proportion to the size of the note. Dr. Westcott once remarked to me, half seriously, half in jest: "I should often like to append a note to this note: 'This note has taken me (so many) hours.'" This absolute thoroughness, combined with an exceedingly high ideal of what men ought to aim at, sometimes led him to forget that all men were not as he, either in intellectual powers or powers of work. Thus, in discussing certain changes in the tripos with reference to a paper on Christian Doctrine, and the amount that might fairly be demanded from men when taking their B.A. degree at the age of two or three and twenty, he remarked with unhesitating conviction: "Of course they will all have read their Hagenbach." This is the well-known "History of Doctrines," a piece of very stiff reading, in three large volumes, of which the highest men should have a reasonable knowledge, but of which I am quite sure that the lower men are profoundly innocent.

This last remark recalls to me Dr. Westcott as President of the Theological Board, a post which he held during his twenty years' professoriate as head of the Divinity Faculty. He was an ideal chairman; he carried business through with less waste of time than most men, lopped off irrelevancies and kept the real point steadily in view. I recall at times a certain deprecatory manner, as though he would point out to the meeting that, of course, those present knew better than he did; yet I am bound to add that, to the best of my remembrance, he ordinarily carried the point he advocated, and that his conclusion was the right one. In a word, he was *ἀρχικός*, in the best sense, though the quality was never obtrusive. It was my privilege to be a member of the Theological Board at the time when Dr. Westcott's Cambridge residence came to an end. At the last meeting the agenda were gone through with punctilious care, and then it remained for the closing prayers to be read for the last time by one to whom that duty had fallen for twenty years. It was a revelation to many, perhaps to all, of us, to see how one who seemed so strong, to have his feelings completely under control, was shaken in strong emotion, and several were moved almost to tears when their chief clearly had to fight against a breakdown.

I do not know that I have much more in the way of reminiscence to add, yet one cannot but put on record Dr. Westcott's breadth and boldness as a critic; he was indeed a "Higher Critic" in the truest sense of that much-abused term. He would boldly face and test and discuss any view put before him, drawing forth from a theory, coming perhaps from a source with which he could have no possible sympathy,

any truth it might possess. Yet, with all the breadth of view, a profound belief in the God-given character of Scripture, and the consequent priceless value of the gift, permeated him through and through. He once said to me: "I do not think you could alter any word in Scripture for any other without incurring some loss." Again: "Behind and above all our controversies there is the Life. . . . However the Old Testament came to be, it was the Book of the Lord and of His Apostles."

For many years there existed in Cambridge a society of graduates which met in term-time for the critical study of the Old Testament. This society—now, alas! defunct—was successively presided over by Dr. Phillips, Dr. Lightfoot, and Dr. Westcott. Under Dr. Lightfoot's presidency some good work was done in revising the translation of some of the Minor Prophets, in days when as yet the Revised Version was unheard of. When Dr. Westcott became president, he suggested that we should devote ourselves to the later chapters of Ezekiel (chap. xl. *et seq.*), which perhaps have not their equal for difficulty in the Old Testament, and yet are of engrossing importance in their bearing on Pentateuchal criticism. He threw himself heartily into the difficulties, as if it were here that his highest interests were seated.

How ungrudging he was in all cases of affording help in difficulties of study to those who consulted him! I can speak very gratefully myself of two occasions when, having asked questions which I supposed might mean the expenditure of five minutes, he gave, in spite of some deprecation on my part, two or three hours' careful examination and discussion of the points at issue. It is outside the scope of the few reminiscences which I have tried to note down, yet no reference to Dr. Westcott's Cambridge life should ignore the warm interest—the interest recalling the keen, apostolic zeal of an earlier day—he at all times showed in the cause of Foreign Missions, notably, of course, that of Delhi, but extending to all efforts for the cause of Christ.

R. Sinker.

Art. II.—THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE AND CANON GORE'S BOOK.—II.

In criticising the three statements—those of Dr. Moule, Lord Halifax, and Canon Gore—I would say that while Dr. Moule hits the mark with exactness when he says that Christ is present, "not *on* the holy table, but *at* it"—that is, at the ordinance, not in the elements—he yet expresses himself, I think, too rhetorically. Were our eyes opened, he says, we