JOHN WORDSWORTH

BISHOP OF SALISBURY (1885–1911)

1843–1911

If ever there was a scholar of whom it might be said that he was 'born in the purple' surely it was John Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury for close upon twenty-six years. His grandfather, Christopher Wordsworth (1774–1846), brother of the poet, was Master of the great foundation of Trinity College, Cambridge. His father, also called Christopher (1807–85), was in succession Head Master of Harrow, Canon and Archdeacon of Westminster, and Bishop of Lincoln, a classical scholar, a theologian, and a Biblical commentator (he was one of the band of classically trained English travellers who did so much for the rediscovery of Greece, and he wrote a commentary, full of patristic learning, upon the whole Bible!). His two uncles, John, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, whose career was cut short at the early age of thirty-four, and Charles, who became Bishop of St. Andrews, were both scholars of distinction. He was thus born and lived in an atmosphere of learning, and it might be said that learning came to him like a second nature. His family was mixed up not only with learning but with affairs; and here too John Wordsworth showed the influence of his surroundings. Things that cost labour to many came easy to him; he would dispatch secular business with the same promptitude and rapidity with which he would work out a problem of research. Only exceptional gifts of this kind made possible the combination of so much knowledge with so much administrative activity; for I doubt if the most active bishop on the bench worked harder in his own diocese.

His sister, Miss Elizabeth Wordsworth, says of her brother:[1] 'One can never remember the time when he was not an omnivorous reader. He had a remarkably good and accurate memory—a false quantity or a misquotation was not likely to escape him, and he was very thorough in whatever he undertook—practical matters as well as scholarship. He had quite a fair amount of mathematical ability and an excellent head for figures.' We can see here the natural aptitude for learning.

[1] In putting together this sketch I owe a special debt to a series of recollections contributed to *The Salisbury Diocesan Gazette* for October, November, December, 1911.

And that aptitude had everything to favour and develop it. The future bishop enjoyed an excellent training, first at a dame's school, then at Ipswich (where he was not happy but where he must have been thoroughly well taught), and afterwards at Winchester, the school of his father and of his uncle John, where his uncle Charles had also been master. The omnivorous reading and a certain oddness of speculation that went along with it militated a little against success in examinations; but that was a trifle. The Latin Essay Prize and a Craven Scholarship made up for a 2nd Class in *Lit. Hum.*; and, after two years' schoolmastering at Wellington, Wordsworth was brought back to Oxford as Fellow of Brasenose in 1867. He remained here as tutor for sixteen years, working hard at his own studies and with his pupils, by whom he was as much respected as beloved. To this happy relation his wife, daughter of H. O. Coxe, the well-known Bodley's Librarian, to whom he was married in 1871, greatly contributed.

This was the time for building up that solid edifice of learning which marked off John Wordsworth among his contemporaries. In any case he would have been a learned man; he could not help imbibing learning through every pore of his mind. But for these sixteen years duty and inclination pointed in the same direction; his whole time was spent in acquiring or imparting knowledge.

At first it was not clear what was to be the goal. Wordsworth was never a man to be engrossed by a single subject. As classical tutor he began by specializing somewhat upon Latin. His first publication was a small book containing three *Lectures Introductory to a History of Latin Literature*, which came out in 1870. Four years later followed *Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin*, which at once showed its author's true calibre. The Oxford of that date produced little that was so massive. It is tempting to speculate what would have happened if John Wordsworth had continued on these lines and had spent the rest of his days as a rival in erudition to Prof. J. E. B. Mayor at Cambridge. We can imagine how such a *par nobile fratrum* would have been fitted to speak with the scholars of other nations in the gate. But that was not to be. We can see how a gradual change took place in the latter half of the seventies. The young tutor felt keenly his obligations for the religious training of his pupils; and his interests were more and more deflected in the direction of theology. The writer of this has in his possession a pamphlet of 56 pp., without a date and not published, but prepared for the use of his pupils and entitled, *Some Elements of Gospel Harmony*. It would be wrong to attach too much importance to this pamphlet, which does

not profess to be more than a collection of notes. And yet it is (to the best of my belief) the only direct treatment by him that we have of the central question of the Gospels; and there is some significance both in what it contains and in what it does not contain. The strong point about it is the scholarly presentation of external data; the most notable omission is that of any attempt at internal critical analysis. In regard to the origin of the Gospels the writer's mind appears to be in a state of suspense; the authority that he seems most inclined to follow is Bishop Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*—one of the least satisfactory of its author's works, and calling for criticism all the more because it is so full of ingenuities. Throughout his life Wordsworth appears to have maintained a considerable reserve on the deeper questions of criticism; he was naturally conservative, and yet he moved with the times in a restrained and sober way. The diocese of Salisbury was not one that was troubled by acute critical controversy.

Among the influences of these years which doubtless helped to strengthen the claim on the young tutor of theological studies as against classics must have been his friendship for Dr. James B. Mozley, Regius Professor of Divinity from 1871 to 1878. Wordsworth lectured for him during the long illness which preceded his death; and, as we now look back, it would not have seemed at all surprising if he had been chosen as his successor. In the year 1881 he was selected to deliver the Bampton Lectures, which were published under the title, *The One Religion: Truth, Holiness, and Peace desired by the Nations, and revealed by Jesus Christ.* The subject is chiefly noticeable as an early application of the new science of Comparative Religion. Its attraction for the lecturer probably lay in the scope which it gave for his remarkable power of rapid assimilation. This is the most striking feature of the book; at the same time the categories with which it dealt were too vague to make a very deep impression.

By this time the plans had been laid and were gradually maturing for the *magnum opus* by which, in the world of scholarship at least, the name of John Wordsworth was to go down chiefly to posterity. In 1877, 1878,[1] the negotiations appear to have been begun with the Delegates of the Clarendon Press which ended in his definitely undertaking to produce a full critical edition of the Vulgate New Testament.

[1] So the first prospectus, p. 4; but an examination of the papers preserved at the Press shows that the real date was Easter, 1878. The motion came from the Delegates of the Press, who consulted Cardinal Newman and Dr. B. F. Westcott. Wordsworth on his side (through Dr. Liddon) took the advice of the Divinity Professors.

Here again there was a convergence of interests which smoothed over the transition from classical scholarship to theology. Her brother, as Miss Wordsworth says, was a 'born philologist', and the philological side of his great undertaking was by no means the least noteworthy. The large number of early MSS. in which Jerome's Version is found make it of special value for determining nice points of orthography and the like; and the new editor made ample use of his opportunities in this respect. An attractive feature of his work, and one that does much to lift it to the high level of scholarship to which it attains, is the occurrence from time to time of notes specially devoted to points of this kind. Justice is done to this side of the *Vulgate* and *Old-Latin Biblical Texts* by that great palaeographer Ludwig Traube (*Nomina Sacra*, p. 149).

A work on such a scale naturally took some time to prepare. I have before me the draft scheme of 'The Oxford Critical Edition of the Vulgate New Testament', dated Nov. 2, 1882, and revised May 25, 1883. Here once more the editor was indebted to Dr. Westcott, whose article 'Vulgate' in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (1863) stood out as the most complete and the most exact survey of the whole subject. At the same time there is no lack of details which bear the impress of the editor's own vigorous personality.

This is perhaps the point at which we may suitably introduce some general remarks on the characteristic features of his scholarship.

He had an ample command of the resources of a scholar, and in particular of a Latinist; but it was essentially a workmanlike command. Though fully equipped as a writer of idiomatic Latin, neither in Latin nor in English did he aim so much at elegance as at a clear and accurate presentation of his subject. Sincere to the very core, few men cared less for appearances or wrote with a more single eye to the substance of what they were saying. The scholarship of John Wordsworth was before all things genuine *learning*. Even as it was I doubt if the Oxford of the nineteenth century produced a more learned man; and, if he had not been carried off and made a bishop, I do not think that there would have been even a doubt. But learning with him meant, first and foremost, a knowledge of libraries, of books and MSS. It was, if I may use the phrase, a folio and quarto-learning. He was as much interested in the accumulated knowledge of past centuries as in the science of to-day. He took an interest in old books—provided that they were, or had been at their time, good books—for their own sake. He used them lovingly, and knew his way about them by a kind of instinct—the instinct by which a man knows his way about his own home. He had all the scholar's fondness for

digressions; he was always wanting to get to the bottom of things—or, I should say perhaps rather, of what was known about things. He did not like to leave an allusion unexplored; he was always wanting to follow out his clues to the end. This was not exactly the scientific impulse which will not let the inquirer rest until he has got at causes; it was rather the literary impulse which drives him on to the limits of what is known. I imagine that these characteristics mark a certain difference between John Wordsworth and some of the leading continental scholars of the present day. They too—the greatest of them, such as a Mommsen or a Harnack—may be credited with a passion for completeness, for penetrating to the bottom of things; but the dominant motive in these cases is scientific; the bottom that they aim at reaching is that of origin. Wordsworth was not a philosopher; the completeness at which he aimed was not philosophical. Neither was it, as I have implied, exactly scientific; but it was before all things completeness of knowledge, as such and for its own sake. In other words, the learning to which he was devoted and which was inbred and native in him, was the more old-fashioned type of learning, the learning of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

There are of course two distinct types of textual criticism. There is, on the one hand, the concise and severe type, which confines itself rigorously to the one sole object of producing a trustworthy text, which is content with a minimum of apparatus, and which cuts down everything that does not contribute directly to the ascertainment of what was originally written. Finished examples of this type may be seen in Dean Armitage Robinson's edition of *The Philocalia of Origen* (1893) and Mr. A. E. Brooke's of the same writer's *Commentary on St. John* (1896), or on a fuller scale but still with not a little self-repression, in Prof. Bywater's editions of the *Ethics* (1894) and *Poetics* (1897, 1909) of Aristotle. On the other hand there is what may be called the exhaustive type, of which the most thorough-going example known to me is Mr. C. H. Turner's *Canons of the Western Church* (from 1899 onwards). It was impossible to aim at exhaustiveness in an edition of the *Vulgate*. We hope some day to see an edition that may deserve that name carried out by the vast and combined resources of the Benedictine Order in the Church of Rome. But as a work begun by a single scholar and carried on up to the present by the allied labour of two, the *Oxford Vulgate* approaches as nearly to this second type as the conditions permitted. It does indeed much more than this; the chief editor from the first followed his bent, and the consequence is that his work—if not exhaustive—is nevertheless a striking monument of the wealth of detail, textual, historical, and

illustrative, that could be brought together by a single hand. When I say this I am sure that the second editor, Mr. H. J. White, will not feel that any injustice has been done to him. Invaluable and essential to the success of the work as his continued and devoted labours have been, he joined it at a time when the whole plan of the work was already settled and already had imprinted upon it the individual stamp of its first projector.

I have already tried to convey something of what that individual stamp was. It may be seen at every turn in all the places where it is natural to look for it—in the original prospectus, in the introduction and epilogue to the first volume, and in a number of special notes expanded beyond the limits of what was strictly necessary in the wider interests of scholarship and learning.

I referred a little way back to Bishop Westcott's article 'Vulgate' as the nearer basis upon which the work was constructed. The remoter basis was the plan drawn out (in 1720) and the collections made for Bentley's great edition—proposed, but unfortunately never completed or published—of the Greek and Latin New Testaments. Behind Bentley there were the Sixtine and Clementine editions—witnesses at once to the power of combined studies and to the active interest of the Popes of the end of the sixteenth century; and, behind these, as first of the series to contain express reference to MSS., the edition of Robert Stephens (1538–40). Not one of these antecedents was the new editor content to take simply as he found it. He must needs turn aside to identify the MSS. used by Stephens (Appendix I to *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*: No. I). In addition to the Sixtine and Clementine editions are cited not only the Hentenian edition of 1547 but also the readings noted in the margin of a fine later copy of this work which represent, as it would seem, the judgement of the Sixtine revisers as distinct from the text ultimately authorized by the Pope. The work of Bentley and his assistants, John Walker and David Casley, is traced out and fully described, partly in the prospectus and preface and partly in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*. Besides these, the readings of a long list of other editions are occasionally noted. Special attention is paid to the 'correctoria', or early attempts at criticism, made in the Middle Ages and especially in the thirteenth century. And, besides as complete a text as possible of the Vulgate and the apparatus of prefaces, tables of sections, and *capitula* associated with it, there is also printed a full text of Cod. Brixianus (*f*) of the Old Latin and a collation, ever increasing in fullness, of the other MSS. of the older form of the Version. This may seem at first sight a work of supererogation; but

it is one for which future students will have special reason to be grateful. The Vulgate, after all, is only a link in an extended chain, and it cannot be rightly judged apart from the preceding links. This is a point that needs close and careful consideration, and it constitutes one of the special difficulties of the subject.

The examples that have been given are only specimens of the wide research on which this edition of the Vulgate rests. They are all characteristic, and they should be borne in mind by those who in time to come will try to form for themselves a picture of the mind by which it was planned and (primarily) executed. It would be tempting to make a study of characteristic notes in detail; but from that I must refrain.

The first rough design of the work had been sketched, as we have seen, in 1878; it had been digested and set out in print in 1882. All this time the editor had been acting with the cordial co-operation of the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, of which body he himself became a member in 1881. Through the mediation of Dr. C. R. Gregory the Delegates had acquired a quantity of material left behind by Tischendorf. This included (1) a collation of Cod. Amiatinus (A); (2) a collation of the Ingolstadt MS. (I); (3) a transcript of Cod. Bobiensis (*k*) of the Old Latin; (4) a similar transcript of Cod. Frisingensis (*q*) also of the Old Latin; (5) some smaller Old Latin fragments from St. Gall. The last three items were taken as the basis of editions published in the series of *Old-Latin Biblical Texts* (*O.-L. B. T.*).

These purchases were certainly a help, but one of them proved something of a snare. All the rest were duly verified by the editors, but unfortunately this was omitted in the case of Cod. I. The collation of this MS. by Tischendorf—who was usually very accurate in such matters—was faulty, and the handwriting moreover rather difficult to decipher. In this way a number of errors crept in, which were animadverted upon somewhat sharply by E. von Dobschütz in his tract *Studien zur Textkritik der Vulgata* (1894). Another flaw was caused by the use of Belsheim's edition of the Old Latin MS. (*ff*$_2$). Belsheim, unlike Tischendorf, bears by no means a good character as a collator; but this was not known at the time. A trustworthy edition has since been produced by Mr. E. S. Buchanan in *O.-L. B. T.*: No. V (1907). Under these two heads the earlier *fasciculi* of the *Vulgate* need correction; but for the rest there is ample testimony to the general accuracy of both the editors. In a work of such magnitude this is of great importance.

I have spoken of 'both the editors'; and this leads me back to the

course of the history. From 1878 onwards Wordsworth was actively engaged in preparations for the Vulgate along with his work as Tutor of Brasenose. In 1883 he received the first appointment to the Oriel Professorship of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, which carried with it a Canonry in Rochester Cathedral and a Fellowship at Oriel. He took up the duties of this new office with characteristic energy, but held it only for two years. In 1885 he was called away to an altogether different sphere as Bishop of Salisbury. To many men the change would have been even greater than it was to him. From 1868 to 1885 his father had held the bishopric of Lincoln; his son acted as chaplain to him, and paid frequent visits to Riseholme; so that he had had abundant opportunities, of which he was not slow to take advantage, of making himself familiar with the work of a bishop. Still, the exacting character of that work made it clearly impossible to carry on the work at the Vulgate single handed. So that in 1886 he called in the help of Mr. (now Professor) H. J. White. The choice was a natural and a happy one. Mr. White had already been engaged on work for the Vulgate and on the Old Latin; he had all the gifts of a coadjutor in such studies—especial skill in penmanship, a neat and orderly mind, clearness and method along with indefatigable perseverance and assiduity. The partnership lasted until the Bishop was called away from this world, and the work which he (alas!) left unfinished is now in Prof. White's hands. In the meantime, in the early years of his episcopate (or possibly before), the Bishop had become acquainted with M. Samuel Berger, who often found his way to Salisbury, where he and Madame Berger were always welcome. This brought a new tributary of knowledge to the main stream of Vulgate studies. M. Berger had taken as his special province research among the MSS. of the Vulgate so plentifully scattered over Western libraries. The fruits of these researches were published in the volume *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du moyen âge* (Paris, 1893). This is a rich repertory of detailed information about the MSS. M. Berger was unhappily cut off by death at the too early age of fifty-seven in 1900. Since that time the most important contribution to the subject has been made by Dom John Chapman, O. S. B., in his *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels* (Oxford, 1908). These brilliant investigations should in the strict order of logic and of science have preceded the construction of a text; and yet they could not themselves have been carried out if it had not been for the Wordsworth-White collection of materials. It is by such gradual spiral steps that progress is made.

The first *fasciculus* of the first volume containing the Gospels appeared in July, 1889; the last, as Epilogue, in 1898; the Acts came out in 1905. It is interesting to look back and to ask, especially in relation to the Gospels, how the work looks now that it is finished in comparison with the prospect at the time when it was begun; how it has been affected in its progress by the accessions of new knowledge. On the whole we may say that the work stands as a monument of skilful scholarship not more impaired by lapse of time and that which lapse of time brings than is inevitable in human affairs. We may probably adopt the language of Dom Chapman, who, after sketching certain desiderata, says: 'The outcome of such a system of restoration would not, I imagine, differ substantially from the text given us by Wordsworth and White. But in some difficult places the verdict might be altered, or (what is just as important) confirmed by stronger reasons.' It would have been a great misfortune (such as has happened in not a few examples) if after all that has been done a wrong family of MSS. had been regularly followed; but that peril I believe has been escaped.

A few remarks may perhaps be made on particulars:

1. The most important additions to the list of MSS. consulted between the first draft of 1882–3 and the edition as finally brought out in 1889–98 are the Utrecht Fragments (U), portions of a Northumbrian MS. of quite small extent; the Salisbury MS. (W) written in the year 1254 and characteristically given as a specimen of a later mediaeval text; and the two MSS. represented by special signs, the so-called Benevento MS. (𝔉) and the Echternach Gospels (𝔓). A peculiar interest seemed to attach to these two MSS. from the presence in them of notes which appeared to throw light upon their history. The first, which is in the British Museum, was supposed to be dated between the years 739–60 and to be localized in the neighbourhood of Benevento in S. Italy. M. Berger, however (*Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 92), has shown reason for thinking that the indications from which these conclusions were drawn are not to be trusted. In any case the text of the MS. (which was quoted systematically for St. Luke and St. John) is disappointing; it appears to be Gallican of an ordinary type and to belong to the ninth century rather than the eighth.

With the Echternach Gospels the case is different. This MS. comes from the Abbey of Echternach, founded by St. Willibrord, who died in 739, and in style and date of writing may well be connected personally with him. The note which it contains is apparently copied from an older exemplar of the year 558, and is to the effect that this

exemplar had been corrected from a copy in the library of the Presbyter Eugipius (*sic*) which was said to have belonged to St. Jerome himself. I am inclined to think that both M. Berger and Bishop Wordsworth do rather less than justice to this MS.; and that for a very simple and natural reason. The text is corrected throughout in a Hiberno-Saxon hand, and the original text contains also a number of Hiberno-Saxon features. But we really need to look behind the original text, and to resolve it into its elements. When that is done I believe there will be found to be a nucleus of very ancient and important readings which may well go back, through Eugipius, to the more immediate surroundings of St. Jerome himself; the Hiberno-Saxon elements count for very little, but this older nucleus counts for a great deal. Dom Chapman has followed up the pedigree of this MS. in a way that I would gladly endorse.

2. One problem of considerable importance relating to the Vulgate is not quite so settled as it ought to be. Wordsworth and White print throughout the Gospels beneath the Vulgate text the text of Cod. Brixianus (*f*) as representing what is commonly regarded as the form of the Old Latin which St. Jerome took as the basis for his emendations. The editors made this assumption, which they took over from Bishop Westcott, and not only from the art. 'Vulgate' but from the joint edition of Westcott and Hort. They (the Vulgate editors) were evidently not shaken in their assumption, but held it as strongly at the end of their task as at the beginning (see esp. p. 666). But it has been challenged, most notably by Professor Burkitt. Professor Burkitt still held the old opinion when he wrote his essay on 'The Old Latin and the Itala' (*Texts and Studies*, 1896). He then wrote that certain peculiarities to which he called attention were 'not due to the intrusion of a Vulgate element in *f*. The more that MS. is studied the more evident appears the probability of the common opinion, that *f* is an example of the type of text from which St. Jerome prepared his Revised Version' (*op. cit.*, p. 56). But four years later he was beginning to change his mind: he raises the question definitely in an article on 'The Vulgate Gospels and the *Codex Brixianus*' contributed to vol. i of the *Journal of Theological Studies*, pp. 129–34. His doubts were chiefly prompted by a comparison of the text of *f* with that of the Gothic Version. This, however, does not seem to be at all conclusive, and my impression is that the old view is still the more probable. But impressions count for very little. The subject deserves, and I believe will reward, closer study.

3. The position in which the Wordsworth-White *Vulgate* leaves us

appears to be something of this sort. It is a great work, and it marks a great stride in advance; but it is still some way from being final. It is to be hoped that the papal edition, when it comes, will be final; it will at least create a standard of its own beyond what is possible to a single scholar or pair of scholars. Enough that there will have been no other edition since St. Jerome took pen in hand to which it will have owed so much as to this. Judging by the provisional standard which alone is suitable, it may be said that for the British Isles the work has been, not quite exhaustively but for practical purposes, sufficiently done. There still remain a few texts that might be more completely collated; but, broadly speaking, the forms of text current in these islands are now fairly well ascertained. I am not sure that I ought to say that next to the British Isles comes France. The French MSS. have indeed been very fully catalogued by M. Berger, and the Wordsworth-White edition embodies a knowledge of prominent and important samples of them. There are also valuable materials brought together by Dr. P. Corssen in *Die Trierer Adahandschrift* (1889), pp. 29–61. But the problem of the Gallican texts is difficult just because the MSS. are so numerous that their lines of relationship cross each other in such complicated patterns. The great Caroline codices in particular, splendid as they are as works of art, serve to obscure the issues rather than to elucidate them. The total effect is still somewhat confused. About Spain we know a little, and the problem is easier because the MSS. to be examined are comparatively few. But several leading MSS. are not yet really known.

It is ever to be regretted that M. Berger's labours were cut short where they were. He had acquired a considerable mastery of British and Gallican MSS. and had some knowledge of those of Spain. But his explorations had not extended far into Germany. The information that he gives, e.g. about Würzburg, is (I believe) derived from Schepss. It is perhaps a little strange that Wordsworth and White do not include at least the MS. called after St. Kilian. Still less, if I am not mistaken, had M. Berger's researches penetrated at first hand into Italy. And yet Italy is the most important region of all; and, though it may seem a paradox to say so, I believe that our knowledge of Italian texts really goes deeper than our knowledge of those of France. This is due to two fortunate circumstances: (i) the fact that Italian codices of first-rate value were brought at such an early date to England—to Wearmouth and Jarrow before the end of the seventh century; and (ii) to the happy chance—which was of course not really chance—that Bishop Wordsworth's authorities include, besides the reconstructed Cassiodorian and Eugipian texts, such priceless direct

evidence as that of Codd. F, J, M, and probably in large part of O, X, and Z. It is especially fortunate that we have in this way evidence at once from South Italy, clearly and definitely localized and set in its place in the chain, and also (presumably) from North. To this another valuable link will be added when Mr. C. H. Turner is able to give us his Fragments from St. Gall. And the Italian scholars may be able to contribute more.

4. The next step in Vulgate criticism will involve a much larger use of patristic quotations. Wordsworth deliberately excluded these from his original plan—and perhaps with reason, as the conditions then stood. I say 'perhaps' because, although it was no doubt true that a full use of quotations would have been beyond the powers of a single editor with limited leisure, I could imagine a restricted use which might have been of great value. We ought of course in fairness to consider the state of things in 1878, and not that which exists now. In 1878 there were hardly any Latin patristic texts in really trustworthy critical editions; but anything short of a thoroughly critical edition would have been valueless; the work would have simply had to be done again. Further, it was not (I believe) at that time known that in some of the later treatises of St. Augustine a Vulgate text was employed. Still less was any one upon the track of the genuine commentary of Pelagius on St. Paul's Epistles, which appears to have been also based upon a Vulgate text. We owe our knowledge of the first fact to Prof. F. C. Burkitt (in *Texts and Studies*, 1896), and of the second to Dr. A. Souter (see *Trans. Brit. Acad.*, 1906). But in 1887—two years before the appearance of the first *fasciculus* of the Vulgate—there was published Weihrich's critical edition of the two writings each of which bears the name *S. Augustini Speculum*. One of these has a text similar to that used by the Spanish writer Priscillian, and therefore does not concern us; but the other appears to be genuine Vulgate, and is in any case very near the time of St. Augustine. It is easy to be wise after the event, and to see that it might have been worth while to collate the readings of this work. That certainly ought to be done now. Without implying any blame upon the editors, it must yet be said that an edition of the Vulgate without use of the criterion afforded by patristic quotations can be no more final than a Greek text of the New Testament would have been produced under like conditions. When this criterion comes to be applied the text will be reconstructed with a surer grip and with greater confidence.

5. Other things will have to be done in the edition of the future. Among them we must look for a clearer identification of the sources

from which is derived the large amount of subsidiary matter (prefaces, capitulations and the like) which is found accompanying many MSS. of the Vulgate. It is a difficult task, and will require prolonged research; but a beginning has already been made. I may refer particularly to Dom Chapman's book, and to some recent researches by Dom de Bruyne of Maredsous in the *Revue Bénédictine*. What Wordsworth and White have done was (very properly) to collect the materials as fully as they could; it will be for future criticism to label and localize them.

6. I cannot leave this great work on the Vulgate without a word on the printers' share in it. Provisional and intermediate as the total result could not but be, it was yet conceived and has been so far executed 'in the grand style'; and it is clothed with an outward form which is also 'in the grand style'. The stately quarto-volume is really a work of fine art. In carrying out this there must have been a close and continuous co-operation between the editor and the printers. It seems right to speak in this case of the 'editor' in the singular, because the details of the form had all been settled when Mr. White joined. But indeed there is nothing of which this country has more reason to be proud than of the presentation to the world of the results of its scholarship. I have in my mind more especially *The New English Dictionary*, Mr. C. H. Turner's *Canons*, the Oxford *Vulgate*, and the Cambridge *Septuagint*. That quartette will not easily be surpassed.

The transference of the Oriel Professor to the see of Salisbury could not be otherwise than for him personally a momentous change. In this instance it is curious to note that the effect of the change was seen at once in that subordinate region to which I have just been referring—the region of the relations between author and printer. The stream of the Bishop's productions never ceased, and did not even slacken, but I believe that in all the rest of his life he brought out only three more books in full library form—the *Life* of his uncle, Bishop Charles Wordsworth, in 1899, *The Ministry of Grace* in 1901, and the Hale Lectures in 1911. The other products of his pen would make a most untidy regiment; they came out in every possible shape and size, many of them in the modest little 12mo of the S.P.C.K. There could be no more striking testimony to the complete absence of anything like literary foppery in the man.

Now it might quite well be thought that his significance from the special point of view of the British Academy would cease more or less completely from this time onward. But it would be a real mistake if such an idea were entertained. It would be a mistake even if it were

thought that the Academy had no concern with the active work of his episcopate. I will venture to say that the future historian of England and the English Church, or a foreign observer or inquirer at the present time, not to speak of his own contemporaries and colleagues, must have a direct concern in it. It would be difficult to find a diocese the working of which was more thoroughly characteristic of the Church of England in nearly every way at its best, and still more difficult to find one in which its working was more abundantly illustrated by documents, and those documents for the most part from the hand of the Bishop himself.

I desire to write as objectively as possible. I do not wish to make any claim for the Church of England as compared with other Churches. I leave it an open question what may be the precise value of the Anglican ideal of a bishop. But I will venture to say that John Wordsworth came up very nearly to that ideal. And I think it may be worth while, even from the point of view of the British Academy, for me to aim at describing him as he was.

The characteristics of the Wordsworth family are strongly marked, and to a surprising degree permanent and hereditary. All the Wordsworths, from the Poet onwards, have been patriots, and their patriotism has been of the best sort, not loud but deep. They have also all been convinced Anglicans, thoroughly content with their position, using it to the full but wanting nothing either less or more than Anglicanism could give them. It is this which makes the Bishop's diocesan work important.

The Bishop was a strong ruler of his diocese, but he was also a constitutional ruler. The simplicity of his habits, his warm-hearted sympathy and his generous support with money where money was needed, won for him the deep attachment and loyalty of his clergy; he took them freely into his counsels through the regular diocesan machinery; but he never failed to give them a lead. The latter half of the past century saw a rapid development of the organization of Anglican dioceses. One of those who contributed most to this, both in theory and practice, was Dr. E. W. Benson (who afterwards became Archbishop of Canterbury) as Chancellor of Lincoln in the years 1872–77; his work *The Cathedral* was published by him as Bishop of Truro in 1878. Bishop, chancellor, and chaplain at Lincoln had worked cordially together; and John Wordsworth took with him to Salisbury the Lincoln tradition. But he found there the foundation already laid. The Diocesan Synod, instituted by Bishop Moberly, had been at work for fifteen years. Besides this, the Bishop made a habit of consulting the Greater Chapter, and he also held regular

conferences of his archdeacons and rural deans. His published communications with the diocese, which were numerous and important and kept both clergy and laity fully abreast of the questions of the day, were usually associated with one or other of these bodies, where they did not take the form of Visitation Addresses.

It was natural, as I have said, that the change from professor to bishop should correspond with a change from scholarly research to the discussion of questions of practice. The literary products of the episcopate were all more or less directly concerned with questions of practice. But at the same time the Bishop was so essentially the scholar and learned man that he could not help treating them from the side of scholarship and learning. It is just this that invests them with special value. It does not often happen that a bishop's charges and pastoral letters and addresses possess so much of permanent significance.

The topics discussed in these various ways fall under two main heads: (1) the principles and practice of Public Worship; and (2) the relations of the Church of England to other communions.

In his first Visitation Charge (1888) the Bishop discussed, besides local matters, '(i) The English Church—Its Organization, Blessings, Dangers, and Duties. (ii) Marriage Law—Impediments to Marriage, Preliminaries to Marriage, Remarriage of Divorced Persons. (iii) Home Reunion.—The Principles of Church Order and their Exercise. Our Present Duty.' His second Charge was devoted entirely to the subject of the Holy Communion. It forms a volume of 212 pp., and is packed with close detail. It is characteristic that it should end with a bibliography of the diocese of Salisbury 'during the past few years'. It should be said in passing that the Bishop did all in his power to encourage serious study in the diocese. Two notable works, W. S. Swayne, *Our Lord's Knowledge as Man* (1891), on a smaller scale, and H. C. Powell, *The Principle of the Incarnation* (1896), on a larger, were directly due to the Bishop's initiative. Among the Pastoral Letters ('issued after consultation with the Greater Chapter') may be mentioned especially *Considerations on Public Worship and on the Ministry of Penitence* (published in 1898). This class of publications may be said to have culminated in the book (486 pp.) *The Ministry of Grace* (Longmans, 1901).

It must not be thought that these deliverances were just 'got up' for the occasion; they sprang from a background of profound knowledge. The Bishop was much more than a liturgiologist, but he might be described as an expert in liturgiology. But there are experts and experts, and it may be interesting to try to define the

sense in which the Bishop was an expert. He was not so quite in the highest class of all. He knew (practically) all that there was to be known; he kept up his reading in the literature from year to year; he was capable of making discoveries, in libraries or otherwise, and he was able to put into its place at once a new discovery (e. g. *Sarapion's Prayer Book*, 1899). But he was not exactly an expert in the more intensive sense in which Mgr. Duchesne or Mr. Edmund Bishop or Mr. F. E. Brightman might be called by that name; *The Ministry of Grace* would not have been so good as it is if there had not been Mgr. Duchesne and Mr. Brightman to build upon. At the same time it is a very useful repertory of knowledge, clearly and systematically set forth.

The other class of subjects which most calls for consideration here is that which is concerned with the relations between the Anglican and other Christian communions. It must be confessed—and this again is a Wordsworthian trait—that the Bishop was rather markedly anti-Roman. He tried to be fair to that great communion, and mellowed somewhat in his opposition as time went on; but it was an inheritance from the past of which it was not possible for him to divest himself all at once. And this attitude partly tends to explain the special interest that he took in those movements for reform which ended in separation from the Roman Church, and also in the great Churches of the East which have maintained complete independence of Rome. There is a growing feeling in the Church of England that it is not well for its members to interfere in the internal affairs of other Churches or to go out of their way to befriend those who secede from them. It goes against the grain with Englishmen to put this restraint upon themselves; their natural impulse is to side everywhere with the cause of freedom. They need not altogether suppress this feeling; but they are coming to see that the lesser end must yield to the greater. If the Reunion of Christendom is ever to be brought about, the first step towards it must be a scrupulous respect not only for the rights but also for the susceptibilities of other Churches. The Bishop, as I have said, did not quite see this. He was cautious in his actions, but he acted; and up to a certain point the effect of his action was good. He was in very friendly relations with the Old Catholics, at whose councils he was more than once present and whom he visited in their homes; and he was in touch with other reforming movements. He took an hereditary interest in the Churches of the East, and for sixteen years acted as President of the Jerusalem Mission. On two occasions he made journeys to the East in connexion with the work of this Mission, and in 1898 he paid formal visits to the heads of the Orthodox Church

and presented to them in the name of the Archbishop of Canterbury the Resolutions of the Conference recently held at Lambeth. The first place must no doubt be given to Bishop Blyth, who since 1887 has discharged his duties as Bishop in Jerusalem with great tact and wisdom. But, after him, it is due to no one more than the Bishop of Salisbury that such an excellent understanding exists between the Anglican and the Eastern Churches. In the last years of his life the Bishop played a leading part in the opening up of friendly relations with the Church of Sweden. He was Chairman of the Committee of the Lambeth conference of 1908 which dealt with the question of Reunion and Intercommunion. This led to the further appointment by the Archbishop of a Commission to follow up relations with the Scandinavian Churches. With his usual energy and predilection for investigating matters on the spot, the Bishop of Salisbury with other members of the Commission went over to Upsala in September, 1909. Here he made many friends; and it was the knowledge which he had thus acquired that furnished the materials for a course of Hale Lectures delivered at Chicago on the history of the Swedish National Church. It is greatly to be feared that the exertion involved in the visit to America for this purpose, which took place in the autumn of 1910, cost the Bishop his life. In the field of Home Reunion the Bishop had for a long time taken a special interest in Scottish Presbyterianism. This was another 'family matter'; for the Bishop's uncle, Bishop Charles Wordsworth of St. Andrews, had devoted to it a large part of the active work of his episcopate.

It was inevitable that with one of the Bishop's temperament, with his ingrained zeal for verified knowledge, this whole group of questions should be the cause of much writing; and the pamphlets and books to which it gave rise are by no means the least valuable part of the legacy that he has left behind him. I should not indeed know exactly where to lay my hand on any systematic defence of his relation to the Old Catholics. I should imagine that he grew into this in such a natural way that he was hardly aware that it needed any defence. His father had been an ardent champion of the Old Catholic cause, and father and son had been present together at their Second Congress in 1872. At that time English people were still suffering from the repellent effects of the Declaration of Infallibility. It was not until a later date that they began to veer round to the principle and policy of non-intervention. In this respect the Bishop of Salisbury was perhaps to the end of his days a little behind the times. The same might be said still more emphatically of another great scholar to whom I have referred, Prof. J. E. B. Mayor of Cambridge. I expect that

there must have been many who like myself were in the habit of receiving trenchant little sermons and pamphlets from that quarter; I doubt if Mayor ever felt any qualms or even saw that there were two sides to the question. But I have said that John Wordsworth mellowed as time went on. His wide knowledge and experience of affairs made him cautious from the first. While his intercourse with individuals, especially with the recognized leaders of the Old Catholic movement, was extremely warm, he was yet careful in the discrimination of character, and was on his guard against the less worthy motives and actions of some whom such movements are apt to bring to the front. He also came to take a larger and more balanced view of the history and place in the providential order of the Church of Rome. This is apparent in his latest utterance on the subject, the fourth Visitation Address on 'The Roman Church and Christian Unity', published in the small volume *Unity and Fellowship*, S.P.C.K., 1910. I would invite attention especially to pp. 73–5.

On his return from the East in 1898 the Bishop delivered a lecture to a gathering of clergy which was published under the title, *The Church of England and the Eastern Patriarchates*. This contains a rapid but scholarly survey of the relations of the English Church with the East since the Reformation, with a brief sketch at the end of existing conditions and of the general lines of policy that should be followed. This was reissued four years later by the Eastern Church Association with instructive appendices. Just before this (in 1901) the Bishop had drawn up and published, with the approval of the two archbishops and several bishops, a statement of leading points in the teaching of the Church of England, for the special information of Orthodox Christians of the East. This was translated into Greek by Dr. John Gennadius.

With even greater fullness the Bishop dealt with the relations of the Church of England to two other Churches, the Presbyterian Church or Churches of Scotland and the Church of Sweden. When the Bishop wrote his *Episcopate of Charles Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrews 1853–1892*, he expressly terms it, 'A Memoir, together with some materials for forming a judgment on the great questions in the discussion of which he was concerned.' The career of the Bishop of St. Andrews had been indeed a somewhat weaker and less impressive reflection of his own. One of its chief interests had been the possibilities of reunion between Presbyterians and Episcopalians; and his nephew is careful to register with much exactness both his uncle's mature opinions on the subject and his own. He returned to the point in one of his latest publications, *Ordination Problems* (S.P.C.K.,

1909). So far as my knowledge goes, no better or weightier treatment of the subject is available from the Anglican side.

It was, as we have seen, in his last years and in direct continuation of the special share that he took in the Lambeth Conference of 1908 that the Bishop was led to make a special study of the history of the Church of Sweden. The writings under this head for which the Bishop was wholly or largely responsible are: (1) the *Report* of a Commission which paid a visit to Sweden and held a conference with the Archbishop of Upsala, the Bishop of Kalmar, and other Swedish divines in September, 1909; (2) the popular account given of this visit in an address delivered on November 2 of the same year and published in *Unity and Fellowship*, pp. 110 ff.; and (3) the Hale Lectures which the Bishop was invited to give at Chicago, *The National Church of Sweden* (Mowbray, 1911).

The department of his duties in which the Bishop of Salisbury was perhaps, comparatively speaking, least effective was in the debates in the House of Lords. He had none of the orator's skill in taking his cue from the audience. This may have been partly due to the short-sightedness which prevented him from seeing his audience. But his speeches were apt to be rather of the nature of soliloquies in which he followed the course of his own thoughts.

But, as if in compensation for this, it may be said that there was probably no department in which his influence was more strongly felt than in the highest counsels of the Church. Wherever learning was needed, as it constantly is, his advice was sure to be asked; and it was given with unfailing promptitude and ability, and with that masculine sobriety of judgement which was characteristic of all that he did. The Archbishop of Canterbury has borne the warmest testimony to this (*Salisbury Diocesan Gazette* for December, 1911). In this respect his place will be indeed hard to fill.

Looking at the Bishop's work mainly as a scholar, he would perhaps find his nearest counterpart in Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614). If he could have led undisturbed the life of a student, there is little doubt that he would have rivalled the literary output of that famous scholar; and if we could conceive of Casaubon as a bishop, he would have been a bishop on John Wordsworth's lines. And yet the assignment of parts was really appropriate; because Wordsworth possessed, what his prototype did not, that commanding force and quiet energy of character which carries with it the qualification for rule.

W. SANDAY.