

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL

AND THE

DIVINITY DEGREES

OF THE

University of Dublin:

BY

CHARLES HENRY HAMILTON WRIGHT, D.D.,

OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN, M.A. OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD,
PHIL.B. OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG, INCUMBENT OF ST. MARY'S, BELFAST,
BAMPTON LECTURER FOR 1878 IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, AND
DONNELLAN LECTURER (1880-1) IN THE UNIV. OF DUBLIN.

DUBLIN :

HODGES, FOSTER, AND FIGGIS,

Booksellers to the University.

LONDON AND EDINBURGH: WILLIAMS & NORGATE.

1880.

Price Sixpence.

BELFAST :
PRINTED BY W. AND G. BAIRD,
ARTHUR STREET.

P R E F A C E .

THE following pamphlet is mainly composed of letters which appeared in the columns of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, in January and February of this year, reprinted with considerable corrections and the addition of notes. No reply was made to any of the letters, although it might have been expected that some would have taken the opportunity afforded of urging opinions contrary to those here advocated.

It is strange that no vigorous effort should have been made to settle the Divinity School question during the years which have elapsed since the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland. It is, perhaps, stranger that the propositions put forward by a considerable number of the leading members of the University of Dublin should have been so generally condemned. For those proposals, though not in all respects satisfactory, offer guarantees not to be despised for the orthodoxy of the future Professors of Divinity, and securities against men of heterodox views obtaining in future years the control of the Divinity School—securities amply sufficient for this purpose provided the future Bishops are courageous enough to do their duty. The proposals referred to, which without any great difficulty might have served as the basis, at least, of a common agreement, will be found in the notes on pp. 9, 11, 22, 24, and our own suggestions on the subject on p. 22ff.

It is earnestly to be hoped that this question will be fully discussed in the present session of the General Synod of the Church, and that no rash decision will be arrived at. It is to be regretted that the points of difference have not previously been discussed on both sides in the columns of the public press. For a large proportion of the members of the General Synod do not comprehend the bearings of the question, and may possibly, under the excitement of public debate, come to a decision afterwards to be regretted.

The separation of the Divinity School from the University would be a blow far more damaging to the Church of Ireland than the Act of Disestablishment. The loss which would be sustained by such a separation would be simply irreparable. No Theological College, even if provided with handsome buildings and rich endowments, can ever possess the prestige and advantages belonging naturally to a Divinity School which is an integral part of a great University. The most strenuous efforts of Churchmen should be directed to the preservation of such a status. It is far better to suffer considerable inconveniences than wantonly to abandon such a position. It is mere "clap-trap" to say that the Evangelical character of our Church is at stake. No doubt we must be prepared to concede to other Churches also the right to found, if they will, Theological Schools of their own in the University. We cannot, under the altered circumstances of our times, claim for our Church what we refuse to grant to other Churches also. But Theology ought to be retained as a branch of University study in the interest of our common Christianity. Our Divinity students will be no less Evangelical in their doctrine, while they will be far better fitted intellectually "to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints," by continuing to receive their Theological training in a University School, where they will be obliged to meet men holding opinions totally different from their own, than the same students can possibly be if educated in Theology in some narrow ecclesiastical seminary, from which all heresy is carefully excluded. We do not want our future clergy to be like plants trained up in some spiritual hot-house, unable to withstand the cutting frosts of intellectual scepticism and infidelity which must be encountered in the world outside.

BELFAST, April 15, 1880.

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL

AND

THE DIVINITY DEGREES.

§ I. *Recent Proposals—Advantages of a University Divinity School.*

IT is not my intention to examine in detail the recent proposals put forward by the majority of the Board, with a number of the Junior Fellows and Professors of Trinity College, for the settlement of the question of the Divinity School.* It may be fairly assumed that those proposals were put forward on behalf of the University, in order to elicit suggestions from persons in authority in the Church, with the object of discovering some common ground of agreement between the two parties concerned. Such proposals were not put forward as representing any definite plan, the details of which were to be insisted on in every particular. It is, therefore, unfortunate that while such propositions have been made on behalf of the University so long ago, no corresponding proposals have been yet put forward by the Church authorities. The Bishops have, indeed, met and consulted on the matter in private, but the public have

Recent
proposals for
settlement of
Divinity School
question.

*Two sets of proposals have been put forward by the majority of the Board with the Junior Fellows and Professors. *First*—The “Suggestions relative to the Divinity School of Trinity College addressed to the members of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, to the members of the Council, and to the members of the Senate of the University of Dublin,” issued April, 1879. This was countersigned by a number also of the members of the Senate, and received my own signature as generally approving of its contents. It was published, with the signatures, in the *Irish Times* of April 25th, 1879, and in other Dublin newspapers. *Secondly*—A circular issued to the members of the General Synod, and signed by a smaller number of Fellows and Professors, which appeared in the *Daily Express* of Nov. 24th, 1879. This latter circular is that alluded to above. The proposal alluded to in the second paragraph above is to be found in this “Circular.” It was not contained in the earlier “Suggestions.” The gentlemen whose names are appended to the last signed also the earlier document, and in both cases expressed only their general agreement with the recommendations put forward.

not been informed what course they have decided to recommend. It would have been well, if a counter scheme is to be presented to the General Synod of the Church, that the public should have been acquainted with it before the meeting of that Assembly. The full bearings of any scheme can scarcely be understood sufficiently in the heat of public debate. One must hope that some reasonable compromise, satisfactory both to the Church and the University, may be arrived at; and that the proposals made on behalf of the University—proposals which may, indeed, require modifications, but which can easily be made the basis of a reasonable arrangement—will not simply be met by an ecclesiastical “*non possumus.*”

Objections made
against such
proposals.

One of the propositions put forward by the Fellows and Professors is that the Church authorities should endeavour to raise “an amount equal or nearly equal to the sum now expended on the Divinity School by Trinity College, to be appropriated to the purposes of the Divinity School, such as the institution of additional professorships, &c.,” required for that School. But it has been objected *in limine* to this proposal, that if the Church Body had any such sum in hands, or could raise such without serious difficulty, the Church would be able at once to found a Divinity School of its own, and would not seek to obtain terms from Trinity College.

Reply to
objections.

This objection, which has been seriously made, shows an utter want of comprehension of the vast importance of the connection of the Divinity School with the University. It is not the present endowments of that School which are of so much importance to the Church as the *status* which the Church possesses at present, by virtue of its Divinity School forming an integral part of a distinguished University. The retention of that *status* is of more advantage to the Church (even were all the endowments connected with it swept away) than the possession of a well-endowed Theological College, deprived of all connection with the University. *Money* can be obtained by a little effort, but such a *status* once lost can never be regained.

The great
importance of
the present
status of the
Divinity School.

Inferiority of a
mere
Theological
College as to
prestige, and
lack of higher
teaching.

A new Theological College would altogether lack the prestige belonging to the Divinity School of the University. Such a College would have no connection with the past. It would be simply more or less like the English Theological

Colleges, as St. Aidan's, St. Bees', or Cuddesdon. Its professors and lecturers would have simply the duty of preparing, as rapidly as possible, young men for holy orders. They would naturally have little to do with the teaching of Theology as a science. They would be certain to succeed best by making up their students carefully in a very limited course of Divinity. The longer such a course could be adhered to, and the more carefully it was gone over, the better fitted would the teachers of the College become as "grinders" for the Episcopal Examinations. The tutors and lecturers of such a College would, for the most part, seek to impart to their students only a general knowledge of the subject, and be compelled to eschew all minute investigations in any special department of the field of Theological Science.

The Divinity School of T.C.D., in consequence of its being a University School, has often attracted to the service of the Church many a man who entered the University without any intention of devoting himself to the sacred ministry, and even with the distinct intention of entering some other profession. Not a few University students have also passed through the Divinity School, and benefited by its studies, who have afterwards entered upon various secular professions. A Theological College unconnected with the University would lose all such University students; and, although the Church might, indeed, require all students in its Theological College to pass through the Arts' course in the University, it is exceedingly doubtful that such a regulation could long be maintained, while its Divinity School would not merely lose prestige by being deprived of its University status, but the Church would lose her most important field from which to recruit the ranks of the clergy.

The Divinity students in the University exercise in many cases an important influence on their fellow University students studying for other professions. The Professors of the Divinity School, as long as they continue to be Professors of the University, must needs be better acquainted with the varying currents of scientific thought than any tutors in a Theological College can possibly be. Such Divinity Pro-

Advantages of a University School of Theology as a recruiting ground for the ministry.

The importance of a Divinity School in the University.

fessors, if men of recognised scholarship, are naturally looked up to by University students as authorities on the subjects which they teach, and their very presence in the University as recognised advocates of Christianity is in itself of great importance in retarding the advance of scepticism among the students. Such Professors, if men of genial manners and Christian earnestness, are able not only to secure a respectful hearing from men of science, but occupy also a most favourable position for true evangelistic labours among the students. I repeat my statement, which was most stupidly carp'd at and misrepresented by the *Church Advocate*, that "a University Divinity School is not designed only for the professional education of clergymen." There are many departments of theological science which can only properly be cultivated at the University, and the cultivation of which is important from a University standpoint, independently of the interest which such studies must ever possess for the professed theologian. The study of Hebrew is notably one of these.

Not merely a Training School for clergy.

Importance of reforms in the Divinity School.

Strongly, however, as I maintain the importance of the preservation of the Divinity School as a part of the University on almost any of those conditions which have as yet been proposed by the Fellows and Professors, I cannot but think that considerable reforms are needed in the system which has been pursued in our Divinity School ever since its formation as one of the professional schools of the University. The Divinity School, notwithstanding all its defects, has done good service, but it is capable, even with its present revenues, of doing far more than it has yet accomplished. The present is the most suitable opportunity for discussing the reforms needed in our Divinity School System, for when the Divinity School question is once settled in any way whatever, the dogged conservatism which at present so characterises our Church is likely to be a serious hindrance in the way of introducing any reforms, however slight they may be.

The opening of the Theological Chairs to the graduates in general.

It will not be necessary now to urge the necessity of removing those restrictions whereby the Theological Professorships have heretofore been confined to Fellows or ex-Fellows of Trinity College, inasmuch as it has been conceded

on all sides that such restrictions ought to be removed, though nothing has yet been done to open such chairs to more general competition.*

§ 2. *Divinity Lectures—Suggested Reforms as to Sub-Lecturers and their Lectures.*

According to the regulations at present in force in the Present Divinity School of the University of Dublin, students in their junior Divinity year have to attend each term the prelections of Archbishop King's Lecturer, which are delivered on two days of each week at eleven o'clock, and the lectures of one of his five Assistants on the same day, at one o'clock. In the senior year the students attend the lectures of the Regius Professor, which are also delivered on two days each week during term, and the classes of some one of his four Assistants. Students have no power of selecting their own sub-lecturer, but are assigned to the several Assistants according to a fixed plan. The Assistants to Archbishop King's Lecturer lecture during two terms on those portions of the Greek Testament appointed for the examinations in the junior year, and for one term on *Pearson on the Creed*. The Assistants to the Regius Professor similarly lecture for one term on the assigned portions of the Greek Testament, and for the other terms of the year on *Browne*, or *Burnet on the Thirty-Nine Articles*. These lectures are catechetical, and the students have to prepare a certain portion every day, in which they are examined, and are liable to lose their lectures if insufficiently prepared.

* The Fellows and Professors express themselves thus in their Circular to the members of the Synod :—

" It is premised that as, according to the probabilities of human life, the Board of Trinity College will, for the next 25 or 30 years, be mainly a clerical body—and for many years afterwards will be mainly or altogether composed of members of the Church of Ireland—there is no sufficient reason why the present management of the Divinity School might not be left undisturbed till the necessity for a change arrives—if it ever shall arrive. Nothing new is needed except—(1.) To open the Divinity professorships, now limited to Fellows and ex-Fellows, to Clerical Graduates of the Church of Ireland; and (2.) To secure, by proper authority, the amount now expended on the Divinity School to the uses of maintaining a Theological Faculty and a Divinity School in Trinity College. Upon the expediency of these two points all are agreed."

Evils of present system.

According to this system, Divinity students are treated exactly as school-boys, while the Assistant-Lecturers have, year by year, to go over the same unvarying course. Each Assistant-Lecturer has but a small number of the Divinity students for each year in attendance on his lectures, and in the general examinations is obliged to confine himself to points with which all students ought to be acquainted. It would be manifestly unfair to examine the students generally on any subjects not contained in the ordinary text-books. The Assistant-Lecturers have, therefore, little to stimulate them to impart information of a higher kind, and too often confine themselves to teaching simply what is contained in the text-books in common use. There have been Lecturers who have sought to attain a higher ideal, and such may even now exist among the present staff of Divinity sub-lecturers. But it is notorious that a student generally learns little more from the lectures of the Assistant than could be acquired by the most ordinary reading. It is, moreover, a fact, that private "grinders" in Theology make up their students far more thoroughly in the special business assigned for the various examinations than the ordinary Assistant-Lecturers.

Divinity
Students should
have power to
choose their
Sub Lecturers.

In order to remedy this state of things, students in Divinity ought to be permitted to select for themselves the lecturers they might deem most profitable. Men might, indeed, in such a case occasionally select as their lecturer one who happened to sympathize with their own particular theological party. This would, however, be a matter of small importance, for students will generally select for themselves those lecturers who are most fitted to teach, and who take the greatest interest in their welfare.

Private Teachers
of ability should
be made
Lecturers.

It would be useful to appoint private teachers of standing and ability in the University to the honorary position of University Lecturers in Theology. Students who preferred to attend the classes of such teachers might be permitted to keep their Divinity terms by such attendance. For if Divinity students find it to their advantage to pay extra money for private tuition in theology, and if the ability of the private teacher has been tested again and again by the success of his pupils, why should not the Church and University recognise

such a teacher? Of course it would be undesirable that any such Lecturer should act as an Examiner in theology, but he ought to be willingly accorded a privileged University *status*. A first-rate Divinity "grinder," like Rev. Canon M'Donogh, ought to be thus rewarded for his services.

As all Divinity students have to pass several examinations in a carefully selected theological course (which secures a general acquaintance with the elements of theology), students might, with advantage, be permitted to absent themselves from attendance on the lectures of the Assistant-Lecturers, provided they kept their terms by diligent attendance on the lectures of any two other Professors in the Theological School, such as those in Biblical Greek and Ecclesiastical History. Comparatively few students now attend the lectures of these Professors unless such as attend with the intention of competing for the prizes offered in those departments. But the lectures of University Professors are certainly not designed merely to facilitate the preparation of a few students who may work to obtain prizes. They ought to be made more generally useful. The lectures in Hebrew and Moral Philosophy ought to be permitted to count as theological lectures, although the Professors in those departments are not now reckoned as belonging to the Divinity School.

This would encourage the better class of Divinity students to take up special studies in subjects connected with theology while passing their ordinary Divinity course. Such an arrangement would permit the number of Assistant-Lecturers to be considerably reduced, and the money thus saved would be available for the purpose of founding additional chairs in Divinity, such as those two suggested by the Fellows and Professors, namely—Pastoral Theology and Biblical Exegesis.* I would, indeed, prefer to see the Assistant-Lecturer-

Advantage of this course.

New chairs to be founded.

* The Circular of the Fellows and Professors thus suggests:—

"Let the provision be made, on the part of the Church of Ireland, either by means of a grant from the Church Surplus, if such can be obtained, or by a special collection, of an amount equal, or nearly equal, to the sum now expended on the Divinity School by Trinity College; this fund to be placed and remain in the keeping of the Representative Church Body, and to be appropriated to the purposes of the Divinity School—such as the institution of additional professorships and of exhibitions and prizes. The foundation, for example, of professorships of Pastoral Theology and of Biblical Exegesis would be a valuable addi-

Sub-lecturers
ought to be
made assistant
Professors.

ships abolished and additional Professorships in Theology founded in their room.† The multiplication of several Professorships in the same subject in the Divinity School (and, indeed, in the University) would be of great importance. It would secure a greater variety in teaching, and would secure a larger body of qualified teachers. Liberty ought to be accorded to the Professors of teaching any subject connected with their department, without being obliged (as in many cases they are) to submit their subjects for the approval even of such a respectable body as the Board of Trinity College. University students will always regard a Professor with greater respect than a mere Sub-lecturer. The Sub-lecturers in past times were looked up to because they were necessarily Fellows of Trinity College. It would be of importance for the future success of the Divinity School of the Church of Ireland in the University to secure for its students, as far as possible, the "liberty of learning," and to grant its Professors the "liberty of teaching," both of which have been so highly prized and so practically useful in the Universities of Germany.

Need of increase
of the staff of
Divinity School.

The Divinity School will require a larger staff in the future than in the past. Let it not be forgotten that with all its usefulness in the past that School has produced very few theologians. If new chairs are founded, it is to be hoped that no attempt will be made to compel the Divinity students in general to attend a much larger number of lectures than they have at present. Some men will be greatly benefited by attendance on lectures on Pastoral Theology, but all students ought not to be compelled to attend such lectures. The Theological Professors ought to exist for the benefit of the Church at large, and not merely for the purpose of "coaching" or "grinding" men who in most cases are only beginning their theological studies. The Professors of the

tion to the staff of the Divinity School. Similar professorships exist in the well-equipped schools at the English Universities; and the establishment of additional theological exhibitions and scholarships would be of great importance to the prosperity of the School. Some of the existing professorships also require an increased endowment."

† In 1869 (according to the Return presented to the House of Commons, and ordered to be printed 31st July, 1874) the sum of £545 was paid to eleven Assistant Lecturers; £560 was paid in 1870 to twelve such Assistants; in 1871 and in 1872 there were only nine such, with £460 divided among them. There are at present nine sub-Lecturers.

future ought not merely to be teachers, but also writers, teaching, lecturing, and studying for the Church at large. It is to be desired that many of these Professors will be men who will not stand aloof from the students, but seek to have free intercourse with them. It is Utopian to expect the rich endowments in Dublin which exist in Oxford and Cambridge. But enthusiastic teaching is not always to be found in the occupants of highly endowed chairs. To prevent stagnation in the future all attempts to keep up a monopoly in teaching ought to be opposed. Several Professors are needed in almost every department. It is not necessary that all should have equal salaries. One Professor will often supply what is lacking in the teaching of another. Let a diligent student be accorded the liberty of indulging his peculiar tastes for studies of one kind or another, without all men being forced into the same groove. Above all, let us seek to attract students to the Divinity School, not by the multiplication of "Exhibitions" or "Scholarships," of which we have almost enough, or by increasing the number of small prizes of the value of £4 or £5, but by providing a number of Professors really enthusiastic in their teaching—men in love with the studies they profess, and, though competently paid, not teaching simply for the sake of the emoluments connected with their respective chairs.

§ 3. *The University Professorships of Hebrew.*

It is of considerable importance in connection with the Divinity School question that the present position of the Hebrew chair in the University of Dublin should be rightly understood. In the *University Calendar* for 1833, and for years afterwards, that chair was known as Erasmus Smith's Professorship of Oriental Languages, the chair having been endowed by the will of Erasmus Smith in 1724. When Dr. Todd succeeded to the Professorship on the resignation of Dr. Wall, he took the title of Erasmus Smith's Professor of

The Regius
Professorship.

Hebrew. Dr. Todd, who was always desirous that the University of Dublin should possess something of that prestige which has ever attached itself to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, desired to have the chair known as the Regius Professorship of Hebrew, to which title, perhaps, the Professorship was entitled, as having been named in the charter of Charles I. (*Car. 13, § xv.*) But as that designation might have been questioned, because it had not been given to any previous occupant of the chair, Dr. Todd got a clause inserted in the Statute of 18th Victoria (1855), by which power was distinctly given to the Provost and Senior Fellows to elect a Regius Professor of Hebrew from among the Fellows of Trinity College. The chair of Greek which is spoken of in the same Statute, together with the Professorship of Hebrew, had been raised to the rank of a Regius Professorship by the Royal Statute of 1761. The latter Professorship was for a long time, however, a mere annual appointment. But this was changed after the Statute of 1855.

Statute which
refers to the
Regius Chair.

The clause in the revised Statutes which treats of these Professorships is as follows:—"Volumus et statuimus ut semper in futurum eligantur e Sociis a Præposito, vel eo absente Vice-præposito, et majore parte Sociorum seniorum, Professor Regius Linguæ Hebraicæ. Et potestatem concedimus Præposito et majori parti Sociorum seniorum, dictis professoribus salario assignandi, a Visitatoribus Collegii approbanda, atque durationem officii et munera eorundem definiendi."

Title of Regius
Professor
assumed
without due
formalities.

In accordance with this Statute, "a decree" of the Board was issued in the same year (1855), by which the duties of the Regius Professor of Greek were duly defined, and a suitable salary assigned to that office. No such "decree" was issued with regard to the Regius Professorship of Hebrew, but Dr. Todd (no doubt with the approval of the Board, of which he was a distinguished member) at once assumed the title of Regius Professor of Hebrew, to which he considered he was entitled, and the title was given to him in all the University Calendars from that date, which are, it is also to be presumed, issued under the authority of the Board. Dr. Todd died in August, 1869, and Dr. George Longfield was appointed in October of the same year as Regius Professor,

and bore that designation in all University documents and in all the University Calendars up to his death in November, 1878.*

The right of nomination to the Regius Professorship of Hebrew had meantime been transferred, in the course of legislation, from the Board to the Academic Council. For the University Tests' Act was passed in 1873. The re-construction of the governing body of the University, left unaccomplished by that Act, was effected by the Royal Letters Patent of 1874, the Queen's Letter having been previously discussed and approved by the Senate of the University. By those Letters Patent the Academic Council was called into existence, and obtained the right to nominate "to all Professorships, except those the nomination to which is vested in some other body or persons by Act of Parliament, or by the direction of private founders, and except also the following Professorships in the School of Divinity, that is to say the Regius Professorship of Divinity, Archbishop King's Lectureship in Divinity, and the Professorship of Biblical Greek." By this clause the Council obtained the right to nominate to the Regius Professorship of Hebrew in 1878 on the lamented demise of Dr. Longfield.

But on due examination into the subject several points became clear. (1) That by the Statute of 1855 only a Fellow of Trinity College could be nominated to the Regius Professorship. This restriction might, had it been the only difficulty in the case, have been easily removed by a Queen's Letter, had the University authorities thought fit to apply for such, and the Crown to grant their application. (2) But a much graver difficulty presented itself. The lawyers consulted on the question gave it as their opinion that there was really no Regius Professorship of Hebrew in existence in the University, no "decree" of the Board having been issued distinctly founding such a chair in accordance with the charter of 1855, and no salary having been assigned to such an office, nor its duties stated. The salary assigned by Erasmus Smith's will could only be lawfully paid to a Fellow of Trinity College,

*Difficulties in
the way of
exercising the
right.*

*The Erasmus
Smith's
Professor must
be a Fellow.*

* This title was also given to Dr. Longfield in the Returns of the Revenue of Trinity College, &c., made to the House of Commons, and printed in July, 1874.

The action of
the Board of
T.C.D.

nominated by the Board of Trinity College. Nothing less than the authority of an Act of Parliament could enable any other person than a Fellow to be appointed to the chair endowed by the Board of Erasmus Smith. In consequence of these difficulties the Board considered it better to postpone for the present all action as to the endowment or regular creation of the Regius Professorship, and the Council had accordingly no opportunity to exercise their right of nomination. The Board were, therefore, obliged to nominate a Fellow to the Governors of Erasmus Smith's Schools, in accordance with the uniform practice, and Rev. Dr. Carson, S.F.T.C.D., was appointed in 1878 to the "Professorship of Hebrew endowed by the Board of Erasmus Smith," and on his resignation in 1879, the Rev. T. K. Abbott, Fellow of Trinity College, and Professor of Biblical Greek, a very competent scholar, was similarly appointed Professor of Hebrew.

No Regius
Professor of
Hebrew in the
University.

Want of
Endowment.

There is, therefore, at present no Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University. The chair, it appears, must be first called into existence by a regular "decree," and a salary must be assigned to it, and even if this were done to-morrow no one except a Fellow of Trinity College could be appointed to the office, unless a new Queen's Letter were obtained repealing the regulation to this effect in the Royal Statute of 1855. The Board was naturally unwilling, under the existing circumstances, to assign a salary, even had the funds of the University warranted such a step; and if such a chair is to belong to the Church it cannot be endowed from the public funds of the University, but must be endowed by private liberality. This state of things with reference to a Regius Professorship is not creditable to the University of Dublin, in which, to use the language of the Statute of 1855, there "ought always to exist a Regius Professorship of the Hebrew language."

Endowment of
Erasmus Smith's
Chair.

The present Professorship of Hebrew, to which Professor Abbott has been appointed, is only endowed by the Board of Erasmus Smith with the small salary of £60 per annum. It is currently reported, I know not with what truth, that the emoluments of the chair are generally raised to £100 by a

grant from the College funds. The Professorship of Hebrew is not necessarily connected with the School of Divinity, and is not one of the Divinity chairs mentioned in the Statute of 1874. It must, however, be observed, that the Professorship of Ecclesiastical History, which is unquestionably a Divinity Professorship, is not named in that Statute, which does not propose to give a full list of the chairs in connection with the Divinity School. The nomination to both these chairs is practically vested "by the directions of founders" in the Board of Trinity College.

It is important that the Church and the public should be put in possession of these facts, which require careful consideration. Private liberality is much needed at the present time for the proper endowment of the chair of Hebrew as well as of other chairs. It is discreditable to the Church and to Irish Protestantism in general that so little has been done for University education by private liberality.

It would be well, too, that it should be distinctly remembered that the Erasmus Smith's Professorship must needs be filled by a Fellow of Trinity College to the exclusion of any other candidate until such time as the existing state of things has been altered by Act of Parliament.

Besides the Erasmus Smith's Professorship of Hebrew there is in the University an Erasmus Smith's Lecturership in Hebrew, which used to be an annual appointment, but has been made a permanent office, with a salary of £60 per annum. There are also two Assistant Lecturers, each paid £50 per annum from the funds of Trinity College. Whether the Erasmus Smith's Lecturership is tenable by any person not a Fellow of Trinity College, I know not; the Assistants need not necessarily be Fellows, though they have always hitherto been selected from the Fellows.* But what scholar of merit would offer his services to the University in such a subordinate capacity at such a salary? The case

* In 1869 there were, according to the Returns already referred to, three Assistant Lecturers in Hebrew, among whom £100 was divided; in 1870 and 1871, £133 12s 0d was divided among the same number. In 1872 there were only two, with £100 between them; and in 1873 three such Sub-Lecturers with £133 12s 0d. To which must be added £60 annually paid to the Erasmus Smith's Lecturer, and £60 paid to the Regius Professor of Hebrew.

would, perhaps, be different if such Assistantships were made Professorships Extraordinary, as they would be in Germany, and if the holders of such posts possessed some of that "liberty of teaching" referred to in my last letter as always enjoyed by German Professors. At present these Assistant Lecturers are doomed, year by year, to go over the same circumscribed course and no other; which system, I maintain, is the surest method of destroying utterly any spark of originality, and almost of interest, in a University teacher, and which has in the past proved a most effective means of discouraging original study.

§ 4 Hebrew Lectures and Proposed Reforms.

Duties of
Professor of
Hebrew and
his Assistants.

The work assigned to the Professor of Hebrew under present regulations is to lecture on Isaiah to the senior class once a week during term, that class being composed of students who have entered on their third year of Hebrew study, to preside and assist at all the examinations in Hebrew (including the Fellowship exam.), and to deliver "public prelections from time to time, as required by the rules of Erasmus Smith's Board" (*Dub. Univ. Calendar* for 1880, p. 67). Until very recently the rule was that these prelections were to be delivered once a week during term, and Dr. Todd used to lecture every Saturday, and Dr. Longfield every Monday. It would consequently appear that these public prelections have not been so frequent since Dr. Longfield's death, probably owing to the fact that the gentlemen who have performed the duty since that time have not had the necessary leisure required for such work. Erasmus Smith's Lecturer has once a week to lecture the middle class, composed of the second year's students, in selected portions of the Psalms, the selection made being modified only at rare intervals, and to take part at the annual examinations of the middle and junior classes. The two Assistants lecture on Hebrew grammar, and on small portions of the Book of Genesis and of 1 and 2 Kings.

When studying in the University I attended as a "freshman" Dr. Todd's public prelections for three terms. The

annual "Primate's Hebrew Prizes," as they were then termed, were open only to students of higher standing, consequently I had at a later period to attend the Professor's public lectures again in due course, and I also attended many of those prelections for a third year. To my surprise the Professor delivered the same lectures year after year without variation. This is, unfortunately, too common a practice, which wherever it occurs ought to be condemned. One result of it is that a Professor's lectures possess a peculiar interest for the first few years after his entrance upon the duties of his chair, but are afterwards generally regarded without enthusiasm on the part of the students, as they know full well that the lectures they have to attend have been often before delivered by the Professor. Abstracts of such prelections, moreover, often circulate among the students, and find their way into the hands of the private "grinders," who are thus enabled to prepare their pupils for the regular examinations.

If a Professor considers his prelections of such importance that they ought to be delivered to his class year after year, and if those prelections have been so carefully elaborated as to require no substantial change, it would conduce both to the credit of the University and to the benefit of the students that the Professor should publish such lectures, and put his book into the course required for examination. Many valuable works of German scholars have originated in this very way. But no German Professor would work hard to make up a set of prelections, and afterwards be satisfied with delivering them year by year without alteration. No set of lectures ought to be read by any Professor for more than five years successively, if so often, even though his class may be entirely composed of different auditors; nor in an age of so much intellectual activity in linguistic and theological research of all kinds, is a Professor justified in keeping to the same unvarying course for a decade of years. In the case of oral lectures, the case may be something different. But even under such circumstances a change is generally needed to keep up the interest of the teacher. The system I refer to has a tendency to make even good Professors indolent after a few years, when they have nothing further to do than to read

Prelections of
Professor often
uniform in past
times.

Prelections
ought to be
changed.

Evils of present
system.

their old lectures over and over again. Dr. M'Neece, who was Archbishop King's Lecturer from 1842 to 1862, was a striking illustration of the truth of this statement. Dr. Todd, formerly Regius Professor of Hebrew and Senior Fellow, was an ornament of the University of Dublin, and a busy man—a scholar of eminence in several departments. His labours in ancient Irish are well known, and will ever be valued; but as Regius Professor of Hebrew he was most indifferent. His public prelections had a certain value, but were always the same, and they gave no indication of having been brought up to the latest results of scholarship. One learned very little even from his lectures on "Isaiah" to the senior class—less than could have been acquired by a study of Rosenmuller's *Scholia* and Hengstenberg's *Christology*, which were then the favourite books on the subject. Though a voluminous author on other subjects, and for fifteen years Professor of Hebrew, Dr. Todd left nothing behind him to show his interest in Hebrew studies. There was a marked contrast in this respect between his lectures and the lectures on Arabic, Syriac, and Chaldee, &c., delivered by Professor Dr. William Wright (then Professor of Arabic in Dublin, now Fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge, and Professor of Arabic in that University), or even between Dr. Todd's lectures and the lectures of Dr. Rudolph Siegfried, at that time Professor of Sanskrit in the University. Both the latter Professors lectured after the German fashion, and had, consequently, enthusiastic students in their classes.

Difficulty of a
F.T.C.D. being
an efficient
Professor.

These remarks are no real digression from the subject. It is hard for a Fellow of Trinity College, actively engaged in the multifarious and heavy work connected with that position, which is no sinecure in Dublin, to be a really efficient Professor of Hebrew. If that Professor had merely to perform the duties assigned in the *University Calendar*, he could do so with comparative ease. Much more, however, ought to be done by a University Professor of Hebrew. It is, however, impossible to do much more under existing circumstances. Dr. Longfield several times regretted, in conversation with me, that he could not devote himself to the studies of his chair. At present a Professor and three Assistants are actually employed in performing duties which, if confined to what is set

forth in the *University Calendar*, might be more effectively performed by half the number of individuals, if only they had no other work to perform. The united salaries, however, of the Professor and his Assistants only reach the sum of £220—a sum inadequate to pay a single Professor a suitable salary.

[See Note page 17.] If, however, these Assistant Lecturerships were transformed into Professorships Extraordinary, and filled by men entirely devoted to such studies, a far larger number of lectures could be delivered on a greater variety of subjects, and much more would be done. The value of such lectures ought not to be estimated by the number of students attending them, but by the number of those stirred up to take a real interest in such studies.

If it should ultimately be found impracticable to open the A second Chair of Hebrew.
Erasmus Smith's Professorship of Hebrew to general competition, it might be advisable to do away with these Assistant Lecturerships (if they could not be modified as suggested) and with the money saved found a second chair of Hebrew. At present, Hebrew grammar is not studied as it ought to be. Study of Hebrew Grammar.
Students seldom do more than obtain a very superficial knowledge of the smaller grammar of Gesenius, while they ought in the course of the Professor's lectures to be encouraged to study the English works on Hebrew grammar of Driver and Kalisch, and the German works of Ewald (now to be had in an English dress), Böttcher, Olshausen, Delitzsch, and others.

The Church in general needs to be aroused to the importance of promoting the study of Old Testament criticism—only men acquainted with such studies can be expected to stem the progress of intellectual infidelity. This subject alone would give full scope to the energies of a Professor. It would be a great mistake for one Professor to be required to lecture both on the Old and New Testaments. Yet, I fear, this is contemplated in the proposition already made to erect a single chair of Biblical Exegesis in the Divinity School.

The Church of Ireland ought to have a Professor of Hebrew of her own in connection with the Divinity School of the University. If such a post is to be filled by a succession of competent men, a fitting salary must be secured. The great object of such a chair ought to be to raise up students really

Assistant
Lecturerships
ought to be
constituted
Professorships
extraordinary.

Study of
Hebrew
Grammar.

New Professors
needed for
Biblical
Exegesis.

A Church
Professor of
Hebrew.

interested in Hebrew studies, and not merely studying for prizes. Prizes and scholarships ought to be stimulants to study, but not the objects solely aimed at.

Real object of Professors' Lectures.

Our Divinity students need to be aroused to set about their work as men, and not as schoolboys. The object of the Professors' lectures ought not to be to "spoon-feed" idle men, only desirous of acquiring a *minimum* of knowledge, but to stimulate real research. In his lectures a Professor ought to show a student how to prosecute such researches. By this system a higher class of students would be drawn to the Professorial lectures. By permitting Divinity students to choose their own lecturers in any special subject, and by allowing them to obtain credit for their terms by attendance on such lectures, with a due attendance on the prelections of the Regius Professor of Divinity and Archbishop King's Lecturer, every man could obtain that instruction which he severally might desire. Men who needed more individual teaching would naturally attend the lectures of some Assistant Professor, or of some private teacher recognised as a University Lecturer. The School of Divinity would thus become a real place of study, and the due acquaintance of all its students with the general outlines of theology would be tested by their answering, as at present, at the numerous examinations. It ought, however, to be presumed that professional students really mean to study, and not to shirk study, as schoolboys are wont to do.

Advantage of Reforms.

§ 5. *Proposed Settlement of the Divinity School Question.*

The Divinity School question.

Although I do not at all purpose to enter into any special examination of the plan for the settlement of the Divinity School question put forward by a majority of the Fellows and Professors of the University, which possesses certain merits of its own,* I may be permitted to ob-

* The first portion of that proposal will be found in Note, p. 11. The remaining portion may well be quoted here.

"Such provision having been made, let the government of the School be vested in the Board of Trinity College, and an Episcopal Committee acting as a separate body, composed of the two Archbishops and of such Bishops as might be selected for that purpose by the Bishops

serve that a simpler arrangement could easily be devised, Fears of the
Church. were it not that the Church authorities have been unduly alarmed by their dread of the Divinity School becoming a centre of heretical teaching instead of retaining its position as a place of sound theological learning.

Notwithstanding the speeches made in the meeting of the General Synod held last year, and the recent Charges of some of the Bishops, especially those of the Bishop of Meath and the Bishop of Cork, no real practical danger could possibly accrue to the Church of Ireland if the nomination to the present Professorships and Lecturerships in the Divinity School was left in the hands of the Board of Trinity College. For it must be borne in mind that no member of that Board has ever proposed that the Board of Trinity College should continue to retain the same exclusive right in the Divinity School which it has at present. On the contrary, it has been proposed that if in process of time any person not belonging to the of the Church of Ireland. All proceedings connected with the Divinity School to require the assent of the Board and of the Episcopal Committee, each body to have equally the power to initiate proposals of change and reform. The Professors and Lecturers—as regards the Professors, &c., now existing and paid out of the funds of Trinity College—to be nominated by the Board; as regards those to be hereafter established, and which are to be paid by the Representative Church Body—the nomination to rest with the Episcopal Committee. The nomination in each case to require the assent of the other body. In case the two bodies should not come to an agreement, the decision to rest either with the Chancellor of the University, or such other referee as may be agreed upon. Questions connected with charges of heterodoxy to be tried by the two Archbishops, with a legal assessor. The reasons are at present omitted, as they have been treated of in another paper [namely, the " Suggestions " referred to in Note, p. 5], why it is essential that the Academical element should be fully represented in the government of the Divinity School of Trinity College; and it is only necessary to observe that the above proposal places the two bodies—supposed to be contributories—on an equal footing; and that Trinity College, while not abandoning its own proper position, is ready to admit, on the conditions stated, the representatives of the Church of Ireland to an equal share in the control and management of the Divinity School. There would be also the advantage of securing large additional means for the work of theological education; and should this proposal be adopted, the time may reasonably be looked for, as near at hand, when—with a wider development and a more extended sphere of usefulness—the School may become—the Divinity School of Trinity College and of the Church of Ire'and." The following note is added at the end :—

" If, at any time, there shall be a member of the Board who shall not be a member of the Church of Ireland, his place to be filled, for the purposes of the government and management of the Divinity School, by the Fellow next in seniority who shall be a member of the said Church."

Guarantees to
be taken for
the future.

Church of Ireland should obtain a seat on the Board of Trinity College in case of any election of a Theological Professor or Lecturer, a Fellow in holy orders of the Church of Ireland, next in seniority, is to supply the place of any Senior Fellow belonging to any other religious denomination. It has been further proposed that the Bench of Bishops should be granted a veto on all such appointments, subject to an appeal to the Chancellor of the University. As, however, it is quite possible that the office of Chancellor of the University may at some future time be filled by some person unfriendly to the Church, it would be better in case of any dead-lock between the Board of Trinity College and the Bishops of the Church that the appeal should lie to the Council which must necessarily be appointed for the special management of the Divinity School.*

Proposed
Divinity
Council.
Its powers.

A Divinity Council could easily be appointed on a plan similar to that on which the Academic Council is now elected. Such a body ought to have power to re-arrange the distribution of the money at present spent by Trinity College on the Divinity School. The right ought, moreover, to be conceded to this Council of founding new Professorships in the School of Divinity, with the approval of the Board of Trinity College, such Professorships to be regarded as Professorships in the University.

*The following is the proposals on this head contained in the "Suggestions" of April, 1869 [See Note p, 5]—"Let the authority of Parliament be at once obtained for allocating the sum—say of £2,867 16s 0d—now expended in connection with the Divinity School, to the purposes of maintaining a Theological Faculty in the University of Dublin, and a Divinity School therein. The government of the Divinity School to be vested in the Provost and Senior Fellows, so long as they shall all be members of the Church of Ireland. If, at any time, there shall be a member of the Board who shall not be a member of the Church of Ireland, his place shall be filled for the purposes of the government and management of the Divinity School by the Fellow next in seniority, who shall be a member of the said Church. This Board, as heretofore, to have all the powers in regard to the Divinity School now possessed by the Provost and Senior Fellows, with this exception, that all the proceedings, of whatever sort, in connection with the Divinity School, shall require the sanction of a Committee, composed of the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, and of three Bishops, to be chosen under the authority of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland. This Committee also to have the power of initiating any measure of reform connected with the Divinity School. In the case of a disagreement between the Board of Trinity College and the Episcopal Committee, the decision to rest with the Chancellor of the University."

This Divinity Council might fairly consist of fifteen members, four representatives chosen by the Board of Trinity College, and the Fellows in holy orders, three nominated by the Bishops, three by the Professors and Lecturers connected with the Divinity School of the Church, and four by the General Synod. The Provost of Trinity College should be an *ex-officio* member. These fifteen representatives should be required to be (1) members of the University Senate, and (2) members of the Church of Ireland, not under the censure of the Ecclesiastical Courts of that Church. They might be elected for three or five years, but should be empowered to hold office until their successors were duly appointed, and that appointment notified regularly to the Board of Trinity College.

Such a Divinity Council might be fairly trusted to uphold the interests of the Church on the one hand, and of the University on the other. It would not be a body alien to the University. To such a Council the Board of Trinity College might, without loss of dignity, concede the right of making all arrangements with regard to the catechetical instruction given to those University students who are members of the Church of Ireland, and might also hand over to that Council the management of the present College Chapel, the paramount rights of Fellows of Trinity College in holy orders of the Church being duly preserved—so long as they taught nothing contrary to the doctrines and practices of the Church.

The Professors and Lecturers connected with the Divinity School, and the clerical Fellows of Trinity College (so far forth as their clerical position is concerned) should, after the vested rights of the present Professors and Lecturers had been duly preserved, be subjected in all questions affecting orthodoxy of doctrine to the ordinary ecclesiastical tribunals of the Church of Ireland. No action, however, for heresy against any such Professor, Lecturer, or Fellow of Trinity College should be entertained without the express consent both of two-thirds of the Bishops and of the Divinity Council. Such a proviso would be a guarantee against all unnecessary prosecutions, while it would not shield a Professor whose

To be a Representative Body.

Ought not to be a body alien to the University.

Concessions which might be made to such a Council.

Professors, Lecturers, and Fellows *quoad* their clerical status to be subjected to the ordinary Ecclesiastical Tribunals.

Provision to be made against unnecessary prosecutions.

opinions were really opposed to the doctrines of the Church from a proper prosecution in the ordinary manner.

*Divinity Council
ought to have
right of
dispensing with
services of
present
Sub-Lecturers,
their financial
rights being
secured.*

It would greatly facilitate a satisfactory settlement of the Divinity School if the Divinity Council were, furthermore, to be permitted to dispense, if thought desirable, with the services of any of the present Assistant Lecturers, provided that due and proper compensation was made. It is well known that one, at least, of the present Assistants is suspected of holding views opposed to the doctrines of the Church, and though it would be highly undesirable to permit any person to be condemned on suspicion without fair and open trial, yet, if it were possible to remove a suspected individual from the Divinity School without doing any injury to either his pecuniary or personal status, that removal would be of advantage in order to secure the full confidence of the public in the teaching given in the School.

If the present status of the Divinity School as an integral part of the University were preserved intact, its Professors continuing to remain Professors of the University, and entitled as such to use the University lecture-rooms and examination halls, the Divinity School might possibly be maintained in a state of tolerable efficiency, even with the sum of money at present spent upon it by the Board of Trinity College. If the present state of the Divinity School is to be improved a larger income is imperatively required. The readjustment of the salaries of its Professors would, also, on the expiration of the present vested rights, be one of the most important duties devolving on the Divinity Council.

*Readjustment
of present
salaries.*

*What might be
claimed from
Government.*

It is quite hopeless to expect that any Government will give for the purposes of the Divinity School a grant of £300,000 from the Surplus Fund of the Irish Church. It is equally hopeless to look for £100,000. Some of the rights for the loss of which such compensation is claimed were surrendered voluntarily by the University itself in giving its support to Mr. Fawcett's Act in 1873. The Church of Ireland did not send in any protest against that Act. No doubt the action of the Church and University in supporting that Bill in Parliament was in great part owing to the pledges given by the leaders of the Liberal party in reference to the Divinity School. The Con-

servative party was always looked upon as friendly to the Church's claims. But it has done nothing for the Church while in office ; and what can be expected from the Liberals now coming into power ? The Church may fairly seek some compensation for the surrender of the exclusive rights she once possessed in the Fellowships and Scholarships of Trinity College ; and if she were to ask, along with the retention of the present status of the Divinity School in its connection with the University, for a grant of some £30,000 or £40,000, in order to found additional Chairs, and for other purposes connected with the Divinity School, such a moderate request would probably be conceded even by the Liberal party.

With the most earnest desire to secure for the future sound evangelical teaching in the Divinity School of the University, I still strongly advocate, from a Church standpoint, the advisability of the Church authorities coming to a friendly understanding with the Board of Trinity College on this question without delay. The members of that Board are not unfriendly to the interests of the Church, as some have most unfairly asserted. The relations of the Divinity School with Trinity College ought to be altered as little as possible. It is of the utmost consequence that that School should ever remain an integral part of the University, and much, if necessary, should be sacrificed rather than abandon a position which is of vital importance both to the Church and the University.

§ 6 *The Divinity Degrees of the University of Dublin.*

The opening of the Divinity Degrees to persons not in the holy orders of the Church of Ireland or of the English Church has of late been severely censured. It must be, however, observed that the Divinity Degrees have no necessary connection with the Divinity School. The Divinity School of the University, in its present shape, is a modern creation, and the University has never required its graduates to pass through a course of study in the Divinity School before proceeding to their degrees in Divinity. The only connection which has

No connection
between the
Divinity Degrees
and Divinity
School.

ever existed between the one and the other is that the exercises for the Divinity Degrees must be performed before the Regius Professor of Divinity, who is considered to be the head of the Divinity School. Degrees in Divinity were conferred by the University long before there was any special Divinity School in the University, and the Divinity School might conceivably cease to exist without the rights of the University to confer Theological Degrees being at all interfered with.

The opening of
the Theological
Degrees.

The opening of the Divinity Degrees to all graduates in arts who may think fit to comply with the required regulations, without any subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, is a question to be considered quite apart from that of the Divinity School, and those who heartily approve of this alteration in the University statutes ought not to be suspected of desiring to make the Divinity School a place in which all kinds of opinions may be taught without restraint.

Approved of
by Divinity
School
Committee of
General Synod.

The Divinity School Committee, appointed by the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, in their report, presented to that Synod in 1874, rightly regarded the question of the Divinity Degrees as quite distinct from that of the Divinity School. The report in question even spoke with approval of the very alteration in the University statutes which is now complained of by some. No voice was raised in the General Synod against such a proposal, but the report was accepted without opposition, and apparently with approval.

Opening of
Degrees
advocated for
years without
protest.

The opening of the Theological Degrees was advocated by the writer in 1869 in the columns of the *London Times*, and afterwards in pamphlets on University Reform and the Divinity School, published in May, 1873, and in February, 1874, previous to the meeting of the General Synod. At the meeting of the University Senate, in June, 1873, I interrogated the Board of Trinity College on the subject, and Dr. Carson, in reply, mentioned that the matter was then under consideration by the Board, while the Provost further stated that action would, ere long, be taken in the matter. A full report of this meeting appeared in the columns of the *Daily Express* and in other papers, and attention was drawn to it in leading articles. The subject was again and again brought before the public by letters in the *Daily Express*, *Saunders*, *Evening Mail*, *Church Advocate*, *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*,

and in the *Belfast News-Letter*. But not a voice was publicly raised against the proposal so recently discovered to be dangerous in its tendency and degrading to the University !

Such facts as these, as well as others which shall now be mentioned, are very awkward facts, which have to be dealt by those who denounce the opening of these degrees in such vehement language as that employed in the *Irish Church Advocate* in its leading articles of last October, November, and December.

The statute of the University by which the opening of the Theological Degrees became an accomplished fact was submitted by the Board of Trinity College to the University Senate in June, 1876. It was discussed at considerable length on that occasion, and again in the meetings of November 2nd and November 18th, when it was duly considered, and amended, paragraph by paragraph. It finally passed without opposition at the meeting of November 30th of that same year.

No member of the Senate was ignorant of the fact that by this Statute of 1876, the theological degrees were opened even to laymen. The statement made by the *Church Advocate* —that the opening of those degrees to “the ministers of the Churches of the Reformation” was “the subject generally discussed in the press at the time,” is without any foundation. Dr. Hart, who introduced the measure to the Senate, distinctly stated that the Statute (the main object of which was to render the “exercises” performed for Divinity degrees real tests of merit) would put an end to the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, formerly required from all candidates for Divinity degrees. The same point was referred to in the speeches of Mr. (now Professor) Monck, Professor Ingram, Archdeacon Reichel, and others. Dr. Salmon, the Regius Professor of Divinity, distinctly stated that the Divinity degrees would be open, if the Statute passed, to persons holding very different religious opinions. He, however, maintained then (Nov. 2nd, 1876) as strongly as at the meeting of the Senate in June, 1879, that it by no means followed that “he, as Regius Professor, could approve of a thesis ignoring the Christian religion.”

Recent
denunciation of
the course
adopted.

University
Statute not
passed with due
discussion.

Result of the
statute well
understood.

Theological
Degrees
not opened to
Infidels.

Divinity
Students not
obliged to
subscribe
tests.

The Regius
Professor sole
judge of fitness
of candidates.

It is not, therefore, quite correct to say that the Theological Degrees are open "to those who may not believe in Christianity." For the fact is that there are limits beyond which no Theological Professor would go in admitting candidates. The Professor of Divinity would be fully justified in refusing to admit a person to a degree in theology, who "stated that he believed there was no God," but he would scarcely be justified in inquiring into the particular religious tenets of a candidate whose printed thesis, or book presented as his qualification for the D.D. degree, was in itself satisfactory; nor would the Professor be justified in inquiring into the creed of any individual who passed creditably the examinations required for the degree of B.D. It ought to be remembered that no Divinity student has ever been obliged to sign the Thirty-nine Articles before receiving his Divinity Testimonium. The case is precisely similar with respect to the Theological Degrees at the present moment. There are bounds which no Theological Professor could possibly be expected to pass. The Statute of 1876 has made the Regius Professor of Divinity absolute judge in all such matters. I still maintain that it would have been better if the Senate had in the Statute in question inserted the words proposed by me, to be added after "*coram Professor Regio*," namely "*ceterisque Professoribus in Sancta Theologia*" (See p. 18 of my pamphlet on *The Divinity School and its proposed Reconstruction under Lord Belmore's Bill*. Dublin : Hodges, Foster & Figgis, 1879).^{*}

*I have always maintained that candidates for theological degrees under the new Statute ought not to be permitted to submit dissertations on any subject of Dogmatic Theology as theses for their degree. A Regius Professor of Divinity, however liberal-minded he might be, might feel himself unable to accept a thesis in which opinions were maintained which he considered as untrue, and in opposition to his most deeply-cherished convictions. Yet it would be scarcely fair if Dogmatic Theology be retained as a subject, to admit only dissertations on one side of the question. Hence, the retention of Dogmatic Theology is a mistake, and will in time prove a source of difficulty, unless the Statute be altered. No formally controversial writings on points of doctrine ought to be accepted as such theses. Dissertations on other questions connected with theology may be fairly examined, and a decision come to as to their merits as contributions to theological literature. Such dissertations ought not to be condemned for casual expressions which may be found in them. But, as I have argued above, no Theological Professor could present any person for theological a degree, who, by his denial of the existence of a God, avowed himself a disbeliever in all theology.

The abolition of tests in the case of the Divinity Degrees was not proposed by any one because of any leaning, secret or avowed, to so-called "Broad Church" views. It was proposed in order to prevent the right of granting Theological Degrees from being taken away from the University. For it is perfectly certain that the Church of Ireland, after her dis-establishment, would not be permitted for any lengthened period to retain the monopoly in the Divinity Degrees which she possessed in the University of Dublin when she was the established Church of the land. And those who advocated the opening of such Degrees to members of all denominations, felt that it was of the utmost importance for religion in general that the study of Theology should not be banished from the University, nor its ancient privilege of conferring Degrees in Divinity be taken away. The course adopted by the Board and the Senate was, therefore, just and proper, and being just was wise.

Moreover, the University Tests Act of 1873, while exempting all "offices" in the Divinity School from its operation, defines the term "office" in its second section in such a way as to exempt the Degrees in Theology. Hence, since that Act received the Royal assent, no candidate for Divinity Degrees has been compelled to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles, as such a subscription was considered to be in opposition to the provisions of that Act. The Degrees in Theology were, therefore, legally open to members of other denominations, before the University Statute of 1876 was passed by the Senate. The *Regulæ*, enacted by the University under the authority of its charters, alone stood in the way of Nonconformists being admitted to such distinctions. These "*Regulæ*" were modified by the Statute of 1876, and brought into conformity with the altered state of the law. The practice of delivering the Latin sermons required by these "*Regulæ*" in the College Chapel had been put an end to some years before 1876, and such sermons were usually read before the Regius Professor in the Divinity School. It was by an extension of this usage to the English sermons that Rev. William Applebe, LL.D., Theological Tutor in the Methodist College, Belfast, was permitted (after the passing of the Statute of 1876) to deliver

Real cause of
the opening of
the Degrees.

These Degrees
virtually opened
by Act of 1873.

Subscription to
Thirty-nine
Articles
abolished
since 1873.

The Regulæ
alone modified
by Statute
of 1876.

A Methodist
clergyman
admitted
to B.D.

both his Latin and English discourses in the Divinity School, and so to qualify for the degree of B.D., to which he was admitted in 1878.

Doctors in
Divinity hold
no office in
Divinity School.

It has, however, been recently maintained that the Act of 1873 did not really affect the Divinity Degrees, because "every Doctor of Divinity is by his title a Professor of Divinity," and Professors in Divinity are specially exempted from the operation of that Act. This argument is based on the fact that in the old style a D.D. was designated in Latin not only S.T.D. (*Sanctæ Theol. Doctor*), but also S.T.P. (*Sanctæ Theol. Professor*). But the argument is more ingenious than profound. For it may be rejoined that Doctors in Divinity as such have never been considered to hold any "office" in the Divinity School, in the teaching or in the examinations of which they are not permitted to take any part, unless elected to some definite "office" in that school. The degrees in theology are also referred to in the Act of 1873, and in close connection with the definition of an "office" found in that Act. They are alluded to in such a way as to shew that they were not viewed as "offices" in the Divinity School, although the Act does not enact anything specially concerning them. Furthermore, if the argument in question were sound, it would only affect the higher degree of D.D., and have no reference whatever to the lower degree of B.D. The point may be a question of interest for lawyers, but until the lawyers have decided that the Divinity Degrees are "offices" in the meaning of the Act, it may be safely assumed that it was a wise and prudent course for the Board and the Senate to assume that that Act necessitated alteration in the Statutes of the University. The result of the new Statute is, that the Degrees in Theology in the Universities of Dublin are open to Graduates in Arts of the University, belonging to all denominations, provided they have the common sense to present as their "exercises" for those degrees theses of sufficient merit, and such as do not contravene the doctrines of the Christian religion in such a manner as to oblige the Regius Professor of Divinity to interpose his veto.

Wisdom of
course adopted
by Board and
Senate.