

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

Peabody, and J. B. Lightfoot), there is an essay by the late Bishop of Durham. His subject and his line of argument are identical with those of Dr. Sanday. Among the rest, he uses the very incident which we have just quoted from Dr. Sanday. We shall quote it in Dr. Lightfoot's own words also, drawing particular attention to the sentence which we shall give in italics.

“Connected with the Messiah's coming,” says Dr. Lightfoot, “are certain conceptions, on which it may be well to dwell for a moment. One of these is the appearance of a mysterious person called ‘*the prophet*.’ This expectation arose out of the announcement in Deut. xviii. 15, ‘The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, like unto me.’ To this anticipation we have allusions in not less than four places in St. John (i. 21, 25; vi. 14; vii. 40), in all of which ‘*the prophet*’ is mentioned, though in the first three the distinctness of the expectation is blurred in the English version by the rendering ‘*that prophet*.’ In all these passages, the mention of ‘*the prophet*’ without any explana-

tion is most natural in the lips of contemporary Jews, whose minds were filled with the Messianic conceptions of the times; while such language is extremely unlikely to have been invented for them more than a century after the date of the supposed occurrences. *But the point especially to be observed is, that the form which the conception takes is strictly Jewish and not Christian.* Christian teachers identified the prophet foretold by Moses with our Lord Himself, and therefore with the Christ. This application of the prophecy is made directly in St. Peter's speech (Acts iii. 22), and inferentially in St. Stephen's (Acts vii. 37); and later Christian teachers followed in their steps. But these Jews in St. John's Gospel conceive of ‘*the Christ*’ and ‘*the prophet*’ as two different persons. If he is not ‘*the Christ*,’ they adopt the alternative that he may be ‘*the prophet*’ (i. 21, 25); if not the prophet, then the Christ (vii. 40). It is hardly conceivable, to my mind, that a Christian writer, living in or after the middle of the second century, calling on his imagination for facts, should have divested himself so absolutely of the Christian idea and fallen back on the Jewish.”

The Study of Theology in British Baptist Colleges.

BY THE REV. T. WITTON DAVIES, B.A., PRINCIPAL OF THE MIDLAND BAPTIST COLLEGE.

I HAVE been requested by the editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to write an article on the above subject, and, hardly realising at the time the difficulty and delicacy of the task, I consented.

The word “Theology” in the title of this paper is used so as to embrace all studies included in the curriculum of a well-organised theological seminary. In the small space at my disposal it is impossible for me to lay out a complete scheme of “*theologische Encyklopädie*.” Those who care to go into this subject may consult the *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der Theologischen Wissenschaften* of Hagenbach, or the *Theologik oder Encyklopädie der Theologie* of Rübiger, Leipzig, 1880: (Messrs. T. & T. Clark have published an English edition). There is a neat little work by Rev. James Drummond, D.D., entitled *Introduction to the Study of Theology*

(Macmillan & Co.), which, though open to criticism, is really useful.¹ For the purpose of this paper, I adopt the following conspectus of Theology:—

- I. SPECULATIVE THEOLOGY, dealing with the basal truths of religion.
- II. HISTORICAL THEOLOGY in its three departments—
 1. History of Doctrine.
 2. Church History and Polity.
 3. Comparative Religion.
- III. APOLOGETICS.
- IV. BIBLE LANGUAGES, together with Archæology, Introduction (General and Special), Exegesis, and Criticism.

¹ I hope that a volume on this subject will be included in Messrs. T. & T. Clark's “International Theological Library,” so well begun by Driver's *Introduction*.

V. BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

VI. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY, based as it should be on V.

VII. PRACTICAL THEOLOGY (so Van Oosterzee), including Elocution, Homiletics, Pastoral Work, and whatever has to do with ministerial work.

THE ATTENTION PAID TO THESE SUBJECTS.

Though the Baptists of the British Islands are numerous and wealthy, they have neglected the education of their ministers to an extent that is hardly credible. There is not a single college belonging to them in which the subjects named are taught with even a moderate amount of efficiency or success. With the conditions under which ministerial training is carried on, it could not well be otherwise.

In each of the colleges one man has to discharge the duties of five or six, so that it is hardly to be wondered at that the work is done superficially and uninspiringly. The same man in most of our colleges teaches the languages and the literatures of both Testaments, with all the rest that this implies. In addition, he has quite a catalogue of other subjects to teach. Is it surprising that the students of these colleges, after they have entered the ministry, find that the training has been miserably inadequate? Hence the chorus of complaints that arise from all quarters. In the *Baptist Magazine* for June 1891, Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., of Norwich, writes:—"The college system cannot justify itself either by pointing to the preachers or theologians it has sent forth." A former student of a British Baptist College writes to me thus:—"The matter given us in the theological classes which I attended was wholly inadequate to meet the demands of the present day, while the manner in which that matter was put before us was simply execrable." This writer complains in strong language of the lack of freshness, originality, knowledge, and enthusiasm displayed by his theological professor. He says that his fellow-students—and most of them are still at college—were unanimous in the opinion that the present Baptist College system is "rotten."

A late student of another British College writes to me that his theological tutor knew a good deal of theology, but that he was no theologian: all his knowledge was got from books, and he never wandered beyond these. In his classes this teacher used to "ask nice little questions, make pleasant

remarks, after which the students vanished, thanking heaven that another class was over." I might go on quoting to almost any extent from the pile of letters which lies before me. I have either spoken or written to students from each of the British Colleges, and I have not found a single case in which satisfaction was expressed with the training supplied. The fault lies often with the pupil, no doubt; but such universal dissatisfaction could hardly exist unless the teaching was at fault. I rejoice beyond measure in this dissatisfaction, and I sincerely hope it will grow in intent and extent, for there is in it the promise and prophecy of reform.

Three British Baptist Colleges are connected with University Colleges, the students taking their Arts course in the latter. In two out of the three there is but one theological professor. In each case this sole teacher of theology is expected to be an authority in all the departments of his subject, among the latter being two languages, though at the University Colleges one man teaches Latin, another Greek, a third philosophy, etc. Besides all this teaching, this theological professor is Principal of the institution, does much correspondence, keeps accounts, visits churches, etc., on behalf of the funds, so that at the most no more than three-fourths of his time—and indeed not that—is devoted to studying and teaching.

In the Rochester Baptist Theological Seminary, U.S.A., there are seven theological professors giving their whole time to the subjects appended to their names in the following list:—

- Rev. A. H. Strong, D.D., Biblical Theology.
- Rev. Howard Osgood, D.D., Hebrew Language and Literature.
- Rev. W. A. Stevens, D.D., Biblical Literature and New Testament Literature.
- Rev. T. Harwood Pattison, D.D., Homiletics and Pastoral Theology.
- Rev. B. O. True, D.D., Church History.
- Rev. H. E. Robins, D.D., Christian Ethics.
- Rev. A. S. Coats, D.D., Elocution and Sacred Oratory.

Rev. J. J. Williams, now pastor at Rochester,—the town where the seminary is,—was for three years a student at the seminary, previous to which for three years he was a pupil of mine at the Haverfordwest College. During his student career at Rochester, and since, he wrote constantly to me of the immense advantage experienced by him in

being under specialists. There, besides having men of acknowledged scholarship and intellectual force, one man at least is told off to instruct and inspire the students in preaching and in general ministerial work, and he a man eminently qualified by natural abilities and successful experience to do this. Among Baptists east of the Atlantic the same man must be scholar, teacher, preacher—at least, a teacher of the art of preaching as well as of other ministerial duties. Now such a combination, except in very rare cases, is not found; and hence it comes to be that one college fails in scholarship, another on the side of preaching, and with present conditions it must be so to the end of the chapter. Why should we not have a college in which more is done for scholarship than at Regent's Park, and in which more is done to make preachers and pastors than at the Pastor's College? This is the case in America, and it might easily be so in this country, if British Baptists did their duty.

The following is a list of the subjects taught by separate professors in the Colgate Baptist College, U.S.A. :—

1. Systematic Theology.
2. Homiletics.
3. Ecclesiastical History.
4. Greek Language.
5. New Testament Exegesis.
6. Hebrew Language.
7. Old Testament Exegesis.

In at least four Baptist Colleges in this country the so-called classical tutor has been teaching all the matriculation subjects, in addition to Bible Languages and Literature.

The President preaches and collects (or is expected to), writes no end of letters, keeps college accounts, and also teaches a few easy text-books like Butler's *Analogy*, Angus's *Bible Handbook*, Hodge's or Strong's *Theology*—such books as could be as well mastered by a good Bible class.

In no single Baptist College this side of the Atlantic is there one chair wholly set apart for HEBREW and OLD TESTAMENT studies, or indeed for any one of the subjects named in my scheme (see pp. 343, 344). Nor in one of our colleges is there a class for studying any language cognate to Hebrew. If a student felt ever so wishful to break ground with, say, Aramaic (Syriac and so-called Chaldee) or Arabic, etc., either for the literature or for the affinity these languages have

with Hebrew, he must study alone or go elsewhere for help. Nor in any British Baptist College is there a class for the special study of the LXX., though it often represents a correcter text than the Massoretic. (Of course, in Hebrew and Greek Testament classes the LXX., Peshito, and Vulgate are referred to by every teacher who deserves the name.)

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY can hardly be said to be studied in earnest at any one of our colleges, though portions are taken up in some instances for the sake of passing the *Senatus Academicus* examinations. But nowhere is the subject adequately studied. The late Principal Goadby of this college, a man in many respects ahead of his day, for many years before his deeply lamented death in 1889, conducted his students through Oehler's book on the Old Testament and Weiss's on the New. Besides this, he gave valuable lectures of his own which ought to see the light of day, and which I hope yet will. It should be mentioned, however, that Principal Goadby rested with Biblical Theology as applied to the several portions of Bible, without attempting to rise to general principles. Indeed his strength lay rather in getting at the facts than in co-ordinating and in generalising them. The late Principal Rooke of Rawdon, who died about the same time as Principal Goadby, was strong and weak in the same directions as the latter. Mr. Rooke was very wide and exact in his scholarship, and with longer life and better health he would have achieved a great reputation. It affords me pleasure to say, with the best authority, that the college lectures—some of them—of the late Rawdon President are being prepared for the press. Those who know what to expect will consider my article worth reading, if only to catch the last statement.

Taking SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY in the usual sense, I have no hesitation in saying that in no one of our colleges is the subject taught with mastery of detail, with independence of judgment, and with enthusiasm. I have been myself, for the last two months or more, a professor of theology, and the statement just made must ever be true of myself as well as of others, so long as we teach under existing conditions. Here and all through this article I am writing against the existing college system, which makes thoroughness of knowledge, ripeness of judgment, and enthusiasm for teaching impossible. In our colleges, as at present conducted, one of

two courses is adopted by the theological teacher. Either some text-book is used and kept to,—with the addition of a running commentary,—or lectures are given which are almost entirely *réchauffés* of published works, and in too many cases of works issued long before the students were born. If the pupil is at all wishful to get at the heart of the theological thinking of the last decade, and to see what is good or bad in it, he has to read for himself books written since his teacher left off reading, or books which his tutor never found time to master when he did read. Such teaching has no life or reality about it, and it is heartily enjoyed by neither teacher nor taught. To be a really effective guide to young men the professor needs time for reading and for thinking, time for reflection as well as for prayer; with these it is possible for him to pass his theology through head and heart, and to teach that which has been thought out and felt and lived. During the eleven years I was at Haverfordwest, I taught Mathematics (pure and mixed), Chemistry, Latin, Classical Greek, New Testament Greek, German, French, English Language and Literature, Welsh, Hebrew and Old Testament Literature, Logic and Philosophy. How could I make the classes very successful! My esteemed colleague the President (Dr. Davies) had at least three men's work to do.

The complaint is made against our colleges that while they do make scholars—a kind, though hardly merited, concession—they do not turn out preachers. Everything is attended to except the actual work which the student will have to do in the ministry. The complaint has reason in it if it means that our colleges have not appointed men to see to the training of preachers and pastors. College presidents and professors have been mostly selected because they have passed certain University examinations, though they might be neither teachers nor preachers. And even if they have turned out such prodigies as to show themselves scholars, teachers, and preachers, they have little time to attend to the art of making and delivering sermons. Indeed, not seldom their power as public speakers has suffered seriously on account of the almost exclusive attention they have had to bestow upon their studies and their classes. And however important for them preaching may be, they would have been even less efficient teachers than they are had they attended more to platform and pulpit work. There is not, in

any one of our colleges, a man told off to give his time to ministerial work, a man full of fire and inspiration, who could tell the men what to do, and show them how to do it. If possible, each of the colleges should have in connection with it a preaching spirit, and he should be spared all other official duties besides guiding and inspiring the young men. But at present, in every British College, the professor of Theology is *ipso facto* the professor of Homiletics, Elocution, Pastoral Work, etc., and some people are so unreasonable as to expect him to do all these things well.

I have said that languages cognate to Hebrew are not taught in any Baptist College. I wish to name two other subjects which, so far as known to me, have no place in the curriculum in a single instance. One is what the Germans call THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA (see p. 343). In the German Universities this subject, together with Old Testament and New Testament Introduction, is among the first things taken in hand by the student in the beginning of his theological studies. And a most helpful thing it is at the opening of one's course to have the ground to be covered mapped out. One advantage of introducing this into our Baptist Colleges would be to compel us teachers of theology to supply fuller instruction or to show our instruction to be shamefully lacking.

COMPARATIVE RELIGION has never found its way into British Colleges, and this largely no doubt because of the unfounded prejudice that exists in relation to this important discipline; and yet to be afraid to study Christianity alongside the other great historical religions, is to admit that the religion of Jesus Christ cannot hold its own. In this age, when such substantial results have been attained by the comparative method, it would be a singular phenomenon if the religion of the Bible could have no light thrown upon it by a comparison with other religions.

I venture to put in a plea for the study of the ENGLISH BIBLE, because when the Bible is studied in the original languages it is the grammar, the lexicon, and such that get the lion's share of the attention. If a plan were adopted according to which the most important books of the Old and New Testaments should be gone through, and such a book as Dr. Angus's *Bible Handbook* mastered, a foundation would be laid that would be of priceless value. We take for granted that our students know their English Bibles, when a little observation

proves that they don't. Bible history, including geography, archæology, the history of the peoples named in Scripture, etc., would make the Psalms, the Prophets, etc., much more luminous and real: and yet the English Bible is very rarely studied in the Baptist Colleges.

SIGNS OF REFORM AND SOME SUGGESTIONS.

There are signs of better days for the British Baptist Colleges. In Universities and in University Colleges it has been for years considered an anachronism for one man to "profess" two languages or two sciences: it is coming to be thought an anachronism, too, for one man in a Baptist College to "profess" two languages and half a dozen subjects besides. We are awaking out of sleep. Thanks to the generosity and untiring zeal of my friend and teacher, Rev. Dr. Angus of Regent's Park College, £30,000 have been recently got together in order to endow three separate chairs at that college. This, in addition to collections and other endowments, makes it possible for my London *alma mater* to introduce something like reasonable specialism in theological teaching. I must, however, express my disappointment that Regent's Park College, with so much money, is so slow to move forward, for there are but three professors, one being Principal and another teaching University degree subjects, though University College is less than half an hour away, and these subjects are of necessity far better taught there.

Judging from recent signs, it appears to be extremely probable that the Manchester and Rawdon Colleges will be amalgamated, so as to form one strong college for the North of England.

The Senatus Academicus has been an immeasurable boon in broadening the curriculum of the Baptist Colleges and in directing the studies, and it is impossible for any careful observer not to be impressed with the increased and improved work done at our colleges since they joined the Senatus.

It has struck me as singular that in no British Baptist College up to last August was Hebrew prescribed or allowed for the entrance examination. It is now an optional subject, and ranks with other subjects in the entrance examination at Haverfordwest and at the Midland Baptist College. Our University Colleges are more and more

providing for the teaching of Hebrew, and we ought to encourage applicants for admission into the colleges by giving them credit for Hebrew, if they offer it. And most assuredly, except in rare cases, Hebrew should be entered upon in the first year of the student's course, so that before quitting college he may acquire such a mastery of Hebrew as he gains of Greek. As it is, men generally begin with Hebrew two or three years before settling in the ministry, and during these years their minds are largely taken up with thoughts of a church. Small wonder that little progress in Hebrew is made as a rule in the best of the colleges.

In all our colleges at present the Arts course proceeds *pari passu* with the Divinity course, though the latter gets more attention towards the end of the student's career. In very many cases a student spends all his college years from first to last in working for university degrees, so that he gives no concentrated attention to theological or ministerial branches at all.

There is a growing feeling that the two courses should be separated, and, indeed, that in the generality of cases the theological colleges should provide theological instruction alone, the student paying for the rest himself. At any rate, the last three years of the college career should be given up wholly to the study of biblical, theological, and ministerial subjects; far better this, even though no university degree be won.

The tendency among British Baptists is to have their colleges affiliated with University Colleges, so that secular studies may be prosecuted at the latter. Half a dozen years back Chilwell College was moved to Nottingham, where it is now known as the Midland Baptist College. Llangollen College was at the beginning of this very year moved to Bangor, and the most enlightened Baptists of Wales are strongly in favour of removing Pontypool and Haverfordwest to Cardiff and Aberystwith respectively, or (better still) to amalgamate them and make one strong college at Cardiff. Bristol uses the University College of that town, and Rawdon constituency is feeling that Classics, Mathematics, etc., should be taught by specialists at a University College. Even if the Baptist Colleges become purely theological, there are innumerable advantages in being in University or in University College towns, for in these towns there would be all the helps that other towns offer,

in addition to which there would be the library, the debating society and special and ordinary lectures in connection with the University College. Often one or two men would be cleverer than their fellows, so as to be able to add to their theological classes work in the University College. Besides, it is not healthy for Baptist or any other students to be always alone, having little or no contact with men of other denominations and of other callings. The larger and freer air of a University or University College town is a most invigorating tonic, and it prepares for work among men of the world.

If Baptist students are to take their Arts studies under specialists, they ought most certainly to have specialists to teach them in those subjects that appertain particularly to their work: and to attain this result, there must be in the colleges a theological faculty; *i.e.* the work done often by three-fourths of one man now must be taken in hand by three or more whole men, the business part being seen to by some one specially fixed for this. Either existing Baptist Colleges should be greatly strengthened, or they should be amalgamated to form better. The great want in this country is money, for we have no Colgates, or M'Masters, or Rockefellers among us. British Baptists have never given or bequeathed much towards the training of their pastors, though nothing—not even Foreign Missions—is of greater moment. In to-day's (11th March) *Daily Chronicle*, I am told that Mr. Rockefeller, having recovered from a serious illness, has given an extra 1,000,000 dollars to the New Chicago Baptist University. He had previously given 1,600,000 dollars; so that within about three years this American Baptist has handed over, for purposes of ministerial training, some £525,000. I wish some British Baptist, feeling that preaching is not sufficiently emphasised in our colleges, would give, say £6000, to endow a Chair of Preaching; that another, who considers that Hebrew and its cognates are shamefully treated, would give a like sum to secure one man for those subjects alone.

If our colleges were as fully equipped with the best teachers as we could desire, there would ever be students—promising preachers too—who could travel barely beyond English and English subjects; but in a well-manned institution there

might be elective courses. No student would be tied down to one or two men, or to a uniform curriculum. And every teacher will bear me out in the statement that the further he proceeds with his subject, the more efficiently and even clearly can he expound the elements.

Where Baptist Colleges are near to colleges of other denominations, they have not in most cases made the use they might of the professors of those other colleges. Just across the road from the Midland Baptist College, where these lines are penned, is the Congregational Institute. It seems to me absurd that the best men in each place should not teach all the students of both. Old Regent's Park men remember with pleasure the classes they took at New College, and the former students of the latter feel similarly regarding classes taken under Dr. Angus. But much more might be attempted even at Regent's Park, if my deeply revered tutor, Dr. Angus, will allow me to say so.

Throughout this paper I have not forgotten that all our teaching and all our learning at the colleges will come to nothing unless the Spirit of God help and bless us. God forbid that I should ignore either in theory or in practice the fact that the main strength of our colleges and of our Churches comes from God. It is unfair and it is unkind to ever hint—as some, I hope unwittingly, do—that because we contend for the best human equipment for the ministry, that therefore we undervalue the Divine preparation. Indeed, the more Divine the work is, the more resolved should we be to link it with the best human agency. God himself employs means, and there is generally a correspondence between the means He employs and the ends He attains. The men whom God elected to be prophets and apostles were more fitted by education and by natural parts than their unselected fellows. And to accomplish special tasks, men like Isaiah and Paul were chosen because of their special fitness. God's part in qualifying the ministry of Christ cannot be left out of our reckoning without the most disastrous consequences; but neither can we, without similar results, set aside the aids of training and education. The human and the Divine factors are both indispensable. May God bless our colleges, and may He give us all more faith and better works.