

noch immer?" and is favoured by Krebs, who paraphrases: "Num jam (cum omnium minime opportunum dormiendi tempus est) dormitis et quiescitis?" More simply and with more regard to the etymology of λοιπόν we may paraphrase: "Are you sleeping and resting for the time that yet remains? Surely you have had enough of sleep. The hour is at hand. Do you not see the torches of the crowd in the distance?" To translate λοιπόν as equivalent to *quod superest* is quite legitimate, as will be admitted; indeed, Alford interprets it exactly thus in 1 Cor. vii. 29, though he does not seem to have hit the precise meaning of that passage. The only objection to doing so is that it makes λοιπόν rather more emphatic than it would seem to be from its place in the sentence; but that is not a very serious point. One argument has been brought forward in favour of giving the sentence an interrogative turn, which must be noticed here in order to point out its fallaciousness. It has been alleged (see Dowdall, *Classical*

Review, December 1888) that we thus harmonise St. Matt. xxvi. 45 and St. Mark xiv. 41 with St. Luke xxii. 46: τί καθεύδετε; ἀναστάντες προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν. *Why sleep ye? rise and pray that ye enter not into temptation; the opening clause of which is interrogative.* But the real parallels to this passage from St. Luke are St. Matt. xxvi. 41 and St. Mark xiv. 38; the words recorded by St. Luke are those spoken by the Lord on the *second* occasion when He found His followers sleeping; the words addressed to them by Him on the *third* and last occasion are not preserved by this Evangelist at all. Hence the interrogative form of the sentence in St. Luke xxii. 46 does not help us in the interpretation of the passage before us.

But on the whole, though this argument be not valid, it seems to the present writer that fewer and less weighty objections lie against the last mentioned line of interpretation than against either of the other two.

The Study of Theology in British Baptist Colleges.¹

BY THE REV. D. WITTON JENKINS, GLASGOW.

I HAVE read with deep interest and sympathy Principal Davies's paper on this subject. And, because I agree with so much of it, I venture to point out what seems to me its defect. As a student of a Baptist college, I can endorse fully the criticism as a whole, and also the suggestions thrown out. The writer has put his finger on the weak points of the training given in our colleges. It is only when a man gets out into the work of the ministry that he realises the fact. The training in theology is not thorough enough. It is too narrow, too shallow, too fragmentary, and by no means covers the ground which ought to be covered. It is true that students *are* dissatisfied, and are crying out for reform. In comparison with what is done in some other colleges in this country, and especially in America and Germany, I do not hesitate to say that we are miserably behind. In most of our colleges an attempt is made to teach most, if not all, the branches named in the conspectus; but it is only an attempt.

¹ This paper was in hand before the issue of the June number, and is therefore independent of Notes by Dr. Culross and Prof. Marshall, with which it agrees.

I wish to emphasise what has been pointed out: viz., that the fault lies, not in the tutors, so much as in the *system*. It is a marvel that the tutors are able to accomplish so much, and produce results so creditable. According to our present system, we have no room for specialists. If they were placed in the position, they would be square men in round holes. The only man that suits is an all-round man, who can beg, preach, transact business, entertain, keep up interest in the particular college, as well as teach theology. Now it is impossible to do thorough work on these lines. Happily in Scotland our theological tutor is not required to attend to these extraneous matters. He devotes himself to teaching theology. It is true that some colleges are affiliated with universities where the students take their Arts course. But these are, in my opinion, worse off than the others, because each has only one tutor to teach all subjects not taken in the university. And this one man has to attend to all the extras already named, without the aid and counsel of a colleague. What can one man do among fifteen or twenty students?

But why is this so? And what is the remedy? The Baptist denomination has not yet learnt to pay its scholars as it should do. The worth of the scholar is only partly appreciated, and even that only by a few. Rich men have not yet learnt their duty toward our schools of learning. We have too many colleges. The force is too much divided. Much money is wasted which could be saved. What is needed is the amalgamation of two or more colleges near each other. This is what many of us have been advocating for some time. In the enlarged college, specialists would be appointed to teach only one or two subjects. The man at the head, call him principal or whatever name you like, would be free to attend to business matters, and perhaps teach one subject. Where amalgamation is not possible, or not expedient, let more tutors be appointed. I most strongly advocate the idea of *theological* colleges, with the Arts course taken outside. We shall never do thorough work until this is done.

So far, I am at one with Principal Davies. But his article is too indiscriminating, too sweeping, especially with regard to one branch of teaching. Had the writer confined himself to theology proper, I should have no fault to find. But in his conspectus he includes, "Bible languages, together with Archæology, Introduction (general and special), Exegesis, and Criticism." I am not sure that such should be included under the term theology, in this special case. But, if included, the writer should have been more discriminating in his condemnation. He says:—"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 of the subjects named in my scheme. . . . Nor in one of our colleges is there a class for studying any language cognate to Hebrew. If a student feel 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 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").

This is too sweeping. It is only partly true, and consequently misleading. It is, I think, true that

as yet we have no chairs set aside simply for the study of Hebrew and cognate languages. But it is *not* true that Hebrew and cognate languages are not taught in our colleges with anything like efficiency. It is not true that a student must go outside for help, or must study alone. And whilst it may be true that there is not a separate class for the special study of the LXX., yet the LXX. is studied, and studied carefully to my knowledge in some of our colleges, side by side with the Hebrew. It is more than "referred to." I do not want to point out names; but I must do so in order to prove my contention. In a conversation which I had the other day with a student who left Regent's Park College only last year—one who passed a very high examination in Hebrew, and who had a right to speak—I was assured that the teaching in Hebrew was most efficient. "Professor Gould," he said, "gives the highest satisfaction to the students." And what shall we say of Manchester, where Professor Marshall is tutor? I need say nothing of his scholarship, which is well known and acknowledged. His students know what enthusiasm he throws into the study of Hebrew and Aramaic, and all which pertains to the Old Testament. His study of the New Testament is not any the less thorough. I had the pleasure lately of reading some note-books by Professor Marshall, and I do not hesitate to say that he is doing as good work in this line as is done in any college in the country. And, whilst criticising Principal Davies's paper, let me say here how pleased I am, as an old friend (we were boys together in the same church), to see him as Principal of one of our colleges, and to recognise his scholarship, which augurs well for Nottingham College. I need name no more.

Nor let me state a fact which confirms what I have maintained. The examinations of the Senatus Academicus are open to students of all Nonconformist colleges; and the best men are sent up. The results prove that our students are not so badly taught as we are led to believe. For the last three years, Manchester, Rawdon, and Regent's Park respectively, have stood at the head of the list. This could not be done if the teaching were quite so defective as Principal Davies's paper implies.

I do not by any means wish to imply that even in this branch the teaching is what ought to be, and might be. I know it can be said that these

tutors would do better work if they had fewer subjects to teach. I agree with this, and plead that they be relieved. But I feel that a word of defence and explanation ought to be said in all fairness both to tutors and students. To say "that the present Baptist College system is rotten" is saying too much, unless you would underline "system." Many of our tutors are doing splendid work, and this should be recognised; and our students now leaving college are not so illiterate, not so far behind the age, as the article would lead men to suppose.

The writer, in his well-known enthusiasm for reform and in his love of learning, has been carried away, and has not weighed well his words. It seems to me that, unintentionally, he is unjust and unfair to our tutors, himself included. He does not take enough into consideration the im-

provement which has taken place during recent years. We have men in our colleges, and others who have just entered the ministry, who will by and by give a good account of themselves; both as scholars and preachers.

I know that Principal Davies had a difficult task to perform. I admire his courage in consenting even to write on such a subject; especially when others had refused: but more so in performing his task so boldly. I am glad no attempt was made to conceal the weak points in our college system, and that attention has been called to it. I trust the Baptist denomination will lay the matter to heart, and do what it can to make the colleges worthy of itself. But nothing is gained by overstating the truth, which I think has been done. I fear we must read Principal Davies's paper *cum grano salis*.

Jesus Crowned with the Glory of Sonship.

HEBREWS II. 9.

BY THE REV. R. A. MITCHELL, M.A., ABERDEEN.

THE interpretation of this difficult and much disputed passage which I venture to propose agrees with those of Hofmann, Professor Bruce, Dr. Matheson, and Professor Findlay, in referring the clause "crowned with glory and honour" to our Lord's earthly life. Its peculiarity lies in this, that the "glory" to which I suppose the apostolic writer to refer is specifically *the glory of Divine Sonship*. It cannot be objected to this view that it attributes to the writer "a fine modern idea," to which he could hardly be supposed to have advanced.

None of the attempts which have been made to explain the passage by those expositors who refer the words "crowned with glory and honour" to our Lord's present state of exaltation, seem to have been very successful. They are obliged to assign a meaning to the clause about "tasting death" which it will not strictly bear, for it is manifestly preposterous to say that Christ was exalted in order that He might taste death. Professor A. B. Davidson escapes the difficulty by saying that the clause "does not depend upon the immediately preceding words 'crowned with glory'; it either takes

up the words 'for the suffering of death'—suffering which He underwent that He might taste death for every one—or it gives by way of resumption the general meaning of the history of Jesus as stated in verse 9." But this explanation requires us to ascribe to the writer an amount of awkwardness in the constructing of his sentence which one would be slow to ascribe to so skilful a writer as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Bleek, whose view is the same as Dr. Davidson's, is obliged to admit that the writer's mode of expression is here harsh and inexact, though he thinks there is no sufficient ground for the suspicion of Schulz that the text is corrupt. He thinks that to bring out the author's meaning the arrangement of the words in the preceding clause should be altered thus: "*crowned with glory and honour because of the suffering of death*," and then the idea supplied, "*which He suffered*," ὃ πάθεν, "in order that by the grace of God," etc. If, however, we connect the final clause, as we should naturally do, with the words immediately preceding it ("crowned with glory and honour"), we shall be obliged to adopt some such interpretation as that of Principal