The Cave of Adullam or Achor, a Door of Hope?

A history of the
Faculty of Theology
of the University of South Africa

Chris Botha

MISCELLANEA GENERALIA 9
UNISA 1990

THE CAVE OF ADULLAM

OR

ACHOR, A DOOR OF HOPE?

A history of the
Faculty of Theology
of the University of South Africa

CHRIS BOTHA
Professor of Church History,
University of South Africa
Pretoria

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA
PRETORIA

First edition, first impression

ISBN 0 86981 630 6

Printed by Sigma Press, Koedoespoort

Published by the University of South Africa, P O Box 392, Pretoria

Contents

Professor J A Lombard, the founder of the faculty

Preface

I believe that a title should be a condensation of the contents of a book. I have chosen the title 'Cave of Adullam or Achor, a door of hope?' I believe it achieves what I intended it to do. But then it requires some explanation. The two metaphors of the title linked with an 'or' indicate that this is a controversial faculty. On the one hand there are critics who have a very negative opinion of this faculty - some of them derisively refer to it as a cave of Adullam. The cave of Adullam was the place where David assembled a gang, described in I Sam 22:2 as 'all who were in distress or in debt or discontented'. They say that at this faculty can be found all those theologians who are in some kind of moral distress or who have run into some or other creditor or who are dissatisfied with the political policies of government or the doctrinal and/or political decisions of their churches. They are discontented because they have been overlooked by the theological faculties of their own churches, and now they take shelter in this 'open' faculty where they can take all kinds of liberties - doctrinal, political and even moral.

When the faculty was started thirty years ago, the founder believed that big changes must and would take place in South Africa - changes that would be as traumatic for many South Africans as was losing the First and Second World Wars for the Germans. He wanted to establish a faculty that would give the Christians in South Africa something to hold on to when the status quo gave way and they experienced disillusionment in the theology which proclaimed the status quo as the will and blessing of the Lord. This brought me to my second metaphor from the Old Testament. Achor is a valley in the mountainous country between Jericho and the Dead Sea. To many Jews it recalled misfortune and perdition. It was there that Achan and his whole family were stoned because they had sinned. And yet, when the liberated people of God returned from Babylon, they were once again refined on their homeward journey by all the tribulations of the desert, and when they crossed the Jordan River they experienced the despised Achor as 'a door of hope' (Hosea 2:15).

The title ends with a question mark. When I was asked to write the history of the first thirty years of the Faculty of Theology, I endeavoured to be true to the motto of Spinoza - not to deride, not to lament and not to curse, but to understand. I have tried to give this history within its context. When you have honoured me by reading it, you may decide for yourself: Adullam or Achor?

I would like to thank the university authorities for giving me permission to do research in the archives. I am grateful to Mr D P Coetzee who opened many doors for me, and to Mr De Jager and especially Mrs Van Niekerk of the archives, who supplied me with all the assistance I needed. I must mention the help of my colleagues in faculty, who shared their memories, insights and publications with me. Without their aid this task could not have been achieved. I want to convey a word of thanks to Kevin Roy and Joan Millard who did their utmost to rescue something of the English language in the manuscript. And how can I thank Annatjie Smit for transcribing everything I wrote on the word-processor?

The Institute for Theological Research finalised the manuscript for publication. A special word of thanks to Mrs Nonnie Fouché who was responsible for the final draft for printing.

The author

CHAPTER 1

The preamble

In June 1960 the first professor of Theology took office at the University of South Africa. His post was described as a chair in Theology. In the proposal which recommended this post to Senate, it was stated that the incumbent of this chair was to organise and develop theological studies at the University. This suggested that some theological work was done at the University which needed extension and organising. The report sounded a very optimistic note, mentioning that the committee believed that this appointment would undoubtedly bring about a large enrolment of students (Minutes of the Board of Lecturers, 5 May 1959). History has proved it correct.

The question is rather intriguing: How could the University of South Africa possibly have been involved in any theological training before 1960? In this preamble I would like to describe that pre-history of the theological faculty. This requires that we should commence with the founding of the University of South Africa in 1918. And it is rather surprising to find a clause in the very first statute of the University of South Africa which authorised it, subject to certain provisions, to confer the degrees BD and DD in the Faculty of Arts. To understand this requires the researcher to go back to the genesis of the University of South Africa.

The University of South Africa has its roots far back in the last century, when the Cape Colony was granted some kind of responsible government by Britain. There arose a need to examine candidates for employment in the civil service. In 1859 the Board of Public Examiners was founded for this purpose. It soon became apparent that the need was greater than just for the public service, and what was really needed was some kind of university in the Cape Colony. The local press spearheaded a campaign which resulted in the passing of Act 16 of 1873. The new university, called the University of the Cape of Good Hope, was not modelled on the classical medieval universities, but on the University of London, which did not impart knowledge, but was an examining body which set examinations and awarded degrees to students who studied on their own at various colleges (*Financial Mail* 1989:61). It is clearly stated in the University Incorporation Act of 1910, paragraph 8, that 'the Council of the University of the Cape of Good Hope shall have the power to confer, after examination, and according to the by-laws and regulations of the University the degrees of ... Bachelor of Divinity and Doctor of Divinity'.

With the establishment of the two well-known universities in the Western Cape in 1916, the University of Cape Town and the University of Stellenbosch, it was decided to disband the University of the Cape of Good Hope and to establish in its place the University of South Africa. The *Yearbook of the Union of South Africa* has this entry:

> The University of South Africa from the 2nd of April 1918 became the legal successor of the University of the Cape of Good Hope, the headquarters of which have been removed from Cape Town to Pretoria, and which embraces the following constituent colleges: Grey University College, Bloemfontein; Huguenot University College, Wellington; Natal University College, Pietermaritzburg; Rhodes University College, Grahamstown; the University College of Potchefstroom and the Transvaal University College, Pretoria. In the case of each college there is a governing Council responsible for general administration, while academic matters and discipline are controlled by the College Senate, consisting entirely or mainly of the professors on staff, the executive functions being discharged by the Registrar, or in some cases, by the Principal.
>
> (*Yearbook* 1922:257)

At two of the above-mentioned colleges students were trained for the ministry. The Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk had an arrangement with the Transvaal University College by which their ministers were trained in the Faculty of Theology, after completing a BA degree. After completion of their theological training they received a BD degree from the University of South Africa. The Gereformeerde Kerke in South Africa moved their theological school from Burgersdorp to Potchefstroom, and it was incorporated as a faculty of Theology at the Potchefstroom University College, with more or less the same arrangements employed as in Pretoria. Both these churches stood in the 'Reformed' tradition, and consequently they saw to it that their ministers were trained in the Reformed tradition. So the theological training at the University of South Africa, via its constituent colleges, was very much in the Reformed mould. This explains why the degrees BD and DD were conferred by the University of South Africa ever since its inception in 1918. Prior to the establishment of the chair of Theology in 1960, the University of South Africa conferred at least 72 BD degrees and seven DD degrees.

Until the end of the Second World War, theological training for the ministry in the 'English-speaking' churches in South Africa was done in Britain or America. But then four of them, the Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church, the Anglican Church and the Congregational Church, approached the Rhodes University College and after successful negotiations appointed the first professor of Divinity at an English-speaking university college in South Africa in the person of Dr Horton Davies. He arrived in Grahamstown on 23 January 1947. He had to obtain permission from the University of South Africa to establish a three-year degree course for theological students, presented by the Faculty of Arts, but which included six theological subjects. At first he met with opposition to studies in Divinity from the Senate Committee, the members of which were by then all members of the theological faculty of the Potchefstroom University College, because the Transvaal University College had become the University of Pretoria. After he had argued his case, the theologians from Potchefstroom yielded and gave their support, and so opened the door for what I would like to call the English tradition of theological training for the ministry (Hewson 1984:221-228). This gave the opportunity for theological candidates in English-speaking churches to receive a university education. As things turned out this was a very important theological development that would have a decisive influence on theological training at the University of South Africa.

Our university was proud of its level of theological training. It was with great concern that the chairman of the Committee of Senate dealing with matters concerning the study of Divinity reported to Council that it had come to his

attention that according to Circular E 56 of the Department of Education, which dealt with the recognition of the degrees of South African universities by the Dutch government, it appeared that they only recognised the BD degrees of the universities of Pretoria and Stellenbosch, but that no mention was made of the BD degrees of the University of South Africa. This was a very sensitive situation, because in reality this meant that the theological training of both the Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk and the Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk was recognised in the Netherlands, but not that of the Gereformeerde Kerke in South Africa. On the proposal of the committee, Council decided to approach the Department of Education and ask them to rectify the situation (Minutes of Council, 23 September 1932).

The previous meeting of Council had approved new regulations for the degree of Doctor of Divinity at the University of South Africa. These stipulated that a candidate would only be allowed to enrol for the degree of DD if he had been in possession of a Magister Divinitatis degree for at least four years. To obtain this master's degree, the candidate was required to write a thesis dealing with any subject in the field of theology, and which was approved by Senate (Minutes of Council, 23 June 1932).

In 1948 the Council of the University of South Africa was forced to face a new crisis. A government circular (53/58) stated:

> As you are aware, Natal University College intends to promote a private bill next session, in order to secure a charter as an independent university. At the same time the Native College at Fort Hare has reached a stage in which it is entitled to the status of a full college. As a result it has become obvious that the whole future of the University of South Africa has to be reconsidered, and the Governor-General has appointed a commission to go into the whole matter. It is quite clear that if the developments anticipated by this commission take place, there will have to be introduced at least six bills in the near future, with the possibility that all existing university acts will have to be amended, and perhaps a consolidating and amending act for higher education in general will be required.
>
> (Minutes of Council, 5 April 1948)

Prior to this move by the newly elected National Party government, 'Council, on recommendation of Senate' decided in September 1945 that a division for the tuition of external students should be created:

1.1 The activities of the Division be limited, for the present, to the tuition of students in the Faculties of Arts, Social Sciences, Commerce and Administration, Education and Law.

1.2 The Division to be placed under the guidance of a Director, assisted by a secretary and the necessary administrative personnel and a full-time teaching staff.

1.3 The Division is to be administered by a joint committee of Council and Senate and to consist of:

The Chairman of Senate;
The Director of the Division;
The Principal of the S A N C;
The Deans of the Faculties of Arts and Commerce and Administration;
Two representatives of Senate;
Two representatives of Council.

1.4 The necessary steps had to be taken to amend the University Act and Statutes for the purpose of incorporating the Division as an integral part of the University.

It may be stated that the Rt Hon J H Hofmeyr, Minister of Education, welcomed the University's intention of providing tuition to external students and promised to table the required amendment as a governmental measure. This happened during the 1946 session of Parliament when Act no 12 of 1916, as amended, was again amended by Act 18 of 1946 to satisfy the new requirements ....

2.3 Lecturers were appointed in the following departments: Classics and Classical Culture, English, Dutch, African Studies, Politics and Public Administration, History, Economics, Psychology, Sociology, Education, Geography, Mathematics, Law, Accounting and Commerce.

> Enrolment started on the 1 March 1947. In November 1947 the number of those enrolled totalled 1 240, exceeding the estimate by no less than 240.
>
> (Minutes of Council, 5 April 1948)

This development brought tension between the University of South Africa and the existing private correspondence colleges who felt, with some justification, that the University was now intruding into their field (Minutes of Council, 29 April 1949). Although the University was prepared to discuss the matter with these colleges, it was not prepared to forfeit the Division of External Studies. It is not difficult to see the reason. The Division of External Studies was the University of South Africa's only hope for its future existence.

Council itself asked the opinion of the constituent colleges on the future of the University of South Africa. Most of the colleges preferred not to voice an opinion, others were convinced that this university had fulfilled its mission, and the natural thing to do now was to disband. But the Potchefstroom University College supported their former colleague, Professor A J H van der Walt, and suggested that the University should be reconstituted in such a way that it could accommodate the external students as its main component (Minutes of Council, 21 September 1949).

Council supported this recommendation, and in 1951 legislation was enacted which structured Unisa as a university for 'distance education', and put it on a par with the other South African universities (*Financial Mail* 1989:62).

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FACULTY OF THEOLOGY

How did all these developments affect theological training at the University of South Africa? Surprisingly enough, in spite of all the uncertainty, Senate recommended the institution of a faculty of Theology at its meeting of 19-22 April 1949. It must be pointed out that this decision was based on the old system and to my mind was nothing more than a practical measure to enable the faculties of Potchefstroom and Grahamstown to organise their respective theological training programmes until such time as both these colleges became independent universities:

> Senate recommends the institution of a Faculty of Divinity, replacing the present committee of Divinity Studies. The constitution will be: the present members of the study com-

mittee, plus Prof P J S de Klerk (PUC); two representatives of the Theological Faculty of the South African Native College (Sect 44 of Statute 1); three representatives of the Board of the Faculty of Arts (for Classics, Semitics and Philosophy); one representative of the Board of the Faculty of Education.

(Minutes of Council, 29 April 1949)

Council agreed, thereby reinstating the degrees BA (Theol), BD, MDiv and DD. At its meeting of 11-14 April 1950 Senate recommended to Council that the Faculty of Divinity should *only examine but not teach* candidates in theological subjects, and that this should be borne in mind in determining the composition of Senate (Minutes of Council, 21 April 1950).

In its report to Council in 1951, Senate voiced its opinion that the Faculty of Theology should lapse at the next meeting of Senate, and thereafter continue whatever was left to be done by the former faculty in the Faculty of Arts (Minutes of Council, 28 June 1952). At its meeting in 1952 Council resolved to abolish the Faculty of Theology and appoint a committee of theological studies in the Faculty of Arts to deal with theological options that could be taken for the BA degree. The committee consisted of Professors S du Toit (Potchefstroom) and Horton Davies (Grahamstown) (Minutes of Council, 28 June 1952).

The Faculty of Theology reported back to Senate that the dean had sent a circular to all the theological faculties re the continuation of the Faculty of Theology at the University of South Africa. The unanimous feeling was that there should not be a faculty of theology for external studies. They recommended that the Faculty of Theology be abolished and that only a committee of studies in Divinity be appointed to deal with theological options in the BA (Theol) course in the Faculty of Arts (Minutes of Senate, 17-19 September 1952).

This proposal was probably not approved by Senate, because reports of the Faculty of Theology appeared annually in the minutes of Senate and Council. In 1959 the Board of Lecturers were asked to pay attention to the plight of the 206 students who were involved in theological and related subjects. These students were in Biblical Studies I (80); II (10) and III (3); Systematic Theology I (35); II (5); Church History I (13); II (1); Hebrew I (48); II (0) and Judaica (0). They recommended that a professor of Theology and Semitic Languages be appointed. It was stipulated that his task would be to organise and extend theological studies and that, if possible, he should be well-trained in Semitic Languages as well as Theology (Minutes of Council, 27 June 1959). The report

also stated that this faculty of Theology should have all the necessary departments so that its students would receive a thorough training, as research had confirmed a definite need for such training.

Before this appointment was made, the Faculty of Arts requested a chair in Semitic Languages (Minutes of Council 1960:270). Obviously this development had an influence on the appointment of the professor of Theology. Dr A H van Zyl was appointed professor of Semitic Languages on 24 September 1960 (Minutes of Council 1960:729).

The post of professor of Theology was approved and duly advertised. A selection committee was appointed, and they had the responsibility of choosing the person who would have to start the new faculty, therefore their names are worth mentioning: Professor S Pauw, Dr W Cosser, Professors S J H Steven, E P Groenewald, A van Selms, W J Snyman and A M T Meyer, and Dr W D Jonker. They had no fewer than 15 candidates to choose from, and they asked nine of them to appear for a personal interview - Rev I H Eybers and Drs B Engelbrecht, J A Heyns, D Kempff, J A Lombard, G C Oosthuizen, J A Stoop, G J Swart and S J van der Walt. These were excellent candidates - and with the advantage of hindsight we can say that every candidate would have steered the new faculty in a different direction. The choice of the selection committee was Dr J A Lombard. His Curriculum Vitae was most impressive: BA (Greek and Hebrew) with distinction in 1938; BD with distinction in 1942; DD in New Testament with distinction in 1951, with a thesis on 'The symbolism of the Fourth Gospel'. Professor E P Groenewald was his promoter. He was working on a second theological degree, in Systematic Theology, under Karl Barth with the title 'Mission und Eschatologie'. Some of his references were from distinguished theologians: Karl Barth, E P Groenewald, B J Marais, F E O'B Geldenhuys and A M Meiring, who was at that time the Moderator of the Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk in Transvaal. He listed no fewer than 33 publications, some of them scientific papers, others popular theology (Report of the Selection Committee, 25 March 1960).

So Johannes Lombard became the first professor of Theology at the University of South Africa. It was his task to lay the foundations of, and give direction to, the new faculty.

Professor J A Lombard and the famous K Barth (Väterchen)

CHAPTER 2

Towards a theologia evangelica

When Professor Lombard accepted the chair of Theology at the University of South Africa, he seems to have experienced it as a command from God; not merely a change from pastor to professor, but as the consummation of everything that had happened to him. He went to Basel on an occasion, lonely and bewildered:

> He stood there, not knowing what to do. He knocked at the door. It was late at night. 'Väterchen' [K Barth] was still working. With him everything became cosy and friendly, as if even the powers of chaos had to remain silent. At first glance the father realised that something had happened to his son. The son dared to cry. And he could tell everything. Not the next morning, but the day after he was able to walk over mountains and abysses. Because a real father had come into his life. In Karl Barth's presence we were able to become unimportant but not despondent.
>
> (Lombard 1956:895)

He stayed with Karl Barth for more than two years. On his departure for South Africa, when he had already bidden Barth farewell, he ran back to him, embraced him and cried. 'Väterchen, how can I survive without you?,' and Barth answered: 'Go and be a Väterchen in South Africa.'

To him this command became a reality with this appointment. It was his commission to lay the foundations and give direction to a new faculty of Theology that would not be limited by ecclesiastical concerns but would be open to the guidance of the Living Christ - a major vehicle to proclaim the message of hope. 'To testify to the world concerning the world's hope is the meaning of the existence of the Church in every age and every clime' (Lombard 1956:893). This commission gave purpose to his experiences at Basel. Everything became clear. This faculty would carry the message of Barth, the evangelical theology, into Southern Africa and he would be a Väterchen to 'his' team of lecturers, inspiring them, educating them and at times comforting them.

He gave a summary of his theology, which was not only a system but the development of his own spiritual experience of following Jesus. This process of following Jesus for him started

> ... at a SCA conference at our small town of Heidelberg [in South Africa]. While a minister was preaching in simple terms, it suddenly happened: Follow me! Jesus is the One. In Him is the fullness of God. He leads. I follow. Even if I have failed Him many times, He led me ever more deeply into His way and His light and Truth became increasingly brighter.
>
> (Lombard 1979:61)

At that time his faith was childlike and defenceless:

> But in church and state everything appeared quite clear and simple and possible for us all. It would be the same in the case of the University and theology, we thought. The state, nestled within the British Empire, guaranteed peace and calm and progress .... Culture was completely Christianised. Every single activity was opened with the reading of the Scriptures and prayer, indeed no cultural organisation or political meeting would dare to do otherwise .... God is available. He is there, he is known, easily grasped, dignified - that's why he's there, after all! From Europe he came to Africa on behalf of European Christianity .... God was the highest authority, majesty and omnipotence ... naked sovereignty.
>
> (Lombard 1979:61, 62)

As he looked back to that period, he realised that the only point of real light was the missionary zeal. 'Even that fitted exactly into the larger pattern. Now is the time to lead Africa to "repentance and faith". It was the laity who took the initiative - the enthusiasm was dumbfounding: half the University attended a revival meeting of the SCM' (Lombard 1979:63). But all this was eventually extinguished by the Dutch Reformed Church

> ... which no longer had a good theology, based as it was on the premises of Neo-Calvinism, probably strengthened by Anglo-Saxon Puritanism. It all became a service to the nation. Faith no longer was an act of obedience, the following of Jesus according to the Scriptures, but an assent to the truth of formulas - an authoritarian faith. The theology of the Afrikaner churches was dominated by H Bavinck's 'Reformed Dogmatics' where everything could be classified into loci which formed a theological system in which all knowledge of God was obtainable.
>
> (Lombard 1979:64-70)

And then came the disillusionment - Lombard's own theology was shaken by England's empiricism and subjectivism, the arrogance and rationalism of the Frenchman Descartes, and the German idealism of Hegel and Schleiermacher. This cut off the branch on which he was sitting. Nothing was certain any more. And so he, who earlier had been so triumphant, could only pray: 'Lord, I know that you cannot possibly exist. Please help me!' (Lombard 1979:71).

But then he met Karl Barth, a

> ... normal person, who with a gigantic freedom, simply walked through all the sham wisdom and hypocrisy. With a single glance he saw through two centuries of German idealism and like the child in Hans Christian Andersen said: 'The King has no clothes on' .... It is not an overstatement to say that this voice sounded to us like the Scotsman who shouted "Hallelujah" during Kirk-week, or like a Mozart symphony you heard for the first time, or simply like voices welcoming you home after you'd been out all night lost in the bushveld.
>
> (Lombard 1979:71)

The earthquake was to get worse and the darkness of the night deeper and colder. When Lombard arrived in Europe, Adolph Keller's *Christian Europe today* was published in London (1942). He spoke of Christian Europe in such a way that it almost sounded as if God had withdrawn. The refugee problem in Europe and the United States was overwhelming. Among those refugees were believing Christians who had put their hope in the League of Nations but were bitterly disappointed. They became an ever-growing caravan of despair. This challenged 'Christian Europe' with the questions: Is the church a lie? Is Christian brotherhood a mere phrase and no reality? What lies at the heart of the Christian church in Europe? At this time, when disaster threatened on every front,

> ... Barth, with head held high, said joyfully: '*Theologische Existenz Heute*!' We may be joyful, because we are not heading for a vacuum, but for a space that has been filled. We are going to meet the King in the fullness of His royal rule, let us prove this by being it, by living from it. In South Africa too, theology can again mean joy, freedom and beauty, if we will learn from Barth that the community of Jesus Christ lives from the coming of His Kingdom - and not from deified natural orders.
>
> (Lombard 1979:75, 76)

For his inaugural address (1960:1-56) he chose the topic: 'Mission as an act of Christian hope'. The essence of this lecture I would summarise thus:

In this chair it is about the basic truth and about the true character of the New Testament - about the Word of God. Here we will be asked to give account of what it means to be a Christian, to be a church, to do theology. This question has become a matter of life and death, because Christianity has become much too interwoven with Western Europe - and Western Europe has lost its credibility. If the church wants to have a message for the world, it must detach itself from this *Corpus Christianum*, this Christian Society, and its adherents must become the pilgrim people of God, en route from Resurrection to Parousia, living on the hope of the One who comes - the Eschaton! Theology, for its part, must become a message of hope, not only to the people who attend church on Sundays, but to the whole world. This missionary church must carry the message of hope, be an instrument of God, who in Jesus Christ stepped out of His concealment to meet humanity. This theology can not be a set of principles, dare not be a 'habitas' or a 'securitas' theology, but must bring a new era in theological thinking. This evangelical theology was born out of the ashes of

theology of the nineteenth century and found ecclesiastical expression in the 'Confessing church' that confronted Hitler and German Christianity. Behind it were the theological contemplations of J C Blumhardt, Kutler, Ragaz, Schlatter and Kierkegaard - not to forget Dostoevsky - and finally Karl Barth.

The theology to be taught at Unisa can not be contemplated behind the walls of confessional or ecclesiastical protection. It is called to stand in the University amongst all the other sciences, exposed and vulnerable, because it does not apply the generally accepted apriories and categories - it is called to be a servant, a witness - looking at its own precarious position with humour. Yes, theology is a dangerous undertaking, because it finds its real essence in making itself redundant in the *lumen gloriae*, while it surrenders itself joyfully to the guidance of the Spirit of the One who is the Hope of the world.

Eight years later the first edition of a journal of the Faculty of Theology of the University of South Africa came into being. It is not surprising that it was called *Theologia Evangelica*. In Professor Lombard's contribution, 'Theology in action', he re-emphasized the theological position of the faculty. Brief extracts will suffice: It is our purpose to accompany our students on this glorious road with great humility. Our first and deepest loyalty will be to the Gospel of God, Jesus Christ our Lord. Our theology will be a *theologia viatorum* - a theology en route. We have no theological school in which to shelter. We are in service of Jesus Christ, and we can only point away from ourselves towards Him, our final destination. Nobody must take us to task because we are not in service of one particular church. We serve an evangelical student community, therefore we cannot but confront Roman Catholicism. But we do not wish to be negative, because we serve the Lord, Jesus Christ.

It must be viewed as a little miracle that an ecumenical faculty, with its only loyalty being to Christ, became a reality at this time and place in the history of our country. We cannot come to rest on one particular school of theology and pretend that that is the final theological word on the issues of our day, or that this is the ultimate church or even the ultimate nation. In the New Testament 'ecumene' means the whole world. We will be on our way towards the ends of the earth and to the end of history. Naturally this kind of theology will disturb people and bring down ivory towers and deprive people of their false securities.

Yet this theology is being done with a joy beyond words, because the gospel is a joyful subject. It fills us with an eschatological joy that assures us: everything is well because God is the ultimate of everything. A theology which does not reflect this joy in the church and towards the world is not real theology (Lombard 1968:7-8).

Lombard believed that it was his mission to teach his version of the evangelical theology of Karl Barth in this faculty. He called his staff together on suitable and less-suitable occasions, lecturing them on this theology. This theology is reflected in the topics of the doctoral students who enrolled to study under his guidance: 'The meaning of the Parousia of Jesus Christ for Christian missions' (E J L le Riche); 'The concept of the church in the theology of Karl Barth' (J F Potgieter); 'Reconciliation and the mission of the church according to the theology of Karl Barth' (H Denkema); 'The Christocentric message today' (J A Lamprecht) and 'Eschatology, with special reference to the Kingdom of God and the Christian Hope' (L M Heyns). Not all these theses were completed, but he was the promoter of nine doctorandi who completed their doctoral studies.

It stands to reason that one of his first objectives was to acquire lecturers for the new faculty. He applied to Senate for two additional chairs, one in Old Testament Biblical Studies and one in Science of Religion and Missiology, as well as a senior lectureship in New Testament Biblical Studies (Minutes of Council 1961:410). In the accompanying motivation he pointed out that there were no fewer than 211 theological students. Besides the seven doctoral students there were 161 students in the three courses in Biblical Studies and 44 in the two courses of Systematic Theology. In his argument, he revealed his goals for the new faculty very clearly. To establish a fully-fledged faculty it was vitally important to start off correctly. Therefore the whole encyclopedia of the study of Divinity had to be kept in mind. The aforesaid encyclopedia required a faculty with six departments: Old Testament, New Testament, Dogmatics and Ethics, Science of Religion, Church History and the latest discipline, Missiology. In the light of this final goal he asked for two chairs to start with, one in Old Testament and the other in Science of Religion.

He grasped the fact that if this faculty were ever to become viable, it was essential to open its doors to people who found the BA, BD courses too difficult. Therefore he applied to Senate for permission to install a new degree in Theology - a BA (Theology). He proposed that this degree be structured in the following way: Biblical Studies I, II and III; Systematic Theology I, II and III plus three compulsory subjects - Afrikaans I or English I, Greek I and Hebrew I. Two courses had to be done from the ensuing package: Church History I and II, Missiology I and Science of Religion I.

At the request of the Minister of 'Black' Education, he also requested permission to install a two-year diploma in Theology which would comply with the requirements of the 'Black' colleges, because the BD course as well as the proposed BA (Theology) degrees were out of the reach of those students (sic!).

Professor Lombard described this request from the minister as a cry from the Black communities. He proposed that this diploma course should have the following curriculum: *First year*: Old Testament exegesis and theology; New Testament exegesis and theology; Dogmatics and Ethics; Comparison of Religions and the theory and history of missions. *Second year*: Old Testament and New Testament Hermeneutics, Philosophy of Religion, General and South African Church History (Minutes of Council 1961:410-412).

Council referred the establishment of the two new degrees to the Board of Lecturers and Senate, but approved the two chairs. The posts were duly advertised, but then a strange piece of manoeuvering happened in the selection committee (Minutes of Council 1961:763). The selection committee took note of the fact that the Committee on General Affairs of Senate recommended not filling the chair in Science of Religion, because it seemed as if a very able candidate from Europe might be available for the post in the near future. Therefore the selection committee decided to write a letter to all the applicants for this post, notifying them that the post would not be filled immediately, but only at a later stage (Minutes of Council 1961:763).

The selection committee then paid attention to the applicants for the post of professor of Old Testament Biblical Studies. There were no fewer than thirty candidates, and four of them were called upon to appear before the selection committee - Drs B J van der Merwe, J H Scheepers, P J N Smal and I H Eybers. The unanimous recommendation of the committee was that Dr I H Eybers be appointed as professor of Theology with his main commission being Biblical Studies. This was approved by Council. Dr Eybers accepted the post and became the second professor of the Faculty of Theology.

Professor Lombard convinced Senate that it was necessary to have at least four departments in the Faculty of Theology at that stage. The four departments should be Old Testament, New Testament, Dogmatics and Ethics, and Science of Religion. Senate thus recommended this to Council, but the Executive Committee of Council recommended to Council that Theology should be limited to three departments at that stage, and that it was for the Faculty of Theology to decide how they would divide the work. This recommendation was approved by Council (Minutes of Council 1962:88). Faculty complied and recommended that the three departments would be Old and New Testament, Dogmatics, Ethics and Practical Theology, and Church History, Missiology and Science of Religion (Minutes of Council 1963:294).

Professor Lombard's attempt to obtain the services of Professor Blauw for the Department of Missiology and Science of Religion failed, so the post was advertised again. Ten candidates applied for the post, and the selection committee recommended Pastor P G Pakendorf, a Lutheran, as their first choice, with Professor G C Oosthuizen, the Dean of the Faculty of Theology at Fort Hare, as their second choice (Minutes of Council 1962:484). But then Pastor Pakendorf was elected as bishop of the Lutheran Church in South Africa, and he believed that it was his duty to accept this post in his church. Professor Oosthuizen decided that it might be wiser to stay where he was. Professor Lombard was desperate to fill this post because there was an urgent need for someone capable of writing study guides for the students in Church History, Missiology and Science of Religion.

It was at this point that Professor Lombard, in his capacity as member of the examination committee at the theological faculty of Pretoria, took note of a student, Mr A C Viljoen, who had spent a few years studying abroad, and then passed his doctoral examinations at Pretoria with distinction. Before Mr Viljoen left the Netherlands for South Africa, a statement was published in which he made some critical remarks about the (to him) obvious interference of the South African Prime Minister, Dr Verwoerd, with the Dutch Reformed Church's response to the decisions of the Cottesloe Conference. This statement was badly received by the leaders of the Dutch Reformed Church and the professors at the faculty in Pretoria, and this made the chances very slim of Mr Viljoen receiving a call to one of the NGK congregations. He was badly in need of some income to live on. Professor Lombard succeeded in having him appointed to the post in a temporary capacity as a senior lecturer. Professor Lombard told me that the Principal, Professor Pauw, was very hesitant to agree, but Lombard insisted and succeeded.

Because Professor Lombard had such clearcut ideas about what he wanted to do in the faculty, he tried to select his staff very meticulously. His task was made somewhat easier by the fact that those Afrikaans-speaking theologians who made critical sounds against the apartheid policy of the National Party were rarely appointed to lecturing posts in the faculties of the different churches, in spite of the fact that some of them had exceptional qualifications. It was feared that they might contaminate the minds of the students. These ministers usually applied for posts at the theological faculty of Unisa.

A new issue arose which threatened the existence of the faculty. In 1962 the University of South Africa came to the crossroads again. The Nationalist government under Dr Verwoerd's leadership was determined to apply its policy of separate development to all levels of society - that included the

universities. Government was eager to turn all the constituent 'Black' colleges of Unisa into independent 'Black' universities. It also felt the need to support the Afrikaner community of the Witwatersrand by erecting an Afrikaans university in Johannesburg. Because they believed the independence of the 'Black' universities would necessarily result in the diminishing of Unisa's students, government believed that Unisa, with its outstanding personnel, could be moved to Johannesburg and become a residential university. For that purpose the Minister of Education met the Principal of Unisa on 13 February 1963. When he heard the Minister's case, the Principal replied that he was not against the move to Johannesburg, but he and his council were not prepared to sacrifice its function as a correspondence university. He pointed out to the Minister that government's decision was based on grave misconceptions. One was that the majority of the students of Unisa were 'Black' so that the independence of the 'Black' university colleges would spell the end for Unisa. In reality the total loss of the college students would be cancelled out by the average growth of only two years. The second misconception was that the people of Pretoria believed that because Unisa was a 'Black' university, a congestion of 'Black' students would spoil one of the most beautiful areas of Pretoria. The Principal pointed out to the Minister that all the members of Council who lived in Pretoria wished Unisa to stay in Pretoria. He told the Minister that the University was in the position where it had the challenge to think big, and he gave the Minister the assurance that Council would always act in a realistic and responsible way.

These were critical days for the Faculty of Theology. If government persisted in moving Unisa and its staff to Johannesburg to become a residential university, the theological faculty hardly would have survived. As things turned out, government abandoned its plan to move Unisa to Johannesburg. They did erect an Afrikaans university in Johannesburg, and its Principal (Professor G van N Viljoen) and quite a high percentage of its personnel came from the Unisa staff. In a letter to the Principal, the Minister predicted that Unisa would face a gloomy future because of the independence of the 'Black' universities, and warned Council not to expect any sympathetic treatment nor additional financial support from government. Unisa (and the Faculty of Theology) would have to weather the storm on its own (Minutes of Special Meetings of Council 1964:17-54).

Did the Faculty of Theology make any progress? Great wisdom was required from the dean for this faculty to become viable. Professor Lombard realised that the fact that Biblical Studies was recognised by the Department of Education as a school subject was of the utmost importance for the future of the faculty, and this also suited his vision that this faculty should be a missionary

endeavour for the salvation of the country. What better vehicles could he ask for than teachers who were trained in evangelical theology teaching Biblical Studies to pupils in the secondary schools all over the country! In 1963 there were no fewer than 202 students enrolled for Biblical Studies I, 48 for Biblical Studies II and 17 for Biblical Studies III. There were no fewer than 66 enrolled for Systematic Theology I, and 33 for Church History I.

But Professor Lombard became aware of a serious impediment. Biblical Studies was placed in Group D of the Faculty of Arts, which meant that students could not do any postgraduate studies in it, nor could they supplement Biblical Studies as the main subject with Systematic Theology or Church History. The Faculty of Arts simply argued that Biblical Studies was by its very nature not an arts subject but a theological subject, and that a faculty of Arts could not be expected to present postgraduate courses in theological subjects. Professor Lombard formally requested that Biblical Studies be classified in Group A. In the ensuing debate he was asked to write a memorandum to Senate to argue his case. He started his memorandum with academic arguments, but ended with theological arguments. I quote:

> If we remove Biblical Studies from the A group, we will put the course of history in reverse, and also into contradictions and absurdity. Biblical Science is the basic subject from which both the school and the University grew - right from the synagogue, and then at an accelerating tempo after the seventh and eighth centuries via the 'Chapter' schools to the public schools (a fruit of the Reformation). It is a fact that you can hardly change the course of the history of more than a thousand years, by arguing that the study of this one 'Biblos' which shaped the development of the university is now 'überhaupt' and not basic any more. This brings us to the foundations from which there may not be any deviation. It concerns the theological perspective that the Old and New Testaments have a primary Author. How can theology dare to call itself theology if this Author and His book are treated as a phenomenon? Theology can only be in service of 'God's Word'. The gravity of the case for scientific theology hinges on this single confession: Theology's source of knowledge is not its own creation, but the witness of a Word and a relationship that is given. If that is taken away theology has no right to pose as theology. There was a time when theology was nothing more than a history of religions, or merely philosophy, or a subsection of sociology - when everything in

> the Faculty of Arts was sociology. But that time has passed. How can we at this university possibly teach the logos of wisdom or the logos of ethics or whatever section of the logos, if we do not teach the basic Logos, the Logos of God? Here we are dealing with the knowledge of the Bible which is basic and therefore it must be in Group A. That is the essence of the matter.
>
> (Minutes of the E C of Senate 1962:185-187)

Professor Lombard was relentless in all matters he thought were important for the establishment of the faculty. Here he perceived that the future of the faculty depended upon the issue of Biblical Studies. How right he was! In the minutes of Senate, 28 March 1962, it was noted that a compromise had been agreed upon. The Faculty of Arts reported that the motion asking for the inclusion of Biblical Studies in Group A had been withdrawn, while Group D, which included all the theological subjects, would be headed: 'Theological Subjects'. This opened the way for postgraduate studies in Biblical Studies at the University of South Africa. The importance of this development for the future of the theological faculty can hardly be over-estimated.

It is rather fascinating to observe how Professor Lombard tried to find lecturers who would comply with his ideals of what the faculty should be. In 1963 Council approved an additional two senior lecturer posts for the Faculty of Theology - one in the Department of Systematic Theology, Ethics and Practical Theology, and the other in the Department of Church History, Missiology and Science of Religion. Because he himself was a dogmatician, Professor Lombard thought it wise to fill the first vacancy with a specialist in the field of Practical Theology. Six candidates applied for the post, and three of them were called upon to appear before the selection committee - Pastor B O Johanson of the Baptist College and two Dutch Reformed ministers, Dr B J Engelbrecht and Rev J M Odendaal. The selection committee unanimously recommended Pastor Johanson. In the light of this it is rather strange to note that when Dr Johanson was later recommended for promotion, the Executive Committee of Senate found it necessary to bring to the attention of the newly appointed members of staff, as well as the old hands, the decision taken at the investment of the Faculty of Theology, namely that the theological education to be given by the to-be-established faculty should not in any way contradict the Reformed Confessions or the Westminster Confession (Minutes of Senate 1959:151).

This reminder came rather late in the day. I have pointed out that Professor Lombard clearly stated that the faculty would not be under the protection of any creed or church. There had been no objection to this from the authorities of the University. If they later objected because Johanson was at heart a Baptist, it is an open question whether they were not in danger of transgressing the famous conscience clause, applicable to all South African universities with the exception of the University of Potchefstroom, and which reads as follows: 'Nobody may be required as a condition for being allowed as a graduate, professor, lecturer or student of the university, or to fill a post or receive remuneration or any privilege, to be subjected to a test of his/her religious convictions, and nobody may be discriminated against on the grounds of his religious convictions' (Statute of the University of South Africa, Minutes of Council 1967:1412 ff).

Dr F J Botha, a minister of the NGK, was appointed as senior lecturer in New Testament Studies (Minutes of Executive Committee of Council, 19 September 1963). Council approved these appointments as well as that of the senior lecturer in Church History. Professor Lombard reported to the selection committee that he had reason to believe that Professor Dr Blauw of the Netherlands might be interested in the chair - so it was recommended that Professor Blauw should be approached to fill this chair for one year as a guest professor, with the option of accepting a permanent appointment. He would be assisted by a senior lecturer. Two candidates were interviewed, Rev J A Greyling and Mr A C Viljoen, who filled the post in a temporary capacity. The selection committee unanimously recommended Mr Viljoen (Minutes of Council 1964:106).

In a report to the Board of Lecturers (5 March 1965) the dean of the Faculty of Theology reported that negotiations with Professor Blauw were unsuccessful but that he was fortunate enough to find an outstanding candidate in the person of Dr W D Jonker, a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church in Johannesburg, who had had a brilliant academic career and had gained his doctorate in Systematic Theology. He was convinced that he was the only suitable candidate available, so a selection committee was appointed to interview Dr Jonker. The selection committee recommended to Council that Dr Jonker be appointed as professor and head of the Department of Church History, Missiology and Science of Religion - although he was not a specialist in any of these fields (Minutes of Council 1965:112).

Professor Jonker delivered his inaugural lecture on a topic in Church Polity: 'Om die regering van Christus in Sy Kerk' (About the government of Christ in His Church). This inaugural address is a brilliant exposition of Protestant

Church Polity, but Church Polity plays a very minor role in the Church History courses at Unisa. It was quite obvious that Professor Jonker was not happy in this chair, and within a year he accepted a call back to the ministry, although he was prepared to accept a chair in Practical Theology at the Theologische Hogeschool in Kampen, the Netherlands, only two years later. After a few years he returned to South Africa to accept a chair in Systematic Theology in the Faculty of Theology at Stellenbosch. Today he is one of the leading dogmaticians of our country.

The post had to be advertised again, and in contradiction to Professor Lombard's statement to the Board of Lecturers a year previously, no fewer than ten candidates applied, two of whom had doctorates in Church History from universities in the Netherlands. The selection committee was still very hesitant to accept them though, and they first had an interview with a non-applicant, Dr B Spoelstra, a minister of the Gereformeerde Kerk. When they established that his doctorate was in History and not in Church History, they asked Dr J A Stoop, a minister of the Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk, to appear for an interview. At that time he fell into disfavour with his own church and some government officials because he was very outspoken about his opposition to the well-known Article 3 in the constitution ('wetboek') of his church, which restricted membership to 'White' people. The report of the selection committee of Senate has this very suggestive addition that 'after an extensive interrogation' Dr J A Stoop 'was recommended for the post' (Minutes of the Executive Committee of Senate, 9 September 1966).

The same selection committee was asked to recommend a candidate for the chair in New Testament Studies and a senior lecturer in Old Testament Studies. In the latter post Dr B J van der Merwe, a minister of the Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk, was recommended unanimously. For the chair in New Testament Studies the committee had difficulty in choosing between Dr P J du Plessis and Dr F J Botha. The vote went to F J Botha. The members of the comittee commented that they regarded themselves fortunate to have had two such excellent candidates for the post. Therefore they requested Council to appoint Dr Du Plessis on an *ad hominem* basis in a senior lectureship, because he would most certainly be appointed elsewhere and thus be lost to the University of South Africa. Council approved all the recommendations of the selection committee, with the exception of Dr Du Plessis, because there were no vacancies (Minutes of Council 1965:711, 735, 758).

The following year Professor Lombard applied for relief in his own department. He most probably had a junior person in mind, as his motivation in asking for a lecturer and not a senior lecturer was that 'it gives opportunity to

build up slowly and to determine if this is the right person for future promotions'. But Council approved a senior lectureship, which was duly advertised. From the nine applicants the selection committee recommended Rev A König, a minister of the NGK, by four votes to two 'because of his youth and his exceptional intellectual acuteness and accomplishments' (Minutes of the E C of Senate, 9 September 1966).

This extension of staff is a clear indication that the faculty was making remarkable progress. In the six years of its existence the number of students grew constantly. In 1966 the Department of Old and New Testament Studies had no fewer than 507 students, the Department of Dogmatics, Ethics and Practical Theology had 180 students and the Department of Church History, Missiology and Science of Religion had 92 students. Of these students only two were enrolled for the BD course, while there were no fewer than 11 doctoral candidates (DD).

In the Principal's 1967 report he mentioned that the Faculty of Theology had 947 students of whom no fewer than 610 followed courses in Biblical Studies. The growth was certainly not in the BD courses, but in those for the BA (Theol).

It became clear that the future of the faculty called for an adaptation to the Anglo-American style of theological training. This forced the faculty to pay attention to a request from a committee which consisted of lecturers and members of Council: 'It is being argued that the language requirements for a degree in theology are too high. Dr Lombard is requested to discuss this issue at a meeting of the Faculty of Theology' (Minutes of Board of Lecturers, 8 March 1963). At that time a student had to include Greek II, Hebrew II and Latin I in a BA degree which had to be completed before he could enrol for BD. He had to do at least Hebrew I, Greek I and Afrikaans I or English I in a BA (Theology) course.

The miracle faculty kept on expanding, perhaps not as fast as the rest of the University, but beyond expectations. In the Principal's report of 1968 he mentioned the first casualty - Dr B J van der Merwe, senior lecturer in Old Testament Studies, who died suddenly of a heart attack. Enrolment kept on rising. In that year no fewer than 370 students enrolled for BA (Theology), three for BD and 15 for DD. No fewer than 458 students enrolled for one of the three courses in Systematic Theology. Church History is not mentioned in the report (Minutes of Council 1969:472).

The first stage of the history of the faculty ended rather tempestuously. Some of the members of faculty did not feel happy about the way in which Professor Lombard officiated as dean of the faculty. They complained that his administration of formal matters was more or less chaotic. They could not bear what they experienced as his paternalistic attitude. He frequently called them into his office and acted like 'Väterchen' Barth, discussing with them all the fascinating aspects of evangelical theology for hours on end, while their desks were loaded with work. Four of them came to the conclusion that a change of dean was an absolute necessity, so they decided to nominate Professor J A Stoop for the office. One of the 'rebels' was Dr A König, a member of the Department of Systematic Theology. When the plan came to Professor Lombard's attention, Dr König manfully told him that he would vote for Professor Stoop. This development struck Professor Lombard like a stroke of lightning. He was so convinced of his divine calling to guide this new faculty into the beauties of evangelical theology, and that this evangelical theology, with the faculty as its source and powerbase, would be the leaven that would eventually permeate the entire ecclesiastical and political life of South Africa. He tried desperately to persuade his colleagues to re-elect him, but to no avail. Faculty elected Professor Stoop as dean for the period 1970-71, and this was approved by Council (Minutes of Council 1970:3).

This turn of events caused so much tension, not only in the Department of Systematic Theology, but in the faculty at large, that the Principal had to report the matter to Council, who asked him to continue his investigation (Minutes of Council 1970:657). Things became so bad that Council appointed a committee of inquiry consisting of the chairman of Council, Mr A J Koen (Convenor), Mr J H van Dyk, Rev G J Davidtsz (who withdrew) and Justice V G Hiemstra (Minutes of Council 1970:658). The heart of the tension was in the Department of Systematic Theology, Practical Theology and Ethics. As it happened, Professor Johanson took study leave and resigned as head of the department, and Senate thought it wise to appoint Professor Theo van Wijk, dean of the Faculty of Philosophy and Arts, as acting head of the department (Minutes of the E C of Senate 1970:438). The committee of inquiry reported back to Council, recommending the unusual procedure of appointing Professor E P Groenewald, a New Testament scholar and dean of the Faculty of Theology at the University of Pretoria, as professor without any teaching responsibility but with the sole instruction of officiating as head of the Department of Systematic Theology for at least a year. Council also decided to send a delegation to Professor Lombard to try and solve the problems (Minutes of Council 1971:69). Professor Groenewald accepted the post. On 22 February 1971 Mr Koen and Professor Theo van Wijk met the members of faculty,

briefed them on the decisions of Council and exhorted them to bury the hatchet (Minutes of Council 1971:82).

It seems that things did calm down in the department as well as the faculty. Professor Groenewald resigned at the end of 1972 and Professor Johanson was appointed head of the department from 1 January 1973 (Minutes of the E C of Council 1972:456), and when he took his sabbatical leave, Professor Lombard was appointed head of the department (Minutes of the E C of Council 1972-6:584) and when the latter's term of office expired Professor A König was appointed head of the department (Minutes of the E C of Council 1972-6:976).

Although the department as well as the faculty survived these very unfortunate events, and even kept on growing at a remarkable rate, they did leave scars. In actual fact this more or less spelled the end of the academic careers of both Professors Johanson and Lombard. On 11 March 1976 Professor Johanson notified the university that he had accepted a call to the City Temple congregation in London (Minutes of the E C of Council 1976:801). Professor Lombard stayed on but did little more than give guidance to his doctoral students. In 1978 he asked for what he himself described as his last application for study leave. In his application form he stated a very ambitious study programme. He believed that visits to the universities of Cambridge, Oxford, London, Manchester, Nottingham, Durham, Edinburgh, Aberdeen and Leeds would be the crowning glory of his life. He also intended writing a book on the theology of Karl Barth and another in which he wanted to expand his own credo, as well as two other books on reconciliation and on Jesus (Minutes of the E C of Senate 1978:1742). The books were never published. He did travel to England, and at some of the universities his lectures ended with standing ovations.

At the end of 1979 he resigned. Although his letter of resignation has a tragic note, it is a moving document, worthy of quoting for a number of reasons - one of them being the witness to a dream that refused to die:

> The moment has arrived to inform you that everything points to the fact that it is time for me to dedicate myself to publishing. For that purpose I need to withdraw myself to my closet and my study. You are aware of the marvellous but surprising fact that my theological message appealed to people in Europe and beyond. I am under continual pressure to get my witness to Scotland, England, Switzerland and Germany concerning the Evangelical Theology, Karl Barth's contribution and South Africa's participation ready for publication. Because of this I ask permission to retire on the 31st

> of December after nearly twenty years of service to the University. You are aware of the fact that I would have loved to go on until May, to complete the twenty years of service, but the most fruitful, and I hope the most selfless service will now be accomplished .... My prayer to Jesus Christ, our Lord, is that my association with and gratitude to you will be made concrete by my life and work, and that I will bring joy to the university and the whole country in the use of every moment granted to me and through every word that I will witness to His name.
>
> (Minutes of the E C of Senate 1979:3728)

The dream and the intentions accompanying it have not materialised as yet. Professor Lombard did show me a whole shelf of unpublished manuscripts in his study - who knows? In 1970 he contributed an article to *Hermeneutica*, a Festschrift in honour of Professor E P Groenewald. It was titled: '... Sodat ek Hom mag ken' ('... So that I may know Him'). A prominent New Testament scholar told me that it was the best article in the book, which undoubtedly contained articles of outstanding quality. In this article Professor Lombard expounds on the place and role of the Bible in his evangelical theology. According to my own perception it was a brilliant summary of Karl Barth's hermeneutic. As I will indicate later, the hermeneutic applied today in the departments of Old and New Testament, the 'new hermeneutic', goes beyond that of Barth (and Lombard). It stands to reason that the founder of the faculty would not be happy with the theological trends that are presently pursued by some of the members of faculty. In retrospect one realises that he saw the work of all the departments through the spectacles of systematic theology. This was doomed to fail because every department became a separate entity, pursuing the goals of their respective disciplines, a tendency which was enhanced by the establishment of the different theological associations and the appointment of secretaries for every department.

I must point out that it seems as if his own predictions backfired on him. He said himself that theology is a dangerous undertaking, because it finds its real essence in making itself redundant. Therefore the theologian is exposed and vulnerable. When he himself became redundant because the faculty moved from his foundations to a position beyond the parameters of his own perceptions - and this is a position no theologian can escape, be he Augustine, Luther, Calvin or Barth - he did not succeed in looking at his own precarious position with humour.

This and all other failures cannot detract from the appreciation the faculty owes Professor Johannes A Lombard for laying the foundations for a faculty that would be free from the '*habitas* and *securitas* theology' and in which the feeling can take root that 'we are in possession, we are safe within a God-given system' (Lombard 1979:66). What we must take with us from him is an awareness of our vulnerability. We must go on doing what is waiting for us on our desks and keep on doing it, awaiting our own hour of redundancy with a sense of humour!

The late Professor I H Eybers (1978-81)

Professor J J Burden (1988–)