The Faculty has marked its progress with modest celebrations. In the course of its first session in 1904–5 twelve special lectures were given, and published in 1905 by the University Press under the title: Theological Lectures, edited by A. S. Peake. In October 1929 it marked its twenty-fifth anniversary with a lecture by F. C. Burkitt, Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, on Twenty Five Years of Theological Study, published by the Rylands Library and the University Press, together with a brief account of the early history of the Faculty by the Dean, Dr R. G. Parsons (later to become Bishop of Southwark and then Hereford). This celebration was somewhat overshadowed by the deaths of Professor J. N. Farquhar in July and A. S. Peake in August. In 1954 the Jubilee was celebrated by three lectures from distinguished visitors who had previously been connected with the Faculty, Professors L. W. Grensted of Oxford, L. E. Browne of Leeds and C. H. Dodd of Cambridge. They were once again published by the Rylands Library and the University Press, under the title: Theological Essays, together with a fourth paper by T. W. Manson on the origins and history of the Faculty. Twenty-five years later we come to our seventy-fifth anniversary. However, it is unlikely that the earlier history is generally known and so, before dealing with recent years, I shall go over once more the story of the beginnings and the first half century. Much of the information comes from Edward Fiddes’ book of 1937, Chapters in the History of Owens College and of the Manchester University, 1851–1914. There has been no comparable study of the University since 1914, a gap that needs filling.

1The substance of a lecture given on 12 May 1979, when the 75th Anniversary of the Faculty was celebrated.
Owens College was founded in 1851. There had been an independent plan for a University in Manchester, put forward in 1836 by H. L. Jones, which was to include Theology. Owens College came from a quite different initiative. Although John Owens and his Trustees were all Churchmen, Anglican or Nonconformist, Theology was not part of the curriculum at Owens College. Indeed religion was quite a tricky matter. The first Principal, Dr Scott, gave some very general lectures on 'The Religion of the Scholar', and even these created a bit of a hubbub. From 1880 to 1903 Owens College was part of The Victoria University, a federal body whose other units were University College, Liverpool, and Yorkshire College, Leeds. In 1890 a proposal to establish a Faculty of Theology in the Federal University failed. The impetus came from Owens College, where the Greek Testament, Hebrew and Ecclesiastical History had been taught for some time. There were two reasons for the failure. The first was the fear of sectarian strife, for which the bad relations of the Churches with one another were to blame. It was this which led Liverpool University in its Charter to rule out Theology until recently. The second reason was a widespread suspicion of religious doctrines as 'unscientific'. Indeed the terms dogma and even doctrine aroused deep emotions of suspicion. For this the Churches were again partly to blame because of what appeared to be their opposition to modern science; whilst the scientists themselves were liable to exhibit that naïve view of science as the key to the universe which has been dubbed 'scientism'. In 1900 another attempt to establish a Faculty of Theology failed because of the indifference or even hostility of Liverpool and Leeds.

In 1903 the Federal University was dissolved and the Victoria University of Manchester came into being. By December of that year the proposal to establish a Faculty of Theology was approved. There was some suspicion of it but the advocacy of distinguished insiders and outsiders, especially of the Vice-Chancellor, Sir Alfred Hopkinson, and Professor T. F. Tout, carried the day and the Faculty began its work in October 1904. Why was its foundation possible?
The chief reason was the influx of Nonconformist Theological Colleges to Manchester from 1840. The Anglican element was very small by comparison. By 1903 there were eight denominational Theological Colleges in Manchester. They produced a remarkable group of scholars on whom the University could call for teaching and the supervision of research. Of the twelve lectures printed in the 1905 volume, seven are by members of College staffs. An eighth is by Canon E. L. Hicks of Manchester Cathedral. His name indicates that the University could also call on scholarly Churchmen not in Theological Colleges. The Anglicans made their contribution more in this way than through a theological college. In these early years there was Bishop Welldon and Archdeacon W. C. Allen, whilst Roman Catholics were represented in associated studies by Bishop L. C. Casartelli of Salford (Iranian language and literature) and T. Fish, who later was given a personal Chair in Mesopotamian Studies in 1948 (by then he was an Anglican) which he held until 1960. Without scholars such as these the Faculty could not have been established.

The debt of the University and the Faculty to the Colleges has been immense. It has meant both a range and variety of teaching which would have been quite impossible if the Faculty had been confined to full time teaching staff, and also a steady supply of students. The cost to the University has been minimal and so has been its responsibility. This debt continues, not least with respect to my own Department. But the situation has changed to some extent. The Faculty has grown and, as we shall see, is no longer so largely concerned with ministerial training; whilst the Colleges, whose endowments go much less far than they used to, show signs of using their scarce resources to appoint teachers in areas connected with ministerial training not covered by the Faculty.

It is this wealth of scholarly resources which enabled Theology

---

1. J. T. Marshall, Principal of the Baptist College; L. Hassé, Principal of the Moravian College; J. H. Moulton, Lecturer at Didsbury Wesleyan College; A. Gordon, Principal of the Unitarian College; W. F. Adeney and R. Mackintosh, Principal and Lecturer at Lancashire Independent College; and H. D. Lockett, Principal of the Anglican Ordsall Hall.

2. There was a similar situation in the Faculty of Medicine, which was able to call upon teachers from the hospitals already established in Manchester.
to be a separate Faculty from the start. The other Faculties of Theology in England are Oxford, Cambridge, London and Durham.\(^1\) Subsequently Theology has begun to be taught, but on a smaller scale, in other Universities as a Department within the Faculty of Arts. Arguments can be advanced for both situations. A separate Faculty can mean that Theology is isolated in its own small corner in the University, but it has greater freedom to determine its own affairs. As a Department in a Faculty of Arts it is compelled to work with others but has less freedom of movement. However, we are now coming to see that the traditional association of Arts and Theology, and within that especially of Classics with Theology, though having a permanent value, is too exclusive. We have recently made links with the Faculty of Economic and Social Studies. In past ages links between Theology and Law were taken for granted and could well be revived before long; today those with Education are obvious; and links with Natural Science are desirable though not easily achieved, if only because of organizational difficulties, but are beginning through the Department of Liberal Studies in Science. In any case Faculty boundaries, though they can be rigid in practice, are ultimately conventional and matters of convenience. It is too narrow for Theology to be so predominantly related to Arts. I have little doubt that we have gained by having Theology as a separate Faculty.

In its provisions for Theology in 1904 the University showed itself a pioneer (as in many other ways) among Universities outside Oxbridge and London. It was absolutely a pioneer in treating Theology exactly like any other subject. There are nine features of its treatment which should be mentioned.

(1) There was, of course, the prohibition of any religious test

\(^1\)The history of the teaching of Theology and its relation to Faculty Boards in these Universities is quite complicated. In Oxford and Cambridge teaching in Theology was established before an Honours School (Oxford 1870) or Tripos (Cambridge 1874), or a Faculty Board (Oxford 1882; Cambridge 1926). In London theological subjects were taught from 1839 but a Faculty of Theology (which had previously been opposed) dates from the Statutes of 1900. In Durham, Theology was taught from the outset in 1833 but the Faculty Board dates from 1905. The Charter allowing for the formation of a Faculty of Theology in the University of Wales was in 1893.
anywhere in the University for staff or student. This is now almost universal in Theology in England and Wales, except for the anachronism of a diminishing number of tied Anglican chairs. (2) There is the unique conscience clause from John Owens' will which is still printed in the Prospectus of the Faculty, 'nothing will be introduced in the matter or mode of education in reference to any religious or theological subject which shall be reasonably offensive to the conscience of any student'. It was provided originally that the complaint would be upheld if two-thirds of the Trustees agreed. The provision is, of course, unworkable and could be intolerable if used by a bigot. Fortunately it has never been used. Its presence, however, is a revelation of how delicate a discipline Theology was felt to be (and not without reason in view of the contentious history of the Christian Church). We should feel all the more grateful, therefore, that the evidence is that the Faculty has always been a harmonious one, indeed more harmonious than some others at some times, and that there has never been sectarian strife in it. An indication of how long this nervousness persisted is that as late as 1924 the approval of Senate was sought for a course of lectures by the noted scholar Fr Bede Jarrett on St. Thomas Aquinas, with Professor Tout to guarantee the integrity of the proposal by giving the first lecture. (3) It was determined that the Faculty was not to be merely an examining body but a teaching one too. At least half of the courses for the BD had to be taken in the University. The exception was the History of Doctrine which was taught in the Colleges but examined by the University until 1966. I shall return to this. (4) The denominational Theological Colleges were recognized by the University.¹ The Anglican element has been fitful, and so far no Jewish or Roman Catholic College has applied for affiliation although there is no reason why they should not. So far there have been no colleges in Manchester belonging to

¹Ordsall Hall closed in 1907 and another small Anglican successor to it, Egerton Hall, closed in 1944; in 1947 Didsbury Methodist College moved near to Bristol, leaving the joint Hartley Victoria College in Manchester (now working closely with and on the same site as the Northern Baptist College); the Moravian College closed in 1958. For a short period before it closed in 1969 the Anglican St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead was also recognized by the Faculty.
either community. But, in view of the strength of the Jewish community in Manchester, second only to London in number, and of the Roman Catholic Church in the North West of England, it is to be hoped that at some time there will be an organized contribution from each community. The isolation of Roman Catholic theology from tertiary education in this country is now happily breaking down and this bodes well for the future. The Church of England has made tentative moves with regard to Manchester in recent years but nothing so far has come of them. Perhaps I may be permitted to say that it would be to the advantage of that Church if they did. (5) Some lectures given by members of the teaching staffs of the recognized Colleges, who are themselves also recognized as teachers by the University, must be open to all students of the Faculty. Therefore in certain fields of study, varying at different times, there is a choice of lectures either at the University or in a College. (6) No examination questions shall call for expressions of personal religious belief on the part of the candidate. This also is universal in this country. If interpreted narrowly it could prevent the setting of questions requiring evaluation and judgement but it has not been so interpreted. However, it was considered a sufficiently delicate matter for an informal Committee to be set up within the Faculty to scrutinize the phrasing of examination papers. This quietly came to an end about twenty years ago and no one has noticed its demise. (7) Comparative Religion was made a compulsory subject in the Faculty in all internal courses (BD, Certificate in Theology, and later in the BA (Theol)). This has only just come to an end, as we shall see. The intention was to make students for the Christian ministry study some other religion than Judaism and Christianity in order that they might be more objective and scientific. We may smile at a certain naïveté in the presuppositions lying behind this, but at the time it was beneficial, and has implanted that discipline so firmly in the Faculty as to give it a distinctive note. (8) A Theological Society was set up for students and staff. This continues, but with the establishment of the Manson Society as a postgraduate Theological enterprise in the Faculty, and the growth of the undergraduate BA degree as distinct from the largely postgraduate BD, it has become much
more a student society. (9) An Advisory Board was created including scholars outside the University, like Dr Davidson and Dr Fairbairn, who had given advice prior to the founding of the Faculty. This is a further indication of a certain nervousness about the subject as a University discipline. The Board never met in my time, and it has been quietly dropped. Indeed its members were dying off! The last mention of it in the Prospectus of the Faculty was in 1963–4.

The Faculty was charged not only with teaching but also with adding to theological knowledge. The research side has flourished exceedingly but, as Professor Burkitt reminded the Faculty in 1929, specialists must not lose touch with the general public. Perhaps that is why the Faculty sponsored, without directly teaching, the Certificate in Biblical Knowledge in 1906 (some part of the teaching for which is now arranged by the Extra-Mural Department), and did what it could to help the starting of a Greater Manchester Theological Society two years ago.

Professor A. S. Peake was Dean from 1904–8, but the Faculty has preferred to require the Dean to do a two-year tenure of office, with the chief exception of T. W. Manson who acted from 1941–52, though two of the twenty-eight Deans have had to serve twice.

What resources did the University put into the Faculty in 1904? (1) The Bishop Fraser Lectureship in Ecclesiastical History was already in existence and held at that time by Tout. (2) The University received an endowment from Mrs Rylands for a Chair in Biblical Criticism and Exegesis. A. S. Peake was appointed in 1904 and held it until 1929; then there was C. H. Dodd 1930–5; T. W. Manson 1936–58; F. F. Bruce 1959–78; and now Professor B. Lindars. (3) The University also received £400 per annum from Mrs Rylands during her lifetime towards a Chair in Comparative Religion. After her death in 1908 it was financed from her legacy to the University. T. W. Rhys Davids was appointed to it and held the Chair until 1915, after which there was a break until 1923. Subsequent holders have been J. N. Farquhar 1923–9; J. Murphy 1930–41; L. E. Browne 1941–6; F. H. Smith 1946–51; S. G. F. Brandon 1951–71, and now Professor T. O. Ling. (4) The lectureship in Semitic Language and Literature was raised to a Chair. Although
in the Faculty of Arts it was intended to relate also to the work of
the Faculty of Theology. Recent economies have meant that it is
regrettably in temporary suspension since the departure of
Professor J. Barr in 1977. It, too, has been held by a distinguished
line of scholars: Hope Hogg 1903–12; M. A. Canney 1912–34;
E. H. Robertson 1934–45; H. H. Rowley 1945–59; E. Ullendorff
1959–64; and J. Barr 1965–77. During Rowley’s tenure the title of
the Chair was changed to Hebrew Language and Literature but
since his time has reverted to its original title. (5) Lastly, in 1908,
the University raised the lectureship in Hellenistic Greek to a
Personal Chair in Hellenistic Greek and Comparative Indo-
European Philology for the outstanding scholar J. H. Moulton,
who died after being torpedoed in the Mediterranean in 1917 as
he was returning from visiting Parsis in India. Later a Personal
Chair in Hellenistic Greek was again to be created for Günther
Zuntz.

The structure of courses as established in 1904 remained
substantially unchanged until after the Jubilee in 1954. The BD
was the basic degree. It could be read as a first degree in four
years. In practice nearly all the candidates were already graduates
(mainly in Arts) from the Theological Colleges who could read it
in two years, but because of its comprehensiveness (it was the
most comprehensive initial Theological degree in the country)
and its linguistic demands they often took three years. In 1913 a
Certificate in Theology was introduced, essentially for candidates
sponsored by the Theological Colleges who were not up to a
degree course, and this remains and has proved useful to them.
There was no change in these provisions until 1946 when the BA
in Theology was launched as an Ordinary three-year Degree in
the Faculty of Arts. It was felt that the returning ex-servicemen
would not be able to afford time for three years in Arts followed
by two at least in Theology, and also that there would be a
number of teachers of Religious Education in schools, following
the Education Act of 1944, for whom a degree which included
both Arts subjects and Theology would be an appropriate
qualification. In 1965 it was moved from Arts to the Faculty of
Theology, where it was gradually modified until 1972, when the
major development of the introduction of Honours regulations
took place. Since then a completely new degree structure has been developed.

II

Throughout the first fifty years the primary concern of the Faculty was with ministerial training. And since it was some time before any Church ordained women it is perhaps not surprising that it was 1931 before there was the first woman graduate. But if things were relatively stable for the first fifty years, they have moved rapidly by comparison in the last twenty-five. First there has been a steady and notable expansion of numbers. In 1954 there were 28 undergraduates; in this session there are 133 (and of this 133 over half (71) are women). In 1954 there were 23 postgraduates (of whom 19 were reading for the BD); in this session there are 82 postgraduates (of whom 16 are reading for the BD). These last figures reveal the very large growth of research students, for apart from those reading for the BD and a postgraduate Diploma in Social and Pastoral Theology, the rest of the postgraduates are research students. Indeed the figures understate the position, for there are a number of research students in the later stages of their work who do not need to register but still come for occasional supervision. The superb resources of the John Rylands University Library are one reason for the increase in research students.¹

With expansion of numbers has come changes of location. In recent years we have been transferred from the top floor of what was Williams Deacons' Bank (which gave rise to obvious remarks about God being over mammon) to the house which had once been the headquarters of the Variety Tiller Troupe of dancing girls. This house is now demolished. From there we were moved to the third floor of the new Humanities Building, then to the south wing of the Arts Building, and two years ago to the new

¹The recent acquisition of the Methodist archives is the latest instance of the growth of these resources. The acquisition of the William Temple Library has also been an asset. Moreover, many members of the Faculty have used its manuscript resources to make important contributions to scholarship in the fields of Biblical Study and Comparative Religion and several have been responsible for lists or catalogues of its manuscripts.
Mansfield Cooper Building. On balance each move has been an improvement, even though our present building suffers in some respects by being built at a time of cutback in standards. Fifty years ago, however, the plea was for something as basic as a fixed centre at all.

With expansion of numbers has also come the inevitable increase in administration, compounded by the much more detailed requirements of University administration, itself largely due to the increase in public scrutiny occasioned by the increase of public funding. One can reflect ruefully that nothing calls for more administration than the effecting of an economy cut of 4 per cent, on which we have recently been engaged, if it is to be done and be seen to be done fairly and with consent. For a long time the Secretary to the Faculty was one of the part-time members of staff. Two in particular had a long reign, A. H. Baker from 1904-22 (except for two years) and J. T. Brewis from 1925-48. Then came W. G. Robinson from 1948-58. From 1958 the scale of the task made this no longer possible, and the Registrar’s Department became responsible for the Secretaryship, which has grown increasingly complex. Four members of the Registrar’s staff have served as Secretaries, Vera Stevens for a notable ten years from 1966-76, and it has become obvious to all (not least to successive Deans) how much has been owed to them. Expansion has also meant an increase in secretarial staff from one when I first came to the equivalent of between five and six now. It needs to be said how much the Faculty has owed to Departmental Secretaries, most of whom have stayed a long time and become thoroughly acquainted with the concerns of their particular Department. I do not see how otherwise the teaching staff could have coped with the increase in the numbers of undergraduates and postgraduates, and we are grateful to the University for seeing this point, which could easily have been overlooked.

Expansion has greatly increased the work-load of the Tutor to the Faculty, not least with regard to undergraduate admissions. For a long time this task, too, was undertaken by a part-time member of staff (a further debt owed to them). The last of these was Mr G. Farr. From 1974 the Tutorship passed to a full-time member of staff, Dr A. H. W. Curtis. The work involved has
increased so much since then that it has been agreed to make a separate appointment of an Assistant Tutor with a responsibility for undergraduate admissions.

But what has this increased number of students been doing? Expansion has meant considerable changes. It will be remembered that in 1954 we had the original BD and the post-war BA (Theol) which was an Ordinary Degree in the Faculty of Arts. The next move was the establishment in 1958 of our first three years Honours Degree; it was in Biblical Studies (and was placed in the Faculty of Arts although taught mainly in the Faculty of Theology). It is naturally a small School, a source of specialists in the Biblical field and of research students. It is a remaining element in what was once a strong structural relation with the Faculty of Arts. New and looser links, however, have been created which give the possibility of reading a joint honours degree in Comparative Religion or Theology, with Philosophy, and departments within the Faculty also provide elements for certain options in the Combined Studies degree. Next came the MA (Theol) in 1966. Previously candidates from this Faculty had been part of the MA structure in the Faculty of Arts. (PhD students remain, with those from the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Music, part of one structure.) The creation of the MA (Theol) is the main reason for the large increase in research students, not least because of its provision for part-time study, which encourages those with research aptitudes, from a geographical area which improved transport facilities has widened, to pursue their interests in contact with University supervision. Also, because it has the possibility of a Qualifying Examination, it enables suitable ‘late developers’, or those with an unusual academic background, to prove that they are suitable candidates for an MA. The part-time provision is also important because of the extremely severe rises in fees for full-time study recently imposed by the Government.

In 1969 the Faculty instituted a three-year Honours Degree in Religious Studies which gave the opportunity to specialize in other fields of Theology than Biblical Studies, namely in Comparative Religion, Ecclesiastical History, or a combination of Historical and Contemporary Theology, Philosophy of Religion and Christian Ethics. At first a more ambitious integrated degree was
explored, but the fluidity of the position in Theological studies at the end of the 1960s proved too great to secure sufficient agreement on method and content to make this possible. In 1904 the historical method seemed obvious in all Theological study; by 1969 there was greater variety but not agreement on analytical and comparative methods. It was clear that the Faculty was seeking a straight three-year Honours Degree in Theology, which is what most students want and which is the standard course in English Universities, and it might be thought that it took a long time to get there. However, in 1972 the BA (Theol) became a three-year Honours Degree and the BD which, as I have mentioned, had always been available as a four-year course for undergraduates (though few took it), became restricted to a graduate entry. Then at last the Faculty undertook a thorough revision of its undergraduate provisions. From 1976 it has operated a unified and flexible three-year course for the BA in the Faculty of Theology.

The structure of this degree allows for flexibility in three important ways. (1) It can be relatively specialized in any field of study in the Faculty, or relatively general, according to the decision of the student. (2) There are no compulsory subjects as such—neither Comparative Religion nor Greek—though the decision to specialize in a particular area carries compulsory corollaries, languages in the case of Biblical Studies being an obvious example. (3) Every effort has been made to avoid a Fresher making decisions on arrival at the University about his first year course which have irrevocable implications for the rest of his degree. It is possible in the course of his first year, as he learns more about the Faculty and about Theology, to re-think the balance of the studies which he wishes to undertake for the rest of his three years.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1}}

In addition to these changes of degree structure within the Faculty there has been a reaching out to other Faculties which is potentially of great significance. For instance, the Faculty offers

\footnote{\textsuperscript{1}With regard to compulsory subjects, a small adjustment of the BD regulations two years ago meant that Comparative Religion ceased to be a compulsory subject in that degree, and so the last element of the 1904 course set-up disappeared.}
theological elements for the Combined Studies Degrees in the Faculties of Arts and of Education. With the Department of Government in the Faculty of Economic and Social Studies it established in 1974 an Honours Degree in Religious Studies and Politics, which runs its own mimeographed termly 'house journal'. The Department of Government has also provided the Tutor, without which it would not be possible. With the introduction of the new BA structure in 1976, this degree was subsumed as a 'special combination' of courses in the BA in the Faculty of Theology. Further developments in co-operation with the Faculty of Economic and Social Studies are about to start with 'special combinations' in Comparative Religion and Sociology, and Theological Studies and Sociology. [By 'Theological Studies' in this context is meant the group of disciplines involving Doctrine, Philosophy and Ethics which we call rather awkwardly by that name for want of a better.]

At the postgraduate level the Faculty was able to initiate the Diploma in Pastoral (later Social and Pastoral) Theology through the help of Hartley Victoria College in providing part-time Tutorial help, and also the co-operation of the Department of Social Administration, another instance of fruitful work with the Faculty of Economic and Social Studies. Unfortunately, though, a postgraduate gap exists with respect to the Faculty of Education, in that it is not possible for someone wanting to specialize in Religious Education as a teacher to do so in its postgraduate Certificate in Education.

These changes and the expansion in numbers has meant more teaching and research staff. The period since 1954 has seen the establishment of three Chairs. First came that in Ecclesiastical History in 1956, which was held by Professor Gordon Rupp from 1956–67 and by Dr Basil Hall from 1968–75. It then fell victim to the era of economies and is at present temporarily and regrettably suspended. Ten years later the University established a Chair in the History of Doctrine, held by Professor H. Cunliffe-Jones from 1966–73, and by Professor R. P. C. Hanson since then. Its title was changed in 1968 to Theology, and again in 1973 to Historical and Contemporary Theology, the changes not indicating any change in the range of its concern for the whole of Christian doctrine,
past and present. Thirdly, in 1970 the University received an endowment of £100,000 from the Ferguson Benevolent Trust Limited (largely owing to the good offices of its Chairman, our present Dean, Dr D. A. Pailin) to establish a Chair in Social and Pastoral Theology, in commemoration of Samuel Ferguson, a Mancunian and a Methodist, who had a flair for industry and finance, and rose from being an engineering apprentice from the Bradford district of Manchester to the developer of the Ferguson-Pailin Switchgear and, after retiring from that, became a financier in Jersey.

In this period the Faculty benefited from two exceedingly learned Germans who settled in this country because of the Nazi tumult. Günther Zuntz (to whom I have already referred) was in the end given a Personal Chair in Hellenistic Greek, which he held from 1963–9. Arnold Ehrhardt was Bishop Fraser Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History from 1958–61 and Senior Lecturer until his death in 1965. His influence as a scholar and a man is indicated by the establishment of the Arnold Ehrhardt postgraduate Seminar in the Department of Biblical Studies. During the same period the Faculty was prominently involved in the excitement following the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Although it later seemed to become associated in the minds of many outside the University with sacred mushrooms, Mr J. M. Allegro, who in the Faculty taught Hebrew and the history of the Inter-Testamental period very successfully, resisted attempts to persuade him to lecture on the subject to his colleagues while the book was in preparation, and resigned in March 1970 just before it was published. Consequently our responsibility for mushrooms, sacred or otherwise, is exiguous.

In the last twenty-five years there have also been considerable changes in Faculty activities. There had been no graduate Theological Society, and when one was founded in 1960 it was called the Manson Society in view of the immense services rendered by T. W. Manson, not only to the Faculty by his scholarship and teaching, but also to the University at large and the Church and civic community in the Manchester area. It is a society which brings staff and postgraduate students together for scholarly papers and discussion over a wide range of theo-
logical and ancillary fields, in the setting of the sociability which goes with eating together. In addition a major commemoration of Manson is an annual Memorial Lecture, also founded in 1960. From 1976 there has been the annual series of Ferguson Lectures (a further gift to the University from the Ferguson Benevolent Fund), which brings a scholar of renown not merely to lecture but to spend a week meeting groups of staff and students for more intimate discussion than is possible merely by questions at the end of a public lecture.

There have also been significant changes in the structural relations between staff and students. Each undergraduate now has a Personal Adviser. This was not necessary when almost all of them were ministerial students from recognized Theological Colleges, who had access to plenty of advice, but now it is. A Faculty Liaison Committee between staff and students was set up in 1969. Student representatives began to attend the Faculty Board by invitation from 1971 and became full members, apart from reserved business, from 1977. Experience suggests that the Faculty has gained from all this; it is a pity that it took the general student unrest of the late 1960s to set it in motion, though relations of staff and students in this Faculty have always been good. Lastly, the Faculty has begun to hold Schools Conferences for sixth formers and their teachers, at the end of the University Lent Term. These have proved very popular, indeed oversubscribed, so that this year the programme had to be repeated.

Since 1954 there has been a significant change in the student body. No longer are we almost entirely concerned with the training of ministerial students, though these remain an important element. Precise statistics are not easily come by, but it seems that approximately one-third of our graduates become ordained, one-third teach at various levels from primary to tertiary education, and the remaining third enter a wide variety of occupations in social work, industry and commerce. Theology is now seen more as a group of disciplines which together provide a good general education (which they do) than as a purely professional study; and the attitude of students to religion in general and

1These have all been published in the Bulletin and off-printed as a separate series.
Christianity in particular is much more varied than it used to be. It is to some of these intellectual changes that I turn in the last part of this lecture.

III

I have talked with some of my colleagues about the theological scene today, especially in relation to the Faculty, but they must not be held responsible for what I say. The general impression is certainly one of greater flexibility and openness in theological studies, with a more questioning attitude, and a certain intellectual excitement at the extent of the horizons revealed.

Biblical Studies is the main route by which Theology came to be studied in English Universities (the Scottish tradition has been different). For this reason it claimed a preponderance of a student's time, not least because of the linguistic demands it made, demands which became increasingly exacting as the vast majority of students no longer came to Biblical Studies with any previous knowledge of classical languages and civilization. In the last quarter of a century we have seen other theological disciplines extended and new disciplines within Theology introduced, whilst the three years normally allowed by public provision for a first degree has remained the same. Some extensions have occurred because the Bible raises more questions than it solves and cannot be treated in a self-contained and isolated way. New areas of study have thus developed because they have come to be seen as a necessary part of theological study. Other extensions have occurred because European religious horizons have tended to widen. However, while Biblical Studies will always retain a central place in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, the required part of a student's time that they take has had to be reduced. This has been done by creating a greater flexibility in the degree structure, so that those who wish to major in Biblical Studies have the same demands made upon them as before, while those who do not face other demands. Meanwhile the wider horizons in Biblical Studies has been seen chiefly in the much greater interest in Judaism, especially the inter-testamental literature, and the Jewish background at the time of Jesus Christ.
The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the establishment of the State of Israel have played their part in this.

In Historical and Contemporary Theology interest in the past tends to fluctuate from one period to another. At present it seems to be focused especially on Patristics and the doctrine of the Trinity. The flexibility of which I have spoken is shown by the fact that Christian doctrine is treated more critically and less reverentially than in the past. Most students in the Department start from within a broadly Christian framework but are prepared to become more flexible within it than was previously the case. Horizons have been widened because Roman Catholics have become much more part of the University theological enterprise in this country, and now their assumptions no longer make participation in it difficult.

In the past Ecclesiastical History has also often been somewhat reverentially denominational, concerned mainly with Churches and ecclesiastical figures. Our Department has set out to cover the whole historical range, though interest has been specially focused on what has been felt to be specially formative periods of Church history, like the Patristic period and the Reformation. This continues, not least in our own faculty, which goes on making notable contributions to such studies. But the study is being set within a wider context. There is more interest in treating religion as a whole with its worship, structure and social and political activity as well as its thought, and in considering how it has affected and in turn has been affected by secular life. In particular the last century is seen as particularly significant as a formative influence on the Church today, not least because of the impact of urbanization and industrialization on popular religion outside as well as inside Church structures. Manchester has particularly rich resources for such a study. Once again Roman Catholic students are beginning to produce long overdue investigations of the history of their own Church from this angle.

Philosophy of Religion thrives in the less reverential attitudes to traditional religious authorities, when denominations are less rigid and the University is less nervous about Theology, and indeed distinctly encouraging to it. Everything is up for investigation. Philosophy of Religion probes everyone else’s area of study,
and in a sense is parasitic on them. What is it to understand *theologically* in the twentieth-century situation? What is meant by revelation? What are the truth-tests in religion? How can one understand another culture? These and similar questions abound. Can philosophy move from logical analysis to questions of truth, as it considers the whole range of religious phenomena? Questions of meaning and value are complex but they cannot be suppressed. Philosophers had a period recently when they gave up asking them, but that is changing. In our Faculty weighty contributions in the Philosophy of Religion have been made in the past through contacts with the Department of Philosophy in the Faculty of Arts; in the last quarter of a century we think especially of Professor Dorothy Emmet. More recently the initiative has been with our own Department, where it remains under Dr Pailin.¹

Social and Pastoral Theology has been a cinderella among University Theological studies in this country until recently, though never in Roman Catholic institutions nor in Protestant Faculties on the Continent and the United States of America. When I first came to Manchester there was the Chair in Moral and Pastoral Theology at Oxford and the part-time lectureship at Manchester. These were the only University posts in the field in England, Wales and N. Ireland. During the war our lectureship had been suspended and the teaching done by Professor Dorothy Emmet, and then by Professor Harold Smith who had combined it with Comparative Religion and the Philosophy of Religion. It is no wonder that all this proved too much for his health. However, the last quarter of a century has seen the establishment of the D. J. James Chair in Pastoral Theology at Lampeter, the F. D. Maurice Chair in Moral and Social Theology at King's College, London, and the Samuel Ferguson Chair here, all privately endowed. We have also now added a lectureship. This is progress indeed. Oxford, London and Manchester have in

¹During the last 25 years the teaching of Psychology of Religion ceased in the Faculty. Time does not permit me, nor have I the competence, to examine why this discipline is in the doldrums; but it is clear that it covers areas of permanent significance which require study under whatever academic title is most convenient.
each case taken two out of the three terms Moral, Pastoral and Social for the title of their Chair, but in a fluid situation I doubt if much is signified by this. I would regard myself as a Moral Theologian, even though Moral is the term out of the three that Manchester did not choose when it established the Chair. In practice we have been concerned with Christian Ethics at an undergraduate and research level, and with Pastoral Theology at the postgraduate level. In Christian Ethics the range of issues, analytical, historical and contemporary, is very great, and the literature has grown enormously since I began to teach in 1949. It requires corporate and interdisciplinary work, and that is why the Honorary Lecturers attached to the Department are of great value, and why the arrival of the William Temple Foundation in Manchester, with its concern for social ethics, and its links with the Business School and the Extra-Mural Department as well as with our Department, has been a great asset. As far as Pastoral Theology is concerned it has been weaned from a kind of 'hints and tips, Pastoralia level into a serious theological study in the few Universities in this country where it is studied. In Manchester we are convinced it should be a postgraduate study. Its development here has only been made possible through help from the recognized Colleges and from Canon F. S. Wright of the Extra-Mural Department, further instances of the Faculty’s debt to its part-time staff. In both areas of the Department we have been surprised by the number and quality of research students who have applied.

The United Kingdom was late in taking up the study of Comparative Religion, which was a nineteenth century development. It is a discipline of mixed parentage out of Christian Theology and Indo-European linguistics. Ours is still the only permanent Chair, and the rather curious name of the discipline is preserved only here and in London; elsewhere it is liable to be called Religious Studies. There has always been something of a bifurcation between the Continental study of the history of religions as a methodological problem, and the grand syntheses of the phenomena of religion attempted in the USA. Manchester has been mid-way in this respect and it was perhaps appropriate that Professor Brandon, just before he died, had become Secretary of
the International Association for the History of Religions. University Faculty and Departmental boundaries are not sacrosanct, the intellectual map is too interconnected to divide rigorously. Clearly the Department of Comparative Religion must be closely connected with that of Near Eastern Studies in the Faculty of Arts, and it is developing (as we have seen that other of our Departments are doing) relations with the Faculty of Economic and Social Studies in the shape of inter-disciplinary work with the Departments of Sociology and Anthropology. This is all to the good, as is its presence in the Faculty of Theology.

IV

What of the future? It would be rash to speculate except to maintain that religion will remain a key feature of human life (despite what some theorists of secularization say) and will require disciplined study, and that Manchester will remain an excellent place in which to study it. Is there now a serious question as to whether the Faculty should change its name from Theology to Religious Studies? I doubt it. If Theology is restricted to a study of Biblical faith, that is too narrow. On the other hand it is also clear that while religion as a phenomenon is much more than theology, Religious Studies needs some more defined framework if it is not to become wishy-washy. I suspect that the term Theology carries in practice overtones of both conservatism and of greater intellectual rigour, but I may be wrong about both. The fact that in this country the Judaeo-Christian tradition naturally receives the greater attention does not seem to bear on the matter either way. I do not think nomenclature matters greatly, and therefore I see no reason to change.

The Ecumenical Movement has made much easier the cooperation of the Churches within the Faculty which the University pioneered in 1904 and we have played a notable part in demonstrating its possibility. The recent beginning of the emergence of Roman Catholic academic theology from being almost entirely confined to seminaries outside the mainstream of tertiary education in this country is to be welcomed. The emergence has still some way to go and I hope that Manchester may in the future benefit from it more than it has done so far.
One thing that the greater flexibility of recent years has revealed is that many vital questions arise on the borderline between our different Departments. I hope we shall move towards greater interdepartmental co-operation. The first year course on ‘Christianity in the Modern World’, sponsored by three Departments, is a very modest start towards this. If our range of study is to extend further it seems clear that art, ritual and liturgy should receive more attention, as Professor Brandon used to remind us.

As it faces the twenty-five years leading to its centenary the Faculty is beginning to think with the University as a whole about a greater concern for post-experience education, and I do not doubt that its creativity will lead to significant innovations in this respect. It is also involved with the University in considering flexibility in methods of examination and assessment.

Finally, there is one point which I have scarcely mentioned and yet which was referred to at each of the three previous celebrations. The task of the Faculty in teaching and research has preoccupied me so far. But what of communication to the general public?¹

The lectures to celebrate the first session in 1904–5 were certainly scholarly but they were also meant for the general public. In 1929 Professor Burkitt’s commemorative lecture urged that specialists should not lose touch with the general public, and this was quoted by Professor Manson at the end of his commemorative lecture in 1954. I wonder if we have yet paid enough attention to it. Dr Eric Sharpe, formerly a distinguished student and teacher of Comparative Religion in the Faculty, now Professor of Religious Studies in the University of Sydney and due next year to move to a Chair at Uppsala, has replied at some length to a letter of mine about our seventy-fifth anniversary

¹Dr Frank Taylor has reminded me that one of the means of communication with the general public has been the participation of members of the Faculty in the annual series of public lectures given in the Rylands (University) Library. In 1904, the year before the Faculty started, one was given by A. S. Peake (printed in vol. 1, no. 2 of this Bulletin), and he continued as a regular Library lecturer. Many other members of the Faculty have been Library lecturers and their texts have been printed in the Bulletin, which has also contained innumerable other articles by members of the Faculty, as the three Indices of 1941, 1976 and 1978 bear witness.
celebrations, and I end by quoting part of what he says. He refers to the need to break down departmental compartmentalization and for a more conscious interest in human communication and adds, 'Religion is so widely practised and so little understood. Theologians seem to wrap themselves up in their own specializations, and to be virtually incapable of communicating with anyone outside a charmed circle. I'm not saying that this applies to Manchester more than to other institutions; I'm sure that it does not. Let the specialists continue to specialize by all means; but not to the exclusion of the attempt to explain to the world what they are doing, and what they are doing might mean to the world.' I wonder if a similar remark will be made once again when the Faculty celebrates its centenary in the year 2004.