Southeastern Seminary--
Whence? What? Whither?

by

James E. Tull

SOUTHEASTERN SEMINARY--WHENCE? WHAT? WHITHER?

Founders Day Address
March 10, 1981

by James E. Tull

An annual Founders Day has been established here so that once a year we might commemorate the founding of this seminary. So it is appropriate, I think, for me to begin this talk by recalling a bit of history, which is familiar to many of you, but perhaps is not known by some.

I. Southeastern Seminary Beginnings

This seminary sprang from a conviction held by some influential Southern Baptists that there should be a denominational seminary on the eastern seaboard. A study of theological education was authorized by the Southern Baptist Convention in May, 1947, and was concluded in a report to the convention at Chicago in May of 1950. Acting upon a recommendation stated in that report, the convention in the 1950 session authorized the establishment of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, agreed to purchase the campus of Wake Forest College as a site for the seminary, and elected a board of trustees. C.C. Warren was elected chairman of the board, J. Leo Green vice-chairman, John W. Kincheloe, Jr. secretary, and William L. Wyatt, treasurer.

At the February meeting of the board in 1951, Sydnor L. Stealey was elected president of the seminary. The first staff member named by Dr. Stealey was Joseph R. Robinson, who became comptroller, and later librarian and instructor in homiletics. The first faculty members elected were J. Leo Green, professor of Old Testament, J.B. Hipps, professor of missions, and William C. Strickland, tutor in New Testament. Dr. Stealey himself taught church history. Marc H. Lovelace was elected a visiting professor. At that time Dr. Lovelace was a professor in Wake Forest College, which occupied this campus. Between 1951 and 1956, until the college moved to Winston-Salem, Wake Forest College and the seminary shared the campus together. Eighty-five students were enrolled for the first semester of the seminary's life in the fall of 1951. The aggregate of students for the first academic year numbered 102.

By the opening of the 1952-53 school year, six more professors had been added to the faculty: Edward A. McDowell, professor of New Testament, Olin T. Binkley, professor of sociology and ethics, Stewart A. Newman, professor of theology and philosophy of religion, R.T. Daniel, professor of Old Testament, Marc Lovelace, associate professor of archeology, and M. Ray McKay, professor of homiletics. If the founders of the seminary, as far as the faculty was concerned, were Stealey, Hipps, Green and Strickland, I suppose McDowell, Binkley, Newman, Daniel, Lovelace, and McKay might appropriately be designated "near founders."

It should be remembered that many persons not named here, persons of vision and determination, should be honored on this Founders Day, for they played an indispensable part in the founding of the seminary. Key figures in the founding were members of the board of trustees and other Southern Baptist leaders. It is, however, particularly the first faculty members whom we honor by name on this day.

Since I did not take up my duties here until the fall of 1955, I was neither a founder nor a near founder. But I would like to tell you in all modesty that the institution has grown trememdously since I have been here!

I remember that the founders and others among the earliest teachers used to refer sometimes to what they called the "Southeastern dream." I was intrigued by the term, and curious about it. Although I never heard it precisely defined, I discovered that it referred not particularly to any institutional or pedagogical innovation, but rather to a spirit and an aim which my colleagues hoped would be embodied in the seminary's life.

In those beginning days there was a climate of excitement on this campus as students, administration, staff, and faculty took up the launching of a dynamic new school and accepted the challenge of a new opportunity. There was a rare feeling of comradeship among those who participated in the new venture. In the seminary bulletin of 1952-1953, Dr. Stealey referred to "a soundly joyous Christian spirit that characterized faculty, office force, and student body from the very first day."

There was here something of the spirit which goes with a pioneer endeavor. Because the school was new, there was a feeling that it did not have to be bound unduly by old ways and old styles. It was felt that the materials of life here were malleable and flexible, capable of being shaped in the mold of all that was best of our past, but also by the needs and challenges of a new time. The curriculum and institutional organization were traditional, for the most part, but many persons hoped that this would be a place where we could break out of our chronic denominational isolationism. While maintaining a loyal commitment to Southern Baptists, it was thought that we would join to a greater degree than ever before the larger Christian family. Some believed that, while holding firmly to our distinctive denominational beliefs, we would feel no separation or estrangement from other Christian scholars, because we belonged to a world fraternity of learning and to the universal brotherhood of Christ which transcended all our differences.

There was a hope that here, in a geographical area which was characterized by some cultural pluralism, we might address more effectively Christian insight and compassion to great ethical issues of our time, like those of race, war, and the vast depersonalizing influences of a mass industrial society. It was hoped that we might develop a close fellowship of faith and learning which would find its focus in study and in worship. One of the treasured qualities of campus life was the spirit of fellowship which existed between students and faculty, a fellowship and closeness that inevitably lessened somewhat as the school grew larger.

Not the least hope was that the seminary might be of great assistance and encouragement to the Baptist churches particularly in this area, in which 33 percent of all Southern Baptist churches, stretching through the seaboard states from Maryland to Florida, were to be found.

Even more basically, as stated in the second seminary bulletin, that of 1952, the founders committed themselves and the school to the essential tasks of Christian ministry. The primary purpose of the seminary, they said, "is to prepare men and women for Christian leadership in various ministries." Certain great emphases, they said, were to undergird the seminary program of education. These were: "1. A sound knowledge of the Bible. 2. A wholesome and intelligent evangelism. 3. A challengeing vision of the world-wide mission of Christianity. 4. A prevailing spiritual dynamic in the lives of students and faculty. 5. A sense of the significance of the local church--urban and rural. 6. A consecrated scholarship for providing genuine Christian leadership."

In summary, we may say that the founders of this institution brought to their task an enthusiastic dedication, a creditable scholarship, a large vision of the work to be done, an unselfish comradeship with their colleagues and students, and a joy in cooperative endeavor. They were able, resourceful, far-sighted men. To borrow a term which Evelyn Wingo Thompson used to describe the great Luther Rice, we can describe them as "believers in tomorrow."

II. The Nature and Task of the Theological Seminary

We come now to an attempt on my part to delineate what a theological seminary essentially is and what it seeks to do. I shall keep in mind particularly Southeastern Seminary. Everybody here who knows me could tell you now that what I shall say will be inadequate. Anyway, you will understand that I shall give only a personal interpretation, by no means an official one. I shall say some obvious, perhaps even some trite, things that I think need to be said again and again.

1. The first thing I should like to say is that Southeastern Seminary is a school. This is a completely innocuous statement, maybe. But I am convinced that many persons don't quite know that this is what a theological seminary is.

A seminary is an academic community. It is a community of learning. It is an intellectual center. It is a place where study, thought, and research are conducted, promoted, and nourished--and to some reluctant scholars, recommended!

As an academic community, the seminary attempts to shape its academic life in accordance with the best standards which obtain in the larger community of higher learning. It maintains contact with colleges and universities, and with other seminaries both inside and outside our own denomination. It formulates curricula which are designed to serve the purpose for which the seminary was created. It studies the works of scholars and formative thinkers who labor in various fields. It seeks academic and intellectual parity with professional schools of other professions. It is a center of critical thought, and of varied

intellectual interests. It guards itself lest it violate the demands of academic freedom, and, I might say, lest any other person or group, inside or outside the denomination, should seek to obstruct that freedom.

The seminary is a school. It is not afraid of learning. It is engaged in the learning enterprise. It is not afraid of scholarship. It is afraid that it will not have enough of it. It is not afraid to join the intellectual task with the task of Christian witness. It is afraid not to do so.

To recognize the seminary to be a community of learning implies that the seminary believes that the Christian minister should be a dedicated, diligent student all his life, a scholar by bent of mind if not by outstanding achievement. I like to make this point by expressing it this way: The seminary is not supposed to turn out intellectual snobs. But neither is it supposed to turn out intellectual slobs!

To concede that being a minister goes along agreeably with superficial judgments, shoddy preparation, sloppy thought, poor workmanship, would be a disgrace to our high calling. It is anything but a compliment to a minister if it can be said of him that he is very spiritual, but doesn't have much sense. That he is consecrated, but seems determined to be an ignoramus. That he is a facile speaker, but doesn't have anything to say. That he is a dynamic leader, but doesn't know where he is going. That he is a hard worker, but doesn't know what it is he is doing.

All of this is not to say, of course, that the minister necessarily has to be a great thinker, but that he should think to the extent of his capability. He does not have to be a greatly learned man, but he should learn as much as he can of what he needs to know.

2. I want to observe, in the second place, that the seminary is a theological school. This means that the seminary's academic program has a certain direction and focus and aim. As you know, the word seminary signifies a plot where plants intended for transplanting are raised from seedlings. Thus education in our seminaries has to do with bringing men and women to full maturity in the seed ideas and basic teachings of our faith, in order that these mature Christians may give leadership to God's people in our time.

On page 2 of the first volume of his monumental Systematic Theology, Paul Tillich says, "Theology moves back and forth between two poles, the eternal truth of its foundation and the temporal situation in which the eternal truth must be received." This sentence, it seems to me, defines in capsule form the reason for being of a theological seminary. It lives to grasp the eternal Gospel, and in its teaching and example it also lives to address the Gospel pertinently and creatively to the ever-changing situation. It attempts to interpret the Christian message in such a way as to conserve the true spirit and the vital insights of historical Christianity, while relating that spirit and those insights to the needs and problems of the contemporary world. On the other hand, it endeavors to prevent the massive achievements of previous eras from obstructing

the Gospel's imaginative and creative encounter with the issues and problems of today.

Since the Gospel is addressed to the world, theological training must have a world reference. It is the seminary's task to open itself to the ebb and flow of the world's dynamic life and, through intelligent and courageous interpretation, to bring the church's future ministers into face to face, hand to hand encounter with the real issues and problems which the world poses.

These are tasks of great magnitude in any era, and they are likely to become more difficult in the future. For we live in a time of rapid change, perhaps in the overlap between two historical ages, one of which is rushing upon us with threat and thunder, with peril and also with promise, but whose form we only dimly can discern. Ours is an extremely technological age, which seems to propel us towards an increasing secularization of all of life. A time when population growth threatens to outrun our planet's ability to feed itself. A time of power politics by super powers, which have arsenals of incredible weapons capable of destroying all life on the face of the earth. A time when small powers seem intensely desirous of acquiring the insane death weapons of the super powers, the effect of which acquisition may make the eventual extinction of the human race doubly sure. A time of the resurgence of non-Christian religions, of the rise of new nations and powerful nationalisms. A time when we are consuming our limited resources in gargantuan gulps. A time when the good earth which God has given us is being poisoned by greedy humans (including ourselves) who pollute our air, our streams, our lands, our oceans, our bodies, and our minds.

During such a time, theological education, seeking to relate the Gospel to the challenges and torments of the world, feels the shocks and tremors and tests of change. This means that our calling, our message, our life-style, have constantly to be reexamined and re-thought. It means that our concepts of the Gospel have to be challenged and re-challenged to see whether what we are proclaiming to the world is the real Gospel, and whether our proclamation is making saving contact with individual persons who live and think in radically secular terms.

The seminary community must always remember and proclaim that the creator God, who made this world, intends, despite its rebellions and gigantic problems, to reclaim the world as his own. The seminary must constantly seize the mighty resources of God with a dauntless faith, remembering that God, who came to us in Jesus Christ our Lord, intends to overcome the powers of evil. It must believe that love, in the words of Arnold Toynbee, "is the ultimate force that makes for the saving choice of life and good against the damning choice of death and evil. Therefore the first hope in our inventory must be the hope that love is going to have the last word."

This divine outreach imposes upon the church, and upon the theological seminary as an agent of the church, the task of giving a prophetic interpretation of the world, of the Gospel, and of their relationships to each other, so that young ministers may be helped to

know how the Gospel can be addressed to the world, and how the world may be introduced to the Gospel.

With such tasks before us, the faculty of a theological seminary should be made up of men and women who are deeply committed to the Christian faith, and who are at the same time enormously curious and wide-ranging in their intellectual and human interests. Together they form a fellowship of common tasks, of coinciding ultimate loyalties, of shared differences, a fellowship enriched by the profound unity of their Christian commitment, and by their contrasts and diversities of background, ability, outlook, attainment, insight, and knowledge.

The seminary must maintain an alert and discriminating receptivity to the impact and import of powerful movements and ideas which affect the world of theological scholarship. In the field of theology, for example, the theological heritage of the past must be joined and modified by new concepts from the physical, social, and life sciences, by developments in Biblical study, by insights which come from the third world and from ethnic minorities. Thus the seminary can become better equipped to address more effectively the ever-changing world situation, and thus can the eternal Gospel be brought into more effective contact with that situation.

The point is that new disciplines invade the precincts of theological scholarship, that new insights and influences constantly invade the old classical disciplines, and that each field is marked by flux and change. But in the midst of changing views and world-shaking events, the seminary must keep before its faculty, staff and student body what Whitehead called "an enduring vision of greatness." In other words, it must constantly view the vicissitudes of our earthly career in the light of one shining center--the eternal Gospel.

3. In the third place, the seminary is a denominational school. This means that our seminaries should know and teach the vital elements of our denominational heritage, should be loyal to the great traditions of the Baptist interpretation of the Gospel, and should bring their students into cordial, searching dialogue with this great heritage.

While denominational loyalty on the part of a denominational seminary is a cardinal focus for the school's operations, it cannot be too strongly emphasized, I believe, that the seminary's service to the denomination must have wide windows on every side which open out upon world vistas. The world reference of this seminary's vision, which includes but also transcends its denominational reference, is a primary reason why students of other denominations can and do come to this seminary and receive a good theological education which serves them well in their own denominational settings.

Of all the factors which should characterize the seminary's relationship to the denomination which it serves, I should like to mention two of capital importance. The first is that the denomination should give the seminary the freedom to do its work. The seminary must be free to do unhampered research in line with its vocation, to examine alternative interpretations which are proposed for the solution of profound

problems, to experiment with different pedagogical techniques, to be a constructive critic of the denomination's programs, and to dissent with loyal good will from denominational measures when it thinks it must.

Secondly, if the seminary asks from the denomination a large measure of freedom, the seminary must remember that freedom is always joined with responsibility. Responsibility defines the character of freedom and the limits within which freedom carries on its work. The seminary must, in fact, maintain multiple loyalties which ramify into a complex network of responsibility. The seminary is responsible to God, to truth, to the world fraternity of scholarship, to sister institutions of higher learning, to colleagues of other institutions, as well as to the denomination under whose sponsorship it serves. The seminary must balance these varied responsibilities and integrate them into its overall purpose for being.

Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom, for there are many adversaries. So also well-considered, adjusted, and reconciled loyalties are the cost of responsibility. Freedom must be held under constant and critical review, lest it degenerate into license and irresponsibity. For, chamelion-like, it tends to reflect the coloration of the age in which it lives, the values of a particular culture, and of particular social and religious groupings. A distorted freedom can become an instrument of coercion in the hands of majorities, an instrument of obstruction in the hands of minorities, a tool of special interests, a shibboleth of pernicious causes, a sackcloth of platitude designed to cover spiritual nakedness, and sometimes a tinselled facade behind which there are deposited large quantities of bunkum, hokum, humbug, and hogwash.

I think that it is also pertinent to our subject to notice the fact that particularly in our denomination the call of God to the ministry of the Word has been considered more important than ministerial training. The great majority of Southern Baptists have agreed with this judgment. The tutelage and leadership of the Holy Spirit and a mastery of the message of the Bible are more important than human schooling.

<u>But why should the call of God and adequate preparation be separated?</u>

Our Baptist forefathers in England and colonial America were dissenters, placed by state churches under legal ban. Their ministers were not allowed to attend the universities, and Baptist schools were forbidden. Ministers of the established churches were highly educated, but many of our Baptist fathers considered them to be oppressors and sometimes even unconverted men. It is no wonder that very many Baptists came to believe that what is important in the ministry is not training but the presence and power of the Holy Ghost.

While perhaps all of us would say a hearty amen to the conviction that ministers must be called and led by the Holy Spirit, it does not follow that the call of God is a necessary partner of poor training. It is true that many of our best ministers in our denominational history have had little formal schooling. It is also true that these

ministers have not been either intellectually or physically lazy, that they have sought to improve their preparation through whatever resources were available to them, and that many of them have battled all their lives to promote the cause of a devout learning. One thinks of men like Richard Furman and Jesse Mercer, both of whom had very little schooling, but who gave themselves indefatigably to the task of training themselves for the ministry, and with distinguished success. They both labored hard to promote the cause of theological education. It is significant that today two of our best denominational schools are named Furman University and Mercer University, in honor of these two denominational giants who, despite the fact that they had little schooling, refused to surrender their minds and their ministries to ignorance.

One of the programs in this seminary of which the seminary community is proud is the associate program, established for men and women who have not had an opportunity to finish their collegiate work, and who have come to this institution the better to prepare themselves for the work of the ministry. The history of this program shows that these men and women have gone from this campus to do effective and sometimes distinguished work in their diverse ministries. All of us are deeply pleased to accord them something that they have earned--an honored place in the fellowship of this seminary.

With respect to our denominational affiliation we should notice also the fact that many if not most of our denominational controversies have involved our seminaries, and that some of these controversies have found our seminaries at the very center of the storm. Before we had any Southern Baptist seminaries, theological education was close to the center of the anti-mission and Campbell controversies which occurred during the first half of the nineteenth century. Seminaries of Southern Baptists have been involved in the stormy Landmark controversy, the turbulent Whitsitt controversy, the fundamentalist controversy, the Elliott controversy, the Broadman controversy, and now the inerrancy controversy. Obviously we do not have time this morning to discuss all of these controversies and their seminary involvements, since I understand that we are supposed to get out of here not later than 2:00 p.m.!

But I think that, whether I should do so or not, I am going to say a word about the inerrancy controversy in which we are now engaged. Nobody has asked me to say anything about it, so what I say will be completely free, and worth at least that much. I shall not attempt to trace the history or the causes of this conflict, but would like to come directly to the point, as I see it.

Most Baptists who believe in the inerrancy of the Scriptures have lived in cordial relationships with other Baptists who do not subscribe to this theory. Now, however, a group of radical inerrantists have arisen in the convention, a group whose monomania on this doctrinal point has taken the form of endeavoring to impose a creed upon all of us. They would like to seize control of all Southern Baptist institutions by ejecting all persons from the employment of the convention who do not agree with them on this point of biblical interpretation. They are aiming most particularly for the capture of our Southern Baptist seminaries.

The Baptist Faith and Message confession adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention in 1963 specifically stated that this confession was not to be used as a creed. But now these radical inerrantists are

trying to impose it upon us as a creed. The part of the confession which they are especially zealous to impose is the affirmation that the Bible is the word of God "without any mixture of error." By this affirmation they mean that the "original manuscripts" of the Bible contained no error--doctrinal error, historical error or scientific error.

It is too bad that these inerrantists appear to overlook the last sentence in the article of the confession which pertains to the Scriptures. This last sentence is not included in the 1925 confession or the New Hampshire Confession of 1833, which are the two models upon which the 1963 confession is framed. The sentence to which I refer reads, "The criterion by which the Bible is to be interpreted is Jesus Christ."

This sentence actually effects a vast change of meaning in the confession, for when we say that the criterion by which the Bible is to be interpreted is Jesus Christ, we acknowledge that Christ, not the Scriptures, is "the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and religious opinions should be tried." We certify that Christ stands in judgment over the Scriptures themselves. This certification does not denigrate the Scriptures, but it places them in a position which clearly subordinates them to Christ.

The radical inerrantists urge upon us an untenable view when they virtually equate, it seems to me, the doctrine of inerrancy with what they call "doctrinal integrity." It should be said in no uncertain terms that the ample spaces of doctrinal integrity are not going to be measured by this six-inch ruler. There are a lot of Southern Baptists who believe in inerrancy whose knowledge of the Bible is little more than a blob of fog on their intellectual landscape. Does their subscription to inerrancy guarantee that they have "doctrinal integrity?"

Our Baptist forefathers, the inerrantists tell us, embraced the doctrine of Biblical inerrancy, which belief supposedly led them unerringly to a doctrinal integrity. Let me say that I love our Baptist forefathers and have honored them enough to study them and about them. But it is a matter of fact that many of them who believed in inerrancy held also to a belief in double predestination, by which doctrine they conceived that God from all eternity had predestined certain persons for heaven and others for hell. Evangelism, therefore, was an impertinence which blasphemed God. Other Baptists who believed in inerrancy affirmed that Christians could fall from grace--not a popular Baptist doctrine these days. Other inerrantists became unitarians in their Christological beliefs, others universalists, and some were so docetic in their Christological convictions that they denied that Jesus was a human being at all. These Baptist brethren were inerrantists. Did that fact endow them with a "doctrinal integrity?"

We do not shape our Christian lives, personally or collectively, on the basis of a theory of inerrancy, but on the basis of God's revelation of himself to us in Jesus Christ. The Scriptures are indispensable to us, for in them we find the will of God expressed to us in the history of Israel and supremely in Christ. Through the Scriptures we know the Spirit who continues to bring the living Christ into our hearts. Through the Scriptures the prophets and apostles continue to

witness to us, and through their testimony there are woven into the very fabric of our lives the great verities of our faith.

The Scriptures, we believe, are of immeasurable value, but they are subordinate to the supreme word, the word made flesh, the word who dwelt among us, through whose face the face of the Father himself shines into our hearts, and who is the power of God unto salvation unto everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek.

During the Whitsitt Controversy in the last decade of the nineteenth century, S. C. Mitchell, a professor in Richmond College, and a son-in-law of the great John A. Broadus, saw that the root of the controversy was the question of whether a seminary professor had the right to do free research without having his findings dictated by persons who did not agree with him. Before Dr. Whitsitt, Mitchell said, is extended the broad shield of intellectual liberty. If Dr. Whitsitt, he said, is pierced through that shield, "he is but one sufferer in a common catastrophe."

The inerrancy position is too narrow to comprehend the great reaches of Christian doctrine. Its effect is to narrow our attention down to one single item, which blocks from our vision the towering mountain ranges, the vast open plains and valleys, the lofty and mysterious forests, and the sweeping seas which comprise the majestic topography of our faith.

I express the personal hope that our seminaries, in a kindly and brotherly way, but with diligent and courageous labor, for the sake of the denomination, and for the sake of the Christian cause, will help to expose the tragic inadequacy of the radical inerrantists' attempt to dictate how the Scriptures must be interpreted. The seminaries must claim the liberty to do this. Before them is extended the broad shield of intellectual freedom. If they are pierced through that, they will be collectively but one sufferer in a common catastrophe.

4. Lastly, I should like to repeat for emphasis something which I have been saying here and there throughout this talk. It is this. The seminary is a school of worship and of service.

The seminary is both an academic community and a community of faith. A seminary, says a discerning observer, "partakes of the nature of a university, of a church, and of a school of vocational training. It is like a university in that it is engaged in the pursuit of knowledge; its interests are intellectual, its discipline academic, its work teaching, and to some extent, research. It resembles a church, for its members belong to the people of God; they love him, they serve him, and it is by his will that they are in school at all. It is like a school of vocational training, for we know what the students are going to be--they are going to be ministers."

The seminary does not exist to destroy or damage faith, but to lead our young ministers and thus our people into a larger, deeper understanding of it and commitment to it. We deal with subjects, problems, questions which require not only academic consideration, but which also involve the personal destinies of all men and women,

including our own destinies. The seminary exists to bring to students and faculty and administration a fresh experience with the living God, and to set the old heritage in new context and pertinence so that the Gospel may come alive for those who will carry the burden and the glory of its interpretation and proclamation.

III. The Future of Southeastern Seminary

I cannot predict the future of t h is institution in any extensive detail. But I can say what I believe--that this seminary's greatest days are in the future. I can express the hope that the seminary will be true to the ideals and purposes which brought it to birth, while expanding, diversifying, intensifying, and enriching the ways in which its ministry is implemented in each new time. I can express the hope that the seminary will march across the world in the persons of alumni whose minds are alight with reverent and prophetic learning and whose hearts are aflame with the good news which God has spoken to us and to the world in Jesus Christ.

In closing, I should like to go back to one more illustrative incident in our denomination history. The Southern Baptist Seminary was founded in Greenville, South Carolina in 1859. It was the first of our Southern Baptist seminaries. One of the founders was James P. Boyce, who was president of Southern Seminary from its founding until his death in 1889. Another founder, John A. Broadus, Boyce's long time colleague and friend, wrote a biography of Dr. Boyce, which was published in 1893. At the end of this biography, Dr. Broadus added a brief postscript of moving and haunting beauty. It read as follows: "O brother beloved, true yokefellow through years of toil, best and dearest friend, sweet shall be thy memory till we meet again. And may the men be always ready, as the years come and go, to carry on, with widening reach and heightened power, the work we sought to do, and did begin!"

We are glad today that two of the four faculty founders of Southeastern Seminary are still very much alive, and three of their six colleagues who came the second year. I believe that if those fallen colleagues who are no longer with us could speak today, to the administration, faculty and staff, and to the great host of alumni and present students of this seminary, they would say substantially what Broadus said in his great apostrophe to Dr. Boyce, "May the men and women be always ready, as the years come and go, to carry on, with widening reach and heightened power, the work we sought to do, and did begin."