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

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

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

done, and they themselves had approved, was something to be ashamed of. There was a general cry of distress, 'What shall we do?'

Peter was ready with his answer. He called them to repentance and to testimony, to open confession of Jesus Christ by baptism.

The beginning of the spiritual life seems just to consist in a consciousness of complete failure, and that consciousness ever grows deeper. This is well illustrated in Browning's account of Caponsacchi; from the time when Pompilia's smile first 'glowed' upon him, and set him—

> Thinking how my life
> Had shaken under me,—broke short indeed
> And showed the gap 'twixt what is, what should be,—
> And into what abysm the soul may slip.

3. Then comes the gentle and tender word: 'For the promise is unto you and to your children.' How gentle Peter could be. When you heard Him in thunder-tones, saying, 'Repent!' you said, 'Harsh man; austere preacher.' Now, when the people are in a right state of mind, and really want to know what to do, having told them what to do, he breathes upon them the very benediction of God. He says, 'There is a promise for you; there is grace in store for you.' When God spake some of His tenderest words you were in His heart at the time, and your children were there. The promise is yours. Come and take it, and even on earth be almost in heaven!

4. 'Make disciples of all the nations by baptism' are the words of our Lord. 'Be baptized, every one of you, for the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off,' is St. Peter's application of this passage. St. Peter's language admits of various interpretations. Like much of Scripture, the speaker, when uttering these words meant probably one thing, while the words themselves mean something much wider, more catholic and universal. When Peter spake thus he proclaimed the world-wide character of Christianity, just as when he quoted the prophet Joel's language he declared the mission of the Comforter in its most catholic aspect, embracing Gentiles as well as Jews. 'I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.' But St. Peter never thought of the full scope of his words. He meant, doubtless, that the promise of pardon, and acceptance, and citizenship in the heavenly kingdom was to those Jews that were present in Jerusalem, and to their children, and to all of the Jews of the dispersion scattered afar off among the Gentiles.

Thirty Years of New Testament Criticism.

By Professor the Reverend James Moffatt, D.Litt., D.D., Glasgow.

In 1889, when the first volume of The Expository Times appeared, Dr. Westcott had just issued his commentary on Hebrews. Westcott's interests were not in the Old Testament, but he declared that he thought it 'likely that study will be concentrated on the Old Testament in the coming generation.' That anticipation was partly, but only partly, realized. The recent publication of *Lux Mundi* had set afire the controversy over the Higher Criticism which blazed round the Old Testament. Canon Driver's great contribution, in his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, which came out in 1891, accentuated the interest, and had the rare merit of stimulating popular intelligence and at the same time of indicating fresh lines of research. But it was not long before the critical issues were recognized to have a bearing upon the New Testament as well. Dr. Gore's famous essay in *Lux Mundi*, upon 'Inspiration,' made this inevitable by asserting that the words of Jesus could not be taken as foreclosing certain critical views, *e.g.* about the 110th Psalm. Such an admission roused Canon Liddon's dismay and wrath, but it had a more lasting effect. For a time the fascination of Old Testament literary and historical research absorbed most students of the Bible in this country. Then the range of interest widened, it was realized that the Tübingen school had raised real issues, and the New Testament writings became involved. For nearly thirty years they have been the subject of persistent, minute, and

varied study. How has the situation developed? And where has it left us to-day? Such are the questions which I am asked to answer in outline.

The alteration in outlook has been great, greater perhaps than most of us at first realize. To measure it, the simplest way is to recall the successive controversies which have marked the advance of the science of New Testament criticism. Controversy is a good thing in intellectual matters. It educates the public, and it clarifies the mind. It has acquired a bad name in religion and in theology, but controversy need not be quarrelling; it is the examination and investigation of some more or less crucial problem, conducted by different sides of opinion, with the desire of arriving at the exact truth, of clearing away misconceptions, of brushing off prejudices, and of inquiring whether traditional views are adequate to the larger synthesis required by the discovery of fresh facts. 'The dust of controversy,' said Carlyle, 'what is it but the falsehood flying off from all manner of conflicting true forces?' Even when the issue appears absurd, and eventually proves absurd, something is gained. Fresh confirmation flows to the position which has been unintelligently assailed. And often some new set of facts is forced upon the unwilling attention of scholars; they are obliged to take account of details which have been unduly ignored, or of considerations which have emerged since the traditional position was drawn up. At any rate controversy is an end of indolent acquiescence in accepted ideas. And indolence is our worst enemy, even inside what is true and right. There is no progress possible without a readiness to restate certain positions and to re-open some questions. 'It is not error which opposes the advance of truth, it is indolence,' said Turgot, 'obstinacy, the spirit of routine, everything that favours inaction.' Which is as true of theology as of politics.

By the year 1889 it seemed to many, like Dr. Westcott, that the problems of New Testament criticism had been fairly settled. The violent controversy over 'Supernatural Religion' appeared to have gone in favour of Lightfoot. No more was to be said. But appearances were deceitful. The controversy was soon to be raised again, over the whole field of the New Testament literature, raised with such energy on both sides that in looking back from the standpoint of to-day we are astonished at the change that has come over the entire situation. The truth is, factors were emerging in the study of ancient civilization and in historical discipline that were bound to tell upon the study of books like those of the New Testament. 'A classical scholar turned fifty,' says Professor Burnet, 'can barely recognise the studies of his youth, and finds it harder every day to keep up with the advance of knowledge in his department. Excavation, especially in Crete, and the recovery of papyri from the sands of Egypt have not only transformed our outlook upon the Mediterranean civilization, of which ours is the lineal descendant, but have given us the inspiring feeling that some new truth of first-rate importance may come to light any day.' New Testament criticism has shared in this transformation to some extent. The setting of the New Testament literature in its age, against the background and upon the soil of the religious movements surging through the first century in Hellenism and Judaism, is one of the vital gains of the past three decades. Particularly in connexion with Paul's theology and letters, and also with the Johannine literature in Asia Minor. The papyri themselves have not yielded very much in the way of actual literary discoveries, nothing equal in importance, *e.g.*, to the *Didachê*. The rubbish heaps in Egypt have done more for the classical scholar than for us. We can still entertain the hope that a copy of Papias's *Logia* may turn up some day. If it did, it would help to settle several disputed questions. But the main use of the papyri has been in the region of language, and their very character, as unliterary productions for the most part, has given them value. The grammar of the New Testament Greek has had to be re-written. To a small extent, textual criticism has also been affected by them. The Westcott and Hort theory has not been substantially shaken by the newer textual criticism, but there seems to be a tendency to modify it in one or two points. Thus, the so-called Western text would appear to be rather earlier than Hort allowed, and the Egyptian affinities of the Neutral text are stronger than he supposed. Still, such results of the new setting are nothing compared with the broader effect, the focussing of the mind upon the New Testament literature as part and parcel of the religious situation in the first century. Contributions have poured in from classical philologists, students of

comparative religion, and archæologists. The older view that the New Testament represented something apart in language and form has finally disappeared along with the theory of verbal inspiration, and with the abandonment of such false claims to isolation the uniqueness of the collection as a religious phenomenon has become all the more marked.

One result of all this has been an awakening sense of the relations between the primitive Christian tradition and Hellenistic religion, especially as regards the mysteries, the religious philosophy of the age, and the ethical movements, which powerfully affected the popular mind. But this Hellenistic atmosphere was impregnated with Orientalism, and a corresponding interest has been stirred in the relations between the early Church and Judaism. Originally this broke out in the study of Paul's religious affinities. How far was he indebted to the Greeks? How far to his rabbinic training? But the discussion soon passed over into the investigation of the Gospels, and it has left us to-day with one of the most pressing problems in our subject. The revival of interest in rabbinic Judaism during the first and second centuries was one by-product of the older preoccupation with apocalyptic literature. Both lines of study have contributed to a fuller appreciation of the teaching of Jesus in form and spirit. The apocalyptic background has been studied with extraordinary care. Probably we have exhausted that field, so far as it offers materials for the understanding of the Gospels. Unless more materials are discovered, I doubt if any valuable gains are to be expected in that quarter. It is in the field of rabbinic learning that there is more likelihood of progress, especially now that Jewish scholars themselves are at last alive to the need of making the materials more accessible and of giving some help in evaluating their contents. The danger of uncritical extremes is, of course, upon us. The exaggerated importance assigned by some to the apocalyptic movement, as if that completely accounted for Jewish piety in the days of Jesus and Paul, has been succeeded by an equally uncritical significance attached to Midrashic and early rabbinic traditions. But we shall arrive before long at a proper appreciation of the true conflicting forces in the controversy. It is a gain, at any rate, to have the issues sharply stated, and the student to-day is in a far better position than he has ever been for handling the early tractates in reliable editions.

It was in the region of apocalyptic studies that the first of the great controversies of our period was roused; I mean, the discussion over the 'Son of Man' title. How far did that represent the idea applied to Jesus in the Gospels, and how far, if at all, did He apply it to Himself? And why did Paul avoid it? This controversy blew past without yielding very satisfactory results, when one considers the amount of time and paper spent upon it. Was it a Messianic title? Did it involve the associations suggested by Daniel and Enoch? Such questions were asked, but they could not be answered adequately till the problem was lifted into a wider range.

This came with the Eschatological controversy, which was really begun by the publication, in 1900, of Johannes Weiss's *Predigt Jesu* (second edition). Weiss was the one theological genius of last generation in German New Testament theology, and the impulse he gave to this particular question was in the right direction. Once the extremists had stated their case on both sides, the re-adjustment became possible. It was recognized that there was a shortening of the time-view on the part not only of the primitive Church but of Jesus Himself. The bearing of this upon the conception of what Jesus intended and taught was first appreciated, and the statement is still being worked out. In spite of Loisy, the purpose of Jesus is now generally admitted to have been quite devoid of political propaganda; in fact, its anti-zealot character is fairly obvious. In spite of writers like Father Tyrrell, it is equally impossible to believe that Jesus regarded Himself as the mysterious Son of Man, the superhuman being who was to come down from the clouds and with shattering forces inaugurate a celestial revolution. These extravagances have proved as untenable as the moral valuation which was content to hold that the apocalyptic material in the Gospels is a troublesome, accidental element, and that the moral doctrine is the one thing needful. The long controversy is beginning to restore the true proportions of the eschatology in the historical teaching of Jesus. We must recognize evidently that Jesus did anticipate an immediate coming of the Kingdom in some sense, and endeavour to face what that admission involves for the significance of His teaching and the development of the

early Church. As regards the former, the issue is: What is required to explain the consciousness of Jesus as the Divine Son, if neither rabbinic piety nor apocalyptic ecstasy accounts for it? As regards the latter, the problem is: Did Paul give the real start to early Christianity in its theological adventures? How far does the primitive Church require to be considered, in understanding, for example, the early significance of the eschatology or of a title like 'Lord'? Was it Paul who detached the early Church from Judaism and gave it a career in the larger Greek sphere by translating the original eschatological gospel into something which was capable of meeting the demands of the outside world?

Such problems were being dimly felt, and the outcome was the 'Paul and Jesus' controversy, which went on, partly as an effect of the eschatological conflict, partly in independence of it. Was Paul independent of Jesus? Or was he acquainted with His main teaching? By this time the older van Manen hypothesis that Paul had never existed, and that his Epistles were later fabrications, had disappeared fortunately from serious criticism. Even its belated re-appearance in the pages of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* did no harm—except to that excellent work. The historicity of Paul and the authenticity of most of his Epistles were now axiomatic. But the more clearly this was recognized. the more sharp seemed the differences between the apostle and Jesus, the more difficult it appeared to give an intelligible account of the rise of Paulinism on the basis of the Synoptic teaching. No controversy during our period has been so fruitful. And the problem is still with us, in spite of the admirable contributions to it in whole or part. Nine years ago Schweitzer could assert that 'present-day criticism is far from having explained how Paulinism and Greek theology have arisen out of the teaching of Jesus.' The explanation has not yet been fully given. Probably the best hope of advance lies in a broadening of the issue, and in a closer appreciation of the middle factor, the religious consciousness of the primitive Church, for which, unfortunately, our literary documents are so scanty.

The 'Paul and Jesus' controversy made it almost inevitable that the question should be raised, Did Jesus ever exist? Can the theology of Paul be reconciled with the existence of such a Jesus as the Synoptic Gospels portray? The controversy came. It still can be heard in stray quarters of amateur criticism, by writers who make play with the myth-forming faculty, which is supposed to have created Jesus as it created Osiris and Dionysus. One good it did, and that was to call out some excellent statements of the historical evidence, and to discredit the reckless methods employed by the sceptical school. Otherwise the theory is as dead for serious work as the Baconian theory about Shakespeare. It was a cloud, and it passed.

What all this discussion has brought out may be described thus. (*a*) It illustrates the danger as well as the need of using methods of comparative religion in dealing with the New Testament. This is obvious in the hasty attempts to identify Paulinism with a Christianized version of the mystery-religions, or to treat the Gospels as Father Tyrrell did, as if Jesus really attached much more importance to sacraments than to morality, or to discover the root of Christianity not in the historical Jesus but in some Christ-idea. Abuses like these are, like measles, almost inevitable in the youth of a new method. But they ought not to discredit the method itself. (*b*) Again, the basis of Christianity, as disclosed by the New Testament, lies in the historical Jesus, not in Paul or any other. So much is clear. Yet, if Paul, as Wellhausen declared, 'was really the man who best understood the Master and carried on His work,' how are we to understand that Master, putting His own words beside the interpretation of the Pauline theology? Was Paul at any rate the founder of Christian theology, as distinct from Christian religion? Or was there something in the message of Jesus which was a real germ for the redemptive interpretation of Paulinism? No thoughtful student of the New Testament can say that the last word has been spoken on this subject. Some false tracks have been explored and abandoned. Some hints of the true direction have been given. But we may anticipate advances in the immediate future.

I have barely referred to the literary criticism. Here the prospects are narrower, because so much attention has been given to the critical forms of the literature that less remains to be done. The Two Document hypothesis of the Synoptic Gospels is fairly sea-worthy. It has stood several storms, and weathered them. The problem of the Fourth Gospel has reached the stage when, with almost

unanimous consent, scholars are agreed that recourse must be had to some theory of its composite origin, and less unanimously that its tradition or one of its sources may be connected with the Apostle John. The only Epistles of Paul which are still disputed, as regards authorship, are the Pastorals and Ephesians, and the literary problems of the others are of minor interest. It is not easy to anticipate very much fresh work along these lines. The one book which is evidently going to excite fresh discussion is Acts. Here the problem of Semitic sources awaits discussion in the light of linguistic research, just as in the case of the Apocalypse.

If I had to sketch the probable direction of New Testament criticism during the next period, indicating its needs and prospects, I should sum up the position thus. The past thirty years have brought us to a point at which the following matters require fresh treatment. (*a*) The precise nature of pseudonymity in literary matters, during the first century. (*b*) The presence of non-primitive elements in the New Testament itself; I mean, the question of tendencies in Matthew which point to a theological interpretation of Jesus and to a recognition of what were afterwards called 'counsels of perfection' in the ethical teaching, the question of powers assigned to apostles in Acts and in the Pastorals, the question of 'sacramental' tendencies in the Fourth Gospel and even in Paulinism, and so forth. The New Testament includes several elements of this kind. It is inadequate to blur them over, and as inadequate to assume cheerfully that they were a necessary part of the evolution of the primitive Christian gospel, the assimilation of an organic spirit working on its environment. (*c*) The economic factors in primitive Christianity, as hinted at by the New Testament, need a fuller treatment than they have received. This partly follows from (*b*), since there is little doubt that Luke, for example, has over-stressed the sayings of Jesus about riches and poverty. (*d*) A new edition of Wettstein is required, or something to take the place of his rare edition. It would be an onerous work, requiring co-operation, but it is wanted. (*e*) With commentaries we are well supplied, for the most part, but a critical edition of the Fourth Gospel in English would be a boon and a blessing, if it were equipped like Lagrange's *Mark* or J. Weiss' *1 Corinthians*. (*f*) We are also without any satisfactory work, in English, on John the Baptist; there is ample room for a critical monograph on his revival movement in connexion with Judaism and with early Christianity. (*g*) Probably the newer psychology, with its training in the methods of valuing psychic phenomena, will prove of use in the historical appreciation of data like the miraculous narratives and the phenomena of visions; along this line, delicate but central, much work waits to be done.

These suggestions do not profess to be at all exhaustive. I merely put down one or two that occur to me at the moment as being urgent. In any department, especially in textual criticism and in theology, New Testament study can be enriched by contributions even upon themes which have been written about endlessly. But one thing ought to be laid on the conscience of all who care for the New Testament, and that is the duty of fostering the study of Greek in the next generation. Modern educational reforms are making this more and more difficult, in schools and even in colleges. It is far less easy to-day to secure a knowledge of the Greek language than it was thirty years ago, in those who are the hope of theology. How the interest in classical studies is to be revived remains a problem, but it is certain that unless efforts are made by competent authorities there will be fewer and fewer students in our theological colleges who are qualified to appreciate the New Testament at first hand, much less to carry forward its interpretation. Perhaps one way of inducing the younger generation to take up Greek seriously, not simply Hellenistic Greek but classical Greek (after which Hellenistic Greek is not grievous), would be to show what the New Testament and classical Greek have in common. For example, Greek literature at its best and the New Testament on every page both deal frankly with life; they are in different ways healthy antidotes to any weak sentimentalism. The New Testament is often preached in a tone that suggests the very opposite; some sayings of Jesus are isolated, the idea of Christian love is evaporated of moral content, and—largely due to Renan—the primitive Church is represented in a mood of provincialism and pathos, like an old woman bending over a jar to inhale the fragrance of withered roses. Nothing is more remote from the truth. The sentimentalizing spirit, a bad effect of the wholesome movement which we call

Romanticism, is totally out of keeping with the New Testament, and also—this is the point I wish to make—with Greek literature. Neither has anything for the dilettante or for the pedant, though the dilettante and the pedant have frequently tried to lay hands on both. As Mr. Livingstone puts it, in his acute book on *The Greek Genius*, 'there are two literatures in the world which are at war with this spirit; they are very different in their conclusions, for they start from widely different presuppositions, but they are very much alike in their determination to see things as they are. One of these is Greek literature, the other is the New Testament. Both to the early Christians and to the Greeks life was too real a thing to be surrendered to sentiment and sham.' Greek literature resisted the temptation to unreality which sprang out of the artistic temperament; the New Testament resisted the religious temptation to unreality, and the one is as subtle as the other in its tendency to seek consolation in unreal fancies, to pose, to be affected either in disclaiming or in expressing moral passion. The severe criticism to which the New Testament has been subjected during the past thirty years has made it impossible to regard this collection of books as a mosaic of texts to be fitted into proofs of dogmas. But it has also done away with the notion that the New Testament is the book of a timid, conventional little society which shrank from contact with the facts of life and sheltered itself behind pretty fancies about God and the world. It was not written for such persons, nor by such persons. Its writers are not self-conscious artists, and its audience is not a handful of dainty, sentimental spirits, who hesitate to face living issues. There is no pathos in the New Testament, in the sense of a weak, regretful, affected attitude to life. The pathetic thing about the New Testament is the way in which it has sometimes been perverted into a book for people whom the apostles would have found it difficult to recognize as alive at all. Whatever the next thirty years bring, in the shape of critical methods and results, one is safe to predict that they will more and more leave honest students with the impression that this is a literature which is never tired, and therefore never eccentric or affected. You may grow old as you work at it, but in this little collection of Greek books you discover what classical students find in Greek literature, not simply the satisfaction of dealing with the sources, which is always freshening to the mind, but a spirit of youthfulness, a moral reality, a vitality, a directness, a refusal to evade great issues, which more than repays any trouble spent upon the language.

Entre Nous.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

Self-respect.

1. 'I RECENTLY listened to two distinguished scholars who occupy important chairs in the University of Berlin. One appeared in rusty garments and soiled linen, while he droned away in a lifeless fashion for nearly an hour. The sight roused in me an instinctive resentment. I felt that his appearance was an insult to his hearers, and that it betokened a want of self-respect, however far these things may have been present to his conscious thought. They ought to have been present to him. There is an everlasting incongruity between great learning and dirty collars. The other man held an equally high rank in scholarship, but he was dressed in faultless taste. His neck was clean, his linen was immaculate. His beard was closely cropped and carefully brushed, his coat was closely buttoned. He was "a gentleman and a scholar." There was nothing foppish about him; he was simply a clean, wholesome man who had a keen perception of the fitness of things. It was a pleasure to look at him, and he spoke as he looked, with freedom, exactness, and fiery animation.'

The story is told by Dr. A. J. F. Behrends, one of the Yale Lecturers on Preaching. Notice the words 'it betokened a want of self-respect.' But has the ambassador to think of himself? Is 'self-respect' a word proper to one who beseeches men *in Christ's stead*? The Bishop of Durham thinks it quite proper, and who has a finer sense of ambassadorship than he? By 'self-respect' he