
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

impassioned addresses emphasizing the need for an outpouring of the Spirit on believers and on the Church. Perhaps the note of criticism is struck too persistently, and Dr. Calkins does not always appear consistent in his teaching. It does not seem easy to reconcile the statement that 'there can be no real revival of religion until first there has been a revival of economic justice and the diffusion of a common material well-being,' with the statement made elsewhere that 'if history tells us anything, it tells us that outward conditions have nothing to do with the inward prosperity of the Church or the spiritual vitality of the Christian faith.' Every reader, however, must be impressed with the writer's earnestness and must feel the force of his plea that a fresh discovery and interpretation of the truth of the Holy Spirit, alike in its theological implications, in the corporate life of the Church, and in personal Christian experience, constitute one of the urgent needs of our time.

A volume of sermons has been published by the Minister of Fetteresso—the Rev. J. B. Burnett, B.D. The title is *Seaside Sermons*. For the Parish of Fetteresso contains that popular seaside resort—Stonehaven—and the Sermons are published at the request not only of the parishioners, but of the many summer visitors who heard them when they were first delivered. There are twenty-one sermons in all—clear and closely reasoned discourses and with the thought illustrated by well-chosen quotations. The volume is printed and published by Mr. David Waldie, Stonehaven (5s. net).

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

VIII. America's Contribution to New Testament Science.

By Professor Burton Scott Easton, Ph.D., S.T.D., New York City.

The special conditions affecting all theological education in the United States have thus far prevented the formation of an American tradition in New Testament work. The rigorous separation of Church and State required by the Constitution involved logically the denial of public funds for denominational training; a prohibition that was and is often construed as forbidding the use of such funds for religious teaching of any sort. In consequence a formal theological faculty in an American university is a rarity. The great 'public' institutions—those founded and controlled by the States and by many of the larger cities—have in the past rigorously avoided theology, and the 'private' universities have largely pursued the same policy. So it is only in those schools originally organized with denominational connexions that theological departments exist: Harvard, Yale, and the University of Chicago are the most noteworthy instances. Students preparing for the ministry normally receive their training in 'theological seminaries'; institutions nearly all founded explicitly for denominational purposes and under strict denominational control. These seminaries are very numerous. Many of them are in proximity to a university, but perhaps more are geographically isolated—something once thought to be somehow an advantage.

The result has been to divorce rather effectually American theological teaching and research from direct university influence. In some departments, no doubt, this divorce was never complete. Church history is an essential part of historical training, and so is necessarily taught at every university. Even Old Testament, under the *alias* of 'Semitic Languages and Literature,' has freely found admission to university curricula. But the same is not true of the New Testament, which is still generally regarded as belonging to the exclusive jurisdiction of the seminaries.

In the better class of these seminaries, to be sure, the standard is traditionally high. An A.B. has always been the normal requirement for admission, and the course fills three years devoted to rigorous study. Nowadays, in fact, fourth and fifth year courses are not uncommon, while a few of the larger seminaries even make provision for six years of technical intellectual training. The chief defect is excessive denominationalism. In the nineteenth century no one would wish or could hope for appointment to a theological chair unless his orthodoxy was above suspicion, and the conditions of tenure

were generally such that a professor could be dismissed at any time. This meant, naturally, that a New Testament professor was virtually required to reach only such conclusions as could be reconciled with denominational standards ; if he failed to do so, his career was terminated abruptly. Under such conditions objective scholarship inevitably suffered.

Similar restrictions still persist rather widely. The most conservative of the larger American denominations, the Lutherans, take pride that the Biblical teaching in all their seminaries is strictly traditionalistic. At the opposite pole are the Episcopalians, the Unitarians, and—I believe—the Reformed Church, who in matters Biblical have no traditional seminaries at all. The Congregationalists likewise tend strongly to liberality. In the other Christian bodies the geographical location of a seminary plays a considerable part ; if in the Middle West it is apt to be 'liberal,' if in the South it is almost certain to be very conservative.[1]

Exact statistics are unobtainable, but even in the best equipped seminaries denominational fidelity is still frequently a primary consideration. This may not interfere with a fairly free handling of Old Testament problems, but it seriously hampers New Testament research.

The same holds to an even greater degree in seminaries of a lower grade. Inadequately endowed and supported, they are unable to provide expert teaching staffs and their students are often poorly prepared. To offset these defects they proclaim uncompromising loyalty to their respective faiths and boast that students sent to them will not be 'upset.' Still lower in the academic scale are the multitudinous 'Bible Schools'—sometimes of enormous size—whose courses are dominated by outspoken dogmatic viewpoints of not infrequently an eccentric nature.

The result has been the creation and zealous propagation of an extreme Biblical conservatism commonly termed 'fundamentalism.'[2]

This need not, indeed, be inconsistent with great learning. In New Testament study, however, it tends to limit research to the minute investigation of exegetical, linguistic, and archæological details.

In the nineteenth century, moreover, ultra-denominationalism retarded the growth of an American theological tradition in a different way. Until well after 1850 the various denominations still thought of themselves as primarily offshoots of the parent bodies in Europe, and it was to these that they looked for guidance.[3] The text-books used were the European works in vogue at their respective 'homes,' and many of the teachers were Europeans brought over for shorter or longer periods. So the literary productions of (say) a Presbyterian seminary were in no way specifically American ; they belonged definitely and designedly to the tradition of the Church of Scotland, and their American imprints were in a sense accidental.

On the other hand—for a variety of reasons—the British universities were little visited by Americans in search of higher technical education. They went in ever-increasing numbers to Germany, so that a considerable proportion of American theologians came to be German trained. These brought home with them German traditions and German methods, which helped to counteract the dispersive tendencies of denominationalism : professors in Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Reformed Church seminaries thought of themselves first of all as disciples of Bernard Weiss or H. J. Holtzmann. Among the Episcopalians, in fact, the Anglican Biblical tradition of Oxford and Cambridge was abandoned in favour of the influence of Berlin and Heidelberg.

Along with this went the world-wide slackening of denominational barriers. Such American universities as possessed theological faculties concerned themselves less and less with the Church allegiance of their teachers, and in the seminaries themselves a similar influence made itself strongly felt. Certain seminaries, indeed, went so far as to shake off denominational control altogether, and reorganized themselves as 'undenominational' or 'interdenominational' institutions. Tests of the orthodoxy of students were even more commonly abandoned, until to-day the majority of American seminaries will admit applicants from almost any denomination.

All of this, to be sure, affected Old Testament study far more rapidly than it did New Testament ; not only were theological prejudices less directly involved, but in the Old Testament field the Semitic faculties of the universities were applying unremitting pressure. So around the turn of the cen-

[1] The Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists, in fact, are legally subdivided into 'North' and 'South' bodies.

[2] The title came into use some twenty years ago to describe the tenets of an interdenominational group who adhered to certain specified 'fundamentals,' among which was premillenarianism. But to-day 'fundamentalism' describes loosely the traditionalist view of the Bible.

[3] The Lutherans were the great exception ; they recoiled violently from the rapid growth of German liberalism.

tury critical results were taken for granted in Old Testament work by all but the avowedly 'conservative' institutions. As one result of this American Semitic scholarship was recognized throughout the world, and more than half of the Old Testament volumes of the 'International Critical Commentary' have been written by Americans. But similar progress in the New Testament was far more hesitating. An extremely large proportion of the articles in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* are devoted to the Old Testament, and of the New Testament volumes of the 'International Critical Commentary' only five out of eighteen titles were confided to American hands.

Yet once a tradition of objective treatment had been established, its results were bound rapidly to make themselves felt. The number of seminaries in which free investigation of the New Testament is encouraged is already large, and is constantly increasing, and the outlook for the future is correspondingly bright. In this regard Americans are most grateful for the aid rendered by British scholars who have accepted American appointments. We count ourselves more than fortunate to have in our theological faculties such specialists as Kirsopp Lake, F. J. Foakes-Jackson, Ernest F. Scott, James Moffatt, and G. H. C. Macgregor—to name only a few. Some of them have now been with us for so many years that we think of them as an integral part of American academic life.

Of course American Bible scholarship, like that of the rest of the world, has suffered from the diversion of interest toward the newer and supposedly more 'practical' subjects, such as pedagogy, religious psychology, and sociology. In the last field particularly we are suffering from a surfeit of books that draw sweeping historical conclusions from inadequate data. Against this, however, may be set the unexpected appearance of courses of Bible study in even the most 'secular' universities. The authorities of these institutions are deciding at last that, even though 'theology' is taboo, the 'history of religion' need not be. They are realizing that religion is an integral part of human culture and has a right to a place in a liberal education. So 'The history of Christianity in the apostolic age' is winning recognition as a not inappropriate companion to the long accepted courses in general Church history—and the history of Christianity in the apostolic age necessarily involves the study of the New Testament. The only proviso made is that the new course must be treated historically and not dogmatically, a requirement that naturally wins the hearty approval of New Testament specialists. We cannot now, of course, predict how far the admission of New Testament work will proceed in the universities, but there is every reason for hope that it may grow to be fairly common. If so, the reaction on the seminaries will be of the very best.

Turning now to the actual output of the American New Testament world, the 'father' of the discipline in its modern sense was Philip Schaff (1819–1893), who was born in Switzerland and trained in Germany, but spent nearly his whole adult life in America. His *The History of the Apostolic Church* (1851) was perhaps the first work published in America that treated the subject from a true historical standpoint. He then induced leading American Biblical scholars to undertake a large co-operative work, the translating and editing of J. P. Lange's *Bibelwerk*, the ten New Testament volumes of which appeared from 1864 to 1874. In 1870 Dr. Schaff was made President of the American Committee for the Revised Version, which also numbered among its members Joseph Henry Thayer, noted for his grammatical and lexicographical labours. When the New Testament work was completed, Dr. Schaff published his *Companion to the Greek New Testament* (1883), an admirable and still useful introduction to textual criticism. And in the same year appeared Charles Augustus Briggs' *Biblical Study*, which laid a corresponding foundation for historical criticism.

Another translation effort followed: this time the *Meyer* Commentary (1884–1887). But this about marked the end of translations from the German, since a knowledge of that language was now generally required of every advanced New Testament student. The rendition of Zahn's massive *Introduction* should, however, be mentioned; it was published in 1909, and was directed by Dr. M. W. Jacobus.

In 1887–1890 Marvin R. Vincent's *Word Studies in the New Testament* developed still further Thayer's lexicographical researches. The way was thus prepared for the fruitful final decade of the century. Of extraordinary significance was the organization of the University of Chicago in 1892, with the New Testament department under the direction of Ernest DeWitt Burton. Much of his published work, to be sure, was of a popularizing nature, but this represented deliberate self-sacrifice on his part; he realized the pressing need of arousing the general public to the changes that were taking place in Bible study. Yet he found time to write his *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testa-*

ment Greek (1893), which is still the most serviceable book of its kind. At Yale, in the meantime, George Barker Stevens had published his *Pauline Theology* (1892), which was followed by his *Johannine Theology* (1894) and *The Theology of the New Testament* (1899), the last in the 'International Theological Library.'

Two of the five American volumes in the 'International Critical Commentary' belong to the same period: E. P. Gould's *St. Mark* (1896)—a somewhat disappointing work but at least really alive to the results of gospel criticism—and Vincent's *Philippians* (1897). In the latter year came also Dr. A. C. McGiffert's *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, long a standard treatise. And Dr. J. H. Ropes had published an authoritative treatment of the Agrapha in German, *Die Sprüche Jesu* (1896). In 1899 Dean Shailer Mathews contributed his *History of New Testament Times in Palestine*, in constant use as a text-book, while the century was closed by Dr. B. W. Bacon's *Introduction to the New Testament* (1900), a 'program' of his immense productivity to follow.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, accordingly, American New Testament scholarship had made a respectable start. The later works may best be considered topically.

The most important American Bible Dictionaries are *A Standard Bible Dictionary* (1909)—revised and enlarged as *A New Standard Bible Dictionary* (1926)—and the five-volume *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (1915, revised 1929). The former, edited by Dr. Jacobus, represents the critical standpoint, the latter—predominantly an American effort although the general editor was James Orr—is very conservative. Among the most noteworthy American books on New Testament 'backgrounds' are Dr. G. F. Moore's admirable *Judaism* (1926); Camden M. Cobern's *The New Archæological Discoveries* (1917; 9th revised edition, 1929); Dean F. C. Grant's *The Economic Background of the Gospels* (1926), a pioneer work; and Dr. C. H. Kraeling's indispensable *Anthropos and Son of Man* (1927).

America possesses only one primary majuscule. The sumptuous *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels* was edited in 1912 by Dr. H. A. Sanders, who accompanied it with a collation, *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*. More practical, perhaps, is Dr. E. J. Goodspeed's *The Freer Gospels* (1914). Otherwise effort has been necessarily limited to studies of the Byzantine text, a work in which Dr. Goodspeed has been indefatigable; under his inspiration the University of Chicago is acquiring an enviable collection of material.

Dr. Ropes' *The Text of Acts* (1925) is far more extensive than its title implies. It gives, of course, every particle of evidence for Acts' text, but it reaches out also into a masterly survey of the whole New Testament textual field. Briefer is Dr. A. T. Robertson's *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (1925). The latter's mammoth *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (1914; third edition, 1919) is well known.

In general exegesis *The Abingdon Bible* (1929) is a 'one-volume' commentary of merit. *The Bible for Home and School*, a serial work based on the English text, is as yet incomplete; E. I. Bosworth's *Romans* (1919), Dr. Bacon's *Galatians* (1909), and Dr. Goodspeed's *Hebrews* (1908) may be specially mentioned. Dr. Goodspeed has likewise produced *The New Testament: An American Translation* (1923), which uses an idiom even more modern than Dr. Moffatt's.

In Synoptic criticism America is justly proud of a scholar of supreme ability, Dr. Bacon. His works form a closely-knit series: *The Sermon on the Mount* (1902); *Beginnings of Gospel Story* (1909), a commentary on Mark of a deceptively 'popular' appearance; *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* (1919); *Jesus and Paul* (1920); *The Gospel of Mark* (1925), profoundly penetrating; *The Apostolic Message* (1925); *The Story of Jesus* (1926), prolegomena, for the most part; *Jesus the Son of God* (1930), a succinct summary of the author's position; and *Studies in Matthew* (1930), doing for Matthew what earlier volumes had done for Mark. Dr. Bacon stands in the 'broad' stream of Synoptic tradition. In contrast the theory of E. D. Burton in his *Some Principles of Literary Criticism* (1904) is somewhat individualistic, but it has had a constant following and is adopted, *e.g.*, in Dr. B. W. Robinson's *The Sayings of Jesus* (1930).

On the third Gospel we have had Dr. R. W. Wickes' *The Sources of Luke's Perean Section* (1912); Dr. E. W. Parson's *An Historical Examination of Some Non-Markan Elements in Luke* (1914); Dr. A. M. Perry's *The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative* (1920); Dr. H. J. Cadbury's *Style and Literary Method of Luke* (1920), his *The Making of Luke–Acts* (1927); and my *Gospel according to St. Luke* (1926).

My *Gospel before the Gospels* (1928) was an attempt to evaluate form-criticism, a subject much to the fore in post-war Germany.

On John Dr. Bacon's *Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate* (1909) is naturally the most important

work. But Dr. A. J. Montgomery—a prominent Semitic specialist—has made an interesting plea for an Aramaic basis for the Gospel in his *The Origin of the Gospel according to St. John* (1923). Dr. Robinson's *The Gospel of John* (1925) is a small but very modern commentary.

There is really no significant American Life of Christ, for Dr. S. J. Case's *Jesus* (1927) and my *Christ in the Gospels* (1930) are chiefly devoted to prolegomena. Dean Mathew's *Messianic Hope in the New Testament* (1905) was one of the earliest works to adopt a definite eschatological standpoint, which in a more elaborate and uncompromising form is represented also in Dr. Walter Lowrie's *Jesus according to St. Mark* (1929). Dr. B. H. Branscomb's *Jesus and the Law of Moses* (1930) is a thorough and satisfactory examination of a difficult subject. There are, of course, endless discussions of the 'ethics' and 'social teachings' of Jesus; in the latter field Dean Mathew's work is outstanding. Dr. Allen Hoben's *The Virgin Birth* (1903) is a 'liberal' work; Dr. J. G. Machen's *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (1930) is conservative to the last degree. On the resurrection of Jesus Dr. C. R. Bowen has closely approached objectivity in his *The Resurrection in the New Testament* (1911). In *The Historicity of Jesus* (1912) Dr. Case has paid his respects to the 'mythical' school.

Dr. C. C. Torrey's *The Composition and Date of Acts* (1915) contains individualistic conclusions, but clears up many difficulties by reference to an assumed Aramaic original for the earlier chapters. Dr. Robinson's *Life of Paul* (1918; revised 1928) is probably the standard American work. E. D. Burton's *Galatians* (1920) in the 'International Critical' series is a classic, while Dr. Ropes' *The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians* (1929) applies the theory of Professor Lütgert—a scholar too much neglected by the English-speaking world. Dr. J. E. Frame's *Thessalonians* (1912), also in the 'International Critical' series, is the best treatment in English. Dr. Machen's *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (1921) is very learned and ultra-traditionalistic, while Dr. M. S. Enslin's *The Ethics of Paul* (1930) is an extraordinarily thorough piece of investigation. In *The Mind of Christ in Paul* (1930), Dr. F. C. Porter has accomplished the miracle of an entirely fresh approach to Paulinism.

Dr. Ropes' *St. James* (1916)—another 'International Critical' volume—needs no commendation. The article 'Revelation, Book of' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (1902), by Dr. F. C. Porter, contained more relevant matter than most separate treatises. The *Millennial Hope* (1918) and *The Revelation of John* (1919), both by Dr. Case, are very useful, while Dr. T. I. Beckwith's *The Apocalypse of John* (1919) is a full-length modern commentary.

New Testament theology as a whole is presented in Dr. A. C. Zenos' curiously named book *The Plastic Age of the Gospel* (1927). The special topic treated in E. D. Burton's *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh* (1918) is highly important. And W. P. DuBose undertook a philosophical restatement of New Testament teaching in three noted works—*The Gospel in the Gospels* (1906), *The Gospel in St. Paul* (1907), and *High Priesthood and Sacrifice* (1908).

The Romance and the Realism of the Gospel.

By the Reverend Thomas Yates, D.D., Bournemouth.

There are two significant feasts in the story of Jesus: one at the beginning and one at the end. One was at Cana and was the prelude of His ministry; the other was at Jerusalem and was the prelude of His public death. Both are sacramental; one of life and one of death. In the first He took water and at His word it was wine. In the second He took wine and said, 'This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many.' Between them these two feasts set forth the romance and the realism of the gospel. What Jesus said and did in them—water into wine, wine into blood—may be taken as the symbol of both the wideness and the depth of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

There is first this story of Cana. 'There were set there six waterpots of stone. Jesus saith unto them, Fill the waterpots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. . . . When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not whence it was (but the servants which drew the water knew): the governor of the feast called the bridegroom, and saith unto him . . . Thou hast kept the good wine until now.' This is how Jesus takes the best things of