
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

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WATTS-DUNTON used to say that true poets are of three degrees of excellence. There is the poet who expresses truly his own mind. There is the poet who in expressing his own mind expresses also the universal mind. And there is the poet who in expressing the universal mind expresses also his own mind. There are many poets who reach the first degree of excellence: they would not be poets without it. Far fewer are the poets who attain to the second degree: WATTS-DUNTON names Pindar, Firdausi, Jami, Virgil, Dante, Milton, Spenser, Goethe, Byron, Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, Schiller, Victor Hugo. The poets who arrive at the last degree of excellence are Shakespeare, Æschylus, Sophocles, Homer, and (hardly) Chaucer—these and no more.

As it is with poets so is it with preachers. There are three degrees of excellence. Every preacher must declare that which he knows, otherwise he is no preacher. And for the most part preachers declare no more than they know. Their experience is limited and it is one-sided. It is theirs, and so has the note of reality which always commands a hearing. But it touches only one here and one there in the congregation, and that only on part of their experience or their need. This preacher is a preacher; but his influence is limited to a few of his hearers, sometimes the more intellectual, sometimes the more emotional; it does not reach the mass of the waiting multitude; it does not altogether take captive even a single soul.

Next there is the preacher whose personal experience is the universal experience. He has come into contact with human nature. He is more than a preacher, he is a man. His personality is not individuality. When he speaks the whole race speaks in him. It has cost him self-denial to find the universal human heart, it costs him self-restraint to appeal to it. But when he is most unconscious of himself he sweeps through the whole congregation without respect of person or attainment.

Then comes the preacher of preachers. In the universal he has found the particular. In the universal human experience, into which he entered by self-discipline and sympathy, he has seen his own experiences interpreted. By his knowledge of the universal human heart he has come into understanding of the individual human life. And now when he addresses the congregation before him he sees, not a congregation but a single person, this person and that, every separate person throughout; and he appeals, not to the intellect only or only to the feelings, but to the entire personality. The admiration of a whole congregation has been changed into the arrest of every member of it.

For the great preacher when he is at his greatest uses language that is intelligible even to the little children.

In the Fourth Series of F. W. ROBERTSON'S sermons (as Canon J. G. SIMPSON reminds us) there is preserved a letter written by an admirer of the preacher, whose name is withheld, which shows clearly enough that what men and women were seeking, and what ROBERTSON gave them, was a revelation of themselves—their yearnings, errors, struggles, hopes. 'Suppose,' says this critic of the pulpit, 'the preacher goes down into the depths of his own being, and has the courage and fidelity to carry all he finds there, first to God in confession and prayer, and then to his flock as some part of the general experience of Humanity, do you not feel that he must be touching close upon some brother-man's sorrows and wants?'

We have had such preachers among us. Not Joseph PARKER. He was a great preacher, but he preached his own experience exclusively, and some he attracted and some he repelled. Not Alexander MACLAREN. He also was a great preacher, even a greater. He was greater because he interpreted his own experience by the Bible. He was an expositor. He carried with him that universal appeal which the study of Scripture makes almost inevitable. Not PARKER and not MACLAREN, but SPURGEON. Charles SPURGEON preached his own experience, but so preached it that first its eccentricity was lost in the experience of all mankind, and then it was offered to every man's astonishment as his own particular experience.

And there have been others. An undergraduate was walking one day with Professor William BINNIE. They had both attended the ministry of Dr. John LAIDLAW before he was appointed to a Chair in the New College, Edinburgh. Said the student, 'What I felt about Dr. LAIDLAW'S preaching was that it seemed to be always addressed to me personally.' Professor BINNIE suddenly stopped. He looked at the student. 'Did *you* feel that? It is exactly what I felt every time I heard him.' That was the preacher of preachers. He spoke exclusively to the young man struggling with ignorance, doubt, and sin, and struggling often unsuccessfully; he also spoke exclusively to the saintly professor of long experience and great learning.

We have had such preachers among us. We have such preachers even now. One we shall name. Professor W. P. PATERSON of the University of Edinburgh has issued a volume of sermons in that series which is called 'The Scholar as Preacher.' Its title is *In the Day of the Ordeal* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net). For it is a volume of which every sermon is in contact with the present awful reality. But every sermon has also the universal note. And within that note every sermon returns again to the individual.

One of the ways by which we know the great preacher when we read him is this. He covers the whole extent of Christian doctrine. And he does it in every sermon. He does not attempt in every sermon an exposition of a complete scheme of salvation; he does not even mention every separate article of it. But no doctrine is expounded without being brought within the Christian atmosphere. Every other doctrine is in the preacher's mind and contributes both to the fulness and to the reserve of the preacher's thought.

Where can a finer theme be found than the freeness of forgiveness? Professor Paterson handles it finely. But he reminds us that 'those who sin deeply against themselves and against society may readily find that they have brought upon themselves penalties from which there is no escape.' It is the Gospel that God will both forgive and forget. It is no part of the Gospel that our fellow-men will forget or that we ourselves will either forget or forgive.

'The esteem of our fellow-men is a valuable possession; but it is as fragile as some vase of brittle ware; let it once be broken, then, piece it together as laboriously as we may, it can never again be as beautiful as it was. The stigma of a crime can hardly be lived down; but, short of this, if a man be guilty of one flagrant and notorious act of foolishness, intemperance, or untruthfulness, though he may be vastly better than that suggests, the world, which does not draw fine distinctions, will not think so. In the light of that he is remembered, by it he is judged, even as Esau, though he doubtless had many excellent qualities, passed into history as the typical fool — the man who sold his birthright for a supper. It may even be observed that a bad reputation tends to get worse of its own accord, just as Esau, who to begin with was nothing worse than a fool, has come to be described, by the time the story reaches the age of the Apostles, as a profane person and fornicator.'

And then there is 'the implacableness of a man's own memory. The belief in the forgiveness of sins by God will not wholly rob memory of the sting wherewith it torments those who have once made of it an enemy. This seems clear enough if we reflect upon such a story as that told in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, in which God is represented as rejoicing to bestow upon the penitent a forgiveness as full as love may grant. The Jewish father, who stands for God, ran and fell upon the neck of the returning prodigal, but do we think it would be easy for him to forgive himself? Must he not for many a year have felt remorse as he recalled the years which the canker-worm had eaten, as he thought of the patrimony which had been squandered and which was not replaced, as he traced out the after-career of the companions whom he had once convoyed on the way to ruin, or mourned, it might be, for a mother whose grey hairs he had brought down with sorrow to the grave? I will tell young men what they shall fear: they are to fear memory with its power to torture those who once forgot God and the future.'

It has already been said that one of the most unexpected things which the great war has done or is likely to do for us is to restore certain doctrines of the Christian creed which were passing beyond our belief. And it was observed that one of these doctrines is the doctrine of the Descent into Hell. In the volume of sermons just noticed Professor W. P. PATERSON (whose mind is so greatly exercised by the war, and whose experience of it has been so searching a trial of faith) publishes a sermon on 'The Descent into Hell.'

It is a doctrinal sermon. Now doctrinal sermons are said to be out of date. Why are they out of date? Because people will not accept them? If that were so it would be no reason for their discontinuance. As Dale said long ago, 'they have got to accept them.' But it is not so. The people will listen to them gladly if the preacher takes the necessary trouble to prepare and deliver them. Professor PATERSON first knows what he is going to say about the Descent into Hell. Then he says it with sympathy, with sincerity, with simplicity.

The sermon critic will call his sermon 'an old-fashioned three-decker.' And part of the criticism will be correct. It has three divisions and they are announced just as Robertson or Maclaren would have announced them: 'We shall consider first the principal views which have been held in the Church; next, the light thrown on the subject by Scripture; and lastly, some of the inferences which are supported by the chief scriptural references as we understand them.'

But we have missed the introduction. And to miss the introduction of Dr. PATERSON'S sermons is to miss that which invariably arrests the attention. The introduction is in two short paragraphs.

This is the first. 'In listening to the public

recitation of the Apostles' Creed one sometimes has the impression that the voice of the congregation falters when it repeats—"He descended into Hell." It is as if some shivered at the suggestion of some unspeakable mystery, or that they paused in the joyful and confident confession to ask themselves, "Do I really believe this?" or at least, "Do I know what I am confessing?"'

And this is the second paragraph. 'There is some excuse if we are puzzled to know what it exactly means. The article was first inserted in a second edition of the Apostles' Creed as enlarged about 500 years after Christ, and since it was inserted it has been interpreted in many different ways. What it certainly does not mean is what many who use the words suppose to be its obvious meaning. By Hell is popularly understood the place of everlasting torment; and it is natural to suppose that what is taught is that Christ after His death went down to the abode of devils and of lost souls; and further, that as Christ endured the penalty of our sins He there endured for a season in our stead the sufferings of the damned. But this was not the idea of those who first framed the article, nor has it been held in this precise form by any representative teachers of the Christian Church.'

It is no present purpose of ours to quote the sermon, and it cannot be abridged. We pass to the conclusion.

'The teaching of the Scriptures in regard to the future state is marked,' says Professor PATERSON, 'by two features—a great certainty as to the fact of a life to come and as to the conditions of eternal salvation, and an equally striking reticence in regard to secondary conditions and problems.'

'The certainties are—on the positive side, that the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord; on the negative side, that those who are in alienation from God, and under the pollution and the dominion of sin, are even now under the wrath of God, and must look forward, unless and until they repent, to the manifestation of a greater wrath to come. These are the things which it vitally concerns us to know, and they have been made abundantly clear and assured.'

'But the hand of God has only lifted a corner of the veil. As to the ultimate fate of those who die unsaved, it is the opinion of many devout students, with whom I agree, that we have not materials for dogmatizing. We do not know whether, if there should be a further day of grace, some would resist God to the end; and we do not know whether the finally impenitent, if such there be, will be annihilated or live on in a Hell.'

'In particular, we must say in regard to the intermediate state that we have no sure knowledge—only guesses and hopes. Even if St. Peter meant what we have taken him to mean, we cannot suppose that the difficult passage was given as a special revelation to light up the dark region: at the most it lends support to an inference from the verities of the Christian faith, and in particular from the patient love of God and the known fidelity of Christ, that there will be a further probation for those who died in unbelief. God meant us to live our lives with a large element of dubiety and ignorance alongside of the great certitudes. One reason doubtless was that there is an uncertainty which has unique value as a spiritual discipline, not only for those who feel that there is nothing they fear more than the terror of the darkness, but also for those who, because of their ignorance cling closer to their God and Saviour. Also it may be that it is one of the joys of the fatherly heart of God to keep in store a world of merciful surprises, as He certainly has also in store many painful surprises, for the children of His human family.'

We are not getting much at present out of the Divinity of Christ. But His Humanity is inex-

haustible. Every month there are published books—not one book but several books—on the human Jesus. Each author has made discoveries and is surprised. And we are surprised with him.

This month there is one notable book. Its author, we are told, is minister of Parkhead Congregational Church in Glasgow. His name is Henry WALLACE. After writing his book Mr. WALLACE must have been exercised to find a title for it. He chose *Can we know Jesus?* (Scott; 3s. 6d. net). It was not a good choice. That question is answered in the second chapter, and ends with it. Then the book goes on. And not only is that question answered in the second chapter but it is answered wrong. For we cannot know Jesus if we confine ourselves to His Humanity. We can know a good deal about Him, and it will easily be fresh and suggestive knowledge. But to know Him—that is impossible without the comprehensive conclusion at which Thomas arrived: 'My Lord and my God!'

Mr. WALLACE does not deny the Divinity. On the contrary we believe he holds it firmly. But he does not deal with it. He does not include it in his exposition. It is the human Jesus that he finds so surprising. That is why his book has got the wrong title. If he favoured a question he should have chosen the title of the first chapter—Do we know Jesus? And as the answer to that would have been, We do not, he would have had a reason for the writing of the book.

We do not know Jesus. With every new book about Him we know Him a little more. But with every new book we discover that we do not know Him. That is the surprise. And we shall never know Him as He may be known. The surprise will last as long as books are written.

We know Him a little better with every good book. With Mr. WALLACE'S book we learn to our surprise that His ministry was divided into three periods. First there was the period of Enunciation and Miracle, next the period of Criticism and Teaching, lastly the period of vicarious Travail.

In the first period Jesus simply announced His ideas. Did He expect that they would be taken up and acted on? Mr. WALLACE thinks He did. There were those introductory ideas, for example, which we call the Beatitudes. The state of things described in the Beatitudes was not in the world as Jesus found it. His Spirit had to make the world in which they were to be found. 'Blessed are the meek,' 'Blessed are the merciful'—they are not in the world yet to any impressive extent. Was Jesus really disappointed that the world did not welcome them at once? Mr. WALLACE thinks so. And when He wrought miracles among men, and the mighty works did nothing to commend the mighty words, He discovered, says Mr. WALLACE, that the problem was harder than He had conceived.

Then the second period began. It was the period of Criticism and Teaching. 'He must begin further back. He began to teach them, and He began also to try and awaken them, applying the sharp lash of reproach to their morbid content. He began thus to disturb men and to provoke resentment. He was, indeed, laying down the track that led at length to Calvary. This is the period of the parables of judgment, the time of keen introspective analysis. Men did not seem to know the meaning of some plain things at all: they must be taught. And the teaching must continue after it had produced the Cross for Him, and so it must be taught to His disciples. He must also lead them to expect His successor, the Holy Spirit, who would continue the teaching.'

How would the Spirit continue His teaching? By conviction. That is to say, it was not simply teaching that was to be the Spirit's work. It was teaching combined with criticism. It was to have 'judgment' in it.

We miss the point by not translating aright the

essential passage. 'He shall reprove the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment'—so we read it familiarly. In the less familiar translation we read 'convict' for 'reprove,' and that is better. But the conviction which was to be the work of the Spirit is not conviction of sin. There would be no criticism in that. It was to be conviction concerning sin. It was also to be conviction concerning righteousness and concerning judgment. That is to say, the work of the Holy Spirit was to be to teach the world what sin is, and what righteousness is, and judgment.

For the world does not know what they are. It does not know that sin, the only sin, is the sin of unbelief. The Spirit would teach men and in teaching convict them 'of sin, because they believe not on me.' He would teach them of righteousness, 'because I go unto my Father.' This had been the Lord's first work, but they would not be taught. 'Blessed,' He had said, 'are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake.' Now they would see at least that the righteousness of which He had spoken was righteous. He was going to the Father that the Spirit might teach them that. And He would teach them concerning judgment, that is, discrimination. For the prince of this world would be discovered in all his naked worldliness.

When He had thus handed over the work of teaching to the Holy Spirit, Jesus prepared Himself for the third period of His ministry. Mr. WALLACE calls it 'the period of vicarious Travail.' For now He must go deeper. He has been checked and thwarted by human inertia. 'He must take upon Himself the burden of human hearts; He must bear their sins for them; He must quicken their sense of sin by letting men see its heinous nature in seeking to destroy good just because it *is* good. Even His temporary reluctance to face the Cross does not prevent Him from seeing that it is inevitable. And so He struggled through that great psychic darkness, into which we can but dimly peer, fighting His way amid inward sorrows we can but vaguely guess at.'

In the year 1883 Dr. Edouard NAVILLE, of the University of Geneva, astonished the world by announcing the discovery in Egypt of the Store City of Pythom. In 1913 he astonished the world again. He announced the discovery that the earlier books of the Old Testament had been written in Babylonian, and the later in Aramaic, none of them having ever been seen in Hebrew until they were translated into that language by the Jews who returned from the Captivity.

In announcing his second discovery, Professor NAVILLE attached to it a refutation of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament. That probably prevented the discovery from making the impression that it should have done. It did not, however, prevent the trustees of the Schweich Lecture Fund from sending him an invitation to deliver the Schweich Lectures of 1915 before the British Academy. The Lectures are now published under the title of *The Text of the Old Testament* (Humphrey Milford; 3s. net). The Lectures tell the whole story of the discovery, and use whatever evidence in its favour the last three years have produced. Nor do they omit the criticism of the Higher Criticism.

When Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees, to go to a land that he knew not of, he carried his library with him. It consisted of tablets of baked clay—an extremely convenient form in which to possess a library if one had a long way to go. These tablets were written in Babylonian. And being written in Babylonian they could be read not only by men like Abraham, who had been living in Babylonia and was a Babylonian himself, but also by any educated person in any country to which he was likely to go. Abraham left Babylonia about the beginning of the reign of Hammurabi, and by that time Babylonian was the literary and to some extent the spoken language of the

whole of Western Asia, including Phœnicia and Palestine.

What did Abraham's tablets contain? Professor NAVILLE believes that they contained the history of the world from the creation down to the time of his father Terah. He admits that this is conjecture. But it is a conjecture supported by two facts. One is that some of the early narratives in Genesis, such as the narrative of the Flood, have a decidedly Babylonian character. The other is that they also contain the genealogy of Abraham.

Did Abraham write the history himself? Dr. NAVILLE does not say that. More probably so powerful a sheikh as Abraham would have a secretary, a man like Eliezer, who not only 'ruled over all he had,' but also kept the genealogy of his house and was able to record the simple annals of that simple time. These annals would be preserved in the family of Abraham until finally they reached Moses in Egypt. For, you see, Dr. NAVILLE believes that 'Moses wrote the Pentateuch after all.'

In course of time Abraham arrived in Canaan, and settled—such settlement as was ever afforded him — among the people of the land. The Canaanites spoke their own dialect — probably many dialects. But they wrote and could read that literary language which Abraham brought with him from Babylonia in his library of tablets. Of this there is no doubt. For in the year 1888 Egyptian fellahin were working at a place called Tel el-Amarna and came upon a box or jar containing about 300 clay tablets written in cuneiform character. These tablets may now be seen in the museums of Berlin, Cairo, and London. They proved to be part of the archives of kings Amenophis III. and IV., containing their correspondence with the kings of Asia and the governors of the cities of Palestine.

Now although these cities of Palestine were under the dominion of Egypt, the correspondence between them and the kings of Egypt took place in Babylonian cuneiform. This does not mean that Babylonian was merely the diplomatic language of that day. It means that it was the literary language of Palestine. It was the language in which everything was written that was written. Other discoveries have been made besides those at Tel el-Amarna. Discoveries have been made in Palestine itself. And all the tablets discovered belonging to this early date are written in Babylonian. Hear what Dr. SELLIN says. Dr. SELLIN has no theory to establish like Professor NAVILLE. Yet he says: 'Even supposing that this writing was used only by the rulers and their officials, and that the people could not read and write, this fact is certain: in the already extensive excavations which have been carried on in Palestine no document has ever been found in any except in Babylonian writing. As for the Phœnician or old Hebrew writing, it cannot be asserted with certainty that it existed before the ninth century.'

If, then, the Pentateuch was written by Moses after all, it was written in Babylonian. Dr. NAVILLE does not say that Moses wrote the Pentateuch every word. He has already told us that Abraham probably carried with him from Babylonia the history of the world from the creation to his own day. But he believes that Moses rewrote those tablets. For he says that even in those earliest tablets there are Mosaic touches, details which indicate a man living in Egypt. But he did not alter the language. If Abraham's tablets written in Babylonia were written in Babylonian cuneiform, so were the tablets which Moses wrote, although they were written in Egypt.

Take the Book of Deuteronomy. Dr. NAVILLE believes that when Solomon built his temple he put in the foundations, or somewhere in the walls of it, a cuneiform copy of that second edition of the Law of Moses which we call Deuteronomy. This was a custom both of the Assyrians and of the Egyptians, which Solomon was likely to follow. For it was the best means of establishing for ever

the fact that Jerusalem and its temple was the locality designated in the words, 'The place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there.' This copy of the Law was found in the time of Josiah during certain repairs which were being made on the building.

It was found by Hilkiah the High Priest. Now when Hilkiah the High Priest found the copy of Deuteronomy in the temple he could not read it. Why could he not read it? Because, says Dr. NAVILLE, it was written in Babylonian, and by this time Babylonian could be read only by specially trained scribes. So he brought it to Shaphan the scribe. Shaphan had to read the letters and treaties which came from Assyria and could read cuneiform easily. Shaphan read the book and carried it to the king. It was probably a clay cylinder, found under the wall or under a slab of the pavement.

We have seen that the tablets discovered at Tel el-Amarna were written in Babylonian, even those that came from Phœnicia and Palestine. The next great discovery of texts which throw light upon the language of the Old Testament was also made in Egypt, at a place called Elephantine. It is not tablets this time but papyri. And the papyri are written not in Babylonian but in Aramaic.

A complete change has come over the literary language of the Jews—for these papyri belong to a Jewish colony in Egypt. The change was inevitable. For the Babylonian cuneiform can be written only on wet clay. Some script was necessary for everyday use which could be written on vellum, skin, or paper. Aramaic was an evolution. The people who used it at first were called Arameans, and the Arameans may have originally been a tribe of Mesopotamia. But when we know of them they had no political boundaries. The Hebrews are themselves called Arameans in the Elephantine papyri. 'In the 8th century B.C., when the Jews were bringing Aramaic into Egypt, local princes wrote in North Syria, in the Amanus, long Aramaic inscriptions which have lately been discovered.'

Now if Aramaic had superseded Babylonian as the literary language of Palestine by the 8th century B.C. it is pretty certain that the Books of the Prophets were written in Aramaic. Professor NAVILLE thinks that official documents like the Books of Joshua, Judges, and Samuel were still written on tablets in cuneiform, but that more popular books like those of the Prophets were written in Aramaic. By the time of Ezra Aramaic was the only language of literature or of religion. It was Ezra's mission to teach the people the precepts of the Law of Moses. They knew something of Aramaic; of Babylonian they knew nothing. Professor NAVILLE believes that Ezra turned the Babylonian of the early books of the Bible into Aramaic. That was the first great translation of the Pentateuch.

The next translation was into Greek. It is the translation of the Septuagint. The translation of the Septuagint was made from the Aramaic. For Josephus says that the books which were translated were written with the characters and in the language of the Jews. Now, the language of the Jews in Egypt, as we know from the Elephantine papyri, was Aramaic. One translation had yet to be made. It was the translation of the Old Testament into Hebrew.

What is Hebrew? On the return from the Captivity two languages were spoken or written in Jerusalem—the language of the country generally, which was Aramaic, and the special dialect spoken in the city itself. What was that dialect? Professor NAVILLE does not call it Hebrew yet. He calls it Jehudith. Jehudith, he says, was the vernacular dialect of Jerusalem.

The return from the Captivity was the birth of Judaism. From that time the life of the nation had its centre in Jerusalem. The dialect spoken in Jerusalem became the language of the land.

Ezra might read the Law in Aramaic still, but the demand was soon made for the Law and also the Prophets in Jehudith.

The Samaritans had already translated the Pentateuch into their own dialect and had written it in their own script. The Jews must not be behind. They had their own dialect also. It was probably very ancient and had changed but little in the course of time. They now turned it into a literary language by adapting to it the script which we call the Square Hebrew. The Hebrew Bible is the Aramaic Old Testament translated into Jehudith and written in square characters.

James Hope Moulton.

By Professor the Rev. George Milligan, D.D., University of Glasgow.

Twenty-three years ago Dr. W. F. Moulton, the father of Professor James Hope Moulton, contributed to this magazine an 'In Memoriam' notice of my father, in which he dwelt affectionately on the friendship that had existed between them, a friendship first formed in connexion with the work of New Testament Revision in the Jerusalem Chamber at Westminster, and afterwards cemented by their joint Commentary on St. John's Gospel. And now the Editor has asked me, in my turn, to write an appreciation of Dr. Moulton's distinguished son, whose tragic death has awakened so deep a sense of loss not only amongst those who knew and loved him personally, but amongst all who have at heart the best interests of New Testament scholarship in this land.

It is not easy for me to speak as I would like of Dr. J. H. Moulton, whose friendship has meant so much for me during a long period of years, but it may at least be possible to recall the main events in his career, and to indicate some of the many directions of his varied and brilliant activity.

James Hope Moulton was born in 1863 at the Wesleyan Theological College, Richmond, where his father was at the time Classical Tutor. He had good reason to be proud of his ancestry. As the descendant of a line of Wesleyan ministers running back to John Bakewell, a friend of the Wesleys, and author of the well-known hymn 'Hail, Thou once-despised Jesus,' he had inbred in him from the first that devotion to the Wesleyan Church which was one of his most marked characteristics, while from his father, one of the most accomplished New Testament scholars of his day, he inherited those tastes for exact scholarship which were afterwards to make him famous. He received his early education at the Leys School, of which his father had become Headmaster, and afterwards entered King's College, Cambridge, with a classical scholarship, where the high expectations formed of him were fully justified by his obtaining a First Class in Part I. of the Classical Tripos in 1884, and a First Class and distinction in Part II. in 1886. In the same year he entered the ministry of the Wesleyan Church, and shortly afterwards was married to the daughter of the Rev. George Osborn, whose untimely death in 1914, followed as it was by the loss of his brilliant elder son at the Front in the autumn of 1916, did so much to darken the closing years of his own life.

In 1888, Dr. Moulton was elected a Fellow of his College, being, I believe, the first Wesleyan minister to receive that honour in Cambridge, and after acting for six years as Classical Master at the Leys, and Classical Lecturer at Newnham and Girton Colleges, he was in 1902 appointed Tutor in New Testament Language and Literature at the Wesleyan College at Didsbury. To the commanding influence which from the first he exercised there his colleagues have already borne generous testimony, while the rapidly growing fame of his scholarship led to his appointment in 1908 as Greenwood Professor of Hellenistic Greek and Indo-European Philology in the University of Manchester.

Other academic distinctions fell freely to him. Already he had won the University of London's gold medal for Classics,[1] and had received its

[1] His father had carried off the same honour for Mathematics in 1856, and his uncle, Lord Moulton, also for Mathematics, in 1868—probably a unique record in one family. Another uncle, Professor R. G. Moulton of Chicago, is widely known on both sides of the Atlantic for his literary interpretation of the Bible.