

*THE DIVISIONS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF  
ST. JOHN.*

*CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN DRS. WESTCOTT  
AND HORT.*

IN the Introduction to his Commentary on the First Epistle of St. John, Bishop Westcott says : " It is extremely difficult to determine with certainty the structure of the Epistle. No single arrangement is able to take account of the complex development of thought which it offers, and of the many connexions which exist between its different parts." This difficulty had been brought home to my father many years ere he wrote the above words, as the following private correspondence between him and his co-editor of the Greek Testament indicates. The correspondence is, unhappily, slightly deficient in the matter of Dr. Westcott's contributions, but the substance of the matter which is lacking can be gathered from Dr. Hort's replies. I found the papers in my father's copy of his Commentary, and having read them with great interest obtained permission to place them before students of the New Testament, believing that many would welcome some small instalment of the mass of correspondence which passed between the co-editors of the Westcott and Hort Greek Testament. It will be remembered that the editors worked independently, and then compared results and argued out their differences. This little discussion not only illustrates their method of working,

but also the labour expended on parts of their work other than the text itself.

A. WESTCOTT.

Dr. Hort opens the correspondence by sending the following scheme of the divisions of the Epistle :

1 ST. JOHN.

Introduction. i. 1-4. The apostolic witness to the known truth bringing others into communion.

I. 5-II. 29. Good and Evil. Light and Darkness.

i. 5-ii. 6. God-likeness not indifference but sinlessness. Caps. at 1 and 3.

ii. 7-11. Exemplified in love contrasted with hatred.

ii. 12-17. The Father and the world.

ii. 18-29. The christs who abide and the antichrists who depart. Cap. at 26.

III.-IV. Sonship to God the foundation of knowledge and communion, and love answering the Father's love the foundation of righteousness.

iii. 1-10. Sonship, incompatible with sin. Cap. at 7.

iii. 11-24. The tests of love. Caps. at 19 and 23.

iv. 1-6. The Spirits of Christ and of Antichrist. Cap. at 4.

iv. 7-21. The origin of love to God and man in God's own manifested love. Caps. at 13, 16, 17, and 19.

V. 1-17. Faith in the Son of God implies that sonship which makes love and obedience possible.

v. 1-3. Faith, love, obedience.

v. 4-12. The object of faith, and the witness on which it relies. Cap. at 6.

v. 13-17. The confidence and power of faith.

Conclusion. v. 18-21. The Christian knowledge centering in Him that is true. (Final warning against imaginary objects of worship.) Cap. at 21.

To the above scheme Dr. Hort appends the following remarks :

The lines of thought shoot across each other in such a complex manner in this marvellous Epistle that it is difficult to be sure one

has divided it rightly. Yet I think there cannot be much wrong here, though I may have failed to find the best and most comprehensive designations. The battle with a speculative and wrangling antinomianism, apparently attaching itself to the Baptist's name, and rejecting the Incarnation as antiquated (cf. μένω esp. in ii. 18-19 with ὁ προδύγων in 2 John 9); professing "love" and denying "faith" underlies the argument, which yet, with all its recurring contrasts, is a positive one. Something might be said for space of one line between the present §§ and changing the ¶¶ to §§. But I do not think the §§ really too long, and the present arrangement brings out the connexions more clearly.

On this scheme of Dr. Hort's, Dr. Westcott scribbles a pencil note :

My division is so different that I think it best to send it. I spent a great deal of time upon it. The symmetry of the Epistle is marvellous.

Dr. Westcott's division of the Epistle will be found in Dr. Hort's next communication :

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF DIVISIONS OF I JOHN.

<i>W.</i>		<i>H.</i> (first draft).	
<u>i. 1-4.</u> Prologue.		<u>i. 1-4.</u>	
<u>i. 5-ii. 17.</u> Introduction.		<u>i. 5-ii. 29</u>	
<i>A</i> <sup>1</sup>	i. 5-ii. 2	<i>A</i>	i. 5-ii. 6
<i>a</i>	i. 5 6, 7	<i>a</i>	i. 5-10
<i>b</i>	8, 9 10-ii. 2	<i>b</i>	ii. 1, 2
<i>c</i>	ii. 3-6 ii. 3-5 6	<i>c</i>	3-6
<i>B</i>	ii. 7-11 ii. 7 8 etc.	<i>B</i>	ii. 7-11
<i>C</i>	ii. 12-14 ii. 15-17	<i>C</i>	ii. 12-17

The lettering in the margins is the work of Dr. Westcott.

THE DIVISIONS OF THE

W.

ii. 18-iv. 6

A ii. 18-25

    a ii. 18, 19

    (b) 20-23

        24, 25

        ii. 26-iii. 6

    c ii. 26, 27

        28, 29

B a iii. 1

    2, 3

    b 4-6

        iii. 7-12

    c iii. 7, 8

        9, 10

        (11, 12)

        iii. 11, 12

C iii. 13-24

    a (b) iii. 13-17

    (c) 18-20

        21-24

---

A iv. 1-6

    iv. 1-3

    4-6

iv. 7-v. 12

B a iv. 7-10

    (b) iv. 11-16

    c iv. 17-21

C a v. 1-5

    b v. 6-12

    c v. 13-21. *Epilogue.*

H. (first draft).

A ii. 18-29

    a ii. 18-25

    b

    c ii. 26-29

iii. iv.

B (1-12) iii. 1-10

    a iii. 1-6

    b

        7-10

    c

        iii. 11-24)

        iii. 11-24

C (13-24) iii. 11-18

    a b

    c 19-21

        22-24

---

A iv. 1-6

    iv. 1-3

    4-6

B iv. 7-21

    a iv. 7-12

    b 13-15

        16

    c 17, 18

        19-21

v. 1-17

C a v. 1-3

    v. 4-12

        v. 4, 5

    b 6-12

    c v. 13-17

v. 18-21. *Conclusion.*

            v. 18-20

            21

After a personal conference with Dr. Westcott, Dr. Hort sends a revised Scheme of Divisions, appending thereto remarks which, for convenience sake, I place first :

Your analysis and my first draft agree better than appears at first. Each has a short Prologue and Conclusion, and three principal masses of text between, and many smaller and not obvious subdivisions coincide. See the Comparative Table.

I gladly agree in making the first main division end at ii. 17. Originally I had 18-29 separately, which was not satisfactory. It is in a manner transitional ; but no doubt it goes best where you put it.

v. 1-17 always dissatisfied me by its shortness : but I do not think it is enough to go back to iv. 7 : therefore on the whole the true break seems to be at the beginning of the Chapter. Finally I think your " Epilogue " begins too soon, notwithstanding *ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν*, which may as well mark the last member of the division as of the entire Epistle. Surely 18-21 exactly corresponds to the Prologue : it is the same thought as reached by an expounded process rather than as propounded by individual conviction. The § 13-17 seems to me far less comprehensive, and in its whole tone to belong to the body of the Epistle.

Your analysis has shown me much to which I was blind before ; but especially the probability of true symmetries. Nevertheless, I cannot follow the actual symmetries that you lay down, nor do I think a quinary type the most likely in itself. Surely it is more natural that the Prologue and Conclusion should stand apart, and the three great divisions themselves have a ternary structure. Such, I feel sure, is the case ; I think most of the subdivisions (including all those of the central division) again fall naturally into three groups of verses. I hope it is not presumptuous to ask you to look closely at the new draft which I now send. I think you will find a number of new correspondences (mostly at first unobserved by me) which afford strong confirmation.

The base of all, the first and the last, is the Christian knowledge, " That which we have seen and heard " (*ὁδοῦμεν*). This is the necessary condition of Faith (111), which is the necessary condition of Love (11), which is the necessary condition of Obedience (1). After the Prologue we begin with this last simplest region, and feel our way downwards, naturally taking with us the results already obtained. Obedience is associated with light and the Father ; Love with abiding and the Anointed Son ; Faith with truth and the Spirit.

The third ¶ of each division sets forth an antagonism of the world and God (ii. 12-17 ; iii. 13-24 ; v. 1-17, esp. 4, 5).

The first ¶ of each division starts from a heresy, the denial of sin (i. 5; ii. 6), the restlessness of the antichrists (ii. 18-29), the denial of the Son of God as come in the flesh (iv. 1-6).

The middle ¶ of each division sets forth some aspect of love, the old and new Commandment (ii. 7-11), the foundation of it in the gift (*δέδωκεν* iii. 1) of sonship (iii. 1-12), the origin of it in God's own manifested love (iv. 7-21).

I cannot think *ἀγαπητοί*, etc., a sure sign of a real break. It comes sometimes when a fresh subject is but just begun, as if the thought had fired the feeling, and necessitated a more direct and personal form of utterance (ii. 1, 28; iii. 2, 6, 18, 21; iv. 11).

ii. 3 is a return to the subject of "light" (knowledge) in another form after the partial digression on sin as sin (i. 8; ii. 2).

ii. 15 should have a cap. or not accordingly as 15 ff. is directly addressed to the whole Church or to *νεανίσκοι* only. I incline to think the latter, but am not sure. Though the world is not mentioned in 12-14, *ὁ πονηρός* must be intended as the antagonistic power within it.

I feel sure that ii. 26-29 belongs to 18-25 and not to iii. (cf. iv. 4-6 in relation to iv. 1-3). It repeats and expands the two partial Christian antitheses to the heresies: 20 f. to 18 f. and 24 f. to 22 f. In 27 *μέτετε* is doubtless indicative, and in 28 imperative. This explains *καὶ νῦν, τεκνία*.

iii. 1-3 is confined to human sonship; 4-8 to sin, its relation to the Son of God; 9-12 to sonship as interpreted by His Sonship, 12 being an appended example of evil throwing out the good (cf. 16 f. after 13 ff. and 21 after 18 ff.).

Again, iii. 13-15 is confined to love in relation to the world's spirit; 16-18 to its own reality within the Church; 19-24 to peace and confidence with God. It is quite impossible to separate 20 and 21. Again, iv. 11 belongs closely to 10, and 12 to the whole passage 7-12 (esp. 7, 8); 13-16, on the other hand, belongs to another region, and says nothing, expressly, of love to men, either by man or by God (in 16 it is *ἐν ἡμῶν*).

## SECOND SCHEME OF DIVISIONS.

### i. 1-4. Introduction.

### i. 5-ii. 17.<sup>1</sup> God and the true light: goodness, not indifference.

#### i. 5-ii. 6. Godlikeness in man freedom from evil.

#### i. 5-7. *Walking* in the light, *ἀμαρτ.*

#### 8-ii. 2. Sin foregone or forgiven *ὁ λογ. αὐτ.* and *γνωσκ*

#### Cap. ii. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Footnote—This and following numbers refer to Dr. Westcott's notes given below.

- ii. 3-6. Godlikeness, keeping God's commandments,  
*ἐντολαί.*
- ii. 7-11. The new light, the old. ? Cap. 9.
- ii. 12-17. The Father and the world eternally at war, *μένει.*  
??? Cap. 15.
- ii. 18-iii. 24.<sup>2</sup> Sonship to God, and hence likeness to His Son, and  
of *abiding* in Him.
- ii. 18-29. The christs who abide and the antichrists who  
depart.
- ii. 18-21. Antichrists and christs, *ψεῦδος.* Cap. 20.
- 22-25. Denial and keeping of the truth. Cap. 24.
- 26-29. They in whom the anointing abides, themselves  
abide and have confidence: *γεγενν. τέκνα.* Cap. 28.
- iii. 1-12. Sonship the root of sinlessness. Cap. 2.
- iii. 1-3. Likeness to God and sonship to God.
- <sup>2</sup>4-8. Sin that which the Son of God abolishes (Son  
opp. to Devil). Cap. 7.
- 9-12. Sonship manifested by righteousness and love.  
(? Cap. 11, or perhaps better 12.)
- Hatred=death.
- iii. 13-24. Hatred from the world and acceptance with God.
- iii. 13-15. The world's hatred the sign of entrance into  
life.
- <sup>4</sup>16-18. Love known in the sacrifice of life, which  
proves its truth, *ἀλήθεια.* Cap. 18.
- 19-24. Peace with God through (1) obedience to  
Him, (2) faith in His Son's Name, (3) love to your  
brethren: attested by the presence of the Spirit.  
*πνεῦμα* (also 23).
- iv. 1-v. 17. Faith resting on knowledge of the truth the mark of  
the Divine Spirit, not indifference.
- iv. 1-6. The spirits of the truth and of error.
- perhaps } iv. 1-3. The test of spirits in doctrine.  
only cap. } 4-6. The test of spirits in response and  
victory.
- iv. 7-21. Love the mark of those who know themselves to be  
God's children.
- <sup>4</sup>iv. 7-12. Love the duty of those whom God has  
loved *ἐν ἡ. μένει.* Cap. 11.
- 13-16. That love of His known only through the  
faith, and itself the ground of abiding in God.  
? Caps. 14, 16.

not forget a very important historical fact. The catalogues of three monastic libraries on the Continent, dating from the ninth and tenth centuries, show that these libraries each possessed in those centuries a copy of Pelagius under his own name. The libraries were at St. Riquier, near Abbeville, in Picardy, Lorsch on the Rhine, and St. Gall, near the Lake of Constance in Switzerland. All three places were on the direct line of Irish missionary travel on the Continent, and there can be no doubt that they owed their copies of Pelagius to the Irish. It is not certain that any of those three manuscripts still survives, though Zimmer believes that he has discovered the St. Gall one at St. Gall.

Apparently about the same time as Zmaragdus was working, another compiler made a commentary on all the Epistles of Paul by a similar method. It is uncertain who the compiler was. The commentary is sometimes attributed to Haymo (of Halberstadt), sometimes to Remigius (of Auxerre), and both attributions occur in ninth century MSS. ; of which there are three, two crediting it to Haymo, one to Remigius. Whether the compiler possessed a pure text of Pelagius or the Pseudo-Primasius form only, is at present uncertain.

There is no such uncertainty about another compilation of the same century. Sedulius, a learned Irishman, whose sphere of activity was the Rhine valley, put together a commentary on the Epistles of Paul. He names Pelagius at least once, and extracts his commentary throughout. The date of his activity was about the middle of the ninth century. It appears to me that he sometimes used what Zmaragdus had collected before him, as well as the Pelagius and other ancient commentaries themselves.

The remaining evidence for the existence of the commentary under the name of its author can be very briefly related. A Munich MS. of the Epistles of Paul, contemporary

said with the purpose of extending its application. In this respect the repetition of the theme makes always a *new* division.

However, our differences now are really small.

On receipt of Dr Westcott's Notes Dr Hort forwarded a second revision of the Scheme of Divisions for the Epistle. He writes :

I am very glad to find we do not now substantially differ. I presume you accept the ternary structure. You have not marked caps. Do you assent to those set down ? (They are now modified, and all more or less doubtful.)

The principle which you mention I entirely recognize : indeed I had imagined myself to have been in great measure guided by it. But surely it is equally certain that St. John winds up many divisions with a reference to their beginnings : indeed, this follows almost as a matter of course when there is tripleness and at the same time not mere co-ordination but progression. If so, care must be needed to distinguish the two possibilities in any given case. And it seems to me that the repetition which opens new divisions is not so much of statements as of ideas or words : (" transitional words " I think you called them in marking some : I marked a few more).

I hope you do not mind looking once more at the disputed verses, except the Epilogue. Discussion of these matters seems to me to waste time less than almost anything that we do. I have examined all points carefully with a strong desire to be convinced.

i. 5-ii. 6.

You do not say what you do with 5<sup>1</sup>. Both it and ii. 3-6 disturb your triple division. But I cannot recognize your three distinct pairs. 6, 7, 8, 9 might do well enough. But the second member is wanting to 10; i.e., it comes only in unsymmetrical form in 1*b*, and that after the interruption of 1*a*. It does seem to me better to treat 10-12 as an extension of 8, 9. " Actual sin " does not begin with 10; 9 has the plural τὰς ἀμαρτίας. 1*a*, in fact, includes both aspects (sinfulness and sins), and so virtually do 1*b*, 2. In fact, 9 may be as well coupled with 10 as with 8 : i. 10 is a return to 8 suggested by 9, only in the region of past fact. All three verses treat of the false abolition of sin (by denial), as 1 and 2 treat of its true abolition (by forgiveness) : 3*a* is thus, in your sense, a presumptive introduction to 1*b* and 2. Of 5-7 light and darkness are the key-words, of 8-ii. 2 sin, of 3-6 τῆρῶ + μένω (both containing permanence). This last is resumed in οὐκ . . . καινήν.

ii. 18, 19, 20-22, give the historical present antichrists, and those who are their opposites. ii. 22-25 run aside first to lay down the permanent principle of an antichrist, and then to exhort the opposite, with a natural expression of the ἰσῆ of i. 1, 2; v. 13, 20; ii. 26

returns to the actual present, and the following *vv.* dwell on the *χρῆσμα* of truth (cf. v. 20), and the abiding, in contrast to the first member 18-21 (where cf. *προάγων*, 2 John 9).

It is possible to take 28 f. with what follows, letting *μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ* be resumptive. But it is better to take *τέκνα θεοῦ* in iii. 1 as resumptive of . . . (*caetera desunt*).

I am content now to let the third main division end at v. 12 instead of 17. 12 has the sound of a true ending more than 17, and there are other reasons. (But see below.)

iv. 11f. Again *ἀγαπητοί*. In 13 *ἐν αὐ. μέν. κ. αὐτος ἐν ἡμῶν* is resumptive of *ἐν ἡμῶν μένει* in 12, but at the same time digressive, leaving altogether the subject of love, and going off to "spirits"<sup>4</sup> which had been spoken of in 1-6. There is no break of matter in 7-12. On the other hand I believe I was quite wrong in making the third member begin at 17<sup>5</sup>. It should begin at 16, which distinctly proceeds after the interruption of 13-15. Thus the third member 16-21 itself falls easily into three parts (which may be marked by capitals) at 17 and 19, 17f. being digressive.

None of the breaks in v. 1-12 are satisfactory<sup>6</sup>. I now much incline to propose to take the Epilogue into the last division<sup>7</sup> (v. 1-12; 13-17; 18-21); the relation of 18ff. to 11, 12 is very like that of a third to a first member.

Another reason for this is the unsatisfactoriness of leaving ii. 7-11, 12-17, not divided in threes; to which add the awkwardness of making a great break (space of one line) precede a *καὶ* (i. 5). May we not include the Prologue thus (i. 1-4; 5-ii. 6; 7-17)? i. 1-4 may be left undivided; ii. 7-17 may fall into 7, 8; 9-11; 12-17; this brings the *γράφω* of 12ff. into a close relation with that of 7ff., and 9-11 is very like a middle member.

There remains undivided in three only iv. 1-6; and there I should be disposed now to make a break at 2 as well as at 4. This would be substantially analogous to ii. 18-21; 22-25; 26-29.

I will now set down what finally seems to me the best arrangement:

#### THIRD SCHEME OF DIVISIONS.

CAPS.		CAPS.	
I. i. 1-ii. 17		II. ii. 18-iii. 24	
i. 1-4		ii. 18-29	
i. 5-ii. 6		ii. 18-21	20 ?
i. 5-7		ii. 22-25	24 ?
i. 8-ii. 2	(ii. 1 ??)	ii. 26-29	(28 ??)
ii. 3-6		iii. 1-12	
ii. 7-17		iii. 1-3	(2 ??)
ii. 7, 8 <sup>a</sup>		iii. 4-8	(7 ??)
ii. 9-11		iii. 9-12	12 ? No. W.
ii. 12-17	(15 ???)		

iii. 13-24	CAPS.	iv. 7-21	CAPS.
iii. 13-15		7-12	(11 ??)
iii. 16-18	(18 ??)	iv. 13-15	(14 ???)
iii. 19-24	21 ? *	iv. 16-21	17 ?, 19 ?
III. <u>iv. 1-v. 21</u>		v. 1-21	
iv. 1-6		v. 1-12	
iv. 1		v. 13-17	16 ?
iv. 2, 3		v. 18-21	21 ?
iv. 4-6			

On Dr. Hort's third Scheme of Divisions Dr. Westcott makes a few pencil notes, for the most part accepting the proposed capitals. At the foot of the page he writes: "For the rest, after a final pleading, I throw myself on your mercy or discretion." This "final pleading" is set forth in the remarks made by him on this revised scheme and the explanatory notes thereto attached, to which Dr. Hort again replied. These remarks and replies run as follows:

1. W. writes: I should place i. 5 by itself, i.e. give ¶ cap. to *Edv* in 6; and so ii. 3-6. i. 5 is the subject; i. 6-ii. 2 the working out; ii. 3-6 the conclusion. The variation in the form of the third division is due to the substance of it. We have sinned and sin (*sin* and have sinned, H.), and yet it was to prevent sin that St. John wrote. However, sin is no longer fatal.

H. replies: I can accept making 5 a separate subsection, though I should have preferred cap. only at 6 and ¶ at 8, so as to keep the light and darkness together: in my view 5 is said for the sake of its application, so that 6 ff. is part of the primary position. What I like less is cap. at 10, especially with none at ii. 1 (the only *τεκν.* or *ἀγ.*—unless it be iii. 21—without cap.). Most of our subdivisions or subsections have been binary: and so here I should prefer ¶¶ 8, ii. 3; caps. 6, ii. 1: but if you feel strongly about taking 6 ff. with what follows, will you not drop the cap. at 10 (if you dislike it at ii. 1)?

W. replies: I now give cap. at ii. 1 (where I was faithless to my own view before): but I wish ¶ at 10, or not at 8: i.e., the divisions at 8 and 10 seem to me homologous. Perhaps a compromise would be ¶ at end of 5: caps. at 6, 8, 10, ¶ at ii. 3. This keeps the binary arrangement. Decide as you like in the spirit of this.

2. W. writes: I prefer still ¶¶ 7-11, 12-17, caps. at 9, 15. H. replies: Your proposal would make this the only section divided into two members. Surely we should keep the triple form if we reasonably can: as I think we may by dividing at 9. Does not 7 ff.

## 492 DIVISIONS OF FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN

answer to i. 5-7 (or 5 if you like) ? Love of the brethren surely (in spite of iii. 11, John xiii. 34) is a part, not the whole, of the *ἐντολή*.

W. replies : A division at 9 will answer to a division at i. 5, and I can accept it.

Further, H. writes : Do you decidedly think that ii. 15-17 is not part of the special message to *καρλοκοι* begun in 14 ?

W. replies : Doubtless suggested by *καρλοκοι*, but not confined to them. Cap. better perhaps on the whole.

3. H. writes : We seem to be giving *Ἀγαπητοί* cap. always, so I suppose also at iii. 21.

W. replies : It is better I see to give caps. in all places.

4. W. writes : ??

H. replies : This may doubtless be questioned : but look at iii. 24 (contr. iv. 1), iv. 6, v. 6.

5. W. writes : I am not satisfied here. I decidedly prefer still to begin with 17 : 17 resumes 12*b* verbally ; but there may be caps. at 18, 19.

H. replies : 15 resumes 12*a* in like manner. Surely not a cap. at 18, which is exegetical of *παρησία* in 17, and in its close repeats the language of 17*a*. The ends of 15 and 16 correspond no doubt, but precisely because they give the correspondence of two different spheres : 13 and 15 relate to Spirit and Truth, knowledge and faith, confession and testimony, all founded in the revealed Son. 16, like 17-21, relates to Love, which is shown to be no less dependent upon God. It lays down broadly that our love is God's love in us : then 17*f*. expounds this idea on its Divine side, as implying a continuity of being which tends to expel fear : while 19 *ff.* expounds it on its human side and its analogous application in practice.

W. replies : I give up cap. at 18. The other line is very hard to draw. On reading again I am inclined to take 16*a* with 15, 16*b* as a new subject with 17 *ff.* Then *ἐγνώκαμεν κ. πιστεύκαμεν* sum up and lead on.

6. W. writes : v. 1-12 falls very fairly into three : 1, 2 ; 3-5 ; 6-12. (Love—victory—witness.)

H. replies : 3 seems to me absolutely inseparable from 1, 2 ; 4 *f.* arise from *βαρ. οὐκ εἶσ.* I should not greatly object to caps. at 4 and 6, though I would rather not have them : but ¶ seems to me to dislocate the section.

W. replies : This I cannot see. The identification of love and obedience is new. Caps. will satisfy me.

7. W. writes : I very much prefer to keep the Epilogue distinct. For the rest there are no serious differences. On the points which I have noticed I feel strongly after considering your arguments, and trust that you may on the whole agree with me or not disagree.

H. replies : To think that I should have to plead with you against

a wanton violation of symmetry ! I really see no more reason for disjoining the Epilogue than the Prologue ; and the cohesion is illustrated by my inclination to take 13-17 with what precedes. Do let St. John keep his triads, if you can. Also consider how very short you would make the last division.

W. replies : Very well. Let us see the effect in print.

The Westcott and Hort Greek Testament was published in May, 1881, and a second edition with a considerable number of corrections was issued in December of the same year. In that interval the divisions of the First Epistle of St. John were again considered, for in October, Dr. Hort, apparently in reply to a suggestion from Dr. Westcott that iv. 1-6 should be transferred from the third to the second main division,<sup>1</sup> wrote :

Would you mind glancing over the old papers on the divisions of 1 St. John ? See especially what is marked with red.<sup>2</sup> It seems to me that the second and third divisions (ii. 18 ff. ; iv. 1 ff.) both begin with errors or authors of error ; and that the first division (after the Prologue) implicitly does the same (i. 5-8), while another similar implication closes the Epistle (v. 21). The antichrists seem to belong to the second division (the Son), as the false prophets (or their spirits) do to the third (the Spirit). It is remarkable that with the solitary exception of the close of iii., striking the keynote for what follows, *πνεῦμα* is confined to iv. and v.

As far as I can see the symmetry of the Epistle cannot be restored if iv. 1-6 is thrown back.

### PANTHEISM.

ANY adequate account of Pantheism, and any sufficient criticism of it would take many volumes, and would need for their fulfilment a knowledge of the history of human thought since man began seriously to think. For there has always been a tendency towards the pantheistic solu-

<sup>1</sup> In Bishop Westcott's own Commentary on 1 St. John, iv. 1-6 is placed in the second main division.

<sup>2</sup> The passage marked with red is that on p. 485 f. : "The base of all . . . God's own manifested love, iv. 7-21."