

WELLHAUSEN ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

WELLHAUSEN has not yet followed up his edition of the synoptic gospels with a similar volume on the fourth, but in the meantime he has published a minor contribution in the shape of a small shilling pamphlet upon a single aspect of its literary criticism. This essay, entitled *Erweiterungen und Aenderungen im vierten Evangelium* (Berlin, 1907), is characteristically independent. Its subject has been discussed for some time, even in his own country, and contributions have been made at various angles of the problem, but of these Wellhausen chooses to remain serenely oblivious. Blass is the only critic whose emendations of the text he notices. He goes his own way, looks at things with his own eyes, and summarily pronounces judgment as if he were the first to sit upon the critical bench. This method has its merits. The criticism is devoid of echoes; it rings fresh and original. But one disadvantage is that more than once the bearings of some problem have been already carefully taken, so that the student finds several of Wellhausen's arguments answered beforehand, while he misses any estimate of some points which have been previously raised. It is all to the good, however, that Wellhausen has drawn attention to the literary criticism of the Fourth Gospel, and especially that he has refused to follow the lead of Jülicher and H. J. Holtzmann. These powerful scholars, the former in his Introduction to the New Testament (6th ed. 1906, pp. 351 f.) and the latter in an essay in Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wissenschaft* (1902, 50-60), flatly refuse to admit the presence of interpolations or transpositions in the Fourth Gospel, with the exception, of course, of such well-known passages as v. 3b-4, vii. 53-viii. 11, where the textual evidence is conclusive. Well-

hausen's interest in the problem seems to have been started by some of Jülicher's remarks. But fortunately he disagrees with the Marburg New Testament expert, and, whatever may be thought of his own particular theories, it is welcome to find that he is no supporter of the "mailed fist" order of criticism which would rule out all interpolation theories and bang the door upon any attempt to analyse and rearrange the literary strata of the Fourth Gospel.

The pamphlet is far from exhaustive. No attention, e.g., is paid to the question of Tatian's *Diatessaron* in its bearings upon the general problem, nor is any notice taken of the position of vii. 15-24, x. 26 f., and xii. 44 f., while even the difficulties of i. 15 and similar verses do not seem to have attracted the author's attention. Thus Kuinoel's transposition of xiii. 20 to a position after verse 16 is unnoticed. The choice of passages for discussion is curiously arbitrary, and Wellhausen assumes, instead of illustrating from outside sources, the possibility of transpositions, expansions, and interpolations in ancient literature. A few paragraphs on this topic might not have been out of place, for many readers still need to be orientated in this matter. The well-known case of Ribbeck's theory about Vergil is a warning that all hypotheses of displacement require to be checked by a wise hesitation in attributing too exact and systematic ¹ a character to any ancient document, whether in poetry or in history; yet it may be pointed out, in passing, that Vergil himself offers instances of undoubted displacement (cf. e.g. *Georgics*, iv. 203 f.), as does Aeschylus

¹ Thus the rearrangement of John iv. 6-9 in the Sinaitic Syriac version is pronounced by Dr. Abbott to be "chronological but not Johannine. John does not accumulate his descriptions of scenery and circumstances at the beginning of a scene as in a stage direction, but prefers to give them in parentheses, each in its turn as it is wanted" (*Johannine Grammar*, 2632). Unevenness is not to be assumed as essentially un-Johannine, but neither, on the other hand, is it legitimate to postulate it as an invariable characteristic of the Gospel.

(cf. *Choephorae*, 997 f.), and Bernays has shown pretty clearly that the original order of Philo's *περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου* has got disarranged during the transmission of the extant text. The anti-sigma of Aristarchus has a rôle outside the pages of Homer. Besides, there is always the possibility that the author of the Fourth Gospel may have himself revised and enlarged his work, so that what we now possess is practically a second draft or edition, bearing marks of its literary evolution. But even this theory, though advocated forcibly some years ago by Becker (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1889, pp. 117 f.) and still applied by several critics to the problem of chapter xxi., is ignored practically by Wellhausen; he prefers the hypothesis of the original Gospel having received enlargement and interpolation from the hand of a later editor who, though belonging to the Johannine circle, did not occupy exactly the theological position of the author.

Some of the minor interpolations do not deserve much consideration. Missing the case for the interpolation of the gloss, *ἕδατος καὶ* in iii. 5, Wellhausen declares that iv. 2 ("Jesus did not himself baptize, it was his disciples") is a "protestatio facto contraria," inserted in order to remove the discrepancy between the Fourth Gospel and the synoptic tradition. But, had this been in the redactor's mind, he could much more easily have reached his end by simply deleting *καὶ βαπτίζει* in verse 1. To omit also the difficult verse 44 ("for Jesus himself testified that a prophet has no honour in his own country") of the same chapter as an unauthentic¹ interpolation (p. 33), is hardly of much use, unless some reasonable explanation can be given of how it ever came to be inserted in its present position; and Wellhausen has none to offer. Similarly, a

¹ Hugo Delff had already deleted it as one of many editorial interpolations.

closer study of the Johannine method of connecting clauses and sentences (see Abbott's *Johannine Grammar*, 2470, 2636) shows that it is needless to take the parenthetical vi. 64*b* as an interpolation (p. 34), and the characteristic play upon the double sense of the word renders it unlikely that ἡ θύρα in x. 7 is a mistake¹ for ὁ ποιμὴν (so Blass), and x. 9 an explanatory gloss (pp. 34–35), just as it is only the *a priori* assumption that the same author could not have given different settings to the same saying which justifies Wellhausen (p. 36) in deleting xviii. 9 as a gloss (cf. xvii. 12)—a suggestion which he does not seem to realize was made long ago by Scholten and Bakhuyzen. Furthermore, it is prosaic to delete xviii. 32 on the ground that nothing has hitherto been said about any definite method of death (pp. 36–37); the context, sketched with characteristic allusiveness, is enough to show that the crucifixion, which was the divinely appointed method of Christ's death, could only be inflicted on him if he passed from the hands of the Jews into those of the Romans. And, finally, the allusion to the hands and feet of Jesus in xx. 20 is not "ganz unmotiviert" (p. 27); the author is here working up, as is often the case, the material of the Lucan tradition (cf. Luke xxiv. 39). Nor does xx. 19–23 give one the impression of being the natural climax of the Gospel. Surely xx. 24–29 is the finale.² It is improbable, therefore, that xx. 20 (καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτῆς) and 24–29 are to be regarded as later interpolations

¹ The tradition, if not the text, of John was evidently familiar to Ignatius (*ad Philad.* ix.), who describes Christ as θύρα τοῦ πατρὸς, δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία.

² In *New Testament Autographs* (pp. 14 f.) Prof. Rendel Harris once suggested that xx. 30–31 should be placed after xxi. 24, on the ground that verse 30 (like 2 John 12, 3 John 13) implies an insufficiency of writing material at the author's disposal; but this involves the hazardous substitution of αὐτοῦ for τῶν μαθητῶν.

(p. 27). The author of the Gospel does not enter into the reasons for the absence of Thomas, nor does he stop to explain how apparently he did not receive the Holy Spirit. To make the latter difficulty a reason for suspecting the authenticity of the passage is to miss the method and aim of the Evangelist. "Dans l'économie de l'enseignement johannique, c'est un hasard providentiel, qui provoque une seconde apparition du Sauveur; au point de vue de la rédaction, c'est le moyen d'amener une dernière et importante leçon, avec la profession de foi qui clôt dignement tant le livre" (Loisy, *Le Quatrième Evangile*, p. 917). Certainly, anyone who hailed Jesus as Lord (xx. 28) would naturally be taken to possess the Holy Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 3).

On some larger passages the discussion is more adequate, however, and to these we must now turn.

The transposition of chapters v. and vi. is no novelty in the criticism of the Fourth Gospel.¹ As far back as the fourteenth century a certain Ludolphus de Saxonia, in his *Vita Christi evangelicis et scriptoribus orthodoxis excerpta* is said to have suggested it, while J. P. Norris, in *The Journal of Philology* for 1871 (pp. 107-112), states the evidence pretty fully. Chapter v. has for its nucleus a Jerusalem-incident, and closes without any hint, such as is given in iv. 43, 46, that the scene has changed. Yet chapter vi. assumes that Jesus is in Galilee. "After these things Jesus went away to the opposite side of the sea of Galilee" (v. 1), as if he and the crowd had been, not in Jerusalem, but on the Capernahum side of the lake (cf. 22, 59). Now, if the original order be taken to have been iv., vi., v., and vii., the awkward geographical transition is smoothed out, iv. and vi. describing Jesus in Galilee,

¹ On the internal criticism of these chapters see Wendt's *das Johannes-Evangelium* (1900), pp. 68 f., Eng. Trans. (1902), pp. 75 f.

v. narrating a visit to Jerusalem on the occasion of a feast, while vii. opens with Jesus again in Galilee, not in Judaea any longer, "because the Jews were seeking to kill Him" (v. 1). The last touch plainly comes more aptly after the similar allusions in v. 16 and 18, than after vi., which is silent upon any murderous aims of the Jews. And this connexion is particularly good if, with an increasing number of critics,¹ we agree to place vii. 15-24 after v. 47, for vii. 1 would then echo vii. 20-21. Wellhausen misses this corroboration entirely. Indeed his pages on the present transposition add nothing to the arguments already advanced, except an ingenious suggestion to account for the shifting of chapter vi. It was due, he argues, to a sense of chronological discrepancy. In v. 1 ("after this there was a festival of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem") the allusion to the Passover was unmistakable in the light of the preceding vi. 4 ("Now the passover, the festival of the Jews, was at hand").² Thus three Passovers would be necessary for the life of Jesus. But the desire to harmonize the synoptic chronology, with its single Passover, and the Johannine led to a transposition of chapter v. and chapter vi., leaving it an open question whether the feast of v. 1 was a passover or not, and permitting the two remaining passovers of the Fourth Gospel to be taken as the termini of Christ's single-year ministry, since that of vi. 4 is the last Passover.³ This is, at first sight, an attractive theory. Only, it would surely have been easier for the redactor or editor to omit vi. 4 entirely. Wellhausen has

¹ See *The Historical New Testament*, pp. 690-691, and Loisy's edition of the Fourth Gospel (pp. 147-148), with Prof. E. D. Burton's arguments in *The Biblical World* (1899), pp. 16-41, where the true order is given as vi. 1-71, v. 1-47, vii. 15-24, 1-14, 25 f.

² On Hort's suggestion, after Voss, Jacobsen, and others, that τὸ πάσχα here is an interpolation, see Prof. Burkitt's criticism in *Evang. da-Mepharr.* ii. 313.

³ Cf. Briggs, *New Light upon the Life of Jesus* (1904), pp. 50 f.

not met this objection fairly, and it remains a serious obstacle to the acceptance of his view. Bakhuyzen, the Dutch critic, omits it entirely as a gloss, while Dr. Briggs (*op. cit.* p. 153) considers that the whole chapter has been unchronologically displaced from its real position after chapter xi. But these suggestions are trenchant rather than convincing. Even Tatian's order cannot be relied upon implicitly as a witness to some superior tradition. For the hypothesis¹ that the Tatianic arrangement reflects the original order followed in the autograph of the Fourth Gospel would imply that the Diatessaron follows the general outline of that Gospel, whereas the feasts are really re-arranged (cf. Mr. Hobson's excellent statement in *The Diatessaron of Tatian and the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 33 f.); it would also involve the freedom of the Tatianic order from the abruptnesses which are occasionally visible in the canonical text, whereas, on the other hand, iv. 45b forms but a poor bridge between v. 47 and vii. 1, while, e.g., vi. 71 is hardly a natural prelude to iv. 4.

In viii. 44 Wellhausen (pp. 19-24) would read, with Aphraates, "ye are of Cain," not of the devil, the point being that as Cain sought to slay his brother who pleased God, so the Jews, by their murderous mind against Jesus (v. 18), betrayed their real affinity not with Abraham but with Cain. To carry out this rendering, he is obliged to regard the words, "For there is no truth in him. When he tells a lie he speaks of his own," as an editorial interpolation by a redactor, possibly the author of the first epistle (cf. iii. 8-12), who first changed "Cain" into "the devil." This is a plausible suggestion in itself, and the reading of Syr-Sin (*πονηροῦ* for *διαβόλου*) tells in its favour, *πονηροῦ* possibly being an echo of Aphraates' reading. What makes one

¹ Defended by Prof. Bacon in *The American Journal of Theology* (1900), pp. 770-795.

hesitate to accept the theory is the context. In the first epistle of John, Abraham is not in view, and the allusion to Cain and Abel, as symbolized in the later Jewish tradition which Philo has expounded, is in harmony with the author's stress upon brotherly love. In the Gospel, on the other hand, Abraham, as the spiritual father of true believers, is everywhere in evidence (cf. viii. 37 f., "I know you are Abraham's offspring, yet you seek to kill me . . . you do your father's deeds," i.e. the devil's), down to verse 53 f. of this chapter. It would be abrupt, therefore, to introduce a reference to Cain in the heart of all this Abrahamic argument, unless the passage in question absolutely demanded it. Nor can it be said that it does; for the rendering, "he is a liar and the father of the liar," or "of falsehood,"¹ is by no means so untenable as Wellhausen alleges,² and, *per contra*, the description "a murderer from the beginning" is as applicable to the death brought on Adam through the devil's temptation as to Abel's murder.

The awkwardness of the long interval between xiv. 31 and xviii. 1 has also been felt by many critics, some of whom have proposed to place xv.-xvi. in their original position previous to xiv. 31, i.e. either between verses 20 and 21 of chapter xiii. (so Professor Bacon), or after xiii. 31a (Spitta), or finally between verses 35 and 36 of that chapter. It is immaterial for our present purpose to discuss the rival merits of these constructions, the second of which is adopted in the present writer's *Historical New Testament* (pp. 522 f., 692 f.), where the re-arranged text

¹ Dr. Abbott, who, like Réville and other modern critics, prefers the neuter rendering, suggests that to speak *ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων* means "out of them, i.e. his family," either through his own agents and organs or out of his own inner nature (*Johannine Grammar*, 2378, 2728).

² He also finds x. 16 an interruption to the context, but the real difficulty in this chapter is the intercalation of verses 22-25, on which see Prof. Burton's article and Prof. Bacon's remarks in *The American Journal of Theology* (1900), pp. 790 f.

may be seen, together with a summary of the evidence. The point is, that Wellhausen, who has rightly caught the intimate connexion between xiv. 31 and xviii. 1 (Jesus rising to his feet and in that attitude of prayer uttering the petitions of xvii.), takes his courage in his hands and proceeds to rule out xv.-xvii. as not merely misplaced but due to a redactor's hand (pp. 7-15).¹ This redactor, it is argued, had two aims in view. He wished to make the Paraclete's mission dependent on Christ (xv. 26, xvi. 7) as well as on the Father (xiv. 16, 26), and he desired to bring out the early Christian doctrine of the Second Advent, which chapter xiv. ignored. In that chapter the gift and the presence of the Paraclete with the community of Christ's people on earth render a second coming of the Lord superfluous. Whereas the redactor, in xv.-xvii. of the Gospel, like the author of the first epistle, brings out the doctrine of the second coming of Christ in a way which throws the Paraclete into a less central position. Furthermore, specific notes of this redactor are to be found in his conception of joy (*χαρά*) as the supreme religious boon, and of the world (*ὁ κόσμος*) as the supreme foe of the Christians, instead of, as elsewhere in the gospel, *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*. Such considerations, Wellhausen concludes, "show that one is not making a great hole in the Fourth Gospel (by eliminating xv.-xvii.), but taking a beam out of its eye. The author of the Gospel is vastly superior to the editor in austerity of tone and in freedom of movement—for truly it was no trifle to advance beyond faith in the parousia."

The evidence for the later origin of xv.-xvii. is, however,

¹ A preliminary objection to any such theory may be tabled, on the ground that it would break up the symmetry of size which prevails throughout the gospel. Its three portions i.-vi., vii.-xii., and xiii.-xx., are of fairly equal dimensions, and while this is not seriously interfered with by the re-arrangement of chapters v.-vii., it would be materially affected by Wellhausen's theory of xv.-xvii.

unequal in parts and inconclusive on the whole. For one thing, the discrepancies between these chapters and the rest of the Gospel are not so decisive as Wellhausen would make out. Thus the second coming is not absent from chapter xiv., for the third verse of that chapter begins : *ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ ἐτοιμάσω τόπον ὑμῖν, πάλιν ἔρχομαι*, while verse 18 closes with the promise, *ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, and the mere absence of these words in the Syriac is not justification enough for their deletion. Nor is persecution at the hands of the Jews entirely absent from the perspective of xv.-xvii. (cf. xvi. 2-3). And as for the doctrine of the Holy Spirit being different in xv.-xvii. from what it is in the rest of the Gospel, it is enough to point out that the same discrepancy (?) occurs within the Gospel itself (cf. xiv. 26 with xx. 22-23).¹ The unique emphasis on "joy" in these chapters is simply due to the change of scene. Jesus is no longer dealing with the outside world but with the inner circle of His disciples ; a fresh and more intimate atmosphere breathes inevitably through the conversation, and the emergence of such a phase of personal religion is no more surprising than the cessation of all allusions to such categories as that of "light," which prevailed throughout the earlier discourses.

It is with real interest that one passes on to Wellhausen's pages upon the difficulties of the eighteenth chapter. Here the hypothesis of dislocation has been worked out variously (see *The Historical New Testament*, pp. 528-529, 693-694), as due either to editorial manipulation or to the blunders

¹ Wellhausen indeed denies that the Holy Spirit in the latter passage is the Paraclete, since the latter is conceived as a hypostasis. But this is futile. The passage in question is the equivalent, in the Fourth Gospel, for the Pentecost of the earlier tradition, the author's aim being to link the gift of the spirit more closely than before with the risen person of Jesus. Besides, even in xv.-xvii., the conception of the Spirit does not correspond with that of the First Epistle (see on this Mr. E. F. Scott's *The Fourth Gospel*, 1906, pp. 340 f.).

of a copyist, though Wellhausen, as usual, ignores the reconstructions. He prefers to delete verse 24 entirely, instead of, with many critics (following Syr-Sin), regarding it as displaced from the end of verse 13 or even verse 14; and this carries with it the omission of ἀπο τοῦ Καϊαφᾶ in verse 28, and πρῶτον in verse 13, with ἀρχιερεὺς ὃν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου. The entire trial is thus supposed, in the original autograph of the Gospel, to have taken place before Annas, not Caiaphas, while the object of the redactor's interpolations would seem to have been the partial harmonizing of the Fourth Gospel with the synoptic narratives. Even if the latter motive is to be assumed, however, it does not exclude the hypothesis of the canonical text having become disordered,¹ and disarrangement, rather than interpolation, seems the more probable clue, especially as Syr-Sin already evinces traces of the original order of the passage (cf. Mrs. Lewis in *Expository Times*, xii. 518-519). One piece of corroborative evidence must now be given up, however. In the *Journal of Theological Studies* (ii. pp. 141-142), Mr. C. H. Turner pointed out that the excellent Old Latin codex *e* had a leaf excised between verses 12 and 25 of chapter xviii., the presumption being that it was omitted because it contained the unfamiliar sequence of Syr-Sin. But, as Professor Burkitt has shown (*Evang. da-Mepharreshe*, ii. 316), this is unlikely, as most of the Latin texts, including *e*, have *ad Caiapham* for *a Caipha* in verse 28, implying that the examination

¹ So Loisy: "L'hypothèse d'une confusion accidentelle, causée par la disposition matérielle du texte dans un manuscrit typique, à une époque très rapprochée des origines, paraît la plus vraisemblable; mais elle n'exclut pas, pour la formation du texte actuel, le souci de la conciliation avec les Synoptiques" (p. 831). Loisy (see further his *Études Bibliques*, 1901, pp. 142 f.), like Blass and Prof. Bacon, prefers the order of Syr-Sin, i. e. 13, 24, 14-15, 19-23, 16-18, 25b, 28, but Spitta's theory, as modified by Prof. G. G. Findlay (i. e. 13-14, 19-24, 15-18, 25b-28), still seems to me more likely, despite the criticisms of Schmiedel (*Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 4580 f.) and Holtzmann (*op. cit.* pp. 56 f.).

was conducted by Annas and not, as in Syr-Sin, by Caiaphas.

Finally, Wellhausen (pp. 27 f.) proposes to delete xix. 37 as un-Johannine in style and contents, with which verses 34–35 would also fall, i.e. the entire incident of the piercing of Christ's body with the lance (so previously Hugo Delff). The linguistic evidence does not amount to much. It is true that *ἕτερος* does not occur elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel, but this would be no decisive reason for pronouncing it un-Johannine,¹ unless a hapax legomenon is to be regarded as intrinsically unauthentic; nor, for the matter of that, does it occur in the First Epistle of John, whose author (cf. v. 6–7) Wellhausen has no hesitation in connecting with the interpolation! If the one could use this unique expression (*καὶ πάλιν ἕτερα γραφή λέγει*), why not the other? The argument from the contents of the suspected passages is not more convincing. Even granting that the water and the blood are meant as mystical symbols of baptism and the Lord's Supper, it is not true to say that the Fourth Gospel ignores the latter entirely, for the references to the "blood" in vi. 53–56 plainly imply that the sacrament was present to the mind of the Evangelist, and it is arbitrary to rule out (pp. 28–29) these references as unauthentic interpolations. The assertion of 1 John v. 6–7 that Jesus Christ came not with water only but with water and blood is regarded by Wellhausen as a later protest against the ignoring of the blood in the Fourth Gospel, the writer of the epistle perhaps being responsible for the introduction of allusions to the latter in vi. 53–56 and xix. 34. This strikes one as a rather artificial and unnecessary construction.

¹ See Dr. Abbott's invaluable *Johannine Grammar* (2675–2677) on this point, and also (2317–2318) for the sense of verse 37. The connexion between xix. 35 f. and vii. 35 f. is excellently brought out by Grill in a note on p. 16 of his *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums* (1902).

What the Gospel and the First Epistle¹ together controvert in these passages, is the undue emphasis laid not only by docetics like Cerinthus, but by the school of John the Baptist upon the baptism of Jesus by water. His death also, it is insisted, is needful to the true estimate of his person and work. He came not by water only, but by water and blood, and the witness to this historic reality is His Spirit in the church (1 John v. 7); the witness is not merely some past historic testimony (John xix. 35), but the Spirit of the Crucified in the believer; and that, again, is not separable from the historic personality, for "the spirit and the water and the blood εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν." Nothing is really gained by Wellhausen's interpolation theory, in the way of "throwing an unbroken light on the truth that Jesus was the true Paschal Lamb" (p. 30). For, as Baur showed long ago, the incident of the piercing is needed to bring out this truth in its full bearings. "The supreme significance of the crisis of the death of Jesus is found in the fact that blood and water flowed from his wounded side. The reason why blood and water flowed from his side was that his side was pierced, and it was pierced because piercing was substituted for the breaking of the bones. . . . The water and blood which flowed from the side of Jesus as the true Paschal Lamb is the symbol of the spiritual life which through the death of Jesus is communicated in all its fulness to mankind" (*Church History*, Eng. Trans. ii. p. 159). This is excellently put, and it serves to show that the aim attributed by Wellhausen to the Fourth Evangelist is clearer when the verses in question are retained than when they are removed as a later interpolation.

Upon the whole, then, the results of the pamphlet are inconclusive. This is perhaps due to the fact that the author

¹ The latter being probably a comment upon the tradition of the former at this point (cf. J. Reville, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, pp. 57, 279 f.).

has hardly done justice to his case. He has not given any indication of his general views upon the purpose and character of the Gospel as a whole, and it is quite possible that some of his arguments would acquire more body if they were set in a reasoned framework of opinion upon the characteristics and origin of John's Gospel. The sole clue to Wellhausen's judgment upon the literary problem of the book is that he evidently associates the various interpolations and additions very closely with the author of the First Epistle, though he lays no stress upon the identification of the latter with the unknown Hellenist who, in his judgment, edited the Gospel. This hint is significant, if for no other reason than that it reveals Wellhausen in the ranks of those critics who feel that the First Epistle has characteristics sufficient to differentiate it from the Fourth Gospel in point of authorship. Curiously enough, Von Dobschütz has just begun a series of studies on the Epistle, which are designed to show that it also is of composite origin (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1907, pp. 1-8), but his arguments have not as yet connected the process with the Fourth Gospel. Taken together with Wellhausen's allusions, they suggest the pressing need of a fresh examination, not only into the literary relations of the First Epistle and the Fourth Gospel, but also into the religious ideas of the former.

JAMES MOFFATT.