

a fine piece of scholarship, and it had the advantage of Lightfoot going before it. Of smaller commentaries on Philippians the best is Principal Moule's in *The Cambridge Bible*. It is published at 2s. 6d., and there is a Greek edition at the same price.

As for the Book of Judges, the one great commentary in the English language is Moore's. Forward enough for the foremost of us, it is nevertheless the work of a most accomplished scholar, and brimful of literary and religious interest. It is also one of the volumes of *The International Critical Commentary*. It is published at 12s. Of smaller books on Judges the best is Sutherland Black's. It is one of the *Smaller Cambridge Bibles*, and costs no more than one shilling.

Black and Moule will do very well for the English student; but we hope that many of our members are scholars enough to enter upon the study linguistically, and to master either Moore or Vincent.

NEW MEMBERS.

- Mr. Charles Beer, 39 Sutherland Square, Walworth, London, S.E.
 Rev. George Herbert Patten, M.A., Rectory, Collinstown, W. Meath.
 Rev. F. W. Reade, M.A. (Oxon.), Maisonette, Slough.
 Rev. Frederick Tavender, B.A., B.D., The Manse, Great Marlow, Bucks.
 Rev. Thomas Appleton, L.Th., Curridge Parsonage, Newbury.

- Mr. Charles Morgan, 92 Millhill Road, Norwich.
 Rev. George Burnett, Free Church Manse, Friockheim.
 Rev. William A. King, A.M., Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.
 Rev. George N. MacDonell, A.B., Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.
 Rev. G. Percy Maynard, Primitive Methodist Manse, 29 Etherley Road, S. Tottenham, London, N.
 Rev. William Dewar, B.A., Presbyterian Manse, Dugald, Manitoba.
 Mr. W. J. Lewis, B.A., General Assembly's Theological College, Belfast.
 Mr. Frederick Potter, Captain S.A., 29 Brinton Road, Southampton.
 Rev. Evan Lloyd, Wesleyan Manse, Blenheim House, Pudsey, Leeds.
 Rev. James Cuthbertson, 57 Musters Road, Nottingham.
 Rev. J. Frazer Smith, M.D., Mhow, Central India.
 Rev. Arthur Wilkes, Primitive Methodist Manse, 6 Victoria Terrace, Tadcaster.
 Rev. Henry Barker, Rector of All Saints, Rosendale, New York, U.S.A.
 Rev. James M. Wilson, Armstrong, Iowa, U.S.A.
 Rev. George E. Metger, M.A., Alliance, Ohio, U.S.A.
 Rev. Thomas Gamble, Mission Manse, Uitenhage, Cape Colony.
 Rev. A. W. Wood, Baptist Manse, City Road, Winchester.

A Wave of Hypercriticism.

BY PROFESSOR W. C. VAN MANEN, D.D., LEIDEN.

THE four Epistles of Paul, namely, to the Romans, to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, have been the object of recent attacks, though they had been generally considered authentically Pauline. The Dutch theologians—Loman, Pierson, Naber, Völter, van Manen, with the Swiss professor, Steck—have impugned their Pauline authorship, especially that of the Galatian Epistle. But defenders have not been wanting, such as Gloël, Lindemann,

Schmiedel, Lipsius, Scholten, Godet, Holsten, Hilgenfeld, and others. Doubtless the letters contain difficult matters, arising out of a comparison of the Paul of Acts with him of the Galatian Epistle; but these are not removed by relegating the four letters in question to A.D. 120-140, by finding imaginary dependencies on the Gospels, or by sacrificing their credibility to the historical truth of the Acts. The tendency

of the latter secures the authenticity of the former. . . .

'The arguments adduced against Paul's leading Epistles are for the most part arbitrary and extravagant, showing inability to estimate the true nature and value of evidence. As this wave of hypercriticism is rejected by the best critics of Germany, and will soon pass away, if indeed it has not already done so, it is needless to describe it, or to show its futility. Whatever permanency it may have is in the minds of ingenious seekers after novelty; but it is devoid of interest for English theologians. The Pauline authorship cannot be shaken by shadowy or conjectural evidence.'

So writes the Rev. Samuel Davidson, D.D., in his valuable work, *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament: Critical, Exegetical, and Theological*, third edition, revised and improved, vol. i. p. 150-152 (London, 1894).

As one of the unhappy men who have been here exposed to public contempt, by a confessedly 'learned and venerable author' (*Inquirer*, 25th August 1894), throughout the two worlds, it becomes me to protest against such a summary sentence.

I.

The description of the so-called wave of hypercriticism is not quite correct. It came less unexpectedly, or, at least, men were not quite so unprepared for it as one might infer from the words, 'though they (the Epistles to the Romans, to the Corinthians, to the Galatians) had been generally considered authentically Pauline.' Edward Evanson had already, in 1792, thrown doubts upon the authenticity of the Epistle to the Romans in *The Dissonance of the four generally received Evangelists, and the Evidence of their respective Authenticity*. Bruno Bauer, in 1850-52, had published his *Kritik der paulinischen Briefe* in three volumes, and in it assigned reasons why he could not, with F. C. Baur, the renowned head of the school of Tübingen, consider the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians as the work of the Apostle Paul. Besides many since, Semler doubted the original unity of Ro and 2 Co. Even before this, the father of the newer biblical criticism, in his *De duplici appendice ep. Pauli ad Rom.* (1769), maintained that Ro 15-16 did not originally belong to the same book as Ro 1-14;

although they also came from the hand of Paul. Heumann had remarked that our canonical Epistle to the Romans consists of two Epistles of the Apostle —chaps. 1-11 and 12-15— and two postscripts —16¹⁻²⁴, and 16²⁵⁻²⁷, which originally belonged to the Epistle preserved to us in 1-11. Ever since F. C. Baur, in his *Paul* (1845), tried to show that both chaps. 15 and 16 must be considered as a later addition to the Epistle to the Romans, and as not proceeding from the Apostle Paul, the acceptance of his opinion among German and non-German adherents of the Tübingen school became the fashion. Semler had taught, in his *Paraphrasis II Epistolae ad Cor.* (1776), to distinguish in 2 Co four Epistles, of which three were supposed to have been sent by Paul to the Corinthians, namely, (a) chaps. 1-8, to which originally belonged Ro 16 as appendix; (b) chaps. 10-12¹³ perhaps ending with 13¹¹⁻¹³; (c) chap. 12¹⁴-13¹⁸; and a fourth, chap. 9, to another community in Achaia. Others had modified this opinion in some particulars, although adopting and defending its main point. After Hausrath (1870), many had accustomed themselves to call 2 Co 10-13, the 'Four chapters Epistle' (*Vierkapitelbrief*) of Paul to the Co, and to consider them earlier than that which we find now in 2 Co 1-9. Dr. Davidson also ranges himself, without reservation, on their side (*Introduction*³, vol. i. 57-58, 63-64). There were many who for long had tried to escape the noticed objections to the obviously Pauline origin of certain communications, expressions, or words in the Epistles to the Romans, the Corinthians, and the Galatians, by accepting larger and smaller interpolations. We also find among these learned men Dr. Davidson, as to 2 Co 6¹⁴-7¹ (*Intr.*³, vol. i. p. 63).

Although F. C. Baur had not doubted the original unity of 2 Co, and apart from the attempts of some of those whose mental affinities agree with his, to dispel entirely or partially his suspicions regarding Ro 15-16, yet even before the appearance of the recent opposers of the authenticity of the leading Epistles (Ro, 1 and 2 Co, Gal), it would have been inexact to speak of 'four Epistles . . . generally considered authentically Pauline.' The history of criticism teaches rather that that contest had been prepared for, and necessarily had to come. As to Dr. Davidson's description of this 'wave of hypercriticism,' Dr. S. A. Naber is no theologian but a philologist, who has several times

deserved thanks for his conjectures on the text of the New Testament. He has written, in collaboration with his late colleague, Dr. A. Pierson, *Verisimilia: Laceram conditionem Novi Testamenti exemplis illustrarunt et ab origine repetierunt*—A. P. et S. A. N.—(Amstelodami apud P. N. van Kampen et Fil.), 1886. In this book it is supposed throughout that we do not possess authentic Epistles from the Apostle Paul, and in it much is to be found to indicate that the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans have the character of a not happy compilation of the documents in hand, but the work cannot be called a regular essay on the question of the authenticity of Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians. The principal point was to explain clearly to the reader that not only the leading Pauline Epistles, but also the other writings of the N.T. have come down to us in a very corrupt and deplorable text. There may be found in *Jahrb. für protest. Theol.* (Leipzig: J. A. Barth), 1887, pp. 395-431, an account of the contents as far as they relate to a supposed Paulus Episcopus as the author of New Testament 'Epistles of Paul.'

Pierson had already stated, in his work, *The Sermon on the Mount, and other Synoptical Fragments*, 1878, pp. 98-110, — shortly after Bruno Bauer had briefly repeated his old scruples in *Christus und die Cäsaren*, 1877, p. 372, — why the authenticity of Paul's Epistle to the Galatians was not an established dogma for him as for others. He was the first in Holland to declare himself of this opinion. Among his antagonists was the Amsterdam professor, Dr. A. D. Loman, who confessed afterwards that Pierson had made him waver in spite of his faulty and incomplete demonstration. He himself began, in a series of *Quaestiones paulinae*, published in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* (Leiden: S. C. van Doesburgh), 1882, 1883, 1886, a justification of the conviction he then reached that the canonical Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians proceed, not from the Apostle Paul, any more than those that follow them in the N.T., but were written in the first half of the second century. Although of great interest for the history of the question, and, in many respects, a scientific essay, this series is not complete, and is no regular, finished inquiry into the authenticity of the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians. It

gives, like prolegomena, general observations about the advance of the question and the necessity for renewed research. It contains, first, a chapter in which the *argumenta externa* for the Epistle to the Galatians are weighed in the balance and found wanting (1882-1883), and a second chapter in which the question of the authenticity of the whole collection of Pauline Epistles is viewed in the light of the history of the Canon (1886). I may refer those who wish a fuller account of the contents, and cannot read Dutch but understand German, to my article on the *Quaestiones*, published in 1882-1883, 'Zur Literaturgeschichte der Kritik und Exegese des Neuen Testaments,' in *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1883, pp. 593-605; or, for the whole, to *Der Galaterbrief im Feuer der neuesten Kritik*—von Lic. Dr. P. V. Schmidt (Leipzig: A. Neumann), 1892, pp. 23-232: an account so full that it is almost equal to a translation. It is the most important pages of this *Kritik* which Schürer and other competent antagonists of the so-called 'wave of hypercriticism' have rejected with a positive *non tali auxilio*.

Dr. Rudolf Steck, professor in Bern, was the first who wrote a sufficiently finished inquiry into the origin, not of the four, but of one of the leading Epistles—that to the Galatians. He had read, first, Loman's *Quaestiones*, and although not at all agreeing with it, he had been led by it to think. The firm belief in the authenticity of the leading Epistles had been shaken, and gradually the conviction arose that it could not and should not be retained any longer. In *Der Galaterbrief nach seiner Echtheit untersucht nebst kritischen Bemerkungen an den paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, (Berlin: G. Reimer), 1888, an account was given of Paul's conversion, and it was declared that the Epistle to the Galatians is not Paul's own, but the work of an unknown man living in the first half of the second century. This work deals first and principally with the so-called internal grounds, because Loman had anticipated it in speaking of the so-called external ones. Although important remarks are made with regard to the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians, these cannot be regarded as an elaborated study, for which that was neither the time nor place.

The Amsterdam professor, D. J. E. Völter, a German by birth and education, can only be partly reckoned among the Dutch theologians who have opposed the authenticity of the leading

Epistles. He wrote 'Ein Votum zur Frage nach der Echtheit, Integrität und Composition der vier paulinischen Hauptbriefe,' published in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1889, pp. 265-325, and partly further elaborated in a separate work, *Die Composition der paulinischen Hauptbriefe: I. Der Römer- und Galaterbrief* (Tübingen: J. J. Heckenhauer), 1890. The result of these studies seems to be that the Epistle to the Galatians is not authentic, but that to the Romans is a revision and development from the original shorter Epistle, which Paul had really sent to the Christians in Rome, while both Epistles to the Corinthians have been compiled from three disjoined Epistles of Paul, to which portions have been added by a third person. Völter wishes to be allowed to speak still about Paul's Epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians.

He thinks that he knows the forms and contents of the original Epistles, after the process of analysis, fairly well. It did not require Steck to convince me. In the course of other earlier studies, Pierson and Loman had opened my eyes, in spite of myself, although I tried to oppose their conclusions. I had learned to read the leading Epistles in a free and impartial spirit, without considering myself bound by the unchangeable dogma that they are the most authentic which we possess from Christian antiquity, and are Paul's own, written between the years 52 or 55 and 60. I had gradually reached the firm conviction that these Epistles, as well as the others in the Pauline collection, are pseudepigrapha, of which the oldest portions certainly do not belong to an earlier date than the end of the first, if not the beginning of the second, century. To the preceding studies belonged an article entitled 'Marcion's Epistle from Paul to the Galatians,' published in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1887, pp. 382-404, 451-533. This led to the surprising result that Marcion probably knew the Epistle in an older form, although one not very different from that in which we read it in the N.T. The important bearing of this conclusion on the question of the authenticity was not expressed in words, but was felt immediately by our countryman, Kuenen, who, although he had struggled against Pierson-Naber (*Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1886, pp. 491-536), and still was convinced of the purely Pauline origin of the leading Epistles, exclaimed, after becoming acquainted with the contents, 'But then

it is impossible that the Epistle to the Galatians is Paul's own.' Indeed, if Marcion knew the Epistle in an older—I do not say the original—form, which Christians in becoming Catholics changed here and there, in order to bring the writing more into agreement with their opinion, it is very likely that the work proceeded from the circle of those who were afterwards called 'heretics,' and that it belongs to the extensive literature which the 'Catholics' pilfered from the 'heretics' and made serviceable for themselves. How 'heretics' could have got possession of an authentic Epistle, written by Paul to the Galatians, known to no other Christians but themselves, is as enigmatical as the consequence is natural: that an Epistle quite unknown to Catholic Christians must have had its origin from another circle, and that it was not written by him whose name it bears.

I have pointed out another result of preliminary research in the first volume of a little series of separate essays under the common title, *Paul* (Leiden: E. J. Brill). In *Paul I.: Acts of the Apostles* (1890) I have tried to answer the question, What do the Acts of the Apostles teach us about Paul and Paulinism, apart from the Epistles? While writing this I could not avoid a research into the origin of the Acts of the Apostles. This led to an acknowledgment that the relative unity of the work cannot be doubted, nor its composition from different originals, among which two rank first, which we can distinguish as *Periodoi* or *Praxeis Petrou* and *Periodoi Paulou*. In the latter is to be found the well-known 'Travel-narrative,' the much-talked-of 'We source.' Now the way was opened to answer the principal question. I had then to look at the Apostle in three different lights, according to what we find in the Acts of the real past, what is to be found in the *Periodoi Paulou*, and what Luke himself regarded as the truth. The conclusion might be summed up as follows (pp. 199-204):—Only in the oldest of the above-mentioned three lights in which the Apostle's life is viewed are we quite on historical ground. Here Paul appears to us as a 'disciple' among the 'disciples.' There is yet no question about 'Christians,' of breaking with Judaism, of disregard of the law, or neglect of circumcision. The days of the Holy Ghost, which in these and other respects will teach the next generation to walk other ways, have not yet arrived. No one knows that Holy Ghost. Nobody

thinks himself guided by Him. The 'disciples' are Jews through origin or conformation, that is to say, by their birth or by becoming proselytes, and remain so, whatever they may be besides in their own opinion or that of others. They profess a creed, and form a sect among the Jews, which, however this may distinguish, does not separate them from those who, with regard to manners and customs, law and prophets, temple and synagogue, are truly called Jews. The centre of their particular deliberation is Jesus, whose 'disciples' they consider themselves, with whose appearance they connect the fulfilment of certain Messianic expectations, and whom they, as it seems, acknowledge as the promised Messiah. The reminding each other of the things concerning Jesus, τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, and the preaching of these to others is what distinguishes them from the other Jews, and constrains them to lead a strictly moral life in mutual love.

Paul joined this community of brethren. He placed himself quite at the disposal of the 'disciples' for the spreading of their principles. He travelled for this purpose through different countries, with varying success and varied experiences. The particulars of this period have come down to us only very incomplete, and mixed with strange elements from later biographies. We do not hear that he has ever written Epistles of any importance, or that there ever arose between him and the other 'disciples' any dispute as to belief and life, the opinion of the common confirmation, or its further effects. A writer who lived later, and who could consult older originals—our Luke—seems to be acquainted with disputes of that kind, in which Paul's name was mentioned, but gives us plainly to understand that, at least in his opinion—and according to a true tradition (?)—they did not break out before Paul himself was withdrawn from the stage of his activities. He puts in his mouth, at his departure from the presbyters of the community in Ephesus, the prediction, 'I know this, that *after my departing* shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things—*διεστραμμένα*—to draw away disciples after them' (Ac 20²⁹⁻³⁰). However this may be, we do not hear of any dispute, and we have no reason to suppose that it is hidden from our eyes on purpose, because we cannot even guess what it would have been about. Paul is congenial in

mind with Peter and others, who, as well as he, although in another sphere, have devoted themselves to missionary labour on behalf of the common interests and wishes of the 'disciples.'

A long time elapses. The first generation, perhaps even more than one, have passed away. Among 'disciples' away from Palestine, namely, in Antioch in Syria, an inclination to get rid of Judaism, and to break also, in other respects, with tradition, reveals itself. We may suppose that their communication with the heathen world and the admitting of former heathens into the communion of brethren caused and fed this inclination. The influence of the Greco-Roman civilization, and not least, the knowledge of the Scriptures and the philosophy transferred from Alexandria to Antioch, Ephesus, and other towns in Asia Minor exercise a positive influence on it. However the particulars regarding the history of its birth may be explained, a reformation does arise among the 'disciples.' The 'things concerning Jesus' are eclipsed, or rather men learn to judge more exactly about them. Religious truth is taken up more deeply and extensively, a new flight given to contemplation in the sphere of religion, matters relating to belief and life in nearly every point are revised and altered, and there is a resolute breaking away from Judaism. 'The Gospel of God's mercy' is born; the glad message which is brought to all without distinction that the Almighty God has sent His Son, the Christ, to save as many as possible by faith or by believing in Him. To a particular revelation, communication, and leading of the Holy Ghost, they owe the new light thrown upon the past and the future of themselves and others, and on the true signification of Jesus, no other than God's Son, the Christ, at whose temporary appearance on earth they cannot stop. The 'disciples,' from being a Jewish sect, become 'Christians' (Ac 11²⁶).

Those who follow this line combine with it the name of Paul. He becomes the hero, the patron of their sect. To him are transferred, to him are ascribed the thoughts and feelings born in others by the regenerated life and the endeavour of the 'disciples' to become first 'Christians.' He must testify, recommend, wish, perform in word and deed what they themselves esteem good and useful. In this way they came to describe his life. In so doing they may have used known traditions and written records. But they can hardly have derived

anything without modifications, because they have before their eyes quite another, greater, sublimer image of Paul's life and work. His position must, besides, as now sketched, prove on the one hand that the doctrine connected with his name has its root in an honourable past, while it is not to be denied, on the other hand, that the doctrine which we now conveniently call Paulinism is really new. From one source and the other we can explain the uncertainties in Paul's image as he appears before us in the Acts called after him, the *Periodoi Paulou*. In the meantime he stands there as a grand proof that Paulinism was born after Paul's death, that it immediately found much approbation, but also encountered opposition, and that in the old circle of the 'disciples' a strong antagonism to the new doctrine was brought to life. Strange to say, there is no evidence at all of Epistles written by this Pauline Paul.

Again several years elapse. The struggle has, in the judgment of men of influence, lost its importance and cannot be kept up. Peter, the hero and patron of the 'disciples,' as Paul was of the 'Christians,' is delineated in Acts called after him *Periodoi Petrou*, after the model of Paul in the *Periodoi Paulou*. The opponents approach each other more and more. 'Peter' appears in the character of 'Paul,' and the former seems to have been from the beginning of one mind and equal with the latter. There must, of course, be something altered in the picture of both lives to show this quite clearly. Luke girds himself for this task. He makes one book out of the two, and combines the two lives, each completing and covering parts of the important whole: the oldest history of the Christian communities, their foundation and their extension over the world. To Peter he gives Pauline touches, to Paul words and tints through which he, more than in *Periodoi Paulou*, resembles Peter, and scarcely distinguishes him by anything remarkable from the other 'disciples.' Probably he knows Pauline Epistles, but he does not mention them, and uses them sparingly. His Paul bears a different character from the one in the Epistles, and in the 'Acts' assiduously consulted by him. He is the apostle who, next to Peter, can become the founder of the Catholic Church, the man in whom are combined the old and the new, the principles of the 'disciples' and those of the 'Christians,' a respect for 'the things concerning Jesus' and a love for 'the Gospel of God's

mercy,' a mode of life conformable with the hints and lessons given by men, and one under constant leading of the Holy Ghost, in a way, after all, it is true, unintelligible, but, notwithstanding, remarkable. Young Christianity has in him for those who delight in beholding its image, lost its history of development, and this is what ought to have been according to the wish and intention of the author of our Acts: one and the same as that of all sincere votaries, especially of men of name after whom parties and doctrines have illegally been named for some time.

In other words, the distinction of three images of Paul's life in our canonical Acts gives us a surprising glance at the oldest history of our religion. It teaches us that the old Catholic opinion, as well as that of the school of Tübingen, must be considered untenable. There is a struggle between Peter and Paul, but not between the bearers of those names. They have lived and worked with others as 'disciples of Jesus,' while no dogmatical quarrels divided them. Not until after their death was Paulinism born, and with that, as with every improvement, an apple of discord was thrown among the people, who were called to live together as brothers.

Let us next examine the Epistles to see whether the result hitherto obtained is confirmed. The answer to this will be found in my *Paul II.: The Epistle to the Romans* (1891). The nature of this work, its unity, composition, origin, are there successively considered, and it is proved, I think, that we do not have here before us a real letter, but a literary one, an 'epistle'; that is, a book in the form of a letter, as Deissmann proposes to distinguish between a *letter* and an *epistle*, in, as I regard it, the perfect first part of his *Prolegomena zu den biblischen Briefen und Episteln*, published in *Bibelstudien* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert), 1895. I have tried to explain that that 'epistle' to the Romans is uncontestedly one whole, although composed in the way of a synoptical Gospel, with the help of older documents, essays, and possibly Epistles, out of which much was taken over, perhaps sometimes *verbatim*. If the non-authenticity of the 'Epistle' follows already from this, a further examination of the tradition brings its untenability to light for those who might have scruples touching the truth of the traces of additions and alterations pointed out, or those who were not entirely

convinced thereby. Attention is called to a series of probabilities relating to the dogmatical contents of the Epistle, the taking for granted the reader's knowledge of Paulinism, the tangible relation in more than one point with Gnosis, the age of the community addressed, the using of a written Gospel and Acts, although it be rather the older *Periodoi Paulou* than Luke,—all of which show the origin of the Epistle to date from a later time than Paul († 64). Attempts made before and since to do away with objections, and to confirm the authenticity, are weighed in the balance and found wanting. Afterwards, it is declared that we may consider the Epistle as a remarkable witness to Paulinism, and an exhibition of the spiritual convictions connected with Paul's name, which we can call shortly and rightly a highly interesting reformation of the old Christianity, *i.e.* the Christianity of the apostles and of those who immediately followed them. As proof of the whole contention, a series of facts are noted which come

into full light if one admits the relatively late origin of Paulinism, or which harmonize perfectly with this supposition.

A fuller account of my book was given by Steck in German: *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, 1892, Nos. 34-35, as he had done in the previous year—1891, No. 34—with regard to *Paul I.: The Acts of the Apostles*. A third volume of these Pauline studies—*Paul III.: The Epistles to the Corinthians*—was published November 1896. It is reviewed and rejected by J. R. in the *Inquirer*, 27th February 1897; H. J. Holtzmann bestowed twelve lines on it in *Theol. Jahresh.* xvi. 144; Carl Clemen summarized the contents and criticized it in half a column of the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1897, No. 21. A long review was given by Rud. Steck, *Protest. Monatshefte*, i. 333-342. In this volume the Epistles to the Corinthians are treated in the same way as the Romans in *Paul II.*

(To be concluded.)

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

JOHN xv. 5.

'I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit: for apart from Me ye can do nothing.'

EXPOSITION.

'I am the vine.'—The first words do not contain a mere repetition. The words which had been formerly spoken generally are now specifically applied to the relation to Christ and His disciples, in order to draw the conclusion that they can bear fruit only in fellowship with Him.—HENGSTENBERG.

'Ye are the branches.'—'I am the vine' was a general truth, with no clear personal application. 'Ye are the branches' brought each individual listener into connexion with it.—MACLAREN.

'He that abideth in Me, and I in him.'—How? Internally and externally. Internally by faith and love, and secret prayer; externally by partaking of the One Bread, and so being in the One Body (1 Co 10¹⁷), and also by continuance in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the common prayers (Ac 2⁴²).—SADLER.

'The same bringeth forth much fruit.'—What is this fruit, because upon so vital a matter there should be no

misconception? The first account of 'much fruit' of Christian works is at the very formation and outset of the Church: 'Fear (the true fear of God) came upon every soul, and all that believed were together, and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men . . . and they continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God.' This fruit, if it be the fruit of Christ dwelling in us, must be in accordance with His teaching. It must be the fruit of the Beatitudes—humiliation, godly sorrow, meekness, earnest desires after righteousness, mercifulness, peace-making, purity of heart, enduring persecution for righteousness' sake, and for Christ's sake. It must be the fruit set forth in St. Paul's account of charity, in St. Peter's adding of virtue to virtue (2 P 1³), in St. James's government of the tongue (Ja 3).—SADLER.

'Much fruit.'—Though it is not expressed, yet it is clear that the amount of the fruit depends upon the closeness of the adherence, *i.e.* on the strength of the faith and love.—SADLER.

'Apart from Me.'—Not simply without My help, but separated from Me. Cf. Eph 2¹², chap. 1³.—WESTCOTT.

'Do nothing.'—Accomplish nothing, bring out no permanent result. The thought is directly of Christian action, which can only be wrought in Christ. At the same time, the words have a wider application. Nothing that