

ness, love, faith. In the first cycle the Christian life, as fellowship with God, is tested by 'walking in the light', and to this are applied the three tests of men's attitude to sin and righteousness, to love and to belief. In the second cycle (ii 29-iv 6) the Christian life, as divine Sonship, is presented in its relation to the same three tests of righteousness, love, and belief: while the third cycle (iv 7-v 21) deals with the closer correlation of these three. We are again reminded that the meditations of the author of this Epistle do not lend themselves to rigid analysis. But Mr Law's treatment of his subject is vigorous and independent, and he fully understands the practical aims of the Epistle. Every student of the Epistle knows that its author did not intend to write a theological treatise, and that he wrote to edify, the polemical aim being always secondary. Mr Law has the good sense never to forget these facts.

A. E. BROOKE.

In *The Pauline Epistles: a Critical Study* (by ROBERT SCOTT, M.A., D.D., Bombay: T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1909), Dr Scott gives us a careful and systematic attempt to throw new light upon the vexed questions connected with the authorship of the Epistles that bear the name of St Paul. His method is stated in the opening chapter: 'The argument rests exclusively upon internal data—mainly on theological ideas and literary style.' Upon these grounds he divides the Epistles into four groups:—(1) 1 and 2 Cor. and Rom. (except certain sections), Gal. and Phil.; (2) Eph., 1 Thess. iv, v, 2 Thess. i, ii, 1 Cor. xv 20-34, 2 Cor. vi 14-vii 1, Rom. xii, xiii, xv, Heb. (and 1 Pet.); (3) 1 Thess. i-iii, 2 Thess. iii, Col., Philemon, Rom. xiv; (4) the Pastoral Epistles—and assigns the authorship of the four to Paul, Silas, Timothy, and Luke respectively. Those of the first group contain the essentials of Paul's teaching, and are indisputably his. The remainder are Pauline in spirit, but each of the three last groups reveals a particular bias which can only be accounted for by the supposition that they are the work of various members of the Pauline circle.

A method, such as this, of classification by internal evidence alone, is open to the obvious objection that the results must be hypothetical and arbitrary. And if the Epistles are all admittedly saturated with Pauline thought, may not it be at least as likely that other Epistles besides those of the first group are from Paul's pen? Dr Scott foresees these objections and devotes some space to meeting and answering them. He examines and criticizes the two main arguments of the more conservative school. The first he illustrates by quoting the words of Lightfoot: 'It is a generally recognized fact that St Paul's

Epistles fall chronologically into four groups, separated from one another by an interval of five years, roughly speaking, and distinguished by their internal character.' The second argument deals with St Paul's alleged Hellenism. We find in the Epistles terms belonging to Greek rather than Jewish life, and traces of Platonic and Stoic influence: and the inference usually drawn from these facts is that St Paul was affected by contact with Greek thought, and must have imbibed at least the atmosphere of Greek philosophy.

Dr Scott's book is practically an attempt to refute these two main positions. He denies that the letters that bear St Paul's name can be a homogeneous whole, or that the differences observable between them in style and thought can be reconciled with their ascription to a single author. On the subject of St Paul's Hellenism he is equally emphatic. St Paul doubtless was acquainted with Greek life, but he remained a Pharisee to the end. It is true that he was emancipated from strict Judaism and his mind received an illumination which produced a revolution: but the effect of this was only to corroborate his faith in the exclusive revelation to Israel. Greek philosophy is, throughout, the theme of his scorn.

Dr Scott seems to me to be at his best in the application of his principles when he deals with the Pastoral Epistles. For the rest, I do not think his two lines of argumentation are fully established. He relies for support of his main position, that his last three groups cannot be the work of St Paul, on differences observable in style, on the presence of philosophical and apocalyptic elements in the thought of the writer, and on divergences of doctrinal presentation of the same fundamental facts. But is it not fair to say that we find in the Epistles of the admittedly genuine first group as great differences in style and tone as we find existing between the first and the other groups? Again, are not there unmistakeable evidences of something more than acquaintance with Greek thought in the two Epistles to the Corinthians? Once again, to Dr. Scott the apocalyptic elements in the Thessalonians destroy their claim to be considered as Pauline: but what more natural than that, if they are the earliest extant Epistles, the Apostle's mind should have been much occupied with the imminence of the *Παρουσία*?

But if Dr Scott's arguments are not convincing we may welcome his book for its freshness and evident freedom from bias, as worthy in spirit and execution to take its place in the onward movement towards more certain knowledge. In his own words, 'The advent of the secular historian and critic is a proof that whether the Church lead or lag the problems will be probed'.

PHILIP C. T. CRICK.