

Introduction to the New Testament

by

Louis Berkhof

About Introduction to the New Testament by Louis Berkhof

Title: Introduction to the New Testament
URL: <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/berkhof/newtestament.html>
Authors(s): Berkhof, Louis
Publisher: Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library
Rights: Public Domain
Date Created: 2004-04-02
Contributor(s): Mike Randall (Digitizer)
CCEL Subjects: All; Bible

Table of Contents

About This Book	p. ii
<i>Title Page</i>	p. 1
Preface	p. 2
Prolegomena	p. 3
The Gospels in General	p. 12
Matthew	p. 30
Mark	p. 38
Luke	p. 46
53John	p. 53
Acts	p. 61
The Epistles in General	p. 67
The Epistles of Paul	p. 73
The Epistle to the Romans	p. 76
The First Epistle to the Corinthians	p.83
The Second Epistle to the Corinthians	p. 89
The Epistle to the Galatians	p.94
The Epistle to the Ephesians	p. 101
The Epistle to the Philippians	p. 107
The Epistle to the Colossians	p. 112
The First Epistle to the Thessalonians	p. 117
The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians	p. 122
The Pastoral Epistles	p. 126
The First Epistle to Timothy	p. 131
The Second Epistle to Timothy	p. 135
The Epistle to Titus	p. 139
The Epistle to Philemon	p. 141
The Epistle to the Hebrews	p. 144
The General Epistle of James	p. 152

Louis Berkhof

Introduction to the New Testament

The First General Epistle of Peter	p. 159
The Second General Epistle of Peter	p. 166
The First General Epistle of John	p. 172
The Second and Third General Epistles of John	p. 177
The General Epistle of Jude	p. 181
The Revelation of John	p. 185
Index of Scripture References	p. 193
Index of Scripture Commentary	p. 195

New Testament Introduction

Louis Berkhof

Eerdmans, 1915

Scanned and proofread by Mike Randall

PREFACE

This little work on New Testament Introduction is the result of labor done in and for the class-room, and is primarily intended for my own students. It is not and does not pretend to be a work of original research, but depends in a large measure on the labors of such men as Davidson, Reuss, Weiss, Westcott, Lightfoot, Godet, Holtzmann, Julicher, Zahn, e. a. The indebtedness to these will be evident from its pages.

In method of treatment I have partly gone my own way, both in virtue of principles that are not generally recognized in works of Introduction and for practical considerations. As far as the limits of the work allowed, the directions given by Dr. Kuyper in his Encyclopaedia of Sacred Theology have been followed; not only the human but also the divine side of the Sacred Scriptures has been treated.

It has been my constant endeavor in writing this book, to make it a work that would introduce the students to the books of the New Testament, as they have in fact been transmitted to the Church, and not as some critic or other would have them be. Hence critical questions, though not disregarded, do not loom as large on its pages as they often do in works on Introduction; the positive constructive element has a decided precedence over the apologetic; and the human factor that operated in the origin and composition of the Scriptures, is not studied to the neglect of the divine.

A limited number of copies was printed, partly in deference to the expressed wish of some of my present and past students, and partly because I desire to use it as a text-book in the future, there being none of the smaller works on Introduction, such as those of Dods, Pullan, Kerr, Barth, Peake e. a., however excellent some of them may be in their own way, that gave me what I desired. If the book may in some small measure be instrumental in leading others to a greater appreciation and an ever better understanding of the New Testament writings, I shall be very grateful indeed.

L. BERKHOF.

Grand Rapids, Mich., November 30, 1915.

PROLEGOMENA.

1. NAME AND IDEA.

The name Introduction or Isagogics (from the Greek εισαγωγή) did not always denote what it does today. As it is used by the monk Adrianus (circa 440) and by Cassiodorus (circa 570), it designates a conglomeration of rhetorical archaeological, geographical and historical matter such as might be helpful in the interpretation of Scripture. In course of time the connotation of the word changed. Michaelis (1750) was the first one to employ it in something like its present sense, when he entitled his work, devoted to the literary historical questions of the New Testament, *Einleitung in die gottlichen Schriften des neuen Bundes*. The study of Introduction was gradually limited to an investigation of the origin, the composition, the history, and the significance of the Bible as a whole (General Introduction), or of its separate books (Special Introduction). But as a designation of this discipline the name Introduction did not meet with general approval. It was pointed out—and correctly so—that the name is too comprehensive, since there are other disciplinae that introduce to the study of the Bible; and that it does not express the essential character of the discipline, but only one of its practical uses.

Several attempts have been made to supply a name that is more in harmony with the central contents and the unifying principle of this study. But opinions differed as to the essential character of the discipline. Some scholars, as Reuss, Credner and Hupfeld, emphasizing its historical nature, would designate it by a name something like that already employed by Richard Simon in 1678, when he styled his work, “Critical History of the Old Testament. Thus Hupfeld says: “Der eigentliche und allein richtige Name der Wissenschaft in ihrem heutigen Sinn ist demnach Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments.” *Begriff und Methode des sogenannten biblischen Einleitung* p. 12. Reuss arranged his work entirely on this principle. It was objected however, by several scholars that a history of the Biblical literature is now, and perhaps for all time an impossibility and that such a treatment necessarily leads to a co-ordination of the canonical and the apocryphal books. And this is just what we find in the History of Reuss. Hence the great majority of New Testament scholars, as Bleek, Weiss, Davidson, Holtzmann, Julicher, Zahn e.a. prefer to retain the old name, either with or without the qualification, “historical-critical.”

Another and important stricture on the name suggested by Hupfeld, is that it loses sight of the theological character of this discipline. Holtzmann correctly says: “Als Glied des Organismus der theologischen Wissenschaften ist die biblische Einleitung allerdings nur vom Begriffe des Kanons aus zu begreifen, nur in ihm findet sie ihre innere Einheit, “*Historisch-critische Einleitung in das Neue Testament* p. 11. This special consideration also leads Kuyper to prefer the name Special Canonics. *Encyclopaedie der Heilige Godgeleerdheid* III p. 22 ff. Ideally this name is probably the best; it is certainly better than the

others, but for practical reasons it seems preferable to abide by the generally recognized name Introduction. There is no serious objection to this, if we but remember its deficiency, and bear in mind that *verba valent usu*.

2. FUNCTION.

What is the proper function of this discipline? According to De Wette it must answer the questions: “Was ist die Bibel, und wie ist sie geworden was sie ist ?” Hupfeld objects to the first question that it has no place in a historical inquiry; hence he would change it a little and state the problem as follows: “Was waren die unter den Namen des Bibel vereinigten Schriften ursprünglich, und wie sind sie geworden was sie jetzt sind ?” *Begriff u. Meth.* p. 13. It is now generally understood and admitted that the study must investigate the questions of the authorship, the composition, the history, the purpose and the canonicity of the different books of the Bible.

A difference of opinion becomes apparent, however, as soon as we ask, whether the investigation should be limited to the canonical books or should include the Apocrypha as well. The answer to that question will necessarily depend on one's standpoint. They who regard Introduction as a purely historical study of Hebrew and Old Christian literature, will hold with Raibiger and Reuss that the apocryphal books must also receive due consideration. On the other hand, they who desire to maintain the theological character of this discipline and believe that it finds its unity in the idea of the canon, will exclude the Apocrypha from the investigation.

A similar difference obtains with reference to the question, whether it is only the human or also the divine side of the canonical books that should be the object of study. It is perfectly obvious that, if the discipline be regarded as a purely historical one, the divine factor that operated in the composition of the books of the Bible and that gives them their permanent canonical significance, cannot come in consideration. The Word of God must then be treated like all purely human compositions. This is the stand taken by nearly all writers on Introduction, and Hupfeld believes that even so it is possible to maintain the theological character of the discipline. *Begriff u. Meth.* p. 17. It appears to us, however, that this is impossible, and with Kuyper we hold that we should not only study the human, but should also have regard to the divine side of the Biblical books, notably to their inspiration and canonical significance.

Lastly the conception of the final aim of this study also varies. Many scholars are of the opinion that it is the final purpose of Introduction to determine in a historico-critical way what part of the Biblical writings are credible and therefore really constitute the Word of God. Human reason is placed as an arbiter over the divine Revelation. This, of course, cannot be the position of those who believe that the Bible is the Word of God. This belief is our starting point and not our goal in the study of Introduction. Thus we begin with a theological postulate, and our aim is to set forth the true character of Scripture, in order to explain, why the Church universal honors it as the Word of God; to strengthen the faith of believers; and to vindicate the claims of the canonical books over against the assaults of Rationalism.

To define: Introduction is that Bibliological discipline that investigates the origin, composition, history and purpose of the Scriptural writings, on their human side; and their inspiration and canonical significance, on the divine side.

3. LEADING PRINCIPLES.

There are certain fundamental principles that guide us in our investigation, which it is desirable to state at the outset, in order that our position may be perfectly clear. For the sake of brevity we do not seek to establish them argumentatively.

1. For us the Bible as a whole and in all its parts is the very Word of God, written by men indeed, but organically inspired by the Holy Spirit; and not the natural product of the religious development of men, not merely the expression of the subjective religious consciousness of believers.

4

Louis Berkhof

Introduction to the New Testament

Resting, as it ultimately does, on the testimony of the Holy Spirit, no amount of historical investigation can shake this conviction.

2. This being our position, we unflinchingly accept all that the various books of the Bible tell us concerning their authorship, destination, composition, inspiration, etc. Only in cases where the text is evidently corrupt, will we hesitate to accept their dicta as final. This applies equally to all parts of the Word of God.

3. Since we do not believe that the Bible is the result of a purely natural development, but regard it as the product of supernatural revelation, a revelation that often looks beyond the immediate present, we cannot allow the so-called *zeitgeschichtliche* arguments the force which they are often supposed to have.

4. While it is the prevailing habit of many New Testament scholars to discredit what the early Church fathers say respecting the books of the Bible, because of the uncritical character of their work, we accept those early traditions as trustworthy until they are clearly proven unreliable. The character of those first witnesses warrants this position.

5. We regard the use of working-hypotheses as perfectly legitimate within certain limits. They may render good service, when historical evidence fails, but even then may not go contrary to the data at hand, and the problematic character of the results to which they lead must always be borne in mind.

6. It is not assumed that the problems of New Testament Introduction are insignificant, and that all the difficulties that present themselves can easily be cleared up. Whatever our standpoint, whatever our method of procedure in studying these problems, we shall sometimes have to admit our ignorance, and often find reason to confess that we know but in part.

4. ENCYCLOPAEDIC PLACE

There is little uniformity in Theological Encyclopaedias with respect to the proper place of this discipline. They all correctly place it among the Exegetical (Bibliological) group of Theological disciplinae, but its relation to the other studies of that group is a matter of dispute. The usual arrangement is that of Hagenbach, followed in our country by Schaff, Crooks and Hurst and Weidner, viz.: Biblical Philology, dealing with the words, and Biblical Archaeology, in its broadest sense, with the things of the Bible; Biblical Introduction,

treating of the fortunes, and Biblical Criticism, supplying the test of Scripture; Biblical Hermeneutics, relating to the theory, and Biblical Exegesis, pertaining to the practice of interpretation. The order of Rabiger is unusual: Hermeneutics, Linguistics, Criticism, Antiquities, Biblical History, Isagogics, Exegesis, and Biblical theology. The disposition of Kuyper and Cave is preferable to either one of these. They place Introduction (Canonics) first, as pertaining to the formal side of Scripture as a book and then let the studies follow that have reference to the formal and material side of the contents of the Bible.

5. HISTORICAL REVIEW.

Although the beginnings of New Testament Isagogics are already found in Origen, Dionysus and Eusebius; and in the time of the Reformation some attention was devoted to it by Paginus, Sixtus of Siene and Serarius among the Roman Catholics; by Walther of the Lutherans; and by the Reformed scholars, Rivetus and Heidegger;—Richard Simon is generally regarded as the father of this study. His works were epoch-making in this respect, though they had reference primarily to

the language of the New Testament. He minimized the divine element in Scripture. Michaelis, who in his, *Einleitung in die gottlichen Schriften des neuen Bundes*, 1750, produced the first Introduction in the modern sense, though somewhat dependent on Simon, did not altogether share his rationalistic views. Yet in the succeeding editions of his work he gradually relaxed on the doctrine of inspiration, and attached no value to the *Testimonium Spiritus Sancti*.

The next significant contribution to the science was made by Semler in his, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Kanons*, 1771-75. He broke with the doctrine of inspiration and held that the Bible was not, but contained the Word of God, which could be discovered only by the inner light. All questions of authenticity and credibility had to be investigated *voraussetzungslos*. Eichhorn also departed decidedly from traditional views and was the first to fix attention on the Synoptic problem, for which he sought the solution in his *Urevangelium*, 1804-27. At the same time the Johannine problem was placed in the foreground by several scholars, especially by Bretschneider, 1820. An acute defender of the traditional views arose in the Roman Catholic scholar Hug. who fought the rationalistic critics with their own weapons.

Meanwhile the Mediating school made its appearance under the leadership of Schleiermacher. The critics belonging to that school sought a mean between the positions of Rationalism and the traditional views. They were naturally divided into two sections, the naturalistic wing, inclining towards the position of Semler and Eichhorn; and the evangelical wing, leaning decidedly toward traditionalism. Of the first class De Wette was the ablest exponent, though his work was disappointing as to positive results; while Credner, following in general the same line, emphasized the historical idea in the study of Introduction. The other wing was represented by Guericke, Olshausen and Neander.

The Tubingen school of New Testament criticism took its rise with F. C. Baur, 1792-1860 who applied the Hegelian principle of development to the literature of the New Testament. According to him the origin of the

New Testament, too, finds its explanation in the three-fold process of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. There was action, reaction and compromise. Paul defended his position in the four great epistles (Romans, I and II Corinthians and Galatians), the only genuine productions of the apostle. This position is assailed by the Apocalypse, the sole work of John. And all the other writings of the New Testament were written by others than their reputed authors in the interest of reconciliation, the fourth Gospel and the first Epistle of John issuing in the blending of the different parties. Among the immediate followers of Baur we have especially Zeller, Schweigler and Kostlin. The further adherents of the school, such as Hilgenfeld, Hoisten and Davidson, modified the views of Baur considerably; while later German scholars, as Pfleiderer, Hausrath, Holtsmann, Weizsacker and Julicher, broke with the distinctive Tubingen theory and indulged independently in rationalistic criticism. The wildest offshoot of the Tubingen school was Bruno Bauer, who rejected even the four epistles regarded as genuine by F. C. Baur. He had no followers in Germany, but of late his views found support in the writings of the Dutch school of Pierson, Naber, Loman and Van Manen, and in the criticism of the Swiss scholar Steck.

Opposition to the radicalism of the Tubingen school became apparent in two directions. Some scholars, as Bleek, Ewald Reuss without intending a return to the traditional standpoint discarded the subjective element of the Tubingen theory, the Hegelian principle of thesis, antithesis and synthesis, in connection with the supposed second century struggle between Petrine and Pauline factions. Ritschl also broke away from the Tubingen tendency, but substituted an equally subjective principle of criticism by applying his favorite Werthurtheile to the authentication of the books of

6

Louis Berkhof

Introduction to the New Testament

the Bible. He had, as he claimed, no interest in saving mere objective statements. What had for him the value of a divine revelation was regarded as authentic. Some of his most prominent followers are Harnack, Schurer and Wendt. An evangelical reaction against the subjective Tubingen vagaries also made its appearance in Ebrard, Dietlein, Thiersch, Lechier and the school of Hofmann, who himself defended the genuineness of all the New Testament books. His disciples are Luthardt, Grau, Nosgen and Th. Zahn. The works of Beischlag and B. Weiss are also quite conservative. Moreover the writings of such men as Lightfoot, Westcott, Ellicott, Godet, Dods, Pullan e. a. maintain with great ability the traditional position respecting the books of the New Testament.

6. SELECT LITERATURE

Including the Works referred to in the Text. In order that the list may serve as a guide for students, both the edition and the value of the books are indicated.

I. BOOKS ON INTRODUCTION, BIBLE DICTIONARIES AND RELATED WORKS.

ALEXANDER, The Canon of the Old and New Testaments, Philadelphia 1851. Conservative.

ANDREWS, The Life of our Lord upon the Earth, New York 1894. Excellent for chronological and historical discussions.

BAIJON, Geschiedenis van de Boeken des Nieuwen Verbonds, Groningen 1901. Scholarly with a liberal point of view.

BARTH, *Finleitung in das Neue Testament*, Gutersloh 1908; 2d edit. since published. Conservative and good.

BAUR, *Church History of the first three Centuries*, London 1878-79. Brilliant but written with a rationalistic tendency.

BERNARD, *The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament*, New York 1864; 4th edit. 1878. A conservative and valuable work.

BLASS, *Crammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Gottingen 1911. Supercedes Winer and Buttmann, but does not render them worthless. An excellent work.

BLEEK, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 4th edit. by Mangold, Berlin 1886. Eng. transl. by W. Urwick, London 1870. One of the best works on N. T. Introd. Standpoint, moderately liberal.

BUCKLEY, *Introduction to the Synoptic Problem*, London 1912. Proceeds on the Combinations-hypothese.

CLARK, GEO. W., *Harmony of the Acts of the Apostles*, Philadelphia 1897. A very useful work.

DAVIDSON, S., *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, London 1894. Scholarly, but extremely rationalistic and verbose.

DAVIS, *A Dictionary of the Bible*, Philadelphia 1903. The best one volume Dictionary of the Bible.

DEISSMANN, *Light from the Ancient East*, London 1911. Very valuable for the new light it sheds on the language of the N. T.

DEISSMANN, *St. Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History*, London 1912. A vivid and delightful portrayal of Paul and his world.

DODS, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, London. A useful manual.

FARRAR, *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, London 1879. Instructive and written in a beautiful style, but not always characterized by sobriety.

GODET, *Introduction to the New Testament, I Pauline Epistles*, Edinburgh 1894; *II The Collection of the Four Gospels and the Gospel of St. Matthew*, Edinburgh 1899. Scholarly and conservative; devotes much space to the contents of the books.

GODET, *Bijbelstudien over het Nieuwe Testament*, Amsterdam. Contains introductions to the Gospels and the Apocalypse.

GREGORY, D. S., *Why Four Gospels*, New York 1907. The work of a conservative scholar, valuable in differentiating the Gospels.

GREGORY, C. R., *Canon and Text of the New Testament*, New York 1907. A scholarly and moderately conservative work.

HASTINGS, *Dictionary of the Bible*, dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents, New York 1900-04. Contains valuable introductions to the books of the Bible. Those pertaining to the New Testament are characterized by greater moderation than those relating to the Old; the latter are often extremely rationalistic, the former usually moderately conservative.

HAUSRATH, *History of New Testament Times: The Life of Jesus* 2 vols., Edinburgh 1878-80; *The Life of the Apostles* 4 vols., Edinburgh 1895. A learned work, full of information, but extremely rationalistic.

HILL, *Introduction to the Life of Christ*, New York 1911. A concise statement of the problems that enter into a study of the Life of Christ.

HOLDSWORTH, *Gospel Origins*. New York 1913. Though differing somewhat from the work of Buckley, it also advocates the Combinations-hypothese.

HOLTZMANN, Historisch-critische Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Freiburg 1892. Perhaps the most important representative of the rationalistic position in New Testament study. Very learned, and rich in historical matter.

JULICHER, Einleitung in des Neue Testament, Leipzig 1906. A scholarly work, written from the rationalistic point of view.

KING, The Theology of Christ's Teaching, New York 1903. Conservative and very instructive; weak in genetic treatment.

KERR, Introduction to New Testament Study, New York 1892. A conservative manual.

KUYPER, Encyclopaedie der Heilige Godgeleerdheid, Amsterdam 1894.

LUTHARDT, St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel, Edinburgh 1875. An able conservative defense, containing a large Bibliography by C. R. Gregory.

MCGIFFERT, The Apostolic Age, New York 1910. A scholarly but rationalizing work.

MOFFAT, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. New York 1911. Very able, but vitiated by rationalistic principles.

NORTON, Genuineness of the Gospels (abridged), Boston 1890. An able defense of the Gospels. The author adheres to the Traditions-hypothese.

PEAKE, A Critical Introduction to the New Testament, New York 1910. Well written, able, but following the line of negative criticism.

PULLAN, The Books of the New Testament, London 1901. A very useful manual; conservative.

PURVES, Christianity in the Apostolic Age, New York 1900. The work of a scholar. In point of view the antipode of McGiffert's book.

RAMSAY, Historical Commentary on the Galatians, London 1899.

RAMSAY, St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen, London 1903.

RAMSAY, The Church in the Roman Empire, London 1893.

RAMSAY, Luke the Physician (and other Studies), New York 1908. The works of Ramsay have a charm of their own: they are original and informing, based on large historical and archaeological knowledge, and, on the whole, written in a conservative spirit.

REAL-ENCYCLOPAEDIE, Hauck, Leipzig 1896-1909. Contains very valuable material for New Testament study, but many of its articles are marred by their destructive tendency.

REUSS, History of the New Testament, Boston 1884. The work of a great scholar; its method is peculiar; its standpoint moderately rationalistic.

SALMON, Historical Introduction to the Books of the New Testament, New York 1889. The antipode of Davidson's Introduction; very able, but suffering from want of method.

SCHURER, Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, Leipzig 1901-1911. The greatest work on the subject, but, on account of its liberal tendency, to be used with care.

SIMCOX, Writers of the New Testament, London 1890. Contains a lucid discussion of the style of the N. T. writers.

STEVENS, Johannine Theology, New York 1894.

STEVENS, Pauline Theology, New York 1903. Both works are stimulating and helpful, but must be used with discrimination.

URQUHART, The Bible, its Structure and Purpose, New York 1904.

URQUHART, The New Biblical Guide, London. Written by a staunch defender of the Bible, in popular style. Often helpful, especially the last work, in clearing up difficulties; but sometimes too confident and fanciful.

VAN MELLE, Inleiding tot het Nieuwe Testament, Utrecht 1908. A very good manual; conservative in spirit.

VON SODEN, Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte, Berlin 1905. Rationalistic.

WEISS, Manual of Introduction to the New Testament, London 1888. One of the best Introductions to the New Testament. Moderately conservative.

WEISS, Theology of the New Testament, Edinburgh 1892-3. On the whole the best work on the subject.

WESTCOTT, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, Boston 1902. Very helpful in differentiating the Gospels; defends the Traditions-hypothese.

WESTCOTT, The Canon of the New Testament, London 1881. One of the best works on the Canon of the N.T.

WESTCOTT and HORT, The New Testament in the original Greek; Introduction and Appendix, New York 1882. The indispensable companion to the Greek Testament, if one desires the reasons for the readings adopted.

WREDE, The Origin of the New Testament, London 1909. Very brief and radical.

WRIGHT, A Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek, London 1903. The most able presentation of the Traditions-hypothese.

ZAHN, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Leipzig 1900; 3. Aufl. 1906; Eng. transl. Edinburgh 1909. A work of immense learning; the best on N. T. Introduction from the conservative side.

II. COMMENTARIES.

Louis Berkhof

Introduction to the New Testament

ALEXANDER, Commentaries on Matthew, New York 1867; Mark, New York 1870; Acts 4th edit. New York 1884. Valuable works, containing sound learning and thoroughly conservative.

ALFORD, The Greek Testament, Cambridge 1894; Vol I, 7th edit.; Vol. II, 7th edit.; Vol. III, 5th edit.; Vol. IV, 5th edit. A truly great work; brief, lucid, scholarly, conservative, embodying the results of German scholarship, yet with a measure of independence, though in some parts leaning rather much on Meyer. Still very useful, though not up to date. Contains valuable Prolegomena.

BARDE, *Kommentaar op de Handelingen der Apostelen*, Kampen 1910. A good commentary, written in a conservative spirit.

BEET, *Commentaries on Romans*, 10th edit.; *I and II Corinthians*, 7th edit.; *Galatians*, 6th edit.; and *Ephesians, Philip pians, Colossians*, 3d edit., all London 1891-1903. Good commentaries by a Methodist scholar; conservative, but must be used with care, especially in passages pertaining to election, the doctrine of the last things, e. a.

BIESTERVELD, *De Brief van Paulus aan de Colossensen*, Kampen 1908. An excellent work.

BROWN, J., *Expositions of Galatians*, Edinburgh 1853; *Hebrews*, Edinburgh 1862; and *I Peter*, Edinburgh 1866. Sound works of a Puritan divine, learned but somewhat diffuse.

CALVIN, *Commentaries in Opera*, Vols. 24-55. There is a fairly good English translation of the Calvin Translation Society. Calvin was undoubtedly the greatest exegete among the Reformers. The value of his exegetical work is generally recognized by present day scholars.

EADIE, *Commentaries on Galatians*, 1869; *Ephesians*, 1883; *Colossians*, 1884; *Philippians*, 1884; *Thessalonians*, 1877, all at Edinburgh. Able and reliable works of a Presbyterian scholar.

EDWARDS T. C., *Commentary on I Corinthians*, 3d edit. London 1897. A good and learned commentary, though sometimes a little over-strained.

ELLICOTT, *Commentaries on I Corinthians*, Andover 1889; *Galatians*, 1867; *Ephesians*, 1884; *Philippians and Colossians*, 1861; *Thessalonians*, 1866; *Pastoral Epistles*, 1869, all at London. Very able grammatical commentaries; conservative. *Expositor s Greek Testament*, London 1912. A very scholarly work on the order of Alford s *Greek Testament*; being more recent, it supersedes the latter. Standpoint is on the whole moderately conservative; it contains valuable introductions.

GODET, *Commentaries on Luke*, 1875; *John*, 1877; *Romans*, -1886; *I Corinthians*, 1886-7, all at Edinburgh. Very able and reliable.

GREYDANUS, *De Openbaring des Heeren aan Johannes*, Doesburg. A good popular commentary.

HODGE, *Commentaries on Romans*, 2d edit. 1886; *I Corinthians*, 1860; *II Corinthians*, 1860; *Ephesians*, 1886. Admirable commentaries, especially the one on *Romans*. *International Critical Commentary*, New York, in course of publication. Some volumes of exceptional value; others of inferior merit. Characterized by a rationalistic tendency, especially the volumes on the 0. T.

LANGE, *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical*. On the whole a useful work; *New Testament* far better than the *Old*. Often suffers for want of clearness, and sometimes loses itself in mystical speculations. Its *Homiletical* material has little value.

LIGHTFOOT, *Commentaries on Galatians*, 1895; *Philippians*, 1895; *Colossians and Philemon*, 1895, all at London. Very able commentaries, containing valuable dissertations. Conservative.

MEYER (Lunemann, Huther and Dusterdieck), *Commentary on the New Testament*, New York 1890. Meyer is recognized as the prince of grammatical commentators. Parts of Vol. 8 and Vols. 9, 10, 11, contain the work of

Lunemann, Huther and Dusterdieck, which though good, is not up to the standard of Meyer's work. Standpoint: moderately conservative. Last German edition by Weiss, Haupt e. a. is no more the work of Meyer.

OLSHAUSEN, Commentary on the New Testament, New York 1860-72. Quite good. Excels in organic interpretation of Scripture; but its mysticism often runs wild. Pulpit Commentary, London 1880 sqq. This, as its name indicates, is far more homiletical than exegetical; yet it contains some real exposition.

STIER, The Words of the Lord Jesus, New York 1864. Very useful, but often fanciful and diffuse; devout, but frequently characterized by too great a desire to find a deeper meaning in Scripture.

STRACK UND ZOCKLER, Kurzgefasster Commentar zu den Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testaments, sowie zu den Apokryphen, Munchen 1886-93. One of the best recent German commentaries. Moderately conservative.

VINCENT, Word Studies in the New Testament, New York 1887-91. Contains some useful material.

WESTCOTT, Commentaries on the Gospel of John, 1890; the Epistle to the Hebrews, 1892; and the Epistles of John, 1905, all at London. All very scholarly and reliable.

ZAHN, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (several co-laborators), Erlangen 1903 sqq., still in course of publication. Will constitute one of the best conservative commentaries of the New Testament.