

Introductory Studies

to the epistles of

Second Peter and Jude.

by

R. A. Falconer. M. A., B. D. (Edin.)

Professor of New Testament Exegesis,

Presbyterian College, Halifax, N. S.

Halifax, N. S.

1902.



Contents.

Introduction.

- I. The Literary Affinities of Second Peter.
- II. The Relation of Second Peter to First Peter.
- III. The Destination of Second Peter.
- IV. External Attestation to Second Peter.
- V. Jude 22, 23 - A Textual Problem.

Note. Numbers I-IV are to appear in forthcoming issues of The Expositor, Number V. was published in The Expositor for September 1901.



Interest has been quickened of late in the second epistle of Peter, so perplexing just at the moment when one arrives at some conclusion regarding it, by the appearance of several works of the first importance. There is Zahn's learned and exhaustive defence of the epistle in his Einleitung in das neue Testament, giving weight to some of Spitta's rather erratic theories. Dr. Chase also has laid students under obligation by his able articles on Petrine literature in Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible, in which he abandons the apostolic authorship of the Second Epistle. And now we welcome a worthy edition of the epistles of Peter and Jude by that eminent authority on the first centuries, Professor Charles Bigg, who is a strenuous advocate of the genuineness of the Second epistle. In view of the mature judgment of two such patristic scholars as Dr. Zahn and Dr. Bigg, there is insufficient warrant for Mr. Moffatt to say in his Historical New Testament that "the composition of this writing during the course of the second century, and probably in its first half cannot be regarded any longer as one of the open questions in New Testament criticism".

These recent researches have prepared the way for a theory as to the destination of the epistle, which, it seems to me, solves the outstanding problems.

The evidence, in my judgment, is strongly against the opinion of Spitta and Zahn that the recipients were Jewish Christians; nor can one agree with Dr. Beigebach that, as "1 Peter will satisfy the conditions of 2 Peter III. fairly well", the same circle of readers is probably addressed in both epistles. But if 2 Peter was written by the apostle through an "interpreter" from Antioch, shortly before he went to Rome, to the churches of Samaria, most of the difficulties in the way of accepting it as genuine will disappear. In support of this hypothesis it will be necessary to examine the literary affinities of the letter, its Petrine element, the nature of its teaching and its attestation.

Some of the language of II. 12 is probably suggested by Isaiah 40: 3-5. Also the original of the first saying of II. 22 is almost certainly to be found in Proverbs 22: 2, because the second half of the verse "So is a fool that repeateth his follies", exactly suits the argument of our passage. Possibly it was current in Greek for it is called "a proverb", but if so, it was independent of the 22d which reads "I will reward the fool because he hath no wisdom" the most probable source for the saying as it stands here, especially in an author who seems to be indebted to

I. The Literary Affinities of 2 Peter.

1. The Old Testament.

There are very few direct quotations from the Old Testament in this epistle. The most obvious is in III. 8, one half of which is evidently taken from Psalm XC. 4, where the LXX agrees with the Hebrew. The author is true to the meaning of the Psalm. No loitering falsifies the promises of God; the prophecy as to the Day of the Lord proclaimed in the far past to the fathers, and afterwards repeated in the Gospel of Christ, though not yet fulfilled, will assuredly prove true. God is maturing purposes of mercy; our distant ages are but as yesterday in His sight, and a thousand of our coming years are only His to-morrow.

Some of the language of III. 13 is probably suggested by Isaiah LXV. 17, LXVI. 22. Also the original of the first saying of II. 22 is almost certainly to be found in Proverbs XXVI. 11, because the second half of the verse, "so is a fool that repeateth his folly," exactly suits the argument of our passage. Possibly it was current in Greek, for it is called "a proverb"; but if so, it was independent of the LXX, which reads τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἔπειρον; and the Hebrew is by far the most probable source for the saying as it stands here, especially in an author who seems to be indebted to

Proverbs in other parts of this epistle.

The indirect influence of the Old Testament on 2 Peter is very much greater and more striking because its conceptions are often the warp of the argument. Prophecy, unintelligible to the original prophet, finds its meaning and the fulfilment of its forecasts only in the Christian facts; the experiences of the old Israel are the most cogent illustrations of the life of the new (I 19, 20; II. 1 ff.).

The citation of Noah and the Flood (II 5; III, 5, 7.), Lot, Sodom and Gomorrah (II. 6-8) as warnings is probably due to the words of Christ (Matt. ~~XXIV~~ 37, 38; Luke ~~XVII~~ 26-29). But there is a subtle proof that our author had drunk deep of the spirit of the Old Testament stories. In the gospel narratives Christ speaks of the days of Noah and of Lot only as days of judgment. This would have suited Peter's threat of doom on the false teachers; but in harmony with the account in Genesis, which sets forth the gracious discipline of God with the world, he adds, "but preserved Noah and seven others"; "delivered righteous Lot"; believing that God cannot forget the righteous remnant of the Christian Church, but that "the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation."

The example of Balaam, though possibly a commonplace, is enlarged by our author from Numbers ~~XXII~~ to suit his own purposes (II 15, 16).

Reminiscences from Proverbs will account for most

of the imagery of II 17. The figure of a flowing fountain, full of meaning in Palestine, is often found in the Old Testament to denote that the fear of the Lord is the truest wisdom (cf. especially Proverbs X 11, XIII 14, XIV 27, XVI 22; Jer. II 13.). This may have given rise to "these are wells without water"; so vain are these libertines with their empty words as compared with the apostles who preached the power and parousia of the Saviour. The second metaphor describing the avarice of the false teachers, "mists driven by a storm", may be derived from Proverbs XXI 6, XXV 14. In contrast with the true prophet of the Old Testament (I 21) these men come upon the Church with their lies and greed, like racing scud in a squall, dimming the light of truth. Also the third clause, "for whom the blackness of darkness is reserved", sounds like a combination of Proverbs XXI 16, with the thought of the fate of the angels (II 4); cf. also the last words of Proverbs XXI 6. The true prophet points to a bright day whose dawn will be ushered in by the morning star (I 19), but thick darkness awaits the false teacher. It should be observed that the Hebrew and not the LXX is the most probable source for these comparisons. Another favourite expression of Proverbs ὁδὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης (VIII 20, XII 28, XVI 17, 31, XVII 23) occurs in 2 Peter II 21 (cf. II 2, 15). Possibly echoes of Proverbs XXI 24, 26, in which the insolently wicked who scoffs not at belief but at law is defined (Joy), may

be found in 2 Peter II. 10, 13.

The third chapter especially must have been written by a Hebrew who was saturated with the thought and spirit of the Old Testament. His cosmogony and the account of the Flood are evidently based on Genesis I 6-9, VII, 11. Every stage of the process of creation begins with "God said" (cf. 2 Peter III. 5, 7, "by the word of God"). In later Jewish theology the instrument in creation is the Memra, or in Philo the Logos. Paul, John, and the author of Hebrews extend the idea by assigning the agency to the Son. The author of 2 Peter abides by the original conception of Genesis, and may intend to give in passing an answer to those who hold that matter is eternal. As in Genesis, the firmament separates the upper waters from the earth, which rose out of the lower waters (ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος, III. 5, chiasmatically arranged, as so often in 2 Peter), and at the Flood the waters from above pouring down, and those from below rushing up (δι' ὧν) overwhelmed the earth.

Another strand in the pattern of the thought of 2 Peter is the Old Testament prophecy of the Day of the Lord, defined and coloured, as we shall see, by the sayings of Jesus. This promise goes so far back that it is now treated by many as a delusion (III. 4.), though the Flood should be a warning that judgment will come in the future as it did in the past. (Compare Isaiah V. 19.). "In

the Old Testament prophets the Day of the Lord is to be a day of judgment and thereby also of salvation. Around this Day as a day of judgment all the terrible pictures of gloom and the dissolution of nature gather" (A. B. Davidson, with 2 Peter III. 7, 10, compare Psalm XC VII 1-5; CII 25, 26; Isaiah XIII 9-13; XXXIV. 4, LI. 6, LXVI 15, 16; Malachi IV. 1. Also

"the eternal Kingdom" (2 Peter I. 11) is not improbably drawn from Daniel VII. 14, 27, which gives a description of the final victorious rule of one like unto a Son of Man.

One cannot avoid the impression that the author of 2 Peter was better acquainted with the Hebrew Bible than with the LXX; for not only does he deal freely with his passages, and depart from the LXX where we can with some degree of certainty check him, but there is no trace of Alexandrianism in his thought. Imagery and ideas are Hebraic.

2. The New Testament.

The Gospels. The two most manifest points of contact with our gospels are found in the account of the Transfiguration and in the Eschatology. 2 Peter I 16-18 presents substantially the same situation as that given in the synoptic narrative of the Transfiguration, with the splendour of the Divine presence and the accompanying voice in attestation of sonship. The reading of B, ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀπαγγέλλων μου οὗτός ἐστιν εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα, adopted by W. H. Weiss, and Nestle, is not

identical with any in our gospel records. Peter is nearest to Matthew, who reads οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα. Nor are the words taken from the utterances recorded in the gospels at the Baptism. If our gospels were before the writer of this epistle, it is also difficult to account for the omission of the words "hear Him", which would have suited his purpose so well. The Transfiguration showed that Jesus is what the apostles claimed Him to be, the Revealer of the Father, possessed of such divine power that His commands must be obeyed, and that His Parousia is certain. If the writer had to meet the objections of false teachers, who claimed that the resurrection was a spiritual fact already come in their own life, his only possible appeal was to the Transfiguration, when they had got a glimpse of the essential honour and glory with which He was to be crowned at the Resurrection (cf. Heb. II. 9). From the Transfiguration Jesus returned to earth to resume His work. Further, the event was witnessed by the three apostles alone. Many saw the risen Christ. Only those of the innermost circle can speak with the fullest authority concerning the nature of their Lord.

The eschatology of 2 Peter also reproduces the main outlines of the teaching of Christ as given in the Synoptics. At the approach of the Son of Man in glory, the world will dissolve before His majestic holiness (cf. δεῖ γὰρ παρεοίαι, 2 Peter

III. 12 with Mark XIII 26 and parallels). The heavens will pass away (2 Peter III 10, 12; Mark XIII 31 and parallels). With the collapse of the firmament, the stars fixed therein will fall melting (στοιχῆα δὲ καυοῦμένα λυθίζονται, 2 Pet III. 10, 12; Mark XIII 24, 25 and parallels: cf. Isaiah XXXIV. 4). Terror and dissolution will overtake the earth and all therein (2 Peter III 10, 11; Luke XXI 26, 33 and parallels). "The promise of the Lord Jesus" (III 13), though expressed in the language of Isaiah I, XV. 17, I, XVI 22, and an apocalyptic idea (cf. Enoch XCI 16: Apoc XXI. 1), probably underlies such statements as Matthew XIX 28, XXV. 31. A blending of prophetic phraseology of the Old Testament with an apostolic term may be seen in the unique phrase "the parousia of the Day of God" (III 12).

There are some additional features. "The day of the Lord will come as a thief" (III 10), an apostolic commonplace (1 Thess. V. 2: Rev III 3. XVI 15), is based on a saying of Christ (Matt XXIV 43: Luke XII 39). Our author shares the conviction of the apostolic era, also to be traced back to Christ, that the times before the Return of the Messiah will be degenerate. Signs of the end are found in 2 Peter in the false teachers (Mark XIII 22, 30: Matt VII 13-15, 22, 23, XXIV. 11, 24): and, evidently under the influence of the teaching of Jesus, he employs the examples of Noah, and Lot and Sodom to pledge the arrow of his threatenings (2 Peter II 5-7, III 5-7). A rich interpretation is given to 2 Peter III 3, 4, 10-12 by the parables of Matthew XXIV. 44-51: Luke XII 35-46: and the consum-

mation of the eternal Kingdom at the appearing of the Son of Man (2 Peter I 10, 11; III 13, 14) finds its best illustration in Matt. thes XXII 1-14; XXV 31-34, 46.

Many scholars hold that a leading purpose in the composition of the gospels, especially Mark, was to counteract doubts as to Christ's return on the part of those who were growing disheartened through their delayed hope. We find the same restiveness and discontent in 2 Peter. It reflects the questionings to which the gospels supplied an answer; its eschatology is of the Synoptical type.

Of indirect references to gospel history there are some which, though not so evident as the foregoing, are more or less obvious. The most natural interpretation of 2 Peter I. 3. is that the writer has in his mind the personal call of Jesus to himself and other disciples to follow Him, and the discovery that He is the Revealer of the Father full of grace and truth (John I, 14. 42). In the Old Testament דוֹעַד and אֲפֵרֹי, almost synonymous conceptions, were applied to Jehovah, and Peter transfers them to Jesus as the one through whom full knowledge of God was brought to him. For this reason "God" and "Jesus Christ" are combined under one article (2 Pet. I. 2).

The remarkable saying of Jesus in Matt. XI 27. Luke X 22, affords a striking parallel to 2 Peter I. 3. 8. Along with this go ideas found in the parable of the sower (Matt XIII 11-13, 23; Luke VIII 10, 15). Those who possess the honest and good heart, the Christian καλλοκρηστοί will be fruit-

bearing. To them are given the mysteries of the Kingdom. These mysteries are dispensed only through the Son, who, having all power, reveals a knowledge of the Father to those who are morally receptive. Not only does the word ἐπιγνώσις (ἐπιγνωσις) occur both in Matthew and 2 Peter, but the thought of Peter agrees with that of the Gospel. Nothing but a character fruitful in virtue is receptive of true knowledge of Jesus Christ, the Revealer of God. Such knowledge in its turn confers power for life and godliness. It is worthy of notice that the addition in Luke X 23, 24 (Matt XIII 16, 17) finds its closest parallel in 1 Peter I 10.

As we shall find when we consider the false teaching of this epistle, there is such affinity in the thought and expression of 2 Peter II 19-21 with Matthew XII 28, 29, 43-45, Luke XI 21, 22, 24-26, that we may safely regard this passage as the gospel source to which the words τὰ ἔοχλητα χεῖρα οὐκ ἔσονται ἡμῶν, and possibly ὑποστρέψαι, are traceable. Whether Luke XIII 7, 8, is a sufficient source for 2 Peter I 8, III 9, 15 is uncertain. There is greater probability that the favourite designation of the Christian life as "the way" (II 2, 15, 21) is an Old Testament expression finding its completion in Christ "the Way", and that "the holy commandment" (II 21) is His command to follow Him in that way. In this connection 2 Peter I 10, 11 may be compared with Matthew VII 14.

A review of these passages shows that the author of

this epistle is familiar with gospel incidents and imbued with its teaching; but he follows no one gospel in preference to the others. Sometimes he is in greater accord with Matthew, again with Luke, and there is one reminiscence of an event recorded in John (2 Peter I 14, John XXI 18, 19). It is almost certain that our written gospels were not before him, so independent is he of them, and so delicately allusive to what in them is put with a different turn. Corroborative evidence of this is found especially in 2 Peter I 19, in which written prophecy is said to be the source of illumination for Christians until the Day of the Parousia dawn. After Matthew had been issued such an utterance as this would have been almost inconceivable. Also the most reasonable explanation of I 15, 16 is that the author hopes to leave a trustworthy written record of that life, into the secret mysteries of which he with but few others had been initiated. Another confirmation is afforded by the words of II 21, which suggest that so far the sayings of Christ had been transmitted by tradition (cf 2 Thes. II. 15.).

The Pauline Epistles. Traces of Pauline thought are very scanty. In I 1, "the righteousness of God" is not the peculiar Pauline conception, but is the quality of one who is a just God and a Saviour for all, and no respecter of persons (cf Acts IX. 34). The word ἐπιγνώσις, though common in the later epistles, has been sufficiently accounted for by Synoptic usage. Moreover, the

Christology of these epistles, especially its cosmic significance, has no parallel in 2 Peter III 5, 7. Nor does the word κἀδὲν occur in the favourite Pauline meaning; and the doctrine of the indwelling Spirit of the risen Christ in the believer is nowhere to be discovered, however much the essential element may be in I, 3. A similar temper to that of the scoffers is perhaps reflected in the epistles to the Thessalonians, and somewhat close analogies with 2 Peter III, 14, are presented by 1 Thess. III 13. V. 23. Also Romans II 4, IX 22, and in fact the general teaching as to the fulness of the times, agree with the Petrine doctrine of the divine long-suffering (2 Peter III 9, 15). Those who abused Christian freedom (2 Pet. II 18, 19) may have justified themselves by a distortion of Pauline teaching (III. 16.).

Attention has often been drawn to coincidences with the Pastoral Epistles. Both contain similar phrases and ideas. Such words as these are in mutual use, ἀίρετικός = αἵρεσις, ἀνυπόκριτος, ἀρνεῖσθαι, βλασφημεῖν, ἐμπλέκειν, ἐντολή, ἐπίγνωσις, ἕτεροδιδασκαλεῖν = ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, εὐσέβεια, μείνεν, μίσος, μωροί, μῦθος. But they may be paralleled in Philo or the language of the time. The doctrine of the false teachers of the Pastorals is a "teaching of demons". They are blasphemous, and walk according to their own passions. Maintaining that the resurrection is already past, they deny the Παροιμία (2 Tim. II. 18). Self aggrandizement is their motive (1 Tim. VI. 5; Tit. I, 11). They are a sign

of the last days (2 Tim. III. 1). These similarities, however, may be accounted for by the religious conceptions that were widely current in the Orient, and by the common vocabulary for such ideas, which would be more or less familiar to an amanuensis from a Greek city of Syria or Asia Minor.

They are outbalanced by fundamental differences of situation and error, which, we shall see, forbid our assuming any kinship between the writings.

The most perplexing feature of the relation to Paul remains in verses III 15, 16. Our author evidently puts the letters of the Apostle Paul on the same level as his own (15); and that this is not quite so high as the Old Testament is clear from two considerations:—(1). His own writings are a reminder of the Gospel preached by himself and other apostles, but not yet written (I, 12, 15, 16). His readers are to hold fast to "written prophecy" along with the commandment of the Lord delivered to them by their apostles (I 19, II 21, III, 2). (2) The prophet of the Old Testament was controlled by the Holy Spirit and spake as God gave him utterance (I, 21), whereas Paul wrote with wisdom (III, 15). Now in his own letters Paul claims that the true Christian may possess such wisdom (1 Cor II 6, 7, 13, XII, 8,) though he himself has special revelations from God (1 Cor II 16, XI 23: 1 Thess. IV, 15), and is peculiarly inspired (1 Thess. II 13: Gal. I, 8, 9, 11). But he places the other apostles alongside himself. His letters or written commands are of equal authority with

the word of mouth (2 Thess. III 4 ; 1 Cor V. 3 ; 2 Cor X 11). 2 Peter and the Pauline epistles present similar points of view. Apostolic writings do not rank quite with the Old Testament, but they are of no less importance than oral teaching. It is difficult to see why δι' ἰστορίας γράψεαι might not mean such apostolic letters. We know from 2 Thess. II 2, III 17 that forgers had set to work early; and these false teachers also might have had little hesitation in distorting Christian literature to suit their own ends.

Further, verse 16 leaves the impression that the writer was acquainted with all the letters of Paul, though his readers were not. The passage would suit a situation in which Paul was still writing. At least there is no sign that any collection of his epistles was circulating anywhere. In view of the impression made on 1 Peter by the epistles to the Romans and Ephesians we are bound to put 2 Peter, assuming it to be genuine, at an earlier period of the apostle's career. On the other hand, if 2 Peter be not genuine, how are we to explain the fact that one who claims to have known all Paul's writings, and who intends to convey the idea that he was on friendly terms with him, has escaped with such meagre traces of his influence? For after 90. A.D. or thereabouts sub-apostolic literature is saturated with Pauline thought. It is indeed questionable whether "distort" is the word that would be employed to describe the attitude of immoral Gnostics of the second century

towards the Old Testament. Most of them rejected its authority entirely; and how would a wresting of the Old Testament scriptures be used to sanction an abuse of freedom? Even the errorists of this letter, who are presumably like those described in III 16, seem to have despised the Old Testament, if we may so infer from the repeated injunctions to give heed to prophecy (I 19-21; III 2, 4-7). The words *ei doctriai perapei* imply that apostolic doctrine is one, and that to distort Pauline doctrine or any other is to reject a common Gospel (2 Thess II 15; Gal I 6-9; II 7-9; Rom XVI 17, Tit. I, 9; Heb XIII, 8; 2 John 9; 2 Pet. II 21, III 2; Acts II, 42.). We have only a suggestion here and there of the large correspondence that must have passed between the Christian churches, besides the writings of the Apostolic Age that remain to us, just as the glint on a solitary sail may be all that tells out on the ocean of the vast commerce of the high seas.

Hebrews. This epistle presents more affinities with 2 Peter than any single letter of Paul's. Similar conceptions of the fulfilment of prophecy in the utterance of a Son occur in 2 Peter I 17-21, and Heb. I. 1; and of danger from apostasy, coupled often with warnings from the history of Israel, in 2 Pet. II 1, 5, 6, 19-22, III 4-7, Hebrews III 6-IV 13, VI 1-8, X 26-27. Delay of the Parousia is a fertile source of discontent in both (2 Pet III 3, 4, 9, 10; Heb. X 37-39). Other parallels are the use of "the fathers" of Old Testament prophets (2 Pet III 4; Heb. I, 1); "honour and glory" of Christ (2 Pet I, 17; Heb. II, 9). *Θεις Κολυ-*

ὡς οὐρανοὶ (2 Pet I, 4) may be compared with Heb. III, 14. VIII 10; 2 Pet III 15 with Heb XI, 40; 2 Pet I, 10, 11 with Heb IX 15, XII 28.

On the other hand, there is not a tinge of Alexandrian thought in 2 Peter. The author is a Hebrew with a strong ethical sense, and no speculative idealism of any sort.

3. Non-canonical writing

The Book of Enoch. The construction of Peter's world-system is based on Genesis and the Prophets, and far surpasses that of Enoch both in simple dignity and the awfulness of its future. But Peter ventures on the swirl and riot of the apocalyptic current, though it is only to snatch a piece of flotsam wherewith to illustrate his warnings.

The description in 2 Peter II 4. is evidently suggested by the punishment of the angels in Enoch IX 4-6, XVIII, 11 - XXI. The abyss, chaotic and horrible, in which the angels are confined in preliminary punishment is called Tartarus in the Greek version (XX, 2). "Pits of darkness" might come from IX 4-6, and "plunging them down to hell" from XVIII 11 - XXI.

If in 2 Peter II, 11, ὁ ἄρχαγγελος be taken ~~at~~ in its most obvious meaning to describe the fallen angels of II. 4, leaders in the hierarchy of evil powers, which were supposed to envelope the world like a spiritual atmosphere (Eph. VI. 12), we have here a strong resemblance to Enoch. In Enoch IX. 1 it is said that the four archangels, Michael, Gabriel, Uriel and Raphael ("angels greater in might and power") look down from

heaven and see the evil wrought by the fallen angels (Ἰὼ Ἰώτα, αἱ ψυχὴς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ Enoch XVIII. 14). The souls of men cry out to them, "Bring our judgment (κρίσιν) to the most high" (cf. "to bring before the Lord βλάσφημιον κρίσιν" 2Pet II, 11).

The angels cry in response, "Lord of lords, God of gods, King of kings, the throne of Thy glory standeth unto all the generations of the ages... all things are naked and open in Thy sight... See then what Azazel hath done, how he hath taught all unrighteousness on earth... What are we therefore to do in regard to this?" Then the Lord gives the archangel authority to bind Azazel and place him under jagged rocks in the desert and cover him with darkness until the final day of judgment (2Pet II. 4). Again in Enoch I. XVIII Michael and Raphael stand appalled at the sight of the wickedness of the angels, and the majesty of the Divine presence. This conduct is an extreme contrast to that of the false teachers who rail irreverently at what they assert to be an impotent spirit world.

It is just possible that the comparison of the libertines with ἄλογα ζῴα (II, 12) may have been suggested by Enoch I. XXXVI - XC., where we have an account of how the fallen stars mingling with the children of men beget evil offspring symbolized by wild beasts. The doom of the errorists will be that of the fallen angels (αὐτῶν probably refers to δὸ' Ἰῶτα).

II. The Relation of Second Peter to First Peter

If 2 Peter stood by itself and did not seem to challenge comparison with the first epistle (2 Peter III. 1), there would be fewer objections raised against its composition by the apostle whose name it bears. But in situation, breadth of interest and range of doctrine, the Second epistle differs so materially from the first, that it is almost impossible to believe that they were written to the same readers, somewhat difficult even to acknowledge them as the handiwork of the same author. A close inspection, however, will reveal subtle marks of the same apostolic ownership for both epistles.

I. Differences between the two epistles.

(a) Lexical and of style. The first epistle is written in good easy Greek with few eccentricities. It is free from anything like pseudo-classicalism, is enriched with figures, and has more quotations from the LXX woven into its texture than most New Testament books. In 2 Peter the Greek is very curious. It is evidently written by a Hebrew who often limps in his attempts at Greek style, many of the sentences are involved, the connections are at times obscure, and words and phrases are frequently repeated.* Finally, though there are probably two or three direct quotations from the Old Testament, and numerous obligations to it, the LXX was not

Dr. Bigg shows that repetition is a characteristic of the style of 1 Peter also.

laid under especial contribution.

(b) Doctrine. In first Peter the Divine names most frequently employed are "God", "God the Father", "Christ" absolutely as the Messiah, and "Jesus Christ" as a historical Person distinct from God the Father. In second Peter the designation "our God and Saviour Jesus Christ", under one article so identifies the two Persons as to involve that the knowledge of God comes only through Jesus Christ the Saviour. Two favourite titles are "the Lord Jesus Christ" alone, or with "Saviour" added, the latter of which does not occur in first Peter. Again, the work of the Messiah, His sufferings, death and resurrection are enlarged on in 1 Peter. He is the example, the shepherd and bishop of souls. His resurrection is the proof of the eternal glory of the Messiah, the ground of the believer's hope in an eternal inheritance. In 2 Peter the thought of Jesus as Messiah is not altogether absent (I, 11, 17), but He is regarded chiefly as the revealer of God, dispensing power for life and godliness to those who have a true knowledge of Him (I 2, 3). He is Lord and Saviour who is known by the believer ~~to~~ rather than loved as in 1 Peter.

(c) Christian life. The differences in this case may be partly explained by a change of situation. In the first epistle the note of suffering under persecution breaks forth, though so far the distress is apparently confined to social disabilities; but it threatens to increase. Hence the sufferings of Christ both as an example and in their redemptive value, become an

important motive in the life of the readers. So little is offered by the present that their hope is cast into the future, which must soon disclose relief, for Jesus Christ will be revealed in Person and will terminate present evils.

In the second epistle we are confronted with an attack of strategical libertines who offer unstable converts full freedom for sensual pleasure, and lay their fears by extravagant assertions that the return of the Lord to judgment is only an imagination. Knowledge of a living Saviour who will assuredly come to judgment is set forth as the only remedy to counteract such seduction.

In view of these differences we must infer that the second letter was not written to the same circle of readers at even after the lapse of some years. It would be almost inexplicable in an author who had written the first epistle brimming with Pauline thought, to have sent our second letter, so free from that type of doctrine, to the same readers who were confessedly somewhat acquainted with the writings of Paul. Nor can 2 Peter III, 1, be regarded as anything but the vaguest description, if indeed it is one at all, of such a ripe fruit of apostolic Christianity as we possess in the first epistle.

II The Petrine element in 2 Peter.

For the petrine element our standard is mainly the first epistle, the genuineness of which I assume. The speeches of Peter in Acts, also, are usually acknowledged as containing

historical elements of primitive apostolic doctrine; and critical research justifies us in regarding the gospel of Mark as drawn from a Petrine source.

To take the last first. The author of 2 Peter claims in I 16, that he was one of the apostolic eyewitnesses of one of the most intimate events of our Lord's life, and that in his preaching he set forth the power and parousia of Jesus Christ the Lord. The Christ of this letter is possessed of glory and virtue, and is a Saviour who has purchased His people (I. 1.3, II. 1.). It would be difficult to find a better description of than this of the Christ of our second gospel. Mark is the earliest of our synoptic gospels, and apparently the framework of the other two. He puts the Transfiguration at one of the crises in the history of Jesus. Throughout the gospel Jesus is depicted as the strong Son of God, who will save from sin and who will come again to judgment (Mark VIII. 38. IX 45. X. 9.). The Christ preached to the readers of our epistle, and in Rome by the apostle Peter, had been seen in life from the same point of vision.

In Acts some close parallels with 2 Peter may be observed. If we interpret, as we may with good reason, τοῖς ἰσότημον ὑμῖν λαχούσω πίστιν (I. 1.) of the admission of the Samaritan readers to full Christian privilege, equivalents for ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ may be adduced from Acts X 34. 35. XV 9, 11. 14. Peter's disclaimer in Acts III 12 that he had produced the wonder ἰδία δύναμις ἢ ἐνορβεία

is not dissimilar in conception or wording to 2 Peter I. 3 which represents Jesus as the source of ~~endowment~~ ~~bringing~~ all power to endow the believer with life and godliness. In Acts V 42, 43 Peter declares that Jesus Christ is the Judge of living and dead, and the Messiah of the prophets. Parallels may be found in 2 Peter I 16, 19 III 10, 11, 14. In this connection the similarity between Acts III 19-21 and 2 Peter III 11, 12 is of peculiar importance. Delay in the coming of Christ is attributed in both passages to lack of repentance. In Acts the reappearing of the Lord and the renovation of the world are dependent on the repentance of Israel; in 2 Peter on the longsuffering of God who desires the repentance of a perishing world. It is not improbable that the idea may be traced to a saying of the Lord in Mark XIII 10 (Matt XXIV 14). "The early preachers of the Gospel felt that it was in some sense within their power to hasten the end by extending the Kingdom" (Swete). A similar thought as to the longsuffering of God occurs in 1 Peter III 20.

First Peter.

1. (a) Style and language. Inscriptions and papyri have afforded so many parallels from contemporary speech with the language of the New Testament that it is of little purpose to cite such words as ἀνοτροπή, ἀβέλγεια, (ἐπι)χορηγεῖν, κοινωτός, ἴδιος, ἀγαπᾶν, which are common to both epistles. More stress may be laid on the use of ἀργύ (though we cannot be sure that it is used in the same sense in both epistles), (ἁ)σπίλος καὶ (ἁ)μίωρος, ψυχή

of persons, compounds of $\sigma\upsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\xi\omega$, $\pi\pi\eta\eta$, $\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\varsigma$, and the phrase $\chi\acute{\rho}\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\pi\iota\upsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \tau\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\ \theta\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma$.

Like the first epistle the second has a large figurative element. The Christian life, for example, is a growth and fruitful walk in which some may stumble but which leads to an entrance into the Kingdom; a nomadic existence or pilgrimage. Death is compared with striking a tent or putting off a garment. Prophecy is a light shining in a dark place till day-break. Apostles are initiated into mysteries. Purchase is the symbol for redemption. The false teachers traffic in souls. Judgment is awake on its journey. Other figures are supplied by nature (II 17).

(6) The use of the Old Testament. The books from which an author draws the strands of his thought are more indicative of his mind than direct quotations. Whether these come from the original or the LXX might depend upon an amanuensis, but a man's favourite authors vouch for his type. In 1 Peter we get not only the shading but much more of the delicate tracing of exact quotation than in 2 Peter. Of the nine or ten instances of ^{direct quotation} ~~the latter~~, four are taken from Isaiah, three from Proverbs. The two or three direct quotations in 2 Peter belong to Proverbs, Psalms, and perhaps Isaiah, while the indirect indebtedness to Proverbs and Isaiah, ⁱⁿ ~~while~~ the second and third chapters is large. This agreement with Proverbs in both cases is the more remarkable, because of the five indubitable quotations from Proverbs in the New Testa-

ment, three occur in first and second Peter. The favourite historical example of 2 Peter is Noah and the Flood, which is used twice; and this incident occurs also in 1 Peter III. 19, 20, a unique passage containing an additional mark of similarity to 2 Peter, to which we have already referred (III 9). The atmosphere and spirit of both epistles is Hebraic not Alexandrine.

(c) New Testament writings. The meagreness of the second epistle in reminiscence of our Lord's teaching as compared with the first is often urged to its discredit, but if our previous analysis be correct this objection loses much of its force. There is, it is true, much less appreciation of the epistles of Paul than in 1 Peter, though 2 Peter III. 16 would go to show that the orbits of the two apostles crossed each other, and changed circumstances might have brought these two great spiritual luminaries of that period into the closer conjunction of our first epistle.* The case of the mutual ^{to the Hebrews} affinities of first and second Peter with the epistle, is striking, for the resemblances between first Peter & Hebrews might be drawn out to much greater length than has been done for the second epistle in our previous treatment of this subject.

(d) The book of Enoch. Professor Rendel Harris and Dr Bigg make out a strong case for the use of this book in first Peter (1 Peter I 12, 13, ^{= Enoch I, 2;} III 19, 20 = Enoch IX 4, 5, 12, 13. See Expositor

* Dr Bigg thinks that the influence of Paul on 1 Peter has been much exaggerated

Sept. + Nov. 1901). In both epistles the mysterious underworld and the fall of the angels in the remote past lends a distinctive note. In the second, Enoch is used somewhat more extensively to point the warnings than in the first epistle for its doctrine.

(2). Doctrine.

(a) Christian facts. Peculiar error such as the claim of a Simon Magus would naturally lead a writer to emphasize the fact that Jesus Christ is the true revealer of the Father, for He is in truth the Son on whom His good pleasure rests (I 17). He is of surpassing power, Lord of an eternal Kingdom, the Saviour from sin, the Judge of the world. This is the teaching of 2 Peter. Traces of the favourite conception of first Peter that Jesus is the Christ are not wanting. The aim of the argument of 2 Peter I 17-21 is to prove that the historical manifestation of Jesus Christ explains Old Testament prophecy. His is an eternal Messianic Kingdom (I 11); the utterance of I 17 is clearly a messianic declaration.

The question is often put why the Transfiguration displaces the Resurrection in 2 Peter, while it is central in the doctrine of the first epistle and the speeches of Peter in Acts. In answer it may be said that these false teachers, like some referred to in first Corinthians and the Pastors, probably asserted that the resurrection was a purely spiritual experience, and as such was a past event in their own lives. If this was so, the resurrection of Christ as an historical event would not appeal to them. Possibly they may have also held an error that afterwards assumed large

propositions, that the real Christ left Jesus at the Passion. For all such false spiritualism there was no more difficult fact to face than the Transfiguration. On the holy mount there had been vouchsafed to the disciples an anticipatory gleam of the future glory of the Resurrection, melting again after a moment into the light of common day. Jesus full of grace and truth was shown to be the veritable Messiah, the Son of the living God, under whose earthly form there had been a divine glory hitherto veiled from human sight. It explained the power of His ~~miraculous~~ miraculous life and justified His promise of the Parousia. It was a seal of His Lordship and Return which could not be gainsaid, for He came back from it to human life to teach, work and suffer, not merely to grant to His disciples intermittent glimpses of His glorified body as He did after His Resurrection. According to 1 Peter I 21 the Resurrection conferred supreme glory on Jesus; the incident of 2 Peter I 16.17 is an earnest of that permanent splendour.

As in 2 Peter so in the first epistle the certainty of the Parousia and of Judgment is insisted on (1 Peter IV. 7.17), and if an impression of greater immediateness is conveyed in the latter, it may be accounted for by the later date of 1 Peter, and by a more acute crisis in the Church. The belief in the Parousia never vanished from the Apostolic Age. Like a white-sailed messenger of succour it stood in the offing ready to come to the rescue of a beleaguered Church on which the world might from time to time repeat its attack. Believers

constantly found relief from the storm and stress of the present in the conviction, the more intense the suffering the more vivid the certainty, that the Kingdom of Satan could not long continue, that the victorious coming of the Son of Man must be near. Suffering makes an instant Parousia the logic of events in 1 Peter; judgment on sin in 2 Peter involves the Parousia no less certainly, however distant it may be.

Along with the absence from both epistles of the Pauline doctrine of the indwelling Christ, is that of the cognate function of the Holy Spirit in the renewal of the character and life of the believer. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is the same in both epistles, and is in some degree unique in the New Testament. The prophets of the Old Testament were directed by the Spirit of God, which was the spirit of Christ in them. Because the living Christ was in both dispensations, the figure of the historical Jesus must be employed to give body to, and render intelligible the prophetic foregleams of the Messiah (1 Peter I 10-12, 2 Peter I 17-21).

The redemptive work of Christ is more prominent in the first than in the second epistle, partly because the actual and threatened suffering of the readers is a temptation to them, and is rendered reasonable only by the redemptive value of the sufferings of the Messiah. But 2 Peter II, 1 preserves a trace of the same fundamental belief, and throughout the epistle Jesus Christ is the Saviour from sin.

(6) The Christian life. Baptism is of primary importance

in both epistles (1 Peter I 2, III 21; 2 Peter I 9). It is the supreme crisis in which old sins are cleansed away, to be followed by progressive sanctification in a developing moral character. Growth in grace is an essential in both, for life is a new birth from the living seed of the word of God, and must be nourished by proper food (2 Peter III 18. 1 Peter I 23-II 2). According to 1 Peter the believer is granted a gradual unveiling of Jesus Christ which will culminate in full glory at the Parousia (1 Peter I 13)*. In 2 Peter the Christian life is a growth in the knowledge of the divine glory and virtue of Jesus Christ which will result in participation in His divine nature (I 3, 4).

Obedience runs as a vibrant note through both epistles and it takes its tone from the possession of truth (1 Peter I 22. 2 Peter II 2, 21, III 11, 14). It is a law of holy living bringing true freedom (1 Peter I 15, 16 II 16, 2 Peter II 19, 21 III 11). The chords in the lyre of life are similar in both epistles, - faith (1 Peter ^{I 5, V. 9} III 9), virtue (II 9) knowledge (III 7), self-restraint (II 11, 12) patience (III 14, IV 7), godliness (I 17 II 5, 17), love of the brethren (I 22, II 17, IV 8, III 8), love (II 13-25), which is the scale of 2 Peter I 5-7, arranged with a view to the false teachers.

Terror of future judgment for the unbeliever rests heavily on the heart of each writer, holy conduct being the only means of averting ruin (1 Peter I 17, IV 7. 17-19. 2 Peter III 10-14). A pilgrim in this perishing world the believer pitches his tent here for a season. He is a resident alien whose incorruptible and unfading inheritance is in heaven. It is now an object of hope.

* See Hort's note in loc.

The promises of God will not be fulfilled till he enters into the eternal Kingdom of the future (1 Peter I, 1, 4, 13, II 11; 2 Peter I 4, 11, 13, 14).

It can hardly be denied that there is a very great similarity between these two epistles. In fact their teaching is fundamentally of the same type and distinct within the New Testament. We must assume however in view of their remarkable differences that they were directed to different readers, were written by different secretaries or "interpreters", and that 2 Peter is earlier than 1 Peter. It is impossible to say how much of his own style and thought, moulded by the apostle Paul, Silvanus may have contributed to the first epistle. But the fact that Peter employed him to write that letter, and, if tradition be true, had Mark also as his "interpreter" lends much probability to the supposition that he commissioned some Greek-speaking Jewish-Christian of Antioch to put into shape the rugged and vigorous thought of our second epistle.*

Without entering upon a thorough discussion of the language of 2 Peter, which is rendered unnecessary by the work of Dr. Chase and Professor Beig, we may draw some inferences as to the writer of the letter. Similarities with Philo, Josephus, and the inscriptions of Asia Minor

Clement of Alexandria mentions another "interpreter" of Peter, Glaucias, whom Basileides claimed as his teacher.

p. 361 ff

(See Deissmann's Bible Studies) justify us in supposing that he was familiar with the religious thought and expression of the imperial period. As may be seen from the inscription of Caria, such terms as *ἱερόν* as applied to the deity, and *Θεὸς Σὺνναγῆς* were current; and possibly the phrase *Θεὸς πάντων κοινῶν* (I. 4) may have been moulded by a stock idea of the time. The frequent inelegancies, solecisms, repetitions, the lack of ease in the use of particles, the occurrence of Hebrew expressions, and examples of the religious language which, in Deissmann's judgment, was in vogue in Asia Minor and in Syria, support the hypothesis that the writer was a Jewish-Christian of Syria. His Greek, if not native to him, may have been learned in commerce or from cultured proselytes or Gentile Christians.

III Destination of the Epistle

Gnosticism has been a name to conjure with. But today the historian must define his term, he must distinguish its multi-form varieties and sift out the original ingredients. System and principle underlay the diverse shapes. It was an attempt to solve the world-riddle, a philosophy of existence. Not every witch's caldron of superstition was worthy to be labelled gnostic. As it is seen in the great systems of the second century, gnosticism is a recombination of elements from different religious structures, oriental, hellenistic and Jewish. Tendencies to a Jewish gnosis ran back to pre-Christian times. There were Jewish radicals, perhaps chiefly Hellenists, who allegorized away the Law and refused to be regulated by its morals. They denied the resurrection of the body, and dealt much in theories of angels and mediating powers.

Magic was another important ingredient in some types of Gnosticism. But magic itself was a syncretism, with at least some rudimentary speculation conformed to its practice. Among the Jews it often went hand in hand with a radical attitude towards the Law; among the Samaritans there were superadded ethnic extravagances. Demonology, the informing spirit of magic, had, at the opening of our era, devel-

oped to enormous proportions throughout the Orient, fascinating even distinguished rabbis contemporary with the apostles, in spite of the fact that in the Old Testament sorcery is an object of horror. Magic was one of the arts of the false prophet who plied it as an exceptional source of revenue. Down through the history of Israel and afterwards of the Church, every where is heard the evil echo of illicit commerce with the world of spirits.

The demons were supposed to be the offspring of the fallen angels, and to have led men into vices of every sort. They swarmed in this world working mischief, bodily and spiritual, against which numerous words and devices were deemed effective by the ordinary timorous Jew, the most potent being the unutterable name of God.

Not the least merciful portion of the ministry of Jesus was His marvellous incursion into the Kingdom of evil spirits. By driving out demons He proved Himself to be the One who could bind the strong man and rid the house, which he had usurped, of him (Matt III, 24-30). On the threshold of the Apostolic Age this hideous spirit of evil again presents itself to the young Church as its first mission-aries go forth. From the book of Acts one may easily trace its shape, and the letters of the apostles occasionally

reveal the apprehension caused to the believing heart by its power. Simon, Elymas, and the Jewish exorcists of Ephesus (Acts VIII, XIII, XIX) have large success with the common people whom they amaze by their power, and are rated at their own valuation by the cultured and wealthy classes. But these men are full of guile and reckless mischief; they are enemies of all righteousness, sons of the devil, doomed to perish (Acts XIII 10).

Astrology, divination, claims of high power through influence over the spirit-world were the chief elements in the "false prophecy" of the magician; greed & desire to use spiritual gifts for money, were perhaps the magician's most marked characteristic (Acts VIII, 10, 18, 20; XIII 6, 10, Deut XVIII 9-12). Acts XIX gives us some insight into the procedure of these false prophets, some of whom "stroling Jews" exorcists, undertook to their own discomfiture, to use the name of Jesus as a potent spell in order to secure control over the demon. An evidence of the mighty hold of these practices even upon the Jews is afforded by the price of the books which were burned by "not a few of them that had practised curious arts" (Acts XIX 19). These books were probably the famous Ephesia Grammata filled with barbaric words and polysyllabic compounds of the name of Sehorah.

The attitude of Jesus, and of ^{Peter and} Paul towards the phenomenon of demon-possession and the system of magic, shows

with what seriousness they regarded the evil. There was never any compromise. Jesus was no exorcist. His disciples were masterful because they possessed the spirit of God. Paul ~~lets~~ sets forth in Ephesians VI 10-12 that the Christian life is a terrible struggle against "the world-rulers of this darkness", and that the Spirit of the risen Christ alone is sufficient to give the victory over the spiritual dignities (cf Rom VIII 38). The same awe of the mysterious realm of the demonic powers of darkness dominated the Christian thought of the sub-apostolic age.

From early days these forbidden practices were connected with Egypt. The "magicians of Egypt" (Ex VIII 11) had been identified in Jewish tradition with San-nes and Sambres (2 Tim III 8), the Sons of Balaam, who was reputed to be the father of sorcery. Samaritans became in time unholy partners with the Egyptians in this traffic, as is shown by the recently discovered papyri used by Samaritan magicians of the Fayum at the beginning of our era.

The geographical situation of Samaria ^{had} affected its history from the beginning. Lying open on all sides it welcomed foreigners and foreign influences. On the invasion of Alexander the great the region capitulated to Greek civilization, which spread rapidly by a ready access on the West from the Sea, and on the East through the Decapolis. A country rich and fair, it suffered

deterioration from its opulence, supporting a population whose ~~certain~~ decay followed ^{inevitably} ~~certainly~~ on the indiscriminate hospitality with which it received Pagan influences, Hellenism, or any strange teaching and superstition from Asia Minor, Egypt, or the further Orient.

The leading city of the district was Samaria, originally Hellenized by Alexander and retaining a large Greek element till the reign of Herod the Great, who enlarged it in honour of Augustus, called it Sebaste, and gave a vast impetus to Greek culture and religion.

Twenty-five miles to the West lay Caesarea, Samaria's seaport, built by Herod the Great as the outlet for his rich territory, and shortly ranking as one of the leading cities of the district. Caesarea did for Samaria what Toppa did for Jerusalem. But Toppa remained Jewish while Caesarea was chiefly Greek and Roman, though it had a Jewish infusion.

The account of the conversion of Samaria is given in Acts VIII 4-25; IX 31. Samaria being only half-Pagan was well fitted to be the half-way house for the Gospel on its way to a wider mission to the nations of the earth. Our Lord Himself may have laid the foundations of a Christian church at Shechem or Nablus, for the welcome He received was generous, and the faith of those who believed on Him the purest He had yet seen (John IV 39-42). Caesarea, the gateway to the fertile

world, was a strategical point for Peter, when at the bidding of God he inaugurated a new era, by bringing the Gospel to Cornelius not long after a kindred work had been accomplished in the sister city of Samaria.

Paul more than once took ship from Caesarea or landed there. When he was spending years of more or less retirement in Syria and Cilicia he may have often met Christians from Caesarea or Samaria, in whom he as the apostle to the Gentiles must have had an especial interest; and a ready communication by letter or personal fellowship might have been easily maintained by frequented trade routes. On his final journey to Jerusalem he was in Caesarea with Philip the Evangelist, the former missionary to Samaria, who seems to have presided over the Church in Caesarea. In these circumstances it is not a baseless conjecture to see in the letter of Paul referred to in 2 Peter III 15, a circular epistle to the churches of Caesarea and the hellenized cities of Samaria.

Samaria's inglorious record was sustained by Simon Magus with his assumption of divine power and the practice of magic. He may well have been the Balaam of the Samaritans, as that character was represented by tradition. There is little ground for doubting that Simon reverted to his type; and it is quite probable that a number of those who had been attracted by the

apostles' manifestation of power, rather than by the moral excellence of their teaching, shortly succumbed to the baleful influences that pervaded their society. As time went on Samaria's rank, luxurious, half-heathen life proved to be a breeding ground for pestilential heresies in the early Church. On its surface there ~~were~~^{had been} thrown up false messiahs as early as the beginning of our era when Dositheus lived, the spiritual father of a line of notorious successors.

Simon drew a deeper scar across the Church's life. Another false messiah was Menander; and the company of the like-minded was not small. By the time of the outbreak of the Jewish war in 66 A.D. the population of Samaria had become chiefly heathen, through the introduction of soldiers under the government of the procurators, and the native Samaritans who lived in the district of Sichem found themselves in a difficult position.

The soil of Samaria contained within it a variety of noxious growths or germs which were bound soon to shoot forth and attempt to choke the good seed of the Gospel. A species of the error which was particularly prevalent in Samaria seems to have sprung up in the churches to which the second epistle of Peter was written.

In 2 Peter a still active prophecy is employed for the propagation of false teaching (cf. *προφητῶν ἑσπερίων* I 20 with *ψευδοπροφητῶν* II). The libertines who abuse the privilege of

"teaching" had been Christians, indeed they still claimed the name, or at least the right of sharing in the sacred feasts of the Church (II 1, 21; 13, 14). They made great boast of freedom, and set forth self-chosen opinions* in opposition to Christian truth, which is a categorical imperative from the Lord who bought them (II, III 2). Their teaching was primarily practical, not speculative, immorality (II 2). Their characteristic vice was that of the fallen angels, the antediluvian world and the cities of the plain, and was indulged with the utmost shamelessness. Greed is ~~equally~~^{hardly less} characteristic of their selfishness. Men count with them for nothing; for lust or for money they will traffic in their souls (II 3).

If these false teachers were wandering or local "foetæ", who had once been Christians, or who had assumed the Christian name in order to push their avaricious commerce in lust among the Churches of Samaria, and if this letter was a circular epistle meant to forestall their work, we have a plausible situation. Further examination will I hope make it a highly probable one.

These errorists may have had some speculative tenets

* The common opinion that διόρισ, ἀνωθείς is to be taken in the sense of "heresies" as in the fathers of the 2nd century is unfounded, for; (1) there is only one type of "heresy" in this epistle, (2) ἀνωθείς is used to qualify διόρισ, whereas the sing. absol. is used in the second century to express the deadly sin of "heresy". (Ignat. Eph VI 2. Trall. VI. 1).

Though it is difficult to disentangle their threads. The day has not yet come for the imaginative structures of later Gnosticism. Several elements of a system may however be detected. They do not fear to blaspheme glories (II 10.11); they follow in the way of Balaam (II 15); they deny the Parousia (III 4); they undervalue prophecy (I 17-21 III 2, 4); they distort Christian writings (III 16).

Like Elymas^{*}, they are a parallel phenomenon to the false prophets of the Old Testament (~~Acts XIII~~ who were led by a spirit of lying and had recourse to the evil arts of Egypt (Isa VIII 19 XIX 3, Acts XIII 6. 2Pet II 1.15). Balaam had become the conventional type of those who employ divine gifts to lead others into licentiousness and idolatry for the sake of gain. He was the arch-magician, the father of Sorcerers. Now, the description, "they utter swelling words of vanity" (II 18) would exactly suit the extravagant claims put forward, for example, by Simon Magus when he gave out that he was "the power of God which is called Great" (Acts VIII 10), or the bombastic spells and divine names found so frequently in the magic papyri of Egypt. This blasphemous speech bordering on idolatry is "vain", as was the ^{false} prophecy of the Old Testament, because it has not the true God as its object [cf LXX Ezek XIII 6.9.19 Dan XI 36 Jk]. By such spells the magician controlled, so he asserted, the realm of evil spirits. Demons were terrible to the ordinary man. Even the Christian regarded them

* Ἐτοίμας is the reading of D. adopted by Blass, Ramsay and Rendel Harris

with dread. Paul taught that only the death of Christ freed him from these spiritual powers. These false teachers however in their audacity seem to have claimed to be superior to the whole hierarchy which they held in check by their evil arts. Probably they justified their immoral conduct by tracing evil to demonic influence, for which they would show their contempt by openly indulging their passions (II 10-12). In Snock VI-VIII the wickedness of the earth is traced to the fallen angels who taught their offspring magic, enchantments and lust, and this belief persists in early Christian literature, as may be seen from Irenaeus who says that the Gnostics, immoral Gnostics of a later age, held that an angel attended them in every one of their sinful and abominable actions, and urged them to venture on audacity and to incur pollution (Adv. Haer I 31.2. of Clem. Recog II 13). It is noteworthy that the doom of the fallen angels is used in 2 Peter II 4 as the first warning of the fate of ~~them~~ for errorists. To rail at dignities, to hold them of no account, to boast of their freedom from them by becoming defiled with sensual passion, to vaunt their power of charming them by meaningless spells, was the most direct denial of the Christ who has purchased the Christian, for it was to say that his life and death were unnecessary (II 1).

Another element of this error was the denial of the Parousia (I 16 III 4, 10). This doctrine had been one of the two pillars of apostolic teaching. Christ is a present power

for life and godliness. He will come again to judge the quick and the dead. Like the Greeks of Asia Minor and probably the Hellenistic Jews, ~~they~~ the libertines of this epistle seem to have denied a bodily resurrection (1 Cor XV 12, 2 Tim II 18), on the ground that emancipation from the body rather than its resurrection was the hope of the future. Friedländer has given good reasons for the opinion that ideas of this kind were not confined to the Greek world, and had infected not only Alexandrian Judaism but even Palestine before the Christian era. They would overrun Samaria almost as rapidly as Egypt and would find a more congenial soil in no part of Palestine. If there is no resurrection of the body, there can be no Parousia and no judgment for sins committed in the body. Possibly one element in the false teaching was that matter is eternal, for the writer appeals to Scripture to prove that by the word of God the world was created and is sustained (III 5, 7).

Though we may infer that the libertines made light of Scripture prophecy (I 17-21 III 4), there is not a sign of the second century Gnostic tenet that the Old Testament was the product of the world-ford — all of which would be accounted for if the Old Samaritan jealousy of prophecy had thoroughly leavened the communities. Like some of their contemporaries they also played fast & loose with Christian writings (III 16; 2 Thess II 2. cf Rev XXII 18, 19).

Without personal greetings 2 Peter may well have been a circular letter to the Church throughout Samaria, to whose composite

population, pagan, Greek, and old-stock Samaritan the descriptions of I 1, II 1, 18 would be appropriate. Their apostles who preached the Gospel to them (I 16, III 2) were Peter and John, who made known the power and parousia of a living Saviour in contrast with the cunningly devised fables and feigned words of false Messiahs like Simon boasting in their vain fancies. The invasion of the false teachers is not yet fully come: they are partly present, partly imminent. This would be explained if Peter recognizes a revival of the influence of the magicians which had received a set-back in the Christianization of the cities of Samaria. The heresy may have retired to more pagan sections where it lurked for a while, scotched not killed. It was merely a question of time when it would present itself anew in Christian centres with all its venom. In our epistle forerunners masking in Christian names & forms are already hard at the work of perversion. They would soon make havoc of some of those baptized by Philip who had professed the Christian faith, but who had never forgotten their earlier superstition and were impatient of the stringency of Christian morals. Also the semi-pagan atmosphere would ~~be~~ constantly enervate the faith of new converts, and favour the boldness of libertines who would find ~~their~~ greater allurements to apostasy than in other parts of Palestine.

Symeon (Simon) Peter addresses the readers (I, 1). The time to fold up his tent for his last journey draws nigh,

though he has hope still of sending them some memorial of the Gospel (I 13-15), from which we may be justified in inferring that the letter was written shortly before he left Antioch for Rome. When Peter sends our first epistle to the churches of Asia Minor his more distinctively Palestinian name has been shortened by the omission of Simon. A probable date for the epistle would be 60 A.D. This would agree with the evidences we have had of its literary affinities. About this time the Synoptic groundwork of the gospels was taking its shape, and the Pauline letters would not yet have had very wide vogue.

Samaria possessed a population which in many respects, at least in its more cultivated & wealthy elements, had points of contact with the Sadduceism of Judaea, in its low moral standard, ^{and} ~~its~~ materialistic temper showing itself in disregard for the unseen world and disbelief of the resurrection of the body. It was devoid of ~~even~~ the ideals even of Pharisaism. Such an environment would explain the tone of 2 Peter. The home of magic, false messiahs and Sadducean sensuality, the province of Samaria would supply the material for the evil practices and theories presupposed in this epistle. Its doors lay open on the West to Egyptian superstition, and its Eastern border was straddled by Greek cities of the Decapolis, in which theosophy and lust in the service of religion were carried to excess.

The two types of error in the New Testament most germane to the teaching just outlined are found in first Corinthians and the Apocalypse. Indeed Professors Bigg & Zahn are inclined to identify these manifestations with that of 2 Peter. Professor Ramsay finds that the description in the second chapter of our epistle is drawn from the same class of persons as is alluded to in the messages to Pergamum and Thyatira (Rev II), and whose action in Corinth prompted Paul's references in 1 Cor VIII 10 & XI 22. The "teaching of Balaam" has by the time of the Apocalypse become a stereotyped formula (II 14). Professor Ramsay is also of the opinion that the evils which Paul denounces in 1 Cor XI are similar to the luxurious revelling at the love-feasts into which the libertines bring Pagan licence (2 Peter II 13). (Expositor February 1901). But I cannot see that the pagan licence more particularly connected with the idolatry of heathen temples is even suggested anywhere in 2 Peter. No mention is made of fellowship in pagan clubs nor of the demonic influences of idolatry. First Corinthians and Revelation present forms of error with much greater mutual kinship than exists between either and that of 2 Peter.

A comparison of our epistle with Colossians and the Pastorals reveals some close resemblances, especially, as we have seen, in the case of the latter. But the differences are

equally patent. The false teaching of the Colossians & the Pastorals comes as a parasite from the Jewish law. Those errorists practised - at least some did - an asceticism which is traced to a Jewish origin. They were also engaged in the trivial casuistry of the Halacha & Haggada (Hort). The Colossians, further, instead of despising angels gave them undue reverence.

Thus though no other New Testament writing reflects precisely the false doctrine of 2 Peter, the elements from which it was composed were found throughout the Orient contemporaneously with the Apostolic Age. In Egypt, Samaria, Syria & Asia Minor there were great beds of error which had run to seed, and the germs were carried far and wide on every wind.

Finally, there are insuperable difficulties in the way of placing this epistle in the second century.

(1) In 2 Peter there is no developed theosophical system such as that of Carpocrates, with eons, transmigration, and the distinction between the Supreme and the Creator God. Nor do the other antinomian heresies described by Irenaeus afford any closer analogy.

(2) Not only is there no suggestion of Gnosticism in Ch 8, which contains a quotation employed by Barnabas and Justin Martyr and Irenaeus in its support, but at the end of the third century Methodius of Olympus cites 2 Peter as an apostolic authority against

the Chiliastic interpretation of the Johannine Apocalypse. But Chiliasm was the orthodox belief in the second century, in circles which, like ~~2 Peter~~ that represented by 2 Peter, were not influenced by Alexandrian thought. There is no hint of Antichrist, ^{a conception} which, as may be seen from the Ascension of Isaiah, was prevalent in some quarters at the turn of the first century. Indeed Antichrist was a figure commonly associated with Chiliastic dreams. (3) There is no evidence of any fixed ecclesiastical organization, of the authority of "the twelve," or of the Church. By way of contrast the Didache & the Ascension of Isaac may be cited. None of the distinctive teaching of the second century as to Baptism or the Lord's Supper separates this epistle from the classical period of the Church's life.

IV. External Attestation to 2 Peter

If it can be shown that the Epistle of Jude is indebted to 2 Peter, this is the earliest and by far the strongest attestation to its genuineness. But here we are faced with a very complicated problem in which subjective opinion judges the evidence by standards that vary with the individual. That there is a connection between the two epistles is beyond controversy, and it appears to me that a strong case may be made for the priority of 2 Peter.

If our analysis of the literary affinities of 2 Peter be correct, some of the imagery which is often supposed to have been borrowed from Jude, is really drawn directly from the Old Testament or the book of Enoch. The sententious wisdom of Proverbs made it a favourite book with our author, as may be abundantly shown from the second chapter of the epistle. (II, 11, 17, 21, 22). On the other hand the imagery of Jude 12, 13 seems to have been suggested by 2 Peter. The first figure οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν οὐκ ἄδεις συνευχόμενοι, can be best accounted for if 2 Peter II 13 be its original. Dr. Beig is of opinion that this holds true if the reading in 2 Peter II 13 be ἡμέραις (as Zahn does also) instead of ἰσθμῶν, and if οὐκ ἄδεις be given the meaning "spots". But the case is even stronger if we follow the reading of the recent textual authorities, Westcott & Hort, Weiss, and

Nestle, and if we translate σπιλάδες differently. We assume then that ἀπάρταις not ἀπάρταις is the reading in 2 Peter.

σπίδος (δ) a post-classical word ordinarily means "spot" "stain", but σπιδος (γ) also signifies "cliff", "rock", being nearly synonymous with σπιλάς, which may mean a reef more or less submerged (τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς ραχίως πρὸς ταῖς σπιδὰς καὶ τοῖς ἔκρω- τηρίοις καταλύμενα. Polyb I 37). Anyone who has watched the swirl of the current in a summer sea setting towards some hidden ledge of rock that rises into a headland, the doom of the unwary mariner, must feel the power of Jude's figure for wreckers of the Church. The σπιδος.... ἐν ταῖς ἀπάρταις of 2 Peter may well have given rise to the fine figure in σπιλάδες, while the assonance of ἀπάρταις would call to mind the ἐπάταις in which the libertines revelled. So Jude would make more definite several suggestions latent in 2 Peter. By adding ἐπιών he heightens the effect of the intrusion which changed the most sacred fellowship of the Christians into a ghoulish carnival. It is difficult to imagine that from the ruins of Jude's imagery a few remnants like σπιδος and οὐνεωχούμενοι are all that are saved by a writer, who, notwithstanding his lack of grace, has a great deal of rugged power and fondness for the picturesque.

In Jude's νεφέλαι ἄνδρες ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παρακφερόμεναι, two of Peter's distinct and significant figures (II 17) are blended into one, perhaps under the influence of Prov-

erbs XXV 14. The former word δρυοποι, which is better suited to Peter's first figure than to Jude's, is very frequently applied in the Old Testament to ~~walls~~ ^{the earth} but not to clouds, and the idea in παραφρόσεναι seems to come from the Hebrew of Proverbs XXI 6 through 2 Peter.

The next clause, also, δένδρα φθινογενεῖν ἕκαστα δις ἄπο-
θνήσκοντα ἐκείσθαι, while it has strictly no parallel in 2 Peter, seems to be a working up of suggestions traceable to 2 Peter and earlier writings. The metaphor was common enough in the Old Testament and in non-canonical literature, and through the teaching of Christ it became a Christian commonplace (Wisdom IV 4, 5. Matt XII 33 Luke XIII 6-9). Jude is writing to churches long past their spring-tide. The intruders are twice dead. Blossoms had once come to a tree given up as worthless, for the errorists had abandoned their old heathen life in which they had been dead in sin, when they were baptized in the Christian name. But no fruit appeared though they were left standing till late autumn, and now they are uprooted, hopelessly apostate. This is precisely the condition into which the author of 2 Peter fears that his readers may come; so the apostle is emphatic on the necessity of ethical progress and growth in grace (2 Peter I 8-10, II 20, 21, III 18). How could the author of 2 Peter, if he had Jude's figure before him, have embedded his ideas so subtly in his epistle, after stripping them of their striking garb?

The last of Jude's figures also is apparently derived from Enoch (XVIII, 15. LXIII 1.6) by way of 2 Peter. For a writer so full of Enoch's ideas, as we have seen Peter to be, would hardly empty of its picturesqueness Jude's powerful metaphor of the star plunging from its orbit into the eternal darkness of death, and add this weak ending to the vigorous imagery of the rest of the verse (2 Peter II, 17). The final clause in 2 Peter II 17 is really the conclusion to the hitherto incomplete warning of II 4, to which his attention may have been drawn again by Proverbs XXI 6, as he was already indebted in this verse to this passage for another suggestion.

The eleventh verse of the second chapter of 2 Peter is often compared unfavourably with Jude 8, 9. But it has been shown that Enoch is a sufficient source for the description in 2 Peter, for it throws light on a passage which is otherwise hopelessly obscure even with the help of Jude. Indeed, Jude instead of throwing light on 2 Peter adds quite a new thought, by changing βλάσφημον κείων - a railing accusation, into βλασφημία κείων - a charge of blasphemy (see Field's OT. Novae. and Bigg's commentary in loc.).

The doxology of Jude seems to contain words and ideas which are best explained as a working over of figures of 2 Peter I 10, 11, with Pauline material. ἀπταίστους (Jude 24) is very similar to οὐ μὴ πταίσωτέ ποτε (2 Peter I, 10): and στήσασε κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀνώμους ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει rings with echoes of 2 Peter I 11, III 14, and of 1 Peter IV, 13.

5.

The general conceptions of Jude also seem to involve a later date for it than for 2 Peter. (1). The doctrine of the Parousia is far less prominent in Jude than in 2 Peter. We have seen that 2 Peter abounding in Old Testament ideas, and reflecting the teaching of Jesus, bears witness to a suspicious impatience on the part of his readers as to the second coming of our Lord; and that this was also characteristic of the environment of the Synoptic framework of our gospels. Both the epistle and the gospels are heightened with the apocalyptic symbolism of judgment, as the forest is with colours after an early frost.

Jude on the other hand is free from the apocalyptic imagery and resembles the later epistles of Paul in this matter. If it is safe to take the progress in the spiritual conception of the Parousia as a criterion of date, as it seems to be in the development from the earliest to the latest epistles of Paul, Jude will rank somewhere beside the later letters such as Romans and Ephesians. It will thus be between the earlier stage as represented by the Synoptic gospels and 2 Peter, and the final development in the gospel according to John.

(2) There are signs of a wider apostasy in Jude than in 2 Peter. In the latter the false teachers rather than the readers are the object of his warning, and they are still chiefly to come. The former is face to face with a serious declension from the faith (5-7: 20-23). There are two classes among his readers, — doubters on the verge of apostasy typified by the Israelites in the desert; and those

who, in addition, are guilty of gross sins of the flesh. The latter are more radical in their defection, are indeed almost as far gone in error as their leaders. Jude 4 presents a well known difficulty in the words $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\rho\iota\mu\alpha$. κ.τ.λ. It seems to me that when the writer begins in verse 4 to speak of the judgment foretold long ago on these false teachers, he is suddenly checked by the thought of the terrible danger to his readers of apostasy, and he goes off at the idea to give them warning by the examples of verses 5-7. He resumes the description of the intruders in verse 8, but does not finally complete verse 4, by stating what $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\rho\iota\mu\alpha$ is till verse 14, when we discover that they were "proscribed of old" in Enoch. Verses 3, 20-23 show the imminent danger of the wreck of an established church. Verses 11, 12, 16 imply a revolt against constituted authority. The libertines complain of the rigour of Christian discipline, and desire to take others back with them to their old life (v 16). Like the Cain of tradition they are wilful and irreverent, scoffing at the idea of judgment either in this world or the world to come. Like Korah they rebel against divine government. In 2 Peter there is not the slightest trace of any fixed order of leaders nor of spiritual anarchy. The apostles still keep in their control the congregations to which they have preached the Gospel (2 Peter I 12-16).

Jude is under such manifest obligations to the book of Enoch and the epistles of Paul, that it would be only natural

for him to put himself in the debt of other apostolic writings. ~~And~~ If 2 Peter was one of these, we get an excellent situation for verse 17, by assuming that Peter and Paul were the apostles referred to. In that case verses 4. 17. 18 will be most naturally interpreted as dependent on 2 Peter II 1, III 2. 3. The purpose of Jude would be not to recall 2 Peter, but to impress upon his readers the flagrancy of a sin which had been denounced by Enoch and the apostles of the Lord. He describes the intruders in the words of 2 Peter because they are the lineal descendants of those who made their first appearance in the district to which 2 Peter was written. Some years have elapsed since, sufficient to allow for the influence of the ~~later~~ letters of Paul to have taken hold upon the church.

The beginnings of Antinomian Gnosticism are shrouded in such darkness that it would be rash to deny that in Jude we find the outlines of later sects, though it is perhaps unjustifiable to lay much stress on the examples of Cain and Korah, who became heroes of schools of Gnostics similar in type to the errorists of Jude. We shall not be far wrong, I think, in putting Jude at the transition period, when the elements which went to form the varieties of Gnosticism were beginning to ~~pass~~ ^{change} from cliques within Christianity into independent schools or sects outside the Church, probably before the great persecutions broke out towards the end of the first century.

The location of the churches to which the epistle of Jude was written may be sought in Lyria, or in the

hellenized cities of north-eastern Palestine, where there were mixed Jewish and Gentile communities thoroughly acquainted with the writings of Paul. Hither antinomian Gnosticism had come from Samaria to form a new home for itself, as it had gone through Caesarea to Asia Minor, and had returned to Egypt laden with Christian transformations. These churches were probably acquainted with 2 Peter, which had been written to combat in Samaria the beginnings of the same heresy ~~which~~^{as} by the time of Jude had spread to the congenial soil of Syria.

It is impossible to suggest a place from which this epistle was written. We may perhaps infer from 1 Corinthians IX 5 that the author, if the brother of the Lord, was an evangelist; and from his letter it is plain that he rejoiced in the scenery through which he travelled. He had grown familiar with the wreck of the storm, the damaged orchard, the break of the wave on a hidden reef, and the wash on a filthy beach near some great city; and on his journey at night as he guided himself by the stars, he saw in the meteor shooting across the firmament the image of fleeting errors for which the blackness of darkness is reserved.

The Apocalypse of Peter. The verbal resemblances between this fragment and 2 Peter are so indisputable*

* For details see Bigg's Commentary & Chase's art on 2 Peter in D.B.

that either one borrows from the other or both are from the same school. That the apocalypse is indebted to our epistle is evident for the following reasons -: (1) The apocalypse is full of verbal reminiscences of the New Testament, and of the language and ideas of the Græco-orphic Hades literature, perhaps even of Virgil. 2 Peter is Hebraic in tone, is saturated with Old Testament conceptions, and is peculiarly free from direct acquaintance with the writings of the New Testament. (2) The language of the Apocalypse is simple; that of 2 Peter is rugged, often almost uncouth; but the former is loose and inaccurate, whereas the latter is intense, well-compacted and true to the situation. In the Apocalypse, for example, the revelation seems to have been given after the Resurrection, and yet the scene is placed on the Mount of Transfiguration and is shared in by "the twelve". In 2 Peter the description of the Transfiguration is accurate in detail, and apparently independent of our gospels. "The twelve" are never mentioned, only "your apostles". (3) The interest of the Apocalypse is spectacular; in 2 Peter we feel the grip of a strong moral personality, who has withal the evangelic note of redemption. (4) Corroborative evidence may perhaps be gathered from the use of the Secrets of Enoch, a book probably of Alexandrian origin and dating from the first half of the first century. (see Charles's edition). The arrangement of the spheres and

the imagery of paradise and hell in the Apocalypse of Peter together with some detailed similarities seem to show that the author was acquainted with the Secrets of Enoch (cf Apoc. Pet 5, 6, 8, 15, 17, 18 with Slav. Enoch 8, 9, 10). There are also unmistakable references to the Ethiopic Enoch in the Apocalypse of Peter. ~~Now~~ But if, as some hold, 2 Peter originated in Egypt and is indebted to the Apocalypse of Peter, how are we to account for ^{its} being of such diverse type from the Secrets of Enoch, which has been used in the Apocalypse, and which treats of matters similar to those in 2 Peter? On the other hand the debt of the Apocalypse to both 2 Peter and the Secrets of Enoch will be explained, if it is subsequent to these two independent writings. 2 Peter has so much of the apocalyptic element in its composition that it would very naturally serve as an apostolic source from which later writers on this theme might draw.

If it can be shown that 2 Peter was prior to Jude and the Apocalypse of Peter, much greater weight is added to the possibility that the scattered words and phrases in 1 Clement, suggestive of 2 Peter, are due to an acquaintance with this epistle on the part of Clement. Of these the most important are the examples of Noah and Lot (Clem VII 5, XI 1, 2 Pet II 5-9); τῆ μετὰ ὀπρεπῶν δόξῃ αὐτοῦ (III 2. cf 2 Pet I 17); ἀκολουθήσωμεν τῇ ὁδῷ τῆς ἀγαθῆς (XXXV. 5 of 2 Peter II 2). In themselves these coincidences could not be regarded as very striking. A similar judgment

must be passed on the parallels between Hermes, Vis IV 3, 4 = 2 Peter II 20, Vis III 7, 1 = 2 Peter II 15 (II 2), and even the somewhat more important one in Similitude VI. 4, = 2 Peter II 13. However, these taken in conjunction with other similarities in Justin, Irenaeus and Hippolytus, insufficient in themselves but noteworthy when considered in the light of our discussion of the relation of 2 Peter to Jude and the Apocalypse of Peter, help to justify Zahn's opinion that "from 90 to 100 A.D. 2 Peter was read for devotion in the service of the Roman Church, and privately by Roman Christians; but gradually owing to the strangeness of its contents it became excluded from the canon of the Western Church." Geschichte d. nt. Kanons, I. 2. 961.

There is also good reason for holding that 2 Peter circulated in Alexandria early in the second century, for in Barnabas XV 4 the words, ἡ γὰρ ὑμέτερον παρ' αὐτῶν χίλια ἔτη. αὐτὸς δὲ μοι μετρουεῖ δέχρον. Ἰδοὺ ὑμέτερον κρείττον ἔσται ὡς χίλια ἔτη, and their connection in the passage, are much more strongly in favour of their being a reminiscence of 2 Peter III 8, than are the similar expressions in Justin Dial c ~~LXXXI~~ and Irenaeus Adv. Her V 28. 3., where they may be quoted as a Jewish commonplace. The view that the epistle circulated early in Alexandria is strengthened by the fact that ~~the~~ ~~of~~ it is found in both the Bohairic and the Sahidic versions, which would be much influenced by the Christian thought of Alexandria. Also the great ~~Alexandrian~~ leaders of this Church, Clement & Origen knew the epistle.

But the apocalyptic imagery would heighten suspicion of its genuineness in the eyes of these philosophical scholars, as it might be supposed to lend apostolic support to Chilistic tendencies. Also the remarkable differences in language between this epistle and first Peter would not escape detection in that critical school.

2 Peter seems to have circulated in Asia Minor and Syria also, though it is impossible to say how early. Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia (fl. c. 264) and Methodius of Olympus in Lycia († 311) quote it, the latter against the Chilists. It maybe that Theophilus of Antioch (180) has reminiscences of 2 Peter I 19-21 in Ad Autol. II 9, 13., though this is anything but certain. Possibly as in Rome and Alexandria an earlier recognition yielded to critical doubts in Syria, for though the epistle does not appear in the Peshitta version it has a place in the Philoxenian and its revision; and the question is awaiting discussion how far these later Syriac versions may represent earlier sources.

By the time of Eusebius 2 Peter is in general use in Caesarea and in the churches known to him, though there is a lingering suspicion that it is not of quite the same rank as 1 Peter and the Pauline epistles. Eusebius and the church of Caesarea in the fourth century would, however, be no better witnesses as to the books circulating in their neighbourhood during the first century, than any other section of the Christian world, because a great gulf is fixed between

the Churches of the first and fourth centuries in Samaria and Caesarea.

If our Epistle was written to the churches of Samaria we get the key to much of its canonical history. Samaria soon dropped out of the life of the Christian world. In the war between the Romans and the Jews it espoused the cause of the former, by whom it was so completely garrisoned that it became practically pagan, and the continuity of church life between earlier and later times was broken. Hence the earlier letters of Peter and that of Paul have disappeared (2 Peter I 12 III 1, 15).

But there is another reason for its scanty recognition as well as for its reappearance in certain localities. Two great principles seem to have been at work for the retention of certain writings as the canon of the New Testament grew. Those letters were kept which were most for edification, and the correspondence of large and central ~~cones~~ churches survived, whereas that of remote districts easily dropped out of use. Such a letter as 2 Peter is not of sufficient range of Christian thought to ~~serve~~ have served greatly in the public reading of the churches, and it would naturally be treasured only in those countries into which errors had worked their way similar to those against which it is a warning. Egypt, Asia Minor and Syria became the chief homes of antinomian Gnosticism, and these are, ~~with~~ possibly with Rome also, the regions in which the earliest traces of 2 Peter actually occur. Further, if there had been a revival of Simonianism in

Samaria which had made it necessary for Peter to keep in touch with the churches of that region by a somewhat extended correspondence, we may perhaps get a satisfactory reason for the immense development ~~in the~~ during the second century of the literature in which Peter is the protagonist in a struggle against Simon Magus the father of heresies. If 2 Peter was the most important of these letters, reminiscences of it might remain in Rome, as they apparently do, because the interest of the apostle in the churches of Samaria would be well-known after he had arrived in the city.

The secret of the inglorious canonical record of 2 Peter, even as compared with Jude, is to be found in the obscurity of the churches to which it was written, the narrow scope of its contents, its apocalyptic element, the fortunes of war, and the strange diversity in style and thought between it and the later, but well-attested, first epistle.

V. Jude 22. 23 —, A Textual Problem.

JUDE 22, 23.

THESE verses present a well known problem in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. Their difficulty, which is partly due to the extraordinary variety of readings in the four primary uncial witnesses, is enhanced by the lack of old Latin or old Syriac versions, and the absence of early patristic evidence. No single uncial is undoubtedly supported by any early version except the Bohairic, nor by any Church father before Clement of Alexandria; and, as we shall see, his evidence is not free from difficulties.

The first point to be determined is whether there are two or three clauses in these verses, a question on which modern editors are much divided. The evidence stands thus:—

(i.) For two clauses:

(a) *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες κ.τ.λ.*, read by B and adopted by WH in their text with a comma after *ἀρπάζοντες*. It is also accepted by Weiss, who inserts a comma after the first *ἐλεᾶτε* as well. This too is the text which Weizsäcker follows in his free translation, "Und habet Mitleid hier mit denen, die in Zwiespalt sind, rettet, reisst sie aus dem Feuer heraus; habet Mitleid, dort mit Furcht, mit Abscheu auch vor dem Rock," etc.

(b) *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ*: read by C^a, Syr. hl.

(c) *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε διακρινόμενοι, οὓς δὲ ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες*: read by KLP, Thphyl. text, Oec. text, and so by TR.

(d) *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ*: read by C.

(ii.) For three clauses:

(a) *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ*; read by A 5, 6,

13, 27, 29, 66** al^p lat. vg., boh., æth., arm. "Ephr." This, which is put by Weymouth in his resultant text, is the reading of Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Nestle. Zahn also accepts this as correct.

(b) καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ; read by **N**, and followed in the text of our Revised Version.

This bewildering array of readings is best explained by some error that crept early into the text and cross-fertilized every family. Our task is to try to determine by external evidence and congruity with the context, first, whether the original contained a two- or a three-limbed sentence; and then, if the former is found to be probable, to decide which, if any, of our extant readings best satisfies the conditions.

Though most modern editors seem to incline to a triple-claused reading, the external evidence is the other way. The threefold division is attested almost entirely by Alexandrian witness, for the text of **N** is evidently conflate. A has as its chief supporter the oldest Egyptian version, the Bohairic, which is regarded by present critics as particularly free from so-called Western additions. Unfortunately in this passage we have no guidance from any great uncial, nor the old-Latin nor old-Syriac, as to how the "Western" reading would run. The Epistle of Jude, it would appear, was not present in any early Syriac version, and if Antioch was the home of the "Western" text, the deficiency in early "Western" testimony may be accounted for.

There is, on the other hand, strong support for two clauses, BC*^a KLP syr. hl. syr. bodl. In addition we have the important testimony of Clement of Alexandria, our earliest patristic evidence, for nothing can be made of the supposed reference in the *Didaché* on this point. Clement's words, *Strom.* vi. 8, are, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεεῖτε, with the lat. Hier.

Ezech., 18: "et alios quidem de igne rapite, aliorum vero qui judicantur miseremini."

Turning to the internal evidence afforded by the passage, we judge it to be in favour of a reading with two clauses. As has been remarked, Jude evinces a fondness for triplets, and at first sight this would seem to support the Alexandrian text. But the progress of the thought of the passage really requires only two classes of persons in 22, 23, to complement the description of the proper attitude of believers in view of the intruding libertines (19-21). The whole work of these impious invaders is destructive and unspiritual. To repel and counteract their influence the readers are exhorted to the exercise of Christian duty, first, for their own benefit and protection (20, 21); secondly, towards brethren who are falling into danger; and finally, towards those whose condition has become almost desperate (22, 23). This exhortation finds its motive power in the great Christian verities summed up in the concluding doxology (24, 25).

Dr. Chase, like v. Soden, is not satisfied with the reading of either A or B; but if the former is accepted, he finds the three clauses rising to a climax, each with its characteristic idea—hopeful compassion, desperate effort, compassion paralysed by fear of contamination (*Hastings' D.B.*, art. "Jude"). Zahn supports a similar interpretation thus: "There are doubters who do not decidedly reject this spurious doctrine, but weigh the pros and cons. They must be convinced with reasons of the folly of their indecision, and of the untruth of teaching that is fraught with peril to them. There are also those who are already laid hold on by the fire of destruction, but who may still be snatched from it. Finally there are those who can now be only an object of compassion coupled with fear; their unclean vices must be hated and earnestly shunned, but they themselves are to be regarded with that unmerited

mercy that all hope to receive from Christ the Lord at the Day of Judgment" (*Einleitung*, ii. 79).

But it is impossible to draw a distinction between the second and third classes. The flames of destruction, which are already playing round members of the Church, find their lurid prototype in the fate that overtook the Cities of the Plain (cf. *v.* 22 with *v.* 7). Some of the Christians to whom Jude writes are in a measure tainted with the same vice as that of Sodom, and a punishment like that of Sodom awaits those guilty of similar sin, whether they be these filthy intruders, or believers who yield to their seductions and become their followers. There is no word of mercy for such. Eternal fire awaits them. The purpose of this letter is to warn the readers against associating with those whose conduct is sensual, not to bid them show mercy towards them, even if it be with fear. Mercy is to be exercised only towards those for whom there is still a vestige of hope. But there is no hope for those plunged into the fire (*v.* 7), though there may be some for those on whom the flames are beginning to play. Incipient sensuality, while fraught with direst peril, is not utterly desperate. But the next step of one on whom the flames are already leaping forth will bury him for ever in the sea of fire where the libertines and their followers are. Mercy is for the former; the latter are beyond its power. So the only three possible stages are, doubt, incipient sensuality—in both of which some of the Christians are involved—and complete ruin, to which the libertines and their disciples are given over. Thus the exhortation to sympathetic treatment contained in verses 22 and 23 is concerned with the first two classes, both of them still within the circle of Christian influence; and this, along with the entreaty to give heed to self-edification on the part of the steadfast portion of the Church, forms the threefold division in 20-23, which harmonizes well with the style of Jude.

If our interpretation of the evidence has been so far correct, a serious difficulty still confronts us when we attempt to decide how the two clauses are divided.

Weiss accepts the reading of B as satisfactory, partly by reason of the harsh asyndeton of the first clause. Weizsäcker, as may be seen in his version already quoted, escapes the difficulty by a free rendering with vivid finite verbs; while Kühl resorts to the extreme expedient of taking ἐλεᾶν in different senses in the two clauses—in the first of active helpful sympathy, in the latter of a pity nerveless through fear, a paralysed emotion. Hort says, "The reading of B involves the incongruity that the first οὗς must be taken as a relative, and the first ἐλεᾶτε as indicative." Such a necessity justifies his opinion that a primitive error affects the passage. To remedy this state of matters he suggests that the first ἐλεᾶτε is intrusive, and was inserted mechanically from the second clause.

But though it is with the greatest hesitation that one ventures to question an opinion from such an authority, one cannot escape the impression that Dr. Hort's suggestion is insufficient. It seems to have both internal and external evidence against it. When the two clauses are divided as in B with οὗς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε after ἀρπάζοντες, the passage presents the same difficulty that invalidates the tripartite reading of A; that is to say, mercy is required to be shown to a class hopeless because they are already in the midst of the fire. If we are shut up to a choice between A and B, the former is much preferable, for in its first two clauses it draws a distinction required by verses 5-7, between those in doubt and those in the flames of sensuality.

Turning again to external evidence, we observe that the reading οὗς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε is supported by \aleph BC^a KLP (ελεεῖτε) Syr. hl., and that οὗς μὲν ἐλέγχετε occurs in AC* minuscules, vg., boh., arm., æth. Thus the balance of testimony

is strongly on the side of οὗς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε. This is also the harder reading, and less likely to have been substituted for the other. ἐλέγχετε would indeed make admirable sense, but it is a word which might have been easily suggested by such passages as Matthew xviii. 15, Ephesians v. 11, 1 Timothy v. 20, Titus i. 9. So we may assume with a degree of confidence that οὗς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε is the true reading in the first clause.

Our next step is to determine where the second clause begins. οὗς δὲ is inserted after διακρινομένους by \aleph AC^a minuscules, vg., boh., arm., Syr. hl., æth., and with ἐν φόβῳ between οὗς δὲ and σώζετε by the Constantinopolitan text. In fact, B is the only great MS. that omits this οὗς δὲ. Thus if, as we have seen, both external and internal evidence lead us to a bipartite reading, we are almost constrained to hold that it would run as follows: καὶ οὗς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, οὗς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες κ.τ.λ.

This reading actually occurs in C^a, Syr. hl.; and the earliest corrections of C, which were inserted in the sixth century, are important. Further, Clement of Alexandria lends more support to this than to any other when he writes: καὶ οὗς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεεῖτε. He seems to be quoting loosely, though the reading of the Bodleian Syriac, "et quosdam de illis quidem ex igne rapite; cum autem resipuerint miseremini super eis in timore," might lead to the conjecture that the inversion was even behind Clement. This would account for the early intrusion of οὗς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε before ἐν φόβῳ. But the fact of importance is that Clement and the Bodleian Syriac agree with C^a, Syr. hl. in the two classes referred to.

The internal evidence agrees remarkably well with this reading. In verses 5-7 Jude warns his readers by illustration against the fatal example of two types of characters—those who, having been guilty of apostasy, like the Israelites

in the desert, will perish; and others whose sensual conduct aggravates their revolt, as typified in the fallen angels and the inhabitants of the Cities of the Plain. Their punishment will also be the doom of those in the Christian Church who repeat their conduct, whether it be of the nature of unbelief or of vice. So in verses 20-23 we have the duties of the true believer set forth in contrast to the practices of the libertinists as outlined in verse 19. These intruders are separatists, introducers of caste. They claim to be spiritually-minded, pneumatic, superior to the average Christian, from whom they withdraw to form cliques of kindred spirits. In reality it is easily seen that they have nothing spiritual in them, but are dominated by the sensual. Evidently these people have been at work with some success, and this epistle is a warning against apostasy and vice. It is also a strong plea for unity.

The integrity of the apostolic faith must be preserved (v. 3). Pernicious example can be thwarted only by a true conception of life based on apostolic doctrine as the foundation of Christian character. A life of prayer in the Holy Spirit will bind the Church together in harmony. God's love, which streams forth upon the brethren, an earnest of the final revelation of mercy when the Lord Jesus shall appear to give them life eternal, will protect the Church and fortify her against error in life or doctrine (20, 21).

But though the bulk of the Church is true, there are some to whom the arguments and promises of the libertines have proved attractive. Catechumens perhaps, they are unstable (*διακρινόμενοι*) and have to be dealt with tenderly or they will be lost. As the Lord will on the last day show mercy to the faithful believer, so must the steadfast Christian exercise compassion towards the erring. Jude, familiar as he is with Pauline thought, gives advice, in accordance with the wise and generous precepts of

2 Thessalonians iii. 14, 15, to disapprove of unruly conduct, though instead of treating the offender as an enemy to admonish him as a brother. An even closer parallel is found in Galatians vi. 1: "Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any trespass, ye which are spiritual, restore such a one in a spirit of meekness; looking to thyself lest thou also be tempted." So here the truly spiritual man is not the separatist, but he who shows mercy to the waverer.

Finally, there are some within the Church who are guilty of gross sensuality. They are not yet past hope, but afford opportunity for the discretion of the most spiritual among the brethren; for the peril both to the rescuer and to the perishing is awful. Hateful as it is and dangerous for the pure to approach the unclean, he is constrained to venture by the knowledge that a doom of eternal fire is reserved for those who apostatize into fleshly vice. Even the impure are not past hope. With the figure of Zechariah iii. 1-5 in his mind, Jude is persuaded that brands may be plucked from the burning, that filthy garments may be replaced with rich apparel; for Satan the Accuser is faced by the Servant, the Branch who will remove iniquity (cf. v. 9). God alone is the Saviour through Jesus Christ. He has all glory and majesty and might and power, and He can keep His Church inviolate. He can preserve the waverer from stumbling to a fall; He can remove the stains of sin, so that the sinner shall with exceeding joy stand in perfect purity, even in the presence of Him whose glory is untarnished.

Thus the doxology gives a well compacted and appropriate conclusion to a letter which begins with an eager exhortation to unity. In the Almighty God their Saviour His people have a magnificent ground for confidence against any inroad of vice.

R. A. FALCONER.