

in Ur of the Chaldees ; it summoned Jonah from his dreams of Jewish patriotism in the court of the second Jeroboam : and it awakened Saul of Tarsus from the sleep of Pharisaism into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

GEORGE MATHESON.

ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

I. HAD THE AUTHOR READ JOSEPHUS ?

It is well known that the genuineness of the Second Epistle of St. Peter is open to considerable doubt. In attempting to ascertain the character of the Apostle's teaching, Bishop Lightfoot (*Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 355), writes as follows : " If the deficiency of external evidence forbids the use of the Second Epistle in controversy, the First labours under no such disabilities." The " if " appears to be not hypothetical, but equivalent to " although " : at all events in the following pages (*Ibid.*, pp. 356-8) the Bishop confines himself strictly to the First Epistle, and makes no use whatever of the Second. Canon Westcott states with great force the deficiency of external evidence. To obtain a complete idea of the judgment of the Church upon the Canon, we must combine (Westcott, *Canon*, p. 264) the two Canons of the East and West ; by doing this " we obtain, *with one exception*, a perfect New Testament without the admixture of any foreign element." That " exception " is the so-called Second Epistle of St. Peter, which is excluded by the consent both of the Eastern and Western Canon. Up to the time of Clement of Alexandria " no trace has been found " of its existence (*Ibid.*, p. 349) ; and it is rejected both by Origen and by Eusebius. The circumstances in which the Epistle was written (supposing it to be genuine) make the

absence of external evidence all the more serious; for it must have been addressed by the foremost of the Apostles, shortly before his death, to readers of whom Alford writes (*Prolegomena*, p. 142) that "by Chap. iii. 1 it would appear that they are identical with at all events a portion of those to whom the first Epistle was addressed," *i.e.*, to "the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." It is difficult to conceive how the last utterance of the Apostle St. Peter, addressed shortly before his martyrdom to so large an audience (or even to a considerable part of it), could have fallen into such complete neglect that up to the time of Clement of Alexandria there is no trace of its existence.

Logically, this absence of external testimony would seem to throw the *onus probandi* on those who maintain the genuineness of the Epistle. But, in practice, it is otherwise; even those who may feel that the Second Epistle occupies a moral and spiritual level far below that of the First, will nevertheless hardly be brought by mere negative arguments, derived from want of evidence, to deny the Apostolic origin of the former. The Epistle is at all events in possession of a place in the Canon, and it is perhaps but natural that possession should count for its "nine points." We are therefore driven to internal evidence, in which the principal arguments usually urged for a late date are the mention of St. Paul's letters (iii. 16) as being, by implication, "scriptures;" the reference to the "Holy Mount" (i. 18) of the Transfiguration, of which Canon Westcott (*Gospels*, p. 175) justly says, that "the comparative elaborateness of the description seems to offer an instructive contrast to the simplicity of the earlier Gospel;" and the apparent interweaving of phrases and sentences borrowed from St. Jude's Epistle in a manner alien (as we should suppose) from Apostolic simplicity, and especially from the character of such an Apostle as St. Peter. Cumulatively this evidence is

of great force, and especially that part which is derived from the use of St. Jude's Epistle. But as the date of that Epistle is unknown, even the demonstrated use of it cannot determine the date of which we are in quest. We may be convinced that the author of the Second Epistle of St. Peter borrowed from the Epistle of St. Jude, and still remain in doubt concerning the date of the latter, and therefore of the former. But if it could be shewn that the Author had borrowed from some work of which the date is known to be late, *e.g.* the Antiquities of Josephus, published in 93 A.D., the date of the Epistle would then be determined to be after 93 A.D., and the author of the Epistle would be known to be not St. Peter. The writer of this article, in the course of a critical study of the Second Epistle, found what appeared to him evidence that the author of it had read the Antiquities of Josephus: and a summary of it was circulated among six or seven of the most eminent of our theological scholars. One expressed a doubt whether the method was safe; another urged that even though the present Second Epistle were proved to be indebted to Josephus, it might be a translation from the Aramaic, so that no more would be proved than that the translator (not the author) borrowed from the Antiquities; a third regarded it as "decisively proved that either the author had borrowed from Josephus, or Josephus from the author," but suggested the possibility of the latter alternative: while all appeared to concur in regarding the evidence, even in the very condensed form in which it was presented to them, as novel, striking, and deserving of discussion. This evidence, therefore, in a popularised form, is now laid before the readers of the *Expositor*. A good deal of it will be omitted as too technical; nor will the writer enter into the question whether it is more probable that Josephus borrowed from the Second Epistle, or the Epistle from Josephus; nor will there be leisure to consider whether it is highly probable that a letter from

St. Peter, addressed to readers familiar with the Greek Epistles of St. Paul (iii. 16), should have been written in Aramaic and left untranslated for more than a quarter of a century. These points, if they appear to require discussion, may be discussed hereafter: for the present the writer, assuming that Josephus did not borrow from the Epistle, and that the Epistle was written in Greek, will attempt to prove that the author of the Epistle had read the Antiquities of Josephus.

Before proceeding to details we must lay down the axiom on which the proof rests. It is as follows:—

The evidence of a *group of words* is far stronger than that of a multitude of single words, to shew that one author has read another.

A single illustration will explain and enforce this. In an unpublished note-book of Francis Bacon, containing a number of quotations, formularies of courtesy, proverbs, and some original aphorisms, there are found (in a group of phrases relating to sleep and awakening), the two following entries close together: “up-rouse,” “golden sleep.” Now if these entries had been at a great interval, nothing could have been inferred from them; but, occurring almost consecutively, they lead the reader almost irresistibly to infer that Bacon had read or heard the following passage in “Romeo and Juliet:”

“But where unbruised youth with unstuffed brain
Doth couch his limbs, there *golden sleep* doth reign:
Therefore thy earliness doth me assure
Thou art *uproused* by some distemp’rature.”

Romeo and Juliet, ii. 3, 40.

Few will find it easy to resist this evidence; no one, I think, would deny that if there had been a third entry in the note book, “unbruised,” for example, or “unstuffed,” the evidence derived from the group of three words would have been absolutely irresistible.

But it may be urged that the strength of the evidence here greatly depends upon the peculiarity of the Baconian entries. If the expression "uproused from golden sleep" occurred in one of Bacon's "Devices," or in the "Wisdom of the Ancients" we should not feel anything like the same certainty that Bacon was borrowing from Shakespeare. It is our knowledge that Bacon in his note-book is stringing together other people's sayings, which makes us feel from the first disposed to believe that he is borrowing; and the passage from Shakespeare comes in only secondarily to prove that the borrowing is from *Romeo and Juliet*. The force of this argument must be admitted: but it can be met, first, by shewing that the author of the *Second Epistle* borrows not only words but, to some extent, thoughts from Josephus; secondly, by bringing forward a group not of two, nor of three, but of four, five, or six words, whose cumulative force will be found extremely strong; thirdly, by shewing that the Author borrowed in the same way from Philo, not to speak of the borrowing from St. Jude, so that, his character as a borrower in two cases being established, we ought to feel the less difficulty in believing that he borrowed in a third case.

Only one other remark need detain us, and that refers to the kind of words which will furnish the most convincing evidence. Obviously, uncommon words are far more weighty than common. But this is not all. The Author, who was familiar with the *Epistles of St. Paul*, must have necessarily been familiar also with the oral or written language of the *Gospels* and, still more, with the language of the *Septuagint*. If we find in *Robinson Crusoe* an isolated expression that strikes us as Shakespearian, but further search reveals it, or something like it, in the *English Bible*, clearly the probability is that Defoe borrowed from the *Bible* and not from Shakespeare; and similarly in the *Second Epistle*, should isolated words be found used both

by Josephus and the LXX., the probability is that, if there has been any imitation at all, the LXX. and not Josephus has been imitated. On the other hand, if the Epistle contains words found in Josephus but not found in the whole of the LXX. and the New Testament, then these words, though they may be common enough in the Greek language, assume the importance of uncommon words. For example, take such a word as *τοιόσδε* "such," "the following." Though it abounds in Thucydides and the classical writers, it is not found once in the LXX., nor anywhere in the New Testament except in a single passage of our Epistle (i. 17). The question therefore arises, what influence induced the author thus to step out of the linguistic sphere of his contemporaries into the sphere of classical Greek? And if it be found that this is one of a group of five or six words in a passage of Josephus, all of which reappear in the Epistle, then *τοιόσδε*, although absolutely a common Greek word, will assume the importance of a word relatively most uncommon, and it will add great weight to the cumulative evidence of the group.

Before proceeding however to Josephus, we will apply our method to an attempt to shew that our Author imitated Philo. In a comment on Genesis xv. 12 ("But about sunset a trance fell on Abraham"), Philo (*Quis Rer. Divin. Her.*, p. 52) declares that this describes the experience of one who is (a) inspired, or *borne on by God* (*θεοφορήτου*); for a prophet uttereth nothing that is his own, or (b) *private* (*ἴδιον*), but is merely a lyre in the hand of God. Human reason must be dormant when the Divine Spirit inspires. Now the reason is to the mind what the sun is to the universe, for both the reason and the sun are (c) *light-bearers* (*φωσφορεῖ*); therefore when "the sun sets," that is, when the human reason is dormant, then, and not till then, the Divine light (d) *rises* (*ἀνατέλλει*).

Compare with this page of Philo three verses of our

Second Epistle (i. 19-21), exhorting the readers to give heed to prophecy until (c) the *Light-bearer* (*φωσφόρος*) (*d*) *rise* (*ἀνατελεῖ*) in their hearts; knowing this, that no *prophecy* of Scripture is of (b) *private* (*ιδίας*) interpretation; for prophecy came not by the will of man, but men spake from God, being (a) inspired or *borne on* (*φερόμενοι*) by the Holy Spirit.¹

It is hardly possible for a critic to resist the conclusion that, in spite of the different adaptation of the words in the two passages, our Author had in his mind the passage of Philo. Indeed, Philo serves as a key to unlock the meaning of the Epistle; for our Author, in borrowing from Philo, as in borrowing from St. Jude, has somewhat obscured the meaning of a part of his own words, "No prophecy is of *private* interpretation." Does this mean, No prophecy can be *privately* or specially interpreted by *private* or special persons, or of special events? Or does it mean, No prophecy can be adequately interpreted as the *private* utterance of the prophet himself, intelligible only to him? Both interpretations have been maintained; but the latter is confirmed by Philo, who tells us that the prophet, like the lyre, gives forth no sound of his own or *private* origination. This thought our Author has amplified, by adding that the prophet not only does not originate, but does not even fully interpret, the words he utters. Again, does the word *φωσφόρος*, *light-bearer*, mean the "morning star" or "sun"? The word is not used in the LXX. (where

¹ Justin (*Ad Græcos*, viii.), says that the prophets "did not teach us from their own fancy . . . for neither by nature nor by man's conception could men discover such divine truths, but by the gift which then came down from above upon the *holy men*." Here, some one may say, is a reminiscence of the Second Epistle of St. Peter. But the next line or two make it much more probable that he has Philo in his mind, for he goes on to speak of the Holy Spirit as the *plectrum* (*i.e.* lyre *striker*), which uses *just men* as its instrument, like a harp or lyre; and Philo similarly says the prophet is the *sounding instrument struck* invisibly by God, and that all whom Moses introduces as *just persons* are also represented as prophets.

ἑωσφόρος is found seven times), nor in the N. T. In classical Greek it appears to have been used (Hesychius) both for *light-giver* generally, and for *bright star* in particular; and the latter is the more common meaning. But the context (i. 19) seems to demand the "sun" ("until the day shall have dawned, and the Light-bearer shall have risen"), because the rising of the Morning Star more naturally precedes or accompanies the dawn of day, than follows it; and, after the mention of the dawn, one naturally expects the mention of sunrise; and this interpretation is supported by Philo, who says of the sun, *it is a light-bearer* (φωσφορεῖ). It must be added that the Author's use of φερόμενος, *borne on*, as applied to men, is unexampled in the LXX. and N. T.; and it is contended that this coincidence of a group of words in a page of Philo, with a group of words in two or three verses of our Epistle, regard being had also to the partial similarity of the thought, and to the complete absence of two words of the group (as here used) from the books of the New Testament and Septuagint, cannot reasonably be supposed accidental, but probably proceeds from an imitation of Philo by the Author of the Epistle.

We pass now to the consideration of Josephus. Assuming that the Author of the Epistle had read parts of the Antiquities of Josephus, our readers will readily admit that he had probably read the short Introduction which describes the motives and objects of the work; and that, if the Epistle contains any traces of an imitation of the Antiquities, the Introduction will be a likely place to search for them.

Now the Introduction (Par. 3) declares (*a*) that the moral derived from the Jewish records is, that those who follow God's will find success and happiness, whereas those who disobey find everything against them, and are involved in irremediable calamities (a thought repeated also in Par. 4);

(*b*) Moses considered that the basis of all law was (Par. 4) insight into the *nature of God* (Θεοῦ φύσιν); (*c*) he exhibited (Par. 4) God in the possession of his *virtue* (ἀρετήν), undefiled by degrading anthropomorphism; (*d*) he considered (Par. 4) that it was the duty of man to partake in this Divine virtue; (*e*) the laws of Moses (Par. 4) contain nothing out of harmony with the *greatness* (μεγαλειότητος) of God; (*f*) he kept free from all unseemly myths and legends, though he might have easily cheated men (Par. 3) with *feigned* stories (πλασμάτων); (*g*) he always assigned fitting actions (Par. 3) to God's *power*; (*h*) nor did he do as other law-givers (Par. 4) who have *followed after fables* (μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες).

The Epistle declares (*a*) that the moral of the stories of the fallen angels, of Noah, and of Lot, is (ii. 9) that the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to keep the unrighteous unto punishment unto the day of judgment; (*g*) his Divine *power* (i. 3) hath granted us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him that called us (*d*) by his own glory and *virtue* (i. 3); that we may become (*d*) sharers in (*b*) the Divine *nature*; false teachers shall arise to make merchandise (ii. 3) of men with (*f*) *feigned* words (πλαστοῖς λόγοις); but we (*e*) were eye-witnesses (i. 16) of the *greatness* (μεγαλειότητος) of Christ; and (*h*) in declaring it we did (i. 16) not *follow after* cunningly devised *fables* (μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες).

The two most important points here are (*h*) the coincidence of phrase, *having followed after fables* (μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες), and (*b*) the mention of the *nature* of God. As to the first, it must be borne in mind that the word *follow after*, though found in the LXX., does not occur in the N. T.; and the word *fable*, though found four times in the Pastoral Epistles, does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, nor (except in the sense of *tale*, Sirach

xx. 19) in the whole of the LXX. The probability, therefore, that the Author borrowed from Josephus this protest that the Christians, as well as the Jews, did not *follow after fables*, is increased by the fact that neither the LXX. nor the N. T. contains *both* of the words which are here combined in the same order by the Author of the Epistle and Josephus. It may be suggested that the resemblance is less striking because the Author adds the words "cunningly devised" (σεσοφισμένοις). But it is the manner of borrowers to add something of their own, and it is a confirmation of the borrowing hypothesis that this added word is used but once in the N. T. (2 Tim. iii. 15, "make thee wise unto salvation"), and there in a sense opposite to the meaning here; whereas in the sense of "cunningly devise," "deceive," it is found at least twice in Josephus (*B. J.*, iii. 7, 20, and iv. 2, 3). Next, as to the expression *nature* of God, or Divine *nature*, it must be remembered that this is not only absent from the LXX. and N. T., but alien to New Testament thought. The Greeks and Romans spoke about "the *nature* of the gods," but St. Paul contrasts "nature" with "spirit," and no New Testament writer, although he might speak of God as the Creator of things in nature, could speak of "the *nature* of God." Although the phrase of Josephus, "nature (θεοῦ) of God," differs slightly from that of the Epistle, "divine (θείας) nature," yet the latter phrase is used by him elsewhere in his Treatise against Apion, and the word θεῖος (rare in the N. T.) is extremely common in Josephus. Of the other phrases it is sufficient to say that πλαστός is not found in the N. T. or LXX.; that *virtue* (ἀρετή, in the sing.) applied to God is only found once in the LXX., where the meaning is "glory" (*Hab.* iii. 2); and that the word here used for *greatness*, found only twice in the LXX. and twice in N. T., is only in one passage (*Luke* ix. 43) used, as here, of the greatness of a Divine Person. Some of the points

of similarity enumerated above (e.g. the *power* of God) are slight in themselves; but it is contended that the combination of coincidences, the mention of the *power*, the *virtue*, and the *nature* of God, the *greatness* of God (or Christ), the similar description of the moral derivable from the History of the Old Testament, the mention of the human sharing or partaking in the divine nature or virtue, the protest against the charge of using *feigned* words and *following after fables*, form an amount of cumulative evidence, important in itself, and more than sufficient to prepare the reader to give his attention to another instance of similar proof.

If the Author was attracted by the comparison (implied above) between Moses the truthful law-giver of the Jews, and the truthful teachers of the Christians, it is natural that in writing the last utterance of St. Peter he should turn his attention to the last utterance of Moses (*Antiquities*, iv. 8, 2), of which it will be well to set down a summary. Moses is said to have spoken (a) as follows (τοιάδε): "Fellow soldiers and (b) *sharers* of our long hardship (*μακρᾶς κοινωνοὶ παλαιπωρίας*, where note the transposition), since I (c) am not *destined* (οὐ μέλλω) to be your helper on earth, (d) I *thought it right* (δίκαιον ἡγησάμην) still to regard happiness for you and (e) *memory* (μνήμην) for myself. Do not set anything above (f) your *present* customs (*νομίμων τῶν παροντῶν*), (g) *despising* (*καταφρονήσαντες*) the (h) *reverence* (*εὐσεβείας*) which ye now feel for God; (i) thus will ye be never *able to be taken* (*εὐάλωτοι*) by your enemies. God will be with you (j) *as long as* (*ἐφ' ὅσον*) you will have Him for your leader. Listen then to your leaders, (k) *knowing that* (*γινώσκοντες ὅτι*) men learn to command by obeying. These things I say (l) at my *departure* from life (*ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ τοῦ ζῆν*), (m) not *recalling* them (*εἰς ἀνάμνησιν φέρων*) by way of reproach, but for your good, that ye may not, (n) through *folly*, degenerate."

With these compare (a) *τοιᾶσδε* (i. 17, here alone in N. T. and LXX.); (b) *θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως* (i. 4, where note the transposition similar to *μακρᾶς κοινωνοὶ ταλαιπωρίας* above); (c) *μελλήσω*, i. 12 (v. r. *οὐκ ἀμελήσω*, (?) *οὐ μελλήσω*, reading and meaning doubtful, *valeat tantum*); (d) *I think it right* (*δίκαιον ἡγούμαι*) i. 13 (here only in N. T. and LXX.); (e) *μνήμην*, i. 15 (sense different from that of Josephus, but here alone in N. T.); (f) "the *present* truth," i. 12 (*παρούση*); (g) *καταφρονοῦντες* (ii. 10, in different context); (h) *εὐσέβεια* (four times in this Epistle, eight times in the Pastoral Epistles, only once in the rest of the N. T.); (i) *made for taking*, ii. 12 (*εἰς ἄλωσιν*, in different context, but the word is only here used in N. T., and twice in LXX.); (j) *as long as*, i. 13 (*ἐφ' ὅσον*) is only here used in N. T. and LXX. in this sense (in the only other passage in which it occurs, Rom. xi. 13, it has a different sense); (k) *knowing that* (*γινώσκοντες ὅτι*) is twice used in this Epistle (i. 20; iii. 3) to introduce a new clause, and only twice elsewhere in the N. T.; (l) *my departure*, *ἔξοδος* (i. 15) only once used elsewhere in LXX. and N. T. (*viz.* Luke ix. 31) in this sense; note also in Josephus the juxtaposition of *ἔξοδος* and *ἀνάμνησιν*, and in 2 Pet. *ἔξοδος* and *ὑπομνήσει*; (m) the word *ἀμαθία*, *folly*, *inability to learn*, is not in the N. T. nor LXX., but the kindred adjective, *foolish* (*ἀμαθής*), though not in this context, is found in this Epistle (iii. 16) and nowhere else in the N. T. or LXX.

Here the evidence rests on the similarity of words rather than of thought; yet even in thought there is considerable similarity. Both Moses and St. Peter look forward anxiously to the time after their *departure*; and both *think it right* to provide for the interests of the faithful by solemn warnings to abide by the *present* truth (or customs). But, apart from the thought, the coincidence in the use of words is striking. Even if the words quoted

above were common in the N. T. we should think such a coincidence remarkable; but, when we remember that *μνήμην, ἐφ' ὅσον, δίκαιον δὲ ἠγοῦμαι* are never used, and *ἔξοδος* only once, in the whole of the N. T., then finding all these expressions in two or three verses describing the last words of St. Peter, and in a page of Josephus describing the last words of Moses, and adding to this the weight of the other less striking similarities, we shall probably find the cumulative evidence quite as powerful as that deducible from the Introduction; and the two together may perhaps be thought to amount to a demonstration that the Author of the Epistle had read Josephus.

It is not to be expected that more than one or two passages of the Antiquities should shew such striking groups of similarities as those above mentioned. Yet, were there no fear of overloading the pages with matter uninteresting to the general reader, it would be easy to point out thirteen or fourteen remarkable words or phrases in the Epistle, not found in the N.T. or LXX., which are found in different parts of the works of Josephus; but the evidence of single words and isolated phrases is of little importance as compared with that of groups, and therefore we will only ask the reader to compare 2 Peter ii. 10, *κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας· τολμηταί*, with *B. J.*, iii. 9, 3, *τολμηταὶ καὶ θανάτου καταφρονοῦντες*, and lastly 2 Pet. i. 19, *ὧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες*, to which ye do well to give heed, with *Ant.*, xi. 6, 12, *οἷς καλῶς ποιήσετε μὴ προσέχοντες*, to which ye will do well not to give heed.

In two other passages, where the language is wholly unlike, our Author agrees with Josephus in supplementing the Bible narrative. (i.) He tells us (ii. 5) that Noah was a "herald of righteousness." Nothing of this kind is found in Genesis ix., which merely tells us that Noah was "perfect"; but Josephus relates how Noah (*Antiquities*, i. 3, 1), "being ill pleased at their deeds and pained at

their counsels, tried to persuade them to amend their minds and actions." This expression reminds us a little of our Author's description of Lot, "worn out by the wanton life of the lawless, torturing his soul from day to day at their unlawful deeds" (ii. 8); but in any case it justifies the Epistle in describing Noah as a "herald" or "preacher" of righteousness. (ii.) Again, commenting on the reference to Balaam in the Epistle (ii. 16), which certainly *implies* (though it is not absolutely necessary to interpret it so) that the prophet was not only "hindered" but "rebuked" by the ass, Alford writes as follows: "A discrepancy has been discovered between this and the Mosaic account, seeing that it was the angel, and not the ass, from whom the rebuke came, the ass having merely deprecated ill treatment at Balaam's hands." Whether in any case the difference amounts to a "discrepancy," may be well questioned; but at all events the ass appears to "rebuke" the prophet in Josephus (*Antiquities*, iv. 6, 3), where we read that "the ass, having received a human voice, blamed Balaam as unjust, *having no cause to find fault with him for its previous services, yet now he inflicts blows on it, not understanding that now, in accordance with the purpose of God, he was being hindered,*" etc.

- Taken as a whole, the evidence in favour of the theory that the Author of the Second Epistle imitated Josephus, can hardly fail to appear striking, if not convincing. For it exhibits: 1st, a very large number of similar words and phrases in the two authors (and I may here add, that the same method applied to the First Epistle of St. Peter exhibits an almost total absence of such similarities); 2nd, all the phrases and words on which stress has been laid above are words and phrases rare or non-existent in the N. T. and LXX., and therefore completely out of the Author's natural sphere; 3rd, the groups of similarities between the Epistle and the *Antiquities* are found in just

those portions of the latter which our Author would be likely to have studied; 4th, besides some parallelism of thought in the two passages selected above to exhibit the parallelism of language, we find two others in which our Author agrees with Josephus in diverging from, or at all events adding to, the Bible narrative. This evidence would be still further strengthened could it be shewn that it is the character of the Epistle to borrow; that it contains no thoughts which may not be traced to St. Paul, St. Jude, Philo, Clement, and the books of the Old Testament; and that the style, in its use of some words almost unknown to Greek literature, in its misuse of other words and idioms, in its fondness for grandiloquent novelties and strained sonorousness, and in its weak reduplication of florid phrases, presents a perfect similarity to the English written by a Bengalee affecting the "fine style," and an utter dissimilarity from anything that could be expected in the last utterance of an Apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ. These, or some of these, propositions the writer will attempt to substantiate in a future article.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

CHRIST AND THE ANGELS.

HEBREWS ii. 11-17.

VERSES 11-13: "For both the sanctifier and the sanctified are all of one [that is, have one father, even God]; for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, 'I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the congregation I will sing praise unto Thee:' and, again: 'I will put my trust in Him;' and, again, 'Behold, I and the children which God hath given me.'"