

of God, where He sits as our intercessor, Christ gives us the assurance of free access to the Father; but it is in his own victory over temptation in all its fulness that He gives to us the not less needful pledge of effectual succour in all temptation.

W. ROBERTSON SMITH.

ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

II. HAD THE AUTHOR READ ST. JUDE?

IN a previous article we attempted to prove that the Author of the Second Epistle had read the Antiquities of Josephus; we will now endeavour to shew that he copied the Epistle of St. Jude.¹

The close connection between this Epistle and that of St. Jude will be most readily perceived if we set down and italicize (in the order of St. Jude) the words and parts of words common to both, inserting merely so much of St. Jude's context as may enable the reader to catch their tenour: "*The servant of Jesus Christ to . . . mercy and love be multiplied.*"² With all zeal I beg you to contend for the faith *delivered* to the *holy* brethren (comp. 2 Pet. ii. 21, the *holy* commandment *delivered* to them). For some have come *in secretly, long ago* ordained to this *judgment, denying the Master*. But I wish to *put you in*

¹ It may be well to remind the reader that there are abundant instances of patch-work composition in apocryphal literature both before and after the Christian era. The First Book of Esdras, for example, contains an original story in a frame-work made up of extracts more or less exact from the Second Book of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah: and the Gospel of Nicodemus has for its basis the Gospel of St. John, but includes many extracts from the other Gospels.

² The salutation of 2 Pet. i. 1, though similar to that of Jude, is more similar to that in 1 Pet. i. 2.

mind, though you know, that . . . and the angels he hath reserved for the judgment of the great day in chains under darkness. As Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities round about, having gone after strange flesh, are a sample to all (2 Pet. ii. 6, ὑπόδειγμα, ensample; Jude 7, δείγμα, sample). Even so these defile the flesh, despise dignity, and blaspheme glories (i.e. authorities). Yet the arch-angel (2 Pet. ii. 11, angels) dared not bring against them a judgment of evil speaking. But these blaspheme what they know not; and what they understand naturally, like irrational beasts, in these things they are destroyed (or 'corrupt themselves'). In the way of Cain they went, and in the error of Balaam, for pay. These are spots (σπιλάδες, the meaning is uncertain; 2 Pet. ii. 13, σπιλοι) . . . revelling with you, clouds waterless, for whom the gloom of darkness hath been reserved for ever. These walk after their lusts, they speak pompous things; but, beloved, remember the sayings that have been before spoken by the apostles of the Lord, how that in the last part of the time there shall be mockers walking after their own lusts. To God our Saviour be glory both now and for all the ages."

None who can appreciate documentary evidence will deny that there has been copying here; but the question arises may not both writers have copied from some common original, some Book of Enoch, for example, describing the fall of the angels and that which was to come to pass in the later days? The improbability of that hypothesis can be inferred from the fact that some of the similarities, being personal to the writer, could hardly have been extracted from any such original. How could the ancient Enoch be introduced as with *all zeal putting his readers in mind, though they know already?* Or as calling on them to remember the sayings previously uttered by the Apostles (or Prophets) of the Lord? But be this as it may, a detailed examination of two or three of the similar passages will

shew that, in any case, St. Jude's Epistle represents the original, whereas the Second Epistle is an unintelligent copy, taken, either from St. Jude, or from the original which St. Jude had copied intelligently.

Take first the following (2 Pet. ii. 9-11): "The Lord knoweth how to reserve under punishment for the day of judgment the unjust, and especially those who *go after the flesh* in the lust for pollution, and despise authority. Audacious, self-willed, they tremble not when railing against glories, whereas angels, in strength and power superior, do not bring against them, in the sight of the Lord, a railing judgment." This passage is an admirable instance of the manner in which the Author, by omitting necessary words from his original, and by inserting unnecessary words, produces an obscure, yet verbose result. He has been speaking above of the fallen angels and of the rescue of Lot from Sodom; and he deduces from it the moral that the Lord punishes especially those who "*go after the flesh.*" In his comment on this expression, Alford says that it means "all following after unlawful carnal lusts:" but the context requires something much stronger than this;¹ and accordingly Jude (7) has "like Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities round about them, which in the same way as these (*i.e.* the angels mentioned above) committed fornication and went after *strange* flesh." That this is the original meaning is confirmed by a passage in the Book of Enoch (Dillmann, p. 82), which uses the word *ὀπίσω* in the same signification, of the fallen angels going astray *after* the daughters of men (*καὶ ἐπεθύμησαν αὐτὰς καὶ ἀπεπλανήθησαν ὀπίσω αὐτῶν*). It is doubtful

¹ It is much to be regretted that the Revised Version translates by the same words ("walk *after* the flesh") two totally different expressions (1) *περιπαροῦσιν κατὰ σάρκα* (Rom. viii. 4) which means merely "walk *according to* the flesh," *i.e.* lead a fleshly or sensual life; and (2) *ὀπίσω σαρκὸς πορευομένων* (2 Pet. ii. 10) which means to "*go astray following* the dictates of the flesh," like "*following after Satan*" (1 Tim. v. 15).

whether the expression "to follow after the flesh" could be used at all (with a personification of the Flesh) to denote obeying the instincts of the flesh; for such a metaphor—possibly because of the verbal inconsistency implied in our "following" the flesh which encloses us—is unknown to the New Testament; but in any case the context of the Second Epistle, the text and context of Jude, and the fragment of Enoch, all tend to prove that the meaning ought to be, not, as Alford would have it, "*all following after unlawful carnal lusts,*" but the special sin imputed to the angels, and to the men of the two doomed cities, a lusting after "*strange flesh,*" *i.e.* unnatural vice.

Still more decisive is the remainder of the passage quoted above (2 Pet. ii. 10, 11), "they tremble not when railing against glories; whereas angels do not bring against *them* a railing judgment." Who could possibly understand this passage as it stands, with this ambiguous "*them,*" without the aid of St. Jude? The meaning of "glories" seems to be spiritual "thrones and principalities:" and it is stated that these false teachers do not hesitate to rail against the highest spiritual powers. Against good powers or bad? Clearly, against the good. But the next clause contrasts the presumption of these false teachers with the modesty of the good angels: "whereas angels do not bring against *them* a railing judgment." Against whom? Against the false teachers? The context certainly at first sight would seem to demand this interpretation; but it conveys no sense, and Alford's note mentions no commentator who has suggested it. It must be then against the "glories," *i.e.* the spiritual powers of *goodness* just mentioned, which have been railed at by the false teachers? But it seems absurd to praise the *good* angels for not railing at the spiritual powers of *goodness*. The sense therefore demands that "*them*" should mean "the spiritual powers of *evil*:" and the sentence ought to run thus: "These

heretics do not hesitate to rail against the powers of *goodness*; yet even the angels shrink from railing against the powers of *evil*." Again, even if the sentence were thus clearly expressed, we should still be forced to ask, what authority had the writer for thus praising the moderation of the angels? What was the special tradition which he must have had in view?

All these questions are answered, and all these obscurities cleared up, by reference to the following simple passage of Jude: "But in the same way these men . . . defile the flesh, despise authority, and rail against glories. [Yet Michael] the archangel, [when he, while disputing with the devil, spoke with him concerning the body of Moses,] dared not to bring *against him* a judgment of railing, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." This makes all clear. The Author of the Second Epistle had this passage before him. But, writing for Gentile readers, he did not wish to introduce the story of Michael, Moses, and the devil: omitting it therefore, he would have these words before him in Jude: "They despise authority, and rail against glories; Yet the archangel did not dare to bring *against him* a judgment of railing, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." Clearly "him" must be altered, now that "devil" is omitted. It is therefore hastily altered into "them," to refer to the "glories" above, thereby making nonsense. Also, the "archangel" looks too much like allusion to a definite story, and is therefore altered into "angels superior in might and power;" lastly, the rebuke of Michael to Satan must be omitted, but still this appeal to the presence of the Lord can be partly expressed by a kind of side-stroke, and for this purpose the Author adds "in the sight of (*lit.* by the side of) the Lord." At the same time he adds some unnecessary but classical verbiage, to the effect that these teachers "*do not tremble* when railing," and that they are "audacious, self-willed," the final result being: "Audacious, self-willed, they do not

tremble when railing against glories; whereas angels superior in strength and power do not bring against them in the sight of the Lord a railing judgment."

In the following passages our Author, in altering Jude, has endeavoured to improve the sense; and although he has not made nonsense, it can be clearly shewn that the text of St. Jude was, or represents, the original from which the Second Epistle was derived. Jude (12) says of the false teachers, "These are they who are *stains* (σπιλάδες) in your *feasts of charity* (ἀγάπαις) feasting with you." The word translated *stains* presents a difficulty; for it always means "rocks" except here and in an Orphic poem (Lightfoot, *On a Fresh Revision*, p. 137) of the fourth century after Christ. yet all the early Versions understood the word in the sense of "*stain*" (Lightfoot, *ib.*), and the cognate word σπιλοι more commonly used in the sense "*stains*," also (Rutherford's *New Phrynichus*, p. 17) appears to have passed from the meaning "rock" to the later meaning "*stain*." It is therefore very probable that our Old Version is here correct, and that St. Jude meant, not as our New Version has it, "rocks," but "spots" or "*stains*." But whatever may have been Jude's meaning, it was certainly obscured by the use of the word σπιλάδες; for if the word meant "rocks," then the metaphor, although conceivable, is harsh and far-fetched; and if it meant "*stains*," then the use of the word, in this rare sense, is objectionable. Naturally therefore the Author of the Second Epistle would alter σπιλάδες into σπιλοι, a word used in St. Paul's Epistles and therefore familiar to him; but that Jude should have altered the intelligible σπιλοι into his own unintelligible σπιλάδες is inconceivable. Again, it would seem that Jude's word "*feasts of charity*" (in uncial characters ΑΓΑΠΑΙC) was corrupted, in our Author's copy, into the very similar ΑΠΑΤΑΙC, "*deceits*." But this change, having been made, necessitated the further change of "*your*"

into "their." Yet a further change is required; for to say "stains and blemishes in their deceits feasting with you" makes absolutely no sense: therefore our Author inserts a word implying a metaphorical feast, a "revelling" in wickedness.¹ But he still retains the reference to the literal feasting although it now makes no sense; and consequently the simple and literal statement of Jude that these heretics were blemishes on the *agapai* or "love-feasts" whenever they feasted with the faithful, is converted into the following chaos: "spots and blemishes, revelling in their deceits, feasting with you." The absurdity of this sentence has induced the scribes of some MSS. to alter the reading "deceits" back to "love-feasts:" but Westcott and Hort retain the reading "deceits" in their text, while inserting "love-feasts" in the margin.

Jude continues (12) by describing the false teachers as "clouds without water, carried past by winds . . . wandering stars for whom the blackness of darkness hath been reserved for ever." The first metaphor is not so readily intelligible to Western as to Eastern readers, who could more keenly realize, in time of drought, the disappointment caused by clouds which; instead of descending in welcome rain, are "wafted past" the expectant husbandman and prove, indeed, "waterless." So unintelligible were these "waterless clouds" to the readers for whom our Author wrote, that he alters "waterless clouds" into the much more common-place "waterless springs;" but still he desires to retain some mention of "clouds." Not however understanding Jude's point of view, he fixes, not on the "waterlessness" of the disappointing cloud, but on the unsteadiness and fickleness of it, as representing

¹ The word occurs, similarly used, in Isaiah vii. 4: and it is perhaps noteworthy that the passage Isaiah lvi. 7—lvii. 5, contains a group of expressions found in this Epistle: *ἐντροφᾶν ἐν* (found here), "my *Holy Mount*" (2 Pet. i. 18); "they are utterly blinded," (*ib.* i. 19); "dog" (*ib.* ii. 22); "the *just one*" (ii. 8); "children of destruction," comp. "children of curse" (*ib.* ii. 14).

teachers blown about by every wind of doctrine; and then (having in his mind possibly two passages in the LXX. Wisdom ii. 4 and 5), he describes them as "mists driven by a blast." At this point he omits, besides other imagery of Jude, the metaphor "wandering stars," probably because he has already anticipated this notion of "unsteadiness" in his description of the clouds. Yet, whether Jude means teachers pretending to give light like the planets, or whether he is thinking of comets—which may be literally said to pass into darkness never to return—in either case the words "wandering stars for whom the blackness of darkness hath been reserved for ever," are most appropriate to express the evanescent light of superficial teachers. But, with even more than his wonted carelessness, our Author retains these last words about "darkness," even though he omits all mention of the "wandering stars" which are reserved for darkness: "These are springs without water, and mists driven by a blast; for whom the blackness of darkness hath been reserved." It is true that the pronoun "whom" refers not to "mists" but to "these"; yet the abruptness caused by the juxta-position of the "mists" and the "blackness of darkness" in reserve, requires explanation; and this explanation is afforded by the supposition that our Author has omitted the "wandering stars" which in Jude's context make the "darkness" appropriate and expressive.

But since in all these passages the text of Jude is superior to that of the Second Epistle in clearness and force, it may be asked why may we not suppose that Jude improved on the Second Epistle rather than that the Author of the latter spoiled Jude? The briefest reference to the several passages will shew that this is impossible. It is not credible that Jude altered "waterless springs" into "waterless clouds," or "driven by the blast" into "wafted past"; but the converse is both credible and natural. It is not credible that Jude took a pointless

metaphor like "revelling in deceits," and by the alteration of a letter or two substituted a pointed and practical meaning, "feasting at your love-feasts"; or that he found in an Epistle of Peter an ill-placed expression, "for whom the blackness of darkness is reserved," and gave it an exact meaning by inserting the words "wandering stars." The same holds true of the alteration of *σπιλάδες*; it is credible and natural that our Author altered *σπιλάδες* into *σπίλοι*; it is inconceivable that Jude altered the easy and intelligible *σπίλοι* into the harsh or unintelligible *σπιλάδες*. Lastly, whereas the Second Epistle speaks of the evil teachers as "railing against glories whereas angels do not bring against *them* a railing judgment," it is not credible that Jude penetrated into the confused meaning of the Author, and detecting the recondite allusion in his mind, made darkness light by inserting the legend which the Author had in his mind but accidentally omitted.

One more instance may be given of the confusion caused by our Author's alterations of his original. Jude writes about the evil teachers as follows (10): "These blaspheme on the one hand what things they know not; and on the other hand in such things as they understand naturally like the irrational beasts, in these they are destroyed (or, destroy themselves)," *i.e.* "these men have no sense of things spiritual, which they revile; and as for the world of sense of which they have some instinctive knowledge, as beasts have, even this they turn to their own destruction by their excesses." The antithesis is clear, and there is nothing objectionable in the statement. But this antithesis is too subtle for our Author. Utilising it only so far as it will enable him to enforce his favourite topic of "destruction" (*ἀπωλεία*)—a word that occurs six times in this Epistle and only fourteen times in all the rest of the N.T.—he emphasizes the word "destroyed" by adding "with destruction;" he changes the present into the future, because he

wishes to be regarded as *predicting future, not describing present*, teachers; and thus produces the following sentence: "But these—like irrational animals that are born natural(ly) for capture and destruction—blaspheming the things wherein they are ignorant, in their destruction shall verily be destroyed." How inferior in point and spiritual truth is this statement to that of Jude! Jude says that these blaspheming teachers are *worse* than the beasts, because they abuse nature and are destroyed by nature's retribution; our Author says simply that they shall be destroyed *like* beasts made for destruction. Yet, although the sense of Jude is so superior to that of our Author, it is inconceivable that Jude should have produced his text by amending our Author's. It is infinitely more difficult to convert a chaotic and immoral sentence into one with point and shape and moral, than to turn shape to chaos by hasty and blundering imitation. Let any one put aside the two sentences, and after giving himself time to forget the text of Jude, let him sit down, pen in hand, and try, with the text of the Second Epistle before him, to alter it and improve it into Jude's sense, and he will realize the difficulty of conceiving that Jude was the copyist.

Let us now pass to the passages in the two Epistles which describe the uprising of the false teachers. A difference will be at once apparent. Jude speaks of false teachers who *have* arisen, our Author of teachers who *shall* arise. Thus Jude has (4): "for certain men *have* crept in privily, they who have been of old appointed to this condemnation;" our Author (ii. 1): "there *shall be* false teachers, who *shall* privily bring in heresies of destruction . . . whose condemnation now of old lingereth not." Again Jude has (17) "But ye, beloved, remember ye the words which *have been spoken before* by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; how that *they said* to you, In the last time there shall be mockers;" but our Author (iii. 2, 3) bids

his hearers remember, not the predictions of the *Apostles*, but "the words which *were spoken before* by the holy *prophets*." Afterwards he makes mention of the Apostles, but not as "predicting," but as "commanding:" "and the *commandment* of the Lord and Saviour *through your Apostles*." He then proceeds to quote the prophecy assigned by Jude to the Apostles, but instead of referring to it as past, he appropriates it *as his own prophecy*, "Knowing this first, that in the last days mockers shall come." If we ask the reason for these changes of tenses, the answer is obvious. The Author, assuming an Apostolic character, must place himself in the position of an Apostle, and instead of referring (as Jude does) to the Apostolic predictions as past, must himself utter them concerning the future.

Should it be suggested that Jude may have, on the contrary, altered our Author's Future Tenses into Past Tenses, we have an answer, not only in the generally imitative nature of the Second Epistle, but also in the manifest proofs afforded by it that the Author wrote *after* the false teachers had come.¹ For he does not consistently sustain his character of one predicting the future, but proceeds to state what these future mockers are *now in the habit of thinking* (iii. 5): "For this they willingly *forget*"—not "they *will forget*"—"that there were heavens from of old, etc." A short but significant phrase (ii. 4) points to the same inconsistency: "Whose condemnation now of old lingereth not and their destruction slumbereth not." This means, as Alford rightly explains it, that their condemna-

¹ Further, let us suppose that Jude is here not copied, but copying. He has before him the words 2 Pet. iii. 3 "*mockers* (*ἐμπαίκτηι*) shall come." This word "mockers" is nowhere else used in the N. T., and its occurrence in these two passages is a confirmation of the supposition that one author borrowed from the other. But on the supposition that Jude borrowed, why did he not quote by name the great Apostle whose last utterance he is repeating? How much more weight would have been attached to a definite prophecy thus definitely quoted, than to the vague generality conveyed the words uttered before by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ!"

tion "is working itself out, is living and in action," and that their destruction "is awake and ready to seize them." Now, although it is very natural for Jude to write of false teachers who *have appeared*, that they were "appointed beforehand of old to this condemnation," yet it is harsh in the extreme to say of heretics who have not yet appeared, and will not appear until the generation of Apostles has passed away, that "their condemnation *is working itself out, is living and in action.*" But the fact is that, although the Author keeps his character of an Apostolic prophet when he predicts the advent of these evil teachers, he relapses into his own true character of a contemporary when he descants on their punishment; and hence he speaks of them as actually alive, and of their punishment as now impending. The different nature of the "mockers" in Jude and in the Second Epistle is also significant. The "mockers" in Jude (12) are those who "make separations," and mock the faith; in the Second Epistle they are those who are weary of awaiting the Lord's coming, "Where," say they (iii. 4), "is the promise of his coming? For, from the day that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." This suits a post-apostolic date, a time when the earlier belief in the speedy coming of Christ had been succeeded by a belief among the faithful that his coming might be long deferred, and among the faithless that He might not come at all; and that this impatient feeling had already set in is proved by the protestation of our Author himself, in the present tense (iii. 9), "The Lord *is* not slow as regards his promise. . . but He *is* long suffering."

It would be beyond the limits of this paper to go through the whole of the Epistle and, pointing out the sources whence a number of other words and phrases are derived, to shew that there is probably not one original thought, and scarcely one natural expression, in the whole of it. One

or two specimens must suffice. It contains only two or three expressions borrowed from St. Peter's First Epistle (for the list of words given by Dr. Plumptre, as "comparatively unfamiliar in other books and common to the two Epistles," will be greatly thinned upon a careful inspection), such as the salutation (i. 1), the use of "precious" (τίμιος) (i. 1) and the phrase (iii. 14) "without spot and blameless" (comp. 1 Pet. i. 19). But the first two verses shew more than one trace that the Author set out with the intention of imitating St. Peter, and yet of not copying the First Epistle too exactly. For although the words "grace and peace be multiplied" are exactly reproduced, he chooses—if the reading "Simeon" be correct,—a peculiar form of Simon, not found elsewhere in the N.T. except in the single passage (Acts xv. 14) where James, in his position as President of the Council at Jerusalem, formally recognises Peter by that name as the opener of the Church to the Gentiles. Again (i. 1) in first addressing his readers—although from iii. 1 ("second epistle") we infer that he intends to have it supposed that they are the same as those who in the First Epistle (1 Pet. i. 1) are addressed as "the sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, etc."—he does not repeat the address of the First Epistle, but resorts to a different one, yet not original. Reading the account in the Acts of the Apostles (xi. 17) in which Peter defended the offer of baptism to the Gentiles against the attacks of the Judaizing party, he found the Apostle describing the Gentiles as those to whom "God gave the *like* (ἴσην) gift as he did also to us, having had faith (πιστεύσασι) in the Lord Jesus Christ." Instead of ἴσην he uses the word (unknown in N.T. but found in Josephus) ἰσότιμον, "equally honoured," and then describes his hearers by the same periphrasis, "*them that have obtained an equally honoured faith with us.*" It is also probable that the expression *μισθον ἀδικίας, wages of iniquity*, twice repeated

in 2 Pet. ii. 13, and ii. 15, and found nowhere in the N.T., except in the speech of St. Peter, Acts i. 18, has been borrowed from the latter passage.

We will conclude the list of our Author's imitations by mentioning two passages for the consideration of the learned, where he appears likely to be indebted to Clement of Rome. In i. 17 he speaks of a voice having been carried to Christ on the Mount of Transfiguration "by the *excellent glory*" (ὕπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεπῆς δόξης). Now the word here rendered "excellent" is rare in the LXX. and not found in the N.T.; but the exact phrase is found in Clement of Rome's Epistle to the Corinthians, Chap. ix., "those that ministered to his *excellent glory*" (τῇ μεγαλοπρέπει δόξη αὐτοῦ); and Clement elsewhere (viii.) speaks of "the *excellent and glorious will of God.*" Again (iii. 5-7) our Author speaks of the old heavens and earth as being "*compacted. . . . by the Word of God,*" and of the new heavens and earth as being "treasured up by the *same Word* (so Westcott and Hort; Alford, 'by his word'), being reserved for fire." This passage occurs in a context that treats of God's promises (ἐπαγγελίας). In a similar passage Clement (xxvii.) bids us attach ourselves to Him who is faithful in his promises (ἐπαγγελίαι), remembering that all things are easy for Him: "In the *Word* of his power He *compacted* all things and in the *Word* He is able to destroy them." Of course it may be suggested that Clement may have borrowed these expressions from our Author; but, if we believe that our Author had read the Antiquities of Josephus, published in 93 A.D., and that he wrote a few years after that date (so as to allow a sufficient time for the Antiquities to come into general circulation) it will appear more probable that our Author borrowed from Clement (who wrote about 95 A.D.) than that Clement borrowed from an Epistle which could only just have come into circulation and which is not distinctly quoted by any

Christian writer till the third century. Two other similarities between Clement and the Second Epistle (less striking verbally, but of some importance when combined with those given above) are given by Kirchofer (p. 277).

Taken by themselves these passages might leave it doubtful whether our Author had borrowed or lent them; but if we find him proved to have borrowed from Jude, Philo, Josephus, the First Epistle of St. Peter, and the Acts of the Apostles, his established character for borrowing ought fairly to turn the scale against him when internal evidence makes it probable that either he or Clement borrowed, but is insufficient to prove which was the borrower. This conclusion will be still further confirmed if we can shew that the style of the Author throughout is that of a copyist and "fine writer," ignorant of ordinary Greek idiom, yet constantly straining after grandiloquent Greek, an affected and artificial style wholly unlike that of the First Epistle of St. Peter, a style so made up of shreds and patches of other men's writings, and so interspersed with obsolete, sonorous, and meaningless words that it really has no claim to be called a style at all, and resembles nothing so much as the patchwork English of a half-educated Hindoo aping the language of Lord Macaulay and Dr. Johnson with an occasional flavour of Shakespeare. But this aspect of the Epistle will demand separate treatment.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.
