

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

burnt-offering"; Schmoller, *Die Propheten Hosea, Joel und Amos* (in J. P. Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 1872), pp. 63, 70, translates, "in love I have more pleasure than in sacrifice"; Marti, *Jahrbücher für prot. Theol.*, 1880, p. 310 (cf. *supra*, p. 211) gives as his translation of 6a, "I have more pleasure in the manifestation of love than in sacrifice"; T. K. Cheyne, *Hosea, with Notes and Introduction* (The Cambridge Bible), 1884, p. 79, interprets, "and not sacrifice=rather than sacrifice"; Orelli also (*ad loc.*, 1896) understands 6a in accordance with 6b. Nevertheless, according to the considerations advanced on pp. 151-209, this assimilation of 6a to 6b can be regarded even less than the converse procedure, discussed under (β), as one actually consistent with Hebrew diction. For the Hebrew possessed an expression for comparative negation, and Hosea himself makes use of it in 6b. And so it cannot but be an unsafe exposition which reads this comparative negation into 6a also, where the speaker himself has not employed it.

ED. KÖNIG.

(*To be concluded.*)

*IS SECOND PETER A GENUINE EPISTLE TO
THE CHURCHES OF SAMARIA?*

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 this is a very complicated problem, especially because the estimate of the arguments is so often dependent on what each deems probable. That there is a connexion is not doubted; and a strong case can, I think, be made out for the priority of 2 Peter.

If the analysis that has been made 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 from the Old Testament or from Enoch. Proverbs, so full of sententious wisdom, was a favourite book, as has been abundantly shown from the second chapter of the Epistle. 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 ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συννευχούμενοι can be best accounted for if 2 Peter ii. 13 be its original. Dr. Bigg is of opinion, as is Zahn also, that the reading of 2 Peter should be ἀγάπαις instead of ἀπάταις, and that σπιλάδες in Jude should be given the meaning "spots"; but we shall follow the reading of the modern editors, Westcott and Hort, Weiss, and Nestle, and take σπιλάδες in an equally probable sense. σπίλος (ὁ), a post-classical word, ordinarily means "spot," "stain," but σπίλος (ῆ) also signifies "cliff," "rock," being nearly synonymous with σπιλάς, which may mean a reef more or less submerged (Polyb. i. 37). Any one 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 σπίλοι . . . ἀπάταις of 2 Peter may well have given rise to the fine figure in σπιλάδες, while the assonance of ἀπάταις would call to mind the ἀγάπαις in which they revelled. By adding ὑμῶν Jude heightens the effect of the intrusion which turned the most sacred fellowship of the Christians into a ghastly carnival. It is difficult to imagine that from the ruins of Jude's imagery a few remnants like σπίλοι and συννευχούμενοι are all that would be 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 ἄνδρῶν, etc., there is much similarity to Proverbs xxv. 14, which may have induced him to blend two of Peter's figures into one. He takes from the former

the word *ἄνυδροι*, which, according to Old Testament usage, is better suited to Peter's first figure than to clouds, and from the other the idea of being "carried along." But Peter is indebted for both his figures to Proverbs. This is almost a demonstration that Jude employed 2 Peter as his source.

The next clause also, *δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ*, etc., while it has no strict 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 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, and had been baptized into the Christian name. But no fruit appeared, though they were left standing till the late autumn, and now they are uprooted, hopelessly apostate. This is precisely the condition into which it is feared that the readers of 2 Peter may come; so the Apostle is emphatic on the necessity of ethical progress and growth in grace (2 Pet. i. 8-10, ii. 20, 21, iii. 18). How could 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, lxxx. i. 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 stars plunging from their orbits into the eternal darkness of death, and add such a weak ending to the vigorous imagery of the rest of the verse. This final clause of Peter's is really the conclusion to the hitherto incomplete warning of ii. 4, to which his attention may

have been drawn by Proverbs xxi. 6, which seems to have been in his mind for a previous figure.

2 Peter ii. 11 is often compared unfavourably with Jude 8, 9; but we have seen that Enoch is the source for the description in Peter; and Jude, instead of throwing light on the obscurity of 2 Peter, adds a distinctly new thought by changing *βλάσφημον κρίσιν*, "a railing accusation," into *κρίσιν βλασφημίας*, "a charge of blasphemy" (see Field, *Ot. Norvic*, and Bigg, *in loc.*).

The doxology of Jude contains, in *v.* 24, words and ideas which are most naturally regarded as a working over of figures from 2 Peter i. 10, 11 with Pauline material, *ἀπταίστους* being suggestive of *οὐ μὴ πταισῆτέ ποτε*, while the next clause, though perhaps best explained from 1 Peter iv. 13, also sets forth the same thought as the "abundant entrance" of 2 Peter i. 11 (cf. 2 Pet. iii. 14).

Apart from the foregoing formal similarities there are two internal evidences of the later date of Jude in the subject-matter: (1) The doctrine of the Parousia so prominent in 2 Peter has fallen into the background. 2 Peter, abounding in Old Testament conceptions and echoing the teaching of Jesus, bears witness to the same suspicious impatience of Christ's second coming as was a part of the environment in the midst of which the framework of the synoptic Gospels took its shape. Both Gospels and Epistle are heightened by the apocalyptic symbolism of judgment, like the forest coloured after an early frost. Jude, on the other hand, freer from the apocalyptic imagery, resembles the later Epistles of Paul. If it is safe to take the progress in spiritualizing the conception of the Parousia as a criterion of date, Jude, along with the later Pauline Epistles, lies between the earlier stage of the Synoptics 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 chiefly in mind, and they are still to come. The former is face to face with a serious declension from the faith (3, 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; indeed they are almost as far gone as the leaders in error. So as Jude begins in verses 3, 4 to speak of the necessity for serious struggle if the invaders are not to have their way and destroy the faith, and to detail the judgment long ago denounced upon them, the awful danger to his readers of immediate apostasy occurs to him, and he goes off at the thought to give them warning in the examples of 5-7. Then he resumes the description of the intruders in *v.* 8, but does not finally complete *v.* 4, by stating what the judgment long ago foretold was, till *v.* 14, when we see that it is found in Enoch. It is then taken up and finished in *v.* 18, where in the words of 2 Peter iii. 3 he describes the phenomenon, the foretelling of which was evidently an apostolic commonplace due to the teaching of our Lord. Verses 3, 20-23 show imminent danger of the wreck of an established Church. Verses 11, 12, 16 imply a revolt against constituted authority, and complaint of the rigour of Christian discipline. Like the Cain of tradition they are wilful and irreverent, scoffing at the idea of judgment either in this world or in the world to come. Like Korah they rebel against government, of which there is not a trace in 2 Peter except the Apostles, who still have some degree of tenure on their congregations (2 Pet. i. 11-15).

Jude is manifestly under such direct obligations to Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, and the Epistles of Paul, that it would be only natural for him to put himself in the debt of other apostolic writers; and if the author of 2 Peter was one, verses 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 17, 18 find their explanation as

being dependent on 2 Peter ii. 1, 4-6, 11, 12, iii. 2, 3. In this case the object of Jude is 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, if not the lineal descendants, at least closely related to the errorists there warned against. Sufficient time must have elapsed since the writing of 2 Peter to allow for the influence of the later letters of the Apostle Paul.

In view of the existence of a pre-Christian Jewish gnosis, it would be rash to deny that in Jude we find the faint outlines of later sects, though probably little stress should be laid on the examples of Cain and Korah, who became heroes of schools of Gnostics of a type somewhat similar to the errorists of Jude. We shall not be far wrong in putting Jude at the transition period when Gnosticism was beginning to shape from cliques within Christianity into independent schools or sects outside the Church, before the great persecutions of the closing decades of the first century broke out. The location of the Churches to which it was written may be sought in Syria or in the Hellenized cities of north-eastern Palestine, mixed Jewish and Gentile communities, which would be thoroughly acquainted with the writings of Paul. Hither antinomian Gnosticism may have come from Samaria to form a new home for itself, as it may have gone also through Cæsarea to Asia Minor, and returned to Egypt laden with Christian transformations. The Churches were probably acquainted with 2 Peter, which had been written to combat the beginnings in Samaria of the same heresy that had now spread to the congenial soil of Syria.

It is impossible to determine the place from which it was written. We may perhaps infer from 1 Corinthians ix. 5, that Jude was an evangelist, and if so 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 up a filthy beach near some great city; or on his journey at night as he guided himself by the stars, he would see in the meteor shooting across the firmament an 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 that either the one borrows from the other, or both are from the same school.¹ 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, e.g., 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 the 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.

¹ See Chase's Article on 2 Peter in Hastings' *Dict. B.*, or Dr. Bigg's *Commentary* for details.

The arrangement of the spheres and the imagery of Paradise and Hell in the *Apoc. Petri*, together with some similarities in detail, seems to show that its author was acquainted with the "Secrets" (cf. *Apoc. Pet.* 5, 6, 8, 15, 17, 18 with Slav. *Enoch* 8, 9, 10). There are also unmistakable references to *Ethiopic Enoch*. Now if, as some hold, 2 Peter originated in Egypt, and is indebted to the *Apoc. Petri*, how are we to account for his being so alien in thought to the *Secrets of Enoch*? On the other hand, the similarities of the *Apoc. Petri* 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 to the *Apoc. Petri* much greater weight is added to the probability that the scattered words and phrases of 1 Clement, suggestive of 2 Peter, are due to the acquaintance of Clement with our Epistle (*Clem.* 7. 5, 6; 9. 2, 4; 35. 5, etc.). A similar judgment will hold for Hermas. These, added to the minor coincidences of Justin, Irenaeus, and Hippolytus, insufficient in themselves perhaps, but striking when considered in the light of the foregoing, help to justify Zahn's opinion that "from 90 to 100 A.D., 2 Peter was read 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."

There is good reason for holding that 2 Peter circulated in Alexandria early in the second century, for in Barnabas (ch. 15) the connexion of the words ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ' αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη favours their being a reminiscence of 2 Peter iii. 10-14, far more than the similar expressions in Justin and Irenaeus, where they may be quoted as a Jewish com-

monplace. This view is strengthened by the fact that the Epistle is found in both the Bohairic and Sahidic versions; and that the great Alexandrians, Clement and Origen, were acquainted with it. But in the judgment of these philosophical scholars its apocalyptic imagery would tend to cast suspicion on its apostolic authorship as lending support to Chiliastic dreams. Also the remarkable differences in language between this Epistle and 1 Peter would not escape detection in that critical school.

2 Peter seems to have circulated also in Asia Minor and Syria though it is impossible to say how early. Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia (250 *flor.*) and Methodius of Olympus in Syria (+ 311) quote it, the latter against the Chiliasts. It may be that Theophilus of Antioch (180) has reminiscences in two passages (*Ad Autolyicum* ii. 9, 13). Apart from this however Syria gives no testimony to 2 Peter. Probably, as in Rome and Alexandria, an earlier recognition yielded to critical doubts, for it does not appear in the Peshitto version; nor is it known to the scholars of Antioch.

If our Epistle was written to the Churches of Samaria we get the key to much of its canonical fortune. Samaria soon dropped out of Christian history. 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 (2 Pet. iii. 15) have disappeared. The few certain remains of the Palestinian literature that survive, are the result not of the first occupation of the country by the Gospel but of subsequent conversion.

But there is another reason for its sparse recognition, as well as for its reappearance in certain localities. Two great principles were at work in the formation of the canon and

the retention of certain writings. Those letters were kept which were most for edification, and the correspondence of large and central Churches survived when that to remoter districts easily dropped out of use. A letter such as 2 Peter is not of sufficient range to serve greatly in public reading in Christian Churches, and would naturally be preserved only in those countries where similar doctrines to those against which it was a warning had worked their way. Egypt and Asia Minor became the chief centres of anti-nomian Gnosticism, and these are, possibly with Rome also, the regions in which the earliest traces of 2 Peter actually occur. Though it is doubtful whether quotations from the Epistle are to be found in the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, the immense development at Rome of a literature in which Peter attacks Simon Magus as the father of heresy, might be more satisfactorily accounted for 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. If 2 Peter was the most important letter of this correspondence, we can understand how the early traces of it in Rome may have been reminiscences of a time when the Apostle's interest in Samaria would be well known.

We may thus discover the secret of the comparatively inglorious canonical record of 2 Peter, even as compared with Jude, in the obscurity of the Churches to which it was written, the narrow scope of its contents, the apocalyptic element, the fortunes of war, and the strange dissimilarity in style and thought to the later and well attested "first" Epistle of Peter.

R. A. FALCONER.