NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE SECOND EPISODE OF PETER.

i. 1. Συμεών Ν AKLP "al. longe plu." Ti Treg WHm Spitta Weiss Kühl von Soden Zahn, Σιμων B vg sah boh WH. It is far more easy to suppose that Σιμων was a correction of Συμεών than the reverse, as Συμεών is only used of Peter in one other passage of the New Testament, viz., Acts xv. 14, where the MSS. all agree, but the Vulg. and several other versions read Σιμων. I cannot think the record of B so good in this epistle as to justify us in following it against the weight of the other MSS. as well as against internal probability.

i. 3. ἵδια δόξη Ν ACP 13 vg sah boh Syrr. Ti Treg WHm v. Soden Weiss Spitta Kühl Keil +, διὰ δόξης BKL 31 "al. longe plu." WH. The recurrence of διὰ in the sentence πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωήν . . . δεδωρημένης διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς. δι’ ὑμᾶς τὰ μέγιστα . . . ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοί φύσεως, makes it more likely that διὰ should have been written by mistake for ἵδια than the reverse; δόξη would then be corrected to δόξης. Again διὰ δόξης is too vague to convey a meaning; while ἵδιος is a favourite word with 2 Peter and ἵδια δόξη gives an excellent sense, "He called us, drew us by His own divine perfection," cf. "we love Him, because He first loved us."

i. 4. δι’ ὁν τὰ τιμία καὶ μεγιστά ημῖν B spec (bis) WH Weiss, δι’ ὁν τὰ τιμία ημῖν καὶ μεγιστά Ν KL + Ti, δι’ ὁν τὰ μεγιστά καὶ τιμία ημῖν ACP 13. 31, 68 Syr. Bodl. + Treg (sed A 68 Syr. Bodl. ημῖν πρὸ ημῖν). As regards the order of the epithets, BNKL agree in placing the positive first, thus avoiding the very unnatural anti-climax. It is true that examples of the anti-climax may be found in other
writers, but only when the epithets are not in pari materia, as in Xen. Cyrop. II. 4. 29 δυνατωτάτων καὶ προθύμων, where the two characteristics do not necessarily vary together. The position of the dative in B seems to be the true one; that in N is explained by the desire to bring it under the influence of τίμια. The order in A seems to have originated in the accidental or intentional omission of τίμια καὶ and its wrong insertion from the margin. A appears to be right in reading ὑμῖν, as we can hardly understand the following γένησθε without it. Confusion between ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς is very common, and the change here is explained by the preceding ἡμᾶς in ver. 3. Spitta, reading τίμια ὑμῖν, inserts ὑμῖν after ἐπαγγέλματα.

i. 12. μελλήσω Ν ABCP vg Ti Treg WH, οὐκ αμελήσω KL, οὐ μελήσω tol Cass, μελήσω Field (Otium Norv. ii. p. 151). The insertion of the negative is an attempt to get over the awkwardness of μελλήσω, "I shall be about to." Field quotes Suidas μελήσων σπούδασω, φροντίσω. Hesychius and Photius wrongly ascribe this force to μελήσω, perhaps from a recollection of the received reading of this passage. Schleusner's note on Photius is (Cur. Nov. p. 227) "pro μελήσω necessario reponendum est μελήσω." Other instances of the personal construction, μέλω for μέλει μοι, are found in Eur. Herc. F. 772, θεοὶ τῶν ἄδικων μέλουσι καὶ τῶν ὁσίων ἐπαίτειν, Plut. Vit. 395.

ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ. For the difficult παρούσῃ, read by all the authorities, Spitta suggests παραδοθεὶς, as in ii. 21 ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείας αὐτοῖς ἁγιᾶς ἐντολῆς, and Jude 3 τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείᾳ πίστει.

i. 17. φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιάσθε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης. So all the authorities. It is difficult, however, to see the force of ὑπὸ, "a voice brought by the excellent glory." We have an example of the proper use of φέρομαι ὑπὸ just below in v. 21, ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν. Surely the excellent glory is the source,
not the vehicle of the voice. I think we should read ἀπό.

i. 19. αὐχμῷρῳ] αὐχμῷρῳ A 26 al. There is the same peculiarity in the ἀκαταπαστοῦς of B in ii. 14, on which see note. Perhaps it originated in faulty pronunciation.

i. 21. ἀπὸ θεοῦ BP + WH Ti, αγιοὶ θεοῦ ΧΚL + Treg, αγιοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ Α, αγιοὶ ἀπὸ θεοῦ al. Evidently αγιοὶ is a correction, which had the advantage of giving greater prominence to the idea of holiness.

ii. 4. σειρῶς Χ Ti (σειρῶς ABC Treg), σειραῖς KLP vg +. If σειραῖς were the reading of the archetype, we can hardly conceive its being changed to σιροῖς, since the former is the commoner word and is also supported by δεσμοῖς in Jude 6. On the other hand, it is difficult to see why the author should prefer to write σιροῖς. If he wished to follow Enoch more closely, why should he not have used a Septuagint equivalent, ἄβυσσος, λάκκος or βόθυνος?

ξοφοῦς BCKLPS Ti Treg WH Weiss, ξοφοῖς A Spitta. Kühl. The latter reading may have arisen from a marginal -οις intended to correct σειραῖς, but wrongly applied to ξοφοῦς. Spitta would read ξοφοῖς contracted from ξοφέοις, but the word itself is very rare, and there is no proof that it was ever contracted.

τηρομένως BCKLP + Ti Treg WH, κολαζομένως τηρεῖν Ν A latt. Spitta, who rejects the usual explanation that this is an emendation from ver. 9 (the influence would rather have been the other way; ver. 9 would have been altered to agree with ver. 4, but there is no trace of this). On the other hand, there are many examples of recurrent phrase in 2 Pet., e.g. διεγείρειν ἐν ὑπομνήσει in i. 13 and iii. 1; τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες in i. 20, iii. 3; ἐξακολουθέω in i. 16, ii. 2, 15; φθορά, ii. 12 bis; μισθὸν ἁδικίας, ii. 13, 15; δελεάζω, ii. 14, 18; οὖρανοὶ ... παρελεύσονται στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθῆσεται in iii. 10, and οὖρανοὶ ... λυθῆσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τίκεται in iii. 12. Moreover, the reading of Ν A is more in harmony with the description in Enoch x. 4, 12,
lxxxviii. 2, where final punishment is preceded by preparatory punishment.

ii. 6. καταστροφή κατεκρινεν N AC²KL Vg + Treg Ti
Spitta Weiss v. Soden, κατεκρινεν BC WH, κατεστρεφεν P.
It seems more likely that καταστροφη should have been
accidentally omitted than inserted. It was a natural word
for the author to use, as καταστρέφω and καταστροφή are
used after destruction of Sodom in Genesis xix. 25, 29,
Deuteronomy xxix. 23, Isaiah xiii. 19, Jeremiah xxv. 40,
Amos iv. 11. For constr. cf. Mark x. 38, κατακρινοῦσιν
αὐτὸν θανάτῳ, Matthew xx. 18 (where B omits θανάτῳ),
Diod. xiv. 4 τῶν πονηροτάτων κατεδικαζόν θανάτῳ, Ael. V.H.
xii. 39 κατεγνώσθη θανάτῳ.

ασεβεσιν BP WH, ασεβειν N ACKL Vg Treg Ti. The
infinite ασεβειν is naturally suggested by μελλόντων, but
does not give so good a sense as the dat. ασεβέσιν. As a
rule, υπόδειγμα takes a genitive of the thing and dat. of the
person, as in Sir. 44. 16, Ἕνωξ υπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς
γενεάς; 2 Macc. vi. 31, τοῖς νέοις υπόδειγμα γενναιότητος
καταλιπών; 3 Macc. ii. 5, παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγενομένοις
καταστήσας. So here it makes much better sense to say
"an example (or warning) of things in store for ungodly
persons" (cf. Heb. xi. 20, περὶ μελλόντων εὐλόγησεν, and v.l.
on Heb. ix. 11, τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν), than to say "an
example of persons about to do wrong," which would be
better expressed by the simple παράδειγμα ἁσεβείας.

ii. 8. ὁ δικαῖος N ACKLP Treg Ti, om. ὁ B WH. The
latter reading gives an easier construction for the datives
βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ, "righteous in look and in hearing,"
i.e. he discouraged sin by the expression of his coun-
tenance and by refusing to listen to evil. Reading ὁ
dικαῖος, we should have to govern βλέμματι by ψυχῇν
dικαιαν ἐβασάνιζεν, and to give an unprecedented force to
βλέμματι, "the righteous man tortured his righteous soul
in seeing and hearing because of their lawless deeds"
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(cf. Field, Ot. Norv. p. 241). Vg (not noticed in Ti) seems to agree with B, "aspectu enim et auditu justus erat habitans apud eos qui de die in diem animam justam iniquis operibus cruciabant."

ii. 11. ου φερουσιν κατ' αυτων παρα κυριω ελασφημον κρισιν BCKLP Ti, om. παρα κυριω Α Vg +, παρα κυριων minusc. et verss. al. Spitta, [παρα κυριω] Treg WH. Here αυτων refers to δοξα (=το διαβολο in ver. 10), and παρα κυριω refers to άλλα ειπεν Επιτιμησαι σοι κυριος in Jude 9. It is implied that reverence for God was the motive which restrained the angel from presumptuous judgment. It is impossible to imagine such a phrase foisted in by a scribe, and its difficulty accounts for its disappearance from A, whereas it is quite in accordance with 2 Peter's remote and abstract way of alluding to what he had before him in Jude. I see no meaning in Spitta's παρα κυριων. If it is "from the Lord," how can it be a βλασφημος κριςις?

ii. 12. εν τη φθορα αυτων καλ φθαρηςουνται ΑΒCPP, for και φθαρ. KL read καταφθαρηςουνται. If αυτων is taken to refer to the άλογα ζωα, as is generally done, I should be inclined to prefer καταφθαρηςουνται in spite of the authority for the other reading, as I see no satisfactory explanation of και; but if it is referred to the κατ' αυτων of v. 11 and the δοξα of v. 10, as I think it should be, και will then mean that the libertines will share the fate of the evil angels.

ii. 13. αδικουμενοι BP Syr. Arm. +WH, κομιουμενοι ACKL Vg + Tr Treg. The future κομιουμενοι is out of place here and can only be regarded as an emendation of the misunderstood αδικουμενοι, which may be translated "defrauded of the hire of fraud," like Balaam, to whom Balak addressed the words, "God hath kept thee from honour" (Num. xxiv. 11), and who was eventually killed in his attempt to seduce Israel. So here the false teachers will be destroyed before they obtain the honour and popularity which they seek.
ev tais apatais auton N A\CKLP plus, for apatais A\BC\ squared
Vg have agapais. The gen. autan proves that apatais is
the right reading. It is in consequence of their wiles
that they are admitted to your love feasts. The reading of B is an evident correction from Jude 12. It is one of the
curious instances of a change of meaning with very slight
variation of sound in passing from Jude to 2 Peter. So σπιλοι and σπιλάδες in the same verse.

ii. 14. akatapavstous N\CKLP 13, 31 Ti Treg, akata-
pavstous AB WH. The latter form is unknown in Greek.
It is supposed to be derived from a Laconian form πάξω, see under ἀμπάξονται in Herwerden, Lex. Gr. Suppletorium,
where, after quoting from Hesych. ἀμπ. = ἀναπάνονται, he continues: “fuit ergo verbum Laconicum πάξεν = παύεν.”
It seems very unlikely that such a form should have found
its way into the archetype of 2 Peter. As suggested above
(i. 19) on the form ἀχιμηρφ, it may have originated in a
faulty pronunciation on the part of the reader, or the ν may
have been accidentally omitted at the end of the line, as in
B, where one line ends with πα- and the next line begins
with -στονε. So in v. 21 below, B has lost the last syllable
of ἔσχατα at the end of a line. Blass, Gr. T. Gr., p. 44,
gives examples of forms in which the ν has been lost,
such as ἐπάνυν, Herm. Vis, i. 33, ἐπαναπάσεται Luke x. 6,
and ἐκάνην from καίω. Cf. New Sayings of Jesus, 1, βασιλεύ-
σας ἀναπάσεται. Schaefer in the Index to Bast's Com-
ment. Palaeogr. (s. av et a confusa) refers to the reading
πίφασκον for πίφανον in Hom. Od. 12. 165 with Porson's
note, and Dr. F. G. Kenyon writes to me that ἐατοῦ and
tató are not unfrequently found in papyri and inscrip-
tions for ἐαντοῦ and παῦτο. He also mentions that Ἀγουστός often stands for Αὐγουστός in papyri, that two
examples of πάο for πάυο occur in the C.I.G., viz., 5984
A 3 ἀναπάδμενος and 6595, 4 ἀναπάεται, and refers to a
paragraph on the subject in Crönert's Memoria Herculan-
ensis, p. 126.
ii. 15. καταλιπτοῦτες B CKLP + Treg WH, καταλείποντες Ν AB Ti WH. The aor. seems to be needed here, as the reference is to a fact anterior to the action of the verb ἐπιλανθήσαν. For the confusion between ei and i see my note on ἵδε James iii. 3 and Hort's Introduction, p. 306: "B shows a remarkable inclination to change i into ei," of which we have the following instances in this epistle, i. 1 ἰσοτείμον, 17 τείμην, 20 and iii. 3 γεινωσκόντες, 21 γεινεται, iii. 1 εἰλικρείνη, 8 χείλια ἔισ.

Βοσόρ Ν ΑCKLP Ti Treg, Βεωρ B WH Weiss, Βεωρσόρ Ν (arising from a confusion between Βοσόρ and the marginal correction εωρ). Grove in Smith's D. of B. (s.v. Bosor) says: "this is the Aramaic mode of pronouncing the name Beor in accordance with a common Chaldaic substitution" (see Zahn's Einl. in d. N.T. ii. p. 110). The support of the ordinary name by B against the other MSS. may be compared with its support of Συμων against Συμεών in i. 1. It seems to me more probable that an original Βοσόρ should have been changed to Βεωρ than the reverse.

ος μισθὸν ἄδικας ἡγαπησέν ACKLP Ν WH Ti Treg, μισθὸν ἄδικας ἡγαπησάν B Arm. Tregm WH. The objection to the latter reading is that in the next clause (ἐλεγξέν ἐσχὲν) we have to revert to the subject Balaam. Possibly an accidental omission of ος may account for B's reading.

ii. 18. ολίγος AB Ν Vg Treg Ti WH, ούντως Ν CKLP, ολίγον minusc. al. The reading ούντως (translated "who were clean escaped" in A.V.) seems to involve a self-contradiction after δειλεάζουσιν. In the MSS. it is hardly distinguishable from the rare adverb ολίγος, which should probably be translated "all but" = διλίγου δείν. Like ούντως the reading ολίγον, "for a short time," would seem to require the aor. ἀποφυγόντας read by KLP.

iii. 6. δι' οὖν ο ὅτε κόσμος ὑδαί κατακλυσθείς απώλετο.
Commentators explain δι' δν as referring to the ἐξ ὑδατος καὶ δι' ὑδατος of the preceding verse, "that there were heavens from of old, and an earth compacted out of water and through water by the word of God." It is very harsh to make two different waters out of two different uses or actions of water, and it is still harsher to repeat ὑδατι in the same clause, "through which (waters) the then world was destroyed by water." Remembering that one of the commonest sources of MS. corruption is the confusion between long and short vowels, I think we should read δι' δν with minusc. 31, which would refer to the immediately preceding τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, and give a much clearer expression to the argument. The world was first created out of water by the Word of God: owing to that same Word it was destroyed by water, and will one day be destroyed by fire.

iii. 7. τῷ αὐτῷ ABP Vg + WH Ti, τῷ αὐτοῦ Ν CKL Treg Weiss. The former is the far more effective reading, emphasizing the identity of the creative and the destructive Word. If a genitive were wanted, it would have been more natural to repeat Θεοῦ.

iii. 9. εἰς ὑμᾶς BCP Treg WH Weiss, δι' ὑμᾶς Ν A Ti Tregm, εἰς ὑμᾶς KL. I do not think δι' ὑμᾶς can be right, as though the delay were for the sake of a single church. Even εἰς ὑμᾶς seems to me to have been rightly corrected to εἰς ὑμᾶς by KL. So in v. 11 below I am inclined to think that ὑμᾶς (read by Ν) must have been what the author wrote and not the ὑμᾶς of ACKL omitted by B.

iii. 10. ἡμέρα κυριον BC Treg WH, ἡ ἡμέρα Κ. Ν AKLP Weiss. The phrase ἡμέρα κυριον is found without the article in 1 Thess. v. 2. Where ἡ ἡμέρα occurs, as in 2 Th. ii. 2, κυριον also generally takes the article; cf. below v. 12.

iii. 10. οὐ οὐρανοι ABC Treg WH Weiss, οὐρανοι Ν KL Ti, add. μεν Ν 13. The anarthrous στοιχεία and γῆ which
follow are in favour of the omission of the article. In v. 7
the article is required by the following νῦν.

eὐρεθησεται ณ BKR, οὖν eὐρεθήσεται, Sab. Syr. Bdl. (“non
invenientur”), κατακαήσεται AL Ti, κανθήσεται vel κατα-
κανθήσονται al., αφανισθήσονται C, om. και γη—eὐρεθησεται
Vg, om. eὐρεθήσεται spec. Weiss reads eὐρεθήσεται with a
question, ex ῥυὴσεται corr. putat Η (S.R. p. 103). The
phrase οὖν eὐρίσκεται is used to denote disappearance in
Ps. xxxvii. 36, οὖν εὐρέθη ὁ τόπος αὐτοῦ Job xx. 8, ὅσπερ
ἐνύπνιον ἐκπετασθὲν οὐ μὴ εὐρεθῇ Dan. ii. 19, πεσεῖται καὶ
οὖν εὐρεθήσεται Αρος. xviii. 21. I do not think we can give
this force to the simple question, as Weiss. It is plain that
the reading of C is merely a conjectural emendation of the
hopeless eὐρεθῆσεται. So probably κατακαήσεται and the
other readings. καταρνῆσεται would give the required
sense, but not, I think, the simple ῥυήσεται. Buttman’s
suggestion, ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα eὐρεθῆσεται, does not seem to me
very felicitous. Dr. Chase thinks that διαρνῆσεται receives
some support from Enoch i. 6, and also that it is nearer to
eὐρεθῆσεται than καταρνῆσεται. He suggests, however, that
possibly ἰαθῆσεται or ἐξιαθῆσεται may be the true reading,
in accordance with the words addressed to Gabriel in
Enoch x. 7, ἰασον τὴν γῆν ἕν ἡφάνισαν οἱ ἔγρηγοροι, and in
anticipation of κανὴν γῆν in ver. 13 below (the three
clauses in vv. 12b, 13, answering to the three clauses in
v. 10); but he allows that “ver. 11 seems to require some
verb implying destruction at the end of ver. 10.” Could
this be ἄρθήσεται?

iii. 11. Τούτων οὖν ณ AKL Ti Treg, τούτων οὗτως B WH
Weiss, τούτων de οὗτους CP. There seems no special reason
for οὗτως. It is the general fact, not the particular manner
of destruction, which has to be insisted on. The reading
of C is merely an emendation. Dr. F. G. Kenyon writes
that the abbreviations of οὗτως and οὖν are scarcely dis-
tinguishable, the former appearing as ὁ in the London
medical papyrus, as δ in the Berlin Didymus papyrus, while ὀν = ὄ in the Aristotle papyrus, and in the Berlin Didymus.

iii. 16. πᾶσαις ταῖς \text{ο} KLP Ti, om. ταῖς ABC Treg WH Weiss. “In all letters” seems to me too indefinite; ταῖς would be easily lost after πᾶσαις.

Readings of \text{B} which are unsupported by other uncial MSS.:

β i. 1 Σιμων. a i. 4 τιμία καὶ μεγίστα ημιν. ? i. 17 ο νιος μον ο αγαπητος μον υπός εστιν. a ii. 8 ακοῆ δικαιος. β ii. 15 Βεβρ ηγαπησαν. β ii. 16 ανθρωποις. β ii. 18 ματαιοητης Β', ματαιοητης Β³. β ii. 20 εσχα. β iii. 5 συνε-στωσης. β iii. 11 τοιτων υπος, om. υμας. Possibly the pronoun was omitted in the archetype and differently supplied by Ν and the other MSS.

Readings of \text{B} supported by one other uncial MS.:

? i. 18 τφ αγιφ ορει ΒC. a i. 21 απο θεου ΒP. β ii. 6 om. καταστροφη ΒC. β ii. 13 αγαπαις ΒΑ². β ii. 14 ακαται-παστοσ BA. β ii. 15 om. ος Β Sin. ? ii. 19 τουτφ Ν B (omitting και). ? ii. 20 κυριου (omitting ημων) ΒΚ. ? ii. 22 κυνισμον BC. a iii. 10 ημερα (omitting η) ΒC.

Readings of \text{B} supported by two other uncial MSS.:

β i. 3 δια δοξης και αρετης ΒΚΛ. ? ii. 4, σειρος ΒΑC. a ii. 12 αδικουμενοι ΒΡ\text{Ν}. ? ii. 15, καταλειποντες ΒΑΝ. a ii. 21 νυστρεψαi ΒCΡ. a ii. 22 συμβεβηκεν (omitting δε) ΒΑ Ν. a iii. 7 τφ αντφ ΒΑΡ. β iii. 9, εις υμας ΒCΡ β iii. 10 οι ουρανοι ΒΑC. ? ευρεθησαται ΒΚΡ. β iii. 16 πᾶσαις (omitting ταῖς) ΒΑC.

1 I have put \text{a} before the readings which seemed to me right, \text{β} before those which seemed wrong, ? where I was doubtful.

J. B. Mayor.