

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE SECOND  
EPISTLE OF PETER.

i. 1. Συμεων Ɱ AKLP “*al. longe plu.*” Ti Treg WH<sup>m</sup> Spitta Weiss Kühl von Soden Zahn, Σίμων B vg sah boh WH. It is far more easy to suppose that Σίμων 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 Σίμων. 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. ιδία δοξη Ɱ ACP 13 vg sah boh Syrr. Ti Treg WH<sup>m</sup> v. Soden Weiss Spitta Kühl Keil +, δια δοξης BKL 31 “*al. longe plu.*” WH. The recurrence of διὰ in the sentence πάντα ἡμῶν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν . . . δωρημένης διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς· δι’ ὧν τὰ μέγιστα . . . ἐπαγγέλματα δωρῶνται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, makes it more likely that διὰ should have been written by mistake for ιδία than the reverse; δόξη would then be corrected to δόξης. Again διὰ δόξης is too vague to convey a meaning; while ἴδιος is a favourite word with 2 Peter and ιδία 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’ ὧν τα τιμια καὶ μεγιστα ημιν B spec (*bis*) WH Weiss, δι’ ὧν τα τιμια ημιν καὶ μεγιστα Ɱ KL + Ti, δι’ ὧν τα μεγιστα καὶ τιμια ημιν ACP 13. 31, 68 Syr. Bodl. + Treg (*sed* A 68 Syr. Bodl. *υμιν pro ημιν*). As regards the order of the epithets, B<sup>n</sup>KL 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 ἡμῖν*, inserts *ὑμῖν* after *ἐπαγγέλματα*.

i. 12. μελλήσω N ABCP vg Ti Treg WH, *οὐκ ἀμελήσω* KL, *οὐ μελλήσω* 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 *μελήσω σπούδασω, φροντίσω*. Hesychius and Photius wrongly ascribe this force to *μελλήσω*, perhaps from a recollection of the received reading of this passage. Schleusner's note on Photius is (*Cur. Nov.* p. 227) "pro *μελλήσω* necessario reponendum est *μελήσω*." Other instances of the personal construction, *μέλω* for *μέλει μοι*, are found in Eur. *Herc. F.* 772, *θεοὶ τῶν ἀδίκιων μέλουσι καὶ τῶν ὀσίων ἐπάτειν*, Plut. *Vit.* 395.

ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ ἀληθείᾳ. For the difficult *παρούση*, read by all the authorities, Spitta suggests *παραδοθειση*, as in ii. 21 *ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς*, and Jude 3 *τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ πίστει*.

i. 17. φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιαύδε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης. So all the authorities. It is difficult, however, to see the force of *ὑπό*, "a voice brought by the excellent glory." We have an example of the proper use of *φέρομαι ὑπό* 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. *αυχμηρῷ*] *αχμηρῷ* A 26 *al.* There is the same peculiarity in the *ακαταπαστους* of B in ii. 14, on which see note. Perhaps it originated in faulty pronunciation.

i. 21. *ἀπο θεου* BP + WH Ti, *αγιοι θεου*  $\aleph$  KL + Treg, *αγιοι του θεου* A, *αγιοι απο θεου* *al.* Evidently *αγιοι* is a correction, which had the advantage of giving greater prominence to the idea of holiness.

ii. 4. *σειροις*  $\aleph$  Ti (*σειροις* ABC Treg), *σειραις* KLP vg +. If *σειραις* 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*?

*ζοφου* BCKLP  $\aleph$  Ti Treg WH Weiss, *ζοφοις* A S Spitta Kühl. The latter reading may have arisen from a marginal *-οις* intended to correct *σειραις*, but wrongly applied to *ζοφου*. Spitta would read *ζοφοῖς* contracted from *ζοφέοις*, but the word itself is very rare, and there is no proof that it was ever contracted.

*τηρουμενους* BCKLP + Ti Treg WH, *κολαζομενους τηρειν*  $\aleph$  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; *ἐξακολουθῶ* in i. 16, ii. 2, 15; *φθορά*, ii. 12 *bis*; *μισθὸν ἀδικίας*, ii. 13, 15; *δελεάζω*, ii. 14, 18; *οὐρανοὶ . . . παρελεύσονται στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται* in iii. 10, and *οὐρανοὶ . . . λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται* in iii. 12. Moreover, the reading of  $\aleph$  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  $\aleph$  AC<sup>2</sup>KL Vg + Treg Ti Spitta Weiss v. Soden, κατεκρινεν BC WH, κατεστρεψεν P. It seems more likely that καταστροφή 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 xxvii. 40, Amos iv. 11. For constr. cf. Mark x. 33, κατακρинуουσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ, Matthew xx. 18 (where B omits θανάτῳ), Diod. xiv. 4 τοὺς πονηροτάτους κατεδίκασον θανάτῳ, Ael. V.H. xii. 39 κατεγνώσθη θανάτῳ.

ασεβειν BP WH, ασεβειν  $\aleph$  ACKL Vg Treg Ti. The infinitive ἀσεβεῖν is naturally suggested by μελλόντων, but does not give so good a sense as the dat. ἀσεβέσιν. As a rule, ὑπόδειγμα takes a genitive of the thing and dat. of the person, as in Sir. 44. 16, Ἐνὼχ ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς; 2 Macc. vi. 31, τοῖς νέοις ὑπόδειγμα γενναιότητος καταλιπών; 3 Macc. ii. 5, παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις 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 ἀσεβείας.

ii. 8. ο δικαιος  $\aleph$  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 countenance and by refusing to listen to evil. Reading ὁ δίκαιος, we should have to govern βλέμματι by ψυχὴν δικαίαν 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"

(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 βλασφημον κρισιν **Ν** BCKLP Ti, *om.* παρα κυριω A Vg +, παρα κυριου *minusc. et verss. al.* Spitta, [παρα κυριω] Treg WH. Here *αὐτῶν* refers to *δόξας* (= τῷ διαβόλῳ in ver. 10), and *παρὰ κυρίῳ* refers to *ἀλλὰ εἶπεν Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι κύριος* 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 *παρὰ κυρίου*. If it is "from the Lord," how can it be a *βλάσφημος κρίσις*?

ii. 12. ἐν τη φθορα αυτων και φθαρῆσονται **Ν** ABCP, for *και φθαρ.* KL read *καταφθαρῆσονται*. If *αὐτῶν* is taken to refer to the *ἄλογα ζῶα*, as is generally done, I should be inclined to prefer *καταφθαρῆσονται* in spite of the authority for the other reading, as I see no satisfactory explanation of *καί*; but if it is referred to the *κατ' αὐτῶν* of v. 11 and the *δόξας* of v. 10, as I think it should be, *καί* will then mean that the libertines will share the fate of the evil angels.

ii. 13. αδικουμενοι **Ν** BP Syr. Arm. + WH, *κομιουμενοι* **Ν**<sup>ο</sup> ACKL Vg+Tr Treg. The future *κομιούμενοι* is out of place here and can only be regarded as an emendation of the misunderstood *ἀδικούμενοι*, 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.

εν ταις απαταις αυτων N A<sup>1</sup>CKLP +, for απαταις A<sup>2</sup>BC<sup>2</sup> Vg have αγαπαις. The gen. αὐτῶν proves that ἀπάταις 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 σπίλοι and σπιλάδες in the same verse.

ii. 14. ακαταπαυστους NCKLP 13, 31 Ti Treg, ακαταπαστους AB WH. The latter form is unknown in Greek. It is supposed to be derived from a Laconian form πάζω, see under ἀμπάζονται in Herwerden, *Lex. Gr. Suppletorium*, where, after quoting from Hesych. ἀμπ. = ἀναπαύονται, he continues: "fuit ergo verbum Laconicum πάζεν = παύειν." 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 ἀχμηρῶ, it may have originated in a faulty pronunciation on the part of the reader, or the υ 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 -στους. 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 υ has been lost, such as ἐπάην, Herm. *Vis*, i. 33, ἐπαναπαήσεται Luke x. 6, and ἐκάην from καίω. Cf. *New Sayings of Jesus*, 1, βασιλεύσας ἀναπαήσεται. Schaefer in the Index to Bast's *Comment. Palaeogr.* (*s. av et a confusa*) refers to the reading πίφασκον for πίφανσκον in Hom. *Od.* 12. 165 with Porson's note, and Dr. F. G. Kenyon writes to me that ἐατοῦ and τάτό are not unfrequently found in papyri and inscriptions for ἐαυτοῦ and ταυτό. He also mentions that Ἄγουστος often stands for Αὔγουστος in papyri, that two examples of πάω for παύω occur in the *C.I.G.*, viz., 5984 A 3 ἀναπαόμενος and 6595, 4 ἀναπάεται, and refers to a paragraph on the subject in Crönert's *Memoria Herculanensis*, p. 126.

ii. 15. καταλιποντες B<sup>3</sup>CKLP + Treg WH<sup>m</sup>, καταλείποντες **N** AB Ti WH. The aor. seems to be needed here, as the reference is to a fact anterior to the action of the verb *ἐπλανήθησαν*. For the confusion between *ει* and *ι* see my note on *ἴδε* James iii. 3 and Hort's Introduction, p. 306: "B shows a remarkable inclination to change *ι* into *ει*," of which we have the following instances in this epistle, i. 1 *ισοτειμον*, 17 *τειμην*, 20 and iii. 3 *γεινωσκοντες*, 21 *γεινεται*, iii. 1 *ειλικρεινη*, 8 *χειλια bis*.

*Βοσορ* **N<sup>c</sup>** ACKLP Ti Treg, *Βεωρ* B WH Weiss, *Βεωρσορ* **N** (arising from a confusion between *Βοσορ* 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 *Σίμων* against *Συμεών* in i. 1. It seems to me more probable that an original *Βοσορ* should have been changed to *Βεωρ* than the reverse.

ος μισθον αδικιας ηγαπησεν ACKLP **N<sup>c</sup>** WH Ti Treg, μισθον αδικιας ηγαπησαν B Arm. Treg<sup>m</sup> WH<sup>m</sup>. The objection to the latter reading is that in the next clause (*ἔλεξι ἔσχεν*) we have to revert to the subject Balaam. Possibly an accidental omission of *ὁς* may account for B's reading.

ii. 18. ολιγως AB **N<sup>c</sup>** Vg Treg Ti WH, οντως **N** CKLP, ολιγον *minusc. al.* The reading *δντως* (translated "who were clean escaped" in A.V.) seems to involve a self-contradiction after *δελεάζουσιν*. In the MSS. it is hardly distinguishable from the rare adverb *ὀλίγως*, which should probably be translated "all but" = *ὀλίγου δεῖν*. Like *δντως* the reading *ὀλίγον*, "for a short time," would seem to require the aor. *ἀποφυγόντας* read by KLP.

iii. 6. δι'ων ο τοτε κοσμος υδατι κατακλυσθεις απωλετο.

Commentators explain δι' ὧν as referring to the ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος 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 ὕδατι 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' ὄν 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 **κ** 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 **κ** A Ti Treg<sup>m</sup>, εἰς ἡμᾶς 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 ἡμᾶς by KL. So in v. 11 below I am inclined to think that ἡμᾶς (read by **κ**) must have been what the author wrote and not the ὑμᾶς of ACKL omitted by B.

iii. 10. ἡμερα κυρίου BC Treg Ti WH, ἡ ἡμερα K. **κ** AKLP Weiss. The phrase ἡμέρα κυρίου is found without the article in 1 Thess. v. 2. Where ἡ ἡμέρα occurs, as in 2 Th. ii. 2, κυρίου also generally takes the article; cf. below v. 12.

iii. 10. οἱ οὐρανοὶ ABC Treg WH Weiss, οὐρανοὶ **κ** KL Ti, *add.* μὲν **κ** 13. The anarthrous στοιχεῖα and γῆ which



follow are in favour of the omission of the article. In *v.* 7 the article is required by the following *νὴν*.

ευρεθησεται **Ν** BKP, *οὐχ ευρεθησεται*, Sah. Syr. Bdl. ("non invenientur"), *κατακαήσεται* ALI Tl, *καυθησεται* *vel* *κατακαυθησονται* al., *αφανισθησονται* C, *οτ. και γη—ευρεθησεται* Vg, *οτ. ευρεθησεται* spec. Weiss reads *ευρεθησεται* with a question, *ex* *ρυσεται* *corr. putat* H (S.R. p. 103). The phrase *οὐχ εύρίσκειται* is used to denote disappearance in Ps. xxxvii. 36, *οὐχ εύρέθη ὁ τόπος αὐτοῦ* Job xx. 8, *ὥσπερ ένύπνιον έκπετασθέν οὐ μὴ εύρεθῆ* Dan. ii. 19, *πεσειται και οὐχ εύρεθήσεται* Apoc. 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 *εύρεθήσεται*. So probably *κατακαήσεται* and the other readings. *καταρυήσεται* would give the required sense, but not, I think, the simple *ρυσεται*. Buttman's suggestion, *ἂ εν αὐτῇ έργα εύρεθήσεται*, does not seem to me very felicitous. Dr. Chase thinks that *διαρυσεται* receives some support from Enoch i. 6, and also that it is nearer to *εύρεθήσεται* than *καταρυσεται*. He suggests, however, that possibly *ιαθήσεται* or *έξιαθήσεται* may be the true reading, in accordance with the words addressed to Gabriel in Enoch x. 7, *ἴασον τὴν γῆν ἣν ἠφάνισαν οἱ έγρήγοροι*, and in anticipation of *καινήν γῆν* in ver. 13 below (the three clauses in *vv.* 12*b*, 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 *ἀρθήσεται*?

iii. 11. Τουτων ουν **Ν** AKL Tl Treg, *τουτων ουτως* B WH Weiss, *τουτων δε ουτως* CP. There seems no special reason for *οὐτως*. 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 *οὐτως* and *οὖν* are scarcely distinguishable, the former appearing as *ο̄* in the London

medical papyrus, as  $\delta$  in the Berlin Didymus papyrus, while  $\delta\delta\nu = \acute{o}$  in the Aristotle papyrus, and in the Berlin Didymus.

iii. 16. πασαις ταις  $\aleph$  KLP Ti, *om.* ταις ABC Treg WH Weiss. "In all letters" seems to me too indefinite; ταις would be easily lost after πάσαις.

*Readings of B which are unsupported by other uncial MSS.<sup>1</sup>:*

$\beta$  i. 1 Σίμων.  $\alpha$  i. 4 τιμια και μεγαστα ημιν. ? i. 17 ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος μου ουτος εστιν.  $\alpha$  ii. 8 ακοη δικαιος.  $\beta$  ii. 15 Βεωρ ηγαπησαν.  $\beta$  ii. 16 ανθρωποις.  $\beta$  ii. 18 ματαιοτης Β', ματαιοτητης Β<sup>3</sup>.  $\beta$  ii. 20 εσχα.  $\beta$  iii. 5 συνεστωσης.  $\beta$  iii. 11 τουτων ουτως, *om.* υμας. Possibly the pronoun was omitted in the archetype and differently supplied by  $\aleph$  and the other MSS.

*Readings of B supported by one other uncial MS.:*

? i. 18 τω αγιω ορει BC.  $\alpha$  i. 21 απο θεου BP.  $\beta$  ii. 6 *om.* καταστροφη BC.  $\beta$  ii. 13 αγαπαις BA<sup>2</sup>.  $\beta$  ii. 14 ακαταπαστους BA.  $\beta$  ii. 15 *om.* ος B Sin. ? ii. 19 τουτω  $\aleph$  B (*omitting και*). ? ii. 20 κυριου (*omitting ημων*) BK. ? ii. 22 κυλισμον BC.  $\alpha$  iii. 10 ημερα (*omitting η*) BC.

*Readings of B supported by two other uncial MSS.:*

$\beta$  i. 3 δια δοξης και αρετης BKL. ? ii. 4, σειροις BAC.  $\alpha$  ii. 12 αδικουμενοι BPN. ? ii. 15, καταλειποντες BAN.  $\alpha$  ii. 21 υποστρεψαι BCP.  $\alpha$  ii. 22 συμβεβηκεν (*omitting δε*) BA  $\aleph$ .  $\alpha$  iii. 7 τω αυτω BAP.  $\beta$  iii. 9, εις υμας BCP  $\beta$  iii. 10 οι ουρανοι BAC. ? ευρεθησεται BKP.  $\beta$  iii. 16 πασαις (*omitting ταις*) BAC.

<sup>1</sup> I have put  $\alpha$  before the readings which seemed to me right,  $\beta$  before those which seemed wrong, ? where I was doubtful.