

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIV.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXXIII.

ARTICLE I.

THE FOREIGN EVANGELIST AS VIEWED BY ONE IN THE FOREIGN FIELD.

III.

HIS HOME RELATIONS.

To the Presbytery.

The editorial published in the *Missionary* for May, 1874, was written "to present the views of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions" upon the subject of the foreign evangelist's home relations. About two weeks after its publication, it was indirectly approved by the Columbus Assembly, as we have seen. Within a year thereafter, the pamphlet entitled *Ecclesiastical Status of Foreign Missionaries* was published. This paper, however, is confined entirely to the question of his relation to the native Church, alluding only incidentally, on page 9, to his home relations. The *Manual* was published and approved, as we have already seen, in 1877, in which the same theories are announced, on this point, as in the two papers just cited.

Now, it is a very curious fact that the views of the Executive Committee on our home relations, as thus presented from time to time, have never been discussed. So far as is known, not one syllable, *pro* or *con*, has ever been elicited from the Church. Not

for the conscience a fundamental question of constitutional law, and urge upon the citizen the sacred duty of a bloody crusade against those who honestly differed from them. It is not objected to, as a mere political exhibition, but because it assumed an ecclesiastical sanctity, and was intended to convince the world that Southern Christians were guilty of a crime which the Christian religion clearly reprobated. Those resolutions, adopted by religious bodies, were conceived in the very spirit of brutal conquest, and contributed their share to the consummation of ruin in fire and blood. The cloak of ecclesiastical authority is too thin a disguise to prevent all sober minds from now perceiving that it was political madness that inspired them. Their reassertion implies a stubborn adherence, on the part of a few, to those errors and passions which the many on both sides ardently desire to bury and forget.

JAMES A. WADDELL.

ARTICLE VII.

DR. EDWIN A. ABBOTT ON THE GENUINENESS OF
SECOND PETER.

In the great revival of interest in all branches of Biblical Criticism which is at present in progress, it cannot seem strange that such a book as 2 Peter has received a great deal of attention. The fact is, at all events, illustrated by the appearance from English presses, during the course of the "publishers' year," extending from the autumn of 1881 to the autumn of 1882, of at least four important (*inter alia minora*) discussions of the genuineness of that Epistle. It may also be a significant mark of the temper of the times that no two of these discussions reach the same conclusion. Dr. Huther,¹ who examines the question with the painstaking care that behoved a German scholar and a con-

¹ *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the General Epistles of Peter and Jude*. By Joh. Ed. Huther, Ph. D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. See p. 284.

tinuer of Meyer's Commentary, but who does not succeed in preventing our missing the master's own hand, comes simply to a verdict of *non liquet*. "If, then," he says, "the grounds for and against the authenticity are thus evenly balanced, there is here presented a problem which is not yet solved, and which perhaps cannot be solved." Canon Farrar, after a discussion in which he has, as is his wont, smelted rhetoric and argument into one glowing mass, finally follows a hint of Jerome's,¹ and asserts for the Epistle a modified genuineness. He cannot find in it either Peter's individual style or characteristic expressions; he recognises in it a different mode of workmanship from his. Yet it seems to him "impossible to read it without recognising in it an accent of inspiration, and without seeing a 'grace of superintendence' at work in the decision by which it was finally allowed to take its place among the canonical books."² He thinks "that St. Peter may have lent his name and the weight of his authority to thoughts expressed in the language of another;"³ "that we have not here the words and style of the great Apostle, but that he lent to this Epistle the sanction of his name and the assistance of his advice."⁴ Professor Lumby, after an examination of the internal evidences for the Epistle which cannot be characterised by any lower term than brilliant, concludes that it points clearly to St. Peter as its author, and that "it bears its witness in itself."⁵ Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, who investigates the difficulties in the way of assigning the Epistle to Peter, in a paper at once learned, acute, and intensely interesting, which runs through three numbers of a critical journal, concludes that it cannot be by Peter, is unworthy in style, barren in thought, a plagiarism from first to last, and depends on writings which were not published until a quarter of a century after Peter's death.⁶ If the careful

¹ *Ep. ad. Hedib.*, 120, 11.

² "*The Expositor*," Second Series, Vol. III., p. 423.

³ "*The Expositor*," etc., p. 409.

⁴ *The Early Days of Christianity*. By F. W. Farrar, D. D., F. R. S., etc. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. Vol. I., p. 207.

⁵ *The Holy Bible, etc. Commentary and a Revision of the Translation*. By Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M. A., etc. Vol. IV., p. 234.

⁶ "*The Expositor*," as above, Vol. III., pp. 49-63, 139-153, and 204-219.

Huther cannot reach any conclusion, and Drs. Farrar and Lumby attain theirs only with difficulty, and express them with modest over-hesitancy, Dr. Abbott at least feels no hesitancy and exhibits no doubt. His decision and language alike are strong. If we may venture to compare the discussion with another, to which it has many points of likeness (although certainly not in its issue)—that which has arisen over the genuineness of the Chronicle of Dino Campagni—we may say that Dr. Abbott uses the method of Sheffer-Boichorst in the spirit of Fanfani.

It will go without saying that Dr. Abbott's argument is attractively and plausibly presented. It constitutes, indeed, the most considerable arraignment of the Epistle that has been put forth since the days of the giants of a half century ago. It is, moreover, in its main points, quite fresh and new. It certainly demands close attention, careful examination and sifting. And it is to be sincerely hoped that it will not continue to be met only by "a conspiracy of silence." Canon Farrar expressed this hope so long ago as last June; but, so far as we are aware, his own brief criticism is as yet the only one that has seen the light.¹ It is only thus because more experienced students have not seen fit or found time and opportunity to publicly examine the new questions raised, that we have felt driven to undertake the task. Whatever may be the final result of discussion, it certainly cannot but be a help towards a proper appreciation of the facts of the case and the attainment of truth, for one and another to set down frankly, in due honesty, the impression which Dr. Abbott's arguments have made upon them. Such is our purpose in this paper.

It would be both impossible in reasonable space and tedious to the reader for us to attempt to detail all the processes of the investigations into which a study of Dr. Abbott's arguments necessarily carries one. It is well to advertise beforehand, therefore, that this paper does not profess to *make* these investigations, but only to

¹ Prof. Robert B. Drummond ("The Academy," for October 14, 1882), in reviewing Canon Farrar's work on *The Early Days of Christianity*, seems to accept Dr. Abbott's "discovery" of dependence of 2 Peter on Josephus. This is, however, only a chance remark, not a criticism.

present, as clearly as may be, support, and commend, the conclusions to which we have, after investigation, arrived. It would be pure affectation to preserve the form of investigation merely for effect; and we cherish the hope that our cause will not be prejudiced by the frank confession that we have not ventured to write upon this subject until after we had reached our conclusions upon it. We trust our *study* has been carried through with open and tractable mind; we confess that we *write* with a foregone conclusion. The purpose of this paper becomes thus a defence of the genuineness of 2 Peter against Dr. Abbott's strictures.

The same necessity for shunning inordinate length and tediousness forbids us, again, to attempt to supply an answer to every specification which Dr. Abbott has made in the course of his three articles. Fortunately, however, a selection may be made among them, without great prejudice to our cause. Only certain portions of his argument are new, and we may fitly confine ourselves to these new portions, especially as they happen to be also both the most forcible in themselves and the most relied upon by Dr. Abbott. The older arguments, although consummately marshalled, are not essentially altered by his treatment of them; and we may content ourselves in dealing with them with referring only to their character and indicating that they have been answered fully in advance.

DR. ABBOTT'S SCHEME OF ARGUMENT.

If, at the outset, we take a general glance over Dr. Abbott's argument against the Epistle, as a whole, we will find that it may be summed up under the following heads: 1. The external evidence for the Epistle is altogether insufficient. 2. It is dependent, in a literary way, on books which were published only after Peter's death—such as the Epistle of Clement of Rome, and notably the Antiquities of Josephus. 3. It not only borrows from Acts, 1 Peter, and especially Jude, and that in such a way as to exhibit its writer as a barren plagiarist, but, in borrowing, bungles and blurs everything it touches. 4. Its style is wholly unworthy of an Apostle—being, in fact, no style at all, but only a barbarous medley of words, such as a vain, half-taught Hindoo

puts together in trying to write "fine" English. 5. It cannot be by the same writer who wrote 1 Peter, as, indeed, this unworthy style, which is not found in 1 Peter, sufficiently witnesses, and as is further proved by other important differences between the two Epistles, such as, for example, their divergent use of such particles as express the manner of thought, their divergent degree of dependence on the Old Testament, etc. 6. Other internal evidences of the spuriousness of the Epistle, are not lacking; such as the statement in iii. 1, implying a very close connexion, both in its readers and in time, with the first Epistle; whereas, the implication of the contents of the Epistles separate them vastly—the use of the term "Holy Mount"—the authorisation of the whole body of Paul's Epistles, etc.

The reader who is familiar with the literature of the subject, will observe immediately that the new matter advanced by Dr. Abbott falls under the second and fourth of these heads; the second is, indeed, Dr. Abbott's own discovery, while the fourth, although old in essence, is treated in so fresh a way as to make it practically new. The other heads of argument only state anew old and well known objections, often urged and often rebutted, and will not demand from us a renewed treatment. A word or two only concerning them seems called for. Only one of them is urged by Dr. Abbot with any fulness—the second paper of his series being devoted to the discussion and illustration of the "plagiarism" from Jude. The specialty of the treatment of the subject lies, not in an assertion of a post-apostolic origin for Jude, and consequently *a fortiori* for 2 Peter, nor in a contention that it is unworthy of an Apostle to borrow so freely from another writer, but in an attempt to prove that the borrowing has proceeded after a dull, unintelligent, distorting, ignoble manner, such as is totally unworthy of any reputable writer. That Dr. Abbott has made out the fact that 2 Peter does borrow from Jude, we freely confess; the fact itself is well-nigh patent, and has been repeatedly much more fully and convincingly proved than Dr. Abbott has proved it. But that it has been shown that the borrowing has been done in a confused, distorted, or unintelligent manner, we can think as little in his case as in the case of

his predecessors who have plied the same arguments, and have been repeatedly satisfactorily replied to.¹ We are unable to discover that Dr. Abbott adduces anything new in this connexion, or adds at all to the force of the old arguments; we feel, therefore, perfectly safe in leaving his refutation to the by no means worn out considerations which have refuted the same arguments in the mouths of a DeWette and a Schwegler.² On the other internal arguments which he adduces against the Epistle, Dr. Abbott only touches, as it were, by the way. They have been superabundantly answered in advance, and Dr. Lumby, for instance, has opposed to them counter internal considerations,³ which hopelessly overshadow them. It would be almost an impertinence in us to mar the strength of his admirable presentation of the subject, by adding a single additional word to it here.

Dr. Abbott does not even state the external evidence, but contents himself with a reference to the admissions of Drs. Lightfoot and Westcott, and the broad assertion that no trace of the existence of the letter can be found earlier than the late second century (Clement of Alexandria). It would be uncalled for, therefore, to turn aside from the discussion of the arguments which he does develop in detail, to enter upon one to which he gives only this one passing word more fully than merely to set opposite to his assertion our counter assertion that Second Peter is quoted by many writers before Clement of Alexandria,⁴ and to call attention to the fact that the "trace" of the Epistle found in Clement of

¹ What the opinion of the critics mentioned above is as to the question of the *manner* of borrowing, may be gleaned from the following. Huther, p. 279, says: "The firmness of 2 Peter's line of thought does not in any way suffer thereby." Cf. p. 256: "In neither have we a slavish dependence or a mere copy, but the correspondence is carried out with literary freedom and license." Farrar, I., p. 196, *seq.*: "St. Peter deals with his materials in a wise and independent manner." Prof. Lumby thinks Jude was the borrower.

² Compare, for instance, the treatment of the subject by Huther, Brückner, Weiss, Alford, and Frederic Gardiner. (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, XI. p. 114.)

³ In the fourth volume of the Speaker's Commentary, as above.

⁴ The proof of this may be read in the *SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW* for January, 1882, pp. 48, *seq.*

Alexandria is of a kind, by itself, to prove much about the Epistle—being nothing less than this: that Clement wrote a Commentary on it as a part of a series of “concise explanations of all the Canonical Scriptures.”¹ This certainly has more evidential value than is brought out in the mere statement that the first trace of the existence of the Epistle is found in Clement of Alexandria. One other fact in Dr. Abbott’s attitude towards the external evidences needs notice. And this is of no less moment than this: the admission that literary connexion has been made out between Second Peter and Clement of Rome. The admission is made, indeed, only to prepare the way for arguing that the borrowing has been done *by* not *from* Second Peter. On this point, however, the mass of scholars may be expected to hold a different opinion. Dr. Abbott pleads that Second Peter has an established character as a borrower and hence probably did this borrowing; and that if Second Peter borrowed from a work of Josephus’ published in A. D. 93, it is not likely that it was borrowed from by Clement as early as 95. If, however, the evidence that 2 Peter was the borrower rests on the probability that it borrowed from Josephus, it leans on a very broken reed, as we hope to show; and Dr. Abbott forgets that Clement is quite as confirmed a borrower as 2 Peter. If the one uses Jude freely, the other uses Hebrews quite as freely; and doubtless if accurate scales were used, as large a proportion of Clement’s letter might be shown to be borrowed as of 2 Peter. On the other hand, it seems to be clear that if there does exist literary connexion between the two documents, as we now think is morally certain, the dependence is of Clement on Peter. The considerations which drive us to this conclusion are the following: (1.) We have a series of writers dependent on 2 Peter—Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Theophilus, Melito, Hermas, Justin, Testt. xii. Patt., Barnabas, Clement of Rome; and it is exceedingly difficult to insert 2 Peter anywhere in that series and say it borrows from all on one side of it and is borrowed from by all on the other. It most naturally comes at the end of the series. The same consideration which Dr. Abbott pleads as a reason why he should not place it between

¹*Id.*, p. 46.

Josephus and Clement of Rome, we plead against placing it between Clement and Barnabas, or Barnabas and the Testt. xii. Patt., and so on. (2.) The phenomena of the parallel passages themselves do not seem to us, as they do to Dr. Abbott, absolutely neutral on this question. All the indications seem rather to point to 2 Peter as the original source, as perhaps a study of them as given in the note below¹ may convince the reader. (3.) Perhaps

¹ The parallel passages are as follows:

(1.) Clement vii. 1.

These things, dearly beloved, we write, not only as admonishing you, but also as *putting* ourselves in remembrance. (*ἰπομνήσκειν* as in 2 P. i. 12.)

2 Peter i. 12.

Wherefore I shall be ready to *put you in remembrance* of these things. iii. 1. This is now, beloved, the second epistle that I write unto you; and in both of them I stir up your sincere minds by putting you in remembrance.

(2.) Clement vii. 5, 6.

Let us review all generations in turn and learn how, from generation to generation, the Master hath given a place for repentance unto them that desire to turn to him. Noah heralded repentance and they that obeyed were saved. xi. 1. For his hospitality and godliness Lot was saved from Sodom when all the country round about was judged by fire and brimstone; the Master having thus foreshown that he forsaketh not them which set their hope in him, but appointeth unto punishment and torment them that swerve aside.

2 Peter ii. 5-9.

For if God . . . spared not the ancient world, but preserved Noah with seven others, a herald of righteousness, when he brought a flood upon the world of the ungodly; and burning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, having made them an example unto those that should live ungodly; and delivered righteous Lot sore distressed by the lascivious life of the wicked (for that righteous man, dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their lawless deeds): the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation and to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment.

(3.) Clement iv.

Wherefore, let us be obedient unto his excellent and glorious will. . . . Let us fix our eyes on them that ministered perfectly unto his excellent glory. Let us set before us Enoch, etc. . . . Noah, being found faithful, by his ministration preached (*ἐκήρυξεν*) regeneration into the world, and through him the Master saved the living creatures that entered into the ark, in concord.

2 Peter i. 17.

For he received from God the Father honor and glory when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, "This is" etc., . . . and this voice we heard, etc. ii. 5, 6. And spared not the ancient world, but preserved Noah and seven others, a preacher of righteousness, when he brought a flood upon the world of the ungodly.

if it stood alone, the passage from Clement xxiii. 3, could not be asserted to be a reminiscence of Jas. i. 8, (*cf.* v. 7) and 2 P. iii. 4, combined;¹ but the fact that other sufficient proof of literary connexion between Clement and 2 Peter exists, turns the scale in this passage and determines that this is another item of it. If so, then, not only is 2 Peter the older document, but also it was held by Clement to be Scripture. We have purposely refrained from adding as (4) that all the presumption for the genuineness of 2

(4.) Clement xxii.

Let our souls be bound to him that is faithful *ἐπαγγελίας* . . . *ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δύναται αὐτὰ καταστρέψει.*

2 Peter iii. 5-7.

For this they wilfully forget [speaking of the surety of God's *ἐπαγγελία*] that . . . οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἐκπαλαι καὶ γῆ . . . συνεστῶσα, τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθσαυρισμένοι εἰσὶ, πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως.

(5.) Clement xxiii. 3.

Let this Scripture be far from us where it saith: "Wretched are the double-minded which doubt in their soul and say, 'These things we did hear in the days of our fathers also, and behold we have grown old, and none of these things have befallen us.'"

2 Peter iii. 4.

In the last days mockers shall come . . . saying, "Where 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."

(6.) Clement xxxv. 5.

If we accomplish such things as beseeem his faultless will, and follow the way of truth, casting off from ourselves all unrighteousness and iniquity, etc., etc.

2 Peter ii. 2.

And many shall follow their lascivious doings; by reason of whom the way of the truth shall be evil spoken of.

The first and sixth of these parallels hardly give indication of the direction of the borrowing; the second, third, fourth, and fifth, however, (independently of the statement of Clement, that he borrowed the fifth) all severally give clear hints of the fact that the passage in Clement is the borrower. Note, *e. g.*, the compression in the fourth by Clement, as he briefly takes from Peter's larger context the exact thought he needed. The way in which the peculiar phrase, "excellent glory," is introduced in the third, in each writer, is again decisive that Peter's is the original. The phenomena of the fifth are even stronger in the same direction, etc.

¹ Compare how Clement smelts together reminiscences of different passages in chapter xiii. (Matt. v. 7; vi. 14; vii. 12; Luke vi. 38; vi. 37; Matt. vii. 2), and from the Old Testament, *passim*.

Peter which arises from the varied proofs which combine to establish it¹ is against the hypothesis that it has borrowed from Clement: not because we do not regard this as a valid or convincing argument, but because we deem it unnecessary for the establishment of our point and do not wish to be delayed to show the strength of the presumption. The result of an examination of the relation between 2 Peter and Clement therefore seems to be that to a moral certainty Clement had and used 2 Peter and that probably as Scripture. This one fact, taken alone, burdens any argument which would go to prove a later date than say A. D. 75 for 2 Peter with an almost insuperable objection at the outset, and it is under a realisation of this that we would wish the reader to proceed with us in our further discussion. We purpose to examine, 1. Dr. Abbott's arraignment of 2 Peter's style, and 2. The relation of 2 Peter to Josephus.

DR. ABBOTT'S ARRAIGNMENT OF 2 PETER'S STYLE.

Dr. Abbott has a very low opinion of the style of 2 Peter. He thinks it "throughout that of a copyist and 'fine writer,' ignorant of ordinary Greek idiom, yet constantly striving 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 flavor of Shakespeare."² He believes it possible "to show that there is probably not one original thought and scarcely one natural expression in the whole of it."³ This would be enough to take one's breath away, except that it admits of a very easy demonstration that the criticism itself is only a piece of "fine writing" and cannot be by any possibility true. Common sense refuses to be persuaded that native Greeks of culture and scholarship—acute critics of language and style, great scholars and rhetoricians, pro-

¹ See SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, January, 1882, p. 45, *seq.*

² P. 153.

³ P. 150.

lific writers—like Origen, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Athanasius, should have read this Epistle for ages, studied it, criticised it, written commentaries on it, and honored it all this time as divinely inspired without ever discovering that its style was such as “would induce a Greek reader to form about it the same judgment that we naturally form about the ‘Native Estimate’ ”;¹ in a word, that “there is no style, no naturalness” about it, nothing but “a barbarous medley of words.”² Calm judgment again refuses to believe that scholars like Ewald, Brückner, Hofmann, Huther, Weiss, could be so wofully deceived as to admire a style which is “essentially ignoble” both in thought and wording, which is characterised by “vulgar pomposity, verbose pedantry, and barren plagiarism,” and can be but the natural expression of “a pedantical phrase-compiler who bungles and blurs” everything he touches. Surely a sober reader is entitled to brush away such a fanfaronade with a justly impatient gesture.

It will be of use to us, however, to observe the kind of specification that is made to support this wholesale attack at once on the style of 2 Peter, the discernment of the Greek fathers, and the scholarship of the best modern masters of Hellenistic Greek, as well as the manner of argumentation by which the style of 2 Peter is made an evidence of its spuriousness. Dr. Abbott recognises the fact that neither apostolicity nor inspiration secures to a writer Attic purity of Greek. “Let it be clearly understood,” he says,³ “that we do not ground our objections to the genuineness of the Epistle on its bad Greek.” The argument bases itself on the contention that the style is bad in such a way as to exhibit not simply ignorance of Greek, but certain bad mental and moral traits: “barrenness,” “inanity,” “shallowness,” “pedantry,” “vanity,” “dulness,” “vulgarity,” “ignobility,” and so on, through almost “a glossary of the *rarest* words in the [English] language.” It is observable, therefore, that Dr. Abbott’s argument is confessedly not valid unless it be shown not merely that 2 Peter contains *bad Greek*, rare, otherwise unknown, or even falsely framed or used

¹ A characteristic specimen of the “half-educated Hindoo English,” mentioned above.

² P. 206.

³ P. 214.

words, rare, difficult, or even solecistic constructions; but also that these words are so used as to exhibit an ignobility of mental or moral constitution in the writer. Dr. Abbott must certainly be held in his specifications to items supporting one or the other of these two assertions: 1. That the style bears witness to a mentally or morally ignoble writer; or 2. That it is ineradically and inexplicably different from that of First Peter.

A careful reader will look in vain through Dr. Abbott's very interesting pages for such items. His three main contentions are that the Epistle is full of "barren plagiarisms," "artificial tautology of fine words," and "vulgar pedantry," concerning which it is immediately to be observed that the argument in each case lies in the adjective, while the facts do not justify even the noun. It is indeed true that 2 Peter has freely borrowed from Jude and adopted phrases here and there from other writings; but it is just as certainly not true that the borrowing has been done in any unworthy, ignoble, or barren manner, or can be justly described as plagiarism. There certainly do occur repetitions of words and phrases in the Epistle, and some unusual, not to say unique, words may be turned up in it; but this mere fact is certainly not unworthy or vulgar, nor are the circumstances of the various cases such as will render them so. We have already said all that we need say concerning the borrowing from Jude; it will be instructive to note here Dr. Abbott's way of dealing with the asserted cases of "tautologies" and "solecisms" in order to obtain a correct notion of the soundness and carefulness of his methods of work, and to guard the reader against the fear that we are dealing as unfairly with Dr. Abbott as he had dealt with 2 Peter.

By "tautology" Dr. Abbott does "not mean the mere repetition of the same word or phrase to express the same thing. Euclid is not tautological." He means the barren repetition of "fine words"—due to "paucity of vocabulary" and the desire of an empty writer to "make the most of the handsome phrases which he has accumulated," whereby he is led, "having found a bright patch," "to insert it twice or thrice before he can bring himself to let it go." It is clear now, that the words adduced to prove such a tautology must be poetical and striking; above all, they must not be such as

can be shown to have been in natural and familiar use in the sense in which they occur in "the tautology." A very fair example of the kind of tautology meant Dr. Abbott adduces from an estimate of Lord Hobart's character which appeared shortly after the death of that statesman, in the *Madras Mail*. It will be sufficient for our purposes to quote the first paragraphs of it:

"The not uncommon (*a, 1*) *hand of* death has distilled from febrile wings from amongst a débris of bereaved relatives, friends, and submissive subjects into (*b, 1*) *the interminable azure of the past*, an unexceptionably finished politician and philanthropist of the highest specific gravity. who, only a few days ago, represented our Most Gracious Majesty the Queen in this Presidency.

"The *hand of* (*a, 2*) destiny has willed that he should be carried into the infinite (*b, 2*) *azure of the past*, when the (*c, 1*) *incipient buds*, and (*d, 1*) *symptoms* of his fostered love and hope for the (*e, 1*) *Oriental* element were observed to be gradually blossoming. The (*e, 2*) *Oriental mind* was just in the (*c, 2*) *incipient* stage of appreciating his noble mental and moral qualities, and consequently can only confine itself to a prediction of what his indefatigable zeal would have achieved for it, had he remained within the category of 'the survival of the fittest.'"

Dr. Abbott thinks that 2 Peter is the same kind of Greek as this trash is English! We are not concerned now, however, with this already refuted and self-refuting charge, but only with the *tautologies*. These are marked by italics and figures in the above passage, and are all striking, either because they are figurative expressions, or intensely poetical expressions, or are used in strange senses. The only exception is, possibly, "*Oriental*," and that probably would not attract attention, or be noted as a tautology of this class, except in association with the others.

Now, Dr. Abbott thinks that in respect to its tautologies, 2 Peter ii. 14-20, is parallel to this; he admits, indeed, that the words there "are capable of being rendered into very simple English," but contends that "their use, and still more their repetition in this Epistle, would induce a Greek reader to form about it the same judgment that we naturally form about the 'Native Estimate.'" We might ask, Even were this true, what of it? Would this prove ignobility of soul or ignorance of Greek? Poverty of Greek vocabulary might be proved; a book-learned and half-understood vocabulary might be proved. But Dr. Abbott's

brief requires him to prove mental or moral unworthiness. It behoves us, rather, to ask, however, is it true? We can determine how the style of this Epistle would affect a Greek reader of say the last half of the first century A. D., only in two ways: 1, by observing how it actually affected the Greek readers who read it nearest to that time; and, 2, by noting whether the words thus "tautologically" used are of the same class that occur in the *Madras Mail* extract. Many Greek readers, sufficiently close to Peter's day to stand as examples, used this Epistle; some of them did not fail to observe the difference between its style and that of 1 Peter—a far more hidden phenomenon than this to which Dr. Abbott appeals. Yet none of them has seen this—which has been reserved to him to discover some eighteen centuries after the advent of the Epistle into an unbelieving and critical world. Again, the words used are found on examination to bear absolutely no real resemblance to those in the *Madras Mail* quotation; but, on the contrary, are used by 2 Peter in senses justified as simple and natural by either known usage or strong analogy.

Dr. Abbott's contention is that some of these words "are very rare in Greek literature;" and others, "though good classical Greek in themselves, are rare or non-existent in the New Testament." Elsewhere we learn that he deems a word not found elsewhere in the New Testament, or in the LXX., an uncommon word to the circle of ideas of a writer like 2 Peter, even though it be otherwise a common Greek word. But would the use of such words repetitiously be enough to convict a passage of being similar in style to the extract from the *Madras Mail*? Dr. Abbott seems to forget for the moment the kind of Greek he is dealing with, and the characteristics of the period to which it belongs. Winer¹ gives us, as the chief lexical peculiarities of Hellenistic Greek, as distinguished from classical, the mixture of dialects; great changes of sense in words; the commingling of poetical and other lofty words; changes of form; and an influx of newly made words, or of words new to the literary language. From these main characteristics of the kind of Greek occurring

¹ Winer's Grammar, etc., § 2; where a sufficient number of examples are given.

in 2 Peter, it is already apparent that Dr. Abbott has engaged in a rather difficult task, when he wishes to prove that its author has used his words in as ridiculous a way as the writer in the *Madras Mail*. That a word is a curious dialectic form, does not prove it was not in the commonest currency in Peter's day; that it occurs in the classics only in the loftiest of poetic speech, does not prove it was not the flattest prose in Peter's day; that old acquaintances are used in the most unheard of senses, or reappear in entirely strange dresses, or give way to utter strangers, obtained no one knows whence—all this would not only be no proof of ignorance of Greek in the author of a writing of this date, but is just what we are to look for and expect in him. It is just what we do find in all the writers of the time. Every one of the New Testament writers has his own ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, absolute, or in the New Testament. Queer phenomena are continually cropping out. The same word, for instance, appears in only two places in all Greek literature; in both cases independently, and in both it is used with the utmost familiarity; or a word can be found only in a single passage in the totality of Greek writing, until it suddenly turns up in an inscription; or a familiar word is used by two widely separated authors, and by them only, in a new and strange sense. The period in which 2 Peter was composed, was, in a word, linguistically speaking, an unsettled age, and an age of transition. Language, as a literary vehicle, was in a ferment; the old vocabulary was no longer clung to jealously; popular phrases and forms of speech were clamoring for recognition, and each man did, in the way of choosing a vocabulary, pretty nearly what was right in his own eyes.

Nor is it possible to speak of the LXX. as almost the only mine from which the writers of the New Testament drew their vocabulary; their great mine was doubtless the popular usage of current speech, as distinguished from any written sources. Professor Potwin, in his very interesting papers on the New Testament vocabulary,¹ gives us a summary view of the matter, which may help us here. He estimates that the New Testament contains eight hundred and eighty-two (882) native Greek words

¹*Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct., 1880, pp. 653, seq.

not found anywhere until after Aristotle, or an average of about two to a page; and yet he has not counted merely dialectic forms, or slight changes of declension or pronunciation, or even the widest changes of meaning, so long as the form was preserved. Of these eight hundred and eighty-two words not found at all in the classical age, only some three hundred and sixty-three in all, or a little over *two-fifths*, are found in the LXX.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from such facts as these. It will require much more than the adduction of repetitions of words that are rare in the New Testament, or rare in the New Testament and LXX., or rare in Greek literature, to fasten such "tautologies" as occur in the *Madras Moil* extract on 2 Peter. The author of that Epistle ought to be given the benefit of the doubt that would necessarily arise in each case as to whether this or that word, known to us only as a rarely occurring word in Greek literature, or perhaps only as an intensely poetical one of the classical period, was not plain and familiar prose in his circle of acquaintances. It is another question whether he needs to ask for the benefit of this doubt. And we hasten to add that an examination of Dr. Abbott's chosen examples from 2 Peter will convince the sober reader that he does not. The "barren tautology of five words" is discovered to exist, not at all in 2 Peter's Greek, but only in Dr. Abbott's English representation of it. It is only by such a forced translation—proceeding by the resurrection of the etymological senses of derivatives and compounds, and the literal senses of figurative words which had acquired well-settled and simple derivative meanings—as would make any author ridiculous, that the "tautologies" can be found in 2 Peter at all. This may perhaps be made plain to the reader by placing Dr. Abbott's forced translation of the first of the two passages he adduces, side by side with another, not at all smooth, but which takes the words in justifiable senses, as the added notes will show. We trust the reader will carefully observe the effect. Any one who thought it worth his while, could readily make Dr. Abbott's own thoroughly clear English style muddy, by treating it as he has treated 2 Peter's. It is to be observed that the passage begins in the middle of a sentence:

DR. ABBOTT'S.

(a, 1) *Setting baits to catch souls*
 (b, 1) *unconfirmed*, having a heart
 practised of¹ greediness, and child-
 ren of curse, having left the straight
 way, they went astray *having fol-*
*lowed after*² the way of Balaam the
 son of Bosor, who loved *the wages of*
iniquity,³ but had the *refutation*⁴ of
 his own⁵ *law-breaking*; a dumb
 beast of burden with the voice of
 a man (c, 1) *uttering a sound*,⁷ hin-
 dered the *maddishness*⁸ of the pro-
 phet. . . For (c, 2) *uttering sounds*
 of swelling things⁹ of vanity, in the
 lusts of the flesh by wanton acts
 they (a, 2) *set baits to catch* those who
 are *in the least*¹⁰ (d, 1) *fleeing away*
from those who are spending their
 life in error; promising them free-
 dom, being themselves slaves of cor-
 ruption—for one is enslaved by that
 by which one is (e, 1) *defeated*. For
 if (d, 2) *having fled away from* the
 pollutions of the world by the *recog-*
*nition*¹¹ of our Lord and Saviour
 Jesus Christ, but afterwards having
 been entangled in these things they
 are (e, 2) *defeated*, their last state is
 worse than the first.

2 PETER.

. . . enticing unstable souls; hav-
 ing hearts practised in covetous-
 ness; children of cursing. They
 have left the straight way and are
 gone astray, following after the way
 of Balaam the son of Bosor who
 loved the wages of unrighteousness,
 but received a rebuke of his own
 transgression. The dumb beast of
 burden, speaking with the voice of
 a man, hindered the prophet's mad-
 ness.

For, speaking great swelling
 things of vanity, they entice, in the
 lusts of the flesh, by wanton acts,
 those who are just escaping from
 them that pass their lives in error,
 promising them freedom, while they
 themselves are slaves of corruption;
 for one is enslaved by that by which
 he is overcome. For, if having es-
 caped the pollutions of the world
 through the knowledge of our Lord
 and Saviour Jesus Christ, but hav-
 ing become again entangled in them,
 they are overcome, their last state
 is become worse than their first.

¹ "A rare and pedantic use of the genitive" (Dr. A.). It will be enough in reply to refer to Winer, §30-4.

² See *post.* ³ Ditto. ⁴ Cf. Job xxi. 4; xxiii. 2 (LXX.).

⁵ "The word *ιδιος*, *private*, ought not to be used where there is no antithesis between what is one's own and another's; but the author is . . . fond of the abuse of this word" (Dr. A.). Perhaps, however, *ιδιος* is not so unessential here as Dr. Abbott seems to think; there is a contrast between the "sin" of Balaam and of his ass. Balaam, supposing his ass to be stubborn and vicious, was punishing her for it, when the dumb beast spake and gave him a rebuke for his *own* sin. Neither is *ιδιος* in ii. 22 unessential, as the careful reader will readily see.

⁶ Cf. Prov. v. 22; Ps. xxxvi. 7; common in classics (e. g., Polyb., Dion. Hal.). Hence, only rare in the New Testament.

⁷ See *post.* ⁸ Ditto.

⁹ "The use of *ὑπέρογκα*, without the article, yet followed by a genitive, is bad Greek" (Dr. A.). Why? Cf. Winer (Moulton's Ed.), p. 235.

¹⁰ "The word *ὀλίγως* is rare, and most used in the phrase *οὐκ ὀλίγως*, *in no slight degree*, like our 'not in the least.' It probably means here: 'to some small extent.'" True enough; *valeat tantum*.

¹¹ See *post.*

Relegating to the foot notes all notice of words and phrases which have been forced from their obvious senses, in order to give the passage as a whole the appearance of the *Madras Mail* extract, we confine ourselves here to the cases of "tautology." Five of these are adduced, to which three more, marked as repeated elsewhere than in this passage, are to be added (marked 2, 3, and 11 above), amounting to eight in all. It is observed with reference to them that while in the left hand column they bear a strange appearance, as they stand in the right hand column they appear natural enough, and their repetition ceases to strike upon the ear unpleasantly or even markedly. Their "tautological" character (in Dr. Abbott's sense), then, depends on the necessity of looking at them from the standpoint of the left hand column, and the real question before us is: Are they fitly represented by the translation given in the right hand column? If no violence has been done to them in this translation, then violence has been done to 2 Peter by Dr. Abbott. Let us take a brief view of the usage of the words involved.

1. (a) *Setting baits to catch.* This is the translation which Dr. Abbott offers of the word *δελεάζειν*, which he further informs us is used only once elsewhere in the New Testament. But is it justifiable to dig up the literal sense of the word here? or has its metaphorical sense a recognised simple and no longer figurative meaning? The primitive *δέλεαρ* (cf. *δόλος*), meaning "a bait," has itself a settled metaphorical sense, as in Plutarch, *De Ser. Num. Vind.*, τὸ γλυκὲν τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ὡσπερ δέλεαρ ἐξέλλκειν [ἀνθρώπους]; and Plato, *Tim.*, lxix. 6: "Pleasure, the greatest incitement of evil" (Jowett). The derivative verb *δελεάζειν* means, in accordance with its form, 1, *literally*, to bait, *i. e.*, either to put on the hook as bait or to entice or catch by bait; and 2, *metaph.*, to bait—to entice. In this, its metaphorical sense, it obtained great currency, always *in sensu malo*; and, as it became common, lost its figurative implication. The literal sense is already out of sight in such passages as Demosthenes, pp. 241-2: *ρασιτώνη καὶ σχολῇ δελεαζόμενον* (by all means compare the context), and Philo. *q. omn. lib. prob.* § 22 (cited by Grimm), *πρὸς ἐπιθυμίας ἐλαίνεται ἢ ὑφ' ἡδονῆς δελεάζεται*. In the only one other New Testament passage in which the word occurs, the resurrection of the literal sense would even introduce confusion: James i. 14, "But each is tempted by being drawn out and having baits set by his own lust." The order of the words here, *ἐξεκλόμενος first*, and *δελεαζόμενος second*, demonstrates that the latter is used in total neglect of its literal sense, and therefore

in no sense figuratively, but only as a current expression for "enticing." To insist on translating the word in 2 Peter, "setting baits to catch," is the same as to insist on giving *dilapidate* its original sense of *scattering stones* in such a passage as this. "The patrimony of the bishopric of Oxon was much dilapidated" (Wood).¹ 2 Peter simply uses a common Greek word, not unknown in the New Testament in its most natural, common, and obvious sense; his repeated use of it in the course of four verses is neither strange nor significant when once we recognise the commonness of the word and the naturalness of the sense.

2. (b.) *unconfirmed*. The word here is ἀσθηπικροί, which occurs in 2 Peter alone in the New Testament. It is rare also in the classics, cf. Longin. *de Subl.*, 2. 2., and Musaeus, 295 ("the *unstable* deeps and watery bottoms of the sea"). It may or may not have been a somewhat rare word in St. Peter's day. Certainly its use at 2 Peter ii. 14, iii. 16, cannot be called "tautological," and can occasion no surprise. It is at worst a vivid mode of speech. And it is worthy of note that words cognate with σθηπίζω (Luke xxii. 32) are favorites with Peter and seem to have had peculiar significance to him: cf. 1 Peter v. 10; 2 Peter i. 12; iii. 17. and SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, 1882, p. 69. note 1.

3. (2) *having followed after*. The word here is ἐξακολουθεῖν, concerning which Dr. Abbott remarks truly enough that it is used here, i. 16 and ii. 2, only, in the New Testament. This fact has, however, absolutely no significance, unless the word itself is either rare or peculiar in some way. It is, on the contrary, however, an exceedingly common word, whether in the LXX. (e. g., Isa. lvi. 11; Sir. v. 2; Amos ii. 4; Job xxxi, 9, etc.), or the writers of the κοινή (e. g., Josephus, Polybius, Plutarch), or of the early Church (e. g., Testt. xii. Patt., p. 644). It is used by 2 Peter in three separate (though only slightly divergent) senses, all of which are justified as natural and current by other writers. (Cf. Grimm's analysis of the word.)

4. (3) *the wages of iniquity*, μισθὸν ἀδικίας, "repeated," says Dr. Abbott, "from ii. 13," and but once used elsewhere in the New Testament, "namely, in the Acts (i. 18) in a speech of St. Peter, whence it has been probably borrowed by our author." We are at somewhat of a loss to understand what is thought to be proved by this. If there is anything curious or "fine-wordy" or pedantic about this phrase, then how account for its use by the genuine Peter (Acts i. 18, for we understand Dr. Abbott to accept that as "a speech of St. Peter")? at the least, then, this use, pedantic or not, is common to Peter and 2 Peter, and is a mark of the Petrine origin of this Epistle just in proportion as it is strange and unusual. On the other hand, if this phrase is not strange in Acts, why is it strange here? We have no wish to haggle over the point whether 2 Peter actually borrows the phrase from Acts, and the less so as it

¹Or, "Christ took our physically dilapidated nature" [Hodge].

seems certain that Acts was published some five or six years earlier than 2 Peter, and verses 18 and 19 of Acts i. do not appear to us part of Peter's speech. This much, however, is clear: in Luke's words we have an example of the same phrase that is here held to be "fine-wordy" and pedantic. Essentially the same phrase occurs also in 2 Macc. viii. 33; while *μισθός* in a bad sense is common in Greek literature (*cf. e. g.*, Callim. *Hymn. in Dian.*, 263, "For neither did Atreides boast in a small *μισθός*;" Eur. *Hipp.*, 1050, the *μισθός* due to an impious man, etc.).

5. (c) *uttering a sound, φθέγγομαι*. Dr. Abbott falls into a slight error in saying (p. 206) that this word does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament; it occurs in a precisely similar sense in Acts iv. 18: "charged them not at all to 'utter a sound' or teach in the name of Jesus." This fact is fatal to the adduction of the word here as pedantic or strange in the simple sense of "speak." Add that it is common in this same sense in the LXX.; *cf.* Job xiii. 7, *ἐναντι δὲ αὐτοῦ φθέγγεσθε δόλον* ("utter a sound" of guile?); Wisdom i. 8: "no one 'uttering a sound' of wicked things." Sir. xiii. 22. *Cf.* Hdian, iv. 6, 12; Xen. *Com.*, ii. 7; Mem., iv. 2, 6. Certainly, as we go on, we become more and more amazed at the items which must be adduced to prove pedantic tautology—if it be proved at all.

6. (d) *fleeing away from, ἀποφεύγειν*, used in New Testament in 2 Peter i. 4; ii. 18, 20, only. For the construction with the genitive (as in 2 Peter i. 4) *cf.* *ἐκφεύγειν* in Xen. *An.* 1, 3, 2, and the simple verb in Philoct., 1034. For the construction with the accusative as in our present passage, *cf.* *Batr.*, 42, 47; *Theogn.*, 1159; *Hdt.*, i. 1; *Plato Apol.*, 39 A.; *Dem.*, 840, 8; *Plato Tim.*, 44, c.; *Xen. Mem.*, 3, 11, 8. The sense in which 2 Peter uses the word is sufficiently illustrated by *Plato Apol.*, 39 A: "For neither in war nor yet at law ought any man to use every way of *escaping death*" (Jowett); *Plato Tim.*, 44 c.: "And *escapes the worst disease of all*" (Jowett). As a pedant and fine writer 2 Peter's author can certainly be content to stand alongside of Plato.

7. (e) *defeated, ἡττᾶσθαι*; not found elsewhere in New Testament, (*cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 13), but not, therefore, necessarily rare, pedantic, or ignoble. *Cf.* Isaiah liv. 17: "And every voice that shall rise up against thee unto judgment,—them all *ἡττήσεις*;" *Josephus Ant.*, I. 19, 4, *ἐρωτι τῆς παιδός ἡττήθεις*. The word is common in the profane Greek, and 2 Peter's use of it is in no sense strange or unwonted.

8. (11) *recognition, ἐπίγνωσις*; "repeated above, I. 2, 3, 8, but the word is common in St. Paul's Epistles," and, we may add, in exactly the same sense that it occurs in here: *cf.* Rom. i. 28; Eph. iv. 13; Col. i. 10, etc. And thus just as we reach the climax of our wonder at what Dr. Abbott is able to adduce as tautologies like those of the *Madras Mail* extract, we reach the end of his enumeration.

The candid reader who has taken the trouble to read through

what we have thus thrown into small print, can certainly be trusted to bring in the verdict of "not guilty" to the charge of "tautology" as urged by Dr. Abbott. We must remember, however, that our author does not stop at the charge of "tautology;" that charge is, indeed, in reality only subsidiary to the farther one, that the author of the Epistle is full of the "vulgar pedantry" of forcing in the "fine words" of his vocabulary everywhere, without really understanding their meaning, and even of coining other "fine words" from the base metal of his own vain and pompous ignorance. We have seen already a sample of what he means by this in the passage we have quoted above from his translations of 2 Peter. That was not, however, quite a full sample; let us look further.

Dr. Abbott declares that the use of such words as *παραφρονία* (ii. 16), *κανσούμενα* (iii. 10), *κίλισμα* (ii. 22), *ἐξέοραμα* (ii. 22), *ταρταρώσας* (ii. 4), are "exactly parallel" to "gairish," "cognoscence," "sickishness," in such Indian English as: "He had one and uniform way of speaking. He made no gairish of words;" "bolstering up the decision of the Lower Court with his sapience and legal acumen and cognoscence;" "on multitudinous¹ occasions, when the hope and affiance of the clients of Justice Mookerjee *toto caelo* suspended on his pleading, and he was absent from court on account of some sickishness, he even on such a day came and pleaded their causes, when they importuned him to do so." He even thinks that "such idiomatic blunders" as "inducing [the Court] to his favor," and "their hope suspended *toto caelo* on his pleading" may be fairly matched by the corresponding blunders, *μνήμην ποιείσθαι* (i. 15), *σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενάγκαντες* (i. 5), the omission of the article (ii. 8, iii. 10, 12), and the use of *δγδοος* (ii. 5). "As for the misuse of *βλέμμα* (ii. 8), it can be matched with nothing so justly as the passage of the Bengalee writer in which he describes Mr. Justice Mookerjee as 'remaining *sotto voce* till half-past four in the evening.'" This arraignment is certainly thorough-going, and, if in accordance with facts, opens up a new and hitherto unsuspected characteristic of 2 Peter; not, certainly, inconsistent with its inspiration and authority, but, at all events, startling to one

¹*Cf.* Macbeth II., ii., 62.

who has been accustomed to read it reverently. It behoves us to test the charge somewhat in detail.

Let us begin with the word *παραφρονία* as one already in a sense before us.¹ Dr. Abbott tells us that the word—"of which Wahl produces no other instance in Greek literature"—"is probably bad Greek for *παραφροσύνη*, as bad as the Indian-English 'sickishness' for 'sickness.'" The facts in this account are, that no instance of the use of this word seems as yet to have turned up in profane Greek or elsewhere in sacred Greek, and that *παραφροσύνη* is used by classical writers to express the notion plainly intended here. Its analogy with "sickishness" seems to be confined to this—that both words are formed on a correct analogy, *cf.* "foolishness" (1 Cor. i. 18) and *εἰδαιμῶνία*. The word "sickishness" does exist in English, but in a different sense from that in which the Hindoo used it, having acquired its meaning from "sickish" in the sense of "nauseating" (*cf.* "the sickishness of the taste"); the badness of the Indian-English consists, therefore, in the use of a word in a sense possible derivatively, but utterly incongruous with its known usage. We are struck with the incongruity at once in reading the passage, and pronounce it bad English. On what ground, on the other hand, we can pronounce *παραφρονία* bad Greek, is not apparent. It is regularly formed; its sense is consonant with both its root-meaning and form; it suggests no incongruous action. The mere fact that it is not known to occur elsewhere in Greek literature could only prove it to be rare (literary) Greek, certainly not bad Greek. Are we to stamp every *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον* as bad Greek? It is far from an impossible supposition that the word was in exceedingly common use in popular speech, and only crops up here in literature. On the other hand, we see no reason why Peter should not have coined it; it is good metal. Nor is it hard to see why he should have adopted here even a rare word instead of a more common one fitted equally to his sense, or even coined a new one for his purpose. He wished a word assonant with *παρανομία*: "but obtained a rebuke for his own *παρανομία*; the dumb ass, speaking in man's voice, hindered the prophet's *παραφρονία*." If Dr. Abbott thinks it unworthy of

¹See above, p. 406.

an apostle or sensible man to choose a little-used or coin a new word for such a purpose, he will be obliged to sit aloft on some misty height in literary loneliness. Few writers, whether in the New Testament or out of it, scorn such "pedantry." Is Dr. Abbott prepared, for instance, to condemn Paul's *κατάκριμα . . . δικαίωμα* (Rom. v. 16, *cf.* also verse 18)? or Mr. J. A. Symonds' "Antichrist . . . Antiphysis?"¹ If 2 Peter falls on account of this word, he falls in a great company.

The word *καυσούμενα* occurs in 2 Peter iii. 10, 12, only in the N. T.; it does not occur in the LXX.; and seems to be found in the classics only late, and in the sense of "to be feverish," "to be in a state of fever" (Dioscorides and Galen). Hence Dr. Abbott translates here "elements in fever heat shall be dissolved," "elements in fever heat are to be melted." Is this fair? Note: 1. The sense of "to be feverish" is late; it seems not to occur earlier than Dioscorides (c. 100 A. D.). 2. That sense is undoubtedly a *derivative* sense, the natural sense of the word, and therefore its primitive sense, being "to burn intensely." 3. All its cognates have this primitive sense, although several of them, such as *καῦμα*, *καυματίζω*, *καυματώθης*, *καῦσος* (primitive of *καυσομαι*), acquired a secondary derivative sense as applied to fevers. How Dr. Abbott can think he is dealing scientifically with a word which occurs four times, in two pairs, separated by both a century of time and the technicalities of the subjects treated, when he tries to force the derivative sense used technically by physicians of 100 A. D. +, on the term so used a century and a half earlier as to demand the primitive sense of the same word, passes our comprehension. He would be scarcely passing beyond this were he to attempt to translate its cognates in Rev. xvi. 8, 9, thus: "And the fourth poured out his bowl upon the sun; and it was given unto it to put men in a fever heat with fire. And men were put in fever heat with great fever heat." How would it do to say

¹*Age of the Despots*, p. 412: "And now in the pontificate of Alexander, that memorable scene presented to the nations of the modern world a pageant of Antichrist and Antiphysis—the negation of the gospel and of nature." *Antiphysis* appears to be a coinage of Mr. Symonds; although the adjectives *antiphysic* and *antiphysical* (Ogilvie) seem to be in use, medical and otherwise. The Greeks used *παράφυσις* (*cf.* Ro. i. 26).

“parched corn” really meant “fever-heated corn,” on the strength of the common phrases “parched lips,” “parched brow”? Would it not be as fair to translate Dioscorides and Galen by 2 Peter’s usage as *vice versa*?

The words *κυλισμὸν* and *ἐξέπραμα*, (ii. 22) naturally go together. Dr. Abbott’s criticism is as follows: “For the word ‘vomit’ [in Proverbs xxvi. 11; 2 Peter] substitutes the word *ἐξέπραμα* (‘hardly to be found elsewhere,’ Alford, but found by Wahl in Dioscorid., vi. 19), a technical term of medicine derived from *ἐξεράω* ‘to evacuate by purge or vomit,’ so that the passage may be rendered, ‘The dog having returned to his own *evacuation!*’ Further, [2 Peter] supplements this quotation by a reference to a sow returning to its wallowing; and here he introduces a word (*κυλισμὸν*) not recognised by Liddell and Scott. . . . It may be rendered ‘wallowance.’ [2 Peter] also uses about the sow a word generally restricted to human beings, ‘having washed herself or bathed.’ The whole passage will then run thus: ‘The dog having turned to his own *evacuation*, and the sow, *having bathed*, to her *wallowance*.’” A precious piece of criticism! Let us suppose “evacuation” fitly represents *ἐξέπραμα*, does ignobility of heart or mind result in the writer? Suppose he has adapted to a more common use a technical medical term, has he done more than Mr. William Wallace in the following sentence in description of the historian Alison (*The Academy* for Dec. 23, 1882): “Called to the Scottish Bar, he made fair way both in law and literature, being industrious, *eupeptic*,² accomplished, and self-confident.” If, then, the argument is a case of *non sequitur*, even if the facts are true, what becomes of it when the facts asserted are themselves brushed away? Yet, in the interests of truth and fairness, we must ruthlessly brush away the “facts.” We have here, indeed, a parallel case to *κασσιμίμενα*, with the difference that the matter is even plainer. The verb *ἐξεράω* is defined as “to evacuate by purge or vomit,” and certainly was used technically as a medical term. But it certainly was not a *purely* technical term (was Dr. Abbott misled by the technical phraseology of the Lexicon’s definition?); that it was a common popular word is proved by the fact that it

²Used also by Carlyle and a few others in an untechnical way.

even passed into a popular metaphorical sense—"to empty" (*e. g.*, the ballot urn of its contents [Arrian], the lungs of air, a vessel of water, etc.). This growth in popular usage necessarily presupposes a common use of the word in its primitive sense; to translate it by the English word "evacuate," thus, gives a false impression save in this particular; "evacuate," like *ἐξεράω*, leaves the question of *manner* open. The noun *ἐξέραμα* seems to be known in the classics only in Dioscorides vi. 19, and Eust. Opusc., 248, 91. The cognates *ἐξέρασις* and *ἐξεραστής*, both in the sense of *vomiting* (as distinguished from *purging*) also occur in Eust. The word was thus one of a class used to denote *vomiting*. What proof is there that it was a technical word? Just this: out of three times in which the word occurs, it is used twice by physicians! Is that a broad enough base for an induction? Another fact is now to be noted: in Levit. xviii. 28, where the LXX. reads *προσοχθιση* (= "abhor," losing the figure), Aquila translates the Hebrew word *אָרַב* by *ἐξεράω*; now in Prov. xxvi. 11, the words are *אָרַב-בָּצַר*, which 2 Peter takes the liberty of translating by *ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα*. Certainly, if Aquila can be allowed without horrible charges to translate the Hebrew verb "to vomit" by the verb, 2 Peter may be allowed to translate the noun "vomit" by the corresponding noun. Dr. Abbott seems to be indeed in this dilemma: either 2 Peter is translating Proverbs xxvi. 11 himself, or repeating it in its popularly current form. If the former, then Aquila justifies him in the word he uses as the Greek equivalent of *אָרַב*. If the latter, then *the people* are responsible for *ἐξέραμα*, and it is proved to be used in a current common sense. At all events and in any case, it is somewhat high-handed to take a word used three times—all in the sense of *vomit*—twice by physicians and once by the populace or a popular writer, and on the strength of these facts declare it to be a purely technical medical word.¹

¹No doubt it will seem natural to the reader to suppose that Dr. Abbott's method of proving words to be technical medical words is unexampled among students of Greek. As a matter of fact, however, it is not quite so. By the same process by which he makes *κασόδομαι* and *ἐξέραμα* appear to be technical medical terms, the Rev. Wm. Kirk Ho-

With reference to *κωλισμός*, which is used here only in the N. T. (*cf.* *κωλιεν*, in Mark ix. 20), but occurs in Hippiatr. 204. 4, and in Theodotion, in Prov. ii. 18 (which brings it into the circle of 2 Peter's author's training), it is doubtless sufficient to observe (1) that the author of 2 Peter did not invent it; (2) it may have been a popular word, cropping up here in a popular proverb, and, indeed, this is by all odds the most likely supposition; and (3) there is no particular reason for preferring "wallowance" to "wallowing," as its translation. The careful Grimm feels no hesitation in translating it "*volutatio*;" and although verbals in —*μος* regularly express "an abstract notion of energy embodying the *intransitive* notion of the verb" (Jelf., § 332, B., p. 334, Vol. I.), yet that rule neither decides for —*ance* instead of —*ing*, in the *intransitive* verb "to wallow," nor is it of uniform application in actual usage. On the whole phrase, *cf.* Epictetus' phrase, *ἐν βορβόρω κωλισθαι*, as quoted by Grimm under Βόρβορος. The verb *λωω* (which occurs six times in the N. T.) is, indeed, nearly always used of persons, but not invariably; so that the usage in this passage, while not the most usual, is a perfectly natural one. Accordingly, the verse is found to be such as would strike a Greek ear about as the following strikes an English ear: "The true proverb: the dog turning to its own vomit again, and the sow that had washed, to wallowing in the mire." What concerns further Dr. Abbott's notion, that the fact that the three words, *κωσούμενα*, *ἐξέραμα*, and *κωλισμόν*, do not seem to occur after 2 Peter in Greek literature until about A. D. 60, has any tendency to prove a late date for 2 Peter, proceeds on his forgetfulness of the chief characteristic of the age in a lexical point of view, and needs no remark here.

Little need be said with regard to *ταρταρώσας* (2 Peter ii. 4). It is easy to confess that it is not found in the N. T. elsewhere, nor

Hobart, LL. D. (*The Medical Language of St. Luke, etc.*, Dublin,) makes *οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι* of Acts ii. 10, and *ἀνελήθη* of Acts i. 2, medical terms—the former on the strength of the use of the verb *ἐπιδημέω* (to be *ἐπίδημος*) of epidemic diseases (*e. g.*, Hipp. *Progn.*, 46), and the latter on the strength of the medical use of the verb *ἀναλαμβάνω* as equivalent to "to restore to health and strength," etc. Dr. Hobart, indeed, presents quite a number of instances quite as bad as Dr. Abbott's.

anywhere in classical Greek ; and as easy to admit that even its primitive *τάρταρος* is never found in the N. T. or the LXX., and may therefore be, in somewhat strong language, said to be "alien to both." That it was capable of being used by Jewish lips is, however, plain from, say, Josephus c. Apion ii. 33 ; although it is probably true that the N. T. avoids the use of the word "Tartarus," in order to avoid suggesting heathen associations. The *verb* is, however, a different matter. And although it is not found elsewhere in this short form, it is certainly impossible to say, in the face of the common *καταταρτάρω*, that it is "uncouth ;" "almost as uncouth as it would be in English to speak of 'helling' some one, instead of 'sending him to hell.'" That this is the very opposite of the fact, the current Greek expression "down-helling" some one is a standing and convincing witness. We have before us, indeed, only one of the well known, though somewhat rare, cases (like *θεατριζειν* for *εκθ.*, or *δειγματιζειν* for *παράδειγ.*), in which the later Greek (*i. e.*, probably the *popular* Greek) preferred, contrary to its usual custom, the uncompounded to the compounded form. See Moulton's *Winer*, p. 25, note 4. In connexion with *ταρτάρω*, however, Dr. Abbott makes much of another "curious" word, *σειροίς*, which he thinks, "to a well-educated Greek," would convey the meaning of "store-pit," and on the strength of which he proposes the following translation of ii. 4 : "If God spared not angels when they sinned, but having *helled* them, delivered them to *store-pits* of darkness." What can be gained by such a mysterious appeal to the "well-educated Greek," in the face of Hesychius' recognition of the sense of "prison" for the word, it is difficult to divine. The word, used here only in the New Testament, and not at all in the LXX., is tolerably common in the classics in the spellings *σειρός* (Pollux, Plut., Varro, Demosthenes [v. 5]), *σιρρός*, and more properly *σιρός* ; and its standing sense seems to be PIT. This seems clearly its primitive sense. It has three secondary meanings : (1) a PIT for keeping corn, and hence a magazine or store-pit. So Eur., Anaxim., Demosth. (2) A PIT for catching wild animals, and hence a pit-fall. So Longus. (3) A PIT for keeping prisoners. So Hesychius tells us, giving "prison" as one of its meanings, and

informing us that the Laconians used a word, *σπία*, for "safe-keeping." While it is to be freely admitted, therefore, that the word was most correctly used in literature in that one of its secondary senses which expressed "store-pit," it is certainly not clear that we must translate "store-pit" in 2 Peter any more than in Longus; or that its context would not determine the sense naturally and simply to "an educated Greek," provided he was educated enough. To an "uneducated" Greek, on the other hand, who might well know more of "pits" of the (2) and (3) kinds than of the (1), the suggestion might be *more* natural of a pit-fall or prison-house than of a store-room or magazine.

Turning from single words to phrases, we somewhat wonder that *μνήμην ποιείσθαι* is singled out for the first strictures on 2 Peter's idiom; nor is it very consonant to speak in one place strongly: this phrase is a blunder, corresponding to "inducing [the Court] to his favor" (p. 210), and in another mildly: "it is not known to be used in the author's sense (Thuc. II. 54, is ambiguous)." Thucid. II. 54 ought to be much more than ambiguous in order to justify the statement. To us, the probability is, that Thuc. uses the phrase in just 2 Peter's sense; though, perhaps, we can never be certain about it. At all events, does anybody suppose that if we should blot out 2 Peter i. 15, and then prove that Thuc. ii. 54 took the phrase as 2 Peter does here, Dr. Abbott would push the charge against him which he here raises against 2 Peter? If not, why not? It is not, however, so very unexampled that a phrase commonly used in the sense of "make mention," should sometimes be used in that of "entertain recollection." We need only recall the kindred phrase, *μνήμην ἔχειν*, which occurs in both senses. Cf. Hdt., i. 14; Soph. *Elect.*, 346; Plato *Phaed.*, 251. D.

"Still more objectionable," we are told (and if objectionable at all, we do not wonder at the "still more"), "is (i 5) *σπονδῶν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες*." Josephus and Diod. Sic. both use the phrase with the uncompounded verb, and rightly enough. "But the sonorous extra syllable added by our author makes nonsense of the phrase, by converting it into 'contribute all zeal in an indirect manner'; or 'as a secondary or subsequent consideration.'"

And then the conjecture is hazarded, that what led "our author" "so superfluously astray," was the grandiose sound of the word and the reminiscence of *παρεισ-έδισαν* in the parallel passage in Jude. Let us, however, remember the full pail and dead fish, and be sure of our facts before we explain them. Is the author so clearly astray? The reader who will read Huther or Alford *in loc.*, may be in a fair condition for deciding. He who will study the word criticised will be in better condition. Why are we told that either the idea of *indirectness* or *subordination* is expressed by the *παρά*? *Subsequence* may be *implied*, but what is expressed is simply *addition, along-sided-ness*. Compare the use of *παρεισῆλθεν* in Rom. v. 20, when the sense is not "came in between" or "subordinately," but simply "beside," "along with." When sin entered, then law had also entered; they came side by side. This thought, which is the natural thought of our phrase, too, is very consonant with its context; and the only one who is astray is the expositor.

The omission of the article before the word *δίκαιος*, in ii. 8, and before *οὐρανοί* and *στοιχεῖα*, in iii. 10, 12, seems to Dr. Abbott very blameworthy indeed. In the first case, it is very doubtful whether the article is rightly omitted, seeing that it is contained in all MSS. except B. But letting that pass, its omission can cause no surprise and produce no difficulty; we would simply read, instead of, "for that righteous man dwelling among them by sight and hearing, vexed his righteous soul day by day," rather, "for dwelling as a righteous man among them, he by sight and hearing vexed his righteous soul day by day," wherein the *δίκαιος* is taken as predicate, instead of subject, perhaps with an adverbial effect, as Dr. Abbott suggests; but perhaps, however, not. We do not assert that this is the way it ought to be taken; we merely assert that it is a way that it might be regularly taken, which is enough to void Dr. Abbott's objection of all force. If any one cares to know, however, how we understand the passage, we have no objection to telling him. We think the article is probably to be omitted; and then the passage reads as follows: "*for dwelling among them to both sight and hearing¹ a righteous man, he day*

¹Literally, "in appearance and report."

by day vexed his righteous soul with their lawless deeds." Many advantages flow from such an understanding of the passage: from an involved it becomes a simple passage; and to pass over the rest and come to one related to our present subject, it takes βλέμμα in its most natural sense, and hence forever destroys one of Dr. Abbott's chief charges against the purity of Peter's style. We do not assert or allow that βλέμμα cannot be used for the "sense of sight;" nor do we admit that on any other understanding of the passage, 2 Peter lies open to such charges as Dr. Abbott brings against it. The Greek writers do, however, use the word rather in the sense of "appearance," "expression," than in that of "sight," "seeing;" i. e., rather of the objective than the subjective "look" of a person (in the plural the word means the "eye" itself); and, although the transition from the objective to the subjective is very easy, and its meaning would argue no unworthiness, ignorance, or pedantry in the author, yet it is perhaps better to take his words in their more obvious and natural sense, and understand him to say that Lot gave every proof to his neighbors—both to their eyes and ears—of his righteous character.

The absence of the article before *στοιχεία*, needs no remark, as it seems paralleled by Wisdom vii. 17: "He gave me to know *σύστασιν κόσμον καὶ ἐνέργειαν στοιχείων*. The article's omission before *οὐρανοί*, is in general quite regular (Moulton's *Winer*, p. 150) and is only peculiar here because it does not elsewhere occur before the *nominative case*. This cannot argue, in a case like the present, any ignorance or pedantry or barrenness, however, but is only to be noted (as *Winer* does) as one fact of language. This class of words, like *ἡλιος, γῆ, οὐρανοί*, etc., quasi-proper names, are, indeed, in a transitional and unsettled state in N. T. Greek, and may and do take or omit the article according to the individual's fancy or training or mode of looking upon the object. Thus, this very word *οὐρανός* is treated differently by the various N. T. writers: the *Apocalypse* stands at one extreme, 2 Peter at the other. In the *Apocalypse* it always takes the article, in the *Synoptists* it is prevailingly omitted in certain phrases, in Paul regularly in those phrases, in 2 Peter it is omitted in new cases.

There is no more reason to object to or feel surprise over one writer's mode of viewing the matter than another's.

We do not feel drawn to join earnest issue, finally, with Dr. Abbott concerning the use of "*eighth*" before instead of after its noun in ii. 5. Greek order was more flexible than he seems to imagine; and we may content ourself with simply referring to the commentators on the passage, and to Winer (Moulton's Ed.), p. 312, where everything unusual or strange in the phrase is discussed and illustrated. A reference to Alford's note on i. 9, is sufficient to set aside the strictures offered on *μωπαζειν* (see also Lumby); and we can well content ourselves with declaring at this point that the difficulty found with the use of *μελλησω* (i. 12) is *wholly* imaginary.

And so it appears that these frightful ghosts of "barren pedantry" are like other ghosts—they need but calm looking at to disappear. The negative character of an examination such as we are carrying on, is apt to leave a false impression on some minds, and to weaken their confidence in an Epistle about whose good character there must be so much discussion. Cæsar's wife ought to be above all attack and defence. Ought not, however, such a discussion as the foregoing to have rather an opposite effect? Without mercy, ruthlessly, and even cruelly, 2 Peter has been plunged into the caustic acid of Dr. Abbott's sharp criticism, and as it lies in the seething fluid, we are boldly told that we need not even look for it: it is dissolved and has passed away. But we look, see, reach down, and draw it out; and lo! the pure gold has not so much as felt the biting touch of its bath. Out of the fiery furnace it comes without even the smell of smoke upon it. The result is negative. We have only shown that *these* objections are not fatal to the book; but there is a positiveness about it, after all. The argument based on an ignobility in the style of 2 Peter, framed with learning and pleaded with skill, as it has been, certainly entirely fails; and its failure means simply the failure of all arguments against the Epistle's genuineness, drawn from the phenomena of its style.

There is, indeed, one refuge left. Though it is not ignoble, it may at least be hopelessly diverse from that of 1 Peter. Dr.

Abbott is too good a general not to supplement his chief argument with such a contention (pp. 215, *seq.*). We have already seen how he frames this contention.¹ But its great support falls with the falling of the charge of ignobility; for Dr. Abbott's first point, here too, is that 2 Peter cannot be by the author of 1 Peter, because the latter Epistle has no trace in its style of the plagiarism, tautology, and pedantry that abound in the former. Beyond this he urges nothing which is new or which has not already been repeatedly fully answered. We do not permit ourselves to be drawn into this old discussion, but are content here with quoting the true words of so liberal a critic as Reuss: "On the theological and linguistic differences between the two Epistles, we lay no stress; the two Epistles are too short, have to do with wholly different circumstances, and especially present no direct contradictions; only if the Epistle is on other grounds proved to be un-genuine, can this also be brought into account;"² and with referring the reader especially to the most convincing discussion of the relation between the style of the two Epistles given by Prof. Lumby in the introduction to his Commentary.³

RELATION OF SECOND PETER TO JOSEPHUS.

The way is thus cleared for us to devote the remainder of our space to a discussion of, by all odds, the newest, most important, and most earnestly urged part of Dr. Abbott's argument—that which is founded on the relation between 2 Peter and the Antiquities of Josephus. Dr. Abbott is the inventor of this argument, and therefore may be, perhaps, credited with a certain measure of pardonable pride in his contemplation of it. Certainly he has made it a very striking argument, and certainly he expresses great confidence in it. He conceives that he has *demonstrated* that the author of the Epistle had read Josephus.⁴ Since the Antiquities of Josephus, from which the borrowing is made, were published in A. D. 93, it follows, in that case, with inevitable certainty, that 2 Peter could not have been written

¹See above, pages 393, *seq.*

²Geschichte, u. s. w., Neue Test., § 270-2.

³Speaker's Commentary, Vol. IV., pp. 228, *seq.*

⁴*Expositor* (1882), Vol. 3, p. 61.

until after A. D. 93, and therefore cannot be by the Apostle Peter, and must needs be a forgery. Certainly, the evidence by which the dependence of 2 Peter on Josephus is thus "demonstrated," demands, therefore, our most earnest scrutiny. We ask the reader to follow us as we very baldly state the evidence as adduced by its discoverer, and then attempt to test its relevancy and validity.

I. *Dr. Abbott's statement of the evidence.* As a matter of course, the only evidence available is internal to the two writings compared; and it is just as much a matter of course that it consists not of direct quotations of Josephus by 2 Peter, but of more hidden and subtle marks of literary dependence. As a matter of fact, the whole stress of the argument is laid upon one kind of evidence, namely, that which arises from the common possession by the two writers of a peculiar vocabulary, distributed in such a way in their writings as to suggest to the mind that 2 Peter, in penning his Epistle, must have had in his mind a very vivid reminiscence of certain assignable passages in Josephus. This main and central argument is, indeed, bolstered by two further considerations: the occurrence in the two writings of a couple of similar sentences which may be deemed parallels, and of a couple of common Haggadoth. But Dr. Abbott clearly assigns small value to either of these facts, and apparently would hardly consider them worth adducing in the absence of the more important marks of literary connexion. And this rightly enough; for nothing can be clearer than that neither of them possesses the slightest force as evidence of literary connexion between the two writings. The Haggadoth, the common knowledge of which by Josephus and 2 Peter is supposed to point to borrowing of the latter from the former, concern the statements that Noah was a "herald of righteousness" (2 Peter ii. 5), and that Balaam's ass rebuked him (2 Peter ii. 16). What 2 Peter says may be read in the English version. Josephus' words are: Noah "being displeased at their deeds, and pained at their counsels, tried to persuade them to amend their lives and actions" (Antiq. I., 3. 1), and "the ass, having received a human voice, blamed Balaam as unjust, having no cause to find fault with it 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. (Antiq., IV., 6. 3). It is extremely doubtful whether any Haggadah needs to be assumed at the basis of the latter statement at all; it is very difficult to see wherein 2 Peter ii. 16 goes beyond the warrant of the account in Numbers xxi., and not easy to see that anything beyond it need be assumed beneath the account in Josephus. The Haggadah with reference to Noah, on the other hand, occurs in the Mishnah, in a form much closer to 2 Peter than Josephus' account is: "There rose up a herald for God in the days of the deluge; that was Noah" (Bereshith Rabba xxx. 6); and, indeed, also, in Clement of Rome (ix. 3). In both cases, thus, common sources of information underlay both 2 Peter and Josephus, covering the whole case; and, in general, any number of Haggadoth might be common to the two writings, without in the slightest degree suggesting dependence of one on the other, provided they were not the *invention* of one of them. By as much as it would be probable that they were current legends of the time, by so much could they fail to suggest direct literary connexion.

The pair of parallel sentences that are adduced are equally invalid for the purpose for which they are put forward, as will become plain on one moment's consideration. They are as follows: 2 Peter ii. 10, *κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας. τολμηταί κ. τ. λ.*, compared with Jos. B. J. iii. 9, 3, *τολμηταί καὶ θανάτου καταφρονοῦντες*; and 2 Peter i. 19, *ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες*, compared with Josephus, Ant. xi. 6, 12, *οἷς καλῶς ποιήσετε μὴ προσέχοντες*. At first sight there is undoubtedly a certain strikingness in the close verbal resemblance of the passages. But a glance at the contexts is enough to dispel at once the delusion. Josephus' "Now these Jews, although they are exceedingly *daring and despisers* of death, are yet both unorganised and unskilled in wars, etc.," has little in common with 2 Peter's "The Lord knoweth how to . . . reserve the unrighteous under punishment to the day of judgment; and especially those going after the flesh in the lust of pollution and *despising* lordship. *Daring*, self-willed, they tremble not when blaspheming glories, etc." Clearly, the hypothesis of a quotation here on one side or

the other is out of the question; the collocation of the two very common words, *daring* and *despising*, is indeed striking, but not in such a way as to present more than a strongly marked illustrative passage. As a matter of fact, it has been quoted by all recent commentators as an illustrative passage, and has never suggested literary dependence to one of them. The same is even more clearly the case with the other parallel quoted. The phrase *καλῶς ποιεῖν* is a very common set form of speech, and is usually construed with participles (*cf. e. g.*, Acts x. 33; Phil. iv. 14; 3 John 6); and *προσέχειν* is common in the sense in which it here occurs (*cf. e. g.*, Heb. ii. 1). Absolutely, the only thing, then, common especially to Josephus and 2 Peter is that they each happen to need, in utterly different connexions, to construe the common phrase *καλῶς ποιεῖν* with this particular common participle. It is not such parallels as these which can be appealed to, to prove literary connexion. Two other phrases common to Josephus and 2 Peter might have been with equal propriety, but are not, introduced in this connexion; one (which has been mentioned above¹) is "bringing in [besides] all diligence" which is found also, however, in Diodorus and elsewhere, and thus is shown to be a current phrase, and the other is "following in the track of myths" in which we do find a rare contribution of perfectly common words. All four are simple but close illustrative parallels which cannot suggest literary connexion, but only community in the same current forms of speech; they have consequently all four been the common property of commentators for years, and have been uniformly used as illustrative and only as illustrative passages.² We must, therefore, refuse to allow any, even corroborative, weight to either of Dr. Abbott's supporting considerations, and insist on viewing and estimating the central tower of his argument in its own separate strength. If its masonry is not solid enough to enable it to stand without such props as these, it is right that it should fall.

¹P. 417.

²Such closely illustrative but by no means connected passages are continually turning up, and many of them are much closer than these; *cf. e. g.*, with Rom. vii. 15, such a passage as this, from Epict. *Euclain.* ii. 26, 4: ὁ μὲν θέλει οὐ ποιεῖ, καὶ ὁ μὴ θέλει ποιεῖ.

The axioms on which the argument is built are as follows: The common possession of the same vocabulary by two writers is evidence of literary connexion between them. "Obviously, uncommon words are far more weighty than common" ones as evidence (p. 53). A word not found in the LXX. or elsewhere in the N. T. is uncommon to the circle of ideas of a writer like 2 Peter, even though it be otherwise a common Greek word (p. 54).¹ "The evidence of a *group of words* is far stronger than that of a multitude of single words, to show that one author has read another" (p. 52). If, then, we can find a common peculiar vocabulary in 2 Peter and Josephus, and especially if we find that these peculiar words occur in groups of narrow compass, we have very strong evidence of literary dependence of one on the other.

Dr. Abbott thinks we can find this very thing, and presents us with two instances of it. We transcribe and condense a statement of the case from his pages (pp. 56, *seq.*):

1. "Assuming that the author of the Epistle had read parts of Josephus, . . . he had probably read the short Introduction which describes the motives and objects of the work. . . . 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 from all unseemly myths and legends, though he might have easily cheated man (Par. 3) with *feigned* stories (πλασμάτων); (*g*) he always assigned fitting actions to God's power (Par. 3); (*h*) nor did he do as other lawgivers (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

¹*Cf.* p. 62, where a word rare or non-existent in N. T. and LXX. is said to be completely out of the author's natural sphere.

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 those marked (*h*) and (*b*). In the former, note: Ἐξακολουθήσαντες though found in the LXX. is not found in the N. T. except here; μύθοις occurs four times in the Pastoral Epistles and nowhere else in the N. T., and not at all in the LXX. (except Sir. xx. 19, in the sense of “*tale*”); while neither LXX. nor N. T. contain the combination. Even the word added by 2 Peter (σεσοφισμένοις) occurs but once in N. T. (2 Tim. iii. 15) and there in an opposite meaning, whereas it is found at least twice in Josephus in 2 Peter’s sense (B. J. iii. 7, 20; iv. 2, 3). With reference to (*b*) note: to apply φύσις to God is not only a *usage* not found in the N. T. or LXX., but a *thought* alien to the Bible. The Greeks and Romans so spoke, but no single N. T. writer. The exact phrase is, however, found in Josephus’ *Cont. Ap.* The other phrases in the passage are also noteworthy: πλαστός is found here only in the N. T. and LXX.; ἀρετή (singular) is applied to God only once in LXX. (Hab. iii. 2, where it means “*glory*”); μεγαλειότης is found only twice each in N. T. and LXX., and only once in application to a divine person (Luke ix. 43). Now combine all these, and note the slighter points also, and note the cumulative character of the argument.¹

2. “If the author was attracted by this comparison between Moses, the truthful lawgiver of the Jews, and the truthful teachers of the Christians, it is natural that in writing the last utterances of St. Peter, he should turn his attention to the last utterances of Moses (Antiq. iv. 8. 2). There, Moses is said to have spoken (*a*) as follows (τοιάδε): ‘Fellow soldiers and (*b*) *sharers* of our long hardship (μακρᾶς κοινῶν ταλαιπωρίας,) (where note the transposition), since I (*c*) am not *destined* (ὄν 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 παροῦτων), (*g*) *despising* (καταφρονήσαντες) the (*h*) *reverence* (εὔσεβείας) which ye now feel for God; (*i*) thus will ye be never *able to be taken*

¹Expositor, as above, pp. 56–59.

(ἐνάλωτοι) 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*) τοιαῦδε (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* (δικαίον ἡγοῦμαι) i. 13 (here only in N. T. and LXX.); (*e*) μνήμην, i. 15 (sense different from that of Josephus, but here only in N. T.); (*f*) καταφρονοῦ τες (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* ἐξοδος (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 ἐξοδος and ἀνάμνησιν, and in 2 Peter ἐξοδος and ἐπομνησεῖ; (*m*) the word ἀμαθία, *folly, inability to learn*, is not in the N. T. or 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 similarity of words rather than thought; yet even in thought there is considerable similarity." To find words like μνήμην, ἐφ' ὅσον, δικαίον ἡγοῦμαι, which are never used in the N. T., and ἐξοδος only once, all in two or three verses, describing the last words of St. Peter, and in a page of Josephus describing the last words of Moses, is striking. Add the other expressions and the cumulative character of the evidence comes out strongly.¹

It appears to be admitted that these are the only passages which "show such striking groups of similarities;"² but it is mentioned that some thirteen or fourteen remarkable words or phrases might be pointed out as common to 2 Peter and Josephus and yet not found elsewhere in the N. T. or LXX. The argument, then,

¹ "Expositor" as above, pp. 59-61.

² Do., p. 61.

beyond doubt depends on the common possession by 2 Peter and Josephus of a small peculiar vocabulary (13 or 14 words), which in two instances tends to arrange itself in groups in Josephus and to a smaller extent in 2 Peter. This, we understand, to be Dr. Abbott's view of the basis of his argument.

II. *Examination of Dr. Abbott's Statement of the Evidence.*

Any extended meditation on the subject will force upon the mind a strong conviction that the method of investigating and determining the relations existing between two writers which Dr. Abbott has adopted, is an exceedingly unsafe one. We are sorry to bring ourselves, by this statement, under the disapproval of both Dr. Abbott and Canon Farrar. The latter¹ "can only suppose that the scholar who" makes this statement is "in reality unable or unwilling to give his full attention to the inquiry." It is, nevertheless, our strong conviction that this method is an eminently unsafe one. We do not, of course, mean to assert by this either that the method is illegitimate or that no secure results can ever be obtained by it. Conceivably, a very strong presumption, passing into moral certainty, might be obtained by it alone, that one writer had borrowed from another. But we are free to confess that we think the instances in which this can be done are very rare, and those in which it has been done are rarer still. When two writers can be shown to possess the same general vocabulary, there is a reason for that fact, and this reason is a legitimate object of search; when two writers can be shown to use in common a very peculiar vocabulary, the cause of this too is a legitimate object of inquiry, and may be demonstrably discoverable; and if this peculiar vocabulary occurs in the two authors grouped in narrow contexts, this also must have a cause, which should be sought, and may be found, and may prove to be direct literary dependence of one on the other. The unsafety of the method does not lie, then, in any necessary unsoundness attaching to it, or any necessary inapplicability of it, but rather in the extreme difficulty of so applying it as to reach secure results. He who launches himself on this method, begins a journey on a very treacherous sea. He who

¹ *Expositor*, etc., as above, p. 404.

attempts to tread this path to truth, starts, indeed, in a road that does lead to the goal, and which may, indeed, be safely trodden, but which can be trodden safely only at the cost of tireless and sleepless watchfulness, in a shifting, moveable road, not like the broad beaten way that invites the even careless step, but rather like a lane of the sea, which a skilful navigator alone can keep. There are so many ways in which two writers may obtain a similar vocabulary, even if a peculiar vocabulary—like training, like associations, like reading, like sources of linguistic knowledge, how many causes may have conspired to the result!—that the case must certainly be an exceptional one which will justify us in saying dogmatically that the real cause of the community is direct literary connexion. And there are so many causes, often subtle in the extreme, and hidden from the coarser sight of man, which may have worked together in crystallising groups of the uncommon words common to two writers around certain centres in their writings, that it is very unsafe to assume that a direct literary connexion can alone be the true account of such phenomena when observed and shown to really exist. And if all this be true in general, how specially true is it of the Greek writers of the time of 2 Peter and Josephus, when the language of literature was in a remarkably unsettled and transitional state; when words and expressions hitherto provincial or popular were suddenly appearing quite independently on the pages of the most widely-separated writers; and when one hardly knows what to assign to the new language common to all, what to the immense mass of underlying popular speech of which we know so little, but of which they knew so much, and which was now striving everywhere to make entrance for itself into literary recognition, what to personal idiosyncrasy or special training or literary borrowing. Our profound ignorance of the spoken Greek of the time—our almost complete unacquaintance with the colloquial vocabulary and usage—alone would bid us beware of too lightly explaining even striking resemblances of vocabulary in two writers by the hypothesis of immediate literary connexion. Nor do there lack special reasons why we should be even peculiarly chary of finding literary connexion at the bottom of resem-

blances existing between 2 Peter and Josephus among the writers of even that transitional age. In any event, the author of the Epistle and Josephus had much in common which bound them closer to one another than either was bound to his age in general, and which might bring to them a common, even peculiar, vocabulary. They were both Jews; both learned Greek doubtlessly in the first instance orally and in a popular form; both learned a peculiar type of Greek current in the same rather peculiar region; both were bred in the same land and under similar teachings and influences; both were accustomed to hear the same speech about them from the same kind of lips; both, so far as they read at all, were readers of largely the same literature. A similarity of vocabulary which might be startling if found in two entirely unconnected writers, might be a mere matter of course between 2 Peter and Josephus. And groups of similar words must be very striking, indeed, as groups, to force the conclusion that there has been immediate literary connexion between those two writers. We do not mean to assert that even in such a case a comparison of the vocabularies of two writers cannot be made profitably, or that evidence could not conceivably be obtained from it which would lead us to suspect that one of them had borrowed from the other. But we do mean to point out that this method of investigating the relations existing between authors, beset with difficulties everywhere, is most peculiarly liable in such a case to be misapplied. We do mean to point out that on launching ourselves upon it, we need a most untiringly careful navigator to our steersman; else, at the end of a voyage, we may fancy ourselves in a port which we are as far as possible away from.

It is worth our notice, next, therefore, that Dr. Abbott does not approve himself to our judgment as an eminently safe sailor on these unsafe waters. On a careful examination of the argument which he has presented, we observe several things which shake our confidence in him as a pilot. Let us enumerate some of them.

1. We observe, then, that Dr. Abbott fails to distinguish sharply, in presenting his argument, between different kinds of evi-

dence. In investigating the relations of two writings to one another, it is conceivable that we might find several kinds of facts, as for example, (1), general resemblance of vocabulary; (2), common possession of a peculiar vocabulary; (3), a number of rare words grouped together in a brief context in one, found also in the other, either (A) scattered through the writing, or (B) similarly grouped; and (4), clauses or sentences occurring in both, either *verbatim* or nearly so, or with strongly-marked similarities. Now the probative force of these several classes of facts is not the same, but increases as we pass down the list, *cæteris paribus*. It is, therefore, essential, in careful investigation, to keep them apart and estimate the bearing of each class separately. This, although he recognises these distinctions theoretically, Dr. Abbott does not succeed in practically doing. For example, if the reader will take his Josephus and mark the words which Dr. Abbott adduces in his groups above, he will not be slow in observing that some items which can justly be classed only under (2) above are included by Dr. Abbott under (3), with the practical effect of unduly raising their probative force as looking towards literary connexion between the two writings.¹

2. We observe, next, that Dr. Abbott does not carefully eliminate irrelevant items from his lists. Lists of expressions meant to prove literary dependence of one writer on another, ought to contain nothing which does not suggest borrowing, and ought, certainly, to contain nothing whose presence in the borrowing writing can be better accounted for by assigning a different origin to it. Dr. Abbott's lists contain words which, whether 2 Peter borrows from Josephus or not, were certainly not taken from Josephus by 2 Peter; and others which are of such character as cannot suggest any closer connexion than that both writings are Greek. Let us instance a few examples. To adduce 2 Peter's mention of the divine *power* (*δυναμις*) as granting unto us all things that pertain to life and godliness, and Josephus' statement that

¹ In the first of Dr. Abbott's examples, only [b, a,] h, c, d, e, and in the second only a, b, c, d, e, have any claim to be grouped in Josephus; while in 2 Peter in the first case only g, c, d, b, stand closely grouped, while in the second only f, d, j, l, e, stand tolerably grouped.

Moses had always assigned fitting deeds to God's *power*, and not attributed to him the indecencies which heathen fables ascribed to the heathen gods,—as an item suggesting literary connexion between the two is but one step removed from the adduction of their common use of the verb *είναι*. The same may be said of the pleading of the common use by the two writers of such words as *καταφρόνησαντες, εἰσέβεια, γιγνώσκοντες ὅτι*, and the more so, as none of them occur in any well-marked group of common words. Once more, it hardly admits of question but that *ἐξοδος* in 2 Peter i. 15, is a reminiscence of our Saviour's words recorded in Luke ix. 31, or a quotation from that passage. The context of 2 Peter leaves no doubt on that point; it occurs just before the Transfiguration is mentioned, and in a context which contains other reminiscences of that scene, and consequently proves that his mind was, at the moment of writing the word *ἐξοδος*, dwelling on the details of that scene. It is no less than certain, therefore, that *ἐξοδος* was suggested here by a reminiscence of Christ's words, and consequently that it was not taken from Josephus. Its presence in Dr. Abbot's list, then, is certainly misleading, and, so far, vitiates the argument he has framed. With it, the attempt to find a parallelism between Josephus' *ἀνάμνησιν* and 2 Peter's *ὑπομνήσει* falls also into hopeless irrelevancy. And, indeed, also the parallel found between 2 Peter's and Josephus' use of *μεγαλειότητος*, which is found in the same context with *ἐξοδος* in Luke (ix. 43), and was perhaps derived from that passage by 2 Peter, but just because found just where it is in Luke and in this special context in 2 Peter, is not and cannot be derived from Josephus. To parallel *θεῖας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως* and *τῆς μακρᾶς κοινωνοὶ ταλαιπωρίας*, on the strength of the arrangement of the words, is, again, simply misleading in such an argument, since the arrangement of the words is determined in each case and explicable in each from the purpose of the writer and needs of the emphasis; the careful exegete will in neither case look beyond the context for the complete account of the matter. To point to the common word *μέλλω* in Josephus, again, as the literary parent of the *μελλήσω* of 2 Peter, is in like manner entirely without significance; and almost as strong language is applicable to the adduction of their common use of

δικαιον ἡγοῦμαι, as an item showing literary connexion between them. Both writers must have been thoroughly familiar with the phrase, independently of each other; and if the exact phrase does not elsewhere occur in LXX. or N. T., this is due to mere accident, as any one may satisfy himself who will compare Acts xxvi. 2; 2 Cor. ix. 5; Phil. ii. 3, 6, 25; iii. 7, 8; 1 Tim. i. 12; Heb. x. 29; xi. 26; 2 Peter ii. 13, etc. It is far from certain, once more—it is not even probable—that 2 Peter i. 3 has anything in common with Josephus' statement that Moses proved that God had his *virtue* unmixed. The paralleling of *ἀρετη* and *δόξα*, in 2 Peter, seems to prove that the writer meant the former word in the sense which it bears in Hab. iii. 3, and therefore in a totally different sense from what Josephus meant. So long as Hab. iii. 3 stands in the Bible, so long is all the probability that the usage represented there, and not the passage in Josephus, is the literary parent of 2 Peter's use of the word.

Now all of these items are out of place in Dr. Abbott's argument. And it is remarkable what a different aspect it presents when purged thus of some of its irrelevancies. The complicated second group is reduced to simply the common use by 2 Peter and Josephus of a half dozen words (*τοιᾶσδε* [τοιᾶδε], *μνήμην*, *παροῖση* [παρόντων], *ἄλωσιν* [εὐάλωται], *ἐφ' ὅσον*, *ἀμαθής* [ἀμαθίαν]), among which there are only two (*ἄλωσιν* and *ἀμαθής*) whose exceeding commonness in all Greek literature does not throw grave doubt on their relevancy; and neither of these really occurs in both writers. All semblance of *grouping* is gone. The first group suffers nearly as severely, but retains as yet the appearance of a group.

3. We observe, next, that Dr. Abbott, in presenting his argument, does not carefully distinguish between what is sound and what is merely plausible. The mixture of different kinds of evidence and the failure to sift out irrelevant items are themselves examples of this, as both increase the appearance but not the reality of strength in the argument. The same vice runs, however, through the whole treatment of the evidence, and it may be, perhaps, not without its value to illustrate this fact with reference specially to the strongest portion of the pleading. After having stated the parallelisms of the first of his groups, Dr. Abbott re-

marks, as we have seen, that the two most important items in it are those marked *h* and *b*, and then proceeds to develop the first of these as follows :

“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 N. T. 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,’ it is found at least thrice in Josephus (B. J. iii. 7, 20, and iv. 2, 3).”

We presume that it will not be denied that this is the most striking piece of evidence that Dr. Abbott has adduced. But how much of it is plausible rather than sound! 1 Corinthians is one of the generally acknowledged Epistles of Paul; we imagine that Dr. Abbott feels no doubt of its genuineness. We open it at random and light upon 1 Cor. ix. 13, and ask, Is there evidence of the dependence of this, too, on Josephus? Let the reader compare the argument which might be framed in support of that proposition with Dr. Abbott’s pleading, as given above:

“We note that Josephus, in a striking passage (B. J. v. 13, 6) represents the zealots as saying: *δει . . . τοις τῷ ναῷ στρατευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τρέφεσθαι*. Now, the parallelism of thought between this and 1 Cor. ix. 13, as well as the similarity of wording, is very marked. It becomes immediately evident that the author of 1 Cor. betrays his consciousness of being a borrower here by introducing his statement by the words ‘know ye not’—a mode of expression which not only implies that he is appealing to a well-known phrase not his own, but which is found in Josephus, and so suggests his manner. It is further worthy of remark, that the word *στρατεύεται* makes its appearance in this context (verse 7)

in a rather peculiar manner. And to make the case still more secure, we read in this same verse (13) the very rare word *παρεδρέβοντες*, which occurs here only in the N. T., and only once in all the LXX., and which yet is found in a cognate form in another book of Josephus (*Contra Apion*, I. 7) in a like context: *τῇ θεραπείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ παρεδρέβοντες*. Now, it is the manner of borrowers thus to combine passages; and this gathering together of phrases from different portions of a writer's works, and combining them into one context, only proves to us the more clearly that we have discovered the original source of the composite passage."

Now, how does the one argument differ from the other? Certainly not in *kind*. And yet the latter confessedly proves nothing. There may be, and there is, a kernel of evidential fact beneath Dr. Abbott's argument, but its outward form is—plausible pleading. Let us observe, now, (1) that Josephus' context and mode of introducing the phrase is totally different from those of 2 Peter. Just compare, "for other law-givers [than Moses], indeed, following after the fables [τοις μ. ἐξ.], transferred in their discourse the shame of human sins to the gods, and gave much pretext to the wicked," with 2 Peter i. 16. (2) That all the words employed are common words, and are used in current senses; the later Greek, such as that of Polybius, is full of *ἐξακολούω*, *σοφίζω*, and *μῦθος*, in just these senses. And (3) that no one of the words is absent from the narrow literature which alone Dr. Abbott is inclined to allow to be familiar to the writer of the Epistle (viz., N. T. and LXX). (4) Actually, therefore, the one only point of resemblance between 2 Peter and Josephus is the very natural collocation in two absolutely different contexts of *two very common words*. *Valeat tantum*.

The second of Dr. Abbott's "important" items is also more plausibly than soundly put. It is true that 2 Peter's statement with reference to our becoming "partakers of the divine nature," is very striking, and in phraseology unparalleled in the N. T. It is, however, often paralleled there in thought. But neither in thought nor phraseology is it paralleled in Josephus. He speaks nowhere of men partaking of the divine nature, but only of their obtaining a share of God's *virtue*, and that in the use of phraseology about as unlike 2 Peter's as it could be. He does

speak also of the "nature of God" and of the "divine nature," but so do nearly all writers of Greek. Peter would in any case be very familiar with the phrase; and the thing needing explanation is *not* where he could have gotten it, *but* how he came to use it. To point to its presence in Josephus, no more explains this, nor as much, as to point to its presence as a current phrase in the common Greek of the age.

4. We observe, once more, that Dr. Abbott does not inquire with sufficient anxiety after the exact account which the resemblances between the two writings, when once drawn out and clearly exhibited, demand for themselves. He seems, indeed, scarcely to recognise this duty, and declines almost contemptuously to investigate the subject.¹ The critical weapon he is wielding, however, is one exceedingly difficult to handle, and almost always cuts both ways. The only possibly sound method of procedure in such cases is clearly some such as the following: (1) The careful collection and classification of the points of resemblance between the two writings; (2) the most anxious investigation of what accounts could be given of them; and (3) the most thorough-going investigation as to which one of these accounts ought to be given. There is no trace in Dr. Abbott's papers that he has proceeded after such a fashion; to all appearance, he has assumed from the outset that, if resemblances exist, they must be explained by the assumption that 2 Peter borrowed from Josephus. On the contrary, however, it is obvious that we have in this case many ways of accounting for phenomena of resemblance. (1) There is the common inheritance by the two writers of a peculiar form of Greek belonging to a peculiar province. We must sharply investigate how much this will account for. (2) Reared thus in the same age, in the same land, under largely the same influences, there is probability of the common knowledge by the two writers of the same or a similar literature. We must determine very closely how much resemblance this will account for. (3) It is only after these methods of accounting for the phenomena have been exhausted, that we are justified in suspecting real literary dependence of one on the other, and not till

¹ P. 51.

that is rendered probable, that we can begin inquiry as to who is the borrower. This last question, again, is not to be settled by either assumption or guessing. Many items combine to its determination, and each must be investigated. We must ask: (A) Which writing, on other evidence, seems to be the older? No force of internal evidence can make us believe that Shakespeare quotes Tennyson. (B) Which writer, on *a priori* grounds, is more likely to have known the other? (C) Are there any other phenomena of the two writings, besides their resemblances, which may help us to a decision? And (D) what solution of the question do the special phenomena of resemblance themselves suggest? It needs to be kept in mind, moreover, that a borrowing which may seem *a priori* impossible, if conceived of as having taken place directly, may yet be *a priori* quite likely, if conceived of as having taken place through an intermediate link.

The need of such a detailed and careful study of the meaning of phenomena of resemblance, in a case like the present, may be illustrated from the undoubted resemblances existing between Seneca and the Sermon on the Mount, or Paul's speech at Athens, or the Epistle to the Romans. It cannot be pretended that the items of resemblance between 2 Peter and Josephus are anything like so striking as those in any one of these cases. But who will believe that either Paul or Christ borrowed from Seneca, or Seneca directly from them? The more carefully the phenomena are investigated, the more clearly the true solution emerges. Is it impossible that an explanation found adequate to explain those closer resemblances should be inadequate to explain these? Meanwhile, when our author acts as if it were impossible, it is plain that under his leading we are in the hands of an unsafe guide.

III. *Sifting of the Evidence.* But if we cannot yield ourselves to Dr. Abbott's leading, nothing is left us but to seek to work our own way through the problem. And in order to this we must first of all attempt to classify strictly the actual phenomena of resemblance between 2 Peter and Josephus. We do not pretend to have made an independent thorough-going examination of the two authors with a view to discover their relation to one another. But we have carefully examined every statement of Dr. Abbott's

with the original texts before us, and gone over the whole ground independently in a cursory way. The result of our examination is as follows :

1. The general vocabularies of the two writings are in some degree alike.

2. The two writers have in common possession a number of words which are rare in the Biblical books. Dr. Abbott speaks of thirteen or fourteen of these (p. 61); we have counted some seventeen. At least fourteen of these are, however, too common in profane Greek to serve as marks of connexion between any two Greek writers. There remain the collocation *μυθοῖς ἐξακολουθήσαντες*, the phrase *ἐφ' ὁδον* perhaps, and the phrase *καταστροφή κατέκρινεν*, which, if it needed accounting for, would be sufficiently accounted for by Gen. xix. 29, but which is probably not genuine in 2 Peter (*καταστροφή* being omitted in B. C.¹ Copt.).

3. Of these words rare in Biblical Greek, *πλάσμα*, *θεοῦ φύσις*, *μυθοῖς ἐξακολουθήσαντες*, occur in §§ 3 and 4 of the Preface to the Antiquities; and *τοιάδε*, *μνημῆν*, *παρόντων*, *ἐνάλωται*, *ἐφ' ὁδον*, *ἀμαθίαν*, in Ant. iv. 8, 1 and 2—in both cases in connexion with other phrases bearing some resemblance to phrases in 2 Peter, which were either certainly or probably obtained elsewhere. Here is an appearance of grouping.

4. No silent quotation of clauses or collocations of words seems capable of being adduced.

5. There are of course no direct citations, and no such community in matter as to suggest connexion.

This sifted statement of the evidence will hardly need further justification than has been incidentally furnished in the preceding pages. On an examination of its contents it will be seen that what we have to account for is the common possession by the two writers of a number of words rare in Biblical Greek—but not peculiar out of it—some of which have a mild tendency to group themselves in the Preface §§ 3–4 and iv. 8, 1 and 2 of the Antiquities of Josephus. The real question before us in testing Dr. Abbott's conclusion is consequently something like this: Does this tendency to grouping, such as it is, raise a stronger presumption that 2 Peter knew Josephus, than all the evidence for the canon-

icity, genuineness, and early date of that letter raises for an earlier date for it than A. D. 90?

IV. *What Account should be Rendered of the Matter?* It will be the part of wisdom, however, to proceed by slower and surer steps to our goal. We note then, on a close view of the items of resemblance, that there are a variety of suppositions which, being assumed, would render an adequate account of them. Some of these are excluded, however, by evidence at once so patent and cogent that we need not occupy our narrow space in stating it. Such are, for example, that 2 Peter was originally written in Aramaic and that the resemblances to Josephus were introduced by a later translator, or that the Epistle, although originally Peter's, was subsequently reworked by a hand that knew Josephus, or that the resemblances are due to pure interpolations of the original letter of 2 Peter's. There are, however, at least four hypotheses which have nothing extravagant about them, and which will therefore require less summary treatment at our hands. We might account for the resemblances by assuming either, (1) that 2 Peter borrowed from Josephus, or (2) that Josephus borrowed directly or indirectly from 2 Peter, or (3) that they are due to the influence of a writing known to and affecting the language of both, or (4) that they are due to the common circumstances, surroundings, training, and inheritances of the writers. Our real task is to determine which one of these is the true account of the matter. In order to this we need to observe that:

1. Any one of them, if assumed, will account for the facts of resemblance. This is immediately apparent of the first three, but can be made apparent of the fourth also. Canon Farrar, indeed, cannot "feel respect for the judgment of any critic who asserted that the resemblances were purely fortuitous;" we do not desire to fail of his respect, and perhaps "purely fortuitous" is too strong a phrase. But if we have proceeded at all soundly in sifting the evidence and its significant elements are all contained in our re-statement of it, it can hardly be denied that it may be accounted for apart from literary as distinguished from what may be called educational connexion. On any careful consideration of the naturally mediated connexion between the two writers (as distin-

guished from the writings), it will be impossible to deny that very close resemblances in style, phraseology, manner, and wording, may be fully accounted for by it. When we remember that both writers belong to the same age and so might be expected to independently fall upon the words and phrases current in the Greek of the time, that both were Jews and wrote the same Hebraistically tinged Greek (though tinged in different degrees), that both were familiar with the LXX., and perhaps Philo and other Jewish-Greek literature, that both were brought up under the same social fabric, in the same narrow land, under the same manner of training, and were necessarily familiar with the same modes of speech and style of language, we cannot feel that it is mere prejudice which makes us doubt whether any further facts than these are needed to account for the resemblances noted. The semblance of grouping which remains after sifting the evidence is certainly not such as *may* not be accounted for in so closely related writers, as a mere "fortuitous" collocation of words common to both.

2. Each of these methods of accounting for the resemblances has its own advantages. The first has the great advantage of absolute simplicity; the second of combining with almost equal simplicity, freedom from the historical and chronological difficulties which lie against the first; the third of escaping the difficulties lying against both the first and second while supplying an exact account of all the facts, such as the curious coexistence of remarkable divergencies in sense and even phraseology, with close resemblance in the very same phrases, the appearance of grouping while yet the words grouped are excessively common, etc; and the fourth of making no assumptions and proceeding only on solid and well grounded fact.

3. Each of the methods is beset with its own difficulties. In the way of assuming that 2 Peter quotes Josephus there stands the immense presumption arising from the focussing of many separate lines of investigation, that the Epistle comes from a time earlier than A. D. 90. The mere fact that the Epistle was a part of the Church Canon of the time of Origen raises a presumption in this direction; the fact that it is quoted as an authoritative book by Justin Martyr increases it; the fact that it was used by

a series of earlier writers, including even Barnabas and Clement of Rome, clinches it. Its internal phenomena raise a presumption in the same direction: its undisproved assertion that it is by Peter; its phenomena of apostolical reminiscence; its resemblance in thought and wording to what we have elsewhere of Peter's; its fitness in manner and style to what we know of the character of the Peter of the Gospels; and perhaps more cogent than any of these, its total silence in the midst of an elaborate and plainly an interested polemic against the heresies that are opposed by it as well as by Jude and the Pastoral Epistles, of any hint of the forms of error prevalent according not only to John but also to Irenaeus towards the close of the century; its total lack of any trace of the state of mind that we know was induced among Christians of Jewish birth by the destruction of Jerusalem; its absolute unlikeness to any of the known literature of the Second Century; its immeasurable superiority in thought, style, and phraseology to any Christian writing of that period, and its likeness, on the other hand, to the writings of the apostolical age.¹

The assumption that Josephus has copied 2 Peter has to labor under the difficulty of supposing that such a man as Josephus had met with and read so unimportant a Christian Scripture as 2 Peter, and had been so sharply affected by its language as to unconsciously repeat it. We say "unconsciously" advisedly, for Josephus certainly introduces the common phrases most naturally and seemingly unconsciously. We are unable to find, indeed, that they are any less naturally and unconsciously used by 2 Peter, and especially dissent from Canon Farrar's making a stumbling-block of its use of *ἀρετή*, wholly, as it seems to us, from failing to take it in the sense which the author of the Epistle defines for us by parallelising it with *δόξα*. But, then, after all, would it be so very strange for Josephus to have known 2 Peter? He knew of Christianity; he could not have avoided knowing of it, and has betrayed knowledge of it. He studiously makes little of it and avoids telling us how much he knew, but he knew something of it. Nothing prevented his having met with the Chris-

¹Compare Canon Farrar's strong but not too strong remarks on this point: "*Early Days of Christianity*," Vol. i., p. 206.

tian Scriptures. Jews of his age, we know from chance hints in the Talmud and elsewhere, found no difficulty in becoming acquainted with their contents, found difficulty, perchance, at times in not becoming acquainted with them. And if he knew any of the Christian writings, would he not be most likely to know those current in such names as Peter's and James'? If, further, we conceive of his acquaintance with 2 Peter as not immediate, but through a mediating oral or written source, all difficulty seems to be on the verge of removing itself.

The third hypothesis, assuming a common literary source for the phraseology of the two writings, rests under the difficulty which always attaches to the assumption of an hypothetical book or literature, of which we know nothing historically, an assumption which is always dangerous and generally indefensible. We must not minimise this difficulty, but it is somewhat lessened by the facts: (1.) That both Josephus and 2 Peter are confirmed borrowers; (2.) That a large part of the sources of Josephus are known to be lost; and (3.) That a large and much-read popular Jewish literature certainly existed in this age, of which we have but few traces now left.

The chief difficulties lying in the way of accounting for the resemblances apart from all literary connexion, in accordance with the fourth hypothesis, arise from the semblance of grouping of the common words, and such collocations of a couple of words as "daring and despisers," "to do well to take heed," "following after myths," "bringing in all diligence." If the discussion of these collocations above be deemed sound, they will not stand much in the way of this explanation, and if the groups be no more strongly marked than appears from our restatement of the evidence, they cannot raise a presumption of more than slight force against it.

4. The phenomena of the resemblances themselves do not suggest with any strength of presumption any one of these explanations as distinguished from the others. They do suggest with some force some connexion between the two writings; and a calm and unbiassed consideration of them leads to the recognition of a mild suggestion in them of some form, but not of what form of

literary connexion. The strength of this presumption depends, of course, on the difficulty of explaining the phenomena in any other way. It amounts to only an original suspicion tending towards a probability, which may be readily overturned by the exhibition of any considerable difficulty in assuming literary connexion. The real problem before us, then, is: Is it more difficult to explain the semblance of grouping without literary connexion between the writings, or to assume literary connexion?

V. *The Conclusion.* The state of the case is simply this. The resemblances between the two writings are capable of being accounted for in at least four ways. There is an *a priori* probability in favor of each of the four in the reverse order of their statement above.¹ The resemblances themselves suggest that the account rendered should turn on literary connexion in some form, but do not distinguish between the forms. We must conclude:

1. That the assumption that 2 Peter borrowed from Josephus is out of the question. Nothing in the phenomena suggests this rather than at least two other accounts of the matter, and there is no reason for assuming it rather than the other accounts. On the other hand, it is burdened down with literary and historical difficulties quite peculiar to itself and such as would forbid its assumption unless the resemblances between the writings were certainly and utterly inexplicable in any other way.

2. Whether we assume one of the other forms of literary connexion or not, depends on our judgment as to the relative strength of the two presumptions; that raised for literary connexion by the phenomena of grouping, on the one hand, and that raised against it by the difficulties in the way of assuming it, on the other.

3. Perhaps the true explanation is to be found in a combination of two of the methods of explanation given above, namely in the natural connexion existing between the two authors combined with an *indirect* knowledge of 2 Peter by Josephus, derived through acquaintance with Jewish-Christian leaders.

4. While the present writer inclines to this explanation, in his judgment the evidence before us is not decisive between the last three of the explanations discussed above, and the true critical atti-

¹ See above, page 436.

tude is to esteem the question to this extent unsettled. Any one of the three, separate or in combination with the others, will explain the facts, and no one of them is burdened with overmastering difficulties. However trying it may be to find it so, it is true that history does not preserve to us, nor chance hide in the records themselves, the decisive considerations which will solve for us every problem of ancient literatures. It is enough to be able to point out, in a case like the present, somewhat narrow lines within which the explanation must be finally found; and enough for the defence of the genuineness of 2 Peter to be able to show that the assumption that it borrowed from Josephus does not lie within these lines. It is, of course, easy to say that that explanation has been excluded only on considerations which are "*rein apologetisch*." To all whose devotion is given to simple truth, however, apart from either apologetic or destructive bias, we can confidently look for a hearty recognition of the fact that it has been excluded (and must therefore be kept excluded) not on grounds of dogmatic or apologetical prejudice, but on purely historical and literary grounds, such as not only can be pleaded as raising a strong valid historical presumption for the early date of 2 Peter, but also apart from noting and yielding to which no valid historical results as to the date or literary relations of 2 Peter can be obtained at all. This is, in fact, one of the not rare cases in which Truth herself is an "Apologist."

And now, that our task is accomplished, we must take summary leave of our subject. Another attempt to find evidence of the spuriousness of 2 Peter has failed, and it begins to look as if that Epistle has too good a claim to a position in the Canon to be ousted by any legal process—as if violence alone could hope to tear it from its place. Certainly if the sharp attack that Dr. Abbott has led and so ably generalised has failed, we may expect others to fail. We confess to a high admiration for the acumen and force of his argumentation; the lever he uses to pry 2 Peter out of its firm bedding in the solid rock of God's word is certainly a most uncommonly admirable instrument. All that is lacking is a firm and solid fulcrum of facts which can stand the pressure

of the immense heaving. Dr. Abbott has brought forward one with a strong external appearance of solidity. But with the very beginning of the prying, it too, like all its predecessors, crumbles into dust, or ever the Epistle moves a jot from its bed. The moral is that 2 Peter must be most stedfastly fixed on its base—perhaps is an undivided portion of the bed-rock itself. So we believe it to be; and certainly, thus far, all the appearances are in that direction.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

That eminent Biblical scholar, Dr. Green of Princeton, has done signal service to the cause of truth by the massive argument he has constructed in defence of the Pentateuch against the attacks of Welhausen, Kuenen, Robertson Smith, and other rationalists.¹ It would have been better, in our judgment, had Professor Green rewritten the separate essays making up this volume in such a manner as to have considered the subject more broadly in its general as well as particular aspects, and to have given more of individual and organic unity to the entire treatise. As it stands the book is nevertheless conceded in Scotland to be the ablest reply that Dr. Smith's alluring presentation of the advanced views on the Continent of Europe has yet received. Dr. Green's remarkable familiarity with the original Hebrew as well as with Oriental and German literature, and his complete mastery of the weapons of the practical logician, unite to render him a singularly formidable antagonist on the field of Old Testament criticism. Lünemann's "Hebrews" probably completes the so-called "Meyer series."² The Pauline authorship is not fully admitted. The

¹ *Moses and the Prophets.* By Professor W. Henry Green, D. D., LL.D. New York: Carters, 1882.

² *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament.* By