

The background of the word ἀποστασία is the falling away of Jews from their religion, which culminated in the attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to make the nation apostatize. But St Paul does not mean a falling away from Judaism, nor from Christianity, nor a revolution against Rome, nor any combination of these; but a general falling away of the heathen world from all morality and religion, such as had been expected before the End. Τὸ κατέχον and ὁ κατέχων alike refer to the civil power of Rome. The difficult ellipse in verse 7 is explained: 'It only [works] until ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι is removed.' But the transposition of ὡς is very awkward. The ellipse in Gal. ii 10 is not quite parallel.

The commentary is printed in the Offenbacher-Schwabacher type, which is much easier and pleasanter to read than the ordinary German type, and much more suited to the language than our Roman letters. The Hebrew type is very poor, and there are several misprints. The worst is אמה for אמה (p. 128 n. 1).

A. H. McNEILE.

*The Epistle of St Jude and the Second Epistle of St Peter.* By Joseph B. MAYOR, M.A., Litt.D. (London, 1907.)

WE owe a debt of gratitude to Dr Mayor for the patient work embodied in this sequel to his edition of St James. In spite of his belief in the genuineness of the Epistle of St Jude, and the statement of opinion in his preface as to the intrinsic value of 2 Peter, that 'there are few who would not feel that the exclusion of [it] from our New Testament would be a far more serious loss than the exclusion of' St Jude—yet the labour in this case cannot in the nature of things have been lightened by the enthusiasm that made his study of St James such a revelation of new fields. For this generation (to say the least of it) it is a descent to lower levels to exchange the rugged ethical preaching of St James and the truly catholic optimism of 1 Peter for the rhetorical denunciations of false teaching which fill the two later Epistles. On the question of date, Dr Mayor ranges himself definitely against the possibility of 2 Peter being a first-century document. It is, in his opinion, 2 Peter that has incorporated Jude, not Jude that has abbreviated 2 Peter. This judgement is based on a minute study of the structure and phraseology of the two documents, and is confirmed by a similar examination of the language of 1 Peter and 2 Peter respectively, which leads Dr Mayor to the conclusion that 'the difference in grammar and style is much less than that in vocabulary, and this again is less than that in matter, feeling and personality'; but this is sufficient to make him certain that St Peter cannot be the author of the so-called second Epistle. It is interesting to find what is perhaps no accidental indication of the change from apostolic to sub-apostolic hopes in the absence from

2 Peter of the series of words connected with *ἀγαθός* and *κακός*, which in the first Epistle reveal the writer's confidence in the ethical appeal of Christianity to the world; even the superficial examination of language quickly betrays the difference between the first-hand fervour of 'a witness of the sufferings of Christ' who has learned by that spectacle the infinite possibilities of spiritual triumph, and the thin rhetorical atmosphere in which the probability of a fiery end of the world can be vouched for by the citation of an equally unexpected event—the Deluge.

Dr Mayor seems relieved when his argument allows him to turn aside for a while to the undoubtedly genuine work of St Peter; he gives an admirable page or two of parallels between 1 Peter and the gospel tradition; and the most interesting chapter in the whole introduction is the 'Comparison between the Peter of the Gospels and Acts and the Peter of the two Epistles', which begins by refuting the curious paradox of the late Dr Bigg that the leader of the apostles being an 'uneducated labourer' was 'apt on a sudden emergency to say and do the wrong thing, not because he was hasty, but because he was not quick'.

It is not difficult to shew that 'uneducated labourer' ill describes a Galilean fisherman of Jewish education, who 'had the further advantage of knowing two languages'; but in any case such evidence as we have emphatically forbids us to put down St Peter as 'shy, timid, and embarrassed'. Even the great denial seems to be well explained, without the imputation of any abnormal cowardice, by Christ's own apparent command to surrender. It was 'as if soldiers whose courage had been strained to the highest pitch at the prospect of leading a forlorn hope were suddenly told that their captain had changed his mind, and that they were now to surrender to the enemy. Despair and bewilderment would succeed to high-wrought courage, and so it was with St Peter'. In further tracing the Apostle's history and character through the narrative of 'Acts', Dr Mayor adduces parallels even in phrase between the speeches and the first Epistle; and, on the other hand, points out how little in common the artificiality, subtlety, and general outlook of the second Epistle has with the Peter of the Gospels and Acts.

It will be gathered from what has already been said that Dr Mayor inclines to let the ultimate decision as to authenticity rest with internal evidence rather than external. When all is said that can be said about the dangers of subjective criticism by latter-day readers, the consideration of the external evidence in a case like this leaves behind the impression that the same desire for edifying matter which led to the production of pseudonymous writings led also to their uncritical acceptance. From Dr Mayor's introduction we cull the following significant facts—that Eusebius quotes as genuine the letter of Christ to Abgar;

that the Apocalypse of Peter is, as regards early recognition in the Church, 'in a stronger position' than 2 Peter; that Tertullian holds that the book of Enoch should be received as scripture, because of its witness to Christ, and because it has the testimony of the apostle Jude.

It is on internal evidence, mainly, that Dr Mayor bases his acceptance of the Epistle of St Jude as being from the pen of Judas the brother of the Lord. It offers similarities of style and temper with the Epistle of the elder brother James, obvious differences being sufficiently accounted for by the later period of writing. The denunciatory and less practical tone of the later Epistle Dr Mayor explains by the fact that 'it was called out by a sudden emergency, to guard against an immediate pressing danger, and was substituted for a treatise *περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας*, which Jude had hoped to send (v. 3), and which would probably have been more in the tone and spirit of vv. 20 f'.

In criticism of this learned volume it may be said that the arrangement of the Introduction leaves something to be desired. The treatment of the two Epistles is so blended, that it is not easy to disentangle the arguments for and against the authenticity and suggested dates of each. I have detected one misprint not noticed in the 'corrigenda', viz. on p. cv a reference to 1 Pet. ii 7, which should be ii 17.

The 'notes' and 'comments' are full of learning and illustrative matter, as was to be expected. Changes from the usual texts are sometimes admitted, e.g. in Jude 5 *ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι εἰδότες ἀπαξ πάντα, ὅτι Κύριος λαὸν ἐκ γ. 'Α. σώσας κτλ.* Dr Mayor would follow N, and several of the versions in placing *ἀπαξ* in the second clause, greatly improving the sense. In the difficult passage, 2 Pet. iii 6, he would read (supported by one minuscule and, apparently, Schmiedel) *δὲ ὃν* instead of *δὲ ὃν*, the relative being made to refer to the 'word of God' previously mentioned. His objection to *δὲ ὃν* is based on the supposed necessity of referring it to the two uses of water expressed in *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δὲ ὕδατος*. I should like to suggest the following translation of the whole passage; as giving passable sense, without alteration of the text:—

'For when [the sceptics] would have it thus, they leave out of account the fact that there had been heavens from of old and an earth that out of water and in the midst of water stood solid by the word of God, in the midst of which, nevertheless, [i.e. in the apparently secure surroundings of a familiar heaven and earth], the then order was overflowed by *water* and destroyed: and it is only by the same word that the present heavens and earth [which they think so permanent] have been laid up as in a safe treasure-house, being really reserved for *fiery* destruction when the day comes for judgement and the perdition of the impious.'

STEPHEN LIBERTY.