

CHAPTER VI

I AND II TIMOTHY AND TITUS; HEBBREWS;
JAMES; I AND II PETER AND JUDE

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO
TIMOTHY

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE
TO TIMOTHY

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO TITUS

IT is generally agreed that the Pastoral Epistles (I and II Timothy, and Titus) cannot be assigned to any period in the life of Paul as recorded in the Book of Acts. The attempts, recently made by J. V. Bartlet, W. E. Bowen and others, to harmonize the statements and allusions in them with the course of events narrated by Luke are not regarded as satisfactory,¹ and if we were shut up to the

¹ The latest statement of this position will be found in an able and ingenious article by Prof. Bartlet in the "Expositor" for April, 1913, in which he seeks to prove that I Timothy and Titus were written soon after Paul's arrival

belief that Paul was never set free from the imprisonment in which the Book of Acts leaves him, we should be constrained to abandon the idea that he ever wrote these Epistles.

But in point of fact there is much to be said in favour of the supposition that Paul's appeal to Cæsar resulted in his acquittal, and that he was thus enabled to resume his missionary labours. Sir William Ramsay holds that such a result was to be expected, having regard to the Roman law and policy of the time; and of this we have some confirmation in the favourable opinion of the Apostle's case which was expressed by Festus and Agrippa, when he was brought up for trial at Cæsarea (Acts 25^{18, 26}; 26^{31 f.}; 28¹⁷⁻¹⁹). Paul himself seems to have expected to be set free, if we may judge from the hopeful way in which he expresses himself in Philemon v. 22 and Phil. 2^{23 f.}, as compared with II Timothy 4⁶⁻⁸, where he speaks as if his career were practically over. There is another passage in II Timothy, namely 4¹⁰⁻¹³, which seems to contain a reference

in Rome, say in the early summer of 60, and II Timothy two years later, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians, and Philippians having been composed in the interval.

to his acquittal and to the opportunity which had thus been afforded him for an extension of his apostolic work.

Tradition bears testimony to the same effect. The First Epistle of Clement (*c.* A.D. 95) speaks of Paul having gone to "the bound of the West,"² and the Muratorian Fragment mentions that he went to Spain, while Eusebius and Jerome seem to have no doubt that he was set at liberty.³ On all these grounds a considerable number of eminent

¹ Against these statements no weight can be attached to the presentiment expressed by Paul, some years before, to the Ephesian elders at Miletus: "And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I went about preaching the kingdom, shall see my face no more" (Acts 20²⁵).

² The words that follow: "And having borne witness before the rulers he was thus released from the world and went to the holy place"—might suggest Rome as the Western limit referred to, if Clement had not been writing from that city, where the expression would naturally refer to Spain, especially as the Apostle had declared it to be his intention to pay a visit to that country.

³ Several apocryphal works of the second century, viz., "Acts of Peter and John," "Acts of Peter," and "Acts of Paul," imply that the Apostle was liberated and afterwards suffered martyrdom in the Neronian persecution. But the "Acts of Paul and Peter" assumes that his first trial at Rome had a fatal termination.

critics, including Harnack, Jacquier, Lightfoot, Salmon, Hort, Zahn, Spitta, Findlay, and Bernard, regard the Apostle's liberation, if not as an assured fact (Harnack), as highly probable. On this hypothesis there is no difficulty in finding room in the Apostle's subsequent life (59-64) for the composition of these Epistles and for the events which they imply—I Timothy and Titus being assigned to the period of his renewed activity, and II Timothy to the later imprisonment at Rome, before his martyrdom under Nero (64 A.D.).

As regards the external evidence for the genuineness of the Epistles, it is generally admitted that expressions derived from I and II Timothy are to be found in the writings of Polycarp, and, from all the three Epistles, in the letters of Ignatius. Clement of Rome also uses language apparently borrowed from the Epistles, but in order to escape the force of his testimony it has been suggested that the writer of the Epistles may have been the borrower, though he must have known that, in putting into the mouth of the Apostle language derived from so well known a writer as Clement, he was running a great risk, of

having his pseudonymity detected and his letters condemned. The most serious defect in the external evidence is that the Epistles are not included in the Canon of Marcion, but this is sufficiently accounted for by their insistence on sound doctrine, which Marcion, with his heretical views, could not be expected to appreciate.¹

As regards internal evidence, there are several things which have excited the grave suspicion of a great many critics. Origen tells us of some people in his day who dared to reject II Timothy on account of its quoting from an apocryphal book about Jannes and Jambres (II Tim. 3⁸). But this objection does not seem to have been widely felt, and the only serious opposition to the Epistles which we hear of in the early Church, was among a few heretical teachers, such as Marcion, Basilides, and Tatian (the last of whom accepted Titus only); and the three Epistles are

¹ The fact of the Epistles being addressed not to Churches but to individuals may have furnished Marcion with an excuse for their omission. It is true that he included Philemon in his Canon, but it is almost inseparable from Colossians (which he admitted), and it comes last of all in his list.

included by Eusebius in his list of books universally received.

It was not till the beginning of the nineteenth century that an attack was made upon them by the Higher Criticism. In 1804 I Timothy was called in question by J. E. C. Schmidt, and in 1807 Schleiermacher suggested that it was based on II Timothy and Titus. Suspicion gradually extended to the two latter also, and in 1812 all three were declared spurious by Eichhorn, followed by de Wette and Schrader. In 1835 Baur pronounced them to be productions of the second century (c. 150), designed to counteract the Gnostic teaching of Marcion and others, to which he found allusions in such passages as I Timothy 1⁴; 4^{3, 8}; 6²⁰; Titus 1^{14 f.}; 3⁹. A similar date was adopted by Schwegler and Hilgenfeld; but recently the adherents of the anti-traditional school have taken a different line, in view of the Jewish character of the errors referred to in I Timothy 1⁴ and Titus 1^{10, 14}, and on account of the light thrown upon the "fables and endless genealogies" by Philo's work on the subject of Biblical Antiquities, and the Book of Jubilees, which show that it is not emanations

of æons and angels that are referred to (as Baur imagined), but allegorical interpretations of Old Testament pedigrees. As for the "oppositions of science falsely so called" (I Tim. 6²⁰), which Baur supposed to refer to the *antitheses* (or contrasts) that Marcion had made out between the Old and the New Testament and had taken as a name for one of his books, it is now generally agreed that this view is untenable, the most probable explanation being that the oppositions referred to were the rival decisions of Jewish Rabbis on minute points of law, which gave rise to endless controversy.

In these circumstances most of the critics referred to find the *milieu* of the Epistles in the end of the first, or the first quarter of the second, century (Holtzmann, Jülicher, Pfeiderer, Beyschlag, Weizsäcker, von Soden). Among English scholars opinion is divided, the genuineness of the Epistles being maintained by Hort, Lightfoot, Salmon, Sanday, Findlay, Bernard, Lock, Ramsay, Knowling, Newport White, Shaw, Grierson (in common with such continental critics as Zahn, B. Weiss, Belser, Blass, and Riegenbach),

but denied, in a general sense, by S. Davidson, McGiffert, Moffatt,¹ Peake, Strachan, R. Scott, and others, who (with the majority of foreign critics) admit the genuineness of a few fragments only, which are to be found in II Timothy, especially 1^{1 f., 15-18}, 4⁹⁻²¹, and in Titus.²

A great amount of industry and ingenuity has been expended³ in the attempt to determine precisely the original documents, and

¹ In the E.Bi. Dr. Moffatt declares this view to be "one of the best established in New Testament research." On the other hand, Canon Grierson in Hastings' most recent D.B. says: "The general tendency of criticism may be said to be towards establishing their genuineness." In his recent volume in the I.T.L., Moffatt describes the three Epistles as "psendonymous compositions of a Paulinist who wrote during the period of transition into the neo-Catholic church of the second century, with the aim of safeguarding the common Christianity of the age in terms of the great Pauline tradition."

² II Timothy is accepted in its entirety (without the two others) by Neander, Bleek, Reuss, and Heinrici. Almost every reader is struck with its earnestness and sincerity, and the verisimilitude of many of its personal allusions, especially in the last chapter, where many proper names are introduced, both new and old.

³ By Holtzmann, Hitzig, Hausrath, Hilgenfeld, Lemme, Harnack, Hesse, von Soden, Clemen, Krenkel, McGiffert, Moffatt, Bacon, and others,—led by Credner (1836).

trace the process of expansion and adaptation by which the Epistles reached their present form¹—but without much success, if we may judge from the conflicting nature of the results. The critics have taken great liberties with the text, even II Timothy 4⁹⁻²¹, which bears unmistakable tokens of genuineness, being cut up into an earlier and a later fragment, in order to get rid of its testimony to a second imprisonment at Rome. The use of the knife has become almost as fashionable in Biblical Criticism as in medical surgery. But whereas in surgery operations are not resorted to till the presence of disease has been ascertained and located on indubitable evidence, our Biblical pathologists have often no evidence to offer but their own impressions of what the writer could, would, or should have written, and they hardly ever agree as to the specific operations that are needed for the removal of extraneous matter and the restoration of a sound text.

At the same time, it cannot be denied that the marked difference in the diction, style, reasoning, and subject-matter of these Epistles,

¹ According to Harnack, the process went on till 150 A. D., chiefly 90-110, the date of the nuclei being 59-64.

as compared with the other writings of Paul, creates for the critic a difficult problem, which resolves itself into the question whether a sufficient explanation of the difference can be found in the special circumstances under which the Apostle wrote, and the special purposes which the Epistles were intended to serve.

The excessive number of new words and phrases is itself a serious difficulty. The number of such expressions is no less than 171, averaging one for every verse and a half, which is a much larger proportion than is found in any of Paul's other Epistles. Some of them are Latinisms, which may be attributed to his recent Western association, and for the rest it has to be remembered that the previous Epistles reveal a gradual extension of the Apostle's vocabulary, as he advanced in life and was confronted with new problems in different parts of the world. If the verbal peculiarities are more numerous here than elsewhere, it is only what might have been expected considering that the Apostle was now engaged in a task which he had not previously been called to perform. It was not a task that was likely to give rise to lofty flights of eloquence, such as

we find in some of Paul's earlier Epistles, neither did it call for the exercise of the dialectical powers which he possessed in a high degree. The absence of his favourite Greek particles, and the comparative smoothness of the style, may reasonably be attributed to the fact that he was not arguing, but giving practical directions with reference to the worship, discipline, and government of the Church; and if the composition shows less spirit and freedom than usual, we have to remember that the writer was no longer possessed of the fire of youth, but was now "Paul the aged," in a fuller sense than when he used these words in his letter to Philemon.¹

One of the arguments for regarding the Epistles as compilations made some time after the Apostle's death is the want of logical connexion sometimes observable in them, but the force of the argument is broken by the fact that Pauline words and phrases and ideas are

¹ It is of course possible that the amanuensis may have had a hand in the composition, and it has been suggested that Luke (II Tim. 4¹¹) may have been the amanuensis, or even the author. Grau thinks the Epistles may even have been written by Timothy and Titus themselves.

to be found not only in the few passages which are confessedly genuine, but in many other places. This fact shows that, if the Epistles were not written by Paul himself, they must have been produced by some one who desired to pass for the Apostle. In that case how are we to account for the fact that in many respects he makes no attempt to preserve Paul's obvious characteristics as a letter-writer? The same argument applies to the historical notes he has introduced into the Epistles, which are so difficult to reconcile with the Apostle's life as recorded in Acts. Why has he not tried to harmonize his inventions with the historical *data* already familiar to readers of the New Testament?

It is alleged by many critics that the condition of the Church as reflected in these Epistles shows a great advance on what we read of in the earlier letters, both as regards organized effort and fixity of doctrine, and that such an advance could not have taken place in the Apostle's lifetime. But it has to be remembered that the Church was still in the full flush of its youthful enthusiasm and energy, which would naturally seek expression in new

forms of thought and action. Hitherto its life and doctrine, in those parts of the world in which Timothy and Titus were called to labour, had been largely regulated and controlled by the personal influence of Paul, and now that his life was drawing to a close, he felt that the time had come when it behoved him to see to the preservation of the great truths of the Gospel which he had laboured to establish that they might be handed down as a precious deposit to future generations, and also to secure that suitable means were provided for the carrying on of the work and worship of the Church, after his guiding hand had been withdrawn.

If it be true that the Epistles are a compilation got up in the interests of an ecclesiastical policy, it is strange that the author did not put more of the genuine Pauline remains into the First Epistle, which is much more important, from an ecclesiastical point of view, than II Timothy. It is also strange that a compiler actuated by such a motive should have so little to say about questions of organization strictly so-called, taking for granted the various officials and classes to

whom he refers, and directing all his efforts to the maintenance of a high moral and religious standard among those who are in any way called to represent the Church.

As regards the inferences to be drawn from the ecclesiastical situation disclosed in the Epistles, we have a decisive proof that the writer could not have belonged to the sub-apostolic age, in the fact that there is here no trace either of the monarchical episcopate to which Ignatius, writing about A.D. 115, attaches so much importance, or of the diocesan episcopate which made its appearance somewhat later. As in Philippians (1¹), bishops and deacons are still the two orders responsible for the teaching and superintendence of the Church; and, as in the Book of Acts (20^{17, 28}), "bishop" and "presbyter" (or "elder") are convertible terms (I Tim. 1^{5, 7}; 3¹⁻⁷; 5¹⁷⁻²²; Titus 1⁵⁻⁹). The position held by Timothy at Ephesus and by Titus at Crete was evidently temporary; they were acting as the Apostle's delegates, commissioned to do a special work, as they had done elsewhere on former occasions.

There are a number of other objections of a

minor nature which have been taken to the Pauline authorship of the Epistles. It is said, for example, that the writer's attitude towards Timothy, which would have been appropriate enough in addressing a young and inexperienced worker, is altogether out of place in the case of a man like Timothy, who had been already about fifteen years in the mission field (1 Tim. 1^{12, 13}; 2⁷; 4¹⁴; 5²²; 2 Tim. 1^{3, 4, 6, 11, 3¹¹⁻¹⁶}). But age is relative, and the lapse of time was not likely to make any difference on Paul's view of Timothy as still "my true child in faith." Timothy appears to have been neither strong in body (I Tim. 5²³), nor self-reliant in spirit; and when we consider the great responsibilities which the Apostle was laying upon him, we cannot wonder at the solemn exhortations he addresses to him, almost in the form of a last will and testament. Both in his personal reminiscences and in his anxiety for Timothy's future (II Tim. 4¹⁻¹⁸), Paul's language is very natural in the circumstances; and the same may be said of his tone in addressing Titus, which is much less tender, because he knows him to be quite competent for the work entrusted to him. It has been well

said that such delicate variations form an excellent proof of genuineness.

As regards the writer's assertion of his apostolic authority, to which objection has also been taken, some of the Jewish Christians may have still been disposed to call in question Paul's apostleship, and in any case there could be no impropriety in his alluding to it, when he was appointing two comparatively young men to act as his deputies over such a wide area.

Again, it has been pointed out, as at variance with Pauline usage, that the word "faith" is occasionally employed in these Epistles in an objective sense, to denote a system of doctrine rather than a personal union with Christ, while the word "righteousness," on the other hand, is used to denote a personal virtue, instead of expressing a theological abstraction. But in both these cases the Apostle's language was probably in keeping with the changing usage of the Church, which was now realizing the necessity of safeguarding the interests both of Christian ethics as represented by righteousness, and of Christian doctrine as embodied in the creed.

There are other things in the Epistles

which are alleged to betray their non-Pauline origin, such as the want of any adequate occasion for a written communication, as the Apostle could have found an opportunity to give oral instructions; the want of any due recognition of spiritual gifts to be exercised by private members of the Church; the occurrence in the Epistles of proverbial sayings already current in the Church, and of apparent quotations from Christian hymns and confessions (I Tim. 1¹⁶; 3¹⁶; 4⁹; 6¹²⁻¹⁶; II Tim. 2^{2, 8, 11}; 4¹; Titus 3⁸); the repetition, in II Timothy 4⁶, of an illustration referring to Paul's approaching death, which he had already used in a similar sense in Philipians 2¹⁷. But it may be fairly said that hardly any of these features presents any real difficulty, when considered in the light of all the circumstances.

Probably the authorship of the Epistles will always remain a subject of controversy, but, by whatever process they may have reached their present form, we may well believe that they represent the ripest fruits of Paul's experience as a preacher and as an administrator. Though they make no fresh contribution to Christian theology, they reconcile in a practical

form, under the name of "godliness" (an expression characteristic of the Epistles), the rival interests of faith and works, of doctrine and morality, and set before the office-bearers of the Church an ideal of pastoral character and duty, which has done much during the last nineteen centuries to deepen their sense of responsibility and keep them faithful to their high calling.

Assuming that the Epistles were written by Paul shortly before his death, we may date them about A.D. 64.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE HEBREWS

In our English Version this Epistle bears the title "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews," but in the oldest manuscript of which we have any knowledge, the only words prefixed are, "To the Hebrews"; and, unlike all the other Epistles attributed to Paul, it contains no intimation that it was either authorized or penned by him. The first authority whom we find attributing the writing to Paul is Pantænus of Alexandria, who accounted for its being anonymous by the

desire of the writer to avoid the appearance of usurping the position of Apostle to the Hebrews, which belonged to Christ himself. Pantænus's successor, Clement of Alexandria, regarded it as probable that Paul had written the original in Hebrew, which had been translated by Luke, and that the suppression of Paul's name had been due to a fear of offending Hebrew prejudice. Origen, who evidently shared the hesitation felt by his predecessors at Alexandria in acknowledging the Pauline authorship, suggested that the Epistle had probably been composed by some one from personal recollections of the Apostle's teaching, and mentions that it was held by some to be the work of Clement of Rome, and by others of Luke. Notwithstanding the doubts thus felt by some of those most competent to judge, the Epistle was admitted into the Peshitta as part of the Syriac Canon, and before the end of the third century it was commonly regarded by the Eastern Church as a genuine writing of Paul.

In the West, on the other hand, notwithstanding the use of the Epistle by Clement of Rome in the first century (95-6), there is no

trace of its being acknowledged by any one as canonical for a century and a half afterwards. It had no place in Marcion's Canon, and is not mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment, unless under the name of "ad Alexandrinos." We do not find it in the Old Latin Version, and its apostolic character was not acknowledged by Irenæus, Hippolytus, or Caius—three very important witnesses in the second and third century. It is true that Tertullian of Carthage (c. A.D. 220) quotes it, but he attributes it, not to Paul, but Barnabas; and Cyprian (c. 250) makes no use of it, notwithstanding the emphasis it lays on Christ's priestly character. Eusebius mentions that the Epistle was questioned at Rome, on the ground that it was not written by Paul. This continued to be the case for some time afterwards, and it was not till the beginning of the fifth century that the Epistle came to be accepted by the whole Church as the work of Paul, partly owing to the high value set upon its teaching, and partly through the deference which Jerome and Augustine were disposed to pay to the sentiment and usage of the Eastern Church.

If the external testimony to the Pauline

authorship is quite inadequate, the internal evidence is still less favourable. Indeed, the Epistle is so unlike the other writings attributed to Paul, both as regards style and diction (notwithstanding a few verbal coincidences); it differs from them so much in its mode of quotation from the Old Testament, in which it invariably follows the Septuagint; and it looks at Judaism from such a different point of view¹ (the priesthood of Christ, to which it gives prominence, being almost entirely absent from Paul's acknowledged writings), that the idea of its being in any sense a production of the Apostle's is abandoned by all who take an interest in New Testament Criticism.

For a long time discussion has turned on the comparative probability of other names suggested, and the destination of the Epistle has also engaged a considerable amount of attention. A good many critics, beginning with Röth, in 1836, and including more recently Weizsäcker, Schürer, Pfeiderer, von Soden,

¹ "The one abolishes the Law, the other transfigures it. . . ." The one was revolutionist, the other evolutionist."—Ménégoz.

Jülicher, Wrede, Harnack, Feine, McGiffert, Bacon, and Moffatt, are disposed to reject the early and unanimous tradition that the Epistle was addressed to Jewish Christians. But, while it undoubtedly contains many things equally suitable for Gentile and for Jewish readers, in its main features it appears to have been specially fitted to meet the intellectual and spiritual needs of those who had been converted from the Jewish to the Christian faith. Its argument from first to last is built upon the teaching of the Old Testament, it takes for granted a deep and intelligent interest, on the part of its readers, in the whole Jewish ritual, and its allusions to "the fathers" (1¹), "the seed of Abraham" (2¹⁶), "the people" (5³; 7^{21, 27}; 13¹²), and "the camp" (13¹³), are such as we might expect if both writer and readers were of the stock of Israel. Although the title "To the Hebrews" is probably nothing more than the supposition of an ancient copyist, it expresses the view which a perusal of the Epistle naturally produces on the reader, and the arguments to the contrary which are drawn from a few isolated passages (6^{1 f.}; 3^{12 f.}) are quite insufficient

to remove this general impression. The object of the communication was to strengthen its readers under the trials to which they were exposed at the hands of their infatuated fellow-countrymen as well as from other sources. For this purpose they are reminded of the heavenly inheritance to which they have succeeded as followers of the risen and exalted Christ, in whom the promises made to their fathers will yet have a glorious fulfilment, with which all the blessings of the Old Testament dispensation are unworthy to be compared. It appears that their early enthusiasm had grown cold, and that there had been a serious declension in their spiritual life; but whether the danger which now threatened them was that of relapsing into Judaism (which is the view generally taken), or of falling into unbelief and idolatry (Zahn, von Soden, Jülicher, G. Milligan, and others) is not very clear (6⁴⁶; 10^{28 f.}).

According to Reuss, Lipsius, Wrede, and others, the Epistle was originally intended for Hebrew Christians in general, and the last chapter with its personal details was an addition intended to give the composition an

epistolary complexion and adapt it to the case of a particular Church or congregation. But this view is refuted by the fact that the special circumstances of the readers are referred to not only in the concluding chapter but in several places in the body of the Epistle (5¹²; 6^{9 f.}; 10^{32 ff.}; 12⁴); and one of the problems of Criticism is to determine to what Church in particular the Epistle was addressed. Jerusalem, Cæsarea, Ephesus, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome have all been suggested, and something can be said for each of them. In some respects Jerusalem is the place where we can imagine that Jewish Christians would be exposed to the greatest trial of their faith, owing to the fanatical rejection of the Gospel by the majority of their countrymen, and the disappointment of their own hopes of a speedy return of the Saviour in His divine power and glory.¹ But there are references in the Epistle (2³; 5¹³; 6¹⁰; 10³⁴) which seem to be at variance with this hypothesis; and the employment of the Greek language, and constant reference to the Septuagint, are regarded by

¹ This is the view taken by Hort, Salmon, Westcott, and Bruce.

many as proving that the Epistle could not have been written by anyone likely to have influence with the most conservative section of the Jewish Christians in the metropolis.

Recently there has been a strong tendency to identify the readers with the members of a congregation at Rome (Rom. 16^{5, 14, 15}; cf. Heb. 13¹⁷ and ²⁴), composed mainly of Jewish Christians.¹ This gives the most natural interpretation to the words in 13²⁴, "They of Italy salute you," as conveying the greetings of Italian exiles to fellow-Christians at Rome, and it also explains the intended visit of Timothy, who was much connected with Rome in his later years, and the acquaintance with the Epistle shown by Clement of Rome. In this connexion it is interesting to learn from ancient inscriptions that one of the synagogues in Rome bore the name of the "Synagogue of the Hebrews."²

¹ So Renan, Pfeiderer, Harnack, Zahn.

² Prof. J. Dickie in an article in the "Expositor" for April, 1913, has suggested that the homily may have been addressed to a latitudinarian House-Church tinged with Alexandrianism, whose interest, both in Judaism and Christianity, was largely of a speculative nature, and that the congregation may have died out, leaving no cherished

As regards authorship, there is little to be said in favour of Clement (suggested by Erasmus), even if we suppose the salutation to have been sent from Italy and the Epistle to have emanated from Rome. While there is some resemblance between the two writers, Hebrews is on a far higher level than we can conceive the author of the Epistle of Clement to have been capable of; and, if he had been the writer, his name would have been almost sure to be preserved.

As regards Luke, the fact that he was a Gentile (Col. 4¹² and ¹¹) precludes the possibility of his having been the author, notwithstanding the linguistic similarities which have been observed between this Epistle and his acknowledged works in the New Testament.

A name which has the support, as we have seen, of Tertullian of Carthage, who had some connexion with Rome, is that of Barnabas. From his associations as a Levite, his knowledge of Greek as a native of Cyprus, his devout character, and his influence in the early Church, we can readily imagine him to have memories behind it, which would account for the want of any reliable tradition regarding the history of the Epistle.

written such an epistle as this, especially if it be true, as tradition affirms, that he had some connexion with Alexandria, whose allegorical mode of thought is reflected in the Epistle. Against all this, however, we have to set the facts that, so far as we know, Barnabas had never any connexion with Rome, and that, if the Epistle was addressed to a Church in the East, his name as the author could scarcely have fallen into oblivion.

One of the most plausible conjectures is that which was favoured, if not originated, by Luther, namely, that Apollos was the author. The description given, in Acts 18²⁴⁻²⁸, of this remarkable man and his preaching—as a Jew, an Alexandrian by race, a learned man, mighty in the Scriptures, who powerfully confuted the Jews, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ—would afford strong confirmation of his authorship, if there was any ancient tradition in its favour; but failing such tradition we can only claim for the suggestion a high degree of probability.¹

¹ Prof. J. V. Bartlet, in an article in the "Expositor" for June, 1913, argues that the Epistle was written by Apollos from Rome to Jewish Christians in Ephesus c. 62 A.D.

Another interesting conjecture, originally broached by Bleek, has recently been advocated with great ability by Harnack (who was at one time in favour of Barnabas), and has been worked out by Rendel Harris. They are of opinion that the Epistle was composed by Priscilla and Aquila, two eminent benefactors of the Church, who gave their house in Rome as a place of meeting for public worship (Rom. 16³ ff.), before they were banished from that city by the edict of Claudius (Acts 18²), and of whose distinguished zeal and ability we have a proof in the fact that when they heard Apollos speaking in the synagogue at Ephesus, and perceived that he knew only the baptism of John, "they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God more carefully" (Acts 18²⁴ ff.). If Priscilla had the chief hand in the composition—and it is noticeable that on several occasions her name precedes that of her husband—this would account for the prominence given to women (Deborah excepted) in the roll-call of faith in the eleventh chapter, and it might also explain how the authors' names had been suppressed in deference to Paul's disapproval

of female teaching in the Church. If we may suppose that Apollos collaborated with Priscilla and Aquila it would render the theory still more probable.¹

According to Sir William Ramsay, the communication was sent by Philip to the Judaizing section of the Church in Jerusalem, as the result of discussions held with Paul during his imprisonment at Cæsarea, the concluding passage only having come from the Apostle's pen. Even this slight reservation is not approved by E. L. Hicks, who attributes the whole composition to Philip, basing his argument chiefly on a comparison of the language of the Epistle with that of Colossians and Ephesians, which he also assigns to the period of the imprisonment at Cæsarea. But, besides sharing in the defect common to almost all the suggestions which have been mentioned, namely, a want of external testimony of any real value in their favour, this theory is rendered unlikely by the fact that there is in the Epistle little trace of the Pauline type of

¹The change from the plural to the singular in 13^{18 f.} and in 13²³ may be due to the writer being associated with others in the composition or sending of the Epistle.

doctrine, and it is also open to the objections, already stated, to the idea that the Epistle was addressed to Christians living in Jerusalem.

The name of Silvanus (Silas) has also been suggested. He was at one time a leader of the primitive Church in Jerusalem (Acts 15²²), and accompanied Paul on his second missionary journey. Later he became a coadjutor of Peter, acting as his amanuensis or secretary in the writing of I Peter (5¹²). We also find him associated with Timothy in preaching (II Cor. 1¹⁹) and correspondence (I Thess. 1¹, II Thess. 1¹). But beyond these general facts no evidence can be adduced in support of the theory, except the resemblance between I Peter and Hebrews, which shows that there was some degree of indebtedness on the one side or the other. Peter himself has been suggested on the strength of this resemblance, but 2^{3 b} gives the impression that the writer had not been himself a hearer of Christ, and, so far as we know, Peter had never come under the influence of Alexandrian culture.

The date we are to assign to the Epistle depends largely on the question whether the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus had already

taken place. While the first impression we receive from the reading of the Epistle is that the Temple was still standing, it cannot be denied that on closer examination certain passages, which were supposed to warrant this conclusion, are found to be capable of a different interpretation, and that the ritual which the writer had in view was that of the Tabernacle, not of the Temple. But it is scarcely conceivable that, if the Temple and its ritual had been already swept away, no reference should have been made by the writer to this crowning proof of the transitory character of the Old Testament dispensation, and that he should still have ventured to ask with reference to the appointed sacrifices (as if the answer would confirm his argument), "Else would they not have ceased to be offered?" (10³). Whether there is a reference in 10^{32 ff.} to the Neronian persecution has been much disputed. If there be, the Epistle could not have been written much before A.D. 70. It is more likely, however, that the reference is to the sufferings of Christians in connexion with the expulsion of the Jews from Rome by Claudius, and in that case the date of writing may be A.D. 64, or

even earlier. The year 66 is favoured by Hilgenfeld, Lünemann, Schürer, Weiss, Godet, and Westcott. Others have in view the persecution under Domitian, and prefer a date between 81 and 96.

On the whole, it must be confessed that this is one of the Books of the New Testament regarding whose authorship and destination Criticism has yielded comparatively little fruit. We have still to say with Origen, "Who it was that wrote the Epistle God only knows certainly." But happily its value is to a great extent independent of such questions, for it speaks for itself from an exegetical point of view, and no question of forgery is involved, as no name is put forward. We may add that this is one of the few compositions in the New Testament whose beauty of style gave promise of the literary culture that was one day to be associated with Christianity.

THE GENERAL OR CATHOLIC EPISTLES¹

These Epistles are seven in number, viz., James ; I and II Peter ; I, II, and III John ; and

¹ In connexion with these writings the distinction between "letter" and "epistle" has been strongly emphasized

Jude. They have been known as the Catholic Epistles from the end of the second century

by a number of recent writers. The Catholic Epistles "are compositions addressed to Christians—one might perhaps say the Church—in general. The catholicity of the address implies, of course, a catholicity in the contents. What the Church calls *catholic* we require only to call *epistle*, and the unsolved enigma with which, according to Overbeck, they present us, is brought nearer to a solution. The special position of these 'letters,' which is indicated by their having the attribute *catholic* instinctively applied to them, is due precisely to their literary character; *catholic* means in this connexion *literary*. The impossibility of recognizing the 'letters' of Peter, James, and Jude, as real letters follows directly from the peculiarity in the form of their address. . . . The only way by which the letters could reach such ideal addresses was to have them reproduced in numbers from the first. But that means that they were literature. . . . It is true, indeed, that these Catholic Epistles are *Christian* literature: their authors had no desire to enrich universal literature; they wrote their books for a definite circle of people with the same views as themselves, that is, for Christians; but books they wrote. . . . It also follows from their character as epistles that the question of authenticity is not nearly so important for them as for the Pauline letters. It is allowable that in the epistle the personality of the writer should be less prominent; whether it is completely veiled, as, for instance, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, or whether it modestly hides itself behind some great name of the past, as in other cases, does not matter; considered in the light

onwards, to distinguish them from the Epistles of Paul (including Hebrews), which were addressed to individual Churches and were attributed to one Apostle only. They sometimes fill a whole Greek manuscript; in the case of manuscripts comprising the whole New Testament, they either follow the order given in our English Bible, or stand between Acts and the Pauline Epistles.

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES

The first of these Epistles bears the superscription: "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are of the Dispersion, greeting." Opinion regarding its authorship is almost as divided now as it was in the fourth century, when it was placed by Eusebius among the *Antilegomena* or "Disputed" Books of the New Testament. The majority of continental critics regard it as a work of the second or latter part of the first century, rejecting the traditional authorship of the book, partly on account of the want of early testimony in its favour, partly because of ancient literary practices, this is not only not strange, but in reality quite natural."—Deissmann's "Bible Studies," pp. 51, 52, 54.

they think they have detected in it features of a post-apostolic character, and partly also because it seems to them improbable that a Palestinian Jew of no great education should have had such a good command of the Greek language as is shown in this Epistle. Baur saw in it what he called "a toned-down Jewish Christianity," and assigned it to about A.D. 110. Harnack puts it still later, regarding it as a compilation (*c.* 170) of heterogeneous passages taken from Christian homilies, which were written between A.D. 120 and 140, based partly on sayings of Jesus, partly on those of Jewish and Gentile moralists. He finds in it the same kind of degenerate Christianity that appears in Clement, Hermas, Justin, and other writers of the second century. Jülicher holds part of it to be of Jewish origin, and characterizes it as "perhaps the least Christian book of the New Testament." He regards it as a work of the second quarter of the second century, issued in the name of James, the Lord's brother, in order to secure a wide circulation for it in the Church.

According to Brückner, the Epistle was forged by an Essene at Rome in the latter half

of the second century. Pfeiderer, on the other hand, regards it as a product of the "practical catholicism" which gained the ascendancy in the Church before the middle of the second century. Spitta (like Massebieau) has propounded a theory according to which the Epistle is a Christian adaptation of a Jewish work of the first century, the only change needed to restore it to its original form being the deletion of a few words referring to Jesus Christ at the beginning of the first and second chapters. Von Soden, while regarding many passages as of Jewish origin (especially 3¹⁻¹⁸; 4¹¹ - 5²⁰), considers the Epistle as a whole to have been addressed to Christians "of the third or fourth generation" by a Jewish Christian named James, who represents the eclectic and ethical tendencies of the Dispersion. Hilgenfeld believes it to have been written by an Eastern Jewish Christian in the reign of Domitian (81-96), while Weizsäcker puts it somewhat earlier (soon after 70), when the Palestinian Church had begun to be Ebionitic in its tendencies, and was preaching a Gospel of poverty.

On the other hand, the great majority of critics in this country have maintained the

genuineness of the Epistle¹ as the work of James, who was for many years at the head of the Church in Jerusalem (Mark 6³; Acts 12¹⁷; 21¹⁸; Gal. 2⁹). For this view a number of foreign critics of eminence² can also be quoted; but of recent years the tendency has been in an opposite direction, not only on the continent but also in America, and even, to some extent, in our own country.³

Recently the Jacobean authorship has been presented by two English scholars in a new light. G. Currie Martin has suggested that the Epistle is composed of short homilies by James on certain sayings of Jesus which he had preserved, and that they were only issued in a collective form after his death. J. H. Moulton is also of opinion that the Epistle embodies sayings of Jesus not preserved elsewhere, but thinks it was addressed by James not to Christians but to Jews, and that this is

¹ This may be attributed, partly at least, to the tendency of British scholars to give a book credit for genuineness till it is proved to be spurious.

² Including Neander, Mangold, Bleek, Kern, Ritschl, Beyschlag, Weiss, P. Ewald, Lechler, Zahn.

³ For example, the traditional authorship is denied by McGiffert, Bacon, Moffatt, and Peake.

the reason why it contains so little that is distinctively Christian, except in two or three passages which may have suffered from interpolation.

All are agreed that the external evidence is comparatively weak. Apart from coincidences with several other books of the New Testament (which may be accounted for in various ways), expressions derived from this Epistle are to be found in *Hermas*, and perhaps also in *Clement*, the "*Didaché*," *Irenæus*, and *Tertullian*. It was also included in the Syriac and Old Latin versions. But it has no place in the *Muratorian Fragment*, and no trace of it is to be found in *Hegesippus*, to whom we are indebted for an account of the martyrdom of *James*, or in the spurious "*Clementine Homilies*," which are addressed to *James* as the highest dignitary in the Church.¹ *Origen* is the first to quote from the

¹ *Hegesippus* tells us that immediately before the siege of Jerusalem was commenced (A.D. 66), *James* was put to death by the unbelieving Jews, who cast him down from a pinnacle of the Temple, and that his monument still stood by the side of the Temple (c. A.D. 160) with the inscription: "He hath been a true witness both to Jews and Greeks that Jesus is the Christ." There has been much controversy

Epistle by name, and he does so in such a way as to suggest that he felt some uncertainty as to the authorship. But before the close of the fourth century the claims of the Epistle to a place in the Canon (like those of the four disputed Catholic Epistles—II Peter, II and III John, and Jude) were fully recognized by the Church, at the Council held at Carthage in 397 A.D.

regarding the precise relationship in which James stood to Jesus. There are three views on the subject, associated with the names of Helvidius, Epiphanius, and Jerome respectively. According to the first theory (the Helvidian), James, like Joses, Judas, and Simon (Mark 6³), were the sons of Joseph and Mary, born after Jesus, and therefore his half-brothers; according to the second (the Epiphanian), they were the sons of Joseph by a former marriage, and therefore only the brothers of Jesus in a nominal sense; according to the third (Hieronymian) they were cousins of Jesus, being sons of Clopas or Alphæus, the husband of Mary's sister (Matt. 27⁵⁶; Mark 15⁴⁰, 16¹; John 19^{25, 27}). The first view is that which naturally occurs to an unprejudiced reader of the passages in the New Testament bearing on the subject, and probably it would never have been disputed but for its being at variance with the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord—a doctrine which grew up in the second century under the fostering influence of sentiment, and soon came to be generally accepted in the Church.

Turning to internal evidence, we find it to be of a very complex nature, lending support in some respects to various theories, but not harmonizing perfectly with any one of them. The traditional view is not without difficulties,—it is open to some objections ; but on the whole, the evidence, external and internal, seems to justify the belief that the early Church was right in admitting this Epistle into the Canon, and that it is not improbably the oldest book in the New Testament.

The way in which the writer designates himself in the opening verse, “James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ,” is very significant. One cannot fail to be struck with the mingled simplicity and dignity of the expression. It would have been quite unsuitable as a designation for any ordinary writer who wished to make himself known to his readers. On the other hand, a pretender wishing to pass for James, the Lord’s brother, would have been sure to claim the dignity of the position more plainly, whereas, if James himself was the writer, he would feel that there was no need for this, as there was no danger of his being mistaken by the reader for any other person.

In keeping with this is the habitual tone of authority which runs through the Epistle, there being fifty-four imperatives in one hundred and eight verses. The writer addresses his message "to the twelve tribes which are of the Dispersion, greeting." This is his Jewish way of describing the brethren at a distance from Jerusalem, many of whom had been scattered abroad by the persecution which broke out in the Holy Land. The Epistle may have been written when as yet there were comparatively few converts from heathenism, and no congregations exclusively composed of Gentiles, Paul's missionary journeys having not yet taken place. Antioch had not become a centre of Gentile Christianity, and Jerusalem was still the metropolis of the Christian, as well as of the Jewish, world. In keeping with this destination of the Epistle is the mention of "your synagogue" as the place of worship, and of "Abraham our father" (2^{2, 21}); also the designation of God by the Old Testament name of "the Lord of Sabaoth" (5⁴); and the prominence given to the law and the unity of the Godhead (2^{10, 10}). Yet the Christian character of the Epistle is unmistakable (1^{1, 18}; 2^{1, 5, 7, 8}; 3¹⁷ etc.).

The early date of the Epistle may be inferred from the meagreness of its Christian doctrine, as well as from the simplicity of the ecclesiastical arrangements to which it refers—teachers and elders being mentioned (3¹, 5¹⁴), but no bishops or deacons. Jesus Christ is acknowledged as “the Lord of glory” (2¹), and there is a reference to His second coming (5⁷⁻⁹), but there is no mention of His death, resurrection, or ascension. The new birth is alluded to (1¹⁸), but not the work of the Holy Spirit; there is a commendation of “the royal law” of love, as between man and man (2⁸), but there is no recognition of the redeeming love of God in Christ Jesus.

The Epistle is replete with our Saviour’s teaching, not in such a form as to give the impression that it is derived from the written Gospels, but moulded and transformed, as we might expect it to be, if the author was drawing upon his recollections of what he had heard during the Saviour’s lifetime, before he had learned to believe in Him as the Messiah.

There is no allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem, and, what is still more significant, no reference to the question of the obligatori-

ness of the Jewish law on Gentile converts, which excited so much controversy for a time, till it was practically settled at the Council of Jerusalem, about *c.* 48 A.D. This is a strong argument for dating the Epistle before the rise of that controversy, and accordingly Prof. Mayor and other advocates of the Jacobean authorship suggest 45 A.D. as the most probable date.

Tokens of the Palestinian origin of the Epistle have been discovered in the allusions to natural phenomena (1^{6, 11}; 3^{4, 11, 12}; 5⁷), and to the troubled state of society, when the Jewish converts had to face the hatred and oppression of the wealthy Sadducees and the proud Pharisees.

With regard to the language in which the Epistle is written, it has to be remembered that James, like the other members of the apostolic circle, was probably familiar with the Greek tongue from his youth, and that many of the members of the Church in Jerusalem, over which he had presided for a considerable time, were Hellenists or Greek-speaking Jews, who used the Septuagint version of the Old Testament—like those congregations in Palestine and Syria and elsewhere, for whom

the Epistle was intended. Though the author is more expert in the use of Greek than most of the New Testament writers, his style of composition bears a distinctly Hebraic character, being abrupt and sententious, reminding one of the Book of Proverbs. Moreover, the diction employed bears a strong resemblance to the speech delivered by James at the Council of Jerusalem, when he proposed that a letter should be sent to the Gentile converts regarding their relations to the laws of Moses.¹ There is some apparent opposition between the teaching of this Epistle and Paul's letters to the Romans and Galatians, with regard to the comparative importance of faith and works. This is owing to the fact that the two writers look at the question from different points of view, and there is no real inconsistency between them. At the same time, it is not unlikely that the warning which Paul addresses in the fourth chapter of Romans to those who pride themselves on their observance of the Law, was intended to guard against

¹ Yet Prof. Bacon ventures to say that "the notion of James writing encyclicals before Paul has even begun to write his epistles, is almost grotesque."

abuse of the teaching in the Epistle of James (2¹⁴⁻²⁶) with regard to the necessity of good works. Others, however, who assign a late date to the Epistle, allege that its teaching was aimed against the extreme Paulinists who perverted the Apostle's doctrine of grace, and did not realize the need for showing their faith by their works. There is a similar conflict of opinion as to how we are to account for the connexion between this Epistle and I Peter and Hebrews; according as we assign the priority to the former or to the two latter, we determine to a large extent the date and authorship of the Epistle.¹

On these and other points there is room for difference of opinion, but, on the whole, there seems to be no sufficient reason to prefer any of the various conflicting theories, which deny the genuineness of the Epistle, to the traditional view which regards it as marking an early stage in the slow transition from Judaism to Christianity, of which James "the Just," the acknowledged leader of the primitive

¹ Prof. Bacon puts it rather strongly when he says that "the indications of date by literary relationship are really conclusive" against the traditional authorship.

Church in Jerusalem, was the most notable example.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER

This epistle was hardly ever called in question until a comparatively recent time. It was included by Eusebius among the *Homologoumena*, or books universally received, and there is no trace of any objection having been taken to it previous to that time. Strong evidence in its favour is afforded by the Christian writers of the second century, from Polycarp onwards, and echoes of its language are to be found in still earlier documents.¹ Even among modern critics the general opinion is that it was composed by the Apostle Peter,² though on the other side there are some well-known names, such as Hausrath, Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, Pfeiderer, Jülicher, Harnack, von

¹ Hermas, Didaché, Clement. Eusebius says it was used by Papias (c. A.D. 135). The author of II Peter (3¹) speaks of his work as "the second epistle" written by him to the same readers.

² So Schleiermacher, Neander, Meyer, de Wette, Bleek, Weiss, Salmon, Dods, Plumptre, Ramsay, Bartlet, Bigg, Chase, Bennett.

Soden, Schmiedel, and S. Davidson.¹ Those who deny the Petrine authorship differ a good deal in their opinions as to the genesis of the Epistle, some holding that it was occasioned by the persecution under Domitian towards the close of the first century (92-96), and others connecting it with the rescript of Trajan to Pliny, in A.D. 112. Harnack considers it too Pauline (as Jülicher also does) to be the work of Peter, and regards 1^{1f.} and 5^{12ff.} as additions made *c.* 150-170 (perhaps by the author of II Pet.) to an anonymous composition, of 63-93 A.D. McGiffert suggests Barnabas as the writer (*c.* 90); von Soden, Silvanus (*c.* 93-96)—to whom Zahn also attributes the authorship (*c.* 50) under the direction of Peter (I Pet. 5¹³). Some of the objections taken to the genuineness of the book are similar to those brought against the Epistle of James, such as the excellence of its Greek—but with this Silvanus may have had something to do—and the use of the Septuagint in the quotations from the Old Testament. The main arguments against it, however, are

¹ Moffatt wavers in his opinion, and calls the writing "semi-pseudonymous."

its want of distinctively Petrine teaching, and the advanced character of the persecutions to which Christians appear to have been liable when the Epistle was written.

According to the opening verse it was addressed "to the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." A few critics, such as Weiss (following Origen and Eusebius), understand this to be a description of the Jewish Christians scattered throughout North-Western Asia; but the contents of the letter are in some respects quite at variance with this supposition (1^{14, 18}; 2^{9 f.}; 4^{2 f.}), and the great majority of writers take the words to be a figurative description of the Christian Churches in the districts referred to. This is in harmony with the mode of expression employed by the writer when he says: "Beloved, I beseech you as sojourners and pilgrims, to abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul" (2¹¹; cf. Heb. 11¹³). On the same principle, "Babylon," from which the Epistle purports to be sent, is another name for Rome,¹

¹ "That this Epistle was written from Rome, I cannot doubt. It is impregnated with Roman thought to a degree

as in the Apocalypse and elsewhere—the use of such figurative language being a precaution against persecution, in case the document should fall into unfriendly hands. The probability seems to be that it was written from Rome shortly before Peter's death, which, according to a well-supported tradition, took place about A.D. 64, in connexion with the persecution under Nero. If such was the case, there is no reason to be astonished at the large infusion of Pauline thoughts and expressions (borrowed especially from Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians),¹ or at the resemblance which the letter bears in some respects to the Epistle of James.² By the time referred to, any feeling of antagonism between the two apostles, had probably died away under the mellowing influence of their advancing years, being overruled by the logic of events in

beyond any other book in the Bible; the relation to the state and its officers forms an unusually large part of the whole" (Ramsay).

¹ Sieffert has suggested that Ephesians and I Peter may have had the same author. But Weiss (with Köhl) gives the priority to I Peter, which he dates as early as A.D. 54.

² There are also verbal coincidences with the Johannine writings and Hebrews.

the history of the Church, which called for unity of action on the part of its leaders. We may see a token of the growing harmony which prevailed in the apostolic circle in the fact that Mark, whom Paul speaks of in Philemon (v. 24) as his fellow-worker, and in II Tim. (4¹¹) as "useful to me for ministering," is here singled out for affectionate recognition by Peter, who calls him "my son," and associates him with himself in sending greetings to the Churches (5²³); to which we may add that the Silvanus whom Peter employed as an amanuensis or secretary (5¹²), was in all probability Paul's former coadjutor Silas, who had laboured with him in Syria, Cilicia, and Galatia (Acts, chaps. 15-18).

All this helps to explain the family likeness which can be traced in many of the writings in the New Testament, even when they bear the names of different authors. By the seventh decade of the first century the Church had begun to realize its unity, and the apostles were working hand in hand. It was not to be expected, therefore, that we should find in this Epistle the distinctive views of the "apostle of the circumcision," whom Paul withstood to the

face, when he separated himself from the Gentile converts for fear of offending the narrow-minded Jewish Christians who had come down to Antioch from Jerusalem (Gal. 2). About fifteen years had passed since then, and during that time we may be sure that Peter must have learned much, for he was singularly impressionable and open to new influences. Apart from his intercourse or correspondence with Paul, we cannot suppose that his intimacy with John had ceased after the conference in Jerusalem (Gal. 2⁹), or that he had failed to share in the intellectual and spiritual progress which characterized that apostle.

At the same time, there are some interesting points of contact between this Epistle and the language or experience of the apostle Peter, as otherwise known to us.¹ While it contains few reminiscences of Christ's ministry, it is significant that the writer speaks of himself as "a witness of the sufferings of Christ." He emphasizes Christ's meekness and patience as

¹ Cf. I Peter 1¹⁷, and Acts 10³⁴ ¹; I Peter 5², and Acts 20²⁸; I Peter 1¹³, and Acts 2⁴; I Peter 5⁸, and Luke 22³¹.

an example to His followers under persecution, and gives prominence to His resurrection as a pledge of the glory that should be revealed. The want of any personal reference to Paul has been unfavourably commented on, but very probably it may have been due to that apostle's having left Rome after his liberation from prison, perhaps to pay the visit to Spain which he had long had in view.

To some critics it seems very unlikely that Peter should have sent a circular letter to Churches with which he had no personal connexion. But the truth is that we know very little about Peter's career after he disappears from the pages of the Book of Acts. Tradition connects him with Syria, Asia Minor, Rome, and Corinth; and it is quite possible that in Asia Minor he rendered more extensive service than Paul ever did. The Churches which are known to have been founded by Paul in that part of the world are comparatively few, and other agencies may have been at work there for the propagation of the Gospel. It has been suggested that Paul's quarrel with Mark in Pamphylia, when the latter left Paul and Barnabas and returned to Jerusalem, may

have had something to do with the rights and interests of other missionaries in the field, and the statement in Acts about the Holy Ghost forbidding Paul and Silas to speak the word in Asia, and about the Spirit of Jesus not suffering them to go into Bithynia, admits of a similar interpretation (Acts 16 ^{6 f.}). In any case, we can hardly believe that the arrangement made many years before, by which Paul and Barnabas should go unto the Gentiles and the other apostles to the Jews (Gal. 2 ⁹), was very long or very strictly enforced, for we find Paul at a later time frequently addressing the Jews in their synagogues, and, as time advanced and the Church increased, it would become more and more impracticable to carry out such an agreement.

According to Schwegler, the object of the Epistle was "that an exposition of the Pauline doctrine might be put into the mouth of Peter." But there is no sign of any such dogmatic or partisan motive, the chief purpose of the writer being apparently a desire to encourage and comfort his readers under the dangers and trials to which they were exposed on account of their religion. If the writer

had been trying to personate Peter, and if conciliation had been his object, he would have been pretty sure to introduce a friendly allusion to Paul, who was well known to have passed a considerable time at Rome in his later years.

As regards the objection taken to the Epistle on account of the alleged signs of a later date in the references to persecution, Mommsen, the great historian of Rome, takes a different view of the matter; and while it may be the case, as Ramsay contends, that such expressions as "being reproached for the name of Christ" and "suffering as a Christian" (4^{14, 16}) would be more appropriate in the reign of Domitian, or even Trajan, than of Nero, there are other expressions which correspond better to an earlier time, when the treatment of Christians depended a good deal on their own character and conduct, and the mere profession of Christianity was not of itself a punishable offence (2¹⁸⁻¹⁹, 3¹³⁻¹⁷, 4¹⁴⁻¹⁷). No doubt, after the example of cruelty set by Nero in the murder of thousands of Christians on the charge of setting fire to Rome, the name of Christian would in fact, though not in law, carry with it a certain amount of odium, and

expose the bearer of it to injurious treatment at the hands of unbelievers. This would be the case not only at Rome but also in the provinces, where the authorities were only too ready to follow the imperial lead in such a case. Neither in this nor in any other question raised by adverse criticism does there seem to be any valid reason for giving up our belief in the Petrine authorship, which comes to us with the authority of the early Church, and seems to meet the facts of the case much better than any other theory of its origin which has yet been suggested. Sir William Ramsay is so impressed with its genuineness that though he cannot assign it to an earlier period than 80 A.D., and the traditional date of Peter's death is about 64 A.D., he still believes it to be the work of Peter at a later time, when he was more than eighty years of age. Weiss, on the other hand, who is equally convinced of its genuineness, dates it as early as 54 A.D.

THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER ;
THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JUDE

These two epistles have been more questioned than any other books in the New Testa-

ment. II Peter, especially, is not only very weak in external evidence but is also open to serious objections on other grounds. Origen is the first writer who mentions it by name, and in doing so he expresses doubt about its genuineness. It is found neither in the Muratorian Canon nor in the Peshitta, and the first clear quotation from it is by Firmilian (c. 250), though it shows many coincidences, in thought and expression, with the earliest patristic writers. It has much in common with the Epistle of Jude, and a comparison of the two leads almost inevitably to the conclusion that one is borrowed from the other. Opinion is divided as to which is the original, but the large majority of critics assign the priority to Jude, both because II Peter often contains the same things in an expanded form, and also because many of its expressions would be almost unintelligible but for the light thrown on them by the shorter Epistle.

With regard to the authorship of II Peter, the writer distinctly claims to be the apostle of that name, and describes the document as the "second epistle" addressed by him to the

expose the bearer of it to injurious treatment at the hands of unbelievers. This would be the case not only at Rome but also in the provinces, where the authorities were only too ready to follow the imperial lead in such a case. Neither in this nor in any other question raised by adverse criticism does there seem to be any valid reason for giving up our belief in the Petrine authorship, which comes to us with the authority of the early Church, and seems to meet the facts of the case much better than any other theory of its origin which has yet been suggested. Sir William Ramsay is so impressed with its genuineness that though he cannot assign it to an earlier period than 80 A.D., and the traditional date of Peter's death is about 64 A.D., he still believes it to be the work of Peter at a later time, when he was more than eighty years of age. Weiss, on the other hand, who is equally convinced of its genuineness, dates it as early as 54 A.D.

THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER ;
THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JUDE

These two epistles have been more questioned than any other books in the New Testa-

ment. II Peter, especially, is not only very weak in external evidence but is also open to serious objections on other grounds. Origen is the first writer who mentions it by name, and in doing so he expresses doubt about its genuineness. It is found neither in the Muratorian Canon nor in the Peshitta, and the first clear quotation from it is by Firmilian (*c.* 250), though it shows many coincidences, in thought and expression, with the earliest patristic writers. It has much in common with the Epistle of Jude, and a comparison of the two leads almost inevitably to the conclusion that one is borrowed from the other. Opinion is divided as to which is the original, but the large majority of critics assign the priority to Jude, both because II Peter often contains the same things in an expanded form, and also because many of its expressions would be almost unintelligible but for the light thrown on them by the shorter Epistle.

With regard to the authorship of II Peter, the writer distinctly claims to be the apostle of that name, and describes the document as the "second epistle" addressed by him to the

same readers (3¹). He also alludes as an eye-witness to two well-known incidents in the life of Christ in which Peter took a leading part (1¹⁴, cf. John 21¹⁸ f.; 1¹⁶⁻¹⁸, cf. Mark 9²⁻⁸). The claim thus made is supported by the fact that the Epistle bears subtle traces of Peter's words and deeds as recorded in the Gospel of Mark and the Acts of the Apostles, and exhibits some marked similarities to I Peter—to which we may add that it is far superior in earnestness and force to any of the sub-apostolic literature that has come down to us.

On the other hand, there is such a difference of style in the two compositions that many critics cannot believe them to be the work of the same writer. For example, while in I Peter our Lord is usually called "Jesus Christ," this name occurs only once in II Peter, where the favourite designations are "our Lord Jesus Christ," "our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," "our God and Saviour Jesus Christ," "Jesus our Lord." From a literary point of view the style of II Peter, though ambitious and showy, is much inferior to that of the other, and the difference is the more remarkable because the two epistles purport

to be addressed to the same readers. One of the strongest arguments against apostolic authorship is found in the reference to the epistles of Paul (3¹⁶), as if they were on the same level as "the other scriptures," a position which they did not fully attain till long after the death of both Peter and Paul. Then, again, the combination of "the holy prophets," "the Lord and Saviour," and "your apostles," in 3²; the paucity of allusions to the Old Testament; the want of any reference to the sayings, doings, or sufferings of Christ, except in the two cases above mentioned (which may conceivably have been introduced for the purpose of authenticating the Epistle); the language put into the mouths of mockers with reference to the long delay of the Second Coming: "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"; the appropriation, without any acknowledgment, of so large a portion of another Epistle; the absence of personal greetings; and, not least, the want of any clear evidence of the use of the Epistle by any Christian writer for 150 years after

Peter's death, have all been adduced as reasons for denying the Petrine authorship.

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that the view held by Eusebius, who placed the Epistle in his list of *Antilegomena* or disputed books, and at the same time indicated that in his opinion the tradition in its favour was insufficient to authenticate it, has been adopted by the majority of modern critics. Reuss speaks of its admission into the Canon as the only positive mistake made by the Church in its collection of sacred books, while Jülicher goes so far as to say that it "is not only the latest document in the New Testament but also the least deserving of a place in the canon," a statement, however, which is not borne out by the general sentiment of Christendom. Harnack dates it as late as 160-170. But while opinion in Germany is generally unfavourable to the genuineness of the Epistle, there are some scholars of eminence who are confident that it was written by the Apostle whose name it bears. In particular, Zahn and Spitta hold it to be more thoroughly Petrine than I Peter, which they believe to be largely the work of Silvanus

(I Pet. 5¹²), the previous epistle of Peter, to which he refers in II Peter 3¹, being supposed to have disappeared at an early date. Like Köhl and Weiss, they hold it to have been addressed to Jewish readers, and date it about A.D. 63-65.

Among British scholars opinion used to be in favour of the apostolic origin of the Epistle, but the most recent critics, with the exception of the writer on the subject in the I.C.C., are disposed to assign it to the second century, and to regard it as designed to counteract antinomian tendencies of a more or less Gnostic character. Some would connect it with the so-called Apocalypse of Peter (with which it has a good deal in common), and other writings put forth in the Apostle's name about the middle of the second century, while others would give it a much earlier date, and see in the evils which it so vehemently attacks such shameful practices as those of the Nicolaitans of Pergamum and Thyatira, referred to in Rev. 2^{13 f., 19-22}. The irreconcilable difference of style in the two Epistles ascribed to Peter, which has been the great stumbling-block from the days of Jerome until now, can find no

better explanation than the one which that great scholar suggested, namely, that the apostle employed different interpreters in the two cases, unless we prefer the view of Calvin that it was the work of one of Peter's followers, who was carrying out his master's wishes, and may have taken the opportunity of giving a wider circulation to the warnings in the Epistle of Jude, by embodying them in his Epistle. It is in this foreign element that the difference of style is most marked, and it has been suggested, as another solution, that this part of the Epistle was a later interpolation.

It must not be supposed that by giving up the Petrine authorship we lose the benefit of the Epistle. We may still say, with Calvin, that "the majesty of the Spirit of Christ exhibits itself in every part of it." It has also to be remembered that there may never have been a time in the history of the Church when there was not uncertainty regarding the origin of this book. In this respect modern readers are no worse off than those who never heard of the Higher Criticism.

It was an idea of Grotius that the words "Peter . . . and apostle" (1¹) were an

interpolation, and that "the second epistle" referred to (3¹) consisted of the first two chapters, the name "Simon" at the head of the Epistle representing Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem. According to Bunsen, the first twelve verses and the concluding doxology were the only genuine parts of the Epistle.

The Epistle of Jude stands on a different footing. It has stronger testimony in its favour, having a place in the Muratorian Canon and being frequently mentioned by Christian writers before the end of the second century. We should doubtless have found it much oftener quoted than it is, had it not been for its brevity and its use of two apocryphal Jewish works, namely, the "Assumption of Moses" (Jude v. 9) and the "Book of Enoch" (Jude v. 14 f.), the latter of which is quoted by name.

With regard to the author, there are some who identify him with Jude the Apostle ("Judas the son of James," Luke 6¹⁶), but the reference which he makes to "the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ," in verses 17 and 18, as well as the fact that he does not himself claim to be an apostle, render this conjecture extremely improbable. Others think that it is

“Judas Barsabbas” of Acts 15²² that is referred to, but the general opinion is that it is Judas one of the Lord’s brethren (Matt. 13⁵⁶, I Cor. 9⁵), whether we understand by that description a younger son of Joseph and Mary or a son of Joseph by a former wife—in either case, a “brother of James,” the head of the Church at Jerusalem. The comparatively obscure position of this Jude in the history of the early Church (as of the others who bore the same name), and the unpretending way in which he is described as “a servant of Jesus Christ,” though he might have claimed to be the Lord’s brother, forbid the supposition that there was here any attempt to use a great name for the purpose of imposing on the reader. That one so closely related to Jesus should have held a position of influence, if not of authority, in the Church at Jerusalem or elsewhere in Palestine, is only what might have been expected; and we can readily believe that this letter, although formally addressed “to them that are called, beloved in God the Father, and kept for Jesus Christ,” was specially intended for some of the Churches known to Jude, in which there had been an

outbreak of antinomian license, such as is foreshadowed in the Pastoral Epistles and has frequently occurred in the history of the Church. From verse 3 it may be inferred that the subject had been chosen by the writer at the last moment, on hearing news of some such perversion of the Gospel.

The author was evidently acquainted with Paul's writings, and from this fact as well as from the way in which he speaks of the personal teaching of the apostles as a thing of the past in the experience of his readers, and of faith in the second coming of Christ as on the decline, many critics who accept the traditional authorship assign a comparatively late date to the Epistle (about 70-80),¹ while others date it before A.D. 70, partly on account of its containing no allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem—an event to which the writer might have been expected to refer, as an awful instance of Divine judgment, if it had already taken place.²

¹ Ewald, Spitta, Zahn, Mayor, Sieffert, Bartlet, Reuss, Lumby, Bennett, etc.

² Bleek, Kirchofer, Weiss, Stier, Salmond, Bigg, Chase. But Hofmann and Zahn fancy there is a reference to this event in verse 5.

There are a considerable number of scholars, however, who are of opinion that the character of the Epistle, and the degenerate state of the Church which it implies,¹ betray an acquaintance on the part of the author with the libertine Gnosticism of the second century. It shows what a wide divergence of opinion there is on the subject, that, while Baur thought the Epistle could not have been written till late in the second century, Renan put it as early as A.D. 54, regarding it as a covert attack on Paul's teaching. Baur's followers generally favour an earlier date in the second century than he assigned to it. This is the case also with Harnack (who dates it about 100-130, and suggests that the words "and brother of James" may have been an interpolation of a later date intended to give the Epistle additional authority), McGiffert, S. Davidson, and others, who hold the Epistle

¹ For evidence that similar evils existed in apostolic times cf. Revelation 2¹⁴ ¹⁵, 20¹⁰ ¹¹; Galatians 5¹³; II Corinthians 12²¹. It has been suggested that in Jude v. 10 there is a reference to the Cainites, a Gnostic sect of the second century, but if so, this would not be the only passage of the New Testament in which Cain is mentioned as a type of ungodliness (cf. Heb. 11⁴, I John 3¹²).

to be pseudonymous, the name of Jude having been selected as a likely exponent for the views expressed in it.

It appears from verse 18 that the readers had enjoyed the personal teaching of the apostles; and from this fact, as well as from the Jewish associations and traditions which enter into the Epistle, we may infer that it was intended for some part of Palestine or Syria where "ungodly men" professing Christianity were turning the grace of God into lasciviousness (verse 10). Jude attributes the evil practices to false and heretical teaching, and as a remedy he exhorts his readers to contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints, and concludes with one of the most beautiful doxologies in the New Testament.

In closing our survey of the History and Results of New Testament Criticism, there are three things which it would be well to bear in mind. (1) With regard to many of the questions involved it is quite impossible to arrive at anything like certainty. (2) Great learning is no guarantee of sound judgment; and the evidence

of experts, in this as in other fields of inquiry, must be carefully considered before their conclusions are accepted. (3) Infinitely more important than any opinion we may form regarding the authorship, date, or text, of any book in the New Testament, is the question: "What think ye of the Christ?" as revealed under various aspects both in the Old and the New Testament. It is their testimony to Christ that gives the Scriptures their chief value; it is the revelation of Christ that forms their inner bond of union.