

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

I was convinced that it was a chapel for worship. The door was originally twenty feet high, opening to the south, and opposite it stood what was probably an altar. The roof was arched and ornamented. I am inclined to think it was a chapel for sun worship at noon-day, as the immense temple above was for the worship of the same luminary at his rising. Thus Baalbek was, so to speak, the capital of sun worship."

"One would naturally suppose that a temple of the sun would in its longer diameter correspond exactly with a line drawn east and west. Instead of this it varies ten or twelve degrees. The reason for this deviation seems to be that the western end is made to face with great exactitude the highest point of *Jebel Sunnûn*, perhaps with reference to some chapel for worship on that summit, or because the morning worshipper would see the rays of the sun lighting up that point a full half-hour before they reached the temple itself."

ARTICLE V.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE APOSTLES.¹

BY S. R. ASBURY, RESIDENT LICENTIATE AT ANDOVER.

INTRODUCTION.

THE subject of which the present work treats forms the second part of the Theology of the New Testament. A presentation of the apostolic doctrine, apart from the doctrine of Christ as contained in the Gospels, presupposes that the former, though closely connected with the latter, yet forms

¹ Abstract of *Die Lehre der Apostel*, dargestellt von Hermann Messner. Dr. Messner is now Professor Extraordinary in the University of Berlin, and editor of the *Neue Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*. He is said to be a man of thoroughly evangelical and progressive views. Other works referred to in the Article are: *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, von Chr. Fr. Schmid, Professor in Tübingen (Stuttgart, 1859); *Die Petrische Lehrbegriff*, by Lic. Dr. Bernhard Weiss, Professor in Königsberg (Berlin, 1855); Neander *Die Pflanzung der Christlichen Kirche*, etc. [*The Planting of Christianity*, etc.].

an independent, distinct whole. Our first task is to define the relation between the two.

We may designate this relation as one of great and surprising unity, together with peculiar differences. By the old idea of inspiration, which regarded the scriptures as a single united divine revelation, these differences were altogether excluded, and all investigation into the object or occasion of the composition of any book was forbidden. By some recent theories of inspiration these differences are emphasized into irreconcilable contradictions. In opposition to both these views we regard the teachings of the apostles as differing from each other, according to their individual characters and the circumstances in which they wrote, but at the same time possessing essential unity with the teachings of Christ. Both in the order of nature and of the Bible facts are presented before doctrine. The teaching of Christ prior to the accomplishment of his Messianic work necessarily consisted of hints only on some points, while others had to be left wholly untouched. It is these germs as given by Christ which were developed by the apostles, each according to his own individuality, which the Holy Spirit did not suppress, but glorified. Christ did not leave a doctrinal system; he is not, however, to be regarded as having merely given the impulse to the productions of the apostles. He was conscious of all the truths which they developed, and in his teaching were included all their peculiar forms, the sententiousness of James, the dialectics of Paul, the intuitiveness of John. The peculiarities of the apostolic doctrine which distinguish it from the teaching of Christ are, its closer relation to church doctrine and systematic theology, especially in those apostles who developed the teachings of Christ most fully; the greater discursiveness of the apostles, which was needed in order to produce firm conviction in the minds of those whom they addressed; and the peculiarities occasioned by the difference between the Messianic and apostolic epochs, especially in the complete separation of the new from the elder dispensation.

In this discussion the word "apostles" is used, not in the

wider meaning which it sometimes bears, but in the more restricted sense of those who were chosen and instructed by Christ himself as his witnesses, who also enjoyed the special influences of the Holy Spirit to enable them to penetrate more deeply into the truth, to exercise greater attraction over other men, and to continue themselves Christ's prophetic office. The canon contains writings by but few such apostles, but these were the most influential in founding and guiding the church, and include representatives of all the different tendencies of Christian doctrine. Paul must be regarded as equal to the rest in apostolic rank, both on account of his special qualification as a witness of Christ, and the confirmation which this received in his powerful grasp of the truth and his success in imparting it. Other writings in the canon have been regarded by some as not apostolic — the Epistles of James, Jude, and to the Hebrews, the Apocalypse, the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and the Acts; but these must not be omitted in the discussion, since the decision as to their origin depends in great measure on the determination of their doctrinal contents. The same may be said of the authorship of the second Epistle of Peter.

With reference to the general character of the apostolic doctrine, it should be observed that the intimate connection of the apostles with Christ confers dignity on their writings, and entirely sets aside the view propounded by Geuss, that these were but imperfect attempts to solve the great problems of Christianity, such as have since been made by uninspired men. The doctrine of the apostles shows by its peculiar form and contents that it was not the result of mere reflection, but accords with their claim that they possessed influences which distinguished them from ordinary writers.

The question as to the sources of the doctrine is connected with that as to its subject and centre. It is not a general doctrine of God and religion, but the whole finds its centre and meaning in Christ. The apostles were prepared for their vocation by the contemplation of the Messianic work and life of Christ, and the understanding of this life was

opened up to them by the express testimony of Christ concerning himself. But the words of Christ were not the only source, since the apostles make many distinctions not touched upon by him. The common source of all and the ground of unity was the spirit of Christ, the operation of which was conditioned by the personality of each and the progress of his development. Another source was the Old Testament with reference to those general ideas which it has in common with the New Testament. But as Christ himself adopted these ideas their source is found also in his teachings. Paul's doctrine seems to be independent of that of the other apostles, in so far as it was derived from express revelation. He received a revelation at the time of his call (and did not go up to Jerusalem to be taught), and also other special revelations. These he distinguishes from the ordinary teachings of the Spirit (1 Cor. xi. 23; xv. 3, *παρέλαβον*).¹ His doctrine is thus, not the result of study, but the development of revelation. The words of Christ were known to him before his conversion, but were not understood without the instruction of the Holy Spirit.

The authenticity of some of the apostolic writings has been called in question; we cannot therefore altogether ignore the criticism of them as sources of doctrine. It will be found, however, that the settlement of critical questions will generally result from the presentation of the doctrinal contents of the various writings. It will thus also be seen that they are all very far superior to those which are generally admitted to be spurious.

We have to regard the apostolic doctrines, at the same time, according to their marvellous unity and their manifold differences. The latter though chiefly formal are not wholly so. They proceed in part from the requirements of the various churches at different times, and in part from different general views of the same truth. Thus there are in the church divergent forms of doctrine which may all find their

¹ But see Bernard's Bampton Lectures on the Progress of Christian Doctrine, Note viii.; and Ellicott's Commentary *in loc.*

foundation with equal right in the scriptures, and which are not only possible but necessary to exhibit the manifold richness of the Christian spirit. What the different apostolic forms of doctrine are, and in what relation they stand to each other, is hereafter to be examined.

In the performance of this task several methods may be adopted. Hahn and others first assume a general system, from which they afterwards separate the doctrinal conception of the particular apostle. But thus they attribute to the whole system much which belongs only to individuals, and in the presentation of this system the arrangement of the doctrinal ideas is according to an entirely abstract scheme. The plan here adopted is the reverse of this method. The doctrinal views of the apostles will first be considered, each by itself, and then their mutual relation as forming a system. It must be remembered that none of the New Testament writings contain the system of an apostle in its completeness; the presentation therefore can be only approximate. The exposition of each form of doctrine will be prefaced by a brief survey of its general characteristics, and those points will be examined first which stand in the foreground in the view of all the apostles.

I. General Characteristics of the Views of the particular Apostles.

Schmid has demolished the theory of de Wette and Cölln, which distinguished Jewish and Hellenistic Christian writings, and three main forms of Christianity, the Palestinian, Alexandrian, and Pauline. If a Pauline form is distinguished, why may not others be ascribed to other apostles? There is in such a theory danger of attributing to one what is common to all. A better method is to distinguish the forms of doctrine by the individuality of the several apostles, James, Jude, Peter, Paul, and John. The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse will have to be considered either as distinct forms, or as different phases in the doctrine of Paul and John.

In order to understand the various expositions of doctrine, and ascertain their proper sequence, we must find the thread which connects them, or the inner relation in which they stand to each other. This, as already shown, must be traced in the fundamental conceptions of each with respect to Christ, his person, work, and the character of his redemption. These again are closely connected with the views held concerning the relation of the revelation in Christ to that of the Old Testament. As it has been well remarked, the doctrinal views with respect to this question assume a middle position, which is both original in that it is not a compromise between opposing views, and conservative in that it saves from the extremes both of Ebionitism and of Marcion and the Gnosis. There is a far greater divergence between these heretical forms and the apostolic than between the different apostles. The fact that some prefer to regard the old and new covenants from the side of their unity, without by any means denying the distinction between them, though not choosing to render it prominent, while others, presupposing the unity of the revelations, attend rather to their differences, making these the main object in their exhibition of the Christian truth, gives rise to a variety of apostolic forms of doctrine, which in depth and circumference can be compared to no other. The latter form, however, which represents the old covenant as imperfect, the new as perfect, in that it does not promise, but possesses salvation, will alone give a satisfactory solution of the questions as to the person and work of Christ. It is easy to perceive to which sides James the apostle to the Jews and Paul the apostle to the Gentiles lean. From the extreme brevity of his Epistle it is more difficult to decide as to the view of Jude; but as he stood in close connection with James the brother of our Lord, we infer that he was on the same side. With reference to Peter the strong Pauline influence said to be manifested in his first epistle and in his speeches in the Acts has been exaggerated. Such an influence doubtless existed, but not in such force as to overrule his own peculiar tendencies. He leans more to the view of

the unity of the old and new covenants, and is thus more intimately related to James than to Paul. The Epistle to the Hebrews seems to contain both views. The fundamental conception is that of Paul, at least in a milder form, while the particular ideas are those of Peter. The epistle is, however, rather Pauline than Petrine, in that it emphasizes the imperfection of the old covenant, and the impossibility of adhering to it, and yet partaking of the blessings of the new. The Apocalypse is related to the Old Testament in form, in which it differs from the Gospels and Epistles of John; on the other hand its more developed doctrine of the person of Christ separates it from the writings of James and Peter. The old covenant itself presents such a rich development that no single apostle can exhibit the whole of its relations. We find therefore that different apostles regard it according to its different sides, their preferences being due to their individual characters, and not to the occasion of their writing. Some emphasize the relation of the New Testament to the law, others to the prophets, others again to the worship. Thus different forms of doctrine may arise out of the same revelation, according to the relative prominence given to the different elements of the old dispensation. James and Paul regarded the new covenant predominantly in its relation to the law, Peter and the Apocalypse in its relation to prophecy, the Epistle to the Hebrews in its relation to worship. The position of John is more difficult to determine, yet on due examination it will be found that he views the new covenant chiefly in its relation to Old Testament prophecy.

A further division of the apostolic forms of doctrine may be made of those which regard the new covenant predominantly on the side of its unity with the old, into those which regard this unity with special reference to the law and those which treat it with special reference to prophecy. The same division may also be made of those forms which insist on the differences of the old and new covenants. Thus with respect to prophecy in one case, it is shown how all the Old Testament prophecies are fulfilled in Christ, in the

other how much more there is in the fulfilment than in the prophecy.

As to the order in which we should treat the different doctrinal ideas there are two views. According to the first, which considers them all as equally important, though regarded from different sides, those doctrines are placed in immediate juxtaposition which connect the redemption of Christ with the law, and then those which connect it with the prophecies of the Old Testament. The second view regards the various doctrines, not as co-ordinate, but as subordinate, to each other, recognizing in them a process of development. According to this genetic method we proceed from the lower to the higher stages of development. Those forms of doctrine which accent the unity of the old and new covenants are less developed than those which accent their differences. We therefore begin with James, Jude, and Peter, and proceed to Paul and John. As the Epistle of Peter seems to have more reference to the prophetic scriptures, of which the centre is Christ and his salvation, than to the law, it should follow James, and form the link between James and Paul. Jude, as far as we can judge from his brief Epistle, renders the peculiarly Christian ideas more prominent than James; we therefore give him an intermediate position between James and Peter.

THE DOCTRINE OF JAMES.¹

Introduction.

The Authorship of the Epistle. — The idea of its interpolation to bridge over the difference between Paul and Ebionitism arose from the statements of Hegesippus as to the position of James, which are in contradiction to those of the Acts. The Epistle contains a view of Christian truth which has nothing in common with Ebionitism, but which is in full harmony with the apostolic period. It exhibits an expecta-

¹ Schmid's mode of designation is "The Apostolic Doctrine according to James," etc., which more fitly expresses the essential unity of the doctrine of the apostles (Cf. Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Tim. i. 8; 2 John ix. 10).

tion of the speedy *parousia* of Christ, and an undeveloped form of doctrine which could not have been presented at a later date. Of external testimony in its favor the strongest is its adoption by the Syriac version, which omits several of the Catholic Epistles.

For what Readers, and when written. — This is not very clear. The superscription would lead us to suppose that it was addressed to the Jews out of Palestine, but as there is no attempt to awaken belief, this being assumed, they must have been believing Jews. Perhaps, as Christians are the true Israel, it may have been addressed to the Christian churches out of Palestine. It is evident that James regarded the Jewish Christians as the nucleus of the church. It must have been written during the apostolic period, though not at the very beginning of it. Settled churches were already in existence (v. 14). The supposed reference of ii. 14 sq. to Paul's doctrine of justification in his Epistles to the Romans and Galatians is too doubtful to serve as a *datum*.

The Fundamental Conception. The Perfect Law. The Word of Truth. The Law of Freedom.

The view of the new covenant which runs through the Epistle is that it is a more perfect law. Wherever James mentions the new covenant he designates it as a law (i. 25 ; vii. 8, 9, 10, 12 ; iv. 11). The Epistle contains moral precepts which agree with this conception, as does also the emphasis on works as the fruit of faith. God is designated as lawgiver and judge (iv. 12). James also speaks of the law as *λόγος*, and more particularly as *λόγος ἀληθείας*, *λόγος ἔμφυτος* (i. 18, 20, 22). That *λόγος* here does not mean the knowledge of Christ is evident from the doing of the word being spoken of in the same way as the doing of the law. Were the law that of the old covenant the Christian character of this Epistle could not be maintained ; but James distinguishes it from this by speaking of it as the *λόγος ἀληθείας*. The designation *perfect law* (i. 25) also implies opposition to some law which is imperfect, and what other can this be than

the Mosaic? This is confirmed by the expression "the word of truth." By comparison with the Sermon on the Mount, with which this Epistle is related, we interpret this as implying that the dispositions of men are to be regarded instead of their outward acts only. The law of freedom (i. 25) is opposed to a law of unfreedom and servitude. It is that which does not compel the outward observance of the law, but fulfils it freely from love.

The perfection of this new law consists in this, that it *imparts power to do that which it requires*. James ascribes to this new law a renewing power (i. 18; i. 21), a power to effect the salvation of men. With this it agrees that in this passage the word of truth is also designated as *λόγος ἔμφυτος*, i.e. such as comes to man, not as the old law, outwardly, but as penetrating to his inmost being. The old law *shows* the will of God, the new law *effects* it.

Is it thus declared that believers are no longer bound to the ritual part of the Mosaic law? Not directly. It is implied that they have the power, and may fulfil it freely from love. What is strange is, that James, who insisted on such strictness in the observance of the ritual, confines himself here to the ethical, part of the law. It may be explained thus, that he might presume on such an observance among those whom he addresses. It is plain from his epistle that he did not ascribe to the observance of the ritual any justifying efficacy, and urged it not as a duty, but from free piety towards the law. He declares the condition of justification before God to be faith and works, and these works are not external legal works, but works of love. This accords with what we learn of James's position toward the Mosaic law from Paul's Epistles and the Book of Acts.

Christ the Fulfiller of the Law, the Lord of Glory.

The question arises: Who, according to James, raised the law of servitude to a law of freedom? He does not expressly say, but as he ascribes the new birth to faith in Christ, it must be he who has elevated the law of the old covenant to

the perfect law. It has been an objection to the Christian character of this epistle that Christ is so seldom mentioned. The doctrine concerning Christ is certainly less developed than in some others, but the Epistle is not on Old Testament ground. It is the regal office of Christ which predominates. According to James he is Lord (v. 8) in a sense in which the term is elsewhere applied only to God. In the beginning he speaks of God and Jesus Christ in immediate connection. Christ is also the Judge (v. 9), a title which presupposes the possession of divine glory and power. This is all that James teaches expressly about Christ. It shows that his idea of God is a Christian one, though in v. 4 he uses the peculiarly Old Testament name of God — the Lord of Sabaoth. But other elements of doctrine which are not definitely stated may be supplied by inference. James speaks in v. 8 of Christ as a judge, but in iv. 12 ascribes judicial activity to him only from whom the law proceeded; therefore the perfect law, the law of freedom, must by him be attributed to Christ.

There are two elements in his conception of the perfect law: 1. That by this law, as the word of truth, the divine will in its whole circumference and depth is applied to the consciences of men; 2. That it not merely requires its fulfilment by men from free love to it, but gives them also the power therefor. According to the first element Christ is to be regarded as the perfect teacher of divine truth, as is shown by the allusion to the words of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount. In accordance with the second, the regenerating power of the perfect law is (i. 18) ascribed to faith in Christ. While the prophetic and regal offices of Christ are so prominent, it is strange that his high priestly office is neither expressed nor to be inferred. This omission does not imply any contradiction to the other apostles, but only a less developed system than theirs. James speaks in v. 15 of the forgiveness of sins, but in the Old Testament sense without any reference to the effect of Christ's death. He declares that by the law of liberty a new divine life is received, but how the guilt of the former life is first expiated

he does not explain. We are not to infer from this that he was uninformed as to the efficacy of Christ's death, though it accords with the fundamental conception of the Epistle that the significance of this side of the work of Christ was relatively less fully disclosed to him.

Sin and the Law.

In James's view of the imperfection of the law is involved that of the condition of the human race as one of sin and death, which accounts for the law being one of servitude. By the works of the law man cannot be justified, because the human will strives against the divine law. Sin is so deeply engrafted in man's nature that it is active even in the regenerate life (iii. 2). Since it is the contradiction of his will, God as the author of the law cannot be spoken of as its cause. James emphasizes the personal guilt of sin, but refers it rather to particular conscious transgressions than to a sinful disposition. Hence by *ἀμαρτία* he always designates actual violations of the law (i. 15 ; ii. 9 ; v. 15). We are not, then, to conclude that he regarded the lust of which he speaks as morally indifferent. It is the first stage of sinful development. He speaks of it as universally existing, but makes no declaration concerning its origin. It is implied that man is still free to resist its influence. But if the will, which (i. 15) is regarded as the productive principle, agrees with the evil desire, the conscious particular transgression of the law follows, and this has death for its consequence, which is thus the common offspring of lust and the human will. That sin does not consist only in these particular transgressions, but in a sinful *habitus*, follows also from the idea of the new birth, which is represented as a radical renovation of the whole inner life. The immediate consequence of sin, which God in his holy law has inseparably connected with it, is death. He does not discuss its nature, as it would be known to his readers, but from i. 15 ; v. 20 it appears that he does not exclude from it physical, but has directly in view moral, destruction, with which the feeling of miserable disunion must be always connected.

Regeneration.

That which distinguishes the perfect law from the law of the old covenant is the power which resides in it to effect a complete renovation of the inner, moral condition of man. James speaks of regeneration in one passage only (i. 18), but the idea is not an isolated one. It results from the connection of the law of freedom with the present condition of mankind. His slight mention of it accords with his consideration of actual sin and works in preference to evil inclination and faith. He does not understand by it complete cleansing from sin (iii. 2). Every man ought to be perfect, but the fulfilment of the law by believers is not absolute. Regeneration is that fact by which lust is not destroyed, but robbed of its power, so that the fulfilment is possible. Its source is in the divine will, not in natural life, and thus the whole Christian life is primarily attributed to God. The new life springs from the new birth. Works are the result of faith.

A peculiarly Christian character has been denied to this Epistle by some, on the ground that its morality is not definitely connected with Christian ideas, but still rests on the basis of Old Testament ethics. It is true that the connection is less definitely exhibited than in the more developed doctrinal systems. Its moral precepts are based on general religious ideas, such as are common to the Old Testament. But not altogether so. Thus in v. 7 the exhortation to patience in the endurance of suffering is founded on the Christian idea of the second coming of Christ, and in ii. 5 the poor being rich in faith is presented as a motive to love them as brethren.

Faith and Regeneration.

Their relation is not definitely expressed, but seems to be presupposed. It is by faith in Christ as the Lord of glory (ii. 1) that the new law receives the power ascribed to it of effecting the regeneration of men. James has a double conception of faith, and only when this is not perceived can it

be said to be a low one. The first conception which is found in the polemic passage (ii. 14-26) is that of historic belief or assent, a conviction of the existence and activity of God which possesses no ethical quality. It has no connection with love and confidence towards God, and may be found in a life altogether estranged from him. James does not disapprove of this faith (ii. 19), and even designates it as *πίστις*. This is remarkable, but may probably be explained as the language of his opponents, which he adopts. He regards it as a lower grade of faith, but worthless in a man whose life is ungodly. It is his object in ii. 14-26 to show that such faith cannot possibly effect justification before God, and to illustrate this by examples from Old Testament history. His second view of faith is of a much higher and profounder character. According to i. 3; v. 15 it is connected with an undoubting confidence in divine power and goodness, and full devotion of the heart to God. It presupposes that man renounces his own power. In v. 15 it is represented as the soul of prayer and the whole Christian life, and in ii. 5 it is implied as the necessary condition of partaking in the kingdom of God and his salvation. His conception of faith, however, appears in a less developed form than that which connects it definitely with Christ. Faith is represented as trust in the divine power and help, rather than an appropriation of the redemption from sin and guilt by the death of Christ; the latter idea never being expressly brought out in this Epistle.

Faith and Works.

It is clear that the lower grade of faith can be found without works, but there cannot be faith in the higher sense without its producing a new life. When James ascribes justification to works he means such as are produced by a living faith. If, according to i. 3, 4, faith produces patience, and patience is a perfect work, it follows that from faith is evolved the whole new life. James's doctrine thus far surpasses the legal point of view. The perfect law recognizes such works only as are rooted in faith.

Justification.

James uses this term in the sense of the Old Testament, of Christ and of Paul, not of an inward transformation, but of the recognition of man on the part of God as just, and his installation into all his rights. This is clear from ii. 23. In this verse faith must be used in the higher sense, since Abraham exercised more than mere historical belief. The condition of the justification of man before God is, then, according to James, faith and works at the same time. The emphasis seems to be on works; but these have no more value than mere historical belief, except as the product of true faith. In ii. 23 he quotes scripture in which faith is represented as the condition of salvation, but this is explained by v. 22 as faith made perfect by works. Abraham was justified by faith because his faith did not remain imperfect, but was developed into act. This view does not depend entirely on the polemic reference of the passage, but on the fundamental idea of the Epistle, that the law is brought to perfection by Christ, who gives power to fulfil it. There would be this difficulty in supposing that James ascribes justification to works only, that he represents these as not in this life the perfect fulfilment of the law. The perfect law takes into account the disposition of men and its expression in words. In the life of the regenerate sin is broken but not fully destroyed. Hence, if works justify, it must be because God overlooks their imperfection. This would seem to lead us back to faith as the principle of justification; but James has not presented the idea of faith as that by which the sinner appropriates the grace of God in Christ, but only as the principle of a new life. This is connected with the undeveloped form of his doctrine of Christ and the atonement. Thus it harmonizes with the Epistle as a whole, and does not necessarily imply any reference to the teachings of Paul. It is not probable that the latter had found much currency among the Jewish Christians, and the Epistle is not of a character to clear up any such misunderstanding as

might have arisen. We cannot believe that James directly combated Paul after acknowledging him as of equal apostleship with himself (Gal. ii. 9).

The rest of the discussion must be deferred till we consider the doctrine of the apostles in its comparative aspects.

THE DOCTRINE OF JUDE.

Jude is the brother of James (v. 1), but, as we infer from v. 17, not an apostle. He is not the son of James, mentioned Acts i. 13. He was one of the brethren of our Lord, and therefore equal in rank with the apostles (1 Cor. ix. 5), especially among Jewish Christians. We should expect that his doctrine would be more closely related to that of James than of Paul, and this we find to be the case, though, from the brevity of the Epistle, it can be presented only in its tendency, not as a complete system. Objections have been raised to the genuineness of the Epistle, on account of its use of apocryphal writings and its similarity to 2 Peter. The latter objection is set aside by the view now generally held that Jude was the original. The internal evidence is in favor of this view. While 2 Peter no longer ventures to maintain the near approach of Christ's coming, the author of this Epistle still lives in expectation of it (v. 21), and connects it with the idea of judgment which runs through the Epistle.

The time of its composition was the later apostolic period, as we infer that the apostles mentioned in v. 17 were not then living. The chief reference must be to Paul, since the prophecy of v. 18 is found in his writings. The author of 2 Peter (iii. 15) also appeals to his agreement with Paul. The Epistle was directed against heretics, whose evil lives were supported by their erroneous views. It contains, also, traces of gnosticism in the references to the angel-world and to the denial of the *κυριότης* of Christ. The fundamental idea which runs through the whole is that of the final judgment, which is prepared for by various manifestations of divine justice. The heretics believed that they were de

livered from judgment by the reception of divine grace. Jude would show by a series of examples that grace does not exclude judgment, but carries it in its bosom. Law and judgment are correlates. Hence this Epistle is a sort of supplement to that of James, which regards the gospel as the perfect law.

Christ the only Lord and Ruler.

It is distinctly expressed by Jude, what is only implied by James, that the salvation of the new covenant is procured by Christ, since the words "by Jesus Christ" in v. 25, though omitted in the received text, have a preponderance of testimony in their favor. Christ is mentioned more frequently than by James. Jude's doctrine of redemption also approaches the more developed form, as is seen in vs. 20, 21, where it is attributed to a threefold causality, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Christ is spoken of as by his second coming completing the work of redemption; but it is not explained on what foundation this rests. In so brief an Epistle we cannot expect all points to be touched upon; but the omission of this leads us to suspect that Jude, like James, regards the new covenant as a glorified law.

The Person of Christ.

With respect to this point, also, the views of Jude are related to those of James. The designation of Christ in v. 4 as the Lord and only Ruler indicates that Jesus is regarded as alone participating in the divine power and glory. The prominence which he gives to the divine glory of Christ is connected with the thought of the judgment, which runs through the Epistle. Jude feels himself impelled by the prevalent errors to maintain the *κυριότης* of Christ. We proceed on the assumption that *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον*, v. 4, is the correct reading, and that *θεόν* after *δεσπότην* is, according to the best ancient testimonies, to be omitted, and that, further, the words *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην* must be referred, not to God, but to Christ. This reference

to Christ is most natural on account of the absence of the article before *κύριον*, and it is moreover required by the fact that the relation to God was spoken of in the immediately preceding context. If these words in v. 4 refer to a denial of the *κυριότης* of Christ, it is then most natural to understand a similar reference to Christ in v. 8, though a more general one also need not be excluded. As warning of impending judgment is the main import of the Epistle, it is most natural to understand the *κυριότης* of Christ here as that glory and divine power which is manifested in the judgment. Christ is thus represented as the Mediator, but without particularizing the kind and manner of his mediation; but he is apprehended above all as the completer of salvation.

The peculiarly Christian ideas of Jude will appear more definitely if we regard the doctrine of the Epistle concerning the new salvation according to its subjective side. There is not so much said of faith as in James; *πίστις* occurs only twice, and in both cases in an objective sense; but such expressions as *ἡγιασμένοι* (v. 1, T. R.), *ἄγιοι* (v. 3), *κλητοί* (v. 1), *τετηρημένοι* (v. 1), remind us of the more developed forms of doctrine, and especially the fact that in v. 20 the subjective Christian life is brought into connection with the Holy Spirit.

The reference of Jude to apocryphal traditions and writings has not been considered, since it has no essential connection with the doctrinal substance of his Epistle, but pertains only to his particular arguments. It seems certain that this reference on the part of Jude was not a mere accommodation to the point of view of his readers. But, in our estimation of this Epistle, it should not be overlooked that it is only ideas which are common to all the other New Testament Epistles that Jude thus seeks to illustrate.¹

¹ Schmid remarks with respect to the didactic portion of this epistle, (a) That in it all the essential points of the Christian consciousness are touched upon. (b) That the main thought and real motive both of its polemic and parenetic portions, is the divine judgment, and that this doctrine of the judgment is the continuation and completion of the doctrine of the Epistle of James, i. e. of Christianity as the perfect law of liberty.

THE DOCTRINE OF PETER.¹*Introduction.*

Among the sources for the exhibition of the doctrine of Peter we must not include Second Peter, since the doubts as to its genuineness, are due not merely to modern criticism, but to the tradition of the ancient church, and are not removed by the consideration of its doctrinal contents. The true sources are the First Epistle of Peter and his speeches in the Acts. The exhibition of the Petrine doctrine will show that the fundamental conceptions are the same in both. The genuineness of First Peter is universally acknowledged; for it presents the apostle in exact accordance with the idea we form of him from the Gospels. The idea that it has a Pauline character must be rejected on a close examination of its doctrine. There are many ideas in the Epistle which are not found in Paul in the same form, and *vice versa*. Paul may have exercised some influence over Peter; but we do not find his peculiar phrases in the Epistle. Still, the Petrine doctrine may be regarded as the mere undeveloped, preliminary stage of the Pauline.

With respect to the readers of the Epistle, the view seems at first most natural that Peter, as the apostle of the circumcision, wrote to the Jewish Christians. But it is evident that Peter had not himself preached to those whom he addresses; and an unbiased exposition will show that the doctrine applies equally well to converts from heathenism.

The historical position of Peter in the apostolic church is between James and Paul. He did not hold that Jewish descent entitled to a share in Christ's redemption; but he did believe this to be the original birthright of the Jews,

¹ Weiss treats of the doctrine of Peter under the following heads: 1. Peter the apostle of hope. 2. Peter the apostle of the circumcision—including his views of the Old Testament, of faith and obedience, bondage and sonship, his doctrine of sin, and of the Word, of the Spirit, and of God. 3. Peter the apostle of Jesus Christ—his doctrine of Christ, of redemption, and of the conditions of securing it, as repentance, baptism, faith, and communion. 4. Peter the co-presbyter—his doctrine of the church. 5. Peter and Paul.

and that the heathen could participate in it only through acceptance of the Mosaic law. Missions to the heathen were not at first approved by him, and, though he was specially directed to extend his labors to them, he seems never to have been at home in the work. That his views afterward underwent a change may be supposed, but cannot be proved. Peter's sphere of activity doubtless affected his apprehension and presentation of Christian truth. Thus he emphasizes the unity rather than the differences of the two economies. He also expected the Jewish Christians to observe the law from piety towards it, not for the sake of legal justification, though, according to Acts xv. 10, he exonerated the Gentile Christians from such observance.

In an apostle of such strong individuality and occupying so important a position we should expect to find a peculiar apprehension and presentation of doctrine. Brückner and Neander, however, fail to recognize any distinct doctrinal tendency in his Epistle. It is true that in Peter, as in James, there is a predominance of ethical ideas; but in the former these are brought into close connection with ideas which are definitely Christian. In James the *λόγος* is the new moral law; in Peter it is the tidings of the Messianic work of Christ. In both, however, the new covenant is represented as the perfection and confirmation of the old.

The Fundamental Conception.

The fundamental conception of Peter is the fulfilment of prophecy in Christ. Weiss denies and Neander ignores any such conception. But the Epistle is not a mere collection of disconnected views, and Weiss acknowledges that the emphasis Peter lays on hope is not to be explained by a paracletic purpose, but by the whole character of the Epistle. In i. 3 hope is designated as the aim of the new birth, and in iii. 5 as the most characteristic quality of the holy women of old. Peter is the apostle of hope as Paul is of faith. In his speeches in the Acts he proves the Messiahship of Christ by showing that the Messianic predictions are fulfilled in him.

The difference between this view and that of the Epistle is, that in the latter this fulfilment is represented as still in part to be realized, and therefore in part the subject of hope.

The Person of Christ.

As Christ was the centre of Old Testament prophecy, the testimony of Peter must relate chiefly to him. The emphasis on the doctrine of Christ as the Messiah is indeed peculiarly Petrine. Christ as the predicted Messiah is the servant of God. This designation occurs repeatedly in the speeches, and though not expressly in the Epistle, is implied in the passage ii. 18 sq. It is characteristic of Peter, and expresses a less lofty conception of Christ than the phrase "Son of God," which he never uses. The perfect sinlessness of Christ is, however, connected with this idea of service. Another designation characteristic of Peter's view is "Prince of life," ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς (Acts iii. 15; v. 31). It is not indeed found in the Epistle, but agrees with its Christology. It is equivalent to "author of life," and thus refers to the resurrection. The words "it was not possible" in Acts ii. 24 refer to the promise in Ps. xvi., and in view of this expression, "Prince of life," obtain a deeper significance.

In accordance with prophecy concerning the servant of God, Christ appears in the two conditions of humiliation and exaltation, which are also repeated in the life of his followers. The sitting at the right hand of God, which Peter expressly mentions (iii. 22), involves his possession of the fulness of divine glory. Still, the term "Lord" appears not to be used in such a wide sense by Peter as by Paul. Is the spirit of Christ (i. 11) the spirit which he always possessed, or the spirit of God which was communicated to him at his baptism, and afterwards dwelt in him in all its fulness? The real pre-existence of Christ is an idea not found elsewhere in the Epistle, and we therefore refer this expression to the idea of the apostle that salvation was ordained of old. He acknowledges the divine decree of redemption as eternal, and leaves it to be understood that the person by whom it was accomplished was also eternal.

The Messianic Work of Christ.

No emphasis is laid by Peter on the prophetic office of Christ, though the preaching in the kingdom of the dead (1 Pet. iii. 19) and to the living (Acts x. 36) is regarded as part of his Messianic work. The benefits conferred on humanity by Christ are attributed rather to his resurrection, ascension, the effusion of the Spirit, and his second coming, than to his death; but as these benefits are received only in connection with the forgiveness of sins, the substitutionary sufferings of the servant of God are an essential part of his Messianic work. The view according to which his death was the main object of his mission is not expressed by Peter. The universality of sin is involved in the death of Christ, as also in his distinction from the human race as the only just one (iii. 18), and in the necessity of regeneration (i. 3). But Peter resembles James in considering rather the single actual sins of men than the disposition which lies back of them. He neither traces their origin nor connection with the sin of our first parents, there being no occasion for this to illustrate the fulfilment of prophecy in Christ. In his sermons in the Acts Peter endeavors to show that the death of Christ is not opposed to his Messianic dignity, being the accomplishment of prophecy. In the Epistle, in relation to the forgiveness of sins by the death of Christ, he does not go beyond what the Lord himself taught, or what was foreshadowed by the Old Testament prophecies and types. Thus the characteristic ideas of Paul on this subject are absent from the doctrine of Peter. In the Epistle the sufferings of Christ are regarded as exemplary for believers. The innocence of the Saviour, which Peter so insists on, is exhibited in his patience under suffering; and since this was not endured on account of his own sin, it must have been for the sin of man. There can be no doubt that Peter viewed the sufferings of Christ as expiatory, though he does not develop the idea of an atoning sacrifice (iii. 18). How these sufferings are brought into relation to the forgiveness of sins and the holiness of God, he does not explain.

As to the inner connection between the death of Christ and the new life of believers, it is represented that the pattern which Christ sets before us constrains us to imitate it. Paul's idea of real life-communion with Christ on the cross, into which we are introduced by baptism, is not found in Peter. A living communion with Christ is indeed expressed in v. 14, "all that are in Christ Jesus"; in iii. 16, "good conversation in Christ"; and in ii. 2, 3, where he is regarded as the means of spiritual nourishment; but these expressions have no further influence on the development of the Petrine doctrine, and differ specifically from Paul's idea of communion with the death of Christ. On the other hand we distinctly find in Peter the resurrection of Christ brought into inner relation with the new divine life, the resurrection being represented as producing the new life (i. 3.) and as the means of salvation (iii. 21).

The ministry of Christ in the kingdom of the dead is also regarded by Peter as a fulfilment of prophecy. The source from which he derived this idea must have been Ps. xvi. 10, which in Acts ii. 27, 31 he applies to Christ. If the soul of the Messiah was not to remain in Hades, it is implied that it went to Hades and left it before the body had time to become corrupt. As the Saviour instructed his disciples in the Old Testament scriptures after his resurrection, he may have opened up the meaning of this Psalm. It is certain that the idea could not have been obtained from Jewish theology or the popular conception. It might have flowed from the doctrine of the universality of Christ's redemptive work, but most probably came from the Old Testament prophecy. Peter speaks of it as known to his readers, mentioning it only twice and incidentally (iii. 9; iv. 6). It was the offering of salvation by the spirit of Christ, not through his apostles, to those who had never had the offer made to them in life. As the final judgment alone decides the eternal destiny, it was to give them the opportunity of obtaining new life, or of securing their condemnation by the rejection of the Saviour. The dead addressed are all those who died

before Christ, of whom those in the time of Noah are given as an example. Its object was to effect a new divine life in those who had it not. They were, according to iv. 6, already suffering the judgment of God in their bodily nature, being deprived by death of corporeity; but they might, by obtaining new life through Christ, escape the death and final judgment of the spirit.¹

The Resurrection of Christ.

Peter lays great emphasis on the resurrection, not merely on account of its miraculous nature, but because it fulfils prophecy and proves the Messiahship of Christ (Ps. xvi. 8-11). It is also connected with the prominence of hope in his system, since it produces the hope that what is yet wanting in the fulfilment, will be realized hereafter by the manifestation of the divine glory in Christ. With the resurrection begins the exaltation of Christ, of which the ascension to the Father forms the second stage. Connected with this is the mission of the Spirit, a new proof of Messiahship, since it also was prophesied. There is thus a presentation of the Trinity, but only in its functional aspect. Peter makes no disclosures concerning the immanent relation of the Son and the Spirit to the Father. There is also special emphasis on the completion of the work of Christ by his second coming, which on its subjective side is hope. So great importance does he attach to the idea of the approaching *Parousia*, that he bases his moral exhortations upon it. Freedom from the power of sin does not free from the ordinances of the world. Believers may submit to these till they are done away with by the second coming of Christ and superseded by the condition of glory. The ethical ideas of the Epistle are thus closely connected with its eschatology.

The Messianic Salvation.

We do not find in this Epistle the Pauline doctrine of

¹ This is the view of the passage almost universally held by German theologians. Cf. Schmid (pp. 440-443), Weiss (p. 177 and references in note, and p. 227 sq.), also Martensen's Dogmatics, § 171.

justification by faith, nor that of adoption in the Pauline sense. The relation of believers to God is represented less as that of filial love than of obedience, which accords with the conception of Christ as the servant of God. Peter's idea of the universal priesthood of believers depends, not so much on that of the priesthood of Christ as on the effusion of the Spirit as characteristic of the Messianic age. The priesthood of Christ, his sacrificial death, and his office of intercessor are not expressly mentioned. That he regards the gift of the Spirit as the fulfilment of divine prophecy, is evident from Acts ii. 17.

The church of Christ takes the place of the Old Testament people of God; but in his earlier sermons Peter regards the church as consisting primarily of Jewish converts. In the Epistle he does not enter into the relation of Jewish and heathen converts or their freedom from the law. In the Christian church the ideal set forth in the Old Testament is first realized. It is a peculiar people, a flock of God. The expressions in ii. 9, which are evidently appropriated from the Old Testament, have been supposed to imply that the church is elected as a whole, without reference to individuals. But this is opposed by the expression (ii. 8) "whereunto they were appointed." If individuals were appointed to destruction, it is implied that the election also extends to all individual members of the kingdom of God.

The *condition of participation* in the Messianic salvation is, according to the Epistle, faith with hope and baptism. In the sermons in the Acts we find a change of mind (*μετάνοια*) also mentioned with faith. This is omitted in the Epistle, as addressed to those who had already experienced the change. In his earlier discourses he requires the Jewish Christians to observe the law; but in the later, faith and baptism are the only conditions spoken of. Faith is nowhere expressly set in opposition to the works of the law. It is also characteristic of Peter that he ever and exclusively treats of faith as obedience. Unbelief is disobedience; the Christian life is a life of obedience. Faith is primarily

regarded as the complete surrender of the heart to God, in which the invisible has the same certainty as that which is visible and certain to the senses (i. 8); and in this confidence there is an act of obedience. As faith is also trust in divine power and grace, it includes faith in the fulfilment of prophecy, in the near future of the kingdom of God, and thus becomes the foundation of hope. Faith is the source of hope, and hope of the new life; and in this sense faith is the source of good works. But Peter does not, as Paul, regard faith as the subjective condition of justification.

Baptism is mentioned in one passage only (iii. 21), where it is designated as the desire (Eng. Vers. "answer") for a good conscience, which essentially coincides with a change of heart. Some light is thrown upon it by comparison with the flood, of which the point lies, not in the destruction of the old man, but in the saving efficacy of the water ("doth also now save us"). It is not a common lustration, since it is the desire for a conscience at one with God; not a vow or promise of a good conscience, but a request to be admitted into the condition of reconciliation, and for the forgiveness of sins, which is obtained through the merits of Christ. The view of baptism peculiar to Paul, as introducing to a life-communion with the crucified and risen Saviour, is as foreign to this Epistle as the idea of communion with death and resurrection itself.

In the above it has been sought to present, not those ideas which are common to other apostles, but those which are characteristic of Peter. These abundantly testify that he could not have borrowed his doctrine from Paul.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

Our task here is a double one. We have to present the doctrinal conceptions of this Epistle, and also to compare them with those which are certainly Petrine. We are thus to decide the question whether this Epistle is to be ascribed to Peter, which is generally denied by modern Protestant theologians.

While Peter in his sermons and First Epistle represents himself only as a witness of the death and resurrection of Christ, the Second Epistle bases the apostolic dignity of its author on the fact that he was a believing witness of the transfiguration of Christ on the holy mount. The First Epistle refers to the oral proclamation of the gospel by Paul, the second to the doctrine of Paul as contained in his writings. This presupposes a collection of the sacred writings, and therefore a later date of composition, and, indeed, a considerable interval between the two Epistles. In the first it is implied that the apostle had not himself preached to his readers; on the other hand, the author of the Second Epistle in i. 16 proceeds on the supposition that Peter had thus preached. If it can be shown that this Epistle makes use of that of Jude, it is decisive against the Petrine authorship; and this is evident from one circumstance, namely, that the passage ii. 11 is unintelligible without the explanation afforded by Jude 9. The greater diffuseness also betrays a later hand. This difference in style is acknowledged by the early church, as well as since the revival of criticism. The external testimony in respect to Second Peter is less than for any other book in the New Testament canon. The view which distinguishes some parts of the Epistle as genuine from others which are not so has been altogether given up. The presumption, then, is against the Petrine authorship; but the question will be more clearly decided after the comparison of the doctrinal contents of the Epistle.

The Fundamental Conception.

According to Schmid this is the same as that of First Peter, namely, that the salvation by Christ is the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. This statement is however based only on i. 19-21, which is not sufficient. The passage merely states that the transfiguration of Christ rendered prophecy more sure; this being a riddle which did not present its own solution. The prophets, being moved by the Holy Ghost, did not themselves understand the words they uttered.

The fundamental conception is rather the same as that of the Epistle of Jude. The idea of the divine judgment is common to both. None of the points which we have seen to be characteristic of Peter are touched upon, while the transfiguration, which is mentioned by no other apostle, is made especially prominent.

Schmid finds a close relationship in the doctrinal bearing of the Epistle to that of Peter, in that it does not didactically expound the difference between the Old and New Testaments; and there is certainly in this a point of contact between the two. But this applies equally to the Epistles of Jude and James. The fundamental idea of the Epistle being that of the divine judgment, we should rather conclude that the author resembled James in regarding the new covenant as a new law. But as this is not confirmed by particular statements, it is by no means a safe conclusion. All, then, that we can definitely and safely say, is that the relationship of this Epistle to that of Jude (the fundamental conception of both being that of approaching judgment) is closer than to that of Peter.

The Judgment and the Second Coming of Christ.

Since the second coming of Christ is the only doctrinal point which is discussed in the Epistle in a didactic manner, we start with it in presenting the doctrines of the Epistle.

In this doctrine we might find a close connection with the theology of Peter, were it not evident that this point was rendered prominent by the occasion of the Epistle. There is no prominence given to hope here, as by Peter, but the reference is mainly to *gnosis*. The Epistle is directed against real heretics. We have to do with an autinomial *gnosis*, arising from a perversion of the doctrine of Paul. The denial by these gnostic heretics of Christ's second advent seems to indicate a post-apostolic date of the Epistle, since in the apostolic period there was a general belief in its immediate proximity.

The author, in opposition to this denial of the divine judg-

ment, proves its possibility, like Jude, by reference to the revelation of divine judgments in history, not from the inner essence of Christianity. He differs from Jude, however, in laying special weight on the divine judgment which was executed in the deluge, as having more than any other the characteristic of totality. According to him the origin of the earth and its first destruction by the flood exactly correspond. Water was the element by which both the creation and the destruction were effected. He regards water as the material of which the earth was formed (*ἐξ ὕδατος*) and at the same time as the means by which it received its present form (*δι' ὕδατος*). The final destruction is to take place by the element opposed to water. In these points, he goes beyond, if not in opposition to, the teachings of the rest of the apostles. As Neander remarks, we feel uncertain whether these "correspond to the practical spirit of the apostolic teaching, or whether they do not display a later spirit, mingling much that is foreign with the religious interest."

In distinction from Peter, the author has adopted the idea of the renovation of the earth in consequence of the Parousia. With this it is connected that in place of regeneration he sets forth participation in the divine nature, and instead of the substitutionary sufferings of Christ the transfiguration. It might be supposed that these points were emphasized as supplementary to the teaching of Peter, were it not for other more radical differences.

The Date of Christ's Second Advent.

The author no longer ventures to represent this as near, but is rather concerned to explain its delay. The doubts springing from this delay he ascribes to the transference of the ordinary earthly measure of time to God, to whom it is inapplicable (iii. 8), and to a misapprehension of the plan of divine love, still to leave room for repentance (iii. 9). It is an object of the gnosis to perceive these reasons for the delay, and at the same time to understand how believers on their

part may hasten the approach of this last catastrophe (*σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέρας*, iii. 12), without doubt by laboring to carry out the plan of the divine love with respect to the world still unconverted. To harmonize the doctrine of this Epistle with the hypothesis of its composition by the apostle Peter, we must suppose that in the interval between it and the first epistle, he had greatly changed his views as to the date of the Parousia; which however is scarcely probable, as the interval must have been very brief. The latest apostolic epistles still speak of it as near, and such doubts as are here combatted could only have arisen after the course of history had proved the contrary.

The Doctrine of Christ, his Person, his Work.

The doctrine of the Epistle concerning Christ is related to that of Peter, in that it is confined to his condition after his incarnation, and especially his ascension. He is represented as now in possession of unlimited power and glory; in iii. 8 all glory is ascribed to him, and in one passage (i. 1) he seems to be called directly God. His divine glory, which he received after his exaltation to the Father, was once manifested in the earthly life of Christ, in his transfiguration on the holy mount (i. 16-18), and therefore the author attributes the greatest importance to this fact. The manner in which the author speaks of himself as an eye-witness of the transfiguration, and the significance he ascribes to it with respect to the whole work of Christ, shows an essential difference not only from the Petrine form of doctrine, but from that also of the other apostles. As Neander remarks, the apostles are accustomed to accredit themselves as witnesses of the sufferings and resurrection of Christ. As Neander also sets forth, the phrase "holy mount" betrays traces of a later date, as we cannot suppose Mount Zion, to which it was usually applied, to be here meant.

With respect to the work of Christ, the contrast to the doctrine of Peter is still greater. Neither the death of Christ, nor his resurrection, nor his ascension and sitting at the right

hand of God, nor the mission of the Spirit is expressly mentioned. When in ii. 1 he designates Christ as the ruler who ransomed us from the bondage of sin, he leaves it altogether undetermined in what manner this liberation took place. There is a certain resemblance between this Epistle and that of Jude, in that both designate Christ as *σωτήρ*, but do not expressly declare *how* salvation is wrought by him, and that both refer to the purification from former sins (2 Pet. i. 9), but do not define the connection of the forgiveness of sins with the death of Christ; while in Peter we find a much more developed doctrine on these points.

In respect to the doctrine of redemption itself and its appropriation, there are similar essential differences. The author attributes redemption to the divine *ἀρετή* and *δικαιοσύνη*, which is not directly contradictory of Peter, who, however, founds it on the divine grace. The new birth is represented as a participation in the divine *φύσις*. This mode of expression might give rise to the suspicion of a tendency to the pantheistic view of the relation between God and the world. But as there are no other traces of this view, we may perhaps understand by this participation in the divine nature the reception of the eternal, immortal life of God by regeneration. Then in expression only, and not in thought, would there be a difference between this Epistle and the other apostolic teachings.

With respect to the appropriation of redemption, the Epistle is distinguished from that of Peter by the absence of the idea of hope, though there was ample occasion for its expression in connection with the doctrine of the second advent. Its place seems to be occupied by *γνώσις* (and *ἐπίγνωσις*), which word occurs with remarkable frequency. In i. 5 faith is regarded as the root of knowledge. True *γνώσις* is distinguished from false by its connection with morality. The more that virtues are united in a life, the deeper and richer will be the gnosis. The exhortations to acquire it presuppose that it is not the possession of a few favored Christians, but may be obtained by all. In i. 8 it is repre-

sented as the aim of the whole moral life; the latter forming only a necessary preparation for it. It is regarded also as a higher stage of faith, to which believers must advance. Since the author would certainly, in a letter in which he is constantly exhorting his readers to gnosis, give further explanations of what belongs to its domain, it is natural to suppose that his statements respecting the mode of origin and destruction of the earth, his exhibition of the reasons for the delay of Christ's coming, and the significance of the transfiguration, fall into the sphere of gnosis.

It cannot, then, be denied that there are some points of contact between this Epistle and the Petrine form of doctrine. Since, however, the differences are much greater than the resemblances, and as they are due not to the particular occasion of the Epistle, but to its fundamental conceptions, we may regard it as a safe conclusion that the apostle Peter was not the author of this Epistle. It is not our province to determine positively the time, place, and author of the composition. But, as Schmid correctly intimates, it contains genuine apostolic ideas, and its general tenor is excellent. There is no reason for supposing so late a date of composition as that which modern criticism assigns to it. While it resembles the Epistle of Jude more than that of Peter, there are essential differences between them. The views concerning gnosis, the transfiguration, and the late date of the second advent are elements which are quite foreign to Jude. The Alexandrian coloring, observed in the Epistle by Schmid, is also confirmed by the peculiar view of the relation of faith and gnosis.¹

¹ The subsequent portion of Messner's work, comprising the doctrinal systems of Paul, of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and of John, will be considered in a second Article.