INTRODUCTION. ] 2 PETER. (cx. xvi.   
   
 acknowledged Epistle: perhaps also a second; for it is doubted   
 about.”   
 On the other hand, in those works which are extant only in a Latin   
 version, Origen again and again quotes our Epistle as Scripture :   
 e.g. in his Homily on Joshua,—\* For Peter sounds with the two   
 trumpets of his Epistles :” on Leviticus,—\* And again Peter says, ‘ Ye   
 are made partakers of the divine nature’” (2 Pet. i, 4): on Numbers,   
 —As Scripture saith in a certain place (2 Pet. ii. 16), ‘The dumb   
 animal speaking with human voice convicted the madness of the   
 prophet.”   
 8. Perhaps the solution of this is to be found, not by supposing that   
 the translator Rufinus interpolated the passages, but by remembering   
 the loose way in which both Origen himself and others were found to   
 cite the Epistle to the Hebrews : ordinarily, and in course of writing,   
 speaking of it as St. Paul’s, but whenever they wrote deliberately, giving   
 expression to their doubts respecting its authorship. We have only to   
 believe that Origen acted similarly with regard to 2 Peter, and the   
 mystery is at once solved,   
 In Origen’s extant Greck works, it is true, we nowhere find the   
 Epistle quoted. Nay, it is more than once by implication excluded from   
 the number of the Catholic Epistles. Thus in his Commentary on John,   
 cited above, ch. iii. § i. 7, he cites 1 Pet. iii. 18—21, as being “in the   
 Catholic Epistle ” and in his passage on the Canon: “ Secondly, that   
 according to Mark, as Peter dictated tohim ; wherefore also he acknow-   
 ledges him as his son in his Catholic Epistle.”   
 9. Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, a disciple of Origen   
 (died 270), certainly alludes to our Epistle, if his words are rightly given   
 in the Latin version in which only we now have them :   
 “The blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, who in their Epistles   
 execrated hereties, and admonished us to avoid them.”   
 Nothing is proved here by “their Epistles,” as to two Epistles of   
 St. Peter being meant : but by the fact mentioned, this second Epistle   
 must be intended, seeing that itis in this only that heretics are inveighed   
 against by St. Peter.   
 10. The testimony of Didymus, whose commentary on the Epistle is   
 extant in a Latin version only, is given at the end of his remarks on   
 this Epistle :   
 “We must not therefore forget, that this Epistle is accounted   
 spurious, and, although it is currently published, yet is not in the   
 canon.”   
 Tfere the Latin expressions cause some little uncertainty, and can   
 only he interpreted by eonjeeturing what they represent in the original   
 Greck. Undue stress has been laid on the “therefore,” as if it were a   
 ratiocinative conclusion from something preceding. But in all proba-   
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