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PREFACE

The present volume follows mainly the same lines as my edition of the Epistle of St. James, to which it may be considered to form a sort of appendix, since the study of St. James naturally leads on to the study of one who claims to be his brother, and the study of St. Jude is inseparably connected with that of the Epistle known to us as the Second Epistle of St. Peter. When I began to pay special attention to the last named epistle, I was of course aware of the general weakness of its canonical position as compared with that of the other books of the New Testament; but my own feeling was that the traditional view must be accepted, unless it could be disproved by positive evidence on the other side; and I was not satisfied that such positive evidence had yet been adduced in proof of its spuriousness. Further consideration, however, of the language, matter, and tone of the two Petrine epistles has gradually forced me to the conclusion already arrived at by Calvin and Grotius, as well as by many modern commentators, that the second epistle is not written by the author of the first epistle—a conclusion which in my view is equivalent to saying that it is not by the Apostle St. Peter. Some have shrunk from this conclusion, because they thought that a falsata epistola, as Didymus calls it, was unworthy of the place in the canon assigned to it by the Church of the fourth century. But we have already an example of a spurious writing admitted into the Old Testament canon in the book of Ecclesiastes, which few or none would now ascribe to Solomon; and we
may at any rate find a parallel to it in the Book of Wisdom, which we are bidden to read 'for example of life and instruction of manners.' Eusebius, while himself regarding it as uncanonical, confesses that πολλοὶς χρήσιμος φανείσα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν (H.E. iii. 3), and Calvin says it contains adeo nihil Petro indignum ut vim spiritus apostolici et gratiam ubique exprimatur. If we compare it with what I hold to be the genuine epistle of St. Jude, I think there are few who would not feel that the exclusion of the former from our New Testament would be a far more serious loss than the exclusion of the latter, in spite of the admiration expressed for this last by Clement and Origen. For the full discussion of these points the reader is referred to the earlier chapters of the Introduction which follows.

Perhaps it may be well to say a word or two here as to the textual emendations mentioned in the twelfth chapter of the Introduction. I have never been able to see why there should be any objection to applying to the N.T. a process which has been so often found essential to the restoration of the right text in classical authors. Of course the abundance of evidence from MSS., versions, and quotations very much circumscribes the field for emendation in the former case; but where a full consideration of this evidence fails to supply a natural or even a possible sense, it seems to me we are bound to fall back upon that which constitutes the basis of all rational emendation, viz. (1) the careful investigation of the relevant facts, so as to ascertain exactly what is wanting in order to put them into proper relation with one another, and (2) a possible explanation of the corruption of the text. This proceeding becomes more necessary in proportion to the defective state of the diplomatic evidence, as in Jude and 2 Peter: see the notes on Jude 1, where Hort proposes to transfer ἐν from Θεῷ to Ἰησοῦ; 2 P. 119, where Field proposes μελήσω for μελλήσω and Spitta suggests παραδοθεῖσα for παρούσῃ; 310, where Vansittart and Abbott suggest viii
PREFACE

παραθέτει τοις εὑρεσισμοῖς; besides 213, where it is proposed to read ἀγάπην for ἡδονήν; and 36, where δι' ὅν is proposed for δι' ὅν.

One who undertakes to edit a book which has been the object of such minute and continuous study, as any portion of the New Testament has been, cannot but feel how insignificant is the contribution which he can himself hope to make to its interpretation, as compared with the accumulated work of preceding generations. His first acknowledgments therefore are due to the labours of his predecessors in the same field, from such patristic helps as the Adumbratianæ of Clement and the compilations of the Catenæ, down to the latest commentaries and aids of whatever kind, grammatical, historical, or theological, to which reference will be found in the pages which follow. I have moreover to return my grateful thanks for private help given by Dr. Gow, Dr. Gwynn, the Rev. G. Horner, Dr. F. G. Kenyon, Professors F. Fuller and G. D. Liveing, and Mr. Herbert Richards; above all to Dr. Chase and to Dr. E. A. Abbott. The former had kindly undertaken to look over my proof-sheets, but was unable to go beyond the earlier sheets in consequence of his removal from the comparative leisure of the professorship to the exacting duties of the episcopate. I have also found, in his articles on Peter and Jude in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, by far the best introduction known to me on the two epistles here dealt with. To my old friend Dr. E. A. Abbott I am even more indebted: he has carefully read through the larger portion of my sheets and helped me with many suggestions, which I have found all the more useful because we have not always succeeded in arriving at the same conclusions.

I have only to add that I shall be much obliged for any correction of errors found in my book beyond those which are already noted in the Table of Corrigenda.

Dec. 29, 1906.
ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

P. 22.—On ἐπαγωγιζεσθαι add Clem. Strom. iii. p. 553 ἐπαγωγιζόμενος τῷ ἀδίκῳ δόξῃ.

P. 23, l. 9 up.—For ‘1 Cor. 2’ read ‘1 Cor. 1’.

P. 24, l. 4.—Add Clem. Strom. v. p. 666 ὁ Κύριος διὰ τῶν παθῶν εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἀρρήτου γνώσιν παρεισδύομενος.

P. 26, l. 9.—Transfer comma from before bracket to after bracket in l. 10.

P. 31.—After § 3 add: But see Hom. Od. xv. 349 ἥψωσιν ἵνα σίγε τῆς ἅλλος.


P. 33, last l.—For repeated δὲ compare 1 Cor. 11, 12, 15.


P. 46.—After § 1 add: See Hort on 1 P. 211 'Sometimes desires, as such, are implied to be evil, as in 4K, 3 and 14'. Sometimes they are implied to be evil in so far as they are individual and so separate and ultimately selfish, as in James 114 ὑπὸ τῆς ἡδὸν ἐπιθυμίας εὐελκομένου: cf. Jude 16 and 18, 2 Pet. 3 κατὰ τὰς ἡδὸν ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι. Sometimes a desire is called evil (κακὴ Col. 3, 5, σαφεῖ 1 Pet. 211, κοσμικὴ Tit. 212).

P. 46, l. 5 up.—Om. refer to Hort's note. I had carelessly omitted to notice that he laid the stress on καμῷ not on ἑνὶ γὰρ.


P. 51, l. 3.—For ‘πρὸδ’ read ‘πρὸς’.

P. 52.—On ἰσαριστῶν add Epict. Fr. 62 Schw. ἐκαστα πταλάζειν ἐν ταῖς κρίσειν εἰς αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ βίῳ ἰσαριστῶν διατέλης, Antoninus v. 9.

P. 80.—First 1. of § 3 add after δοῦλος ‘in 11, though we read of Θεοῦ δοῦλος in 216.’

P. 81.—Add after § 2 ‘Col. 112 τῷ μερίδᾳ τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων with Lightfoot’s n.’

P. 84, l. 4.—For ‘Appendix’ read ‘Introduction, p. cxxx.’

P. 86.—Add to exx. of the combination of positive and superlative, Clem. Strom. p. 587 τῆς ἀπευθεσίας καὶ κυριακάτης ἁγάπης.

P. 88, l. 5.—After δόθαν add 4 MacC. 183 δεῖας μερίδος κατηχεύοντας.

P. 89.—Add to § 3 cf. Phil. 212-13. l. 3 up, for ‘Appendix’ read ‘p. cxxx.’

P. 90, l. 14–16.—Transfer ‘in the δήμω’ to l. 19 after στρατεύοντων. l. 17, for ‘Polyb. iii. 78’ read ‘Polyb. iii. 68’. l. 1 up, after κληρίζως add. Cfr. the Sorites in Wisdom 612. ἄπρο τοιοῦ ἡ ἀληθεύσεται παθής ἐπιθυμία, προφιλ δὲ παθής ἀγάπη, ἀγάπη δὲ τύρμης νόμων αὐτῆς, προφιλ δὲ νόμων βεβαιώσεις ψυχομελίς, ψυχομελίς δὲ ἑγγός εἰναι ποιεῖ Ἰησοῦν ἐπιθυμία ἡ ἀφοινή ἀνίγνοι εἰπεῖ βασιλεὺς.
ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

P. 92, l. 24.—For 525 read 523. l. 10 up.—On εὐσίβισα see Bonitz, Index to Aristotle s.v., Dlog. L. iii. 83, and my note on Cic. N.D. i. 116.


P. 98, last l.—After 510 add Dan. 717 ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ βασιλεία αἰώνιος, Isa. 4517 σωτηρία αἰώνιον, 1 Mac. 2201 βρόχον βασιλείας εἰς αἰώνα αἰώνιον, Wisdom 1014 δόξα αἰώνιον.

P. 101, § 2.—Add on διεγείρα rare in classical Greek, used in Aristot. Fr. of stirring up the feelings, see Bonitz, Index, s.v. On σκέψεις see quotations from Eus. H.E. in Introd. p. cxx, from Apos. Pauli in p. cxxi. σκέψις is used by pl. Plato, see Ast’s Lex.

P. 104, § 4.—μεγαλουσίς is found in Jer. 4016 (33a) and 3 Esdr. 14.

P. 105, § 5.—τοιούτος also occurs in Ezra 518. Other exx. of the use of μεγαλουσία occur in Ps. 2014, 14412. The phrase μεγαλουσία δόξα occurs in two of the early Greek liturgies (Swainson, pp. 129, 368).

P. 107, § 3.—The reading in Mt. 1918 is doubtful: WH. and Ti. omit εἰς and read δε with B处处; Treg. reads εἰς φίλων with CD, vg. etc.: εἰς δε is supported by CIL etc., Clem. Hom. iii. 53, Eus. Dem. Ec. p. 452 C. § 5.—Dr. Chase states that the phrase δαμα τρας is always followed by a possessive genitive in the O.T. but there seem to be some exceptions, e.g. Ps. 871 οἱ θεμέλιοι αἰώνοι εἰς τοὺς δαμάς τοῖς Δίκαιοι, Isa. 2712, Dan. 930, 1 Macc. 1117 (of a document) τεθήκω εἰς τῷ ὕψει τῷ βασιλεία τῶν ἑλευσώμενοι. In Isa. 119 it stands for the Messianic kingdom. § 6.—προτείνειν βεβαιότερον, compare the exx. of βεβαιοτέρον παρίκειται τόν ὅποιον in the index of Dittenberger’s Sylloge Inscriptionum.

P. 111, end of § 1.—Insert ‘Alex.’ after Cyril.

P. 118, l. 6 up.—For ‘15’ read ‘18.’

P. 124, l. 24 up.—After ‘Cf.’ insert 2 Tim. 214 λογομαχεῖν . . . ἐπὶ καταστροφῆ τῶν αἰωνῶν, Gen. 1918 ἐπιστέφετε τῶν ἱερῶν ἐκ μέσου τῆς καταστροφῆς.

P. 128, end of § 1.—Om. 1 before Tit. l. 4 up.—Read δικαίου.

P. 133, heading. Om. ‘12.’

P. 134, l. 3 up.—Commas after ἀκράτως.

P. 135, last line.—Read δίδωμι.


P. 141, last § but one ἔπειτα.—This is the only place where the verb occurs in the N.T., but the cognate ἔρισω is found in 2 Cor. 1213, and ἔπειτα in Rom. and 1 Cor. We meet with the active in Isa. 5417 πάντας ἔπειτας.

P. 143, l. 8 up.—See Introd. p. xii n.

P. 144, end of first note. Add ‘This rendering is confirmed by the Story of Ahikar ed. by Conybeare and others, Camb. 1898, pp. 54, 82, and 115 ‘My son thou hast behaved like the swine which went to the bath with people of quality, and when he came out, saw a stinking drain, and went and rolled himself in it.’ The edd. consider that the story dates from 150 B.C. and that traces of it are to be found in the sapiential books of the O.T.

P. 146, § 2.—In 1 P. 113 we have a similar reference to missionaries in the plural, διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισμένοις ἡμᾶς.

P. 148, l. 19.—Read ‘Pet. 418.’

P. 151, § 2.—Add R.V. ‘compacted out of water and amidst water’ and the explanation of Oecumenius ἡ γῆ ἕξ ἐδαστος μὲν ὅς ἔξ ἐξ οὐκετί αὐτῶν, δι’ ἐδαστος δὲ ὅς διὰ τελείου ἐδωρ γὰρ τῷ συνεχοῖς τῆς γῆς, οἷον κόλλα τὶς ἕπαρξον αὐτῆ.

P. 160, n. 3.—Read ‘Dr. Bigg.’
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INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

RELATION OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER TO THE
EPISTLE OF JUDE

The general resemblance between the two Epistles will be plain
to any one who takes the trouble to read them as they stand
side by side in my Text (pp. 2–15). The resemblance of vocabu-
lary is shown in the Index of Greek words, and it is also indicated
in my text by the marginal references and by difference of type.
I propose here to compare the Epistles throughout, stating the
reasons which have led me to believe that the epistle of Jude was
known to the author of 2 Pet. not vice versa.

To begin with, both style themselves servants of Jesus
Christ and address themselves to those who in some way
belong to God and Jesus Christ, desiring that peace might be
multiplied upon them. We notice here certain differences oc-
casioned by the difference of the writers. J. marks his identity
by naming his brother James; P. claims apostleship. J. adds
the prayer for mercy and love to that for peace; P. who is
about to speak more fully of love immediately, omits it here, and
changes ἡλεος into the wider χάρις. J. defines his readers as ‘the
called who have been beloved by God the Father and kept safe in
Jesus Christ’; P. defers the notion of ‘calling’ to the 3rd and 10th
verses, and dwells here on God’s free gift of faith (τοῖς λαχεύσιν
πιστιν) as characteristic of his readers. He adds two remark-
able phrases, (1) that, through the justice of our God and of

---

1 For justification of the readings adopted see the Chapter on the Text, and for
the translations the explanatory notes.

2 In what follows P. stands for 2 Peter, J. for Jude.

3 We may compare πιστὶς εἰσιν in 1 Pet. 4:19, Rom. 2:6 (ἀποκλίνεσθε) δικαιοκρισία-
tοὺς θεοὺς, διʼ ἀνθρώπων ἐκαστῷ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, and 2:11 χεὶρ ἐστὶν προσώπων
ληφθῆναι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ.
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our Saviour Jesus Christ, this faith is (2) equally privileged with that of the writer (whether we are to regard him as representing the Apostles, or the Jews, as seems to me more probable), and he emphasizes this equality of Jew and Gentile by the unique use of his own double name, the Hebrew 'Symeon' added to the Greek 'Peter,' suggesting that his sympathies embrace both. We may compare with this the friendly reference to St. Paul in 3:15, and the association of Silvanus with the writer in 1 Pet.

After this greeting J. turns at once to the immediate occasion for his letter. He had been preparing, he says, to write on the subject which is of highest interest to all Christians, viz. salvation, when news reached him of a new danger threatening the Church, against which he felt bound to warn his readers. It seems hardly possible to suppose that this note of alarm could have come to him through P., who writes in a much more leisurely way, not feeling it necessary at once to plunge into controversy and supply his readers with weapons for the defence of the faith. In fact the latter begins with the very subject which J. had felt himself obliged to omit, or at least to postpone to the end of his epistle (v. 20), viz. the doctrine of salvation. Thus we seem to lose sight of J. until the beginning of the second chapter of P., but we shall see that in the intervening passage of P. there is frequent recurrence to thoughts which are found in the former epistle. In the latter part of 1:5 P. introduces a topic which is of great importance in his eyes, ἐπιγνώσει. 'The knowledge of God is (not a privilege reserved for the few, but) the means,' he says, 'by which grace and peace are multiplied; just as it is through the knowledge of Him who called us by his own glory and goodness that the Divine power has granted us all that is needed for life and godliness. Through this manifestation of the Divine goodness you have received the most blessed promises (cf. 2 Cor. 1:20), in order that thereby you might be made partakers of the Divine nature, having escaped from the corruption which is in the world.

1 If the epistle is assigned to the second century, the term ἱστιμως may have reference to the pretensions of the Gnostics. Compare what Clement of Alexandria says of the relations between faith, knowledge, and love (Strom. vii. 56), and his condemnation of the heretics who considered that the distinction between the elect and others existed φύσιν, and stood in no need of the ἐπιγνώσει of which P. speaks in 1:11.
2 The word κοιμη here may have suggested to P. his phrase ἱστιμων πιστιν.
3 Cf. J. v. 1 καταφορα. 
through lust. ἤθορον here (cf. ἤθείαρνει in J. 10) is opposed to ἡζω in v. 3. It is not original evil, but ἡ ἐπὶ τὸ χείρον μεταβολή. Here we find the writer freely using expressions borrowed from Greek philosophy, such as τῆς θείας δυνάμεως, θείας κοινωνοι φύσεως, the ἀρετή of God; and thus showing his sympathy with the Hellenic spirit, in other words welcoming Hellenism within the pale of Christianity.

After speaking generally of the blessings in store for man through the goodness of God, P. goes on (18) to speak of the corresponding duty on man's part. We are to use every effort to build up the Christian life in its seven-fold1 completeness on the rock of faith. Towards the end of J. we find words which may very possibly have suggested to P. this idea of the seven ascending tiers rising on the foundation of faith and culminating in love (J. v. 20) ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ὕμων πληρεῖει... ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἡ Θεοῦ τρητήσατε. The phrase σπουδὴν πᾶσαν of P. 18 occurs also in J. 3. The philosophic ἀρετή occurs twice in P. 18. It has been suggested by Dr. Chase that the association of γνώσις with ἀγαθία in the next verse may be pointed at the antinomianism of some of the Gnostics. The mention of εὐσέβεια in P. 18,6,7 may be due to the prevalence of ἀσέβεια so often deplored by J. The verses which follow (18-11) dwell on the importance of the cultivation of these virtues or graces. 'Their continued growth will tend to make us not unfruitful (cf. J. v. 12) in regard to that knowledge of God out of which they grow. Their absence causes blindness, or at least limits us to narrow earthly views, and makes us forgetful of the baptismal cleansing from the sins of our old life. Remember that it is not enough simply to have been baptized. We have to make sure the calling and election of which baptism was the seal. If you are diligent in doing this, you will never stumble, but will have a glorious entry into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.' Here too we find connecting links with the later verses of J. 'Eternal life' is the goal in J. 21, 'the eternal kingdom,' in P. 11. The οὐ μὴ πταίσῃ and the πλούσιος ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται of P. remind us of J.'s summing up in v. 24.

1 The number seven plays an important part in the Apocalypse, where we have 7 churches, 7 lampes, 7 spirits, 7 stars, 7 horns, 7 eyes, 7 seals, 7 angels, 7 thunders, 7 vials, 7 plagues. So there are 7 deacons (Acts 218), and 7 pillars in the house of Wisdom (Prov. 94), cf. also the spirits in Isa. 119, and Clem. Al. p. 813.
'God our Saviour is able to keep us without stumbling and to set us before his glory without blemish in exceeding joy.'

P. continues (11:12-15), 'I know that you are established in this truth, but it will be always my care to remind you of it, as I am indeed bound to do, whilst I continue in this earthly habitation. Even after I leave it, as our Lord Jesus Christ has warned me that I must soon do, I hope to bequeath to you a legacy which will enable you to make mention of these things after my departure.' We have here an echo of J. v. 5 'I desire to put you in remembrance, though ye know all things,' i.e. as it is explained afterwards, though you are familiar with the examples of judgment contained in the O.T., including the punishment of the angels who sinned. P. addressing Gentiles, who could hardly be expected to be familiar with a narrative resting mainly on Jewish tradition, gives the phrase a more fitting application in reference to the general moral and religious teaching which precedes.

In 11:21 P. goes on to speak of the evidences of the Christian religion. 'It was no vamped up story we declared to you, when we preached the coming of the Lord in power. I was myself one of the eye-witnesses of His majesty on the holy mount,' when the voice came to him from the excellent glory, proclaiming him to be the beloved Son, in whom the Father is well pleased. Thus was confirmed to us the word of prophecy, to which you rightly give heed as to a lamp shining in darkness until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts. And remember, in your study of prophecy, that it is not limited to the prophet's own horizon, or to any one particular interpretation ('God fulfils himself in many ways'), since it is no mere product of man's thought and will, but is the expression of the eternal thought and will of God uttered through men inspired by the Holy Ghost.' Why does the writer here lay stress on the thought that prophecy ἡδας ἐπιλύσεως οὖ γίνεται? Is it because, while he recognized one Coming in the Transfiguration, he in no way regarded this as precluding a greater Coming, but on the contrary as being a sort of preparatory rehearsal, confirming the faith of those who witnessed it? Or could it be because, as

---

1 This phrase is used in Isa. 11:9 and 65:10 of the Messiah's kingdom, 'They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain,' saith the Lord. Perhaps P. means that in the Transfiguration the three Apostles were admitted to behold the glories of that kingdom, without alluding to any particular Jewish mountain.
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we read below (34), doubts were entertained of any Second Coming, some affirming, like Hymenaeus and Philetas, that the Resurrection was past already (2 Tim. 217,18)? In any case, his main object seems to have been to make his readers understand that prophecy, though uttered so long ago and under such different circumstances, cannot lose its significance, but has a message for all times, all characters, and all situations.1 This deeply interesting and instructive view of prophecy is suggested rather by St. Peter's words in the Acts (321, 1043) and 1 Pet. (110,12) than by anything in the Epistle of Jude, though the latter refers to Enoch's prophecy of the future Coming to judgment (vv. 14, 15) and speaks of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (v. 20) as aiding our prayers.

The connexion between the two Epistles is most conspicuous in the second chapter of P. In both, this section begins with a short Introduction (J. v. 4, P. 214), describing in general terms the innovators against whom the readers are warned. They steal into the Church, they deny the Lord, their lives are stained by impurity, the verdict of heaven has long been pronounced against them. To this P. prefixes a clause to connect the new subject with that of the preceding chapter. The gift of prophecy was liable to misuse under the old dispensation (of which he presently quotes Balaam as an example, cf. P. 215,16, and J. v. 11). Corresponding to this in the new dispensation will be the abuse of teaching (cf. James 31,12); and these false teachers will introduce destructive heresies and bring on themselves swift destruction. [The word ἀπώλεια does not occur in J., but in the next verse he says that the Lord τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν.] P. adds the Pauline epithet ἄγοράσαντα before δεισπότην. He foretells that many will follow the loose living of these teachers and that thus the way of truth (Ps. 11930) will be evil spoken of (Isa. 526). He speaks of their covetousness, cf. J. v. 11 on Balaam [ἐμπορεύόμενοι in P. 25 perhaps contrasted with ἄγοράσαντα in 21], and of their glowing words. While J. speaks of οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τὸ τοῦ κρίμα (where the reference in τοῦτο is obscure), P. has the fine phrase οἱ τὸ κρίμα οὔκ ἄργει καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάξει. On the other hand we lose J.'s τῆν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, for which perhaps ἐλευθερίαν αὐτῶι ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δούλοι ὕπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς (P. 219) was intended as an

1 Dr. Abbott compares Christ's warning against those who say, 'Lo here is the Christ, or there,' Mt. 2422.
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equivalent, cf. Gal. 5:13 ἐν' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε· μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί.

Then follow (J. 5–7) three examples of judgment taken from the O.T.: Israel in the Wilderness, the offending angels, the sin of Sodom, which are repeated in P. 2:6, except that the Deluge takes the place of the punishment of Israel. Why was this change made? Probably because the destruction of the world by water and the destruction of Sodom by fire were recognized types of Divine vengeance (Lk. 17:28–29), and also because P. had already referred to the case of Israel (ἐν τῷ λαῷ) in comparing the false prophets of the O.T. with the false teachers of the N.T. Perhaps, too, he wished to keep the chronological order in his three examples. It has been suggested in the note on τὸ δεύτερον that in speaking of the destruction of Israel after their falling back into unbelief, J. may have had in his mind the question of the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin. There is perhaps a similar reference in P. 1:9 λήθην λαβών τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτίων as well as in P. 2:20. With regard to P.’s triplet, it is to be noticed that it is given in a far more animated form than that of J., being used as a protasis to an apodosis applying the same principles to the persons addressed, εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεός οὐκ ἐφείσατο κ.τ.λ. Of the angels P. says merely that they sinned, J. dwells on their pristine dignity, and follows the book of Enoch in making their sin to consist partly in the fall from their high estate, and partly in their going after σαρκὸς ἐτέρας, as the men of Sodom did afterwards (τῶν ὁμοιῶν τρόπων τούτως J. 7). If P. had J. before him, these omissions are natural: if J. wrote after P., he would scarcely have gone out of his way to insert particulars so derogatory to the angelic nature. As to their punishment, they are reserved for judgment under darkness in chains. P. uses the strong phrase ‘chains of darkness’ and the extremely rare word ταρταρωτός, which may be regarded as another instance of his fondness for Hellenistic phrases.

1 Dr. Abbott suggests that P. may also have preferred a cosmopolitan judgment (like the Deluge) to one which was confined to Israel.

2 I supplement here what is said in the explanatory note on 2:4. The simple verb ταρταρώω occurs in Amphiloocius (fl. 370 A.D.) Patr. Graec. vol. xxxix, p. 41 A, διὰ παρεθεινὸς τοκετοῦ τεταρτὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν τοιοῦτον καὶ τηλείαν συστήματος. The substantive ταρταροῦς occurs in Clem. Hom. iii. 35 (on the immensity of creation) μέχρι τοῦ τούτου ταρταροῦ τῷ ἑπταν πέντε διδασκαλίας; ἐπὶ τίνι ἐπαραθέτεται αὐτὸν περίτοιον σώφρον; ib. i. 4 παραβολήσαμαι καὶ ἐνίκην φιλοσοφὸν λόγου Πυθαγόρευτον καὶ Ταρτάρον . . . καὶ ἔσωσα ἐν ἄξω τῶν αἰῶνα κολαζόμενος, ib. xx. 9 ὁ ταρτάρος σιδήρων χαλίνων κατὰ τὴν προσευμένην μετὰ τῶν ὁμοιωτῶν ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ταρτάρου σκότος κατελθὼν ἡδονα, ib. Ep. ad Jac. 14 ταρτα-
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The Deluge is described in P. 25, where he uses the words φυλάσσω and ἄσβησθι found in J. 4, 15, 18. Besides the reasons mentioned above, P. was naturally led to speak of the Deluge here, as he is about to make use of it below (357) to show that there is nothing incredible in the supposition of the destruction of the existing universe by fire.

It is interesting to compare what is said in the two epistles about the two missionaries of the antediluvian world. In J. v. 14 Enoch, the seventh from Adam, appears simply as the denouncer of vengeance to come: in P. Noah is a preacher of righteousness and he is the eighth saved. I have suggested (p. 192) that P. may have intended a mystical opposition between the two numbers; and, I think, this is confirmed by the way in which the number 8 is introduced in 1 P. 30 (κιβωτοῦ) εἰς ἕν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἐστιν ὁκτώ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δὲ ἔδατος.1 The ark is here regarded as a symbol of the Church. What was the writer's motive in adding that it contained only a few, and further that these few, on being reckoned up, were found to amount to 8? Must he not have intended to signify that, while the visible Church consisted of a mere 'remnant,' a 'little flock,' yet these few represented all who share the Resurrection of Christ, 'the general assembly and church of the first-born,' which would be continually recruited not only from the living, but also from the dead by the ever-present, ever-active Spirit of Christ (319)?

In the account of Sodom (P. 29) P. differs from J. in laying stress on Lot's protest against surrounding wickedness, and on the mercy shown towards him, just as he had done before in regard to Noah (hereby illustrating the duty of the faithful under the present stress); and the moral he draws from the two stories is that 'God knows how to deliver the godly from trial,' as well as to keep the wicked under chastisement for the day of judgment.' P. alone gives details as to the destruction of Sodom (τεφρώσας καταστρώθη κατέκριμεν), 3 while


1 Cf. Justin M. Dial. 138, Iran, i. 18. 3.
2 Cf. Clement on this subject in Str. vi. § 44–§ 52, esp. § 47 fin. ὁ πᾶρ ἐνταῦθα μέν ἡ δύσας ἡ ἐνεργητική (τοῦ θεοῦ) φόβας, πάντη δὲ ἐστι καὶ δὲ ἐργάζεται.
3 In my note on 29 I have illustrated these words from Pliny's letter to Tacitus, giving an account of the eruption of Vesuvius. Is it possible that 2 P. borrowed these details from Pliny?
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J. speaks of its present state as a warning to future ages. As regards this warning P.'s ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν is better expressed than J.'s rather confused πρόκειναι δείγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι. In v. 8 J. turns to the libertines and declares that they are guilty of like sins with these sinners of the old world: they defile the flesh, make light of authority and rail at 'glories' (as the men of Sodom did towards the angels), and this they do because they are still buried in a carnal sleep (cf. Eph. 5:14). These men (v. 10 ὁδὸν δὲ) rail at things beyond their ken, while they surrender themselves like brute beasts to the guidance of their appetites, and thus bring about their own destruction. 1 P. (210) combines part of J.'s description of the men of Sodom, who went ὄπισθο σαρκὸς ἑτέρας (for which he substitutes ὄπισθω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μασσοῦ πορευομένου) with J.'s condemnation of the libertines as despising authority, 2 and predicates both characteristics of the wicked, whom God keeps under chastisement for the day of judgment. Then turning to the libertines he exclaims against them as 'headstrong and shameless (τολμηταί, cf. ἐτόλμησεν J. v. 9) men that shrink not from railing at glories' (210). In 218 he goes on, as J. does in v. 10, with a ὁδὸν δέ, 'these are like brute beasts.' Apparently he wants to bring out more fully the force of J.'s δοκᾷ φυσικῶς ἐπιστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθειρονται by the periphrasis γεγενημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἀλοιπὸν καὶ φθοράν and ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν φθαρὼν τούτοις. That is, while J. simply states that the libertines are destroyed through their indulgence in their animal instincts, P. draws out the comparison to the brute beasts, 'which are born mere creatures of instinct, with a view to capture and slaughter,' and then adds that the libertines will share their fate, since they mock at that higher world which is beyond their ken. Here there can be no doubt that P.'s language is far more obscure than that of J. Even J. is not quite clear. The true antithesis would have been 'they rail at what transcends the senses, they admire what appeals to the senses and appetites' (and yet these are the causes of their ruin). Is it possible that P., writing with an imperfect recollection of J., understood ἐν τούτοις φθειρονται to mean 'perish among them,' i.e. among the brutes?

1 For the connexion between the darkened heart which refuses to know God, and the indulgence in the vilest lusts, see Rom. 1:21-25.
2 It will be noticed that, while J. couples κυριότητα and δόξα as belonging to the same category, P. only names the abstract word κυριότητα here, and introduces δόξα later on as a concrete example.
We have now to consider the very curious verse interposed between J. 8 and 10, P. 210 and 212. In J. it runs 'Michael, the archangel, when he was disputing with the devil about the body of Moses, did not venture to bring a judgment of railing, but said, "the Lord rebuke thee'': in P. 'whereas angels, though greater in power and might, do not venture to bring against them a railing judgment before the Lord.' The former is a little difficult, but with the help of the Ascensio Mosis we can understand that, if the chief of the archangels abstained from using any contemptuous expression against Satan, and contented himself with making his appeal to God, much more should frail and sinful mortals abstain from slighting language about the powers of the invisible world. What however is to be made of P.? Standing by itself, it is merely a riddle, for which the answer is to be found in J. That is to say, P. wrote with J.'s sentence in his mind, but for some reason or other chose to eliminate the points essential for its intelligibility. What was his reason? The same, I think, which led him to omit the details as to the fall of the angels, which are mainly derived from the Book of Enoch, in 24, and the reference to the preaching of Enoch below. He objects, that is, to make use of these apocryphal writings, and generalizes the story by dropping the proper names and by twice changing a singular into a plural (ἀγγελοι, αὐτῶν). So too a vague παρὰ Κυρίῳ takes the place of ἐπιτιμήσας σοι Κύριος; and the vagueness is increased by the use of the indeterminate αὐτῶν and by the omission of the object of the comparative μείζονες. In fact the sentence is meaningless except to one who was already acquainted with its parallel in J., though it may perhaps be true, as Dr. Bigg suggests, that P. felt himself justified in his generalization by the remembrance of an obscure passage in the Book of Enoch.

I go on to J. v. 11, 'Woe to them, for they have followed in the steps of Cain, and been carried away in the error of Balaam for gain, and lost themselves in the rebellion of Korah. These are sunken rocks in your love-feasts, where they join your feast without any feeling of religious reverence, caring only for their own enjoyment. They are clouds without water, scudding before the wind; trees without fruit in the fruit-bearing season, twice dead, torn up by the roots; raging waves foaming out their own shame; wandering stars for which the blackness of darkness is reserved for ever.' This passage corresponds to P. 215-17, but, in the latter, the
order is considerably altered and there are various additions and
omissions. Balaam (who is also prominent in the Apocalypse 21
is the only one of the old haeresiarchs referred to, but his story
is given at more length in 216,18 'They (the libertines) have
wandered from the straight path, following the path of Balaam
son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness and was
convicted of his error by the dumb ass, which spoke with human
voice and stayed the prophet's madness.' Here P. clutches the
comparison made before (21) between the false prophet of the O.T.
and the false teacher of the N.T., and brings out again the motive
of covetousness (see above 28 and 215). Has he any special
reason for introducing the story of the ass rebuking the prophet?
We may compare other passages in which God is represented as
choosing the foolish things of this world to confound the wise
(1 Cor. 121, Ps. 83), or in which men are called upon to learn a
lesson from animals, as Isa. 18, Jer. 87, Prov. 68, Job 127. Possibly
P. may be thinking of the scorn entertained for simple believers
by those who called themselves Gnostics (see below 218).

J. v. 12 appears with some remarkable alterations in P.
218, σπιλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν
συνενοχούμενοι ύμῶν. Here σπιλοι and ἀπάταις are substituted
for σπιλάδες and ἀγάπας in J. Some editors read ἀγάπας with
B, but the addition of αὐτῶν suits much better with ἀπάταις. J.
speaks of ἀγάπας ύμῶν. It was natural of course that the
wolves should seek to find their way into the sheep-folds; but
can we suppose that the faithful would enter the love-feasts of
the libertines? Moreover the change of an original ἀγάπας
to ἀπάταις by a copyist is hardly conceivable, while the reverse
change to suit J. is most natural. But how are we to account
for the disappearance of the important—we might almost call
it the indispensable word—ἀγάπη? In the chapter on the
Readings I have suggested that ἀγάπην was the original
reading, instead of ἡδονήν, in the earlier part of this verse (ἡδονήν
ηγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῆν); where my explanatory note
will show how hard it is to make a satisfactory distinction between
ἡδονήν and τρυφήν. On the other hand ἀγάπην gives exactly the
sense required 'thinking that revelling in the daytime makes an
ἀγάπη,' as may be seen from the quotations from Clement given
in the chapter referred to (cf. too Rom. 1312). I account for ἡδονήν
by supposing that it was a marginal gloss on τρυφήν. The word
βατη is often joined with τρυφη, as shown in the explanatory note, and it is wanted here to explain how the libertines managed to gain admission to the love-feasts of the Church. We have next to ask why σπιλάδες should have been changed to σπιλών. The former word is a daring metaphor even among the metaphors which accompany it in J., but quite out of place here, and P. substitutes for it the similar sounding σπιλος found in Eph. 5:2, of which the derivatives ἄσπιλος and σπιλώ are found elsewhere in P. and J. Are we to suppose that P. intentionally replaced J.'s words by others of similar sound, in order not to startle people who were already familiar with them? or was it the unconscious action of the mind, calling up similar sounds, as in rhyming or alliteration? The latter seems to me the more probable explanation.

P. returns to J.'s metaphors in 2:17, where he splits up μεθέλαι ἀνθρωπινὸν παραφέρόμενα into two, παρασκεφαλαῖαι ἀνθρωποί and ἐνίκαι ἀναλαμβανόμεναι, perhaps because he regarded J.'s expression as superfluous, and also because he thus provides distinct pictures of present disappointment (the well) and future uncertainty (the cloud). He omits the fruitless trees, the stormy waves and wandering stars as unsuited to his purpose, but inappropriately appends to his last metaphor, the clause in which J. describes the doom of the wandering stars, ὡς ἡ ξύφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται. Of course the gender shows that P. intends this clause to apply to the persons whom he has just figuratively described, as it is indeed applied by J. himself in v. 6, but it loses the aptness which it has in J. v. 13, and thus supplies another convincing proof of the priority of J. How could the latter have had the patience to gather the scattered fragments out of P. in order to form the splendid cluster of figures in vv. 12, 13? We have still to consider the insertion in P. (2:18), ἀδικοῦμενοι μισθῶν ἀδικίας, which commences the loose series of participles ending in 2:18. If the participle is omitted, this phrase recalls J. 11 τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαάμ μισθοῦς ἐξεχύθησαν and is repeated again in 2:18; but ἀδικοῦμενοι is difficult. Apparently P. intends his paradoxical phrase to correspond to J.'s ova: the libertines are miserable, because they are, as they think, 'robbed of (or 'robbed as') the reward of their iniquity.' The following participles give a striking and powerful description of the evil influence which these men exercise over unstable souls, ὄφθαλμοις ἐχοντες μεστοὺς
moukalidos kai akatapauutos amartias, delouseontes physas
astirikous (cf. geyguneimena eis allosin, 212), karidian geygummas-
menvn ploveneias exontes, kataresakes tckna. Perhaps P. may intend
this partly to take the place of J.'s fine figure kymata agria
thalassas evapfrizeonta tas eauton aischinas.

In vv. 14, 15 J. gives the prophecy of Enoch, the seventh from
Adam, which simply announces the future judgment on impious
deeds and words. To this P. makes no direct reference, but, as I
have before suggested, it may have been one reason for speaking
of Noah as the eighth. In v. 16 (perhaps taken from the Ascension
of Moses) J. goes on to describe the libertines as 'murmuring and
discontented, walking after their own lusts, whose mouth laliei
upterojka, and who flatten others for the sake of advantage.' To
the same effect P. (218) speaks of them as uttering uperojka
mataiotitos, by which they seduce through the lusts of the flesh
those who were just escaping from heathen error. In 219-22
P. is mostly independent of J., but I have already noticed that
pleuverian epaggeklomenoi may be an echo of J. 4 chera
metatibentes eis aseleiai. He continues ei gar apofugontes tais
mamata tou koumou en epitumwsei tou kuriou kal souteros Iesou
Xristou, words which recall what he had said in 14 apofugontes
tis en to koymen en epitumia phoraias, . . . dia tis epitumwseos . . .
tou Theou kal Iesou tou kuriou umon, and goes on to give an
impressive warning against the dangers of backsliding, in which
he borrows from J. 3, upostrejava ek tis paradodeths autois
angias eunoleia, concluding with the proverb of the dog and the
sow returning to their foulness after being cleansed from it.1
This may have a reference, like 19, 20, to post-baptismal sin, and
seems to have been applied to the torments of the unseen world in
the Apocalypse of Peter, §§ 11 o ixwro kai h dousdia ton kolaxomewn
katerees kai oseper limw egevento ikei: kakei ekathemto ynaike
exousia ton ixwra mexi ton trachylaon, and §§ 8, 9, 16, quoted
on p. cxxx.

In the third chapter of P. we return again to J. The readers
are addressed as agapetois in P. 31 as in J. v. 17. In both, they
are hidden to remember the words of the Apostles, warning them

at Jac. § 18) antistates . . . aptestates (al. apestates) toustesin ephimologomenoi
ta parapomata oseper tososoi cholas, tas ek eisprasia amartias legon kai ta eis
epitumias aptates evreubonta kasa, evna to doulologias oseper ap erastentes
(cf. efarmma in 2 P. 22) koufizeste tis vados.
against mockers who should come in the last days, walking after their own lusts. To this P. adds (31.2) 'This is the second letter I am writing to you, and in both I stir up your sincere mind by calling on you to remember the command of the Lord and Saviour spoken by your Apostles.' Since in 1\textsuperscript{18} he had used the phrase ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν παρουσίαν, it would seem that P. must himself be included among 'your Apostles. He further bids them 'remember the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets,' recurring in this to what he had said in 1\textsuperscript{19}. What are we to understand by the allusion to a previous letter? Our first thought is naturally of 1 P. But is there anything in it which would answer to the description here given? Many have denied this, because they thought that the contents of the prophecy, as given in J. 18, were included in P.'s reference to an earlier epistle. J. there says ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν 'Ἐπ' ἐσχάτων χρόνου ἔσονται εἰμπαίκται κ.τ.λ., that is, he asserts that the words quoted by him were words which were often in the mouth of the Apostles. On the other hand P. makes a clear separation between 3\textsuperscript{2} and 3\textsuperscript{3} by inserting the phrase τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες, which he had previously used in 1\textsuperscript{20}, not to introduce a particular prophecy, but to lay down how prophecy was to be understood. The reference to a former letter is therefore restricted by P. to 3\textsuperscript{2}, bidding the readers pay heed to the words of the prophets and the apostles. If we turn now to 1 P. 1\textsuperscript{10-12} περὶ ἡς σωτηρίας, ἔξεζητησαν ... προφήται οἱ περὶ τὴν ἐὰν γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐρωτεύεσθε τὸν εὐαγγελισμὸν τοὺς ἀγίους διδάσκοντας ὑμῖν, πρὸ τοῦ εὐαγγελισμοῦ τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ ἐπιθυμεῖ ... σιγητὸς τοῦτο ὑποτέλειαν τοῦτο. P. reminds us of J. 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι οίς τούτῳ τὸ κρίμα (though no doubt the immediate reference there is to the prophecy of Enoch) and of P. 2\textsuperscript{3} οίς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπάλαι ὡς αὐτοῖς, ὡς οἰκείοι ἔργα. In citing the prophecy, P. adds the emphatic ἐν ἑπιθυμεῖᾳ, which may be compared with ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθορῇ συνεργητᾷ of 2\textsuperscript{12} and with the reiterated ἀσεβείας of J. 15 and κατὰ τὰς ἑπιθυμίας προεράμονας of J. 16 and 18.

In 3\textsuperscript{4}, P., omitting J.'s somewhat obscure v. 19 οὕτω εἰς ὃ ἀποδιορίσετε, даσικά, πνεύμα μὴ ἐχοντες, goes on to specify in what the mockery of the ἐμπαίκται consisted. They said that
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the promise of the coming of Christ (to which P. had borne witness in 116) remained unfulfilled, and that the world was not liable to the catastrophic changes predicted as accompaniments of the final judgment. There is a little awkwardness in P.'s wording, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως following ἀφ' ἥς ἔκοιμήθησαν, but it is a very natural blending of two objections. I cannot think that if J. had known this verse, which gives so much point to the preceding prophecy, he would have refrained from inserting it. P. gives a double answer in 36-10: (a) as the world was created out of water by the word of God, so owing to the same word it was destroyed through water, and will be destroyed again by fire on the day of judgment (cf. J. 6, 7, P. 23.4-9); (b) God is not limited to days and years. If He waits, it is from His long-suffering patience, because He desires that all should repent and be saved. We may compare this with P.'s use of the O.T. types of judgment to point out proofs of mercy in the case of Noah and Lot (25.7), in contrast with the severer tone of J. 5-7. In 310 P. bids his readers make a practical use of the knowledge that the Lord is about to come unexpectedly. 'Do not be blind to the symptoms of the breaking up of the frame of nature (perhaps a reference to volcanic eruptions and earthquakes). Make ready for the coming of the day of God by the practice of holiness and piety. Look forward to the fulfilment of the promise of the reign of righteousness in a new earth and heaven.'

At this point J. and P. again come together in J. 20 and P. 314, both commencing a new section with ἄγαπητοί. J.'s exhortation to his readers 'to build themselves up on their most holy faith and keep themselves in love' has been already used by P., as we have seen, in 157. His reference to the Spirit's help in prayer may be compared with P. 120 on the inspiration of the prophets. His phrase in v. 21 προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰωνίου is taken up in the προσδοκώντας of P. 312 and προσδοκῶμεν of 313, and again in 314, while the goal εἰς ζωὴν αἰωνίου may be compared with εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν in P. 111. P. inserts ἀσπιλοὶ καὶ ἀμώμητοι (cf. 1 P. 19) from J.'s ἀμώμους in v. 24, and in contrast to his own σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι in 218, and to J.'s ἑπταλωμένον in v. 23. ἐν εἰρήνῃ looks back to J. v. 2 and P. 17. While in vv. 22, 23 we have J.'s stern rule for the treatment of backsliders, P. gives utterance again (315) to the more hopeful

1 Reading δὲ ἄν, for which see Chapter on the Text.
view of 39, and claims for it the inspired support of Paul. 'Yet Paul's letters, wise and good as they are, offer some difficulties, which have been misunderstood and perverted, like the rest of the Bible,1 by the unlearned and unstable to their own destruction.' The word σωτηρία in 316 reminds us that J. had originally intended to write περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας (v. 3) and that his purpose is apparently carried out to a certain extent in these last verses from 20 onwards. In v. 24 J. begins an Ascription partly borrowed from St. Paul, addressed to Him who is able to keep His people free from stumbling (cf. P. 110) and present them before His glory in exceeding joy' (cf. P. 111). P. bids his readers, 'knowing these things beforehand (see above 112, 32) to be on their guard, that they may not be led away by the error (J. 11, P. 218) of the wicked (P. 27, cf. J. 23 ἐλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ), and so fall from their own stedfastness' (cf. P. 112, 214, 318). J.'s ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει soars higher than the lesson which P. here inculcates: it may be compared, as we have seen, with the πλούσιας ἐπιχορηγήθησαν of 111. P. continues his exhortation in 318 αἰδώνετε ἐν χάριτι καί γνώσει, for which we may compare χάρις πληθυνθεῖσα in 15 and ταῖτα πλεονάζουσα in 18, also J. 4. The Ascription in P. is much simpler than that in J., being addressed to our Saviour Jesus Christ, while J.'s is addressed μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτηρίᾳ ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. P. has δόξα only, while J. has the full liturgical form δόξα, μεγαλωσύνη, κράτος, καὶ ἐξουσία. P. has καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰώνος, while J. has πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τάς πάντας τοῦ αἰώνας, concluding with ἀμὴν, which is omitted in P. by WH. after Cod. B. Cf. J. of THEOL. STUD. vol. viii. 75 on Emphasis in NT.

To sum up: What do we find to be the main points in which the two epistles agree, what the points in which they differ? Both agree in making faith, which is itself the gift of God (P. 11 λαχεούσιν πιστίν), the foundation of the Christian life (J. 3, 20, P. 11, 5): both agree that its commencement lies in the divine call (J. 1, P. 18, 10). The call was sealed in baptism for the forgiveness of sin (J. 5 in connexion with 1 Cor. 101, 2, P. 19), but we have to make our calling sure through good works (P. 110), to build ourselves up on the foundation of the faith (J. 20, P. 157), to keep ourselves in the love of God by praying with the help of the Holy Spirit (J. 20), looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ (which shall be fully revealed) in the life eternal (J. 21). God our

1 For the justification of this rendering see explanatory notes.
Saviour is able to keep us without stumbling and to present us before his glory unblemished in joy (J. 24, 25). P. does not expressly mention prayer, and he lays more stress on personal effort than J. in the words 'give diligence that ye may be found in peace, without spot and blameless in his sight' 314, 'beware lest ye fall from your steadfastness, grow in grace' 317.18. So in 158 he bids his readers add all diligence to supply 'in your faith energy, in your energy knowledge,' etc., and goes on in v. 10 to say 'if ye do these things, ye shall never stumble: for thus shall be richly supplied to you the entrance into the eternal kingdom.' At the same time he ascribes to the divine power 'all that pertains to life and godliness through the knowledge of Him who called us by the manifestation of his own goodness.' That manifestation has been to us the guarantee of most blessed promises, through which we are enabled to become partakers of the divine nature (P. 15.4).

The broad distinction between the two epistles may be said to be that, while J. is throughout occupied with the denunciation of evil-doers, except in vv. 1–3 and 20–25, P.'s denunciations are mainly confined to a portion of chapter 2, and that the latter dwells more upon the mercy of God as shown even in his punishments.

Taking these points more in order, we will consider:

1. The teaching as to the nature of God.—Jude speaks of the love of God the Father (vv. 1, 21). He speaks of Him as the only Master (v. 4), the only God, our Saviour, to whom glory is to be ascribed through Jesus Christ (v. 25). His grace is made a pretext for licentiousness and He is himself denied by the innovators who have lately found their way into the church. 'The Lord' saved Israel but afterwards destroyed the unbelievers (v. 3). The archangel Michael appealed to Him against Satan (v. 9).

Jesus Christ is called our Lord (vv. 4, 17, 21, 25). We look forward to the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life (v. 21). Enoch prophesied that 'the Lord' will come to judge the wicked (v. 14). Jude calls himself the servant of Jesus Christ (v. 1). Christians are kept safe in Him (v. 1). The innovators deny Him, as they do the Father (v. 4).

The Holy Spirit is mentioned as the inspirer of prayer in v. 20. The innovators are branded as πνεύμα μη ἔχοντες (v. 19).

P. speaks of the Divine power, which has granted to us all that is
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needed for life and godliness (1\(^3\)) of the Divine nature in which man may share (1\(^4\)). He refers to the word of God the Father (styled also 'the Excellent Glory'), which was uttered at the Transfiguration, 'This is my son, my Beloved in whom I am well pleased' (1\(^12\)). God is the source of the inspiration of the prophets (1\(^12\)). He spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to Tartarus in chains of darkness; He saved Noah from the flood which swept away the ungodly, and Lot from the overthrow of Sodom. He knows how to save the righteous and punish the wicked (2\(^4\)9). The angels do not venture to utter a railing judgment in His presence (2\(^11\)). By His word He created the heaven and the earth out of water; by the same word He destroyed them through water, and will one day destroy them with fire (3\(^8\)7). In 2\(^1\) it would seem, from the ordinary use of the word δεσπότης in early Christian writers, that we must understand τὸν ἄγοράσαντα δεσπότην as used, at any rate in the first instance, of God, who redeemed Israel out of Egypt (2 Sam. 7\(^28\)), though there is probably also some reference to the Christian use of ἄγοράζω. Measures of time have no relation to Him (3\(^8\)). The delay in the day of judgment (the day of God) is due to His long-suffering, because He would have all come to repentance (3\(^9\)11,15).

Jesus Christ is called 'our Lord and Saviour' in 1\(^11\), 2\(^20\), 3\(^2\), 3\(^18\), 'our Lord' simply in 1\(^2\) where grace and peace are said to be multiplied through the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord, in 1\(^14\) where He is said to have announced to Peter his approaching death, in 1\(^16\) where the Transfiguration is described. In 1\(^1\) P speaks of himself as a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ. Jesus has called us ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ and in this manifestation of His character has made possible to us the highest hopes for the future (1\(^8\)4). The final doxology is addressed solely to Him.

The Holy Spirit. 'Men spake from God' ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἀγίου φερομένοι (1\(^21\)).

Many have drawn attention to the frequent use in 2 P. of what Dr. Bigg has called 'reverential periphrases,' ἦ θεία δύναμις, θεία φύσις, ἦ μεγαλουπρεπής δόξα. I have spoken of the two former as denoting a sympathy with Hellenic feeling, which is not to be found in Jude or 1 Peter. We may compare them with the terms θεότης and τὸ θεῖον used by St. Paul (Col. 2\(^6\), Acts 17\(^29\)), with the 'Word' of St. John, and with such phrases as 'the Deity,' 'Providenee,' 'Heaven,' 'the Author of Nature,' 'the
supreme Being,' which were common with the writers of the 18th century, or with the striking phrase of Matthew Arnold 'A stream of tendency which makes for righteousness.' If they stood alone, such phrases might be regarded as in a way equivalent to the ἄγνωστος θεός of the Athenians: they have an air of coldness and remoteness which cannot but strike one on passing from 1 P. to this epistle; but they all express different aspects of God's revelation of Himself; and our author is only following St. Paul and St. John when he recognizes these different conceptions as all included in the Christian faith.

(2) Man as he is by nature.—J. speaks of man under grace, and man fallen from grace, but hardly at all of man by nature. P. on the other hand, adopting the language of St. Paul and St. John, speaks of the believer's escape from 'the corruption which is in the world through lust' (14), from 'the pollutions of the world' (220), from 'those that live in error' (1'), from 'the ignorance of the way of righteousness' (221). He refers to 'the old sins from which we are cleansed in baptism' (19).

(3) Man under grace. While still in this ignorant, degraded state, man is made conscious of a call (P. 13.10) and of an answering faith, which is itself a gift from God (11). The call consists in the appeal made to us by the exhibition of Divine goodness in the life of Jesus Christ (13), which is the foundation and embodiment of all the promises of future good contained in the Gospel (14), promises which are summed up in our being made partakers of the Divine Nature (14). This call is sealed in baptism for the washing away of sin (110). The more we know of God and of Jesus Christ, the more we shall grow in grace and peace (12, 318). The Divine power has granted to us all that is needed for life and godliness (15). The goal which we have in view is 'the entrance into the eternal Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ' (111), otherwise described as the 'new heavens and new earth in which righteousness dwells' (313).

On this subject J. says that those to whom he writes are holy and called, beloved by God the Father and kept safe in Jesus Christ (113). The faith once for all delivered to the saints has been communicated to them, and they are to build themselves up upon it with prayer in the Holy Ghost (J. 20). He prays that 'mercy, peace, and love may be multiplied upon them' (J. 2), that they may be 'kept from stumbling,' and eventually 'presented
before the Divine Glory, faultless in exceeding joy’ (J. 24). They are further exhorted to ‘keep themselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ (to be fully revealed) in eternal life’ (J. 21).

(4) Danger of falling away. It is possible to be again entangled in the pollutions of the world after escaping from them (P. 210). To have thus turned away from the holy law once delivered to us is worse than never to have known the way of righteousness (221). The danger arises from sloth and unfruitfulness as regards the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, from forgetting the baptismal cleansing, from blindness or short-sightedness (19). We fall from our own steadfastness, being carried away by the surrounding evil (317). We must make our calling and election sure or else we shall stumble (110). For this purpose it is necessary to use every effort to build up the Christian character on the foundation of faith, adding to our faith energy and knowledge and self-denial and endurance and piety and brotherly kindness, all crowned with love to God and man (167). And we shall be able to do this, if we keep in mind that God has granted to us all that is needed for life and godliness (18-4). It will help us to resist temptation, if we are always on the watch for the coming of the Lord and endeavour to prepare ourselves for it by doing our duty in that state of life to which we are called and by perseverance in religious exercises (311). At the present time there is a special danger impending from false teachers who will steal into the church and assault both your faith and practice by denying the Master who bought them and indulging their lusts without restraint (21-5). They seduce the ignorant and unwary by their confident words (214) promising them liberty, while they are themselves slaves to corruption (218,19). They live by sight and not by faith, they have no reverence for the unseen world, they seek to make gain of you by encouraging the gratification of your lower nature (28,10,12), they dishonour your love-feasts by their loose behaviour. They pervert the meaning of Scripture to their own ruin (315). They mock the Christian hope by the sneering question ‘Where is the promise of His coming? All remains unchanged’ (38-4).

J. calls upon his readers to defend the faith once delivered to them against the assaults of impious men who have crept into the fold, changing the grace of God into licentiousness and denying the only Master and Jesus Christ our Lord vv. 3, 4. These
innovators are stained by the sins of Sodom; they make light of authority whether visible or invisible (v. 8); they have an eye only for the things of sense (v. 10); they are covetous, rebellious, discontented, self-confident (vv. 11, 16); they flatter you in the hope of gain (v. 16); they make invidious distinctions, are not led by the Spirit (v. 19), profane your love-feasts (v. 12); they are the mockers of the last days against whom the apostles uttered their warning (vv. 17, 18).

(5) Punishment of the false teachers. They will fall under the same judgment as that which overtook the sinners of the O. T. (P. 20). They are reserved under punishment for the day of judgment, which will be the day of their final destruction (29, 37). Similarly J. speaks of the judgment long ago prepared for these impious men (v. 4), compares them to trees twice dead, to falling stars for whom the blackness of darkness is reserved.

(6) Possibility of repentance after falling away—Both P. and J. speak somewhat doubtfully on this point. P. says that if men, after having escaped from the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of our Saviour Jesus Christ, are again entangled in these pollutions and overcome by them, their last state is worse than the first, since men become slaves to that by which they are overcome (219, 20). So he speaks of those who have forgotten the cleansing of baptism (19). On the other hand the delay of punishment is a token of the long-suffering patience of God, who would not that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance (39). Hence we are told that we are justified in regarding the long-suffering of God as a token of our own salvation (315). The tone of J. is less hopeful: he speaks of Israel once for all saved from Egypt, but destroyed in the wilderness when they again fell into unbelief (v. 5); and though he bids the faithful to do their best to convert those who were going astray, yet he mentions one class in whose case trembling pity combined with abhorrence of their sin seems to be all that is possible (vv. 22, 23).

(7) Eschatology and the Evidences of Christianity are two subjects on which P. speaks at considerable length. The mockers denied the Second Advent (ν παρουσία) on the ground that the promise of its occurrence during the life-time of those who had seen the Lord, was still unfulfilled. The fathers had died, yet all remained as it was from the beginning of the world (34). P. answers generally that God is not limited by measures
of time which are merely relative to man; but he had already
given a more precise answer in 116 where he declared that he
had been himself an eye-witness of τὴν τοῦ κυρίου δύναμιν καὶ
παρουσίαν. He might also have answered that the fall of
Jerusalem was itself a συντέλεια τοῦ αἰώνος, another fulfilment
of the prophecy of the παρουσία, which, like all prophecies, was a
matter οὐκ ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως. He turns however to the assertion
that the world had remained without change from the creation,
and cites the Deluge as evidence to the contrary. As the world
was then destroyed by water at the word of God, so on the great
day of judgment it will be destroyed by fire in consequence of
the same word, and will be succeeded by new heavens and a
new earth, the dwelling-place of righteousness (3v-13). On that great
day the offending angels and ungodly men will meet their doom
(2v, 2v). J. quotes the prophecy of Enoch that the Lord will
come with hosts of angels to execute judgment on impious men
and impious deeds (v. 14). For that judgment the rebel angels
are reserved in chains under darkness, and sinners shall then be
punished in eternal fire (vv. 6, 7), while the righteous enter into
eternal life, being presented before the throne of God in exceeding
joy (vv. 21, 24).

P. speaks of the evidence of prophecy in 119-82. It is the word
of God uttered by men under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.
Hence it is of no limited application, but declares the universal
principles of God's government. It appears first as a lamp in
darkness, but to those who attend to it, it is the harbinger of the
full light of the Gospel day and of the day-star of the Spirit in
the heart. Its teaching is confirmed by the eye-witness of those
who beheld the glory of Christ when on earth (1v-12), and by the
contemplation of his goodness as manifested in the record of his
acts and words (1v).

The conclusion I have drawn from the above comparison of the two
epistles as to the priority of J., is confirmed by the general opinion
of modern critics, as by Neander, Credner, Ewald, Hilgenfeld
Holtzmann, Harnack, Bernhard Weiss, Abbott, Farrar, Salmon
above all by Dr. Chase in his excellent article on the Second
Epistle of St. Peter in Hastings' D. of B. It is true some of the
best authorities speak very doubtfully both of this priority and of
the authenticity of 2 P. Thus Döllinger, who in his First Age of
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the Church had maintained the priority of 2 Peter, wrote to Dr. Plummer in the year 1879 that he could no longer hold this opinion (Plummer’s St. James and St. Jude 1891, p. 400). See also Plummer’s St. Jude p. 268 ‘While admitting that the case is by no means proved, we may be content to retain the priority, as well as the authenticity of 2 Peter, as at least the best working hypothesis.’ And Hort is quoted by Dr. Sanday (Inspiration p. 347) as saying that ‘If he were asked he should say that the balance of argument was against the epistle; and the moment he had done so he should begin to think that he might be wrong.’ On the other hand three of the most recent critics, Spitta in his Commentary on the two epistles 1885, Dr. Bigg in his International Critical Commentary ed. 2, 1902, and the veteran Zahn in his Einleitung in das N.T. ed. 2, 1900 have no hesitation in maintaining the priority and authenticity of 2 P. I proceed to consider the arguments which have been adduced by them or by others in favour of that view.1

(1) Assuming the genuineness of the two epistles, it is easier, in a case of evident borrowing, to suppose that the borrower should be the comparatively obscure Jude, rather than Peter, the foremost of the Apostles.

(2) Jude seems to acknowledge his obligations to Peter in v. 4 oί πάλαι προηγεραμένοι eis τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα . . . τῶν μόνων δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι and in vv. 17, 18 μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἦμων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἐσονται ἐμπαίκται κατὰ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορεύμενοι, the former verse being regarded as an allusion to P.’s 23 ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσονται ψευδοδιδασκάλοι . . . τῶν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι . . . οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαλαὶ οὐκ ἀργεὶ, the latter to P. 323 μνησθήναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἡμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος, τούτω πρῶτον γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἦμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαίγμονῇ ἐμπαίκται κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορεύμενοι.

(3) The priority of P. is confirmed by the prevailing use of the future tense in regard to the innovators, whereas J. uses the past

1 I agree with Dr. Bigg that it is superfluous to consider theories which suppose 2 Pet. to be made up of two independent epistles. Its unity, as shown in the earlier part of this chapter, forces itself on the mind of any careful reader.
or the present, cf. P. 21 ἔσονται, παρεισάξονσι, 22 ἐξακολουθήσονται, Ἕλλας ημιῆσται, 23 ἐμπροεύσονται with J. v. 4 παρεισδύσαν, v. 8 μαίνουσι, v. 10 Ἕλλας ἠμυδώνοι and the aorists in v. 11.

[I will deal first with these objections taken from Spitta and Zahn. We may concede that, if both epistles are genuine, we should rather have expected the borrowing to be on the side of the more obscure. Yet the probability is not one that can be pressed. Milton and Handel borrowed from men much inferior to themselves; Isaiah borrows from Micah, and 1 P. from James. If on the other hand we find reason to believe (see chapter on the Relation between 2 P. and 1 P.) that 2 P. was not written by the Apostle, the objection only amounts to this, that, though St. Peter himself had borrowed from James in 1 P., an admirer of St. Peter could not have borrowed from Jude in 2 P. With regard to obj. (2), I have pointed out in my note that the word πάλαι in J. 4 cannot refer to P., but must be understood of the prophecy of Enoch, quoted in J. v. 15, in which the word ἄρεβεις (which sums up the judgment in v. 4), occurs no less than four times (if we include the cognate verb and abstract noun). I have also pointed out that J. in v. 17 refers not to any one writer, but to the oral teaching of the Apostles, and that P. in 3 does not profess to utter any new prophecy, but simply adds to what Jude had said, that the teaching of the Apostles rested upon the authority of Christ, and that it was in agreement with the teaching of the prophets. As regards obj. (3), the difference of tense, P. is not consistent in his use of the future. We have the pres. in 210 τρέμονσι, 217 εἰσίν, 218 δελείζονσιν, 35 λαβθάνει, from which we should conclude that the innovators had already begun their work, if not among those to whom he writes, yet among other churches, to which J. may have addressed himself. If the former epistle is a product of the second century, the writer may have used the future tense to give it verisimilitude, while falling into the present from inadvertence.]

(4) Spitta asks why, if P. is borrowing from J., he makes no reference to him, as he does to Paul? It might be enough to ask in reply, 'Why, if J. borrows from P., does he make no definite acknowledgment of the fact? But we have a parallel case, though no doubt on a smaller scale, in the unacknowledged borrowings from the epistle of James in 1 Peter, on which see the Introduction to my edition of James, pp. xcviii. to cii. The reason however
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for the mention of Paul in 2 P. is quite distinct from the acknowledgment of a debt. The libertines claimed his authority in behalf of their own views (cf. J. 4), and it was necessary for P. to protest against this.

(5) Dr. Bigg says (p. 217) that 'Jude has certain words which may be called Pauline and are certainly not Petrine.' He 'mixes up the psychology of St. Peter with that of St. Paul, and this fact seems to tell heavily against him.' Supposing it to be true that J. is more Pauline than Peter, as it is certainly true that he is more Pauline than his brother James, I am unable to see in what way this bears upon the question of the priority of either epistle. Dr. Bigg instances certain words used by J., κλητός, ἁγιος (= Christian), πνεῦμα (= indwelling spirit), ψυχικός, which he regards as non-Petrine; but quotes no examples of 'Petrine psychology,' which would be more to the point, if Jude is really copying 2 P. I will deal first with the non-Petrine words. It is true that κλητός does not occur either in 1 P. or 2 P., but κλησις is found in 2 P. 10 and καλέω of the Divine calling four times in 1 P. as well as in 2 P. 18. The synonymous ἐκλεκτός is found in 1 P., as ἐκλογή is found in 2 P. 11, both being thoroughly Pauline words. When it is said that ἁγιος is equivalent to 'Christian,' this must mean that it denotes 'consecration' rather than the actual holiness of the persons spoken of; but this is just the sense which it bears in the phrase ἐθνός ἁγιον used in 1 P. 20. As to πνεῦμα, it may be true that the distinction between the human soul and spirit belongs especially to the Pauline phraseology, but we find it in Joseph. Ant. i. 34, where God is said to have infused into Adam πνεῦμα καὶ ψυχήν. And what are we to say of 1 P. 48 ξῶσιν κατὰ Θεόν πνεύματι and 38 ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ ἑσυχίου πνεύματος, where καρδία and πνεῦμα are both preferred to ψυχή? So 315 Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις υμῶν. The 'indwelling spirit' is surely indicated in 1 P. 111 τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ. Again the word ψυχικός is not exclusively Pauline. It occurs in the least Pauline of the books of the N.T., written by Jude's own brother (James 315, where see note). Dr. Bigg denies that it could have been used in the Pauline sense by Peter, because to him 'ψυχή means the soul in relation to the religious life,' but we meet the phrase ψυχής ἀστηρίκτους in 2 P. 24, and in 1 P. 320 ὁκτὼ ψυχαῖ stands simply for 'eight persons,' without
any allusion to the religious life, while on the other hand we find the phrase οἶκος πνευματικός and πνευματικάς θυσίας in 1 P. 26. Dr. Hort commenting on 1 P. 22 ('hostile that war against the soul') says 'the modern religious sense of the term "soul," as the highest element in man, is founded on a misunderstanding of the N.T. On the other hand there is considerable exaggeration in the supposition that the word has in the N.T. a definitely deprecatory sense . . . We must not be tempted to force into St. Peter's language here St. Paul's meaning in Gal. v. 17 ἢ γὰρ σάρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος.' ψυχή, as Hort says, 'answers very nearly to our modern word and conception "self."' See my note on 2 P. 2ν ψυχὴν δικαιὰν ἐβασάνιζεν. Other Pauline words which occur in Peter are ἀγοράζω, αἰρεσίς, ἀνόμος, γνωρίζω, δικαιοσύνη, δουλω, ἐγκράτεια, εὐλογία, ἐλευθερία, ἐπίγνωσις, παραδίδωμι, to name a few from 2 P., and similarly we find φιλασόμος, αἷμα Ἰησοῦ, Χριστοῦ παθήματα, εὐλογέω, εὐλογητός, εὐλογία, κληρονομία, προγνώσκει, γάλα, συνείδησις, συνελπισίνωμος, χάρισμα, σάρξ, σαρκικός in 1 P. On the other hand I have vainly searched for any specially Petrine word such as ἀναστροφή (though that is not un-Pauline) in the epistle of Jude.1

It would be endless to go into a minute examination of the parallel passages which have been cited to prove the priority of P. I have already said all that I think need be said about them in the earlier part of this chapter and in the explanatory notes. The impression which they leave on my mind is that in J. we have the first thought, in P. the second thought; that we can generally see a reason why P. should have altered J., but very rarely a reason why what we read in P. should have been altered to what we find in J. P. is more reflective, J. more spontaneous.

1 The commentators generally recognize the influence of the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Romans, especially the latter, on 1 P., and a glance at the marginal references gives evidence of a closer connexion between them than is to be found between 1 P. and any other book of the N.T. with the exception perhaps of James. See Dr. Chase in Hastings' D. of B. iii. 788 for a careful list of the resemblances between 1 P. and the Pauline Epistles.
CHAPTER II

GRAMMAR AND STYLE OF JUDE AND OF 2 PETER

UNUSUAL INFLEXIONS.

Jude v. 4 παρεισεδύησαν read by WH. after B for παρεισεδύσασαν read by Ti. Treg. after ΝΑ etc., see explanatory note. 2 Pet. 2ε έπαξάς for the usual ἐπαγαγών, cf. Blass p. 43. 2 Pet. 1ε έγενθην for έγενομήν. On the other hand it might seem that hybrid aorist forms such as ἔβαλαν, ἐπέσαν, which are found in other books of the N.T., and the termination -σαν in impf. or 2nd aor. as εἴχοσαν, παρελάβοσαν, and -αν for -ασι in the pf. as εἰσελήνυθαν, were unknown to the writers of these epistles; but the fact simply is that they have no examples of the 3rd pl. of the imperfect, 2nd aor., and perfect (except οἴδασιν in v. 10), so that we are without the means of judging which form would have been preferred by the writers. For the confusion between the verbal contractions in -άω and -έω see p. 51.

ARTICLE.

The Greek language differs from the English in prefixing the definite article: (1) before proper names, a use which has the advantage of showing the case, where the name is indeclinable, as in Jude 9 ὁ δὲ Μιχαηλ, 11 τοῦ Καιν, τοῦ Βαλαάμ, τοῦ Κορέ, also in 2 Pet. 2ε τοῦ Βαλαάμ.

It is omitted in J. v. 14 ἔβδομος ὑπὸ Ἀδάμ, Ἕνωξ, v. 1 Ἰακώβου, v. 5 Αἰγύπτου, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ passim. So in 2 Pet. 2ε Νῦν, 2ε Λότ.

1 Compare throughout my Introduction to St. James, Chapters VIII. and IX. As stress has been laid on the unclassical character of the Greek of 2 Pet., I have thought it advisable to point out his agreements, as well as his disagreements, with the ordinary rules.

2 Since this chapter was in type Messara. Conybeare and Stock have brought out Selections from the Septuagint with a useful introduction on Grammar.

3 Dr. Abbott has discussed the reasons for the presence or absence of the article, Johannine Grammar, pp. 57 f. Cf. J. H. Moulton Gr. of N.T. Prolegomena, p. 83.
(2) Before a name which is applicable only to one as ὁ Θεός, ὁ Κύριος: always so with the nom. and often with other cases in St. James; but found in St. Jude only where the word is defined by a genitive, as in v. 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα, v. 17 and v. 25 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. In 2 Pet. 11 we find ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 12 ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ, 313 τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, 118 την τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν.

Since the unique use easily passes into a proper name, the former is often found, like the latter, without the article, as in Jude v. 1 τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις, v. 21 ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ, v. 5 Κύριος ἀπάλεσεν, v. 9 ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος. So 2 Pet. 117 παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός, ἢδ. v. 21 ἐπάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, 29 οἶδεν Κύριος ἀσεβείς ῥύεσθαι, 39 οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος, 29, 310 ἡμέρα Κυρίου, 211, 38 παρὰ Κυρίῳ. When Κύριος (nom.) is used as a proper name without the article, it must be understood of God; but in oblique cases it is often used of Christ, as in 1 Cor. 722 ὁ γὰρ ἐν Κυρίῳ κληθεὶς δυὸς ἀπελεύθερος Κυρίου ἐστίν, 1 Cor. 1021 ποτήριον Κυρίου.

This use is widely extended in the N.T. owing to the growth of a special Christian terminology, e.g. πνεῦμα ἄγιον 2 Pet. 121: σάρξ, Jude v. 8 σάρκα μὲν μιαλουσι αὐτοῖς, 2 Pet. 210 τοὺς ὁπλικοὺς σαρκός πορευομένους, 218 σαρκὸς ἀσελγείας: γραφή, 2 Pet. 120 προφήτεια γραφῆς.1

Use of Article with a Qualified Noun.

The noun may be qualified by the addition of an adjective or participle, or of a genitive, or an adverb or adverbial phrase. If the article is used, a noun thus qualified may take one of four forms—(1) the ‘compact,’ where the qualification is placed between the article and the noun as in ὁ τότε κόσμος 2 Pet. 36; (2) the ‘appositional,’ where the qualification stands in apposition to the noun, the article being prefixed both to the qualifying phrase and to the noun (a), or to the former only (b), as in Jude v. 17 τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων (a), in Jude v. 6 ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας (b); (3) the ‘loose’ or ‘uncompact,’ where the article is immediately prefixed to the governing noun, which is itself followed by a qualifying phrase, as Jude v. 13 ὁ ζῷος τοῦ σκότους, ἢδ. 5 ἐν τῇ πίστει ἡμῶν. I give below the more remarkable examples of (1) and (3) which are found in these epistles.

(1) Jude v. 3 περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας, ἢδ. τῇ ἀπαξ παρα-

---

1 See below under Irregular Omission of Article.
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dōheîs tōîs ἀγίοις πίστει, v. 4 τήν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα, v. 7 αἱ
περὶ αὐτῶν πόλεις, v. 9 περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος, v. 23 τῶν ἀπὸ
tῆς σαρκὸς ἐστιλαμένου χιτῶνα, v. 12 [οἷς] ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν
σπιλάδες συνευχοῦμενοι. (Here, if we read the article, it seems
best to treat σπιλάδες as complementary to the following participle.
If we omit the article, σπιλάδες becomes the predicate to the
sentence.)

2 Pet. supplies many elaborate instances of the compact form,
which is used by him, as Dr. Bigg remarks, with exceptional freedom
and elegance: so 14 τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, 16 τήν
τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν, 21 τῶν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην,
27 ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀδέσμων ἐν ἀσέλγειᾳ ἀναστροφῆς, 210 τοὺς ὁπίσω
σαρκῶς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μισσοῦ πορευομένους, 218 τήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ
τροφῆς, 216 τήν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν, 221 ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης
αὐτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς, 32 τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς,
315 κατὰ τὴν δοθεὶσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν.

Where there is a complex qualifying clause, a part of this is
sometimes allowed to overflow the inclosure formed by the article
and noun, either for euphony, or in order to avoid clumsiness or
ambiguity, e.g. the word πίστει in 2 Pet. 11 τοῖς ἱσότιμον ἡμῖν
λαχώσιν πίστειν. Such a clause may be called ‘semi-compact.’
Other examples are Jude v. 3 oί πάλαι προεγγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο
τὸ κρίμα, v. 7 τῶν ὁμοίων τρόπων τούτως, v. 18 κατὰ τὰς ἐαυτῶν
ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἁγιασθηκών, 2 Pet. 32 μησοθήκῃ τῶν
προερμήμων ἡμάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, ὡδ. τῆς τῶν
ἀποστόλων ἐντολῆς τοῦ Κυρίου.

Sometimes we have the converse irregularity. A word from
the outside is inserted in the inclosure, e.g. 2 Pet. 14 τὰ τίμια καὶ
μέγιστα ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, where the dative which
depends on δεδώρηται is introduced into the articular phrase.

(3) I proceed to give examples of the uncompact clause: Jude v. 6
τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἄρχην, v. 11 τῆς ὁδὸς τοῦ Καΐρου,
τῆς πλάνης τοῦ Βαλααμ, τῆς ἀντιλογίας τοῦ Κορέ, v. 17 μηνίσθητε τῶν
ῥημάτων τῶν προερμήμων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων, v. 21 τοῦ ἔλεος τοῦ
κυρίου ἡμῶν. 2 Pet. 13 διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος
ἡμᾶς ἰδία δόξῃ (where the desire of compactness would have
resulted in the less simple διὰ τῆς ἰδίας δόξης ἡμᾶς καλέσαντος
ἐπιγνώσεως), 19 τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν, 111 ἢ
ἐλεοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, 114 ἢ ἀπόδειξις
tοῦ σκηνώματός μου, 216 τῆς ὁδὸς τοῦ Βαλααμ τοῦ Βόσορ, 218 τοὺς
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Use of Article with Possessive Genitive of Pronoun.

By far the commonest order here is the uncompact,—article, noun, genitive,—as in Jude v. 4 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ... τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν (also vv. 17, 21, 25), v. 12 ἐν ταῖς ἁγάπαις ὑμῶν, v. 16 κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν, τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν, v. 24 τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

2 Pet. 1 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, 1 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (also in vv. 8, 11, 14, 16, iii. 15, 18), 1 τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, 1 ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν, 1 ἐν τοῖς σκηνώματος μου, 117 ὁ νόος μου, ὁ ἁγαπητὸς μου, 1 ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, 2 ἡ ἀπόλυτα αὐτῶν, 2 ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν, 2 ἐν ταῖς ἁπάταις αὐτῶν, 3 τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν, 4 τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, 3 ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ.

Where the noun is preceded by an adjective or quasi-adjective, the possessive genitive sometimes follows the noun, as in 2 Pet. 1 quoted above; sometimes the adjective, as in Jude v. 3 τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας, v. 20 τῇ ἁγιασμῇ ὑμῶν πίστει, 2 Pet. 1 τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν, 315 ὁ ἁγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφός, 316 τὴν ἰδιαν αὐτῶν ἀπόλυειαν.

Where the possessive genitive follows immediately on the article, as in Jude v. 6 τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἱρχήν, v. 13 τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας, v. 18 τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας, the effect is to give special emphasis. Since ἑαυτὸς is in itself emphatic, it is usually found in this emphatic position, as in Mt. 82 τοῖς ἑαυτῶν νεκρῶσ, Lk. 2 ἐκαστὸς εἰς τὴν ἑαυτὸ τοῦλη, 9 ὁ Θεὸς τῶν ἑαυτῶν νεκρῶσ, 11 φιλάση τὴν ἑαυτὸν αὐλήν, 14 καὶ τὴν ἑαυτὸν ψυχὴν, Rom. 410 τὸ ἑαυτὸ σώμα ἡ γενεκρωμένου, 8 ὁ Θεὸς τῶν ἑαυτῶν νεκρῶσ, 164 τῶν ἑαυτῶν πράξεων, 16 ὁ Θεὸς τῶν ἑαυτῶν νεκρῶσ, 147 δοσις οὐ βαστάζει τῶν σταυρῶν ἑαυτῶν. An examination of the passages quoted under ἑαυτὸ in the concordance shows that in general the latter position is less emphatic than the former, and that, in many cases of the latter, αὐτὸ and αὐτῶν occur as various readings. The more emphatic position is naturally assigned to τοὺν in 2 Pet. 16 τὴν τοῦτον μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, and to ἐκείνον in 2 Pet. 16 τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος. So Joh. 57 ἄνε ἐκείνων γράμμασιν, 2 Cor. 8 ἐκείνου πτωχείας,
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818 τὸ ἐκείνων περίσσευμα, 814 τὸ ἐκείνων ύστερημα, 2 Tim. 223 τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα, Tit. 37 τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι. In 2 Pet. 37 some MSS. have τῷ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, which resembles James 112 τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων, 1 Pet. 13 τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος, Tit. 36 τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος, 1 Joh. 27 τὸ αὐτοῦ χρίσμα, Rom. 324 τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι, 325 τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, 1 Thess. 219 ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ. Heb. 24 κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν (quoted by Abbott, Joh. Gr. p. 415); but there can be little doubt that in 2 Pet. 37 αὐτῷ is right, see explanatory note. The possessive pronoun in this position has the same emphatic force as the genitive of the personal pronoun, e.g. 2 Pet. 115 μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον contrasted with the preceding ὅμας.

In two passages of 2 Pet. we find the possessive genitive preceding the articular phrase, 22 πολλῷ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσεβείαις, and 31 διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινὴ διάνοιαν. Clauses of this form are common in St. John’s Gospel, and Dr. Abbott has christened them ‘the vernacular possessive.’ See Joh. Gr. pp. 414 foll., where many examples are quoted, e.g. Joh. 127 ἔνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἵμαντα τοῦ υποθήματος (corresponding to Lk. 316 λύσα τὸν ἵμαντα τῶν υποθημάτων αὐτοῦ), Joh. 416 φωνῆσον σου τὸν ἄνδρα, as well as from other books. In most cases the preceding possessive genitive seems to throw special stress on the following noun, but I do not think that this is so in the examples above quoted from 2 Pet.; and Dr. Abbott allows that in some cases the genitive is itself made emphatic by contrast, as in Joh. 136 σὺ μον νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας; 1314 εἰ οὖν ἐγὼ ἐνεφα ὑμῶν τοὺς πόδας ... καὶ ὑμεῖς ὀφειλετε ἀλλήλων νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας.

Irregular Omission of Article.

So far the N.T. usage does not differ materially from that of classical Greek. In what follows I think we must recognize a failure to appreciate the refinements of the Greek article on the part of those whose mother tongue was not Greek and who may have also been influenced by the fact that Latin had no article. Such cases are:

(1) Where the noun is defined by a dependent genitive, as Jude v. 6 εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας (R.V. ‘the judgment of the great day’). Here the ordinary use in prose would have required εἰς τὴν τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας κρίσιν: but the phrase μεγάλη ἡμέρα, as well as the word κρίσις, has acquired a technical sense, which
allows of the omission of the article without causing ambiguity, and this omission is further facilitated by the preposition. We may compare the phrase ἐν ἡμέρα κρίσεως, which occurs four times in Mt., εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως 2 Pet. 2ο, 3ο, ἦξει ἡμέρα Κυρίου 3ο, εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος 3ο, cf. οὐκ ἀναστήσονται ἁσβείς ἐν κρίσει Ps. 1ο, μέχρι ἡμέρας κρίσεως Enoch x. 11 (Gizeh), p. 339 ed. Charles. On the other hand we find the full form τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας 2 Pet. 3ο, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως 1 Joh. 4ο, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ (MS. τῆς—λης) τῆς κρίσεως Enoch p. 337. Jude v. 14 ἐν ἁγίαις μυρίασιν αὐτῶν: the parallel in Enoch has σὺν τοῖς (?) μυρίασιν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτῶν (p. 327 Charles); but the article is omitted in Heb. 12ο προσελκύθατε ... μυρίασιν ἄγγελον, Ps. 3ο οὐ φοβηθήσομαι ἀπὸ μυρίαδων λαοῦ, and in Deut. 33ο σὺν μυρίασι Κάδης (R.V. ‘from the ten thousands of holy ones’).

In our passage the R.V. is probably right in translating ‘with ten thousands of his holy ones’ so as to keep the indefinite force. In the quotation from Enoch, which occurs in Jude v. 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν ἐργῶν ἁσβείας αὐτῶν, the Gizeh Greek (followed by and others) omits ἁσβείας αὐτῶν, and Treg. brackets ἁσβείας. The omission of the article is awkward but not more so than in Joh. 3ο δι’ ἁσβείαν δόρων δὲ ἐδέχοντο, and other examples cited in my Introduction to St. James, p. exciii. So Jude v. 7 πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι (R.V. ‘suffering the vengeance of eternal fire’), where we should have expected τὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου πυρὸς δίκην, cf. Heb. 6ο (θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι) βασιλισμῶν διδαχῆς, ἐπιθέσεως τε χειρῶν, ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου. Jude v. 21 ἐν ἁγάπῃ Θεοῦ (R.V. ‘keep yourselves in the love of God’). We find similar examples in 2 Pet.

2 Pet. 1ο ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν (R.V. ‘in the righteousness of our God’), cf. Rom. 4ο διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως and even the nominative in Rom. 1ο δικαιοσύνης Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται: so 2 Pet. 1ο ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ and 2ο, but we meet the full form just below 1ο εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐπίγνωσιν and 1ο διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς, as in Rom. 2ο we have τὴν ὀδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης. 2 Pet. 1ο οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ὑπορώτου ἡνέκηθε προφητεία (R.V. ‘by the will of man’), cf. Joh. 1ο ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός, 1 Pet. 4ο θελήματι Θεοῦ βιώσαι: so the phrase διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ occurs seven times in St. Paul. 2 Pet. 2ο κατακλυσμόν κόσμῳ ἁσβείων ἐπάξας (R.V. ‘the world of the ungodly’): we might translate ‘a world of ungodly men,’ but
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κόσμος is often anaehrous, not only in prepositional phrases such as ἀπὸ καταβολής κόσμου, ἀπ’ ἀρχής κόσμου, ἀμαρτία ἡν ἐν κόσμῳ, but in such cases as Rom. 11:12 τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτοῦ πλούτος κόσμου, and even in the nominative, as Gal. 6:14 δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἔσταυρωται καὶ ἡ κόσμῳ. 2 Pet. 2:6 πόλεις Σωσθῆμων καὶ Γομόρρας κατέκρινεν (R.V. ‘the cities’), cf. Lk. 24:18 ἀνέβη ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρέτ. 2 Pet. 2:10 τοὺς ὑπίσχους σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μισιμοῦ πορευόμενους (R.V. ‘after the flesh in the lust of debility’), cf. 2:18 ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείας (R.V. ‘in the lusts of the flesh,’ but see explanatory note). Gal. 5:16 ἐπιθυμίαι σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσῃ, 1 Pet. 2:4 ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ... βιωσαι. 2 Pet. 2:13, 15 μισθὸν ἀδικίας (R.V. ‘the hire of wrong-doing’), cf. Acts 1:31 ἐκτῆσατο χωρίον ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ἁδικίας. 2 Pet. 3:4 ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως (R.V. ‘from the beginning of the creation’), cf. above ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κόσμου.

(2) Other examples of omission. Jude v. 21 εἰς ἥσσαν αἰώνιον, which is more usual than the full phrase, τὴν ἥσσαν τὴν αἰώνιον in 1 Joh. 1:2, 2:5. Jude v. 18 ἐτ’ ἐσχάτον χρόνον (R.V. ‘in the last time’), cf. 2 Tit. 3:1, James 5:5 ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, 1 Pet. 1:1 ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, 1 Joh. 2:18 ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἡταν, 2 Pet. 3:1 ἐτ’ ἐσχάτοι τῶν ἡμερῶν, where see note. Jude v. 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ σοφὴμι ἡμῶν δόξα (R.V. ‘to the only God our Saviour,’ Rom. 16:27 μόνῳ Θεῷ, 1 Tim. 1:17 μόνῳ Θεῷ τιμή; but in Joh. 5:24 τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ ὑμῖν ζητεῖτε, ἰδ. 17:3 ἰδ. γινώσκοι σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, Jude v. 4 τὸν μόνον δεσπότην. Cf. Thuc. iii. 57. 4 ἡμεῖς τε, ὅ Λακεδαιμιόνοι, ἡ μόνη ἐλπίς, δέδωκαν μὴ οὐ βέβαιοι ἦτε, Joh. Gr. p. 10. 2 Pet. 2:5 ἀρχαίον κόσμον οὐκ ἐφείσατο (R.V. ‘spared not the ancient world’), cf. Ps. 78:8 μὴ μνησθῇς ἡμῶν ἄνομῶν ἁρχαίων, Job 21:28 ὑπὲρ τὴν φρονήσιν πάντων ἁρχαίων ἄνδρῶν. 2 Pet. 2:15 καταλείποντες εὐθείαν ὁδὸν (R.V. ‘the right way’): elsewhere in this epistle ὁδὸς is joined with the article, as in 2:2, 2:21, and in Jude v. 11; but it is anaehrous in Mt. 21:32 ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, Lk. 1:79 εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης, James 5:20 ἐκ πλάνης ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ, and in the following quotations from the LXX., Acts 2:26 ἐγνώμονος μοι ὁδὸν ἡσσῆς, Rom. 3:17 ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἐγνώσαν, and constantly in the poetic books of the O.T. e.g. Ps. 1:8 ὁδὸν δικαίων, ὁδὸς ἀσεβῶν, Ps. 2:18 ἐς ὁδὸν δικαιας, Prov. 21:6 ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ εὐθείας, 2:1 ὁδὸν εὐλαβεμένον αὐτὸν διαφυλάξει. 2 Pet. 2:18 ἔλεγεν ἐσχέν ἰδίας παρανομίας, 1:8 ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ, cf. Acts 13:36 ἵδια γενεὰ ὑπηρετήσας, 1 Cor. 9:7
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2 Pet. 2:11 δι' άγγελοι 'whereas angels, though greater,' etc. So εὐσεβεῖς and ἀδίκους in 2 Pet. 2:9 οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ρύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ κολαζομένους τυρεῖν, where R.V. has 'the godly,' 'the unrighteous,' but it is possible to keep the indefinite force 'godly men,' 'unrighteous men' contrasted with the definite class which follows, μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὑπὸ σαρκὸς.

It is sometimes a little difficult to see why the article is used, as in 2 P. 1:4 δὲ ὁ τὰ τίμια ὑμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, where definite reference is made to the promises of Christ. So in 1:15 ἔχειν ὑμᾶς τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι 'that ye should have it in your power to practise the mention (not simply 'to make mention') of these things.'

The combination of the fully formed articular phrase with what might be thought an illiterate use of the anarthrous noun is very remarkable in this writer. The latter feature is more visible in the prophetic portions (ii. 4–18, iii. 7–12), the first chapter, which is chiefly argumentative, preserving more of a classical character throughout. We may compare the difference between the preface and the poetical portions of the early chapters of St. Luke, the former affording a good specimen of the periodic style, ἐπειδὴ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περί τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, the latter resembling the broken utterances of the Sibyl, τὸν δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αυτῶ ἐν ἀφέσει ἀμαρτίων αὐτῶν διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους Θεοῦ ἡμῶν. So the use of the article in the narrative portion of the book of Job is for the most part in accordance with ordinary rules, e.g. 1:18 οἱ τούτων λαλοῦντος ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἔρχεται λέγων τῷ Ἰωβ, Τῶν αὐτῶν σοι καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων σου ἐθύμησαν καὶ πυθόντων παρὰ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτῶν τῷ προσβυτέρῳ, ἔξωφης πνεῦμα μέγα ἐπήλθεν ἐκ τῆς ἐρήμου καὶ ἤπνε τῶν τεσσάρων γωνίων τῆς οἰκίας, καὶ ἔπεσεν ἡ οἰκία ἐπὶ τὰ παιδία σου καὶ ἐτελεύτησαν, while in the drama itself we meet such phrases as συνέκλεισε πύλας γαστρός μητρὸς μου 3:10, ἵσχυν ῥημάτων σοι τὸ ὑποίσις; 4:2, στόνου λέντος, φωνὴ δὲ λείανης, γαυράμα δὲ δρακάντων ἐσβέσθη 4:10, ἀφρονα ἀναρίη ὄργῃ, πεπλημμένον δὲ θανατοῦ ξῆλος 5:5. There is a similar contrast between the style of the narrative portion of Judges, e.g. 4:21 συνεκάλυψεν αυτόν ἐν τῇ δήρει αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐλαβεν . . . τὸν πάσαλον τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ ἔθηκε τὴν σφυραν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτῆς . . . καὶ ἐνέκρουσε τὸν πάσαλον ἐν τῇ γνάθῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ διήλασεν ἐν τῇ γῇ, and the song of Deborah 5:8 δρή ἐσαλευ-
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θησαυ ἀπὸ προσώπου Κυρίου, τοῦτο Σινᾶ ἀπὸ προσώπου Κυρίου, 5,20 σοφαὶ ἄρχουσών αὐτῆς ἀνταπεκρίναντο πρὸς αὐτήν.

If we ask why there should be this difference between the language of prose and that of poetry or prophecy, it may be answered generally that the aim of prose is clearness and exactness, while that of verse is to appeal to the feelings and imagination; that largeness and mystery are proper to the latter, which frets at the minute and definite restrictions of the former. In Greek this natural predilection of verse was assisted by the fact that in Homer the article was not yet separated from the pronoun, and that later poets followed in the footsteps of Homer. The LXX. translators would naturally endeavour to maintain a corresponding distinction between prose and verse in their translation of the O.T., and we know from the Sibylline books that Alexandrian Jews had practised the writing of Greek hexameters, where the article is not more common than in Homer, for more than 150 years before the Christian era.

Article belonging to more than one Noun.

2 Pet. 111, 220, 32, 318 τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Here the ordinary rule holds good: substantives subordinated to the same article are simply different names for the same subject; but in 2 Pet. 11 ὑ ἰκαλοικαταν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (σωτήρ belonging to the class of anarthrous nouns) it seems better to understand the substantives as indicating different subjects, since they are plainly distinguished in the next verse τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν; so too in Jude v. 4 τον μᾶν δεσποτήν καὶ κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, where see note.1 In 2 Pet. 110 βεβαιάν ἡμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἔκλογην ποιεῖσθαι, 118 τῆν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, 316 οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι, the single article is sufficient because the connected nouns belong to one category (see Winer, p. 154).

Cases.

NominaTe—There is a tendency in the Hellenistic writings to put the noun or participle into the nominative case, when by the ordinary rules of grammar it should be in an oblique case to suit the preceding construction, see 2 P. 318 διεγείρω ἡμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν,

1 J. H. Moulton, p. 84, understands τοῦ Θεου 2 P. 11 of Christ.
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μησθήναι τῶν ῥημάτων . . . γινώσκοντες, where the participle should have been in the acc. to agree with the understood subject of the infin. μησθήναι. See below under Anacolouthon, and Moulton, Prolegomena, p. 69; Blass, pp. 81, 242, 243, 284.

ACCUSATIVE.—Jude (1) Adverbial: v. 5 τὸ δεύτερον μὴ πιστεύσαντας, v. 7 τὸν ὁμοίον τρόπον τούτως ἐκπορνεύσασαι; (2) with prepositions: εἰς, v. 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα; χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἄσελγειαν; v. 6 εἰς κρίσιν τετήρηκεν; v. 13 εἰς αἰώνα τετήρηται; v. 25 Θεῷ δόξα εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰώνας; v. 21 προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος εἰς ζωήν αἰώνιον. περὶ c. acc. v. 7 αἰ περὶ αὐτῶν πόλεις. υπό, Jude v. 6 υπὸ ζῴων τετήρηκεν, cf. Moulton p. 63.

2 Pet. (1) Adverbial: 15 αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ . . . ἐπιχορηγηθάτε ἄρετην. Acc. of duration of time: 28 ἡμέραν εἰς ἡμέραν. Cognate Acc. after passive verb: 2 Pet. 218 αἰδιούμενοι μακρὸν ἀδίκιας. (2) with preposition: eis eleven times, the more remarkable instances being 18 ἀκάρπους εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν, 117 εἰς ὑποδήματα. 223 (ἐπιστρέφεις) eis κυλισμῶν βορbeta, 36 μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ύμᾶς. ἡκαὶ c. acc. 22 δι’ οὗ ἡ ὡς βλαφήμια ἑται, 36 δι’ ὑν (λόγον) ὁ κόσμος ἀπόλετο (MSS. δι’ ὑν), 36 δι’ ὑν (παρουσίαν) οὐρανοὶ λυθήσονται, 36 μακροθυμεῖ δι’ (al. eis) ύμᾶς. ἐπὶ c. acc. 113 εφ’ ὅσον, 222 ἐπιστρέφεσι· ἐπὶ τὸ ἱδιον εξεραμα. metá ὡς c. acc. 115 μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐξοδον. ἑκατὰ c. acc. 36 κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι, 36 κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα προσδοκῶμεν, 36 κατὰ τὴν σοφίαν ἐγραγμ. πρὸς c. acc. 13 τὰ πρὸς ζωήν, 315 στρεβλοῦσιν πρὸς ἀπόλειαν.

Complementary construction with factitive verb. 2 Pet. 28 τὰς πόλεις ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβείας τεθεικός, of which we have the passive in Jude v. 7 αἱ πόλεις πρόκειται δεύτημα; 2 Pet. 18 ταῦτα ύμᾶς (ὑμᾶς) καθίστησιν; Jude v. 24 στήσαι ύμᾶς ἀμώμους; 2 Pet. 218 ὑδοινον ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρα τρυφῆν, 315 τὴν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε; Jude v. 24 φυλάξαι ύμᾶς ἀπαίτητος.

GENITIVE.—The most notable examples in Jude are (after substantivize) Possessive: v. 6 κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας; v. 15 περὶ τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν; v. 18 κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας

1 On the use of the prepositions in later Greek, see J. H. Moulton, pp. 98-107.

* Denotes an unclassical use.
† Denotes an idiomatic expression.
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2 Pet. Noteworthy examples of the gen. are (after substantive) the Possessive, 17 ὁ νιώτος μου, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, 31 ἡμέρα Κυρίου, 312 ἡμέρα Θεοῦ, 318 ἡμέρα αἰῶνος, 22, 317 ἡμέρα κρίσεως, 120 προφητεία γραφῆς, 22 ᾗ δόθη τῆς ἀληθείας. Objective: 13 ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος, 113 ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος, 115 τὴν τούτων μνήμην, 216 ἑλευθερίας παραφομάς. Reduplicated genitive:* 313 μυθηθήματι τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ Κυρίου, where ὑμῶν depends on ἀποστόλων, ἀποστόλων on τῆς ἐντολῆς τοῦ Κυρίου, and this last on μυθηθήματι. Gen. of Quality: 21 ἀιρέσεις ἀπωλείας, 210 ἐπιθυμία μισσοῦ, 24 σειραὶ ᾧφων, (reading σειραὶ it is easier to explain it as a Gen. of Material). Gen. of Apposition: 26 ἄπολες Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας, (cf. Hes. Sc. Herc. 469 πόλιν Τρηχίνος, Aesch. Ag. 29 Ἰλοῦ πόλις, Thuc. iv. 13 ὄ Μένη πόλις). Hebraistic: 214 κατάρας τέκνα. After neuter article: 222 ὑπὸ τῆς παραμιᾶς. After neuter adjective: 218 ὑπέροχα ματαιότητος. So Heb. 38 ἀγια ἀγίων, 1 Cor. 58 ἐν ἀξίους εἰλικρίνειας. This construction is common with the article, as in Rom. 123 τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ Θεοῦ, Eph. 612 τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας, 1 Cor. 465 τὰς κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκοτοῦς. But here it is not a whole class that is spoken of, not the baubles of vanity in general, but occasional swelling words, as in Jude v. 16 λαλεῖ ὑπέροχα and in Dan. 1136. So even in Soph. Ant. 1209 τῷ 5 ἀθλῶν ἄσημα περιβαίνει βοής and 1265 ὄμων ἐμῶν ἀνόλβα βουλευμάτων.1 Cf. such Tacitean phrases as vana tumoria, inania honoris. With adjective: of the sphere 214 ἀκατάπαυστος ἀμαρτίας, γεγυμνασμένος πλεονεξίας,* of possession or privation, 214 μεστὸς μοιχαλίδος ἀφθαρμός. With verb: 25 κόσμου φείδεσθαι, 38 μυθηθήματι ῥημάτων, 317 ἐκπίπτειν

---
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στηργμοῦ, 14 ἀποφεύγω τῆς φθορᾶς* (but with acc. 200 ἀπ. τὰ μιᾶςματα καὶ 218); of the sphere 150 προφητεία ἑιδας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται, 37 βραδύνω ἐπαγγελίας.* Genitive absolute 1: 2 Pet. 13 τῆς θείας δυνάμεως τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν δεδωρημένης, 17 φαύνης ἐνεχθέσθης, 311 τοῦτον πάντων λυμεών. With prepositions: ἀπὸ three (or four if we read ἀπὸ for ὑπὸ in 117), esp. 121 ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ,* 34 ἀφ’ ἥς (ἡμέρας) εἰκομήσθησαν; 21 ἐκ five, esp. 28 ἡμέραν ἢ ἡμέρας. 1 ὑπὸ five (or four if we read ἀπὸ in 117), 121 ὑπὸ πνεύματος φερόμενοι, 27 καταπούωμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀδέσμων ἀναστροφῆς (where we should rather have expected διὰ or the dative, but see my Introd. to St. James, p. cc, and the note on James 34), 217 ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαλάτως ἐλαλούμεναι. ὀπίσω* once, 216 τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς παρευμένους. έδως once, 119 ἔδως οὐ (χρόνου) ἡμέρα διανυγάσθη. 1 διὰ five times (six if we read διὰ δόξης in 1, four if we read δὲ ὑν in 36), esp. 30 ἢ δὲ ἢδοτος συνεστῶσα,* where it seems to have the force of μεταξὺ. ἐπὶ three, 28 ἐπὶ ἐγκαθιδρυτικῶν τῶν ἡμερῶν. κατά once, 211 οὐ φέροντι κατ’ αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν.* παρά once, 117 λαβὼν παρὰ Θεοῦ τιμήν. περί twice.


Of Instrument: v. 6 εἰς κρίσιν δεσμοῖς τετήρηκαν. Of Cause: v. 11 τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορέ ἀπόλουτο. Of Manner* : v. 11 τῇ ὑδό τοῦ Καίν ἐπορεύθησαν, τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαάμ ἐξεχύθησαν. With Preposition: εἰς eight times, three being uncritical, viz. the dat. of the instrument in v. 10 εἰς τούτοις φθείρονται, that of association in v. 14 εἰς ἀγάλματι μυριάσιν ἤλθεν, that of divine influence v. 20 εἰς πνεύματι προσευχόμενοι. See Index.

2 Pet. Dat. of Indirect Object: after διαφοράι 15, 14, ἐπιχορηγεῖν 111, παραδίδωμι 24, 221, δίδωμι 315, δηλῶν 114, γνωρίζω 110, ἐπάγω 24, 26, ἐπαγγέλλομαι 219, δουλώλ 219, γράφω 31, cf. 11 τοῖς ἱσότομοι λαχοῦσιν πίστις, where χαίρεις λέγει is omitted, as at the beginning of 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Gal., etc. and usually in epistolary

1 Used correctly in 2 P. not, as often in N.T., of the subject or object of the verb, see Blass, pp. 251 f.

Dat. of Instrument: 13 ἵδια δόξῃ καλεῖν, 23 λόγους ύμᾶς ἐμπορεύονται, 26 καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν. 238 ἀσεβείων δελεάζω, 219 φίληται, 26 κόσμος ὑδατι κατακλυσθεῖσα. Dat. of Cause: 121 θελήματι ἀνθρώπων ἡμέχθη, 253 ψυχήν ἁμόριος ἑργοὺς ἐβασάνων. 236 ὑπὸ συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, 37 οὐρανοὶ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι. Dat. of Respect: 238 βλέπματι δικαιος, 211 ἱσχύι μείζονες.

With Prepositions: 1 ἐν forty instances, many being uncritical, e.g. the dat. of the instrument, 238 ἐν ἀνθρώπων φωνῇ φθείραμεν, 23 ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ ύμᾶς ἐμπορεύονται, 13 λαχῶν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, dat. of manner, 128 διεγείρειν ύμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 37 ἐν ἐμπαγμονῇ ἐδεύσωνται. παρὰ Κυρίῳ δι. σῦν όνε. With prep. in compound verb: 238 συμνεχούμενοι ύμῖν, 230 τοῦτοι ἐμπλακέντες, 317 πλάνη συναπαθέντες.

Number and Gender.

The rule as to neuter plurals being followed by a singular verb is not strictly adhered to in the N.T. (see Blass Gr. p. 78), but it holds good in 2 Pet. 18 ταύτα καθάτησιν, 19 πάρεστιν ταύτα, and 310 στοιχεῖα λυθήσεται (where some MSS. have λυθήσονται). Where two or more subjects are joined each may have a separate verb, (1) as in 2 Pet. 19 ἐως ὅσον ἡμέρα διανυκτήσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ, 310 οὐρανοί παρελεύσονται στοιχεῖα δὲ λυθήσεται, 312 οὐρανοὶ λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα τήκεται. Or (2) where the subjects are names of things and in the singular number, they may be followed by one verb in the singular, provided that the subjects belong to the same general category, as Jude 2 (and 2 Pet. 12) ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χάρις πληθυνθεῖσθ. A singular verb is also found where the compound subject is made up of a singular and a neuter

1 See Index.
plural, as 310 γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὐρεθήσεται (where some MSS. have the plural). Elsewhere, as a rule, (3) the compound subject is followed by a plural verb, as 37 οἱ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τεθηραυρισμένοι εἰσίν. In 31 a plural relative follows a singular noun δευτέραν γράφω ἐπιστολὴν ἐν αἷς διεγείρω*, because δευτέραν carries with it the thought of a first letter. A collective noun in the singular is followed by a plural participle in Jude v. 5, if we omit the article, λαὸς σώσας [τοὺς] μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσαν. Cf. Evang. Petri § 28 ὁ λαὸς γογγύζει καὶ κόπτεται τὰ στήθη λέγοντες κ.τ.λ.

Plural of Abstract Nouns to express the various concrete manifestations of the abstract idea: Jude v. 18 τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀσεβείων, v. 8 δόξας βλασφημοῦσιν (‘glories for ‘glorious beings’): so 2 Pet. 210 δόξας οὐ πρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦσι, 2ης πολλῶν ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἁσελεγείαις, 215 δελεάζουσιν σαρκὸς ἁσελεγείαις τοὺς ἀποφεύγοντας, 311 ἐν ἁγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ ἁσεβείαις, where there may be an intentional reference to Jude v. 18; see explanatory note. Other examples are James 2ης μὴ ἐν προσωποληψίαις ἔχετε τῇ πίστιν, Col. 322 ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλείαις, 1 Pet. 21 ὑποκρίσεις, φθόνους.

Gender.—Exceptional examples are 2 Pet. 35 οὐρανοὶ ἡσαν ἑκπαλαι καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὀδατος συνεστῶσα, where I think we must supply συνεστῶτες with οὐρανοῖ, the gender of the participle being accommodated to the nearer, though less important, of the nouns in the compound subject. On the other hand in 37 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τεθηραυρισμένοι εἰσίν the gender agrees with that of the more important, though more distant, noun. So in 313 οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν προδοκῶμεν ἐν οἷς κ.τ.λ. the gender of the relative agrees with οὐρανοῖς. In Jude v. 12 the reading of the best MSS., οἱ . . . σπιλάδες εὐνωχούμενοι, is very harsh. I have suggested that σπιλάδες may be taken as complementary to the participle; but it gives a much easier construction to omit the article with Κ and some versions. There will then be no difficulty in the fact that the subject οὗτοι differs in gender from the predicate σπιλάδες, the following participle being masculine to suit the subject.

Demonstrative.

Pronouns.

οὗτος (a) Substantival (masculine) used as in Demosthenes, of opponents, in Jude 8, καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι, 10 οὗτοι δὲ
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(b) Substantival (neuter). Jude 10 διὰ ἐπιστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται. 2 Pet. 120, 33 τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκουσι, 36, 38 τοῦτο λαμβάνει, 219 τοῦτο δεδούλωται, 18, 9, 10, 314 ταύτα, 14 διὰ τούτων, 112, 316 περὶ τούτων, 115 τὴν τούτων μνήμην, 311 τούτων λυμομένων, 220 τούτως ἐμπλακέντες.


For αὐτὸς and ἐαυτοῦ, see Index under these and under ἰδιός. ἐαυτοῦς is used of the 2nd person in Jude 20 and 21.

tοιοῦτος is not found in either epistle, though common in other parts of the N.T. τοιόσοδε, found in 2 Pet. 117 alone in the N.T., retains its classical perspective use, as it does in Ezra 58 τοιάδε εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, and in Josephus Ant. ii. 2. 1 αἱ δύνας τοιαίδε ἠσάν, xvii. 13. 3 Ἀρχέλαος διναρ τοιαύτη ἐκδηγεῖται, repeated in § 4.

δς μὲν . . . δς δὲ used as demonstratives, J Jude 21, 22.

Relative.

δς. Attracted: Jude v. 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν ἄργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν δὲ (= δς) ἥσεβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν δὲν ἐλάλησαν. 2 Pet. 212 ἐν οἷς (= ἐν τούτως δς) ἄγνοοούσιν βλασφημοῦντες.

With ambiguous antecedent, 2 P. 14 δι᾿ δὲν referring to the immediately preceding δόξα καὶ ἀρετῇ but misunderstood by many editors; 35 δι᾿ δὲν ὁ τότε κόσμος ἀπώλετο, where various antecedents have been suggested, but where I think we should read δι᾿ δὲν, see note. A similar ambiguity is found in the use of the demonstrative, cf. note on Jude v. 4 τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, and 2 Pet. 211,12 φέροντων κατ᾿ αὐτῶν . . . ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν, id. 13 τῆς θείας διδάξεως αὐτῶν.

Replaced by demonstrative in second clause, 2 Pet. 28 οἷς τὸ κρίμα οὓς ἄργει, καὶ ἡ ἀπόλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει, cf. 1 Cor. 88 εξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμείς εἰς αὐτῶν, Winer, p. 186, Jelf § 833.

Elliptical: 2 Pet. 119 δως οὗ (sc. χρόνον) ἡμέρᾳ διαιγάσῃ, 34 ἄφι ής (sc. ἡμέρας) οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν.
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For δς μεν... δς δε see under Demonstratives.

δοτις: 2 Pet. 2\textsuperscript{1} ο\iota
νε\iota
παρεισάξουσιν,† 'men that will bring in heresies.'

δοσω: Jude v. 10 δοσα μεν... δοσα δε... εν τούτωι. 2 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{13} ἐφ' δοσυν† (sc. χρόνου) εἰμὶ εν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι.

Interrogative: τις, πώςος, ποιος do not occur in these epistles. ποταπός, 2 Pet. 3\textsuperscript{11}.

Indefinite: emphatic Jude v. 4 τινες ανθρωποι. 2 Pet. 3\textsuperscript{9} δς τινες βραδυτήτα ἡγούνται, ἵδ. μη βουλόμενος τινας ἀπολέσθαι.

ADJECTIVES.

Neuter Plural as Object. Jude v. 15 σκληρα ἐλάλησαν, v. 16 and 2 Pet. 2\textsuperscript{18} λαλει ὑπέρογκα.

Neut. Pl. folowed by Gen. 2 Pet. 2\textsuperscript{18} ὑπέρογκα ματαιώτητος, see above p. xxxvii.

Comparison of Adjectives. In later Greek the proper force of the comparative and superlative is very much lost. The latter is chiefly found in the 'elative' sense, as ἐλάχιστος in James 3\textsuperscript{4}, though it retains its proper superlative force in 1 Cor. 15\textsuperscript{9}. Possibly this may explain the combination of μεγίστα with τίμια in 2 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{4}. J. H. Moulton goes so far as to say that μεγίστος is 'practically obsolete in Hellenistic,' p. 78. It occurs however in Job 26\textsuperscript{3} τινι ἐπακολουθήσεις; οὐχ ὃ μεγίστη δύναμις; and 31\textsuperscript{28} ἀνομία ἡ μεγίστη. In the same page he gives an example of the comparative μείζων used in the elative sense, which would account for the omission of the gen. after μείζων in 2 Pet. 2\textsuperscript{11}.

SPECIAL USES OF SOME COMMON ADJECTIVES.

πᾶς. Qualitative: Jude v. 3 πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος, 2 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{5}, cf. James 1\textsuperscript{2}. πᾶσα... οὐ = οὐδεμία 2 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{20}.

ἐτερος. Qualitative: Jude v. 7 ἀπελθοῦσαι ὡπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας, cf. Acts 2\textsuperscript{4} λαλεῖν ἐτέραις γλώσσαις.

ἰδιος, used without the article, see above p. xxxii f., with αὐτῶν added, see p. xxxiii. Cf. J. H. Moulton, Prolegom. pp. 87 foll.

VERBS.

Moods and Tenses.

Mixture of Tenses in prophetic utterance: Aor. for future, Jude vv. 14, 15 ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἐσώχ λέγων Ἰδοὺ ἤλθεν Κύριος ποιήσαι
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Imperfect Indicative used without ἠν where condition has failed, 2 Pet. 21 κρείττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μη ἐπεγινοκέναι, cf. Moulton, pp. 199 f. and, for Latin parallels, references under Indicative in my Index to Cic. N.D.

Future: Doubt as to 2 Pet. 112, where most MSS. read μελήσω αὲι ὕμᾶς ὑπομονήσκειν, translated in R.V. 'I shall be ready always to put you in remembrance.' In the note I have argued in favour of Field's reading μελήσω, * 'I shall take care.'

Aorist answering to English Perfect: 2 Jude v. 4 παρεισδύσαν 'there are certain men crept in privily,' R.V. J. v. 11 τῇ ὅδε τοῦ Καίν ἐπορευθήσαται καὶ . . . ἐξεχύθησαν καὶ . . . ἀπώλουτο. This is not prophetic, but a statement of fact as in v. 8. The R.V. translates 'they went in the way of Cain, and ran riotously . . . and perished,' but as this verse is interpolated between two verses in which the present is used, we cannot, I think, doubt that the writer means the aorists to be understood as equivalent to the completed present. Moreover, the verbs here used are rarely found in the perf. pass. 2 Pet. 117 ὁ ἀγαπητός μου σωτήρ ἐστιν εἰς ὅν εὐδόκησα 'in whom I am well pleased,' R.V. I believe that no instance of the perf. of this verb has been discovered. The aorist is used of God in Mt. 317, 1218, 175, Mk. 111, Lk. 322, and in every case R.V. has the perfect rendering 'is well pleased.' It is a statement not referring to the past, but to the 'eternal now.' In Jude v. 15 ἔλεγξα τοὺς ἀσεβείς περὶ τῶν ἔργων δν ἡσέβησαν καὶ . . . ἔλαλησαν the aorists, as they refer to a time previous to that denoted by ἔλεγξα, seem to have the force of pluperfects, cf. Joh. Gr. pp. 335 foll.

Aor. Imperative is sometimes used not of momentary action, but to express urgency, Jude v. 21 τηρήσατε. In v. 17 μνήσθητε

1 Zahn (Einl. vol. II. pp. 85 foll.) explains the differences of tense by the supposition that the dangers against which P. warns his readers, as still future, were already visible in other churches.
2 See Moulton, Proleg. pp. 135-140; Abbott, Joh. Gr. pp. 324 foll. and 581 foll., where he points out that some perfects were avoided owing to their inconvenient form. The fact that Latin has one and the same form for the perf. and aor. was likely to influence the usage of Greek speakers under the Empire.
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tων ῥημάτων, it is perhaps better to translate ‘call to mind,’ rather than ‘remember’ with the R.V. The present imperatives in vv. 21, 22 ἔλεγχετε, σώζετε, ἔλεητε prescribe a course of conduct. So in 2 Pet. 1\(^5\) ἐπικοροφήσατε, 1\(^{10}\) 3\(^{14}\) σπουδάσατε have the quality of urgency,\(^1\) while the present imperatives in 3\(^{8}\) μὴ λαυθανέτω, 3\(^{15}\) ἥγεισθε, 3\(^{17}\) φυλάσσεσθε, 3\(^{18}\) αὐξάνετε have a continuous force.

Aor. Subjunctive is correctly used in 2 Pet. 1\(^4\), 3\(^{17}\) after ἰνα (while in other books of the N.T. the indicative is often used after this and other particles, which would be followed by the subj. in classical Greek, see Winer, pp. 360 foll., Joh. Gr. 123); and after οὐ μὴ in 1\(^{10}\) (for which the fut. ind. is sometimes used in other books of the N.T., see Blass 209, Joh. Gr. 205); and έως οὖ in 1\(^{19}\) έως οὖ ἡμέρα διανύσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατελῇ (this classical construction is common in Lk. and Acts). The subj. is not found in Jude, and the pres. subj. is not found in 2 Pet.

Aor. Opt.: In the N.T. this mood is comparatively rare except in Lk., see Blass, pp. 37, 219, J. H. Moulton, pp. 194–199. It is used to express a wish in Jude v. 9 ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος, and in v. 2 έλεος πληθυνθείη, repeated in 2 Pet. 1\(^2\). Usually the verb is omitted in the salutations of the Epistles, as in Rom. 1\(^{7}\) χάρις ὑμῖν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς.

Aor. Inf. is contrasted with Pres. Inf. in Jude v. 3 πάσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενον γράφειν . . . ἀνάγκην ἐσχον γράψαι, the present implying continuous action, the aorist a momentary act, so in 3 Joh. 13 πολλὰ ἔχον γράψαι σοι ‘I had much that I wanted to say,’ ἀλλ’ οὐ θέλω διὰ μέλανος καὶ καλάμον σοι γράψειν ‘but I do not care to be writing to you by pen and ink,’ v. 5 ὑπομνήσαι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι ‘I wish to give you a reminder,’ v. 24 τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς φυλάξαι ἀπαίτου τού καὶ στήσαι ἀμώμονος: here στήσαι denotes a momentary act, but the act of guarding might seem to be continuous. The aorist however shows that it is not regarded as such (cf. ἐφύλαξεν in 2 Pet. 2\(^{5}\)) but as an action now to commence, with a particular end in view, viz. στήσαι. In 2 Pet. the present infinitives ποιεῖσθαι 1\(^{10}\), ὑπομνημάσκειν 1\(^{12}\), διεγείρειν 1\(^{13}\), ἐκάστοτε ἐχεῖν . . . ποιεῖσθαι 1\(^{15}\) are all continuous. Similarly ῥύεσθαι and τυρεῖν in 2\(^{4}\), and ὑπάρχειν in 3\(^{11}\). On the other hand ὑποστρέψατε 2\(^{21}\), μνημοθήναι ‘call to mind’ 3\(^{2}\), ἀπολέ-
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σθαι, χωρῆσαι (‘to arrive at’ not ‘to keep going’), 39 ἄσπιλοι εὐρεθῆναι 314, all denote a single act.

Unusual constructions of Infinitive: After verbs of motion, as Jude v. 15 ἥλθεν ποιῆσαι κρίνων; so Mt. 23 ἠλομεν προσκυνήσαι, 118 τι ἐξήλθατε ἰδείν; Mk. 217 οὐκ ἥλθον καλέσαι διακονοῦς, Lk. 312 ἥλθον βαπτισθῆναι, 23 ἐπορεύοντο ἀπογράφεσθαι, Gen. 2532 πορεύομαι τελευτάν. For examples in late Greek see Jannaris, Gr. p. 575. It is occasionally found in classical writers, as Soph. Oed. Col. 12 μανθάνεις γὰρ ἢκομεν, Eur. Medea 1303 ἔμων δὲ παίδων ἥλθον ἐκσώσας βλον, where some read the more regular ἐκάτωσαν. After verbs of knowing, 2 Pet. 29 οἴδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ῥύεσθαι, ἄδικος δὲ τηρεῖν, cf. James 417 εἰδὼς καλὸν ποιεῖν, Mt. 711 οἴδατε ἀγαθὰ διὸναι, Mt. 1618 τὸ μὲν πρῶτον τοῦ ὑπάρκου γνώσκετε διακρίνεων Phil. 412 οἶδα περισσευειν, 1 Th. 41, 1 Tim. 35; also found in classical writings. After ἔχω = δύναμαι, 2 Pet. 115 σπουδάω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μνημήν ποιεῖσθαι. Infinitive of Result 2 Pet. 115 σπουδάσω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς, 2 Pet. 312 διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν διάνοιαν, μεσοθῆκαν τῶν ἡμάτων, cf. Acts 53 διὰ τί ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, φεύγωσασθαί σε; Apos. 56 ἐνίκησεν ὁ λέον... ἄνωθεν τὸ βιβλίον, Col. 43 ὁ λόγος ἄκατι ἡρτυμένος, εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς πῶς δεῖ ἀποκρίνεσθαι, also in classical writings, e.g. Thuc. vi. 69. 3 μαχούμενοι ἔχωρον περὶ τῆς ἄλλητρας, οἰκεῖαν σχεῖν.

Infinitive as subject: 211 κρείττον ἦν μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι ἡ ἐπιγνώσων ὑποστρέψαι.

Infinitive with Article is not found in either of these Epistles. This construction is in fact very rare in the N.T. ‘outside the writings which were influenced by the literary language, namely those of Luke and James’ (Blass, p. 233). The latter has seven examples, see p. ciii. of my edition. 1 P. however has four examples.

Accusative with Infinitive. This use is greatly restricted in the N.T. by direct speech (see below under Substantival Clauses) or by employing ὥς and ὅτι. The following exx. are found in 2 Pet. 115 σπουδάσω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, 312 διεγείρω ὑμῶν τὴν εἰκονικὴν διάνοιαν μεσοθῆκας τῶν ἡμάτων, 3; μὴ βουλομένους τινας ἀπολέσθαι, 311 ποταποῦς δεῖ ἕπαρχειν ὑμᾶς, 315 τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν (εἶναι) ἥγεισθε. It is not used at all by Jude.

Participle: Joined with a finite verb, the general force of the
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Aor. Part., as contrasted with the Present or Perfect Participle, is to express priority of time, as in Jude v. 5 ἀπαξ σώσας ἀπώλεσεν ‘after once saving destroyed,’ ‘once saved and then destroyed.’ 2 Pet. 1 4 ἰδα γένησθε θελας κοινωνοι φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς φθορᾶς ‘after escaping from,’ ‘that ye may escape from φθορά ἀ and thereby become partakers of a divine nature.’ 15 σπουδὴν παρεισενέγκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε ‘contribute all diligence and so add energy to faith.’ 116 οὖ μύθος ἐξακολούθησατε ἐγνωρίσαμεν τὴν παρουσίαν, ἀλλʼ ἐπόπται γενηθέντες ‘it was not from any reliance on fables but from eye-witness that we were empowered to declare the second coming.’ 117 λαβὼν τιμήν καὶ δόξαν, φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης τοιάδε . . . ἥκούσαμεν κ.τ.λ. (the last words standing here by anacoluthon for the logical apodosis ἐβεβαίωσε τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον) ‘when he received honour through the voice that came from heaven, he confirmed the truth of prophecy in us who heard it.’ Here the finite verb follows as a consequence on the τιμή, which itself was a consequence of the φωνή. 24 σειραὶς ταρταρόσας παρέδωκεν ‘he cast them down to Tartarus and then delivered them to chains.’ 25 Νῦ κρατήρας κατακλυσμόν ἐπάξας ‘when he brought a flood upon the earth, he saved Noah.’ 26 τεθρόνωσας καταστροφῆς κατέκρινεν, first came the showers of ashes, then the earthquake which overthrew the cities, see explanatory note. 215 καταλείποντες ὀδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν, where some MSS. have the aorist, which would mean ‘they forsook the road and wandered,’ the force of the present being ‘they strayed from (literally ‘leaving’) the road.’ 216 φθορὲς κατακλυσμοῦ ἐκόλουθεν ‘it spoke and so hindered,’ lit. ‘by speaking it hindered.’ 36 ὁ κόμος κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο τὸ παλαιότερον the world perished by the flood.’ 37 ἰδα μὴ τῇ πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἑτημίμου ‘that ye may not be involved in their error and so fall from your steadfastness.’ So when the part. is in agreement with the object, e.g. 2 Pet. 1 18 φωνὴν ἥκοσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθείσαν ‘we heard a voice that came from heaven.’ 24 ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων ὁυκ ἐφείσατο ‘spared not angels when they sinned,’ R.V. A good example of the succession of time in a series of aorist participles is to be found in Mk. 15 36 δραμὼν δέ τις, γεμίσας στόμην, περιεῖκεν καλάμως, ἐποτίζειν.

I have thought it worth while to bring together these examples because a different view of the participial sequence has been taken by some interpreters, as in Dr. Bigg’s note on 1 17 ‘The temporal relation of the participles is not to one another, but to the main verb.
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See Thuc. iv. 133 ὁ νεός τῆς Ἑρας κατεκαύθη, Ἱροσίδος τῆς ἱερείας λύχνων τινὰ θελής ἥμιμον πρὸς τὸ στέμματα καὶ ἐπικαταδάρθουσας. Chrysis did not fall asleep before she set the lamp near the garlands. Here there is no καὶ between λαβὼν and ἐνεχθείσα, but this makes no difference.’ Surely Thucydides leaves no doubt as to the sequence: the verb expresses the final result, the preceding participles the conditions which caused it, viz. (1) the proximity of the lamp, and (2) the subsequent falling asleep. So Alford on 215, where he reads καταλιπώντες, ‘the aorist part. and the aor. verb are contemporary,’ and again on 216 ‘aor. part. contemporary with aor. verb.’ It is the present part. which expresses contemporaneousness, as in Jude 3 σπουδὴ ποιούμενος . . . ἔγραψα, v. 4 παρεισεδύσαν . . . μετατιθέντες . . . ἄρνομενοι, v. 8 ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι μιαίνομεν, v. 9 διακρινόμενος διέλεγεν, v. 14 ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγαν, v. 21 ἐαυτοὺς τηρήσατε προσδεχόμενοι. 2 Pet. 121 ὑπὸ πνεῦματος φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ‘spake under inspiration,’ ‘as inspiration came to them,’ 22 δικαίος ἐνατοικῶν ψυχῆν ἐβασανίζειν, 315,16 ἔγραψεν . . . λαλῶν περὶ τούτων ‘he wrote touching this matter,’ 110 ταύτα ποιούντες οὗ μὴ παλάσητε ‘while you do this.’ So too when the part. agrees with the object of the verb, as 27 Λῶτ καταπονούμενον ἐρύσατο ‘saved Lot under his sufferings.’

The aorist participle is sometimes equivalent to a perfect, especially where the verb is in the present tense, as in Jude v. 7 αἰ πόλεις ἑκτορεύσασαι πρόκεινται δὲ γύμα ‘the cities having given

1 Dr. J. H. Moulton in his recent Gr. of the N.T. (Prolegomena, p. 131) supports the view that the aor. part. and the main verb sometimes denote coincident or identical action; for which he quotes (Mt. 222) ἔσκεψες ἐθεα. (Acts 1023) καλῶν ἐσκόψας παρακυψώμενος. He adds that ‘the latter puts into the past a formula constantly recurring in the papyri . . . εἴ τι σαίμεν ὅδες ‘you will oblige me by giving,’ a dederis in Latin. I should have no objection to admit ‘coincident action’ in this sense, which allows antecedence, whether temporal or logical to the aor. part. The phrase ‘you did well to come’ implies that the fact of the coming was first in the speaker’s mind, and that it was followed by the approving judgment. So in the phrase ‘B answered and said,’ the first speaker (A) is aware of the fact of B’s answering, before he has heard all the words that make up the answer. So in Phil. 227 εἰς τὸν ἐκείνους μόρφων δόλου λαβὼν means ‘He put on the form of a servant and thereby emptied himself.’ κεκόσας ἠλαβεῖ would mean ‘he emptied himself and then took the form of a servant.’ In some cases, in which the aor. seems to have a present or even a future force, as in ἐφήσεα, ἐκείνους, τί ὅπε ἐκείνους; (Jelf, § 403, 1 and 3), this force has to be explained by the rapidity of Greek thought. The moment the thought was on the point of utterance, the Athenian had already anticipated it, and approved or condemned accordingly. And so in his eager impatience he cries, not ‘Why does he not answer?’ but ‘Why did he not do so the moment he had a chance?’ ‘Why has he not answered already?’ Cf. Thuc. iii. 38 ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι τοῖς λέγοντες μὴ διεταρ ηκολούθησα δοκεῖ τῇ γνώμῃ, δέξιω δι τι λέγοντος προσωπαίσα.
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themselves over to fornication are set forth as an example,' R.V. v. 12 ὁτοὶ εἰσίν ... δένδρα ... διὰ ἀποθανόντα ἐκρίζωθέντα 'trees twice dead, plucked up by the roots,' where the relation of the participles to each other is much the same as that in v. 16 κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα, and v. 20 ἐποικοδομοῦντες ... προσευχόμενοι. 2 Pet. 11 τοῖς ἰσότιμοι λαχανίνη πίστιν (sibawd. γράφει) 'to them that have obtained a like precious faith,' R.V. 215 ἐπλανήθησαν ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ, 'having followed the way of Balaam,' R.V. 19 τυφλός ἐστιν, λήθην λαβών 'is blind, having forgotten,' R.V. 220 εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μαύσματα τοῦ κόσμου, τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακόντες ἢττονται 'if, after having escaped the pollutions of the world, they are again entangled in them and overcome by them.'

A remarkable feature in the use of participles in 2 Pet. is the sequence of present participles in 213,14 ἀδικούμενοι ... ἡγούμενοι ... ἐνυπόκοιμοι ... ἐνυποκοιμώντες συνενοχόμενοι ... ὀφθαλμοῦ ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδους ... δειλάζοντες ψυχὰς ... καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην ἔχοντες. I am inclined to think that these suspended nominatives are intended to have something of the effect of the historic infinitive in Latin, giving, as it were, in successive scenes, characteristic qualities or actions, apart from the particular circumstances in which they occur. Compare what is said above as to the omission of the article. Blass (p. 284) refers to St. Paul's free use of the participle instead of the finite verb, quoting 2 Cor. 75 οὐδὲμιᾶν ἐσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἡ σάρξ ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, Rom. 122 τῆς ἀγάπης ἀνυπόκριτος, ἀποστυγμόντες τὸ πονηρόν, κολλῶμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ ... προηγούμενοι ... ζέοντες ... δουλεύοντες κ.τ.λ. See 1 Pet. 31 ὁμολόγοις γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι, 37,9, Lightfoot on Col. 318 διδάσκοντες, J. H. Moulton, Prolegomena, pp. 180-183, 222-225.

Participle used instead of Infinitive 2 P. 210 οὐ τρέμονσιν θλασφημοῦντες, where see note.

A participial clause is changed into a finite clause in Jude v. 16 οὕτως εἰσίν γογγυσταί ... πορευόμενοι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα.

Voices.

Active for Middle 2 Pet. 15 στονδὴν παρεισενέγκαντες instead of the usual στονδὴν εἰσενέγκαμεν.1 21 ἐπάγοντες ἐαυτοῖς

1 The aor. mid. of φέρω does not seem to occur in biblical Greek.
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ἀπώλειαν instead of ἐπαγόμενοι. 2 Pet. 15 σπουδάσω for the classical σπουδάσομαι, cf. ἀκούσω Mt. 1219, 1314, ἀμαρτήσω 1821, ἀπαντήσω Mk. 1413, Blass, p. 42. So we find μεταπέμπω for μεταπέμπομαι in Thuc. i. 112. 3, iv. 30, vi. 52, etc., also μεταχειρίζομαι, ληστῶ (quoted in Poppo's n. on i. 13. See Blass, pp. 183 f.; Moulton, pp. 154–160.

ποιεῖν act. Jude v. 15 ποιήσαι κρίσιν 'to execute judgment': 2 Pet. 19 καλῶς ποιείτε προσέχοντες. ποιεῖσθαι mid. with periphrastic force Jude v. 3 σπουδῶν ποιούμενος 'hasting;' 2 Pet. 10 βεβαιάν τὴν κλῆσιν ποιεῖσθαι 'to confirm,' 15 μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι 'to call to mind' or 'to mention.'

diaκρίνεσθαι 'to contend.' Jude v. 9 τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος, v. 22 ἐλέγχετε διακρινόμενος. The latter might also be taken to imply 'hesitation.' I think both senses are derived from the passive. See my n. on James 16 μηδὲν διακρινόμενος.

ϕθείρονται pass. Jude v. 10 ἐν τούτοις ϕθείρονται 'in these things they are destroyed' or 'corrupted' (they corrupt themselves' A.V.): 2 Pet. 212 ἐν τῷ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ ϕθαρῆσονται, see Appendix, p. 177.

ἐξεχώρησαν pass. with middle force, see note on Jude v. 11.

μνήσθητε pass. with middle force, Jude v. 17, 2 Pet. 32.

dεδώρηται deponent, perhaps used with passive force 2 Pet. 14 though δεδωρημένης has an active force in 14, see quotations in n. and Winer, pp. 324, 325.


ἡττηται true passive followed by dat. 2 Pet. 219, 20.

ἐκοιμήθησαν pass. with middle force 2 Pet. 34.

tήκεται (al. τακήσεται or τήζεται) pass. 2 Pet. 312.

λούσομαι, 2 Pet. 222 ὃς λουσαμένη, the middle does not exclude the passive sense.

COMPOUND SENTENCE.

(1) Substantival Clauses.

(a) Direct Statement subordinated to verb of saying, Jude v. 9 εἴπεν Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος, v. 14 λέγων Ἰδοὺ ἠλθέν Κύριος, v. 18 ἔλεγον ... ἐσονται ἐμπαίκται. 2 Pet. 17 φωνής ἐνεχθέσης τοιάδε ... ὁ νῦς μον ὀντός ἐστιν, 34 λέγοντες Ποῦ ἐστιν ἢ ἐπαγγελία;
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(b) Indirect Statement introduced by ὅτι, Jude v. 5 ὑπομνῆσαι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι ὅτι Κύριος ἀπάλεσεν, νῦν. 17, 18 μνῆσθε ὅτι ἔλεγον. 2 Pet. 1:14 εἴδες ὅτι, 1:20, 2:3 γινώσκοντες ὅτι, 3:5, 3:8 λαν-θανέτω ὅτι.


(3) Adverbial Clauses.

(a) Temporal (α), Local (β), Modal (γ).

(α) Jude v. 9 δύτε διελέγετο. 2 Pet. 1:9 ἔως ὡς ἡμέρα διανύσῃ, 3:4 ἄφι ἢς ἐκοιμήθησαν, 1:12 ἐφ' ὃς οὖν εἰμὶ.

(β) 2 Pet. 2:11 ὅπου ἄγγελοι οὐ φέρουσιν (tropical force).

(γ) Jude v. 7 ὃς αἰ πόλεις πρόκεινται. 2 Pet. 1:4 καθὼς ἐδή-λωσέν, 2:1 ὃς ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται, 3:9 ὃς τινες ἡγούνται.

(β) Causal, Jude v. 11 οὖν αὐτοῖς ὅτι ἐπορεύθησαν.

(c) Final, 2 Pet. 1:4 δεδώρηται ἵνα γένησθε, 3:17 φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσητε.

(d) Conditional, 2 Pet. 2:4 εἴ ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἐφείσατο ... οἴδεν εὑσεβεῖς ρύσεται, οἴδικον δὲ τηρεῖν (irregular apodosis), 2:20 εἴ ἠττωνται ... γέγονεν αὐτοῖς.

No other form of the conditional clause occurs in either epistle. εἴν, ἥν, ὅταν are not found either here or in 1 Pet., except εἴν once in 1 Pet. 3:13.

NEGATIVES.

There is nothing unusual in the use of οὐ in either epistle, except that πᾶς ... οὐ = οὐδεὶς, 2 P. 1:20, οὐ ... ποτέ = οὐποτε ἢ. 1:21. It occurs twice only in Jude vv. 9 and 10. It is found after εἴ in 2 P. 2:4 εἴ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ ἐφείσατο — καὶ ἄρχαίον κύσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο in accordance with the predominant use in the N.T. See Blass, p. 254, and my note on James 1:23. For μὴ see Index. It is used with the relative where qui would take subjunctive, as in 2 P. 1:9 ὃ μὴ πάρεστιν, 1 Joh. 4:8 πᾶν πνεῦμα μὴ ὑμολογεῖς, Tit. 1:11 διδάσκοντες μὴ δεῖ. More commonly the relative is followed by οὐ as in Joh. 4:22 προσκυνεῖε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε, Lk. 14:27 δότες οὐ βαπτίζεις. As a rule μὴ is used with the participle, as in Jude v. 19 πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες, 2 P. 3:9 μακροθυμεῖ μὴ βουλόμενος.
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The exceptional cases in which ὄ is used with the participle are given in Winer, pp. 609 f. and J. H. Moulton, pp. 231 f.

The prohibitive use of ὄ μή is not found in biblical Greek. The negative use is common in the LXX.; and J. H. Moulton (Prolegomena 190 foll.) states that it occurs 93 times in the N.T. generally in quotations from the O.T. and in the Gospels and Apocalypse. It is most often joined, as in 2 P. 10 ὄ μή πταίσθε and in classical Greek, with the aor. subj., but is also found with the future indicative, as in Mk. 26 καὶ μή σε ἀρνήσομαι, and in Aristoph. Ranæ 508 ὄ μή σ' ἐγὼ περιψωμαι.

Other Adverbs and Particles.

ἀλλά is used twice in Jude, six times in 2 Pet. always to contrast a positive with a negative conception. In 2 P. 2:5 the opposition is varied: in the former verse ἀλλά contrasts the verbs, the object remaining the same εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ὦκ ἐφείσατο, ἄλλα σειραίς παρέδωκεν; in the latter it contrasts the objects as well as the verbs, καὶ ἀρχαίον κόσμου ὦκ ἐφείσατο, ἄλλα Νὼς δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, thus preparing the way for the general apodosis οἶδεν Κύριος ἐνσεβείς ῥύσῃ, ἀδίκους δὲ κολαζομένους τηρεῖν. Here the strict logical sequence would have been εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ὦκ ἐφείσατο, ἄλλα σειραίς παρέδωκεν, καὶ ἀρχαίον κόσμου ὦκ ἐφείσατο, ἄλλα κατακλυσμὸν ἐπῆξεν, ὡς δὲ Νὼς σώσας, with some such apodosis as πῶς τούτων φείσεται;

γὰρ is used once in Jude, 15 times by 2 Pet.

ἄν three times in 2 Pet., not in Jude.

μέν—δὲ, Jude vv. 8, 10, 22, 23. In vv. 8 and 23 δὲ is repeated. μέν is not found in 2 Pet. though it occurs five times in 1 Pet.

δὲ occurs 21 times in 2 Pet. twice with καὶ, 15 σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ, 2 ἐγέρνυτο δὲ καὶ, which is also found in Jude v. 14. Rarer uses in 2 Pet. are καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ 1, and the repeated ἐν δὲ in 1:5, where see notes.

ἡ. The idiomatic use of ἡ with the numeral is found in 2 Pet. 11 ταύτην ἡ δευτέραν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, where see n.

καθὼς. 2 Pet. 1:4, 3:15, once in 1 Pet.

καὶ. See Index. te not found in 2 Pet. or 1 Pet., once in Jude v. 6 τοὺς μή πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν, ἀγγέλους τε τετήρηκεν.

καίπερ. 2 Pet. 1:10 καίπερ εἰδότας.
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καλὸς. The idiomatic καλὸς ποιεῖτε occurs in 2 Pet. 110; cf. Moulton, pp. 228 f.

μέντω used with its proper force 'nevertheless' Jude v. 8.


πάλαι. Jude v. 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι, 2 Pet. 10 τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτίων.


πού. Rhetorical use.† 2 Pet. 34 ποῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγαγεία τῆς παρούσας; cf. Isa. 3318 ποῦ εἰσίν οἱ γραμματικοὶ; Ps. 4210 ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς σου; Eur. Heracl. 369 ποῦ ταύτα καλὸς ἀν εἰς παρά γ' ἐν φρονοῦσιν; where Paley quotes Elmsley 'Particula interrogativa ποῦ non sine indignatione negat, ut saepe apud tragicos,' cf. Aes. 1075, Phoen. 548 ποῦ 'στιν ἡ δίκη; Soph. Aj. 1100 ποῦ σὺ στρατηγεῖς τοῦδε; Oed. T. 390 ποῦ σὺ μάντις εἰ σαφὴς; Sibyl. viii. 75 ποῦ τότε σου τὸ κράτος;

ὡς with gen. abs., 2 Pet. 15 ὡς πάντα τῆς θελας δυνάμεως δεδώρημεν, following χάρις μέν πληθυνθείη, where the subjective force almost disappears. If the sentence had run 'I pray that you may be blessed through the knowledge of God, seeing that the Divine Power has granted us all good through the knowledge of Himself,' ὡς would have kept its usual force. Winer (pp. 770 f.) and others prefer to connect the gen. abs. with the imperative ἐπιχορηγήσατε in v. 5, but this involves us in greater difficulties. See explanatory note. For the other uses of ὡς see Index.

ELLIPSIS.

Of Verb in the Salutation, Jude v. 1 Ἰουδᾶς τοῖς κλητοῖς συ. χαίρειν λέγει, so 2 Pet. 11 Πέτρος τοῖς λαχοῦσιν. Of the substantive verb in the Ascription, Jude v. 25 Θεῷ δόξα sc. ἐστω, so 2 Pet. 318 αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα, and 315 τὴν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν (euan) ἴγεισθε. Of Noun in agreement with relative 2 Pet. 119 ὡς οὗ (χρῶνον), 112 ἐφ' ὅσον (χρῶνον), 34 ἄφ' ἃς (ἡμέρας); of Antecedent understood from relative 2 Pet. 10 ὃ μὴ πάρεστιν ταύτα (οὕτως)
Gamma: Grammar of Jude and of 2 Peter

τυφλὸς ἐστίν, 212 ἐν οἷς ἄγνοοσιν βλασφημοῦντες by attraction for ἐν τούτῳ δ ἄγνοοσιν. Noun or pronoun expressed with one verb and understood with another, 2 Pet. 18 ταῦτα ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα οὐκ ἀργοῦς (ὑμᾶς) καθίστησιν. 1 Pet. 28 προσκύπτοντωσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες (τῷ λόγῳ). Verb of subordinate clause understood from the verb of the principal clause, 2 Pet. 316 (Παῦλος ἔγραψεν) ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς (γράφει). Participle understood in a later clause from a preceding clause, 2 Pet. 39 μὴ βουλόμενος τινας ἀπολέσθαι ἄλλα (βουλόμενος) πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρήσαι, 222 κύων ἐπιστρέφεις ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα καὶ ὑς λουσα-μένη (ἐπιστρέφεσα) εἰς κυλισόμον. Also κύων is without a verb, which may be thus supplied, ὁ πάλιν ἐμπλακείς (v. 20) ἐστίν ὡς κύων.

Pleonasm.

Jude v. 3 ὑμῖν repeated after γράφει; v. 5 ὑμᾶς repeated emphatically after εἶδότας; v. 4 ἀνθρωποι after τινὲς, after ἀσεβεῖς 2 Pet. 37; redundant pronoun after ἰδίος, 2 Pet. 38 κατὰ τὰς ἱδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, 316 πρὸς τὴν ἱδιαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν; in resumption of preceding noun 2 Pet. 316 ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς (γράφει) λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων. Compare the similar redundant use after a relative (Blass, p. 175). The fourfold repetition of πᾶς and of the cognates of ἀσεβής in Jude v. 15 is emphatic. So the phrase used for eternity in Jude v. 25.

Intensification of the meaning of the verb by repetition through the cognate noun or participle, as in Gen. 2738 ἔξετη Ἰσαὰκ ἐκστασιν μεγάλην, Lk. 2215 ἐπιθυμιὰ ἐπεθύμησα, James 517 προσευχῇ προσηύχατο, where see my note, also Vorst De Hebraismus pp. 610–635. Two remarkable instances are found in 2 Pet. where ἐν is joined to the dative, viz. 212 ἐν τῷ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσουτε; where αὐτῶν appears to refer to the preceding ἁλογα ἰδα, and ἐν implies that their destruction will be shared by the libertines; and 33 ἐλεύσονται ἐν ἐμπαίγμονῃ ἐμπαίκται, where ἐν ἐμπαίγμονῇ is equivalent to the participle, as in Lam. 12 κλαίοντα ἐκλαίσειν.

Periphrasis.

With ἔχειν, Jude v. 3 ἀνάγκην ἔσχον (= ἣναγκάσθην) γράψαι ὑμῖν, 2 Pet. 119 ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν λόγον = perfect of βεβαιό, 226 ἔλεγξιν ἔσχεν παρανομίας = ἠλέγχθη περὶ π., 214 καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλειονεξίας ἔχοντες = γεγυμμασμένοι πλειονεξίας.
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ποιεῖσθαι,† 2 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{10} βεβαιὰν τὴν κλήσιν ποιεῖσθαι = βεβαιοῦν, 1\textsuperscript{15} τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι = τούτων μνησθήναι. Jude ν. 3 σπουδὴν ποιούμενος = σπεύδουν. λαμβάνειν, 2 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{9} λήθην λαβῶν = ἐπιλαθόμενος, 2 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{17} λαβῶν τιμήν = τιμηθεῖσ. 2 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{13}, 3\textsuperscript{1} διεγείρειν ύμᾶς ἐν υπομνήσει = υπομνήσασ. Ἑσπείδαις. 2 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{18} τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν = τὴν ἐν δυνάμει παρουσίαν, see Mt. 24\textsuperscript{80} and Mk. 9\textsuperscript{1} quoted in explanatory note.

ANACOLUTHON.

Jude ν. 16 οὕτωι εἰσών γογγυσταί, κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα. Here the construction would have been regular, if we had had ὅν τὸ στόμα, instead of καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν. Even the latter would in itself have been an ordinary construction, if it were not for the added participial clause in agreement with the general subject. By strict rules of grammar the participle should have been in the genitive case to agree with αὐτῶν, but this would have implied a close connexion between the two latter clauses, whereas they are really inconsistent, the first clause being that with which the last clause is really connected. The nominative of the participle is often freely used where another case would be strictly correct: see Blass, p. 285, and the instances from 2 Pet. 3\textsuperscript{1} below.

2 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{17-19} λαβῶν ... δόξαν, φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης τοιάσθε ... καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνῆν ἥκουσαμεν ... καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν λόγον. Here λαβῶν prepares the way for such an apodosis as ἐβεβαιώσεν τὸν λόγον, but the interposed clause of ν. 18, dwelling on the importance of the evidence referred to, causes the writer to lose his construction.

2 Pet. 2\textsuperscript{4} εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ... οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἄλλα παρέδωκεν ... καὶ ... οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἄλλα ... ἑφύλαξεν, ... καὶ πόλεις ... κατέκρινεν, ... καὶ δίκαιον ... ἐρύσατο, ... οἶδεν Κύριος εἰσῆβείς ῥύσθαι, ἄδικους δὲ ... τηρεῖν. The natural apodosis to the first protasis would be τούτων οὐ φείσεται, but the multiplication of protases showing mercy joined with judgment requires a mixed apodosis, which is further postponed by the interposition of ν. 8 to explain καταποιούμενον.

2. Pet. 3\textsuperscript{1-3} διεγείρω ύμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν, μνησθήναι τῶν ῥημάτων τοῦ κυρίου, γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐμπαίκται. Here we
should have expected γινώσκοντας to agree with the subject of the infinitive μνησθήναι, but the writer ends his sentence, as if he had begun, as Jude does, with μνησθήτε. See explanatory note.

Asyndeton, confirmatory, where we might have expected a genitive absolute, 2 Pet. 2:16 ἐλεγξεν ἐσχεν παρανομίας ὑποζύμιον ἀφώνον ἑκάλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν.
CHAPTER III

FURTHER REMARKS ON THE STYLE OF JUDE AND OF 2 PETER

A marked feature of the style of St. Jude is his fondness for triplets. Thus in v. 2 we find ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθεῖν. In v. 4 ‘the men who were designed for this judgment’ are described as ἀσεβεῖς, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἁσέλγειαν, τὸν μόνον ἀσεβίτην ἄρνούμενοι. In vv. 3–7 three examples of punishment are adduced, Israel in the wilderness, the angels who sinned, the overthrow of Sodom. In v. 8 the libertines σάρκα μὲν μαλακονοσίν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. [In vv. 9, 10 we have two couplets οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν— ἀλλὰ ἐπεν: δει καὶ οὐκ ὀλάσασιν—βλασφημοῦσιν, δεὶ— φθείρονται.] In v. 11 we return to the triplet, Cain, Balaam, Korah. [In vv. 12, 13 we have a quintet of metaphors, hidden rocks, rainless clouds, dead trees, turbid waves, falling stars. In v. 15 again two couplets ποίησαι κρίναυ—ἐλέγχαι, περὶ πάντων δὲ ἱσέβησαν—δὲν ἐλάλησαν.] In v. 16 we return to the triplet πορευόμενοι—καλοῦντες (dissguised in the form καὶ τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ ὑπέροχα)—θαυμάζοντες. So in v. 17, the word—the Apostles—the Lord. v. 18 does not admit of subdivision. v. 19 has the triplet ἄποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοὶ, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. v. 20 and 21 have a double triplet ἐποικοδομοῦντες—προσευχόμενοι—προσ— δεχόμενοι and πνεῦμα ἁγίου—Θεὸς—Ἰσραήλ Χριστός. v. 22 has the marked triplet οὐδὲν μὲν—οὐδὲ—οὐδὲ. v. 24 has a coupel φυλάξαει—στήσαι. v. 25 has a quartet δόξα, μεγαλωσύνη, κράτος, ἐξουσία, followed by the triplet πρὸ του παντὸς του αἰώνοις, καὶ νῦν, καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰὼνας, thus closing with a septet. Compare the stress laid on the fact that Enoch was seventh from Adam, v. 14.

There are some traces of the triplet in St. James, as in 114.
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There is something analogous to this last in 2 Peter, as in 1:27 where faith is represented as the root, out of which the seven virtues spring, each growing out of the one before it (ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ύμων τὴν ἀρετὴν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν, ἐν δὲ κ.τ.λ.). I have suggested (p. 192) that the writer may have had in his mind the mystical oedoad, which includes and completes the sabbatical hebdomad, and that he may have intended to mark this by substituting Noah the eighth (2 P. 25) for Jude’s Enoch the seventh (J. v. 14). A less elaborate refrain, if we like to call it so, is found in 2 P. 3:10-12 οὐρανοί παρελεύσονται, στοιχεία δὲ καισόμενα λυθήσεται καὶ θυσία πυρομοσμένων ... συγκείμενας τὴν παρουσίαν ... διὰ οὐρανού πυρομοσμένου λυθήσεται καὶ συμμετακληται. Not unlike is the intensive force of the reduplication of ἐμπαίκτησις in 3:8 ἐλεύσονται ἐν ἐμπαικτίσει ἐμπαίκται, and of φθορά in 21:28 γεγενημένα εἰς ἀλωνίων καὶ φθοράν, ... ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθορῆσονται. The same idea is dwelt on 14 ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθοράς, 21:9 δούλην ὑπάρχουντες τῆς φθορᾶς. These examples lead us to suppose that the reiteration of the same words throughout the epistle does not necessarily arise from a limited vocabulary,—an explanation which seems hardly consistent with the occasional use of very rare words on the part of the writer—but either from a liking for recurrent sounds, or from a

1 Cf. a similar climax in Wisdom vi. 17-21.
desire to give emphasis by the use of 'line upon line' or from both. Such repeated words are ἀπώλεια in 21 παρεισάξουσιν aἰρέσεις ἀπώλειας... ἐπάγγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχύν ἀπώλειαν, 25 ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει, 31 πρὸς τὴν ἴδιαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν, and ἀπόλλυμι in 38 οὐ κόμος ἀπόλετο, 39 η ταυτόλογον τινας ἀπολέσθαι. So we have the word ἐπίγνωσις four times, γνώσις twice, ἐπιγνώσκω twice, ἐπιθυμία four times, κολαζομένους τηρεῖν twice, τοῦτο πρῶτον γνώσκετε twice, διεισέρχετο ἐν ὑπομνήσει twice, ὑπομνήσκω once, μνῆμην ποιεῖσθαι once, the tropical use of the rare ἔξακολουθέω thrice, the rare ἄδειμος twice, σπουδάζω thrice, βεβαιωθεῖς twice, ἐπανγέλλα twice, ἐπανγέλλα thrice, ἐπάγαγελλα thrice, πάρεμι twice, κρίσεις four times, βλασφημεῖν thrice, βλάσφημος once, ἐκπαλαι twice, προσδικῶ three times, ὁδὸς (tropical) four times, κόμος four times, παρουσία thrice, ἐπιχορηγεῖ thrice, συνή προ τιμάς of Christ, στηρίζω 112, ἀστήρικτος 316, στηριγμός 317. It is worth noting how frequently the repetition occurs in the same sentence, as in 18, 14 ὅς σαῦρα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως δεδωρημένης... δι' ὁμ τὰ τίμια ἐπανγέλλαμα διδώθηται (where the verb seems to be used first as middle and then as passive), 18, 14 ὅφ' ὅσον εἰμι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι... ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος μου, 19, 18 λάβων δ ὁ ἑαυτοῖς, φῶν ἡ τοῦ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δ ὁ θ' η... καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἥκουσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεὶς σα ἁ, 27, 18 δι' οἱ αἰῶν. Λῦε ἐρύσας αὐτο, βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοὴ δι'-καὶ αὐτος ψυχήν δι' ἑκαλαν ἐβασάνιζεν, in the next verse comes ὅ τις αἰ, 23 ἡδονὴν ἥκουσαμεν τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῆν, ἐν θυρὶ ὁφὶ δοῦ τεσσ' ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις, 39 οὗ βραδύν ὁ ὄντες τῶν βραδύν ὁ- τή τι τα ἡγούμεναι. There is the same impressive fourfold repetition of ἅσβεσια and its cognates in Jude v. 15. We also meet with pairs of synonyms, as 17 ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τῇ ἀγάπη, 19 κλησιν καὶ ἐκλογήν, 23 σπίλοι καὶ μόμοι, 34 ἂσπίλοι καὶ ἄμωμοι. The only triplets I have noticed in 2 Peter are the three examples of judgment in 248, and the constituents of the Cosmos (οὐρανοῖ, στοιχεῖα, γῆ) in 310.

I have alluded to the influence of rhythmical considerations on the choice and order of words in my edition of the epistle of St. James (pp. cxxvi foll.). As examples of fine rhythm I would cite 2 P. 18, 17 οὗ γὰρ σεσοφοιμένους μύθους ἔξακολουθήσαντες |

1 See the quotations in the Index.
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εγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ὅπως καὶ παρουσιάν
|| ἀλλ’ ἐπόται γεννήθεντες τὴν ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος
|| λαβοῦν γὰρ τῷ Θεοῦ πατρός τιμήν καὶ δόξαν φωνῆς
ενεχθείσης τοίαυτε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλόπρεπους δόξης
|| ὁ νῦν μοι ὁ ἄγαςτος μου οὐτὸς ἐστιν, where the alliteration in m, p, (β, φ), and s may be noted. An equally fine rhythm is to be found in 1:19-21 καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων ὁ καλὸς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ὅπως λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ δέως ὁ ἡμέρα διανυάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν. It will be observed that in this and the following verses the rhythmical effect is enhanced by the alliteration in p and l. I cannot go into further details here, but those who have an ear for beautiful rhythm should read aloud 2:9 and 3:13; also Jude νν. 20, 21 ὑμεῖς δὲ ἄγαςτοι ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀγωτατῇ ὑμῶν πίστει ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ προσευχόμενοι ἐρτούς ἐν ἀνάπη Θεοῦ τηρήσατε προδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. There is a marked alliteration in p, as also in ν. 3. Another peculiarity in Jude is the rhyme in ν. 8 σάρκα μὲν μακὰ ὅσιν, κυρίοττας ἃθετο ὡσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφήμωσιν, and in νν. 10 and 11: ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδα σιν, βλασφήμωσιν, ὅσα δὲ ἐπὶ σταυρωταὶ ἐν τούτοις φθείρων ταύτα ταύτα oúai αὐτοὺς ὑπὲρ ἡσαυ av καὶ ἐξεχαίη θῃσαμν. We may compare the occasional iambic fragments to be found in 2 P. as 1:19 τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων, ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, ἡμέρα διανυάσῃ, 2:4 εἰς κρίσιν προσευχόμενος, 28 ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας, γυνῆν δικαίαν, 22 κύλισαμ βορβόρου, as to which see a note by Canon E. L. Hicks in C.B. iv. 49, Dr. Bigg’s Commentary, p. 227. Cf. also Deane’s Book of Wisdom, p. 28.

Criticisms on the Style and Vocabulary of 2 Peter considered.

We have seen that in some respects, notably in the use of the article, the style of 2 P. is more classical than that of most of the books of the N.T. So also as to the use of the genitive absolute, of the negatives, the attraction of the relative, and such idiomatic phrases as καλὸς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες 1:19, καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ 1:5, ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας 2:8, τὸ πρὸς ἐωθίν 1:8, τὸ τῆς παροιμίας 2:22, ἐως ὁ διανυάσῃ 1:19, ἀφ’ ἡς ἐκοιμήθησαν 3:4, ἐφ’ ὅσον εἴμι 1:13, and

1 I use the half stroke, the stroke, and the double stroke to mark an ascending scale of the rhythmical pause.
the subjunctive after ἢνα and οὐ μή. Generally speaking, I think the writer's command of grammar is quite up to the usual level of the N.T. On the other hand, his style suffers from such defects as the non-use of the particle μέν, and of the articular infinitive; but I do not think it deserves the severe censures that have sometimes been passed upon it. Dr. Chase, who is more moderate than others, condemns, as solecisms, P.'s use of βλέμμα, καυσοῦσαι, μελήσω, μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, παρεισφέρω, φωνή. Taking these in order, we must allow that, if we retain the old reading, and the old translation of 28, βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ ὁ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς... φυγῇ δικαίων ἀνόμων ἔργων ἔθασαν ζευν ('For that righteous man dwelling among them vexed his righteous soul, in seeing and hearing, with their unlawful deeds'), βλέμματι will bear a sense for which no precedent can be found; but, if we omit the article before δίκαιος with WH. and B, and translate aspectu et auitu justus with the Vulgate, we get rid of the difficulty. The objection to καυσόομαι is that it is elsewhere used only of fever, but the same objection might be made to the word καυματίζω, which also is commonly used of fever in profane Greek, but occurs four times in the N.T. (Mt. 13a, Mk. 4a, Αρκ. 16b, d) of external heat, as in Epict. i. 6. 26 ἐν 'Ολυμπίᾳ δ' οὐ καυματίζεσθε; οὐ στενοχωρεῖσθε; A similar explanation may be given of μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι in 15. If we translate this with the A.V. 'to have these things in remembrance,' we give an unusual, but (as I have endeavoured to show in my note) not an impossible sense to the phrase. I think however that we may take it in its ordinary sense 'to practise the mention (or 'to make your mention') of these things after my death.' With regard to μελήσω (12a), I agree with Dr. Field in thinking that it makes no sense here, and that it has probably been written by error for the rare μελήσω 'I will take care to.' Two objections are taken to the phrase σπουδὴν παρεισενεγκαντες (1) that the verb regularly used in periphrasis with σπουδὴν is the middle εἰσφέρεσθαι, and (2) that, in the compound παρεισφέρω, παρά must mean 'secretly,' as in παρεισεδύσαν Jude v. 4 and παρεισάξουσιν 2 P. 2a. As to the second objection, παρά in composition is not limited to the meaning 'secretly,' cf. Rom. 5bόνος παρεισήλθεν ' the law came in beside,' and see Schweighäuser Lex. Polyb. under παρεισώγω. Compare also the compounds παρεισβάλλω, παρεισδέχομαι, παρεισφέρω, παρεισχέω and other compounds quoted in my note on
2 P. 1. As to the voice, in Hellenistic Greek the force of the middle was very much forgotten, as we may see from the forms στον-δάσω and ἐπάγοντες quoted above (pp. xlviii f.) from this epistle; and the parallels there adduced show that even writers of the best period did not shrink from using the active, where later Atticists insisted on the middle. The objection made to φωνή is that, whereas it properly means 'an irrational cry,' it is used in 2 P. 1 of the divine utterance at the Transfiguration. This account of φωνή however only applies when it is contrasted with λόγος, as in Ignat. Rom. 2: by itself φωνή stands not only for the bare sound, but also for the significant utterance, as in the Homeric ὁς ἀρα φώνησεν, and even for the thought apart from the utterance, as in Plato Protag. 341 B τὴν Σιμωνίδου φωνὴν 'the saying of Simonides,' Epict. iv. 1. 32 (after a quotation from Diogenes) τούτ' ἐστιν ἐλευθέρον ἄνδρός φωνή, Plut. Mor. 106 B ἐνταῦθα ἂν τις ἐλκύσει τὴν τού Σωκράτους φωνήν, εἰ συνεισένεγκαίμεν εἰς τὸ κοίνῳ τὰς ἀτυχίας δόσει διελέσθαι τὸ ἱςον ἔκαστον, ἰσόμενον δὲ τούς πλείους τὰς ἐαυτῶν λαβόντας ἀπελθεῖν. So Acts 13 11 ἀγνοοῦσαι τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πάν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας, Gen. 45 18 δειβοήθη ἡ φωνή (R.V. 'the fame thereof) εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φαραώ, λέγοντες ὅτι Ἡκασίων οἱ ἄδελφοι Ἰωσήφ.

Another word which has caused offence is μυστάζων. It is certainly not a common word; and if the use of uncommon words is to be imputed as a crime, then the author of 2 P. must be found guilty of this crime along with many of the greatest writers of all ages and countries. But such criticism is surely somewhat pedantic. What Englishman, writing naturally, ever stops to ask whether the word which occurs to him is to be found in a dictionary? Knowing himself to be a living embodiment of his native tongue, not bound by any external code, he fearlessly uses whatever expression may be needed to make his meaning clear to himself and to his readers. In the next place our record of the Greek of the first two centuries is very far from complete. Hence all we have to ask in reference to any unusual expression is simply (1) Was the idea worth expressing? (2) Could it have been better expressed in any other way? In 2 P. 1 1 τυφλὸς ἐστιν μυστάζων, the last word defines or limits the first: he who is without the virtues mentioned in 1:7 is blind, or, to put it more exactly, is short-sighted; he cannot see the things of heaven, though he may be quick enough.
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in regard to worldly matters. Cf. what is said of the libertines in 218. The same characteristic is noted in Plato Rep. vi. 508 C ἀμβλυώτητοι καὶ ἑγγὺς φαίνονται τυφλῶν, but μυστάζουν gives a more exact expression of a finer thought. A similar criticism has been passed upon what appears to me an even more effective phrase, ὄφθαλμος ἔχοντες μεστούς μοιχαλίδος (214). In the note I have compared the saying of Timaeus οὐκ ἐφη κόρας ἐν τοῖς δημασίων ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ πόρνας, which gives the origin of μοιχαλίδος in 2 P.; and the quotation from Arcesilas, 'oculos incecebræe voluptatique plenos,' which supplies the remaining words ὄφθαλμος μεστούς in the phrase of 2 P. Other words of extreme rarity are παραφρονία, ἔξεραμα, ταρταρῶν, κυλισμός on which see explanatory notes. The first is an irregular derivative from παράφρων instead of the ordinary παραφρόησις. It was probably used in 2 P. 216 for the sake of the assonance with παρανομία (ἔλεγξιν ἐσχῆν ἰδίας παρανομίας· ὑποτύχων ἄφον . . . ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν). The second takes the place of ἔμετον in the quotation from Prov. 2611. The verb ἔξεραμος is used by Aquila in translating the same word, and the cognates ἀπεράω, ἔξεραμος are comparatively common.1 The simple verb ταρταρῶν occurs elsewhere only in Amphilochius (A.D. 370), the compound καταταρταρῶ is found in Sext. Empir. The substantive τάρταρος occurs more than once in the LXX. and in Philo and Josephus, and is not unfrequent in later Christian writings. κυλισμός is found in Theodotion's version of Prov. 218.

One reason for the use of these out-of-the-way forms may have been the desire of euphony, as παραφρονία to correspond with παρανομία. So ἔξεραμα gives a better rhythm than ἔμετον, and κυλισμόν than κύλισιν in 22, Κύλιον ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ίδιον ἔξεραμα, καὶ ἤτοι λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμόν βορβύρου. So too the word τάρταρωσας contributes greatly to the fine rhythmical effect of 218. What should be our judgment as to this attention to rhythm? If it involves disregard for the thought, if it endangers exactness and clearness of statement, or weakens the expression of emotion, simply in order to gratify the ear, we must allow that, in matters of importance, such a want of seriousness would very much lower our opinion of the writer:

1 If the late Bp. Wordsworth is right in supposing that the proverb in 2 P. 22 is an inexact quotation of two iambic lines

εἰς ίδιον ἔξεραμ' ἐπιστρέψας κύλιον,
λειτουργήθη θ' ὡς εἰς κύλισμα βορβύρου,
this would account for two out of these rare words.
but take such a case as our English Prayer book, who could dispute that the thought is made more, not less impressive, from the perfection of the rhythm? There is no inconsistency between the two. Noble thought naturally tends to clothe itself in noble form, as we see in the fifteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, and in St. James (see p. ccxxviii of my Introduction to the latter). The difficulty which many of us have found in using the Revised Version arises just from this cause, that the form does not correspond to the thought. The general effect is at times weakened or destroyed by too close attention to insignificant detail, and by the erroneous assumption that every word or construction in one language must have an exact correspondence in another.

It may be worth while just to run through the rest of the words which are found in 2 P. and in no other book of the N.T. Some of these are common in ordinary Greek, such as ἀλωσις, ἀμαθής, ἀποφεύγω, ἄργεω, βόρβορος, βραδυτής, ἐκάστοτε, ἑπάγγελμα, ἐπόπτης, κατακλύζω, λήθη, μεγαλοπρεπής, μέγιστος, μίαμα, μνήμη, μνεύλη, παρανομά, πλαστός, σειρά, τοιόσοδε, ὑς, φωσφόρος, the wonder being, not why they are used in 2 P., but why they are excluded from the rest of the N.T. Some are classical but rare, as ἐνκατοικεῖον, τολμητης. Others are fairly common in post-Aristotelian Greek, as ἀθεσμος (Diod. Plut. Macc.), ἀκατάπανος (Polyb. Plut.), διαναγάω, ἐκπαλαι, ἐντρυφάω, ἐξακολουθέω, ἐπιλνω, ἔστιμον, παρεισάγω, σπίλος, ταχινός, τεφρώ. Some bear an unusual sense, as ἀλχιμηρός, usually 'dry' and 'squalid,' used (not in 2 P. only) for 'dark'; μώμος an old word for 'blame,' used in 2 P. in the sense of 'blemish,' which it bears in the LXX.; so ἀμώμητος, used in Homer and elsewhere for 'unblamable,' means 'unblemished' in 2 P.; στρεβλώ an old word meaning to 'twist' or 'wrench,' used here metaphorically of wilful misinterpretation; στρήμμος used of planetary stations (Diod. and Plut.), of rhetorical pauses (Dionys. H.), is used metaphorically of moral steadfastness in 2 P. Among very rare words found in 2 P. may be mentioned ἄστημικες, apparently found elsewhere only in Longinus ii. 2, but its use is really involved in that of στηρίζω, just as much as that of any particular part of the verb would be; δυσνόμητος Luc. and Diog. L.; ἐλεγξις LXX. and Philostr.; ἐμπαιμονὴ ἀπ. λεγ.; μασμός found elsewhere only in Wisdom and 1 Macc., Test. Levi 17, Test. Benj. 8; ὀλγωσ occurs only thrice elsewhere; ἤμηθον twice, see notes; ψευδοδιδασκάλος apparently first used in 2 P.,
found in later writers. If we read μελήσω with Dr. Field in 2 P. 112, we have another extremely rare word to add to our list. We have also to take account of such rare constructions as ἀποφεύγω with the genitive in 14, though it is joined to the ordinary accusative in 218 and 220; βραδύνω followed by ἐπαγγελλας (39) and ἀκατάπαυστος followed by ἀμαρτίας (214), both being classified above under the 'genitive of the sphere.' The combination of positive and superlative in 14 τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα is rare but, as is shown in the note, not unparalleled in classical writings.

Looking back on this list, we must certainly allow that 2 P. has an unusual percentage of out-of-the-way expressions. Of these some appear to me to be justifiable and convenient, such as ἀκατάπαυστος, ἀστήρικτος, δυσνόητος, ἐλεγξις, μοιχαλίς, στηρυγμός, ψευδοδιάσκαλος; some to be unnecessary, such as the Hebraic ἐμπαγμονή and perhaps καυσόδοθαι, which however does not read to me like an invention, but rather like a colloquialism or provincialism. ῥοιξιδόν is a poetical word, which may be compared with the phrase ὑπέροχα ματαιότητος (218) and was perhaps borrowed from Lyco- phron, or possibly from some Jewish or Christian poet of the time. I confess I see nothing in these peculiarities which should much affect our view of the value of 2 P., or which would in the least degree determine our judgment as to the merit of some new papyrus from Egypt, if they had been found there for the first time.

In any case we find many parallels to these peculiarities of 2 P. in the list given below (pp. lxx f.) of words occurring in 1 P., which are not found elsewhere in the N.T. Such are ἄλλοτροπισκότος, ἀνάχυσις, ἀνεκλάλητος, ἀπροσωπολήμμης, δεδοξασμένη, ἐγκυμβόσμαι, ἐμπλοκή, ἐπερώτημα, περίθεσις, συνπρεβύτερος. And the same holds good of St. Paul and of the epistle to the Hebrews. If these latter neologisms cause no difficulty, why should those of 2 Peter? The truth is, each neologism must be tested and judged by itself. It is not the part of wisdom to refuse to listen to a prophet, or indeed to a poet or a philosopher, because he may not confine himself strictly to the language of common life.

What must, I think, be regarded as a fault is the vagueness and ambiguity which run through so much of the epistle, partly in the use of pronouns, of which I have spoken above, partly in particles, e.g. ὦς in 18, which in my opinion refers to what precedes; but there is something to be said for putting a full stop at the end of
the preceding verse, and a comma at the end of the 4th verse. So in the use of prepositions, we have ἐν ἑπιγνώσει in (12, 20), διὰ τῆς ἑπιγνώσεως (18), εἰς τὴν ἑπιγνώσιν (18) where it may be puzzling to catch the precise shade of meaning. If we read with WH. διὰ δόξης in 18, we have a succession of four phrases introduced by διὰ—διὰ τῆς ἑπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς, δι' ὅν τὰ μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδόθηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνία φύσεως, and it is difficult to get a clear conception of this quadruple causal relation. In the next clause ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἑπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, the first ἐν has a local, the second a causative sense. Again, the sense varies in 18 δίκαιον ἡγοῦμαι, ἢ' δ'sου εἰμί ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, διεγείρει ύμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 218 ἐν οἷς ἀγνοούσιν βλασφημούντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν φθαρήσονται, 218 δειλαδίζοντες ἐν ἑπιθυμίαις τούτῳ ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους, 31 (ἐπιστολάς) ἐν ἀλλιώτεροι ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τῆς διάνοιαν. The force of the repeated ἐν ἐν is not clear. So the meaning of διὰ in 3.8 οὖναν ἦσαν ἐκπαιδευμένοι καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστώσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ δι' ὅν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὑδατὶ κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπόλεστο is not easy to make out. I think that in the former verse it is equivalent to μεταξύ, in the latter the plural ἐν is so ambiguous that it seems necessary to read διὰ, referring to the preceding λόγος. In 17 φωνὴς ἐνέχεισθαι ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης we should probably read ἀπό. In 3 Blass thinks it necessary to insert διὰ after τῆς, 'the Lord's command given through the apostles.' In 34 the repeated ἀπό gives two superior limits, the disappearance of the 'fathers' (itself a very ambiguous term) and the foundation of the world. The excessive and sometimes not very perspicuous use of prepositions and the predilection for long complicated sentences are not confined to 2 P. Both are marked features of 1 P. and of the Pauline epistles, especially those to the Romans and Ephesians.

There is much dispute as to the meaning of στοιχεῖα in 3.16,12, of ὁριστῇ in 18 and 15, and as to the force of ταχινῆ in 14 and 21, whether it should be translated 'sudden' or 'speedy,' also as to the allusion contained in the words καθὼς ὁ κύριος ἐδηλώσει μοι. In 14 are we to take δεδώρηται as passive or middle? The latter is in accordance with δεδωρημένης in 18, the former makes better sense. In 18 is ὁ καλέσας to be understood of God or of Christ? How are we to understand τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς (3.16)? In 18, ἐν τῇ
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παρασκευή ἄληθεία should we read παραδοθεῖσθαι with Spitta? In 219 how is τοὺς ὀλύνθες ἀποφυγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφο-
mένους related to the words which follow (220), ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιᾶματα τοῦ κόσμου?

I must refer to my notes for the questions which have been raised as to the interpretation of 11 τοὺς ἴσον τιμῶν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, 21 τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἄρνούμενον, 219 δόξας βλασφημοῦντες, 119 ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, 119 ἐστιν ἡμέρα διανυάσθη καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατελθή, 318 εἰς ἡμέραν αἰώνος.

Sometimes the difficulty lies in determining the construction, as in 219, δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ σαρκὸς ἀσελεγείᾳ: does σαρκὸς depend on the preceding or on the following word? In 36 λαυθάνει αὐτοῦ τοῦτο θέλοντας is τοῦτο subject to λαυθάνει or object to θέλοντας? In 37 τεθράσχουμεν εἰς ἑαυτῷ προφέρομεν εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως, on which of the participles does προφέρεσθαι depend? The difficulties culminate in 210-13, which might seem to be intentionally left obscure. For an attempt to deal with them I must refer to my notes, but I will add a further remark about the remarkable antithetical phrase ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας. This evidently refers on to Balaam in 219, who was tempted to do wrong by the rewards offered by Balak, but afterwards missed those rewards on account of his failure to curse Israel. It must however have some connexion with 212, which speaks of brute beasts born for capture and destruction, and it would seem that the bait, which brings about their death, is compared to the pleasures of sin by which the libertines are tempted to their own ruin (cf. δελεάζουσιν in 213,15). The instinct of animals leads them to be caught and killed by other animals or by man. Man, the rational animal, definitely aiming at pleasure, wealth, or power, by doing what he knows to be wrong, is cheated of the reward of his iniquity, like Ahab or Macbeth, by the inevitable law of retribution: ἡ ἐπιθυμία συναπεδεύεται πλεῖτε ἄμαρτλα, ἢ δὲ ἄμαρτλα ἀποστελεθεῖσα ἀποκυνεῖ θάνατον. The meaning of the words ἀδικία, ἀδικεῖον is a little forced for the sake of the antithesis.

I am far from saying that there is nothing to counterbalance the obscurities of our Epistle. Perhaps no part of it has given occasion for more discussion than the passage on prophecy, especially those words of deep meaning which Dr. Arnold has made the foundation of his lectures on the subject, πᾶσα προφητεία γραφής.
ιδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται· οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἤνέχθη προφητεία ποτὲ. For brevity and for profundity, it seems to me, these words are not unworthy of the Apostle in whose name they are written. So other phrases to which objection has been taken as obscure seem to me full of instruction for those who will take the pains to think over them. I would instance especially 1st, where the calling of the Lord is said to have come through the goodness which shone out in His life and character, and which is the living source of all the promises.
CHAPTER IV

RELATION BETWEEN 1 PETER AND 2 PETER

Jerome remarks on the difference between the two epistles which bear the name of St. Peter in his Script. Eccles. 1: ‘Scriptavit Petrus duas epistolam quae catholicae nominantur, quarum secunda a plerisque eius esse negatur propter stili cum priore dissonantiam’; and again in his letter to Hedibia (Epist. cxx. cap. 11): ‘Duae epistolae quae feruntur Petri stilo inter se et charactere discrepante structuraque verborum. Ex quo intellegimus pro necessitate rerum diversis eum usum interpretibus.’ That Peter made use of an interpreter is asserted by Papias, who reports (ap. Eus. H.E. iii. 39) that John the Elder used to say Μάρκος μὲν ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσε ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραξθέντα: οὔτε γὰρ ἦκουσε τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. So Irenaeus iii. 1 (after the death of Peter and Paul in Rome) Μάρκος, ὁ μαθητής καὶ ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγραφός ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. To the same effect Clement of Alexandria in the Sixth Book of the Hypotyposes (ap. Eus. H.E. ii. 15) says τοσοῦτο δὲ ἐπελάμψεν ταῖς τῶν ἀκροασίων τοῦ Πέτρου διανοαῖς εὐσεβείας φήγος, ὥς μὴ τῇ εἰσάπαξ ἰκανως ἔχειν ἀρκεῖσθαι ἄκολον μηδὲ τῇ ἀγράφῳ τοῦ θελον κηρύγματος διδασκαλίᾳ, παρακλήσει δὲ παντολαῖον Μάρκον, οὐ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκόλουθον δυτὶ Πέτρου λαμδῆται ὡς ἄν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς καταλεύγω (ἢ καταλεύσαι) διδασκαλίας, μὴ πρότερον τε ἀνείναι ή κατεργάσασθαι τὸν ἀνδρὰ, καὶ ταύτῃ αἰτίους γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς (cf. 2 Pet. 118). And Tertullian (Adv. Marc. iv. 5): ‘Marcus quod edidit Evangelium Petri affirmatur, cuius interpretem Marcus.’ We read of another interpreter of Peter named
Glaucias, by whom Basileides claimed to have been taught (Clem. Al. Strom. vii. § 106).

Do the facts then confirm the idea that, on the supposition of both epistles being written by the same person, the author in writing them made use of different interpreters to put his ideas into Greek, whether by way of revision of his own rough draft, or in regard to the entire Greek rendering of what he may have uttered or written in Aramaic? We will begin with instances of likeness in the vocabulary employed.

2 P 18 κύριε ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, is found also in 1 P 14. 2 P 11 κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἵδια δόξῃ may be compared with 1 P 11 κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ἡμᾶς ἄγιον, ἰδ. 21 τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστόν αὐτοῦ φῶς, ἰδ. 21, 30 εἰς τούτῳ ἐκλήθητε, ἰδ. 510 ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν. 2 P 110 βεβαιάν ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι, cf. 1 P 1 ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιθηκοῖς, 25 παρὰ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτός, 25 γένος ἐκλεκτῶν. 2 P 111 οὐ γὰρ θελῆματι ἀνθρώπου ἡνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ . . . εὐλαβεῖαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου, cf. 1 P 216 οὐτος ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, 31 εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, 4θελήματι Θεοῦ τὸν ἐπίλουον βιώσαι χρώνων, 41 κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ. 2 P 218 δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκϊς ἀσέλγειαις, ἰδ. 22 πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσέλγειαις, cf. 1 P 45 πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσέλγειαις, ἐπιθυμίαις. 2 P 118 ἐποται γενηθήντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειώτητος, cf. 1 P 218 Ἰνα ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ζηγῆς ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσου τὸν Θεόν, 3ἐποπτεύοντες τὴν ἀγὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν. 2 P 314 ἄπτιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι, 1 P 1 ἄμωμος καὶ ἄπτιλος. 2 P 214 ἀκαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας, cf. 1 P 41 πέπαντα ἀμαρτίας.

Other resemblances may be more summarily given.
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δεσπότης 2 P (1) of God, 1 P (1) of man. δηλώ 2 P (1), 1 P (1).
ἐργαν 2 P (2), 1 P (2). ἐσχάτος 2 P (2), 1 P (2). εὐφρίσκομαι 2 P (2),
1 P (2). ἡσυχία 2 P (1), 1 P (2). ημέρα 2 P (11), 1 P (3).
ἰσχύς 2 P (1), 1 P (1). καθώς 2 P (2), 1 P (1). καλέω 2 P (1),
1 P (1). λαλέω 2 P (2), 1 P (2). λαμβάνω 2 P (2),
1 P (1). λάθος 2 P (1), 1 P (2). λάθος 2 P (4), 1 P (7). μακρο-
πειρασμός 2 P (1), 1 P (1). πληθύνω 2 P (1), 1 P (1). πνεύμα 2 P (1),
1 P (1). προγνωστικό 2 P (1), 1 P (1). προφήτης 2 P (2),
υδάρ 2 P (2), 1 P (1). νίχτις 2 P (1), 1 P (1). φαίνω act. 2 P (1),
χάρις 2 P (2), 1 P (10). Total 100.

Words used in 1 P not in 2 P.

ἀγαθός (7), ἀγαθοποιεῖ (4), ἀγαθοποιοῖ (1), ἀγαθοποιός (1), ἀγαλματία (3), ἀγάλνω (1), ἀγαπημός (1), ἀγάπη (1), ἀγαπημός (1), ἀγαπημός (1), ἀγνοεῖ (1), ἀγνοεῖ (1), ἀγνοεῖ (1), ἀδικώματι (1), ἀδικώματι (1), ἀδικώματι (1), ἀδικώματι (1), ἀδικώματι (1).

1 Words to which * is prefixed are not found in the N.T. except in 1 P.
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Words used in 2 P not in 1 P.

άγνοεω (1), ἀγοράζω (1), ἀδικεω (1), ἀδικία (2), ἀθέσμος (2), αἵρεσις (1), ἀκαρπος (1), ἀκατάπαυστος (1), ἀκοή (1), ἀκούω (1), ἄλογος (1), ἀλεως (1), ἀμαθῆς (1), ἀμάρτημα (1), ἀμώμητος (1),
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υπομνήσιων (1), υπομνήσιως (1), υπόμνησις (2), υπομνήσις (2), υπο-
στρέφω (1), ἡδονή (1), φείδαμαι (2), φείδογμαι (2), φείδω (1), φθοرأ (4),
φυλάσσω (2), φυσικός (1), φύσις (1), φανῇ (3), φωσφόρος (1),
κείρων (1), κωρέω (1), *ψευδοδιδάσκαλος (1), ψευδοπροφήτης (1).
Total 230, of which 56 occur only in 2 P among the writings of
the N.T.

It will be observed that, as regards the vocabulary, the number
of agreements is 100 as opposed to 599 disagreements, i.e. the
latter are just six times as many as the former. And if
we examine some of the latter, we shall find much to confirm
Jerome's view that, whatever may be the case as to the subject-
matter of the two epistles—a question which will be shortly
considered—at all events the Greek of the one is not by the same
hand as the Greek of the other. This is especially shown by the
different terms used for the Second Advent—which occupies so
large a space in both epistles. In 2 P the term παρουσία is
used for this in 1η, ἐγνώρισαμεν υμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν
καὶ παρουσίαν, i.e. it formed the subject of the Apostles' teaching;
in 3η it is said that in the last days scoffers shall appear who will
make a mock of the promised Advent, asking ποι ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία
tῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; and in 3αη the disciples are bidden to look
forward to and to hasten τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας.
The same word is used four times in Mt. 24 of the Coming of the
Son of Man, in James 5η, in 1 Joh. 2η, and by Paul in 1 Cor.
15η, and six times in the Epistle to the Thessalonians. It is also
the word commonly used by later writers. On the other hand, 1 P
uses ἀποκάλυψις for the Advent in 1η that the trial of your faith
may be found for praise and honour and glory ἐν ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ; in 4αη, where it is said that the joy of sharing in the
sufferings of Christ leads on to the joy ἐν τῇ ἀποκάλυψις τῆς δόξης
αὐτοῦ; in 1α ἐπισευτε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκάλυψις
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, where the revelation is not limited to that of the
Day of the Lord, in Hort's words 'The grace is ever being brought,
and brought in fresh forms, in virtue of the continuing and pro-
gressing unveiling of Jesus Christ.' Cf. 1η, 'kept through the
power of God' εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοίμην ἀποκάλυφθηναι ἐν καιρῷ
ἐσχάτῳ, 5η ὁ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκάλυφθησαί δόξης κοινωνίας.
Hort adds that the phrase goes back to our Lord's words in Lk. 17η
'In the day when the Son of Man is revealed.' It is used by St.
Paul in the same sense 1 Cor. 1η, 2 Th. 1η. There can be no doubt
that, of the two, ἀποκάλυψις is the finer and richer phrase, implying, in Hort's words (on 1 P 15), that 'Revelation is always in the strictest sense an unveiling of what already exists, not the coming into existence of that which is said to be revealed.' If 2 P preceded 1 P, we might suppose that the writer subsequently adopted the superior phrase, but, as we shall see, the facts of the case are decidedly in favour of the priority of 1 P.

Another word used for the Second Advent with much the same force as ἀποκάλυπτω is φανερόω in 1 P 54 φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχιποιμένου κομίσθη τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον. It is also used of the First Advent in 1 P 120.

It is perhaps worth noting that while ἀγαθός, ἀγαθοτοιός, ἀγαθοποιεῖ, ἀγαθοποιεῖα, and κακός, κακία, κακόω, κακοποιεῖ, κακοποιεῖα are found in 1 P, no representative of either group occurs in 2 P. Other words denoting good qualities which are found in both epistles are ἁγιός, δίκαιος δικαιοσύνη, ἐλευθερία, μακροθυμία, γνώσις. Found in 2 P only are εὐσέβεια, εὐσέβεια, ἐγκράτεια, ἐπίγνωσις, μετάνοια, σοφία, στήριγμα. Found only in 1 P are ἁγιός, ἀνυπόκριτος, ἀγαλ-λιάδορας, ἐπεικής, ἐυσπλαγχνος, ἐυλογεῖ, ἅσυχος, καλός, νήφω, ὀμόφρον, πιστός, πιστεύω, πνευματικός, πράγμα, πράξης, προθυμία, στερεός τῇ πίστει, συμπαθής, σωφρονεῖ, συνείδησις ἁγαθός, ταπεινός, ταπεινόφρον, ταπεινοφροσύνη, ὑπακοή, ὑποτάσ-σωμα, φόβος, χαίρω, χαρά, χάρισμα, χρηστός, Χριστιανός. Words denoting bad qualities found in both are ἀμαρτάνω, ἀμαρτία, ἄδικος, ἁσεβής, ἁσέλγεια, βλασφημέω, ἑπίθυμω, σάρξ. Found in 2 P only are ἄγωνε, ἅδικα, ἅδικος, ἅθεος, ἅρεις, ἅμαθς, ἅμαρτημα, ἁνομος, ἀπάτη, ἀπώλεια, ἀργός, ἐς, ἀστή-ρικτος, αὐθαίρης, βλάσφημος, ἐμπαιγμόν, ἐμπαιίτης, μυστάξων, παρανομία, παραφρονία, πλεονεξία, τολμητής, τρυφή, ἐντρυφάω, τυφλός, θυρία. Found in 1 P only are ἄγνωση, ἀδέμιτος, ἀπειθέω, ἀπιστεύω, ἀγνωσία, ἄφρων, ἀμαρτωλός, ἀλληλουσικόπος, αἰσχροκερδός, ἀσωτία, γογγυσμός, εἰδωλατρία, ἐπηρεάζω, κατα-λάλω, ἱλαρά, κερδάινω, κόμω, λοιπόω, -ρα, λυπέω, οἰω-φλυγία, πότος, πρόσκομμα, προσκόπτω, πτόχες, ῥύπος, σαρκικός, σκάνδαλο, σκολιός, σταύρωσις, υπέρφανος, υπόκρισις, φθόνος, φονεύς. Many similar contrasts might be obtained from the lists given above, but I will only mention one more, i.e. the predilection of 1 P for compounds in σύν, such as συμπαθής, συνείδησις, συνεκλεκτός, συνεκληρονόμος, συνοικεῖο, συνοχηματίζομαι, συν-
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Some of the words in the above lists are more or less synonymous; the use of others betrays a difference of feeling, or character, or experience, in the writers. Examples of the former are ἀδεσμος 2 P for ἀθέμιτος 1 P; ἔξακολοθέω 2 P for ἐπακολοθέω 1 P; ἐπιχορηγεώ 2 P for χορηγεώ 1 P; ἡγεμοι 2 P for λογίζομαι 1 P; ἡμέρα 2 P for ἡμέρα, καιρός, and χρόνος 1 P; ἀγοράζω 2 P for λυτρόμαι 1 P; ἀπ' ἀρχής κτίσεως 2 P with Mk. for πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου 1 P with Paul; ἐπόττης 2 P for μάρτυς 1 P; ὑπόδειγμα 2 P for ὑπόγραμμος 1 P; aι πάλαι ἁμαρτιαί 2 P for aι πρότερον ἐπιθυμιαί 1 P; ποταπός 2 P for ποτός 1 P; πταῖω 2 P for προσκόπτω 1 P. Words significant of a difference of mind and feeling are ἔλπις and ἐλπίζω in 1 P, which are inadequately represented by ὑπομονή and προσδοκάω in 2 P; as also words and phrases referring to the pattern set before us in the earthly life of Christ, to His atoning sacrifice, His visit to the spirits in prison, His resurrection and ascension, His throne of glory in heaven. Such phrases are ῥαστῖσμος αἵματος 1 P 13, τίμιον αἷμα ός ἁμοιοῦ αἵμων 11, ἐπαθεῖν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν 1 P 21, περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν, δίκαιοι ὑπὲρ δίκαιων 313, παθήματα (cf. especially 1135, 221-25, 313, 4.113, 51), ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν 13, cf. 121 ο οἰκεία τῶν αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δοῦσι, 321 δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 322 ὅς ἔστω ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ πορευθείς εἰς οὐρανόν, ὑποταγόντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἔξουσίων.

Sometimes we have particular scenes in our Lord’s life, or sayings of His called up before us. Thus the phrase ἀναξιωσάμενος τὰς ὁσφύας τῆς διανοίας (135) reminds us of Lk. 1235 ἐτοιμαζον ὑμῶν αἱ ὁσφύες περιεξωσμέναι, while that most picturesque and remarkable phrase ἐγκομιβώσασθε ταπεινοφροσύνη (55) reminds us of Christ’s girding himself before washing the feet of His disciples (Joh. 135) and of His injunction to them to follow His example (1314). The word ἀρχηγιόμην, with its accompaniments, ποιμαίνω, ποιμήν, ποιμνιον, πρόβατα, reminds us of the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Good Shepherd, and of the charge to Peter ποιμαίνε τα προβατιά μου. Perhaps αὐτὸς στηρίζει in 1 P 510, and the cognate words in 2 P may have a reference to another charge in Lk. 2232, στηρίζον τοὺς ἄδελφους. And the phrase ὃν ὁκ ἰδώντες ἀγαπάτε, εἰς ὃν ἀρτι
mu ὑρόντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιάτε (1 P 18) naturally recalls the words addressed to Thomas, διὶ ἐφορακάς με πεπιστευκας; μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἱδόντες καὶ πιστεύοντες. When we read ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν Κύριον . . . ως Ὁ θεοῦ δυναμι (1 P 215-16), our thoughts naturally go back to the rule laid down by the Master in Mt. 17 21, as to the payment of the half-shekel, and the words in Mt. 2221, 'Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's.' So when we read 1 P 58 νήψατε, ἡγηγορήσατε, ὅτι ὁ ἀντιδίκος ὑμῶν διάβολος περιπατεῖ, ζητῶν τινα καταπει, we naturally think of our Lord's warnings in Lk. 2231 and in Mt. 2641, γρηγορείτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν. The words κλῆρος, κληρονομέω, κληρονομία (1 P 14), συνκληρονόμους bring to our minds Mt. 1929 ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει, along with 58 and 2524. So ἀναγεννήσας 1 P 15, ἀναγεννησμένοι οὐκ ἐκ στοράς φθαρτή, ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου 1 P 13, and ὡς ἀρτιγενήτα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἠδονίν γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε 1 P 25, suggest a reminiscence of the words recorded in Joh. 112 οὐκ ἐξ αἵματος ὑμῶν ἐκ τελήματος σαρκὸς ὑμῶν ἐκ τῆς ἁλαζόνης ἀνδρός, ἀλλ’ ὅτι ὁ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν, and 38 εὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ foll., taken with 1 Joh. 39 πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν οὐ ποιεῖ, δι’ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, and Lk. 1837 ὅτι μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς παιδίων, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὸν. 1 P 414 εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι: reminds us of Mt. 511 μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς . . . ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ (cf. 1022, 1929); 1 P 16 ὡς ἀγαλλιάσθῃ ὁ λόγον λυπηθήσετε κ.τ.λ. of Mt. 512 χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιάσθητε, διὸ ὃ μισοῦσα πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 419 οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ πιστώτε κτίστη παρατίθεσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς, recalls Lk. 2346 Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθημαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. So 314 μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε recalls Joh. 1417. 410 ἐκαστος ως ἔλαβεν χάρισμα, ὡς καλοὶ ὁικονόμοι recalls Lk. 1242 τὸν ὁ πιστὸς ὁικονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος, and the Parable of the Talents. When Peter tells his readers that 'if they are buffeted for doing well, when they take it patiently, this is pleasing to God' (250), who can doubt that he had in his mind the scene which he had witnessed in the palace of the high-priest, and of which we have the record in Mk. 1446? Again 53 μὴ ὁ κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων recalls Mt. 2025 οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύοντος αὐτῶν . . . οὐχ οὕτως ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν. So 212 ἵνα οἱ τῶν καλῶν ἐργῶν ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσι τὸν Θεόν seems
to be a reminiscence of Mt. 5:16 οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, δι' ὃς ἔδωσαν ὑμῶν τὰ καλά ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς: 18 ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε, of Joh. 13:34, 15:12: 110 περὶ ζητήσας ἔξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξεραύνησαν προφήται, of Mt. 13:17.

The quotation from Ps. 118:22 in 1 P 2:4 was also used by our Lord (Mt. 21:45), who specially applied the word ἀποδοκιμάζω to his own treatment by the Jews, after Peter had made his great confession (Mk. 8:31); and by Peter himself in Acts 4:11. The thought of the living stones which are to be joined to the corner stone and built up into the spiritual temple (1 P 2:4 foll.) must have been associated in the mind of the Apostle with the commission laid upon him by the Lord in the name Πέτρος (Mt. 16:18).

Similarly the quotation from Isa. 8:14 in 1 P 2:8 must have been connected in the writer's mind with many sayings of Christ; cf. Mt. 11:9, Mk. 14:27, Joh. 6:61. Also the quotation from Lev. 11:44 in 1 P 1:16 as compared with Mt. 5:48; that from Isa. 10:8 in 1 P 2:18 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς compared with Lk. 19:44; that from Ps. 110:4 in 1 P. 3:2 compared with Mt. 22:44, 26:64 and Acts 28:4.

It may be said that we have similar reminiscences in 2 P., such as the account of the Transfiguration, of which the writer was a witness on the holy Mount (116:18) and the use of the words ἔξωθος and σκήνωμα in the preceding verses (115:15) reminding us of words then spoken; the warning as to his own approaching death (1:14); the stealthy intrusion of false prophets (21; cf. Mt. 7:15, 24:11), denying their Lord (21, cf. Mt. 10:33); the parable of the Return of the Evil Spirit (2:20, cf. Mt. 12:45); ἦλθεν ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς καλέστηκες (3:10, cf. Mt. 24:48-44). But these references are few and of a far less intimate nature than those in P. They are chiefly connected (as are the other allusions to our Lord) with His power and majesty (δύναμις and μεγαλειότης 118), His judgment of sinners (21, 12:17), the terrors of His second coming (37:10-11), the danger of falling away (2:20-21); though their severity is modified, as compared with that of St. Jude, by the announcement of His long-suffering (3:14), and of His care for the righteous (29). How different is the tone in which our Lord is spoken of in 1 P. What a warmth and intensity of feeling is shown throughout the whole epistle, especially in such passages as 18 'Whom, not having seen, ye love; on whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing ye rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable and full of glory' (χαρᾶ ἀνεκλαλήτω
13 Knowing that ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things from your vain manner of life, but with precious blood, as of a lamb slain without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ; 18 Love one another from the heart fervently; 2 As new-born babes long for the spiritual milk which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation; if ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious; 2 Ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a people for God’s own possession, that ye may show forth the excellencies of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvellous light. 11 Beloved, I beseech you as sojourners and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul; 21 Hereunto were ye called; because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example that ye should follow his steps... who his own self bare our sins in his body on the tree, that we having died unto sins might live unto righteousness. 42 Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you to prove you, as though a strange thing happened unto you: but insomuch as ye are partakers of Christ’s sufferings, rejoice; that at the revelation of his glory also ye may rejoice with exceeding joy. If ye are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye, because the Spirit of glory and the Spirit of God resteth upon you. 51 The elders among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who am also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight not of constraint but willingly... neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away. Likewise, ye younger, be subject unto the elder. Yea, all of you gird yourselves with humility, to serve one another.... Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time; casting all your care upon him, for he careth for you.

I think none who read these words can help feeling that, not even in Paul, not even in John, is there to be found a more beautiful or a more living description of the secret of primitive Christianity, of the force that overcame the world, than in the perfect quaternion of faith and hope and love and joy, which pervades this short epistle. No one could make the same assertion with regard to
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2 P: thoughtful and interesting as it is, it lacks that intense sympathy, that flame of love, which marks 1 P. No doubt these feelings were especially called out by the persecutions under which the readers of 1 P were suffering, while 2 P is largely a warning against heretical teachers; but no change of circumstances can account for the change of tone of which we are conscious on passing from the one epistle to the other. This impression is confirmed by a consideration of the vocabulary of 2 P where it differs from 1 P. We find, for instance, such expressions as ὁδὸς ἀληθείας, ὁδὸς δικαιοσύνης, εὐθεία ὁδὸς, the Gospel is spoken of as the ἐντολή τοῦ κυρίου, ἡ παραδοθεῖσα ἀγία ἐντολή; ἀπώλεια occurs five times, ἀπόλλυμι twice; the warning against forgetfulness is often repeated, as in 1 P 12, 13, 15 3 (the last of which, διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινή διάνοιαν, may be contrasted with 1 P 13, ἀναξιωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, νήφοντες τελείως ἐλπίσατε), also in 2 P 3. I have before referred to the ‘reverential periphrases’ to be found in 2 P, as θεία φύσις, θεία δύναμις, μεγαλειότης, μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα, κυριότης; and to the frequent recurrence of ἐπίγνωσις, ἐπιγνώσκω used especially of our knowledge of God. These things may be good, but they lack the personal tie that marks the first epistle, the devoted affection which binds the disciple to his Master and the penitent to his Saviour, as well as the tender sympathy shown not merely for his own countrymen, but for churches which lay outside his own special sphere of work. I venture to think that the distinction which Dr. Bigg draws between the ‘disciplinarian’ Peter and the ‘mystic’ Paul would be more appropriate if used to contrast James or 2 P with 1 P. Another difference between the two epistles is the amount of space given in 1 P, as in Eph. 522-24 6-8, Rom. 131-8, to the exposition of relative duties between husbands and wives, rulers and subjects, servants and masters, elder and younger. This however is easily explained by the difference of circumstances in which the two were written.

So much for the difference between the tone and the subject-matter of 1 P and 2 P. Is it possible to trace any likeness in these respects, as we have done in respect to the vocabulary, in spite of a preponderance of unlikeness?

One of the most prominent topics in both epistles is the Second Coming of the Lord. In 2 P it is described as the day of judgment (2, 3) when heaven and earth shall be destroyed by fire,
when evil men and angels shall be finally judged and punished, while the righteous will be admitted into the eternal kingdom in the new heavens and earth, in which dwelleth righteousness (111, 322). To this day of God they are urged to be continually looking forward (312). In 1 P we read of an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for those who by the power of God are guarded through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ (145); their tried faith will eventually redound to praise and honour and glory in the revelation of Jesus Christ (17); at the revelation of the glory of Jesus Christ they will rejoice with exceeding joy (423); when the chief shepherd appears, they will receive the crown of glory which fadeth not away (54); the God of grace has called them to his eternal glory in Christ (510). The wicked shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead (4518). The thought of this Coming should cheer believers in their trials, and at the same time make them sober and watchful, given to prayer (47); remembering that the end of all things is at hand (47). On the contrary, 2 P tells us that the continued delay in the Second Coming had led some to scoff at the idea of any future Coming. He seems himself to look forward to its being put off for an indefinite period (345).

Another topic which is common to both is that of Noah's being saved from the Flood. 2 P mentions this with reference to the changes which have come over the face of the world, showing that there is nothing incredible in the prophecy of its final destruction by fire (357); and in 25 he refers again to the destruction of the ancient world, when God brought a flood on the world of the ungodly, but spared Noah, the eighth, a preacher of righteousness. In 1 P 319-21, 45 the allusion to Noah is connected with the thought of baptism and with the mysterious doctrine of the Descent into Hades. Christ after his crucifixion went in the spirit to preach to the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the Ark was being prepared, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved through water, which also after a true likeness doth now save you (δ καὶ υμὰς ἀντίτυπον τῶν σώξει), even baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation (ἐπερώτημα) of a good conscience toward God.' We will first notice some points of connexion with 2 P. The μακροθυμία of God, which is here
said to have been at work in the first destruction of the world by water, is spoken of in connexion with the second destruction by fire in 2 P 38.15. The object of this μακροθυμία is to give opportunity of repentance to all, and the writer even goes so far as to bid his readers hold μακροθυμία to be equivalent to σωτηρία, a statement illustrated by the story in 1 P of the preaching to the spirits in prison, which had once refused to listen to the preaching of Noah. I have pointed out in a previous chapter the connexion between the eight souls saved in the Ark in 1 P 30, and Noah the 8th in 2 P 25. The former writer takes the deliverance from the flood by means of the Ark sailing over the waters to be typical of the deliverance from final condemnation of all who were united with Christ by the baptism of the Spirit. The same typical character is ascribed to it in Mt. 2487-39 οὐσπερ γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ Ναός, οὕτως ἄσται ἡ παρούσια τοῦ νεότον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. See also the comparison of the cloud and the sea to baptism in 1 Cor. 101,2 οἱ πάτερες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἤσαν καὶ πάντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διήλθον καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωυσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. In this last passage there appears to be a play on the meaning of the preposition διὰ, which is used first of the passage through the Red Sea, and then suggests the use of water in baptism; so 1 P speaks of the Ark, εἰς ἣν ὡς ψυχαλ διεσώθησαν δι’ ἕδατος, translated in R.V. mg. ‘into which eight souls were brought safely through water.’ This suits the allegorical reference to the Church, ‘into the shelter of which they were brought by baptism.’ The text of the R.V. however has ‘wherein eight souls were saved through water,’ taking εἰς in its later sense, as equivalent to ἐν (see Blass, p. 122). The question then arises, How are we to understand δι’ ἕδατος in its application to the Flood? Some take it of ‘escaping through the rains and the flood which had already begun before Noah got to the Ark; but this contradicts the account in Gen. 74.5.106. which certainly implies that the windows of heaven were not opened till Noah was safe in the Ark. Others understand it in the sense that water was the means of saving them, since it bore up the Ark; but the Ark was safe enough by itself: the only danger which threatened it was from the water. I am rather disposed to take διὰ in the sense μεταξὺ, which it seems to bear in 2 P 35, ἐξ ἕδατος καὶ δι’ ἕδατος συνεστῶσα. In my note there I have explained it of the position assigned to the earth by Jewish tradition, between the waters of
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the deep and of the firmament. Similarly in 1 Cor. 10:1 διὰ is strictly ‘in the midst of the sea’ which rose up as a wall on one side and on the other. So in 1 P δ’ ὅδετος would refer to the ark threatened by waters above (the windows of heaven) and below (the fountains of the great deep), between which it rode secure. Allegory is not particular as to a word being understood in the same sense in the type and in the antitype.

Whence did the writer obtain this remarkable and most significant story of the Gospel being preached not only to those who perished in the Flood (30) but also to the dead generally (46)? Probably the reference to those who were lost in the Deluge is due to P’s allegorical treatment of the story of the Ark. If that is a type of the Church, then those who were not in the Ark are a type of those who are outside of the Church. In Acts 27,31, Peter applies to our Lord the words of Ps. 16, ‘Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades.’ And we cannot doubt that the subject must have been much in the thoughts of the disciples. It seems to me that the most natural explanation of its appearance here is that it was communicated to Peter by our Lord Himself, perhaps with some injunction as to its being kept secret for the present, such as follows the account of the Transfiguration and the confession of Peter in Mt. 16. Other early allusions to the ‘Harrowing of Hell’ are Test. Levi. 4, where amongst other accompaniments of the Judgment Day—πάσης κτίσεως κλονουμένης καὶ τῶν ἄοράτων πνευμάτων τηκομένων—we read τοῦ ἄδου σκυλευμένου ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει τοῦ υφίστου; perhaps Mt. 27:53 τολλά σάματα τῶν κεκομιμεμένων ἁγίων ἡγέρθησαν, καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μιμείων μετὰ τὴν ἐγέρσαν αὐτού εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν τολλοῖς; certainly Ignat. Magn. ix. οὗ (Ἰσσου Ἰησοῦ) οἵ προφήται μαθηταὶ ὄντες τῷ πνεύματι ὡς διδάσκαλον αὐτῶν προσεδόκοι. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ὡς δικαίως ἀνέμενον, παρῶν ἡγερέν αὐτοὺς ἐκ νεκρῶν, where Lightfoot says: ‘Here our Lord is assumed to have visited the souls of the patriarchs and prophets in Hades, to have taught them the truths of the Gospel, and to have raised them either to paradise or to heaven. . . This belief appears in various forms in early Christian writers. Justin Dial.

1 Eusebius connects this with the Descent of Christ in his Demonstr. Evang. x. 8. Μη δὲ μὴ χάρις ἔπει σωτηρία τῶν ὧν ἔξω ψυχῶν παρῆι, ἐκ μικρῶν αἰῶνος την ἀφέσιν αὐτῶν περιμενομένων, καὶ ἔτη: γα τόροι καλάς σωτρίζω: . . . καὶ τῶν προσδιόρισμα ἡλεύθερου ἀπῆλθεν. καὶ γέγονεν, ὡς τολλά σάματα τῶν κεκομιμεμένων ἁγίων ἅπαστα συνεκήθησαν αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν ἀληθῶς ἁγίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ πόλιν.
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72 (p. 298) quotes a passage from Jeremiah, ἐμνήσθη δὲ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ (al. ὁ ἁγιος) Ἰσραήλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς ἑτὸν χώματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτούς εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ. He says that the Jews had cut out this passage from their copies; and it does not appear in the extant MSS. of the LXX. . . Irenaeus quotes it several times. . . Even Marcion accepted the descent of Christ into Hades, though (unless he is misrepresented) he maintained that the righteous men and prophets under the old dispensation, as being subjects of the Demiurge, refused to listen to His preaching, and that only such persons as Cain . . . listened and were saved.

Another allusion is to be found in the Gospel of Peter probably written before A.D. 150. It occurs in § 10, ed. Robinson and James 1892. (The soldiers watching at the tomb) φανής ἥκων ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λεγούσης Ἐκείρυξας τὸς κοιμωμένος; καὶ ὑπακοὴ ἥκοΰτο ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὅτι Ναλ.

A third topic common to the two epistles is prophecy. In 1 P we read that the inspiration of the prophets was owing to the spirit of the Messiah which was in them (11); in 2 P 1st that no prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God being moved by the Holy Spirit. In 1 P the subject of prophecy is said to be salvation, the grace that should come upon believers in Christ, whether Jew or Gentile; Christ's sufferings and the glory that should follow; in a word, the Gospel preached by Apostles speaking under inspiration of the same Holy Spirit. In 2 P the Transfiguration is said to have been a manifestation of the power and Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; and the voice from heaven 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased' is quoted in confirmation of the word of prophecy, implying that such was the essence of the prophetic teaching. As to the meaning which the prophets attached to the message they conveyed,—whether, as Philo believed, they were merely unconscious channels of the prophetic spirit within them; or spoke, as St. Paul desired for himself, with the spirit and the understanding also,—1 P tells us that, while the message intrusted to them transcended their own powers, and had a signification which they could only vaguely surmise, a meaning not limited to their own day, but reaching far into the future, still by diligent search they were able to learn 'what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto.' To the same effect, 2 P says
that prophecy is like a lamp shining in a dark place, to which we must give diligent heed if we would understand its teaching; that it is not limited to any one particular interpretation, but declares the mind and will of God extending through all time; that, if rightly used, it prepares us for the full light of the Gospel and for the inner witness of the Spirit. Much the same is the teaching of Peter in Acts 3:18. ‘The things which God foreshowed by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ should suffer, he thus fulfilled, until the times of restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets’; cf. the words of Paul in Acts 26:22. ‘I stand unto this day, saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come; how that the Christ must suffer, and how that he first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles.’

One or two slighter resemblances may be noted. The idea of growth in 1 P 2:5 ὑπὸ ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν appears also in 2 P 3:18 αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, which may be compared with Eph. 4:15 and Col. 2:19. The reference to angels in 1 P 1:12, where it is said of the mysteries of the Gospel εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν ἄγγελοι παρακώπαι, and in 3:22 ὑποταγέτων αὐτῷ ἄγγελου καὶ ἐκκόσμων καὶ δυνάμεων, may be compared with those in 2 P 2:4 ἄγγελον ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, 2:11 ἄγγελοι ἵσχυι καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ’ αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν, in all of which the word ἄγγελος is anarthrous. In 2 P 2:4 the reference is to fallen angels, who appear to be also referred to under the name δόξαι in 2 P 2:10.

We have seen that 1 P differs greatly from 2 P in the number of allusions to the Gospel history. We will now compare them as regards the allusions to the O.T. Hort (Appendix, p. 179) reckons 31 quotations in 1 P against 5 in 2 P. They are as follows:

where the words spaced are quoted exactly from Isa. 40:6-8.

2 εἰ ἐγενεύσασθε δεῖ τι χρῆστος ὁ Κύριος, from Ps. 34:5, 6, 7. Λέον ζωῆς ὑπὸ ἀνδρῶν μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον, παρὰ δὲ Θεόν ἐκλεκτὸν . . . ἵδον τὴν ἡμᾶς ὡς Σιὼν λίθον ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαίον ἐντιμών, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπὶ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ. ὃς γὰρ ἤτοι τοὺς πιστεύοντας, ἀπιστεύσαν δὲ λίθος δυν ἀποδοκιμασαν οἱ ἑκοδομούντες, οὕτως ὑγιή σει ἐκφαλὴ γηνίας, from Ps. 118:22 λίθον δυν ἀποδοκιμασαν οἱ ὑγιείς δυν ἀπειθήσαν ἐκφαλὴν γηνίας, and Isa. 28:16 ἵδον ἐγώ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τα θεμέλια Σιὼν λίθον πολυτέλη ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαίον ἐντιμών, εἰς τα θεμέλια αὐτῆς, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ. 21 καὶ λέον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου, from Isa. 8:14 καὶ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ πεποιθῶς ἃς, ἔσται σοι ὡς ἀγίασμα καὶ ὁ ἐν ἑν ἰδόν προσκόμματι συναντήσεις σοὶ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι. 29 ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτοί, βασιλείαν ἑράτευμα, θόνοις ἄγιοι, λαὸς εἰς περιπολήσιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρέτας ἑξαγγέλλητε, from Isa. 43:20, 21 ποτέ σοι τὸ γένος μου τὸ ἐκλεκτὸν, λαὸν μου ὑπερποιησάμην τὰς ἀρέτας μου διηγεῖσθαι, Exod. 19:6 ἐνσέβεσθε μοι λαὸς περιποίουσι ... βασιλείαν ἑράτευμα καὶ θόνοις ἄγιοι, ὑβ. 23:28, Deut. 7:14, 20 ὡς ποτε οὐ λαὸς, νῦν δὲ λαὸς ἡ Θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἡ λεγέμενοι, νῦν δὲ ἐκείνοι ἐντεκες from Hos. 1:9 κάλεσον τὸ ἄνωμα αὐτῆς Ὡν ἡ λεγέμενη ... κάλεσον τὸ ἄνωμα αὐτοῦ. Οὐ λαός μου, ὑβ. 21 εἶπα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ὑμῶν Δαὸς μου, καὶ τῇ ἀδελφῇ ὑμῶν Ἡλεμένη, ὑβ. ν. 28. 21 παρακαλῶ ὅσο παροικός καὶ παρεπιδήμως, from Ps. 33:12 πάροικοις ἐγὼ εἰμί ἐν τῇ γῆ καὶ παρεπιδήμοις καθὼς πάντες οἱ πατέρες μου. 22 ἐν ἡ μέρα ἐπεισκόπητος, from Isa. 10:8. 217 τὸν Θεοῦ φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε, from Prov. 24:21 φοβοῦ θνὸν Θεοῦ καὶ βασιλέα. 22 δὲ ἀμαρτίαις ἡμῶν αὐτῶς ἀνήνεγκεν . . . οὐ τῷ μῶλῳ πιστί ἐν τῇ τῇ, from Isa. 53:11 ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν, ὑβ. ν. 5 τῷ μῶλῳ αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς λάθημεν. 23 ἢν γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανόμενοι, from Isa. 53:11 πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν. 30 Ἁρμόνες ἢν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, κυρίον αὐτῶν καλοῦσα, from Gen. 18:12. 30 κυρίον αὐτῶν προβατά πλανόμενοι, from Prov. 23:25 οὐ φοβηθήσητε πτῶσιν ἐπελθοῦσαν. 31 ὁ γὰρ θελῶν ζωῆν ἄγαν πάντα καὶ ἰδεῖν
RELATION BETWEEN 1 PETER AND 2 PETER lxxvii

ἡμέρας ἁγαθὰς παυσάτω τὴν γλώσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χείλη τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλων, ἐκκλινάτω δὲ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιησάτω ἁγαθὸν, ζητήσατο εἰρήνην καὶ διωξάτω αὐτὴν, ὅτι ὁ φθαρμοὶ Κύριον ἐπὶ δικαιούσαν καὶ ὠτὸν εἰς δέσμαν αὐτῶν, πρὸς τὸν Ἐξετάζετε... κακὰ, from Ps. 34:12-16 τὰς ἀστὰς ἀνθρώπων θέλων γῆν, ἁγαθῶν ἡμέρας θείων ἁγαθῶς (where the reading ἀγαθῶν should perhaps be restored in 1 P). The remainder of the quotation is exact, except that the original has the 2nd instead of the 3rd person. 31-15 τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε, Κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε, from Isa. 8:12, 13 τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ φοβηθῆτε οὐδὲ μὴ ταραχθῆτε. Κύριον αὐτὸν ἀγιάσατε καὶ αὐτὸς ἐσται σου φῶς. 32 δὲ ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ, from Ps. 110:1 ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, Κάθως ἐκ δεξιῶν μου. 43 ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλήθος ἀμαρτίων from Prov. 10:18 'Love covery all transgressions' (R.V.), where LXX. has τοῦς μὴ φιλονεικούντας καλύπτει φιλία. 44 εἰ δευτερεύετε... καίριων, ὅτι... τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὕμνας αἱ παρεμβολαί. Hort reckons this as a quotation from Ps. 89:50, but the connexion is very slight. It seems to me to be a distinct quotation from Mt. 5:11; see above, p. lxxvii. For the latter part of the verse Hort compares Isa. 11:2 ἀναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πνεύμα πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, from Ezek. 9:5 ἀπὸ τῶν ἄγιων μου ἁρξασθε... καὶ ἐσπευσάμεθα πρὸς αὐτούς Μιᾶς τὸν ὅικον. 48 εἰ δὲ δικαιομένων μόλις σάκται, ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἀμαρτωλὸς ποὺ φανεῖται; quoted exactly from Prov. 11:31. 46 Θεὸς ὑπὲρφάνεσαν τὸν Θεοῦ, from Prov. 18:27 with the change of Κύριος into Θεός. 57 τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ αὐτὸν, δι' αὐτοῦ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν, from Ps. 52:22 ἐπιρρήσει ἐπὶ Κύριον τὴν μέριμνάν σου, καὶ αὐτὸς σε διαθρέψει.

Perhaps we may add to these, as probably in the mind of the writer, 14 εἰρήνη τοῦ θεοῦ, from Dan. 4:1 (31) and 6:25. 14 ἁφθαρτοὶ καὶ ἀμάλαντοι καὶ ἀμαραντοὶ: 'These three words are all absent from the LXX. and are all found in Wisdom (12:1, 18:4, 3:14, 42, 8:20, 6:12)'. Hort. 17 ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμούτερον χαρὰς νοοῦ τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, διὰ τοῦτο δὲ δοκιμαζομένου εὐρεθῇ εἰς ἑπανοῦ, from Zechar. 13:15 πυρῷ σοι αὐτὸς ἀλλὰ πυρόται τὸ ἄργυρον, καὶ δοκιμῶ
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autous ous dokimazetai to xrion. 110-112 peri hes swthrias eixe philon . . . profothai . . . eranwntes eis tin . . . kaipron edhlou to pneuma pro ma prn evoun tae iis Xristovn pav a th eva tasa metat taata doxas . . . eis a episthmois anagelois parakuphai, from Dan. 8:13-16, 9:24-26, 12:6-9, Isa. 52:18-53:12, 117 klinonta kata to ekastos ou eragon, from Ps. 62:12 sun apodwseis ekastoph kata to eurga auton. 118 see above, and add Ps. 49:8. 119 amnon amwmon, from Lev. 22:21 ammonon estai eisdekonton, tais moumos ouk estai en autoph. 319, 20, from Gen. chapters 6 and 7. 417 see above, and add Jer. 25 (32)59 en poloi en h anomasth to ourom mou emn oug arochos kakkostai. 419 piofor to tostis parathisthsan tais psykhas, from Ps. 31:5 eis cheiras sou parabhsomai to pneuma mou elutroso mou Kuriou o Theos tis allotheias. 58 o antikos oumoun diabolois . . . periptatei xhtwn katanephein, from Job. 17 apokripheis o diabolos elpe, Perielethoun twn gyn kai epmepistatphsa twn up ouroand h pareimi, id. 22.

In 2 P Hort reckons the following as quotations: 22 de ovs h odos tis allotheias beta phi mou th se ta, from Isa. 52:5 de idia . . . to ourom mou blasshmetai en tois ethneis. 222 kouwv enepostevasi eti tis idioi en eirema, from Prov. 26:11a oster per kuvn outhen epelbh eti twn eanvou emetov kai mishtos genetai, outhe afroun tis eanuov kakia anastrephas eti ten eanuov amartian. 38 mia h mepa parak Kuriow vos kilia eti, kai chila etin vos hemera mia, from Ps. 90:4 kilia etin en ovthalamois sou vos h hemera eti ethes etis dieilh. 312 ouv ranoi purmnenoi luthhsontai kai stoicheia kauvoumena tis ketai, from Isa. 34:4 kai taikhsontai pasais ai dunamies twn ouroandov, kai elygenetai o ouroandos vos bblion kai pantta tis astera peestein. 313 kai nivous de ouv ranoi kai g h evn h evn pursookomen, from Isa. 65:17 estai gar o ouroandos kauvos kai ghe kainhe, id. 66:22. Perhaps we may add the following: 122 tophi elos mutapokos, compared with Isa. 59:10 vos othi uparchonton ovthalamovn psychicoun. 119 tis vos lychv vos aivaun tis avluchv vos kai h eukratian, from Ps. 119:106 eukratios tois posai mou o vmos sou, 2 Esdras 12:22 tu nobis superasti ex omnibus prophetis . . . sicut lucerna in loco obscuri. 22 h odos tis allotheias, from Ps. 119:30. 24 seiraios zofoi paraparwassas paradeoken eis krasin tpyromenous, cf. Wisdom 17:18 elin skontous pantes edeisthoun. 25 saving of Noah, cf. Gen. chapters 6 and 7. 26 polveis Sodomovn kai Gomorra stefwos kas tisastrafh katarkwene, id. 18.
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δὲ ἐγὼ μα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς, cf. Gen. 19:24f. Κύριος ἐβρεξεν ἐπὶ Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα θείον καὶ πῦρ παρὰ Θεοῦ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ κατέστρεψε τὰς πόλεις ταύτας καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον, Numb. 26:10 (of the destruction of Korah) καὶ ἐγενήθησαν ἐν σημείῳ. 27 saving of Lot, cf. Gen. ch. 18, Wisdom 10:4-7. 21:10 Balaam, cf. Numb. 22:21-23. 30 οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγέλλας, ὅς τινες βραδύττα ἁγιοῦνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ, cf. Sir. 35:18 καὶ ο Κύριος οὐ μὴ βραδύνῃ οὐδὲ μὴ μακροθυμήσῃ ἑπ' αὐτοῖς. 30 μὴ βουλόμενος τινας ἀπολέσαν ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χαρῆς, cf. Ezek. 18:22, Wisdom 11:24 ἠλείος δὲ πάντας, ὅτι πάντα δύνασαι, καὶ παρορθήσῃ ἀμαρτήματα ἀνθρώπων εἰς μετάνοιαν. It will be seen that the points of contact between the O.T. and 2 P are not only much fewer in number, but also of a far less intimate nature than those between the O.T. and 1 P, so that this difference would by itself suffice to prove that the two epistles did not proceed from the same author.

We have still to compare the grammar and style of the two epistles, to see how far they confirm the conclusions already arrived at from a comparison of the vocabulary and the subject matter.

UNUSUAL INFLEXIONS.

1 P has the aor. inf. βιώσατι (42), found also in Aristotle and Plutarch, instead of the classical βιώναι. The fut. pass. κερδηθήσονται is found only in 1 P 31. κερδήσω occurs in James 4:13, ἐμπορευσόμεθα καὶ κερδήσομεν (where see my note), and the aor. ἐκέρδησα is common in the N.T. The form κερδάω (WH.) or κερδάνω (Blass) occurs after ἰνα in 1 Cor. 9:21. 1 P has three examples of the form ἐγενήθην (118, 21:4, 21:5). It keeps the classical προσαγάγῃ in 3:18 as contrasted with ἐπάξας in 2 P 25. In 21:6 WH. (Introduction § 410, App. p. 166), read φιμοῦ with N comparing κατασκηνῶν read by BD in Mt. 13:32, by B in Mk. 4:32, and ἀποδεκατοῖν read by BD in Heb. 7:5, while Ti. Treg. read φιμοῦ with the other MSS. Moulton Proleg. p. 53 favours the ordinary reading.

ARTICLE.

In this respect there is a great similarity between the two epistles, both exhibiting the same mastery of the fully formed articular phrase, combined with the frequent use of the anarthrous
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noun. Of the former we have examples in 1 P 1ος τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φυσιομένους, 1οι οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες, 1ος ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἁγιολα ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίας, 3ος τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἁγίην ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν, 3ος ὁ ἐξεσπερής ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιβέσεως χρυσών ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμου, 3ος τῇ ἁγαθῇ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφῇ, 4ος εἰς τὸ μηκετί ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ τὸν ἐπιλογόν ἐν σαρκὶ βιώσαι χρόνον, 5οὶ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινονίας, 5ος τῶν ἀμαραντίων τῆς δόξης στέφανων, 5ος τῇ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητι. Of the latter in 1ος ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος, εἰς ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος, 1ος δὲ ἀπαστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν νεκρῶ, 1ος ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ, ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, 1ος ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ, 1ος (εὐαγγελισάμενοι) ὑμᾶς πνεύματι αἵρηται ἀποσταλέντες ἀπὸ οὐρανοῦ, 1ος πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, 1ος διὰ λόγου ζωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος, 3ος οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ρύπου, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἁγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα, 2ος περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ (cf. 2 P 1ος πάσα προφητεία γραφῆς), 4ος Χριστοῦ παθῶσον σαρκὶ, 4ος εἰς τὸ μηκετί ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ βιώσαι, 4ος οἰκονόμων ποικίλης χάριτος Θεοῦ, 4ος ἐν οἴκῳ Χριστοῦ, 5ος ὁ ἀντιδίκος ὑμῶν διάβολος περιπτατεί, 5ος ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἰναι ἀληθεία χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, 3ος πρόσωπον Κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακὰ. We find also in 1 P examples of the looser constructions which we have seen in 2 P, e.g. 1 P 1ος τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας, 1ος τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, 1ος τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας, 2ος τὸ βέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, 4ος τὸ βούλημα τῶν θεών, 4ος τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης, 4ος ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ: of the ‘appositional’ form in 1ος τὸ ἔνθαμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθέν τοῦ προφήτου οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς υἱῷ χάριτος προφητεύσαντες: of the ‘semi-compact’ in 1ος τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φυσιομένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοίμασαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, 1ος τοῦ ἀποκαλύπτεις κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργων, 1ος τὴν φερομένην υἱῷ χάριν ἐν ἀποκάλυψε τοῦ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1ος τῆς ματαιας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου, 4ος τῇ ἐν υἱῶν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμόν υἱῶν γινομένη. 4ος τῇ δόξης καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεύμα is an exception to the general rule that the repetition of the article implies a plurality of subjects; see above, p. xxxv. The rule is observed in 5οϊ συμπρεσβύτεροι καὶ μάρτυς.

1 See for 2 P above, p. xxvi foll.
Cases.

Accusative. We find the Adverbial Accusative in 1 P 33° τὸ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες, 39° τούναντιόν, 16 ἀλήγον; the Acc. of Duration of Time in 117 εἰ ὕψιν τὸν τῆς παροικίας χρόνον ἀναστράφητε, 42° τὸν ἐπίλουσαν βιώσας χρόνον; Cognate Acc. in 39° φοβοῦμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόσιν, 314 τὸν φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθήτε, 41 ὁπλίσασθε ἔννοιαν (some take these as Accusative of the Object). Double Acc. in 315 αἰτεὶ ὑμᾶς λόγον ὑπερ ἐπίλοος. Of Prepositions which take the Acc. eis is the commonest in 1 P as in 2 P, the former having 42 examples as compared with the 11 of the latter: διὰ 1 P (4), 2 P (4); ἐπὶ 1 P (5), 2 P (2); κατὰ 1 P (9), 2 P (3); μετά 1 P (1), 2 P (1); πρὸς 1 P (3), 2 P (2). Especially noticeable are the following: 1 P 320 εἰς ἦν (κιβωτὸν), διεσώθησαν, 121 πιστὸς εἰς Θεόν, ὅτι τὴν πίστιν ἔλει τὸν Θεόν, 512 εἰς ἦν αὐτῆς; 111 τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα; 112 κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἄγιον καὶ αὐτὸν ἄγιον γεννήθη, καὶ 46 ἵνα κριθοῦν μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους, ἵνα δὲ κατὰ Θεόν, which are unlike anything in 2 P with the exception of eis in 2 P 117 ἐν ἔνα ἐνδόκησα. So 118 ἐπισάσατε ἐπὶ τῆς χάριν, is copied from the Hebrew use: see Hort’s n.
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1 P, never in 2 P; ἀνευ twice in 1 P, not in 2 P; ἀπό occurs five times in 1 P; thrice in 2 P (or four times if we read ἀπό in 117); ἐκ 1 P (8), 2 P (5); διά 1 P (15), the most remarkable being 512 δι' ὠδήγων ἔγραψα, and 320 διεσώθησαν δι' ὦδατος, 2 P (5), or 6, if we read διὰ δόξης in 13, the most remarkable being δι' ὦδατος συνεστῶσα. ἐπί 1 P (1), 2 P (1); ἐνώπιον 1 P (1), 2 P (0); ἔφος 1 P (0), 2 P (1); κατά 1 P (1), 2 P (1); μετά 1 P (1), 2 P (0); παρά 1 P (0), 2 P (1); ὑπίσω 1 P (0), 2 P (1); περι 1 P (5), 2 P (2); πρό 1 P (2), 2 P (0); ὑπέρ 1 P (2), 2 P (0); ὑπό 1 P (1), 2 P (5) (or 4, if we read ἀπό in 117).

Dative. Indirect Object 1 P 11 ἐκελευτός παρεπιδήμοις (λέγει χαίρειν), cf. 2 P 11, 12 χάρις ὑμῖν πληθυνθείσῃ, 1 P 11 ὅς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι ὑμῖν διηκόνον αὐτά ὅ νῦν ἀνήγγελῃ ὑμῖν, 113 τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν, 121, 56 after δίδωμι, 213, 18, 31, 56, 22, 56 after ὑποτάσσομαι, 221 ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπόγραμμον, 221 ἐπακολουθεῖν τούτο ἢ ἤχειν αὐτό, 223 παρεδίδον τῷ κρίνοντι, 31, 417 ἀπειθεῖν τῷ λόγῳ, 31 ὑπήκουσαν τῷ Ἀβραάμ, 37 τῷ γυναικείῳ (σκευεῖ) ἀπονεμοντες τιμήν, 310 τοῖς πνεύμασι εἰκρηφεῖν, 44 ἀποδόσωσαν λόγον τῷ κρίνοντι, 46 νεκροῖς εὐφυγελίσθη, 44 πιστῶ κτίστη παρατιθε- σθωσαν τὰς ψυχάς, 55 ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινωφορούσην ἐγκομβώσασθε, 56 ὑπερφάναιον ἀντισάσται, 56 ὃ ἀντίστη, ταῦτα τῇ ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελεῖται, 318 ἦν ὑμᾶς προσκομίσει τῷ Θεῷ, 25 εὐπρόσδεκτος Θεῷ, 315 πρὸς ἀπολογίαν τῷ αἰτοῦντι; with eiμί, etc., 411 ὃ ἐστιν ἢ δόξα, 412 πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένη... ἐξον ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος, 27 ὑμῖν (ἐστίν) ἢ τιμή, 511 αὐτῷ τῷ κράτος (ἐστώ), 51 αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ἡμῶν. Dat. of Reference 224 ἦν τοὺς ἀμαρτίας ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ἥσσωμεν, 41 πέπανται ἀμαρτίαις (αἶ. ἀμαρτίας); with compound verb 28 προσκόπτειν τῷ λόγῳ, 114 συνοχηματιζόμενοι τοῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. Dat. of Instrument 112 εὐαγγελισάμενοι πνεύματι ἀγίῳ, 119 τιμῷ ἀμῷ ἐλευθήτη, 224 οὐ τῷ μόλωπί ἱάθητε; Dat. of Cause 412 μὴ ἐνειδίκεσθε τῇ πυρώσει; Dat. of Respect 41 παθῶν σαρκί, 46 ἦν κραδώσω μὲν σαρκὶ, ἤσσο δὲ πνεύματι, 318 βανατοθείς μὲν σαρκὶ, ἔστωσι κινηθείς δὲ πνεύματι, 413 κοινοφεῖται τοῖς παθήμασιν, 51 στερεὶ τῇ πλείστῃ; Dat. of Manner 13 ἀγαλλιάτερα ἄρα ἀνεκκαλήτη, 45 ὑπότητος ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ βιώσαι. With Prepositions ἐν 1 P (49), 2 P (44), ὕππι 1 P (1), 2 P (0), παρὰ 1 P (2), 2 P (2), σύν 1 P (0), 2 P (1). The most noteworthy examples in 1 P are ἐν Χριστῷ (3), 414 ὄνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὑνόματι Χριστοῦ, 418 δοξαζέω τὸν Θεόν ἐν τῷ ὑνόματι τούτῳ, 514 ἀσπάσασθε ἐν φιλήματι.
The accumulation of prepositions is even more noticeable in 1 P than in 2 P, hardly less than in Romans, e.g. 12 ἀπόστολος κατὰ πρόγνωσιν ἐν ἀγίασμῷ εἰς ὑπακοήν, 13 ὡς κατὰ τὸ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ἐξωσιν ὡς ἀναστάσεως ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐκ κληρονομιᾶν τετηρημένην ἐν ὑπάρχον ἡμᾶς τούς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρομένοις ἐις πίστεως ἔνωσιν ἐν σωτηρίαν ἐποίημα ἐν καιρῷ ἐξάχω. Cf. 2 P 1st. χάρις ὑμῖν πληθυνθεὶς ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ἑαυτὴν δεδομένα ἡμῖν τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἐκ δόξης (αἱ ἐναὶ δόξῃ) καὶ ἀρετῆς, καὶ ἐν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἐπαναγέμητα δεδομένα, ἦν ἡμῖν τοιῶν γένοις ἡμᾶς κοινοῖ φύσεως ἀποφύγοντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθοράς, and Rom. 1st. Παύλου ἀφορισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, ὁ προεπηνεύειτο ἐκ τῶν προφητῶν ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις περὶ τοῦ νευμόν τοῦ γενομένου εἰς σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὑμισθίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεύμα καὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, καὶ οὗ ἑλάβομεν χάρις ἐκ ὑπακοῆς πίστεως ἐν πάσιν τῷ ἑνὸματος αὐτοῦ, ἐν ὑς ἑστε καὶ ὑμεῖς, πάσιν τοῖς θύσιν ἐν ἩΡώμη χάρις ἀπὸ Θεοῦ.

**NUMBER AND GENDER.**

We find an irregularity where nouns, differing in gender, are joined to the same adjective, as in 21 ἀποθέμενοι πάσιν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλων καὶ ὑπόκρισιν καὶ φθόνους καὶ πάσας καταλαλλαίας. Here it would have been easy to make the construction regular by putting πάντα δόλων after ὑπόκρισιν. WH. give ὑπόκρισις in the margin, which seems to me the better reading, and this is supported by δΣ etc. The plural would be easily assimilated to the preceding singulars. In 410 (ἐκαστος καθὼς ἐλαβε καρσιμα) εἰς ἑαυτοὺς διακοινώνυμεν we have a mixture of singular and plural, depending upon the imperative σωφρονήσατε in v. 7. This would be regular if the phrase in brackets had been placed after διακοινώνυμεν. 21 also affords examples of the Plural Abstract in φθόνους and καταλαλλαίας. So we find δόξαι 11, ἀσέλγειαι 43.

**PRONOUNS.**

**Demonstrative.** As 1 P is not controversial, it has no example of the denunciatory use of οὗρος which is so common in 2 P. The most characteristic use here is the prospective, where it serves as
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a pivot for a following explanation, as in 219 τούτο χάρις εἰ διὰ συνεδίδησιν ὑποφέρει τις λύπας, 3ο εἰς τούτο ἐκλήθη, ἵνα ἐκληρονομηθῇ, 4ο εἰς τούτο εὐηγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσιν; and so with οὕτως in 216 οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, followed by the appositional infinitive ἁγαθοποιούντας φιμοῦν. The pronoun is retrospective in 220, 21 τούτο χάρις παρὰ Θεῷ, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθη, 27 λίθος ἐν ἀπεδοκίμασαν... οὕτως ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γιαννᾶς. And so οὕτως in 36 οὕτως γὰρ αἱ ἁγιαὶ γυναῖκες ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτᾶς.

Neither δὲ nor ἐκεῖνος occurs in 1 P.

ἐαυτοῦς is used in 48 τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοῦς ἁγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἐχοντες, and in 410 for ἅλληλως, as in Col. 313 χαρίζομενοι ἑαυτοῖς, and elsewhere both in the N.T. and in classical writers. It is curious that it is coupled with ἅλληλως in 49 φιλόξενοι εἰς ἅλληλος, as in Col. 313 ἀνεχόμενοι ἅλληλος. It keeps its usual reflexive sense in 112, 36.

There is a remarkable use of τὰ αὐτὰ followed by a genitive in 50 εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων τῇ ἐν κόσμῳ ύμῶν ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελεῖσθαι 'knowing that the same sufferings are accomplished in your brethren who are in the world' (R.V.). Dr. Bigg writes about this, much as others have done about unusual constructions in 2 P: 'It is impossible to see why St. Peter did not write τὰ αὐτὰ παθήματα, if these words would convey his meaning. He was not a scholar, but there are some errors of expression which no man would make.' I must confess, I do not feel quite at ease as to the reception which a Greek of the second century would have given to these sweeping assertions. Was Ovid no scholar when he wrote (F. i. 46), 'Non habet officii lucifer omnis idem'? There was nothing to prevent him from writing the more commonplace 'officium.' Are we sure that no Greek would have written ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῆς ἁναισχυντίας ἐφθάσεν τῷ Θερσίω, or τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν θλίψεων ἀντλήσαντες? I do not mean that the last is exactly equivalent to τῶς αὐτῶς θλίψεις: it is rather 'the same sort of persecutions,' there was an identity in the persecutions they had to endure.

Relative. Sometimes the antecedent is not clearly defined, as in 16 ἐν δὲ ἀγαλλιάσθη, where some find it in καρφῳ, some in Θεῷ, some in the general sense of the preceding clause; 44 ἐν δὲ ἁγιαὶ γυναῖκες, where it sums up the preceding clause; 29 εἰς δ καὶ ἑτέθησαν, where the antecedent is suggested by the preceding
RELATION BETWEEN 1 PETER AND 2 PETER

προσκόπτουσιν. Replaced by demonstrative in second clause, 222 δός ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ. ὅταν occurs once, 211 ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αὐτῶν στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς 'whose nature it is to war against the soul.' A common feature of 1 P is the repetition of relatives, as in 222f. (Χριστός) δός ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν... ὅς λοιδοροῦμενος οὐκ ἀντελοῦρει... ὅς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεικεν... οὐ τῷ μόλοντι ἑάθη: 18 δός οὐκ ἱδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς δὲ ἀρτι μὴ ὀρώντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιάσθη: 112 οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὦτι οὐχ ἐαντίος ὑμῖν δὲ διηκόνου αὐτά, ἡ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν... εἰς ἅ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἀγγελοί παρακώπαι: 310-21 ἐν ᾧ πνεύμασι εἴηρυξεν... κατασκευαζόμενης εἰςαντον, εἰς ἥν ὁλίγα διεσώθησαν δι' ὅδας, ὅ καὶ ἡμᾶς σώζει. Attraction, 212 ἵνα ἐν ᾧ (=ἐν τούτῳ ὅ) καταλα- λοῦσιν ὑμῶν... δοξάσωκα τὸν Θεόν, 318 ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν... κατασκυφώσων. δός does not occur in 1 P.

Interrogative. τίς and ποῖος, 318 τίς ὁ κακός σου; 417 τί τὸ τέλος; 111 ἐρωτώντες εἰς τίνα ἡ ποίου χρόνου ἐδήλου. παταπός, found in 2 P, does not occur in 1 P.

ADJECTIVES.¹

Neuter used as a substantive (1) with article 34 τὸ ἀφθαρτὸν τοῦ ὑσυχίου πνεύματος, (2) without article 120 ἐπ' ἐσχατοῦ τῶν χρόνων, 311 ἐκκλησίατο ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ πουςάτῳ ἀγαθὸν. Ηδίος is preceded by the article without αὐτῶν in the two places where it occurs (314-5). The distributive πᾶς is found with the article in the singular, 315 παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι.

VERBS.

TENSES. Future Indicative after ἵνα, 31 ἵνα εἰτίνες ἀπειθοῦσιν... κερδηθήσονται, cf. Blass, pp. 211 f.

Aorist Indicative answering to English Perfect. 112 καὶ νῦν ἀνηγ- γέλη 'these things which have now been announced unto you' (R.V.), 226 ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τῶν ποιμένα 'are now returned' (R.V.), 23 εἰ ἐγενεσάθη ὤτι χρηστὸς ὁ Ἐρυθρός 'if ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious' (R.V.), 225 ἢ ήτα ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενα ἀλλ' ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τῶν ποιμένα 'ye were going astray... but are now returned' (R.V.), 33 ἢς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι

¹ See below under 'Participles.'
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‘whose children ye now are if ye do well’ (R.V.). We have two examples of what is called the Gnomic aorist in 1\textsuperscript{24} ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος, τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν.

Aorist Imperative (of urgency). Much commoner than the present in 1 P., the latter being used nine times, the former twenty-four. In 2\textsuperscript{17} we have them combined, πάντας τιμήσατε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπάτε, τὸν Θεόν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε. Hort rightly explains the reason for the variety; ‘St. Peter begins with the aorist imperative as the most forcible tense for the exhortation on which it was his present purpose to insist ... the other exhortations might be taken more as a matter of course.’ There was nothing startling to Gentiles in the command to honour the king (i.e. the emperor), to fear God, to love those to whom they were united by a tie of brotherhood; but that honour was due to all, to the publicans and sinners, to the ignorant and debased, was indeed taught by our Lord’s example, but it was a hard saying, not only to Greek philosophers and Roman statesmen, to Jewish priests and Pharisees in the first century, but is still so to the immense majority of civilized and Christian mankind in the twentieth century.

Subjunctive is used in final sentences in the N.T. even though the governing verb may refer to past time; cf. 1 P 3\textsuperscript{9} εἰς τὸν ἐκκλησίαν ἵνα κληρονομήσητε, 3\textsuperscript{18} Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ. After ou μὴ 2\textsuperscript{6}.

Optative. The true optative occurs in 1 P. 1\textsuperscript{2} εἰρήνην πληθυνθείη, as in 2 P. 1\textsuperscript{4}. Its use to express a pure hypothesis is rare in the N.T., but is found in 1 P. 3\textsuperscript{14} εἰ πάσχουτε . . . μακάριοι (ἔστε), 3\textsuperscript{17} κρείττων (ἔστιν) ἀγαθοποιούντας, εἰ θέλου τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιοῦντας. The latter parenthetical use may be compared with 1 Cor. 14\textsuperscript{10} τοσαῦτα, εἰ τύχοι, γένη φανῶν εἰσίν, 15\textsuperscript{87} σπείρεις . . . γυμνῶν κόκκον, εἰ τύχοι. Luke is more free in the use of the optative than the other writers of the N.T.; cf. Acts 24\textsuperscript{19} οὐς ἔδει . . . κατηγορεῖν εἰ τι ἔχομεν πρὸς ἐμέ, ἦδ. 17\textsuperscript{27}, 20\textsuperscript{18}, 27\textsuperscript{12}, etc.

Infinitive after verb: 1\textsuperscript{12} ἐπιθυμοῦσιν παρακεῖσαι, 2\textsuperscript{11} παρακαλῶ ἀπέχεσθαι, 5\textsuperscript{1} μέλλουσα ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι, 5\textsuperscript{8} ζητῶν καταπιεῖν. Accusative with infinitive 5\textsuperscript{9} εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι ‘knowing that the same things are accomplished.’ As the more usual construction of οἴδα in this sense is that which we find in 1\textsuperscript{18} εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοὶ εἰληφόθητε, some understand οἴδα in the
sense in which it is used in 2 P. 2o ὁδεῖν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ρύεσθαι, but Blass (p. 231) prefers the usual translation which he illustrates from Luke 4o ἔχεισιν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτῶν εἶναι. Another example of acc. with inf. is 1 P. 5o ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Infinitive after adjective: 1o ἔτοιμος ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, 4o ἀρκετός ὁ χρόνος κατειργάσθαι).

Epexegetic Infinitive. 2o οἰκοδομεῖσθε . . . εἰς ιεράτευμα ἁγιῶν ἀνενέγκαι θυσίας, 2o οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀγαθοποιοῦντας φιμοῦν. After δόστε 1o.

Infinitive with Article: 4o ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἀρξασθαι, 3o εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν, 4o εἰς τὸ μηκὲτι βιῶσαι, 3o πανσάτω τὴν γλώσσαν ἀπό κακοῦ καὶ χεὶλη τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλων, where the genitive implies purpose, as in Mt. 13o ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρων, see Blass, pp. 284 f.

Infinitive as subject without article: 3o κρεῖττον ἀγαθοποιοῦντας πᾶσιν ἡ κακοποιοῦντας.

Participle used for Imperative 2o (following imperative τιμᾶτε in v. 17) οἱ οἰκεῖα ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς δεσπόταις, 3o ὁμοίως γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἴδιοις ἀνδράσιν (no imperative in the preceding eight verses); 3o (following imperative ἔστω in v. 3) οἱ ἀνδρεῖς ὁμοίως συνοικοῦντες κατὰ γυνῶν, 3o ἡ ἀποδιδόντες κακῶν, 4o (after νήψατε in v. 7) πρὸ πάντων δὲ τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῇ ἔχοντες.

The adjective is sometimes used for a participle, as in 3o τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀγάπατε ἑτοιμοὶ (δυτείς) πρὸς ἀπολογίαν, 4o νήψατε . . . τὴν ἀγάπην ἐκτενῇ ἔχοντες . . . φιλάδεξεν (δυτείς) εἰς ἀλλήλους, and thus gains an imperative force in 3o τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντων ὁμόφρονες συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, εὐσπλαγχνοι, ταπεινόφρονες, μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακῶν.

We have a remarkable instance of the combination of the aorist and perfect participle in 2o ὁ ποτὲ οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαός Θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἡλεμένοι, νῦν δὲ ἑλεμέντες, where it might seem, on a first glance, that the perfect, that is, the completed present, should have been with νῦν; only that νῦν is joined with the aorist in two other passages of 1 P., viz. 1o, 2o. The R.V. has ‘which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy,’ giving a pluperfect force to the perfect participle; and so Hort, ‘the contrast of tense is that between the long antecedent state and the single event of conversion which ended it,’ and he illustrates it from Rom. 11o, οὖσις γὰρ ὡμεῖς ποτὲ ἠπειθήσατε τῷ Θεῷ, νῦν δὲ ἠλείησθε. For
other instances of the perfect participle used with pluperfect force, see Joh. 2νοί διάκονοι ἠδείσαν οί ἡμεληκότες, Acts 18v εὐρών Ἰουνάτου . . . προσφάτως ἐλήλυθοτα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, Heb. 2νοί τὸν δὲ βραχὺ παρ’ ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν . . . ἐστεφανωμένον, quoted by Winer, p. 430.

Voices.

Instead of the classical ἀγάλλω, -ομαι, the N.T. has ἀγαλλιάω, -ομαι, the middle being the form in most common use, as in 1 P. 1v, 4v. In 1v however WH. read ἀγαλλιάτε χαρά ἀνεκλαλήτω, and this form occurs also in Lk. 1v, Apoc. 19v. Perhaps the distinction which I have drawn between αἰτεῖν and αἰτεῖθαι in James 4v may be applicable here. The subjective middle gives prominence to the feeling, the objective active to the action in which it shows itself. The active ἑπικαλέειν is used in the N.T. in the sense of ' to call by name,' as in Mt. 10v εἰ τῶν οἰκοδεσπότην Βεβληθοῦν ἑπεκάλεσαν, the middle in the sense ' invoke,' as in 1 P. 1v εἰ πατέρα ἑπικαλεῖθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτος κρίνοντα 'if ye invoke as Father,' or, as Dr. Bigg prefers, ' invoke the Father,' πατήρ being frequently anarthrous; cf. 3v Κύριον δὲ τῶν Χριστοῦ ἀγάσατε. The active αὐτρῶ is not found in the N.T., the middle being used in the sense ' to ransom,' Lk. 2v, Tit. 1v. The passive ἀπορῶθητε is used in 1 P. 1v in the sense ' were ransomed.' Similarly the middle εὐαγγελίζομαι (very rarely the active εὐαγγελίζω) is used with the accusative either of the thing or the person, in the sense to ' preach good tidings to,' as in 1 P. 1v οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ἠμᾶς, and the passive is used of the word preached in 1 P. 1v, 4v. Another passive of a deponent verb is ἰάθητε 1 P. 2v. The verb ἐπιστρέφω bears the same sense ' to turn ' or ' to be converted ' in the active (2 P. 2v), middle, and passive (1 P. 2v). The passive forms ὑποτάγητε and ταπεινώθητε have a middle force in 5v.

Two curious uses of the active voice are found in 1 P., one where περεύχω might be thought to have a passive force (2v) περεύχει ἐν γραφῇ. The original phrase is περεύχει ἡ γραφή τούτο ' the Scripture contains, has, this,' which is easily changed into the impersonal ' it has in Scripture,' just as ' Scripture saith ' is changed into ' it says in Scripture.' The same passive force attaches to ἡ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς. In 2v we find the unique παρεδίδου τῇ κρίνοντι,
where we should have expected παρεδίδου ἑαυτῶν. We may compare the use of παρέχω in Plato Gorg. 456 B υἱὸν ἔθελον ἢ τεμεῖν ὁ καύσα ανασχέν τῷ ιατρῷ, 475 D γενναῖος τῷ λόγῳ ὀπερ ἰατρῷ παρέχουν ἀποκρίνου, 480 C, Protag. 348 A, Theaet. 191 A, and the full construction in Apol. 33 B ὁμοίως καὶ πλουσίως καὶ πένητι παρέχω ἑαυτῶν ἑρωτάν.

COMPOUND SENTENCES.

(1) Substantival Clauses.
(a) Direct Statement, subordinated to verb of saying. 116 γέγραπται [ὅτι] Ἄγγις ἔσεσθε ὃτι ἐγὼ Ἀγγιος, 26 περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ Ἰδοῦ τίθημι λίθον.
(b) Indirect Statement. 118 ἀπεκαλύφθη ὃτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς διηκόνουν αὐτά, 118 εἰδότες ὃτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς ἐλυτρώθητε, 23 ἐγεύσασθε ὃτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κύριος.
(c) Indirect Question. 111 ἔρανωντες εἰς τίνα καιρὸν ἐδήλοι τὸ πνεῦμα.

(2) Adjectival Clauses, introduced by relative, too numerous to mention.

(3) Adverbial Clauses.
(a) Causal Clause, introduced by διότι 116, 24, 26, by δι 215, 21, 36, 12, 18, 41, 8, 17, 55, 7.
(b) Temporal (a), Local (β), Modal (γ).
(a) 320 ὃτε ἀπεξεδέχετο, (β) does not occur, (γ) 413 καθὼς κοινωνεῖτε χάριτε, 512 πιστοὶ ὃς ὁ λογίζομαι.
(c) Final Clause. After ὅπως, ἐμεῖς λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν ἔστε, ὅπως τὰς ἀρέτας ἐξαγγείλησε; after ἵνα, 17 λυπηθέντες . . . ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον . . . εὐρεθῇ, 22 γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα . . . αὐξηθῆτε, 212 ἀναστροφὴν ἔχουτε καλὴν, ἵνα δοξάσωσι, 91 Χριστὸς ἐπαθεὶς . . . ἵνα ἑπακολουθήσῃ, 124 τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἀνήνεγκεν . . . ἵνα κίσσωμεν, 53 εἰς τούτο ἐκλήσητε, ἵνα κληρονομήσῃ, 318 (ἀγιάσατε) . . . ἵνα καταισχυσθῶσιν, 418 ἀπέθανεν . . . ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγώγῃ, 46 εἰς τούτο εὐγγελίσῃ, ἵνα κριθῶσιν, 411 (διακονεῖτο) ὡς ἕξ ἑσχύνῃ ἢς χαριτε στὸ Θεός, ἵνα δοξάζηται ὁ Θεός, 413 παθήσαις χαίρετε, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει χαρῆτε, 56 ταπεινώθητε . . . ἵνα ἡμᾶς ὑψώσῃ. It will be noticed that in all these cases ἵνα is followed by the subjunctive, even though the principal verb may
be in the past, the final optative never occurring in the N.T. In 3\textsuperscript{1} ἣνα is followed by the future indicative κερδηθήσονται, as in ἀποκ. 3\textsuperscript{9} ποιήσω ἣνα ἥξουσιν, and even in Gal. 2\textsuperscript{4} οἴτινες παρεισ- ἥλθον... ἣνα ἡμᾶς καταδούλώσουσιν. and Acts 21\textsuperscript{24} διαπάνησον ἐτ' αὐτοῖς ἡνα ἐφήσθησαν τὴν κεφαλήν.

(d) Conditional Clause. ei with present ind. both in protasis and apodosis: 2\textsuperscript{19} τούτο χαίρει (ἐστίν), ei ύποφερέι τις λύπας, 4\textsuperscript{14} ei ὁνειδίζεσθε μακάριοι (ἐστε); with pres. ind. in protasis and fut. ind. in apodosis, 4\textsuperscript{17} ei πρῶτον (ἀρχεταί) ἀφ' ὑμῶν τι τὸ τέλος (ἐσται); 4\textsuperscript{18} ei ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σῶζεται, ὁ ἀσεβής ποῦ φανεῖται; pres. ind. in protasis and imperative in apodosis 1\textsuperscript{17} ei πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε... ἐν φόβῳ ἀναστράφητε, 4\textsuperscript{10} ei δὲ ὡς Χριστιανὸς (πάσχει), μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω; fut. ind. both in protasis and in apodosis, 2\textsuperscript{20} ποιον κλέος (ἐσται), ei ἀμαρτάνοντες ὑπομενεῖτε; aor. ind. in protasis, imperative in apodosis, 2\textsuperscript{8} ei ἐγεύσασθε, ἐπιποθήσατε. With pres. opt. in protasis, pres. ind. (understood) in apodosis, 3\textsuperscript{14} ei καὶ πάσχετε μακάριοι (ἐστε), and where the apodosis is dependent on the principal verb as in 3\textsuperscript{17} κρείττον (ἐστιν) ἀγαθοποιοῦντας, ei θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιοῦντας. Here if we liberate the dependent clause, we should have, in the classical construction, ei θέλοι τὸ θέλημα, πάσχομεν ἢν, which subordinated to κρείττον ἐστιν, becomes πασχεῖν. A similar case of dependence is 1\textsuperscript{6} ὅλγον ἄρτι ei δέον λυπηθήνετε, where the conditional sentence, if freed from its surroundings, would be ei δέον ἐστι, λυπηθήσεσθε, but the apodosis is subordinated as a participle to the principal verb ἀγαλλιάσθε.

ἐάν with subjunctive in protasis and fut. ind. in apodosis, 3\textsuperscript{13} τις ὁ κακόσων ὑμᾶς (ἐσται), ἐάν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ξηλωται γένησθε;

NEGATIVES.

μὴ is used with the imperative in 3\textsuperscript{14} μὴ φοβήθητε, cf. 4\textsuperscript{12}, 15, 16; with participle or adverb in imperatival sentence, as 3\textsuperscript{8} μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακῶν, following τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες (ἔστωσαν), 1\textsuperscript{14} (ἐπιπάτε) ὡς μὴ συνσχηματιζόμενοι, 2\textsuperscript{10} ὡς ἐλεύθεροι καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες... ἀλλ' ὡς δοῦλοι Θεοῦ πάντας τιμήσατε, 5\textsuperscript{5} ποιμάνατε ἐπισκοποῦντες μὴ ἀναγκαστῶσ... μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς... μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κληρῶν; also with participles where there is no imperative, as in 1\textsuperscript{8} δὲ ὡς ἐδόντες ἀγαπάτε, εἰς δὲ μὴ ὀρὼντες, πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιάσθε, 'whom, not having
RELATION BETWEEN 1 PETER AND 2 PETER

seen, ye love; on whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing ye rejoice' (R.V.), where οὐ denotes a fact, μὴ a concession; 4
ἐν ὧν ξενίζονται μὴ συντρεχόντων ύμῶν, where μὴ denotes the
cause; 3 Ὑς ἐγενέσθη τέκνα . . . μὴ φοβοῦμενα μηδεμίαν
πτόσιν 'if ye are not put in fear' [for the double negative
compare Mk. 11:14 μηκετί ἐκ σοῦ μηδεῖς καρπῶν φάγοι]; with
infinitive 3' εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι, 4' εἰς τὸ μηκετί βιώσαι.

Sometimes we find οὐ where the principal verb is in the impera-
tive as in 1:22 ἀλλὰ λοις ἀγαπήσατε ἀναγγέλεσθε οὐκ ἐκ
στοράς θυστής ἀλλὰ ἄφθαρτον, 2:18 οἱ οὐκέται ὑποτασσόμενοι
tois δεσπότας, οὐ μόνον τοις ἁγαθοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς σκολοῖς, 3:8
opto ὀχὸ οὐξ ὑποθεῖν κόσμους . . . ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτὸς ἀνθρωπος.
In these cases οὐ negatives, not the principal verb, but a word or clause
dependent upon it. It is also used with a participle in 2:10 οἱ οὐκ
ἐλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἔλεηθέντες, and so with the article or relative,
when it simply negatives a fact, as in 2:10 οἱ ποτε οὐ λαός, and
2:22 δὲ ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν.

οὐ μὴ is used with the subjunctive in 2:6 ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ κατ-
ασχυνθῇ with the negative sense as in 2 P. 1:10.

OTHER ADVERBS AND PARTICLES.

ἀλλὰ is generally used to contrast a positive with a negative
conception as in 1:16 μὴ συναχθήσατε . . . ἀλλὰ, 1:19 οὐ
θυσται . . . ἀλλὰ τιμῷ οἱ ματι, 1:28 οὐκ ἐκ στοράς θυστής ἀλλὰ
ἀθάνατον, 2:16 μὴ ὡς ἐπικαλύμμα ἐχοντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀλλ'] ὡς
Θεοῦ δοῦλοι, 2:18 οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ, 3:4 οὐχ ὁ ἐξωθεὶς κόσμος,
ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτός, 3:21 οὐ σαρκίς ἀπόθεσις . . . ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως
ἐπερώτημα, 4:1 ὕπαται ἐπιθυμίας, ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ βιώσαι,
4:12 ὑπὲξίζεσθε . . . ἀλλὰ χαίρετε, 5:2,3 μὴ ἀναγκαστοῖ, ἀλλὰ
ἐκουσίως, ἢμ. μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς, ἀλλὰ προθύμως, μηδὲ ὡς κατα-
κυρεύουσι . . . ἀλλὰ τύποι ἡμῶν. The negative side is less
prominent in 2:20 ποιον κλέος εἰ ἀμαρτάνουτε καὶ κολαφίζωμενοι
ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ'] εἰ ἀγαθοποιοῦσιν ὑπομενεῖ, τούτο χάρις,
which is equivalent to 'suffering when guilty is not praiseworthy,
but suffering when innocent is praiseworthy.' In 3:14 ἡς οὐ
κακώσων υμᾶς, ἐὰν τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ ἤλωται γένησθε; ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ
πάσχετε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακαρίω (ἐστε), the opposition is not
the simple contradictory 'not this, but that,' but the contrast of a
higher with a lower stage, not a mere escape from evil (τὸς οὐ κακῶ-
σων), but positive blessedness (μακαρίω). With the contradictory
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οὐκ—ὦλλα may be compared the contrasting μὲν—δὲ, which is common in the Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles of St. Paul, and that to the Hebrews, but is not found elsewhere in the N.T. except once in James, thrice in Jude, and in the following passages of 1 P., 120 (ἑλπῳ ὅτι άματε Χριστοῦ) προοεκομίζεσθαι μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φαινομένης δὲ ἐπὶ ἑσχάτου τῶν χρόνων, 24 άθικὸν ὠπὸ ανθρώπων μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμαζόμενον, παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ ἐκκλητόν, 210 οὐ ποτε οὐ λαὸς, νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἢλημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἑλημένοις, 218 θανατῳθεῖς μὲν σαρκὶ, ζωοποιηθεῖς δὲ πνεύματι, 218 ἵνα κρυθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ανθρώπους σαρκὶ. ζωοὶ δὲ κατὰ Θεοῦ πνεύματι. Sometimes μὲν is omitted, as in 17 χρυσόν τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, διὰ τυρός δὲ δοκιμαζομένου, 214 (πεμπτομένου) εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν, ἐπαινοῦν δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν, cf. Jelf § 767. In 1 P. we, not unfrequently, find δὲ opposed, as a weakened ὄλλα, to a preceding negative as in 18 εἰς δύν ἄρτῳ μη ὀφρύνεσθε, πιστεύσετε δὲ ἀγαλλιάτε, 112 όντες ἐναυσίς, οὐν δὲ δηικόνων, 123 οὐκ ἥπειλεν, παρεδίδουν δὲ τῷ κρίνων, 139 μὴ ἀποδίδουσι λοιποῖα, τούσαντον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες, 131,16 τὸν φῶς αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθήτε, Κύριον δὲ τῶν Χριστῶν ἀγίασατε, 416 μὴ ἀιτίον ἑσθοῦσθαι, δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν Θεὸν. Occasional examples may also be found in the Acts 129 οὐκ ἤδει ... ἐδόξει δὲ, 1214 οὐκ ἰνοξε ... ἐνδράμονος δὲ, and in some of the Epistles, as Eph. 428, 511 μη ... μᾶλλον δὲ, but not in 2 Pet. or Jude. δὲ καὶ is not found in 1 P.

γάρ is used 10 times in 1 P., 15 times in 2 P.

καὶ in the sense of 'also' or 'even' occurs 16 times in 1 P., 8 times in 2 P.

ποὺ occurs once in 1 P. 418 ὁ ἁσεβὴς ποὺ φανεῖται; where it has the same rhetorical force as in 2 P. 34.

Dr. Bigg has called attention (p. 4) to the 'refined accuracy' of the use of ὡς in 1 P. 119 ὡς ἀμυνόμοι ἀμώμοι καὶ ἀστίλου Χριστοῦ, 211 παρακάλω ὡς παροίκους ἀπέκσεθαι (ὕμας) τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμίων, 37 συνοικοῦσθε ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σχεῖσθαι τῷ γυναικεῖῳ (σχεῖσθαι), 216 μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχουστε τὴς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, in all of which the comparison precedes the thing which is compared to it. He illustrates this from Heb. 127 ὡς σοί ὑμῖν προσφέρεσαι ὁ Θεὸς and Plato Legg. x. 905 B ὡς ἐν κατοπτροίς ταῖς πράξεσιν, where Stallbaum quotes Rep. iii. 414 έ ὡς περὶ μητρὸς ἡς χώρας ἐν ἦ εἰς βουλευόμεναι and other examples. The more usual order of words is found in 1 P. 212 καταλαλούσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν. In 412 ὡς is used with the gen. abs.
eíte—eíte is not found in N.T. except in the Epistles of Paul and in 1 P. 215, 14 υποτάγητε πάσην ἀνθρωπίνην κτίσει, εἰτε βασιλει... eíte ἡγεμόσιν. The phrase is properly used with a finite verb, as in 2 Cor. 1ε eíte θλιβόμεθα... eíte παρακαλούμεθα, but the verb is more frequently omitted, both in the N.T. (as in 1 Cor. 3ετη: πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἑστίν, εἰτε Παύλος εἰτε Ἄπολλων), and in classical Greek.

ώστε followed by infinitive 1 P. 1ετη, by imperative 419 ὀστή αἱ πάσχοντες... παρατιθέσθωσαν τὸς ψυχᾶς.

ELLIPSIS.

Of verb. eἰμί: 220 ποῦν κλέος (ἐστίν), εἰ ὑπομενεῖτε; 313 τὸς ὁ κακῶσον ὑμᾶς (ἐστίν); 31ε καὶ πάσχοντε μακάριοι (ἐστε), 41ε καιρός (ἐστι) τοῦ ἀρξασθαι, 41ε ὁνειδιζόμησθε μακάριοι (ἐστε), 31ε ὁβαλμοὶ Κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαιοῦσιν (εἰσίν), 1ε εὐλογητός (ἐστιν) ὁ Θεός,

Of other verbs. 1ε Πέτρος ἐκλεκτοῖς (χαίρειν λέγει), 41ει τὶς λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια (λαλεῖται), εἰ τὶς διακονεῖ, ὥς εἰ ἰσχύος ἂς χαιρεῖ

Of noun (subject of infinitive). 21ε παρακαλῶ (ὑμᾶς) ἀπέχεσθαι, (of object) 22ε παρείδιον (ἐαντὸν) τῷ κρίνοντι, 3ε ὃς ἀσθενεστέρος σκευεὶ τῷ γυναικείῳ (σκευεῖ) ἀπονέμοντες τιμῆν.

PLEONASM.


ANACOLUTHON.

1 P. 21ε, 12 ἀγαπητοὶ, παρακαλῶ ὃς παροίκους... ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν... τῆν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐχοῦντες καλὴν. Here we should have had ἔχοντας to agree with the (understood) subject of ἀπέχεσθαι; but the periphrastic imperative παρακαλῶ ἀπέχεσθαι suggests the simple imperative ἀπέχεσθε, just as in 2 P. 3ε τῆς διαφελῶ ὑμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν μυθηθήναι suggests the simple μυθηθήτε and is followed by the nominative γυναικοῦντες.
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Asyndeton, confirmatory, 1 P. 58 γρηγορήσατε ὁ ἀντίδικος περιπατεῖ ζητῶν καταπιεῖν, where some MSS. insert ὅτι.

Reiteration.1

As in 2 P. so in 1 P. we find a marked liking for iteration. Thus ἀποκαλύπτω and ἀποκάλυψις occur in 15,7,12,13, ἡ ἀποκάλυψις τῆς δόξης in 413, cf. 51; δοκίμων and δοκιμαζόμενον in 17; δόξα in 17,11, δεδομένη in 18; σωτηρία in 15,8,10; ἐξερανώνω in 110, ἑραννώ in 111; ἄγιος four times in 115,16, also in 25,9; ἀναστροφή in 115,18, 212, 31,2,16; ἐλπίς (3), ἐλπίζω (2); ἀναγεννάω (2); ἀμαρτία (6); λόγος (7); χάρις (10); ἀγαθός (7); ἄφθαρτος (3); ἔποςττευω (2); εὐαγγελίζομαι (3); ἰεράτευμα (2); κακοποιός (3); κρίνω (4); λίθος (5); νήφω (3); νεκρός (4); ὁλόγος (4); πᾶσχω (12); συνείδησις (3); τέλος (4); ὑπακοή (3); ὑποτάσσομαι (6); φόβος (5); φοβέομαι (3).

Rhythm.2

Perhaps no other book of the N.T. has such a sustained stateliness of rhythm as 1 P. I take as an example 169 ἐν φράσει ἀγαλλιάσθε | ὁλόγων ἄρτι, εἰ δὲν λυπηθήστε, ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς | ἦν τὸ δοκίμων ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως, τοὺς ἀπολλυμένους, διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζόμενου, εὑρεθῇ, εἰς ἐπαινόν καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμήν, ἐν ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰησοῦ Ἰουστοῦ, Ἰουστοῦ, ὡς ὁ θεός Ἰουστός ἐς δὲν ἄρτι μὴ ὀρθῶντες, πιστεύοντες δὲ ἁγαλλιάτε, ἔκτισιν ἀνεκκαλυτῷ καὶ δεδομένῃ | κομιζόμενον τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως | σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν. The reader will notice here the repetition of l(14), p(12), d(8), and of the syllables in ἀπολλυμένου, δοκιμαζόμενου, δν., εἰς δν., ἰδομένες, ὀρθότατες, πιστεύοντες, ἀγαπατές, ἀγαλλιάτε.

What do we gather from this survey of the grammar and style of the two Epistles in respect to identity of authorship? There can be no doubt, I think, that the style of 1 P. is on the whole clearer and simpler than that of 2 P., but there is not that chasm between them which some would try to make out. As to the use of this article, they resemble one another more than they resemble any other book of the N.T. Both use the genitive absolute

1 See pp. Ivii f. 2 For notation, see note on p. lix.
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correctly. There is no great difference in their use of the cases, or of the verbs, except that 1 P. freely employs the articular infinitive, which is not found in 2 P. The accusative with the infinitive is found in both. The accumulation of prepositions is also common to both. The optative is more freely used in 1 P. than in 2 P. In final clauses 2 P. conforms to classical usage in attaching the subjunctive to ἢνα, while 1 P. in one place has the future indicative. 2 P. is also more idiomatic in the use of such elliptical forms as ἕως οὗ, ἐφ' ὅσον, ἀφ' ἧς. On the other hand 1 P. shows special elegance in his use of ὡς in comparisons, and emphasizes the contrast between the aorist and the present imperative by coupling τιμήσατε with τιμᾶτε in 27.

Nor is 1 P. quite free from the ambiguities and the difficulties which are objected to in 2 P. Compare what is said above as to the relative and its antecedent, the construction of περιέχω and παραδίδωμι, not to mention phrases such as 28 τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα, 36 μὴ φοβούμεθαι μηδεμίαν πτώσιν, 39,31 διεσώθησαν δὲ θάνατος: δὲ καὶ ὡμάς ἀντίτυπον ἐν σώζει βαπτίσιμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσιν ῥύπου, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεόν. In the last I am disposed to agree with Hort that we should read ὑ (or else οὗ) for the MS. δ. The latter gives an extraordinarily complicated expression, 'which thing (water), an antitype, now saves you, viz. baptism,' which we may seek to explain as follows, 'which thing, in the form of an antitype, now saves you,' but what we want is 'the antitype to which (sustaining water of the Deluge) now saves you, viz. baptism.' Again the last verses of the Epistle teem with difficulties, arising in part no doubt from our ignorance of the circumstances alluded to. Such are τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς λογίζομαι, which seems to suggest that the writer was not quite sure how far Silvanus was to be trusted; ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἄληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, which is, I think, rightly explained to mean 'testifying that Paul's teaching, embodied in this letter, is the true grace of God'; but the expression is far from clear. And the phrases that follow, ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ νῦν μου, are still matters of controversy.

On the whole I should say that the difference of style is less marked than the difference in vocabulary, and that again less marked than the difference in matter, while above all stands the great difference in thought, feeling, and character, in one word of personality.
CHAPTER V

Comparison between the Peter of the Gospels and Acts and the Peter of the Two Epistles

The author of 1 P. is steeped, as we have seen, in the Gospel story, which possesses his mind and heart. Almost every sentence he has written calls up in our minds some word or some scene, in which His Master is concerned. No one could say this of 2 P. It may be interesting however to go further and inquire whether the character of Peter as we know it from the Gospels agrees with the character of the author of 1 P., as it is shown in that epistle; because it is perhaps conceivable that 1 P. might have been written by some other disciple who had had Peter's experience and yet was not Peter himself. But is it really conceivable that any other could have shared Peter's very unusual experiences? And looking at the question from the other side, is it consistent with the deep earnestness, the intense affection, and the transparent simplicity of 1 P. that it should be written by one who was not uttering his own genuine experience? In the present day we find no difficulty in supposing that the drama of Job was written by a man who was not Job, and that the book of Wisdom was written by one who was not Solomon, though he claims as his own in chapters 7 and 9 the experiences ascribed to Solomon in the historical books of the O.T. We see nothing to be surprised or shocked at in the appearance of pseudonymous writings of Peter in the second century. Supposing that the evidence should eventually lead us to conclude that what we know as the Second Epistle of St. Peter was one of these pseudonymous writings, would that prove it unworthy to hold a place in our canon? This question will come on for consideration in another
chapter. At present I will only say that, while in my opinion the author is an eminently wise and good man, and the writing itself one that deserves our careful attention, yet the voice does not sound to me like the voice of the author of 1 P., nor does the teaching agree with my idea of a genuine product of the Apostolic age. But though we may feel satisfied that 1 P. is a sufficient guarantee for its own authenticity, still it will be interesting to compare our impressions of the Peter of the Gospels and the Peter of the Epistle; and it seems to me all the more necessary to do this in some detail because the picture given of the former by the latest editor of the Epistles is not, to my mind, in harmony with the facts of the case. Dr. Bigg says (p. 54) that St. Peter 'was a married, uneducated labourer. Such men . . . are tender-hearted but slow. They have seen too much of the hard realities of life to be greatly elated or greatly depressed . . . St. Peter is often spoken of as ardent and impulsive, but our Lord called him Cephas "Rock," and the fiery apostles were James and John. He was often the first to speak, because he was the leader and mouthpiece of the Twelve.' 'We may imagine Peter as a shy, timid, embarrassed man, apt on a sudden emergency to say and do the wrong thing, not because he was hasty, but because he was not quick.' 'His defect had been want of readiness and decision.'

If this is really a true picture of St. Peter, how are we to explain the fact that he was chosen by our Lord to be 'the leader and mouthpiece' of the Apostles? I must say that there is scarcely a single point in this character-sketch which agrees with the impression I have myself formed of the man Peter, an impression which is, I think, shared by Bible students generally, whether learned or unlearned.

Take first the phrase 'uneducated labourer.' Peter was a fisherman, an occupation fitted beyond all others to call out energy, promptitude, courage, and comradeship, a life full of adventure and vicissitude bringing him into contact with a great variety of races and characters, Jews and Gentiles, Greeks and Romans, in fact a life the very opposite to that of our ordinary agricultural labourer. Next as to education. The Jews of that time seem to me to have had a better system of elementary education than we have yet got in England, perhaps better than we shall ever get. Those who lived in the neighbourhood of the Sea of Tiberias had the further
advantage of knowing two languages.\footnote{See my Introduction to St. James, p. xliii.} Above all, as we see from the discourses in the Acts, Peter was well trained in the history and literature of his own country, had a mind open to all high ideas, and was ready at once to act upon them. He had also, as Dr. Bigg allows, a most tender and affectionate heart. So far from the dull stoicism which he is supposed to share with the labourer, he was a man of very quick sensibilities, as we may see from his behaviour after the miraculous draft of fishes (Lk. 5\(\text{v}\)), his walking on the water (Mt. 14\(\text{viii}\)), his refusal to allow his Master to wash his feet (Joh. 13\(\text{v}\)), his bitter tears after his denial, and that most touching answer 'Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee.' I come now to the most paradoxical part of the whole description. St. Peter was 'shy, timid, and embarrassed.' Omitting the middle epithet, we may perhaps allow that the other qualities might be ascribed with some plausibility to a Moses or a Jeremiah, but to Peter? Peter, who was always so prompt and ready in thought and expression, at times indeed too ready to speak without due consideration; but whose hasty word was always the outcome of a noble and generous nature?\footnote{See my edition of St. James, p. 201.}

The remark that Peter was 'apt on a sudden emergency to say and do the wrong thing' is hardly to be reconciled with the fact that on two of the most critical moments of the life of our Lord, when many were tempted to go backwards, it was Peter who answered the appeal to the disciples, 'Will ye also go away?' (Joh. 6\(\text{v}\)), 'Who say ye that I am?' (Mt. 16\(\text{v}\)), by the prompt word of loving trust, in the one case, 'Lord, to whom shall we go?' Thou hast the words of eternal life,' in the other, 'Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God,' the last response drawing from the Saviour His highest commendation 'Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.' If I were called upon to analyse St. Peter's character I should say that he was perhaps the most human of all the Apostles, natural, large-hearted, impulsive, spontaneous, with none of the cramping self-consciousness of the shy man, and without a particle of guile. Though capable of pondering over what was said to him, he more often spoke and acted on the spur of the moment at the prompting of his own generous heart. He was full of initiative, full of confidence, easily elated, but really humble, quick to own where
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he had been in the wrong, but never despairing; a reverent and
devoted, yet a thoroughly free-spoken follower of his Master, as
well as a loved and trusted leader of men. Our first introduction
to him (Joh. 14) shows him to be one who was looking for the
Messiah. He is quick to lay his doubts and difficulties before
Jesus: 'How oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive
him?' On hearing the words 'Whither I go, ye cannot come,' he
is the one to ask 'Whither goest thou? Why cannot I follow thee
now?' He is not abashed or silent in presence of Moses and
Elijah on the holy mount. He even ventures to rebuke Jesus
when He foretold His approaching death, just after He had
commended Peter's confession 'Thou art the son of God.' His
positiveness, combined with docility and readiness to be corrected
and instructed, is seen in Joh. 13, 'Lord, dost thou wash my feet?
Thou shalt never wash my feet'; and then, on hearing the
explanation of Jesus, 'Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands
and my head.' So in Acts 10:34, on hearing the voice 'Rise, Peter,
kill and eat,' he breaks out with 'Not so, Lord; for I have never
eaten anything that is common and unclean.' But his behaviour
to Cornelius shortly afterwards shows how thoroughly he had
imbibed the spirit of the words 'What God has cleansed, make
not thou common.' His self-confidence is seen in such words as,
'I will lay down my life for thee,' 'Though all men should be
offended, yet will not I,' 'Even if I must die with thee, yet will I
not deny thee.' Nor was this mere empty boasting. When the
armed band of the chief priests appeared, he drew his sword and
attacked them. How was it, then, that his courage so soon failed
him? We must remember the circumstances of the case. A few
days before, Jesus had entered Jerusalem in triumph amid the
Hosannas of the multitude. He had spoken mysterious words
about the coming of the kingdom of God: he had warned his
disciples to provide themselves with swords. But now he bids
Peter put up his sword into its sheath: he tells his disciples to
leave him alone with the powers of darkness. And at the word
they all forsook him and fled, two only venturing to follow at a
distance into the Judgment-Hall. Under these circumstances, is it
right to regard the denial as proving timidity in Peter? Is Elijah
to be called timid because he fled from Jezebel, and was for a
brief space inclined to despair of the triumph of right? Both
Elijah and Peter were suffering from reaction: the spirit was
willing, but the flesh was weak. It is as if soldiers whose courage had been strained to the highest pitch at the prospect of leading a forlorn hope were suddenly told that their captain had changed his mind, and that they were now to surrender to the enemy. Despair and bewilderment would succeed to high-wrought courage, and so it was with Peter. But one look of his Master's was sufficient to recall him to himself. His deep repentance was followed by no false shame on his own part, and by no reproaches on the part of his fellow-disciples. He is the one to whom the Magdalene first brings the news of the empty tomb. He and John are the first of the Apostles to visit the tomb. At the sea of Tiberias we find Peter as usual taking the initiative, and the others as usual following, 'I go a fishing,' 'We also go with thee.' Impetuous as ever, on hearing that it was 'the Lord,' who had foretold the miraculous draft of fishes, Peter leaps into the sea and makes his way to Jesus on the shore. One phrase, in our Lord's colloquy with him, suggests his energetic, independent character: 'When thou wast young, thou walkedst whither thou wouldest.' The question about John, which followed immediately afterwards, shows how quickly he resumed his usual tranquillity and his thought for his friends.

The beginning of the Acts shows Peter in a position of unquestioned authority, even before the day of Pentecost, in regard to the election of Matthias. When he denounces the Jews for having crucified the Holy and Just one (cf. 1 P. 3:18), the Prince of Life (Acts 2:36, 3:13), his tone is as decided and unflinching as that of the Baptist. At the same time he uses in their behalf the plea uttered on the cross 'I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers' (3:17), reminding them (as Joseph reminded his brethren in Gen. 45:6) that God had made use of their evil action to fulfil His eternal purpose declared by the prophets, that Christ should suffer and be raised from the dead and received up into heaven till the time of the restoration of all things. He calls upon them to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. He testifies before the Sanhedrin that the miracle done to the impotent man was done in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, whom they, the rulers, had crucified, but whom God had raised from the dead. When the Apostles were charged to keep silence, and when they were brought again before the
Sanhedrin for disobedience, it was Peter who on each occasion answered 'We must obey God rather than men: We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard': 'We are witnesses of these things, and so is the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him' (Acts 4:19, 5:29-32).

I pause here for a moment to consider how far this early teaching of Peter agrees with that which we find in 1 P. It will be seen at once that the main features of both are the same. The Apostles are sent to witness to the fulfilment of prophecy in the sufferings and death of the Messiah, in his Resurrection and Ascension, and in the coming of the Holy Ghost (1 P. 1:21, Acts 15:22, 2:22, 3:15, 10:35-41). The promise is to the Jews, and to all that are far off, as many as the Lord our God shall call. We may notice one or two minuter agreements, e.g. 5:41 ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες ὅτι κατηχεῖσθεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὄνόματος ἀτιμασθήσεται compared with 1 P. 4:12-16: and the quotation from Ps. 118:22 in Acts 4:11 which is repeated in 1 P. 2:7.

Returning to the Acts we find in the story of Ananias and his wife a severity which we might be inclined to think more after the spirit of Elijah than of Christ (cf. Lk. 9:54f.). But a different light is thrown upon it by 1 Cor. 5:5, where St. Paul speaks of a judgment 'in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, ye being gathered together and my spirit . . . to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' It is plain how necessary it was to guard the purity of the early Christian community from the idea that God's favour could be purchased by gifts; how necessary it was to instil into them the opposite idea, that the Father must be worshipped in spirit and in truth. In the same way the idea of the perfect holiness of God was taught to Israel of old by the command 'If even a beast touch the mountain it shall be stoned.' But the later history of the Church shows plainly that such power could not be safely entrusted to any but Apostles. A similar severity is seen in the story of Simon Magus, where Peter's indignation at the proposal to buy the gifts of God for money breaks out in the words 'Thy silver perish with thee,' 'thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter.' It may have been his recollection of this conduct on the part of one who had just been baptized, which led Peter to distinguish so carefully between the ἀπόθεσις ρύπου and the ἐπερώτημα συνειδησεως ἀγαθῆς in baptism (1 P. 3:21). I have
already referred to the story of Cornelius in Acts 10. Particularly deserving of notice are v. 28 ἀθέμιτον ἔστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουνάχφ εἰσίν ἡ ἀπολλάνθησις, compared with 1 P. 45, the only other passage in the N.T. in which the word ἀθέμιτος occurs; and the succeeding words of the same verse, 'God hath showed to me that I should not call any man common or unclean,' which may be compared with 1 P. 217 'Honour all men.' Again Acts 1034 ἐπὶ ἀληθείας καταλαμβανόμει δέι οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήμματις ὁ Θεός may be compared with 1 P. 117 εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμματος κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστων ἔργων; and 1042 'This is he which is ordained of God to be judge of quick and dead' with 1 P. 46 ἀποδώσασθαι λόγον τῷ ἐποίμον ἔχοντι κρίναι ζωῆς καὶ νεκρῶν. The phrase ἱσότιμων πίστις in 2 P. 11 may be illustrated by Acts 1047 'Who can forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?' also with 1118, 17, 18. The last place in the Acts in which mention is made of Peter is ch. 15 where he supports the action of Paul and Barnabas, and speaks of the obligation of the Jewish law as 'a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear. But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus we shall be saved even as they' (the Gentiles). This is the first occasion on which we find the word χάρις used by Peter. It was no doubt borrowed by him from Paul, and occurs frequently in 1 P. The view of the Law as a yoke is also Pauline, and agrees with the absence of any mention of law in either epistle, but is hardly reconcilable with the description of Peter as a disciplinarian.

To these references in the Acts we must add one from Gal. 211 foll. Shortly after the meeting of the Council at Jerusalem, Peter was staying at Antioch, mixing freely with the Gentile converts and sharing their meals; but when certain members of the Jewish Church came there, professing to speak with the authority of James, Peter with the other Jews, including even Barnabas, separated himself from the Gentiles 'fearing them that were of the circumcision,' and was severely rebuked by Paul for dissembling his real views. There can be little doubt that Paul was in the right here; yet there was no surrender of essentials on the part of Peter. There was nothing in his action here to contradict his declaration that God made no difference between Jew and Gentile, both being alike saved by faith, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. His fault was that he failed to see the full
consequence of this acknowledgment. Probably he regarded the eating with Gentiles as a question of expediency, and endeavoured to decide it by acting on the Pauline principle of becoming all things to all men. If Paul was ready to abstain from meat for fear of offending the weak brother, was it so very wrong of Peter to abstain from eating with Gentiles for fear of hurting the conscience of the Jewish converts?

To sum up again the main features of St. Peter's character, as they are presented to us in the rest of the N.T. We have seen that he is distinguished from all the Apostles by his simplicity and naturalness and by the strong and ardent feeling, which shows itself especially in his intense affection for his Master. How does this agree with what we gather from the two Epistles? We should expect that the writing of such a man would be characterized by a natural and simple eloquence, not entering into elaborate arguments, as St. Paul does, but appealing throughout to the hearts of his readers, dwelling upon the salvation wrought by Christ, and holding up before them His life as the example which they should follow. This is exactly what, it seems to me, we find in 1 P. His mind is fixed on the sufferings of Christ: they form the subject of prophecy (1:11); it is through them that the Christians to whom he writes were redeemed from their vain manner of life handed down from their fathers (1:19); servants are to suffer patiently because Christ suffered for them, without reviling or threatening (2:21-24); it is better to suffer for well-doing than for evil-doing, because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God (3:17, 18); since Christ suffered in the flesh we should arm ourselves with the same mind (4:1); we should rejoice if we are partakers of His sufferings (4:18); as a fellow-elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, as well as a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed, the writer exhorts the elders to make themselves examples to the flock (5:3). Turn now to 2 P.: neither style nor matter can be called simple. It is not altogether without eloquence, but the eloquence is elaborate and often artificial, as in the octave of virtues (1:5-6). In many passages the thought is too subtle to be easily followed, as in the introductory verses. Nothing is said of joy, which is so conspicuous in 1 P. (χαρά, χαίρω, ἀγαλλιάω); instead of it we are urged to aim at knowledge and further knowledge of God and Christ (γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις), while in 1 P. γνῶσις alone is used, and that only once in
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3', where it is equivalent to practical good sense. Again 2 P. shows a preference for the general and abstract above the concrete and particular; and this often leads to ambiguity, as in 2:10-12. Even where he goes into further particulars than 1 P. he does not always gain in impressiveness. Thus 1 P. says nothing in regard to the physical accompaniments of the second Advent; but his allusions to the inheritance incorruptible and undefiled reserved in heaven for you, who are guarded by the power of God through faith for a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time (18); his reference to the joy unspeakable and full of glory, produced by the consciousness that they were already receiving the end of their faith, the salvation of their souls (18); his earnest warning to his readers to be sober and watch unto prayer, because the end of all things is at hand (4'), suggest far stronger motives than the passing away of the heavens, the dissolution of the elements, and the destruction of the earth by fire, on which 2 P. dilates (3:10-13).

It is only when we pass away from the earthquake and the fire to the still small voice in 3:18, 'according to his promise we look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness,' and again in 3:18, 'Grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ,' that we recognize an appeal as powerful as that in 1 P.

Speaking generally, I think we may say that, as the Apostle Peter stands in an intermediate position between the Bishop of Jerusalem and the Apostle to the Gentiles, so the First Epistle, which bears his name and is instinct with his spirit, is intermediate between the Epistle of James and the Epistle to the Romans; while the second Epistle shows signs of careful study of 1 P. and of the Epistle of Jude, but has very little affinity with the Peter of the Gospels and the Acts.1

---

1 Harnack (Gesch. d. alt-Chr. Literatur, part ii. vol. i. p. 451), if I understand him rightly, disputes the authenticity of 1 P. mainly, if not solely, on the ground that one who had been guilty of denying his Master could never have dared to speak of himself as 'a witness of the sufferings of Christ and a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed' (5'). I do not see how such an objection can have any weight with those who accept the story of the renewed commission given by the Lord to the penitent Apostle, and of the latter's hesitating leadership of the infant Church. With equal reason it might be alleged that he who felt himself unworthy to be called an Apostle, because he had persecuted the Church, could never have dared to hold his own against the authority of the older Apostles.
CHAPTER VI

AUTHENTICITY OF THE EPISTLE OF JUDE AND OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER CONSIDERED

External Evidence.

Both Epistles were recognized as canonical in the Third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397 (Westcott on the Canon, p. 566), with which agree Jerome (Westcott, p. 580) and Augustine (De Doctr. Christiana ii. 12). Jerome however (De vir. ill. iv.) mentions that, owing to the use made of the apocryphal Enoch, the epistle of Jude a plerisque reiicitur. So Eusebius H.E. ii. 23, 'Not many old writers have mentioned the Epistle of James, nor yet the Epistle of Jude, which is also one of the seven so-called Catholic Epistles, though we know that these have been publicly used with the rest in most churches.' Ib. iii. 25, 'Among the controverted books, which are nevertheless well known and recognized by most, we class the Epistle circulated under the name of James and that of Jude.' Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386 A.D.) acknowledged both Jude and 2 P. In Asia Minor both Jude and 2 P. were recognized as canonical by Gregory Naz. (d. c. 391). In Alexandria Didymus (d. 394) wrote commenting on the Catholic Epistles, especially defending Jude from the attacks made upon him as having made use of apocryphal books. Athanasius (d. 373) in his list of the books of the N.T. 'agrees exactly with our own Canon' (Westcott, p. 520). Origen (In Matt. x. 17) says of Jude ἓγραψεν ἐπιστολήν, ὄλογοςτιχον μέν, πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῶν τῆς οὐρανίου χάριτος ἐρρωμένων λόγων. In the same treatise (xvii. 30) he quotes Jude 6, adding words which signify that it was not universally received, ei δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰουδᾶ πρόσοιτο

1 For further details compare Dr. Chase's excellent articles on Peter and Jude in Hastings' D. of B.
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tis ἐπιστολήν. Clement of Alexandria commented on Jude in his Hypotyposes (Eus. H.E. vi. 14)—the comment is still extant in the Latin translation—and quotes him by name (Pead. iii. 44, 45) with commendation, διδασκαλικώτατα ἑκτίθεται τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν κρινομένων. He quotes him again Strom. iii. 11, and, without naming him, in Strom. vi. 65. Tertullian (De Cult. Fem. 3) says 'Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet.' It appears in the Muratorian Canon (c. 170 A.D.), 'Epistola sane Judae et superscripti Johannis duae in catholicis habentur.' Theophilus of Antioch (ad Autol. ii. 15) seems to allude to Jude 13 in the words quoted in my note on that verse. Athenagoras (c. 180) speaks (§ 24, p. 130 Otto) of the fallen angels in a manner which suggests acquaintance with Jude v. 6, ὀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρή-ςαντας τὴν έαυτῶν ἀρχήν. (Of the angels some) ἐμείναν ἐφ’ οἷς αὐτοὺς ἐποιήσεν καὶ διέταξεν ὁ Θεός, οἱ δὲ ἐνύβρισαν καὶ τῇ τῆς οὐσίας ὑποστάσει καὶ τῇ ἀρχῇ, and he adds that he asserts this on the authority of the prophets, which may perhaps refer both to Enoch and Jude. The form of salutation used in Jude 2 Ἑλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη is found in Mart. Polyc. Inscr. and Polyc. ad Phil. The earliest reference however to Jude is probably to be found in 2 Pet., which, as we have seen in the preceding Chapter I, is largely copied from him. There appears also to be an allusion to it in Didaché ii. 7 οὗ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἅλλα οὖς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, περὶ δὲ ἄν προσεύξῃ, οὖς δὲ ἄγαπήσεις, cf. J. v. 22. Jude's epistle was included in the Old Latin Version, but not in the Peshitto.

The evidence in favour of 2 P. is far more scanty. It is not found either in the Old Latin or in the Old Syrian Version, both of which must be combined, says Westcott (Canon, p. 294), in order 'to obtain a complete idea of the judgment of the Church.' 'By enlarging our view so as to comprehend the whole of Christendom, and to unite the different lines of Apostolic tradition, we obtain, with one exception, a perfect New Testament:' that exception is the second Epistle of St. Peter, which 'wants the earliest public sanction of ecclesiastical use as an Apostolic work.' Westcott points out (p. 288) that 'if it was at once received into the Canon like the first Epistle, it would in all probability have been translated (into Latin) by the same person.' 'When, on the contrary, it appears that the Latin text of the Epistle not only exhibits constant and remarkable differences from the text of other parts of
the Vulgate, but also differs from the first Epistle in the rendering of words common to both: when it further appears that it differs no less clearly from the Epistle of St. Jude in those parts which are almost identical in the Greek: then the supposition that it was received into the Canon at the same time with them at once becomes unnatural. 1

Dr. Chase (in Hastings' D. of B. p. 804) draws a similar argument from the double sections, an older and a later one, contained in the Vatican codex. This twofold division is found in all the Catholic Epistles excepting 2 Pet., from which we conclude that the ancestor of B, to which these sections were first attached, did not contain 2 Pet. 2

The judgment of Eusebius as to the canonicity of the writings attributed to St. Peter is given in H.E. iii. 3: Πέτρου μὲν οὖν ἐπιστολὴ μιᾷ ἡ λεγομένη αὐτοῦ προτέρα ἀνωμολόγηται, ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ οἱ πάλαι πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλέκτῳ ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακέχρηται συγγράμμασι. τὴν δὲ φερομένην αὐτοῦ δευτέραν οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκον μὲν εἶναι παρειλήφαμεν, δόμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρῆσιμος φανείσα μετὰ τῶν ἅλλων ἐσπονδάθη γραφῶν. τὸ γε μὴν τῶν ἐπιεκκλημένων αὐτοῦ Πράξεων καὶ τὸ κατ' αὐτῶν ὄνομασμένον Ἐυαγγέλιον, τὸ τε λεγόμενον Κήρυγμα καὶ τὴν καλουμένην Ἀποκάλυψιν οὖν δόλως ἐν καθολικῷ λαῷ παραδεδομένα, ὁτι μήτε ἄρχαίων μήτε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς συγγραφεῖς ταῖς εἰ αὐτῶν συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίαι... ἄλλα τὰ μὲν όνομαζόμενα Πέτρου, δὸν μὲν μόνην γνησίαν ἐγὼν ἐπιστολῆν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πάλαι πρεσβύτεροις ὁμολογούμενην, τοιαῦτα. 2 P. is included in the catalogues (quoted by Westcott pp. 572–575) of Greg. Naz. (d. 391), of Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), of Athanasius (d. 373). The last (Dia. de Trin. i. 164) quotes (18) ἡδὲ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ as from the Catholic Epistles; and (14) θείας κωσμονόμο φύσεως in

1 In his note Westcott gives examples (a) of 'Differences from the general renderings' of the Vulgate: κοινωνίας τοισοῦ (14); ἐγκατείχεν τοισοῦτα (15); ἀρχαίος ἡ ἑορταλίας 20. (b) 'Differences from renderings in 1 Peter: ἡλθόνεσθαι καταπληκτεῖ (16), μιςάριας (1 P. 1'); ἐνδύμα concurriscentia (14, 29, 38), desiderium (1 P. 1, 11, 21, 48) and in 2 P. 24, τηρεῖν τεσσαρα (24, 17, 3), conservare (1 P. 42). (γ) Differences from the translation of Jude, ἔλογος ἡ ἑττομάσια (29), μαῖας (J. 10); ψυχρά σαρανταρέε (29), constringi (J. 10); συναφείς (28), constringi (J. 12); δόξαι τοῖς ξένοις καλίγο tenebrarum (29), procilla tenebrarum (J. 13)

Words marked † occur nowhere else in the N.T. Vulgate: those marked ‡ occur nowhere else in the whole Vulgate.

2 Vansittart's suggestion (Journal of Philology iii. p. 357), derived from his study of the corruptions of the text of 2 P., that its existence 'depended for many years on a single copy,' is worthy of note.
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Orat. c. Arian. ii. 1. 133. There is also a catalogue, considered by Tischendorf and Westcott (Canon, p. 578 m.) to be earlier than the fourth century, which is contained in the Codex Claromontanus of the seventh century. It recognizes the seven Catholic Epistles as well as the Shepherd of Hermas, the Acts of Paul, and the Apocalypse of Peter (cf. N.K. pp. 157–172).

Didymus (d. 394) wrote comments on all the Catholic Epistles, fragments of which have come down to us in the Latin translation. The comment on 2 P. ends with the words ‘Non igitur ignorandum praesentem epistolam esse falsatam (= νοθευται), quae licet publicetur, non tamen in canone est.’ This unfavourable view seems to be due to his dislike to the doctrine, promulgated in 2 P. 310c, of the total destruction of the earth by fire. In a later treatise (De Trinitate) Didymus quotes repeatedly from 2 P.: cf. Migne Patr. Gr. vol. xxxix, pp. 304 B, 409 B, 415 A, 453 A, 512 C, 644 C, 688 A.


Methodius, a bishop of Lycia at the end of the third century quotes from 2 P. 38 in a fragment of his de Resurrectione cited by Dr. Chase (Hastings’ D. of B. p. 804) χίλια δὲ ἡ τῆς βασιλείας ἀνάμοισεν, τὸν ἀπέραυνον αἰώνα διὰ τῆς χιλιάδος δηλῶν γέγραφεν γάρ ὁ ἀπόστολος Πέτρος δὴ μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἡμέρα ἑτη καὶ χίλια ἡμέρα ἡμέρα μία. Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, a friend and pupil of Origen, writing to Cyprian in 256 A.D. (included in Cyprian’s Letters, No. 75) refers to 2 P. in the following words: ‘Stephanus adhuc etiam infamans Petrum et Paulum beatos apostolos... qui in epistolis suis haecreticos exsecreati sunt et ut eos evitemus monuerant.’ As 1 P. has no allusion to heretics, this can only be understood of 2 P. Origen speaks doubtfully (In. Joh. v. 3, Lomm. i. p. 165): Πέτρος ἐφ’ οἷον δεικνύειται ὡς Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία... μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην καταλέλουσεν ἐστο δὲ καὶ δευτέραν ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ. There are several references to 2 P. in the Latin translation of Origen, which are thought doubtful by Dr. Chase and others, because of the license elsewhere taken by the translator, Rufinus. Westcott however notes that some of these passages are very characteristic of Origen, especially the allegorical use made of the fall of Jericho before the blasts of the trumpets (Hom. in Jos.
vii. 1, Lomm, xi. 62): Dominus noster mittit sacerdotes, Apostolos suos, portantes tubas... Sacerdotali tuba primus in Evangelio suo Matthaeus increpuit... Petrus etiam duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis. Jacobus quoque et Judas... Novissime autem ille veniens, qui dixit "puto autem nos Deus novissimos Apostolos ostendit," et in quatuordccim epistolarum suarum fulminans tubis, muros Jericho et omnes idolatriae machinas et philosophorum dogmata usque ad fundamenta deiecit.'

It is usually denied that there is any reference to 2 P. in Clem. Al., which is hardly consistent with the statement of Eusebius (H.E. vi. 14) and Photius (cod. 109) that Clement commented on all the Catholic Epistles. Dr. Bigg cites the following: Protr. § 106, p. 83 τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἀλήθειας as taken from 2 P. 2; Str. i. p. 374 σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις (cf. id. iv. 636 τελειος καθαρὸς τὸν κοσμικὸν εἰς τὴν εὐχάριστον τοῦ σκηνῶματος μου); Paed. iii. p. 280 ἐν τοῖς ἐν τῷ Συνομίλων πάθος κρίσει μὲν ἀδικήσας, παιδαγωγία δὲ ἀκύςασιν. As Clement quotes Jude by name in the following §§, it might be supposed that the reference here was to Jude v. 7, Σύνομοι καὶ Γόμορρα... πρόκειναι δείγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου, but there is a much closer resemblance to 2 P. 26 πόλεις Συνομίλων καὶ Γόμορρας... κατέκρινεν, ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβείας τεθεικώς, καὶ δικαίων Λόγος καταπονούμενον ἐρύσατο κ.π.λ. Eccl. Proprh. 20 ἀ γροφος ἐν δὲ ἡμᾶς Κύριος τιμηθεὶς αἱ ἐρματί, δεσποτὼν πάλαι τῶν πιστῶν ἀπαλάσον ἀμαρτίων is like 2 P. 2 τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοῦς δεσποτήν ἀρνομένους and 1 P. 19 ἐντυρώθητε... τιμῶν αἱματί; Str. ii. p. 458 βασιλεὺς ἡμαρτεν τὴν ἐαυτοῦ ψυχήν ἀγαθοτερεί like 2 P. 2 ψυχῆν δικαίαν ἀνόμους ἐργαζόμενων, though the verb seems to me to have a different force in the two passages. In my notes on 2 P. 13.4 I have further called attention to resemblances in such phrases as θεία δύναμις, θεία φύσις, θεία ἀρετή and the doctrine of man’s participation in the Divine nature; but these probably belong to the philosophical thought of the time. There is a closer resemblance in Strom. vi. p. 778 πεπιστευκέν διὰ τῆς προφητείας... παρονισίας... τῷ ψευδομένῳ Θεῷ... καὶ τῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας βεβαιωθησαίν... τῷ δὲ τῆς ἑν οἷς ἐστὶ κατάστασιν βεβαιωθῆν... εἰδώς δὲ ἀγάπης προσπαντά τῷ
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μέλλοντι, where faith is said to rest on prophecy, and on the actual manifestation of Christ, whereby the promises of the Gospel are confirmed, as in 2 Pet. 1:19 ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν καὶ παροσίαν... καὶ ἐχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, κ.τ.λ. There seems to be an allusion to the same passage in Str. v. 663, ή μὲν Ἑλληνική φιλοσοφία τῇ ἐκ τῆς θρυαλλίδος ἐοικεν λαμπηδόνι, ἥν ἀνάπτουσιν ἀνθρώποι παρὰ ἡλίου κλέπτοντες ἐντέχνος τὸ φῶς, κηρυχθέντος δὲ τοῦ λόγου πάν ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἄγιον ἐξέλαμψεν, where philosophy is compared (like prophecy in 2 P. 1:19) to the light of a candle which disappears before the sun. The latter part of the verse, ἦσσος οὗ ἡμέρα διανυάσθη καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλη ἐν ταῖς καρδιάς ὑμῶν, is illustrated in my note by three quotations from Clement, of which I will only repeat the last here, Ὁροφ. p. 89, λαμψάτω οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀτοκερκρύμενῳ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, τὸ φῶς. The words ἐωσφόρος and φωσφόρος occur in the others. It must be allowed however that Clement makes far less use of 2 P. than of 1 P., and that he omits references which might seem appropriate to his purpose, such as 1:1 ὥσ περ ἐγένοσθε θείας κόσμων φύσεως, which is often referred to by Didymus.

There appears to be a reminiscence of 2 P. 1:8 in Eus. H.E. iii. 31 Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου... τῆς μετὰ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν τοῦ βιωτοῦ τῶν σκηνωμάτων ἁπλὸς ἄνθρωπος δεδήλωται, and H.E. ii. 25, speaking of the site where τῶν εἰρημένων ἀποστόλων τὰ ἱερὰ σκηνώματα κατατεθεῖται. In the same writer's c. Hierochem. c. 4 there seems to be an allusion to 2 P. 1:8 τοῦ καλόσαντος ἐνδιά δόξῃ καὶ ἁρετῇ in the words τῇ ἐνδιάθεσιν τοῦ καὶ ἁρετῇ πάσαν ἐσώσει τὴν οἰκομένην; and the same treatise abounds in such phrases as θεία δύναμις, φύσις, ἁρετῇ (see my note on 2 P. 1:8. 4).

Hippolytus (d. 235) Haeres. ix. 7 (We resisted Zephyrinus and Callistus, confuting them and compelling them to confess the truth) οἱ πρὸς μὲν ὧδε αἶδουμενοι καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἁληθείας συναγόμενοι (?συνεχόμενοι) ὁμολόγουν, μετ’ οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρον ἀνεκυλίζοντο, cf. 2 P. 2:22 and Clem. Al. Proto. p. 75 οἱ δὲ περὶ τέλματα καὶ ἀνθρώπους, τὰ ἡδονῆς ρέματα, καλυπτομένους ἄνωθενς ἐκβάλοντον τροφάς, ὕδων δὲ τινὲς ἀνθρώπους ὑπὲρ γάρ, πιθανῶν, ἡδονοῦσι βορβόροι μᾶλλον ἡ καθαρότεραι ὑδατι. Hippol. x. 34 μὴ προσέχοντες σοφία μασίν ἐντέχνων λόγων μὴ δὲ ματαιοὶς ἐπανγελίαις κλεφτικῶν
AUTHENTICITY OF THE TWO EPISTLES


Clementine Literature. Recognitions n. 12 unusquisque illius fit servus cui se ipse subiecerit, cf. 2 P. 210. Homiliae, Epist. Clem. 2 επεί, ὡς εὐδίκαιον ἀπὸ τοῦ με ἀποστείλατος κυρίου τε καὶ διδασκάλου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, αἰ τοῦ θανάτου μου ἡγηγήκασιν ἡμέρας Ἐλίμεντα τούτων ἐπικοστοῦ ὡς χειροτονοῦ, cf. 2 P. 114. So, in Ep. Petri ad Jac. 2, St. Peter complains that his own writings were misinterpreted, and in § 2 prayς ἵνα τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα παραδοσῶν, ἐρμηνευόντες τα πάντα πρὸς τὴν παράδοσιν ἡμῶν καὶ μὴ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ ἀμαθίας καταστῶμενι ἀλλοις εἰς τὸν ὄμοιον τῆς ἀπωλείας ἐνέγκασι βίονον, cf. 2 P. 316 ἀ νικεῖστως στρέβλουσιν πρὸς τὴν ἱδιὰν ἀπώλειαν.

Ἀριστοτέλειος Παύλου 13 τὰς τῶν δικαίων καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐξόδους; 15 θεόρησιν τὴν ψυχήν τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς πῶς ἐξερχεται ἐκ τοῦ σκηνώματος αὐτῆς, cf. 2 P. 114.15; 18 παραδοθήκης ἡ ψυχή αὕτη ταρταροῦ χρόνον ἀγγέλων καὶ φυλαττέσθω ἐστὶς τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς κρίσεως, cf. 2 P. 22, 31, 24; 4 ἡ μακροθυμία μου πάντων τούτων ἀνέχεται ὥσις μετανοήσουσιν, cf. 2 P. 32.

Irenaeus (β. 180) iii. 1. 1, μετὰ τὴν τούτων (καὶ Peter and Paul) ἐξοδὸν Μάρκους τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγραφῶς ἡμῖν παραδείσκεται ἐκ τοῦ σκηνώματος αὐτῆς, cf. 2 P. 115: iv. 36 Noe justus iullium indwecens, cf. 2 P. 24 κατακλυσμοῦ ἐπάξας. Irenaeus has the same adaptation of Ps. 904 χίλια ἐτη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σοῦ ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἔχθεσι, as we find in 2 P. 33 μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἐτη, though he applies it with a different reference, viz. to explain the non-fulfilment of the warning against eating the forbidden fruit (v. 23, 2) and as signifying that the millennium would begin after the completion of 6000 years. We have seen that Methodius names 2 P. as the source of this quotation, which occurs also in Justin Martyr Dial. 81 (written about 145 A.D.) συνήκαμεν καὶ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἐτη, which has, with him, the same double application as with Irenaeus. So Barnabas (xx. 4) commenting on
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Gen. 2\textsuperscript{a} ςυντελέσειν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐκτῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, explains it as meaning that ἐν ἔξαικισχιλίοιο ἔτεσιν συντελέσει Κύριος τὰ σύμπαντα. Ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ’ αὐτῷ χίλια ἐτην αὐτοῦ δὲ μοι μαρτυρεῖ λέγων. Ἡδον σήμερον ἡμέρα ἔσται ως χίλια ἑτη. And he proceeds to explain the rest of the 7th day to mean that the Son will come to judge the wicked and change the existing universe and put an end to τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον, and will afterwards rest on the 7th day.

It will be noticed that Barnabas uses the phrase παρ’ αὐτῷ (sc. Κυρίῳ) which we find in 2 P., but quotes as his authority Ps. 90\textsuperscript{4}, and there seems no doubt that the latter had been employed by rabbinical writers before the birth of Christ to establish the idea of a millennial reign of happiness and peace to succeed the six ages of misery and conflict. See Spitta on 2 P. 3\textsuperscript{8} and Dr. Chase in Hastings’ D. of B. iii. p. 80.

I go back now to Theophilus of Antioch (A. 170). In the treatise ad Autol. ii. 13 there appears to be a reminiscence of 2 P. 1\textsuperscript{5} in the words ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ φαίνων ὁσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι συνεχομένῳ ἐφότισεν τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανὸν; while ii. 9 οἱ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώποι, πνευματόφοροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφήται γενόμενοι, ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες ἐγένοντο θεοδίδακτοι, and ii. 33 ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου διδασκόμεθα τὸν λαλήσαντος ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις προφήταις remind us of 2 P. 1\textsuperscript{1}.

Justin Martyr (Dial. 51) εν τῷ μεταξὺ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ (‘in the interval before His Second Coming’) γενήσεσθαι αἱ ἐρείσεις (MS. ἐρείσι) καὶ ψευδοπροφήταις ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ προεμίησε, (ib. 82) ὑπερ δὲ τρόπον καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐπὶ τῶν παρ’ ὑμῖν γενομένων ἁγίων προφητῶν ἡσαν, καὶ παρ’ ἡμῖν νῦν πολλοὶ εἰσὶ καὶ ψευδοδιδασκάλοι. remind us of 2 P. 2\textsuperscript{1} ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι.

Heraclen (c. 130) ap. Orig. in Joh. tom. 13, τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας τοῦ ἀνωθεν ἐπιχρησιμολογοῦντος πλούσιως καὶ αὐτοῦς ἐκθέτουσα εἰς τὴν ἐτέρων αἰώνιον ἥγεσιν τὸ ἐπιχρησιμολογοῦμενον αὐτοῖς, cf. 2 P. 1\textsuperscript{11} οὕτως γὰρ πλούσιος ἐπιχρησιμολογηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ ἐσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος.
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Aristides (c. 130) Apol. xvi. ἡ δόξα τῆς ἀληθείας ἂν τοὺς ὧν ἡ ζωὴ εἰσὶν εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ ὀρθοδοξίαν, cf. 2 P 1,11 22.


Polycarp Ep. ad Phil. 3 κατακλούσαντα τῇ σοφίᾳ τῶν μαθητῶν Παύλου, cf. 2 P 3,18.

2 Clem. Rom. (c. 150) 11 (a quotation from a προφητείας λόγος) ταύτα πάντα ἡ κοίσμας καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡ μέρας ἔχει ἡ μέρας προσδεχόμενοι ὦ οὐδὲν τούτων ἡ ράκα καὶ καὶ τακτίσαντα διὰ ἰδιακάμες τῶν ὠρανῶν καὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως ὡς κλίσεως καὶ καίμενος, καὶ τοῦτο φανερωτάτα ἐργά καὶ φανερά ἐργά τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Cf. 2 P 2,37,10,12.

Hermas (c. 140) Vis. iii. 8 ἐκ τῆς πίστεως γεννᾶται ἡ γράτεια, ἐκ τῆς ἐγκαταλείπας ἀπλότης, ἐκ τῆς ... ἐπιστήμης ἡμᾶς ἡ ἐγκράτεια τῆς πίστεως; a similar climax occurs in Mand. v. 2, 4, cf. 2 P 1,5 ἐν τῇ πίστει τὴν ἀρετήν, κ.τ.λ.; Mand. xi. 12 ὁ δοκόν πνεύμα ἐχειν ὑφον ἐαυτόν καὶ ἀναιδής ἔστω καὶ ἐν τῷ φαναρίᾳ τολμαίς ἀναστρέφομεν καὶ ἐν ἐτέραις τολμαίς ἀνάταις, καὶ μισθοῦς λάμβανε τῇ προφητείᾳ αὐτοῦ, cf. 2 P 2,13.

Clement of Rome 9 τελείως λατοσκόπησας τῇ μεγαλοτρεπτῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ, cf. 2 P 2,17. Ἰδ. 35 ἁγωνισόμεθα εὐφρενωι ἐν τῷ ἀριθμῷ τῶν ὑπομνήματος αὐτῶν, ὅπως μεταλάβωμεν τὸν ἐν πνευματικότερῳ τόν. Ἐφων δὲ ἐστιν τούτο, ἰδιατελεῖς; ἐὰν ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς ἀλήθειας ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς πίστεως τῶν Θεοῦ ... ἔναν παντεόμενον τῇ ἀνίκοντα τῇ ἀμωμοὶ Ὑπελήφθη αὐτοῦ καὶ ἁγιολογηθεὶς ἡ ἱσωμεν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τῆς ἀληθείας, cf. 2 P 3,11 14,12 25. Ἰδ. 27 ἐν λόγῳ τῇ μεγαλοσύνῃ αὐτοῦ σωσίματι ἐπὶ τῶν πάντων καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δύναται αὐτῇ καταστρέψει, cf. 2 P 3,5,7. Ἰδ. 23 πόρρῳ γενέσθω ἅρφη ἡμῶν ἡ γραφή αὐτή ὑπὸ λέγει Ταλαιπωροθείσονοι εἰσιν ... οἱ λέγοντες, Ταῦτα ἡ κοίσμας καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ ἐστὶ διὰ κοινότητος ἡμῶν πνεύμων συμβιβασθεὶκεν, cf. 2 P 3,4 and 2 Clem. Rom. 11 quoted above.
Internal Evidence.

Making allowance for the possibility that many of these resemblances may be accounted for by the general similarity of thought and speech in the early Church, still I think that, if we had nothing else to go upon in deciding the question of the authenticity of 2 P., except external evidence, we should be inclined to think that we had in these quotations ground for considering that Eusebius was justified in his statement that our epistle πολλοὶς χρήσιμοι φανεία μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν. Our previous investigations however seem to me to show conclusively that the epistle is later than that of Jude (see Introduction, ch. i.) and that it was not written by the author of 1 P., whom we have every reason to believe to have been the Apostle St. Peter himself (see above chapters iv. and v.).

We conclude, therefore, that the second Epistle is not authentic; but was written by some one who made use of the honoured name of Peter, as was done by others in the second century, with a view of commending to the Christian reader views which he regarded as important, and which he believed to be in accordance with St. Peter’s teaching. The production of such pseudopigrapha was common both among the Greeks, as in the case of the Platonic Epistles, some of which are ascribed to Plato’s immediate disciples, and among the Jews, as Ecclesiastes and the apocryphal books of Wisdom, Esdras, Baruch, Enoch, and the Sibylline Oracles. Their example was naturally followed by Christian writers, as early as the second century, in the form of Gospels or Acts or Epistles or Revelations or didactic treatises. Sometimes these were used for the purpose of putting forth new, perhaps heretical views, as in the Gospel of Peter, which was read in the churches of Cilicia in the second century, but the use of which was forbidden (c. 200) by Serapion, bishop of Antioch, on the ground that it favoured the heretical views of the Docetae. At other times they were of the nature of romances, as the Acts of Paul and Thecla, though this, like many other productions of the time, was written (or revised) in the ascetic interest. The author of 2 P. probably desired to emphasize the warning against

1 None have felt more strongly the difficulty of assigning the two epistles to the same author than Spitta, who in order to support the genuineness of 2 P., found himself driven to deny the genuineness of 1 P.
antinomian heresy contained in the little known epistle of Jude, while omitting the references contained in it to the suspected book of Enoch and to the Jewish Haggada, as less suited for Gentile readers; and at the same time to recommend the Christian teaching to philosophers who were accustomed to speak of Divine Power and Virtue, and of man's participation in the Divine Nature. Apparently he wished also to impress upon his readers the consistency of the teaching of Peter and Paul, while warning them of the misinterpretation to which the latter had been subjected, and to explain the meaning and use of prophecy and the lessons to be derived from the Transfiguration, as well as to meet the objections raised by sceptics against the Coming of the Lord to judgment.¹

Does the Epistle supply any hints from which we may infer its date?

In 3¹ we have the sceptical argument against the promised Coming of the Son of Man before the passing away of the first generation of Christians. 'Since the fathers fell asleep all things

¹ It is, I think, from not making due allowance for the judgments and practices of a different age that some modern writers have argued in favour of the genuineness of 2 P. on the ground that, if it is not genuine, the author must have been guilty of deliberate forgery in claiming to have witnessed the Transfiguration. As I have said elsewhere, he is in this only following the example of the author of the Book of Wisdom, who writes throughout in the character of Solomon and professes to have gone through the experiences of Solomon. In the same way the author of the Apocryphal Gospel of Peter says § 60 ἐγὼ ἦν Πέτρος καὶ ἀναφέρας ἐν αὐθάντων μου λαβώντες τὰ λίνα αὐθανάμων εἰς τὴν θλίψεως, and the author of the Apocalypse of Peter giving his version of a Transfiguration, says ἡμεῖς οἱ δὲ λόγων μανθανάς δεδηθημεν διὰ τε καθέρ ἡμῶν ἐνα τῶν ἀνάλογων . . . τῶν ξελθόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου, ἵνα ποιήσῃς τὸν κόσμον εἰς τὴν μορφήν. Similarly the author of the Praedic. Petri speaks of the Apostles in the 1st person. It does not appear that Serapion objected to the Gospel of Peter as spurious, but as heretical; and though Tertullian (De Baptismo xvii.) tells us that the writer of the Acts of Paul and Thecla was condemned quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, 'on the ground that he imputed to Paul an invention of his own,' yet the reason of his condemnation seems to have been that he made Paul guilty of allowing a woman to preach and to baptize. (This is also the view of Lipsius, Acta Apocrypha xv.) In like manner the vehement warning against apocryphal writings in the Apostolic Constitutions (vi. 16) is not directed against them simply quæ forgeries,—a charge to which all the books professing to give teachings of the Apostles, independent of what is recorded in the N.T. were themselves liable, as we may see from the curious list of names which stands at the head of the Canones Ecclesiasticorum—but on the ground of their heretical teaching. When we further call to mind that Eusebius (H.E. i. 3) quotes as genuine an epistle purporting to be written by Christ to Agbarus, which epistle is now universally allowed to be a forgery, it is evident that there were among the early Christians good and pious men who had no scruple about impersonating not saints alone, but the Lord of Saints Himself. We should gather the same from the readiness with which the orthodox worked up and expurgated the religious romances by which the heretics sought to popularize their doctrines.
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continue as they were.' Could this argument have been used, if Peter himself and John and the other Evangelists were still living? It implies, I think, a date not earlier than the last decade of the First Century.

In 15 we seem to have a reference to the Gospel of St. Mark, which suggests that the writer was acquainted with the tradition that it contained the teaching of St. Peter. In 26 the importance attached to the number 8 may be thought to be inconsistent with an early date. We find it first dwelt upon in the Epistle of Barnabas, the date of which is a matter of dispute; also in Justin M. Dial. 138, where, after quoting as from Isaiah the words ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ τοῦ Ναὸς ἐσωσά σε, he goes on to explain that τὸ μυστήριον τῶν σωζόμενων ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ γένουσι ... those that were saved being eight in number σύμβολον ἔχον τῆς ἀριθμοῦ μὲν ὄγδος ἡμέρας ἐν ἕ ἕφανεν ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἀναστάς ... δι' ὑδάτωσι καὶ πίστεως καὶ ξύλου οἱ μετανοοῦντες ἐφ' ὅς ἠμαρτον ἐκφεύγονται τῇ μέλλουσαν κρίσιν. And so Irenæus (i. 18. 3) in his account of the heresy of Marcus says τὴν τῆς κιβωτοῦ οἰκονομίαν ἐν τῷ κατακλυσμῷ ἐν ἕ ἕκτῳ ἀνθρώπων δισεϊδοθαν φαινεντατα φασὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν ὑγιαδά μηνύειν. It would however naturally form a subject for discussion, as soon as the Christians were called on to show a reason for their observance of the Lord's day as possessing a superior holiness to the Jewish Sabbath; so I think we may fairly leave this point out of consideration. In my note on 26 I have suggested that the author may have been indebted to Pliny for his description of the overthrow of Sodom, τεφρότας καταστροφῆ κατέκρινεν. If so, it must have been written after 80 A.D. In my note on 32 I have assumed that the writer is included in τῶν ἀναστόλων ὑμῶν, but the passage would read more naturally, if the writer could be regarded as making a distinction between himself and the Apostles. So far as it goes, this tells against the authenticity of the Epistle. Dr. Bigg considers that the absence of any reference to the Millennium, which was connected with 2 P. 36 and with the passage in Ps. 90 (from which it was derived by later Christians), proves the early date of the Epistle; but we learn from Justin Martyr (Dial. 80) that there were many orthodox believers in his time who refused to accept it.

In my note on 316 I have argued that the phrase τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς must mean 'the remaining scriptures,' which assumes the
existence of a body of writings called γραφά, in which St. Paul's epistles were included; and we are told in the same verse that the unlearned and unstable distort St. Paul's epistles—not merely one, but all of them—as they do the remaining scriptures, to their own destruction. This surely must be regarded as an anachronism on the assumption that it was written by St. Peter, who is generally believed to have been crucified before the death of Nero in June 68 A.D. It is certainly most unlikely that St. Paul's epistles could by that time have been collected into a whole, and still more unlikely that they should already have been placed in the same category with the old Jewish Scriptures; while, if we are to understand by it our present scriptures, including the books of the N.T., we should have to alter the received dates of the writings of Luke and John. And the date must be still further postponed to leave room for the misinterpretation of these scriptures. Taking all these things into account I think 125 A.D. is about the earliest possible date for 2 Peter.

If the consideration of these various arguments leads us to postpone the date of 2 P. to the second quarter of the Second Century, it of course compels us to reconsider our interpretation of the resemblances noticed between 2 P. and any writings prior to 150. We shall now have to regard these as proofs that the author of 2 P. borrowed from Clem. Rom. I., and possibly from Clem. Rom. II., probably also from Barnabas, Heracleon, and Hermas. We must also take into account resemblances which have been noticed by others between 2 P. and certain non-Christian writings.

Other Possible Literary Affinities of 2 Peter.

Dr. Abbott for instance (From Letter to Spirit, p. 459) lays great stress on the resemblances to be found in the Preface to the Antiquities of Josephus as compared with our epistle. The latter, he says, begins by saying (1) that all things are bestowed on us by the divine power through the recognition of Him that called us through His virtue that we may become sharers of the divine nature. (2) The middle portion of it deals with the punishing of those who will not thus recognize God. (3) Much of the third section deals with the physical nature of the world (the earth being made out of water and destined to perish by fire).} ‘Josephus has the same three thoughts in reverse order and gives them a logical
connexion. People ask, he says (Pref. § 4), why the Law deals so largely with φυσιολογία, i.e. the science of nature, inanimate, animate, and divine. To this he replies that Moses made it his first object Ὁ εἶναι φύσις κατανοήσαι.' From this point it will be more convenient to quote the Greek, καὶ τῶν ἑργῶν τῶν ἑκεῖνον θεατὴν τῷ φύσι μεμειχθαι ... οὖτε γὰρ αὐτῷ ποτ' ἀν γενέσθαι νοῦν ἀγαθόν τῷ νομοθετῇ ταύτης ἀπολειπομένῳ τῆς θεᾶς, οὔτε τῶν γραφησομένων εἰς ἀρετῆς λόγον οὐδὲν ἀποβήσεσθαι τοῖς λαβοῦσιν, εἰ μὴ πρὸ παινότο αὐλοῦ διδάχθειν, ὁτι πάντων πατήρ τε καὶ δεσπότης ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Θεὸς διὰ πάντα ἐπιβλέπειν τοὺς μὲν ἐπομένους αὐτῷ δίδωσιν εὐδαίμονα βίον, τοὺς ξένῳ δὲ βαινόντας ἀρετῆς μεγάλαις περιβάλλει συμφοραῖς. Τούτῳ δὴ παιδεύσαι θολόθρησεις Μωυσῆς τὸ παιδεύμα του ἐαυτοῦ πολίταις, τῆς τῶν νόμων θέσεως οὐκ ἀπὸ συμβολαίων καὶ τῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλων δικαίων ἥξιο εἰς τῶς ἀλλαίων παραπλησίως, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν καὶ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου κατασκευήν τὰς γνώμας αὐτῶν ἁνάγκην καὶ πείθαι, ὅτι τῶν ἑπὶ γῆς ἐργῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ καλλιστον ἔσμεν ἀνθρώποι, ὅτε πρὸς τήν ἐν γείαν ἐβιάζοντες, ἀρδεύως ἤδη περὶ πάντων ἐπείθετον. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι νομοθέται τοῖς ἐν γείας ἀνθρώποις, ὅταν δὲ τῆς τοῦ νόμου ἀλλαγής ἡ παραλαμβάνειν εἰς τοὺς Θεοὺς τῷ ἀλλοι τὴν αὐτῶν μετέθεσαν καὶ πολλὴν ὑποτήμησιν τοῖς ποιητοῖς ἐδοκεῖν· ὁ δὲ ἡμέτερος νομοθέτης ἀκραιφή τῇ ἡ ἀρετῆς ἐστὶ ὡς τούτη τῇ κατασκευασμένης ἁρματημάτοις εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τῷ ἡμῶν καὶ πολλήν ὑποτήμησιν τοῖς ποιητοῖς ἐδοκεῖν ὁ δὲ ἡμέτερος νομοθέτης ἀκραιφή τῇ ἡ ἀρετῆς ἐστὶ ὡς τούτη τῇ κατασκευασμένης ἁρματημάτοις εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τῷ ἡμῶν, ἀρδεύως ἤδη περὶ πάντων ἐπείθετον. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι νομοθέται τοῖς ἐν γείας ἀνθρώποις, ὅταν δὲ τῆς τοῦ νόμου ἀλλαγής ἡ παραλαμβάνειν εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τῷ ἡμῶν καὶ πολλὴν ὑποτήμησιν τοῖς ποιητοῖς ἐδοκεῖν ὁ δὲ ἡμέτερος νομοθέτης ἀκραιφή τῇ ἡ ἀρετῆς ἐστὶ ὡς τούτη τῇ κατασκευασμένης ἁρματημάτοις εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τῷ ἡμῶν, ἀρδεύως ἤδη περὶ πάντων ἐπείθετον. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι νομοθέται τοῖς ἐν γείας ἀνθρώποις, ὅταν δὲ τῆς τοῦ νόμου ἀλλαγής ἡ παραλαμβάνειν εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τῷ ἡμῶν, ἀρδεύως ἤδη περὶ πάντων ἐπείθετον.

The connexion between this passage of Josephus and our epistle does not seem quite so close as has been suggested. The only reason for the reference to natural science in the last chapter of 2 Peter is to meet the objection that the regularity and unchangeableness of the course of nature forbade the expectation of a great Day of Judgment. The author endeavours to disprove

1 2 P. 14.  
2 2 P. 12.  
3 2 P. 15.  
4 2 P. 15.  
5 2 P. 15.  
6 2 P. 21.  
7 2 P. 15.  
8 Notice also the repetition of the words στοιχή (twice) and στοιχεία (thrice) in the preceding sections of Josephus, together with the words δεισδεῖν, εὐθεία, and ψεῦδη πλάσματα.
this unchangeableness by reference to the past destruction of the world by water, and dwells on the features of its future destruction by fire. This has little to do with Josephus' explanation of the reason why the Law began with an account of the Creation. And again, much has to be omitted from the first chapter of 2 Peter, if we are to limit it to the manner in which we may become sharers of the divine nature. It cannot however be denied that there is a marked resemblance in the vocabulary and in many of the ideas of the two writers, a resemblance which is natural enough in two Jews trained on the old sacred books and familiar with later Jewish writings, such as Philo. This resemblance is found in other passages to which Dr. Abbott refers, e.g. Αντ. iv. 8. 2 (Last words of Moses) λέγει τοιάδε ἄνδρες . . . τῆς μακράς κοίνωνοι ταλαντωρίας, ἑτεί . . . χρόνων ἐτῶν εἰκόνι καὶ ἱκατον ἁπάντων δεῖ με τοῦ ξῆν ἁ πελθεῖν, καὶ . . . οὐ μὴ ἁλω 4 βοηθῶς ὑμῖν ἐσεσθαί . . . δι' ἱκαίνυ 9 ἡ γνήσιμα καὶ ὑμῖν μὴ νῦν ἐγκαταλείπειν τούμων ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμετέρας εὐφαντικίας. πρὸ- θυμον, ἀλλ' ἀδιόν πραγματεύσατο . . . μὴ νῦν ὠμοῦ ἐμαυτὸ . . . μήτε νομιμῶν τῶν προ οὐντων 10 ἀλλ' ὑπομὴντα διάτηξεν μὴν εὑσε βιλας, 8 ἦς νῦν περὶ τῶν θεον ἔχετε (αλ. ἄχοντες), κατα- φορούντας μετακατηγορεῖν τρόπον. ταῦτα δὲ πράττοντες ἐσεσθαί . . . μὴν νῦν ἐν οἷον 11 . . . (sc. Eleazar and Joshua) ἀκροάσθη μὴ χαλεπώς, γινώσκοντες ὅτι πώντες οἱ ἀρχεσθαὶ καλῶς εἴδοτες καὶ ἀρχεῖν εἰσόνται . . . τὴν η ἐνεργείαν 12 ἡ γείσθε . . . μὴ τὸ προσαγαγαντεῖν οὐς ἃν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἡγομόνες πράττειν ἀξίωσι . . . ταῦτα δ' οὖν ὑπενδίκειν ὑμῖν προθέμενον, οὐ γὰρ ἐπί ἐξοδον 14 τοῦ ξῆν δυσχε- ραῖνοντες καταλείπειν ἡξίωσιν εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησιν 15 φέρεαν . . . βεβαία 16 γὰρ ἄν οὕτως ὑμῖν ὑπάρξειν ἢ τῶν ἄγαθῶν ἀσφάλειαν ὡς δὲ μὴ δι' ἀμαθίαν 17 ἡ φύσις ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸ χείρον ἀπονεύσθη, συνελθηκα ὑμῖν καὶ νόμους, ὑπάρχειν, καὶ ποιεῖτε τις ἡμῶν, τούτοις καὶ ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες, closely resembling 2 Pet. 1.14 ὁ καλὸς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες.

Similar resemblances might be quoted from Philo (M. 1. 70) on 2 P. 1.11 ἴσοτιμον αὐτῷ ἠγούμενον ψυχῇ, ὦ, M. 1. 165 τῶν σοφῶν ἴσοτιμον κόσμῳ, so ἴσοτιμία in M. 1. 160, 2. 86; on ἀρετὴ Θεοῦ

---

1 2 P. 117. 2 2 P. 14. 3 2 P. 114. 4 2 P. 112. 5 2 P. 113.
6 2 P. 112. 7 2 P. 112. 8 2 P. 116. 9 2 P. 20. 10 2 Pet. 22.
11 2 P. 2. 12 2 P. 210. 13 2 P. 311. 14 2 P. 115. 15 2 P. 118.
16 2 P. 10. 17 2 P. 314. 18 2 P. 118.
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(2 P. 13), M. 1. 75, 222, 488, 489, 635; on θεία φύσις (2 P. 14), M. 1. 51, 647, 2, 22, 143, 329, 343; on πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθῆ-σεται (2 P. 11), M. 2. 476; on τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων (2 P. 119), M. 1. 95, 347.

Deissman (Bible Studies, pp. 360 f.) compares with 2 Pet. a decree of Stratonicia in Caria in honour of Zeus Panheermios and Hecate, which begins by stating that τὴν πόλιν ἀνωθεν τῇ τῶν προστάτων αὐτῆς μεγίστων θεῶν [προνοίᾳ, Διὸς Πανημερίου καὶ Εὐθυμίας, ἕκ τι πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων καὶ συνεχῶν κινδύνων σεσώθαι, διὶ καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἅγια καὶ ἱερὰ καὶ ἡ ἱερὰ σύννεφος, δύναμις Σε[βαστοῦ Καλαφαροῦ ἐπὶ] τῆς τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν ἁγίων ἀρχὴς, ἐποιήσαντο προφανεῖς ἐναργεῖας· καλῶς δὲ ἐγχει πᾶσαν σκούφων εἰς τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐσέβειαν καὶ μηδένα καιρόν παραλίπειν τοῦ εὐσεβείας καὶ λιτανεύειν αὐτοῦς· καθιστάται δὲ ἀγάλματα ἐν τῷ σεβαστῷ βουλευτηρίῳ τῶν προερημένων[ν θεῶν ἐπιφανεῖς] τοῖς θείας δυνάμεως ἀρετάς· δι᾽ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν σύνταγμα πλήθος θύει τε καὶ ἐπιθυμία (‘offers incense’) καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ αἵ[ε] τοῖς οὕτως ἐπιφανεστάτους θεοῖς κἀκ τῆς δι’ ἡμῶν τῶν προσώπων καὶ θρησκείας εὐσεβείας εἰς αὐτούς [εἰδίσταται]. ἐδοξεῖ τῇ βουλῇ κ.τ.λ.

Deissman judges this inscription to be about 22 A.D. He refers to the notice taken of an Athenian inscription by Paul; considers that this decree copies the common form of the religious decrees of Asia Minor, just as expressions in the Pauline epistles remind us of an inscription at Halicarnassus (Newton, Hist. of Discoveries, vol. ii. p. 2).

I think that Dr. Chase is right in regarding the resemblances noticed in this decree and in Josephus, as due in the main to the diffusion of commonplace expressions of rhetorical study, set prefatory phrases, and the like, which were employed by those who learnt Greek in later life.

Apocalypsis Petri.

A much closer relation exists between the lately discovered Apocalypsis Petri and our Epistle. The resemblances noted below

---

1 2 P. 14.
2 The words in brackets are Dr. Deissman’s conjectural fillings-up of gaps in the inscription.
3 2 P. 11.
4 2 P. 17.
5 2 P. 13.
6 2 P. 14.
7 2 P. 18, 31.
AUTHENTICITY OF THE TWO EPISTLES
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are taken chiefly from Dr. Montague James' Lecture on the Revelation of Peter, p. 52.

Apos. § 1. πολλοὶ εἰς αὐτῶν ἔσονται ψευδοπροφήται (2 Pet. 21), ἵδ. δόγματα ποιεῖται τῆς ἀπωλείας διδάσκοντων (2 P. 21), ἵδ. κρινεῖ τοῖς νῦν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας (2 P. 214 κατάρας τέκνα), ἵδ. τὰς ψυχὰς ἑαυτῶν δοκιμάζοντας (2 P. 22). Apos. § 2. The twelve Apostles have gone up with the Lord εἰς τὸ δρόμος (2 P. 118) desire to see one of the departed saints in his glorified body, ἐμθέμεναι ὅπως διεξῆ ἡμῖν ἐνα τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν τῶν δικαίων [τῶν] ἐξελθόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου (2 P. 115), ἵνα ἰδοὺ τιναποὶ (2 P. 311) εἰς τὴν μορφὴν, καὶ θαρσήσαντες παραθαρασύνουμεν καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἡμῶν. § 3 καὶ εὐχομένων ἡμῶν ἀ[φινο φαινο]νται δύο ἀνδρεῖς ἔστωτες ἐμπροσθέν του κυρίου πρὸς ἐξω ὅς ὁ θεοῦ εἰδοὺς ἀντιβλέψας ἐξήρχετο γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑφες αὐτῶν ἀκτίν ὡς ἡλίου, καὶ φωτιῶν ἡν αὐτῶν ὄλων τὸ ἐνδυμα. This answers to the account of the Transfiguration in so far as it takes place on a mountain, as it exhibits the glorified bodies of two saints, and so inspires the Apostles with a confidence in the life to come, which they are able to infuse into their hearers (2 P. 116 ἐγνωρίσαμεν ἡμῖν, 119 ἐχομεν βεβαιότερον). There are however several points of difference. The time is apparently after the Resurrection (James, p. 54). It is the Twelve and not the Three to whom the vision is manifested. There is no voice from heaven. The two saints are anonymous, so that the whole passage might seem to be rather a working up of the appearance of saints mentioned in Mt. 2758 than of the Transfiguration of the Lord. Further resemblances are Apos. § 6 εἶδον καὶ ἐποροτὸ πον ἂν χμηρόν (2 P. 118) πάνω, καὶ ἰδοῖ τοῖς κολάσεσω και τοι κολάζομεν ο ἐκεῖ καὶ τοιοῦτες ἄγγελοι σκοτινῶν ἐλεύθερον αὐτῶν τὸ ἐνδύμα κατὰ τὸν ἀρτύ τοῦ τοποῦ (2 P. 29), ἵδ. (and § 13) oὶ βλάσφημοι τῆς ἡμῶν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, cf. 20 oὶ ἀφίνετε τὴν ὄδον τοῦ Θεοῦ (2 P. 215 21). Apos. § 8 ἠμὴν πεπληρωμενή βοδρόν (also in § 9, ἵδ. § 16), ἵδ. § 15 ἐκλευνόντω κολαζόμενοι (2 P. 22 and Acta Thomas 52 εἰδον ἑρμηνεῖον καὶ ψυχὰς ἐκεῖ κυλιομένας). Apos. § 9 τὸ μισαμα τῆς μοιχείας καὶ § 17 μιᾶς τὰ σώματα ἐαυτῶν ως γυναικεῖς ἀναστρέφομεν (2 P. 220, 210). Apos. § 13 (and § 15) πεπληρωμενός (2 P. 312). Apos. § 15 ἀμελήσαντες τῆς ἑντολῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ (2 P. 221, 32). Fragm. 1 ἢ γῆ παραστήσει l 2
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πάντας τῷ Θεῷ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως καὶ αὐτῇ μέλλουσα κρίνεσθαι σὺν καὶ τῷ περιέχοντι ὀφρανῷ. Fr. 2 καὶ ταχεῦσται πάσα δύναμις ὀφρανοῦ καὶ ἐλευθέρωσε τὸ ὀφρανὸν ὡς βιβλίων καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀστρα πεσοῦται (2 P. 310-123). Fr. 5 παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (ἀθεσμος 2 P. 27, 317) τῆς μακριας ἐκείνης φύσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ (2 P. 14). Ιβ. καταφρονήσαντες τῆς ἐν τολῆς (2 P. 210, 221). Fr. 6 διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἐπράση ὁ λαὸς (2 P. 219 ἃ τις ἡττηται, τούτῳ δεδούλωται). The punishment of sins against nature Aporcs. § 17, 2 P. 20, 10, 13.

These resemblances of subject and of language seem too marked to be accidental. Dr. Sanday (Inspiration, p. 347) says: 'It is no doubt possible that the writer of the Apocalypse may have imitated the Epistle or that both may be affected by some common influence. If there had been, on the whole better reason than not for believing the Epistle to be the genuine work of St. Peter, it would be natural to fall back upon some such assumption. But as the balance of argument is really the other way, the question is forced upon us whether it is not on the whole more probable that the two writings are both by the same hand. This is at least the simplest of the different hypotheses which are open to us.'

As regards the question of early recognition in the Church, the Apocalypse is certainly in a stronger position than our Epistle. It is named with the Apocalypse of John in the Muratorian Fragment, Apocalypses etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus, though it is added, quam (the latter ?) quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt. Clement of Alexandria is said to have commented upon it in his Hypotyposes (Eus. H.E. vi. 14, 1), and in his Eclogae ex. Script. Proph. he quotes from it several times (§§ 39, 40, 41, 48, 49). In § 41 he quotes Πέτρος ἐν τῇ Ἱποκαλύψει and refers to it as ἡ γραφή. Methodius (Concin. Virg. ii. 6) towards the end of the third century quotes from a passage referred to by Clement, speaking of it as a 'divinely inspired writing.' Eusebius (H.E. iii. 3, 2) classes it as spurious, along with the Acts of Paul, the Shepherd, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Teachings of the Apostles. Sozomen in the fifth century (H.E. vii. 19) says that it was still read in certain churches of Palestine once in the year.

The portion which has come down to us appears to be about half of the complete Apocalypse, some 160 out of the 300 lines mentioned in the list of Nicephorus (James, p. 45). About 6
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lines are devoted to the Second Coming to which may be added 7 from the Fragments. About 27 lines are occupied with the description of the two glorified saints, 13 lines with the description of the abode of the blessed, about 76 with the description of hell, to which last section may be added some 35 lines from the Fragments. It may be worth while to quote a portion of the description of the glorified saints and of hell, in view of the suggestion that it was written by the author of 2 Pet. Of the saints it is said, τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἦν λευκότερα πάσης χιόνος καὶ ἐρυθρότερα παντὸς ρόδου, συνεκέκρατο δὲ τὸ ἐρυθρὸν αὐτῶν τῷ λευκῷ, καὶ ἀπλῶς οὐ δύναμαι ἔξεγεσισθαι τὸ κάλλος αὐτῶν· ἢ τε γὰρ κοίμη αὐτῶν οὐλὴ ἦν καὶ ἀνθρωπός καὶ ἐπιτρέπουσα (ἔπιτρέπουσα ἢ;) αὐτῶν τῷ τε προσώπῳ καὶ τοῖς ὀμοιοῖς, ὀσπερεῖ στέφανος ἐκ ναρδοστάχυος πεπλεγμένος καὶ ποικίλων ἀνθῶν, ἢ ὀστερῷ ἱρᾳ ἐν ἀεί, τοιαύτη ἦν αὐτῶν ἢ ἐπιτρέπεια. It seems to me that the whole tone of this has much more resemblance to the puerility of the Erotici Scriptores than it has to the dignified and serious tone of 2 Peter. Then take the place of torment. There seems to be very little reason in the classification of sinners and of their punishments. Those who blaspheme the way of righteousness appear twice: in § 7 they are suspended by their tongues over flames, in § 13 they gnaw their lips and are blinded with red-hot iron. Besides these, there are persecutors, false-witnesses, usurers, idolaters, apostates, murderers, the impure under various heads, the pitiless rich, the unjust (ἀποστρέφοντες τὴν δίκαιος-

νην). Comparing this list with that in the Apocalypse of St. John (219) we notice the absence of the fearful, sinners, and all liars.’ Comparing it with St. Paul’s ‘works of the flesh,’ we miss witchcraft, hatred, enmities, seditions, heresies, envyings, drunkenness, etc. (Gal. 519 f.). If the author of 2 Pet. had made out such a list, must he not have mentioned the αἰρέσεως ἄπωλείας and ψευδοδιδασκαλοῦ of 21, the ἄργία and ἀκάρπία of 18, the πλευνεξία and falsehood of 28, the proud, the presumptuous, and rebellious of 218, the boastful of 218, the back-sliders of 220, the mockers of 38? And there is nothing in our Epistle to suggest that its author would have allowed his fancy to revel in the grotesque ugliness of the tortures depicted in the Apocalypse called by his name. It appears to me therefore very improbable that the author of our Epistle wrote the Apocalypse, and I doubt very much whether he was in any way
indebted to it. On the other hand I think it highly probable that the writer of the Apocalypse was acquainted with our Epistle, and that the phrase κυνηγός βορβόρου (2 P. 22, Ps. 402), along with the undying worm (Isa. 6624), the darkness (2 P. 24), and the unquenchable fire, formed the substratum of his idea of hell. Thus the worm appears in §§ 10, 12 and Fr. 6; the darkness in §§ 6, 12; the fire in §§ 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20; the mire in §§ 8, 9, 11, 16; rolling or wallowing in § 15 ἐκυλίαντο ἐπὶ χαλίκων πεπυρωμένων, § 10 (murderers) πλησσομένους ὑπὸ ἔρπετῶν πονηρῶν καὶ στρεφόμενους ἔκει ἐν τῇ κολάσει ταύτη, § 20 φλεγόμενοι καὶ στρεφόμενοι. On the other hand Dr. Bigg has pointed out (pp. 207 foll.) that in many respects the description given in the Apocalypse agrees with that in the Aeneid (cf. vi. 296 Turbidus hic caeno vastaque voragine gurges aestuat); also that it shows signs of being written under stress of persecution: cf. § 12 οὕτωι ἡσαν οἱ διώξαντες τοὺς δικαίους, and the use of the word πηγαντιζόμενοι, denoting a mode of torture referred to in the Viennese letter (Eus. H.E. v. i. 38), to which there is no sort of allusion in 2 Pet. Dr. James also points out its similarity to the Sibyline Oracles, Bk. ii, the Vision of Josaphat in the History of Barlaam (James, pp. 59 foll.) and other Apocryphal works.

The Apocryphal ‘Acts of Peter and Simon’ contain certain similarities to 2 P., as in ch. 20, Dominus noster volens me maiestatem suam videre in monte sancto; videns autem luminis splendorem eius cum filiis Zebedei, ecclidi tamquam mortuus et oculos meos conclusi, etc.
CHAPTER VII

UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES WERE THE EPISTLES WRITTEN?

This question has been to some extent answered already so far as the 2nd of Peter is concerned. We have seen reasons for believing that it was not written by the author of the First Epistle, that it was written after Jude, that it was written at a time when the first generation of believers had passed away, when the hope of the second Advent was dying out, when St. Paul's Epistles were united into one volume, and regarded as a part of the inspired Scriptures. There are however other points which call for consideration under this head. Is there anything in 2 P. which may assist us to determine where and to whom it was written? It differs from 1 P. in its address, which is general and anonymous, τοῖς ἵστιμον ἡμῶν λαχεύσων πίστιν, whereas the former is limited to the Christian communities of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, that is, to Churches which had probably received the Gospel either directly or indirectly from Paul and Silas, or, as he is called in 1 P. 5:12, Silvanus. The mention of the latter in that Epistle suggests that Peter may have been induced by him to write to the Christians of a region which, as far as we know, Peter had not personally visited, in addressing whom he might therefore be glad to use the name of Silvanus as an introduction. It is easy to understand why Silvanus should have wished to bring St. Peter's influence to bear on the Churches of Asia Minor, if these, during the long absence of St. Paul, caused by his imprisonments in Caesarea and in Rome, had been led away by Judaizing teachers, who magnified the authority of St. Peter at his expense.1 These Churches, as we learn from the

1 Cf. 1 Cor. 11:2, 4:18, Gal. 2, 3.
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Acts, were made up of Jews and Gentiles, and the latter are plainly alluded to in 1 P. 1, ἐντροφήτε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου. The vague language of 2 P. 1 seems to imply a similar division, with an assumption of higher privileges on the part of the Jewish section, which made it necessary to insist on the ἰσοτιμία of Jew and Gentile; but the most pressing danger seems to have been one which would probably affect the latter more seriously than the former, viz. the anti-nomianism which professed to rest itself on the authority of Paul (2 P. 3). The phrase ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιᾶςματα τοῦ κόσμου in 2 seems also more appropriate to Gentile than to Jewish converts.

It has been argued from 1, ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἠμῶν δύναμιν καὶ παρονήσιαν, that the writer must himself have preached the Gospel to those whom he is addressing, and that he must therefore be included among 'your apostles' referred to in 3. It would seem also from 1, ἐπόταται γεννήθεντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειώτητος, that the Apostles referred to must have been those who witnessed the Transfiguration. But is there any hint either in the N.T. or in later Christian literature of any such joint mission undertaken by Peter and the two sons of Zebedee? It seems better therefore to understand the plural as referring here to a single person (cf. Blass, p. 166, where he quotes 1 Joh. 1 ταῦτα γράφωμεν, Heb. 6 ποιήσαμεν, 6 λαλοῦμεν, etc.), and to suppose the writer to refer simply to his own personal experience, though we may still hold, in accordance with 3, that he was not the only apostle concerned in the evangelization of the Church or Churches addressed.

We now come to the consideration of the mention in 2 P. 3 of a previous letter addressed to the same readers by the author. The allusion has generally been taken to mean that 2 P. was written to the Churches of Asia Minor designated in the first verse of 1 P. But the result of our comparison of the two Epistles has led us to ascribe them to different authors; and this is confirmed by the remarkable fact that, while the second Epistle implies a long acquaintance between the writer and his readers, who had received the Gospel from him and his fellow-apostles (1 ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἠμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν καὶ παρονήσιαν) and whom he felt bound to be continually reminding of the teaching they had received from the holy prophets, and
of the law of Jesus Christ in which they had been instructed by
their Apostles (118-19, 312), there is no hint in 1 P. of any previous
connexion between the writer and readers of that Epistle. On the
contrary, the writer seems to be indebted to Silvanus, a companion
of St. Paul's, for an introduction to St. Paul's old converts. And
yet there is a warmth and intimacy in the manner in which these
strangers are addressed, which contrasts curiously with the calm
intellectual tone conspicuous in 2 P. Spitta and Zahn, who join
in upholding the genuineness of 2 P., suppose that the letter
alluded to in 2 P. 31 has been lost, thus sharing the fate, as Zahn
thinks, of hundreds of other letters written by the Apostles.
Another of these lost letters he considers to be that of St. Paul,
referred to in 2 P. 315 καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν Παῦλος ἐγραφεν
ὑμῖν. I have suggested in my note that the Epistle referred to is
that to the Romans, on the ground that καθὼς must be explained
by the immediately preceding admonition τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν
μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε, which is more distinctly stated in
Rom. 24, 323, 325 than elsewhere, though we find an echo of it in
other Epistles, such as 1 Cor. 15, 2 Cor. 41, 61, Eph. 24, 2 Th. 26.
If this is so, the writer of 2 P. intends us to understand that his
letter is addressed to Rome.

It may help to clear matters if I give here Bishop Lightfoot's view
of the Roman Church (taken from his introduction to the Epistle
to the Philippians) during the last years of St. Peter and St. Paul.

In considering the results of St. Paul's labours it will be necessary to view
the Jewish and Gentile converts separately. In no Church are their
antipathies and feuds more strongly marked than in the Roman . . . and a
generation at least elapses before they are inseparably united.

Several thousands of Jews had been uprooted from their native land and
transplanted to Rome by Pompeius. In this new soil they had spread rapidly,
and now formed a very important element in the population of the metropolis.
Living unmolested in a quarter of their own beyond the Tiber, protected and
fostered by the earlier Caesars, receiving constant accessions from home, they
abounded everywhere, in the forum, in the camp, even in the palace itself.
Their growing influence alarmed the moralists and politicians of Rome.
'The vanquished,' said Seneca bitterly, 'have given laws to their victors.'
Immediately on his arrival the Apostle summoned to his lodgings the more
influential members of his race, probably the rulers of the synagogues. In
seeking this interview he seems to have had a double purpose. On the one
hand he was anxious to secure their good-will and thus to forestall the
calumnies of his enemies; on the other hand he paid respect to their spiritual
prerogative by holding out to them the first offer of the Gospel. On their
arrival he explained to them the circumstances which had brought him there.
To his personal explanations they replied, in real or affected ignorance, that
they had received no instructions from Palestine; they had heard no word of
him and would gladly listen to his defence; only this they knew, that the
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sect of which he professed himself an adherent, had a bad name everywhere. For the exposition of his teaching a day was fixed. When the time arrived, he 'expounded and testified the kingdom of God,' arguing from their scriptures 'from morning till evening.' His success was not greater than with his fellow-countrymen elsewhere. He dismissed them, denouncing their stubborn unbelief and declaring his intention of communicating to the Gentiles that offer which they had spurned. It is not probable that he made any further advances in this direction. He had broken ground and nothing more (pp. 14, 15).

But where he had failed other teachers, who sympathized more fully with their prejudices and made larger concessions to their bigotry, might win a way. The proportion of Jewish converts saluted in the Epistle to the Romans, not less than the obvious motive and bearing of the letter itself, points to the existence of a large, perhaps a preponderating, Jewish element in the Church of the metropolis before St. Paul's arrival. These Christians of the Circumcision for the most part owed no spiritual allegiance to the Apostle of the Gentiles: some of them had confessed Christ before him; many no doubt were rigid in their adherence to the law. It would seem as though St. Paul had long ago been apprehensive of the attitude these Jewish converts might assume towards him. The conciliatory tone of the Epistle to the Romans—conciliatory and yet uncompromising—seems intended to disarm possible opposition. . . . He had good reason to 'thank God and take courage,' when he was met by one deputation of Roman Christians at the Forum of Apollus, by another at the Three Taverns. It was a relief to find that some members at least of the Roman Church were favourably disposed towards him. At all events his fears were not unfounded, as appeared from the sequel. His bold advocacy of the liberty of the Gospel provoked the determined antagonism of the Judaizers. We can hardly doubt to what class of teachers he alludes in the Epistle to the Philippians, as preaching Christ of envy and strife, in a factious spirit, only for the purpose of thwarting him, only to increase his anguish and to render his chains more galling.1 An incidental notice in another, probably a later epistle, written also from Rome, reveals the virulence of this opposition still more clearly.2 Of all the Jewish Christians in Rome, the Apostle can name three only as remaining steadfast in the general desertion: Aristarchus his own companion in travel and captivity, Marcus the cousin of his former missionary colleague Barnabas, and Jesus surnamed the Just. 'In them,' he adds feelingly, 'I found comfort' (pp. 16–18).

Meanwhile among the Gentiles his preaching bore more abundant and healthier fruit. As he encountered in the existing Church of Rome the stubborn resistance of a compact body of Judaic antagonists, so also there were doubtless very many whose more liberal Christian training prepared them to welcome him as their leader and guide. If constant communication was kept up with Jerusalem, the facilities of intercourse with the cities which he himself had evangelized, with Corinth and Ephesus for instance, were even greater. Thus aided and encouraged the Apostle prosecuted his work among the Gentiles with signal and rapid success. In two quarters especially the results of his labours may be traced. The praetorian soldiers, drafted off successively to guard him, and constrained while on duty to bear him close company, had opportunities of learning his doctrine and observing his manner of life, which were certainly not without fruit. He had not been in Rome very long, before he could boast that his bonds were not merely known, but known in Christ, throughout the praetorian guard. In the palace of the Caesars too his influence

---

1 Phil. 115–18.  
2 Col. 410, 11.
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was felt. It seems not improbable that when he arrived in Rome he found among the members of the imperial household, whether slaves or freedmen, some who had already embraced the new faith and eagerly welcomed his coming. . . Writing from Rome to a distant Church, he singles out from the general salutation the members of Caesar’s household, as a body both prominent enough to deserve a special salutation and so well known to his correspondents that no explanation was needed (pp. 18, 19). Of the fact that the primitive Church of the metropolis before and after St. Paul’s visit was chiefly Greek there is satisfactory evidence. The salutations in the Roman letter contain very few but Greek names, and even the exceptions hardly imply the Roman birth of their possessors. The Greek nationality of this Church in the succeeding ages is still more clearly seen. Her early bishops for several generations with very few exceptions bear Greek names. All her literature for nearly two centuries is Greek. The first Latin version of the Scriptures was made not for Rome, but for the provinces, especially for Africa (pp. 19, 20).

The points to which I would call attention here are (1) the division of the Christians of Rome into a Jewish and a Gentile section, the former of which was more or less hostile to St. Paul; (2) the comfort St. Paul derived from the presence of Mark at the time when he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians, perhaps in the year 61; (3) Mark’s intended visit to Colossae (Col. 4:9); (4) the reference to Mark in 1 P. 5:18 ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἐν Βαβυλώνι συνεκκλητῇ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱὸς μου, from which we learn that he was then (that is probably in the following year) with St. Peter in ‘Babylon.’ What are we to understand by ‘Babylon’ here? It was a name used by the Jews, as Edom also was, to express their hatred of the great world-power of that time: cp. Apoc. 14:8, 16:19, 17:5, etc. and also Orac. Sib. v. 143, where Nero is described as

τῆς μεγάλης ἹΡάμης Βασίλειος μέγας . . .
δοτις παμμοῦσιν φθόγγοι μελητέας ὑμνοὺς
θεατροκοπῶν ἀπολεί πόλλοι σὺν μητρὶ ταλαίνῃ.
φείξεται ἐκ Βαβυλώνος ἀναξ φοβερός καὶ ἀναιδής,

and v. 158,

φλέξει αὐτὴν Βαβυλώνα
'Ἰταλῆσι γαϊάν θ', ὃς εἶνεκα πολλοὶ δλοῦτο
'Εβραῖων ἄγιοι πιστοὶ καὶ ναὸς ἀληθῆς.

That Rome was the scene of the joint labours of the two Apostles1 and of their martyrdom under Nero is established by very early

1 See Eus. Η.Ε. ii. 15, and Chase, Art. on Babylon in Hastings’ D. of B. i. p. 213.
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tradition. Clement writing from the same place some thirty years afterwards says (chapters 5 and 6): 1

"Let us come to the noble athletes of our own generation. Because of envy the great and righteous pillars of the Church were persecuted and contended unto death. Let us set before our eyes the good Apostles—Peter, who endured many labours, and having borne his witness (μαρτυρήσατο) went to the appointed place of glory; Paul who suffered much and journeyed far, and having borne his witness before the rulers departed from the world. . . . To these men there was gathered a great company of the elect who . . . by reason of many outrages and tortures became a noble example among us." The Muratorian Canon speaks of the martyrdom of Peter in connexion with the journey of Paul to Spain. Ignatius (Rom. iv.) gives the names of both Apostles as having authority over the Church in Rome. Irenæus (iii. 1. 1) says of the Gospel of Matthew that "it was written among the Hebrews in their own tongue at the time when Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the Church in Rome. After their death Mark wrote down the teaching of Peter." Tertullian (Scorp. 15) writes: "Orientem fidel Romae primum Nero cruautavit. Tunc Petrus ab altero cingitur, cum cruci adstringitur."

It may be well to add here a condensed statement of Dr. Chase's Reconstruction of the later history of St. Peter taken from D. of B. iii. 777.

It seems impossible to suppose that St. Peter had already worked in Rome when St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans (111f., 152f.). The account of St. Paul's arrival in Rome (Acts 28:14 foll.) seems to exclude the possibility of St. Peter's having been in the city at that time. This evidence is confirmed by the negative evidence of the Epistles of the Captivity. We are led therefore to the conclusion that St. Peter's arrival in Rome must be placed after the last of the epistles of St. Paul's first captivity, and long enough before the writing of 2 Tim. to allow St. Peter to have left the city when that epistle was written, after having worked there some considerable time.

It is hardly possible to suppose that after St. Paul had taken the Apostolic oversight of the Church of Rome, St. Peter could, apart from St. Paul, have planned a visit there. It is clear (1) that St. Paul's mind was set on averting any rupture between Jewish and Gentile Christians, and on welding them together into one Church (Hort. Ecclesia 281 f.); (2) that in his view Rome was the key to the evangelization of the empire; (3) that he was keenly alive to the need that Peter, the unique representative of one side of the Church's work, should visit now the Mother Church at Jerusalem, now the Church in the capital of the empire; (4) that the problem of reconciling the two great elements in the Church presented itself to St. Paul in a concrete form in Rome (Phil. 114 f.), and that in Rome he grasped, as even he had never done before, the greatness of the issues involved (Eph. 2:11-14). If the churches saw the Apostle of the Gentiles and the leader of the Apostles of the Circumcision working together at Rome, they would learn the lesson of the unity of the Church, as they could learn it in no other way. Moreover St. Paul was pledged to distant journeys, so that the Church in Rome would be deprived of his immediate guidance, and as the far-reaching needs of that Church pressed upon him, he might well realize how manifold would be the gain resulting from the presence there of St. Peter. Hence it is probable that St. Peter may have arrived there at St. Paul's request in the spring of 61. His absence from Rome when St. Paul wrote 2 Tim. we may perhaps explain on the supposition that

1 What follows is taken chiefly from Chase in D. of B. iii. 769 foll.
he had been summoned to Jerusalem in connexion with the appointment of a successor to St. James. He must have returned to Rome before July 64. Dr. Chase suggests the following chronological abstract of St. Peter's labours.

35-44 Close of the ministry at Jerusalem; 44-61 work in the Syrian towns with Antioch as its centre; 61-64 work in Rome interrupted probably by a visit to Jerusalem; martyrdom in Rome July 64.

We may compare with this Zahn's view of the last years of St. Peter and St. Paul ('Einleitung in das N.T. ii. 17 foll.). He thinks that the sphere of St. Peter's activity was limited to Palestine and Syria, until St. Paul's first Roman captivity, and that it was to these Churches that he wrote 2 P. about the year 60, in order to warn them of the coming heresy. In the year 63, after St. Paul had been released from prison, and had commenced his missionary labours in Spain, St. Peter, probably on the invitation of Mark, went to Rome to supply St. Paul's place. In Rome ('Babylon' 1 P. 5) he met Silvanus, and was induced by him to write a letter of encouragement to the Churches of Asia Minor, giving his entire sanction to the teaching which they had received from St. Paul (5:12 'ἐπιμαρτυροῦν ταύτῃ εἶναι τὴν ἀληθὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς ἥν στήτε). St. Paul's absence in Spain explains why there is no allusion to him. Zahn thinks that within a year, in the spring of 64, St. Peter was crucified in the gardens of Nero.

After leaving Spain Paul returned to Asia Minor and from thence to Rome, where his martyrdom took place probably in the year 66. Zahn imagines that the lost letter of St. Paul mentioned in 2 P. may have been an apology addressed to the Jewish Churches during his imprisonment in Caesarea. But a letter of such importance was hardly likely to be lost.

To return now to 2 P. If Dr. Chase is right in supposing that Peter may have been called from Rome to Jerusalem to take part in the election of the new Bishop, it would of course have been quite possible for him to write a letter to Rome from thence. On

---

1 Cf. Eus. H.E. iii. 11.
2 This seems very improbable, if we are right in supposing that the Epistle of Jude was written to the same Churches.
3 If he had gone there sooner, he must certainly have been mentioned in the epistles of the imprisonment.
4 Dr. Hort ('Introd. to 1 Peter, p. 6) suggests that, as Silvanus was the bearer, St. Peter may well have left all personal matters for him to set forth orally.
5 Not 'head-downwards,' which is merely a misinterpretation of ἀναθέν, in the phrase which we find in the Acta Pauli cited by Orig. Tom. xx in Joh. ἀναθέν μέλλω σταυρωθῆσαι, itself borrowed from Heb. 6:8 ἀνασταυρωθέται τοῦ τοῦ ἡδιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. See Zahn Einl. ii. 25, G.K. ii. 846.
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the other hand if, as we have seen reason to believe, 2 P. is a spurious document written some fifty years after St. Peter’s death, it would be very natural for the writer to introduce a reference to the generally recognized tradition that both Apostles had preached and suffered in Rome (cf. εὐαγγελισμέν 115, and τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν 32). It may be said that the writer was not one to have overlooked the certainty that, if Peter wrote to the Church at Rome during the captivity of Paul, he must have sent some message of condolence or comfort or congratulation. This difficulty however is obviated, if he was aware that St. Paul was then on a missionary journey in Spain or elsewhere. But such hypotheses are not simply groundless, but altogether unnecessary. There is no reason to suppose that the author of 2 P. any more than the author of the Book of Wisdom desired to deceive his readers. The object of both was the same, to put before them the teaching which they supposed that Solomon in the one case, Peter in the other, would have given under the same circumstances. So far as they introduce historical or biographical allusions beyond what was essential to the actual teaching, these were added only by way of avoiding any startling disillusion.

In my note on 2 P. 115 I have suggested that allusion is there made to the tradition that the Gospel of Mark embodied the teaching of St. Peter. Zahn opposes this view (Einf. ii. 47) in the following words: ‘Selbst wenn der 2 P. um 170 geschrieben wäre, dürfte man nicht an das Evangelium des Marcus denken; denn erst lange nach diese Zeit hat man gefabelt dass P. den Marcus beauftragt habe sein Evangelium zu schreiben, und auch, nachdem diese Meinung gebildet hatte, konnte man sie dem P. nicht mit Worten, welche nur an eine religiöse Leseschrift denken lassen, als Absicht in den Mund legen’; i.e. ‘Even if 2 P. were written as late as 170 A.D. it would still be impossible to find in it a reference to the Gospel of Mark, for the legend to that effect did not originate till much later, and even after this view had established itself, it could not have been referred to in language which implies a book of religious instruction.’

Supposing this Epistle to have been written by St. Peter himself, why might he not have referred to a forthcoming life of Christ, as a treatise which would enable his readers to make mention of the Christian virtues and graces of which he had before spoken? He had already referred (13) to Christ, as having called them
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ίδια δόξα καὶ ὁρετή: surely nothing could be more appropriate, more helpful to a godly life, than that lie should leave behind the picture of this δόξα καὶ ὁρετή drawn up from his own recollection by his favourite disciple. And the following words οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μόθοις ἔξακολουθήσαντες, ἀλλὰ ἐπόπται γεννηθέντες seem to imply a statement of facts. Then comes the objection that the story as to St. Peter's connexion with the Gospel was later even than 170. Probably Zahn had in his mind the words of Clement of Alexandria, quoted from the Sixth Book of the Hypotyposes by Eusebius, H.E. ii. 15: 'The hearers of Peter in Rome were not satisfied with simply listening to his preaching' (τῇ ἀγράφῳ τοῦ θείου κηρύγματος διδασκαλίᾳ), paraklēsai δὲ παντολαίας Μάρκου, οὐ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκόλουθον δυνα τὸν Πέτρου λατρήσαι, ὡς ἂν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμηνῃ τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδειγμάτος ἀυτοῦ καταλείψαι διδασκαλίας, μὴ πρὸ τοῦ τε ἄνειναι ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τόν ἄνδρα, καὶ τούτῃ αἰτίας γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Μάρκου εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς. γνώντα δὲ τὸ πραξθὲν φασὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον, ἀποκαλύψαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πνευματος, ήσθηναι τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν προθυμίᾳ κυρώσατε τῇ γραφήν εἰς ἐντευξιν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Κλήμης εὖ ἐκτῷ τῶν Τοποτυπώσεως παρατέθηκε τῇ ἰστορίᾳ, συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ο Ἰεραπολίτης ἐπίσκοπος ὁμόματι Παπίας. Much the same account is given in Eus. H.E. vi. 14, according to the traditions τῶν ανέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων preserved by Clement, except that Peter is said to have expressed neither approval nor disapproval of the action of Mark. Irenaeus (iii. 1) says more briefly that after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul in Rome Μάρκος ὁ μαθητής καὶ ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. Similarly Tertullian (adv. Marc. iv. 5). These testimonies may all be considered later than 170 A.D., and we have seen that Clement varies to a certain extent in his account. Eusebius however (H.E. iii. 39) gives us the exact words of Papias, reporting the testimony which he had heard with his own ears from τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου 'Ἰωάννου, an actual disciple of the Lord:

καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε. 'Μάρκος μὲν ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος δ ἐκμιμοίνευσεν ἄκριβῶς ἐγραφέν, οὐ μὴν τάξει τα ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ή λεχθέντα ή πραξθέντα. οὔτε γὰρ ἡκούσα τοῦ Κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὑπετέρου δέ, ὡς ἐφην, Πέτρφ, δι πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὖθεν δὲσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγουν· ὡστε οὐδὲν ἡμαρτεν Μάρκος, οὕτως
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This statement seems to me to have every mark of simplicity and truth, and from it I think we should certainly infer, as Clement seems to have done, that Mark made notes of Peter's teaching at the time, and probably mentioned to him his intention of publishing his notes at some future time. If this was so, it was very natural for St. Peter to mention it in what he regarded as his last address to his disciples. If it was not so, that is, if Mark never spoke of his intention during Peter's lifetime, it was at any rate most natural that the pseudonymous writer of 2 P. should draw the same inference as Clement did from the words of Papias, or the tradition which they embody.

I take now one or two expressions in the Epistle which seem to be more easily explained on the supposition of a comparatively late date. If 116 was written by St. Peter, we naturally suppose the allusion to be to the words of Christ recorded in Joh. 2118, but it is not easy to see how those words can be construed as implying that Peter, writing some thirty years afterwards, was shortly to die. Yet this must be the sense here, for it is given as a reason for making the most of the short time which remained. If stress is laid on the words δυναν δε γηράσον, old age in itself is a sufficient warning of approaching death, so that there seems no reason to recur to the ancient prophecy, the point of which lies not in the nearness or remoteness of death, but in its character, a violent, as opposed to a natural death. It is a far-fetched way of connecting this idea with the nearness of death, to say that a violent death is a sudden death, and a sudden death leaves no time to prepare for death. It is much easier to understand it of a later warning, such as we find alluded to in Clem. Hom. and other apocryphal books. As St. Paul refers to his own approaching death in Acts 2022,26 and 2 Tim. 44, so it seemed natural that a similar intimation should be made to St. Peter.

The phrase το δεμον δρος (2 P. 118) seems to imply a later date than the simple εις δρος υψηλον (Mk. 9, Mt. 17) or εις το δρος (Lk. 936), whether we interpret it of a known mountain which had now become consecrated as the scene of the Vision, or whether we take it allegorically of the Mount of God, the New Jerusalem, as I have suggested in p. iv.

If του αγορασαντα αυτοου δεσποτην (2 P. 21) is to be under-
stood of Christ, as I think it is by most commentators, this is probably the first instance of its being so used. Some scholars deny such a use previous to the fourth century.

In 3\textsuperscript{2} the writer reminds his readers of the command of the Lord, which they had received through their apostles, \textit{i.e.} through those who had preached the Gospel to them. It is evident from 1\textsuperscript{16} that Peter himself is to be counted as one of these, and from 3\textsuperscript{16} Paul would be another, together with the companions who had laboured with him at Rome during his imprisonment.

The most important passage in Jude bearing upon the circumstances of its composition is v. 17, where the readers are bidden to call to mind the words formerly spoken to them by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ (which would fit in with the suggestion (p. cvi) that it was addressed to the Syrian churches) \textit{δι' ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἐσονται ἐμπαίκται}, the latter words showing that these communications of the Apostles had now ceased, either by their death or by their removal from Jerusalem. Jude recognizes that 'the last time,' of which they had preached, had now arrived. The long retrospect which these words imply agrees with the far-away note of v. 3, \textit{παρακαλὼν ἐπαγωνίζονται τῇ ἁπαξ παραδοθεῖσθαι τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει}, as contrasted with such passages as Lk. 4\textsuperscript{1} σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη, though we must not forget what has been pointed out in the comment (p. 61 below), that the idea of a Christian tradition is familiar to St. Paul, and (p. 23) that there are other examples in the N.T. of the objective use of \textit{πίστει}.

It has been argued that this epistle must have been written before 70, or it would have contained some reference to the destruction of Jerusalem among the other notable judgments of God. We may grant that this is what we should have expected, if the letter were written shortly afterwards, though even then it is a possible view that a patriotic Jew might shrink from any further allusion to so terrible a subject, beyond the reference to the destruction in the wilderness (v. 5); but this difficulty is lessened if we suppose the date of the Epistle to be nearer 80 than 70.
CHAPTER VIII

THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE OF JUDE

ASSUMING for the moment the genuineness of the Epistle, what do we know of the author?

The name Judas (Ἰουδας) was naturally in very common use among the Jews at the time of the Christian era. It was dear to them as having been borne not only by the Eponymos of their tribe, but also by their great champion Judas the Maccabee. Two among the Twelve bore this name, Judas Iscariot, and the Judas not Iscariot (Jn. 14:22), who is also called Judas son of James (ὁ Ἰακώβου, Lk. 6:16, Acts 1:13) and Thaddaeus (Mt. 10:3, Mk. 3:18, where some MSS. add Δεδεμένως). Besides these we meet with a Judas among the Brethren of the Lord (Mt. 13:55, Mk. 6:3), Judas of Galilee (Acts 5:37), Judas surnamed Barsabbas (Acts 15:22), Judas of Damascus (Acts 9:11). It is therefore not surprising that the writer should have added a note of identification, δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀδελφός ὃς Ἰακώβου. The most famous James in the latter half of the first century was the head of the Church at Jerusalem and brother of the Lord, who also begins his epistle by styling himself simply δοῦλος (Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Hence it seems probable that the addition was made, not merely for the purpose of identification, but, like the addition of ἀπόστολος δέ in Tit. 1, as giving a reason why his words should be received with respect, since he was brother of James and therefore one of the Brethren of the Lord. In my Introduction to the Epistle of St. James (pp. i–xlvii), I have endeavoured to show that the Brethren of the Lord were sons of Joseph and Mary, that they did not join the Church till after the Crucifixion, and that none of them was included among the Twelve.¹

¹ See ver. 17, where the writer appears to distinguish between the Apostles and himself.
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Other facts which we learn from the N.T. are (1) that Jude was probably either the youngest or the youngest but one of the Brethren of the Lord, as he is mentioned last among them in Mt. 1356 οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας, and last but one in Mk. 63 ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος; (2) that the Brethren of the Lord (of course exclusive of James, who remained stationary at Jerusalem) were engaged in missionary journeys like St. Paul (1 Cor. 96), but that they differed from him in the fact that they were married and were accompanied by their wives, and also, as we may suppose from Gal. 29, Mt. 1058, that their ministrations were mainly directed to the Jews. In my edition of James (p. cxv) I have argued that his epistle was addressed to Jews of the eastern Diaspora and it seems improbable that Jude, writing many years after his brother's death, may have wished to supply his place by addressing to the same circle of readers the warnings which he felt bound to utter under the perilous circumstances of the new age. His cousin Symeon, the son of his uncle Clopas, had succeeded to the bishopric of Jerusalem (Eus. H.E. iii. 22, iv. 22, quoted in my edition of James pp. viii foll.), and is said to have been crucified A.D. 107 at the age of 120 (cf. Hegesippus ap. Euseb. H.E. iii. 32 ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν αἱρετικῶν κατηγοροῦσι τινὲς Συμεῶνος... ὡς δὲντος ἀπὸ Δαβίδ καὶ Χριστιανοῦ, καὶ οὗτος μαρτυρεῖ ἐτῶν δὲν ἐκατόν εἰκοσιν ἐπὶ Τραϊανοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ ὑπατικοῦ Αὐτικοῦ).

Eusebius (H.E. iii. 19) quotes again from Hegesippus an interesting story of the grandchildren of Judas: τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ Δομετιανοῦ τοὺς ἀπὸ γένους Δαβίδ ἀναρείσθαι προστάζαντος, παλαιὸς κατέχει λόγος τῶν αἱρετικῶν τινὰς 1 κατηγορήσαι τῶν ἀπογόνων Ἰουδᾶ (τούτων δὲ εἶναι ἀδελφὸν κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ σωτηροῦ) ὡς ἀπὸ γένους τυγχανόντων Δαβίδ καὶ ὡς αὐτοῦ συγγενεῖαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ φερόμενων. τὰυτα δὲ δηλοῖ κατὰ λέξιν ἄδε πως λέγων ὁ Ἡγήσιμος. (20) ἐτὶ δὲ περιήσαν οἱ ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ Κυρίου ὑιοῦν τοῦ Ἰουδᾶ, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὁς ἢδηπλάτορευσαν 2 ὡς ἐκ γένους δυτας Δαβίδ, τοῦτος δὲ ὁ Ἰουνίακατος 3 ἤγαγε πρὸς Δομετιανόν Καίσαρα. ἔφοβειτο γὰρ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὃς καὶ Ἡρώδης, καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς εἰ ἐκ Δαβίδ εἰσὶ καὶ ὄμωλόγησαν. τότε ἤρωτησεν αὐτοὺς πόσας

1 Perhaps provoked by this epistle of their grandfather.
2 From delator.
3 Evocatus.
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Mr. James Moffatt (Historical N.T. p. 591) tries to use this story in support of the view that our epistle was written in the second century. He says, ‘As grandsons of Jude were alive in Domitian’s reign, the period of his own life would be far too early to suit the evidence of the writing.’ Domitian’s reign extended from 81 to 96 A.D. Jude, as we have seen, was apparently the youngest of the Brethren of the Lord, probably born not later than 10 A.D., if we accept the date of 6 B.C. for the Nativity. Taking into account the age at which marriage generally took place in Judaea, we may suppose that he had sons before 35 A.D. and grandsons by 60 A.D. These may have been brought before Domitian in any year of his reign. Jude himself would thus have been 71 in the first year of Domitian. If his letter was written in 80 A.D. (see last chapter, p. cxliv) he would have been 70 years of age, and his grandsons about 20. Any date after the death of Jude and before the end of the reign of Domitian is possible for the interview.

In my Introduction to St. James I have pointed out that his epistle bears marked traces of some characteristics which are found in the Lord Himself. I propose to call attention here to
some resemblances and differences between the epistles of the two brothers.

A. (1) Among the former we may note the tone of undoubting and unquestioned authority which pervades the two epistles, combined with the personal humility of the writers. They do not arrogate to themselves that relationship which constituted the ground of the reverence with which they were regarded by their fellow-believers. They are simply servants of Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, to whose coming, as the righteous Judge, they look forward, whose power still manifests itself in works of mercy (James 1:1, 2:5, 5:8-9, 14); of Jesus Christ, who keeps His people safe to the end, through whom they hope for eternal life, to deny whom is the climax of impiety, in whom the Father is glorified for ever (Jude 1:3, 6, 21, 25). They are sharers of a common salvation (Jude 5), they need forgiveness of sin like other men (James 3:2).

(2) Mental characteristics as exhibited in the two epistles.

In my edition of James (p. ccxxix) I have summed up the more general qualities of his style in the words 'energy, vivacity, and as conducive to both, vividness of representation, meaning by the last that dislike of mere abstractions, that delight in throwing everything into picturesque and dramatic forms, which is so marked a feature in our Epistle.' To a certain extent this is true also of Jude, as shown in his imaginative power and his frequent use of figurative speech. Cf. Jude v. 8, where the innovators are spoken of as dreamers polluting the flesh; v. 12, where they are compared (1) to sunken rocks on which those who meet them at the love-feasts run aground and perish, (2) to waterless clouds driven by the wind, (3) to trees which have to be rooted up, because they bear no fruit in the fruit-bearing season, (4) to wild waves foaming out their own shame on the shore, (5) to falling stars which are extinguished in everlasting gloom. In v. 20 the faithful are bidden to build themselves up on their most holy faith; in v. 23, to save sinners, snatching them from the fire; to hate the garment spotted by the flesh. In regard to St. James I further illustrated the quality of vividness by 'the frequent reference to examples such as Abraham, Rahab, Job, Elijah.' In the same way St. Jude gives animation to his warnings by reference to the Israelites who perished in the wilderness for their unbelief after being saved from Egypt; to the fallen angels who are reserved for the judgment in everlasting chains; to Sodom and the neigh-
boring cities, which sinned in the same way as the angels, and now suffer the penalty of eternal fire (vv. 5–7). Reverence for the powers of the unseen world is commended by the pattern of the archangel Michael, who, even in his dispute with the devil for the body of Moses, refused to bring a railing accusation, but committed the case to God (vv. 8, 9). Cain and Balaam and Korah are cited as the predecessors of the present disturbers of the Church (v. 11). Enoch the 7th from Adam has left us his warning against such men (vv. 14, 15). ‘You have yourselves heard the same warning from the Apostles’ (v. 17).

(3) For moral strictness and stern severity in rebuking sin, the whole of this short epistle may be compared with such passages as James 2:18, 3:15, 4:1–5. For noble and weighty expression we may compare vv. 20, 21, γυμέως δέ, ἀγαπητόι, ἑποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, ἐν πνεύματι ἄγιοι προσευχόμενοι, ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἄγια π θεοῦ τηρήσατε, προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον and the final doxology, with the passages which I have selected from St. James in p. cxxviii. The appealing ἀγαπητοί, which is thrice found in St. James, is also thrice repeated in Jude. The warning against Respect of Persons is found in James 2:10 and in Jude 16: that against a murmuring discontented spirit in James 1:3, 4, 5, in Jude 15, 16; that against the misuse of the tongue in James 3:10, in Jude 16: the charge to labour for the salvation of others in James 5:19, 20, in Jude 22, 23. For special details of style see above, ch. ii. pp. xxvi foll.; but I may notice here the forcible antithesis in v. 10, δόσα μὲν οὖν οἰδασίν βλασφημοῦσιν, ἵπ τέ φυσικῶς ό ω τὰ ἄλογα ζεύε ἐπιστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρουται.

As regards vocabulary, the most striking resemblance is the occurrence of ψυχικός as opposed to πνευματικός, of which the earliest biblical example is in James 3:15, but this had been adopted by Paul (1 Cor. 2:10 foll.) before it was made use of by Jude.

B. (1) The differences between the two epistles are hardly less marked: Jude evidently belongs to a much later period of Christian development. James, as I have endeavoured to show in the Introduction to his Epistle, wrote about the year 45 A.D. before any of the other canonical books was in existence, and his theological position is that of the early church described in the opening chapters of the Acts. Jude is familiar with the writings of St. Paul. He is familiar with the terms σωτήρ and σωτηρία (vv. 3 and 25):
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in vv. 20, 21, quoted above, he brings together the three Persons of the Trinity; he addresses those to whom he writes in Pauline language as κλητοί (v. 1) and ἐγιοι (v. 3), and uses forms of ascription and doxology closely resembling those which occur in St. Peter and St. Paul. Their 'most holy faith' is a 'tradition once delivered to the saints' (vv. 4, 20): they are bidden to 'remember the words of the Apostles, how they told them that in the last time there should come scoffers' (vv. 17, 18). The error which he combats appears to be a misgrowing of St. Paul's teaching in regard to a salvation of free grace, 'not of works, lest any man should boast' (v. 4). Many of the features which he distinguishes are such as we find delineated in St. Paul's farewell to the Ephesian Church, and in some of his Epistles, especially those to Titus and Timothy.

(2) Another difference might seem to be Jude's repeated references to Pseudepigrapha such as the book of Enoch and the Assumption of Moses (on which see the next chapter) and his readiness to give credence to fanciful legends such as the fall of the Watchers, and the contention for the body of Moses. Credulity of this kind seems to be far apart from the strong practical sense of James. Yet there are signs that the latter was not unacquainted with rabbinical traditions. Spitta even goes so far as to trace most of his teaching to pre-Christian sources. I have argued against this view in ch. vii. of my Introduction to his Epistle; but my notes on 19 (διψύχοι) and 48, ἀγνίσατε καρδίας διψύχοι ταλαίπωρησατε, suggest a connexion with an apocryphal writing quoted in Clem. Rom. i. 23 ἡ γραφὴ αὐτῆ, ὅπου λέγει Ταλαίπωροι εἰσὸν οἱ διψύχοι and identified by Lightfoot and Spitta with Eldad and Modad (on which see Herm. V 3 2), by Hilgenfeld with the Assumption of Moses. The phrase in 414, ἀτμῆς γάρ ἐστε πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινόμενη, has been traced by some to another apocryphal quotation found in Clem. i. 17 ἐγὼ δὲ εἰμὶ ἀτμῆς ἀπὸ κύθρας, which Hilgenfeld also supposes to be taken from the Assumption of Moses. The phrase κόσμος ἀδικίας in James 36 is found in Enoch 48'. The Testaments of the Patriarchs, which also contain quotations from Enoch (such as Sim. 5 ἐφοράτθη ἐν χαρακτηρὶ γραφῆς Ἔνωχ, Levi 10 βιβλίον Ἔνωχ τοῦ δικαίου, id. 14, ἐγναν ἀπὸ γραφῆς Ἔνωχ ὅτε ἐπὶ τέλει ἀσεβήσετε, id. 16, Juda 18,

1 The quotation, as given more fully in Clem. Rom. ii. 11, contains the somewhat rare word ἀκαταστασία, which is also used by James 34.
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Benj. 9, Zab. 3, Nephi. 4, in γραφὴ ἄγια Ἐνώχ ὅτι ... ποιήσετε κατὰ πάσαν ἀνομίαν Σωδόμων), furnish several parallels quoted in my note on James 47 ἀντίςτητε τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ φεύγεται ἄφ' ὑμῶν. The words which immediately precede (ἐγγύσατε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐγγύσεις ὑμῖν) are not unlike another quotation which occurs in Herm. Vιι. ii. 3 ἐγγὺς Θεός τοῖς ἐπιστρεφομένοις, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἑλλάτ καὶ Μωδὼν τοῖς προφητεύσασιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ. James has also been credited with a knowledge of the Sibylline writings on the ground of the phrase ἵνα θανατηφόρον which occurs in 38 and also in Sib. Ἰουν. 71

eἰσι θεοὶ μερόπων δηλήτορες1 <ἐντοι> ἄβουλον,
tῶν δὴ κάκα στόματος χείται θανατηφόρος ἵνα.

But if there is borrowing, it is just as likely to be on the other side. The strange expression τροχὸς γενέσεως in 36 is regarded as Orphic by some, but it seems to have been used by the Orphic writers in a different sense, viz. that of the endless changes of metempsychosis.

(3) Another difference which strikes one on reading the two epistles is that while the former is full of instruction for the present time, the bulk of the latter is made up of denunciations, which have very much lost their force. To a modern reader it is curious rather than edifying, with the exception of the beginning and end (νν. 1, 2 and 20–25). This is no doubt to be explained by what is stated of the purport of the letter in ν. 3. It was called out by a sudden emergency, to guard against an immediate pressing danger, and was substituted for a treatise περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας which Jude had hoped to send (ν. 3), and which would probably have been more in the tone and spirit of νν. 20 f.

1 MS. δολοτρόπες. Geffken reads δόλῳ ἡγητήρες.
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USE OF APOCRYPHAL BOOKS BY JUDE

Clement of Alexandria in his *Adumbrationes* (Dind. vol. iii. p. 483), after quoting Jude v. 9, 'Quando Michael archangels cum diabolo disputans altercabatur de corpore Moysis,' remarks 'hic confirmat *Assumptionem Moysis*; i.e. here the writer corroborates the *Assumption of Moses*; and again, in commenting on v. 14, 'Prophetavit autem de his septimus ab Adam Enoch,' he adds 'His verbis prophetam (al. prophetiam) comprobat.'

The Hebrew original of the book of Enoch ¹ is now lost. It was translated into Greek, of which only a few fragments remain, and this was again translated into Ethiopic, probably about 600 A.D. A copy of the last was found in Abyssinia in 1773 by Bruce, the famous traveller, and an English version was published by Abp. Laurence in 1821, followed by the Ethiopic text in 1838. The composite nature of the book is generally recognized. The latest editor, R. H. Charles, who is my authority for what follows, divides it into five sections and recognizes many interpolations in these. He considers that the larger portion of the book was written not later than 160 B.C., and that no part is more recent than the Christian era. It exercised an important influence on Jewish and Christian literature during the first three centuries A.D., being probably used by the author of the *Assumption of Moses* (written about the Christian era), also by the writers of the *Book of Jubilees*, the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, the *Fourth Book of Ezra*, and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Mr. Charles traces its influence in the N.T. not merely in the epistles of St. Jude and the two epistles of St. Peter, but above all, in the Apocalypse;

¹ On which see Schürer, *Hist. of Jewish People*, vol. iii. pp. 54–73.
also in the Acts, and the epistle to the Hebrews, in some of the epistles of St. Paul, and in the Gospels. It is quoted three times (twice as Scripture) in the Epistle of Barnabas, is referred to, though not named, in Justin and Athenagoras, is cited by Irenaeus iv. 16. 2: ‘Enoch ... cum esset homo, legatione ad angelos fungebatur et translatus est et conservatur usque nunc testis judiciei Dei, quoniam angeli quidam deciderunt in terram in judicium’ (En. 147). Tertullian quotes it as Scripture, calling Enoch the oldest of the prophets (Idol. xv, Apol. xxii). He allows that its canonicity was denied by some, ‘quia nec in armarium Judaicum admittitur,’ and also because it was thought that, if it were a genuine writing of Enoch, it must have perished in the Deluge. He considers however that it should be received, because of its witness to Christ, and because it has the testimony of the Apostle Jude. It is twice quoted in Clement’s Ec. Proph. (Dind. iii. pp. 456, 474) as well as in Strom. iii. 9. Origen speaks doubtfully of the authority of Enoch: cf. C. Celsum v. 54, ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πάνυ φέρεται ὡς θεία τὰ ἑπηγεγραμμένα τοῦ 'Ἐνώχ βιβλία, and In Johannem vi. 25, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐνώχ γέγραπται, εἰ τῷ φίλῳ παραδέχεσθαι ὡς ἄγιον τὸ βιβλίον, also In Num. Hom. xxviii. 2, De Princ. i. 3. 3. Hilary (Comm. in Psalm. cxxvii. 3) writes: ‘Fertur id, de quo etiam nescio cuius liber extat, quod angeli concupiscentes filias hominum cum de caelo descendenter in montem Hermon convenerant.’ Jerome says that the doubts entertained as to the epistle of St. Jude arose from his quoting an apocryphal book as an authority (De Vir. Ill. iv), ‘quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonia a plerisque reicitur.’ Cf. also Comm. in Ps. cxxxii. 3 and Comm. in Titum, i. 12. Augustine (Civ. Dei, xv. 23. 4) and Chrysostom (Hom. in Gen. vi. 1) speak of the story of the angels and the daughters of men as a baseless fable. Still more severe is the condemnation passed on the book of Enoch with other apocryphal writings in Const. Apost. vi. 16. 2 as φθοροτοια καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθρά. Mr. Charles has also edited the Assumption of Moses (1897), which he regards as a composite work made up of two distinct books, the Testament and the Assumption of Moses.1 ‘The former was written in Hebrew between 7 and 29 A.D., and possibly also the latter. A Greek version of the entire work appeared in the

1 Cf. Schürer, pp. 73–83.
USE OF APOCRYPHAL BOOKS BY JUDE

first century A.D. Of this only a few fragments have been preserved. The Greek version was translated into Latin not later than the fifth century’ (pp. xiii, xiv). ‘The book preserved in the incomplete Latin version, first published by Ceriani in 1861, is in reality a Testament and not an Assumption.’ ‘The editing of the two books in one was probably done in the first century, as St. Jude draws upon both in his epistle’ (pp. xlvii and l). Thus Jude v. 9 is derived from the Assumption, Jude v. 16 from the Testament (p. lxii). On the latter Charles compares οὗτος εἰς γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαναμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὄφελίας χάριν with Asc. M. vii. 7 quaerulosi, vii. 9 et manus eorum et mentes immunda tractantes et os eorum loquetur ingentia, v. 5 erunt illis temporibus mirantes personae ... et accipientes munera (MS. accessiones munerum). He identifies the ἐρπαίκται of Jude v. 18 with the homines pestilentiosti of Ass. M. vii. 3, and calls attention to the frequent recurrence of the word ἀσεβείς in the former (vv. 4, 15, 18) and impii in the latter: see vi. 1 facient facientes impiatatem, vii. 3 pestilentiosti et impii, ib. 7, ix. 3, xi. 17.

Again there appears to be a reminiscence of the Testaments of the Patriarch, where the sin of the Watchers is connected with that of Sodom: cf. Test. Neph. 3, ἡλιος καὶ σελήνη καὶ ἀστέρες οὐκ ἀλλοιούσι τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν ... ἑρμηνευτικά καὶ ἀφέντα κύριον ἡλιοσωμα τάξιν αὐτῶν ... ἔσκειλαν ἀπειλημμένης πνεύματι πλάνης. Ὑπερείς μὴ ὁδώσῃ ... ἵνα μὴ γένηται ὡς Σόδωμα, ἡτίς ἐνδιέλαβεν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῆς. Ὑμοίως καὶ Ἐγχύργοροι ἐνδιέλαβεν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν, οὐκ χατηράσατο Κύριος ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ, Test. Aser. 7 μὴ γίνοιτε ὡς Σόδωμα ἡτίς ἦγον ἀνεγέλαν κυρίον καὶ ἀπώλετο ἐως αἰώνοις. There seems to be more than a casual coincidence between these passages and Jude 6, 7, and 13, ἀνέγελαν τοῦτo μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν ... ὡς Σόδωμα ...

1 See n. on this, and add to the illustrative passages there quoted a scholium printed for the first time in James Test. of Ahabram, p. 18: ὁ διαβόλος ἀπειρίζει πέλεν ἀποστήσαι, λέγω δὴ ἐμοὶ ἐστιν τὸ σώμα, ἀν τῇ θλή διαμόρφωσιν καὶ ἤκουσα σοι ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριοι, τούτου τι Κύριος τὸ κάτω τῶν προφυλακτών δολοῖ δὲ, δι' ἔκακομοιν οἱ Θεοὶ δι' θεοὶ δι' θεοὶ, δι' ἑκάστην ἑκάσταν τοῦ ἐπιπλάσιον, τοῖς ἑκάστην τυχεῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑπὲραντίοις <ἤπιαν> θεομοίς πορευμέναις τὴν ἑκάστην ἑκάσταν, τούτο οὖν συνεργάσατα ὄρασιν ἐν τῇ Μωσίου ταφῆς ἐξελασφήμεις γὰρ καὶ ὁ διαβόλος κατὰ Μωσίου, φορεῖ τοῦτον καλὸν διὰ τὸ πατάξαν τοῦ Ἀγγέλου τὸν Μιχαήλ ὁ ἄρχαγγελος, μὴ ἐνεργεῖα τὴν αὐτὸν βλασφημίαν, εἰρήκην αὐτῷ δὴ ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος ὁ Θεός, διαβόλοι. ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ τούτῳ, δη ἐφεύσατο ὁ Θεός εἰςαγαγὼν τὴν Μωσίου ἐνθα διώκειν αὐτὸν μὴ εἰσελθεῖν.
We have seen how this use of apocryphal books was viewed by the early Christian writers. They were at first disposed to think that a book stamped with the approval of St. Jude must be itself inspired. Later on, the feeling changed: the authority of St. Jude was no longer sufficient to save the apocryphal writing: on the contrary the prejudice against the Apocrypha and its ‘blasphemous fables’ (Chrys. Hom. 22 in Gen.) led many to doubt the authority of St. Jude: see above quotation from Jerome, who argues that the approval of the Apostle need not be supposed to extend to the whole of the book of Enoch, but only to the verses quoted by him. So Augustine (Civ. Dei, xv. 23, 4): ‘Scritsisse quidem nonnulla divina Enoch illum septimum ab Adam negare non possumus, cum hoc in epistola canonica Judas apostolus dicat’ (although the book as a whole has been justly excluded from the Canon).

Some modern writers have endeavoured to avoid the necessity of allowing that an apocryphal writing is quoted as authoritative in the Bible, by the supposition that the words quoted may have come down by tradition and have been made use of by the inspired writer, independently of the book from which he is supposed to quote, or that they were uttered by immediate inspiration without any human assistance, or again, that the book of Enoch may be subsequent to that of Jude, and have borrowed from it. But the careful investigation of many scholars, as summed up by Charles, can leave little doubt in any candid mind as to the proximate dates, both of Enoch and of the Assumption. St. Jude does not put forward his account of the burial of Moses or the preaching of Enoch, as though it were something unheard of before. As regards the libertines described in the latter book, he uses the phrase προγεγραμμένος, implying that he refers to a written prophecy. None of the early Fathers find a difficulty in supposing him to refer to a book which was not included in the Canon. Jews of that time were accustomed to accept rabbinical explanations or additions to Scripture as having authority. Thus St. Paul accepts the story of the Rock which followed the Israelites in their wanderings (1 Cor. 104), gives the names of the magicians who withstood Moses before Pharaoh (2 Tim. 39), recognizes the instrumentality of angels in the giving of the Law (Gal. 319, cf.
Heb. 22, Acts 722). So, too, Stephen speaks of Moses as learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (Acts 722), the author of the ep. to the Hebrews (11st) alludes to the tradition as to the death of Isaiah (see Charles' *Ascension of Isaiah*, pp. xlv foll.), and James (517) limits the drought predicted by Elijah to 3½ years.
CHAPTER X

THE STORY OF THE FALLEN ANGELS

St. Jude (vv. 5–8) introduces as examples of the divine wrath against those who had sinned after receiving favours from God (1) the Israelites who perished in the wilderness for unbelief after they had been saved from Egypt; (2) the angels who abandoned their original office and habitation, being led away by fleshly lusts, and are now kept in chains under darkness till the day of judgment; (3) the people of Sodom, who inhabited a land like the garden of the Lord (Gen. 13:10) and were rescued from Chedorlaomer by Abraham (Gen. 14:16, 17), and yet sinned after the fashion of the angels, and are now a warning to all, suffering the punishment of eternal fire. A similar account is given in 2 Pet. 2:4, where it is said (1) that God spared not the angels who sinned, but hurled them into Tartarus, to be detained there in pits of darkness until the final judgment; (2) that He brought a flood on the world of the ungodly, while He spared Noah; (3) that He destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, while He delivered righteous Lot; in all three cases punishing impurity and rebellion.

As is shown in the explanatory notes, this account of the Fall of the Angels is taken directly from the book of Enoch, which is itself an expansion from Jewish and Gentile sources of the strange narrative contained in Gen. 6:1-4: 'It came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the ground and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose... The Nephilim were in the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bare children unto them: the same were the mighty men which were of old, the men of renown' (R.V.). ἐγένετο ἡμῖνα
THE STORY OF THE FALLEN ANGELS

Then the version ἄγγελοι gives the true force of the original is evident from the other passages in which the phrase 'sons of God' occurs, Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7, Dan. 3:25, 28, Ps. 29:1, 89:6. It has been suggested that the phrase μετ' ἐκείνοι may be a marginal note having reference to Num. 13:33, where the Nephilim are mentioned as a gigantic race, 'in whose eyes the spies were as grasshoppers,' inhabiting a part of Canaan at the time of the Exodus. The translation γῆς antes implies not only superhuman size, but also superhuman insolence and impiety. According to Greek mythology they were children of Heaven and Earth, who rose up in insurrection against the Gods and were hurled down to Tartarus or buried beneath the mountains. This resemblance is noted by Josephus in the passage quoted below.

It is evident that the passage in Gen. 6 is a fragment unconnected either with what precedes or follows. Driver says of it: 'We must see in it an ancient Hebrew legend...the intention of which was to account for the origin of a supposed race of prehistoric giants, of whom no doubt (for they were "men of name") Hebrew folk-lore told much more than the compiler of Genesis has deemed worthy of preservation.' Ryle (Early Narratives of Genesis, pp. 91–95) speaks of it as 'an extract from a very early legend which gives an alternative explanation of the Fall, in which woman is again tempted by one of higher race.'

The story was variously commented on by later Jewish writers, most of whom supposed that the Nephilim were the offspring of the intercourse between the angels and the daughters of men, and that they were destroyed in the Flood: cf. Sir. 16:7 οὐκ ἐξελέγασον...
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358-359, Josephus Ant. 1. 3. 1, πολλοὶ γὰρ αγγέλοι Θεοῦ γυναιξὶ συνίον- 
τες ὑβριστὰς ἐγέννησαν παῖδας καὶ παντὸς ὑπερόπτας καλοῦ διὰ 
τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ δυνάμει πεποίθησιν. ὅμως τοῖς ὑπὸ υγιάντων τετολμη-
όσοι λεγομένωσιν ὑπὸ Ἤλληνων καὶ οὕτως δρᾶσαν παραδίδοντες.
Philo (Vit. Cont. p. 472) ridicules the idea of angels being open 
to such temptation, ἣν τολμῶσιν οὐκ εὐάγγεις προσάπτειν ταῖς 
μακραιαῖς καὶ θελαίς δυνάμεσιν, εἰ γυναιξὶ θυνταιεσ ἐπιμανέντες 
ὁμιλήσαν οἱ παντὸς πάθους ἀμέτοχοι. A knowledge of the sin 
of the angels seems to be implied in Job 418, ‘Behold he put no 
trust in his servants and his angels he charged with folly,’ and also 
in the story of Sarah and Asmodeus (Tobit 614 etc.). Tertullian 
(De Virg. Vel. 7) explains St. Paul’s injunction (1 Cor. 1110) by 
reference to the same history ‘propter angelos, scilicet quos legimus 
a Deo et caelo excidisse ob concupiscientiam feminarum.’

The Fall of the Angels is largely treated of in the collection of 
treatises which goes under the name of the Book of Enoch. The 
earliest portion of the book is considered by the latest editor, Mr. 
R. H. Charles, to have been written in the first quarter of the 
second century B.C. Two hundred of the angels, or watchers, 
Ἐγρηγοροὶ as they are called in the Greek versions of Dan. 513 by 
Aquila and Symmachus, conspired together under the leader-
ship of Semjaza (elsewhere called Azazel, as in chapters 8 and 9) 
and descended on Mt. Hermon in the days of Jared, father of 
Enoch (c. 6). There they took to themselves human wives 
whom they instructed in magic and various arts, and begot giants, 
who afterwards begot the Nephilim: cf. c. 8 οἱ δὲ γῆγαντες ἐτέκνω-
σαν Ναφηλεῖοι . . . μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἡρῴαν τοῖς γῆγαντες κατεσθείν 
τὰς σάρκας τὰς ἀνθρώπων (like Polyphemus). Complaint having 
been made of the sin and misery thus introduced into the world, 
Raphael is sent down from heaven to bind Azazel hand and foot 
and shut him up in darkness till the judgment day, when he will 
be cast into eternal fire. Gabriel is at the same time sent to slay 
the giants (10b): the watchers will be bound under the hills for 
seventy generations, and then be confined for ever in the abyss of 
fire: the spirits of the slain giants become demons. In c. 19, 
however, the demons are represented as existing before the fall of 
the watchers.

The prevailing demonology of the Book of Enoch is thus 
summed up by Dr. Charles (Enoch, p. 52). The angelic watchers 
who fell from lusting after the daughters of men have been
imprisoned in darkness from the time of their fall. The demons are the spirits which proceeded from the souls of the giants who were their offspring. They work moral ruin on earth without hindrance till the final judgment. Satan is the ruler of a counter kingdom of evil. He led astray the angels and made them his subjects. He also tempted Eve. The Satans can still appear in heaven (as in Job). They tempt to evil, they accuse the fallen, they punish the condemned. In portions however of the Book of Enoch there is no mention of a Satan or Satans, but the angels are led astray by their own chief Azazel, or as he is sometimes called Semjaza (En. ix. x. xiii. liv.). Of the Secrets of Enoch, which is supposed to date from about the Christian era, Dr. Charles says: 1 'It is hard to get a consistent view of the demonology of the book: it seems to be as follows: Satan, one of the archangels, seduced the watchers of the fifth heaven into revolt in order to establish a counter kingdom to God. Therefore Satan or the Satans were cast down from heaven and given the air for their habitation. Some however of the Satans or Watchers went down to earth and married the daughters of men.' Compare ch. xviii. 3.

'These are the Grigori, who with their prince Satanail rejected the holy Lord, and in consequence of these things they are kept in great darkness.'

In c. 54 there appears to be an attempt to connect the two different stories of the Fall: the guilt of the Watchers is said to have consisted in their becoming subject to Satan, who was either identified with the Serpent, as in Apoc. 12ο και ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ δείκτης ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὀλυν—ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐβλήθησαν; or else was supposed to have made use of the Serpent as his instrument, as in the Assumption of Moses quoted by Orig. De Princip. iii. 2. 1 (Lomm. vol. xxi. p. 303): 'In Genesi serpens Ewam seduxisse describitur, de quo in Asc. Mosis, cujus libelli meminit apostolus Judas, Michael Archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Mosis ait a diabolo inspiratur serpente causam exstitisse praevericationis Adae et Evae.' 2

The history of the gradual development of the belief in regard to Satan, as exhibited in the Bible, will be found in any of the Dictionaries of the Bible. Besides the attempt

---

1 See his note on pp. 36, 37.
2 Cf. Tennant, The Fall and Original Sin, pp. 245, 246.
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to harmonize the two Fall-stories by making Satan the cause of both, an attempt was made to arrive at the same result by ascribing to Satan or the Serpent the same motive which led to the fall of the angels. In Wisdom 24 we read 'By the envy of the devil death entered into the world.' This envy is explained in rabbinical writings sometimes as occasioned by the dignity of Adam and his lordship over the creation, but more frequently by Satan's desire for Eve: 1 cf. 4 Macc. 188 οὐδὲ ἐλυμήνατο μον τὰ ἀγνὰ τῆς παρθενίας λυμεῶν ἀπάτης δῆν. Sometimes again his fall is ascribed to the less ignoble motive of pride, as in the pseudepigraphic Life of Adam: 'When God created Adam, He called upon the angels to adore him as His image... Satan however refused, and on being threatened with the wrath of God said that he would exalt his throne above the stars of heaven' (Isa. 1413). In other writings (Life of Adam, Secrets of Enoch) Satan refuses to worship God Himself, 'entertaining the impossible idea that he should make his throne higher than the clouds over the earth, and should be equal in rank to [God's] power.'

There can be little doubt that the story of the punishment of the angels took its colouring from two passages of Isaiah, the fine imaginative description of the mighty king of Babylon, under the figure of the morning star, entering the realm of Hades (ch. 14) and what appears to be an account of the punishment of guardian angels for their neglect of the nations committed to their charge (ch. 241f.). 'It shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison and after many days shall they be visited.'

St. Jude's allusion to this story is merely parenthetical, to illustrate the law of judgment. He appears not to recognize any connexion between the Fallen Angels and Satan. The former are suffering imprisonment in darkness till the final judgment: the latter was apparently able to confront the archangel on equal

1 See Tennant, pp. 152 foll.; Thackeray, St. Paul and Jewish Thought, pp. 50 foll.; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus, i. p. 165, ii. 753 foll. In the latter passage the rabbis are quoted to the effect that the angels generally were opposed to the creation of man, and that the demons were the offspring of Eve and male spirits, and Adam and female spirits, especially Lilith.
2 See Tennant, pp. 199, 201, 206.
terms, when contending for the body of Moses. So the continued 
activity and even the authority of Satan and his angels in this 
world are asserted both in the O.T., as in Job 1st and Zech. 3st, 
and in the N.T., as in James 4st, 1 P. 5st, Eph. 6st. (we have to stand 
against the wiles of the devil, ... our warfare is not against flesh 
and blood, but) πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσιας, πρὸς τὸν 
κοσμοκράτορα τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον, πρὸς τὰ πνευ-
ματικά τῆς πονηρίας εν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, see Lightfoot on Col. 215. 
In 2 Cor. 4st Satan is spoken of as the god, in John 12st and 16st 
as the prince of this world. He is the tempter and accuser of the 
brethren, and did not shrink even from assailing the Son of God 
Himself (Mt. 4st).

The above account of the Fall of the Angels was that usually 
accepted, with slight variations, both among Jews and Christians 
till towards the close of the fourth century A.D. It is alluded to 
in Test. Neph. iii. οἳ Ἑγρηγόρες ἐνήλικαν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν, 
οὗς κατηράσατο Κύριος ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ, and with a rational-
istic explanation in Test. Rd. v. where the watchers are said to 
have been seduced by women, οὕτω γὰρ ἔθελεν τοὺς Ἑγρηγόρους 
πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ: κάκευοι συνεχός ὀρόντες αὐτὰς ἐγένοντο 
ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἀλλήλων καὶ συνέλαβον τῇ διανοίᾳ τὴν πράξειν καὶ 
μετασχηματίζοντο εἰς ἀνθρώπους καὶ εἶν τῇ συνοδίᾳ τῶν ἄνδρων 
αὐτῶν συνεφαίνοντο αὐταῖς, κάκευναι ἐπιθυμοῦσαι τῇ διανοίᾳ τῆς 
φαντασίας αὐτῶν ἔτεκον γῆγαντας. So Justin M. Apol. i. 5, τὸ 
palaioν δαίμονες φαύλου ἐπιφανειάς ποιησάμενοι καὶ γυμνάκας 
ἐμοίχευσαν καὶ παίδας διέφθειραν καὶ φόβητρα ἄνθρωποι ἔδειξαν, 
ὡς καταπλαγήναι τούς οἷς . . . μὴ ἐπιστάμενοι δαίμονες ἐναι 
φαύλους, θεοὺς προσωνόμαζον, Apol. ii. 5, οἱ δ’ ἄγγελοι, παραβάντες 
τῇ διδ. τὴν τάξιν, γυμνακῶν μίξεσιν ἤττήθησαν καὶ παίδας 
ἐτέκνωσαν, οἳ εἰσὶν οἱ λεγόμενοι δαίμονες, Heracleon ap. Orig. 
(ἐν Ἰολ. tom. 13, Lomm. vol. ii. p. 125) ζητείοθαὶ φησὶ περὶ τῶν 
ἄγγελων, εἰ σωσθήσονται, τῶν καταλθόντων ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν ἄνθρωπων 
θυγατέρας, Tert. Apol. 22, De Virg. Vel. 7, De Culte Fem. 2 (where he defends the authenticity of our Epistle), ib. 10, Iren. iv. 36. 4. 
Clem. Al. Paed. iii. p. 260, δειγμά σοι τούτων οἱ ἄγγελοι, τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ 
kάλλος ἀπολελουτότες διὰ κάλλος μαρανόμενον, καὶ τοσοῦτον ἐξ 
σωρανῶν ἀποπεσόντες χαμαλ., ib. p. 280, Strom. iii. p. 538, Str. v. 650, 
οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐκεῖνοι οἱ τῶν ἀνω κλήρоν εἰληχότες κατολοθήσαντες 
eἰς ἡδονάς, ἐξεῖσον τὰ ἀπόρρητα ταῖς γυναιξίν κ.τ.λ. Celsus 
having made use of the story in his attack on the Christians, 
m 2
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Origen in his reply (v. 54) states that the Book of Enoch was not regarded as authoritative in the Church, and quotes Philo's explanation of Gen. 6 to the effect that it gives an allegorical account of the fall of the soul through temptations of sense: he does not however pronounce any definite opinion of his own. In his comment on Joh. 625 he seems to accept the ordinary view in the words ὦ μόνον δὲ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τελείου ἑως τὸ ἀτελές, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ νῦν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἄνθρωπων κ.τ.λ.

His contemporary Julius Africanus is said to be the only one of the ante-Nicene Fathers who enunciated the view which afterwards prevailed, viz. that 'the sons of God were the descendants of Seth, and the daughters of men descendants of Cain.' See the quotation in Routh, Bel. Sacr. ii. p. 241, where he also gives the alternative explanation εἶ δὲ ἐπὶ ἄγγελον νοοῦτο τοῦτο, τὸν περὶ μαγεῖας καὶ γυοτείας . . . ἐναρκάσας συνείναι χρή τῶν μετεώρων ταῖς γυναιξὶ τῆν γυνών δεδωκέναι. Eusebius (Pr. Ev. v. 4. 11, 12) still keeps to the old view and compares the narrative of Gen. 6 to the stories of the Titans and giants of Greek mythology. So Lactantius, Div. Inst. ii. 14: ‘Deus ne fraudibus suis diabolus, cui ab initio terrae dediderat potestatem, vel corrumparet vel disperderet homines, quod in exordio rerum fecerat, misit angelos ad tutelam cultumque generis humani . . . Itaque illos cum hominibus commorantes dominator ille terrae fallacissimus consuetudine ipsa paulatim ad vitia pellexit et mulierum congressibus iniquavit . . . sic eos diabolus ex angelis Dei suos fecit satellites,’ etc. So Sulpicius Severus (Chron. i. 2): ‘Angeli quibus caelum sedes erat, speciosarum forma virginum capti . . . naturae saeae originisque degeneres . . . matrimonios se mortalibus miscuerunt.’ Julian, like Celsus, used this belief as a ground for attacking Christianity. Cyril of Alexandria, in his reply (ix. p. 296) repudiates the belief as altogether unworthy, and injurious to morality, since men plead the angels’ sin as excuse for their own, and adopts the interpretation of ‘sons of God’ previously given by Africanus. Chrysostom deals at length with the subject in his 22nd homily on Genesis. He calls the old interpretation blasphemous, and holds that it is precluded by the words of Christ, that ‘in the

1 It is also found in the apocryphal Conflict of Adam and Eve of uncertain date, on which see the art. ‘Adam, Books of,’ in the D. of Christ. Biog. i. 36 foll.
resurrection men shall be like angels, neither marrying nor
given in marriage.' Augustine (Civ. Dei, xv. 28) thinks it cannot
be denied 'Silvanos et Faunos, quos vulgo incubos vocant... mulierum appetisse ac peregisse concubitum... Dei tamen
angelos sanctos nullo modo sic labi potuisse crediderim, sed potius
de illis qui primum apostatantes a Deo cum diabolo principe suo
ceciderunt,' unless we are rather to understand this of the child-
ren of Seth. A little later Philastrius (Haer. 107) goes so far as
to condemn the old opinion as a heresy.

The sympathies of Christians in the present day must assuredly
be with those who endeavoured to eliminate from the Scriptures
all that might seem to be dishonouring to God and injurious to
men. But the methods employed with this view were often such
as we could not now accept. For instance, the allegorical method
borrowed from the Stoics by Philo, and adopted from him by many
of the Fathers, is too subjective and arbitrary to be of any value
in getting rid of moral difficulties. We have replaced this now
by the historical method, first enunciated by our Lord, when he
contrasted the spirit of the Gospel with that of the old Dispensa-
tion.1 There is a continuous growth in the ideal of conduct as set
before us in the Bible. Much that was commanded or permitted
in the days of Abraham or Moses or David is forbidden to those
who have received the fuller light of Christianity. So, what it
was found possible for men to believe about God Himself and
about the holy angels, is impossible for us now.2 The words put
into the mouth of God in Gen. 322, and in 116.7, we feel to be
inconsistent with any true idea of the power and wisdom and love
of God, and only suitable to a very low state of human develop-

1 Cf. Mt. 521-44, 190, Lk. 934-36. In the last passage the reading supported by
the best MSS. is Κύριε Ἰησοῦς εὐλογεῖ σου καταβηγαί ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐκ
καταβηγαί αὑτοῖς; στέβεσθε δὲ ἐνελθενσεν αὑτοῖς, leaving out all that gives point to the
fuller narrative preserved in other MSS. and versions, which insert the words ὅση
cαὶ Ἡλιας ἐκθέσθης at the end of the Apostles' question, and the words καὶ ἐθνο-
σιὰ αἰώνια οὐρανὸν πνευμάτω ἢ αὐτοῖς. ὁ γὰρ ὢν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν ψυχάς ἀνθρώ-
πων ἐκτελεῖ να ἄλλα σώζει, after αὐτοῖς. Hort thinks that these clauses were
probably 'derived from some extraneous source, written or oral' (Sel. Read.
p. 60), but the additions are of such extraordinary interest and value, so evidently
bearing the mark of the spirit of Christ Himself, and the narrative without them is
so bald and pointless, that I cannot believe that the latter is all that
came from St. Luke's pen. It seems to me far more probable that a complete
early copy fell into the hands of some Jewish Christian, who was so shocked to
see the authority of the great prophet Elijah thus contumeliously set aside, that
he reduced the pungent life-giving text to the harmless residuum preserved to us
by our present oldest MSS., and unhappily sanctioned by the R.V.

2 See Tennant, l.c. p. 4.
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So also for the story of the fall of the angels. But is it a satisfactory explanation of the latter to suppose that 'sons of Seth' are meant by 'sons of God'? Ryle (Early Narratives of Genesis, 91–95) points out that 'there is nothing in the context to suggest this, no sign that the Sethites were distinguished for piety: they are not even exempted from the charge of general wickedness which brought on the Flood.' Equally untenable is the Jewish explanation that 'sons of God' are the nobles. I think no one who has studied with any care the recent investigations as to the origin of the book of Genesis, of which Driver's Book of Genesis may be taken as a specimen, can doubt that it contains much which is unhistoric, though full of moral and spiritual teaching. The pre-Abrahamic narrative shows many resemblances with the Babylonian records, but in general the motive has been changed and purified.¹ Thus Driver says (p. lxiii): 'It is impossible, if we compare the early narratives of Genesis with the Babylonian narratives, from which in some cases they seem plainly to have been ultimately derived... not to perceive the controlling operation of the Spirit of God, which has taught these Hebrew writers... to take the primitive traditions of the human race, to purify them from their grossness and their polytheism, and to make them at once the foundation and the explanation of the long history that is to follow.' Of the particular passage in question however Driver says (p. 83): 'As a rule, the Hebrew narrators stripped off the mythological colouring of the piece of folklore which they record; but in the present instance it is still discernible.'²

¹ Tennant, 20, 21, 41.
² For further information on this subject see Suicer's Thesaurus under ἄγγελος, and ἄγγελος, Hastings's D. of B., under 'Angel,' 'Demon,' 'Fall,' 'Flood'; Encycl. of B. Lit., under 'Angel,' 'Demon,' 'Deluge,' 'Nephilim,' 'Satan'; Maitland's Ruvin (Essays iv.–vi.), where the literal interpretation is defended; Hagenbach, Hist. Doctr. § 52 and § 132.
CHAPTER XI

FALSE TEACHERS IN THE CHURCH TOWARDS THE END OF THE FIRST CENTURY

Jude.

Who are the mischief-makers against whom Jude's warning is directed?

The occasion of writing is that intelligence has just been received of a new danger threatening the Church. Jude feels bound to warn the faithful that they must defend the faith once delivered to the saints against certain persons who have secretly made their way into the Church, men long ago marked out for judgment, impious, changing the grace of our God into licentiousness, and denying the only Master and our Lord Jesus Christ. following, as they do, in the steps of the sinners of past ages,—Israel in the Wilderness, the apostate angels, the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah,—they will also share their fate. The offence of these was sensuality and disobedience to the laws of nature and of God. So the sin of the new apostates is impurity, rebellion, and irreverence. [Yet even the chief of the angels, when defending the body of Moses against Satan, treated him with respect.] They rail against things (persons) beyond their ken, while they bring destruction on themselves through following their carnal appetites. They are followers of Cain in their jealousy and hatred of the righteous, of Korah in rebelling against authority, of Balaam in their eager propagation of error for the sake of gain.

1 In my note on this passage I have quoted parallels from the Book of Enoch, which must certainly be taken literally. I think therefore that it is better to understand the denial by these heretics as explicit and theoretical, not merely as implied in their evil life and practice.
They are like sunken rocks which cause the shipwreck of heedless souls by the bad examples they set in your love-feasts; like rainless clouds scudding before the wind; like trees in autumn which are yet without fruit, twice dead, torn up by the roots; like wild waves foaming up their own shame; or falling stars destined to disappear in eternal gloom. It is of these that Enoch prophesied that the Lord would come to convict the impious of their impiety and of all their murmuring against Him. Against these the Apostles used to warn you that, in the last time, there would come mockers walking after their own lusts. They are the causes of division, carnal, without the Spirit. (To resist them) it is necessary that you should build up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Spirit, keeping yourselves in the love of God, looking for everlasting life. As for those who are in danger of falling, it is your duty in some cases to convince them when they dispute (or 'are in doubt'), in others to snatch them from the fire which threatens them, in others to feel towards them a trembling pity joined with abhorrence of their impurities.

2 Peter.

Here the mischief-makers are characterized as ψευδοπροφήται and ψευδοδιδακτα. They will secretly introduce destructive heresies, even denying the Master who bought them, drawing down on themselves swift destruction. Many will follow their licentiousness, bringing discredit on the way of truth. Through covetousness they will make merchandise of you with feigned words, but the judgment pronounced against them has been long working and will speedily bring about their destruction. Examples of such judgment in the past are the fall of the angels, the deluge, the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, when Lot was vexed with the sight and hearing of the impiety and licentiousness which surrounded him. God saves the righteous from temptation, but reserves the wicked for the day of judgment, especially those that surrender themselves to the lusts of the flesh, and despise authority. They are daring and self-willed, and tremble not to rail at dignities [yet angels who are so far superior do not bring railing accusations against them]. Thus railing where they are without knowledge, they become like brute beasts made by nature to be captured and destroyed, and shall
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themselves be utterly destroyed, 'defrauded of the hire of fraud.' They count it pleasure to spend the day in carnal gratification; they are spots and blemishes, indulging themselves in your feasts, to which they gain admission through their wiles. Accursed as they are, they have adulterous eyes, unwearied in sin; they entice the unstable, their heart is practised in covetousness; they have gone astray from the right road and followed the way of Balaam, who loved the hire of wrong-doing, but was rebuked by the ass for his transgression. Such men are wells without water, mists driven by the wind, doomed for ever to outer darkness. By their confident boasting they allure through the lusts of the flesh those who were just escaping from the snares of error. They promise them freedom, while they themselves are servants of corruption. Unhappy men, their former conversion has only sunk them to a worse state, if they again plunge into the defilements of the world.

Remember the words of the prophets and of your apostles, that in the last days mockers should come, walking after their own lusts and saying 'where is the promise of his coming? all continues as it was.' They forget that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years. The delay proceeds from the long-suffering of God, as Paul wrote according to the wisdom given to him, though it is true that in his writings there are difficult sayings, which are liable to be misunderstood and misused by the ignorant and unstable.

Paul.

The Epistle to the Philippians was probably written about the year 61, early in St. Paul’s first captivity in Rome. Bp. Lightfoot (in his Commentary, p. 42) says that ‘it represents a short breathing-space when one antagonistic error has been fought and overcome, and another is dimly foreseen in the future. The Apostle’s great battle hitherto has been with Pharisaic Judaism, his great weapon the doctrine of grace. In the Epistle to the Philippians we have the spent wave of this controversy . . . A new type of error is springing up—more speculative and less practical in its origin—which in one form or another mainly occupies his attention throughout the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians,

1 I have suggested in the chapter on the Text that ἀγαπάω should be read for ἀγαπάων.
and the Pastoral Epistles; and which under the distinctive name of Gnosticism in its manifold and monstrous developments will disturb the peace of the Church for two centuries to come.' There is much resemblance between the antinomians described in Phil. 3:18, πολλοὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦσιν, οὕς πολλάκις ἔλεγον ὑμῖν, νῦν δὲ καὶ κλαίουσιν λέγον, τοὺς ἔχθροὺς τούτων σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὥστε τὸ τέλος ἀπόλυτος ἡ κοιλία, καὶ η ἄδεια ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν, οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες, and those referred to in J. vv. 4, 10–13, 2 P. 2:1-3.

The first distinct allusion to these heresies appears in St. Paul's farewell speech to the Ephesian elders, Acts 20:29, 'After my departure wolves will enter in, not sparing the flock, and of yourselves will rise up men speaking perverse things to draw away the disciples after them.' But occasional warnings of a nature not altogether dissimilar may be found even in the earlier epistles: thus we read of ψευδάδελφοι in Gal. 2, of ψευδαπόστολοι in 2 Cor. 11:13, of a mystery of iniquity already at work in 2 Th. 2', of those that deny the resurrection from the dead in 1 Cor. 15:12, of those who eat the Lord's supper unworthily and cause divisions among the brethren in 1 Cor. 11:18-27, of those who are puffed up with notions of their own superior enlightenment in 1 Cor. 11:17-13, 8:1-3, who think they may take part in idolatrous feasts on the ground that all things are lawful unto them (1 Cor. 10:23), who defy their teachers and even the Apostle himself (1 Cor. 4:8-12, 5:5, 8:1-13, 9:12, 10:14-33), innovators in doctrine, serving their own belly, indulging in carnal lusts (Rom. 16:17, 18, 1 Cor. 6:19-20), deceiving the simple through their plausible speeches (Eph. 4:14, περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διασκαλίας ἐν τῇ κυβία τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδίαν τῆς πλάνης, ἢ μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς ἀπατᾶτο κενοὶς λόγοις).

'The letters to the Colossians and Ephesians exhibit an advanced stage in the development of the Church. The heresies which the Apostle here combats are no longer the crude materialistic errors of the early childhood of Christianity, but the more subtle speculations of its maturer age . . . The heresies of the Pastoral Epistles are the heresies of the Colossians and Ephesians grown rank and corrupt.' For the detailed account of the Colossian heresy see Lightfoot's Commentary, pp. 73–113, especially pp. 98 ff.: 'Gnosticism strove to establish . . . an intellectual oligarchy in religion. It had its

1 Lightfoot, Phil., p. 45.
hidden wisdom, its exclusive mysteries, its privileged class... St. Paul in this Epistle feels himself challenged to contend for the universality of the Gospel.' 'Only in the light of such an antagonism can we understand the emphatic iteration with which he claims to warn every man and teach every man in every wisdom, that he may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus (128). It will be remembered that wisdom in Gnostic teaching was the exclusive possession of the few,... that perfection was the term especially applied to this privileged minority, and thus it will be readily understood why St. Paul... should express his intense anxiety for the Churches of Colossae and the neighbourhood, lest they should be led astray by a spurious wisdom to desert the true knowledge' (24). 'This false wisdom is... speculative, vague and dreamy' (24.8.18). [We may compare the phrase ἐννυπνιαζόμενοι in Jude 8.] As regards their cosmogony and theology St. Paul attacks the doctrine of angelic mediators, setting against it the doctrine of the Word Incarnate, in whom the whole Pleroma resides. Angelolatry is a denial of Christ's twofold personality and His mediatorial office. As regards the practical results of this teaching, we find these to be either immoral, as in the Pastoral Epistles to some extent, 'and still more plainly in the Catholic Epistles (Jude 8, 2 P. 210f.) and the Apocalypse'; or ascetic, as among the Colossians (216. 21. 23) and 1 Tim. 42. St. Paul in his warning against the new heretics does not dwell on the contrast of law and grace, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, but denounces their ascetic practices as concentrating the thoughts on earthly things, while they are found valueless against sensual indulgence, which can only be overcome by the elevation of the inner life in Christ.

I proceed to cite the relevant passages from the Pastoral Epistles. 1 Tim. 127 some have turned aside into ματαιολογίαν, θέλοντες εἶναι νομοδιάδασκαλοι, μὴ νοοῦντες μὴτε καὶ λέγουσιν μὴτε περὶ τίνων διὰ βεβαιοῦνται; (v. 19) Some have made shipwreck concerning the faith, of whom are Hymenaeus and Alexander; (36) μὴ νεοφυτων, ἵνα μὴ τυφώθοις εἰς κρίμα εἰμέτεσθαι τοῦ διὰ βολοῦ; (41) τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα βητῶς λέγει δὴ ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἀποστήσονται τιμῶς τῆς πίστεως προσέχοντες πνεῦμα σοι πλάνοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαμασών, ἐν υποκρίσει φευγολογοί, κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἱδιὰν συνείδησιν,
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κωλυόντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων; (ver. 7) τοὺς βεβήλους καὶ γιραώδεις μύθους παραίτον; (68) εἰ τις ἐτεροδίδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέχεται υψιλούντως λόγους, ... τῇ φωτὶ ται ... νοσών περὶ ζήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας, ἐξ οὗ γίνεται ... διαπαρατριβάλ διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν ... νομιζόντων ποιρημένων εἶναι τὴν εὐσεβείαν; (ver. 20) τὴν παραθῆκην φύλαξον ἐκτετράμενος τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας καὶ ἀντιδειγμάς τῆς φευγώνυμον γνώσεως. 2 Tim. 1:13 Hold the pattern of sound words, etc.; (214) Of these things put them in remembrance; (v. 16) Shun profane babblings ... Their word will eat as a canker, of whom are Hymenaeus and Philetus, men who, concerning the truth, have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already. (225) In meekness correcting them that oppose themselves, if peradventure God may give them repentance ... and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil; 2 Tim. 3:1 foll. εἰς σχάταις ἡ μέρας εὐντῆσθαι καιροὶ χαλεποὶ. ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ ἀνθρώποι φιλανθοί, φιλάργυροι, ἀλαζόνες, ὑπερήφανοι, βλάσφημοι, γονεὺριν ἀπειθεῖς, ἀχάριοι, ἀνόσιοι, ἀστοργοῦν, ἀσποδοῦ, διάβολοι, ἀρατεῖς, ἀνήμεροι, ἀφιλάγαθοι, προδόται, προπετεῖς, τῷ τῆς φωμένοι φιλήδονοι, μάλλον ἡ φιλόθεοι, ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἀρνοῦμενοι. καὶ τούτων ἀποτρέπουν. ζὺ τῶν γὰρ εἰσὶν οἱ ἐνδύναμενες εἰς τὰς ὀικίας καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντες γυνακάρια σεσωρευμένα ἀμαρτιαῖς ἀγόμενα ἐπὶ θυμίαις ποικίλαις ... δρότων Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς ἀντέστησαν Μωσείης, οὕτως καὶ οὕτω καὶ άνθισταντι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἀνθρωποὶ καὶ ἐφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν, ἀδικοὶ περὶ τὴν πίστιν ... (v. 13) πονηροὶ δὲ ἀνθρωποὶ καὶ γοητεῖς προκάψωσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χείρον, πλανώμενοι καὶ πλανώμενοι. οὐ δὲ μενεὶ ἐν οἷς ἐμαθεῖς ... (48) ἐστιν γὰρ καιρὸς ὅτε τῆς ὑγιαινούσης διδασκαλίας οὐκ ἀνέξονται, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἑριθίμιας ἐπισερεύσωσιν διδακτικόν, κυνηγόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν.

Titus 1:10 εἰσὶν πολλοὶ ἀνυπότακτοι, ἀματαιόλογοι καὶ φρεναπάται μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, οὗς δὲ ἐπιστομιζεῖν, οὗτως ἠλώνοι ἀνατρέπουσιν διδασκοῦντες μὴ δειαῖς χρόνοὺς καὶ ἐσθεῖαν τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦμεν, βελουκτοὶ δυντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἄγαθον.
2 (Ephesus) ἐπείρασας τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους εἶλαι καὶ οὐκ εἰσίν, καὶ εἴρης αὐτοῖς φευδεῖς; (ver. 6) μισεῖς τὰ ἔργα τῶν Νικολαίτων ἀ δέ γώ μισῶ; (ver. 9 Smyrna) those that say they are Jews, but really are the synagogue of Satan; (ver. 13 Pergamum) the seat of Satan; (ver. 14) ἔχεις ἐκεῖ κρατοῦντας τὴν διδασκὴν Βαλαὰ ἀμ, δς ἐδίδασκεν τῷ Βαλακ βαλεῖν σκάνδαλον ἐνώπιον τῶν νιὼν Ἰσραήλ, φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα καὶ παρνεύσαι; (ver. 15) Nicolaitans; (ver. 18 Thyatira) the harlot Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess and teaches my servants to commit adultery and eat εἰδωλόθυτα; ‘the depths of Satan’ as they say; (3 Sardis) ‘they have not defiled their garments’; (3 Philadelphia) ‘thou didst keep my word and didst not deny my name.’

Epistles of John.

1 Joh. 28 εἰς χάτη ὀ ῥα εἰσὶν, καὶ καθὼς ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γενόναι σιν, ὥσεν γινώσκομεν ὅτι εἰσχάτη ὡρα ἐστίν. εἴ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθαν, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἤσαν εἴ ἡμῶν... (v. 22) τίς ἔστιν ὁ πειστὴς εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀρνοῦμενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστὸς; οὕτως ἔστιν ὁ ἀντίχριστος ὁ ἀρνοῦμενος τὸν πατέρα καί τὸν νῦν ἡμῶν. πάς ὁ ἀρνοῦμενος τὸν νῦν οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει... (v. 26); ταῦτα ἔγραψα ύμῖν περὶ τῶν πλανῶντων ύμῶν; (4) πολλοὶ πειστῇ εἴ ἐξελήθη ὅσιον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. (2 Joh. 7) πολλοὶ πλανῶν ἐς ἐξῆλθαν εἰς τὸν κόσμον οἱ μὴ ὁ μὸλονοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἔρχομενον ἐν σαρκί. (3 Joh. 9) ὁ φίλος ὥστεν ὒ τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἔπι πιθανεῖ σοι ἡμᾶς; διὰ τούτῳ, ἕν ἔλθων, ὅ ποιμنهσω αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ἀ ποιεῖ λόγοις ποιησάς φυλαρὼν ἡμᾶς.

How far do these prognostics of evil agree? We may say that the general picture is that of the prevalence of antinomian heresy, resulting in corruption of morals and disbelief in God and
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Christ. This falling away is to take place in the last times (Jude 18, 2 P. 21, 35, 1 Tim. 41, 2 Tim. 34, 45, 1 Joh. 218, 19, 2 Th. 2812, Matt. 2411-13), but it has already begun, as is shown by the use of the past or present tenses in Jude 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 19, 2 P. 210, 15, 17-22, 34, 1 Tim. 16, 7, 19, 63, 2 Tim. 329, Tit. 110-16, Apoc. 25, 6, 14, 1 Joh. 218, 19, 22, 41, 3, 2 Joh. 7. In some passages the stress is laid more upon practice, in others more upon the erroneous belief which lay at the root of the evil practice and was developed and strengthened by it. St. Jude, for instance, speaks more of practice and less of belief, but it seems to me unnecessary to suppose, as some have done, that the dangers against which he warns the Church are different from those against which St. Peter's warning is directed. The moral corruption described in the two epistles is the same even in its minutest points: the cause of this corruption is the same, the misinterpretation and misuse of St. Paul's doctrine of God's free grace (Jude 4, 2 P. 219, 316, cf. Rom. 36-8). The agents use the same methods and are described in the same terms: they are Christians in name and steal into the Church in each place without divulging their impious views (Jude 4, 12, 2 P. 21, 20, 21). They join in the love-feasts (Jude 12, 2 P. 218, 1 Cor. 1118), are greedy of gain (Jude 11, 16, 2 P. 212, 15, 16), are disputatious (Jude 22, 2 P. 34, 16), plausible (Jude 12, 2 P. 29), boastful, disobedient, irreverent (Jude 8, 11, 16, 2 P. 210, 11, 18), speaking evil of things and persons beyond their knowledge (Jude 10, 2 P. 218), seducing the simple by their confident and scornful assertions (Jude 18, 16, 18, 19, 2 P. 214, 16, 18), murmuring against God and even going so far as to deny 'the one Master and the Lord Jesus Christ' (Jude 4, 15, 16), or 'the Master that bought them' (2 P. 21). It is true that in 2 P. the mischief-makers are distinctly called 'false-teachers' and charged with introducing αἰτέσεις (21), while these terms are not used by St. Jude; but the language used by the latter seems to imply something more than a mere indulgence in the lusts of the flesh. The faithful are bidden not simply to abstain from the sins of impurity, disobedience, irreverence, covetousness, murmuring, impiety, self-seeking; they are not simply told to keep the commandments, but to defend the faith once delivered to the saints, and build themselves up upon its foundation (vv. 3, 20); they are to answer opponents (v. 22) who use the doctrine of grace to justify sin (v. 4), who deny God and Christ—a phrase which cannot, I think, mean less
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than that they put forward ideas out of harmony with the true doctrine of the Incarnation and of the Divine Nature. The same characteristics appear in v. 8, where the innovators are said ‘to make light of lordship and to rail at dignities,’ which can hardly be meant for earthly authorities, since in v. 10 they are spoken of as things ‘beyond their ken.’ Again the metaphors used in vv. 12 and 13 seem to require claims on the part of the innovators to be regarded as leaders and teachers, who are there represented as disappointing the hopes of their followers, like clouds which give no water, trees which yield no fruit, meteors which are soon lost in darkness. They utter proud and hard words against God; they are ψυχικοί (not merely σαρκικοί); they make invidious distinctions and so cause divisions (vv. 15, 16, 19).¹

The italicized and spaced words in the quotations given above from the Pastoral Epistles and the Epistles of St. John will serve to show the general resemblance between these and our two Epistles. The Epistle to the Colossians goes more fully into the more speculative side of heretical teaching in reference to the Pleroma and the worship of angels (as to which latter there is a curious difference between the Epistle to the Colossians and those epistles with which we are more especially concerned); but the presumption and exclusiveness of the false teachers, their inadequate views of the nature and work of Christ, and the practical immorality which was combined with their ascetic practices, are quite in agreement with the features of the heresy which are disclosed in the Epistle of St. Jude and the 2nd Epistle of St. Peter.

¹ Zahn (Einleitung, ii. pp. 76–81) particularizes the characteristics of the Innovators in Jude’s epistle, in words which may be thus summarized.

1. They profess Christianity and have gained admission to the Christian love-feast, but do not show the fruits of the Spirit; on the contrary they give rise to divisions in the Church.

2. Like Korah, they rebel against those who are over them in the Lord, and stir up discontent on the ground that all have equal rights, and that there is no ground for the discipline exacted of them.

3. They walk after their own lusts, make use of the love-feasts as occasions of self-indulgence, and show a tendency to the unnatural vices of the Sodomites and the Apostate angels (ver. 8).

4. They are confident and boastful, and utter hard words not only against their superiors in the Church, but even against God (ver. 15). They make light of the Divine majesty and speak ill of the angels (ver. 8) [from ver. 9 we gather that evil angels also are included]. They live in a dream-world of their own.

5. For the sake of gain they follow eagerly in the steps of Balaam the seducer of Israel, flattering the rich (J. 18), and seeking for popularity by all means fair or foul (cf. Tit. 11, 1 Tim. 6).

6. This state of things had been prophesied long before.
Comparing together Jude 11, 2 P. 2.15-16 and Apoc. 2.14, it would seem that it was customary with the orthodox to mark their disapproval of the proceedings of some of the contemporary heretics by styling them followers of Balaam. The reference to ἐἰδωλοθυτα in connexion with this name reminds one of the difficulty caused in the Churches of Rome and Corinth by the apostolic warning against eating what was offered to idols. St. Paul, after declaring that an idol itself is nothing and that a Christian may eat freely of all that is set before him, because the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, yet requires the strong to bear with the infirmities of the weak, and in 1 Cor. 10.20 affirms that, though all things are lawful, all are not expedient, and that, since the worship of the heathen is really a devil-worship, those who partake in the heathen feasts really enter into communion with devils. When Jude refers to the error of Balaam, he probably refers to those who considered it a mark of enlightenment to join in the life of the heathen round them and at the same time strove to make gain by flattering the rich. In Apoc. 2.12-15 it is said that the Church in Pergamum was troubled with those that hold the doctrine of Balaam (who are apparently identified with those that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans), and from v. 6 it would seem that this sect was also known in Ephesus and had rendered itself hated there by its deeds. Clement (Strom. ii. 118, iii. 25) frees not only Nicolaus himself (whom he calls ἀνήρ ἄποστολικός, and who is identified with the deacon of Acts 6 by Irenaeus and Tertullian) but also his sons and daughters, from the charge of immorality, and thinks that the heretics who abused his name misunderstood the phrase employed by him, τὸ δεῖν παραχρησθαι τῇ σαρκί. ἄλλῳ οἷ μὲν γενναῖος κολούειν δεῖν ἐδήλου τὰς τὴν ἡδονὰς τὰς τῇ ἐπιθυμίας...οί δὲ εἰς ἡδονὴν τράγων δίκην ἐκχυθέντες οἴον ἐφυβρίζοντες τῷ σώματι καθηδυπαθοῦσιν. He tells however a most extraordinary story about Nicolaus being ready to hand over his wife to any one who would take her.1

Referring to St. Jude's description of the heretics of his time Clement says (Str. iii. 11, p. 515) that vv. 8-16 might appear to be spoken prophetically of the Carpocratians of a later age. Epiphanius says the same of the 'Gnostici' (which seems to have been the name used of themselves by the Ophites), Haer. xxvi. 11, where he quotes Jude vv. 8-10 as an exact description of their

1 See Lightfoot, Gal. pp. 297 n., 309.
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horrible mysteries, and says they even used Jude’s denunciations as
countenancing their own proceedings, c. 13.1 He adds that their
order of Levites, whom they held in highest esteem, were guilty
of the sin of sodomy against which Jude so earnestly warns his
readers (vv. 7, 8). The Cainites, who are said to be a branch of
the Ophites, held that the Creator was evil (Jude 4), that the
Serpent represented the wisdom of God, that Cain and Esau,
Korah, and the Sodomites were champions of right (Jude vv. 7, 11):
see Epiphan. Haer. xxxviii. 1, Iren. i. 31. 1, Hippol. Ref. v. 16 (on
the Peratæ). Hippolytus says of the Naassenes or Ophites, that
they called themselves Gnostics, φάσκοντες μόνοι τὰ βάθη
γνώσειν (Ref. Haer. v. 6), which reminds us of the words
addressed to the Church in Thyatira (Apoc. 218–25), where we
read first of a false prophetess who tempts the believers
to commit fornication and eat things offered to idols, which
is also the teaching of the followers of Balaam and of the
Nicolaitans (vv. 14, 15), and secondly of those who say that
they know τὰ βάθα τοῦ Σατανᾶ, where the addition τοῦ Σατανᾶ
pronounces judgment upon the heretics. Of these Nicolaitans
Irenæus says (iii. c. 1) that the evangelist St. John wrote his
Gospel to remove the error ‘qui a Cerintho inseminatus erat
hominibus et multo prius ab his qui dicuntur Nicolaitae, qui sunt
vulsio (ἀπόστασις) eius quae falsa cognominatur scientia, ut
suaderet quoniam unus Deus qui omnia fecit per verbum suum;
et non, quemadmodum illi dicunt, alterum quidem fabricatorum,
alia autem Patrem Domini; et alium quidem fabricatoris filium,
alterum vero de superioribus Christum, quem et impassibilem
perseverasse, descendentem in Jesus... et iterum revolasse
in suum Pleroma.’ This account would agree with the statement
of St. Jude that the heretics, whom he condemns, denied the
Father and the Son (v. 4). We seem to be justified then in saying
that the heretical movements of the latter part of the first century,
of which we find traces in the later epistles and in the Apocalypse,
culminated in the teaching of Cerinthus, the opponent of St. John,
for a fuller account of whom I must refer to pp. 106 to 114 of
Bishop Lightfoot’s commentary on the Colossians.

There is however an earlier name, which I cannot think we

1 In this passage he condemns the literal interpretation of the word ἐνυπνη-
ζομενος, holding that the context shows it to be spoken peri της μυθους αὐτῶν
ταξισθες και ἀπολογίας, ὡς διὰ την νοον λεγομενης και ουκ ἄνω ἐφρωμενης διανοιας.
are at liberty to pass over, like some German commentators, as though it were absolutely unhistorical, denoting an imaginary personage, used by the Ebionites as a pseudonym for the Apostle St. Paul,—and that is Simon Magus. Believing that we have in Acts viii. a true account of an actual historical event, drawn up by a contemporary writer, and seeing no reason to doubt that his followers formed a heretical sect known to Justin Martyr, and holding, more or less, the opinions ascribed to them by Justin, Irenæus, and Hippolytus, I think we are at any rate bound to compare these opinions with those which we have found to be condemned in the later writings of the N.T. Our first witness, St. Luke, tells us that, before the martyrdom of St. Stephen, Simon had already gained notoriety as a magician and aroused the wonder of the people of Samaria, λέγων εἶναι τινα έαυτών μέγαν; that the Samaritans of all classes believed his professions and agreed in holding that οὕτως ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη. On Philip’s visit to Samaria after Stephen’s death Simon was much struck with the miracles which he wrought, and received baptism from him. Afterwards, when Simon saw that the gift of the Holy Spirit followed the laying on of the Apostles’ hands, he offered Peter money that he might receive the same power, and was met by the stern reproof τὸ ἀργύριον σου σὺν σοι εἶη εἰς ἀπώλειαν. The story ends with Simon’s entreaty that the Apostles would pray for him δι’ ὅτως μηδὲν ἐπέλθη ἐπ’ ἐμὲ δὲν ἐίρηκατε.

From this account we learn that Simon, before his baptism, claimed to be magnus quidam, a mysterious being, whom his followers regarded as ‘that potency of God which is called great.’ His teaching and his claims are more fully given by his compatriot Justin Martyr, who tells us that Simon was born in the village of Gitta in Samaria (Apol. i. 26), and was honoured by almost all the Samaritans and by a few others ὡς τὸν πρῶτον θεόν, and again (Dial. 120 θιν.) δεύθων ύπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ εξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως εἶναι λέγουσιν. He adds that Simon was accompanied by a woman named Helena, whom he declared to be ἡ πρώτη ἐννοια, ‘the first Idea or Conception.’

Irenæus (i. 23) explains that the Idea (corresponding to the

1 Justin’s story of the worship of Simon in Rome is now generally allowed to have arisen from a confusion between Simon and the ancient Sabine deity Semo Sancus.
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Sophia of other gnostic systems), in accordance with the will of her Father, gave birth to the angels and archangels, by whom this world was made, and was detained here below as the lost sheep, suffering all manner of indignities, till at last her Father, being wearied of the evil rule of the angels, descended to redeem her, and raise mankind, taking the shape first of angel and then of man. The law and prophecies of the O.T. were given, he said, by the angels and need not be regarded by those who put their trust in Simon and Helena. Men were saved, as was asserted by the heretics in Jude 4, by grace and not by good works ('secundum ipsius gratiam salvari homines, sed non secundum operas justas' Iren. i. 23. 3, οὐ γὰρ μὴ κρατείσθαι αὐτοῦς ἐπὶ τινι νομιζομένῳ κακῷ λελύτρωνται γάρ, Hippol. vi. 19). 2 Indeed the difference between good and evil was only conventional, depending on the arbitrary will of the angels (οὐ γὰρ ἐστι φύσει κακὸν ἄλλα θέσει ἔθεντο γάρ, φησίν, οἱ ἄγγελοι, Hippol. vi. 19). Simon claimed to have shown himself to the Jews as a Son, to the Samaritans as a Father, to the Gentiles as a Holy Spirit. Origen says the sect had dwindled down to less than thirty in his day (c. Cels. i. 57). Celsus himself professed to have come across Christians who called themselves Simonians or Helenians, but Origen will not allow that they are really Christians, ὅτι οὐδαμῶς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὁμολογοῦσιν τίδι Θεοῦ Σιμωνιανοῦ, ἄλλα δύναμιν Θεοῦ λέγουσι τὸν Σίμωνα (ib. v. 62). He adds that they had never suffered persecution, because Simon had taught them that idolatry was of no consequence (ib. vi. 11). Hippolytus quotes words which bear witness to the indiscriminate indulgence of their lusts ἀλογιστῶς φάσκοντες δεῖν μιγνυσθαι..., ἄλλα καὶ μακαρίζουσιν ἐμφυτοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ κοινῇ μίξει, ταύτην εἶναι λέγοντες τὴν τελείαν ἀγάπην. It is unnecessary to point out in how many respects this short abstract agrees with the features of the heresy against which the later epistles are directed. 3

We have seen above that one characteristic of these heretics was that they spoke evil of angels, and we have just had an instance

1 The distinctive feature of this as compared with other gnostic systems seems to have been that Simon claimed to be the Father or first principle, manifesting himself in a series of incarnations.

2 So Irenaeus says of the Valentinians (ib. 8. 2) αὐτοῖς μὴ διὰ πρόξειν, ἄλλα διὰ τοὺς πνευματικοὺς εἶναι, παρὰ τῷ τι καὶ κάτως σωθήσονται δρακυντίζοντος.

3 See further Mansel, Gnostic Heresies, pp. 79 foll.; Headlam's article on Simon in Hastings' D. of B., Salmon's in the Dict. of Christian Biography; and on the other side Schmiedel in Encycl. Bibl.
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of this in the case of Simon Magus. In my note on v. 8 I have suggested other ways in which we might understand this, one, which is supported by Ewald, being identical with the views of some early heretics, e.g. the Simonians and Carpocrates, of whom Irenaeus says (i. 25. 1) 'mundum ab angelis multo inferioribus ingenito Patre factum dicunt,' that Jesus received power from the Father, 'uti mundi fabricatores effugere posset,' and that His followers also were enabled 'contennere mundi fabricatores archontas.' A βλασφημία of a more atrocious kind is attributed to the Cainites by the same writer (i. 31. 2), 'nee alter servari nisi per omnia eant' (so they interpreted Math. 590). What follows is more clearly given in the Greek of Epiphanius, Haer. 38. 2, ἐκαστὸς ἄρρητα ποιῶν καὶ αἰσχρονείγιας ἐπιτελῶν ἐπικαλεῖται ἐκάστου ἀγγέλου δόμα καὶ ἐκαστὸς τῶν προσώπων τὸ ἔργον ἀθέμιτον ... ὁ δεῖνα ἀγγέλε ταχαρωμαί σου τὸ ἔργον· ἢ δείναι ἔξουσία πράττω σου τὴν πράξιν. Epiphanius asserts that these abominations were common to the Nicolaitans with other sects, and professes that he learnt this, not merely from books, but from actual intercourse with those who practised them and tried to induce him to join their society (Haer. 26. 17). Strong as is St. Jude's language, it would probably have been stronger still, if the evil had reached this height when he wrote. Like the other N.T. writers he saw the germs of intellectual licence and moral laxity which were destined to show such a frightful development in a later generation.¹

¹ On the Nicolaitans see Ramsay, Expositor, vol. ix. pp. 401–423, especially p. 407. This movement 'was evidently an attempt to effect a reasonable compromise with the established usages of Graeco-Roman Society, and to retain as many as possible of those usages in the Christian system of life.' The historian must regard the Nicolaitans with intense interest, and must regret deeply that we know so little about them, and that only from their enemies. And yet at the same time he must feel that nothing could have saved the infant Church from melting away into one of those vague and ineffective schools of philosophic ethics except the stern and strict rule here laid down by St. John ... Only the most convinced, resolute, almost bigoted adherence to the most uncompromising interpretation of its own principles could have given the Christians the courage and self-reliance which were needed ' (p. 408).
CHAPTER XII

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE EPISTLE OF JUDE AND THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

If we may judge from the number of 'primitive errors' suspected by WH in the short Epistle of Jude, it would seem that the text is in a less satisfactory condition than that of any other portion of the New Testament. There are no less than four such errors in these twenty-five verses, the same number as are found in the eight chapters of the two Petrine Epistles, and in the forty-four chapters of the first two Gospels.

Since the publication of the 8th edition of Tischendorf's Greek Testament by Dr. C. R. Gregory in 1872, much study has been bestowed on the Syriac and the Egyptian versions by the Rev. Dr. Gwynn and the Rev. G. Horner, who are now respectively engaged on critical editions of these versions. Dr. Gwynn gave some account of the results of his labours in an article published in the Hermathena for 1890, entitled The Older Syriac Versions of the Four Minor Catholic Epistles, and I have to thank both him and Mr. Horner for their kindness in answering queries put to them when I was in doubt as to a reading. The Syriac versions are distinguished by Dr. Gwynn as follows: the Philoxenian made by Polycarpus for Bishop Philoxenus in the year 508 A.D. is denoted by the initial ܐ, and the Harkleian which is a revision of the Philoxenian made by Thomas of Harkel in 616 A.D., by the initial ḫ. Unfortunately the ordinary notation of these is rather misleading, ܐ being distinguished as Syr. bōd., in Tischendorf and elsewhere, because it was printed by Pocock in 1630 from an inferior MS. in the Bodleian, whereas Dr. Gwynn has been able to collate 15 MSS., many of much superior value to the Bodleian. The fate of ḫ has been even
worse, as it is cited by Tischendorf as Syr. though Tregelles cites it correctly as Ηcl. There is a good account of the Egyptian Versions in Hastings’ D. of B. vol. i. pp. 668 f., the writer of which distinguishes three Coptic versions: the Bohairic of northern Egypt, sometimes called Memphitic or Coptic (boh.); the Sahidic, sometimes called Thebaic, of southern Egypt (sah.), which only exists in a fragmentary state; and the Middle Egyptian, of which fragments have been found in the Fayoum and at Akhmim.

In what follows I give the text of WH.

Jude v. 1. Τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις καὶ ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς.

Here ἡγαπημένοις is supported by ABK, several cursives and versions, Orig. iii. 607, Lucif. Cassiod. al., while ἡγασμένοις is read by KLP al. WH (in App. p. 576, and Notes on Sel. Readings, p. 106) say that ‘the text is probably a primitive error for τοῖς θεῷς... καὶ ἐν Ἰ. Χ.’ For the reading ἐν Ἰ. Χ. they cite Vulg. Spec. Syr. Sah. Ath. Orig. (M.2) Lucif. Cassiod. ; but I learn from Dr. Gwynn that the true readings of the Syriac versions are as follows:—

‘ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις καὶ ἐν ἰησοῦ Χριστῳ τετηρημένοις. ’

The object to the text rests on internal grounds. There appears to be no parallel either for ἐν Θεῷ Πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοι, or for Χριστῳ τετηρημένοι, whereas the preposition ἐν is constantly used to express the relation in which believers stand to Christ as the members of His body. If Bishop Lightfoot is right in saying (on Col. 3:12) that in the New Testament the word ἡγαπημένοι ‘seems to be always used of the object of God’s love,’ it is difficult to see the propriety of the phrase ‘Brethren beloved by God in God.’ Omitting the preposition we have the dative of the agent,

1 Dr. Gwynn adds: ‘It is important to distinguish the readings of the text of h from those of the margin. In other parts of the N.T., especially Gospels and Acts, the latter are often of value, though in the four Minor Catholic Epistles they are usually merely copied from p, and therefore add nothing towards the determination of the Greek text.’
as in Nehemiah 13:28, ἄγαπώμενος τῷ Θεῷ ἦν. Nor does it seem a natural expression to speak of 'those who are kept for Christ' (so Alford, Spitta, B. Weiss, v. Soden, al.); rather believe is kept by and in Christ, as in 2 Thes. 2:16, Apoc. 3:10. The easiest way of accounting for the error is to suppose that ἐν was accidentally omitted, and then corrected in the margin and inserted in the wrong place. Possibly the wrong insertion of ἐν may have suggested or facilitated the change from ἡγαπημένοις to ἡγιασμένοις.

v. 2. 'The better MSS. of p are divided between ἐν ἄγαπη and καὶ ἄγαπη, the one which is best of all reading καὶ. The confusion is one that often occurs, as the difference is in a single letter, and there is no case-ending to decide the doubt. ἐν has καὶ ἄγαπη.

v. 4. Θεὸν καὶ Κύριον ἐν and all the best MSS. of p: the later ones om. καὶ, thus making δεσπότην Θεὸν refer to Jesus Christ.' G.

v. 5. ὑπομνησαί δὲ ὑμᾶς Βούλομαι εἰδότας ἀπαξ πάντα, ὅτι Κύριος λαῶν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτων σώσας ὁ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσατε ἀπώλεσεν. I quote Tregelles' notes with additions from Tischendorf in round brackets, only changing the notation of the Egyptian and Syriac versions to prevent confusion, and correcting the citations in accordance with more recent collations.


In point of fact however B reads εἰδότας υμᾶς, as any one may convince himself by looking at Cozza-Luzzi's photographic reproduction. Also Dr. Gwynn reports that ἐν and all the MSS. of p give the same reading, though he adds that the pleonastic idiom of the Syriac would lead the translators to supply the pronoun even if wanting in the Greek. The preponderance of authority is therefore in favour of this latter reading. The repeated υμᾶς emphasizes the contrast between the readers ('to remind you, you who know it already') and the libertines previously spoken of. The repetition here may be compared with the repeated υμῶν of v. 3.

ἀπαξ ἀπὸ πάντα ABC, 13, 31. L. τοῦ. ἀπὸ ὅτι κ. ἀπὸ λαῶν κ. (Syrr.) Arm. ἀπὸ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγ. Clem. 280 (and 997, Did. Cassiod.). ὅτι κύριος σώσας τῶν λαῶν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγ. ἀπὸ Sah., ὅτι ἀπαξ κύριος σώσας λαῶν αὐτῶν Boh. ὅτι. ἀπαξ Lucif. 28. [ἀπαξ is so placed in Syrr. as to be connected with σώσας 'when he had once saved them,' G.]

It appears to me that the true reading of the passage is ἵπτομησαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ὑμᾶς πάντα, διὶ Κύριος ἀπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον [τοῦ] μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν. I see no difficulty in πάντα, which gives a reason for the use of the word ἵπτομησαι, ‘I need only remind you, because you already know all that I have to say.’ It was easy for the second ὑμᾶς to be omitted as unnecessary, and then the word ἀπαξ might be inserted in its place partly for rhythmical reasons; but it is really unmeaning after εἰδότας: the knowledge of the incidents, which are related in this and the following verses, is not a knowledge for good and all, such as the faith spoken of in v. 3. On the other hand, ἀπαξ is very appropriate if taken with λαὸν σώσας (a people was saved out of Egypt once for all), and it prepares the way for τὸ δεύτερον. For the reading πάντας I see no reason. Can it be assumed that all who are addressed should be familiar with the legends contained in the Book of Enoch and the Ascension of Moses, to which allusion is made in what follows? It is surely much more to the point for the writer to say, as he does again below (v. 17), that he is only repeating what is generally known, though it need not be known to every individual. As to Hort’s suggestion on the word κύριος, that the original was διὶ ὁ (λαὸν σώσας), I think the fact of the variants is better explained by Spitta, who considers that the abbreviations IC, KC, ΟC might easily be confused, if the first letter was faintly written, and that the mention of τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ Κύριον Ἰ.Χ. in the preceding verse would naturally lead a later copyist to prefer IC, a supposition which is confirmed by Cramer’s Catena, p. 158, ἐγένεται γὰρ πρὸ τούτων περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὥσ ἐν ἄλλην ὁθὸς ὥς σύντος ὁ μόνος δεσποτής ὁ κύριος Ἰ.Χ., ὁ ἀναγγέλων τὸν λαὸν ἢς Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωσέως. Spitta himself however holds that ΟC is the true reading, as it agrees with the corresponding passage in 2 Peter 24, ὁ Θεὸς

1 ‘This is an error: the two best MSS. of p represent σαντα.’ G.
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ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, and with Clement’s paraphrase (Adumbr. Dind. iii. p. 482): ‘Quoniam Dominus Deus semel populum de terra Aegypti liberans deinceps eos qui non crediderunt perdidit.’ There is no instance in the New Testament of the personal name ‘Jesus’ being used of the pre-existent Messiah, though the official name ‘Christ’ is found in 1 Cor. 10:19, in reference to the wandering in the wilderness. But in the second and later centuries this distinction was less carefully observed. Thus Justin M. (Di. 120), speaking of the prophecy in Genesis 49, says that it does not refer to Judah, but to Jesus, τὸν καὶ τῶν πατέρας ὑμῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγαγόντα, and this use of the name was confirmed by the idea that the son of Nun was a personification of Christ (see Justin, Di. 75; Clem. Al. 133; Didymus, De Trin. 1. 19, Ἰουδας καθολικῶς γράφει, ἀπαξ γὰρ κύριος Ἰσραήλ λαὸν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου σώσας κ.τ.λ.; Jerome, C. Jov. 1. 12; Lact. Inst. 4. 17, ‘Christi figuram gerebat ille Jesus, qui cum primum Auses vocaretur, Moyses futura praestiens jussit eum Jesum vocari’). In the explanatory note I have stated my reasons for considering that the article before μὴ did not belong to the original text.

v. 6. ἀγγέλους τε] ἄγγ. ἰε Α. boh., καὶ ἄγγ. sah. boh.

[v. 7. ἢ and ἤ punctuate πρόκεινται δεύγμα τυρώδα αἰωνίου, δίκην ὑπεχονσαι, ἢ interpolates τέφρα bef. πρόκεινται: so Lucifer (de non conv. c. haereticis) reads ‘cinis propositae sunt exemplum.’ G.]

v. 12. ὁδόν εἰσιν [οἱ] ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνενω-χούμενοι ἄφοβοις έαντούς ποιμαίνοντες. The article here is omitted by NK and many inferior MSS. with vg. (but not syrr. or sah. or boh.), and some of the patristic quotations. I agree with Dr. Chase in thinking that it is out of place here, as in v. 5 above. There is not only the difficulty of construction (οἱ... σπιλάδες), but the very bold assumption that the signification of σπιλάδες will be at once apparent. If we omit the article, ἄφοβοι should be attached to συνενωχούμενοι, as by Ti. In syrr. it is joined with ποιμαίνοντες.

συνενωχούμενοι] C sah. boh. add ὑμῖν.

[v. 18. Syrr. ἢ and ἤ agree with KLP in prefixing δι to ἐν ἐγχάτῳ or ὑπ' ἐγχάτου τῶν χρόνων; but this is only in accordance with the Syriac usage in introducing a quotation, and is no evidence as to the Greek reading. G.]

Mr. Horner sends me the following Greek rendering of a
fragment from a Fayoum papyrus, which is supposed to belong to the fifth or sixth century, containing vv. 17–20, τῶν ῥημάτων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων, διότι εἰπον ὅτι ἐν ἑσχάτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐμπάικται ἐλεήσονται πορεύομενοι κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἀσεβείας· οὕτω εἰσίν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοὶ, μὴ ἔχοντες πνεῦμα. ἦμεις δὲ, ἀγαπητοί, ἔστε οἰκοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐν πίστει ὑμῶν [Ἁγία τὸ ἔλεος] προσευχόμενοι ἐν πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ, which agrees exactly with sah. except that, for the bracketed words, the latter has ἄγιατάτη omitting τὸ ἔλεος.

v. 19. οὕτω εἰσίν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

ἀποδιορίζοντες add. iavrouς C vulg. syr. Om. ΔABKL 13, etc.

This rare word is used of logical distinctions in Arist. Pol. iv. 48, ὁστερ οὖν εἰ ζῷον προποιομέθα λαβείν εἰδή, πρῶτον ἐν ἀποδιορίζομεν ὅτερ ἀναγκαῖον πάν ἔχειν ζῷον (‘as, if we wished to make a classification of animals, we should have begun by setting aside that which all animals have in common’), and I believe in every other passage in which it is known to occur. Schott, B. Weiss, and Huther-Kühl would give it a similar sense in this passage, supposing the words ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες to be spoken by, or at least to express the feeling of οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες: ‘welche Unterscheidungen machen, sc. zwischen Psychikern und Pneumatikern, wobei dann der Verfasser diese Unterscheidungen in seiner drastischen Weise sofort zu ihren Ungunsten umkehrt.’ This explanation seems to me to give a better sense than the gloss approved by Spitta, οἱ τὰ σχίσματα ποιοῦντες; for one cause of the danger which threatens the Church is that the innovators do not separate themselves openly, but steal in unobserved (παρεισεδύσαν, v. 4), and take part in the love-feasts of the faithful, in which they are like sunken rocks (v. 12); and, secondly, it is by no means certain that the word ἀποδιορίζομεν could bear this sense. ἀφορίζω is used in Luke 6:28 of excommunication by superior authority, which of course would not be applicable here. On the other hand, it seems impossible to get the former sense out of the Greek as it stands. Even if we allowed the possibility of such a harsh construction as to put ψυχικοὶ in inverted commas, as the utterance of the innovators (and should we not then have expected the contrast ψυχικοὶ, πνευματικοὶ?), still we cannot
use the same word over again to express Jude’s ‘drastic’ retort. This difficulty would be removed if we supposed the loss of a line to the following effect after ἀποδιορίζοντες:—

ψυχικοῦς ύμᾶς (οί τοὺς πιστοὺς) λέγοντες, ὅτες αὐτοὶ ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

We may compare Clement’s paraphrase in the Adumbrationes (Dind. vol. iii. p. 483, more correctly given in Zahn, Forsch. iii. p. 85): *Isti sunt* 1 inquit *segregantes* fideles a fideli bus secundum proprium infidelitatem redarguti 2 et iterum [non] 3 discernentes sancta 4 a canibus. 5 *Animales inquit spiritum non habentes, spiritum scilicet, qui est per fidem secundum usum justitiae.*

[The authorities are two MSS., Cod. Laudun. 96, sec. ix. (L), Cod. Berol. Phill. 1665, sec. xiii. (M), and the Ed. Pr. of De la Bigne, 1575 (P).]

Zahn endeavours to defend the reading sancta a canibus by quoting Clem. Str. ii. 7, τῶν δὲ ἀγίων μεταδίδοναι τοῖς κυρίων ἀπαγορεύεται, which seems to me entirely alien to the general drift of the passage. Starting with the carnibus of the oldest MS., I think we should read carnalibus. If we retain sancta, I should be inclined to understand this in reference to the behaviour of the libertines at the love-feasts described in v. 12, which may be compared with 1 Cor. 11 29, ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων ἀναξίως κρίμα ἐστὶν ἐσθιές καὶ πίνει μὴ διὰ κρίνων τὸ σῶμα. But perhaps we should read sanctos and transpose the clauses as follows:—

*Isti segregantes*: fideles a fideli bus et iterum sanctos a carnalibus discernentes secundum proprium incredulitatem, redarguti, animales spiritum non habentes, the Greek being something of this sort: οὗτοι εἰσὶν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες. πιστοὺς τῶν πιστῶν, ἁγίους δὲ αὐτῶν ψυχικῶν διακρίνοντες κατὰ τὴν ἰδιαὶ ἀπιστίαν, διέγχονται ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

The opposition of ψυχικοῦ to πνευματικοῦ is familiar in the writings of Tertullian after he became a Montanist. The Church is carnal, the sect spiritual. So the Valentinians distinguished their own adherents as pneumatici from the psychici who composed

1 *Sunt* M, om. L.P.
2 *Redargui* MP, *redargui* L.
3 *Non* inserted by Zahn (the Rev. P. M. Barnard suggests *parum* for *iterum*).
4 *Sancta* L has the word between the lines.
5 *Canibus* MP, *carnibus* L, (‘wenn ich nicht die Variante übersehen habe’).
the Church. These were also technical terms with the Naassenes and Heracleon (see my notes on James 315), and were probably borrowed by the early heretics from St. Paul, who uses them to distinguish the natural from the heavenly body (1 Cor. 1544), and also to express the presence or absence of spiritual insight (1 Cor. 214) ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος οὗ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, μωρὰ γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστίν ... δὲ πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνεται πάντα.

The innovators against whom St. Jude writes seem to have been professed followers of St. Paul (like the Marcionites afterwards), abusing the doctrine of Free Grace which they had learnt from him (v. 4, τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἄσελγειαν), professing a knowledge of the βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ (1 Cor. 210), though it was really a knowledge only of τὰ βάθη τοῦ Σατανᾶ (Apos. 224), and claiming to be the true δωματικόν and πνευματικόν, as denying dead works and setting the spirit above the letter. This explains the subsequent misrepresentation of St. Paul as a heresiarch in the Pseudo-Clementine writings.

vv. 22, 23. (Text of Tischendorf and Tregelles) καὶ οὗ μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὗ δὲ σῶζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἄρπαξοντες, οὗ δὲ ἐλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλαμμένον χιτῶνα. (Text of WH. and B. Weiss) καὶ οὗ μὲν ἐλεάτε διακρινομένους σῶζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἄρπαξοντες, οὗ δὲ ἐλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλαμμένον χιτῶνα. In App. to WH. it is added, 'Some primitive error probable: perhaps the first ἐλεάτε an interpolation' (Sel. Readings, p. 107).


Tischendorf makes the matter clearer by giving the consecutive text of versions and quotations as follows: Vulg. Et hos quidem arguites judicatos, illos vero salvate de igne rapientes, aliis autem miseremini in timore. Ar†. Et quisdam corripite super peccatis eorum, et quorundam miseremini cum fuerint victi, et quisdam salvate ex igne et liberate eos. Ar†. Et signate quos-
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dam cum dubitaverint orbos (?) et salvae quosdam territione, 
abripite eos ex igne. Aeth. quoniam est quem redarguunt per verbum 
quod dictum est (Aeth.v. prop. peccatum eorum), et est qui et 
servabitur ex igne et rapient eum, et est qui servabitur timore et 
poenitentia. Arm. Et quosdam damnantes sitis reprehensione, et 
quosdam salvae rapiendo ex igne, et quorundam miseremini timore 
judicando (? indicando). Cassiodor.142 Ita ut quosdam djudicato 
arguant, quosdam de adustione aeterni ignis eripiant, nonnullis 
miereantur errantibus et conscientias maculatas emundent, sic tamen 
Ut peccata eorum digna execratione fugiant. Mr. Horner states 
that vv. 22, 23 are omitted in Sah. He translates Boh. as follows:

cai obi mέν ελεγχετε διακριμομένους, οδι δε σώζετε εκ του πυρός 
(al. om. του), οδι δε ελεάτε (al. φέρετε) εν φόβῳ. Commentaries of 
Theophylact and Oecumenius, κακείνους δε, ει μέν αποδιδόταια 
υμών—τούτο γαρ σημαίνει το διακρίνεσθαι—διακρίνετε, τοιστι 
φανερούτε τοις πάντας την ασέβειαν αυτών είτε δε πρός 
λασιν αφορώσι, μη ἀπωθείσθε, ἀλλα τού τῆς ἀγάπης υμῶν ελέρο 
προσ— 

λαμβάνεσθε, σώζοντες εκ του ἡπειλημένου αυτών πυρός προσ— 

λαμβάνεσθε δε μετα του ελείν αυτοις και μετα φαβου.

In all these it will be observed that three classes are 

distinguishéd, as in the text of Tregelles and Tischendorf, and in A, 

οδι μέν ελεγχετε διακριμομένους, οδι δε σώζετε εκ πυρός ἀρτάζουν 
tes, οδι δε ελεάτε εν φόβῳ, and N, οδι μέν ελεάτε διακριμομένους, 

οδι δε σώζετε εκ πυρός ἀρτάζουντες, οδι δε ελεάτε εν φόβῳ. We 

should draw the same conclusion from the seeming quotation in 

Can. Apost. vi. 4 (ου μικήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλα) οδι μέν 

ελέγχεις, οδι δε ελέησεις, περι ὑν δε προσεύξη (οδι δε ἀγαπής 

ὑπὲρ την ψυχήν σου), which occurs also, with the omission of the 

cause οδι δε ελέησεις in the Didache ii. 7.

Two classes only are distinguished in the following: Syrp.

Et quosdam de illis quidem ex igne rapite; cum autem resipuerint, 

miseremini super eis in timore, representing και οδι μέν εκ 

πυρός ἀρτάζετε, διακριμομένους δε ελεάτε εν φόβῳ. SyrL. et 

hos quidem miseremini resipiscéntes, hos autem servate de igne 

rapientes in timore, representing και οδι μέν ελεάτε διακριμομένους, 


quosdam autem salvéte de igne rapientes, quibudam vero miseremini 

in timore,1 representing οδι δε σώζετε εκ πυρός ἀρτάζοντες, οδι δε 

1 The paraphrase continues, id est ut eos qui in ignem cadunt doceatis ut semet 

ipos liberent. (It would seem that this clause has got misplaced and should be
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ἐλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ. Clem. Strom. vi. 773, καὶ οὗτος ἡκ τυρὸς ἄρταζετε, διακρινομένονς δὲ ἐλείητε, implying that he was acquainted with two different recensions. With these we may compare the texts of B, followed by WH. and B. Weiss, καὶ οὗτος μὲν ἐλεάτε διακρινομένονς σώζετε ἐκ τυρὸς ἄρταζοντες, οὗτος δὲ ἐλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ, of C, καὶ οὗτος μὲν ἐλέγχεστε διακρινομένους, οὗτος δὲ σώζετε ἐκ τυρὸς ἄρταζοντες ἐν φόβῳ, and of KLP, καὶ οὗτος μὲν ἐλεείητε διακρινομένοι, οὗτος δὲ ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε ἐκ τυρὸς ἄρταζοντες.

St. Jude’s predilection for triplets, as seen in vv. 2, 4, 8, in the examples of judgment in vv. 5–7, and of sin in v. 11, is prima facie favourable to the triple division in this passage. Supposing we take A and Ν to represent the original, consisting of three members, a b c, we find B complete in a and c, but confused as to b. As it stands, it gives an impossible reading; since it requires οὗτος μὲν to be taken as the relative, introducing the subordinate verb ἐλεάτε, depending on the principal verb σώζετε; while οὗτος δὲ, on the other hand, must be taken as demonstrative. WH suggest that ἐλεάτε has crept in from below. Omitting this, we get the sense, ‘Some who doubt save, snatching them from fire; others compassionate in fear.’ It seems an easier explanation to suppose that ἐλεάτε was written in error for ἐλέγχεστε, and οὗτος omitted in error after διακρινομένους. The latter phenomenon is exemplified in the readings of SyrP. and Clem. Str. 773. The texts of C and KLP are complete in a and b, but insert a phrase from c in b. The most natural explanation here seems to be that the duplication of ἐλεάτε in a and c (as in Ν) caused the omission of the second ἐλεάτε, and therefore of the second οὗτος δὲ. The reading διακρινομένοι in KLP was a natural assimilation to the following nominative ἄρταζοντες, and seemed, to those who were not aware of the difference in the meaning of the active and middle of διακρίνω, to supply a very appropriate thought, viz. that discrimination must be used; treatment should differ in different cases.

The real difficulty however of the triple division is to arrive at a clear demarcation between the classes alluded to. ‘The triple division,’ says Hort (App. p. 107), ‘gives no satisfactory sense’;

inserted after rapientes.) Odientes, inquit, eam, quae carnalis est, maculatam tunicam; animae videlicet tuncia macula (read maculata) est spiritus concupiscentiis pollutus carnalisibus.
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and it certainly has been very diversely interpreted, some holding with Kühl that the first case is the worst and the last the most hopeful: ‘Die dritte Klasse . . . durch helfendes Erbarmen wieder hergestellt werden können, mit denen es also nicht so schlimm steht, wie mit denen, welchen gegenüber nur ἔλεγχειν zu üben ist, aber auch nicht so schlimm, wie mit denen, die nur durch rasche, zugreifende That zu retten sind’; while the majority take Reiche’s view of a climax: ‘a dubitantibus minusque depravatis . . . ad insanabiles, quibus opem ferre pro tempore ab ipsorum contumacia prohibemur.’ My own view is that Jude does not here touch on the case of the heretical leaders, of whom he has spoken with such severity before. In their present mood they are not subjects of ἔλεος, any more than the Pharisees condemned by our Lord, as long as they persisted in their hostility to the truth. The admonition here given by St. Jude seems to be the same as that contained in the final verses of the Epistle written by his brother long before: ἕαν τις ἐν ὑμῖν πλανηθῇ ἀπό τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ἐπιστρέψῃ τις αὐτόν, γινώσκετε ὅτι ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ βανάτου. The first class with which the believers are called upon to deal is that of doubters, διακρίνομενοι, men still halting between two opinions (cf. James 16), or perhaps we should understand it of disputers, as in Jude 9. These they are to reprove and convince (cf. John 16, ἔληγξεν περὶ ἁμαρτίας ὅτι οὐ πιστεῦοντι εἰς ἐμέ). Then follow two classes undistinguished by any special characteristic, whose condition we can only conjecture from the course of action to be pursued respecting them. The second class is evidently in more imminent danger than the one we have already considered, since they are to be saved by immediate energetic action, snatching them from the fire; the third seems to be beyond human help, since the duty of the believers is limited to trembling compassion, expressing itself no doubt in prayer, but apparently shrinking from personal communication with the terrible infection of evil. We may compare with this St. Paul’s judgment as to the case of incest in the Church of Corinth (1 Cor. 5), and the story told about Cerinthus and St. John.

2 P. i. 1. Συμεὼν ΝΑΚΛΠ syrr ‘al. longe plu.’ Ti Treg WH. Spitta, Weiss, Kühl, von Soden, Zahn, Σιμὼν B vg sah boh WH. It is far more easy to suppose that Σιμὼν was a correction of Συμεὼν.
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than the reverse, as Συμεών is only used of Peter in one other passage of the New Testament, viz., Acts xv. 14, where the MSS. all agree, but the Vulg. and several other versions read Σίμων. I cannot think the record of B so good in this epistle as to justify us in following it against the weight of the other MSS. as well as against internal probability.

i. 2. τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν MSS. generally Ti Treg WH., Οτ. τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Άησοῦ Π. vulg. Minusc. 69, 137, 163, Spitta, Zahn, Nestle. There is much to be said for the omission: see n. on the passage.

[i. 3. syrP represents ὡς πάντα τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ δεδομένου 'in as much as He has given all things of divine power,' syrH δὲ ... δεδομένον; both connect vv. 3, 4 closely with v. 2, not with v. 5. G.]

идιὸς δόξη Ν ACP 13 vg sah boh syrr Ti Treg WH., v. Soden, Weiss, Spitta, Kühl, Keil+, διὰ δόξης BKL 31 'al. longe plur.' WH. The recurrence of διὰ in the sentence πάντα ἡμῶν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωήν ... δεδομένης διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλοσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς διὰ διὸ τὰ μέγιστα ... ἐπαγγελματα δεδομένης, ἵνα διὰ τοῦτον γένηται θείας κοινωνία φύσεως, makes it more likely that διὰ should have been written by mistake for ἴδιος than the reverse; δόξη would then be corrected to δόξης. Again διὰ δόξης is too vague to convey a meaning; while ἵδιος is a favourite word with 2 Peter and ἴδιος δόξη gives an excellent sense, 'He called us, drew us by His own divine perfection': cf. 'we love Him, because He first loved us.'

i. 4. δι' διὸ τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῶν B syrH spec (διὸ) WH. Weiss, δι' διὸ τὰ τίμια ἡμῶν καὶ μέγιστα Ν, ΚL+T, δι' διὸ τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ἡμῶν ACP 13. 31. 68 syrP Treg (sed A 68 syrP ὑμῖν πρὸ ἡμῶν). As regards the order of the epithets, ΝBKL agree in placing the positive first, thus avoiding the very unnatural anti-climax. It is true that examples of the anti-climax may be found in other writers, but only when the epithets are not in pari materia, as in Xen. Cyrop. ii. 4. 29 δυνατωτάτων καὶ προθόμων, where the two characteristics do not necessarily vary together. The position of the dative in B seems to be the true one; that in Ν is explained by the desire to bring it under the influence of τίμια. The order in A seems to have originated in

1 SyrH has ἡμῶν but, as usual, gives the reading of syrP in margin.
the accidental or intentional omission of τίμα καὶ and its wrong insertion from the margin. A appears to be right in reading ὑμίν, as we can hardly understand the following γένησθε without it. Confusion between ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς is very common, and the change here is explained by the preceding ἡμᾶς in v. 3. Spitta, reading τίμα ὑμίν, inserts ὑμίν after ἐπαγγέλματα.

i. 12. μελλήσω & ABCP vg Ti Treg WH, οὐκ ἀμελήσω KL syrr, οὐ μελλήσω tol Cass, μελήσω Field (Oecum. Nov. ii. p. 151). The insertion of the negative is an attempt to get over the awkwardness of μελλήσω, 'I shall be about to,' the only other example of which in the N.T. is Mt. 246 μελλήσετε ἀκούειν πολέμους, where the tense seems to point to an event which will be imminent at a time still in the future. This is not the case here. Other instances of the confusion between μέλω and μέλλω are John 126, 1 P. 57, Mt. 2216, where many MSS. have the incorrect μέλλω. Field quotes Suidas μελήσων σπούδασο, φρονίσω. Hesychius and Photius wrongly ascribe this force to μελήσω, perhaps from a recollection of the received reading of this passage. Schlesusner's note on Photius is (Cur. Nov. p. 227) 'pro μελήσω necessario reponentium est μελήσω.' Other instances of the personal construction, μέλω for μέλει μοι,¹ are found in Eur. Her. F. 772 θείοι τῶν ἀδίκων μέλουσι καί τῶν ὀσίων ἐπατεῖν, Plut. V. 395.

ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ. For the difficult παρούσῃ, read by all the authorities, Spitta suggests παραδοθείσης, as in ii. 21 εκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῦ ἀγίας ἐντολής, and Jude 3 τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείση πίστει.

i. 17. φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιάσθε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης. So all the authorities, except syrr, which give ἄπτο, and vg which has delapsa a (in Sabatier's Old Latin del. de). It is difficult however to see the force of ὑπὸ, 'a voice brought by the excellent glory.' We have an example of the proper use of φέρομαι ὑπὸ just below in v. 21, ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἀγίου φερόμενοι ἑλάχησαν. Surely the excellent glory is the source, not the vehicle of the voice. I think we should read ἄπτο with syrr. In like manner ὑπὸ has been substituted for ἄπτο in most MSS. of Lk. 339 and Acts 154.

i. 19. αὐχμηρῷ] ἐχμηρῷ A 26 al. There is the same peculiarity

¹ Suidas explains μέλω by ἐν ἑμμεθείᾳ εἰμι.
in the ἀκαταπάστος of B in ii. 14, on which see note. Perhaps it originated in faulty pronunciation.

i. 21. ἀπὸ θεοῦ BP syr² + WH Ti, ἀπὸ θελήματος θεοῦ boh, ἄγιοι θεοῦ Ν Κ Λ syr² + Treg, ἄγιοι τοῦ θεοῦ Λ, ἄγιοι sah, ἄγιοι ἀπὸ θεοῦ αλ. Evidently ἄγιοι is a correction, which had the advantage of giving greater prominence to the idea of holiness.

ii. 4. σειρὸς Ν Ti (σειρός ABC Treg), σειραῖς KLP vg syrr boh+. Sah translates freely, 'For God spared not the angels when they sinned, but cast them down to the abyss in darknesses infinite, he gave them to be kept for the judgment being punished,' which seems to represent ἄβυσσος ἐν ἀπείρους (cf. J. 6 αἰδίως) ξόφους ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν κολαζομένους τηρεῖν. If σειραῖς were the reading of the archetype, we can hardly conceive its being changed to σειρῶς, since the former is the commoner word and is also supported by δεσμοῖς in Jude 6. On the other hand, it is difficult to see why the author should prefer to write σειρῶς. Why should he not have used a Septuagint equivalent, ἄβυσσος, λάκκος, βόθυνος etc., unless indeed the former was the word employed in Enoch? See further in the explanatory note.

ξόφου BCKLP Ti Treg WH Weiss, ξόφους ΝΑ Spitta, Kuhl. The latter reading may have arisen from a marginal -ος intended to correct σειραῖς, but wrongly applied to ξόφου. Spitta would read ξοφοῖς contracted from ξοφεῖς, but the word itself is very rare, and there is no proof that it was ever contracted.

τηρομένους BCKLP syr² + Ti Treg WH, κολαζομένους τηρεῖν Ν Α latt syr² boh sah Spitta (who rejects the usual explanation that this is an emendation from ver. 9 on the ground that the influence would rather have been the other way; ver. 9 would have been altered to agree with ver. 4, but there is no trace of this). On the other hand, there are many examples of recurrent phrase in 2 Pet., e.g. διεγείρεων ἐν ὑπομνήσει in i. 13 and iii. 1; τοῦτο πρῶτον γιώνειται in i. 20, iii. 3; ἐξακολουθεῖ in i. 16, ii. 2, 15; φθορά, ii. 12 ἔτι; μυσθὸν ἀδικίας, ii. 13, 15; δελεάζω, ii. 14, 18; οὐρανοί...παρελεύσονται στοιχεῖα δὲ κανοσύμενα λυθῆσεται in iii. 10, and οὐρανοὶ...λυθῆσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα κανοσύμενα τῆκεται in iii. 12. Moreover, the reading of ΝΑ is more in harmony with the description in Enoch x. 4, 12, lxxxviii. 2, where final punishment is preceded by preparatory punishment.

ii. 6. καταστροφῆ κατέκρινεν Ν AC² KL vg syr (ἐν κατ.
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den merely marks the dative]+Treg Ti Spitta Weiss v. Soden, κατακρινεῖν BC WH, κατέστρεψεν P. It seems more likely that καταστροφή should have been accidentally omitted than inserted. It was a natural word for the author to use, as καταστρέφω and καταστροφή are used of the destruction of Sodom in Genesis xix. 25, 29, Deuteronomy xxix. 23, Isaiah xiii. 19, Jeremiah xxvii. 40, Amos iv. 11. For constr. cf. Mark x. 33, κατακρινούσιν αὐτῶν θανάτῳ, Matthew xx. 18 (where B omits θανάτῳ), Martyr. Andr. prīmüs 13 ἀνδρα μηδὲν ἀδικήσαντα κατεκρινεῖν σταυρῷ, Diod. xiv. 4 τοὺς πυρροτάτους κατεδίκαζον θανάτῳ, Ael. V.H. xii. 41 κατεγυνώσθη θανάτῳ.

ἀσεβέσιν BP syrβ (exemplum eorum quae impis futura sunt ponens) syrα (exemplum impis futurorum ponens, al. exemplum impis futuris ponens) WH, τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν sah boh, ἀσεβέις ACKL vg Treg Ti. The infinitive ἀσεβεῖν is naturally suggested by μελλόντων, but does not give so good a sense as the dat. ἀσεβεῖν. As a rule, ὑπόδειγμα takes a genitive of the thing and dat. of the person, as in Sir. 44. 16 Ἐν δὲ ὑπόδειγμα μετανοιάς ταῖς γεναιάς; 2 Macc. vi. 31 τοῖς νεόσι ὑπόδειγμα γεναιότητος καταλιπτόν; 3 Macc. ii. 5 παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγινόμενοις καταστήσας. So here it makes much better sense to say 'an example (or warning) to ungodly persons of things in store for them' [cf. Heb. xi. 20 περὶ μελλόντων εὐλογήσεως, and v.i. in Heb. ix. 11 τῶν μελλόντων ἁγαθῶν, Col. 217 ἀ ἐστιν σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, Petri Αριστ. (ap. Clem. Al. Στρ. vi. § 48) ἀποστόλους δηλοῦντας τὰ μελλόντα] than to say 'an example of persons about to do wrong,' which would be better expressed by the simple παράδειγμα ἀσεβείας.

ii. 8. ὁ δίκαιος ACKL syr Treg Ti, om. ὁ B WH. The latter reading gives an easier construction for the datives βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ, 'righteous in look and in hearing,' i.e. he discouraged sin by the expression of his countenance and by refusing to listen to evil. Reading ὁ δίκαιος, we should have to govern βλέμματι by φυσήν δικαίου ἐβασάνιζεν, and to give an unprecedented force to βλέμματι, 'the righteous man tortured his righteous soul in seeing and hearing because of their lawless deeds' (cf. Field, Ot. Nov. p. 241). VG (not noticed in Ti) seems to agree with B, 'aspectu enim et auditu justus erat habitans apud eos qui de die in diem animam justam iniquis operibus cruciabant.'
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ii. 11. οὐ φέρονσιν κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίῳ βλάσφημον κρίσιν Ν BCKLP syr Tι, ὀπ. παρὰ κυρίῳ Λ νγ+, παρὰ κυρίου τίμιους. et. verss. al. Spitta, [παρὰ κυρίῳ] Treg WH. Here αὐτῶν refers to δόξας (=τῷ διαβόλῳ), and παρὰ κυρίῳ refers to ἀλλὰ εἶπεν ἐπιτιμήσας σοι κύριος in Jude 9. It is implied that reverence for God was the motive which restrained the angel from presumptuous judgment. It is impossible to imagine such a phrase foisted in by a scribe, and its difficulty accounts for its disappearance from Λ, whereas it is quite in accordance with 2 Peter's remote and abstract way of alluding to what he had before him in Jude. I see no meaning in Spitta's παρὰ κυρίου. If it is 'from the Lord,' how can it be a βλάσφημος κρίσις?

ii. 13. ἀδικούμενοι Ν BP syr arm + WH, κομικούμενοι Νε ΑCKL vg sah boh syrh (ementes) + Ti Treg. The future κομικούμενοι is out of place here, where we want a present (or even a past) participle synchronizing with the verb φθαρήσουται, and can only be regarded as an emendation of the misunderstood ἀδικούμενοι, which may be translated 'defrauded of the hire of fraud,' like Balaam, to whom Balak addressed the words, 'God hath kept thee from honour' (Num. xxiv. 11), and who was eventually killed in his attempt to seduce Israel. So here the false teachers will be destroyed before they obtain the honour and popularity which they seek.

ἡδονήν ἡγούμενοι all MSS. and edd. I have endeavoured to explain this reading in the note. But I am inclined to think that ἡδονή, which may have been a marginal gloss on τρυφήν, has taken the place of a half-obiterated ἀγάπην. Cf. Clem. Al. Str. iii. 10 οὐ γὰρ ἀγάπην εἰποῦμ' ἀν τὴν συνέλευσιν αὐτῶν, and just below μεθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἡδὴ (= 2 P. εν ἡμέρα) παρ' ἀν ἀν ἐθελήσωσιν γυναικῶν ἀπαίτειν τὴν τοῦ Καρποκρατεῖον νόμον ὑπακοήν. So Paed. ii. 4 (p. 165) τήν ἀγάπην τὴν ἡγιασμένην ... καθυβριζούντες, ἵδι τὰς τοιαύτας ἐστιάσεις ὁ κύριος ἀγάπας οὐ κέκληκεν, ἵδι. § 7 ἀγάπη μὲν οὖν δειπνον οὐκ ἔστιν, ἡ δὲ ἐστίασις ἀγάπης ἡρτήθησθο, and other passages quoted in my App. C on Strom. vii. If ἀγάπην had thus been lost, it was natural to change ἀπάταις into ἀγάπαις, but the quotations from Hermas in my note here show that τρυφή and ἀπάται were often connected.

ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν Ν ΑciąKL syrh + WH, for ἀπάταις ΑβBC2 vg syr (and mg of syrh) Treg Zahn Nestle Lightfoot (on Ign. Smyrn.), WH mg. read ἀγάπαις. The gen. αὐτῶν is in favour
of ἀπάταις. It is in consequence of their wiles that they are of admitted to your love feasts. We have here one of the curious instances of a change of meaning with very slight variation of sound in passing from Jude to 2 Peter. So σπίλοι and σπιλάδες in the same verse. The reading of B is probably a correction from Jude 12.

ii. 14. ἀκαταπαύστωσις ΝΚΛΠ 13 31 Ti Treg, ἀκατα-πάστωσις AB WH. The latter form is unknown in Greek. It is supposed to be derived from a Laconian form πάξω, see under ἀμπάξωνται in Herwerden, Lex. Gr. Suppletorium, where, after quoting from Hesych. ἀμπ. = ἀναπαύστωσις, he continues: 'fuit ergo verbum Laconicum πάξων = παύεων.' It seems very unlikely that such a word should have found its way into the archetype of 2 Peter. As suggested above (i. 19) on the form ἄχμηρι, the reading may have originated in a faulty pronunciation on the part of the reader, or the ὅ may have been accidentally omitted at the end of the line, as in B, where one line ends with πα- and the next line begins with -στως. So in ν. 21 below, B has lost the last syllable of ἔχναρα at the end of a line. Blass, Gr. T. Gr., p. 44, gives examples of forms in which the ὅ has been lost, such as ἔπάνη, Herm. Vis. i. 33, ἐπαναπαύσεται Luke x. 6, and ἐκάνη from καίω. Cf. New Sayings of Jesus, 1 βασιλεύσας ἀναπαύσεται. Schaefer in the Index to Bost's Comment. Palæogr. (s. av et a confusa) refers to the reading πίφασκον for πίφανσκον in Hom. Od. 12. 165 with Porson's note, and Dr. F. G. Kenyon writes to me that ἐστοῦ and τάτο are not unfrequently found in papyri and inscriptions for ἐστοῦ and ταῦτο. He also mentions that Ἀγοῦστος often stands for Ἀθοῦστος in papyri, that two examples of πάω for παύω occur in the C.I.G., viz., 5984 Α 3 ἀναπάμωνος and 6595, ἒ ἀναπάμει, and refers to a paragraph on the subject in Crönert's Memoria Herculaneensis, p. 126. Hort in his Notes on Orthography (Appendix, p. 170) mentions the form ἀναπαύμος = ἀνάπαυνας in a glossary quoted by Ducange. His own view however is that 'the better sense “insatiable” is provided by an altogether different verb πάσασθαι (from πατέομαι). After pointing out that in Homer it means no more than “to taste,” Athenaeus adds in contrast (i. 43, p. 24 Α) οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πληρωθῆναι τιθέασι τὸ πάσασθαι ... Ἀκατάπαχτος is exactly similar to ἀκατός, ἀπαστία, ἀπαστί.' There is no evidence however that

1 See J. H. Moulton Gr. of N.T. Greek, Prolegomena, p. 47.
these words bear the suggested sense. In all the recorded examples ἀπαστος and its cognates have the sense of 'fasting.'

ii. 15. καταλείποντες Ν ΑΒ Τι WH, καταλιπόντες Βετσιτσίου ΣΤ Κωνοφωνία ΚΥ Τεργ WH. If we assume that the reference is to a fact anterior to the action of the verb ἐπλανέθησαν, the aor. would seem to be needed here; but there is no reason why the facts should not be regarded as contemporaneous: or rather we might say that we have here one fact described under two names: leaving the right path is equivalent to going in the wrong path. For the confusion between ei and ι see my note on ἔδει James 3 and Hort's Introduction, p. 306: 'B shows a remarkable inclination to change ι into ei,' of which we have the following instances in this epistle, i. 1 ἔστειλαν, 17 ἐκπέμην, 20 and iii. 3 γενωσκοντες, 21 γενεται, iii. 1 εἰκοσαίρειν, 8 χείλια δίσ.

Βόσορ Ν ΑΚΛΠ Βοβ ΣΤ Τι WH, Βεσφορόσ Ν (arising from a confusion between Βόσορ and the marginal correction έσφορ). Prof. Swete informs me, on the authority of Mr. Norman M-Lean, who is engaged on the forthcoming critical edition of the LXX, that while the name of Balaam's father occurs in seven passages of the Pentateuch, there is no support for the reading Bosor, 'either in our thirty cursive or in the Armenian, Ethiopic, Latin, or Syriac versions.' Prof. Driver considers that it is simply due to textual corruption, (see Hastings' D. of B. i. p. 447, and Zahn's Einl. in d. N. T. ii. p. 110). The support of the ordinary name by B against the other MSS. may be compared with its support of Σίμων against Συμεών in i. 1. It seems to me far more probable that an original Βόσορ should have been changed to Βέσφορ than the reverse.

δς μισθόν ἀδικίας ἡγάπησεν ΑΚΛΠ Ν syg WH Τι Τεργ, μισθόν ἀδικίας ἡγάπησαν B arm Τεργ WH. The objection to the latter reading is that in the next clause (ἐλεγξαν ἐσχέν) we have to revert to the subject Balaam. Possibly an accidental omission of δς may account for B's reading.

ii. 18. ὀλίγως ΑΒ Ν ιγ syg ('propemodum' White, 'paullum' Poc., Gwynn is doubtful), sah boh render 'slightly' Teg WH, δυτος Ν ΑΚΛΠ, ὀλίγον μίνυσ. al. The reading δυτος (translated ' who were clean escaped' in Δ. V.) seems to involve a self-contradiction after δελεάζωσιν. In the MSS. it is hardly distinguishable from the rare adverb ὀλίγως. Like δυτος, the reading ὀλίγον,
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'for a short time,' would seem to require the aor. ἀποφυγόντας read by KLP.

iii. 6. δι' ἄν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὑδατί κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο. Commentators explain δι' ἄν as referring to the ἐξ ὑδατός καὶ δι' ὑδατος of the preceding verse, 'that there were heavens from of old, and an earth compacted out of water and through water by the word of God.' It is very harsh to make two different waters out of two different uses or actions of water, and it is still harsher to repeat ὑδατι in the same clause, 'through which (waters) the then world was destroyed by water.' Remembering that one of the commonest sources of MS. corruption is the confusion between long and short vowels, I think we should read δι' ἄν with minuac. 31, which would refer to the immediately preceding τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, and give a much clearer expression to the argument. The world was first created out of water by the Word of God: owing to that same Word it was destroyed by water, and will one day be destroyed by fire.

iii. 7. τῷ αὐτῷ ABP vg sah boh + WH Ti, τῷ αὐτοῦ Ν CKL syr Treg Weiss. The former is the far more effective reading, emphasizing the identity of the creative and the destructive Word. If a genitive were wanted, it would have been more natural to repeat Θεοῦ.

iii. 9. δι' Ν A 5. 13. 69 + vg Aug. spec. sah syr aeth, εἰς BCKLP arm boh Oecum., ἡμᾶς KL boh Theoph. Oec., ἡμᾶς Ν ABCP sah syr arm aeth vg spec +. δι' ἡμᾶς Tregm, εἰς ἡμᾶς Treg WH Weiss, εἰς ἡμᾶς K.L. I am inclined to think that δι' ἡμᾶς is right, though the weight of evidence is the other way. It is a wider and deeper truth which is expressed by saying that God delays his coming for our sakes in order that none may be lost, than by saying that God is long-suffering toward you, the particular church addressed. 2 The frequent interchange of ὑμεῖς and ἡμεῖς in MSS. is generally recognized, cf. Winer, p. 330 n. So in υ. 11 below I am inclined to think that ἡμᾶς (read by Ν) must have been what the author wrote and not the ὑμᾶς of ACKL omitted by B.

iii. 10. ἡμέρα κυρίου BC Treg Ti WH, ἡ ἡμέρα k. Ν Α KLP Weiss. The phrase ἡμέρα κυρίου is found without the article in

1 I learn from Nestle's Introduciton to Textual Criticism that Schmiedel in his revision of Winer's Gr. § 19, is also in favour of this reading.

2 Cf. however 1 Pet. 1:17. ἐλευθερίαν ἐν' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς, τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστῶν εἰς Θεόν, which Hort explains of the Gentiles generally.
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1 Thess. v. 2. Where ἡ ἡμέρα occurs, as in 2 Th. ii. 2, κυρίον also generally takes the article; cf. below v. 12.

iii. 10. οἱ οὐρανοί ABC Treg WH Weiss, οὐρανοί Ν K L Ti, add. μὲν Ν 13. The anarthrous στοιχεῖα and γῆ which follow are in favour of the omission of the article. In v. 7 the article is required by the following νῦν.

evĕrebhĕsetai Ν B K P syr, οὐχ εὐρεθῆσεται sah, κατακαὶσται AL boh syr Ti, καυθῆσεται νεὶ κατακαυθῆσονται al., ἀφανισθῆ-

σουται C, om. καὶ γῆ—εὐρεθῆσεται vg, om. εὐρεθῆσεται spec, Weiss reads εὐρεθῆσεται with a question, ex ῥυὴσεται corr. ρωτατ H (S.R. p. 103). The phrase οὐχ εὐρίσκεται is used to denote disappearance in Ps. xxxvii. 36 οὐχ εὐρέθη ὁ τόπος αὐτοῦ, Job xx. 8 ὁσπερ εὐτυχιὸν ἐκπεπαθεῖν οὐ μὴ εὐρέθη, Dan. xi. 19 πεσεῖται καὶ οὐχ εὐρεθῆσεται, Heb. xi. 5, Apost. xviii. 21. I do not think we can give this force to the simple question, as Weiss. It is plain that the reading of C is merely a conjectural emendation by a scribe who could make nothing of εὐρεθῆσεται: so probably in the case of κατακαὶσται and the other readings. The required sense would be given by καταρυψεται or διαρυψεται, but not, I think, by the simple ῥυῆσεται. Buttmann’s suggestion, δὲ αὐτῇ ἔργα εὐρεθῆσεται, does not seem to me very felicitous. Dr. Chase thinks that διαρυψεται receives some support from Enoch i. 6, and also that it is nearer to εὐρεθῆσεται than καταρυψεται. He suggests however that possibly ἱαθῆσεται or ἐξιαθῆσεται may be the true reading, in accordance with the words addressed to Gabriel in Enoch x. 7, ιασον τὴν γῆν ἦν ἡμάναι αἱ ἐγρήγοροι, and in anticipation of καυνὴν γῆν in ver. 13 below (the three clauses in vv. 12b, 13, answering to the three clauses in v. 10); but he allows that ‘ver. 11 seems to require some verb implying destruction at the end of ver. 10.’ Could this be ἄρθησεται? There is much to be said for πυραθῆσεται suggested by Dr. Abbott and also by Vansittart in J. of Philol. vol. iii. p. 358. The latter thinks the variants may be explained by the supposition that the archetype had become illegible in places, that the first and fourth letters had disappeared before the first scribe conjectured [ε]υρ[ε]θῆσεται, and that the letters υρ had also disappeared before the second scribe conjectured [ἀφανι]σθῆσεται, while θ also had disappeared when the third scribe conjectured [κατακα]σεται.

iii. 11. τούτων οὖν Ν A K L syr Ti Treg, τούτων οὕτως B
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syrh (mg. οὖν) WH Weiss, τούτων δὲ οὕτως CP. There seems no special reason for οὕτως. It is the general fact, not the particular manner of destruction, which has to be insisted on. The reading of C is merely an emendation. Dr. F. G. Kenyon writes that the abbreviations of οὕτως and οὖν are scarcely distinguishable, the former appearing as ο in the London medical papyrus, as ο in the Berlin Didymus papyrus, while οὖν=ο in the Aristotle papyrus, and in the Berlin Didymus.

iii. 16 πάσας ταῖς ΝKLP Ti, ομ. ταῖς ABC Treg WH Weiss. 'In all letters' seems to me too indefinite: ταῖς would be easily lost after πάσας.

As a rough test of the character of B in these epistles, I give below the readings in which it differs from all or most of the other uncial MSS. I have put (α) before the readings which seemed to me right, (β) before those which seemed wrong, (?) where I was doubtful.

Readings of B which are unsupported by other uncial MSS.:

JUDE.

4 (α) παρεισδύηταν. 5 (β) ὑμᾶς ἀπαξ πάντα (instead of ὑμᾶς πάντα). 9 (β) διέ Μιχαήλ ... τότε. 13 (β) πλάνητες αἰς ξόφος σκότους. 14 (α) ἐπροφήτευσεν. 23 (β) ὀμ. 1st ὃς δέ.

2 PETER.

i. 1 (β) Σίμων. i. 4 (α) τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν. i. 17 (?) ὃ νιός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὕτος ἐστιν. ii. 8 (α) ἀκοῆ δικαιο. ii. 15 (β) Βέβαρ μοι δὴ ἀδικίας ἡγάπησαν. ii. 16 (β) ἀνθρώποι. ii. 18 (β) ματαιότης Β', ματαιοτητης Β². ii. 20 (β) ἐσχα. iii. 5 (β) συνε- στῶς. iii. 11 (β) τούτων οὕτως, ὃς ὀμ. ὑμᾶς. Possibly the pronoun was omitted in the archetype and differently supplied by Ν and the other MSS.

Readings of B supported by one other uncial MS.:

JUDE.

5 (?) Ἰησοῦς BC. 18 (?) ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου BC. 21 (β) τηρήσωμεν BC.

2 PETER.

i. 18 (?) τῷ ἀγίῳ δρει BC. i. 21 (α) ἀπὸ θεοῦ BP. ii. 6 (β) ὀμ. καταστροφῆ BC. ii. 13 (β) ἀγάπαις BA². ii. 14 (β) ἀκαταπά-
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στούς ΒΑ. ii. 15 (β) om. δὲ ΒΝ. ii. 19 (? τούτῳ ΒΝ (omitting καί). ii. 20 (?) κυριόν (omitting ἡμῶν) ΒΚ. ii. 22 (?) κυρισμόν ΒΧ. iii. 10 (α) ἡμέρα (omitting ἡ) ΒΟ.

Readings of B supported by two other uncial MSS.:

2 Peter.

i. 3 (β) διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς ΒΚΛ. ii. 4 (?) σειρώς ΒΑΣ. ii. 12 (α) ἀδικούμενοι ΒΡΝ. ii. 15 (?) καταλείποντες ΒΑΝ. ii. 21 (α) ὑποστρέψαι ΒΧΡ. ii. 22 (α) συμβέβηκεν (omitting δὲ) ΒΑΝ. iii. 7 (α) τῷ αὐτῷ ΒΔΡ. iii. 9 (β) εἰς ὑμᾶς ΒΧΡ. iii. 10 (β) οἱ οὐρανοὶ ΒΑΣ. (?) εὑρεθήσεται ΒΚΡ. iii. 16 (β) πάσας (omitting ταῖς) ΒΑΣ.
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The text given below is founded generally upon that of WH. Where I have departed from this, I have given my reasons for so doing either in the Introduction on the Text or in the Critical Notes. The latter are drawn principally from the last editions of Tregelles and Tischendorf and also from personal inspections of the facsimiles of codd. B and ℄, as well as from information received from Prof. Gwynn and the Rev. G. Horner in reference to the Syriac and Egyptian versions, of which I have said something in the Introduction on the Text.

Both Epistles are contained in the uncialς ΨABCKLP. They are omitted in the Peshitto, but included in the later Syriac versions, the Philoxenian and Harkleian, here distinguished as sygr and sygrh. In citing the Egyptian versions I have used the notation Boh., now commonly employed, instead of the less distinctive Copt., employed by Tischendorf. The only other point which it may be well to mention is that, as in the Epistle of James, the symbol + is appended in the Critical Notes to signify that the reading in question is found in other authorities besides those previously mentioned.

The marginal references denote various degrees of resemblance in the two Epistles, including not merely the recurrence of the same word in parallel passages, but also the occurrence of cognate or equivalent expressions.

It may be well to mention that in the following passages I have supported in the notes a different reading from that given in the text: Jude v. 1 τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . καὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ, 2 Pet. 1st om. τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ, 1st om. αὐτοῦ, 1st ψίλιν, 1st ἀμαρτημάτων, 1st μελήσω, 1st ἀπό, 2nd σεμαίνει, ἴδ. κολαξομένους τηρεῖν, 3rd δι’ ὅν, 3rd ἡμᾶς, 3rd τήχεται.
ΙΟΥΔΑ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ

2 Π. 1. 1
1 Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου, τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαστηρίου καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τετηρησμένοις κλητοῖς. 2 ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.

1. τοις θεφ...καὶ εἰ Ἰησοῦ conj. H (Sel. Read. p. 106). ἡγαστηρίου AB K, ἡγαστηρίου KLP.
ΠΕΤΡΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ Β

1 Ἑμεῶν Πέτρος δούλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦς Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦς Χριστοῦ. 2 Χάρις υἱῶν καὶ εἰρήνη πάλιν θυνθαίρησε ἐπὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν,
3 ὅπως πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωῆν καὶ ευσέβειαν δεδομένης ἔδωκαν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώμονος τοῦ καλεσμαντοῦ ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ, 4 ὥστε τὰ τίμια καὶ μεγίστα ἡμῖν ἐπαγγελματα δεδομένα, ἵνα διὰ τοῦτον γένηθε θείας κοινωνίας φύσεως, ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐφθάσας 5 καὶ αὐτῷ τούτῳ δέ σπουδὴν ἡμῖν πᾶσαν ἐπερείσκαιτε ἐπιχρηστώς ἐν τῇ πίστει. 6 ὅσον ἡ ἀρετὴ, ὥστε τῇ ἀρετῇ τῇ γνώσει, 7 ἐν τῇ ἐυσέβειᾳ τῇ περισσότεροι καὶ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τῇ προσωπικῇ, 8 καθώσπερ καὶ πλεονάζοντας οὐκ ἀργοῦς οὐδὲ ἀκρόπους οὕτω·
9 Χριστοῦ.
3 Ἀγάπητοι, πάσαν σοφόν ποιοῦν μένος γράφειν ύμίν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας ἀνάγκην ἐσχον γράψαι ύμίν παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθεῖσα ἡ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.

3. κοινῆς ἡμῶν ἢ, ύμων boh., ἢμων ἡμῶν KLP +, σωτηρίας add. καὶ ἡς K. γραφαὶ γράφειν K.
12 Διδ μελλήσω άεί ύμας ὑπὸ μὲν ὑπὸ σειν περὶ τούτων, καίπερ εἰ δότας καὶ ἐσπηριγμένως ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ. 13 δικαίων δὲ ἡγομαί, ἐφ᾽ ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, διεγείρειν ύμᾶς ἐν ὑπὸ μὲν ὑπὸ σειν, 14 εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχύνη ἐστὶν η ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος μου, καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ἐδήλωσεν μοι. 15 στουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἐκάστοτε ἔχειν υμᾶς μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον τῆς τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖν θαὶ. 16 οὐ γὰρ σεσφιοσεμένοις μύθοις ἐξαιρούθησαντες ἐγνωρίσαμεν ύμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, ἀλλὰ ἐποτπά γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος. 17 λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ Ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ ἡμῶν φῶν ἐνεχθείσας αὐτῷ τοιαύτη ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς ἐν ἐμῶ ἐυδοκίμονα,—18 καὶ ταύτην τὴν θυματίως ἥκοντας ἐν ὑπὸ ἐν τῷ ἠγίῳ ὀρεί 19 καὶ ἐχόμενες βεβαιότερον τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων, ὃ 14 καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχομεν ὡς λύχνοι φαίνοντες ἐν αὐχένη τόπῳ, εἰσοδὲν ἑαυτῶν ἀπὸ διανάγασθαι καὶ φωσφόρου.
Τοιούτον άμειον ἄρησεν εἰς τὸ κρίμαν, ἀσεβεῖς, τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατίθεντες εἰς τὴν θυσίαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸν ἄρνον μενοῦ. 5 Ὀποτε μὴν ἔστησας δὲ υμᾶς βούλωμα, εἰδότας υμᾶς πάντα, ώστε κύριος ἀπαξ λαόν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ περικυκλώσας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἁρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολυτών τὸ ἑδονὸν οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοὶς αἰδίως ὑπὸ τὸ κρύφιον τετήρηκεν. 7 ὃς Σῶδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις, τὸν ὤμοιον τρόπουν τούτους ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὁ πῖσω σαρκός ἐτέρας, πρόκειται δὲ γεμαῖραι πυρὸς αἰώνιον δίκην υπέχουσαι. 8 Ομοίως μέντοι καὶ οὕτωι ἐπινειαζόμενοι σαρκα μὲν μιαίνον οὐσίαν, κυρίοτητα δὲ ἄθεοτον οὐσίαν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοὺσίν. 9 Ο δὲ Μιχαήλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ότε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μουσῆου σώματος, οὐκ ἔτολμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίαν.

9. ο de Μιχαηλ...οτε ACKL N, ote Miho...τοτε B. κυριος] ὅ C² Clem.
πετρού β 7

ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδιαῖς υμῶν. 20 τούτο πρῶτον γυνώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφής ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται. 21 οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἡμέρθη προφητεία ποτὲ, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεῦματος ἡ ἡγίασιν περιμένειν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώποι.

II

1 Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς Ἰ. 5 καὶ ἐν υμῖν ἐσονται ψευδοδιδασκάλοι, οἵτινες παρεῖσκαν καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτούς δεισότην ἁρπονύμου, ἐπάγοντες αὐτοὺς. 4 ταχύνω ἀπὸ λειαν. 2 καὶ πολλοὶ παρεξελοθνουσιν Ἰ. 5 αὐτῶν ταῖς αἰσχροῖς, διὸ ὡς ὑδατοίς λύκοις ἐμπροεσονται ὡς το ἐκκλησία Ἰ. 4 ἐκπαλαιά ὁν ἄργῳ, καὶ ἡ ἀπόλεια αὐτῶν ὑπὸ Ἰ. 4, 5 νυστάζει. 4 εἰ γάρ ὁ Θεός ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτήσει Ἰ. 5 σάντων ὁν ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειροῖς ἐκ οἰον ταρ. Ἰ. 6 ταραφόν παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τὴν ομοίους Ἰ. 6 καὶ ἀρχαιον κόσμου ὁν ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ ὄγδοον ὁ νόες δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ Ἰ. 24 ἀ σ ἐ β ὑν ἐπάξας. 6 καὶ πολεὶς Σωδόμα καὶ Κ. 4, 15, 17 Γόμορρᾶς τεφώσας καταστροφὴ κατέκρινεν, ὑπὸ δέ εἰ γ μα μελλόντων ἀ σ ἐ β ὑ ἡ τεθεικός. 7 καὶ δικαίων Ἰ. 7. 4 λόγος καταπονύμου ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέουσων ἐν ἀ σ ἐ λ γ ν Ἰ. 4 αναστροφῆς ἐρύσατο, 8 βλέμματι γάρ καὶ ἀκοή δίκαιος ἐνκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέρας ψυχήν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἐργοῖς ἐβασανίζει. 9 οἴδειν Κύριος Ἰ. 15


12. οὕτω εἰσίν] add. (ex v. 16) γογγυσταί—παρευμονεῖς Κ C9. οἱ εἰς ταῖς


syr. +, συννυχαμένοι, ἀφοβῶς syr. Treg. WH, συνεκφορικῶς, αφοβῶς, Ti. παραφορικῶς B.

13. πλακτές όις (οὐσίων πλακτόςς B.)

πειρασμοῦ ὑπὲσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέ- Ἰ. 8
παν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τῇ ῥῆειν, 10 μάλιστα
dὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιᾶς μοῦ Ἰ. 7, 8, 16, 18
πορευομένους καὶ κυριότητος καταφρο-
νοῦτας. τολμηται αὐθάδεις, δόξας οὐ τρέμου- Ἰ. 8
σιν βλάσφημοντες· 11 ὅπου ἀγγελοι Ἰ. 9
ἰσχὺ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν
καὶ αὐτῶν παρὰ Κυρίῳ βλάσφημον κρίσιν.
12 οὕτῳ δέ, ὡς ἀλογα ἥμα γεγενεμένα φυ- Ἰ. 10
σικα εἰς ἀλωσι καὶ θοραρν', ἐν οἷς ἀγνου-
σιν βλάσφημοντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν
καὶ φθαρῆσονται, 13 ἀδικοῦμενοι μισθὸν
ἀδικίας· ἵδονεν ἥγομενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφὴν
καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφοῦτες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις Ἰ. 12
αὐτῶν συνευχομενοὶ ὑμῖν, 14 ὀφθαλμοὶ
ἐχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπάστους ἀμαρ-
τίας, δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτοσιν, καρδίας γεγυ-
νασμένην πλεωνεξίας ἐχοντες, κατάρας τέκνα. 15 κατα-
λειποῦτες ἐνθείαν ὁδὸν ἐπὶ ἀνήθησαν,
ἐξακολουθήσατε τῇ ὁ δόξῃ τοῦ Βαλαδὸ μ τοῦ Βόσορ
ὁ μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἡγάτησεν, 16 ἔλεγξιν δε
ἐσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἀφωνον ἐν ἀνθρό-
pου φωνῆ φθεγξάμενον ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφῆτα
παραφρονίαν. 17 οὕτῳ εἰσὶν πνευματικοὶ καὶ Ἰ. 12
ὁ μιχλαὶ ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαν νομέναι, οἶς

9. πειρασμοῦ ];σωμάτες κ. Τά. Τ. 10. ἐπιθυμια.; οἰ, οἱ CP syh+b., +.,
tολμηται αὐθάδεις Τί. Ζώς, τολμηται,
αὐθάδεις Τρ. WH. 11. παρα κριμαί NK BCKL συρτ+Τ. Ὁμ. τ. +, παρα κριμαί τίμησεν. εἴ ἐντοῖς
ῥήμαρ. Σπίττα, παρα κριμαί] WH. Τρ. 12. γεγενεμέναι ἈΒΤΡΕ. WH. Treg.,
γεγενεμένα NK A2 KΛ+Τ. γεγ. φυσ. Ν. ΚΑΒΡΕ, φυσ. ἡγ. ΚΛ. καὶ φθαρ-
ησονται καταφρο- KΛ+. 13. ἀδικοῦμενοι BK ΒΡ συρτ. + Η. οι,
kομμουνοὶ ΑΚΛΤ. Βολ. συρτ. + Τ. Τρ. ἀναφαίρε ΑΚΛΤ συρτ. (mg. ἀγαπαί), ΥΗ. ΤΙ. ἀγαπαί ΑΒ συρ.
συρτ. + ΤΕ. WH. m. 14. μοιχαλίδος BCKL+, μοιχαλίδος
Α Ν vulg. sah. boh., ἀκαταπάταις Ν. 
ΚΑΚΤΕΡ συρτ. + ΤΕ. Τρ. -.Ἀπαιτοῦ AB 
WH. -.Ἀπαιτοῦ Vulg. +. ἀμαρτίας
ἀμαρτίας Ν. σεμι. 15. καταληπτοὺς Ν ΑΒ WH. ΤΙ. καταληπτοὺς Β+ΕΚΛ Χ +
ΤΕ. WH. m. Βοσορ ΑΚΛΤ Ν. vulg. boh. συρτ. αἰθ.,
ΤΙ. Τρ. WH. m., Βεσορ Β συρτ. + Η. 
Βεσορος Ν. οἱ ΑΚΛΤ Ν. συρτ. Η. ΤΙ. 
οἱ β. Β Η. m. ἠγαπησεν] ἠγαπησεν Β
Η. m. 16. ἀνθρώπου] ἄνθρωπος Β. 17. καὶ ὁμιχλαὶ] ρεφελαι (ex Ὁμ. 12)
Λ++, ὅ, τ. καὶ—τερληθηκε Κ. σεμιtauos
ἀπ. εἰς αἰωνα (ex Ὁμ. 18) ΑΚΛΤ.
2 P. 3. 1; 1.

17 Ὑμεῖς δὲ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 18 ὅτι ἔλεγεν ὁμίλων Ἡσύς ἀπὸ τῶν χρόνων ἐσονταὶ ἐμπαίκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἁσθενῶν. 19 Οὕτωι εἴσον οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεύμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

ο ζόφος τού σκότους τετήρηται. 18 ύπέρ- Ι. 13
ο γκα γάρ ματαιώτητος φθεγγόμενοι δελεάζουσιν Ι. 16
ἐν ἐπιθυμίαισι σαρκὸς ἄσελγείαις τοὺς ὄλι—Ι. 7
γως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους, Ι. 11
19 ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δούλοι
ὑπάρχουσαι τῆς φθορᾶς· φί γάρ τις ἦττηται, τοῦτο
δεδουλωταί. 20 εἰ γάρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιᾶς ματαίος
τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος. 25
Ἅσιον Χριστοῦ, τοῦτοι δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἠπτότηται,
γένοντες αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐσχάτα χείρων τῶν πρωτῶν.
21 κρείττον γάρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν
τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἑπιγνώσας ὑποστρέφαι ἐκ τῆς
παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐν τολῆς. 3. 8
22 συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀλήθους παρουσίας, Κύνον
ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἑδίον ἐξέραμα, καὶ Ἰησοῦν ἑλέσαμένη 5
eis κυλισμὸν βορβόρου.

III

1 Ταῦταν ἡδῆς, ἀγαπτοί, δευτέραν υμῖν ἃ ἐπιστολήν, ἐν ἀεὶ διεγείρω υμῶν ἐν ὑπο- 30
祏 αρφῶ ἐπιστολήν, ἐν ἀεὶ διεγείρω υμῶν ἐν ὑπο- 3
μνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινή διάνοιαν, 2 μνήσεις ἡναι 5
τῶν προειρήμενων ῥήματων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων
προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ύμῶν ἐν- 14, 17
τολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος, 3 τοῦτο ἐν
πρῶτον γινόμεναι ὅτι ἐλευσονται ἐπὶ ἐς χά- 18
τῶν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαίγμονη ἐμπαίκται
κατὰ τὰς ἒριδας ἐπίθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευό- 21

18. ματαιωτης] ματαιωτης B', oμιλεις 
19. τουτοι Β sah. boh. + WH. Ti, 
20. κυριου BK + WH. Trg., oμιλεις Ν Α, ΚΛΠ + Τεργ.

21. επιγνωσων] add. eis τα οπισω Α 
22. συμβηκεν Ν ΑΒ, add. Ν ΚΛΠ, κυλισμον BC, κυλισμον Α, ΚΛΠ.

III 2. υμων Ν ΑΒΚΛΠ, ημων μενος. 
3. εσχατων Ν ΑΒΚΟ, εσχατον KΛΠ +, 
του ΕΝ Μπαγμον Ν ΑΒΚΡ, (ομ. 
εν ΚΡ), ομ. ΚΛ.
III 3-13]

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Β

μενοι 4 καὶ λέγοντες Ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; ἀφ’ ἡς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκουμηνήσαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. 5 λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸ τὸ θέλοντα ὅτι οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἐκπαίδευται καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι’ ὕδατος συνεστώσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ; 6 δι’ ὅτι τὸ κόσμος ὤδατε κατακλυσθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ ὑλῆς τοῦ. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρίσμενοι εἰσὶν πνεῦμα ἦν μενοὶ εἰς τοὺς 8 ἡμέρας κρίσεως καὶ ἀπολέσας τοὺς ἄσσε ὁ δὲ ν. 9 ἀνθρώπων. 8 Ἐν δὲ τούτῳ μὴ λανθανόντων ὑμᾶς, ἀγαπῶν τούτῳ, ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια. 8 ἐτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία. 9 οὐ διανόησεν Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὡς τινες βραδυτήτα ἡγούνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ύμᾶς, μὴ βουλόμενος τινας ἀπὸ ὅλος τὸ σάρξ ἡ ἡμέρα μία. 10 Ἡξεί. 11 δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης, ἐν οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἡ δήμον παρελεύσῃ καὶ στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται, καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὐρήσεται. 11. 12 Τούτων οὖν πάντων λυμένων ποταποῦ δεῖ υπάρχειν ύμάς ἐν αἰῶνι ἀναστορηφαίς καὶ εὐσεβείας. 12 προσδοκῶντας καὶ στειχουμένους τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς Θεοῦ τοῦ ἡμέρας, δι’ ἄν οὐρανοὶ πυροφοροῦν ἡ λυθήσεται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται. 13 καὶ οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ γῆς καὶ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ πρὸς δοκῶ μέν, ἐν οἷς διακοινώθη ἡ κατοικεῖ. 21
20 Ἄμειν δὲ ἀγαπητοί, ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς
τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσ-
ευχόμενοι, 21 ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε
πρὸς ἐκείμενος, 22 ἵνα εἰς Χριστὸν ἐστὶν αἰώνιον. 23 Οὐς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς
ἀπαύγαστε, οὕς δὲ ἐλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ
τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐστὶν λοιμὸν χιτῶνα.

24 Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπείρους
καὶ στῆσαι κατενώπιον τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ ἀμώ-
μον ἐν ἀγαλλίαις, 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν
diὰ Ἰσοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ὁ ἄξιος μεγα-
λωσύνη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία πρὸ πάντως τοῦ αἰώνος
καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμῖν.

21. τηρησάτει] τηρησάτει BC.
22. ἐλεύθετε AC vulg. boh. arm. +, ελεύθεται BC, ελεύθεται KLP +, διακρι-
μενος Ν ΑΒΓ, διακριμένου KLP.
23. οὐς δὲ (1) ἐΝ ΑΚΛΠ, om. B. σώζετε
ἐν φόβῳ σώζεται KLP. οὐς δὲ (2)
ἐλεώσαις Ν ΑΒ,..., om. KLP., εν
φόβῳ C.
24. ὑμᾶς Ν ΒCL vulg. syr. boh., ἡμᾶς
ἐστὶν Ν, autous KP. ἀπείρους Ν
καὶ αὐτοὺς Α. σωτῆρι KLP. +, διὰ Π. Κ."
τοῦ κυρίου ημῶν] om. KP. εἰς τοὺς
εἰς Ν.
14 Διό, ἀγαπητοί, ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες σπουδάζει· J. 17, J. 21 ἵστατε ἁστίλοι· καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῶ· εὐρεθήναι ἐν J. 23, J. 24 εἰρήνη· 15 καὶ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σοι· J. 2, J. 3, 25 τιμῶν ἡγεῖσθε, καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος κατὰ τὴν δοθείαν αὐτῶ· σοφίαν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν, 16 ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων, ἐν αἰς ἐστὶν δυσνόητα τινα, ᾧ ὁμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι σπερμὸν ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπόλειαιν. J. 19

17 Ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, προανέσκοντες φυ· J. 20 λάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ τῇ τῶν ἀδέσμων πλάνη συν· J. 24, J. 11 απαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηρίγμου, 18 αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ J. 4 σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. αὐτῶ· ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν J. 24, J. 25 καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος.
NOTES ON ST. JUDE

1. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος.] The same phrase is used by St. James in the Inscription to his epistle, also by St. Paul in Rom. and Phil. In 1 Pet. the phrase used is ἀπόστολος Ἰ. Χ., in 2 Pet. δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος. It is, I think, a mistake to translate δοῦλος by the word 'slave,' the modern connotation of which is so different from that of the Greek word (cf. 2 Cor. 4%). There is no opposition between δουλεία and ἔλευθερία in the Christian's willing service. It only becomes a δουλεία in the opposed sense, when he ceases to love what is commanded and feels it as an external yoke.

ἀδελφές ἡ Ἰακόβου.] Cf. Tit. 1 δοῦλος Θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰ. Χ. See Introduction on the Author.

tοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς.] On the readings see Introduction on the Text. For the phrase Θεοῦ πατήρ see Hort's note on 1 P. 1%. The easier reading of some MSS., ἡγαπημένους for ἡγαπημένοις, is probably derived from 1 Cor. 1 ήγαπη-μένους ἐν Χ. Ἰ. There is no precise parallel either for ἐν Θεῷ ἡγ., or for Χριστῷ τετ. The preposition ἐν is constantly used to express the relation in which believers stand to Christ: they are incorporated in Him as the branches in the vine, as the living stones in the spiritual temple, as the members in the body of which He is the head. Thus we find such phrases as τοῖς ἐν Χ. Ἰ. Rom. 8%, τοὺς ὑπό τὸν Κυρίῳ ἡδ. 16% ἀνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ 2 Cor. 12%, εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτισθημεν Gal. 3%, τοὺς ἄγιας ἐν Χ. Ἰ. Phil. 1%, δικαιοθείμαι ἐν Χριστῷ Gal. 2%, ἀγάπης τῆς ἐν Χ. Ἰ. 1 Tim. 1%, σωτηρίας τῆς ἐν Χ. Ἰ. 2 Tim. 2%. So here 'beloved as members of Christ, reflecting back his glorious image,' would be a natural and easy conception. Sometimes the name of the Father is joined with that of the Son in such a phrase, as in 1 Th. 1% Παύλος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοσαλαντικῶν ἐν Θεῷ πατρι κ. Κυρίῳ Ἰ. Χ., cf. 1 Joh. 4% ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μένων ἐν αὐτῷ ἀγάπη ἐν τῷ Θεῷ μένει καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ. Joh. 17% ἢν πάντες ἐν σοί, καθὼς σύ, Πατήρ, ἐν ἡμῖν καί ἐν σοί, ἢν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὑπάρχοντες, below ver. 25 μόνον Θεῷ σωτήρι ἡμῶν ἢ Ἰ. Χ. There would therefore have been no difficulty in the expression ἐν Θ. Π. καὶ Ἰ. Χ. τετηρημένοις, cf. Joh. 17% πάτερ ἀγιε, τῇρησον αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί σου ὁ δεδωκας μοι…Ὅτε ἡμῖν
THE EPISODE OF ST. JUDE

met' autón eis ἐπήρων autóis k.t.l., also ver. 15. But it is different with ἡγαπημένοι. Lightfoot, commenting on Col. 3:12 ἐκεῖτο τοῦ Ἡσώ, ἀγιοὶ καὶ ἡγαπημένοι, says that in the N.T. the last word 'seems to be used always of the objects of God's love,' which he illustrates by 1 Th. 1:4 εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Ἡσώ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν, and 2 Th. 2:13, ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Κύριου. Cf. 2 Cor. 13:12, Rom. 5:8, 1 Joh. 4:10, 19, Hos. 14:4. B. Weiss takes it in the same way here, but it is difficult to see the propriety of the phrase, 'Brethren beloved by God in God.' Ἡγαπημένοι is used of the objects of man's love in Clem. Hom. ix. 5 τῶν αὐτῶν ἡγαπημένων τοὺς τάφονα νυκτὶς τιμῶσιν, and the cognate ἀγαπητοὶ is constantly used in the same sense (as below ver. 3), as well as in the sense of 'beloved of God' (Rom. 1:7 ἀγαπητοῖς Ἡσω, κλητοῖς ἀγίοις). If, therefore, we are to retain the reading, I am disposed to interpret it as equivalent to ἀδελφοὶ, 'beloved by us in the Father,' i.e. 'beloved with φιλολογία as children of God,' but I think that Hort is right in considering that εἰν has shifted its place in the text. See below.

The verb τηρεῖν, used of persons, has two significations, that of friendly, or that of punitive keeping,—to keep safe from harm, or to keep in custody. An example of the former use is found in this epistle ver. 21 ἐμφασεν εἰς ἁγίᾳ Ἡσώ τηρήσατε, the latter in ver. 6 εἰς κραῖνος δεσμον τετηρηκεν. The former is the sense required in this verse, but the force of the dative is not quite clear. Alford, Spitta, Keil, Kühl take it as dat. commodi 'kept for J. C.' (cf. 2 Cor. 11:1 ηματίαν ὑμῶν τηρήσατε, Athanas. I. 393 λ ὑμῖν ἀκράσαν τῷ βασιλεῖ τηρεῖν). This might also mean kept safe 'for the sake of' or 'at the request of J. C.': cf. Joh. 17:11 quoted above. The difficulty is that this seems to ignore any active participation by Christ in the work of preserving or defending His Church, as shown in 2 Th. 3:3 πιστὸς δὲ ἄπαντι δ κύριος, δς στηρίξει υμᾶς και φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου. Below (ver. 24) it is said of the Father that He is able φυλάξαι υμᾶς ἀπαλάτους and so in Rom. 16:25 we read (μόνον σοφῷ Ἡσώ) τῷ δυνατῷ υμᾶς στηρίξαι. In ver. 21 the faithful are called upon to keep themselves in the love of God. It is possible, however, to take the dative as expressing the agent, cf. Nehem. 13:28 ἡγαπήμονος τῷ Θεῷ ἦν, and my note on James 3:7 δαμάζεται και διδα- μασται τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ. Others suppose the dat. to be governed by the εἰν which precedes Ἡσώ, but the interposed ἡγαπημένοι makes this very harsh.

The above difficulties have led to the suspicion of a 'primitive error,' in the text, see WH in Sel. Readings, p. 106, where it is suggested that εἰν should be omitted before Ἡσώ and inserted before ἦν, giving the sense 'to those who have been beloved by the Father, and who have been kept safe in Jesus from the temptations to which others have succumbed.' The prominence here given to the love of the Father is in accordance with the general tone of the N.T. and especially of the writings of St. John. Whatever reading we adopt, Jude has in mind the contrast with those who had not been 'kept' but had broken loose from the Christian fold: cf. 1 P. 1:18 τοὺς εἰς δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρονου- μένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν.
Dr. Chase defends the MS. reading in the following note which he allows me to insert:

Israel in the Old Testament is represented as differing from other nations in that Jehovah ‘loved’ him or ‘loved’ the ‘fathers’—Deut. 4\textsuperscript{27}, 10\textsuperscript{2}, 23\textsuperscript{2}, 2 Chron. 21\textsuperscript{1}, 9\textsuperscript{4}, Is. 43\textsuperscript{1}, Hos. 2\textsuperscript{2} (LXX.; cf. Rom. 9\textsuperscript{2}), Mal. 1\textsuperscript{1}; comp. Psa. Sol. 9\textsuperscript{4}.

Hence [4] Ἰακαμηνὸς becomes a title—or of the nature of a title—for the people: Deut. 32\textsuperscript{1}, 33\textsuperscript{1}\textsuperscript{2}, 20, 2 Chron. 20\textsuperscript{2}, Ps. 28\textsuperscript{1}(?), Is. 5\textsuperscript{5}, 44\textsuperscript{2}, Bar. 3\textsuperscript{2}.

Further, it is used in the singular of certain typical Israelites, Abraham (Dan. 3\textsuperscript{a}, Th. and LXX.), Moses (Ecclus. 45\textsuperscript{1}), Samuel (Ecclus. 46\textsuperscript{2}), Solomon (Neh. 13\textsuperscript{3}); and in particular it seems to have got a special force as a title of the Messiah (Robinson, Ephesians, pp. 229 ff.). Moreover in one passage of 3 Macc. (6\textsuperscript{1}) it is in the plural used of a body of Israelites as opposed to heathen—μὴ τοῖς ματαιοῖς οἱ ματαιόφρονες εὐλογησάτωσαν ἐν τῷ θεαματίῳ του αὐτολείπτων. Hence like such words as ἔγειρον, ἐκλειπόντο, which also are specially applied to the Messiah, it has a particular application to Israel and need not be in the singular a title of the people and of the Messiah, the typical Israelite. In the salutation to the Ep. the singular would have been impossible, but the plural seems to me quite natural to express the thought that these correspondents of St. Jude were now the true Israel.

The other three passages of the New Testament in which Ἰακαμηνὸς is used I think confirm this view of the word. (a) In 1 Thess. 1\textsuperscript{4} (εἰδότες, ἐδεικνύω ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῷ ἐλευθερών ὄσιμῳ) it is brought into close relation to the divine ἐλευθερία, the latter word being pre-eminent one used to express Israel’s relation to Jehovah (see Hort on 1 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{1}, 2\textsuperscript{2} [Messianic use]*). (b) 2 Thess. 2\textsuperscript{2} (καὶ Ἰακαμηνὸς ἐνδύκτου, διά ἐπάγω ὕμνος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπὶ ἀρχῆς κ. τ. λ.), where WH give the words as a quotation from Deut. 33\textsuperscript{3}. Here also we have the O.T. idea of God’s choice—for the word ἐλατρεύσεως in reference to Israel, see Deut. 26\textsuperscript{3} (c) Col. 3\textsuperscript{3} (ἐυθεῖας ὅπου ἐκ τούτου τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐγίνεται καὶ Ἰακαμηνὸς). St. Paul had just said οὐκ ἐν Ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ ἔλληνοις: then he uses of the gentile Colossians three words specially connected with Israel—ἐλατρεύσεως (the same idea as in 1 and 2 Thess.), ἐγίνεται, Ἰακαμηνὸς. The use of Ἰακαμηνὸς (and -οί) both in the O.T. and in the N.T. seems to me to afford very strong reasons for regarding the word as one taken over by the Apostles from the vocabulary of the Theocracy. For the thought, see Hort 1 Pet., Introd. Lec. p. 7.

I cannot help thinking that, following on these words, the words τὸν ἑσπερινὸν ἔλλην ἐγίνεται (1 Pet. 14\textsuperscript{1} with Hort’s notes).

Such a reference to the Gentile character of his friends—of course in its religious aspect—is just what we should expect from a Hebrew Apostle writing from Jerusalem: cf. Jas. 1\textsuperscript{1} (to the Theocracy), 1 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{1} (to Gentiles).

Such a reference I find in the following verse τοῖς κοσμίῳ ἄνθρωποῖς—see my art. in Hastings’ Dict. ii. p. 805a. I was glad to find that Dr. Armitage Robinson adopted this interpretation in a University sermon (‘Unity in Christ’ p. 248: ‘Our common salvation’—a phrase which falls naturally from the pen of a Jewish Christian writing to his Gentile brethren’).

It also appears to me most natural, as other writers of other N.T. Epistles, St. Jude should in the salutation refer to the essential position of his friends. He begins as he would have done had no necessity been laid on him to devote his letter to warning them against special dangers. The reference to these begins with v. 36.

For the phrase ἔν τῷ Ἱσραήλ compare Ps. 43\textsuperscript{3} ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ἐκαταπάθητος, 59\textsuperscript{2} ἐν τῷ Θεῷ παρθένον βέναμι. I venture to think that the use of such an O.T. phrase, made definitely Christian, is very probable in St. Jude. I further compare Ignatius Rom. 1 ἐκκλησία Ἰακαμηνὸς καὶ πεφωτισμένη ἐν θελήματι τοῦ βασιλέως τὸ πάντα ἐστὶν—a parallel which gives part of the meaning. Perhaps one might paraphrase St. Jude—‘who through the will and the working of God have attained to the being numbered among the Beloved.’
I quite agree with all that is here said on the application of ἡγαπημένος in this passage. Jude speaks to the Christians as inheriting the privileges of God's ancient people. But the use of ἐν in the phrase ἡγαπημένος ἐν Θεῷ does not seem to be quite on a par with the instances quoted from the Psalms, where the R.V. has 'In God have we made (LXX. 'shall we make') our boast,' and 'Through God we shall do valiantly.' The quotation from Ignatius would furnish a nearer parallel if it were not for the interposition of περιτωμένη after ἡγαπημένη, and the use of ἐν θελήματε instead of Θεῷ. Then, are we justified in assuming that those addressed are Gentiles? Zahn (Einleitung II. 75, 51) holds that Jude's mission was limited to the circumcision (Gal. 27, 1 Cor. 9), and this view gains support from the familiarity imputed to the readers not merely with the facts of O.T. history, but also with apocryphal books and rabbinical traditions in vv. 5-7, 9-11 and 14. The innovators, of course, may have come from Gentile communities. Again, as the thought which fills the writer's mind is one which has nothing to do with the difference between Jew and Gentile, but has reference to a new danger threatening both alike, it seems to me that the phrase κοινῆς σωτηρίας will have a more living meaning, if it is contrasted here with the special warning required for the particular church to which he writes, than if we assign to it a meaning which, if not quite worn out, was at least of less pressing importance at the time.

κλητος is here the substantive of which ἡγαπημένος and τετηρημένος are predicated. We find the same use in Apoc. 1714 (νικησοναι) αἵ μετ’ αὑτοῦ κλητοι κ. ἐκλεκτοι κ. πιστοί, in St. Paul's epistles, as in Rom. 16 ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς, κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. 12 κηρύσσομαι Χριστόν ἐσται και ἐπισκοπήν, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάβδαλον ... αὕτης δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς . . . Χριστὸν Θεοῦ δύναμιν. The calling is sometimes specially defined, as in Rom. 1.1 Παύλου κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, ἢδ. 17 κλητοὶ ἁγίοις. At other times its nature is further explained, as in Rom. 828 τοὺς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοὶ ὄσιν, 1 Cor. 120 βλέπετε τὴν κλήσιν ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οὗ πολλοὶ σοφοί κατὰ σάρκα ... ἀλλὰ τὰ μαρὰ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελέγατο ὁ Θεός, Eph. 118 εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐπίστας τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλούτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, 2 Tim. 19 Θεοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ ανθρώπου ὑμᾶς καὶ καλεσάντως κλησάς ἁγία, Heb. 31 κλητοὺς ἐπωρανίον μέτοχοι. In Matt. 2214 a distinction is made between calling and election (πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσὶν κλητοὶ, ὄλγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί) but Lightfoot (Col. 318) denies that this distinction is to be found in the Epistles.

We have many examples of the divine calling in the Gospels, as in the case of the Apostles (Mt. 421, Mk. 120) and in the parables of the Great Supper and the Labourers in the Vineyard. This idea of calling or election is derived from the O.T. See Hort's n. on 1 Pet. 11 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοὶ: 'Two great forms of election are spoken of in the O.T., the choosing of Israel, and the choosing of single Israelites, or bodies of Israelites to perform certain functions for Israel . . . It is singular that ἐκλεκτοί never stands at the beginning of St. Paul's Epistles, as it does here . . . his corresponding word is
κλητον and he often uses καλω with a similar force. The calling and the choosing imply each other, the calling being the outward expression of the antecedent choosing, the act by which it begins to take effect. Both words emphatically mark the present state of the persons addressed as being due to the free agency of God . . . In Deuteronomy (4:8) the choosing by God is ascribed to His own love of Israel: the ground of it lay in Himself, not in Israel . . . As is the election of the ruler or priest within Israel for the sake of Israel, such is the election of Israel for the sake of the whole human race. Such also, still more clearly and emphatically is the election of the new Israel.' For a similar use of the word ‘call’ in Isaiah, cf. ch. 48:12, 43:7. The chief distinction between the ‘calling’ of the old and of the new dispensation is that the former is rather expressive of dignity (‘called by the name of God’), the latter of invitation; but the former appears also in the N.T. in such phrases as James 2:27 to καλω δενμα το εκπληθην εφ’ ομα, and 1 Pet. 2:29 ομες δε γενος ελεκτοιν, βασιλειαν ιερατευμα . . . λαος εις περιποιησιν. The reason for St. Jude’s here characterizing the called as beloved and kept, is because he has in his mind others who had been called, but had gone astray and incurred the wrath of God.

2. For the Salutation see my note on χαρεω James 1:1, and Hort’s excellent note on 1 P. 1:2 χαρεις . . . πληθυνησι. We find ἡλεος and ειρηνη joined in Gal. 6:16, and with the addition of χαρεις in 1 Tim. 1:2, 2 Tim. 1:3, 2 Joh. 3. The mercy of God is the ground of peace, which is perfected in the feeling of God’s love towards them. The verb πληθυνθησευν occurs in the Salutation both of 1 Pet. and 2 Pet. and in Dan. 5:22 (in the letter of Darius), ειρηνα γυνα πληθυνθησευν, cf. 1 Thess. 3:12 γυνας δε ο κυριος πλεονασαι και περιποιηθησαι τη διαπατη εις αλληλους. 'Αγαπη (= the love of God) occurs also in the final salutation of 2 Cor. 1:7 χαρεις τ. κυριου ιησου και η αγαπη του Θεου, and in Eph. ειρηνα τοις αδιεξοδοι και αγαπη μετα πιστεως απο Θεου πατρος και Κυριου 'Ι. Χ. Cf. 1 Joh. 3:1 ἵδετε ποιημεν αγαπην δεδωκες ημιν ο πατηρ ινα τεκνα Θεου κληθημεν, where Westcott’s n. is ‘The divine love is infused into them, so that it is their own, and becomes in them the source of a divine life (Rom. 3:10). In virtue of this gift they are inspired with a love which is like the love of God, and by this they truly claim the title of children of God as partakers in His nature, 1 Joh. 4:7-19.’ The same salutation is used in the letter of the Smyrneans (c. 156 A.D.) giving an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, ἡλεος και ειρηνα και αγαπη Θεου πατρος και Κυριου ημιν ‘Ι. Χ. πληθυνθησευν. The thought of ἡλεος and αγαπη recurs again in ver. 21.

3. Διατηρησαι occurs in vv. 17 and 20, also in 2 P. 3:15, 14, 17, 1 Pet. 2:9, 4:12, and James. It is common in the Epistles of John and of Paul, sometimes with μου attached, as in 1 Cor. 10:14. Phil. 2:12, and is often joined to ἀδιεξοδοι, especially in James. The αγαπη of ver. 2 leads on to the διατηρησαι here. They are themselves διατηρησαι because the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts.

τασιν σπουδην τοιομαν.] For τασιν see my n. on James 1:2, and cf. 2 Pet. 1:6 σπουδην τασιν παρεισεγενατε, 1:15 σπουδαιος οικιν γυμνα.
THE EPISODE OF ST. JUDE

μνήμην ποιείσθαι, also Isocr. Orat. v. p. 91 δ ἃταν τὴν σπουδὴν περὶ τούτου ποιείσθαι, Plato, Ethyd. 304 ε περὶ οἰδενός ἀξίων ἀναβιον σπουδὴν ποιοῦνται. Other examples in Wetstein. Jude was busy on another subject, when he received the news of a fresh danger to the Church, which he felt it his duty to meet at once. Whether he lived to carry out his earlier design, and whether it was of the nature of a treatise or of an epistle, we know not. It is noteworthy that there is a similar allusion in 2 P. 3:1 to an earlier letter now lost. Compare Barn. 4:9 πολλὰ δὲ θύλων γράφειν . . . γράφειν ἑπούδασα.

κοινὴς σωτηρίας.] Cf. n. on 2 P. 11 ἰσότιμων, Tit. 1:4 κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν, Ign. Eph. 1 ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ ἅγιοι with Lightfoot's n., Jos. Ant. 10. 1. 3 (Hezekiah besought Isaiah to offer sacrifice) ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας. Bede explains as follows: 'omniaum electorum communis est salus, fides et dilectio Christi.' Jude puts on one side the address he was preparing on the main principles of Christianity (probably we may take vv. 20 and 21 as a sample of what this would have been) and turns to the special evil which was then threatening the church.

ἀνάγκην ἥχου γράφαις.] Cf. Luke 14:18 ἠχον ἀνάγκην ἤδην αὐτῶν, Heb. 7:27, al., also Plut. Cato Mi. 24 ἀνάγκην ἥχου ἠκαθαρῶν ἀγχωμοσύνας τῆς γνώσεως. There is a similar combination of γράφεων and γράφαι in 3 Joh. 13. The sorrow, contrasted with the preceding pres. γράφεως, implies that the new epistle had to be written at once and could not be prepared for at leisure, like the one he had previously contemplated. It was no welcome task: 'necessity was laid upon him.' The watchman was bound to give warning, however much the people might resent it (Ezek. 31:17, 33:6).

ἐπαγωγισθαι τῇ ἀπεξικατάστασι τῆς ἀγίως πίστει.] 'to contend for the faith,' almost equivalent to the ἀγωνίσασθαι περὶ τῆς ἁλλεθῆς in Sir. 4:28, see 1 Tim. 6:12 ἀγωνίζων τὸν καλὸν ἀγωνίζων τῆς πίστεως, and εἰς δ' κοτικὸν ἀγωνιζόμενον Col. 1:23. We may compare ἐπαμύνουν, ἐπαναπαύειν νῦν Rom. 2:17. Bengel connects this with the parallel phrase ἐπικοινωνίας τῇ πίστει in ver. 20 by the thought borrowed from Nehem. 4:16 foll. 'Officium duplex, pugnare strenue pro fide contra hostes, et aedificare se ipsum in fide.' It is possible (as is shown by the following examples) for spiritual blessings, once given, to be lost, unless we use every effort to maintain them. The redemption from Egypt was a fact, as baptism into the name of Christ is a fact, but, unless it is borne in mind and acted upon, the fact loses its efficacy. The word ἐπαγωγίζεται is rare in this sense (1): it is found in Plut. Mor. 1075 δ' ἐπαγωγιζόμενος δ' Κλεάνθης τῇ ἐπικυρώσει. Stephanus quotes Maximus Schol. in Dion. Aenop. p. 54 ταῦτα τῇ δόξῃ ἐπαγωγίζεται. Philo (M. 2. 495) uses it in the same sense with the dative understood, ἐπαγωγιζόμενος (τῷ ἄνωτε εἰναι τῶν κάσμων) ὁ Κριγάλαος ἐχρήτου καὶ τοιούτω λόγῳ, id. p. 228 füms. (2) Closely connected with this sense is that which we find in Plut. V. 65 c. ἐτέρως ἐπαγωγίζεται τεκμηρίως 'lay stress upon other proofs.' Aristid. τέρησι προτορική p. 688 (D. vol. ii. p. 756) κατὰ λέξεις χίνεται ραχαλύτης, ὅταν τις . . . μὴ ἐπαγωγίζεται τῇ λέξει . . . ὅταν τις μὴ φιλοτιμήτων πρὸς τὴν λέξιν, ἄλλα καὶ πρὸς τά.
NOTES

3, 4]

πράγματα ἀποβλήτης. (3) Libanius (Arg. in Androt. p. 587 δεύτερος ὁ Διόδωρος ἐπαγωγεῖται τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ) seems to use it in the sense of 'following up the argument of the previous speaker,' λόγῳ being the instrumental dative. So Philostr. V. Soph. i. 17 ἦσαν τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ ὁ Πράγας καὶ τῷ μῆ παρελθέντι ἐκ τούτων ἐπεδιεικάθι τοὺς ἐπαγωγισάσθαι σι (ut post eum ad declamationem non venireat, nec post eum dicere auderet), Sext. Emp. Math. iii. 327 ἦρξει μὲν ἰσον ἐν τούτοις περαιτέρω τ. ἀντίρρησιν, ὡμως δὲ ἐπαγωγισάμενον (uterius decernentes) περαιτέρωθα διδάσκων, Dion. Hal. Ars Rhét. vii. 6 'urge those who have taken few prizes' ὅτι δὲ μὴ τούτοις ἀρκεσθαι ἀλλὰ ... ἐπαγωγισάσθαι καὶ προσλαβέων ἰτέρων. (4) 'Fighting against,' so translated in Plut. V. 187 Φάβιος, ὃσπερ ἄλητης ἁγάδος ἐπαγωγισάμενος τῷ Ἀντίβα. ib. 486 Κύμων ἄιστερ ἄλητης δείνος δύο καθηρτικός ἀγωνισμάτα ... ἐπαγωγισάμενοι ταῖς νίκαις by L. and S. but probably to be understood as (3) 'followed up.'

τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἀγώνις πιστεύει. The word πιστεύει is not used in its primary sense of a subjective feeling of trust or belief, but in the secondary sense of the thing believed, the Truth or the Gospel, as in ver. 20 below, Gal. 1:23 ὅ δεικνῶν ἡμᾶς ποτὲ τοὺς εἰσαγελεῖται τὴν πιστίν ἣν ποτὲ ἐπάρθει, also Gal. 3:25, Phil. 1:25 συναθλοῦντες τῇ πιστεῖ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, where see Lightfoot, Acts 6:7. In the same way ἠλλίκες is used in a concrete sense for the object of hope (as in Col. 1:5 τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς ἀποκειμένης ἑαυτῶν, 1 Tim. 1:1 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἑαυτῶν, Tit. 2:13 προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα), and φόβος for the object of fear, Rom. 13:1, 1 P. 3:14.

ἀπαξ.] Used here in its classical sense 'once for all,' as below v. 5, and in Heb. 6:4 τοῖς ἄπαξ φωτισθέντας, ib. 9:26, 27, 10:2, 1 P. 3:18. This excludes the novelties of the libertines, cf. Gal. 1:10. The later sense 'on one occasion' is found in 2 Cor. 11:25 ἄπαξ ἠλλίκες, 1 Th. 2:18 καὶ ἄπαξ καὶ διὸς ἠλλίσαμεν ἑαυτῶν.

παραδοθείσῃ.] Cf. Philo M. 1. 387 πιστεύει τοῖς ἄπαξ παραδοθείσῃ, 2 P. 2:1. The Christian tradition is constantly referred to by the Fathers, as by Clem. Al. Str. vii. where we read of ἡ ἀληθίνη παράδοσις (p. 845), ἡ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ π. (p. 890), ἡ θεία π. (p. 896), ἡ πάντων τῶν ἀποστόλων π. (p. 900), αἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ π. (p. 901), and even in the N. T. as in 1 Cor. 11:2 καθὼς παρεδώκαμεν ἑαυτῶν τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε, 2 Th. 2:15, 1 Tim. 6:20 τὴν παραθηκὴν φίλαξον. For an account of the gradual formation of the Creed, see Kattenbusch Das Apostol. Symbol, 1894, M'Giffert The Apostles' Creed, 1902, and especially A. E. Burn's Introduction to the Creeds, ch. ii. 1899.

τοῦ ἀγώνι.] Generally used of Christians who were consecrated and called to be holy, as in 1 Cor. 2, Phil. 1, where see Lightfoot. The word contains an appeal to the brethren to stand fast against the teaching and practice of the libertines.

τοῖς ἀνθρώποι.] For the form, which is found in B and adopted by WH, Veitch cites διεκώπηται in Hippocr. i. 601, and compares ἐφύη, ἔφφη. The aor. is here used with the perfect force, as in v. 11 ἔφευξαν, etc., cf. Blass Gr. p. 199, my ed. of St. James. p. cxxi, and Dr. Weymouth there cited. The contrary view is maintained by Winer, but corrected in Moulton's n. p. 345. The verb
occurs in Demades 178 ἀδικοὶ παρεισδύνων λόγος εἰς τὰς τῶν δικαιῶν ἄνωμας οὐκ ἐξ συνοράν τὴν ἄλθηαν, Clem. Al. p. 659 ὅπως εἰς τὴν τῶν αἰνιγμάτων ἔννοιαν ἢ ἑξήκοντα παρεισδύνουσα εἰπὶ τὴν εύφεσιν τῆς ἄλθηας ἀνάθριμα, D. Leert. ii. 142 λαθραίως παρεισδύτης εἰς τὴν παρίδα, Plut. M. p. 216 Β τὰ ἀρχαῖα νόμιμα ἐκλειμένα τάρα, ἄλλα δὲ παρεισδύνουν μυστήρια, other exx. in Wetst. The noun παρεισδύνων occurs in Barn. 211, 49 ἀντιστώμεν ἵνα μὴ σχετικὴς παρεισδύνων ὁ μέλας, Clem. Al. p. 189 ἀκροσφαλῇ ἢ τοῦ ὅνου παρεισδύσως. Similar compounds are παρεισοφέρω in 2 P. 18, παρεισφέρω in 2 P. 21, παρεισότακτος in Gal. 24 διὰ τοῦ παρεισότακτος ψεύδομα oútiles παρεισότακτον κατασκευάζει τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ὑμᾶς, Rom. 520, 2 Mac. 81 παρεισοφερόμενοι λεληθότως εἰς τὰς κόμας, 80 παρεισφέρω, παρεισφέρωτα, παρεισφέρωτα. The earliest prophecy of such seducers comes from the lips of Jesus Himself Mt. 712 προσέχετε ἄπο τῶν ψευδοφραγμῶν, οὗτοι ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἑνδύμαις προβάτων, ἀδιαφόροντες δὲ εἰς τὰς λύκους ἄρτας, cf. Acts 2029, 30 and Introduction on the Early Heresies.

ταῖς ἀνθρωποις. For the position of the indefinite τοῖς see Acts 319 καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις...ἐξαιρήτως, 143, 151, 176, 84, 1 Tim. 524 τινῶν ἀνθρωπῶν οἱ ἀμαρτίαι προδρόμης εἰσαγονται: and for pleonastic ἀνθρώπουs Lk. 154 τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐξω πρόβατα κ.τ.λ. Mt. 79, 1812, Jn. 55. [For τοῖς, hinting at a party who are yet well known, compare 2 Cor. 1018, Gal. 17. C. Compare also Gal. 218 πρὸ τοῦ ἐλευθερίας τούτου ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, 2 P. 30 δὲ τοῖς βραβευτῷ ἰδουαντείς.] It has often a contemptuous signification.

οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τῇ κρίμα. Cf. 2 P. 238 εἰς τοῦ κρίμα ἐκταλαί ὁ εἰς ἀργυρί. Clem. Al. Adumbr. in ep. Judaš translates 'homines impii qui olim...praedestinati erant in judicium...non ut flant impii; sed existentes jam impii in judicium praescripti sunt.' The word πάλαι precludes the supposition that the 2nd ep. of Peter can be referred to.1 The allusion is to the book of Enoch quoted in vv. 14, 15. In ver. 18 below the same warning is said to have been given by the Apostles. The phrase oii ἀνθρώποι in opposition to τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, cf. Gal. 17 with Lightfoot's n., Lk. 189 ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς τούτοις πεποθήτατο εἰς ἐαυτοῖς. For τοῖς cf. Rom. 154 ὑπὸ γὰρ προγεγραφείς εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγραφή. Bp. Lightfoot in his note on Gal. 31 ὁ κατ' ὀφθαλμόν Ι. X. προγεγραφή ἐσταυρωμένος seems to give to the word here the same sense 'placard' which it bears there, quoting in support Demosth. 1151 τοὺς προτάμεις προγράφοντι αὐτῷ τὴν κρίσιν ἐπὶ δύο ἡμέραις and Plut. Camill. 9 τῆς δίκης προγεγραμμένης: but in those passages the subject is the trial, here it is the person. He would, I suppose, translate 'long ago advertised for this judgment.' Perhaps it is better to take it as 'designated beforehand,' sc. by Enoch, or (less probably) 'written before in God's book of judgment,' cf. Exod. 3228, lsa. 43 oii γραφέντες εἰς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, Dan. 121, and the passages quoted from Enoch below. In any case

1 Zahn, it is true, following Schott and others, argues in favour of this reference, holding that πάλαι may be equivalent to 'latesly'; and the word is of course very elastic in meaning; but unless the contrast makes it clear that the reference is to a recent past, I think we are bound to assign to the word its usual force, especially here, where it stands first, giving the tone as it were to what follows, and is further confirmed and explained by ἰδέως ἀπὸ Ἀδαμ in ver. 14.
the word is intended to show that they are already doomed to punishment as enemies of God. As such, they are to be shunned by the faithful, but not to be feared, because, dangerous as they may seem, they cannot alter the divine purpose. Dr. Chase compares Hort's interesting note on 1 P. 2:8 eli δ και ἐπίθεσαν. By 'this' Spitta understands 'that judgment which I am now about to declare,' i.e., the condemnation contained in the word ἀσεβείας used by some ancient writer. Zahn however remarks that ὁστος usually refers to what precedes, and he would take τοῦτο here (with Hofmann) as referring to παρασεβηκίαν.

I agree that the classical distinction between the prospective use of ἀσεβείας and τοῦτο, and the retrospective use of ὁστος and τοῦτο prevails also in the N.T., as in the τάδε λέγει of Ἄρωκ. 21, 5, 12, 18. 31. 7. 14 contrasted with the μετὰ τοῦτα of Ἄρωκ. 41, 71, 9, 155, 181, 191, and the solitary instance of τοῦτο in 2 P. 1:17 (where φωνὴς τοῦτος is explained by the following δ υὸς μοι υστὸς ἔστω), as contrasted with the common retrospective use of τοῦτος. Ὁστος however may acquire a prospective use when it serves (like the Lat. is) simply as the base of a subsequent explanatory clause, whether introduced by the relative, as in Lk. 6:22 οὕτω τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε δ ἐντούχεις Δανεῖ; Phil. 2:2 οὕτω φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν δ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ, or by a conjunction such as ἠδο (Lk. 14:8) or ὡς (Lk. 10:11), or εἰ (1 P. 2:19 τοῦτο χάρις εἰ), or μή (2 Cor. 8:20 σταλλόμενοι τοῦτο μη τίς), or what approaches more nearly to the use here, by a verb or noun in apposition as Lk. 3:20 προσέθηκεν καὶ τοῦτο, κατέκλισεν, id. 12:18 τοῦτο πονηρός, καθελώ, 1 Th. 4:3 τοῦτο ἐστιν βήλημα θεοῦ δ ἀγαθομοῦ βιῶν, Lk. 21:22 τοῦτο υμῖν σημεῖον, εὐρήσετε βρέφος, Rom. 14:15 τοῦτο κρίνατε, τὸ μή τίθατε πρόσκομμα, 2 Cor. 2:1 ἐκρήμω τοῦτο, τὸ μή ἀλθεῖν. None of these is quite like our text, where every reader naturally looks back for an explanation of τοῦτο. I think however παρασεβηκίαν hardly satisfies the requirements of the case. It is not referred to in the Book of Enoch, and it is a very subordinate feature in the evil doings of the libertines. I should rather carry back the thought to the assailants of the faith implied in the παρακλήσεος ἐπαγωγῆσθαι of ver. 3, which is then further explained by the participles in ver. 4. The sin itself is its own judgment (Joh. 3:19). Dr. Bigg considers that τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα is meaningless here, and can only be explained by the supposition that it was hastily borrowed by Jude from 2 P. 2, but why should he have added τοῦτο, which makes the difficulty?

We may compare Enoch 108:7 'Some of them are written and inscribed above in heaven, in order that the angels may read them and know that which will befall the sinners and the spirits of the humble,' ch. 81:4 'blessed is the man who dies in righteousness, concerning whom there is no book of unrighteousness written,' ch. 106:19: 'after that there will be still more unrighteousness...for I know the mysteries of the heavenly tables, for the Lord hath showed me...and I have read in the heavenly tables,' also Charles on 47:3 Test. Patr. Aser. 7 ἀνέγνων ἐν ταῖς πλαξὶ τῶν ὅμοιων ὑπὲρ ἀπειθεῖτες ἀπειθήσετε αὐτῷ (the Messiah) καὶ ἀσεβείας ἀσεβήσετε εἰς αὐτῶν, id. Levi 14 ἐγνών ἀπὸ γραφῆς Ἑνώχ ὅτι ἐπὶ τίλος ἀσεβήσετε, ἐπὶ Κύριον χειρὰς ἐπιβάλλοντες ἐν πᾶσι κακίᾳ, Ἄρωκ. Baruch. 24:1 'aperientur libri in quibus scripta sunt peccata omnium qui
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peccaverint.' Charles says the conception is variable; in Jubilees it sometimes implies little more than a contemporary heavenly record of events,' while in Enoch and Test. xii Patriarch, 'it wavers between an absolute determination and prediction, pure and simple.'

ἀσέβες.] This word may be almost said to give the keynote to the Epistle (cf. v. 15, 18) as it does to the Book of Enoch.

τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατίθησιν οἰς ἀσέλγειαι.] With this we may compare 1 P. 2:16 μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμα ἔχοντες τῇ κακίᾳ τὴν ἱλευρίαν, 2 P. 2:19, ἱλευρίαν ἐταγελλόμενοι, 3:18 δυσνοτά τινα, δὲ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς στραβλοῦν πρὸς τὴν ἴδιαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν, Rom. 3:12. A man is justified by free grace and not by works, then works are unnecessary ib. 6:1, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12 Cor. 12, 10, 12 foll., Joh. 8:32-35, Gal. 5:13 ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ ἱλευρία ἐκλήθητε μόνον μὴ τὴν ἱλευρίαν εἰς ἀφορμήν τῇ σαρκὶ. For μετατίθησιν see Gal. 1:6, for ἀσέλγειαι 2 P. 2:18 πολλοὶ ἰδακολούθουσιν αὐτῶν τῶν ἀσέλγειῶν, ib. 2:18, 1 P. 4:4, and Lightfoot on Gal. 5:10 'A man may be ἀκάθαρτος and hide his sin: he does not become ἀσέλγης until he shocks public decency. In classical Greek the word ἀσέλγης generally signifies insolence or violence towards another...In the later language the prominent idea is sensuality...op. Polyb. 37. 2 πολλῇ δὲ τις ἀσέλγεια καὶ περὶ τὰς σωματικὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῷ συνεξήκουσθε. Thus it has much the same range of meaning as ὑβρὶς. On the meaning of χάρις see Robinson Ephes. p. 221 f. The form χάριν is used elsewhere in the N.T., except in Acts 24:27.

τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κόρον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνοῦμεν.] So 2 P. 2:1 τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνοῦμεν. On the denial of God and Christ see Mt. 10:33 ὅτες ἂν ἀρνησίτας με ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνησόμασιν κἀγὼ αὐτῶν ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου, ib. 26:10 (Peter's denial), 1 Joh. 2:22 οὕτως ἐστιν ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ἀρνοῦμεν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν γιόν. Tit. 1:16 Θεον ἀμαλαγούσων εἰδέναι, τοὺς δὲ ἔργους ἀρνοῦμαι, βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδικοῦμεν. 1 Tim. 5:2 δυνάσθη. This denial is one of the sins noticed in the book of Enoch. 38:2 'When the Righteous One shall appear...where will be the dwelling of the sinners and where the resting-place of those who have denied the Lord of Spirits?' ib. 41:3, 45:3, 46:7, 48:3 'They will fall and not rise again...for they have denied the Lord of Spirits and His Anointed.'

Two questions have been raised as to the meaning of the text, (1) is τ. μόνον δεσποτὴν to be understood of the Son, (2) what is the force of ἀρνεῖται? The objection to understanding δεσποτῆς our Lord is that in every other passage in the N.T., where δεσποτῆς occurs, except in 2 P. 2:1 (on which see n.), it is spoken of God the Father; that, this being the case, it is difficult to understand how Christ can be called τὸν μόνον δεσποτὴν. It seems to me a forced explanation to say that the phrase μόνος δεσποτῆς has reference only to other earthly masters. No Jew could use it in this connexion without thinking

1 It is true that the use of the word δεσποτῶν, to denote the kinsfolk of Jesus, by Julius Africanus (lived at Emessa about 200 A.D.) ap. Euseb. H.E. i. 7, proves that the word δεσποτῆς must have been used of our Lord at an earlier period, but I am not aware of any example of this use in the Apostolic Fathers.
of the one Master in heaven. Again μόνος is elsewhere used of the Father only, as in Joh. 54 τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ σε ζηταῖς, 17 ἣν γνώσκων ἐν σε τῶν μόνον ἄληθινῶν Θεόν, Rom. 15 μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Tim. 17 τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων . . . μόνῳ Θεῷ τιμῇ κ. δόξα, ἦδ. 615. 16 δακτύλιος κ. μόνος δύνατος, δ. μόνος ἰδίων ἀδανασίαν, and by Jude himself, below 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτήρ ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰ. X., τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δόξα. Wetst. quotes several passages in which Josephus speaks of God as δ. μόνος δεσπότης. On the other hand the phrase, so taken, seems to contradict the general rule that, where two nouns, denoting attributes, are joined by καί, if the article is prefixed to the first noun only, the second noun will then be an attribute of the same subject. In the present case however the second noun (κύριον) belongs to the class of words which may stand without the article, see Winer pp. 147–163. A similar doubtful case is found in Tit. 213 προς ἀναφύσεων τῆς μακρινὰς ἀλήθειας καὶ εἰρήνας τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν X. 1 ἐσθιοκεφαλάς ἐν ὑπὸ ἡμῶν ἰδίως ἵνα λυτρώσῃ ἡμᾶς, where also I should take τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ to refer to the Father. Other examples of the same kind are Eph. 55 οὐκ ἑκα τοιοτοῖς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ (where Alfr. notes 'We cannot safely say here that the same Person is intended by X. κ. Θεοῦ merely on account of the omission of the art.; for (1) any introduction of such a predication regarding Christ would here be manifestly out of place, (2) Θεὸς is so frequently anarthrous that it is not safe to ground any such inference on its use here'), 2 Th. 13 οἵτως ἐνδοξάστη τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐν υἱῶν καὶ υἱοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; 1 Tim. 51 (cf. 2 Tim. 41) διαμαρτυρόμεθα ἐνότερον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν ἱκλεκτῶν ἅγγελων, which Chrysostom explains μάρτυρα καλῶ τῶν Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ; 2 P. 11 ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ηροδοτοῦ Χριστοῦ, where see n. On this use of the article see Green's Gr. of N.T. pp. 205–219. Rampf compares Eus. H.E. vii. 30 (the charge brought against Paul of Samosata) τοῦ καὶ τῶν Θεοῦ τῶν ιαντοῦ καὶ Κύριον ἀρνούσιν. The denial of the only Master and Our Lord J. C. may be implicit, shown by their conduct, though not asserted in word, as in Tit. 116; but it is more naturally taken as explicit, as in 1 Joh. 23, where Westcott notes that a common gnostic theory was that "the Aecon Christ" descended upon the man Jesus at His baptism and left Him before His passion. Those who held such a doctrine denied . . . the union of the divine and human in one Person . . . and this denial involves the loss of the Father, not only because the ideas of sonship and fatherhood are correlative, but because . . . it is only in the Son that we have the [full] revelation of God as Father." The phrase τῶν μόνων δεσπότην might also refer to the heresy attributed to Cerinthus by Hippolytus (Haer. vii. 33, x. 21) οὐχ ἐπὶ τοῦ πρῶτον Θεοῦ τῶν κόσμων γεγονέναι ἢθηλοσιν ἀλλ' ἐπὶ δυνάμεως τῶν ἀγγελικῶν, and Irenaeus (Haer. i. 26). See Introduction on Early Heresies.

5. ὑπομνήσας ἵν ἰδίως βούλομαι, εἴδοτας ἵνα πάντα.] 1 Cf. 2 P. 118 διὸ

1 On the readings see Introduction.
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mellew oμες ̄ ὑμας δει ὑπομνημακειν καπερ ειδωτα, ὡδ. 13 διεγειρω ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνημα, ὡδ. 3 διεγειρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνημα τὴν εἰλικρινὴ διάνοιαν, Rom. 15 ὑπεικεια δε ὦτι καὶ αὐτὸ μεσοι ἐστιν ἀνθρωπόνοι καίρις τῆς γνώμης... τολμηρότερος δὲ ἡραφα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ μέρους ὡς ἐπανα-

μμυρισκον ὑμᾶς. The word ειδωτα justifies ὑπομνημα: they only need to be reminded of truths already known, so that it is unnecessary to write at length. The repeated ὑμᾶς contrasts the readers with the libertines of the former verse. The words in themselves might be taken ironically of persons professing (like the Corinthians) to ‘know all things,’ but the broad distinction maintained throughout the epistle between ὑμεῖς and οἱ τοι (the Libertines) forbids such an interpretation. If we read ἀπαξ πάντα with some MSS., it suggests something of anxiety and upbarding, which may be compared with the tone of St. Paul in writing to the Galatians. See, however, the following note for the position of ἀπαξ. Instead of πάντα some MSS. have τοῦτο. The former finds some support in Enoch 1 ‘I heard every thing from the angels,’ 252 ‘I should like to know about every thing,’ Secrets of En. 401.2 ‘I know all things from the lips of the Lord...I know all things and have written all things in the books,’ 612 (quoted by Chase in D. of the Bib.). It should probably be understood of all that follows, including the historical allusions, implying that those addressed were familiar not only with the O.T. but with rabbinical traditions, so Estius ‘omnia de quibus volo vos communera.’ 1 Bede’s note is ‘omnia videlicet arcana fidei scientes et non opus habentes recentia quasi sanctiora a novis audire magistris.’ In what follows he takes ἀπαξ with σωσικε, ‘ita clamantes ad se de afflictione Aegyptiae primo salvavit humiles, ut secundo murmurantes contra se in eremo prosterne mer superbos... Meminerimus illum sic per aquas baptismi salvare credentes, ut etiam post baptismum humilem in nobis requirat vitam.’

ὅτι Κόρων, ἀπαξ λαλῶ ἐκ γῆς Ἀλγυπτοῦ σῶςαν, τὸ δέσποτον τοῦ να ἡ ποτησσαντας ἀπάλλασσαι.] For text see Introduction on Readings. Clement in his Aduoirationes gives the paraphrase ‘Quoniam Dominus Deus semel populum de terra Aegypti liberans deinceps eos qui non crediderunt perdiderit’ and then to obviate a possible misconstruction of the last word, adds characteristically ‘ut eos videlicet per supplicium erudiret. In praesenti quippe tempore puniti sunt et perierunt, propter eos qui salvantur, donec convertantur ad Dominum.’ Justin (Dial. 120) speaking of the prophecy in Gen. 4910, says that it does not refer to Judah, but to Jesus τὸν καὶ τοῦ πατέρας ὑμῶν ἐξ Ἀλγυπτοῦ ἐγεγεννητο, but the use of the personal name Jesus in such a connexion has no parallel in the N. T., though the official name Christ occurs with a similar reference in 1 Cor. 10:9, Heb. 11.28. Clem. Al. p. 133 says (of Exod. 23) ὁ μυστικὸς ἐκεῖος ἄγγελος Ἰησοῦς. The reading

1 Dr. Bigg points out that the facts which Jude expects his readers to remember, viz. the instances of judgment which follow, were less likely to be remembered than the admonitions of judgment which precede 2 P. 13, and he argues that this proves clumsy borrowing on the part of the former; but the provocation in the Wilderness and the destruction of Sodom were among the most familiar lessons of the O.T.
'Iσραής is recognized by Jerome (Jovin. 1. 12) but explained by him of Joshua. With this we may compare Sir. 46 foll. κρατάως ἐν πολλῷμο 'Ἰσραής Ναβή...δε ἐγένετο κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μέγας ἐπὶ σω- τηρία ἐλεήμων αὐτοῦ, Justin Dial. 75, where reference is made to Exod. 23:20, 21. 'Behold I send my angel before thee, to keep thee in the way and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him and obey his voice; for he will not pardon your transgression, for my name is in him.' Justin's comment is τίς οὖν εἰς τὴν γῆν εισήγαγε τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν; ἡδη ποτὲ νοώσατε ὅτι δ' ἐν τῷ ἀνάματι τούτων ἐπονομαζότους 'Ἰσραής, πρότερον Ἀβραάμ καλοῦμενος (see Numb. 13:11), id. 106, 132, Clem. Al. 134, Lactant. Inst. 4. 17 Christi figuram gerebat ille Jesus; qui cum primum Aues vocaretur, Moyses futura presen- tiens jussit eum Jesum vocari; other ref. in Pearson (Art. 2. p. 75, ed. Chevallier). It is difficult however to see how Joshua can be said either to have saved the people from Egypt or to have destroyed the disbelievers. Moses was the divine instrument in the former case, and we are only told of one, Achan, whom Joshua put to death, and that, not for disbelief, but for disobedience. Again Joshua had nothing to do with the punishment of the angels (v. 6). The punishment of murmurers and unbelievers is always ascribed to God, as in Numbers 14:10-12, Ps. 78, 95, 106, Sir. 16:10, Heb. 3:16-19, and I Cor. 10:13. τὸ δεύτερον has given rise to much discussion. If we place ἄπαξ before λαὸν with Sin., or before ἐκ γῆς with Clem. Al. p. 280 (ὁ Θεὸς ἄπαξ ἐκ γῆς Ἀλντπλου λαόν σώσας, τὸ δεύτερον...ἀπάλεσεν), we might then regard it as contrasting the preceding σαρίν with the following destruction. I think Ewald is right in connecting ἄπαξ with this later clause rather than with εἰδότας, as it agrees better with the ἄπαξ of ver. 3, and intensifies the warning. The deliverance from Egypt was the creation of a people once for all, but yet it was followed by the destruction of the unbelieving portion of the people, i.e. by all but Caleb and Joshua (Num. 14:6-27). So in 1 Cor. 10 we have the privileges of Israel allowed, and yet all was in vain because of their unbelief. There seems less force in the connexion of ἄπαξ with εἰδότας: ἡδη would have been more suitable. For the opposition to τὸ δεύτερον cf. Heb. 9:28 ὁ Χριστὸς ἄπαξ προσευχήθη εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀναγεννήτων ἀμαρτίας ἐκ δεύτερου χωρίς ἀμαρτίας ὁμοίωσεν, Theoph. Autol. ii. 26 ἵνα τὸ μὲν ἄπαξ ἕτερον διηγησαί μας ἐκ τῆς ἐκ τοῦ δεύτερου μέλλει πληροῦσα μετὰ τὴν... κρίσιν, Liban. ap. Wust. ἐμὼ δὲ ἄπαξ ἄρκει γέλωσι ὄψεις, δεύτερον δὲ οὐκέτι. I am inclined to think that the article before μῆ is an intrusion, as it seems to be before ἐν in ver. 12. Omitting it, we can take δεύτερον with μῆ πιστεύσας, getting the sense: 'In the 1st case of unbelief (in Egypt) salvation followed; in the 2nd (in the wilderness) destruction,' lit. 'when they, a second time, failed to believe, He destroyed them.' If this was the original reading, it is easy to understand the insertion of τούς as facilitating the plural construction after λαὸν. We may compare the solemn utterance in Heb. 10: 26 ἐκοινώως

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE

The epistle is addressed to the Church in Judea, with a view to reprimand and exhortation. It is written in a style which is characterized by its brevity, urgency, and passion. The author, St. Jude Thaddeus, is one of the Twelve Apostles, and the epistle is often referred to as the "T在现场 reads metaphorically of the new Israel and reads 'Ἰσραήλ', maintaining that Jesus may be called the destroyer of Jerusalem, because He prophesied its destruction and spoke of His word as that which should judge men at the last day (Joh. 12:48). He considers that, if the saving and destruction are to be understood of the Exodus of old, it is difficult to account for its being placed before the Fall of the Angels. But why may not Jude have followed the warning derived from O.T. history in 1 Cor. 10, and then have thought himself of the warning derived from the story of the Watchers in Enoch? Some again imagine allusion to a second destruction, such as the carrying away captive, or even the fall of Jerusalem under Titus. I do not think we can make τὸ δεύτερον simply equivalent to ὄστερον, as is done by many interpreters. In Nonnus Dionys. 46. 189 καὶ τότε μὲν λίπη λύσασα νοοσφάλος Δωνύσου, καὶ προτέρας φρένας ἐσχε τὸ δεύτερον it is nearly 'again.' For the combination σώσας—ἐπώλεσαν B. Weiss compares James 4:12 εἰς ἔστιν—

6. ἄρχων τοῖς μὲν τῷ ἐπὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῖς ἁγίων...αἰς κρίσιν...παρὰ τουτερεῖς. Cf. Clem. Al. Adumbr. 'Angelos qui non servaverunt proprium principatum, scilicet quem acceperunt secundum prophetiam.' This of course supplies an even more striking instance of the possibility of falling away from grace, cf. Bede 'Qui angelis peccantibus non pepercit, nec hominibus parcer superstientibus, sed et hos quoque cum suum principatum non servaverint, quo per gratiam adoptionis filii Dei effecti sunt, sed reliquerint suum domicilium, id est, Ecclesiae unitatem...damnabit.' On the Fall of the Angels see Introduction and the parallel passages in 2 P. 24, and in Enoch, chapters 6–10.

ἄρχον.] Used of office and dignity, as in Gen. 4021 of the chief butler; here perhaps of the office of Watcher, though Spitta takes it more generally of the sovereignty belonging to their abode in heaven—τὸν ἁγή κλήρον in Clem. Al. 650 P. The term ἄρχον is used of the evil angels themselves in Eph. 612. Cf. Enoch 124, of the Watchers (angels) who have abandoned the high heaven and the holy eternal place and defiled themselves with women, ib. 158. Philo says of the fallen angels (M. 1, p. 268) καλὸν μὴ λιποκτήσω μὴ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ τάξεως, εἰ γὰρ τοὺς τεταγμένους πάντας ἀριστεύους ἀνάγκη, αὐτομολθησαί
NOTES

5–7]

Δι πρὸς τὴν ἀνανέων ὥδεν. So Just. M. Arol. ii. 5 s' ἄγγελοι παρα-
βάντες τῇ τὸν τάξιν γυναίκαν μέλειν ἔπτησαν with Otto's n.

Ἀπολύσεται τῷ ἔως οἰκήμην.] Cf. 2 Cor. 5 to oik. τῷ ἔως ὀβρανοῦ, and
the quotation from Enoch in the last n. [For οἰκήμην cf. Enoch 157
(the message of Enoch to the Watchers) 'the spiritual have their
dwelling in heaven.' ... ἡ κατοίκησις αὐτῶν ἐσται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. C.]

eis κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμεύεται ἄδικον ὑπὸ ἰδίου τετήρηκεν.] Cf. 2 P. 24
σεφοῖς ἱδονα ταρατσάσας, id. 29 ἄδικον εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαξιμένους
τηρεῖν, id. 37 τηρούμενως εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως ... τῶν ἀσεβεῖν ἀνθρώπων, Joel 281
ὁ ἡλιος μεταστραφῆται εἰς σκότος ... πρὸν ἐθείν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν
μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανήν. Αρω. 617 ἠλθεν ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ,
id. 1614 συναγαγέων αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τῇ μεγάλῃ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ
tοῦ ταυτοκράτορος. Enoch 106 ἐπικάλυψον αὐτῷ (Azazel) σκότος, καὶ
οἰκησάτω εἰς τὸν αὐλῶνα, 1013 δησοντι αὐτοῖς ... μέχρι ἡμέρας κρισίως
αὐτῶν, id. 2211 (Gr. in Charles' App. C) μέχρι τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τῆς
κρίσεως, id. 5410, note on xlv. 1. So ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου 1 Cor. 152 P. 310
αλ., ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα 2 Th. 110. On δεσμοί see En. 5422 'I saw how they
made iron chains of immeasurable weight, and I asked for whom they
were prepared, and he said unto me, "These are prepared for the hosts
of Azazel.' Cf. δέσμαι σκότους (Wisd. 172) of the plague of darkness,

For the use of the acc. after ὅτι to express 'rest under,'

ἀδίκως.] The chains are called 'everlasting,' but they are only used
for a temporary purpose, to keep them for the final judgment. It
seems to be here synonymous with αἰώνιος in ver. 7. So too in the
only other passages in which it occurs in the Bible, Wisdom 726
ἀναγάμασα ἐστι φωτός ἄδικος, and Rom. 110 ὁ ἄδικος αὐτοῦ δίναμα καὶ
θεώτης. After ζῷον Clem. Al. p. 280 adds ἀγρίων ἀγγέλων, a variant of
which is found also in Lucif. 28 sanctorum angelorum, Speculum,

7. ὑμεῖς Θεόδωρα καὶ Γεωρρά καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτῶν πάλιν.] The 3rd example of
divine judgment differs from the two others, as it tells only of the
punishment, not of the fall from grace. Hence the difference of con-
nexion ἀγγέλους τε ... ὑμεῖς Θεόδωρα. Cf. 2 P. 26 πάλιν Θεόδωρον καὶ
Γεωρρά καταστροφή κατέκρινεν. The destruction was not limited to
these two cities, but extended to all the neighbouring country (Gen.
1928, called Ἰσραήλ in Wisd. 109), including the towns of Admah and
Zeboim (Deut. 2923, Hos. 116). Zoar was spared at the request of
Lot.

τὸν ὄμοιον τρόπον τούτου ἐκτεταμενασάμεν] For the adverbial acc., which
repeats the preceding ὅτι = σωκίων (Clem. Adumbr.), cf. Mt. 2327 ὁ τρόπον
ἐπισυναγαγεὶ ὄρον τὰ νοσσία, 2 Mac. 1529 ὁ τρόπον ὄρους ... ἀποτελεῖ, ὀφθαλ-
μα, Luc. Catapl. 6 τεθνάσθαι τὸν ὄμοιον τρόπον. 'Like them,' i.e. the
fallen angels. The two judgments are similarly joined in Test. Néph. 3
μὴ γίνθητε ὑμεῖς Θεόδωρα, ὑμεῖς ἐντάλλαξαν τάξιν φύεσως αὐτῆς. Ὁμοίως ὅτι καὶ
οἱ Ἑρρήγηρες ἐντάλλαξαν τάξιν φύεσως αὐτῶν, ὅπως κατηράσατο Κύριος, 3 Mac.
245. Others understand τούτους of the libertines who are subse-
quently referred to as ὁποῖοι (vv. 8, 10, 12, 16, 19); but the beginning
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of ver. 8 (μέντοι καὶ οὖν) seems to distinguish between them and the preceding. The verb ἐκποιείν occurs in Gen. 38:24 of Tamar, Exod. 34:15-16 (μὴ ποτὲ ἐκποιείσθωσιν ὄπις τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν, Lev. 17:7, Hos. 4:12, Ezek. 16:55. 28. 28.

ἀπελθοῦντα ὀστὶς σαρκὸς ἐκθεῖς.] In the case of the angels the forbidden flesh (lit. 'other than that appointed by God') refers to the intercourse with women; in the case of Sodom to the departure from the natural use (Rom. 1:27), what Philo calls ἄνοιγμα καὶ ἐκθέματα μιέος (de Gign. M. 1, p. 267), cf. Exod. 30:9 σὺν ἀνοίγματι υμώμα ἐτέρων. For the post-classical phrase cf. 2 P. 2:10 τοὺς ὀστίας σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μισοῦ τοποθημένου, Deut. 2:5 ἐπορεύθη ὄπισθε Βεθλεὲμ, Jer. 2:8.

προκειμένη ἀποίμα τυρών αἰωνίου δικαίων ὑπέκειται.] Cf. Enoch 67:12: 'this judgment wherewith the angels are judged is a testimony for the kings and the mighty,' 2 P. 2:6 ὑποδείγμα μελλόντων ἀνεβέναι τεθεικός, 1 Cor. 10:5-11 τοῦτο ἐγένετο, Heb. 3:7 ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑπόθειγμαι πῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀπεθανόντων, 3 Macc. 25 σὺ τοὺς ὑπερθυμιάν ἐργαζόμενος Συνομίζας... τυρι θεῖοι κατέφλεξαν, παραδείγμα τῶν ἐπαγωγοῦντος καταστάσεως, Clem. Alex. p. 280 δειγμά σου τούτων οἱ ἄγγελοι, τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ κάλλος ἀπολείπετο διὰ κάλλος μαρανόμενον, Dei. V. H. vi. 12 n. ἰτ. δειγμά οὗ τοῦ τυχὸς τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς σωφροσύνην ἢ τοῦ Διονυσίου έκ τῶν τριλούσων εἰς οὕτω ταπεινὰ μεταβολὴ. The present aspect of the Locas Asphantites was a conspicuous image of the lake of fire and brimstone prepared for Satan and his followers, Apoc. 19:20, 20:10, 21:8. It is questioned whether τυρών is governed by δειγμα or δικαίων. If by δικαίων, the burning of Sodom is itself spoken of as still going on (eternal), and this is in accordance with Jewish belief as recorded in Wisd. 10:7 (τοῦ Πεντατέλεως) ἢ ἐν παρθένῳ τῆς πονηρίας κατεμόμην καθότι θέρος, Philo (De Abtr. M. 2. 21) μέχρι νῦν και ἐκεῖ, τὸ γάρ καταράον τοῦ ἡκτια σβήνομενον ἢ νεκροται ἢ αἰτωθεῖται. πιτυς δὲ σαβαστάτα τὰ δρόμανα, τὸ γάρ συμβεβηκότοι πάνως σημείων ἥξετο δὲ τὰ αναπάλοντο τοῖς κατακόπτων καὶ δε μεταλλησάντων θεῖον, ib. V. Mosis. M. 2, p. 143. Some disallow this sense of αἰώνιος and think it can only be used of hell-fire, as in 4 Macc. 12:8 (the words of the martyr contrasting the fires of present torture with the eternal flames awaiting the persecutor) ταμασεῖται σὺ ἡ θεία δικαίωσιν καὶ αἰώνιον τυρι, καὶ δόγμα αὐτοῦ ἢ τοῦ τούτου σὺν δημοςούσε σε. For an examination of the word see Jukes 'Restitution of All Things,' p. 67 n. and cf. Jer. 23:39-40, Ezek. 16:53-55 (on the restoration of Sodom), 47:12 (a prophecy of the removal of the curse of the Dead Sea and its borders), Enoch. 10:6 and 12, where the εἰς αἰώνιος of the former verse is equivalent to 70 generations in the latter, also ver. 10 where ἡ αἰώνιος is reckoned at 500 years. As the meaning of δειγμα is made clear by the following participial clause, it seems unnecessary to take it with τυρών in the sense of 'an example or type of eternal fire,' which would escape the difficulty connected with αἰώνιος, but leaves δικαίων ὑπεκείναι (for which cf. Xen. Memb. ii. 1, 8, 2, Macc. iv. 48) a somewhat otiose appendage. In the book of Enoch (67:4 foll.) the angels who sinned are said to be imprisoned in a burning valley (Hinnom, ch. 27) in which there was a great swelling of waters, accom-
panied by a smell of sulphur; and 'that valley of the angels burned continually under the earth.' Charles notes on this that 'the Gehenna valley here includes the adjacent country down to the Dead Sea. A subterranean fire was believed to exist under the Gehenna valley.'

8. ἐνυπναζόμενοι σαρκα μαίνοντο.] Notwithstanding these warnings the libertines go on in similar courses.

Clement's paraphrase in his Adurnbrationes is 'qui somniant imaginationes sua libidines ... bonum esse putantes non illud quod vere bonum est.' He also explains the word in Str. iii. 11, oţ (so Hort, in the margin of his copy, corrects δ of MS.) γὰρ ὡς τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἐπιβάλλουσιν. Cf. parallel in 2 P. 210-13, 1 Th. 5¹, Rom. 13¹¹, Ps. 73²⁶, 126. Can there be any reference to the blindness with which the men of Sodom were smitten? The verb is used in Acts 217 (a quotation from Joel 2⁴) ὁ προσβύτεροι ὄμων ἐνυπναζόμενοι ἐνυπναζόμενοι of those that see visions, and so Spitta, holding that Jude copied from 2 P., would render it here, prefixing the article to make it correspond with the ἐνυπναζόμενοι and ἐνυπναζόμενοι of 2 P. 2¹. Those who take the opposite view (viz. that 2 P. was copied from Jude) will see nothing to justify the article. Moffatt (Hist. N.T.) translates 'these men of sensual imagination,' but in the introduction to the epistle (p. 589) regards it as implying a 'claim to possess visions.' The word is used by Isaiah 56¹⁰ in connexion with the words oţ κενόπων, ὁτι εἰσίτε (see ver. 10 below), ἐνυπναζόμενοι κατ' θυσίαν φιλοτιμίας νυστάζαν, which Delitzsch explains 'instead of watching and praying to see divine revelations for the benefit of the people, they are lovers of ease, talkers in their sleep,' cf. ὅ. 2⁹, Jer. 23³⁵-³⁶ where lying dreams are contrasted with the word of the Lord, ὅ. 2⁹ (LXX. 3⁴) μὴ ἀκούετε τῶν ἐνυπναζόμενοι ὄμων ... καὶ τῶν ἐνυπναζόμενοι ὄμων ('nor to your dreamers') καὶ τῶν ὀλονισμάτων ὄμων, Deut. 13¹, ὅ προφήτης ἐνυπναζόμενος. Compare Gen. 28¹², 4¹⁵.

Bengel's explanation 'Hominum mere naturalium indeoles grappiche admodum descripta est. Somnians multa videre, audire, etc. sibi videtur,' appears to agree with Clement's paraphrase. So Chase 'they live in an unreal world of their own inflated imaginations,' comparing the conjectural reading of Col. 2¹⁸ ἀπά κενεμβατεύων. This accords with ver. 10: in their delusion and their blindness they take the real for the unreal, and the unreal for the real. The verb is used both in the active and middle by Aristotle, Somn. 1. 1 πότερον συμβαίνει ἐκ τοῖς καθεύδοντων ἐνυπναζόμενοι, ἀλλ' ὁ μημονεύοντως; Probl. 30. 14. 2 οἱ ἐν τῷ καθεύδον ἐνυπναζόμενοι ἵσταμένοι τῆς διανοίας, καὶ καθ' ὄσον ἡμεῖς, ὑποερωτούσι, cf. Artem. Oneir. 1. 1. Some interpret of polluting dreams (cf. Lev. 15) ; but the word ἐνυπναζόμενοι is evidently intended to have a larger scope, covering not merely μαίνοντι but ἄθετον and βλασφημον. We must also interpret μαίνω here by the ἀσέλγειας of ν. 4, the ἐκτηρίσασαι and σάρκος ἑτέρας of ν. 7. This wide sense appears in Tit. 1¹⁴ τοῖς μεμαιάσματος οὐδὲν καθαρόν, ἀλλὰ μεμιάνται ἀτάτων καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ θυσίας. The heretics condemned by St. Paul for forbidding marriage (1 Tim. 4⁸) regarded it as μαίνετο σαρκός.

κυρίστητα ἐκ ἀθετουων, δέσσας ἐκ βλασφημον.] On first reading one is
inclined to take the words κυριότης and δόξα simply as abstractions. The result of indulgence in degrading lusts is the loss of reverence, the inability to recognize true greatness and due degrees of honour. This would agree with the description of the libertines as sharing in the ἀντιλογία of Korah, as κύματα ἀγρία βαλάσσεται, as γογγυσταί uttering hard speeches against God. When we examine however the use of the word κυριότης and the patristic comments, and when we consider the reference to the archangel's behaviour towards Satan, and the further explanation in ver. 10, where the σάρκα of ver. 8 is represented by δῶσα φυσικῶς ἐπιστανται and the phrase κυριότης ἄδετούσιν, δῶσα δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν by δῶσα ἄκατον βλασφημοῦσιν, we seem to require a more pointed and definite meaning, not simply 'majesty,' but 'the divine majesty,' not simply 'dignities,' but 'the angelic orders.' Cf. 2 P. 210, Eph. 121 (having raised him from the dead and set him on his right hand) ἰσχαρίων τάς ἀρχῆς καὶ ξοφικίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος, Col. 116 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτισθεὶς τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὅρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἰς θρόνοι εἰς κυριότητες εἰς ἀρχαὶ εἰς ξοφικίας, where Lightfoot says 'St. Paul does not profess to describe objective realities but contents himself with repeating subjective opinions . . . His language shows the same spirit of impatience with this elaborate angelology, as in ii. 18.' 'There can be little doubt that the primary reference is to the orders of the celestial hierarchy conceived by these gnostic Judaizers' (see my n. on Clem. Str. vii. 9, p. 833). Lightfoot however considers that the words are intended to be taken in their widest sense, including bad and good angels, as well as earthy dignities. In our text it would seem that the word should be understood as expressing the attribute of the true κύριος, cf. Didache 4. 1 (honour him who speaks the word of God) ὅς κύριον, οὐκ ἐστι δὲ δικαίος λαλεῖται, εἰς κύριος ἐστιν, Herm. Sim. v. 6. 1 εἰς δύοις τρόποις ὅς κεῖται δ ὁ θεός τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' εἰς ξοφικίας μεγάλης κεῖται καὶ κυριότητα. Hase, on Leo Diaconus v. 3, p. 449, has the note 'κυριότης vocatur dignitas Servatoris, quæ est Dominus et noster et rerum creatarum omnium' and cites among other exx. Chrys. Hom. in Matt. lxxi. p. 696, 'the prophet bears witness to τὴν κυριότητα of Christ καὶ τὸ ἀμώμιον τὸ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα,' Greg. Nyss. c. Eunom. vi. p. 180 c ἡ κυριότης οὐχ οὐσίας οὐσία ἀλλ' ξοφικίας ἄστ. It was also used as a complimentary address, ἡ σῇ κυριότης 'your lordship.' The verb ἰσχαρίων has God or Christ for its object in Lk. 1013, Joh. 1248, 1 Th. 48, etc. We have then to consider how it can be said that the libertines (οἵτινες) 'despise authority' in like manner to the above mentioned offenders. For the former we may refer to ver. 4 κύριον ἡμῶν ἀρνοῦμεν, for the latter to the contempt shown by the Israelites towards the commandments of God. [This is not inconsistent with the statement in ver. 5 that the unbelieving were destroyed, for the neglect of God proceeded from unbelief.] So the desertion of their appointed station and abode by the angels showed their disregard for the divine ordinance, and the behaviour of the men of Sodom combined with the vilest lusts an impious reverence towards God's representatives, the angels (Gen. 195). Cf. Joseph. Ant. i. 11. 2 εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἦσαν
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8, 9] Sodom is expressly stated to have been their behaviour towards the angels, μὴ γίνεσθαι ὦς Σώδομα ἦτος ἤγνοσε τοὺς ἀγγέλους Κυρίου καὶ ἀπελέγετο ἦς αἰῶνος.[ Cf. 2 P. 210 τοῦγεταί αὐθαίρετος δόξας οὐ τρέμων γεί βλασφημούντες. The only other passage in the N.T. in which the plural occurs is 1 P. 111, where the sense is different. Dr. Bigg compares Exod. 1511 τις ὁμοίως σου ἐν θεοῖς, Κύριε; τις ὁμοίως σου; ἰδοὺ ἐν ἑγκαταρτόντος ἐν δόξας, τοῦ μετατέραν ἐν δόξας. Clement's interpretation of this and the preceding clause is as follows (Adumbr. 1008) 'dominationem spernunt, hoc est solum dominum qui vere dominus noster est, Jesus Christus... majestatem blasphemant, hoc est angelo. The word δόξα in the singular is used for the Shekinah, see my n. on James 2. This suggests that Clement may be right in supposing the plural to be used for the angels, who are, as it were, separate rays of that glory. Compare Philo's use of the name λόγοι for the angels as contrasted with the divine Λόγος. In Philo Monarch. 2 p. 218 the divine δόξα is said to consist of the host of angels, δόξαν δὲ σην ἐνία τοις σε διαφορούσας δυνάμεις. See Test. Jud. 25 Κύριος ἐλάχιστος τοῦ Λατίου, ὁ ἀγγελος τοῦ προσώπου οὗτος, αἱ δυνάμεις τῆς δόξης τοῦ Σωμάτων, also Luke 923, where it is said that 'the Son of Man will come in His own glory and in the glory of the Father and of the holy angels.' 1 Ewald, Hist. Ier. tr. vol. viii. p. 142, explains ἡ κυριότης of the true Deity, whom they practically deny by their dual God; αἱ δόξαι are the angels, whom they blaspheme by supposing that they had created the world in opposition to the will of the true God, whereas Michael himself submitted everything to Him. This last clause would then be an appendage to the preceding, with special reference to the case of the Sodomites (cf. Joh. 1320). There may also be some allusion to the teaching or practice of the libertine. If we compare the mysterious reference in 1 Cor. 1110 διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔφεσεν ἡ γυνὴ ἐννοιάν ἐχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τούς ἀγγέλους, which is explained by Tertullian (De Virg. 7) as spoken of the fallen angels mentioned by Jude, 'propter angelos, scilicet quos legitimus a Deo et caelo excidisse ob concupiscientiam feminarum' we might suppose the βλασφημία, of which the libertines were guilty, to consist in a denial or non-recognition of the presence of good angels in their worship, or of the possibility of their own becoming κοινωνια δαιμονίων; or they may have scoffed at the warnings against the assaults of the devil, or even at the very idea of 'spiritual wickedness in high places.' So understood, it prepares us for the strange story of the next verse.

9. ὁ τε Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος.] The term ἀρχ. occurs in the N.T. only here and in 1 Th. 416. The names of seven archangels are given in Enoch. The story here narrated is taken from the apocryphal Assumptio Moris, as we learn from Clem. Adumbr. in Ep. Judae, and Orig. De Princ. iii. 2. 1. Didymus (in Epist. Judae Enarratio) says that some doubted the canonicity of the Epistle because of this quotation from

1 There is much said of the glory of the Angels in Asc. Isaiae, pp. 47, 49 foll. ed. Charles.
an apocryphal book. In Cramer's *Catena* on this passage (p. 163) we read τελευτάντος ἐν τῷ ὄρα Μωσείων, δὲ Μιχαήλ ἀποστέλλεται μεταβάσιν τὸ σῶμα, ἐτών τιμιωτάτων καὶ τοῦ Μωσείων βλασφημούντος καὶ φονεύων ἀναγορεύωντο καὶ το πατέρα τοῦ Λαογράφου, πάντως τὴν καρ' αὐτοῦ βλασφήμαν ὁ ἄγγελος, Ἐπιτιθήματος υἱὸς τὸ Θεὸς πρὸς τῶν διὰ βολον ἔφη. Charles in his edition of the *Assumption* thus summarizes the fragments dealing with the funeral of Moses: (1) Michael is commissioned to bury Moses, (2) Satan opposes his burial on two grounds: (a) he claims to be the lord of matter (hence the body should be handed over to him). To this claim Michael rejoins, 'The Lord rebuke thee, for it was God's spirit which created the world and all mankind.' (b) He brings the charge of murder against Moses (the answer to this is wanting). The story is based upon Deut. 34 R.V.) 'he buried him (mg. he was buried) in the valley...but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day,' Compare the vain search for Elijah (2 K. 216). Further details in Josephus (Ant. iv. 8, 48) αἱρεῖται κατὰ τοὺς πάρακτους ἄνθρωπον μετά τῶν φάραγγός. γέγενας δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν ταις Ἰσραήλ βοήθας τεθνώντα, δεικνύεις δὲ ἐπιβολὴ τῆς περὶ αὐτῶν δικαιίας πρὸς τὸ θεόν αὐτῶν ἀνακρίνοντα τολμήσαι εἰπών, Philo I. p. 165, and Clem. Al. (Str. vi. § 132, p. 807) where it is said that Caleb and Joshua witnessed the assumption of Moses to heaven, while his body was buried in the clefts of the mountain.

Διακριμένους.] Here used in the sense of 'disputing;' as in Jer. 1510 ἄνδρα διακριμένου πάσα τῇ γῇ, Joel 32, Acts 11. See my note on James 18 and below ver. 22.

βιλίγητα.] Cf. Mk. 934 πρὸς ἀλλήλους διελέχθησαν, τὰς μείλικες.

σκότι ἐκείνης κρίσει ἐπιτιθήματος βλασφημείας.] Cf. Plat. Legg. ix. 856 προδόσεως αἰτίαν ἐπιφέρων, id. 943 τιμωρίαν ἐπιφέρων. The word occurs elsewhere in N. T. only in Rom. 35. Field (On Translation of N. T. p. 244) compares Acts 2515 οἱ κατηγοροῦντες ἐπιθετοῦσιν ἐπιφέρειν, Diod. 16. 29 ἐπιφέρων κατὰ τῶν Ἱπποκρίτων, id. 20. 10 κρίσεις ἀδίκους ἐπιφέροντες, 20. 62 φοβηθεὶς τῶν ἐπιφέροντὸς κρίσεις, tom. x. p. 171 ed. B. ἐπιφέροντας κρίσιν περὶ ἰδίων, and translates 'durst not bring against him an accusation of blasphemy;' but surely that is just what he does in appealing to God. Besides such a statement would be altogether beside the point. The verse is introduced to show the guilt attached to speaking evil of dignities, i.e. of angels. If Michael abstained from speaking evil even of a fallen angel, this is appropriate; not so, if he simply abstained from charging the devil with speaking evil of Moses.

I take βλασφημεῖα to be gen. qualitatis, expressed by the adj. βλασφήμων in 2 P.: see below on ver. 18, James 152 ἀκρατείας ἐπιλησιμοῦ, 24 κρίται διαλογισμῶν ποιημάτων, 30 ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδίκιας, also 2 P. 21 αἰρέσεως ἀποκλειστα, 210 ἐπιθυμία μισοῦμα.

κρίσεις, like κρίνω, has the two meanings of judgment and of accusation, cf. Lycurg. 31 where of συνοφραστόντες are distinguished from τῶν δικαίως τὰς κρίσεις ἐναντιμενῶν.

Ἐνιαυτῷ σοι Κύριος.] These words occur in the vision of Zechariah (3119) where the angel of the Lord replies to the charges of Satan against the high priest Joshua with the words ἔπιτιθήματι Κύριος ἐν σοί,
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διάβολε, καὶ ἐπιτιμῆσαι Κύριος ἐν σοί, ὁ ἐκλεξάμους τὴν Ἰερουσαλήμ. They were no doubt inserted as appropriate by the author of the Ac. Mos. in his account of the controversy at the grave of Moses. We may compare Mt. 17:18 ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰσσοῦς.

10. οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν μὲν σοὶ οὖσοι μεταφερόμενοι.] The libertines do the contrary of what we are told of the respect shown by the angel even towards Satan: they speak evil of that spiritual world, those spiritual beings, of which they know nothing, cf. 2 P. 2:12. The common verb μεταφέρω shows that the δόξα of ver. 8 are identical with ὡσά σοί ὤδεισαν here. For the blindness of the carnal mind to all higher wisdom cf. 1 Cor. 2:15, a passage linked with our epistle by the distinction between the ψυχικοὶ and πνευματικοὶ and by the words λαλοῦμεν Θεοῦ σοφίαν, ἧν οὐ δέχεται τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἔργων; εἰ γὰρ ἔργωνον οὐκ ἂν τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης ἀσταράγων. See too Joh. 3:19, 1 Tim. 6:4 τετύφωσαν μὴ δὲν ἐπιτυγχάνοις. For the form ὤδεισαν see my ed. of St. James p. clxxxiii.

δόξα δὲ ψυχικῆς ὡς τὸ ἄλογον ἤξα ἐπιστανταί.] This stands for σάμαρα in ver. 8 and is explained by ἀσέλγειαν in ver. 4, ἐκπαρείσομαι in ver. 7, μαιάνων in ver. 8, κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν παρεορίστηκαν in ver. 16.

ψυχικῶς 'by instinct,' so Diog. L. x. 137 ψυχικῶς καὶ χορίς λόγου. Alford cites Xen. Cyrop. ii. 3. 9 μάχθεν ὅδε πάντας ἀνθρώπους φύσεως ἐπισταμένους, ὡσπερ γε καὶ τάλλα ἤξα ἐπιστανταί τινα μάχθει ἐκαστα οὔδε παρ' ἐνός ἄλλου μαθόντα ἡ παρ' τῆς φύσεως.

ἐν τούτῳ φοροῦντες.] The natural antithesis here would have been 'these things they admire and delight in.' For this Jude substitutes by a stern irony 'these things are their ruin.' Cf. Phil. 3:19 where speaking of the enemies of the Cross the apostle says ἐν τῷ τέλος ἀπώλεια, δεν ὁ θεός ἡ κοιλία καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰωνίᾳ αὐτῶν, Eph. 4:18 ἀποθέλουσα τῶν παλαιών ἀνθρώπων τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας.

11. οὗ οὖσαν, δι' ἃ τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Καίν ἐκορεθήσασαν.] For the use of the aorist see n. on ver. 4 παρεισελήφθησαν: for the phrase cf. Blass Gr. p. 119, and 2 P. 2:15 ἐξακολουθήσασας τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Βαλααί. The phrase ὡσάν, so common in Enoch, esp. in cc. 94 to 100, and in the Gospels and Apocalypse, occurs in the epistles only here and in 1 Cor. 9:16. The woe is grounded on the fate which awaits those who walk in the steps of Cain, Balaam, and Korah. In 2 P. Balaam is the only one referred to of the three leaders of wickedness here named by Jude. Cain, with Philo, is the type of selfishness (M. I. p. 206) τὰς φιλαντροπίας ἐπικλησαν Καίν εὑρήκει (quoted by Schneckenb. p. 221); he is named as a type of jealous hate in 1 John 3:11-12 ἵνα διαφώτησην ἀλλήλους· οὐ καθὼς Καίν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἴνα καὶ ἐσφαξέν τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ· καὶ χάριν τόις ἐσφαξεν αὐτοῦ; ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἴνα, τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ δίκαια, of unbelief in Heb. 11:14 πίστει πλείονα ὑστεροῦσα Ἀβέλ παρὰ Καίν προστίθηκεν τῷ Θεῷ. This view of his sin is also taken by the later Jewish writers, cf. Philo De Agric. 1 M. 300 f., and Targ. Jer. on Gen. 47 cited by Schneckenburger, in which Cain is represented as saying 'non est judicium, nec judex, nec est aliud seeculum, nec dabitur merces bona justis, nec ultio sumetur de improbis, etc. There seems no reason why we should not regard Cain here as symbolizing the absence both of faith and of love, cf. 1 Joh. 3:19. Euthym Zig. gives an allegorical explanation, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἄδελφοι κτῶν
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elai, de' de νυ διδάσκωμε τας των ἀπατωμένων ψυχας ἀποκτείνοντες. Cain and Korah are said to have been objects of special reverence with a section of the Ophite heresy, which appears to have been a development of the Nicolaitans (Epiph. Pan. i. 3. 37. 1 εἰς Οφιτας τας προφασεις εἰληφασιν ἀντι τῆς Νικολάου καὶ Γυνωστικώς καὶ τῶν πρὸ τοῦτων αἵρεσεως). They held that the Creator was evil, that the Serpent represented the divine Wisdom, that Cain and his successors were champions of right (Epiph. ib. 38. 1, οἱ Καισάρεις φασι τῶν Καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας Δυνάμεως ἐπάρχει καὶ τῆς ἀνθρώπων αὐθεντικιας, and boast themselves to be of kin to Cain, καὶ τῶν Σοβοματιῶν καὶ Ἱσαάκ καὶ Κορέ, see too Iren. i. 31, Clem. Str. vii. § 108).

τὴν πλάνην τοῦ Βαλαάμ μισθότετο ἔξωθεν.] Westcott on 1 Joh. 18 says that 'the idea of πλάνη is always that of straying from the one way; not of misconception in itself, but of misconduct [as in Rom. 1:17]. Such going astray is essentially ruinous. The cognate terms are used of the false Christs and prophets (Mt. 24 ff, Apoc. 20, 13, 19, 20, 1 Joh. 4, 2 Joh. 7), of Satan (Apoc. 12, 20 ff), of Babylon (Apoc. 18), of Balaam in Jude 11.' See also his on 46 ἐκ τοῦτον γνώσκομεν πεπείμα τῆς αληθείας καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης.

Every word in this clause is open to question. The passive of ἐκχείω to 'pour out' is used to express either the onward sweeping movement of a great crowd, or the surrender to an overpowering motive on the part of an individual = effusi sunt,1 as in Sir. 3729 ἐκ ἐκκυψέως εἰς ἐθεματών, Test. Repub. 1 πορεία εἰς τὴν ἐκχύθην, Clem. Al. Str. ii. p. 491 εἰς θονηστήν, τράγων δίθην, ἐκχύθηνες καθηκοπαιδούν, Plut. V. Ant. 21 εἰς τὸν ἱδρυμα καὶ ἀκλαστὸν βίον ἐκκυψώμαν. Such an interpretation seems not quite consistent with μισθότετο, which implies cold self-interest. That covetousness, αἰχμοκόρδεα, was a common motive with false teachers is often implied or asserted by St. Paul and St. Peter in the passages quoted below: and this, we know, was the case with Balaam; but would it be correct to say either of him or of his followers here condemned by St. Jude that they ran greedily into (or 'in') error for reward? No doubt there have been cases (such as the St. Bartholomew or the September massacres) where people engaged for hire ran greedily into all excesses of cruelty; or covetousness itself may become a passion, as in the case of the miser: but these cases seem hardly parallel to that in the text. Perhaps we should understand it rather of a headstrong will breaking down all obstacles, refusing to listen to reason or expostulation, as Balaam holds to his purpose in spite of the divine opposition manifested in such diverse ways. Then comes the difficulty, how are we to understand the dative πλάνη, and what is the reference in the word? Should we take πλάνη as equivalent to εἰς πλάνην (Winer p. 268)? This is the interpretation given by Lucifer p. 219 'vae illis quoniam in seductionem B. mercedem effusi sunt,' but it is a rare use of the dative, and it seems more natural to explain πλάνη by the preceding δῆς (dat. of the means or manner), which is used in the same collocation in 2 P. 215. What then are we to understand by

1 I do not think the marginal reading in the R.V. 'cast themselves away' is tenable.
they were hurried along on the line of Balaam's error.' What was his error? From Numb. 22, 25 13, and 31 10, Nehem. 13 1. Moaβται ἵμποστο ἐπ’ αὐτόν τὸν Βαλαάμ καταράσσειαι, Jos. Ant. iv. 6. 6, we learn that B. was induced by Balak's bribe to act against his own convictions and eventually to tempt Israel to fornication. This then is the error or seduction by which he leads them astray. 1 In rabbinical literature Balaam is a sort of type of false teachers (Pirke Aboth v. 29 with Taylor's n.). Some suppose the name Nicolaitan (Apoc. 2 1) to be formed from the Greek equivalent to Balaam = 'corrupter of the people;' see however the passages quoted from Clem. Al. in the Introduction on Early Heresies. In Apoc. 21 4 we read of some in Pergamum that held the teaching of Balaam, δὴ διδασκαλι ὁ Βαλάκ βαλλείν σκάνδαλον ἐνώπιοι τῶν νῦν Ἰσραήλ, φαινεῖν εἰδωλοθυτα καὶ πορνεύειν. There is no hint to suggest that the innovators, of whom Jude speaks, favoured idolatry, but they may have prided themselves on their enlightenment in disregarding the rule of the Apostolic Council as to the use of meats offered to idols (cf. 1 Cor. 8), and perhaps in burning incense in honour of the Emperor, see Ramsay Expositor for 1904, p. 409, and July pp. 43-60. On the other hand Jude continually charges them with moral laxity, and we may suppose that this was combined with claims to prophetic power and with the covetousness which is often ascribed to the false teachers of the early Church, as in 1 Th. 2 11, where Paul asserts of his own ministry that it was οὐκ ἐκ πλανῆς οὐδὲ ἐκ ἀκαθαρσίας οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ . . . οὐκ γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας ἐγενήθημεν, οὐτέ ἐν προφάσει πλεονεξίας, οὐτέ ἐχοντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν, 1 Tim. 3 9 διακόνους μὴ διλόγους, μὴ οὖν πολλῷ προσέχουντας, μὴ αἰσχροκερδείς, ἔχοντα τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθαρᾷ συνείδησιν, Tit. 1 7. 11 διδασκόντες ἀ μὴ δεῖ κρεδούς χάριν, 1 Pet. 5 2. For the gen. μωθεύον ex. Winer, p. 258, Plat. Rep. ix. 570 ἐν μωθεύον ἐπικουροῦν, 1 Cor. 7 28 τιμῆς ἡγοράσθητε.

On the whole I understand the passage thus: Balaam went wrong because he allowed himself to hanker after gain and so lost his communion with God. He not only went wrong himself, but he abused his great influence and his reputation as a prophet, to lead astray the Israelites by drawing them away from the holy worship of Jehovah to the impure worship of Baal Peor. So these false teachers use their prophetic gifts for purposes of self-aggrandisement and endeavours to make their services attractive by excluding from religion all that is strenuous and difficult, and opening the door to every kind of indulgence.

tο ἀντλογία τοῦ Κορᾶ ἀπόλοντο.] For Korah's sin see Numb. 16 1 foll. and compare, for the same rebellious spirit in the Christian Church, 3 Joh. 9. 10 (of Diotrephes), Tit. 1 10. 11, ἵνα πολλοί ἀναστατωθῇ . . . οὐκ δεῖ εἰσταιμολέων, ib. 11; ib. 310. 11, 1 Tim. 1 20 (among those who have made shipwreck of the faith mention is made of Hymenus and Alexander) οὐς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν μὴ βλασφημῆν, ib. 6 4, 2 Tim.

1 Zahn understands πλανή in an active, not a passive sense, as the ruling principle of the πλάτον Balaam, not as the error into which others fell through his seductions. I do not think Jude discriminated between these meanings: πλανή covers both.
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21618. 55 δὲ λόγος αὐτῶν ὡς γάγγραινα νομίζει δὲν ἵστων Υμέναιοι καὶ Φιλήτος, οἴτινες περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠστόχησαν, 414 where the opposition of Alexander the coppersmith is noted; but especially 313, which presents a close parallel to our passage, referring to a similar resistance to Moses in the case of the apocryphal Jannes and Jambres. For ἀντιλογία see Heb. 128 ἀναλογίασθε τὸν τοιαύτην ἐνομισματικά ὑπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν εἰς θανόν ἀντιλογίαν. It is used as a translation of Meribah in Numb. 2018 al. and (in relation to Korah) in Prove. 1ac. 9 μνήμης ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς Δαβίδ, Καρέ, καὶ Ἀβεβαμ, πῶς ἐδείκτη ἡ γῆ καὶ κατέπαυσεν αὐτοὺς διὰ τὴν ἀντιλογίαν αὐτῶν.

Rampf draws attention to the climax contained in these verses. The sin of Cain is marked by the words ἐπορεύθησαν ἄδεια, that of Balaam the gentile prophet by ἔξεχθησαν πλάγη, that of the Levite Korah by ἀπώλειαν ἀντιλογία.

12. οὕτω εἰσέβλεψον οἱ λαῶν σπλαχνεῖς συμπάθειας.  Dr. Chase quotes Zech. 110†, Aproc. 714, Enoch 463, Secrets of Enoch, 73, 183, 193, etc. for the phrase οὕτως εἰσέβλεψον, adding that it was probably adopted by St. Jude from apocalyptic writings, for which he clearly had a special liking. On the early history of the Agape, see my Appendix C to Clem. Al. Strom. vii. The parallel passage in 2 P. (on which see n.) has two remarkable divergencies from the text here, reading ἀπάντας for ἀγάπας and επιλογισμος for σπλαχνεῖς. There has been much discussion as to the meaning of the latter word. It is agreed that it is generally used of a rock in or by the sea, and many of the lexicographers understand it of a hidden rock, ὑφάλος πτέρω, see Thomas Mag. σπλαχνεῖς, Ἀρτικώς: ὑφάλος πτέρω, Ἑλληνικά, Εὐγενικά. Μ. σπλαχνεῖς...αὐτῷ ἐκλαθέναι κεκρυμμέναι πτέρων, ὅθεν καὶ ὑφάλους ἄνθρωπος ἐκλέγεται, κεκρυμμένοις καὶ πανοῦργοις, ἐκατασταλαίποντες, κατακρύπτοντες, ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ὑφάλων πτέρων, ἀιτίας ἀπὸ ἐδώς καλυπτόμενοι τοὺς ἀπουρών προσπελάξαντες κίνδυνον ἐπιφέροντο (both cited by Wetst.). The same explanation is given by the scholiast on Hom. Od. 5. 401–405 καὶ δὴ δοῦναν ἀκοῦσαν τοις σπλαχνεῖσιν βαλάσασθωσ...ἀλλ' ἀκάτοι προβλήτης ἦσαν σπλαχνεῖς τε πάγοι τε. See Plut. Mor. 101 b εὐθηλί σπλαχνος which Wytt. translates 'tranquillitas maris caveam rupe turbescit,' i. 476 Α, Oecumenius on this passage αἱ σπλαχνεῖς τοῖς πλάνοις ἀλθόησιν ἀποροδίκητος ἐπεγενόμενα (1 νους), καὶ ἐξαιρέθη, ὅπερ σπλαχνεῖς, ἐπάγοντες αὐτοῦ τὸν ἐλθών τῶν ψυχῶν. Wetst. also quotes Heliod. v. 31 βαλάσασθη προσπελάσας ἄν τοὺς ἄνθρακας ἀδιπομείκτους σπλαχνεῖς καταστεθέντας. The compound κατασταλαίπων joined with the parallel case of ὑφάλου justifies, I think, this sense of σπλαχνεῖς, which is rejected by most of the later commentators. 1 Cf. also the use of ὑπογεῖον in 1 Tim. 119, and the description of drunkenness.

1 Dr. Bigg denies this meaning on the strength mainly of two quotations, Hom. Od. 3. 298 ἀπὸ γῆς ἐν ποις σπλαχνεῖσιν δάβα ψυχα, where, he says, the σπλαχνεῖς are identical with λεοσ αἰώνιοι τε ἐν ἑλενικοῖς τοῦ ὁμοίου τῶν οἰκείων σπλαχν. In both of these I think the word refers to the breakers at the bottom of the cliffs: in the latter it is said that hidden rocks are more dangerous than visible reefs. Compare Diod. iii. 43 ὁ δὲ ταύτη παρακατεῖ κατὰ μέρα τὴν κορύφην πτέρων ἀποτελόμενος ἵον καὶ τοῖς ὑφεσι κατακλητικάς οὐδὲ δὲ τὰς σπλαχνεῖς ἀείας καὶ πυκνὰς ἐνθάλαττος.
(perhaps suggested by the text) in Clem. Al. Paed. 183 \textit{simp. ἄριστο} τοῦ 

gαναγίου τὸν κίνδυνον...δὲ νοεῖ περιφέρεται τῷ κλύδωνι...ἐνθαλασσίων ἐλγυ-

gκία τῷ ζῷῳ τῆς καταγίζουν τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀντισχόσας λιμένον, ἕως 

ἀντιπεριπετέων υφάλω τέρας αὐτῶν αὐτὸν ἐξοκείλασ εἰς ἰδρυμᾶ διαφθείρη.

Scopulus is used in a similar metaphoric sense, see Cic. in \textit{Pis}. 41 

where Piso and Gabinius are called 'geminae voragines scopulique 

republicae.' On the other hand \textit{στυλάς} is sometimes used loosely of 

a rock of any kind, as we find it joined with \textit{ψυθλός} in Soph. \textit{Laoc. fr.}; 

sometimes of gravel, as in \textit{Trach.} 678 (=\textit{χοιο} in 638) where however 

the reading and the interpretation are doubtful; sometimes of a cave, 

Callim. \textit{Del.} 242, where the seals are said to bring forth their young 

ἑνὶ \textit{στυλάδων}, see also Suidas and \textit{Apolon. lexz}. Others take \textit{στυλάδες} 

in the very rare sense of 'spota,' or 'stains' like \textit{σπύλαι} in 2 P. The only 

example of this sense seems to be in Orph. \textit{Lith}. 614, but \textit{Heauch.} 

gives the interpretation \textit{στυλάς}, \textit{μεμαυσµύνω}. Lightfoot, on the \textit{Rev-

sion} of the N. T. p. 136 n., puts forward some arguments in favour of 

this interpretation. (1) All the early versions translate it either as 

a substantive 'stains,' or as an adjective 'polluted.' (2) He thinks the 

author of the \textit{Lithica}, who probably lived in the fourth century, must 

have had some other authority for his use of the word besides that of 

Jude. I agree with Wordsworth and Dr. Chase in thinking that the 

metaphor of the sunken rocks is more in harmony with the context. 

Howard are we to account for the gender in \textit{αὐ...στυλάδες συνενω-

χούμενοι}? Are we to suppose the gender of \textit{στυλάς was changed or 

forgotten in late Greek (cf. Winer pp. 25, 38, 73, 76)? If so, the 

forgetfulness seems to have been confined to this author. Or is this a 

\textit{constructio ad sensum}, the feminine being changed to masculine 

because it is metaphorically used of men (Winer pp. 176, 648, 660, 

672), cf. Apc. 11\textsuperscript{4} οὐτός εἰσαι οὐ δύναναι οὐ ἐποίην 

τοῦ κυρίου ἑστῶτες and B's reading \textit{παραφερόμενοι} below? Or may we take 

\textit{στυλάδες} as expressing a complementary notion in apposition to 

\textit{συνενωχούμενοι}? The last seems the best explanation though I cannot recall any exact 

parallel. An easier remedy would be to omit the article (with K and 

many versions), as suggested by Dr. Chase in Hastings' \textit{D. of B. ii. 

p. 799}, translating: 'these are sunken rocks in your love-feasts while 

they feast with you.' Sippa considers that there is a reference to 

the same prophetic warning as in ver. 4. 

\textit{συνενωχούμενοι}. Is used in the parallel passage of 2 P. with a dat. as 


άφσις ἐκτοις σομαίνων.}] If we take \textit{στυλάδες} as complementary to 

\textit{συνενωχούμενοι}, it is better to take \textit{άφσις} with \textit{σομαίνων.} if we omit 

the article and take \textit{στυλάδες} to be the predicate, \textit{συνενωχούμενοι} will be 

an epexegetic participle, which will require strengthening by \textit{άφσις}. 

Generally \textit{άφσις} is used in a good sense, but we find it used, as here, 

of the want of a right fear in Prov. 19\textsuperscript{23} φόβος Κυρίου εἰς ζωὴν ἀνθρώπος. 

ο ἐν \textit{άφσις} κ.τ.λ. ἢ. 15\textsuperscript{6} κατάθενον μικρα μερίς μετὰ φόβου Κυρίου ἢ 

θησαυρον μεγάλοι μετὰ \textit{άφσις}. Sir. 5\textsuperscript{6} περὶ ἱζωσμοὺ μὴ \textit{άφσις} γίνουν, 

προσθέαν ἀμαρτίαν ἢ ἀμαρτίας. The phrase \textit{κατὰ τοὺς ποιμένες ἐκτοις,} 

τὸ δὲ πρὸς τάς μονὰς οὐκ ἢ \textit{άφσις}.}
but there does not seem to be any reference to spiritual pastors in Jude; and τομαίον has probably here the sense 'to fatten, indulge,' as in Prov. 28γ δὲ τομαίοι ἀπωτάν, ἀπαινάζει πάφρα, id. 29δ δὲ τομαίον πόρον, ἀπολαῖ πλούς, Plut. Mor. 732 in Ἀτταλοῦ ἐπὶ ἄργιας μακών ἀληθεῦται καμία Ἐλπισάμην ἐπιοίμασεν ἀνέχεις πανομένων. We may compare 1 Cor. 11τις fol. James 5δ, 1 Tim. 5δ.

νεφέλαι ἄνδροι ἐπὶ ἄνθρομον παραφρόμενοι.] The character of the innovators is illustrated by figures drawn from the four elements, air, earth, sea, heaven (ἀθόρ). Spitta points out the resemblance to a passage in Enoch (chapters 2–5), which follows immediately on the words quoted below vv. 14, 15. The regular order of nature is there contrasted with the disorder and lawlessness of sinners. 'I observed everything that took place in the heaven, how the luminaries...do not deviate from their orbits, how they all rise and set in order, each in its season, and transgress not against their appointed order....I observed and saw how in winter all the trees seem as though they were withered and shed all their leaves...And again I observed the days of summer...how the trees cover themselves with green leaves and bear fruit...And behold how the seas and the rivers accomplish their task. But as for you, ye have not continued steadfast; and the law of the Lord ye have not fulfilled...and have slanderously spoken proud and hard words (below ver. 15 περὶ πάνων τῶν σκληρῶν ἀν ἀληθεύνατο κατ' αὐτοῖν) with your impure mouths against his greatness.' For the metaphor cf. Eph. 414. Clement's paraphrase in the Adumbr. is 'Nubes sine aqua, hoc est qui verbam divinum et secundum in se non possident. Ob hoc et a ventis et spiritibus violentis hujusmodi circumferuntur homines.' In the parallel passage of 2 P. the first figure is broken into two, πηγαί ἄνδροι, ὅμιχλαι ὑπὸ λαξίαν ἄλανόμεναι. Perhaps the writer may have thought that there was an undue multiplication of causes; if the clouds were waterless, it was needless to add that they were driven past by the wind. It seems however to have been customary with St. Jude to 'mak siker' by the accumulation of causes, as we have below διὰ ἀποθανοῦντα, ἢριζομένας. We find the same comparison in Prov. 2514 'As clouds and wind without rain, so is he that boasteth himself of his gifts falsely.' [The LXX. is less like our text, suggesting that Jude was acquainted with the original Hebrew. C.] For the use of ὑπὸ with ἄνθρωπον see my n. on James 3δ.

ἄνθρωπος φθείρωμαι ἄνεργα. ] Clement's paraphrase is 'Arbores autumnales instructuosae [et] infideles videlicet, qui nullum fructum fidelitatis appor tant.' See below App. on φθείρωμαι.

διὰ ἀποθανοῦντα ἢριζομένας.] Clement's paraphrase is 'Bis mortuae, semel scilicet quando delinquendo peccareunt; secundo vero quando supplicis contradentur secundum prædestinatæ Dei judicium: mors quippe reputanda est etiam quando quiescet hereditatem non continuo promeretur' (Clement's favourite doctrine of the divine training and discipline continued after death, as in Str. vii. 835, 879). I prefer Schneckenburger's explanation, 'He who is not born again is dead in his sins (Col. 216), he who has apostatized is twice dead,' cf. Apoc. 218, Heb. 6δγ, 2 P. 2δτον, and the n. on ὑπὸ διωκοῦν above, ver. 5. This
does not however explain the words in their first application to the trees. These may be called doubly dead, when they are not only sapless, but are torn up by the root, which would have caused the death even of a living tree. The figure of a tree is often used to illustrate the consequences of a good or evil life, as in Ps. 1:5, Mt. 3:10, 7:19, 15:13 πάσα φυτεία Ἰν οὐκ ἠφύτησεν δ ἀπατή μου . . ἡρίζωθεντα, Joh. 15:6.

13. κύματα ἀγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τάς ζωντάν αἰσθήματα.] Cf. Cic. Ad Herenn. iv. 55 spumans ex ore sceclus. The two former illustrations, the reefs and the clouds, refer to the special professions of the libertines and the mischief they caused; the third, the dead trees, brings out also their own miserable condition; the fourth and fifth give a very fine description of their lawlessness and shamelessness, and their eventual fate. Clement's paraphrase here is not much to the purpose: 'Fluctus ferocis maris: his verbis vitam gentilem significat, quorum ambitionis abominabiliis est finis.' The comparison reminds us of Isa. 57:10 'the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt.' See my n. on James 1:9. The phrase ἀγρια κύματα is found in Wisdom 14:1. The rare word ἐπαφρίζω is used of the sea in Moschus v. 5. It refers to the seaweed and other refuse borne on the crest of the waves and thrown up on the beach, to which are compared the overflowings of ungodliness (Ps. 17:8), the ἰμυρα καὶ περισσεία κακίας condemned by James 1:21, where see my note. The libertines foam out their own shames by their swelling words (ver. 16), while they turn the grace of God into a cloak for their licentiousness (ver. 4). We may compare Phil. 3:19 ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν.

ἀστέρες πλαγηταί.] Clement's paraphrase is 'Errantes et apestatas significat: ex hujusmodi stellis sunt qui angelorum cecidere sedibus.' This is borrowed from Enoch (chapters 43, 44) where it is said that some of the stars become lightnings and cannot part with their new form, ib. 80, 'In the days of the sinners, many chiefs of the stars will err, and will alter their orbits and tasks, ib. 86, where the fall of the angels is described as the falling of stars, ib. 88 'he seized the first star which had fallen from heaven and bound it in an abyss; now that abyss was narrow and deep and horrible and dark . . . and they took all the great stars and bound them hand and foot, and laid them in an abyss,' ib. 90 ἀγρια ἐπαφρίζω 'and judgment was held first upon the stars, and they were judged and found guilty and were cast into an abyss of fire'; more especially 18:14 (where the Greek has been preserved, see Charles, p. 354) δεσμοτήρων τοῦ ἔγεντο τοῖς ἀστροις καὶ ταῖς δυνάμεις τοῦ οἴκου καὶ οἱ ἀστερεῖς οἱ κυλιόμενοι ἐν τῷ πυρὶ οὗτοι εἰσν, οἱ παραβάντες πρόσταγμα Κυρίου ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἀνατολής αὐτῶν, ὅτι οὐκ ἠγριάδον ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔφεσα παραβάτες µέχρι καιροῦ τελειώτως ἀμορφίας αὐτῶν ἐναυτῶν µυρίων, ib. 21:2 ἄφρακτοι . . . τόπον ἀκατασκευαστὸν καὶ φθορόν . . . καὶ ἑκεῖ τεθέναι ἐπὶ τὰ ἀστέρα τοῦ οἴκου δεδεµένους . . . οὐτοὶ εἰσν τῶν ἀστερῶν τοῦ οἴκου οἱ παραβάντες τὴν ἐπιταγήν τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἐδέθησαν δέος µέχρι τού πληρώσαι µυρία ἑτη.

It would seem from these passages, which Jude certainly had before him, that πλαγηταί cannot here have its usual application, the propriety of which was repudiated by all the ancient astronomers from Plato.
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downwards. Cf. Cic. N. D. ii. 51 'maxime sunt admirabiles motus earum quinque stellarum quae falsa vocantur errantes. Nihil enim errat quod in omni aeternitate conservat motus constantes et ratos,' with the passage quoted in my notes. So too Wordsworth in his Ode to Duty. I think 'the A. V. 'wandering stars' gives exactly the right sense. Theophilus however, who is probably copying Jude, seems to assume that πλάνηται here bears its usual sense (ad Autol. ii. 15) ἦ δὲ τῶν ἀστρῶν θέσεως οἰκονομίαν καὶ τάξιν ἔχει τῶν δικαίων καὶ ἐσεφών καὶ τηροῦτων τῶν νόμων...οἱ δ' αὐτὰς μεταβάνοντες καὶ φεύγοντες τόπον ἐκ τόπου, οί καὶ πλάνητες καλούμενοι, καὶ αὐτοὶ τόποι τυγχάνουσιν τῶν ἀρματομένων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Some commentators take it as applying to comets; perhaps the quotations from Enoch 44 and 80 fit better with shooting stars, ἀστέρες διάφοροι (Arist. Meteor. i. 4. 7) which seem to rush from their sphere into darkness; compare Hermes Trism. quoted in Stob. Ecl. i. 478, κάτωθι τῆς σελήνης εἰσὶν ἔτεροι ἀστέρες φθαρόντο ἄργοι...οὗ καὶ ἠμένις ὀρῶμεν διαλομένους, τῆν φύσιν ομοίαν ἔχουσι τοῖς ἀρχόντοις τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ζῴων, τοῖς ἐτέροις δὲ οὐδὲν γίγνεται ή ἡ μονὸν φθορά. For the close relationship supposed by the Jews to exist between the stars and the angels see my n. on James 117 φωτών. In this passage however the subject of the comparison is men, who profess to give light and guidance, as the pole-star does to mariners (ὡς φωτιζόμεν εἰς κόσμῳ Phil. 218), but who are only blind leaders of the blind, centres and propagators of πλάνη (ver. 11), destined to be swallowed up in everlasting darkness. Cf. Apost. 613, 810.12, 91, 124.

οὐ τόπον εἰς αὐτοῦ ἐν δὲ αἰῶνα τετήρηται.] See the parallel in 2 P. 217, and above ver. 6.

14. ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τοῦτος ἱδρυμός ἀπὸ Ἄδαμ Ἐνώχ. 'It was for these also (as well as for his own contemporaries) that the prophecy of Enoch was intended, far as he is removed from our time, being actually the sixth (by Hebrew calculation seventh) descendant from Adam.' For Enoch compare Kalisch's n. on Gen. 521 and the allusions in Sir. 4410, 4914, Heb. 115, Charles Introduction to Book of Enoch. The prophecy is contained in En. 19 (Greek in Charles App. C. p. 327) ὅπι ἐχεῖ ἐστὶν τῶν τού τὸ τις μυρίας καὶ τοὺς γιόν τοῦ αἴτου τούτου καὶ ταῖς γίνοις αἰτου τοῦ ποιήσας καὶ κατὰ παντων, καὶ ἀπόλοις τούς ἀσβεσί. ἔργων καὶ ἐλέγει εἰ παντιν σώρα περὶ παντων ἐργῶν αὐτῶν ἡ καὶ περὶ κατα παντων ἀσβεστο λοι ἀσβεστο. The phrase ἱδρυμός ἀπὸ Ἄδαμ is also found in En. 605 'My grandfather was taken up, the seventh from Adam,' ib. 938 'And Enoch began to recount from the books and spake: I was born the seventh in the first week, while judgment and righteousness still tarried; and after me there will arise in the second week great wickedness,' where Charles refers to Jubilees 7. The genealogical order, as given in Gen. 520, is (1) Adam, (2) Seth, (3) Enos, (4) Cainan, (5) Mahaleel, (6) Jared, (7) Enoch. It is probably the sacredness of the Number 7 which led Jewish writers to lay stress upon it in Enoch's case: see rabbinical quotations in Wetstein. For the position of the augment in ἐπροφήτησεν, see L. and S. s.v., Winer p. 84, Blass p. 39.
Charles’ translation from the Aethiopic is “And lo! He comes with ten thousands of his holy ones to execute judgment upon them, and He will destroy the ungodly and will convict all flesh of all that the sinners and ungodly have wrought and ungodly committed against Him.” For μυρίσαν διάγγελον cf. Heb. 12:22, Ps. 68:17, Deut. 33:2. For the use of ἐν denoting accompanying circumstances see Blass Gr. N.T. tr. p. 118, and Lk. 14:31 εἰ δυνατός ἦστιν ἐν δικαίωμα ἡμῶν ἀπαντήσαι τῷ μετὰ ἐκκοσμίων δικαίωμας ἐπὶ αὐτῶν. The aorist here is the periphrastic middle = κρίνεται (as in Isocr. 48 D) see my nn. on αἰτῶν and αἰτεῖσθαι, ib. and ibi (James 4:2, ib. 3).

οὐκ ἐπελεύσατε τὸν ταύτην τῶν ἐργῶν αὐτῶν ἀνθρώπων.] Shortened from the Greek Enoch quoted above.

ἀπελεύσητε.] Cf. vv. 4, 18. The word thrice repeated in this verse runs through the epistle as a sort of refrain.

περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ἐν ἀλήθειαν.] This is taken from Enoch 272. Charles p. 366 (To Gehenna shall come) πάντες οἴνοις ἐροῦσιν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν κατὰ Κυρίων φωνὴν ἀπρήπη καὶ περὶ τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν σκληρά λαλήσουσιν, cf. ib. 64 ‘The law of the Lord ye have not fulfilled, but have slanderously spoken proud and hard words with your impure mouths against His greatness,’ ib. 1018, al., Gen. 42:7 ὡς τούτοις σκληροί, 1 Kings 12:12 ἀπεκρίθη πρὸς τὸν λαὸν σκληρόν, Mal. 3:15.

οὗτος ἐστιν γαγγοστά, μεμψύχων.] Charles thinks that we have here another case of borrowing from the Assumption of Moses, see Introd. on Apocryphal Quotations. The word γαγγοστά is used in the LXX., Exod. 16:2, Num. 11:1, 14-27, 39. The verb γαγγωζόω found in Joh. 7:38 of the whispering of the multitude in favour of Jesus, but is generally used of smouldering discontent which people are afraid to speak out, as in 1 Cor. 10:10 of the murmuring of the Israelites in the wilderness; Mt. 20:11 (where see Wetst.) of the grumbling of the labourers who saw others receiving a day’s pay for an hour’s labour; Joh. 6:41-48 of the Jews who took offence at the preaching of the Bread of Life. It is found in Epict. and M. Aur. but not in classical authors. γαγγωζόομαι is used in 1 P. 4:9. See further in Phrynichus p. 358 Lob. For the word μεμψύχων see Lucian Cycnis. 17 υμεῖς δὲ διὰ τὴν εὐθαμονίαν οὖν οὖν τῶν γυναικῶν ἀμέσως, καὶ παντὶ μεμψύχω, καὶ τὰ μὲν παρόντα φέρειν οὐ τὰ ἐθέλετε, τῶν δὲ ἀπόκτων ἐφίλετο, χειμώνας μὲν ἥρους εὐχέμενοι, θέρους δὲ χειμώνα . . . καθάτερ οἱ νοσούντες, δυσάρεστοι καὶ μεμψύχων οὖν, and Theorpr. Char. 17. It is used of the murmuring of the Israelites by Philo Vit. Mos. 1. 109 M. See other exx. in Wetst. The same spirit is condemned in James 115.
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κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν παρεμένων. Cf. 2 P. 3\textsuperscript{8} and 2\textsuperscript{10}, below ver. 18, and see my notes on James 4\textsuperscript{11,12}. Plumptre notes 'The temper of self-indulgence recognizing not God's will, but man's desires, as the law of action, is precisely that which issues in weariness and despair... cf. Eccles. 21\textsuperscript{20}.'

τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλάται ὑπόργυς.] See Enoch 5\textsuperscript{4} quoted on ver. 15, also Enoch 101\textsuperscript{3} 'ye have spoken insolent words against His righteousness,' Ps. 12\textsuperscript{4}, Ps. 73\textsuperscript{8}, Dan. 7\textsuperscript{8} στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα and ver. 20 of the little horn; compare above vv. 4, 8, 11, and James 3\textsuperscript{5} foll. In classical writers ὑπέρογυς is generally used of great or even excessive size, in later writers it is also used of 'big' words, arrogant speech and demeanour, see Alford's n. on 2 P. 2\textsuperscript{18} and Plut. Mor. 1119\textsuperscript{p} (Socrates) τὴν ἐμβρονησίαν ἐκ τοῦ βίου καὶ τὸν τύφον ἔζηλαυε καὶ τὰς ἐπαθέσεις καὶ ὑπέρογυς κατοῳδείς καὶ μεγαλαυχίας, ἵστ. 7\textsuperscript{a}, where ἡ θεατρική καὶ παρατριγύδος λέξεις ἐστι stylized ὑπέρογυς in contrast with ἤσχημη λέξεις, Plut. Vidas 505\textsuperscript{b} τοῦ βασιλέως τὸ φρόνημα τραγικόν καὶ ὑπέρογυς ἐν τοῖς μεγαλαυχίαις εὐχαρίστες ἔγεγον. It is found in 2 P. 2\textsuperscript{18} and in Dan. 11\textsuperscript{56} ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑψωθέτεται καὶ μεγαλυθέτεται ἐπὶ πάντα θεῶν, καὶ λαλήσει ὑπέρογυς.

θαυμάζοντες πρὸς τοῖς ἀφέλεις χάριν.] The phrase occurs with the same force in Lev. 19\textsuperscript{15} ὅπῃ μὴ θαυμάζησθε πρὸς σοιωμ', Job 13\textsuperscript{9}, see my n. on James 2\textsuperscript{1} μὴ ἐν προσωποληψίας ἔχετε τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ.Χ., and cf. 1 Tim. 3\textsuperscript{8} quoted above on ver. 11. As the fear of God drives out the fear of man, so defiance of God tends to put man in His place, as the chief source of good or evil to his fellows. For the anacoluthon (τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ—θαυμάζοντες) compare Col. 2\textsuperscript{3} ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν συμβεβαιωθήτες ἐν εἰρήνῃ, where a similar periphrasis (αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν = ὑμεῖς) is followed by a construction ad sensum, also Winer p. 716. Perhaps the intrusion of the finite clause into a participial series may be accounted for by a reminiscence of Ps. 17\textsuperscript{10} τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν ἀλλῆλον ὑπερφανεῖαν, or Ps. 144\textsuperscript{8,11} where a similar phrase occurs.

17. ἐμαῖς δή, ἀγαπτοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ἰημάτων τῶν προερχόμενων ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων.] The writer turns again, as in ver. 20 below, to the faithful members of the Church (ver. 3) and reminds them, not now of primeval prophecy, but of warning words uttered by the Apostles. Some have taken this as a quotation by Jude from 2 P. 3\textsuperscript{8}, where the quotation is given more fully. But, there also, the words are given as uttered by holy prophets and by 'your Apostles', see n. on the passage. The words ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὑμῖν, which follow, imply that the warning was spoken, not written, and that it was often repeated. See Introduction on the Early Heresies.

18. ὡς ἵσχατον χρόνων ἵσταται ἑπαρκεῖ.] The parallel in 2 P. 3\textsuperscript{8} is ἔλευσονται ἐπὶ ἵσχατον τῶν ἰημάτων ἐκ τιματικοῦ ἔμπνευσε, where see n. on the use of the article with ἵσχατος, etc. Hort in his note on 1 P. 1\textsuperscript{5} translates ἐν καιρῷ ἰσχατῷ 'in a season of extremity,' adding 'there is no reason to think it has any technical sense such as by association we attach to "the last day." It does not seem to me that this translation is suitable in 2 Tim. 3\textsuperscript{1} ἐν ἰσχάτω ἰμεραὶ ἐνοπτήσονται καροί
The prophecy of this mocking, as a mark of the future trials of the Church, has not come down to us. An example of it in the very beginning of the Church is given in Acts 213 ἵπποι χειλατάντες ἢλεγον ὅτι γλείπνοι μεμεστωμένοι εἰσὶν. In the O.T. we have such exx. as 2 Chron. 3616 (the summing up of the attitude of the Jews towards the prophets) ἦσαν μοικτηρίζοντες τούς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔρωθον ἠτούτων τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔπαιλαίζοντες ἐν τοῖς προφίταις αὐτοῦ, Jer. 20 ἕγανηθη λόγοι Κυρίου εἰς ἀνειδισμόν ἢμι καὶ εἰς χασαμόν πάων ἢμέραν. Cf. also the mockery at the crucifixion, and the declaration in Mt. 1025 ἤ τοι ὁ ἰσοδιστήρων Βεσσεβολά ἐπεκέλευσαν τὸ ὑπό μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ. In 2 P. the purport of this mockery is explained to be the unfulfilled promise of the Parusia. Here we must gather its meaning from the account already given of the libertines. If they turned the grace of God into licentiousness, they would naturally mock at the narrowness and want of enlightenment of those who took a strict and literal view of the divine commandments: if they made light of authority and treated spiritual things with irreverence, if they foamed out their own shame and uttered proud and impious words, if they denied God and Christ, they would naturally laugh at the idea of a judgment to come. On the form ἤματησις and its cognates see n. on 2 P.

τῶν ἀνεμπλαιῶν.] (R.V. 'their own ungodly lusts.') The position of the gen. is peculiar, and probably intended to give additional stress. We may compare it with James 2 ὁ προσωπολογωμαῖος ἔχει τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς δόξης, where some connect τῆς δόξης with κυρίου in a qualitative sense. I am rather disposed to take τῶν ἀνεμπλαιῶν here as a subjective gen. 'lusts belonging to or arising from their impieties,' cf. Rom. 12 καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρεδοχέν αὐτῶν ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν.

19. στοι ἐστιν οἱ ἀνεμπλαιῶντες.] 'These are they that make invidious distinctions.' See Introduction on the Text. The rare word ἀνεμπλαιῶντες is used of logical distinctions in Aristotle Pol. iv. 43, ὡστε σὺν ἐν ἐν τῷ προηγομένῳ λαβεῖν ἑπί, πρῶτον ἐν ἀποδιορίζομεν ἐπερ ἀναγκαῖον πᾶν ἔχειν ἔσον ('as, if we wished to make a classification of animals, we should have begun by setting aside that which all animals have in common') and, I believe, in every other passage in which it is known to occur: see Maximus Confessor, ii. p. 103 δὸ τὸ μὲν φυσικὸν ὄρισεν ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ γνωμικὸν ἀποδιορίζομεν translated 'naturali in eo (Christo) constituita voluntate, arbitrarium dispunxit,' ib. p. 131 c ως δὲ λόγος ἦ τούτου μόνον τὸ ἔμπαθες, ἄλλῳ οὖ τὸ φυσικὸν ἀποδιορίζοντας θέλημα 'quod
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dixerat hoc solum spectare ut libidinosam, non ut naturalem voluntatem a
Salvatore eliminaret," Severus de Clisst. 32. 25 όταν ταύτα τά συμπτώματα
όφρ παρόντα, ἀποδώρει τὴν ὄργανην νόσον ἐκ τῆς ὁμομορφοῦν. I am
indebted for these references to Stephanus, but have not been able to
identify one to Hermes Poem. p. 17. The reference given for the word
ἀποδώρειμος to Hermias in Plat. Phaedr. p. 166 is valueless, as the
true reading there is ἀπομορφεῖμος (so stated in Couvreur's ed. 1901).
The simple διώριζε is found in Lev. 20:24 διώρισε ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν θηνῶν
'I separated you from the nations,' Job 35:11: ἀν αὐτῷ, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρήμων, Acts 19 (Paul left the syn-
agogue) καὶ ἀφόρισαν τοὺς μαθητάς, 2 Cor. 6:17 ἤξελθατε ἐκ μάσου αὐτῶν
καὶ ἀφορίσθητε, Lk. 6:22 (of excommunication) ὅταν ἀφορίσασθε ὑμᾶς,
Gal. 2:11 (of Peter's withdrawal from the Gentiles) ὑπότελεν καὶ
ἀφόρισαν εὐαγγελίων.

ψυχομεν.] Used of worldly wisdom in James 3:15, where see note,
distinguished from πνευματικός in 1 Cor. 2:13-15. 154, cf. the teaching of
the Naassenes (ap. Hippol. p. 164) εἰς τῶν υἱῶν θεοῦ υἱὸς εἰσελέβονται
ἀκάθαρτοι οἰκεῖοι, οὐ ψυχικοῖς, οὐ σαιρικοῖς, ἀλλὰ τρειτᾶ τεννυματικοῖς.

πνεῦμα μὴ ἤχωντος.] The subjective negative may be explained as
describing a class (such as have not) rather than as stating a fact in
regard to particular persons; but the use of μὴ is much more widely
extended in late than in classical Greek, cf. such phrases as ἡτεῖ μη,
ὅτι μή. It is simplest to understand πνεῦμα here of the Holy Spirit,
cf. Rom. 8:9 υμεῖς υἱῶν ἐστί· ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἰπὲρ πνεῦμα θεοῦ
οἰκεῖ ἐν υμίν, 1 Cor. 2:13, 7:40, 1 Joh. 3:24, 4:13, and the contrast in ver. 20
ἐν πνεύματι ἅγιον προσευχόμενοι. Others, e.g. Plumptre, prefer the
explanation that 'the false teachers were so absorbed in their lower
sensuous nature that they no longer possessed, in any real sense of
the word, that element in man's compound being, which is itself spiritual,
and capable therefore of communion with the Divine Spirit.' The
connexion of the last clause with what precedes is illustrated by such
passages as Eph. 4:4, στουκόντες τοις ἐν τούτῳ τοῦ πνεύματος . . .
ἐν σώμα καὶ ἐν πνεύμα, and 1 Cor. 3:16 ὅτι γὰρ ἐν υμῖν ζῆλος . . . καὶ
διακοσμήσατε, υἱοὶ σαρκικοὶ ἐστε;

20. υμεῖς σαλς, ἀγαπητοί.] Contrasted with the libertines, as in ver. 17.

ἐπαινομοῦμεν ἑαυτοῦς τῇ ἁγιατρίᾳ ὑμῶν πιστεί.] These words, descripti-
evous effort to build up the one spiritual temple are, in ver. 18, con-
trasted with the ἵπται of ver. 18, and the ἀποδώρειμος in ver. 19.
For the construction of verbs compounded with ἐπὶ see Winer pp. 555,
ἐποικισμὸν εἶπε τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ότις
ἀρχογονίου ἀντῶν Χριστὸν Ἰσχυοῦ κ.τ.λ., 1 Cor. 3:17, a passage which
the writer may have had in his mind here and in ver. 23. Dr. Bigg
compares Polyc. Phil. 3 'If ye study the epistles of the blessed
apostle Paul, δυνηθὴσαθε νοοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθείσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν.
Usually Christ is spoken of as the foundation or corner-stone of the
Church, and we should probably assign an objective sense to τῇ πίστει
here, as in ver. 3 above (ἐπαινομοῦμεν τῇ πίστει). Otherwise it might
be explained of that faculty by which we are brought into relation
with the spiritual realities (Heb. 11:1 πίστεις ἀληθεύμων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἀλήγος τί τί χρήσω, οὐ βλεπομένων), that is to say the introduction to all the other Christian graces, see n., on 2 P. 1:18, and which leads to eternal life (1 P. 1:5, and ὁ κοιμώμενος τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὑπό ἑνώσεως σωτηρίας γενόμενος). The faith is here called ’most holy,’ because it comes to us from God, and reveals God to us, and because it is by its means that man is made righteous, and enabled to overcome the world (1 Joh. 5:5–6). Cf. 1 Pet. 5:5 ἐκ τοῦ ἄνωτέρου στερεότητος τῆς πίστεως.

For exx. of ἄνωτος used of the 2nd person see Winer tr. p. 187 f.

In πνεύματι ἄγας προσευχόμενος.] These words, contrasted with πνεύμα μὴ ἑξοντες in ver. 19, show how they are to build themselves up upon their faith. I understand them as equivalent to James 5:16 δήκοις δικαίων ἐνεργομένης, where see n. Compare also Eph. 6:18 διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς προσευχόμενοι ἐν πνεύματι, Rom. 8:26, 27.

21. ἰδοὺ τῇ ἁγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρησατέ.] In ver. 1 the passive is used: those who are addressed are described as kept and beloved (cf. ver. 24 τῇ δυναμίνᾳ φιλαξίας): here the active is used and emphasized by the unusual order of words: each is to keep himself in the love of God, cf. James 1:27 ἀπόλυτον ἱπταμένων τηρεῖν, Phil. 2:12 τῇ ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζοντες Θεὸς γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ ἐνεργείων ἐν ὑμῖν. Again in ver. 2 the writer invokes the divine love and mercy on those to whom he writes: here they are hidden to take steps to secure these. Compare Rom. 5:5 ἡ ἁγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκύνηται ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δωδεκάτου ἡμῶν, id. 8:29 ἐρωτευμαῖς ὅταν ὦτα θάνατος ὀφείλει . . . οὐκ οὕτως ἐντολαὶ αὕτης ἡμᾶς καρδιάς ἀπό τῆς ἁγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ, Joh. 15:9 ἀγάπη μεθ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ καγώ ὑμᾶς ἀγάπη μεθ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ, μεινάτε ἐν τῇ ἁγάπῃ τῆς ἑμῶν. ἵνα τὰς ἐντολὰς μοῦ τηρήσητε, μενείτε ἐν τῇ ἁγάπῃ μου. The aor. imper. is expressive of urgency, see n. on ἄγαμον ἡμῶν James 2:20.

προσδέχομενοι τὸ ἄρσεν.] Cf. Tit. 2:13 προσδέχομαι πᾶν μακαριάν ἐπίθεμα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ., and 2 P. 3:11–12, 14. The same phrase is used of the Jews who were looking for the promised Messiah at the time of his first coming, Mk. 15:43, Lk. 22:53, 58.

ἐχεῖς ὑμῶν ἀλόγων.] Some connect this closely with the imperative τηρήσατε, but it seems to me to follow more naturally on the nearer phrase πρὸ τοῦ ἄρσεν: cf. 1 P. 1:137 οὐλογητός ὁ Θεός . . . ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτῷ ἄρσεν ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς κληρονομιάν ἀφθαρσίαν . . . τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς τούς . . . φρουροῦμενους . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθήναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ.
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ἀλέγχεις τὸν ἀδελφόν σου, and Hare's excellent note L in his Mission of the Comforter, where he argues that the conviction wrought by the Spirit is a conviction unto salvation, rather than unto condemnation; and quotes Luecke as saying that 'ἀλέγχεις always implies the refutation, the overcoming of an error, a wrong, by the truth and right. When this is brought before our conscience through the ἐλεγχος, there arises a feeling of sin, which is always painful: thus every ἐλεγχος is a chastening, a punishment.' Compare Grote's life-like account of the Socratic Elenchus in his Hist. of Greece. This verse seems to be referred to in Can. Apost. vii. 4 οὗ μακροῦς πάντα ἀνθρωπῶν ἀλλ' οὐ μὲν ἐλέγξεις, οὔ δὲ ἐλέγχεις, περὶ δὲ προσεύξῃς, οὗ δὲ ἀναπήγγεις ὧν τὴν ψυχήν σου, which is also found in the Didache ii. 7 with the omission of οὐ δὲ ἐλέγχεις. Cf. Joh. 16:1 ἐκεῖνος ἐλέγξει τῶν κόσμων περὶ ἀμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως, 1 Cor. 14:24 ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντων (the effect of the prophets' teaching on an unbeliever), Tit. 1:13 ἐλέγχει αὐτοὺς ἀπότομον ἵνα γινανωσὶν ἐν τῇ πίστει, ἦν 10 τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχους, 2 Tim. 4:4 (the charge to Timothy) ἐλέγξον, παρακάλεσον ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ, Ἀρος. 3:10 διότι ἐὰν φιλῶ ἐλέγχω καὶ παιδεία, Eph. 5:3 τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐλέγχομεν ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός φανεροῦται. There is a tone of greater severity in the ποιήσας κρίσιν καὶ ἐλέγξας of the 15th verse, but even there we need not suppose that the preacher is hopeless of good being effected. The point is of importance in deciding the mutual relations of the three cases here considered.

διακρινομένος.] We should have expected a nominative here to correspond with ἄρπαζοντες and μοιοῦστες in the following clauses, and so the text. rec. has διακρινομένως wrongly translated in A.V., as if it were the active διακρίνοντες, 'making a difference.' This gives such a good sense that some commentators (e.g. Stier) have been willing to condone the bad Greek. It would have been better to alter the reading at once. Keeping the reading of the best MSS. we may either take the accusative as complementary to ἐλέγχετε (as we find in Plato Theaet. 171 ν ἐμὲ ἐλέγξας λυροῦστα, Xen. Mem. 1. 7. 2 ἐλέγχθησαν γελοίοσ ὡς, Jelf § 681), or simply as descriptive of the condition of the persons referred to. There is also a question as to the meaning we should assign to διακρ. Is it to be understood in the same sense as in James 1:24? In that case we might translate 'convict them of their want of faith,' taking the participle as complementary to the verb; or 'reprove them because of their doubts.' It seems more probable however that the meaning here is 'convince them when they dispute with you,' which we may compare with 1 P. 3:15 ἰδοὺμοι αἱ πρὸς ἀπολογοῦντα τῷ ἀποτύχοντες λόγον ... ἀλλὰ μετὰ πρασθηνος καὶ φοβοῦν (cf. ἐν φόβῳ belw). So taken, this first clause would refer to intellectual difficulties to be met by quiet reasoning; the force of διακρινομένως being the same as that in ver. 9 τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρ., and in Socr. E.H. v. 5 ὁ λαὸς ἐξεν ὁμόνοιαν καὶ σκέφτη πρὸς ἄλλους διακρίνοντο.

23. στέλεται.] Here again a word which is strictly applicable to God is transferred to him whom God uses as his instrument, cf. 1 Pet. 4:11 and notes on τρέφεται, ἐλέγχετε above, especially James 5:20 ὁ ἐπιστρέφας ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐκ πλάνης ὅδοι αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου.
The expression is borrowed from Amos 4:11 where God says, "κατέστρεψα ὑμᾶς καθὼς κατήστρεψαν ὁ Θεὸς Σοδόμα καὶ Γούμορρα, καὶ ἔγκατε οὕς δαλός ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός, καὶ οὐδὲ ἐπεστράψατε πρὸ μὲ, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ Ζεχ. 3:8 οὐκ ἤδουν οὗτος δαλός ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός.

Both passages have further connexions with our epistle, the former from the reference to Sodom (see above ver. 7), the latter as following immediately on the words ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος quoted in v. 9, and preceding a reference to filthy garments (see note below). In it the High Priest Joshua is a representative of Israel, saved like a brand from the captivity, which was the punishment of national sin. The image of fire is naturally suggested by the allusion to the punishment of Sodom in the passage of Amos, and of Korah (see above ver. 7) described in Numb. 16:35, Ps. 106:18 ἡκακαίη πῦρ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν καὶ φλὸς κατέφλεξεν ἀμαρτωλοῖς. The writer may also have had in mind St. Paul’s description of the building erected on the One Foundation (see above ver. 20), which, he says, will be tried by fire, 1 Cor. 3:13 ἵκαστον τὸ ἔργον ὅπως ἔστω τὸ πῦρ αὐτὸ δοκιμάζει... εἰ τινὸς τὸ ἔργον κατακαίησε, κατακαίησε, αὐτός δὲ σωθήσεται, οὗτος δὲ ὁ διὰ πυρός. Such an one might be spoken of ‘as a brand snatched from the fire,’ not however as here, saved from the fire of temptation, but as saved through the agency of God’s purgatorial fire, whether in this, or in a future life.

Διὰ τὸ ἐν φόβῳ.] Luther (quoted by Huther) understands this in the sense ‘lasst sie gehen... habt nichts mit ihnen zu schaffen,’ implying that the case is hopeless, and that there is nothing for bystanders to do but to watch their fate with awe and pity. Huther argues that this is against the use of δἰεος in the N.T. which expresses no mere passive impression, but active benevolence, cf. James 2:18, 19. The faithful are urged to show all possible tenderness for the fallen, but at the same time to have a fear lest they themselves or others whom they influence should be led to think too lightly of the sin whose ravages they are endeavouring to repair. Cf. 2 Cor. 7:1 καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἐπιστευόμενες ἀγιωτάτην ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ, Phil. 2:12, 1 P. 1:17, 3:15. For the confusion of the contracted verbs in -εω and -εω in late Greek see Janmatis § 850, § 854 foll., Winer p. 104. The best MSS. read δἰει in Prov. 21:28, and δἰεώντος Rom. 9:18, but δἰεἰ in Rom. 9:18.

κατέφλεξεν καὶ τὸν ἄπο τῇ σαρκί ἐσπλαγμένον κυτῶν.] While it is the duty of the Christian to pity and pray for the sinner, he must view with loathing all that bears traces of the sin. The form of expression seems borrowed from such passages as Isa. 30:12, Lev. 15:17, perhaps too from Zech. 3:14 Ἰσραήλ ἦν ἐνδεχόμενος ἵματι μυκαρα. Cf. Apost. 3:4 οὐκ ἐμάλλον τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτῶν, and Apostol. Pauli quoted by Spitta χιτῶν μονο σκιά ἐρυθρῆς. The derivatives of σπλαχνός are peculiar to late Greek: the only other examples of σπλαχνός in Biblical Greek are James 3:1 ἡ γλώσσα... ἡ σπλαχνά δὲ τὸ σῶμα καὶ Wisd. 15:4 εἰδος σπλαχνῶν χρωματι διηλαγμένων. Compare for the treatment of the erring 2 Tim. 2:25, 26 ἐν πράξειπτο πεπείσθη τοὺς ἀντιδιατεθέμενους μήποτε δύνατος ὁ Θεὸς μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀλθείας, καὶ ἀναγνώσας, εἰκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος.
24. τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξει ὁμᾶς ἀπαίτησιν. Apparently a reminiscence of Rom. 16:26 τῷ δὲ δυναμενῷ ὑμᾶς στηριζει ... μονεφαια Θεοὶ δὲ Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ ὃς δὲ δέξα ἐν τοῖς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. Similarly the noble doxology in Eph. 3:20 commences τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ. The reading ὑμᾶς is confirmed by the evidence of N and B, which were unknown to Alford when he endeavoured to defend the reading αὐτοῦ, found in K and some inferior MSS.

δυνάμεως.] Occurs in 3 Macc. 6:38 μεγαλοδόξω εὐφάναν τῷ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ δ τῶν ἀλων δυνάσθη ἀπαίτησιν αὐτοῦ ἐρρίσιστο: used here only in the N T. The verb παίσω has the same figurative sense in James 2:19, 3:2 εἰ τις ἔν λόγῳ οὐ παίσω, οὕτως τέλεως ἄνηρ, 2 P. 1:10 ταῦτα ποιοῦτες οὐ μὴ παλαιητέ ποτε.

στίς τα κατενώτων τῷ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ ἀμώμονοι εἰν ἀγαλλίασα.] Cf. Mt. 25:31-33 όταν δὲ Αληθὲς ὡς τοῦ αὐθίνου εἰν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ ... στίς τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δειμένων αὐτοῦ, Acts 6:8 οὗ ἐστησεν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνώτατῶν, Col. 1:12 παραστηθήσεται ὑμᾶς ἄγιος καὶ ἀμώμονος καὶ ἀνεκληνηθένιον κατενώτων αὐτοῦ which Lightfoot refers to present approbation rather than to the future judgment of God, comparing Rom. 14:22, 1 Cor. 1:29, 2 Cor. 2:7, 12, 2:12, 12:119. In the present passage the addition of the words τῆς δόξης shows that the final judgment, the goal of φυλάξει, is spoken of. Lightfoot remarks that ἀμώμονος is 'without blemish' rather than 'without blame,' being a sacrificial word like τέλεως and ἀλληλομερός. Hort gives a fuller account of the word in his interesting note on 1 P. 1:19 τιμῶν αἰματι ὡς ἀμώμονος καὶ ἀπρόθυμον Χριστοῦ, where he traces the way in which the words μῶς 'blame,' and ἀμώμος 'blemless,' come to be used (in 'the Apocrypha the N.T. and other books which presuppose the LXX.' in the entirely unclassical sense of 'blemish' and 'unblemished,' cf. Eph. 1:14, 57, Heb. 9:14. In 2 P. 3:14 ἀμώμης seems to be used in the same sense. The word κατενώτων is apparently confined to the Bible, where it occurs in Jos. 1:1, 21:14, Lev. 4:17, Eph. 1:6, ἀμώμους κατενώτων αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάθη: κατένωτα is found in Hom. Π. κυ. 320. For ἀγαλλίασι see Hott's n. on 1 P. 1:16 ὁ ἀγαλλίασθε 'in whom ye exult.' The verb with its cognate substantives is unknown except in the LXX. and the N.T. and the literature derived from them, and in the N.T. it is confined to books much influenced by O.T. diction (Mt., Lk., Acts, 1 P., Jude, Joh., including Apoc.), being absent from the more Greek writers, St. Paul, and (except in quota) Heb. ... It apparently denotes a proud exulting joy, being probably connected closely with ἀγάλλωμαι, properly "to be proud of," but often combined with ὡμαι and such words ... Clem Str. vi. p. 789 says τὴν δὲ ἀγαλλίασιν εὐφροσύνην ἐναὶ φαίμεν, ἐπιλογισμὸν οὕσαν τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀληθείαν ἀρετῆς διὰ τινος ἐσπάσας καὶ διαχειρίσεως ψυχῆς ... See also Str. vi. p. 815 εὐφρανθώμεν καὶ ἀγαλλιαθώμεν ἐν αὐτῇ τυπίστω ... τὴν θείαν ἑστίαν εὐχρησθήμεν, Dr. Chase notes that it occurs in Enoch 5:9 τὰ ἐκ τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτῶν πληρωθήσεται ἐν ἀγαλλίασι.

For the position and genuineness of this doxology see the Introduction and notes in Sanday and Headlam's commentary, and the dissertations by Lightfoot and Hort in the former's Biblical Essays, pp. 287-374.
25. μόνε Θεός σωτήρι ἡμῶν.] See above on ver. 4 τῶν μόνων διεστάθην. God is called σωτήρ in Is. 45:15 σὺ γὰρ εἶ Θεός, οὖν Θεός τοῦ Ἱσραήλ σωτήρ, ὁδ. ver. 21, Sir. 51 aινά atop σε Θεόν τὸν σωτήρα μου, Philo. Contibus. Ling. § 20, i, p. 418 βο. τίς σικ ἀν...πρὸς τὸν μόνον σωτήρα Θεόν ἐκβοήθησέν (ἀναι); cf. Lk. 1:17 ἡγαλλάσσεν τὸ πνεύμα μου ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ σωτήρι μου, elsewhere in N. T. only in Tit. 1:2, 2:10, 3:4 1τε ἡ χριστότης...ἐπεφάνῃ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Θεού...κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸν Θεός ἐσωθεὶν ἡμᾶς διὰ...πνεύματος ἁγίου ὦν ἐλέησεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλοῦν νόμο διὰ Ἰ. Χ. τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν, 1 Tim. 1:1 Παιλός ἀπόστολος Ἰ. Χ. καὶ ἐπιταγήν Θεοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χ. Ἰ. ib. 23, 4:10. The later writers of the N. T. seem to have felt it needful to insist upon the unity of God, and the saving will of the Father, in opposition to antinomian attacks on the Law.

καὶ Ἰσραήλ Χριστός:] It seems best to take διὰ with δόξα and the following words. The glory of God is manifested through the Word, cf. 1 Pet. 4:11 ὅταν πάντων δοξαζόμεθα ὁ Θεός διὰ Ὀ. Χ. ἡ ἡσυχία ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Σότε.] The verb is often omitted in these ascriptions, cf. 2 P. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα, Rom. 11:36, 16:27, Gal. 1:6, Lk. 2:16 δόξα ἐν ψυχίσφα Θεῷ. In 1 P. 4:11 it is inserted, ὁ ἡσυχία ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος, and, as we find no case in which ἠσυχία is inserted, and the indicative is more subject to ellipsis than the imperative, it might seem that we should supply ‘is’ here; but the R. V. gives ‘be,’ and there are similar phrases expressive of a wish or prayer, as the very common χάρις ἡμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς, where we must-supply ἔστω or γένοστα. De Wette maintained that the following words πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος, referring to already existing fact, were incompatible with a prayer; but it is sufficient that the prayer has regard mainly to the present and future: the past only comes in to give it a fuller, more joyful tone, reminding us of the eternity of God, as in the psalmist’s words, ‘I said it is my own infirmity, but I will remember the years of the right hand of the Most High,’ and the close of our own doxology ‘as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be.’ I do not see however that we need exclude either interpretation. The writer may exult in that which he believes to be already fact in the eternal world, and yet pray for its more perfect realization in time, as in the Lord’s Prayer γενηθήτω τὸ βαλήμα σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανίῳ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς. The omission of the verb allows either of both views in varying proportion. δόξα by itself is the commonest of all ascriptions. It is joined with τιμή in 1 Tim. 1:17 and elsewhere, as here with μεγαλωσύνη. It is joined with κράτος in 1 Pet. 4:11, 5:11, Apoc. 1:6. Fuller ascriptions are found in Apoc. 4:11 ἐξός εἶ, ὁ κύριος...λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν, 5:18 τῷ καθήμενῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ...ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, 7:12 ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ λογία τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν. Just before (ver. 10) we have the remarkable ascription ἡ σωτηρία τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν. Compare with this the ascription of David (1 Chron. 29:11) σοι Κύριε ἡ μεγαλωσύνη καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ τὸ καύχημα καὶ ἡ νίκη καὶ ἡ λογία, ὅτι σὺ πάντων τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς δεσπότεσσα. For a similar expression in regard to the future blessedness of man
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see Rom. 210 δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζόμενῳ τῷ ἀγαθῷ. An unusual form of ascription occurs in Clem. Rom. 65 ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μαθέως ὑμῶν καὶ μετὰ πάντων πανταχῇ τῶν κεκλημένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ δι’ αὐτοῦ δόξα, τιμή, κράτος καὶ μεγαλοσύνη, θρόνος αἰώνιος ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων.

μεγαλοσύνη. Only found elsewhere in N. T. in Heb. 13 εἰκάθισεν ἐν δεξίᾳ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης ἐν υψηλοῖς, repeated in 81. Dr. Chase notes that occurs in Enoch 54 κατελαθήσατε μεγάλους καὶ σκληροὺς λόγους ἐν στόματι ἀκαθαρσίας ὑμῶν κατὰ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης αὐτοῦ, 123 τῷ κυρίῳ τῇ μεγαλοσύνῃ, 1416 (a house excellently) ἐν δόξῃ καὶ ἐν τιμῇ καὶ ἐν μεγαλοσύνῃ. It is coupled with δόξα, of which it may be regarded as an extension, in the doxology used by Clem. Rom. 20, 61. I am not aware of any other example of ἐξουσία in a doxology: compare however Matt, 2818 δόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.

πρὸ παντὸς τῶν αἰώνων.] Cf. 1 Cor. 27 (τὴν σοφίαν ἢ προώρισεν ὁ Θεός πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν, Prov. 822 πρὸ τοῦ αἰώνος ἐκμελεῖσά με (ἰ.σοφίαν), ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τῆς γῆς ποιήσαι. An equivalent expression is πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου found in Joh. 1724 ἡγάπησάς με π. κ. κ. also Eph. 14 εξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ π. κ. κ. and 1 Pet. 120 (Χριστοῦ) προεγνωσμένον μὲν π. κ. κ., φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπὶ ἐσχάτῳ τῶν χρόνων. St. Jude speaks of one past age and of several ages to come. On the other hand St. Paul speaks of many ages in the past (1 Cor. 27), and St. John of only one age in the future.

eis τῶν αἰώνων.] This precise phrase is unique in the Bible, but εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας is common enough, as in Lk. 138, Rom. 132, 54, 1138, 1637, 2 Cor. 1181, etc., so in LXX. Dan. 244, 66. 20. The stronger phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων occurs in Gal. 15, Phil. 420, 1 Tim. 117, 2 Tim. 418, Heb. 1321, 1 P. 411, 511, Apec. 16, etc. John uses only εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα apparently with the same meaning. Other variations are found in Eph. 321 αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χ., 1. εἰς πάσας τὰς γενέας τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων, 2 P. 318 αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰώνων.

1 For a full account of the early doxologies see Chase on the Lord’s Prayer (Texts and Studies, i. 3. p. 68 foll.). He states that the common doxology at the end of the Lord’s Prayer (στό ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας ‘appears to be a conflation of two distinct forms,’ and ‘was added to the Prayer in the “Syrian” text of St. Matthew’s Gospel.’
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φθινοτορινός.¹

The force of this word seems to me to have been generally mis-understood by the commentators on Jude¹², δὲνδρα φθινοτορινὰ ἀκαρπα δίς ἀπολανόωνα ἐκρυβόλεντα, where the A.V. has 'trees whose fruit withereth,' corrected in R.V. to 'autumn trees.' The former interpretation is retained in Weymouth's 'trees that cast their fruit' (The N.T. in Modern Speech) and in Stier's 'frugi perdae,' 'fruchtverderbenden.' It is not denied that this is an entirely unexmpled use of the word, but it is thought to be justified by the etymology, as illustrated by the parallel ἔρις φθινόκαρπος (Pindar, P. iv. 471) used of a tree which sheds its fruits before they ripen, and φθινοτορις ἀνέμων χειμερίς καταπνοά (Pindar, P. v. 161), 'the fruit-withering blast of stormy winds,' also by ἱερας ἀλεοῦκαρποι (Od. x. 510). There can be no doubt however that φθινοτορινός is an adjective² derived from τὸ φθινόπωρον, which is itself, I think, best explained as a compound of φθινοῦσα ὀπόρα (cf. φθινοῦσης μηνός), meaning the concluding portion of the ὀπόρα. This latter word is, according to Curtius, compounded of ὀπό-, connected with ὀπίως, ὀπωσθείν, and ὀπα = 'the later prime.' We find ὀπα used by itself both for the spring with its flowers and, more rarely, for the summer with its fruits, as in Thuc. ii. 52, ὀπα ἐνοῦ. Perhaps from this double use of the word may have come the ambiguity in the application of ὀπόρα, of which Ideler says that 'it originally indicated, not a season separate from and following after the summer, but the hottest part of the summer itself, so that Sirius, whose heliacal rising took place (in the age of Homer) about the middle of July, is described as ἀστήρ ὀπωρινὸς Ἰ. v. 5).' In early times it would seem that the Greeks, like the Germans (Tac. Germ. 26),

¹ In writing this paper I have made use of the article on Astronomia in the D. of Ant., Ideler's Handb. d. Chronologie, G. F. Unger on Zeitrechnung in Iwan Müller's Handb. d. klas. Altertumswiss. vol. i. p. 561, and Ruehl's ed. of Schmidt's Griech. Chronologie, pp. 475-81. For the knowledge of the two latter I am indebted to Dr. Gow.

² Dr. Gow reminds me that the termination -ως (so accented) is almost confined to adjectives of time, as ἀπρως, θενως, χειμωνως, δελως, κατανως. The two apparent exceptions (πεινως, ἄλητως) are perhaps of different formation, cf. Brugmann, Grundriss der Verrl. Gramm. ii. pp. 135, 147.
recognized only three seasons—winter, spring, summer; and that the last was indifferently named ἥρως or ὀπώρα: compare Arist. Ἀνες 709, πρώτα μὲν ὁπάρα φανονεύ ἡμείς ἥρως, χειμῶν, ὀπώρας, with Aesch. Ἑρων. 453, ὃν δ' οὖν αὐτοῖς οὖτε χείματος τέκμαρ οὐ' ἀνθειμόδους ἥρως οὐτε καρπήμον τέρμους βέβαιων. But though ὀπώρα was thus used strictly for the dog-days, when the fruit ripened, it was also vaguely used for the unnamed period which ensued up to the commencement of winter. Thus Hesiod (Op. 674) μηδὲ μένειν νῦν τε νῦν καὶ ὀπωρῶν ὄμμον καὶ χειμῶν ἐπώντα: and ὀπώρα appears as a definite season by the side of the others in a line of Euripides, quoted by Plutarch (Mor. 1028 ρ), from which it appears that he assigned four months each to summer and winter, and two to spring and ὀπώρα

(see the epithet ἄρας διάτικος ἥρως τ' ἱστος (where the epithet ἄρας deservers notice). It is said that the author of the treatise De Diaeta (c. 420 B.C.), which goes under the name of Hippocrates, was the first to introduce a definite term (ὑμνόσωρον or μετόπωρον) for the new season, the word ὀπώρα being reserved for the late summer, according to the definition of Eustath. on Π. ν. 5, ὀπώρα ἄρα μεταξ' κειμένη θέρους καὶ τοῦ μετ' αὐτὴν μετόπωρου. And so we find it used by Aristotle (Meteor. ii. 5) αἱ χάλαξε γίνονται ἡρῶς μὲν καὶ μετόπωρον μᾶλλον, ἐνα καὶ τῆς ὀπώρας, χειμῶνος δὲ ὄλγαδις, and by Theophrastus (περὶ Σχεμεῖων, 44) ἵνα τοῦ δια καὶ τὸ θέρος ψυχαρ γίνησί, ἢ ὀπώρα γίνεται καὶ τὸ μετόπωρον πνεγῥόν.

There is a good deal of inconsistency about the exact limits of the seasons, as is natural enough when we remember that they were first distinguished for purposes of agriculture and navigation, as we see in Hesiod’s Works and Days. Each season brings its own proper work, and the farmer or merchant is reminded of the return of the season by various signs, the rising and setting of stars, especially of the Pleiades and Arcturus, the sun’s passage through the signs of the zodiac, the reappearance of the birds, etc. A more strictly accurate division was made by the astronomers, who distinguished between the various kinds of rising and setting of the stars, and divided the year into four equal parts by the solstices and equinoxes. In the year 46 B.C. Julius Caesar introduced his revised calendar, which assigned definite dates to the different seasons. Thus spring begins a.d. vii. id. Feb. (Feb. 7), summer a.d. vii. id. Mai. (May 9), autumn a.d. iii. id. Set. (Aug. 11), winter a.d. iv. id. Nov. (Nov. 10).

Taking then the Julian calendar as our standard, as it was no doubt

---

1 Ungor (p. 560) mentions others who shared this view. Among them, as will be seen, is the author of the De Diaeta.

2 The word μετόπωρον is found in our present text of Hesiod (Op. 415), μετόπωρον ὄμμον αὐτῆς τῆς ἁμένων Ζωράς.

3 Ptolemy, Appar. (quoted by Schmidt) gives the limits of the ὀπώρα as follows: 21 July, ὀπώρα ἄρχη; 15 September, μετόπωρον ἀρχή.

4 See Varro, R.R. i. 28 (where Keil quotes Theoponics, i. 1, 3, μετόπωρον ἀρχήθαι ἀρχηθαί τῇ προ ἡς εἰνδοὺ Ἀθηνῶν, ἡλικι ὠντας ἐν λεοντί); Columella, R.R. xi. 2, 57, 84; Flin. N.H. xvi. 68. 7; Ov. Fasti, ed. Peter, pp. 20–22.
the generally accepted standard of the Roman world, we find that
autumn begins on August 11 and ends on November 10. There are
however other reckonings which it may be worth while to compare
with this. Thus in the Diaeta we read (p. 366, 38) φθινόπωρον ἀπὸ
Ἀρκτοῦρον (i.e. his morning rising about Sept. 15) µέχρι Πλειάδων
dύσεως (the morning setting about Nov. 9), giving less than two
months to this season. As the same treatise (Bk. iii. init.) says τὸν
ἔναυτὸν ἐς τὸν πάσαρα μέρα διαρροῦν, ἀπερ μάλιστα γυνόκοραιν οἱ τολλοί
. . . ἐστὶν οὗτος ἤσμερερής (March 21) µέχρι Πλειάδων ἑπτολῆς (May 10),
his summer must have extended over more than four months. Another
reckoning was that from the autumnal equinox, φθινοπωρίνα ἤσμερεια,
(Polyb. iv. 37. 2, Plut. Ant. V. 40), to the solstice Sept. 22 to
Dec. 22. This does not seem to have been in such common use: the
only Latin authority quoted for it in De Vit's Forcellini (a.v.
'Autumnus') is Ulp. Dig. 43. 20. 1, § 32, 'aestatem incipere sic
peritiores (I the astronomers) ab aequinoctio verno, et finiri aequinoctio
autumnali, et its sensis mensibus aetas atque hiems dividitur,' and even
here it is only stated that summer ends on the autumnal equinox,
autumn and spring being entirely omitted. Yet Lewis and Short give
this as though it were the only reckoning for autumn, while they
further confuse the student by the statement that the Pleiades set on
December 22 (instead of Nov. 9). Hesychius, quoted both by
Stephanus and by Roet and Palm under φθινόπωρος, has the following
blundering account of its duration, ἀπὸ τῆς πεντεκαίδεκας Ἀγαύωστου
μνήσι τῆς πεντεκαίδεκας Δεκεμβρίου, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἑκαοτῆς δευτέρας
Ἀγαύωστου ἐς τάλιν ἑκαοτῆς δευτέρας Δεκεμβρίου. Here it will be
noticed that both reckonings give four months for autumn; and that,
while the second reckoning agrees with the astronomers in ending the
season with the winter solstice, it does not begin with the equinox. I
think therefore that we should change the latter Ἀγαύωστος to Σεπτεμ-
βρίων. [Since this was written I find that the same change is suggested
by Unger.] If we make a similar correction in the earlier part of the
sentence, changing the former Δεκεμβρίου to Νοεμβρίου, we get the
ordinary agricultural reckoning.

To turn now to the commentators, I may take Trench as represent-
ing their view in his Authorised Version, p. 186, ed. 2, where he
says, 'The φθινόπωρον is the late autumn . . . which succeeds the
δεύμα (or the autumn contemplated as the time of the ripened fruits
of the earth) and which has its name παρὰ τὸ φθινοποιεῖ τὴν ὅμωραν,
from the waning away of the autumn and the autumn fruits . . .
The deceivers of whom St. Jude speaks are likened to trees as they
show in late autumn, when foliage and fruit alike are gone.'

I have stated above what I hold to be the origin of the word
φθινόπωρον. Trench's explanation is ambiguous and unsuited to the
facts of the case, as will be seen from the criticisms in Lightfoot's
Fresh Revision, p. 135: 'In the phrase "autumn-trees without fruit,"
there appears to be a reference to the parable of the fig-tree . . .
At all events the mention of the season when fruit might be expected
is significant.' He adds in a note, 'Strange to say, the earliest
versions all rendered ἁκαρπα ἁκαρπα correctly. Tyndale's instinct led him to give what I cannot but think the right turn to the expression, "Trees with out frute at gadringe (gathering) time," i.e. at the season when fruit was looked for. I cannot agree with Archbishop Trench, who maintains that "Tyndale was feeling after, though he has not grasped, the right translation," and himself explains ἁκαρπα ἁκαρπα as "mutually completing one another, without leaves, without fruit." Tyndale was followed by Coverdale and the Great Bible. Similarly Wycliffe has "harvest trees without fruyt," and the Rheims version "trees of autumnne unfruiteful." The earliest offender is the Geneva Testament, which gives "corrupt trees and without frute." . . .

The Bishops' Bible strangely combines both renderings, "trees withered (φθινω) at fruite gathering (δισώρα) and without fruite," which is explained in the margin, "Trees withered in autumnne when the fruite harvest is, and so the Greke woord importeth."

The correctness of the interpretation, given by Lightfoot alone among modern commentators, is confirmed by a consideration of the context. The writer has just been comparing the innovators, who have crept into other Churches, to waterless clouds driven past by the wind. Just as these disappoint the hope of the husbandman, so do fruitless trees in the proper season of fruit. If φθινω were equivalent to χειμωνικά, denoting the season when the trees are necessarily bare both of leaves and fruit, how could a tree be blamed for being ἁκαρπον? It is because it might have been, and ought to have been a fruit-bearing tree, that it is rooted up.

If we follow the Julian calendar, Trench's interpretation is evidently impossible. Even if we suppose St. Jude to have been familiar with the scientific calendar, which makes autumn begin with the equinox; since leaves and fruits would even then not be cleared from the trees till autumn was more than half through; and since the first part of the compound φθινωμένον has already spent its force in the change from the dog-days (δισώρα) to the autumn, and cannot act again (as Trench supposes) to change autumn into late-autumn, it follows that φθινωμένον would have been a most unsuitable word to express the barreness of winter. How unsuitable it would have been, how little corresponding to the Spätberbat and senescens autumnus of the commentators, will be evident from the way in which autumn is spoken of in the Greek romances. The scene of Longus' Pastoralia is laid in this season: in i. 30 he speaks of the temperature as ἐν τῇ ὅραι ὀντις καμακάβων, in i. 28 of the ripening of the grapes, μετοπώρων ἀκαμάκαβως καὶ τοῦ βότρυνος. At the beginning of Book ii. the vintage is described, and in the third chapter we are introduced to a shepherd who speaks of the produce of his garden at different seasons, ἔρηκε ὀᾶς, κρίνα . . . θερόν μῆκον καὶ μῆλα τάπτα: νῦν ἄμπελον καὶ συκαὶ καὶ ὅιαλ καὶ μύρτα χλωρά. Similarly Philostratus (Heroic. i. 5, 6, p. 663) dwells on the delights of autumn, ὡς ποικίλη σοι

1 This agreement is probably owing to their dependence on the Vulgate "avōres autumnales infructuosae."
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ή ἀρα καὶ ὡς ἐκδεδώκασιν ιλαροὶ οἱ βότρυες, τὰ δένδρα θ' ὡς διάκειται τάντα καὶ ὡς ἀμβροσία ἡ φύη τοῦ χωρίου. We may compare the saying attributed to Euripides (Ael. V.H. xiii. 4), οὐ μόνον τὸ ἐκ τῶν καλῶν κάλλιστον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ μετόπωρον; Hor. C. iv. 7. 11, pomifer autumnus fruges effuderit, Epod. ii. 17 decorum mitibus pomis caput autumnus agris extulit; Macrobius (Somn. Scip. i. 20. 6) mollities autumnalis aurae.
EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE

PARAPHRASE AND COMMENTS

Salutation (vv. 1, 2).

Jude a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James, to those who have received the divine calling, beloved of the Father, kept safe in Jesus Christ. May mercy, peace, and love be richly poured out upon you!

Mercy and love are spoken of again at the end of the Epistle (v. 21) where the readers are bidden to keep themselves in the love of God, awaiting the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ for life eternal. The thought of peace is present to the writer’s mind throughout the Epistle, while he utters his warning against the enemies of union who walk according to their own lusts and have not the Spirit (vv. 18, 19). In contrast to these, his readers are urged to keep fast hold of peace and to build themselves up on their most holy faith, praying in the Spirit and using every effort to help and save those who are in danger of falling away (vv. 20–23), always looking to Him who is able to keep them from stumbling and present them before His presence without spot.

Reasons for Writing (vv. 3, 4).

He had been intending to write to them on that which is the common interest of all Christians, salvation through Christ, but was compelled to abandon his intention by news which had reached him of a special danger\footnote{For this see the Introduction on Early Heresies.} threatening the Gospel once for all delivered to the Church. His duty now was to stir up the faithful to defend their faith against insidious assaults, long ago foretold in ancient prophecy, of impious men who should change the doctrine of God’s
free grace into an excuse for licentiousness, and deny the only Master and our Lord Jesus Christ.

\[\text{πάσαν στοιχὴν ποιούμενος.}\]

It was not to have been a mere extemporized effusion, but a well thought out treatise. Such were the epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews, and such, as we learn from his preface, was St. Luke's intention in preparing his Gospel. Nor were his readers to be mere passive recipients of an impression from without. They were to contend for the faith (v. 3), to build themselves up upon it (v. 20), to keep themselves in the love of God (v. 21), to use every effort to save those who were in danger of falling away (vv. 22 f.).

**The Faith once for all delivered to the Saints.**

One or two references have been given in the explanatory note to illustrate the idea of a Christian tradition. It may be well here to adduce further evidence as to (1) the fact, and (2) the contents of such a tradition.

(1 a) That there was a recognized tradition or traditions (\(\piαράδοσις\), \(\piαράδοσεις\)) in the Apostolic age, appears from 2 Th. 2:15 κατά τὰς παράδοσεις δὲ ἐνδιάχυτε εἰτε διὰ λόγου εἰτε δι’ ἑπιστολῆς ἡμῶν, ἤβ. 3:6 κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἦν παρελάβετε παρ’ ἡμῶν, 1 Cor. 11:2 καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παράδοσεις κατέγραψα. In contrast with this there was a Jewish παράδοσις of which we read (Mt. 15:7) ἠκούσατε τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἡμῶν, Mk. 7:8 ἠφέντες τὴν ἑπιστολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ κατέγραψε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Gal. 1:14 ἦλθεν ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μοι παραδόσεως, and also such oral traditions as those to which the Christianized Essenes of Colossae made their appeal, see Col. 2:2 κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων with Lightfoot's note. The cognate verb was similarly used, as in 1 Cor. 11:2 quoted above, ἤβ. v. 23 παρέλαβον ἄποικος δὲ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν (viz. the institution of the Eucharist), ἤβ. 15:8 παρέδωκα γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐν πρώτοις δὲ καὶ παρέλαβον (viz. the Resurrection of Christ), Lk. 1:2 καθὼς παρέδωκαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἄπ’ ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, 2 P. 2:2 ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείας αὐτοῖς ἄγίας ἑπιστολῆς.

1 A remarkable instance of the passive used of a person is given under (1 b).
The converse term to παραδίδωμι is παραλαμβάνω, of which some examples have already been given (2 Th. 3ν, 1 Cor. 11λς, 15α, Gal. 1λς); others are Mk. 7ν (of Jewish tradition) ἄλλα πολλά ἐστιν το παρέλαβαν κρατεῖν, 1 Cor. 15δ τὸ εἰσαγγελέον δὲ ἐνεγκελεσμένων ὡμί, δὲ καὶ παρελάβετε, . . . δὲ οὐ καὶ σώζετε, Gal. 1ε ἐὰν τὰς ὥμας εἰσαγγελίζεται παρ' ἐμοὶ παρέλαβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἐστώ, Phil. 4δ καὶ ἐμάθετε καὶ παρέλαβετε καὶ ἴκνουσαι καὶ εἴδετε ἐν ἑμῖν, ταύτα πράσσετε, Col. 2δ ὡς παρελάβετε τον Χριστὸν, ἐν αὐτῷ πεπιστάτε, 1 Th. 2λς παραλαβώντες λόγον ἁκούτε παρ' ἦμων τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγου ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ, καθὼς ἀληθῶς ἐστιν, λόγον Θεοῦ, id. 4λ παρακαλοῦμεν ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα καθὼς παρελάβατε παρ' ἦμων τὸ πόσ δὲι ὑμᾶς πεπιστάτε . . . ὡς πεπιστήσατε μᾶλλον.

(1b) It is a definite type of teaching, cf. Rom. 6λτ ὑπηκούσατε ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ἐν παρεδόθη τῷ τῶν διακριθείτο, Rom. 16λπαλαμβάνω ὑμᾶς σκοτέντων τοὺς τὰς δισχορρασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διδαχήν, ἡν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε, τοιούτοις, 1 Cor. 11λκ ήμεῖς των ἑυπόθεν τινήθησαι οὐκ ἔχομεν, οὐδὲ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ Θεοῦ, Gal. 15 'though we or an angel from heaven should preach to you any other Gospel, let him be anathema,' 2 Cor. 11λ, 2 Tim. 1λς ἰστιντίποσαν ὑμᾶς ὑγιανόντων λόγων ἐν παρ' ἐμοὶ ἴκνουσαι εἰς τόπον, 1 Tim. 1λς ἵνα παραγγελήσως τοῖς μὰ ἐπέρευσανταί, 1 Tim. 4λ ἐπεφέρομεν τοῖς λόγοις τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας ἡ παρεκκλησία, 2 Tim. 3λς σὺ δὲ μὲν ἐν ὀς ἔμαθες καὶ ἐπιστώτης, εἰκὸς παρὰ τῶν ἔμαθες, Tit. 1λ τοῦ κηρύγμα, δ' ἐπιστέφθη τοῦ καθῆς ἔθετο, ἵνα ἴκνουσαι καὶ ἕρπος διδάσκαι.

(1c) Sometimes it is spoken of as a deposit (παραθήκης, παραθηκημένος), cf. 1 Tim. 6λος δ Τμαθεῖτε, τὴν παραθήκην τοῦ ἡμᾶς, ἐκτετράμενοι τοῖς βεβηθοσιν κενοφυσίας, 2 Tim. 1λκ τῆς καλῆς παραθήκης τοῦ ἡμᾶς διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο, 1 Tim. 1λς τῶν τῆς παραγγελίας παραθηκήματος οὗ, 2 Tim. 2λς δ' ἴκνουσας παρ' ἐμοί ... ταῖν παράδον πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐκεῖνοι ἴκνονται καὶ ἔρχεται διδάσκαι.

(1d) In the pastoral epistles we also meet such phrases as ὑγιαίνων, πιστοῖς λόγοις οἰ διδασκαλία, cf. 1 Tim. 1λς οί τῇ ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία ἀντικείται κατὰ τὸ εἰσαγγελέον . . . δ' ἐπιστεύθη τοῦ ἴκνος, id. 6λκ οἳ τὸ ἐπερεύσαντας καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαίνουσας λόγοις τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῇ κατ' ἐνεργείας διδασκαλίας, τετυφωμένοι, 2 Tim. 4λς τῆς ὑγιαίνουσας διδασκαλίας οὐκ ἴκνονται ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἔκθεσις ἐπιστῶμας έπενθευσάτων διδασκάλους, Tit. 1λς ἐπενθυμοῦς τοῦ κατὰ διδασκαλία πιστοῦ λόγον, οὐ δυνατός γὰρ καὶ παρακαλεῖ εἰς τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ἐν εὐθείᾳ διδασκαλίᾳ, τετυφωμένος, 2 Tim. 2λς λόγον ἴκνος ἀκατάγγειλον. The phrase πιστοῦς τοῦ λόγου is used with more freedom, sometimes with reference to salvation through Christ, as 1 Tim. 1λκ, sometimes of a proverb or maxim, as apparently in 1 Tim. 3λ εἰ τῶς ἐπισκόπης ὁρεύεται, καλὸς ἔργου ἐπισκευαζεί.

(2) A comparison with the parallel passage in 2 P. 2λτι suggests that this tradition had two sides: Jude speaks of it as πιστίς, teaching what we should believe, Peter as ἔνσωμα, teaching what we should do. We have the same two sides brought out in the Baptistical Service and Church Catechism.

(2a) St. Paul gives briefly the contents of the tradition in 1 Cor. 12λτ.
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3] [Text in Greek]

He speaks of it as 'the ministry of reconciliation (τὴν διακοινίαν τῆς κατάλλαγῆς) that God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself,' 2 Cor. 5:18. So in 1 Tim. 112 πιστὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἢς, ὅτι Χριστός Ἰησοῦς ἠλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἀμαρτημάτως σώσας, and still more briefly in Rom. 10:13, τούτ' ἐστιν τὸ βήμα τῆς πίστεως ἡ κηρύσσομεν ὅτι, ἐὰν ἤμολογησή τοῦ μήμα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησούς, καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ο Ὀρθος αὐτὸν ἤμειν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ, 1 Cor. 128 οὕδεις δύναται εἰπεῖν Κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν μη ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ. Much to the same effect St. John says (1 Jo. 4:2) τὰς πνεύματα δ' ὤμολογεῖ ἸΧ. ἐν σαρκὶ ἡλιθιότα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν, of which the converse is given in 2 Jo.7, πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἔξηθαν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οἱ µη ὤμολογούντες ἸΧ. ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί. We may compare Dr. Armitage Robinson on Eph. 5:26. 'The confession ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς was the shortest and simplest statement of Christian faith (compare Acts 1631 πιστευον ἐπί τῶν Κύριων Ἰησοῦς καὶ σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ ὁ ὁλοκληρωμένος σοῦ . . .). That some confession was required before baptism is seen from the early glosses on the baptism of the eunuch, Acts 8:37, and that this soon took the form of question and answer (ἐπικρήτημα) is suggested by 1 Pet. 3:21, where the context contains phrases which correspond with the baptismal creed of the second century. We may go back to our Lord Himself as sanctioning this tradition in his commendation of Peter's answer (ὁ εἶς ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱός τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζωτος). ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀυτῷ Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων Βαπτιστής, ὅτι σάρκι καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψεν σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς κἀγὼ δὲ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺν εἰς Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πτέρᾳ οἰκοδομήσῃ μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (Mt. 16:16). Compare 1 Cor. 1211 θεμέλιον ἄλλον οὕδεις δύναται θείως παρὰ τὸν κείμενον, ὅτι ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς.

(2) But the tradition also included rules of action. Thus in 2 Th. 3:6 St. Paul warns his converts στέλλουσαν ἂν παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ ἀσάκτους περιστατόντος καὶ µη κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἑν παρέλαβε τε παρ᾽ ἡμῶν. His own conduct was to be a τύπος to them (ib. ver. 9). See also Rom. 6:17 ἡ καρδία τῆς Θεοῦ ὅτι ἔχει διαθήκην τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ὑποκύπτεται ὡς ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὡς παρεξεύρητο τόπον διδαχῆς, ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἐδούλωσατε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. As the nucleus of the tradition in regard to faith was belief in the Father's love manifested in His Son, so the nucleus of the tradition in regard to practice was the love which is the fulfilling of the law (Rom. 13:10), that love, of which St. John says (1 Jo. 3:11) αὕτη ἔστιν ἡ ἀγάπη ἡ ἡκουσάτη ἐπὶ ἀρχής, ἢν ἀγαπῶν ἄλληλους, to which he refers again in 3:23 as the command of Jesus Christ. Thus the ethical, as well as the doctrinal tradition is derived from the teaching of Christ Himself, not only from His sanction of the old commandment (Mt. 22:40), but also from the words reported by St. John, (13:24) ἐντολήν καὶ ἐν διδάσκον ὑμῖν ἢν ἀγαπᾶτε ἄλληλους, καθὼς ἡ γάπησα ὑμῖν, ἢν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἠγαπᾶτε ἄλληλους, to which the Apostle refers in 1 Jo. 2:24.
as in 1 Cor. 11:1 ἐπανῶ ὑμᾶς ὅτι . . . καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε: but immediately afterwards St. Paul proceeds to point out that there were exceptions to their obedience. Thus women take part in public worship with uncovered heads (1 Cor. 11:3) and venture to speak in the congregation (1 Cor. 14:34). He settles the former question summarily by appeal to the universal practice of the Churches (11:10), the latter by appeal to a Κυρίῳ ἐντολή (14:37).

It may be worth while here to consider some of the terms which are used to express the contents of the παραδόσεις, and we will begin with ἐντολή. This is used of the Mosaic law in the synoptists and in the epistles to the Romans and Hebrews. In St. John's writings it is mostly used of the Father's will as revealed in the Son, e.g. 10:18 the 'power to lay down His life and take it again' is spoken of as an ἐντολή from the Father: iδ. 12:49, 50, My Father has given Me an ἐντολή τῇ ἐπι καὶ τῇ λαλήσει καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἡ ἐντολή αὐτοῦ ζωή αἰωνίως ἐστιν: also of a command of our Lord, iδ. 13:34 ἐντολὴν καὶνὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, 1 Joh. 4:20. The widest significance of the term is found in 1 Joh. 3:22 αὕτη ἡ ἐντολή αὐτοῦ, ἵνα πιστεύσωμε τῷ ὑιῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, on which Westcott comments 'The things that are pleasing, the many commandments (of the previous verse) are summed up in one commandment, which includes faith and practice, the power of action and the form of action, faith, and love.' In 1 Cor. 7:19 the τήρησις ἐντολῶν Θεοῦ is distinguished from the ceremonial law. In 1 Tim. 6:14 τήρησαι σε τὴν ἐντολὴν ἀσπιλον μέχρι τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ κυρίου, it is used, as Alford says, 'not to designate any special command . . . but as a general compendium of the rule of the Gospel, after which our lives and thoughts must be regulated.' In 2 Pet. it occurs twice, in 21 already quoted under παραδόσα, and 3:24 μνησθῇς τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολής τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος, implying that the Lord spoke through his apostles; and so, apparently, in 1 Cor. 14:37, where St. Paul calls upon the prophets and the spiritual to acknowledge that in his decisions on various points of discipline, he is uttering a Κυρίων ἐντολή. Sometimes it is used of instructions about persons (Col. 4:10): sometimes of rules laid down by men and condemned by the Apostle (Col. 2:22, τὰ ἐνταλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Tit. 1:12 μὴ προσέχωτε Ἰουδαίκοις μίθους καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφομένων τῆν ἀλήθειαν).

A similar word is παραγγελία found in 1 Th. 4:2 οἴδατε τίνας παραγγελίας ἔδωκαμεν ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (warnings against impurity as appears from the context), 1 Tim. 1:6 δὲ τὸ δὲ τὸς ἐνταλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας ἐστὶν ἀγαθή, iδ. 118 τὴν παραγγελίαν παρατίθεμαι σοι . . . ἵνα στρατεύῃ τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν, and so παραγγελία.

A more important word is ἔφαγείλον, the good news of the kingdom, as it is called in Mt. 4:23, etc., the good news of Jesus Christ (Mt. 11), of God (Mk. 14); men are called to believe in it (Mk. 11), to sacrifice home and life for it (Mk. 10:29, 84); it is to be preached to all nations (Mk. 13:10, Mt. 24:14). Paul was especially called to bear witness of the good news of the grace of God to the Gentiles (Acts 20:24, Gal. 2:7). He speaks of it as ἡμεῖς or our Gospel, Rom. 2:16, where it is said to
include the coming of Christ to judge the world, id. 1625 τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ στρατεύειν ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰ.Χ. κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου... εἰς ὑπάκοιν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἱθὺν γνωσιςθέντας, 2 Cor. 4:25 τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας συμπαράκειται ἐλαττῶν πρὸς πάσαν συνεδρίαν ἀνθρώπων ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, εἰ τοὺς ἀποκαλυμμένους ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένου, ἐν ὅς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τουτοῦ ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπόστων εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσας τῶν φωτισμῶν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα ἐστὶν εἰκὼν Θεοῦ. οὐ γὰρ ἐαυτῶν κρίσιμον ἀλλὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν Κυρίον, 1 Th. 1:6 τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔγενετο εἰς υἱὸν ἐν λόγῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἄγιος καὶ πληροφορίᾳ πόλλῃ, 2 Th. 2:13 εἰπὼν ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἄρ' ἄρχῃ εἰς σωτηρίαν τὸν ἀγιασμὸν πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας εἰς τὸ ἐκάλεσαι υἱὸν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἡμῶν, 2 Tim. 2:8 μημόριεν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐγηγερμένον εκ νεκρῶν, εκ στήριμας Δαυίδ, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίον μου. Ἡ nature is further shown by Rom. 10:9 τούτῳ ἔστω τὸ ρῆμα τῆς πίστεως εἰς κρίσιμον. σὺν τῶν ὑμῶν συνεδρίας ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι οὐκ ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν ἔγραψεν εκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ. From this and other passages it appears that, while the distinctive feature of St. Paul's Gospel was the thought that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, and that he who thoroughly believed this died with Christ to sin and was raised with Him to newness of life (which he sometimes speaks of as an immediate revelation to himself) yet it included the thought of final judgment and the more ordinary topics dwelt upon by the earlier preachers of the Gospel. Nor need we suppose that when he speaks of 'my gospel' he is always thinking of a difference of subject or contents: he thinks sometimes of the difference of hearers, as when he says πεπίστευμεν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιομῆς (Gal. 27). It would take too long to go through other terms which are employed to express the new message of salvation, such as ἀληθεία, κηρύγμα, τὸ ρῆμα, τὰ ρήματα, ἡ, ἐπίτε, λόγος, πίστει.

(3) When St. Jude speaks of defending the faith once delivered to the saints, and of his readers building up themselves on their most holy faith (ver. 20), he refers of course, not to any matter of detail, not to rules enacted for a temporary purpose, such as the decisions of the Council of Jerusalem, but to the very foundation of all Christian teaching laid down once for all.

This may be regarded as a definition of Christianity—'the Christian is he who believes that Christ is Lord'—, or it may be regarded as the minimum required in the way of Christian belief. It is also the seed or starting point, as well as the rule or canon of an endless development. In all ways, in feeling, in understanding, in action, in character,—growth, moral, intellectual, and spiritual is of the essence of the kingdom of Heaven, whether it appear in the individual or in the community. Thus St. Peter says 'grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour' (2 P. 3:18) and St. Paul 'one thing I do, forgetting the things that are behind and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on towards the goal.
unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus' (Phil. 3:14). And again, he declares it to be his aim γνῶναι αὐτὸν (not simply 'know,' but 'recognize' 'feel' 'appropriate' L.) καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ (Phil. 3:10). Hence in St. Paul's epistles and elsewhere we find allusions to a higher teaching, a wisdom not of this world, strong meat suited for those that are mature, as opposed to the milk which is proper for infants (1 Cor. 2:6, 7, 3:1, 2, Heb. 5:12-14). Our Lord enjoins that every scribe instructed into the kingdom of heaven should bring forth out of his treasure things new as well as old (Mt. 13:52); and St. Peter, in reminding his readers that they are all stewards of the manifold grace of God, bids those who speak in their words should be as it were oracles of God (1 P. 3:11). The whole constitution of the Church, all its offices and all its ministers are εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐνεργώσεως τοῦ νοὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡμεῖς τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Eph. 4:12, 13). So too our Lord looking forward to the future says εἰς πολλὰ ἐκ πολλῶν λέγειν, ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθαι βαστάζειν ἅρμαν ὅπως ἢ ἐκείνου, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ἐφηγήσει ῥᾴδιας εἰς τὴν ἀληθείαν πᾶσαν (Joh. 16:12, 13), and in his final charge ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμί πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἐστὶς τὴς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. We must beware therefore of laying too great a stress on the ἐπαξ of Jude, as though it forbade us to look for any further accession to the faith or knowledge of Christians in the future. Jesus Christ has once for all brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel, yet He has still further truth to unfold through His Spirit till He comes again.

On the other hand, if we hold with Plato that, God being the highest ideal (ἡ ἴδια τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ), the perfection of man consists in ὁμοίωσις θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν and with the old Hebrew Scriptures that man is made in the image of God; if we believe that the Eternal did at a certain point in the world's history manifest Himself in the form of man and under the conditions and infirmities of humanity; if we further believe that we have in the Gospels a true picture of this life, and in the remaining books of the N.T. a true account of the way in which His first followers, animated by His Spirit, strove to carry out His plans and build up the spiritual temple founded by Him—then the record of His life and teaching and those of the acts and words of the men whom He had Himself trained to carry on His work after His departure,—these records can never be superseded: in every age the eyes of all who are striving for the elevation of our race must continue to turn back to them as furnishing the highest ideal of humanity, the clearest conception of divinity. One main instrument of the growth and development, of which we have spoken, will consist in the ever deeper understanding, and the ever wider realization of the lessons of that life, as well as in the openness to see and hear the signs of the divine Presence still at work within us and around us. This is perhaps meant by the concluding words of St. John's Gospel. For the full understanding of Christ's life and teaching there needs the entire experience of humanity, and even so, its significance will still be unexhausted.
(4) There are various ways of misusing the Apostolic tradition. It may be openly denied, as it seems to have been by the innovators here condemned (ver. 4). It may be entirely neglected without being specifically denied (as in Tit. 1:16 τοῖς ἐργοῖς ἀρνώμενοι.) It may be so modified by subsequent additions as to lose its original character. This was to a certain extent the case with the Montanists, who held that supernatural revelation had not come to an end with the Apostles, but that more wonderful manifestations might be expected under the dispensation of the Paraclete, whom Christ had promised to send. So Tertullian (Vel. Virg. 1) after premising 'Regula fidei sola immobils et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in Deum omnipotentem' (then follows a creed ending with the Resurrection of Christ) 'Hac lege fidei manente, oetera... admissunt novitatem correctionis. Quale est enim, ut diabolo semper operante et adjiciente quotidie ad iniquitatis ingenia, opus Dei cessaverit?' The growth of righteousness is like that of a grain of wheat: 'primo fuit in rudimentis natura Deum metuens; dehinc per legem et prophetas promovit in infantiam; dehinc per Evangelium efferruit in juvendum; nunc per Paracletum componitur in maturitatem.' The fault of the Montanists was that they confined the looked for teaching of the Spirit to the one channel of ecstatic revelation through the mouth of their prophets, and attached too great authority to these. It was a movement which had the qualities and defects of all revivalist movements. On the other hand there was a simultaneous development of Christian truth on broader and saner lines, in accordance with the great saying of St. Paul, δοσις ἁγιασμοῦ, διὰ σωμάτων, δόσις δύκαια, δόσις ἁγία, δόσις προσφυγή, δόσις εὐφημία: εἰ τις ἁρετή, καὶ εἰ τις ἐπανόρθωσε, ταῦτα λογίζεται, and his favourite refrain from the Psalms τοῦ Κυρίου ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς. Men such as Justin and Clement of Alexandria, who had been taught of God, not merely through the religious emotions, but through the word received into the heart and interpreted by conscience, reason, and experience,2 such men saw and recognized the work of the Spirit in the poetry and philosophy of Greece, as well as in the tradition of

---

1 Compare the teaching of the Eternal Gospel ascribed to the Abbot Joachim towards the end of the twelfth century, in which it was prophesied that a new dispensation, that of the Holy Ghost, was about to replace the dispensation of the Son, as that had replaced the dispensation of the Father.

2 In my Introduction to the Seventh Book of the Stromateis (p. xxii foll.) I have commented on the seeming preference shown for Montanism, as compared with Catholicism, by writers whose views would generally be regarded as more or less rationalistic, such as Harnack and Hatch. Here, it seems to me that a writer, whose judgment is in general less to be relied on than Harnack's, has yet come nearer to the truth. See Wernle, Beginnings of Christianity, p. 124 'Prophets are amongst the distinctive marks of this first Age of Christianity. But we learn at the same time that their authority was secondary... The ultimate authority, the foundation, was in all cases the tradition of Jesus. This might be supplemented by the prophetic word, by the spirit, but never transformed. To make the spirit of the prophets the ultimate authority would have been tantamount to subjecting oneself to the whims and fancies of men whose religious nature was powerful, while their moral character was immature and undisciplined.'
the Hebrews, and drew from all quarters material for the building up of the Church.

It is not of course implied that the developments of Christian teaching which we find in the writers named or in later Catholic writers at any particular period in the Church's history were necessarily in the right direction. Speaking generally, these developments are owing partly to the Spirit of Christ working in individuals, and so leavening the Church; and partly to the interaction of the Church and the World. The Spirit of God bloweth where it listeth; and secular improvement has often reacted with advantage upon the Church tradition. On the other hand there can be no doubt that a considerable portion of the beliefs and practices of the mediaeval Church was affected for the worse by Pagan or Jewish associations. In the Reformation appeal was made from the existing Church traditions to the traditions of the earliest Church, and above all to the original tradition preserved in the Bible, on the ground that whatever was really alien from this could be no genuine work of the Spirit. A sad experience has taught us that no Father, no Council, no Pope, no reformer, is infallible. Every generation, every individual, is sent into the world as a new organ of divine truth to deal with new circumstances and new difficulties, and is bound to exercise the right of private judgment on the conclusions left by preceding generations, to the best of his, or their, opportunities and ability. This does not preclude the attainment of practical certainty in religion, any more than in science: nay, as the subject matter of religion is mainly of the nature of inward experience, the sincere Christian, though unlearned, has surer ground for confidence in matters of religion, than the mass of mankind have in regard to matters of science.

As time passes, the Church as a whole ought to be growing in knowledge as well as in grace. It would be sad indeed if all the increase in knowledge of men and things, of God's universe and of His mode of dealing with mankind, together with the recorded experience of the past ages of Christianity and all the fresh difficulties and troubles of to-day, not to mention the subordinate helps to the understanding of the written word by means of archaeology and criticism—if all this had been given in vain and left us no further advanced than Christians of long vanished centuries. We do not, it is true, expect to meet in our day the equals of a St. Paul or a St. John, any more than we expect to meet the equals of a Plato or a Shakespeare; but, since we have Christ's own word that He will be with us all the days till the end of the world, and that His Spirit will lead us into all the truth, we are surely justified in the hope that the sorely protracted fermentation of our times may yet issue in an outpouring of light and life, of knowledge and of earnestness, proportioned to the preceding birth-pangs of a new day of the Lord.

To return to the immediate point, perhaps the most dangerous misuse of the Christian tradition, as it is the easiest and the commonest, is that which, whether from indolence and indifference, or ignorant
superstition, or a suicidal theory of religion, transforms it into a mere dead fetish, to be regarded with reverence indeed, but not to be made the subject of thought, for fear that thought may land us either in the Scylla of dogmatism or the Charybdis of rationalism. The repetition of a creed is worse than useless, unless the mind finds there food for imagination, thought, and feeling, as well as a stimulus and ground for action. It is, I suppose, from an exaggeration of this danger that Deissman (Bible Studies, p. 59) makes the extraordinary assertion 'The beginnings of Christian literature are really the beginnings of the secularization of Christianity: the Church becomes a book-religion.'

1 I have given expression above—I fear rather confusedly—to some of the thoughts which arise as one meditates on the words ἐναγωγή σωθή τῇ διάφορα ἐνθοτικών πραγμάτων. Perhaps the opposing errors might be more clearly distinguished as that which assigns too much, and that which assigns too little weight to the past. Both errors tend to the denial or the ignoring of the eternity and the omnipresence of God, who is always revealing Himself in all that is done, felt, and thought throughout the universe, excepting only (with Cleanthes) βώσα μείωσι καὶ αφήλλήραν αίολας. Hence, according to Westcott's fine saying, Christianus nihil in rerum natura a se alienum putat. If we affirm, say, with the Puritans against whom the argument of Hooker is directed, that religious usages were fixed once for all in the Apostolic Age; or if with others we affirm that the doctrines and usages which prevailed at a particular period of the history of the Church are to be placed on a pedestal, under the mystic name of 'Catholic,' supra grammaticam, beyond the reach of interrogation or criticism, are we not denying the continued presence of Christ in His Church and forgetting the goal to which St. Paul directed the eyes of the Ephesian Church, when all should come to perfect manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ? In religion, as in science, man rises to perfection in the future through the failures and imperfections of the past.

On the other hand if, with the ordinary modern man, we hold that the final decision of what is right and true and beautiful and good is to be found in the latest utterance of the majority, we are indeed building on a foundation of sand. Each new generation delights in nothing more than in ridiculing the folly of the preceding generation, forgetting that it is doomed to a similar treatment from ensuing generations, and moreover each generation comprises an infinity of changing and inconsistent majorities. The path of progress in the present and the future can only be discerned by the eye which has been duly disciplined by the study of progress in the past. Not one jot or tittle of the law was to pass away till it had found a higher form in the Gospel.

Nor is it much more reasonable to look to science (as the word is commonly understood) to determine what is to be the ultimate form of our religion. On the subject of religion, science through the mouth of its recognized leaders proclaims itself agnostic. It is negative, not positive: it can offer criticisms on the contents or deductions of theology, it can supply materials for religious thought and feeling to work upon; but it cannot itself pierce the veil of the spiritual world. A man may be a great chemist or mathematician, and yet a very poor philosopher, or poet, or historian; but it is the region of thought to which these latter belong which is, far more nearly than pure science, allied to religion. Religion has certainly learnt much in the past from historians such as Herodotus and Thucydides, from philosophers like Plato, from poets such as Aeschylus and Sophocles. Nay, even in our own day, for how much of our deeper thought on religion are not we Englishmen indebted to such poets as Browning and Tennyson? No man can be a great poet or a great philosopher who does not naturally soar upwards to the highest region attainable by man, and who is not penetrated by the sense of the Divinity within him and around him. And yet even the highest utterance of our greatest poets needs to be tested by the comparison of the 'Faith once delivered to the saints' before we can trust it as a voice from heaven.
How are we to contend for the faith? Our natural instinct is to dislike any kind of contradiction. For another to differ in opinion from us is to cast doubt on our intelligence. To the confident and high-spirited it is a βλασφημία, an insult: to the diffident it causes a painful feeling of uncertainty. To recover our sense of security or to punish this insult, we feel tempted to put down dissent by ostracism or violence. We form cliques or parties in which the bond consists in the maintenance of a common opinion; or, it may be, in the participation of a common dislike or prejudice. Where we attach great importance to the opinion or dogma which is questioned, for its own sake, as in the case of religion, intolerance of diversity finds further sanctions. We honestly believe that the acceptance of the dogma would be beneficial to the dissidents themselves. For their own sakes we feel bound to compel them to come in. And the shallower is a man's notion of what constitutes real belief, the readier he is to insist on another's accepting, on peril of persecution, the belief which is pressed upon him. One way then in which men have endeavoured to contend for the faith is by physical force, as was symbolized in Poland and Lithuania by the nobles drawing their swords when the Creed was repeated. St. Paul however has taught us that the weapons of our warfare are not carnal. Another defence was by means of anathemas, such as were attached in former times to some forms of the Creed, and in later days to the decrees of the Council of Trent. The habit of cursing was very common among the Jews, one of the worst examples being Ps. 109 (where vv. 17, 18 might seem to be a protest against what precedes). It is strictly forbidden by St. Paul 'Bless and curse not,' and by our Lord 'Bless them that curse you.' Jude uses the phrase οδῷ in ver. 11, which might be an imprecation, but is perhaps better taken as a simple declaration of fact. Another method of defence is denunciation or invective. This is, I think, permissible, where it is required to arouse the slumbering conscience, or to make the ignorant or obtuse realize what is the nature of the attack, and what the character of the assailants of the truth. Jude has certainly no scruple in using this, and even our Lord has employed it against the Pharisees, but it is not his usual method, and it is not the method recommended by St. Peter (1 P. 3:15) ἵτομοι ἐν πρός ἄπολογίαν παιμεν τῷ αἰτωτίῳ ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραύντητος καὶ φόβου, συνείδησιν ἤκουσες ἀγαθῆν. Jude himself adopts this better method towards the end of his epistle, where he instructs his readers how they should build themselves up upon their most holy faith.

I mentioned ostracism as one means by which people have endeavoured to compel consent to their own views. St. Paul enjoins this in the case of open offenders against the moral law (1 Cor. 5), yet our Lord ate with publicans and sinners. He could do this because, though tempted like as we are, He was yet immune from the poison of temptation, carrying about with Him an atmosphere of purity which called out good even
from the most degraded. But in ordinary circumstances there can be no doubt of the wisdom of St. Paul's rule, not merely for safety, or to avoid scandal, but to supply a further motive to the weak, in the fear of forfeiting their Christian fellowship, and to those who have fallen, in the sorrow for its loss and the yearning for its renewal. This discipline is extended to those who taught erroneous doctrine by St. Paul himself in Tit. 310 and by St. John in 2 Joh. 10, 11 'If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house nor bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.' Does this mean that we are to have no dealings with those who do not hold the articles of the faith as embodied in the Creeds? Plainly it has no reference to those who have never heard of Christianity. It is limited to those who are, or have been, professed Christians. Is it true, then, of such, if they can no longer conscientiously repeat the Creed, that they are to be excluded from the society of their fellow Christians on this ground only, apart from other considerations? So far as doubt arises from a high sense of what belief means, from scrupulous fear of saying with our lips more than we believe in our hearts to be true, from a consciousness of our own ignorance, and the incapacity of man to fathom the councils of the Most High, or again from open-mindedness and readiness to welcome light from all quarters, and not prematurely to shut the eyes to what may prove to be a very ray from heaven—to deny admittance to our homes and churches in the case of such a doubter, would be blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. But where disbelief, as in the case referred to by Jude, is confident, loud and boastful, eager to startle and shock the simple-minded, without reverence, or seriousness, or sense of responsibility, above all where it distorts religion in the interest of the baser lusts—there, who can hesitate to say that the sentence of St. John is fully justified?

A special kind of ostracism was excommunication, which was practised by the Jews (cf. the words ἀφορίζω, ἐκβάλλω, ἀποσυνάγωγος, Lk. 622, Joh. 922) and sanctioned by our Lord (Mt. 1817). St. Paul uses this as a regular instrument of Church discipline in a case of immorality in 1 Cor. 525 ἕως μὲν ἄτων τῷ σώματι, παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, ἥδη κέκρικα ὡς παρὼν τὸν οὐτὸς τούτο κατεργασάμενον, ἐν τῷ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ιησούς, συναχθέντων ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἱματιοῦ πνεύματος σύν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ιησοῦ. παραδοινάει τὸν τούτον τῷ Σατάνα εἰς διεθρον τῆς σαρκὸς, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου, and in a case of disbelief in 1 Tim. 120, where he says (speaking of Hymenaeus and Alexander) οὗτοι παρὰ τῷ Σατάνα, ἵνα παραδεικνύωσιν μὴ βλασφημῶσιν. The remarkable phrase 'delivery to Satan' may perhaps contain an allusion to the story of Job.

**Nature of the Threatened Danger (v. 4).**

*It is stealthy; it is serious enough to have been predicted long ago; its characteristic is impiety, showing itself in the antinomian*
The use of ἀρνώμαι (denego) followed by an accusative of the person is unclassical and seems to be confined to Christian literature. In general ἀρνώμαι is opposed to ὁμολογεῖν. The N.T. use is illustrated in the Homily 139, on the Adoration of the Cross, wrongly ascribed to Chrysostom: ὁ ἀρνώμενος ἔτερον οὖν ἢ ἀδελφόν ἢ φίλον . . . κάν μαστιζόμενον ἢ τούτον . . . κάν ὁποῖον πάσχοντα, οὔ προσταται, οὔ βοηθεῖ . . . ἀπαξ γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἠλλοτριωται, i.e. it is equivalent to repudiation. So Peter repudiated our Lord. The sin and its punishment are spoken of in Mt. 10 and 8 the phrase δότως ἀρνήσεται is replaced by δὲ ἐν ἑπαξιμαχή με καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λόγους. In the martyrlogies the word occurs frequently, as the confessors were called upon either to deny Christ, or to deny that they were Christians, or what comes to the same thing, to affirm Κύριος Καὶ βασιλέας, and offer incense to Caesar or swear by his name. In Ἀρκ. 215 it is said of the church at Pergamum ὅπω ἀρνήσεται τὰ πάντα, in contrast to the followers of Balasam, who did not scruple to eat things offered to idols; and we read that Basilides justified those who so acted and abjured the faith in time of persecution (Euseb. Εὐσ. Εἰρ. iv. 7). It would seem however that what is here condemned is a wrong view of God and Christ, such as a denial of the divine attributes of holiness and justice, wisdom and power, and of the salvation wrought by Christ, the helplessness of man and the need of prayer and watchfulness. See Clem. Al. Str. vi. p. 802 (the heretics, though they profess one God and sing praises to Christ, yet really) ἄλλον θεόν παρευρίσκονται καὶ τῶν Χριστῶν οὖν ὡς αἱ προφητεῖαι παραδίδοσιν ἰδέαν, and the Introduction on the Early Heresies. Confession being a main element in baptism (cf. Rom. 10 karb πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν), the subsequent denial was an ἀποστασία.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF SIN AND JUDGMENT DERIVED FROM HISTORY AND FROM NATURE (vv. 5–13).

The judgment impending over these men is borne witness to by well known facts of the past, and may be illustrated from the phenomena of nature. God showed his mercy in delivering the Israelites from Egypt, but that was no guarantee against their destruction in the wilderness when they again sinned by unbelief. The angels were blessed beyond all other creatures, but when they proved unfaithful to their trust,
they were imprisoned in darkness, awaiting there the judgment of
the great day. The men of Sodom (lived in a land of great fertility,
they had received some knowledge of God through the presence and
教学 of Lot, they had been lately rescued from captivity by Abru-
ham, yet they) followed the sinful example of the angels, and their
land is still a prey to the fire, bearing witness to the eternal punish-
ment of sin. In spite of these warnings the heretics, who are now
finding their way into the Church, persist in their wild hallucina-
tions, giving themselves up to the lusts of the flesh, despising authority,
and railing at angelic dignities. They might have been taught
better by the example of the archangel Michael, of whom we are told
that, when disputing with the devil about the body of Moses, he uttered
no word of railing, but made his appeal to God. These men how-
ever rail at that which is beyond their knowledge, while they sur-
render themselves like brute beasts to the guidance of their appetites,
and thus bring about their own destruction, following in the wake of
impious Cain, of covetous Balaam, and rebellious Korah. When
they take part in your love-feasts they cause the shipwreck of the weak
by their wantonness and irreverence. In greatness of profession and
smallness of performance they resemble clouds driven by the wind
which give no rain; or trees in autumn on which one looks in vain
for fruit, and which are only useful for fuel. By their confident
speaking and brazen assurance they seem to carry all before them;
yet like the waves bursting on the shore, the deposit they leave is only
their own shame. Or we might compare them to meteors which shine
for a moment and are then extinguished for ever.

Punishment of the Fallen Angels.

The Introduction on the story of the Fallen Angels shows how
inconsistent was Jewish tradition on this point.

There can be no doubt that Jude makes a broad distinction
between the fallen watchers and the devil. The former are in close
imprisonment under the earth until the day of judgment: the latter
is still at liberty: he was able to resist Michael when he sought to
bury the body of Moses; and (as Jude doubtless held with his brother
and with Peter) he is still the adversary whom we are bound to resist.
Clement of Alexandria however does away with this distinction,
interpreting the prison of the angels to mean 'vicinum terris locum,
hoc est caliginosum aerem. Vincula vero dixit . . . cupiditatem
ins[tr]marum rerum; cupiditate quippe devicti propria converti non
queunt' (Adumbr. p. 1008). This is evidently an attempt to reconcile
the present passage with those which speak of an ἡγουσία τοῦ σκότους
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(Lk. 22:58, Col. 1:13), and of the ruler τῆς ἐνομίας τοῦ δέσπος (Eph. 2:2). In his note on the latter Dr. Robinson, after quoting from the Testament of the Patriarchs and the Ascension of Isaiah adds that 'the air was regarded by the Jews, as well as by others, as peopled by spirits, especially evil spirits,' for which he cites Philo De Gigant. 2, De Somn. I. 22.

In the explanatory notes I have accepted the explanation of Clement and Bengel to the effect that the innovators live in an unreal world of their own, but I am not sure that there may not be a further allusion to the words of St. Paul in 2 Th. 2:7-11 το γὰρ μυστήριον ἣν ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας ... καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πέμπει αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς ἐνέργειαν πλάνης εἰς τὸ πυωτέρας αὐτοῦ τῷ ψεύδει which may perhaps refer to the wild dreams of Gnostic mythology.

The Example of the Archangel.

For the origin of the story see the chapter on the Use of Apocryphal Books. One of the most difficult things in this difficult epistle is to understand the reason why the writer introduces this curious reference. Apparently he wishes to check the spirit of irreverence towards the representatives of authority and dignity, and especially towards the Supreme Authority and the high dignities of that unseen world, which is altogether hidden from the materialists against whom he writes. We might have expected that he would take his examples from the behaviour of holy men in presence of one of these august beings: Moses at the Burning Bush, Joshua and Manoah before the angel of the Lord, Isaiah when he beheld the vision in the Temple, Zechariah and Mary at a more recent period, on their receipt of angelic communications. Or, if this contempt for authority, as is suggested by the allusion to Korah, was also shown towards earthly superiors, what more was needed than such a grave remonstrance as we find in Heb. 13:17 'Obey them that have the rule over you and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief.' It would seem to be altogether going out of the way to take an archangel for our pattern; but if it was thought worth while to do so, would it not have been more natural to refer to the seraphim who veil their faces in the presence of God, rather than to the apocryphal story of Michael's behaviour towards Satan? Suppose, to allow our thought a freer range, we substitute for this the Miltonic account of the interview between Satan and Gabriel at the end of the fourth book of the P.L. Milton's Satan, we remember, is one whose 'form had not yet lost all her original brightness, nor appeared less than archangel ruined and the excess of glory obscured,' yet there was a certain amount of θλοφημία, not

1 In agreement with this, Bengel in his note says 'Angeli qui peccarunt, tamen ut creaturae Dei habent bonitatem ..., et in sua natura praestantisima, quam a Creatore accipierunt, characterem retinent indebilem majestatis.'
merely in the language addressed to him by Zephan in the earlier part of the book, but in that of Gabriel towards the end, though, after the appearance of the celestial sign, the latter concludes in words of calm dignity

'Satan, I know thy strength, and thou know'st mine,
Neither our own, but given. What folly then
To boast what arms can do, since thine no more
Than Heaven permits, nor mine.'

We can imagine such a passage being appealed to by one of Cromwell's Ironsides to put a stop to some vulgar squabble among his comrades; but we can hardly imagine it used in a sermon, to inculcate either a fitting reverence towards angels or submission to an earthly superior. It might be more appropriately used (much in the spirit of Gamaliel's answer to the persecuting priests recorded in Acts 5:38, 39), to check the bitter and scornful language of some orthodox controversialist: 'See how the archangel met the taunts of evil personified!'

To arrive at any satisfactory conclusion, it seems necessary in the first place to determine the meaning of βλασφημέω, and its cognate βλασφημία, in the three passages in which they occur. According to the explanation we have followed, it is used in the 8th verse of injurious speech of some sort towards angels; in the 9th verse of injurious speech towards Satan; in the 10th the statement of the 8th verse is repeated in other words. In none of these passages, if our explanation is right, would the translation 'blasphemy' be correct. Blasphemy, in the strict sense, is only possible against God: it would be irreverence to speak against an angel, and in the note it is suggested that one way in which this irreverence showed itself may have been the slighting language used by the heretics in regard to the creative and providential ministration of the angels. But neither of these terms could apply to angelic dealings with Satan. No! nor to human dealings either. To worship or revere Satan would be the height of impiety. We are to defy him, renounce him, resist him, and he will flee from us. What, then, is the wrong behaviour towards Satan on our part (for such I think is implied by the appeal to the example of Michael) which Jude here wishes to correct? It is suggested in the note that the Libertines may have scoffed at the idea both of angelic help and of diabolic temptation. St. Paul had warned those who took part in the idol-feasts that they thereby made themselves partakers with devils. We can well imagine that the Balaamites and the Simonians would mock at this as an empty threat. But will the word βλασφημέω bear the sense of χλενίζει or λαοδόρει or ἀποσκοπτεῖ; I think the following quotations tend to show that it may: Clem. Al. Paed. p. 297 πολλοῖς βλασφημοῦσιν εἰς γέλωτα οὕ ταῦτα, Herodian iv. 12. I εἰς τούτον πολλάκις ἀποσκοπήσας καὶ μέχρι αἰσχράς βλασφημιάς. The more common meaning of βλασφημέω 'to speak evil' does not seem appropriate here, for there is hardly a place in the N.T. where the devil is mentioned without some opprobrious addition. He is a sinner from the beginning (1. Joh. 3:8), a murderer from the beginning, a liar and the father of it (Joh. 8:44), a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour (1. P. 5:8), the
Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil (1 Joh. 3:8). The force of Jude's warning seems to be this, 'Do not make light of the devil, do not belittle the danger of his assaults. Even the archangel invoked the power of God against him.' In the same sense St. Paul writes (Eph. 6:11-12) ἐνδύσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὸ δύναμαν ὑμᾶς στήναν πρὸς τὰς μεθοδίας τοῦ διαβόλου ὅπει ὃ ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας εἰς τοὺς ἐπουρανίους. So too our Lord (Lk. 12:5) μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτενῶν τὸ σῶμα καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἐξόντων περισσότερον τι ποιήσατε. Ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθῆτε: φοβηθῆτε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτείνα ἐξοντα ἐξουσιῶν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γένειν, on which see the conclusive remarks of Stier, Words of the Lord Jesus, tr. vol. II. 40-50. As ἐξουσία is here predicated of Satan, so in Heb. 2:14 we find him spoken of as ὁ τὸ κράτος ἐξοντα τοῦ θανάτου. Similar warnings are suggested by Lk. 22:31, Joh. 13:27, Mk. 3:27.

THE PROPHECY OF ENOCH (vv. 14-16).

The ancient prophecy, to which reference has been already made, was intended for these men as well as for the prophet's own contemporaries, where he says 'The Lord appeared, encompassed by myriads of his holy ones, to execute justice upon all and to convict all the ungodly concerning all their ungodly works, and concerning all the hard things spoken against Him by ungodly sinners.' (Like them) these men are murmurers, complaining of their lot, slavery to their own carnal lusts, while they utter presumptuous words against God, and seek to ingratiate themselves with men for the sake of gain.

The Context of the Prophecy as it is read in the Book of Enoch.

I quote the essential part of the introduction as given in the Greek (p. 326, Charles) ἱπρα τὴν ὑδραγον τοῦ ἀγίου... ἦν ἤδειξαν μοι ἀγγελοι καὶ ἤκουσα παρ' αὐτῶν πάντα καὶ ἐγνών αὐτὸ τῷ θεῷ· καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἐστι τῇ κατοικίᾳ καὶ δὲ Θεός τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐπὶ γῆν παντοκράτει ἐπὶ τῷ ζωλῷ ὥρος... καὶ φανερώτατον τῇ δύναμιν τῆς ὁθόνος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ φοβηθησότατοι πάντες. The Greek at this point is corrupt and I go on with the translation of the Ethiopic (p. 58 Charles): 'And the high mountains will be shaken and the high hills will be made low and will melt like wax before the flame. And the earth will be rent and all that is upon the earth will perish, and there will be a judgment upon every thing and upon all the righteous. But to the righteous He will give peace (J. 2) and will protect the elect (J. 1), and grace (Gr. ἡλίος, cf. J. 2), will be upon them,
and they will all belong to God and it will be well with them, and they will be blessed, and the light of God will shine upon them. And lo! He comes with ten thousands, etc.'

**THE FAITHFUL ARE BIDDEN TO CALL TO MIND THE WARNINGS OF THE APOSTLES (vv. 17–19).**

The Apostles warned you repeatedly that in the last time there would arise mockers led away by their own carnal lusts. It is these that are now breaking up the unity of the Church by their invidious distinctions, men of unsanctified minds, who have not the Spirit of God.

*ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου χρόνου.*

It may be worth while here to quote from Westcott's note on 1 John 2:18. 'The successive partial dawning of “the age to come” give a different force to the words “the last days” which usher in the age, according to the context in which they occur. In one sense “the age to come” dated from Pentecost; in another from the destruction of Jerusalem; in another it was still the object of hope. So also “the last days” are found in each of the seasons of fierce trial which precede the several comings of Christ. The age in which we live is, under one aspect, “the last days,” and in another it is “the age to come,” which was prepared by the travail pains of the old order. As we look forward, a season of sore distress separates us from that which is still to be revealed (2 Tim. 3:1; 2 Pet. 3:8; Jude 18; 1 Pet. 1:5; contrast ver. 20): as we look back we have entered on an inheritance now through struggles of “a last time.”'

We find similar references in the O.T.: thus in Gen. 49:1 Israel blessing his sons tells them of what should befall *ἐπ’ ἐσχάτον τῶν ἡμερῶν,* and this blessing, in the case of Judah, is generally thought to refer to the coming of the Messiah. In Numb. 24:14 Balaam foresees *ἐπ’ ἐσχάτον τῶν ἡμερῶν* the rising of the Star out of Jacob. Moses speaking of the future dispersion of Israel, as a punishment for their sins, still holds out the promise that *ἐπ’ ἐσχάτον τῶν ἡμερῶν* a time of restoration should come if they turned to God with all their heart and with all their soul (Deut. 4:30). In a later chapter (31:8) the phrase *ἐσχάτον τῶν ἡμερῶν* is used to denote the period of the previous falling away. In Job 19:25 the A.V. has ‘I know that my Redeemer liveth and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth,' but the LXX. has nothing answering to ‘latter day,’ and the general sense of the passage is much disputed. In Isa. 2:2 and Micah 4:1 we read that *ὑπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων ἡμέρων*‘ the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains and all nations shall flow unto it.’ Jeremiah uses the same phrase of the restoration of Moab (48:22) and of Elam (49:38), and twice over of the repentance of Israel, *ἐπ’ ἐσχάτον τῶν ἡμερῶν νοστοῦντος αὐτοῦ* (23:20, 30:24). It is used by Ezekiel of the.
invasion of Gog and Magog (388.16), by Daniel in explaining the vision of the four kingdoms (223), and in the description of the wars of the Diadochi, which is to be followed by great tribulation and then by the resurrection and the judgment (ch. 12). In this book there is an attempt to give an actual date to the time of the Messiah and to the last times generally (928, 1212). Hosea, after announcing that the children of Israel would abide many days without a king, or sacrifice, or ephod, prophesies that afterwards in the latter days they should return, and seek the Lord, and David their king (35).

THE FINAL CHARGE TO THE FAITHFUL (vv. 20–23).

Use all diligence to escape this danger. Make the most of the privileges vouchsafed to you. Build yourselves up on the foundation of your most holy faith by prayer in the Spirit. Do not rest satisfied with the belief that God loves you, but keep yourselves in His love, waiting for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ which leads us to eternal life. And do your best to help those who are in danger of falling away by pointing out their errors and giving the reasons of your own belief; and by snatching from the fire of temptation those who are in imminent jeopardy. Even where there is most to fear, let your compassion and your prayers go forth toward the sinner, while you shrink from the pollution of his sin.

ἐν πνεύματι ἅγιω προσευχόμενοι.

It is not enough to use the words of prayer. Prayer must be heart-felt, dictated by the Holy Spirit, who makes intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered, and through whom we are enabled to, cry Abba, Father, and to worship, as the Father would have us worship, in spirit and in truth. Thus we shall be enabled to build ourselves up as stones in the spiritual temple of which Christ is the corner-stone, to realize to ourselves the love of God and to be always looking for the mercy of Christ which leads us on to eternal life. Nor must we forget that we are bound to show that same mercy towards our brethren who are tempted, striving for them as we strive for ourselves.

But what, if we are not conscious of the Spirit in our hearts? Are we then to give up praying and striving? The parables of the leaven and the mustard seed show us that there are many degrees of spiritual growth. In no one is there an entire absence of the good seed. He who is faithful to that he hath, shall find more given to him. Every good thought, every good resolution, every aspiration after better things, every feeling of sorrow and shame for past misdoing or uselessness, is at least the earnest of the Spirit within us, and should be
thankfully recognized as such, and turned to practical use, as by him who brought his child to Jesus with the prayer 'Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.'

**Final Benediction and Ascription (vv. 24–25).**

*I have bidden you to keep yourselves in the love of God; I have warned you against all impiety and impurity. But do not think that you can attain to the one or guard yourselves from the other in your own strength. You must receive power from above; and that it may be so, I offer up my prayer to Him, who alone is able to keep you from stumbling, and to present you before the throne of His glory, pure and spotless in exceeding joy. To Him, the only God and Saviour, belong glory, greatness, might, and authority throughout all ages.*
NOTES ON THE SECOND EPISTLE
OF ST. PETER

I. 1. Συμεών.] See Introduction on the Text. The writer of the First Epistle calls himself simply Πέτρος. In every other passage of the N. T., where the double name occurs, it is Ζίμων Πέτρος. Indeed Συμεών is used of Peter only in one other passage, viz. Acts 15:14, the address of James at the Council of Jerusalem. The hellenized form Ζίμων appears for the first time in post-Alexandrine writings, e.g. Sirach 50:1, 1 Macc. 15:24, and seems to be the only one used of Peter in post-Apostolic times.

So far as it goes, this is an argument for the genuineness of our epistle. Our author is at any rate a man of observation and reflexion, and, if he chose to write under another name, would have been careful to copy his model. This applies also to the other points in which this salutation differs from that of the first epistle.

Δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] The first epistle omits δοῦλος; Jude, who is followed so closely in our epistle, omits ἀπόστολος. 'By the addition of the common apppellative δοῦλος and the use of the pre-Christian name, Symeon, the writer puts himself on a level with those whom he addresses and prepares the way for the epithet ἱσότιμον which follows. The faith of the ordinary believer puts him in the same position as that of the apostle. In both cases it is the gift of God leading to salvation.' Spitta. See however n. on ἱσότιμον below.

τοῖς ἱσότιμοι ἡμῖν λαχάσιν πίστιν.] Field seems to be right in holding that ἱσότιμος and ὑρότιμος ' invariably borrow their meaning from τιμῆς honour,' and not from τιμῆ in the sense of price. He quotes Jos. Ant. xii. 3. 1 ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ μητροπόλει Ἀντιοχεία πολιτείαν αὐτοὺς ἡξίωσε καὶ τοῖς ἐνοικοθείων ἱσότιμοι ἀπεδείξε Μακεδόνι. The same holds good in the great majority of compounds of τιμῆ. So here F. translates 'equally

---

1 I see however that it bears this sense in Philo M. i. p. 165 τῶν σεφῶν ἱσότιμον κάθημεν δ ὦθες ἡγεῖται quoted in Salmon's Introd. to N. T. p. 502.
privileged,' a faith which carries equal privileges, so putting them on
an equality with us, whether we the Apostles, or, if addressed to
Gentiles, we Jews. The latter would be in accordance with St. Peter’s
action in the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of the Gospel.
Jewish arrogance and exclusiveness were the cause of much bitter feeling
and danger in the early Church, as may be seen from Acts 15, 21\textsuperscript{50-58},
Rom. 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, Ephes. 21\textsuperscript{4-22}, esp. ver. 14 αὐτῶς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἡμῶν, δὲ ποιήσας τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἐν, καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἕξθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτῶς, with which our passage may be compared.
On the contrary there is no hint that there was any jealousy of the
position of the Apostles generally, which could explain the use of such
words as ἵστιμον and ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. It is true that those here ad-
dressed are warned against the τολμηταί αἰθάδες who speak evil of
dignities (21\textsuperscript{10}) and that they are bidden to remember the teaching of
the Apostles (3\textsuperscript{8}); which implies a division in the Church, and a
disposition on the part of some to question the authority of the
Apostles; but in writing to such persons, it would hardly be appro-
prate to weaken the authority of the Apostles by denying to them
any prerogative rights over other Christians. The only objection to
the view that the equality referred to is that between Jew and Gentile
is that we are not told that the writer represents the Jews, and those
to whom he writes the Gentiles. It has been suggested that the use
of the name Symeon may have been intended to mark the former;
the latter point is discussed in the Introduction. For the compressed
comparison (ἡμῶν = τῇ ἡμῶν) see Winer pp. 777 f.

The use of the word λαγχαίω here is to emphasize the fact that
faith itself is the gift of God; so Wisd. 8\textsuperscript{10} ὑπεραρχήν ἔληξαν ἀναβῆνες, Plato
Phileb. 55 β ἁνδριαν ἢ σωφροσύνην... ἡ τι τῶν ἀλλῶν δι’ ἀγαθὴν ἐλκυστοχ
ψυχῆς, Polit. 269 c φρόνησον εὐλογεῖς, cf. Eph. 28\textsuperscript{9}.

ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.] Does this form one phrase with πίστιν? Does it
mean ‘faith in the righteousness of Christ as our justification’? Cf.
Eph. 11\textsuperscript{8} τὴν καθ’ ἡμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, 1 Tim. 31\textsuperscript{8}. Or should it be connected with all the preceding words ‘those who have received
a faith no less highly privileged than ours through the justice of God,’
who is no respecter of persons? The latter seems to me the more
natural way of taking it. For this narrower sense of δικαιος cf. Heb.
6\textsuperscript{10} οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιλαβήθαι τοῦ ἥργου ἡμῶν, 1 Joh. 1\textsuperscript{9} ἢν
διαλογίζων τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστὸς ἑστιν καὶ δίκαιος ἢν ἄφη ἡμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, and Clem. Al. p. 116 ὅτι γε μία καθολικὴ τῆς ἁνθρωπότητος σωτηρία ἡ πίστις, ισότης δὲ καὶ κοινωνία τοῦ δικαίου καὶ
φιλανθρόπου Θεοῦ ἢ αὐτὴ τῆς πᾶν τῆς ἀνθρώπου, ἢ ἄποικος σαφεῖται ἐξιγνόσεω, shortly after which follows the quotation from
Gal. 31\textsuperscript{22-23}.

τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] See n. on Jude v. 4 τῶν
μονον δεικτὴν. If we take Θεοῦ of Christ with Spitta, we may com-
pare 21 below τῶν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτῶς δεικτὴν, Joh. 20\textsuperscript{28} (the words of
Thomas) ὁ κύριος μου καὶ ὁ Θεὸς μου, Tit. 21\textsuperscript{8}, and Lightfoot’s n. on
Clem. Rom. 2 where similar examples from the early Fathers are
collected. On the other hand the next verse clearly distinguishes
between God and Christ, and it is natural to let that interpret this, as there seems no reason for identity here and distinction there.

σωτήρ is used of Christ in four other passages of this epistle, 111, 20, 32, 318, but does not occur at all in 1 Pet. Apart from its use as predicate, it occurs without the article in 1 Tim. 11 Παῦλος ἀνέστατος . . . καὶ ἐπιταγμὸν Θεοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ἡμῶν, and in Jude v. 25 μόνον Θεοῦ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν, Ps. 245, Isa. 4515.

2. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.] See n. on Jude 2. The same formula is found in 1 P. 12 and (without πληθυνθείη) in Rom. 17, 1 Cor. 13, 2 Cor. 13, Gal. 13, Eph. 13, Phil. 13, Col. 13, 1 Th. 1, 1 Th. 13, Phil. 3 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰ. X. In 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit. we have the same salutation with ἀλλης added. The salutation in Apoc. 14 is χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ ὅ δέν; the final salutation in Heb. 1325 is simply ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν, as in Eph. 624, Col. 418, 1 Tim. 621, 2 Tim. 422, Tit. 315, to which the words τοῦ κυρίου Ἰ. X. μεθ' ὑμῶν are added in Rom. 1620, 1 Th. 520, 2 Th. 318. In Gal. 618 and Phil. 421, we have the fuller form ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. X. μεθ' τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν. In 2 Cor. 1318 the names of all three Persons are invoked ἡ χάρις τ. κυρίου Ἰ. X. καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἅγιου πνεύματος μετά πάντων ὑμῶν. On χάρις see Hort's n. on 1 Pet. 13.

ἐν ἐπίγνωσι τοῦ Θεοῦ.] The word ἐπίγνωσι occurs four times in this epistle (here and 15, 18, 20), once in Heb. 1026, fifteen times in the later epistles of St. Paul, and nowhere else in the N.T. It is found in the LXX., as in Prov. 25 ἐπίγνωσιν Θεοῦ εἰρήνης, Hos. 415 ὅπε ἐστιν ἀλήθεια . . . οὕτω ἐπίγνωσις Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἰδ. 67. For its meaning see App. below.

The preposition ἐν denotes that grace and peace are multiplied in and by the fuller knowledge of God, cf. Joh. 173 αὕτη δι' ἐστιν ἡ ἀλώνιος ζωὴ ἵνα γνωσθήσῃ σε τῶν μόνον ἀληθινῶν Θεον καὶ δι' ἐπιστείλας Ἰ. X., and the words of the Blessing, 'The peace of God which passeth all understanding keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God and of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.'

Spitta, followed by Zahn (Einl. ii. 61), prefers the shorter form ἐν ἐπίγνωσι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, read by P and some of the Lat. vers., to the longer form ἐν ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου1 read by BCK, and by ΑL+ with the addition of Χριστοῦ after Ἰησοῦ. He compares 1 Th. 11, where the editors agree in a short form against the preponderating weight of MS. authority in favour of a longer form, and Col. 12 εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, of which Lightfoot says it is 'the only instance in St. Paul's epistle where the name of the Father stands alone in the opening benediction without the addition of Jesus Christ. The omission was noticed by Origen and by Chrysostom. But transcribers naturally aimed at uniformity, and so in many copies we find the addition καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.'

1 The phrase Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου (without Χριστοῦ) is only found elsewhere in N.T. in Rom. 424 and 1 Cor. 91, though the converse order ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς is frequent in the epp. to the Thessalonians.
The use of the sing. αὐτοῦ in the 3rd verse is perhaps in favour of the short form here.

3. ὡς τὰντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ ... δεδωρημένη. The editors differ as to whether this clause should be taken with what precedes or what follows, WH. putting a comma, Ti. and Treg. a full stop at the end of v. 2.1 It is in favour of the latter connexion that all other epistolary salutations in the N.T. close with a full stop; but Spitta points out that this rule is not followed in Ignatius ad Philad. 1 and other epistles, unless we are to put up with troublesome anacolutha, and that there is the same irregularity in the beginning of the 3rd and 8th of the pseudo-Platonic epistles. What then is the force of this clause, if taken in connexion with what precedes? It appears to justify the assertion that ‘grace is multiplied in and by the knowledge of God,’ on the ground that ‘His divine power has given us all that tends to life and godliness through the knowledge of Him who called us.’ Compare, for similar instances of the use of the gen. abs. with ὅς, 2 Cor. 5:20 υπὸ Ἱρμοτοῦ προσβείομεν ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν, Acts 27:30 τῶν ναυτῶν χαλασάντων τὴν σκάφην ... προφάνει ὡς ἐκ προφασ ἄγκυρας μελλόντων ἐκτίνων, 1 Cor. 4:18 ὡς μὴ δρομίων μου δρομιστησών τινες, 1 Pet. 4:12 μὴ δεύτερως ὡς ξένου υἱῶν συμβαίνοντος. In all these cases ὅς has a subjective effect indicating a feeling or point of view, whereas here such a feeling has almost to be forced into the words, ‘may grace be given through the knowledge of God, inasmuch as (we believe that) His divine power has given us all things through the knowledge of Him who called us.’ It is perhaps in favour of continuing the construction into vv. 3 and 4, that αὐτοῦ is used to define δυνάμεως. If the 3rd verse came after a full stop, we should rather have expected δ. Ἡγοῦν.

On the other hand, if we connect this verse with what follows, as is done by Kühl, Keil, Weiss, Hundhausen, the subjective force of ὅς is apparent. ‘Seeing that the divine power has supplied us with all things needed for the attainment of the divine nature, give all diligence for the acquirement of the necessary virtues and graces’ (vv. 3–7). The chief objection to this lies in the form of the apodosis, καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δι', on which see n. below.

Spitta, Weiss, and Nestle read τὰ πάντα with Ν. A Ti., preferring it as the lectio difficilior, and explaining it as meaning ‘die Gesamtheit welche zu Leben und Frommigkeit dient.’ This seems to me very unnatural. I think the reading simply originated in a ditto- graphia of the 1st syllable of παντα. Spitta further carries out his idea of the opposition between the Apostles and the community by insisting on the contrast between ἡμῖν in v. 2 and ἡμῶν in v. 3. In my opinion there is no opposition, the ὑμεῖς of the former are included in the ἡμεῖς of the latter.

τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.] Cf. 2 Macc. 3:29 (of Heliodorus) ὃ μὲν διὰ τὴν θείαν ἐνέργειαν ἀφωνοὶ ἔρριπτο, Job 27:3 (and elsewhere) πνεῦμα θείων.

1 I do not understand Nestle’s reading. He puts a full stop at the end of the second and also of the fourth verse.
Besides this verse the adj. only occurs in the N.T. in v. 4 (where see n.) and in Acts 17 and in the Appendix, αγάλματα ἐπιφανεστάτας παρέχοντα τῆς θείας δυνάμεως ἀρέτας, this is common in philosophic writings, e.g. Plato Ion 534 c (the poets speak) θεία δύναμει, Legg. iii. 691 e, Arist. Pol. vii. 4 θείας τούτου δυνάμεως ἔργον, ἓτις καὶ τόδε συνέχει τὸ τάν, Justin Apol. 1. 32, Clem. Al. Strom. i. p. 376 χωρίζειται ἡ Ἐλληνική ἀλήθεια τῆς καθ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ μεγέθεις γνώσεις καὶ ἀποδείξεις κυριώτερα καὶ θεία δύναμις, id. vii. p. 535. The addition of the gen. αὐτοῦ does not add to the perspicuity of the sentence, whether we accept the longer or the shorter form of the salutation in v. 2. Without αὐτοῦ we should naturally understand ἡ θεία δύναμις as equivalent to ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμις, but, as αὐτοῦ stands for τοῦ Θεοῦ, we are obliged to assign to θεία a more general force, such as μεγαλοπρεπής in v. 17. Cf. Eus. c. Hieroc. 4 ἵστοις πλεοῦς ἐπί τοῦ τῆς θείας διασκαλία λόγον προτρέψατο, id. μύρα πληθυ ἐπί τὴν θείαν ἀνυότητι διασκαλίαν ἐπαγόμενος, id. θεία καὶ ἀρρητῶ δυνάμει τοὺς μὴ ἑπανομαζόμενοι αὐτοῦ τῇ θείᾳ διασκαλίᾳ διάδοσις μετών, τὸν δὲ παγέντα καὶ παραδοθέντα θείον λόγον κρατίνων, οὐδ’ ὄτε εἰσέκαί καὶ τὴν τῆς ἐκθεσιν δυνάμεως τὴν ἀρετὴν εἰσδεικτέοτα κ.τ.λ. If two Persons are mentioned in v. 2, it would seem most natural to understand αὐτοῦ of the nearer, but Keil, de Wette, Brückner, Wiesinger, take it of the Father as the leading idea, while Dietlein supposes it to refer to the Deity in general including the Son. There is a similar difficulty as to τοῦ καλεσάντος, see n. below.

τὰ πρὸς ᾧν καὶ εἰσεβεβαι. [‘All that tends to, or is needed for, life and godliness,’ cf. Jud. 17. ‘I will give thee thy victuals’ (τὰ πρὸς ᾧν σου), Acts 28 τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν, Lk. 19 τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνη σου, Jos. Ant. Proosm. 6 παιδεύθηντες τὰ πρὸς εἰσεβεβαι καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀρετῆς. Weiss explains ‘it handelt sich um alles was dazu gehört um in uns das durch die Wiedergeburt erzeugte wahre geistliche Leben, dessen Hauptcharakterzug die εἰσεβεβαι ist, zu erzeugen.’ εἰσεβεβαι and the cognate terms are found in the N.T. only in the Acts, in this epistle, and in the pastoral epistles. In 1 Tim. 3 Christ, the Incarnate, Risen Lord, is spoken of as τῆς εἰσεβεβαίας μονοτήρου, ‘the secret of piety.’

διδομένης.] See n. on δώρημα James 1. The only other passage, besides this and the following verse, in which the word is found in the N.T. is Mk. 15. It occurs also in Gen. 30 δεδώρηται ὁ Θεὸς μοι δώρων καλῶν, Prov. 4 δώρων ἀγαθῶν δωροῦμαι υἱῶν.

δι τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλεσάντος ἡμᾶς.] There is a considerable resemblance between this passage and Col. 1 αὐτοῦμεν ἡ φυλακὴ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ δηλημάτως αὐτοῦ ἐν πάγοι σοφίᾳ καὶ συνάγει πνευματικ. . . ἐν πάντι ἐργῇ καρποφοροῦντες (see below v. 8 οὐκ ἀδάμπτος) καὶ αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμοῦμεν κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, where we have ἐπιγνώσεως repeated as here, and the words underlined correspond to words in our text. For καλεσάντος see below v. 10 σπουδάσατε βεβαιαν υμῶν τὴν κλήσιν ποιεῖσθαι, and cf. 2 Tim. 1 (Θεοῦ) τοῦ σώοντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλεσάντος κλήσει ἀγία οὖ κατὰ τὰ ἥργα υἱῶν ἄλλα κατ’ ἵδιαν πρόθεσιν, 1 Pet. 15 κατὰ τὸν
NOTES

The calling of the Christian seems to be generally ascribed to God in the N.T. Here Spitta, with v. Soden, Beda, Cajetan, Estius, etc., refers it to Christ, citing Mt. 9:13 οὐκ ἠλθὼν καλέσαι δικαίους, 2 Clem. Rom. 9 εἰ Χριστὸς δὲ κύριος... ἐγένετο σάρξ καὶ σῶμα ἤμας ἐκάλεσεν. In other passages of this epistle Christ is mentioned as the object of ἐπίγνωσις (1, 20). Cf also Herm. Sim. 14. 5 εἰ δὲν πάσα ἡ κτίσις διὰ τοῦ ιύου του Θεοῦ βασταζεται, τι δοκεῖ τοὺς κεκλημένους ὑπ᾿ αὐτοῦ; In any case the text seems to distinguish between the Possessor of the divine power, and the Caller, through the knowledge of whom that divine power has granted to us all that is necessary for life. The former we naturally identify with the Father, the latter with the Son. See note on κλητοίς J. 2.

ἰδιὲ δὲ ἐλλογος καὶ ἄρτην.] See Introduction on the Text. For the use of ἴδιος as a possessive pronoun, see Blass N.T.Gr. tr. p. 169, and Winer tr. p. 191, cf. Mt. 22:1 ἀπέλθων δὲ μὲν εἰς τὸν ιύου ἄγρων, δὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ, below 22 ἐπὶ τὸ ιύον ἐξέφαρμα compared with Prov. 26:11 ἐπὶ τὸν ιναυτὸν ἐμενον, Barn. ν. 9 τοὺς ιδίους ἀποστόλους ἐξελέγατο. It is found also in LXX. Job 21:11 παρεγένοντο ἐκατοστοι εκ της ιδιας χωρας, Prov. 27:5, Herm. Βίω. i. 3. 4 δ᾿ Θεός... τη ιδια σοφια καὶ προνοια κτισα την ἐκκλησαν. Plut. Μορ. 237 δ τοὺς νευον τοὺς ιδιους αἰδεωθαι πατερας, Chariton Aphr. iv. 6 ιδιω δεοπτη χαιρεων with D’Orville’s n. Cf. Phrynichus p. 441 Lob. τα ιδια πραττων οι πολλοι λεγον, διον τα ιματου πραττω λεγεν. The article is frequently omitted, as in Acts 13:30 Δαυειδ ιδια γενεα υπηρετησα, Gal. 6:9 καιρω ιδιω θερισων (σο καιρους ιδιους 1 Tim. 2:6, 6:15, Tit. 18, as compared with Polyb. i. 30, 10 χρομενοι τοις ιδιους καιρους), 2 Tim. 1:9 ου κατα τα ζηγα ημων αλλα κατα ιδιαν προθεσιν, Tit. 2:9 δουλους ιδιους δεοτογας υποτασσονθαι κακα και below 216 υλεγην έσχεν ιδιας παρανομιας. By δοξα we are probably to understand the manifestation of the Divine character, which compels the veneration, the love, and the worship of men. It is used of Christ below (v. 17), and in Joh. 11:14 δοξα σαρξ εγνευο... καὶ ιδεσαμενα την δοξαν αυτου, δοξαν δε μονογενους παρα πατρος, which is explained immediately afterwards by saying that He was πληρης χαιρετος και λαθειας. δοξη is perhaps the inner perfection or excellence which is thus manifested. The only other passages in the N.T. in which it occurs are 1 Pet. 2:9 διως τας άρετας ἐξαγειλητε του τη σκοτους υμας καλεσαντος, where it is usually translated ‘praises’ (in accordance with its use in Thuc. i. 33 and in the LXX., cf. Hatch Essays in Bibl. Gr. pp. 40, 41), below v. 5, where it seems to bear the special sense of ‘energy’ or ‘courage,’ and Phil. 4:8 δοξα ευφυμα, ει τις δοξη και ει τις έταινος, ταιτα λογιωθο, where Lightfoot comments ‘some treat δοξη and έταινος as comprehensive expressions, recapitulating the previous subjects under two general heads, the intrinsic character and the subjective estimation.’ He himself prefers the explanation ‘whatever value may reside in your old heathen

1 See Hort’s excellent note in p. 129 of his commentary.
conception of virtue, whatever consideration is due to the praise of men. The fact that philosophical terms like θεία φόρος are used in 2 Pet. leads one to suppose that ἀρετή has its usual Greek meaning, as in Wisdom 8', 4 Macc. 14•4.1320, where the cardinal virtues are recounted, cf. Justin M. Apol. ii. 2 τὸ διδασκαλίαν τῆς θείας ἀρετῆς, Clem. Al. p. 438 παράδειγμα θείας ἀρετῆς, Eus. c. Hieroc. 4 τῇ ἱδίᾳ θεότητι καὶ ἀρετῇ πάσην ἰσότητα τῆς οἰκουμένης. It was a debated question whether ἀρετή was to be ascribed to God, see my n. on Clem. Str. vii. § 88. The Stoics affirmed, against the Academics and Peripatetics, the identity of divine and human virtue. For the phrase cf. Jos. Ant. 17. 5. 6 ἐνεπαραίνῃ τῇ ἀρετῇ τοῦ θείου 'abused the goodness of Providence,' id. Procem. 4. 11 οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι νομοθέται τῷ μόνῳ ἔξωκολοθήσαντες τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἀμαρτημάτων ἐπὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας μετέδεσαν ... ὁ δὲ ἠμέτρητος νομοθέται, ἔκραυγὴ τῆν ἀρετὴν ἔχοντα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποφήμα, φήσῃ δέν τοὺς ἀνθρώπων εἰκείνης περιστὰ ἐκ μεταλλαβήν, id. i. 3. 8 (the words of God to Noah after the Flood) οἷς ἐξεύρεθη εἰς τὴν ἡμῖν εὐνέμενα καὶ ἀρετῆν, τούτους ἐξεβιαστόντο με ταύτην αὐτούς ἐπιθέειν τὴν δύναμιν. Philo Leg. Alleg ii. 14 (M. 1. p. 75) speaks of τῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ σοφίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ τῆς μητέρας τῶν συμπάντων, Q. det. pot. § 44 (M. 1. p. 222) τῶν ἀρετῶν, ἢ μὲν Θεοῦ πρὸς ἅλθαιν ἐτί ... ἢ δὲ Μωσίως σκηνή, συμβολικῶς οὐσα αὐτρόπον ἀρετή ... μῦρα καὶ ἀπεικόνισμα τῆς θείας εἰκές, id. i. 1. p. 635 init. The meaning of the passage then will be: Christ has called us, not through our seeking, but through the attractive power of His own glory, i.e. through the revelation of His own perfection. Wetstein quotes many examples of the combination ἀρετή and δόξα, e.g. Plut. Mor. 355 (De Vit. Pudore) τῶς οὗ παριστάται δεινών εἶναι τῷ τῆς ἱδίας δόξας καὶ ἀρετῆς ἀφειδεῖν;

4. οἷς ἐὰν τὰ τίμα καὶ μέγατα ήμῖν ἑπαγγέλματα διδόρησα.] The verb may be taken here in the middle sense, as before, with Θεός (understood from τῆς θείας δύναμεως αὐτοῦ) for the subject; but the perf. of deponent verbs frequently bears a passive sense, as in Clem. Al. Prostr. p. 73 οὐ μείζον οὐδὲν ἐκ Θεοῦ διδόρηται, Pae. id. i. p. 133 καὶ τῆς διαθήκης διδόρηται, Str. iii. 1. 4 οἷς τοῦτο διδόρηται ἵνα Θεοῦ, and the article suits the subject. For the combination of positive and superlative epithets, see Plato Rep. 450 b peri τῶν μεγάλων τε καὶ φιλῶν, where H. Richards proposes to read φιλῶν (C.R. vii. 349). He has supplied me with the following exx. taken from Rehbander's n. on Lycurgus 29, δοκεὶ δικαίωτατον καὶ δημοτικόν εἶναι, Thuc. i. 1 ἐπτίπατος μέγαν τε ἐξεσθαί καὶ ἐξειλογήτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων, i. 84 ἐγεῖθαι καὶ ἐυδοκήτατον πόλιν νεμομεθα, Xen. Hell. v. 3. 17 εὐτάκτους καὶ εὔπολεστάτους, Eur. Cyclo. 315 κυμφῶς γενήσει καὶ χαλαστάτος, Plato Legg. 808 D ἐπιβολου καὶ δριμυ καὶ υβριστάτων θηρίων, Plato Symp. 205 D ὁ μέγατος καὶ δολερὸς ἑρως παντί, Xen. Cyrop. ii. 4. 29 δυνατοτάτων καὶ προβώμων, Aesch. ii. 11 δεν δ' ἤγοιμαι σαφεστάτον μοι τοὺς λόγους ἔπεσθαι καὶ γνωρίσαμοι ὑμῖν. In these combinations the difficulty is greatest when the epithets are such as to make it probable that they would vary in the same degree, as here τίμα and μέγατα, and when the superlative comes first, so as to produce an anti-climax. These considerations are in favour of B's reading here. Wetstein quotes two examples of the combination.
NOTES

\[ \text{I 3, 4} \]

méγιστα καὶ τιμώτατα which might suggest reading τιμώτατα here. The forms ἐπάγγελλα and ἐπάγγελεία are both classical; the latter alone is found in biblical Gr., excepting this verse and 3:18 below.

Three explanations of δι’ ὑμῖν have been given. Spitta would understand them of ὑμῖν in vv. 1 and 3 (i.e. the Apostles, according to his view): he then reads τὰ μεγίστα καὶ τίμια ὑμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα <ὑμῖν> διδόμενα, ‘through whom He has granted to you the promised blessings which are so great and precious to us.’ The 2nd view is that δι’ ὑμῖν refers to πάντα τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐνσέβεσθαι: so Keil, Schott, and Hofmann, ‘Wie die Erkenntnis Gottes das Mittel ist, durch welches uns alles zum Leben u. zur Gottseligkeit Dienen gegeben ist, so ist letzteres das Mittel, wodurch uns künstliche u. grosse Verheissungen gegeben werden.’ Against both of these explanations it has to be said that the reference is too distant, and against the second that the promises are not conveyed to us by τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἡμῖν, but are included in them. The 3rd view (held by Kühn, Dietlein, Wiesinger, Brückner) is far the simplest, connecting the relative δι’ ὑμῖν with the immediately preceding ἵνα δέξη καὶ ἀρέτη, ‘through the glory and goodness of Christ God has given to us His most precious promises,’ i.e. what has been revealed to us in the character of the Incarnate Son is the greatest of all promises, cf. 1 Joh. 3:13, 18. For the contents of the ἐπαγγέλματα see below 3:18. I should prefer however to read υμῖν with \( \lambda \) 68 see\(^{2}\), instead of ὑμῖν, on account of the following γένοισθε. See Lightfoot (Philemon 6) on the confusion between the 1st and 2nd persons ‘though ὑμῖν has somewhat better support, we seem to be justified in reading ὑμῖν as being much more expressive. In such cases the MSS. are of no great authority.’ So here the preceding ἡμῖν would easily lead to ὑμῖν being written for ὑμῖν.

\[ \text{Ενά διδ τοῖς γενέσθε θείας κοινωνοφύτευσι.} \] The reference in διὰ τούτων is to ἐπαγγέλματα (as Dietlein, Wiesinger, Schott, Keil, Kühn, Weiss), not to τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἡμῖν (as de Wette, Hofmann, Spitta), nor to δέξαντες καὶ ἀρέτη (as Bengel). Our nature is changed to divine by the moral power of hope and faith kindled in us by the promises. The phrase \( \text{θείας φύσης} \) is Platonic, see Critias 120 d–121 a μέχρι περὶ τῆς θεοῦ φύσεως αὐτού εἴτερα . . . φύσεως θείας παραμονής πάντα αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐκείνης, Rep. 366 c θεία φύσις δυσχεραίνει τὰ ἀδικία, Legg. iii. 691 φύσις τῆς ἀνθρωποπνεύμης μεμελημένη θεία τῶν δυνάμεων, Phaedr. 230 a θεία καὶ ἀνθρώποι μορίας φύσας μετέχον, 253 a ἐφατόμενοι θεοὺς τὴν μνήμην ἐκ κάθειν λαμβάνουσι τὰ ἔθη καὶ ὅσον δυνατὸν θεοῦ ἀνθρώποι μετασχηματίζονται, Rep. vi. 500c, Protag. 322 a ὁ ἀνθρώπος θείας μετέχει μορίας. It is found also in Xen. Hell. vii. 1. 2 δοκεῖ ταῦτα συν ἀνθρωπηπνοί μᾶλλον ἡ θεία φύσις καὶ τῆς δωρεύσεως, so Aristotle Part. Anim. iv. 10, Epicurus ap. Diog. L. x. 97, 113, Seneca Epist. 92. 30 homo Dei pars est, Epict. Diss. ii. 19. 27 θεὸν ἐκ ἀνθρώπου ἐπιθυμοῦντα γενέσθαι καὶ . . . περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Δία κοινωνίας βοηθεῖν. It will be noticed that in these passages the participation of the divine nature is spoken of sometimes as innate, sometimes as attained by effort (as in Arist Eth. x. 7. 8 ὧν ἐνδέχεται ἀθωνιστεῖν). The same idea occurs in slightly altered form in Heb. 3:14 μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν, 64 μετόχους γεννηθέντας
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πνεύματος ἄγιων, 1210 εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ, 1 Joh. 13, ἡ κοινωνία ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰ.Χ., 1 P. 51 ο καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνίας, 2 Cor. 318 τὴν δόξαν Κυρίων κατοπτριζομένη τὴν αὐτήν εἰκόνα μεταμορφώμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν. The phrase or its equivalent also occurs in Apost. Petri ap. Method. Ἀντ. ii. 6 ἡ μακαρία ἐκεῖνη φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ, Ioh. c. Ap. 26 Ἀμεμοῦμεν θείας δοκοῦσε μετεχεχείναι φύσεως, Philo M. 2. p. 329 ἡ ἀμετρώτης καὶ μακάριος καὶ τρισευθαίμων θεῖα φύσις, ib. p. 343 ἡ μακαρία Θεοῦ φύσις, ib. M. 1. p. 51 οὐ γὰρ ἐν ἐπετόλμησι τοσοῦτον ἀναδραμέν ὁ ἀνθρώπων νοῦς ἢ ἀντιλαβόμεθα Θεοῦ φύσεως εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἀνέστασεν αὐτὸν πρὸς έαυτόν, ib. 647 ὅσοι λογικῆς κεκοιμήσαντες φύσεως, and in many of the Fathers, e.g. Iren. iv. 20 μεταχεὶ Θεοῦ ἐστιν τὸ γυνώσκειν Θεὸν καὶ ἀπολαύει τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ, Clem. Al. p. 471 ἡ δὴ ἡμετέρα φύσις ἔμαθεν οὐδὲν ἐγκρατείας δεῖαν, δὲ ὅσα συνεγγίζει περιὰ τῇ θείᾳ φύσει, Euseb. c. Hieroc. 6 θείαν μὲν φύσιν, εὐεργετικὸν οὖν καὶ σωτηριαν καὶ προνοητικὸν τῶν δυνατῶν, ἀνθρώπους ποιεῖ ὡς ὀμιλίαι ἔλεος οὐδὲς ἂν ἐπιεύχουν λόγος, ib. 7 ἡ γὰρ τούτων ἀποτέλουσα . . . θεῖαν φύσιν ἀνθρώπους ἐπελάμβασαν (i.e. οἱ Ἀπολλωνίους) σκότον τοῦ καὶ μυστικῶς ἀποτελεί, οὐκ ἦν ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁρετὴν ἐπεδείκνυσθη: Quotations will be found from Origen, Hilary, Athanasius, Jerome, and others in HUDS. On this verse. The phrase is profusely used by Greg. Nyss., cf. Anim. ετ Resurr. 224 λ ἕπειδαν ἡ ψυχή πάντα τὰ ποικίλα τῆς φύσεως ἀποσκευασμένη κινήματα θεοειδής γίνεται . . . τὴν ὑπερέχουσαν μιμεῖται ἔως, τοὺς ἑώρασε τῆς θείας φύσεως ἐμμορφωθείσα, 228 δ ἡ θεία φύσις ἡ πτηγὴ πάσης ἐστὶ τῆς ἁρετῆς, Catech. 46 b, 48 b, 51 b, 52 a, 54 d, etc. The same idea receives a stronger and more startling expression in the θεοσοφίας of Athanasius and other Fathers, see Westcott on the epistles of St. John p. 319 and my note on Clem. Al. Str. vii. § 3 ἐσομένων τιν. ἀποφεύγω τὴν ὡς τῇ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς.] The negative preparation for the positive glorification, as in James 131 ἀποθεμένου μικριὰν δέξασθε τὸν λόγον, cf. Plat. Theod. 176 a φυγὴ (ἐνθέθεν ἐκείνη) ὁμοίωσις τινὸς τὰ κατὰ τὸ δυνάμενον. The acc. is commonly used after ἀποφεύγω, as below 218. 20. In fact this is the only recorded instance of the gen. with this verb. Winer (p. 532) mentions other compounds of ἀπό, ἀπαλλοτριών (Eph. 212. 419), ἀφύσασθαι (1 Tim. 41), which have the same construction. To these may be added ἀποδιδόμενος Philo Alalg. p. 90, ἀποκρύπτεσθαι ib. p. 88, ἀποτείχειν, ἀποβαίνειν, ἀπολύειν. The gen. whether with or without a preposition serves to intensify the danger which has been escaped, cf. Mt. 37 φυγεῖν ἐπ' ἀργίᾳ, 1 Cor. 1014. Sometimes the simple φυγεῖ takes the gen., as in Soph. Phil. 1034 τῆς πυλῆς φεύγαναι λίγο τῆς πυλῆς τοῦ θεοῦ χροὸν Philo i. p. 88. On the word φθορά see Appendix. It is here defined by ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ, 'the corruption caused by, consisting in, lust'; and then its environment is stated to be the world, on which see James 44 with the notes in my ed. pp. 218 f. Also compare Rom. 821 αὐτὴ ἡ κίνησις ἐλευθερωθμέναι ἀπὸ τῆς δομάς τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ Θεοῦ, Gal. 68 ὁ σπειρών εἰς τὴν σάρκα . . . θεριστεῖ φθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπειρών εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα . . . ἡ ψυχή αἰώνιον.
The author is fond of these compact articular phrases, see 27 below.

5. καὶ αὕτη τοῦτο 84.] See for καὶ δὲ 2 Tim. 3.12 καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ θεὸντες ἔτη, 1 Tim. 3.10 καὶ οὗτοι δὲ δοκιμάζονται, Rom. 11.22 κἀκεῖνοι δὲ . . . ἀγκεντροφόροντα, Mt. 10.18, 16.18, Joh. 6.51, 8.16, 17, Acts 3.24, 22.29, Heb. 9.31, 1 Joh. 1.3 καὶ ή κοινωνία δὲ with Wescott's n., and Madvig Gr. Gr. § 185. 2, 'By annexing a δὲ to καὶ the new member acquires a special corroboration and enlargement of the preceding (and too, and also).' For classical examples cf. Prom. 972 [χλιδώντας δδ οὗτος ἢμων ἑγὼ ἐχθρόις ἄδωμι καὶ οὐδ' ἐν τούτοις λέγω, Xen. Cyrop. i. 1. 2 ἄρχοντες μὲν εἰσὶ καὶ οἱ βουκάλοι τῶν βοῶν . . . καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ καλούμενοι νομεῖς. In all these cases δὲ has its ordinary connective use: here (if we suppose the construction continued after φθοράς) it would be used in μορφόι, as in 1 Cor. 12.13, ἐπειδὴ ἦταν αὐτοῦ σημεία αἰτοῦσιν . . . ημεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν, 1 Cor. 3.10 δ ὀφθαλμός οὐκ εἶδον . . . ημῶν δὲ ἀνεκάλυψεν οἱ Θεος according to Alford's interpretation, and B in 1 Pet. 4.18 ο δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ο δὲ ἀνεβης ποῦ φανεῖται; I cannot however believe that any writer would have introduced the apodosis by this cumbrous and awkward phrase. If we wish to begin the apodosis with this verse, we must read κατ' αὐτῷ with Blass (N. T. Gr. p. 171 n.) for καὶ αὐτῷ.

For the adversative use of αὕτη τοῦτο see Kühner's Gr. Gr. vol. ii. p. 267, Plut. Protag. 310 A αὕτη τοῦτο καὶ νῦν ἦκε παρά σε, Xen. Anab. i. 9. 21 αὕτη τοῦτο οὕτως ἐνεκα φίλους φέροντο δείκτων, ὡς συνεργοις ἤχου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκπάθη συνεργοῖς τοὺς φίλους εἰμι νῦν ἐρωτῶμαι. 9. 21, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐκπάθη συνεργοῖς τοὺς φίλους εἰμι νῦν ἐρωτῶμαι. The exact reference of the phrase in this place? It has just been said 'God has given you precious promises in order that through them you may become partakers of the divine nature.' The writer continues 'Aye, and for this very reason, viz. because it is God's will, do you do your part in order that the divine will may be carried out'.

στουδὴν πάνταν παραστήκαστε ἐνηχορηγήσατε.] The παρὰ καὶ ἐνί serve to show the subordinate nature of human effort (along with and in addition to the grace of God) in giving effect to the δώριμα twice mentioned above. The word παρεισφέρων is used by Democtenes (Lept. 88, 89, 99, 137) of moving an amendment to an existing law. It is also used by smugling, importing through by-ways, also of heretics introducing unmeaning phrases κενοφωνίας ὀνόματα Epiph. Hær. xxvi. 1, and 16, also Index 11 μυθολογίας παρεισφέροντες. Cf. παρεισάγω below 21.

The phrase εἰσφέρομαι στουδὴν is very common in later Greek, see Polyb. xxii. 12. 12, Diod. i. 83 οὐδ' ὁ χλοῖς πάσαν εἰσφέροντο στουδὴν, ib. 84, xviii. 34, xvi. 3 φιλοτιμαν εἰσφέρομεν, Jos. Ant. xx. 9, 2 πᾶσαν εἰσινέκαστο στουδὴν καὶ πρόνοιαν, and the Inscription quoted in the Appendix. The prefixing of ταρὰ alters the sense as in πάρεργον, παρανύμφος, παρατίθεν, παραβλάπτω, παραθέγγομαι, παραφύλλος, παραθράσθω, παραδιαστέως, etc. The meaning is well
expressed by Aug. De Pec. Meritis, ii. 5, quoted by Hundhausen ‘nec ideo tantum solis de hac re votis agendum est, ut non subin-
feratur adnittinge etiam nostrae efficacia voluntatis.’

ἐπιχορηγήσατε.] (‘supply,’ ‘provide’). Used twice in 2 P., viz. here and in 111 πλουσίων ἐπιχορηγήσητε ἡ ἐκκοδος, and thrice by St. Paul
in 2 Cor. 910 ὅ ἐπιχορηγῶν στέρμα τῷ στερέωτί καὶ ἄρτον εἰς βρόδινα χορηγήσει, Gal. 35 ὅ ἐπιχορήγῃ ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα, Col. 219 τὰν τὸ σώμα διὰ τῶν... συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον. The simple verb means literally to be a χορηγός, i.e. (in its first sense) one who leads the chorus, (in its second sense) one who defrays the cost of the chorus, and then,
generally, one who supplies the costs for any purpose. Hence the
verb is used absolutely, as in Xen. Mem. iii. 4. 3 ὅσικες Ἀρτινήν
κεχορήξας, τοῖς τοῖς χοροῖς λευκής, Plut. Mor. 13 ο ἱδέων πατέρ, ἄλλα
καὶ χορήγησον (‘respond’), Antiph. p. 117 λαμπρός χορηγῶν; in the
passive Xen. Resp. Ath. i. 13 χορηγοῦσι μὲν οἱ πλούσιοι, χορηγεῖται 88 ὅ δὴ
δήμος: sometimes it has for direct object the person benefited as in
Polyb. iii. 78. 8 (the Celtic population) δαμαλώς ἐξορθηγεῖ τὸ στρατόπεδον
toις ἑπτυρείοις, id. 49. 11 σήμες καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἑπτυρείοις ἀφόδωνος
ἐξορθηγεῖ τὸ στρατόπεδον; sometimes the assistance given, as in
Diod. ii. 35 χορηγοῦσα τὰς προφάς ἀφόδωνος, and similarly in 2 Cor. 910
just quoted, and in 1 P. 411 ὃς ἐξ ισχευσις ἴς χορηγεῖ ὅ Θεος. The com-
 pound is found once in the LXX. (Sir. 2521) γνώη ἐὰν ἐπιχορηγῇ (if she
supports) τῇ ἄνδρι αὐτῆς (is a cause of shame); the simple verb is more
common, e.g. in 1 K. 47 χορηγεῖν τῷ βασιλεί, 1 Macc. 1410 ταῖς πόλεων
ἐξορθηγεῖ βρώματα. It is frequently used by classical writers in the
same wide sense, e.g. in Aristotle’s definition of the ἐσθιάμον (Eth. i.
10. 13) τοῖς ἔκτος ἀγαθοῖς ἱκανοῖς κεχορηγημένοις, Dio. Chr. vol. i. p. 52
(Thubner) ἕλλες χορηγεῖ τὸ κάλλιστον δραμάτων, φόσον. The rarer compound
occurs in Dionys. Hal. (Ep. ad Pomp. 1) τὰς συντάξεις ἐπιχορηγοῦτος
σου Ζήνωνος, Strabo xii. 14. 16 ἐξ εἰπόρων οἰκῶν ἐπιχορηγοῦμενοι, Diog.
L. ν. 67 πλεύστα ἐπιχορήγον αὐτῷ, Aristid. D. ii. p. 194. 9. i. Clem. R.
38 ὅ πλούσιος ἐπιχορηγεῖτο τῷ πτωχῷ, id. ἐτρόφοι ἐστών ὅ ἐπιχορήγων αὐτῷ
τὴν ἔγκρατεας, Theoph. Autol. 73 b, where ἕτοι seems to have an ac-
cumulative force, ‘to add further supplies,’ ‘to provide more than was
expected or could be demanded.’

ἐν τῇ πίστῃ τὴν ἀρετήν.] Faith is the foundation of a series of seven
virtues, each of which is apparently described as rooted in the pre-
ceeding. We have similar lists in Rom. 5τ ἡ θλίψει υπομονής κατεργα-
ζεται, ἡ δἐ υπομονῆς δοκίμη, ἡ δἐ δοκίμη ἐπίταξα, ἡ δἐ ἀλήθεις ὑπὸ κατασχεῖν,
which is itself an expansion of James 15 ὅ τὸ δοκίμων ὑπὸ τῆς πίστεως
catergάζεται υπομονήν, ἡ δἐ υπομονῆς ἔργον τέλειον ἐγέετο ἵνα ἔτε τέλειον.
Blass (Ν. T. Gr. p. 301) adds the following examples of this ‘kind of
climax which consists in each clause taking up and repeating the
principal word of the preceding clause,’ Rom. 829τ. οὐς προὼσι, καὶ προῄσχωσιν...
οὐ δὲ προῄσχωσιν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλυψιν καὶ οὐς ἐκάλυψιν,
toútous καὶ ἐκδικάσωσιν οὐς δὲ ἐδικάσωσι, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξοσι, id. 1014.
Herm. Mand. ν. 2. 4 ἐκ τῆς ἄφοσιν γίνεται πυρκία, ἐκ δὲ τῆς πυρείας
θυμός, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ θυμοῦ δραγή, ἐκ δὲ τῆς ὁράς μύγας. Cicero uses σχέδιαμον
to express the Gr. κλίματος. Examples are given in the Ad Herenn.
iv. 25 e.g. 'Africano industria virtutem, virtus gloriam, gloria semulos comparavit.'

The list here agrees with the ordinary description of Christian growth in so far as it begins with πίστις and ends with ἀγάπη, intermediate between which comes γνῶσις according to Clem. Al. Str. vii. §§ 46, 55 f. We will consider the other steps as they are brought before us. Since faith is the root of the Christian life (Eph. 2:8 χάρις ἐστε συναγωμένοι διὰ πίστεως), the other virtues may be said to be contained in it. It is not quite so clear that each of the series is in like manner dependent on that which immediately precedes, though this would suit 1, 2, and 7. Possibly the writer may have used ἐν as the connecting link in his climax without considering whether it retained its full force in each case; or he may have intended to mark, not the addition of a distinct virtue, but the infusion of a new quality in the preceding virtue, which would suit 5 and 6; or again he may have had in his mind the poetic use of ἐν δὲ (perhaps derived from the repeated ἐν δὲ used in describing the successive compartments of the Homeric shield in Il. xviii.) to express addition, as in Soph. Oed. C. 55, Trach. 206. Other lists of virtues and graces will be found in Gal. 5:22: ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνευματός ἐστιν ἀγάπη, χαρά, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, χροστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις, πρᾳοτητίς, ἐγκάρδεα, 2 Cor. 6:6 (where S. Paul appeals to his sufferings and the spirit in which they were borne) ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλαρεῖ...ἐν ἀγάπητι, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν χροστότητι, ἐν πνευματικῇ ἁγίῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀνυποκρίτῃ κ.τ.λ., 1 Tim. 6:11 δι' αὐτού δικαίουσιν, εὐθείᾳ, πίστιν, ἄγαπην, ὑπομονήν, πραΰταιρα, ἀρετή, ὁδὸν σου τὰ ἔργα, καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην, καὶ τὴν πίστιν, καὶ τὴν διακοινίαν, καὶ τὴν ὑπομονήν σου, where the words which occur in our list are in thick type. It will be noticed that ἀγάπη occurs in all the four lists, πίστις in three, ὑπομονή in three. It is just these three which are chosen for mention in 1 Th. 1:3 and 2 Th. 1:5, where ὑπομονή ἐλπίδος takes the place of the single ἐλπίς in 1 Cor. 13:13. In none of the longer biblical catalogues, whether of virtues or vices, does the arrangement seem to rest on any more distinct principle than that in our text. We may compare also Hermas Vis. ii. 8 (explaining the vision of the Seven Virgins) κρατοῦνται δὲ ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτῶν καὶ ἀκολουθοῦν ἀλλήλων, καθὼς καὶ γεγενημένα εἰσίν. εἰς τὴν Πιστεύει Εὐγένεια, εἰς τὴν Ἐγκαραπήνας Ἀπλότητα, εἰς τὴν Ἀπλότητας Ἀκακία, εἰς τὴν Ἀκακίας Χειρότητα, εἰς τὴν Χειρότητας Ἐπιστήμη, εἰς τὴν Ἐπιστήμης Ἀγάπη, which is perhaps modelled on this passage; Barn. ii. τὸ ὑπὸ πίστεως ἡμῶν εἰσίν βοηθοῖ φόβος καὶ ὑπομονή, τὰ δὲ συμμαχοῦσα ἡμῶν μακροθυμία καὶ ἑγκράτεια: τότες μενέντων τῶν πρὸς Κύριον ἄγνοι, συνεφαραίονται αὐτοῖς σοφία, σύνεσις, ἐπιστήμη, γνώσης. In i. Clem. R. 1 πίστες, εὐθείᾳ, γνῶσις are found together, and in 62 we have περὶ γὰρ πίστεως καὶ μετανοίας καὶ γνησίας ἀγάπης καὶ ἑγκρατείας καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ὑπομονῆς πάντα τῶν ὕψιστοι συνεχείαιν.

ἀρέτην.] 'Moral energy.' Strænus animae tonus et vigor Bengel, equivalent to 1 Pet. 1:18 ἀναξιωσάμενοι τὰς ὁσφυας τῆς διανοιας ὑμῶν. It is found in this sense in 2 Mac. 6:1 τῶν ἐκατού διάνοιαν ὑποδείγμα γεναιοκτητος καὶ μυθομονυμὸν ἀρετῆς κατάλειπεν, 4 Mc. 9:12, 12:14, 17:12, Plut. Mor.
169 c ἁγιαὶ ἁλιὰς ὁ Θεός ἱστιν, οὐ δειλίας πρόφασις. Since it is here simply one in a series of virtues, this seems better than to take it in the more general sense of virtue, as in 2 Macc. 15\textsuperscript{12}, 3 Macc. 6\textsuperscript{1}, Wisd. 4\textsuperscript{1}, in which case it would answer to the ἐγκρατεία of James 2\textsuperscript{20} εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἀστικά, cf. 1 Joh. 5\textsuperscript{4}. 5.  

6. ἐν ἰδὲ τῇ γνώσει τῆς ἐγκρατείας. The Seventh book of the Ethics contains a graduated scale of good and evil states in reference to our power of resisting temptation. The highest is σωφροσύνη, where passion is entirely subject to reason, the lowest ἀκολούθω, where reason is entirely subject to passion. Between these come ἐγκρατεία 'self-control' or 'continence' where reason wins the day against resisting passion, and ἁραδία 'incontinence' where passion prevails in spite of the resistance of reason. It is of course true that knowledge strengthens the motives to self-control, but it is equally true that hope or fear or simple submission to authority may induce a habit of self-control, in which case the converse holds good θεμέλιος γνώσεως ἢ τοιαύτη ἐγκρατεία (Clem. Al. Str. vii. p. 874), and again θεμέλιος ἁγιαίς ἢ ἐγκρατεία (ib. Str. ii. p. 484); cf. also Str. iii. p. 538. It closes the list of the fruits of the Spirit in Gal. 5\textsuperscript{25}, cf. 1 Cor. 9\textsuperscript{23} πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται, ib. 7\textsuperscript{9} ei ἀπὸ τῆς ἐγκρατείας, γαμησάτωσαν, Gen 4\textsuperscript{31} of Joseph restraining his tears ἐξελὼν ἐνεκρατεύσατο. It was one of the topics of Paul's address before Felix. 

7. ἐν ἰδὲ τῇ ἐυμονῇ τῆς ἐσθίεσαν. For ἐυμονή see my note on James 1\textsuperscript{3}. It corresponds to the Aristotelian καρπεία, which is distinguished from ἐγκρατεία in Mache. Mor. ii. 6. 34 ἢ μὲν ἐγκρατεία ἐστιν ἐν ἐφόνω καὶ οἱ ἐγκρατησις ὑμῶν ὑπὸς καρπαὶ καὶ ἐπιλυπας ἢ ἐν καρπαῖα ἐπὶ λύπας ἀν Ἕλλην καρπαγως ἀστιν. The cognate verb is used of Moses (Heb. 11\textsuperscript{27}) τὸν γὰρ ἀπάτον ὅπως ἄρων ἐκατέργησεν. 

7. ἐν ἰδὲ τῇ εὐφέβειᾳ τῆς ἐφευρέσεως. The martyr is in 4 Mache. 5\textsuperscript{22}. 23 combines ἐυμονή, εὐφέβεια, and φήλη ἐγκρατεία. No doubt εὐφέβεια here, as in v. 3, is in tacit opposition to the δεισίδαις against whom a large part of the epistle is directed. Its action may be illustrated by the case of Moses just referred to. It was no callous insensibility, no feeling of pride which supported him, but the sight of the Invisible. 

7. ἐν ἰδὲ τῇ εὐφεβείᾳ τῆς φιλαδελφίας, ἐν ἰδὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τῆς αὐτέρκειας. Cf. 1 Joh. 4\textsuperscript{20} εἶν τις εἰπῃ 5τι Ἱάγατο τῶν Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν δεισίδαι τοῦ αὐτοῦ μονὴ, ψευτὴ τοῦ ἰστιν καὶ Westcott's n. on 1 Joh. 2. 2 'Brethren are those who are united together in Christ to God as their Father' (Joh. 20\textsuperscript{17}, 21\textsuperscript{2}, Matt. 12\textsuperscript{50}). φιλαδελφία (1 Th. 4\textsuperscript{3}, Rom. 12\textsuperscript{10}, Heb. 13\textsuperscript{1}, 1 Pet. 1\textsuperscript{2}, where see Hort, 3\textsuperscript{2}) leads up to ἀγάπη. Cf. 1 Th. 3\textsuperscript{12} ὡς ὁ κύριος πλεονάζῃ καὶ περισυπεύχεται τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς ἄλληλους καὶ εἰς πάντας. The R.V. 'in your love of the brethren, love' is surely most unfortunate. It implies that the word ἀγάπη is repeated in the original, and gives an extremely harsh and most un-English, if not an illogical and unmeaning phrase.
The 'brotherly kindness' of the A.V. may not be an exact equivalent of the untranslatable φιλαδελφία, but it might easily be explained by a marginal note. In profane Greek (including Josephus Ant. iv. 2. 4 where Moses' feeling for Aaron is called φιλαδελφία) φιλάδελφος and φιλαδελφία are only used literally of the affection between actual brothers. Among the Israelites patriotism was so strong that they regarded one another as brothers (see my note on James 1:2) and thus φιλάδελφος is found with a wider meaning in 2 Macc. 15:14 (spoken of the prophet Jeremiah) δε φιλάδελφος ουτός ίστων δε πολλά προσευχό-μενος περι τοι λαού. The noun φιλαδελφία occurs twice in Clem. R. 47 ή περιβοητος φ. and 48 ή σεμνη της φ. ήμων αγνη αγωγη. Wetstein quotes Themist. vi. 76 to the same effect as Pope's 'God loves from whole to parts, the human soul Must rise from individual to the whole,' φιλαδελφία ώσπερ δρυ και στοιχείων της προς άπαντας ανθρώπων ευνοίας. . . έπειται το φιλαδελφει μεν δε φιλῶκεις, το φιλουκίω δε δε φιλόπατρε, το φιλοσάρηδε δε δ φιλάνθρωπος. We may compare Plato's famous description of the development of ἐρως (Symp. 210).

The relation between the seven virtues may be thus stated. Faith is the gift of God already received; to this must be added (1) Moral Strength which enables a man to do what he knows to be right; (2) Spiritual discernment; (3) Self-control by which a man resists temptation; (4) Endurance by which he bears up under persecution or adversity; (5) right feeling and behaviour towards God, (6) towards the brethren, (7) towards all.

8. ταῦτα γὰρ φημὶ ἐπάρχουσα καὶ πλεονάζουσα. ‘The possession of these qualities and their continued increase.’ πλεονάζω in classical writers is a term of disparagement, implying excess, to be, or to have, more than enough, to exaggerate. In the N.T. (except in 2 Cor. 8:15 δε το πολύ (νυλλέζας) οὐκ ἐπέλευσαν, καὶ δε το ἀληθεῦσεν, which is a quotation from Exod. 16:18) it is eulogistic, implying increase or abundance of what is good, as in 2 Cor. 4:16 ή χάρις πλεονάσασα διὰ των πλεονῶν την εὐχαριστίαν περισσεύσῃ εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ‘grace being multiplied through the more (i.e. through the increase in the number of the disciples) may cause the thanksgiving to abound unto the glory of God,’ Phil. 4:17 ὕπερτυχω τὸν καρπὸν τῶν πλεονάζων εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν ‘I long for the fruit that increaseth to your credit,’ 2 Th. 1:13 υπερεξάπειν ή πίστις ὑμῶν καὶ πλεονάζει ή ἀγάπη εἰς ἐκάστου πάντων ὑμῶν εἰς ἄλλους ‘your faith growth exceedingly and the love of each one of you all toward one another aboundeth,’ Rom. 5:20 νόμος παρεισῆλθαν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα, οὐ δὲ ἐπέλευσαν ἡ ἀμαρτία ὑπερεξάπεισθεν εἰς χάρις ‘where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly.’ In the only other passage of the N.T. in which the verb occurs (1 Th. 3:12) it has a transitive force ὑμᾶς δὲ δ κύριος πλεονάσαι (‘make you to increase’) καὶ περισσεύσῃ τῇ ἀγάπῃ. It will have been noticed how often the verb περισσεύω is joined with πλεονάζω in these passages. There is indeed a remarkable similarity

1 We might have expected that (3) and (4) would be immediately subordinate to (1), preceding γρώσις.
between them both in their uses and in their history. The prevailing classical use reminds one of the μηδὲν ἄγαν, the Aristotelian μᾶκον, the Greek hatred of the ἀπειρόν, a trace of which may be found in Ἐκκλησ., 716 'Be not righteous overmuch.' But to the fervent Christianity represented by St. Paul there can be no excess of good. The Greek words expressive of excess fall far short of the intensity of his feelings of love, of hope, of joy, of adoration, and he is driven to invent new phrases to meet the new experience. See Rom. 520 quoted above. So in 2 Cor. 74 he cries ὑπερπερισσῶμαι τῇ χαρᾷ, in 1 Tim. 114 ὑπερπλεόνασεν ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, in Eph. 320 τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιήσαι ὑπερπεπρισχοῦ ἐν αὐτοῖμεθα ή νοοῦμεν, cf. 1 Th. 310, 513. The very word ὑπερβολή chosen by Aristotle to express the vice of excess (Eth. N. ii. 8. 1 δύο οὖσας κακιῶν τῆς μὲν καθ' ὑπερβολήν, τῆς δὲ κατ' ἀλλευσί) is employed to express surpassing goodness, as in 1 Cor. 1231 ἐκαθ' ὑπερβολὴν δόνα δεικνυμ. 2 Cor. 417 τὸ παρανικτικὰ ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίμας καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνοι βάρος δέχεται κατεργάζεται ἡμῶν, Eph. 319 γνώσει τῆς ὑπερβάλλοντας τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ιόν. 27, 2 Cor. 310, ιό. 914.

σὰς Ἀργυροὶ σεβαζόμενοι καθῖστομεν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 'Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ιεργῶν.] The Greek naturally means 'make you not idle nor unfruitful for the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ'; but some editors having regard to the statement made in ver. 3, viz. that God has given us all things needed for life and godliness by means of the knowledge of Christ, consider that this knowledge, being the foundation of a virtuous life, cannot be here spoken of as its crown or end, and they would therefore translate εἰς 'in' or 'in reference to' and καθῆσθον 'show.' So Schott 'läßt euch nicht·trág noch fruchtetele ereischen in Beziehung auf die Erkenntnis J. Ch.' A more correct translation is v. Soden's 'wenn diese Dinge bei euch vorhanden sind und sich mehren, machen sie euch nicht erfolglos noch fruchtlös für die Erkenntniss unseres Herrn J. Ch.'; and Hundhausen has well disposed of the imagined difficulty in the words 'wie die christliche Erkenntniss die Grundlage und fortwährende Voraussetzung aller christlichen Tugend

en ist, so ist sie andererseits auch in gewissem Sinne Ziel derselben, insofern die Seele durch die Uebung und das Wachsthun in den christlichen Tugenden, zu immer lebendigerer, immer klarerer und vollkommenerer Erkenntniss Christi gelangt.' That knowledge should follow on virtue was stated above v. 5; that it is not a fixed quantity given once for all, but an ever growing capacity, appears below in 318 αὐξάνετε εἰς χάριν καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. Just in the same way St. Paul (Col. 118<br>following) after speaking of the growth of the Colossians in faith and love from the day that hekousate καὶ ἐγνώσατε τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . goes on to tell them of his prayer εἰς ἄνθρωπον τὴν ἐνέγκλητον τοῦ θηλήματος αὐτοῦ εἰς πάση σοφία καὶ συνένε πνευματικὴν . . . εἰς πνεύμα ἄγαθα καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αἰλαξάμενοι τὴν ἐνέγκλης τοῦ Θεοῦ: cf. Phil. 119 προσεύχεσθε εἰς ἡ ἁγίατ ἡμῶν ἐκ σχῆς περισσοτέρας εἰς τὴν πίστιν ἀρχηγῶν καὶ τελειωτήν. Above all, see Joh. 1713 compared with 1 Cor. 1312 ἅρτι γνώσει ἀκεμένων. It is surely a mistake to suppose
that the writer of our epistle regarded the knowledge of God and Christ as merely the first step toward a holy life. We cannot argue from ver. 2 that grace and peace originate in knowledge; but only that they are capable of being multiplied in and through knowledge. Nor does ver. 3 assert that knowledge precedes the faith and virtue of ver. 4: it only asserts that God has given us all that is needed for life and for godliness through the knowledge of Christ. Of course some knowledge of God is needed before we can either fear Him, or trust Him, but each step forward in the Christian life deepens and widens our knowledge and makes that knowledge more effectual in moulding our conduct. γνωσεω δ’ αει τοιλλα διδασκόμενοι is an experience which the Christian has no need to learn from others.

καθιστησαν.] It is curious that there is no other precise example of this use in the N.T., common as it is in classical Greek. The nearest are the passives in Rom. 5:19 ἀμαρτολοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἵ τολλοί, κ.π.λ.

We have still to ascertain the exact force of εἰς after ἀργοῦς and ἀκάρτος. ‘Not idle for the attainment of knowledge’ is simple enough, but the phrase ‘not fruitless for knowledge’ or ‘fruitful with a view to knowledge’ is perhaps, as Schott says, a less natural expression. Still I think we should find no difficulty in such a phrase as ‘his prolonged and laborious studies were fruitful for the advance (or the attainment) of knowledge’ or ‘bore fruit in knowledge,’ where ‘in’ expressive of result would be equivalent to the Greek εἰς. The use of the word ἀκάρτος is perhaps borrowed from the ἄκαρτα of Jude v. 12.

9. ὢ γὰρ μὴ πάρεσθαι ταῦτα, τυφλὸς ἄτιμω.] The thought of the last verse is repeated in a negative form. As the diligent practice of the virtues above mentioned conduces to spiritual insight, so their absence conduces to, nay, actually constitutes spiritual blindness.

μυχᾶσαν.] The only other recorded example of this word in the whole of Greek literature is found in Ps. Dionys. Eccl. Hier. ii. 3, p. 219, quoted in Suicer, where, after speaking of the Light which lighteth every man, he continues ‘if man of his own free will closes his eyes to the light, still the light is there, shining upon the soul μυχᾶσαν καὶ ἀποτρέφο-

μάνη (blinking and turning away).’ Suidas gives the following interpretations, μυχᾶσαν = τυφλότης (corrected from MS, τὸ φυλάττω): μυχᾶσαν = μυχᾶσαν, παρακαμφόνων (half-closing the eyes), ἁρκος τοῖς ὄφθαλμοις προσέχον (observing, as it were, with the edge of his eyes). The same explanation is given under the form ἐμυχάσασον. Spitta thinks that

1 Dr. Bigg (p. 259) is of opinion that the correct form of the verb is either μυχα-

τάζων (cf. ὑποκινθεῖν) or μυχαίνει (cf. ἡμωσκείν). But ἡμωσκείν is not formed from ἡμωσκείν, which does not exist, but from the Aristotelian ἡμωσκοῦσος. So ὑποκινθεῖν comes from ὑπάκοιε, like ἁρτίδω from ἀρτίος, σκηνικίω from σκηνικός, ἱδιάζεω from ήδισ. Nouns ending in -οψ or -οψ usually give rise to verbs in -ηος, as ἄληθεια ἀληθείω, μελαγχολία μαλαγχω, σκολιασμός, and so μέμψ, ‘gaddly’ or ‘goad,’ μυχαῖν. When it was desired to find a verb for the other sense, μυχαῖος was chosen (like σαρκάζω from σάρξ, ἐπηλγάζω from ἐλαζ), though μυχαῖος would have been perhaps an easier formation, as we find μυχαίν, μυχαίνας, μυχαίσας. The form -ος is also found in derivatives from words ending in -οψ, as θεωσία, κλωτείω; see Lobeck’s careful investigation of the whole subject in his Πραγματικόν.
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the word is distinguished from the preceding τυφλός because it implies ‘wilful blindness,’ with which v. Soden agrees; but there is nothing of wilful blindness in the μύψ; if he screws up his eyes, it is in order that he may see, not that he may avoid seeing, cf. Arist. Probl. xxxi. 16 διὰ τὸ οἱ μύωτες συνάγοντες τὰ βλέφαρα ὀρῶσιν; . . ὑπὸ ἀθροιστείᾳ ὡς ἐξήκ. δὲ ἐπάττων ἐξοίωσα, καὶ μὴ εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀναπταμένου ἐξοίωσα διαστασέως and Cope’s n. on Rhet. iii. 11. 13 ‘the involuntary contraction of the half-closed eyes of the short-sighted man is compared to the spattering of the lamp, when water is poured upon it’: ἀμφός γὰρ συνάγεται ‘because both are contracted.’ The relation between μύωτες and τυφλός is not that of climax, but of correction or limitation. This is well explained by Beza, Estius, and others, of the near-sightedness which confines the view to earth (Jude v. 10, 2 P. 212). Cf. Anton. iv. 29 δ ἐκαταμών τῷ νοσήματι ὄμματι, Greg. Naz. Anim. et Res. 186 λοιπὸν τὸν κόσμον ὀρῶντες πρὸς τὸν διὰ τούτων δηλάμενον ἀμφότερον, Clem. Rom. i. 3 ἐν τῷ πίστει ἀμφότερος, Clem. Al. p. 116 ἀμφότερον περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Hippol. Ref. v. 16 where Isaac’s blessing of Jacob is called ἀμφότερος εἰλογία, Plato Rep. vi. 508 o ἀμφότερον τε καὶ ἄγονον τυφλῶν. The vulg. and boh. translate ‘manu tentants.’

λάθνη λαβῶν.] The phrase occurs in Timotheus Dionysiasa (b.c. 340) δὲ γὰρ νοῦς τῶν ἱδών λάθνη λαβῶν, Jos. Ant. ii. 6. 9 ὡμάς βουλομαι καὶ αὐτοὺς λάθνην ἐκείνων λαβόντας ἰδεῖναι, ib. iv. 8. 44, Ael. V.H. iii. 18, Hist. An. iv. 35, cf. Job 721 ἵπτομαι τῆς ἀνοίας μου λάθνην, Deut. 819, Wisd. 1611: other exx. in Wetstein. Such phrases as λάθνην ἓνως, τοιοῦτοι, ἐμποίουσι are common in the best authors. For a similar use of λαμβάνω see 2 Tim. 15 ἵπτομεν λαμβάνων τῆς πίστεως, Heb. 1129 πείραν λαβόντες (τῆς θαλάσσης). This forgetfulness is itself an example of failure in the knowledge of Christ. One whose eye is fixed on the example of Christ, who remembers with gratitude what he has received from Christ, and looks to Him for daily supplies of the Bread of Life, cannot forget the time when he was incorporated with Him in baptism, cf. Col. 118-14.

tοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαὶ αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν. Cf. Heb. 13 διὰ ἑαυτοῦ καθαρισμοῦ παρὰ τούτων τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, Joh. 335 ἔγενετο ἐξήγησις . . . περὶ καθαρισμοῦ, i.e. as to the meaning and value of John’s baptism. It is used elsewhere in the N.T. of the ceremonial washings of the Jews. We may compare 1 P. 321 (φ.?) and ἡμᾶς ἀντίτυπον τῶν σώζει βάπτισμα, οὗ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγάθου ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεόν, 1 Cor. 611 καὶ ταῦτα τινὲς ἴνα· ἀλλὰ ἴσασθαι, ἀλλὰ ἴσατε, Eph. 524 δὲ Χριστός ἔγαγεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς· ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγάθη καθαρίσῃ τὸ λουτρό τοῦ ὀστὸς ἐν ρήματι. Tit. 33 ἵσσωσιν ἡμᾶς διὰ λοτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινίσως πνεύματος ἁγιών, Rom. 63, the words of Peter in Acts 238 μετανοεῖτε καὶ βαπτίσθητε pp. 216-233, and Pathologiae Serm. Gr. Prolegomena, pp. 439-483, where many examples of the double form -αςω and -ασω are given.

1 Hundhausen, following Ti. and Treg., prefers the reading of ΝΑΚ ἁμαρτη-

μάτων on account of its comparative rarity and because it might naturally be altered to suit Heb. 14.
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εκαστος ὁμών ἐπὶ τῷ ὑνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν, καὶ
λήμψεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, and of the Baptist in Lk. 3,3,
also Job 712 διατε ὁ ἐπουροῦν τῆς ἁμαρίας μοι ἤθην καὶ καθαρισμὸν τῆς
ἀμαρτίας μοι; Barn. 1111 καταβαίνομεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ γέμοντες ἀμαρτίων
καὶ μυτῶν, καὶ ἀναβαίνομεν καρποφοροῦντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, Herm. Mand. 4. 3
ήμερα μετάνοιας ὁμών ἑοτιν εἰ μὴ ἤκειν ὅτε εἰς ὕδωρ κατέβηκαν καὶ ἐλάβομεν
ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν τῶν προτέρων ... ἵνα γὰρ τὸν ἐλθόντα ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν
μηκέτι ἀμαρτάνειν, Sim. 9. 16. Spitta denies the reference to baptism,
and would explain it by what follows in 20,22, I Joh. 3 'he that hath
this hope purifieth himself even as he is pure,' 'The cleansing referred
to is that wrought by the effort of the converted man himself.
When it is said that he forgets this, he means that he has lost the
knowledge of Christ, which made it possible for him to put away sin.' It seems
to me that the passages already quoted, the use of πάλαι, denoting pre-
baptismal sin, of the word καθαρισμὸς here and of φωτισθέντας in Heb.
645 prove conclusively that the writers must have had the thought of
baptism in their minds. It corresponds to an appeal to the baptismal
vows among ourselves, cf. 1 Pet. 4, and see note on ὁ δεύτερον Jude 5.
To the passages quoted there on the forgiveness of post-baptismal
sin, add Hippol. Ref. vi. 41, (The Marcionians) μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἥτον
ἐπαγγέλλεται, ὁ καλοῦν ἀπολύτρωσιν, καὶ ἐν τῷτο ἀναστρέφοντες κακῶς
tοῦτοι αὐτοῖς παραμένεται εἰς ὑπίκειται τῆς ἀπολύτρωσεως, ὃς ἄπαθος μέτα
tο ἀπατε ϑικθάναται (καὶ βαπτισθῆναι) πάλαι τις ἄφασεν κ.τ.λ. Second
baptism was practised by the Elkesites, as we learn from Hippol.
Ref. ix. 15 (whoever has committed any enormous sin and seeks for-
giveness) βαπτισάσθω ἐκ δεύτερον ἐν ὑνόματι ψυγίων θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ νιῶν
αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. Callistus Bp. of Rome is accused of doing the same
(ib. ix. 12). For the use of the article with the adverb in place of
attributive adjectives, cf. below 36 ὃ τέσσαρα, 37 ὃ ἐν οἷς ὑπάρχει,
1 Pet. 210 ὃ ποτὲ οὐ λαῖς, Gal. 426 ὃ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ, Joh. 828 ὃ μεῖς
ἐκ τῶν κατῶ ὑπερήφανος, Phil. 314 ὃ ἄνω κλήσως, James 414 τῆς
αὐριόν, Xen. Mem. 1. 6. 14 τῶν πάλαι σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν.
10. διὸ μᾶλλον, ἀδελφοί στουδάσατε.] We have διὸ στουδάσατε again in
314, and διὸ in v. 12 below and in 1 P. 113. Here its force is 'Since
there is this danger of the coming on of spiritual blindness, be still
more on your guard.' He had already bidden them στούδην πάναν
παρεισφέρατε in v. 5 and now appeals to them more earnestly
under the name ἀδελφοὶ, which is found here only in the Petrine
writings. The aorist imperative is expressive of urgency, see Jude 21, and
Abbott Johannine Vocabulary p. 49, nn.

βεβαίαν ὅμων τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν τοιοῦτοις.1] The only other passages
in the N.T. in which ἐκλογὴ occurs are Acts 215 (where Saul is described
as σκέφτως ἐκλογής), four times in Rom., and once in 1 Th. The heavenly
calling and election (on which see n. on κλητοῖς, Jude 1), witnessed to
in baptism, do not supersede effort on man's part. The word βεβαιοῖσ
occurs several times in the Epistle to the Hebrews, cf. especially 36

1 Ewald and Hundhausen prefer the reading of ζ. A συν. sah. boh. (στουδάσατε
ἐν διὰ τῶν καλῶν ὁμῶν ἔργων βεβαίαν ... τοιοῦτος, which is also thought possible
by Hort.
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τὰν τὴν παρρησίαν... τῆς ἀληθοῦς μέχρι τέλους βεβαιάν κατάχωμεν, ἵνα εἴτε τὴν ἁρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαιάν κατασχωμεν. βεβ. ποιεῖται = βεβαιοῦν 'to certify,' 'confirm,' 'attest,' the ordinary periphrastic use of the middle of ποιεῖν, like σπουδῆς ποιούμενον Jude 3. The word βεβ. occurs again in v. 19 below. For κλήσις cf. n. on καλέσαντος above 1, Eph. 4:2. parakaló ἡμᾶς ἐξίων περιτρίττει τῆς κλήσεως ἐκ εἰλήφθη μετὰ πάντας ταπεινοφοροῦντες κ.τ.λ., Phil. 3:14 esp. τοῖς ἐπιμορφεῖσθαι ἐπεκτείνομενοι διὰ ἐκ τὸ βραβεῖον τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως.

ταύτα ποιόντες] Repeating the ταύτα of vv. 8, 9 with reference to the preceding list of virtues.

οὐ μὴ ταύτην ποτέ.] As a blind or short-sighted man might do (Joh. 11:19). οὐ μή with subj. is very common in the N.T. and is also found in the LXX., cf. Winer, pp. 634 foll. παίω is found in James 2:10, 3:1, and Rom. 11:11. See n. on ἀπαντῶσας, Jude 24.


πλούσιοι ἐπιχειρησθένται ἐμν. ] If you provide the above-named virtues in full measure (πλεονάζοντα v. 8), you will be richly provided for the entrance into the Kingdom, see n. on v. 5. For πλούσιοι compare Col. 3:16 ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνουκίωτο ἐν ὑμῖν πλούσιος ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, Philo Vit. Cont. M. 2. p. 476 σοφία πλούσιος καὶ ἀφθονόν τὰ δόγματα χορηγεῖ, Heracleon ap. Orig. in Joh. tom. 13, § 10 τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας τοῦ ἀνθρώπον ἐπιχορηγημένον πλούσιος καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐκβλήσας εἰς τὴν ἐτέρων αἰώνων ζωὴν τὰ ἐπιχειρημένα μία, πλούτος τῆς δόξης and similar phrases are found in St. Paul's epistles, see Lightfoot's n. on Col 1:27 γυμνωσάτε τὸ πλούτος τῆς δόξας τοῦ μυστηρίου τουτοῦ... δ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξας. For the thought compare Lk. 6:38 δόστε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν: μέτρον καὶ πλουσίον σεσωλυμένον ἐπερεκχυμένον δοσούντων εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν. The use of ἐπιχειρέω here suggests the ordering of a triumphal procession, cf. Plut. Vit. 994 ὁ δήμος θεάτο τῆς θεᾶς ἀφείδως πάνω χορηγουμένας.

ἡ εἰσόδος εἰς τὴν αἰώναν βασιλείαν.] 'A glorious entrance into the eternal kingdom shall be provided for you,' lit. 'the entrance into the kingdom shall be richly, unstintedly, provided for you.' Cf. Mt. 25:20 δεῦτε οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός μου κηρυχθήσατε τῇ ἡγομαισίᾳ ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, Joh. 14:2 παρε phéσαι εἰς τούτῳ τῶν ὑμῶν. In the N.T. εἰσόδος is used not of a place but of an action, cf. Heb. 10:19 ἵστατε παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἰσόδον τῶν ἄγιων 'boldness to enter into the holy place,' 1 Th. 1:9, 21, Acts 13:24. It is curious that the phrase αἰώνων βασιλείας does not occur elsewhere either in the N.T. or in the Apostolic Fathers. The earliest other examples appear to be Aristides Apol. xvi (quoted on 22 below) and Clem. Hom. x. 25 αἰώνιας βασιλείας κηρυχύμου. From the Index published by the Lightfoot Trustees I learn that ἅδος β. occurs in the same viii. 23, xiii. 20, Ep. Clem. 11. In the LXX. we find ἡ βασιλεία σοι, βασιλεία πάντων τῶν αἰώνων (Ps. 144:13), Κύριοι βασιλεία σοι αἰώνα καὶ ἑτέρων αἰώνα καὶ ἑτέρων (Exod. 15:18), ἐξουσία αἰώνων (Dan. 4:17 7:14), cf. Ps. 101:16, Lk. 1:35, αἰώνων κηρυχύμου Heb. 9:15, δόμα αἰώνων 1 Pet. 5:10. The usual biblical equivalent is ζωὴ αἰώνων often found

1 In Mart. Polyc. 20, where codd. b p have αἰώνων β., Lightfoot reads ἐκουσάνων βασιλείας with cod. m.
with κληρονόμοις, etc. as in Mt. 19:29, Mk. 10:17, Lk. 10:25, 18:18, Tit. 3:7, Heb. 9:15, James 2:5, 1 Pet. 4:19. St. John prefers ἵναις ὑμῖν which occurs in his Gospel 3:16, 15, 36, 5:24, 39, 6:40, 47, 54, 68, and indeed passim. The former expression implies that the life is thought of as future, the latter as already present. St. Paul seems to speak of it as future in Rom. 2:7, 5:12, 6:23, 2 Cor. 4:17, 18, Gal. 6:8, 1 Tim. 1:11, 2 Tim. 4:8, Tit. 1:2; perhaps as present in 1 Tim. 6:12 ἐναλβαζόμαι ὑμών ἕν, cf. Col. 1:13, Eph. 2:8: Jude (v. 21) refers to it as future. We must beware however of supposing that these views are mutually exclusive.1 The unity of the divine life in man, whether here or there, and its perfection in the life which follows this, are equally declared in Col. 3:3 ἐπεθάνατε γάρ (in your baptism) καὶ ἡ ἱερατεία κάθερεν συν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ. ὅταν οὖν Χριστὸς φανερώθη, ἡ ἱερατεία τῆς ἱμάτια ἐξειλαμβάνεται, καὶ οὕτως ἐν ἁρμόδιῳ ἐσώμεθα: οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι, ἐὰν φανερώθη, οὕτωι οὕτω εὐθύμησα, ὅτι δύναται αὐτῷ ἐσώμεθα, τῷ δύναμιν αὐτῶν καθὼς ἐστιν. The same double view is seen in the use of the phrases βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῶν οὐρανῶν, etc., which stand sometimes for the Gospel dispensation or the Church on earth, and sometimes (as in 2 Tim. 4:18 ἐνεχθέν τε με κύριος ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ) for the glory hereafter. In this passage, as in our text, the kingdom is spoken of as belonging to Christ, compare also Mt. 16:28 where it is said of the Transfiguration (to which our author refers immediately below) that in it the disciples should see the Son of Man ἐφόρομεν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ, so Mt. 28:18, 1 Cor. 15:24, Joh. 18:38, Eph. 5:5 κληρονομαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ, Ἀρωμ. 11:15, Lk. 22:29, 30, 23:12, and Messianic prophecies in the O.T. as Ps. 29.

12. διὰ μελλόνων δὲ ὑμᾶς ὑπομνήματα περὶ τοῦτον. It seems best to explain διὰ by the two preceding verses, stating the negative and positive results of attending to his advice: 'You will not stumble, you will have a glorious entry into the eternal kingdom.' With a view to this he proposes to be continually reminding them of these things, viz. of the promises referred to in v. 4, and of the way in which their faith was to be built up in virtue and knowledge (vv. 4–8).

μελλόνων.] See Introduction on the Text. The only parallel cited for this use of the future tense is Mt. 24:6 where, after prophesying of the false Christs who should appear before his Second Coming, our Lord, continues μελλόνων δὲ ἠκούειν πολέμους, which some take (like the present μελέτησε in Mt. 21:13 μέλετης ἢττεῖ) as a periphrasis for the future. But μελλόνων suggests a further future contemplated from the ground of a nearer future, implying 'you must then be prepared for, you must then expect,' a meaning which is out of the question in our text. I think therefore that Field is right in reading μελέτησα 'I shall take care to remind you.' This thought of the duty of reminding his readers, appears again in vv. 13 and 15, and in 31. δὲ implies a prospect of frequent communication between him and them.

καίτερ εἰσέπεσα.] Cf. for construction Heb. 5:8, 7:5, 12:17. In Heb. 4:3 we find the unclassical καίτοι τῶν ἐργῶν γενηθέντων. The connexion with ὑπομνήματα in Jude 5 is different. There the use of the verb 'remind' rather than 'teach' is justified, because the readers already

1 C. Charles' Eschatology, pp. 315, 362 foll.
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know what he is about to say: here the writer seems to apologize for venturing to remind them of what they already know.

stoicheiōmenous en tē parαrhē̂ ἀληθείας. When Jesus warned St. Peter of his approaching fall, he added the word of comfort καὶ σὺ ποτὲ ἐπιστρέψῃς στρήμαν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς σου. The same word is used in 1 P. 5:10 ὁ Θεὸς πάντας χάρισες...ἐνταῦθα καταρτίσεις, στηρίζεις, σκεπάσωσις, and the cognate noun in 2 P. 3:17 φιλάσσωσθε ἵνα μὴ τῇ τῶν ἀδέσποτων πλάνῃ συναπαρχόμενοι ἐκτάσητε τοῦ δόξου στηριγμοῦ. Cf. Rom. 11:14 ἐπιστρεφόμενοι ἵνα ἠμᾶς ἐως τὸ στηρίγμα μας, τούτο δὲ ἐστὶν συνταραχθῆναι ἐν ἀμώμια τῇ ἐν ἀλληλούς πίστεως, id. 16:25 τῷ δὲ δυναμών ὑμᾶς στηρίζεις, Jude ν. 24, Rom. 14:9. This metaphorical sense occurs in Sir. 5:10 ὅσιοι ἱστοριγμοῖς ἐν συνέσει σου, id. 6:21, αὐτὸς στηριζεὶ τὴν καρδίαν σου, and 22:15 καρδία ἱστοριγμένη ἐπὶ διανοημάτω τοὺς βούλης ἐν καρφῷ ὑπὸ δειλίας, Ps. 51:12 πνεύματι ἡγεμονικὰ στήριζον με, id. 112:9, Clem. R. 35 ἱστοριγμένη ἡ διάνοια ἡμῶν διὰ πίστεως πρὸς τὸν Θεόν; but is not found in classical authors. It is difficult to see the force of παράτησις. Editors refer back to πάρωσιν ν. 9, but this would add nothing to what is already expressed in the sentence. If we take παράτησις in a strict temporal sense, it might suggest, like Phil. 3:18, καὶ ψηφίζῃ ἐν ἄξω αἰῶνις, and κρατεῖ δὴ ἐξεις ἐν Ἀρωσ. 3:14, that there is a wider, higher truth than they have yet attained, but that they are to make the best of what they have got. If this is so, it seems to take us back to the state of things described before the 5th ν. where they are said to have received all that is necessary for salvation through the knowledge of the Saviour. In Col. 1:5,6 Paul speaks of the hope which the Colossians had received ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγέλου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς, translated by Lightfoot 'which reached you.' So the meaning here might be 'established in the truth which has come to you,' but it is not a natural expression, and the close resemblance to Jude ν. 3 and 5, together with the parallels in Jude 3 τῇ ἄπαξ παραδοθεωτῇ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει and 2 P. 21 seem to me to favour Spitta's emendation παραδοθεωτής τοῖς παράφοροι 'established in the truth handed down to you.' Such repetitions are not infrequent in 2 P.1

13. ἔκαστον δὲ ἐγούμαι...] His first reason for reminding them was the gain to his readers, his second his duty as an Apostle, cf. Phil. 3:17 ἀλ拉动 ὑμῖν, ἔμοι μὲν ὡκ δικηροῦν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀσφαλεῖς, id. 17, Eph. 6:4. This duty was now more urgent from the approach of death. For this particular phrase, as well as for the general sense, compare the farewell address of Moses in Jos. Ant. iv. 8. ἐπὶ χρόνων τῶν ἐκοσίων καὶ ἐκατόν ἡγούμενον δὲ τοῦ ζῆν ἀπελθόν...δέκα τόν ἔγον ἡ ἐγκατέστησε...ἀδιάθετον τοῖς ἁγιασμοῖς ἀπόλαθον καὶ μὴ μὴ τοῦ...πραγματεύσασθαι τῇ τῶν ἁγιασμῶν ἀπόδοσιν καὶ ἐν τῇ...οὐκ ἦμπτε...προτερήσῃς ἀπαντήσες καταληψιν ἑξώντως, εἰς τῇ...ν ἀλάμμα σελαῖ φύσα ὑμῶν, and at the end ἐν τῇ μη δὲ ἀμβλιῶν τοῦ κρίτη τοῦ ἡ θύσιος ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸ ἱερὸν ἀπονέσθησθαι, συνεθήκας ὑμῖν καὶ νόμους.

1 Compare however the Traditions of Matthias quoted in Clem. Al. Str. ii. p. 453 init. θαύμασον τὰ παρόντα, ἤκατον τοῦτον πρῶτον τῆς ἐπέκεινα γενέσεως ὑποτιθέμενον.
NOTES

 Cf. Mt. 9:15 if' δοὺς εἰμὶ ἐν τοῖς τῷ σκηνώμαι.] Cf. Mt. 9:15 if' δοὺς μετ' αὐτῶν ἵναν δ' εὐμφώοι, Rom. 11:18 εἰς εἰμὶ εἰς τὸν ἓθων ἄπότολος. This seems to be the first instance of the use of σκήνωμα in this sense: it is used in the literal sense of 'tent' in Deut. 33:10. σκήνως is similarly used in 2 Cor. 5:1 ἐὰν ἡ ἐπίγεια ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνων καταλύθη, οἰκοδομῆν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἔχομεν, οἰκίαν ἀγεροστάτου αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις, where σκήνως seems to be so far identified with σάμα, that the original figure of the tent or hut has to be recalled by the use of the synonym οἰκία, id. v. 4, Wisd. 9:16 βρίσκει το νέοτέροις σκήνως νοῦν πολυφυσιτίδα, also in profane Greek, e.g. Plato Az. 365, Tim. Loc. 103. We may compare Job. 4:19 τοῦ κατοικοῦντας οἰκίας πηλάς, Isa. 38:12 where the body is spoken of under the figure of 'a shepherd's tent.' Later Ecclesiastical writers have followed our author's use of σκήνωμα, e.g. Ep. ad Diogn. 6 ἀδιάκοπος ἡ ψυχή ἐν τηθύ τοι ἐκκαθάριστη κατοικεῖ, Eus. H.E. iii. 31 Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου . . . τῆς μετὰ τὴν ἀπαλλαγήν τοῦ βίου τῶν σκηνωμάτων ἀποθέσεως ὁ γάρος θεσθήλωται, with Heinichen's n. Weiss thinks the metaphor has reference to the pilgrim life of the Christian, comparing 1 Pet. 2:11.

[συνιέγενεν ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑπνοτικῇ.] The same phrase is repeated in 31. Elsewhere in the N.T. διεγήρω is used literally of waking from sleep, except in Joh. 6:18 of the tossing of the waves. It is used, as here, of the mind in 2 Mac. 15:10 προσυμπόσια αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου ὁς ἂν ἐπεκτελεσθεῖ, προθυμοτέρως αὐτοῦ κατέσκεψε καὶ τοὺς θυμοῖς διεγήρασε κ.τ.λ., id. 7:21; Test. Dan. 4 διεγείρετε ἐν θυμῷ μεγάλῳ τὴν ψυχῆν αὐτοῦ. For the use of ἐν see Blass G. T. Gr. § 38. 1, § 41.

14. εἰδός ὅτι ταχύν ἢν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος μου.] ἀποτέθηκαι is frequently used of putting off a garment as in Acts 7:58 (see my n. on James 1:21), and ἀπόθεσις occurs in Lucian Hipp. 5 of the ἀποθέτηριον in the bath. Its combination with σκήνωμα here reminds us of 2 Cor. 5:24 where ἐνδύσασθαί καὶ ἐκδύσασθαί are used with reference to the earthly and the heavenly ὑποτήριον. Perhaps it is from this passage that Clement of Alexandria has borrowed the phrase σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις in Str. i. p. 374 and ἡ ἀπόθεσις τῶν κοσμικῶν εἰς τὴν . . . εὐκριται τοῦ σκήνωμος ἀπόδοσιν, id. iv. p. 636. τὰ χάριν ὃς has the sense of 'speedy' in Isa. 59, where it is used of πόδες, Sir. 11:20 ἐν ὑφα ταχύν, also in Theocritus and other post-Aristotelian writers. Some interpret it here 'sudden,' in accordance with the use of ταχύς in Plato Rep. 553 οὐκ ἔστι ἀλλὰ μεταβολὴ οὕτω ταχεία τε καὶ ἑξεχρώ, Eur. Hipp. 1047. We may compare St. Paul's words to the elders of Ephesus when he thought he should see them no more, Acts 20:34, and his final charge to Timothy (2 Tim. 4:1 foll.) διαμαρτυρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίνειν ζωντας καὶ νεκροὺς, καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ . . . κρίνων τὸν λόγον· ἐπιστρήθη εὐκαίρως ἀκάρως . . . ἐγὼ γὰρ ἦδη σπέρματι καὶ τοι ταχύνω καὶ τοι τὸν ζωῆς αὐτῶν· but α.
little consideration shows (as Estius, Spitta, v. Soden, Hundhausen, and others have seen) that it is inappropriate. The writer says that the Lord had shown him that he must soon die. The prophecy addressed to the youthful Peter in the Fourth Gospel says that, when he is old, he should stretch out his hands (on the cross) and be carried to execution against his will. It is much easier to suppose that Peter may have received an intimation, by vision or otherwise, of his approaching end, as in the famous story of the ‘Domine quo vadis.’ See Clem. Hom. Ep. ad Jason, 16, ὃς ἐδιδάχθην ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ, αἰ τὸν δίκαιον μου ἡγιάζον ἡμέρα. Compare similar intimations in the life of St. Paul (Acts 16:9, 21:11, 23:11, 27:28).

15. σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἔκαστος ἦκεν ὡμέα. This goes beyond the intention, expressed in vv. 12 and 13, of continually reminding his readers of certain truths. That intention was limited to his own earthly life; here he speaks of making provision for them after his death. The form σπουδάσω is used by Polybius and later writers for the classical σπουδάσωμαι. There seems to be only one other recorded example of the acc. c. inf. after σπουδάζω, Plato Alc. sec. 141 σπουδάσωμαι τοὺς αὐτοὺς παραγενόμεθα, but it is not uncommon with the cognate σπείρω, which shares most of its uses. Thus Blass (Gr. p. 223) compares Herm. Sim. ix. 3. 2 ἔλεγον τοῖς ἄνδραίσι σπείρεις τὸν πύργον οἰκοδομίσατα, so Herod. 1. 74 ἔπεσαν εἰρήνην ἐνυπότισι γενεσθαί, Plato Crit. 45 c τοὺναία σπείρεις περὶ σαντὸν γενεσθαί, Arist. Pau 672 ἐσπείρεν εἶναι μὴ μάχας. The infinitive however and even the passive infinitive is not uncommon after σπουδάζω, see Plato Euthyd. 293 a σπουδ. ἐπιδέξαμε, Eur. Hec. 337 σπ. μὴ στηρεθήναι βίου. For ἔκαστος with infin. cf. Mt. 18:29 μὴ ἔκαστος αὐτοῦ ἀποδόουσα, Eph. 4:28 ἵνα ἐκκαθησθῶσι τῷ κρατεῖν ἔχοντι, Ἰερ. 6:13. ἰκαστοτο εὐθανασία, whenever there is need: used here only in N. T. and LXX.

μετὰ τὴν ὑπάρχον ἔξοδον. The emphatic pronoun contrasts the continued activity of his book with his own decease. The same phrase is used of death in the account of the Transfiguration (Lk. 9:31) ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ ἣν ἔμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν ἱεροσολύμῳ, Wisd. 3:2 ἐλογίσθη κάκωσιν ἔξοδος αὐτῶν, ib. 7:8 μία πάνων ἕξοδος εἰς τοῦ βίου ἔξοδος τὸ ἱερ., Jos. Ant. iv. 8. 2 ἐν ἔξοδον τοῦ ἔξω, Iren. iii. 1. 1 (ap. Eus. H. E. v. 8.) μετὰ τὴν τούτων (i.e. Peter and Paul) ἔξοδοι Μάρκου, ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγραφῶς ἤμεν παραδώκων. Did Ireneaus mean this as an interpretation of our passage? Did he find in it an allusion to the Gospel which St. Mark was believed to have taken down from the lips of St. Peter?

τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖται.] The words μνήμη and μνεῖα combine the meanings ‘memory’ ‘memorial’ ‘mention.’ The former word is only used here in the N.T. but occurs in Ps. 30:4, ib. 97:12, Prov. 11:11, Eccl. 11:11, 216. The phrase μνεῖαν ποιεῖται is found in Ps. 111:4, Rom. 1:16, Eph. 1:16, Phil. 4:4, etc. in the sense ‘to make mention,’ see Robinson on the Epistle to the Ephesians pp. 279 f.; μνεῖαν ἔχειν has the sense ‘to remember’ in 1 Th. 3:6. The same distinction holds good in

1 See also Eus. H. E. vi. 14, ii, 15, and cf. Lat. exitus.
classical Gr.; see Aeschin. 23. 5 οίδαμον μυείαν περὶ συνθηκῶν τεκολογιας. Plato Protag. 317 ά περὶ εν μυείαν ἑτοίμων πρὸς ἐμί (for μυείαν ποιεῖται); Plat. Legg. 798 Β (for μυείαν ἔχειν). Similarly we find μυήμαν ποιεῖται 'to mention' in Herod. i. 15, Polyb. 2. 7. 12, id. 2. 71. I τίνος χάριν ἐποιημέραθα τὴν ἐπὶ πλεῖον ὑπὲρ τοῦ πρωιρήματος πολέμου μυήμαν; while μυήμαν ἔχειν 'to remember' occurs in Plato Theaet. 163 δ, Polit. 306 δ ἦ καὶ μυήμαν ἔχεις δι'τατον πρόπον αὐτῷ δρόμων. The distinction however is less rigidly observed in the case of μυήμα. Thus we find τοῦ καὶ ἀλλον τι προσεραμμεν μυήμαν ἔχων φάμιν κ.τ.λ., Herod. iv. 81, id. 79, in the sense of 'mention,' and μυήμαν ποιεῖται in the sense of 'remember' in Thuc. ii. 54 (as to whether λημος ἢ λαμός was the right reading in the prophecy) πρὸς δ ἐπισχον τὴν μυήμαν ἔποιαντο 'accommodated their memory to their experience.' Even μυείαν ποιεῖται seems to be used in this sense in Job 14.13 ὧξ μι χρόνον ἐν φε μυείαν μου ποιήσῃ, cf. λῆθην ποιεῖται, Job 7.21, Herod. 1. 127. It would seem therefore that either sense is admissible in this verse: the writer hopes to leave something behind him, which will enable his readers either to call to mind (lit. 'to call up' or 'practise the memory of'), or to make mention of the promises referred to in vv. 3, 4, 12, of which the life of Christ is the foundation and embodiment. Are we at liberty to find here an allusion to the Gospel of St. Mark? Must not that have been already published before this epistle was written? See the discussion in the Introduction.

16. συσοφισμένοι, μύθοις ἔξακολουθησάντες.] In the N.T. ἔξακολουθέω occurs only here and below, 22, 215. It is found in Amos 2.1 τὰ μάταια ...οῖς ἔξακολουθησαν οἱ πατέρες, Isa. 56.11 τοῖς ὀδοίς αὐτῶν ἔξακολουθησαν. The phrase μύθοις ἔσκακ. occurs, as Wetstein has pointed out, in Jos. Ant. xxxviii. 3. οἱ ἀλλοι νομοθέται τοὺς μύθους ἔξακολουθησάντες τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἀμαρτημάτων εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τὴν αἰσχύνην μετέτρεψαν, which is itself borrowed from Philo M. 1. 1 μύθους πλασάμενος. The act, σοφιζω is used in the original sense 'to make wise' in 2 Tim. 3.15, Ps. 187, etc.; and the middle in the sense of 'to be wise,' 'to behave wisely,' in 1 K. 4.51, Eccl. 2.19. Sometimes the latter is used to express quibbling, as in Sir. 37.20 ὅτε σοφιζόμενοι ἐν λόγοις μυητός. Both uses are found in classical writers, as well as the transitive use which we have here, cf. ὧσα προφάσεως χάριν σοφιζοῦντα πρὸς τὸν δήμον Arist. Pol. iv. 13. For the passive L. and S. quote Greg. Nyss. i. 171 ὅ συσοφισμένη μυὴμ 'suppositious.' The phrase here is not unlike Pind. Ol. i. 46 ἐ βεδεδιλλειμνοι ψεύδεις πεποίητος μύθοι. Apparently the mockers of 33 spoke of the Christian hope of the glories to come (above v. 11) as resting on fictitious prophecies. In denying this charge the writer uses the word μύθοι, which is often used in the Pastoral Epistles of the fanciful gnostic genealogies: 'our belief is not founded on fables as theirs is.'

1 Dr. Bigg thinks that μύθοι here must bear the sense of 'a fiction which embodies a truth—an allegorism.' The False Teachers must have maintained that the Gospel miracles were to be understood in a spiritual sense, and not regarded as facts. But the first thing we have to ascertain is, What is the charge made against the Apostles by the false teachers, which our author here repudiates; and not, What was the error of the false teachers themselves. No doubt the author goes on to rotrot the charge: 'it is you who are guilty, and not we, of using cunningly devised fables to support your beliefs or assertions.' But
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ἐγερθόμενοι.] We, who were witnesses on the Holy Mount. γερίζω in the N.T. is generally used of the preaching of the Gospel.

δύναμις καὶ παρουσία.] The word παρουσία is used of the Second Advent below 3rd and 31st, twice in James, once in John, several times in the Epp. to the Thessalonians, once in 1 Cor., and four times in Matt.: it is found also in Test. Jud. 22 ἦσαν τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ. Equivalents are ἀποκάλυψις, found thrice in 1 Pet., once in 2 Th., once in 1 Cor.; and ἐπιφάνεια found in 2 Th. 2nd, 1 Tim. 614, 2 Tim. 415, Tit. 213; also the verb φανερόω in Col. 34, 1 Joh. 33. More commonly the verb ἔρχομαι is used, or ἠμέρα Κυρίου or Χριστοῦ: ἑσόδος is used in Mal. 3. δύναμις has been already referred to in v. 3. Its connexion with the παρουσία is shown in Mt. 2438 ὄφος τῶν ὀφειλων ἑξωθερίων ἐτί τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ ὀφε κάτα δύναμεις καὶ δόξης πολλῆς, and in the Transfiguration, which was to the Three a foretaste of the παρουσία, and of which it was said of μιᾷ γενέσεως θανάτοι ἐστὶν ἐως τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δύναμιν (Mk. 91).

ἐπέταττα γενόμενος.] — έφετευσάντες in 1 P. 3, see also 1 P. 218, and Aesch. Prom. 299 καὶ οὔ δὴ πάνω εἰμὶ ἡ ζωή ἐπέταττα; The word was used to denote the highest degree of initiation in the Eleusinian mysteries. It was employed like other mystic terms by Plato and his followers, from whom it was borrowed by the Jews (Wisdom 1423, Philo i. p. 146 §11) and Christians, see Ch. 3 of my Introduction to Clem. Al. Str. vii. pp. 1 to lx. (Clement and the Mysteries).

τὴν ἐκάντων μεγαλειώτητος.] The word occurs elsewhere in N.T. only in the account of the healing of the demoniac (Lk. 948) ἐξελπήσαντο πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ μεγαλειώτητι τοῦ Θεοῦ, and of the goddess Artemis in Acts 19, see Lightfoot on Ign. Rom. in loc. p. 189, Jos. Ant. procem. 4 τῆν μεγαλειώτητα τοῦ Θεοῦ. The phrase τὰ μεγαλειώτα τοῦ Θεοῦ is found the text certainly implies that the belief of the faithful concerning the coming in glory was affirmed by the heretics to rest upon fabulous statements. Perhaps this may refer to such details as are given in Mt. 2428-31 or to considerable portions of the Apocalypse, such as the precise description of the New Jerusalem, which few would now interpret in a literal sense. Then comes the question, What were the μιθοί followed by the heretics themselves? Dr. Bigg says they were allegorical misinterpretations of the Gospel miracles. But can μιθοί mean this? It is true that we are told of some who declared the resurrection to be already past (2 Tim. 217, 12), probably misinterpreting the teaching of St. Paul in such passages as Col. 212. But this is not the allegorization of a miracle but the one-sided spiritualization of a doctrine. The meaning of μιθοί here must surely be determined by a comparison of the other places in the N.T. in which it occurs. This however is denied by Dr. Bigg, where he says (Those false teachers) 'differ from the False Teachers alluded to in the Pastoral, in as much as they do not appear to have introduced any myths of their own.' Is there any ground for this assumption? A few lines before Dr. Bigg had asserted that even in the Pastoral μιθοί might bear the sense of 'allegorism. Examining these passages we find that two out of the four are joined with words which are certainly not suggestive of spiritual or allegorical interpretation, viz. 1 Tim. 14 μιθοὶ προσέχειν μιθοὺς καὶ γενειακαὶ ἀπαράτους, ἢ, 4 τοὺς βεβηλίας καὶ γαράδεις μιθοὺς παρατηροῦν: in Tit. 114 the μιθοὶ are defined as 'θυσίαις καὶ joined with ἄρχολαί ἄθροισι ἀποστροφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν: in the remaining passage there is nothing to mark the character of the μιθοὶ beyond that they suit the taste of those who like to have their ears tickled, and that they set them against the truth. See further in the Introduction on False Teachers.
in Acts 211. For the emphatic ἐκεῖνον cf. 2 Tim. 228. The ordinary pronoun would have been αὐτὸς following μεγ. Bengel says of ἐκεῖνον 'remotum quiddam et admirabile et magnum notat.'

17. λαβὼν—λόγων v. 19]. The construction is broken off after εὐδόκησα. I agree with Dietlein, Schott, and Ewald that the writer intended to go on ἐξανευρείαν τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων, for which he substitutes καὶ ἤχοιμα βεβαιότερον, after the parenthetic 18th verse. See Blass pp. 283 foll., Winer p. 442 on varieties of Anaclotethon.

Ωδίοι πατρεῖ.] See n. on Jude 1.

τῷ οὖν καὶ δόξαν.] Alford's n. is ‘Honour in the voice which spoke to Him: glory in the light which shone from Him,' and similarly Wordsworth. This, I think, corresponds to the general distinction between the words, τῷ being rather extrinsic, δόξα intrinsic. We find them combined in I P. 17, Rom. 27-ever, 1 Tim. 117, Heb. 27-ever, and six times in the Apocalypse. Cf. Heb. 18 ἄν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης.

φαινεῖν ἐνεχθέος αὐτῶ τοιῶθε.] The only instance of τοιῶθε in bibical Greek. It is used here prospectively as in classical Greek, 'to the following effect.' Compare for the use of φέρω 1 Pet. 118 τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν and vv. 18 and 21 below.

ὅτῳ τῇ μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξῃ.] In the Introduction on the Text I have stated why I think ἄποι should be read here for ὑπό. This is the only example of μεγαλοπρεπής in the N.T. It occurs in Deut. 33-ever ἐμὲ τὴν ἁγιότητα του ποιήματος 'who rides in his excellency upon the sky,' A.V., also in 2 Macc. 15-ever μεγαλοπρεπεστάτην εἶναι τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν ὑποστῆν, id. 815 ἐπίκλησις τοῦ σεμνοῦ καὶ μεγαλοπρεποῦς ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ. So ἀ μεγαλοπρεπῶς σου is used of God in Ps. 81. The above phrase is found in Clem. Rom. i. 9 τελείως λειτουργήσαντας τὴν μεγαλοπρεπεῖ δόξη αὐτοῦ, with whom the adjective is common, and in Clem. Al. p. 793 τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι οἱ κατὰ τὴν τελείαν γνώσιν . . . καὶ τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτῃ δόξῃ τετυμημένοι; there is a reference to the Transfiguration id. p. 812. Dr. Bigg calls attention to our author's fondness for these 'reverential paraphrases,' instancing θεῖα δύναμις v. 3, θεῖα φόνος v. 4 and gives the following examples, taken from Spitta, of a like fondness in Jewish Apocryphal writers: Test. Levi ἐν τῷ ἀνωτέρῳ (σοφαίς) πάντων καταλείπῃ ἡ μεγάλη δόξα, Ascens. Is. xi. 32 et vidi quod sedit a dextera illius magnae glorie (ed. Charles p. 146 τατά ἢκονον τῆς δόξης τῆς μεγάλης λεγομένης τῷ κυρίῳ μου καὶ Χριστῷ), Enoch xiv. 20 ἢ δόξα ἢ μεγάλη ἑκάθηντο ἐν' αὐτῷ (the throne): τὸ περιβόλαιον αὐτοῦ ἡλίου λαμπρότερον (Charles p. 347), also c. 11. 3. So Heb. 81 ἑκάθεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλοφύνης ἐν τοῖς σοφαίς.

It may be well to compare with the above account the synoptic narratives of the Transfiguration.

(1) The change in the appearance of Jesus.

Six days (Lk. about eight days) after Peter's confession made at Caesarea Philippi Jesus took with him Peter, James, and John, and went into a high mountain1 (Luke adds 'to pray, and while he was praying')

1 Probably not Tabor, but one of the lower slopes of Hermon; see Ederheim Messiah, vol. ii. p. 92 foll.
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καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στυλβωτα
λευκὰ λιαν, οὐ γαρφεύει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται αὐτὸς λευκάναι Mk. 9ος foll.;
καὶ ἠλαμψὲν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ο ἡλίος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκὰ
ὡς τὸ φῶς Mt. 17ος foll.; (ἐγένετο) τὸ ἑδὸν τοῦ προσώπου ἕπον καὶ ὁ
ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ λευκὸς ἐξαστράτων Lk. 9ος foll.

(2) The appearance of Moses and Elijah.

καὶ ὄφη αὐτοῖς Ἡλίας σὺν Μωυσεί καὶ ἤσαν συνελάθεντες τῷ Ἰσσωῦ
Mk. and Mt.; καὶ ἤδη ἄρεν δύο συνελάθουν αὐτῷ, οἴκους ἤσαν Μωυσείς
καὶ Ἡλίας, ἢ ὅφθεντες ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον τὴν ἐξοδον αὐτοῦ ἦν ἡμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἰερονομισά μύ Lk.

(3) The words of Peter.

καὶ ἀποκρίθης ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰσσωῦ ὁ Ραββεί καλῶν ἵστων ἡμᾶς ὡς
ἐλεῖ, καὶ ποιήσομεν τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοί μίαν καὶ Μωυσεί μίαν καὶ Ἡλίας
μίαν. οὐ γὰρ ὑδεί τι ἀποκρίθη, ἐκφοβοί γὰρ ἐγένοντο Ἰσσωῦ καὶ Μτ. (except that Mt. has Κύριῳ for Ραββεί and omits the last sentence), ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἤσαν βιβλιο-
μένοι ύπνῳ, διαγραφοῦσαντες δὲ ἐλέγαν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας τοὺς συνετότας αὐτῷ.
καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζομαι αὐτοῦ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς τὸν Ἰσσωῦν, Ἐπιστάτα κ.τ.λ., μὴ ἐδόθη λέγει Lk.

(4) The overshadowing cloud.

καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκυδάζουσα αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἑκ τῆς νεφέλης
Mk.; εἶ τι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἵσθαι νεφέλη φωνή ἐπισκύδαζεν αὐτοῖς,
καὶ ἵσθαι φωνὴ ἑκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα Mt.; τάστα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἐγένετο
νεφέλη καὶ ἐπισκύδαζεν αὐτοῦ; ἐφοβήθη θησαυροῦ δὲ ἐν τῷ εἰς κλῆθεν ἐν
αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν νεφέλην. καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἑκ τῆς νεφέλης
λέγουσα Lk.

(5) The voice from Heaven.

οὗτος ἦστων ὁ ἑδὸν μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ Mk.; οὗτος ἦστων ὁ ἑδὸ
μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ὑπὸ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ Mt.; οὗτος ἦστων ὁ ἑδὸ
μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε Lk. (Compare Mt. 1218.)

(6) The end of the vision.

καὶ ἔδω καὶ ἐπερβλεψάμενοι ὅλητες οἴδαν εἶδον μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν εἰ μὴ τῶν
Ἰσσωῦν μόνον Mk.; καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον καὶ
ἔφοβηθησαν σφόδρα. καὶ προσήλθεν ὁ Ἰσσωῦς καὶ ἀφαίρεσαν αὐτοῖς ἔπετε
Ἐγέρθητε καὶ µὴ φοβεῖσθε. ἔπαυντες δὲ τοὺς ὑφαλαμούς αὐτῶν οἴδαν εἶ
μη αὐτῶν Ἰσσωῦν μόνον Mt.; καὶ ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν φωνὴν εὐρέθη
Ἰσσωῦν μόνος Lk. 1

The chief points of resemblance between the Gospel narratives and
our epistle are δόξαν in v. 17 and Lk. 9ος εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; ἔξοδον
in v. 15 and Lk. 9ος ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ; φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης ἀπὸ τῆς
μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξας in v. 17 and Mt. 17ος νεφέλη φωτεινή (the Shechinah)
ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτοῦς, καὶ οὐδὲν φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης; εὐδόξησα ἐν v. 17 and

1 Compare the account in Apoc. Petri quoted in Appendix.
Mt. 17\(^5\), as in all the accounts of the Baptism. Schott and others have called attention to a discrepancy between the account here given and that in the Gospels, as witnessing to the independence of our authority. In the Gospels, it is said, the Transfiguration preceded the voice; here the aor. part. ἐνεχθείσης seems to show that the voice preceded, and occasioned the receiving of the glory (λαβὼν τιμήν καὶ δόξαν). If we accept Alford’s interpretation of τιμή as referring to the Voice this order would be correct as far as that word is concerned, but I do not see that we are bound to suppose δόξαν to be equally dependent on the Voice.

οὐδὲς μου, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, οὗτός ἦστιν.] Cf. the loose quotation from Isa. 42\(^1\) in Mt. 12\(^10\) ἦστιν ὁ παῖς μου ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἐρείστα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, εἷς δὲ εὐδόκησεν ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς μου. See note on ‘The Beloved,’ as a Messianic Title in Dr. Armitage Robinson’s edition of the Ephesians, pp. 229–233.

eἷς δὲ ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα.] The construction of εἷς with εἷς is only found here and in Mt. l.c. Elsewhere, as in Isa. 62\(^4\), Mt. 17\(^5\), and in all the synoptic accounts of the Baptism, εἷς in reference to a person is followed by ἐκ. The word belongs to late Greek, not being used by any profane writer before Polybius.

18. ἐσ’ ὁμοιωτότων ἐνεχθείσων.] Heaven here corresponds to the bright cloud of the synoptics. The repetition of ἐνεχθείσων from v. 17 is characteristic of the writer.

ἐν τῷ ἀγῷ ὑπέκ. This phrase, translated ‘holy mount,’ or ‘holy hill,’ is frequently used in the O.T. for the temple on Mt. Zion, in which it pleased Jehovah to dwell. We also read of holy ground, as where God appeared to Moses in the burning bush (Exod. 3\(^5\)), to Joshua (Jos. 5\(^12\)), of Jerusalem the holy city (Isa. 52\(^1\), 63\(^18\), Mt. 4\(^2\), 27\(^3\)), and so of the new Jerusalem (Apoc. 21\(^2\)). Zahn (Einf. in das N.T. ii. p. 59) gives a quotation from the Gnostic Acts of Peter (ed. Lipsius, p. 67) in which the same name is given to the Mount of Transfiguration: Dominus noster volens me maiestatem suam videre in monte sacro etc.

19. ἔχουμεν βεβαιότερον τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων.] We should rather have expected ἔχομεν, to suit the preceding ἕκοσμα; but the present tense expresses a larger truth. The vision not merely attested the prophecies at the time, but (for those who beheld it) it permanently strengthened their faith in them. Cf. above v. 10 βεβαιάν τὴν κλήσιν τοιεσθαί. Field illustrates from Isoc. ad Dem. p. 10 τὴν παρ’ ἑκείνων εὐνοιαν βεβαιότεραν ἔχειν, Chaeremon ap. Stob. Flor. 79, 31 (Mein. vol. iii. p. 83) βεβαιότεραν ἔχει τὴν φωιλάν. Charit. iii. 9 βεβαιώτερον ἐγών τὸ θαρρεῖν. Cf. for ἔχει 1 Pet. 2\(^12\) τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ἐχόντες καλήν, id. 4\(^8\) τὴν ἀγάπην ἑκτείνεται ἔχοντες. The word propheticus is not found elsewhere in biblical Greek except in Rom. 16\(^25\) μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίου σκοπεύματος, φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν, διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν... εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως... γνωρισθέντος. It occurs in Philo de Plantat. M. i. p. 347 τῶν τέσσαρα ἄρθραν... ἀποσειμάντων ἔσχεν δ’ προφητικός λόγος, Leg. All. M. i. p. 95 Μείωσης δὲ δ’ προφητικὸς λόγος φησιν κ.τ.λ. and is not uncommon in Justin, e.g. Apol. i. 54 (after quotations from Deut.) τούτων τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων ἀκούσατες οἱ δαίμονες Διόνυσον ἔφαγαν γεγονόντας νῦν τοῦ Δίως, Dial. 39 τοὺς σοφοὺς.
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... ἀπὸ τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων ἀποδείκτωμα ἂν ἔχωμεν, 56 (p. 276) Θεὸν αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐν τῷ προφητικῷ λόγῳ σημαίνει, 77 (p. 302) τὸ πατέρα γνῶναι 
τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὸν πατέρα τὸν πατέρα ὁ προφητικός λόγος ἐφη, 110, 128, 129, Clem. Rom. ii. 11. What is the prophetic word referred to? No one particular prophecy, but the whole body of declarations of the coming glory of the Messiah, such as Mal. 4, Isa. 60, 49, 62, esp. v. 9 ὑψωτάτην ἐγερθήσεται ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος ισίων ... ἐπί τοῖς πόλεσιν Ἰουδαίον ὁ Θεὸς ἀνήλθη. Compare St. Peter's remarks on messianic prophecy in Acts 217-86, 316-31, and Pseudo-Petr. Ap. Str. vi. p. 804 ἀναπτυξάτες τὰς βιβλίους ἂς ἔχωμεν τῶν προφητῶν, ἃ μὲν διὰ παραβολῶν, ἃ δὲ αἰκίγματων, ἃ δὲ αἴθετον καὶ αὐτολεξεῖ τῶν Χριστῶν Ἰησοῦν ὑπομείναντες, εἰρόμενε καὶ τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὰς λοίπας καλάσεις πάντας ὅσος ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ τὴν ἐγέρσαν καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάλησιν ... ταῦτα οὖν ἔπεισιν ἐπιστεύεσμεν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τῶν γεγραμμένων εἰς αὐτῶν. These predictions were attested, made more secure, by the experience of the Transfiguration. I cannot agree with Alford and others in thinking that there is a comparison here made between the apologetic value of miracle (the glory and the voice from heaven) and prophecy, and that the latter is declared to be βεβαιατορος, as presenting a broader basis for the Christian's trust. The comparison is between prophecy supported by its fulfilment, and prophecy not so supported. So Cyril of Alexandria ap. Euth. Zyg. ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦ δόθηκεν τῷ αἰῶνα ἐν τῷ ἀμφροσύνην τῆς προφητείας ἂν ἔχωμεν τῶν προφητῶν ἦλθον τὸν λόγος ἐγένετο, ἢ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι ἐποίησαν, ταῦτα παρὰν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστρέφετο, and most commentators, Or. Princ. iv. 6 ἢ Ἰησοῦν ἐπιδημίω νικήμανον ὑποτεύχθηκαι τῶν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας, ὡς οὐ θεῖα, οἷς τομφομὲν ἐγγάρευ, ὡς οὐρανοὶ χάριτι ἀναγεγραμμένα. Clem. Al. p. 778 πεπίστευκεν διὰ τὴν προφητείας τῆς παροιμίας τῷ μὴ προερχόμενος Θεῷ, καὶ δὲ πεπιστευκεῖ ἔγει καὶ κρατεῖ τῆς ἐγκατάλελείας ... καὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας βεβαιώσειται κατελήφησαν Ἰησοῦν τὴν ἐν ὦς ἑστὶν καταστασιν βεβαιάν τῶν μελλόντων κατάληψιν εἰς ὦς δὲ ἑστὶν κατάστασιν 

φαλοῦ πολύτεροὶ προσέχοντες. On the phrase καλῶς ποιεῖτε cf. James 22 with my note; on προσέχειν Ἰεβ. 21 περιστέρωροι προσέχειν τοῖς ἠκουσθείσι, Acts 6 προσέχειν τοῖς λεγομένοις. For both cf. Jos. Ant. xi. 6. 12 οὗ (γράφουσιν) ποσεῖτε καλῶς μὴ προσέχαστε. The importance of prophecy is also dwelt upon in 1 Pet. 10-12, which should be compared with this passage. See too Lk. 1631, 2425 et. Joh. 145, Acts 1043.

δὲ λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρρὶ ὀπίφε.] So John, the last and greatest of the prophets, is described by our Lord as ὁ λύχνος ὁ καίμενος καὶ φαῖνων (Joh. 5). Spitta cites Ps. 119105 λύχνος τοῖς ποσι μοῦ δὲ νόμος σου, and 4 Esdr. 1242 ὁ μεν ἐπιστρεφεῖς ἐν ὅπως οὐρανον, Macro. I 13 ὁ λύχνος αὐτοῦ (sc. Θεοῦ) φαίνων ὁσπέρ λύχνος ἐν οἶκῳ οὖσα συνεχόμενος ἐφώτισεν τὴν ὑπὸ οὐρανον, Ματ. Ιησ. 1. ὁ λύχνῳ δίκαιος θείου τὴν ἔκαστον φωτισμὸν διάνοιαν διὰ τῆς τῶν γραφῶν ἐξηγήσεως ἐπετύχχαν τῶν κατ' εὐχήν. Cf. Clem. Al. Str. vi. p. 663 init. ἢ μὲν Ἑλληνικὴ φιλοσοφία τῇ ἐκ τῆς
NOTES

The word θεωρός is properly 'dry and parched,' then 'squalid and rough,' found here only in biblical Greek: θεωρήσος is the form used in the LXX, as in 1 Sam. 22:14. The apocryphal Apocalypse of Peter § 21 has ἐδώκας καὶ ἔτεκεν τόπον καταπτήμονα έκεινον αὐχέμνορα. καὶ η τόπος κολάσεως, καὶ οἱ κολάσιμοι... σκοτεινόν στίχον έγινεν <τό ένδυμα> αὐτών, ἐνδεχόμεθα κατά τόν άρα τού τόπου. Suidas explains it as στύγνον Ἦ σκοτεινόν, Ἰσαγοριός as σκοτώδες, and the Vg. has 'caliginosus' (Itala 'obscursus') which is the meaning suggested both in our text and in Apoc. Petri. In Arist. de Color 3 το λαμπρόν ἢ στύλον is opposed to τό αὐχέμνορον καὶ ἀματεύς. It does not seem to imply absolute darkness, but dingy and dusky obscurity as contrasted with 'the brightness of Messiah's rising' Isa. 60:8, Rom. 13:12. The τόπος αὐχέμνορος may be illustrated by Clem. Al. Protr. p. 87 εἰ μή τόν λόγον έγινεν καὶ τούτω κατηγορήθησαν, οὖν ἅ τυχεν κυνεμένων ὀρνίθισι, καὶ σκοτείνης τιμήτως καὶ θανάτῳ τρέφομεν.

ἐνος ἐν ἡμέρα διανυσώμεν. For construction cf. Lk. 15:8 ἔχεις ἐν συρῃ, ἰδ. 22:18 ἐν μέ τις ἡ βασιλεία τού Θεοῦ ἑλοθ. It seems better to connect ἐνος, ἐν διὰ, ἡ βασιλεία, καί Θεοῦ ἑλοθ. with φανερωτι, than with the more remote προσέχοντες. The rare διανύσωμεν is used of the first streaks of dawn breaking through the darkness, cf. Polyb. iii. 104.5 ἰδ. το διανύσωμα πρῶτον διήλευσε, of a flash of lightning, Plut. Mor. 893 τῇ πλήγῳ καὶ τῷ σχοινῷ διανύσωμ. The form διανύσωμα is found in Plut. V. Arati c. 22 ἡμέρας ἐν διανύσωμοι.

καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατηλή ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἤμων.] The word φωσφόρος is not found elsewhere in biblical Greek, but the synonymous ἡσυχαστικός occurs in Isa. 14.12 έδέσθη ἐκ τούτου ὄνεαν ᾄξει ἡσυχαστικός το δνομά μου ἑλοθ κατασκευής καὶ λάις εἰ ταῖς πέριμοιν αὐτών, Lk. 17:27 ἢ ἡς φυσίν κλήσθησαι... έτούμασα δοὺς αὐτών, τού δοῦναι γνώσιν σωτηρίας... ἀλά στηλάγμα ἐλέους Θεοῦ ἤμων, ἐν ὃς ἐπισκέψεται ἡμᾶς ἀνατηλήν ἦς ἑς υψόσι, εἰ πιθαίνει τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκοτεί ναν ανατομ καθήμενος. Apoc. 22:18 εὗρεν εἰμι... ὁ ἀστήρ ᾄξει τοῦ λαμπρός, ὁ πρωῦσες, cf. id. 22:26, 2 Cor. 4:6 ὁ Θεός τοῦ αἰώνος τούτου εὑρίσκειν ἐν νομίμῳ τῶν ἡσυχαστικῶν εἰς τὸ μή αὐχέσαι τον φωτισμόν τοῦ εὐαγγελιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ... ἢ τον Θεός εἰπὼν 'Εκ σκότους φῶς λαμψει, ἐν ἡς λαμψειν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμόν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦν, 1 Joh. 28 ἢ σκότα παράγεται καὶ τῶ φῶς τῷ ἀληθεύνῃ ἦτη φαίνει. A difficulty which presents itself here is that the dawn is represented

1 In Geden's Concordance these and similar examples are given under the head 'ἐνος conj.' Of course τό (χρῆμα) is the relative governed by ἐνος prep.
as preceding the appearance of the day-star (say, the planet Venus) thus reversing the order assumed by the poets from Homer downwards, e.g. I. 23. 226 ἡμῶς δ' ἐωσφόροι ἐστὶ φῶς ἔρεων ἐπὶ γαίαν, διὰ μέτα κροκόστολος ὑπερ ἂλα κείναται ἕως, τῆμος κ.τ.λ., Ον. Τριε. iii. 5. 55 hunc utinam nitidi solis prænuntius ortum adferat admissus Lucifer albus equo, Heroïd. 18. 112 prævius Aurorae Lucifer ortus erat, Virg. Ecl. 8. 17, Juv. 8. 12, 13. 158, Milton May Day ‘Now the bright morning star, day’s harbinger.’

Possibly this reversal of the usual order may be owing to the phrase πρὸ ἐωσφόρον in Ps. 110, which is apparently referred to in connexion with our passage by Hippolytus Ref. x. 33 τὰ δὲ πάντα διωκεῖ δ' λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ πρωτόγονος πατρὸς παῖς, ἡ πρὸ ἐωσφόρον φῶς πρὸ ἐωσφόρον φῶς. There may also be a reference to our text in Clem. Al. Protr. p. 70 (δ' κύριος) ἀμφίπλεξαι καὶ τοῦ σκότους τοῦ πεπλανμένου διανίκησιν ἐγείρει, φησίν, ὁ καθεύδων, ... καὶ ἐπίκαλεῖ σοι δ' Ἐρμής, τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἥλιος, ὁ πρὸ ἐωσφόρον γεννόμενος, ὁ ἤλιος χαρισάμενος ἀκτίνων ἱδιώς, p. 87 πῶς γὰρ οὐκ χαρίζεται δ' τὸν ἐν σκότει κατορμητέμονον νοῦν ἀνάργυρον ποιμάνοις καὶ τὰ φως ϕόρα τῆς ἤλιος ἀποξύνας ὅμιμα; and p. 89 λαμψάτω ὁ ἐν τῇ ἁπάντη κρυμμένῳ ἐν τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τὸ φῶς, καὶ τῆς γνώσεως αἰών ἄκτινες ἀνατείλαται ἄνθρωπον. Wetstein compares Philo de Decal. ii. p. 188 ἀστείως καὶ βεβαιάζονται τὰ Θεοῦ λόγια καθάπερ χρυσά νυκτὶ ... οἱ μὲν τοῖς χρυσοίς ἀξίωσες εἶναι καταπείδευς ὡς ἐν ἀσκίᾳ φωτὸν τὸν θεόν ἱεράν βιώσουσι, τοὺς νόμους ἀστείους ἐχοντες ἐν ψυχῇ φωσφοροῦντας. Dr. E. A. Abbott compares the whole passage (vv. 19–21) with Philo Q. R. D. Haer. § 52, M. i. p. 510 foll., of which the following is an abstract, ‘A prophet utters nothing that is his own or private (ἰδιόν, cf. v. 20), but is merely a lyre in the hand of God. Human reason must be dormant when the Divine Spirit inspires. Now reason (λογισμὸς) is to the mind what the sun is to the universe, for both reason and the sun ὀφθαλμοῖ. When the divine light shines, the light of human reason sets; when the former sets, this rises, ἡ δύνα τοῦ λογισμού καὶ τὸ περί αὐτῶν σκότος ἐκστασιν καὶ θεοφόρῃ τὸν καθαρᾶν ἡγησόμενον.’ Dr. Abbott thinks that the use of ψωφορεῖς above implies that the substantive ψωφόρος (often applied to Helios, Apollo, etc.) may stand for the sun; but ψωφοφορεῖς simply means ‘I give light.’ It is true that Wetstein quotes Suidas as interpreting ψωφόρος by ἥλιος, but Gaisford omits this gloss in accordance with the best MSS., and no example of such a use is quoted, so that it could only be resorted to in despair of any other explanation. What then does the writer mean by urging that

1 The meaning of this is explained by an earlier sentence in the same chapter, where it is said of the generation of the Logos, that the Father begot first of all λόγον ὡς φωνή, ἀλλ' ἐνδιάθετον ... ἢ μὲν γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ γεννηείνως προελθέντα, πρωτότοκος τοῦ γεννήμενοι φωνῆς ἤχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς προευθείας ἱδίας. Thus ψωφόρος φωνή is the light-giving utterance of the Word, which was ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὡς φωτιζεῖ πάντα ἄθρωπον ἠχομένον ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.
those whom he addresses should give heed to the prophetic word shining in obscurity, until the morning breaks and the day-star arises in their hearts? I do not think it is possible to explain this of the Second Advent in connexion with v. 16 and 34. The phrase ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν implies an inward coming (Lk. 17:21) as we see in Rom. 2:5, 8:27, 2 Cor. 1:19 in ἐπίθεσις ἡμῶν σὺν ὑμῖν εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ χρίσας ἡμᾶς Θεός, δὲ καὶ σφυραγισμένος ἡμᾶς καὶ δωσὶ τὸν ἀρραβώνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, 4:6, Eph. 1:13, 3:15, Col. 3:10. The prophets are evidently those of the old dispensation, who spoke amid prevailing darkness (Isa. 8:22) and were themselves ignorant of the full meaning of their prophecies (1 Pet. 1:10). Still they were inspired of God to shine as lamps in the darkness, and cannot be superseded until the Gospel-day lights up the sky and the Spirit of Christ is (Apoc. 22:6) manifested in the heart of the individual. The former clause implies 'Search the Scriptures,' the latter, 'Accept the Gospel which has been revealed to you and pray for the first fruits of the Spirit whereby ye are sealed for the day of redemption. Your experience of the latter corresponds to the vision which we saw on the Holy Mount, and will confirm your faith in the former as it did ours.' We have thus the three stages, the prophetic lamp, the Gospel dawn, the inner light of the Spirit. The lower degree of faith in the written word will be followed by divine insight. It is because Christ has come and established His Kingdom upon earth, because He has risen and ascended into heaven, that the spirit of truth has come to abide in the heart of each individual Christian. Compare Euth. Zig. (from Cyril) ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος τοὺς ἐν ἁγνοῖς φωταγωγεῖ ἐως καθαρόν ὑμῖν τὸ φῶς τοῦ σωτηρίου διαφανῇ καὶ ὁ νοητὸς ἐσωφόρος, τουτέστι Χριστὸς, ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν ἀνατελῇ.

20. τοῦτο πρῶτον γυνώσκοντες.] Occurs again below (38) in reference to the coming of mockers in the last times, cf. 1 Tim. 2:1 παρακαλῶ πρῶτον πάντων ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις and Robinson’s Ephesians pp. 278 f. on the epistolary phrase πρὸ πάντων. The part. γυνώσκοντες, continuing the construction of καλὸς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες, defines the spirit and feeling with which the Scriptures should be read, ‘recognizing this truth first of all.”

τάσα προφητεία γραφῆς.] Here we have the Hebraic τάσα—οὗ for οὐδεμία, as in 1 Joh. 2:21 παν ψεύδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἑστὶν. The converse οὗ—πάσα is also common as Mt. 24:22 οὐκ ἐν ἑώρηθη πᾶσα σάρξ, see Blass tr. p. 178. For prof. γρ. cf. Apoc. 22:1 this profetia τό βιβλίον τούτου, and Acts 8:2 ή δὲ πετοχή τῆς γραφῆς ήν ἀνεγίνωκεν, 2 Tim. 3:18 τάσα γραφῆς θείαν καὶ ἀφέλμος πρὸς διδασκάλαν. Here the addition of γραφῆς seems to contrast the prophecies of the O.T. with other prophecies, such as that of Enoch (of which Jude had made use) or of the prophétai mentioned below.

ἵνα ἐπιλύσοις οὖν γίνεται.] Aquila has ἔπνιων ἐπιλύσεις in Gen. 40:8, where the LXX. has διασάφης. Cf. Mk. 4:24 καὶ ἵνα ἐπέλευσαν πάντα, Herm. Serm. ix. 13 ήδεις τὴν ἐπίλυσιν τῶν ἄποβλητῶν, id. v. 5. 1. αὕτης εἰ ἐπέρωτον τὰς ἐπιλύσεις τῶν παραβολῶν. ἐπιθύμη δὲ σὺν παρά- μονος εἰ, ἐπιλύσω σοι τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ ἄγγελου, id. v. 6. 8, 3. 1, 4. 2, 3,
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viii. 11. 1 τὰς ἐπιλύσεις πασῶν τῶν ῥάβδων, Iren. ii. 28. 3 τῶν ἐν τοῖς γραφαῖς ζητουμένων, δλών τῶν γραφῶν πνευματικῶν οὐσιών, ἕνα μὲν ἐπιλύομεν (= absolviimus) κατὰ χάριν Θεοῦ, ἕνα δὲ ἀνάκειται Θεοῦ, id. 27. 3. parabolae possunt multas recipere absoluciones (= epilysis), Philo. Vit. Cont. M. II. p. 483 ἤρθε τις τῷ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ιεροῖς γράμμασιν, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλον προσταθεῖν τι ἐπιλυτεία, Heliod. I. 18 ἄνωμάτων ἐπιλυσις, id. IV. 9 πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἁγιομένων εὐρέως καὶ τῶν χρηστότερων τὴν ἐπιλύσιαν, Clem. Al. Paed. ii. p. 172 ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἐπιλύσια δὲ στατήρ. For the gen. cf. Heb. 121 πάσα παιδεία οὐ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς ἐναι ἅλλα λύπης, Acts 208 ἐγένετο γνώμης τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν, Plato Apol. p. 28 ὡς μὲν ἐγὼ οὐκ ἄδικον, οὐ πολλῆς μοι δοκεῖ ἐναι ἀπολογίας. Alford and others urges that γνώμη requires the translation 'prophecy springs not out of human interpretation,' but its force seems to me sufficiently expressed by 'comes under the scope of.'

The statement that 'prophecy is not a matter of private interpretation' has been variously explained. One explanation is founded on Philo's language quoted above on v. 19, with which may be compared Vitia Mosis M. ii. p. 125, where Balaam is represented as saying λέγω γὰρ οὐδέν ἐγὼ να, ἀλλ' ἄπτεν οἱ ὑπήκοια τὸ βεβίον, and again δὲ μαθηκεῖς ἐξίφθησι θεοφησεῖται καὶ μαθηκές συνεις, ὡς περὶ μετανοια-μένου τοῦ λόγου τι, ὑποβαλλόμενα ἐξελάτει, p. 126 ἀπολογία χρώμων ἀλλ' οὐδέν ἔδω οἱ λέγοντας, κατεχόμενος δὲ καὶ ἐνθυσίων διεμπρέπει τι ἤτοι. It was the mark of a false prophet to speak τὸ θεὸν οὐ καὶ θε' ἀτάντ. Compare Jer. 2318 ματαίοις ἀναστοι ὄρασιν ἀπὸ καρδίας ἀντών ἁλούσιν καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ στόματος Κυρίου, Ezek. 138 οὐδὲ τοῖς προφητεύσωσιν ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ καθόλου μὴ βλέπουσιν. Of the true prophet we read (Hippol. Antich Chr. 2) οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἱδίας δυνάμεως ἐφθέγγοντο, οὐδὲ ἂν αὐτοὶ ἐβουλόντο τοιαύτα ἐκηρύσσοντο, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐσοφίζουσιν ὅρθως, ἑπείτα δὲ ὀραμάτων προεδόντας τὰ μέλλοντα καλῶς ἐπὶ οὕτω πεπεισμένοι ἔλεγον τοιαύτα ἂν αὐτοῖς ἢν μόνον ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποκεφριμένα. This is the view taken in a scholium from Oecumenius quoted by Wetstein λαμβάνομεν μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἰπροφητὰ τὴν προφητείαν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐκεῖνοι βουλοῦσιν, ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ κινου ἀυτῶν ἢν ἐνεργεῖ πνεῶμα. Such an interpretation is applicable to the next verse, but is not in harmony with the ordinary force of ἐπιλύσις here. Accordingly Grotius altered the reading to ἐπιλύουσις, Heinsius to ἐπιλύουσις, with the sense 'prophecya non est res propriae impetui,' while Alford, following Hüther and Bengel, seems to understand epilysis, not of the interpretation of a given prophecy, but of the prophet's interpretation of the signs of the times, which (he says) is not peculiar to himself, but comes from God. The continuation of Wetstein's scholium seems to give the more correct view of epilysis— the prophet knew that the word which came to them was prophetic—οὐ μέντοι καὶ τὴν ἐπίλυσιν αὐτοῦ ἐπιλύοντο. So even the holy prophets had very vague ideas as to the meaning and scope of their prophecies, cf. Dan. 126 οὶ καὶ ἐγὼ ἦκουσα καὶ οὐ συνήκα, καὶ ἐπά, Κύριε, τί τὰ ἐσχάτα τοῦτον; καὶ ἐπέ, Δείρο Δανίηλ, ὅτι ἐμπροφαγάνου καὶ ἐσφαγμένου οἱ λόγοι ἦσαν καρποί πέρας, Zech. 46, 1 Pet. 110.11. This agrees very well with v. 21 but not so well with what precedes. Why should it be so important,
for those who are bidden to give their minds to the prophecies, to remember that the prophets themselves were ignorant of the meaning of their utterances.

Perhaps however we should take this simply as an instruction as to the way in which we are to understand the prophecies: they are not limited to what the prophet himself may have regarded as their purpose and scope, or to any single event of the future; but reveal principles which will be continually illustrated by God's government of the world, while they find their highest fulfilment in the work of Christ and the establishment of His kingdom. See the words of St. Peter in Acts 3:21 (Jesus Christ) ὰν δὲ εὑρανόν μὲν δέξαται ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων δὲ ἐλάλησεν ὁ Θεός διὰ στόματος τῶν ἀγίων ἀπ' αἰώνοις αὐτοῦ προφητῶν, Acts 10:43 τούτω πάντα οἱ προφήται μαρτυροῦσιν ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτίων λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ ὅνοματος αὐτοῦ πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτὸν, Rom. 15:8 λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενήθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὸ αληθείας θεοῦ εἰς τὸ βεβαιώσαι τὰς ἑπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων, Iren. iv. 6. 1 Χριστὸς διὰ τῶν καὶ παραβολῶν ἐσημαίνειτο μὴ δυσμένων νοσῆσαι πρὸ τοῦ τῶν ἱκανῶν τῶν προφητευμένων ἠλθεῖν, ἦτις ἐστὶν ἡ παροικία τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

The different interpretations of this difficult phrase may be classified as follows. Those who agree that ἐπιλυσις (ἐπιλύων) means solution of a problem or explanation of a difficulty, are divided as to whether this solution should be regarded as preceding or following the prophecy in question. There can be no doubt that according to common, if not universal use, it means the explanation of a given problem or difficulty, e.g. of an oracle (Heliob. iv. 9), of a puzzle (Athen. x. 71, p. 449e), above all of a prophecy. Many commentators however not seeing how to reconcile this explanation with the preceding injunction to give heed to the word of prophecy, have been driven to adopt the far-fetched interpretation of a solution, embodied in the words of the prophet, of some practical problem, 'a discerning of the signs of the times' (Mt. 16:3). In this way v. 20 would mean much the same thing as v. 21. Some have endeavoured to find support for this interpretation in the word γίνεται, which they would translate 'comes of private interpretation.' This seems to me to be an undue straining of the meaning of the word γίνωμαι, attributing to it a force which it could only bear if followed by the preposition ἐκ. It cannot however be denied that this is the view of the passage taken by many commentators, e.g. Bede 'hoc primum intellegere debent, quia nullus prophetarum sanctorum propria sua interpretatione populus dogmata vitae praedicavit, sed quae a Domino didicerant, haec suis auditoribus agenda commendabant.' So Bengel ἐπιλυνυς; dicitur interpretatio qua ipsi prophetae res antea plane clausas aperuere mortuibus,' Cajetan, Alford, Keil, Kuhl, Hundhausen. Spitta proposes an entirely new sense of the word ἐπιλυσις, translating 'no prophecy is of such a nature that it can be dissolved,' for which he compares John 10:35 οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι η γραφή, Mt. 5:17 οὐκ ἐλθον καταλῦσαι ἡλλὰ πληρῶσαι, but confesses that he can make nothing of ἔδος, for which he proposes to read ἔγιας.

There is similar diversity of opinion as to ἔδος. (1) à Lapide, Estius, and the Roman Catholics in general take it as equivalent to ἔνωσις,
and contrast this with the judgment of the Church. They also extend
the rule to Scripture generally: so Concil. Trident. Sess. iv. Nemo
suae prudentiae innexus, in rebus fidei et morum ad aedificationem
doctrinae Christianae pertinentium, Sacram Scripturam ad suos
sensus controquens contra eum sensum quem tenuit et tenet Sancta
Mater Ecclesia, cuius est iudicare de vero sensu et interpretatione
Scripturam Sanctorum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensus
Patrum, ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari audeat. (2) Ecumenius
interprets it of the prophet himself in accordance with 1 Pet. 1101,
cf. 4 Esdras 1211 of Daniel’s vision. (3) Luther, Erasmus, Wiesinger,
Schott, Hofmann, etc. take it of man’s own interpretation, contrasting
this with the understanding imparted by the Holy Spirit, who is
Himself the source of prophecy. (4) Werenfels, Brückner, Bisinger
refer διὰ to προφητεία itself, in the sense ‘no prophecy is self-inter-
preting’; it receives its interpretation from the event which fulfills it,
or from a second inspiration. There is truth in each of these, but each
appears to me to narrow the saying unjustifiably. The words mean
literally ‘no prophecy falls under private interpretation,’ or to put it
in positive form, ‘Prophecy is of general interpretation,’ i.e. it is not
exhausted by one interpretation to which it is, as it were, tied. I
reserve the further examination of the passage for the Comments.

21. οἱ γὰρ θελόματι ἀνθρώπου ἰνήχθη προφητεία ποτὲ.] Cf. Joh. 118 οἱ δὲ
ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὗ τέκνος έκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν.
We have another example of a final ποτέ in v. 10 above (where, as
here, it means ‘at any time’), also Rom. 72 ἐγὼ δὲ ἔξω χαρίς νόμοι
ποτὲ, I Cor. 92 τίς στρατεύεται ἰδίους ὁφυνίους ποτὲ; so Eph. 23, Col. 3v,
Heb. 118. With ἰνήχθη we should probably supply in thought ἐξ
ὁραμοῦ or its equivalent as in vv. 17, 18.

ἐντὸς πνεύματος ἀγίου φερόμενον.] Compare the compoundia θεοφόρος
Aesch. Ag. 1150, θεοφόρος ib. 1140, θεοφορία Strabo, θεοφόρησις Plut.,
θεοφορείσθαι Menander, πνευματόφορος and πνευματοφόρους Eccl.,
and Philo i. 510 quoted above under φορέως ἀνατέλλη, also
p. 482, ἐκτοθήθη σεαυτής, καθάπερ οἱ κορυβαίωντες καὶ κατεχόμενοι,
βαικχεισθεία καὶ θεοφορείσθε, κατά τὰ προφητικά ἐπιθεωροῖν, Mt. Nm.
M. i. p. 609 (of Balaam) σοφοίτεια, εμετική τὴν θεοφορίαν προφητείαν
παρεξάραξε, de Somn. p. 689 ὅταν ἕξ χρόνων διέκλαιε τὰ κατασχέθη δ νῦν,
συνετίνας ἄκατον ἐδώτω τῶν ἀδώτων, ὅρμη καὶ στενοῦ πάσης χρήσεως
προέρχεται, θεοφοροῦμεν ἐπιλήφθη τῶν ἄλλων, Justin Apol. i. § 33
οὕτω δέωσι σωφρόνως οἱ προφητεύοντες εἰ μὴ θεῖοι λόγῳ, ib. § 35
Ἡσαῖας, θεοφορούμενος τῷ πνεύματι τῷ προφητικῷ, Theoph. Autol. ii. 9 οἱ
δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώποι, πνευματόφοροι πνεύματος ἀγίου καὶ προφητίζοντες
γενόμενοι, ὅταν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπινευοῦντες . . . . ἐγένετο θεοδικατός, iii.
12 τῶν πάντων πνευματοφόρων ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ λειτουργεῖν. For the
simple φερόμενος cf. Jos. B. J. vi. 2. 2 φερόμενοι τοίς θυμοίς οἱ στρατιώται τῆς
στοίχειας φωβάστων, Plut. Mor. 205a φερόμενοι ταῖς ὁρμαῖς, Acts 22 of
the descent of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost ὕστερον φερομένης πνεούς
βιαίας, and such phrases as Mk. 112 τῶν πνεύματος αὐτὸν ἐκβαλλείς ἐν τὴν
ἐρήμον, Acts 880 πνεύμα Κυρίου ἤρπασεν τὸν Φιλιππον, 2 Cor. 132
ἀρπαγήνια ἐως τρίτων ὀφρανῶν.
NOTES

Cf. Acts 3:21 (Times of Restoration of which) ἡλισθην ὕ Θεον ἄνθρωποι.]

Besides the true prophets spoken of in the previous verses there were also false prophets among the Israelites. The word ψευδοπροφήτης in used of O.T. prophets in Jer. 27:8 (LXX. 34) μὴ ἀκουστῇ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν ὄνων, ib. 267 (LXX. 337) and in Lk. 6:26. We often meet references to these, as in Deut. 13:1, 18; 21; Jer. 5:21, Ezek. 13 esp. v. 3 οὐλ τοῖς προφητεύοντας ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτῶν (= θελήματι ἄνθρωπου in 21:2 above). Examples of such are Zedekiah (1 Kings 22), Hananiah (Jer. 28). Words compound-d with ψευδο- may either mean, falsely named, a 'sham' or 'counterfeit,' as ψευδόχριστος Mt. 24:24, ψευδαστόλος 2 Cor. 11:18, ψευδάδελφος Gal. 2, ψευδονόμον 'a sham Nero' (Lucian), ψευδοκότων 'a sham Cynic' (Plut.); or they may mean falsely doing the work implied in the second part of the compound, as in ψευδοστομόω 'to speak falsely' (Soph.), ψευδοφυγός 'one who practises deceitful arts' (Plato), ψευδορθικία 'perjury' (Phil.), ψευδομάρτυρ 'a false witness' Mt. 26:60, ψευδολόγος 'speaking falsely' 1 Tim. 4:1. Either meaning would suit ψευδοπροφήτης, for to prophesy falsely in the narrow sense was at any rate one of the marks of a pretended prophet; and if we assign to the second half of the compound its full sense of the interpreter of God's will, then it will be equivalent to the other meaning, 'a counterfeit prophet.' We may gather the characteristics of the false prophets from the descriptions contained in the prophecies of the O.T. They sought popularity by flattering the people and promising them peace and prosperity, while the true prophets told them plainly of their faults and called them to repentance by warning them of impending judgment. The false prophets were eager for gain and dissolute in their life, see Isa. 28:7 'The priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink,' Jer. 23:14 'In the prophecies of Jerusalem I have seen an horrible thing; they commit adultery and walk in lies, and they strengthen the hands of evildoers... they are all of them become unto me as Sodom,' ib. v. 32, ib. 29:21-22, Ezek. 13:3 'Woe unto the foolish prophets that follow their own spirit and have seen nothing,' ib. v. 16 'which see visions of peace for Jerusalem, and there is no peace, saith the Lord.
God,' Micah 3:11 'The prophets divine for money.' It will be seen how closely this description corresponds to the description given below of the false teachers. For warnings against ϕευδοπροφήται in the Christian Church, cf. Mt. 24:11, 1 Tim. 4:1.

laods is used of Israel generally in the O.T. esp. in Ex. 19 and Deut. 8:15 εστω τοις λαοις γενομενοις, from which is taken the phrase in 1 P. 2:9 λαός εἰς περιποίησιν. Compare also Lk. 2:32 φως εἰς ἀνακάλυσιν εἰθῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ, and Acts 26:17, 28, where we find the same distinction between the λαός and the Ισραήλ.

And in ἑαυτῶν ἐνεργεῖ περιποίησιν.] The mention of the false prophets of old leads naturally to the thought of the false teachers who were even then making their way into the Church. Διδάσκαλος corresponds to Rabbi (John 1:49). In the early Church teachers are joined with prophets (Acts 13:1, 1 Cor. 12:28 προφοράς ἁπάντως, δύναι τοὺς προφίτας, τρίτην διδασκαλίαν, Eph. 4:11 ἔχουσιν τοὺς μὲν ἄνωτάς, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, τοὺς δὲ τοιμάσεσ καὶ διδασκάλους). We learn from James 3 that the office was much sought after, see my note there. The word ϕευδός is rare, ϕευδοδιδάσκαλος is found in Polyc. ad Phil. 7. For further information see Introduction On the False Teachers.

οἵνες παρευρίσκοντον ἀρέτας ἀπαντάμας.] ‘Men who will introduce destructive heresies into the Church,’ ὅτες seems to have its usual indefinite force, cf. Mt. 7:15 προεξήκει τοῖς ϕευδοπροφητικῖς, οἵνες . . . εἶπον γενόμενοι ἄρταγες. There are some places in the N.T. in which ὅτες cannot be distinguished from δέ; ultimately the distinction quite broke down,’ Hort on 1 Pet. p. 133. For παρευρίσκω, which is found only here in N.T., see nn. on Jude 4 παρευρισκόμενοι and 2 Pet. 1:9 παρευρισκόμενοι, also Lightfoot’s n. on παρευρισκόμενοι Gal. 2, and Clem. Al. Str. vii. p. 854 ὑπεμνήσθην τῶν περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν εὐχεθαι πρὸς τινῶν ἄλλων παρευρισκόμενων δομικῶν. It is frequently used in the Apology of Aristides without any notion of secrecy, which however easily attaches to παρὰ, as in παρευρισκόμενοι.

ἀρέταις.] Athanasius quoted by Suicer defines the word ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρέταθαί τι διὸν καὶ τοῦτο ἐξακολούθων. Hence it is used for a school or sect whether in philosophy or science, as in Clem. Al. Str. vii. p. 887 καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ παρὰ τοῖς δοκιμαστάτοις τῶν παρ᾽ Ἀλεξάνδρου φιλοσόφων πάμπολλας γεγονομεν ἀρέταις . . . καὶ μίας ἀναισθήματος κατὰ τὰς ὀλέσιας ἀρέτας, ἣν ἰσα γεγονὼν ἐρωτεύσων. Apparently the first instance of its use in this sense is in Cicero’s amusing letter to Cassius (Pam. xvi. 16. 3). So in Acts 5:17 αἰρέταις Σαλώμακις, ib. 15 a.ρ. Φαρισαίων, 24:6 παραποτατήν τῆς τῶν Ναζαρηνών ἀρέτεσσων. In our text it is used in a dyslogistic sense, as in 1 Cor. 11:12 δέ γάρ καὶ αἱρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, ἵνα δὲ δικαίων φανεροὶ γίνονται, Gal. 5:20, where διακοσμώναι καὶ ἀρέτας are joined with adultery and idolatry as works of the flesh, Tit. 3:10 αἰρετικῶν ἀδρωμον παρατού. It is a question whether what is condemned in such passages is sectarianism, that is, the disposition to break off from the general body of Christians, as being spiritually, or intellectually, or even socially inferior; or whether it is an exaggeration of particular views, such
as millennialism. Of course the two run very much together: a heretic in the latter sense, that is, one who lays great stress on views which he holds as peculiarly his own, apart from the general belief, is likely to separate himself from those with whom he is out of sympathy; and in like manner one who begins as a separatist is likely to develop particularist views. In ordinary Greek the subjective meaning is, as might be expected, older than the objective. Polybius uses it much in the sense of προαίρεσις for ‘principle of conduct,’ e.g. ii. 56. 9 τὸ μὲν οὖν ἀγέννις καὶ γνωκόκως τῆς αἱρέσεως αὐτοῦ, xviii. 20. 4 οὐδέποτε ταύτην ἐσχηκέναι τὴν αἵρεσιν, οί δὲ πολεμοῦν ἰδαλίτως. In the N.T. there seems to be a general agreement that the objective meaning is to be preferred, except perhaps in this verse of 2 Pet. But it is joined in two passages (Gal. 520 and 1 Cor. 1118 where I am glad to see the R.V. has ‘heresies’) with words signifying division, which seems to make the subjective meaning ‘opinionativeness’ more appropriate, cf. Clem. Al. Str. vii. p. 894 οὐ εἰς οἴνος οὐ κατὰ τὰς αἵρεσις. There can be no doubt that Ignatius uses the word in the sense of our ‘heresy’ in Trall. 6, where Lightfoot’s translation is ‘I therefore entreat you to eat only the wholesome food of Christianity and to abstain from the noxious herbs of heresy. These false teachers mix poison with Jesus Christ; they impose upon men with their plausible professions; and the deadly drug, thus disguised with a sweet flavour, is thoughtlessly taken, though death is its consequence,’ id. Eph. 6 εἰς ἀθικός αἵρεσις κατοικεῖ where it seems to be equivalent to κακὴ διακοδαχή in 9. I am disposed to assign the same force to αἵρεσις in our text, as more suitable to the word παρεισάξωνων and receiving a natural explanation in ἀρνομένου. Spitta, von Soden, and Weiss interpret it in the same way, of opinion, not of schism, but Spitta thinks that αἵρεσις in 2 Pet. is still by itself neutral, and gets its bad sense from the following qualitative genitive.

ἀξιωματικ. ‘Dangerous heresies,’ the gen. qualitatis, as below in v. 4 σειρός ξύφων, v. 10 ἐπιθυμία μασμοῦ, see Sir. 167 ἔθνος αἰσθαλίας and my n. on Jas. 1 ψυχὴς ἀροστῆς ἐπιλησμονής and p. ccxiiv. The word occurs five times in this ep., once in Acts, where Peter rebukes Simon, and is found in Ἀροτ. Petri 1 ὅδοις καὶ δὲ γὰρ αὐτὰ τούτα τῆς ἐν λείας διὰ διὰ τοῦ σιν. It appears as the opposite of σωτηρία in Phil. 128.

καὶ τὸν ἀγοράζοντα αὐτοῖς δεσπότην ἀρνομένου.] ‘Denying even the Lord that bought them.’ Alford and others have got into unnecessary trouble about the construction by refusing to recognize that καὶ is used in the sense of ‘even’ in the N.T. as in other Greek. See his n. on Mt. 1030 ὕμνη δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες ... ἠρεμημέναι εἰσὶν, where he translates ‘and yet.’ For other instances of this use of καὶ cf. Mk. 127, 420, 1 Cor. 210. For ἀγοράζοντα see Hort on 1 Pet. 118, 19 (pp. 78–80) οὐ φθαρτοὶοι πληροῦσι ... ἀλλὰ τιμῶν αἴραιτη, ὡς ἁμόν ἀμέμον καὶ ἀστήλου, Ἰωσὴφ: ‘The starting-point of this and all similar language in the Epistles is our Lord’s saying (Mk. x. 45) The Son of Man came ... δοῦναι τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν ... The nearest
repetition of these words is in 1 Tim. ii. 6 ό δὲ ὁ Ἱαντὸν ἀντιλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. For λυτροῦμαι St. Paul uses ἄγγελος 1 Cor. vi. 20 ἡγήσασθε γὰρ τιμῆς, vii. 23, Gal. iii. 13 Χριστοῦ ἡμᾶς ἐξαγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα. So Αρος. v. 9 (of the Λαμβ) ἡγήσασθα τῷ Θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου. . . . In the LXX. λυτροῦμαι is connected with the Exodus . . . in Acts vii. 31 St. Stephen boldly says that God sent Moses as ἄρχων καὶ λυτρωτήν. . . . In some of the passages quoted Christ Himself appears as the ransomer: elsewhere it is the Father, as in Acts xx. 28, rightly understood and illustrated by Rom. v. 8 (where note ἵπποι) and viii. 32.' Spitta takes the latter view in our text, comparing these passages as 2 Sam. vii. 23 'Thy people which thou redeemedst to thee out of Egypt.' On this interpretation δεσπότης would be used here, as elsewhere in the N.T., of the Father; so Acts 424 δεσποτα, σύ δ' θυσίας τόν ὁφρυνον καὶ τήν γῆν, Lk. 249, Αρος. 610. See n. on Jude 4, and Wetstein 'semper Deum Patrem significat, nunquam Filium.' If we take it so, with Spitta and v. Soden, we must understand ἄρνούμενοι of the various idolatries, and ἐπαγόμενος of the consequent punishments of Israel; but this is rather an awkward construction. Otherwise ἄρνεω describes the nature of the threatening heresy, ἡτ. its effect 'so bringing on themselves destruction.' Mr. Feltoe in his ed. of Dionysius of Alexandria p. 242 notes that 'the use of δεσπότης of Christ is said to indicate the end of the fourth century, esp. the Cappadocian divines (Holl on Amphilochius p. 127). Two examples occur in the doubtful Exegetical Fragments inserted in Feltoe's edition (pp. 248 f.) βασιλείας τῆς ἀνάκαινως τοῦ δεσπότου, τούτου καὶ κατορθούς τούτου προδοτήν, and in p. 242 we have the phrase τό δισποτικὸν σώμα used of the Lord's body. For ἄρνούμενοι see n. on Jude, and Peter's words in Acts 312. 14.

ἐπαγόμενος ἰαντὸν ταχείνην ἀπέληναν.] The middle is used by classical writers in cases of self-caused evil, e.g. Dem. p. 424, 10 αὐτοὶ ἐπαγόμενοι διοικεῖ τοὺς Ἰερα. p. 102. 19 κυνωνιός πολλῆς συμφορᾶς ἐμαντῷ ἐπαγαγόσθαι. see Blass pp. 183 f., Jannarius Gr. §§ 1472, 1478. Another instance of the unclassical active is found in Sir. 16 μὴ ἐξοφυλήσαι σαιτόν ἐνα μὴ . . . ἐπαγαγός τῇ φυλῇ σου ἀτιμίαν. The active is properly used in v. 5 below. For ταχείνην see n. on 144. Spitta finds a difficulty in the doubled participle, on which see Winer p. 433 and Blass p. 250.

2. τολοθρεὶς ἐκκοιτοθείρουντι αὐτῶν ταῖς ἐσφαλμαῖς.] αὐτῶν refers to the ψυχοδιδάσκαλον, whose bad example will be largely followed. This verse is parenthetical referring to the deluded followers, while v. 3 returns to the false teachers. The heretics are noted for their licentiousness, see Introduction on Early Heresies, and notes on Jude 4, 6, 8, 13, 16, 18, 23, below vv. 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 22, 31. 17. For pl. ἀσφαλεῖαι cf. below v. 15 and τεσσαρεῖαι 311, also James 21 with my note. Cf. Rom. 222. 24 (a quotation from Isa. 522) δε ἐν νόμῳ καυχάσεται, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τῶν Θεοῦ ἀτραμένης; τό γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ δε ἡμᾶς βλασφημεῖται εἰς τοῖς θεσμοῖς, τ. 38, Tit. 28, James 257 (where see my note), Αρος. Petri. 7 οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὄδον τῆς δικαιοσύνης. For ἰδόν see also vv. 15 and
21 below, and Mt. 21:38, Lk. 17:9, Rom. 3:17 (οδὸν εἰρήνης), Acts 16:17 (οδὸν σωτηρίας), Barn. i. 4, v. 4 δδ. δικαιοσύνης. The phrase ὅδες ἀληθείας comes from Ps. 119:10: it is opposed to the ‘way of lying’ in v. 29.

3. Τὸ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῦ λόγου ἡμᾶς ἀποφέρουσα. ‘Through covetous ness the false teachers will make gain of you by insincere words,’ i.e. by their flatteries, the opposite of φιλαδελφία ἀνυπόκριτος in 1 P. 1:22. Contrast with this 1 Th. 2:8-10 ὅτι γὰρ ποτε ἐν λόγῳ κολακίας ἔγενηθημεν . . . ὅτι προφαίρεσιν πλεονεξίας . . . ὅτι ἐξουσίας ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δέχατο. For causal ὅς cf. 11, 218, 218, 230, Jude 10, Blass 130, 131.

ἐμπορεύομαι.] Strictly to travel as a merchant (as in James 4:13), then with a transitive force ‘to import,’ ‘purchase,’ ‘traffic in,’ ‘make gain or business of,’ ‘exploiter,’ cf. The mist. 298 ἐμπ. τὴν φιλοσοφίαν, Philo M. ii. p. 536 ἐμπορευόμενον τὴν λάθειν τῶν δικαιῶν ‘purchased the forgetfulness of the jurors,’ Jos. B.J. i. 26. 1 ὅδεν ἑγεῖτο τὴν καθαρὰν δόσιν εἰ μὴ δὲ αἰματος ἐμπορεύοταται τὴν βασιλείαν, Chion Epist. i. ἀρετὴν ἐμπορευόμεθα, οὐδέν τοῦ ἄλλου πλῆθος καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἀνῶν, Prov. 31 κρείσσον σοφίαν ἐμπορεύεσθαι ἐν χρυσοῦ τῆς γης, Jos. Ant. iv. 6. 8 (of the Midianitish women) οὗτοι ἐμπορεύομαιν τὴν ὕμνον τοῦ σώματος προσκυμάμεθα τὴν ὑμετέραν ἐξουσίαν ‘we have not lented an ear to your request with a design of making traffic out of our beauty.’ Suicer quotes Greg. Nyss. de Bap. μὴ ἐμπορεύοντο τὴν χάριν ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέφυε τῆς δωρεᾶς, Theodoret τὰς τῶν πενήντων συμφοράς ἐμπορεύεσθαι. The idea is the same as that in 2 Cor. 2:17, 1 Tim. 6:5 ‘thinking that godliness is a trade’ (τοιούτοις ‘a means of gain’). The compound χρυστέμπορος occurs in the longer recension of Ignatius ad Magn. ix. οἱ χρυστέμποροι τῶν λόγων κατηπλέουσα καὶ τῶν Ἰησοῦ παλαιόντες καὶ τῶν Ἰησοῦ παλαιότερον, and ad Trall. vi. where see Lightfoot’s note.

πλαστοῦ.] ‘Made up,’ ‘fictitious,’ not found elsewhere in biblical Greek, cf. Herod. i. 68 ἐκ λόγου πλαστοῦ ἐπισκειναὶ αἰτίαν ἐδώκαν ‘banished him, having having brought a charge against him on a false pretext.’ Cf. Jos. Vita 65 πράττοντι μὲν δημοῖ τοῖς περὶ συμβολαίων πλαστὰ γράμματα συνθεκοῦσι ‘they act like those who have forged false documents in a case of contract,’ Philo M. i. p. 1 μυθικὸς πλάσμασι τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπικρίσαντες. I do not think there is any reference to the σεσοφοιμαίον μίθου of 118.

οἱ τὸ κρίμα ἐκταλλαὶ σὲ ἀργεῖ.] ‘Over whom the judgment (pronounced against false prophets in the O.T.) has long been impending.’ The combination of ἀργεῖ and νυστάξει reminds one of ἀργεῖς and μυστάξας in 14:9. The judgment is not idle, but already active in the punishment of other offenders, and gathering up for those false teachers. ἐκταλλαὶ only here and in 315 in biblical Greek, is found in Philo, Josephus, Plutarch, etc. The use of compound adverbs, which is comparatively rare in classical Greek (e.g. ἀπαράπτας, ἀναπροφορή, καθαπεταί, ἀποκτισμά, παρατύχη), received a great extension in post-Aristotelian writers, see Lobeck’s Phryn. p. 45 f. Thus we find the unclassical ὑπεράνω, ὑπεριά, ἐφάνασι, κατέναι, κατενώθην in the N.T.

1 Dr. Bigg quotes Aristid. Αρού. xvi αυτὰ ἔστιν ἡ δῆλη τῆς ἀληθείας, εἰς τοὺς διδασκόμενας αὐτὰν εἰς τὴν αὐθέντον χαρισματική βασιλείαν, which, as he says, appears to be directly taken from this verse combined with 118.
THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

The repetition of ἀπάλεια (here personified) for the third time in these three verses is characteristic of the writer. νυστάξει is only used here and in Mt. 25:5 (of the slumbering virgins) in the N.T. It is found in LXX Ps. 121:4 of νυστάξει οὐδὲ ἐπνοεῖ ὁ φιλάσσων τὸν Ἰσραήλ, Isa. 57:1 (of the avengers) οὐδὲ κοπιάσον ὁ οὐδὲ νυστάξουν, Prov. 24:43, Nah. 3:18. Compare the scene of the sleeping Eumenesides awakened by the shade of Clytemnestra.

4. εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτήσαντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο.] The natural apodosis would have been ὑμῶν οὐ φείσατε, but (as above 117-19) the sequence of thought is weakened by the length of the sentence, and the actual apodosis in v. 9 (οἶδαν Κύριος) takes its shape from the preceding verse, and speaks first of the rescue of Lot, and then of the punishment of the wicked. The absence of the article (which is present in Jude 6) throws a stronger emphasis on angels: even angels, when they sinned, were not spared. For the general structure of the sentence cf. Rom. 11:21 εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, οὐδὲ σου φείσαται, Mt. 6:30.

σεφρόν οἶδον παρεδώκατος παρέδωκεν.] For σεφρόν see Introduction on the text. σεφρόν or σφρόν is properly a pit for the storage of grain as in Demosth. p. 100 αὐτὴν ἐν τοῖς Θερμίσι σφρόν, where the scholiast explains τοὺς σφραγίζοντας καὶ τὰ δρύγαμα ἐν οἷς κατεύθυν τὰ στέρματα (different kinds of grain) σφρόνων ἐκάλουν οἱ Θερμίσι καὶ οἱ Διδώνες. In the Etym. Magn. it is defined as a fitting receptacle for the storing of wheat and pulse. So Artemid. ii. 24, Varro R.R. i. 57 quidam granaria habent sub terris, speluncas, quas vocant σφρόνοις. In Anaxandrides ap. Athen. iv. 131 it seems to mean a large bin for holding edible roots (βολβοί). It is also used of the stores of grain in an ant hill (Ael. N.A. ii. 25, vi. 43), of a pit made for trapping a wolf (Longus i. 11), of the pit into which Antigones was thrown and burnt alive (Diod. xix. 44, though σφρόν is read there instead of σφρόν by one of the editors, see Wesseling's note).

In the book of Enoch the watchers are sometimes said to be punished by being bound in chains, see Jude v. 6; sometimes by being buried alive, see ch. x. 4 f. (of Azazel) ἐμβάλει αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος καὶ ἀνασάλως τὴν ἐρμην τὴν οδον εν τῇ ἐρμην Δουάδηλα, καὶ ἐκεῖ πορεύεται βαλε αὐτόν· καὶ ὑπόλεια αὐτῶν λίθους βίες καὶ λίθους τραχεῖς καὶ ἐπικάλυψιν αὐτῶ σκότος, καὶ οἰκοστάτω ἐκεῖ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα... καὶ φῶς μηθηρείτω, id. 12 (of Shemjaza and his companions) ἐξοντο αὐτῶν ἐπὶ ἐβδομάδον γενέως εἰς τὰς νάσας τῆς γῆς... εἰς συντελεσθῆ κρίμα τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰῶνων, ch. xviii. 14, xix. 1. 'At the bounds of heaven and earth is the prison for the stars of heaven which transgressed the commandment of God, and for the angels who connected themselves with women... till the day of the great judgment'; xxi. contains a further description of the prison: 'and the place was cleft as far as the abyss being full of great descending columns of fire,' lxxxviii. 1. 'The first star which had fallen from heaven was bound hand and foot and laid in an abyss: now that abyss was narrow and

1 The Gizeh text has τῇ ἀ. omitting τῇ ἐφείσω (Charles p. 337).
deep and horrible and dark.' Keil thinks there may be a reference to Isa. 24:21, 22. 'It shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together as prisoners are gathered in the pit (εἰς δεσμωτηρίον) and shall be shut up in the prison (εἰς δρόμων), and after many days shall they be visited.' Considering what is said in these passages of the punishment of the apostate angels, I feel very doubtful as to whether their place of confinement could be fitly described by the word σωφρος, which does not seem to suggest anything awful or terrible. Supposing, as I think we must, that 2 Pet. was partly copied from Jude, the relation of this verse to Jude 6 would be more easily explained, if the original reading of 2 Pet. were σωφρος, which as the substitution of a more elegant word for the common-place σωμας, would be in accordance with our author's procedure elsewhere. The scholiast to Demosthenes, quoted above, states that the word σωφρος was in use in Egypt. Supposing it to have been better known than the word σειρα to the scribes of ΕΕ and B, it might easily happen that the former was unconsciously written in the place of the latter. We also find σωφρος attested by Didymus, Cyril, Ephrem Syr., Procopius, Damascenus, Eusebius, and Theophylact, as well as by most cursives and versions. The word occurs in the LXX. in the sense of fetters, Prov. 5:22 παρανομαι ἄνδρα ἁγνοῦσιν, σωφρος δε τῶν ἐντού ἄμαρτων ἐκατός σφίγγεται. Ἰδὴν occurs below ν. 17, twice in Jude, once in Heb. 12:18, not in LXX. παραδίδωμι is usually followed by a dative of the person, as Mt. 18:24 παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν τοῖς βασανισταῖς, and an accusative preceded by εἰς of the thing, as Acts 8:3 παρέδωκαν εἰς φυλακήν, 2 Cor. 4:11 εἰς θάνατον. We find παρέδωκαν ἐντού τῆς ἀσελείας Eph. 4:19, παρ. λήσθη τι. Dion. H. ad Pomp. p. 768, but these are very different from the datives here. While our dative is certainly unusual, I cannot see that it specially favours either of the readings: 'to deliver to pits' is not easier than 'to deliver to chains.' Von Soden compares Αροκ. 20:1 εἶδον ἄγγελον καταβάλοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἔχοντα τὴν κλέον τῆς άβυσσον καὶ ἄλοιπην μεγάλην . . . καὶ ἐκρατήσαν τῶν Δράκων . . . καὶ ἔθηκαν αὐτὸν χίλια ἐτη καὶ ἐβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν άβυσσον. Alford illustrates σωφρος ζυφος by Wisdom 17:16 (of the Egyptian plague of darkness) μεθάλετε σκότους πάντες ἐδίδησαν: the darkness constituted the chain which prevented them from moving: so in ν. 2 of the same chapter we have δέσμων σκότων καὶ μακρὰς πετότα νυκτὸς and in ν. 15 ἐφραυχέτο εἰς τὴν ἀσίδηρον εἰρκὴν κατακλεισθείς. 

ταρταρώσας.] ἀπ. λεγ. See for the compound καταταρταρώ ων Sext. P.H. iii. 24. 210 δ Ζεὺς τῶν Κρόνων καταταρτάρωσεν with the note of Fabricius. In Enoch 204 Uriel is the ruler of Tartarus. Charles (p. 42) notices the appropriate use of 'ταρταρώσας in connexion with the fallen angels: Tartarus was originally the place of punishment of the Titans.' The substantive is found in Job 40:15 ἐπελθὼν ἐπ' ὅρον ἀκρότον, ἐπεσέκασε χαρισμὴν τετράσσον ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ (where the R.V. has the entirely different 'Behold now behemoth which I made with thee;

1 See Introduction on the subject.
he eateth grass as an ox,’ and in 4132 τὸν δὲ τάρταρον τῆς ἀβύσσου δυσπερ ἄλματον (γηγαι), which is again entirely unlike the Hebrew; also in Philo M. 2 p. 433 (the wicked) ὑποστήρισται κατατάτο, πρὸς αὐτὸν τάρταρον καὶ βαθὺς σκότος ἀνεχθείς, Jos. c. Ap. ii. 33 (of the Greek mythology) τοὺς πρεσβυτάτους αὐτῶν (τοῖς τῶν θεῶν) ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ δεδεμένους, cf. Hippol. Refut. p. 544, l. 28 foll. δὲ ἤταν ἐπιγυναίων ἐκδεινούσι τῇ ἐπερχομένῃ πυρὸς κρίσις ἄταλή καὶ ταρτάρου ζωφερὸν ὄμμα ἀφώτιστον . . . καὶ ταρταροῦχων ἀγγέλων κολαστῶν ὄμμα δὲ μένων ἐν ἄταλῇ, Acta Thomae 32, where the serpent who tempted Eve says ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ τῶν ἄβυσσον τοῦ ταρτάρου οἰκών, Acta Philippi 110. For the reasons stated in the Introduction on the Text, I am inclined to prefer the longer reading κολασμένως τηρεῖν (on which see below v. 9) to the shorter τηρομένους. The infinitive would be exegetical after παρέσκευς.

5. ἄρχαίον κόσμου οὐκ ἐφεστατο.] The second example of punishment does not appear in Jude. It is however closely connected with the sin of the angels in Gen. 6. The destruction of the ancient world by water is referred to again in 3v in contrast to the present world which is doomed to be destroyed by fire. Compare Sir. 167 οὐκ ἐξιλασάτο περὶ τῶν ἄρχαίων γιγάντων. The omission of the article is common in 2 Pet. See κόσμῳ ἄστιβῶν, πόλεις Σωδόμων, just below and Introduction on Grammar.

Ἀλλὰ ἀγὼν Νωὴ δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐθάλαξεν.] The negative statement οὐκ ἐφεστατο is contrasted with the positive (brought a flood on the world of the ungodly at the time when he saved Noah) by ἀλλὰ, just as the οὐκ ἐφεστατο of the preceding verse is contrasted with σεροῖς παρέσκευα; but the contrast is blurred from the fact that the writer wishes to combine the evidence of mercy with that of judgment. He even gives more prominence to the former by putting the latter into the participial form; though his limitation of the number of the saved to eight prepares the way for the general statement of judgment on the wicked. For ἀγὼν cf. 1 Pet. 326 ἐν ἡμέραις Νωῆς κατασκευασμένης κηρύκου, εἰς ἣν ὄλγω, τοῦτ’ ἐστὶν ὅτι ψυχὰς ἐσώθησαν δὲ ἑδαμόν, Clem. Al. p. 812 init. (on the Transfiguration) δὲ κύριος, τέταρτος ἀνάβας εἰς τὸ ὄρος, ἐκτὸς γίνεται, καὶ φωτὶ περιλαμβάνεται πνευματικῇ, τῇ δύναμιν τῆς ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ παραγωγικῇς εἰς ὄσον ὀνόματε τῆς ίδίως τοῖς ἀνασκέφασι, δι’ ἐβδόμης ἀνακρυσσόμενος τῆς φωνῆς υἱός εἶναι Θεοῦ. The Greeks usually add αὐτὸς with this peculiar use of the ordinal, but Winer quotes as examples of the omission of the pronoun, Plato Legg. iii. 695 e λαβὼν τὴν ἄρχην ἐβδομος, Plut. Pelop. 13 εἰς οἰκίαν διδάκατος κατελθὼν. Others compare ἐβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδριμ in Jude 14 and think that Noah may be similarly described either as 8th from Adam, or the 8th preacher of righteousness. But, if Enoch is 7th, Noah, his great-grandson (Gen. 5) must be 10th (so Jos. Ant. I. 3. 2 ἐν δ’ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ Ἀδαμον διδάκατος) not 8th. Hundhausen refers to J. Lightfoot, Heinsius, and others, as maintaining that Noah might be described as the 8th preacher, because Enoch, the son of Seth, is said to have been the first to call upon God (Gen. 426). But he rightly replies that we have no knowledge of such a series of preachers, and that Noah is
here called κήρυξ, not simply as one of a line of unknown preachers, but as having actually warned the antediluvians of the approaching judgment. That such was the Jewish tradition is proved by Spitta from Jos. Ant. i. 3. 1 Ναχος δε των πραττομενων ιν' αυτων δυσχεραινων . . . έκτεθην επι το κρίστον την διανοιαν αυτου και τας πραξεις μεταφερειν, Sib. Orac. i. 128 Νοε δεμας θαρσουν ενω λαοις τε πανι κηρυξεν μετανοιαν, επι των σωματων δρατειες, where also his sermon is given extending from I. 150 to 200. So Clem. Rom. i. 7 Νοε εκηρυξεν μετανοιαν και οι διποκονταιες έσοδησαν, id. 9 Νοε προτος ειρεθεις . . . παλαγγειειαν κοσμω εκηρυξεν, Pauli Apostol. (Tisch. p. 68) έγω ειρεθα Νοε . . . και ουκ έπαινομεν τοις άνθρωποις κηρυσσομεν, Μετανοειτε, ιδον γαρ κατακλυσμος έρχεται, Theoph. ad Autol. iii. 19, also quotations from the Mischna and the Koran in Spitta p. 147. On the other hand it is of great importance to mention the small number of those who were saved in the ark. 'God spared only eight persons out of the ancient world,' which explains the prominent position given to δυσθον. In his reference to Noah and Lot, the author differs from Jude by calling attention to the exhibition of mercy in the midst of judgment.

The noun κήρυξ occurs in the N.T. in this sense only here and in 1 Tim. 27, and 2 Tim. 11 έις δ' έθεθην ἄγω κήρυξ και ἀπόστολος, but the verb κηρύσσω is common. Clement of Rome (v.) speaks of St. Paul as κήρυξ γενόμενος εν τη άνατολη και εν τη δύναμιν, and so Epict. Dis. iii. 21. 13 (quoted by Lightfoot in loco) calls his ideal philosopher κηρυξ των θεων. In the Book of Enoch 124, 151, Enoch is addressed as 'Thou scribe of righteousness.' Here δικ. κ. is contrasted with κόσμω δρατειων. Noah is called άνθρωπος δικαίως in Gen 69, like Lot below v. 9.

κατακλυσμον κοσμω δρατειων επαζοι.] See below 30 δ τοτε κόσμος ιδατι κατακλυσθεις· απώλετο and Mt. 2438.39 Lk. 1727, Gen. 617, where the same noun is used. For επαζεις cf. n. on επαζοντες v. 1, and for the form of the aor. Lk. 1324, Acts 1427, Winer p. 99, Veitch εν. άγω, who quotes exx. of this form from Herod. Thucyd. Xen. Antiph. as well as later writers. The aorist participle is, I think, best understood as introducing a condition of things preceding the action of εφιλαξαν: Noah was kept safe in the flood which came on the world of the ungodly.

6. και πόλεις Σαδμών καί Γαμέρρας τεφρώσατο.] Winer (pp. 666-668) and Blass (p. 98) take this as a gen. appositionis, like Rom. 411 σημειων έλαβε περιτομής, and the Latin urbi Romae, virtus continentiae. On the contrary A. Buttmann (p. 68) and Spitta take it as possessive, 'the cities belonging to Sodom and Gomorrah,' which the latter compares with the more exact language of Jude, Σάδμα καί Γαμέρρα καί αι περι αυτας πόλεις. I prefer the former explanation, as the latter strictly taken refers only to αι περι αυτας πόλεις, omitting the principal cities. Probably our author introduced the pleonastic πόλεις here from his recollection of Jude. The very rare τεφρώσω, meaning either to cover with, or to convert into, ashes (cf. αιδαλων), is found in the description of an eruption of Vesuvius (Dio Cass. lxvi. p. 1094) των εν μετω κραυρουμένων (being parched) καί
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tεφρομένων (overwhelmed with ashes), Lyc. Cass. 227 τεφρώσας γυναίκες τηρεῖ. τεφρός is also used by Strabo and Plutarch. Philo (M. 2. p. 21) uses the word τέφρα of the overthrow of Sodom, whose abnormal sin was followed by abnormal punishment, ἡμέρα μεταξύ αἱ μὲν εὑαναρώσατο τόλμης τάφος τῶν οἰκήτων ἐγεγένητο, αἱ δὲ ἐκ λίθων καὶ ξύλων κατασκευαζότα τέφρα καὶ λεπτή κόνις.

καταστροφῆ κατερκίων.] For the reading and construction see Introd. on the Text. Cf. also Phryn. (p. 475 Lob.), where other exx. of the unclassical construction are given, also Roby § 1199 for exx. of the Latin construction morti damnare instead of the more usual ad or in metalla damnare, and Munro on Lucr. vi. 1232. It might seem however that the 'condemnation to destruction' should precede and not follow τεφρώσας. Von Soden answers that the phrase includes the carrying out of the judgment, citing Rom. 83 κατερκίνεν τὸν ἀμαρτιῶν ἐν σαρκί, and 1 Cor. 113 κραίνομεν δὲ ἅπα τοῦ κυρίου παιδιωμένα, ἀναμιῆ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακρίθησαι. Another possible and, I think, a better interpretation is that the dat. καταστροφῆ should be here taken as the dative of the instrument. In like manner the Lat. abl. is sometimes used with damnare, causing occasional ambiguity, as Munro says l c. The sense would then be 'to condemn, or pass sentence upon, by destroying.' Clem. Al. (Paed. iii. p. 280), quoting Jude, dwells on the lesson to be derived from the history of Sodom. In Gen. 1924 we have Κύριος ἰδέσθη εἰς Σοδώμα καὶ Γόμορρα θέου καὶ τῷ παρά Κυρίον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, after which follows in v. 25 καὶ κατάστρεψε τὰς πόλεις ταῦτας, the latter seeming to imply an earthquake which followed the rain of fire and overthrew the cities. So Spitta and Weiss. Cf. Strabo xvi. 2. 44 of the district by the Dead Sea, which he calls γῆ τεφρώδης, and says that its appearance bears out the story told by the inhabitants that ἅπα σεσωμένος καὶ ἀναφυφημάτων πυρὸς καὶ περιττῶν ὑδάτων ἀσφαλτίων τε καὶ θεωδάν ἦ λίμνη προσέποι . . . αἱ τέρες καταστείλει, also Pliny's account of the eruption of Vesuvius (Ep. vi. 16. 6) 'the cloud arising from the crater was sometimes light, sometimes dark, prout terram cineremve sustulerat, ita 11 iam navibus cinis incidebat calidior et densior, ita 14 area . . . its iam cinere mixtisque pumicibus oppleta surrexerat, ut si longior in cubiculo mora, exitus negaretur, Ep. vi. 20. 16 tenebris rursus, cinis rursus multus et gravis. Hunc identidem adsurgentes excutiebamus; operti aliqui atque etiam oblisi pondere essamus. . . . mox verus dies . . . occursabant trepidantibus adhuc oculis mutata omnia altoque cinere tanquam nive obducta.' This shows that τεφρῶν must here mean 'to cover with ashes,' not, as most editors, 'to reduce to ashes.' Pliny also speaks of the accompanying earthquake (vi. 20. 3), 'praecesserat per multos dies tremor terrae . . . ille vero nocte its invaluit, ut non moveri omnia, sed verti crede- rentur . . . iam quassatis circumiascentibus testitis . . . magnus et certus ruinae metus.' The truth of this description is proved by the present condition of Pompeii and by the accounts of the late terrible eruptions in the West Indies. 

ὑπεδοθηκε υπολόγων αὐτής τεθαυκάς.] For the reading and construction see Introd. on Text. Compare Clem. Al. 280 ἵνα δὲ ὑπεδοθηκάς μνησθῆσο-
NOTES

μαι... τὸ Σοδομίτων πάθος, κρίσις μὲν ἀδίκησας, παθαγωγία δὲ ἀκούσαν. Phryn. (p. 42 Lob.) condemns ὑπό. ἡσ un-Attic.

7. καὶ δίκαιον Δέω... ἐφίστατο.] Cf. Abraham's pleading in Gen. 1828 μὴ συναπτόντες δίκαιον μετὰ ἀδεβοῦ, and Wisdom 108 αἱρ (σοφία) δίκαιον ἐξαπλολυμένων ἄσεβων ἐφίστατο, φιγοῦντα καταβάσιον πῦρ Πεντα-πόλεως. The verb occurs again in v. 9; the form ἐφίστατο is supported by B, see Lightfoot on Col. 11a.

καταπυκτόμενον.] Cf. Acts 724 ιδὼν τινα ἀδικούμενον ἡμῖνατο καὶ ἐστίγμην ἔδικησεν τῇ καταπυκτόμενᾳ, 3 Macc. 22 Κύριε... πρόσχες ἡμῶν καταπυκτόμενοι ὑπὸ ἄνωτὸν καὶ βεβηλίου, Theophr. Char. 8 τοὺς ἀκούσατες καταπυκτόμετε ταῖς ψυχολογίαις.

ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἄθυμων ἐν ἀσυλίᾳ ἀναστροφής.] 'By the licentious behaviour of the wicked.' For other exx. of a compact articulare phrase see Introd. on Grammar and 14 τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, where, as here, an ἐν-clause is incorporated: cf. 1 Pet. 32 τῇ ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφήν, ἦς. v. 16 τῆς ἀγαθῆν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφήν. For the gen. see n. on James 34 ὑπὸ ἀνέμων ἑλανόμενα, Philo i. p. 609 κατα-κυττάνυμεν ὑπὸ θεσοφαλαβείας. ἄθυμος occurs again in 317, alone in N.T., also in 3 Macc. 52 τῆς ἄθυμου προθέσεως διασφαλίμενος, ib. 628. Not used by classical writers. The cognate ἄθυμος is used in 1 Pet. 42. Philo has ἔκθημος in the same sense, cf. Abrah. 369 χείρων ἐκθέμονοι μεταδιώκοντες, ἦς. ἐκφύλους καὶ ἐκθέμονοι συνύδους (of Sodom), Gigant. 288 τῶν ἐκφύλους καὶ ἐκθέμονοι ὁμίλιας τε καὶ μίξεις (of the Watchers). It is a stronger word than ἄνωμος, because θέσις is used especially of a divine ordinance, a fundamental law.

8. βλέψατε γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ δίκαιον ἀνακομάνων ἐν αὐτοῖς.] For the reading see Introd. on Text. The rare ἐκ is found in Herod. iv. 204 βασιλεὺς ὑπὸ σφι ἑδικέ κόμην ἐγκατοικήσας, Eur. Αντιώρε fr. 198 ἢ δὲ κενοῦν ἐγκατοικίσεις δόμων. Alford with most commentators takes βλέψατε in the objective sense of τῷ βλέπειν, where the eye brings the man into communication with an external object; but the word is generally subjective, where the eye reveals to outsiders the inner feeling of the man: see exx. in Wettstein. I quote one from Philo Conf. Ling. i. p. 406 καὶ γὰρ ἐκτετημένοι γλώσσαι νεύμασι καὶ βλέμμασι καὶ ταῖς ἀλλαὶς τοῦ σώματος σχέσει καὶ κινήσει, οὐχ ἦτον τῆς διὰ λόγων προφορᾶς, ἀν θάλασσαν ὑποσημαινον. Wettstein would interpret it of the look and report of the Sodomites by which Lot was vexed, but the interval between βλέψατε and ἐβασανίζει makes this improbable. I prefer the Vulgate aspectu et auditu iustus 'the righteousness of the man showed itself in his shrinking from the sights and sounds which met him on every side': lit. 'righteous in look and in hearing he tortured himself at their lawless deeds while he lived among them.' Cf. Field Notes on N.T. p. 241, Chase on 2 Pet. in Hastings' D. of B. iii. 867.

ὁμαν ἢ ἡμερας ψηχὴν ἴσων οὐρνος ἐβασανίζει.] Cf. Ps. 962

1 Perhaps Clem. Al. Q. Div. Serv. p. 950 εἰ βλέποντον πρὸς τὸν κόσμῳ ἀτετακτῷ τῇ βλέμματι, καθάπερ εἰς ἀγαθοῦ κυβερνήτου νεύμα δεδορκότες, τί βοθήσεται, τί προστάσει, τί σημαίνει, τί διδοσεν τοῖς αὐτῶν νασται τὸ σύνθηκα combines the two meanings. It describes a fixed gaze or intent on the actions of the pilot.
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"εὐαγγελίζεσθε ήμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ, Jer. 52\textsuperscript{24} a portion was given to him from the king ἐξ ἡμέρας εἰς ἡμέραν, Gen. 39\textsuperscript{10}, Num." 30\textsuperscript{15}, 2 Clem. R. 11, in a quotation from what is called a προφητείας λόγος, which corresponds closely with 2 P. 3\textsuperscript{4} ταῦτα πάντα ἡκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἡμείς δὲ ἡ μὲν πραν ἐξ ἡ μὲν πρασσομένοι οὐδὲν τούτων ἑκόμενον. The same passage is quoted with slight variations in 1 Clem. R. 23, where it is introduced as ἡ γραφή αὕτη. Lightfoot calls attention to these resemblances, and thinks the quotation is probably taken from the apocryphal Eldad and Modad. Hilgenfeld suggests the Assumption of Moses. The phrase is used by Euripides (Heroes 443) and Heniochus (c. 350 B.C.) in Mein. Fr. Com. vol. 3, p. 563. See Blass Gr. (Ind. s. ἡμέρα). It is equivalent to the Hebraic ημέρα καὶ ήμέρα of 2 Cor. 4\textsuperscript{16}, and ήμέραν καθ’ ήμέραν of Ps. 68\textsuperscript{19}.

[βασανίζω.] Used of testing, questioning, especially by the use of torture; then for bodily pain in general, as Mk. 5′ μὴ με βασανίζει, Wisdom 11′ μετ’ ἄρχης κρυμμένοις ἀσβεστὶ βασανίζοντο; of disease, Mt. 8′ δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος, 1 Sam. 5′ ἐβαρύνθη χερὶ Κυρίου ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἀζώτους καὶ βασανίζοντες αὐτοὺς; then of fatigue, Mk 6	extsuperscript{48} βασανιζομένοις ἐν τῇ ἔλαινει; Lastly of mental suffering, as in Plut. Vit. 896c, where Antigonus says to a messenger who had been tardy in bringing good news, οὔτως ἡμᾶς βασανίζατας δικρύν ἐφέξεις ‘you shall pay for keeping me so long on tenterhooks,’ Ign. Eph. 8 οἵτως μιμήμα ἐπιθυμεῖ ἐφεξείται ἐν ψυχῇ ἡ δυναμικὴ ἡμᾶς βασανίζω, ἀρα κατὰ Θεὸν ὁτὲ, Clem. Al. Str. ii. 55, p. 458 μετανοῶν ἐμ’ οἶς ἐδρασεν οὐκέτι ποιεῖ ἡ λέγει, βασανίζων δὲ ἐμ’ οἶς ἱματεῖ τὴν ἑαυτόν ψυχήν ἀγαθοργεῖ, which is perhaps a reminiscence of our text. There is a peculiarity in the expression here: we should rather have expected βασανωθεῖς, just as in Joh. 11′ 8 ἐπάραξεν ἑαυτὸν might seem to be equivalent to Joh. 13\textsuperscript{21} ἐπαράσχα τῷ πνεύματι, like the French reflexive verb. Augustin however (quoted by Westcott) gives it a special force ‘turbatus est Christus quia voluit,’ cf. the play Ἐαυτὸν τιμωροῦμενος. Alford on our text compares our use of the phrase ‘distress yourself’ (so ‘vex yourself,’ ‘trouble yourself,’ ‘worry yourself,’ ‘put yourself out’). For ἑαυτὸν the writer substitutes ψυχήν δικαίων, repeating the idea of justice already embodied in δίκαιος. In an ordinary writer we should have expected τὴν δικαίων αὐτοῦ ψυχὴν, but 2 Pet. abounds in anarthrous phrases, and he may even have intended to give it an abstract character ‘torturing a righteous soul,’ as giving greater prominence to the epitheth. I cannot agree with Dr. Bigg’s interpretation ‘By sight and hearing that righteous man, as he dwell among them, day by day put his righteous soul to the touch by lawless deeds and ‘emerged victorious from the ordeal.’ Such a use of βασανίζω may perhaps be supported by Philost. APOLL. iii. 18 ὁ φιλοσοφήσας μὲλλὼν ἑαυτὸν βασανίζασ εἰπερεῖ, but could it be followed by such a dative?

ἀνάμωσ τρόγων.] The adjective is used (a) of persons who are not subject to law, Gentiles, as in Acts 2\textsuperscript{32}, 1 Cor. 9\textsuperscript{21}; (b) of persons who break the law, malefactors, Lk. 22\textsuperscript{37}; (c) of lawless deeds, as here and in Prov. 1\textsuperscript{19} οἱ ὁμολογοῦντες τὰ ἁνόμα Job. 34\textsuperscript{17} δει σὺ τῶν μισουντά ἁνόμα.

9. οἰδὲν Κύριος ὁμολογεῖ ἐκ παρασκευῆς ἐν ὑπεροχῇ.] Here we have the apo-
dosis to εἰ γάρ—οὖν ἐφεύσατο in v. 4, modified to suit the second member of the protasis contained in vv. 5 and 7 ἀλλὰ ὑγίουν Νόει ἐφύλαξεν ... καὶ δίκαιον Δωτ ἐφύσατο. Notice the repetition of ὑγίασθαι from v. 7. Compare for the general meaning of the passage Ps. 18 γυνώκει Κύριος ὑγίουν δικαίων, καὶ ὑγίους ἀσεβῶν ἀπολέεται; for infin. with οὕτος 1 Tim. 3, James 4 17, Mt. 7 11; for the meaning of πειρασμὸς James 1 2 with my note and comments, Apoc. 310 καθό γὰρ συν θηρίων ἐκ τῆς ὀρασίας τοῦ πειρασμοῦ. Noah and Lot were exposed to trial, as standing alone amid mockers and unbelievers.

ἀδίκους δὲ αἱ ἡμέρας κρίσεως κολασμένας τηρεῖν.] For ἡμ. κρίσ. see 37 and note on Jude v. 6. The phrase καλ. τηρ. agrees with the account given in 1 Pet. 3 19 of τοὺς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύματος who had been disobedient in the days of Noah, to whom Christ preached, θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ, χωστοθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι, and also with the account of the fallen angels in the Book of Enoch (see n. on v. 4 above).

10. μᾶλλον δὲ τούτο ὑπιστῶ σαρκὶ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μισμοῦ πορευομένους.] Prominence is here given to the licentiousness on which Jude laid so much stress in his description of the sin of the angels and of Sodom (v. 7) as typical of the sin of the libertines (v. 8). So far our author had only alluded vaguely to them by his use of the word ἀσεβεία in vv. 2 and 7. For the compact articlar phrase see above on v. 5. On ὑπίστω σαρκῶς see Jude v. 7. The word ὑπίστω is often used of following a teacher or leader, as in Mt. 4 19 δεῦτε ὑπίστω μου; so of following Satan in 1 Tim. 5 18, of the worship of Baal in Deut. 4 3, Jer. 2 25; then of surrendering ourselves to evil practices or passions, as here and in Isa. 65 2 τοὺς πορευομένους ὡς οὖν καλή, ἀλλ' ὑπίστω τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. Similarly in the Baptismal Service the candidate promises that he will not follow nor be led by the lusts of the flesh. Jude's distinctive ἐπίθεα is here omitted, unless we suppose it to be represented by μισμὸς. Alford translates ἐπιθυμίᾳ μισμοῦ 'lust of pollution,' which he explains as 'lust hankering after unlawful and polluting use of the flesh.' I think it is more natural to regard it as another instance of the gen. qualitatis, so frequent with this author, see above 21 on αἰρέσεις ἀπολείπονται. For πορεύομαι see on Jude v. 16 and cf. 1 Pet. 4 1. μισμὸ found here only in N.T., occurs in Wisdom 14 26 ψυχῶν μισμοῦ, 1 Mac. 4 48 'who cleansed the sanctuary and bare out the defiled stones (τοὺς λίθους τοῦ μισμοῦ) into an unclean place,' Test. Levi. 17. μισμὰ occurs below v. 20, μισαῖν in Jude v. 8.

κυρίττης κατακαφυνόντας.] See n. on Jude v. 8. Here it seems most natural to understand κυρ. in an abstract sense. Such a variation from Jude's meaning is very common in our author. The leading reference however may be the same, viz., to the irreverence shown towards the angels by the men of Sodom, as well as to the denial of the Lord on the part of the libertines (see 21 above).

τολμήσας αἰθίδεσμω.] W H. and Treg. separate the words by a comma. I have followed Nestle's punctuation, taking αἰθί as an epithet of τολμ. with Bengel, Spitta, and others. In a somewhat similar phrase in Jude 16 οὗτοι εἰσὶν γογγυσται, μεμψίμοροι, I have retained the dividing comma, as it seemed to me that the weighty word μεμψίμοροι was
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better able to stand on its own basis. From this point the writer addresses himself directly to the libertines. We have no good English equivalent for the substantive τολί, 'headstrong dare-devils' would be too flattering: perhaps 'shameless and headstrong.' The meaning of τολμητής is suggested by Jude 9 οίκ τολμητέων and Jos. Ant. i. 11. 4, where speaking of the behaviour of the men of Sodom, he says δὲ θεος ἄγανακτός ἄδικος ἄδικος, δὲ τολμήται τοις μεν ἠμαύρωσεν. So we find τολμητή in Arist. Theophr. 702, Isæus 60, Antipho 123, Plat. Apol. 38 d, ἄλειπτης καὶ τολμητός in Antipho 122, τολμητής is found in Thuc. i. 70 οί μεν καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν τολμηταί καὶ παρὰ γνώμην κωπευονται, Plat. V. 988 E τολμητάς οίτις ἄγαθοι, Jos. B.J. iii. 10. 2 Ἰουδαίων μὲν, εἰ καὶ σφόδρα τολμηταί καὶ βαθέαν καταφύγονται, ἀλλὰ πολέμοις ἀπεριο. The only other place in the N.T. in which αὐθαίρης is found is 1 Tit. 17 'the εἰς πόσον to μὴ αὐθαίρῃς.

Whereas, 'seeing that,' lit. 'in a case in which,' as in 1 Cor. 3ον γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν ἤλεγκται καὶ ἔρεις, οὐχὶ σαρκίκο ότε; 4 Macc. 214 (ὁ νόμος καὶ τῆς φιλων συνθείας διεστὶ) καὶ μὴ νομίζητε παραδοξόν ἐναῖ, ὅπως κε καὶ ἐπικρατεῖν ἄγαθον δύναται διὰ τὸν δύναμις, κ.τ.λ. δικαίως ἐστιν ὑμ∶ τὸς κράτος ἐναῖ τὸν λογομπο, ὅπως γε καὶ τῶν ἔξοδων ἀγαθών ἐπικρατεῖ. Common in classical writers, as Antipho p. 112 ὅπως δὲ μὴ ἁλεθῇν ἐλέγχοι ποιήσασθαι τῶν πεπραγμένων, τῶς περὶ γ νῶς ν δὲ ἡθελῆσαν πυθῆσθαι. ἐγχωρεῖ αὐτός περὶ τούτων εἰδέναι; Andocides p. 12 ὅπως τοίνυν ὑπότοι τοὺς πρακτὸν ἄμεστα μὴ μυστικάκεις, τοῖς μεγάλοις κακῶν αἰτίων . . . ἰ τοῦ συχότω τῶν φοιλῶν πολεμῶν τῶν ἠθελοῦν μυστικακεῖς, Isocrat. p. 164 ὅπως γὰρ Ἀθηναίων καὶ Καλλίστρατος, δὲ μὲν ἰδιώτης άνω, δὲ φοιαγέο, οἰκίσας πάλιν άκοι τέτοντα, τοῦ βουλήτευες ἡμεῖς πολλοίς ἀν τόπους τοιούτους κατασχέεις δυνηθείμεν, Thuc. viii. 96, Dem. Herod. etc.

This dative is sometimes described as the dat. of reference. It differs from the acc. of reference, as the dative of time or place differs from the corresponding acc. Roby (Gr. § 1210) describes it more exactly as denoting 'the thing in point of which a term is applied.' In classical Greek it is often interchanged with the looser and vaguer acc., as Xen. Cyr. ii. 3. 6 has οὐκο άποστοι εἰμι ταχύς οὐτε κεραυνοὶ ἰσχυρῶς ἐν κόσμως ἐν κόσμως, in contrast with the ποῖος ἐκ τῆς Homer, cf. Plato Rep. v. 473 δ ἐλεγομενος τῶν ἀδικίμων, σμικροτάτο, τῆς δύναμος, Symp. 190 δ ἐρ υμα ταύτα τα γένη ἰσχυρὸν διεναι. See above v. 8 βλέπωμαι δίκαιως καὶ Plus pp. 117, 118. We find ἰσχύς and ἰσχύς combined in the ascription in Apoc. 712, Deut. 33, Cant. 27. The latter is the more general word. Our author gives an indefinite reference both to angels and to δίκαια, instead of the very
definite reference (in Jude) to the dispute between Michael and Satan about the body of Moses. This vagueness causes ambiguity. What is the object of the comparison in μεταφορεῖς? Dr. Bigg (with Hofmann, Spitta, and Weiss) understands evil angels implied in the word δόξα. I think it is better to understand men (with Bengel Alford and Keil) i.e. the false teachers who are spoken of as βλασφημοῦντες in v. 10. The angels, though far superior to them, abstain from any such βλασφήμος κρίνεις, as the ψευδόδασκαλοι indulge in towards δόξα. Hofmann's objection to this interpretation, though approved by Spitta and others, seems to me to have very little force: he thinks that the assertion of the superiority of angels to men would be an unnecessary truism. Are we sure that it was recognized as a truism by the libertines? Anyhow the main object of reasoning is to show the connexion between what is questioned (here man's right βλασφημεῖν δόξας) and what is supposed to be unquestioned (that man is inferior to angels).

οἱ φίλοι καὶ αὐτῶν μετὰ Κυρίων βλασφημοῦν κρίνειν.] Who are meant by αὐτῶν? When did the angels abstain from bringing a railing accusation against them? What is the force of μετὰ Κυρίων? To answer the first question we must go back to the railing of the false teachers. This was certainly directed against the δόξα by whom Jude, as we have seen reason to believe, means angels, including evil angels, as we learn from his introducing Michael's behaviour to Satan, by way of example of the manner in which we should behave towards the δόξα. Are we then to understand our author as simply putting Jude's meaning into vague words; and, if so, why does he do it? I think with most of the commentators that this is on the whole the right view, and that the particularities of Jude are omitted, like the name Enoch afterwards, in order to avoid direct reference to apocryphal writings. Is it possible however to find any explanation of the plural? Dr. Bigg suggests that there may be a reference to Enoch 9, where it is said that men complained of the evil done by the fallen angels and their children. The four great archangels—Michael, Uriel, Raphael, and Gabriel—lay their complaint before the Lord saying 'Thou knowest all things before they come to pass, and Thou knowest this thing and every thing affecting them, and yet Thou didst not speak to us. What are we therefore to do in regard to this?' The sentence of God is 'Bind Azazel hand and foot' (Enoch. ch. 10). Much the same suggestion had been previously made by Spitta, who however joined it with the reading Κύριον, which he strangely interprets in reference to the declaration of judgment from the Lord against the sinful Watchers, a judgment first intrusted to the archangels (Enoch 104), and then delegated by them to Enoch (124), and by him announced to Azazel (131). Accordingly Spitta's explanation is 'whereas the angels, though greater in power and might (which he

1 It is not clear that this is done by the four archangels. The watchers (i.e. the unfulfilled Watchers) are here said to summon Enoch and enjoin him to visit the fallen Watchers and announce to them the sentence of judgment.
regards as a periphrasis for ἀρχάγγελοι, decline to carry an announcement of degradation (βλασφημον κρίσιν) from the Lord; and he illustrates this from Test. Leti 15 καὶ λήψασθαι οὐνεισμόν καὶ αλεξύνην αἰώνον παρὰ τῆς δικαιοκρατίας τοῦ Θεοῦ. I think this explanation impossible for many reasons, chiefly because it holds up an act of disobedience on the part of the angels, as a model for men, and because it justifies βλασφημία. There is much more to be said for Dr. Bigg's view. If our author wished to generalize the special case named by Jude, he might take advantage of the incident referred to in En. 9. The archangels did not take it upon themselves to condemn the sinful Watchers, but made their appeal to God.

I take παρὰ Κυρίω to represent the words of Jude ἄλλα εἰς Ἑκείθησιν οὖν Κύριος. The consciousness of the Divine presence keeps the angels from any injurious word.


12. αὕτω εἰς ἡλιον ἣ...φθαρσον.] The expression in Jude v. 10 is far simpler and more natural.

γεγενημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἡλιον καὶ φθοράν.] 'Born creatures of instinct for capture and destruction.' Cf. Joh. 18:37 ἐγὼ εἰς τὸ θύμον γεγενημένα... ἢν μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἡλιον, Juv. i. 141 'animal propter convivia natum,' and a rabbinical quotation in Wetstein's n. 'quidam vitulus sum ad mactandum adduceretum, R. Judam accessit capitque in ejus aegremium reponens flevit. Sed ille, Abi, inquit, in hunc finem creatus es.' For φυσικὰ compare Plut. Mor. 706A on the pleasures arising from music, which are not limited, like the pleasures of taste, to the irrational and instinctive portion of the soul (εἰς τὸ ἡλιον καὶ φυσικὸν ἀποτελεσταῖ τῆς ψυχῆς, ἄλλα τοῦ κρίνοντος ἀπότομα καὶ τοῦ φρανοντος). One would rather have expected σφαγῆν than φθοράν, which is not more appropriate for animals than for men. But it seems to be the intention of the writer to use a word which is applicable to both, as shown later on, εν τῇ φθορᾷ αἰτίων φθαρσονται. We must therefore compare ἡλιον with such passages as 1 Tim. 3:7 ἢ μὴ εἰς οὐνεισμόν ἐμπέπη καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου, 2 Tim. 2:26 καὶ ἀναγγέλων ἐκ τῆς διαβόλου παγίδος ἕγγραμμον ἐν αἰτίων εἰς τὸ ἱερών ἠλέημα, 2 Tim. 3:8 αἰχμαλωτίζοντες γυναικάρια σεσωρυμένα ἀμαρτίαις, Ecles. 10:12, Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 4. οὐκόν ὁ σύντριπτην... ἔτοι καὶ σιγῳ υπὸ τῶν ἀνταύλων ἢ τὰ λοιπά ζῷα ἀλίσκεσθαι... γαστρὶ δελαζόμενα... τῷ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τοῦ φαγείν ἀγόμενα πρὸς τὸ δέλεαρ ἀλίσκεται, κτλ., and v. 18 below.

ἐν εἰς ἄγουσθων βλασφημούντες.] In the N.T. βλασφημεῖν is usually followed by the accusative as in v. 10 above: in classical Greek by εἰς, which also occurs in Mk. 3:29. If we are to expand the relative phrase into ἐν τοῖς ἄ, the frequent confusion between εἰς and ἐν in late

1 B and WH. om. κατά.
Greek may account for the use of εδε here, compare 1 Esdr. 149 ἐξέμυκ- 
τήσαν τοῖς ἀγγέλωις αὐτῶν. It is better however to give it a wider 
sense 'blaspheming in matters of which they know nothing.' Others 
expand the clause as follows, ταῦτα ἐν ὅσις ἀγγελοῦν, for which they com-
pare the totally dissimilar Sir. 515 ἐν μεγάλῳ καὶ ἐν μικρῷ μὴ ἠγούντε.
The point of the phrase is explained by Test. Ασετ 7 μη γίνεσθε ὡς 
Σόδομα, ὅτις ἐγνώνει τοῖς ἀγγέλοις Κυρίου καὶ ἀπώλει ἐως αἰώνοις.

ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρῆσονται.] A very rhetorical phrase to express 
Jude's ἐν τοῖς φθαρόνται. We may compare it with ἐν ἑμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαι-
ταί 38 below, and Philo i. p. 693 βούλεται διουκίσας ἡμᾶς τῶν 
σωματικῶν, ἀπερ ἐν ρύσει καὶ φθορᾷ φθειρόμενη καὶ φθειροῦσῃ θεωρεῖ-
tαι, κληρὸν ψυχής λαβεῖν μετά τῶν ἀφθάρτων καὶ ἀφθάρταις ἄξιοι 
ἀρτέριν. What is the reference to αὐτῶν? Probably we should explain 
it of τὰ ἄλογα, of whom φθορά was predicated above; but what is the 
sense of saying that 'the libertines shall also be destroyed in their 
destruction'? Looking back to the parallel in Jude, we find two sorts 
of knowledge contrasted; the one, belonging to the spiritual order, is 
declared to be beyond the reach of the libertines (ὅσα μὲν οὐκ αἴσθαν 
corresponding to ἐν ὅσις ἀγγελοῦν here), who in both epistles are said to 
rail at the objects of this knowledge (δοξαί): the other kind of know-
ledge belonging to the natural order, the region of sense, is that of 
which the libertines are made cognizant, like brute beasts, through their 
animal nature, viz. those sensual gratifications, which are the cause of 
their destruction, as they are of the snaring and destruction of the 
brutes. This latter kind of knowledge is not distinctly mentioned by 
our author. Perhaps he did not think it deserved to be called know-
ledge; but he enlarges on the comparison of the brutes saying that 
their end is destruction, and that, if men degrade themselves to their 
level, they will also share their destruction. Another way of taking 
it is Bengel's, 'In corruptione σωμ (αὐτῶν) plane corruum est,' reading 
cataphthoraσονται for καὶ φθορᾶ, meaning, I suppose, 'their own corrupt 
hearts will bring about their destruction.' But would not this require 
αὐτῶν or at any rate a more emphatic position for αὐτῶν? Spitta 
understands αὐτῶν of the δοξαί, who are referred to as καὶ' αὐτῶν 
in v. 11, and explains ἐν οἷς ἐν τοῖς οἷς (because δοξαὶ= 
ἀγγελοῖ); this ἐν τοῖς is then replaced by ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν, 
depending on kataphthoraσονται; 'der Untergang der δοξαί wird auch 
der der Libertiner sein (νν. 4, 11, 12).' He further explains the 
reference to the ἄλογος of the brutes by the use of σωμ in v. 4. 
The difficulty of this explanation lies in the fact that it destroys 
the relation between the second φθορά (that of the angels, according to 
Spitta) and the first φθορά (that of the brutes), and again in the con-
fusion between good and bad angels.

The general meaning seems to be the same as that of Rom. 856. 
οἱ κατά σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονοῦσιν, οὓς δὲ κατὰ πνεύμα 
tὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. τὸ γὰρ φρονήμα τῆς σαρκὸς δύνατον· τὸ δὲ φρονήμα τοῦ 
pνεύματος ζωή καὶ εἰρήνη, and 1 Cor. 214 ψυχικὸς δὲ ἀνθρώπος οὐ δέχεται 
tὰ τὸ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, μορφὰ γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστιν, καὶ οὗ δύναται γνῶινα, 
ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται. See further in the Comment.
13. ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἄδικαια.] For the reading see Introduction on the Text. The reading κομίζεται resembles Col. 3:25 δὲ γὰρ ἀδικῶν κομίζεται ἡ ἁδικία, Barn. iv. 12 δὲ κύριος κρίμα τῶν κάσων ἡμῶν, καθὼς ἔτοιμη, κομίζεται... δὲν ἦν πονηρός, δὲ μισθὸς τῆς πονηρίας ἐπιρροεῖσθαι αὐτοῦ. But there seems no reason for a future here. The principal verb φθαρμόνται is followed by seven present participles before we reach καταλάβοντες, which forms part of the escort of the next principal verb ἐπιρροεῖσθαι. This series of participles is broken, like v. 10, by exclamatory substantives in apposition, στίλοι καὶ μῶμοι in v. 13, and κατάρας τέκνα in v. 14, though the latter is perhaps best taken with the next sentence. The first participle ἀδικ. is closely connected with the preceding verb: the second is connected with the subsequent clauses, which serve to bring out its separate features: the third and fourth are merely appendages to the second. Spitta, putting a full stop after the fine-sounding καταφθαρμόνται, thinks that the participles stand for finite verbs as in Hebrew. Cf. Blass G.T. § 79. 10, Janzaris § 2168. If ἀδικοῦμενοι is correct, it is another example of the author's love of far-fetched and artificial expressions. The simple thought which underlies the phrase is probably 'being punished for their ἄδικα' (cf. ἄδικος in v. 9), a thought which may have recalled to his mind Rom. 6:22 τὰ γὰρ ὄφεια τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος, and perhaps Mt. 6:14 ἀπέχουσαν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν. The corresponding verse in Jude speaks of μισθὸς in connexion with Balaam, and our author uses the phrase μισθὸς ἄδικας himself in reference to Balaam in v. 15. But, as he would reflect, Balaam never received the promised wages of his iniquity. Balak, who had hired him, never paid his hire (Numb. 24:11). And is it not the same with these libertines, who sacrifice so much for the sake of wealth and popularity, and yet are defrauded of their wages by death? So Tischendorf appears to take it translating 'decepti circa μισθὸν ἄδικας.' The construction ἄδικας τινὰ τὶ 'to wrong a person in any way' is common enough, cf. Acts 35:10, Gal. 4:12. But in classical writers the acc. rei does not seem to extend beyond the cognate ἄδικας: μισθὸν ἀποτεροῦμενος would rather have been used for the sense 'defrauded,' which is here supposed. See however Plut. Cato Mi. 17 (p. 766) εὑρόν χρέα παλαιά τῷ δημοσίῳ πολλούς ἀφέλοντας καὶ πολλοῖς τῷ δημοσίῳ, ἀμὴν τὸν πόλιν ἐπαισχύνειν ἄδικομένην καὶ ἄδικον. The R.V. has 'suffering wrong as the hire of wrongdoing,' which is much the way in which it is taken by Dr. Abbott, who would understand ἄδικας after ἀδικοῦμενοι, translating 'they receive from God what they call injustice as the requital of their injustice,' and by Hofmann 'Sclimmes erfahren als einen Lohn für Schlimmes,' which may be compared with Ps. 18:36 'With the froward thou wilt show thyself froward.' The difficulty of this is that μισθὸν ἄδικας is used below of the literal reward offered to Balaam. But this playing on the double use of μισθὸς is not unlike the play on φθορά, above, and εἶδατο καὶ βίει ἔδατος in 35.

Here again we have a very ambiguous sentence. Both ἠδονὴ and γραφή may be taken either in a
good or a bad sense, while ἀρεία has been variously interpreted. The word τροφή occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in Lk. 7:25 where of ἀρεία μετάδοξω καὶ τροφή ὑπάρχοντες are contrasted with the Baptist, the reference being to a luxurious life with no special blame attached. In James 5:6 τροφήσατε is joined with ἐσπατάλυσατε in a bad sense, like ἀντραφαólω here. Exx. of τροφή in the bad sense are found in Hes. Μανδ. vi. 5 (of the works of the Evil Angel) πολυτέλεα μαθησάμενοι καὶ ποικίλων τριφών καὶ πεποιημένοι γυναικῶν, id. viii. 3, xi. 12 ὁ δοκοῦντε ἕχειν ὑποτέλεον καὶ ἀναίδης ἔστιν καὶ ἐν τροφαίς πολλαῖς ἀναπροσδόκημον καὶ ἐν ἄρεαις πολλαίς ἀπάταις καὶ μισοῦσθις λαμβάνει τῆς τροφής αὐτοῦ, id. xii. 2 πάσα τροφή μωρᾶ ἔστι καὶ κενὴ τοῦ δούλου τοῦ Θεοῦ, Sim. vi. 2 ὅστος δέχεται τροφήν καὶ ἀπάτης ἔστιν, id. 2 πορεύεται ἀπάταις καὶ τροφαίς ματαιάς, id. iv. 4 τῆς τροφῆς καὶ ἀπάτης ὅρα ἄρτι μία, τῆς ἐν βασανών ὡρά λ' ἁμαρτών δύναμιν ἔχει, καὶ σωθῆναι. On the other hand τροφή is used of the gifts of wisdom in Prov. 4:9 ἐν δῷ σῇ κεφάλῃ στεφάνων χαρίτων, στεφάνῳ δὲ τροφῆς ὑπερασπίζῃ σου, and of the divine blessing in Ps. 36:7. 'Thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures,' (τὸν χειμάρρον τῆς τροφῆς σου ποταίσι ἄντοις), moreover the garden of Eden is called ὁ παράδεισος τῆς τροφῆς (Gen. 2:10, 3:8, Ezek. 31:8). In the N.T. ἰδοὺ εἰς ὑμᾶς is used only in a bad sense, see Lk. 8:14, Tit. 3:8, James 4:13. In one place in the LXX. (Prov. 17:1) it has a good sense, κρείσσον ψωμὸς μεθ' ἰδοὺ εἰς εἰρήνην, ὡς ὁ λογος πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν μετὰ μάχθει. I doubt whether we can find ἰδοὺ in an entirely good sense outside the Epicuran school, but Philo's definition would suit here, see M. 2. p. 164 τοῦ παράδεισου καὶ γομοσώματος ἀγαθοῦ φαντασία διαγερὰ τὴν ψυχήν: ... καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ πάθος ἰδοὺ, M. 1. p. 39 στεφάνι τῶν ἀγῶν ὡς ἀναγκαζότατον καὶ συνεκτικώτατον τέλος, ἰδοὺν, καὶ μᾶλλον ἀνθρώπων, or Aristotle's (Eth. N. x. 4) ἑπετέ υἱώσων τελειοὶ ἰδοὺν. I think this justifies the reading of the R.V., 'Men that count it pleasure to revel in the daytime,' agreeing with Assumpt. Mops. iv. 4 'omnia hora diei amantes convivia,' Ewald 'Welche jeden Tag (rather 'am Tage') zu schwelgen für die höchste Lebensfreude achten,' v. Soden 'Als Lust betrachtend die Schlemmerei am Tage,' and Keil 'Den Tag, der zur Arbeit bestimmt ist mit Schwellen hinzubringen für Vergnügen achten sie.' For the phrase εἰς ἰδοὺ cf. 3 Macc. 5:11 εἰς νυκτὶ καὶ ἰδοὺ, Rom. 13:12 ὡς εἰς ἰδοὺ μεσημβρίων περιπατήσωμεν, μη κάμοις καὶ μάθαις, μη κοίταις καὶ δαπανήσεσθε. 1 Th. 5:8 ἰδοὺ δὲ ἱμάρας ὡς νυφόμεν, also Joh. 9:4 ἵνα ἰδοὺ ἢμέρα ἐστίν. Joh. 11:9 ἵνα τε περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ ἱμέρᾳ, οὐ προσκόπτει. The more usual expression in classical Greek would be ἱμέρας or μεθ' ἱμέραν. For the thought see Isa. 5:11, Eccles. 10:17. Dr. Bigg's rendering is 'counting our sober daylight joy (the Agape) mere vulgar pleasure,' which keeps closer to the ordinary meaning of the words in biblical Greek; but the meaning given to την εἰς ἱμέρα τροφην is very far-fetched, and it is by no means certain that the Agape was then a daylight meal.1 Spitta reads τροφή for τροφη, translating

1 See my Appendix C to Clem. Al. Strom. vii.
'Als Lustbarkeit betrachten die Libertiner die tägliche Mahlzeit, die doch nur den Zweck hat den Menschen für die Arbeit des Lebens die nötigse Kraft zu geben.' The objections to this are (1) that ἡμέρα is not equivalent to καθ' ἡμέραν, cf. Mt. 26:54, Lk. 11:3, (2) that there is nothing wrong in a man's finding pleasure in his daily bread (Eccles. 5:18), but rather in a morose refusal to enjoy what God has provided for enjoyment (1 Tim. 4:4). Weiss interprets τὴν ἡμέραν τρυφήν 'luxury which according to its nature can only last as long as it is day, i.e. during our earthly life.'

σπλακ καὶ μῶμοι] σπλακ is late Greek for the classical κηλής (Phryn. p. 28 Lob.), used of moral defect in Eph. 5:27; ἐν παραστάσει αὐτοῦ λαυτῶ ἐνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μη ἐξονταν στίλων ἢ μοιχαὶ ἢ τις τοιούτων, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἢ ἄγια καὶ ἁμαμοι; of a person who discredits the body to which he belongs in Dion. Hal. Ant. iv. 24 (speaking of slaves manumitted in reward for disgraceful services) εἰς τούτους δυσεκκαθάρει τοιούτων συνεκκαθάρεις οἱ πολλοὶ δυσεκκαθάρεις. The adjective ἀσπλακ is used below 31:4, also in 1 Pet. 1:18 ἅμα μαμου, ὡς ἀμμοῦ ἁμμοῦ καὶ ἀσπλακ, Ἀριστοῖ, as well as in 1 Tim. 6:14, James 1:27; and the verb σπλακα in Jude 23, James 3:8. As the word σπλακ in the parallel passage of St. Jude is also found in the sense of σπλακ in one solitary passage, so the σπλακ of 2 P. is also found, though rarely, in the sense of σπλακ, only with the gender changed to the feminine. Hence confusion was easy. For a discussion on the general bearing of these parallelisms, see Introduction on the Relation between the two Epistles. For μῶμοι see note on Jude v. 24, and Lev. 21:21 πας ἢ εστιν ἐν αὐτῷ μῶμοι . . . οὐκ ἐγγιν τοῦ προσενεκεῖν τὰς θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ σου, ὅτι μῶμοι ἐν αὐτῷ, where it refers to ritual blemish: in Sir. 11:21 προσέχει ἀπὸ κακοῦργον . . . μὴ ἀπειρούμενοι εἰς τὸν αἰώνα διὸ σου, ἢ. 18:14 ἐν ἁγαθοῖς μη δῆς μῶμον, ἢ. 20:23 μῶμοι πονηρῶς ἐν ἄνθρωπῳ ψείδων it is used as in profane Greek, in the sense of 'blame,' 'reproach,' 'disgrace.' With the exclamatory σπλακ καὶ μῶμοι may be compared Ἰωάννης in v. 10, κατάρας τέκνα in v. 14, and the denunciatory terms introduced by οὕτωι εἰσιν in v. 17 and Jude vv. 12, 16.

ἔντρυφον ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν.] For readings see Introduction on the Text. Cf. Isa. 55:2 ἔντρυφον στείρον ἐν ἁγαθοῖς ἢ ψυχὴ ὠμῶν (good sense), 'Let your soul delight itself in faithness' R.V., 57:4 ἐν τῖν ἐντρυφή-σατε; (bad sense). 'Against whom do ye sport yourselves?' R.V. Both meanings are common in profane Greek, see exx. in Wetstein. Hofmann understands it here in a metaphorical sense 'revelling in their deceits,' and explains it by δελαφίζοντες ψυχὰς in the next verse. Ewald takes it literally, supposing that ἀπάτη is a sort of pun on the ἄγαθη of Jude, 'Diebesmahle' for 'Liebesmahle.' It might also be taken absolutely, as in Xen. Hell. iv. 1. 30 ὑποθεύειν δε αὐτῶ τῶν θεραπόντων βαπτή, ἢ ἵνα καθίσοντιν οἱ Πήραιοι μαλακῶς, ψυχικὴ ἔντρυφον, and Philo M. 1 p. 232 ἐνυφαίνεται καὶ ἔντρυφα πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων, ἀμφιγεί καὶ κράτοις ἢ τί δε ἀρτίοις καὶ πληρεὶς κεφαλο-μένοις ἀνθρώπων; in which case ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις might be joined with συνευοχύνειν to explain how it happened that the libertines were
admitted to the feasts of believers. On the whole however I prefer Hofmann's rendering.

14. ὀφθαλμοὶς ἔχοντες μεστοὶς μοιχαλίδος.] A striking expression to describe the man who sees an adulteress in every woman, or in plainer words, who cannot see a woman without lascivious thoughts arising in his heart, such thoughts becoming as it were stereotyped, and betraying themselves in his looks, cf. Mt. 5:23 τὸς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμεῖν αὐτής, ἵδε ἐμαχεύσειν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, Plut. Mor. 528 κ. ὁ μὲν ἔγνω τόν ἀναίσχυντον οὐκ ἐθνίς κόρας ἐν τοῖς ὀμμασιν ἔχειν, ἄλλα πόρας (a saying attributed to Timaeus by Longin. 4, 5), Gell. iii. 5 (Arcesilau.) sum oculos ludibundos atque incelebres voluptatisque plenos videret: ' nihil interest,' inquit, 'quibus membris cinaedi sitis, posterioribus an prioribus' (cited by Wetstein).

For the metaphorical use of μεστὸς see Mt. 23:23 ἔτισθαι μεστὸν ἄρτε ὀποκρίσεως, Rom. 1:29 μεστὸς φθόνου, Prov. 6:34, Xen. Symp. i. 13. μοιχαλίας found in Rom. 7:3, 7:4, James 4:4, Mt. 12:28, and late Greek writers (see Phryn. p. 455 Lob.) instead of the classical μοιχεύειν. The reading μοιχαλίας found in Ν Α and some versions is a νον μοιχεύειν.

ἀκατάπαυτος ἀμαρτίας.] For readings see Intro. on Text. For the construction cf. 1 Pet. 4:1 πάντως τὰ αἷματα ἀμαρτίας, and γεγυμνασμένην πλευρανίας below: see my note on James 1:13 ἀπέτραπτος κακῶν.

The late word αἰ. is only found here in biblical Greek. It is used by Polyb. 4. 17. 4, Plut. Mor. 114: άκατάπαυτος συμφορά συνεσομέθη, id. 924 b, Vitae p. 734 c ἢ μοναρχία τὸ ἀκατάπαυτον προσλαβοῦσα, id. 1039 c ἀκατάπαυτος ἄρχη. The classical equivalent is ἀπαντος, used with gen. by Eur. Suppl. 82 ἀπαντος γόων.

δειλιώτες ψυχᾶς ἀστηρότερον.] For the rare late Greek ἀστηρότερος see below (318), and n. on ἀστηρότερον (112) it is used by Longinus ii. 2 (great wits) διὰ εὐστήρησεν ἀστηρότερα καὶ ἀναιρετότα. For δειλ. see below v. 18, Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 4 quoted above on v. 12, and my n. on James 1:14.

καρδίαις γεγυμνασμένην πλευρανίας ἔχοντες.] Cf. Heb. 5:14 τῶν διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐγκυμνασμένης ἔκκομοι πρὸς διάκρισιν. Wetstein illustrates the construction from Philostratus Heroic. iii. p. 688 βαλαίην οὐκ ἐγκυμνασμένον, ἰδ. iv. p. 696 πολέμων πολλῶν ἐγκυμνασμένον, ἰδ. ηπ. p. 708 σοφίας τῆς ἐγκυμνασμένος, Alford adds Clem. Hom. iv. 7 πάσης Ἐλληνικῆς παιδείας ἐγκυμνησμένης, Hes. Op. 649 καυτλίας σεσομασμένης. Exx. of this 'genitive of the sphere' are also to be found in Lat. e.g. 'vetus militiae,' 'prodigiorum peritus.' For πλευρανίας see above v. 3.

κατάρας τίτανα.] For this Hebraism = κάταρατος, cf. τίτκα ὑπακοῆς I Pet. 1:14, τίκτα ὄργας Eph. 2:23, τίκτα φωνῆς ἴδ. 5:8, τίκτα ἀπωλείας Is. 57:4, τίκτα ἀδειᾶς Hos. 10:2, and τίκτα τῆς ἀπωλείας Eph. 2:23, 5:6, ὁ νῦν τῆς ἀπωλείας 2 Th. 2:3, Joh. 17:12, Winer p. 298 f. Spitta quotes Ps. 95:10 δὲ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ οὐκ ἐγραψαν τὰς δόξας μου· ὡς ὄμοσα ἐν τῇ ὑγρῇ μου El εἰσελεύσονται. For κατάρας cf. Deut. 11:26 ἵδιον ἴδιον διδωμί
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15. καταλείποντες εἰσεύρηκαν ὅδεν ἐπλανήθησαν.] For the readings see Introd. on Text. For the metaphorical ὅδεν see above on v. 2, 1 Sam. 12:22 δείξο ὑμῖν τὴν ἄγαθὴν καὶ τὴν εἰδωλίαν, Extra 81 ἐργάζομαι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅδεν εἰσεύρηκαν ἡμῖν, Ps. 107:7, Isa. 30:21, Hos. 14:9 εἰσεύρηκα αἱ ὅδει τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ δύκαια πορεύονται ἐν αὐτοῖς, Acts 13:10 (of Simon Magus) διαστρέφω τὸς ὅδος κυρίου τὰς εἰδωλίας. For the absence of the article see Introd. on Grammar. For πλανάμαι cf. Jas. 5:19, 20, 1 Pet. 2:25.

ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὅδε τοῦ Βαλαάμ τοῦ Ὅσερ.] See Introd. on Text. For ἔξακ. cf. above 116, 23. For Balaam see n. on Jude v. 11. Alford compares Num. 22:22 ὅπειρα ἡ ὅδος σου ἐναντίον ἑμοῦ. δὲ μωθῶν ἀδίκως ἡγάπησαν.] See Introd. on Text. For a similar use of ἀγαπάω cf. Lk. 11:43. Balaam’s offer was a bribe, a reward of wrong doing, because Balaam was fully aware that Israel was under the protection and blessing of Jehovah, and yet he consented to go with the messengers of Balaam when they came for the second time to ask him to curse Israel. Compare the two equations in the first epistle of St. John ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστίν ἡ ἁμαρτία (34) and τίσα ἀδίκω ἁμαρτία ἐστίν (517) with Westcott’s notes ‘Sin is the assertion of a selfish will against a paramount authority,’ ‘By whatever acts, internal or external, man falls short of God’s will, as it is spiritually apprehended, he sins.’ So here Balaam is guilty of παρανομία because he consents to ἀδίκω.

16. ἔλεγεν ὅπειρα ἔλεγεν ἔλεγεν παρανομίας.] The only other recorded instances of ἔλεγεν in biblical Greek are in Job 21:4 μὴ ἀνθρώπων μου ἢ ἔλεγεν; ‘is my complaint of man?’, ib. 23:2 ὥστε μου ἡ ἔλεγεν ἐστιν, where R.V. has ‘even to-day is my complaint rebellion.’ Cf. Philostratus Vit. Ap. ii. p. 74 ὅπειρα πρὸς τὸν ἔλεγεν τὸν. Here ἔλεγεν is used with the noun as a sort of periphrastic passive of the cognate verb, as in αἰτίαν ἔλεγεν. For ἔλεγεν see above on 18 ἔδει δοῦναι, Winer p. 191 f., Jannaris Gr. Gr. §§ 1416 f. Dr. Bigg after Huther and Hofmann regards it as merely equivalent to αὐτοῦ, comparing Mt. 22:25 οὐ δὲ ἀμήλιστας ἐπηλθον, δὲ μὴ εἶν τὸν ἔλεγεν ἄργων, δὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμορίαν αὐτοῦ. There can be no doubt however that in the great majority of instances in the N.T. ἔλεγεν retains its emphatic force, and so the R.V. has ‘own’ both here and in Mt. 22. Weiss translates it ‘eine Zurechtweisung der ihm charakteristischen παρανομίας,’ Dietlein ‘die ihm als Urbilde der Lügenpropheten eigene παρανομία,’ Wiesinger ‘er der andern ein Prophet war, musste durch eine Eselin sich die eigene παρανομι vorhalten lassen,’ Keil ‘ἔλεγεν steht nicht einfach für αὐτοῦ, sondern hebt hervor, dass die παρανομία einen stehenden Zug seines Charakters bildete.’ Hundhausen explains it as follows: ‘Balaam, der als Prophet den Willen Gottes und das göttliche Gesetz am wenigsten hätte übertreten sollen, selbst dawider handelte, und er der als gotterleuchteter Prophet andere zurechtzuweisen berufen war, sich ob seiner eigenen Frevelthalt von einer Eselin musste zurecht weisen lassen.’
Perhaps it is simpler to explain as follows: 'He who was bribed by Balak to curse Israel was rebuked for his own disobedience by the disobedience of the ass and thus hindered from receiving the promised reward.' παραφονία is not so strong an expression as ἀνομία. It is not a general defiance of law, but rather a breach of a particular law. It occurs here only in the N.T., but is found in classical Greek and in Prov. 5:22 παραφονίαν ἄνδρα ἀγρεύοντι, ib. 10:26 ἢπειρ κατινὸς δρμασιν, οὔτως παραφονία τοῖς χρωμάνων αὐτῇ.

υπάλων . . . ἱκάλων τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφονίαν.] An example of confirmatory asyndeton, which would have been more usually expressed by the gen. abs. ὑπολογίων καλύπτοντος. The indefinite ὑπολογίον is sometimes used for the more common δος in biblical Greek, as the ass was the familiar beast of burden among the Israelites, see Mt. 21:5, Exod. 4:20, 20:17, 23:4, Josh. 6:21, Jud. 1:14, Job 24:23. Among the Greeks and Romans the term ὑπολογίον or iumentum would be more naturally understood of the mule, though it is used to include the ass in Plut. Mor. 178 b. In Plato Legg. xi. 936 ξ we find δοσολογίον distinguished from the horse.

ἁφωνον.] As ἁφων is used of the sound uttered by any living thing (Arist. de Anim. ii. 8. 9), the epithet ἁφωνος is properly applicable only to creatures which are entirely mute, or to lifeless things, as by Aeschin. 88. 37. A distinctive force is given to the word by the reference to the human voice which follows. In 1 Cor. 14:10 ἁφωνος is used of the gift of tongues in the sense 'without signification.'

ἐν ἀνθρώποι πρωτης φθοράματος.] For exx. of the use of ἐν to express the instrument, see the Index. φθοράμαι is found in N.T. only in this Epistle (here and below v. 18) and in Acts 4:18. The aorist participle is taken by Alford and others as contemporary with the aorist verb following, but ἱκάλων is really consequent upon φθεγξάμενον: the present participle might be translated 'in human speech,' being simply descriptive of the action; the aorist denotes a logical antecedent to the action, 'by speaking in man's voice'; see Acts 13:3 νηστείαντες και προσευχάμενοι . . . ἱκάλων and Introd. on Grammar.

ἱκάλων τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφονίαν.] 'Hindered the madness of the prophet.' The behaviour of the ass caused Balaam to see that he was confronted by the angel of the Lord, and that he could only utter the words permitted by God. Observe the contrast, the madness of the prophet, whose eyes had been opened, rebuked by the vision of the ass. The ordinary termination of substantives derived from φρόνις is -οφονή, as παραφοσφόνη in Plat. Soph. 228 b, from παράφρον 'delirious' (another form is παραφρόνης LXX. Zach. 12:4); sometimes -ων as in εὐφρόνη, ἀφρόνη, δυσφρόνη. Lobeck gives a long list of nouns in -οφονή in Pathologia Serm. Gr. pp. 230–240, such being the prevailing formation for derivatives from nouns in -ων which shorten the vowel in the gen., but we find ἀδημονία (rarely ἀδημοσύνη) from ἀδήμων, γεινόν (rarely γειτοσύνη) from γεῖτων, εὐδαιμονία and κακοδαιμονία (very rarely εὐ- and κακο-δαιμοσύνη) from δαίμων, ἀπαμοσύνη as well as ἀπεμοσύνη from ἀπήμων. Probably the author was led to select the form παραφρονία from the assonance to-
the preceding παρανομία. Philo i. p. 609 speaks of Balaam as κατα-
κεντούμενος ὑπὸ φρενοβλαβείας τῆς ἤπατος.

17. οὕτω εἰσιν τυγχ. ἀνδρός καὶ ὄμιχλα ἐν τῷ λαλατος ἑλανομένως.] For οὕτω εἰσιν see n. on J. 16. The author may have thought that, in
splitting up the metaphor, he was adding clearness and point to the
parallel in Jude v. 12. For the former metaphor cf. Job 615, Jer. 143
foll., for the latter Job 76, 3015, Hos. 64, 153. λαλασ is used of the
storm on the Lake of Galilee in Mk. 437, Lk. 823. It seems an unnee-
sarily strong expression here. Compare however Wisdom 514 Οὐκ
ἀσέβεις ὡς φερόμενος χρόνος ὑπὸ ἀνεμοῦ, καὶ ὡς πάχη ὑπὸ λαλασ
dιωχθεὶσα λεπτή. Philo i. p. 611 uses it metaphorically λαλασ κενής
dόξης μὴ ἀναφασθήναι. We should hardly think of a mist as promis-
ing rain, indeed Aristotle (Meteor i. 9. 4) asserts the contrary, ὄμιχλη
σημείων μᾶλλον ὅτιν εὐδίας ἢ εὐαίων οἷον γὰρ ἤτιν ἢ ὄμιχλη νυφέλη
ἀγοράς, and so in the De Mundo i. p. 394a; Plato however defines
ὕμηλη ὡς τὸ ἐξ ἀέρος εἰς ὅφοι ὅν, and is on this account condemned
by Theophrastus (De Sensu et Sensiīli §§ 90), who makes a mist a sign
of fine weather, ὅταν ὄμιχλη γένηται, ὅφος ὅπως γίνεται, ἢ Ἐαττον
(De Signis c. 4). Possibly the author may have had in his mind Gen.
28, where a mist is said to have supplied the place of rain in the
Garden of Eden. For ἑλανομ. see n. on James 34.

οὐ δὲ τόφος τοῦ σκότους τεθήκηται.] This clause, taken from Jude 13,
is there appropriately used of the meteors, which flame out for a
moment and then disappear in the blackness of darkness for ever;
but here it is quite unsuited to the preceding figures of the springs
and the mists. The masculine οὐ is used because the false teachers
are typified by these figures, cf. Winer pp. 176 f. Spitta quotes Micah 34
(ἐν τούς προφήτας τούς πλανώντας τόν λαόν μου) διὰ τοῦτο νῦς ὁμίας ἐσται
ἐξ ὀράσεως καὶ σκοτία ἐσται ὑμῖν ἐκ μαντείας καὶ δύναται ὁ ἥλιος ἐπί
tοις προφήτας κ.τ.λ. contrasting it with Dan. 128.

18. ὑπερομπαγμα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθονιμένου.] For ὑπερομπαγμα see note on
Jude ver. 16. The verb φθονιμόμαι is used from the time of Homer
downwards of any kind of utterance or sound of man or animal, or even
of inanimate things. It is repeated here in the author's way from v. 16.
ματαιότης a biblical word used only by ecclesiastical writers, cf. Ps. 46
ἰνατί ἀγαπάτε ματαιότητα; Ps. 398 τὰ σύμπαντα ματαιότητα, Eccles. 12 ματ.
ματαιότητων, Rom. 820 τῇ ματαιότητι ἢ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, where it is used of
what is empty, passing, and transient. In Ps. 264 οὐκ ἐκάθισα μετὰ
συνεδρίου ματαιότητος, Ps. 11987 ἀπόστρεφον τοὺς ὑβαλόμους μου τοῦ μῆ
ἰδέων ματαιότητα, Ps. 1444 ὅπως ὁ πάντως ἐλάθησε ματαιότητα, Eph. 417 μηκέτι
ὑμᾶς περιποιεῖ καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιποιεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν,
it is used of moral instability, of men without principle on whom no
reliance can be placed. Here it seems best to understand it in the
former sense of emptiness. The false teachers use big words, make
high professions, which have no corresponding reality. The word
occurs in Barn. 43 θυμομεν ἁπό πάσης ματαιότητας, Polyc. ad Philipp.
7 διὸ ἀπαλαιτόντες τὴν ματαιότητα τῶν ταλαίων, cf. ib. 2 ἀπαλαιτόντες
tὴν κενήν ματαιολόγιαν. For the genitive see Introd. on Grammar.

1 Quoted in Ideler's note to the Meteorologica.
γάρ here introduces the reason why the false teachers are compared to wells and mists which encourage false hopes of water. Their fine words are equally delusive.

Σελένωσαν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείας.] For σελ. see v. 14 above. It is a question whether σαρκὸς should be taken with the word that precedes or the word that follows. The rhythm suits the latter, and so Alford translates 'They entice in lusts by licentiousness of the flesh'; but the usage is in favour of the phrase ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς, as in Eph. 2:11 ἐπιθέσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, where Hort says 'this is the only place in the Epistle where St. Peter uses σάρξ or σαρκίκος strictly in the Pauline or ethical sense. Two points need attention with respect to it... the flesh includes much more than sensuality, as a glance at Gal. 5:19 foll. will show, where hatreds and envyings form part of a list which begins with fornication and ends with revellings. On the other hand the term "flesh" is not applied to any part of human nature, absolutely and in itself, but as placed in a wrong relation, that being allowed to rule which was meant to serve' (shortened). Other examples are Rom. 13:14 τῷ σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ παρέσχετε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας, Gal. 5:16 πνεύματι περιπατέτω καὶ ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε, ib. v. 24 οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆν σάρκα ἑπαύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, 1 Joh. 2:16, above v. 10 τοῖς ὄρεσι σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις μιασμοῦ παρακεντάνου. It might seem also that since ἐπιθυμία, though commonly used in a bad sense, is a neutral word to start with, while ἀσελγεία is always bad, it was more appropriate to define the former by adding σαρκὸς. There are however two kinds of misconduct denoted by ἀσελγεία and the cognate words, (1) petulance, insolence, and (2) lasciviousness. Of (1) we have exx. in Plato Legg. ix. 879 νδ where ἀσελγαίων is used of one who wantonly strikes another, Isocr. p. 174 ἄ τίς ἐν ὑπέμεινῃ τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ τῶν πατέρων τῶν ἡμετέρων, where it refers to tyrannical treatment of the allies, ib. 398 δ, where it refers to striking, ib. 240δ ἀσελγείας καταχρονέ ἐν τοῖς πόλεως. and generally in classical Greek, see other exx. in Wetstein i. p. 588. In later Greek it is used almost exclusively in the sense of Polybius’ periphrasis (37. 2. 4), ἀσελγεία περὶ τᾶς σωματικῆς ἐπιθυμίας, to which σαρκὸς ἀσελγείας here corresponds. For the plural of abstract words see on ἀσελγείας v. 2 above and Blass p. 84. The meaning would then be 'They ensnare in lusts through fleshly indulgences,' ἐν denoting the sphere ('Anknüpfungspunkt', Kühn) in which the bait is applied, ἀσελγεία the bait itself. Or, perhaps, it is better to take ἐν as expressing generally the way in which they seek to ensnare their victims (through their lusts as distinguished, say, from ambition or curiosity), and the dative ἀσελγείας as the precise means employed to attain this result. Cf. 1 Pet. 4:2 ὁ θολωμενος τῶν ὑθνῶν κατεργάζεται πεπορευμένων ἐν ἀσελγείαις, κ.τ.λ.

τοὺς ἄλλους ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάγῃ ἀναστρέφομενοι.] See Introd. on the Text. There are two difficulties here: (1) should we read the

1 Codex P with some of the versions has the genitive ἀσελγείας, which might be translated 'lusts of fleshly wantonness,' cf. above v. 10 ἐπιθ. μιασμοῦ.
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present (with most authorities) or the aorist participle (with KLP etc.)? (2) what is the force of ὀλίγως? If we read ἀποφεύγοντας, it implies an inferior degree of Christian progress, especially if we give to ὀλίγως the meaning of ‘slightly,’ ‘a little,’ ‘scarcely,’ ‘but just.’ Such a description does not seem in harmony with what we gather as to the state of those addressed in ch. i. or at the end of ch. iii. It would seem to refer rather to a minority, to novices and catechumens, who were in special danger from the false teachers (so Kühl). On the other hand, if we read the aorist, as in ν. 20 ἀποφεύγοντας τὰ μάσματα τοῦ κόσμου and in 14 ἀποφεύγοντες τῆς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, we get an exhortation which is suited to the general body of the Church, and which would agree better with other interpretations of ὀλίγως mentioned below. This rare adverb is found in Anthol. xii. 205. 1 παῖς τῆς ὑλῆς ἀπαλός τοῦ γεώτρος οὐκ ὀλίγως (‘in no slight degree’) με κινεῖ, Isa. 104 ἐξολοθρεύεισα ἐθνὰ οὐκ ὀλίγα (Aquila ὀλίγας). So understood it would mean ‘those who were slightly escaping,’ i.e. ‘just beginning to escape from.’ We find it used in a different sense in Hippocr. Aph. ii. 7 τὰ ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ λεπτύνομεν σώματα νοθρῶς ἐκατερέῳ διὰ, τὰ δὲ ἐν ὀλίγῳ ὀλίγως where the Latin has celeriter. Taking it thus, we might explain the word here of those who waste no time in turning from their sins to God. Another way of taking it would be to give ὀλίγως the sense of ἄλογον, and read ἀποφεύγοντας, ‘those who had all but escaped.’ The other reading ὀντὶς ἀποφεύγοντας is illustrated by Arist. Vesp. 997 ὀντὸς ἀπέφυγεν.2

The clause τοῦ ἐν πλαγίῳ ἀναστρεφόμενος has been explained (1) of the false teachers; (2) of the heathen; (3) as in apposition to the preceding clause. This last explanation is that given by Jerome adv. Iovin. ii. n. 3 ‘qui paululum effugerant et ad errorem reversi sunt,’ Aug. de Fid. et Op. c. 45 ‘eos qui paululum effugerunt, in errore conversati,’ the Vulgate itself ‘eos qui paululum effugiunt, qui in errore conversantur,’ Luther ‘diejenigen die recht entronnen werden und nun im Irrthum wandeln’ (from Hundhausen). This third view is now universally abandoned. An objection to (1) is that the false teachers are the subject of the verb δελεάζοντας, and that the clause would then be a rather futile periphrasis for ἔκατον. Spitta answers this by referring to 13 where τοῦ καλῶντος refers, if not to the preceding αἰτοῦ, yet to Ἰησοῦ in ν. 2. In the similar passages 317 τῶν ἀθέων πλαγίῳ συναπτόμενος, 27 τῆς τῶν ἀθέων ἐν ἀστύλῃ ἀναστροφῆς, and 214 δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτως, there seems little doubt that the reference is to the false teachers. So v. Soden (entice those) ‘welche zu wenig von den in der Irre wandelnden (die Libertiner selbst bezeichnend) sich abkehren. Weil sie nur wenig, nicht ganz, von jenen sich gewendet haben, sind sie ihren Lockungen immer noch erreichbar.’ The second explanation is supported by

1 See however n. on ἀποφεύγοντας ν. 20 below.
2 In Plato, Alcib. sec. 149 a, where the MSS. have τέλλα πάντα αὐτὸ δίλαγος ὀφει- στόρως τιμῶν ἵππης, Buttmann, reading διλαγι, says in his note, ‘Voici δίλαγος, cuius parceissimus est veteribus usus, nullus omnino hic locus est.’ He refers to Hippocr. l.c. where he translates διλαγι brevi and νοθρᾶς lente.
Weiss, who understands the verse of recent converts ‘die sich noch lange nicht ganz von der Gemeinschaft heidnischen Lebens losgesagt haben’; Hundhausen ‘öf εν πλάνη ἀναστρέφομενο bezeichnet die Heiden von denen jene Christen durch ihre Bekehrung zum Christenthum sich losgemacht haben’; Keil ‘Die in Irrthum wandelnden sind die Heiden die ihr Leben εν πλάνη führen. Dem Wandel der Heiden noch nicht ganz entronnen, lassen die Christen sich durch die Schwelgereien der Ἀρρητοί leicht ködern’; and so Wiesinger, Alford, Schott, Brückner, Hofmann, Kühl, and Dr. Bigg. I agree with the latter explanation, mainly on the ground that, if we understand the clause of the general subject of the sentence, it will not do to translate ‘the false teachers entice, by means of fleshly indulgences, those who are barely escaping from those that live in error’ (viz. the false teachers themselves): we must at least suppose a difference in time, and read ἄποφυγόντας, implying that the false teachers were now making a second attack on those who had to some extent escaped them before. But there is nothing here to suggest a previous attack. The author is warning against a new danger now beginning to develop itself. On the other hand, if we suppose the heathen to be meant, this will be the concrete form of the abstract which we find in v. 20 ἄποφυγόντας τὰ μάρτυρα τοῦ κόσμου. The word πλάνη would suit either interpretation. It is used of heretics below 317 and Jude v. 11; of heathens in Rom. 117, Barn. 145 Χριστὸς τῆς παραβασίας τῆς πλάνης ἀναμένει φυχάς ἡμῶν λυτρωσόμενοι τοῖς σκότοις, and generally.

19. Ἀκούειν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι.] The participle gives a further explanation of the phrase δελεάζωσιν δοκεῖν, see quotations in n. on Jude v. 4.

αὐτοῖς δοῦλοι ἐπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς.] The participles ἐπαγγ. and ὑπ. are contrasted by asyndeton instead of by μέν and δέ. For φθορά see Rom. 821 and Appendix below.

ἢ γὰρ τις ἄρρηται, τοῦτω δεδομένω.] The act. ἄρρηται is found in Polyb. and later writers: the pass. is used with the dat. (not of the personal agent, which is expressed by ἵνα with gen. as in 2 Macc. 1034, but of an overmastering feeling) in Ael. N.A. xiii. 22 ἔλαφαντες ἀγρυπνοι καὶ ὑπὲρ μὴ ἄρρητοι πιστῶσαί φιλάκτων. Plut. Vit. 766 ἄρρητοί τοῖς δικαίως ‘defeated on the merits of the case,’ even by Thuc. iii. 38 ἀκοῦσα ἁγιατὴ ἁγιάσωμεν, and vii. 25. 9. δοῦλος is followed, like δοῦλος, by the dat. of the remotest object, cf. Mt. 624 ὑπὲρ δύναται δοῦλος κυρίος δουλείαν, 1 Cor. 919 πᾶν ἐμαυτῶν ἐδόθη τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. Tit. 23 αὐτόν ἐν πολλῷ δεδομένοις, 1 Sam. 179 (the challenge of Goliat) εὰν ἠγατάξα αὐτῶν, ἔσησε ἡμῖν εἰς δοῦλον, Joh. 824 πρὸς τὰ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν δοῦλος ἐστιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας, Rom. 616, Tit. 34, Plato Phaedr. 238 ε, Xen. Mem. i. 6. 8, Julian Orat. vi. p. 198 βίον αἰδοίοις καὶ γαστρῆ δουλεύοντα. Estius remarks ‘ex jure belli victum et captum sibi faciebat mancipium.’

20. αἱ γὰρ ἄποφυγόντες τὰ μάρτυρα τοῦ κόσμου.] We naturally suppose

1 Spitta’s objection to this view is founded on the assumption that the Epistle is addressed to Jewish converts, as to which see Introduction.
the subject to be continued from ἐπαγγελλόμενοι and δελεάζοντας, as Schott, Keil, Kühl, Hundhausen, Weiss, v. Soden, Alford, Plummer, and Plumptre; but Estius, Bengel, Dietlein, Hofmann, and Dr. Bigg suppose a change of subject, on the ground that ἀποφυγόντες here must refer to τῶν ἄλλων ἀποφεύγοντας of v. 18. It would seem however that the persons here spoken of have got beyond the stage of progress implied in ἄλγη. ἀπόφ. even if we read the aorist there. They have obtained a fuller knowledge of Christ (ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου) and of the way of salvation (τὴν ὄδον τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐγνώσας), see above 12. 3. The force of γὰρ is seen in the apodosis, ‘their last state is worse than the first,’ which confirms the preceding statement that they are δούλοι τῆς φθορᾶς. No doubt is implied by the hypothetical form (εἰ γὰρ ἦττάνταί ... γέγονεν αὐτοῖς): it simply expresses a general principle. For μισμα which occurs here only in N.T. see n. on μισμα in v. 10 above. Both are found in the LXX. Compare for the sense 14 ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς and 1 Pet. 4. 3.

ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἡσυχ Ἰριστοῦ.] See on 19 and 318. τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἦττάντα. The participles ἐμπλακέντες and ἀποφυγόντες are opposed to one another by δὲ: the emphatic τούτως is used instead of αὐτοῖς because of the intervening clause. It is governed by ἐμπλακέντες and must be understood with ἦττάντα. For ἐμπλακέντες see 2 Tim. 2, the only other passage in which it occurs in N.T., οὕτως στρατευόμενος ἐμπλάκεται ταῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματίαις. It is found once in LXX. ὁ σκολαίας οὕτως παρευμόνες ἐμπλάκησεν Prov. 28. 18. So Eur. Hipp. 1236 ἥναίσθη ἐμπλακεῖς.

γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἵππατα χειρόν τῶν πρῶτων.] This is the moral of the parable of the Return of the Evil Spirit (Mt. 12. 45, Lk. 11. 20). Cf. Heb. 6. 14, 10. 26. n. on Jude v. 5, Herm. Sim. ix. 17. 5 τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐμίαναν ἰαυτοὺς ... καὶ πάλιν ἐγένετο όλοι πρῶτον ἦσαν, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ χειρονές, ib. 18. 21. κρείττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπηγνώκαν ἐν τῷ ὄδου τῆς δικαιοσύνης.] For the omission of ἄν with imperfect indicative in the apodosis, especially in verbs having something of an auxiliary force, as expressing necessity, propriety, possibility, etc., see Jelf § 858, Blass p. 206. Exx. are 1 Cor. 5. 10 ὠφελείτε ἃρα ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελθεῖν 'then must ye needs go out of the world,' Heb. 9. 28 ἐπεὶ ἐδοὺ αὐτῶν πολλάκις παθεῖν 'else must he often have suffered,' Rom. 7. 7 τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ὦν ἦσαν ('I had not known sin'), εἰ μὴ νόμος ἐλεγεν ὡκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, Xen. Anab. vii. 7. 4 ἁγγείον ἦν. More frequently κρείττον is used with the present, or the verb is omitted, as in 1 Cor. 7. 9 κρείττον ἦστιν γαμεῖν ἡ πυροδιάθεμα, 1 Pet. 3. 7 κρείττον ἀγάθοποιότατα πάχειν ἢ κακοποιότατα, Exod. 14. 12, Prov. 25. 4, Xen. Oecoon. 20. 9 προκαταλαμβάνει τὰ ἐπίκαιρα κρείττον ἡ μη. For the phrase cf. above 2. 2 ὄδος τῆς ἀληθείας, v. 15 καταλείποντες τὴν εὐθείαν ὄδον, Mt. 21. 32 ἠλθεν Ἰωάννης πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ὀδῷ δικαιοσύνης, Prov. 21. 16, Job. 24. 13. ή ἐπηγνώσει ὑποστρέφαι.] For the dative instead of the acc. with inf. see Acts 15. 26 ἐδοξάζειν ἦμι ... ἐκλεξαμένοις (al. -μένοις) ἀνδράς πέμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ib. 27. 3 ἤπετρεψεν (τῷ Παύλῳ) πρὸς τοὺς φίλους πορευθέντι (al.
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ἐκ τῆς παραδείγματος αὐτοῦ ἂν γίνῃ ἐντολῆς.] Cf. note and comment on Jude v. 3 ἐπαγεγραμματεύθη τῇ ἄμαξα παραδείγματι τούτος ἂγιος πίστει, and the use of ἐντολῆ below in 3:14 and 1 Tim. 6:14, 1 Joh. 3:23. The fact that our author speaks of Christianity as command, while Jude speaks of it as faith or gospel, refutes the view that the latter is exclusively practical, the former exclusively theoretical.

22. συμβιβάζειν αὐτοῖς τῷ τῆς ἄλλης παρομαίας.] 'They exemplify the truth of the proverb,' more literally 'the (warning) of the true proverb has happened to them,' cf. Mt. 21:26 τὸ τῆς σκεύης 'the case of the fig-tree,' James 4:14 τὸ τῆς αὐρων, Xen. Oec. 16. 7 ἀνεμνήσθη τοῦ τῶν ἀλίασ ὅτι θαλαττοῦργοι νῦντες ὄμως . . . τὴν μὲν κακίαν γην ψέγουν, τὴν δ' ἀμαθίαν ἐπανοὐν, Plato Phaedr. 230 c πάντων δὲ κομψάτων τὸ τῆς πόλεως ὅτι έκις τέφυκε κ.τ.λ. Wetstein quotes Lucian Dial. Mort. viii. 1 τούτῳ ἐκείνῳ τῷ τῆς παρομαίας, ὃ νυβρὸς τῶν ἱοντα. For συμβ. cf. 1 Cor. 4:11 ἢ τιμικὸς συνέβαλεν ἐκείνος.

κῶν ἰπποστρέφεσι ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν ἔξομα.] This proverb is found in Prov. 26:11 ὥστε κων ὅταν ἔπληθ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱατόν ἔμου τα κατηγοροῦς, 'but the day of emptying the clepsydra, Plut. Mor. 904 δέρα ὑπάρχει ἐξεράν. of expelling the air from the lungs, Arist. Vesp. 993 φίλον ἐξεραῖο τὰς ψῆφους 'let me pour out the voting pebbles from the urn,' id. Adv. 341. So κατεξεράω Epict. iii. 13. 23 μὴ κατεξέρα αὐτόν τα σαμοὺ εὔφωνα, id. iii. 26 ἀκούσατε μον σχίαλα λέγωντος. ὑπεραγε, ζητεῖ τόν κατεξεράος, id. κεραία, διερα. Warfield notes that ἐξερά is used by Aquila in Levit. 18:28 'that the land vomit not you out also, as it vomited out the nation which was before you,' where the Hebrew word is the same as that used in Prov. 26:11 quoted above. Wetstein gives two instances of the use of this proverb by rabbinical writers. It is also found in Epiph. Haer. xxv. 1, where he says that Nicolaus said μὴ τοσοῦ ἢς κακοπληθείς ὃς κυνο ἤπι τὸν ἑδων ἦματον ἤπιστρέφειν, προ-

φάσεις των ἄνθρωπον, which seems to be taken from this passage with the change of ἔξομα into the more common word.

ἐκ λασσαμέρη εἰς κυκλῳμιν βορβδον.] The former proverb contrasted two states, repentance typified by the purging, apostasy by the return to the vomit. And so Hippolytus, apparently referring to this passage, says Ref. ix. 7 (p. 44088 Duncker), speaking of Zephurinus and Callistus πρὸς μὲν ἠρμα παπεμέναι καὶ ἤπι τῆς ἀληθείας συνεγάμοιο (ἱ συνεργόμου) ὁμολόγους, μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἤπι τῶν αὐτῶν βορβδον ἀνεκ-

αέρως. Dr. Bigg however, following Spitta, takes the sense to be 'not
that the creature has washed itself clean in water (as the R. V.), still less that it has been washed clean (as A. V.) and then returns to the mud; but that having once bathed in filth it never ceases to delight in it': and he compares Arist. Hist. An. viii. 6 τος ο ζως και το λαυσθαι επι γηλώ (παίνει). Other passages are quoted by Wetstein to the same effect, as Ael. H. A. v. 45, Varro R. R. ii. 4 (voluntari in loto) est illorum requies, ut lavatio hominis. The objection to this explanation is that the proverb is quoted in illustration of the saying τά ἐσχάτα κείρονα τῶν πρώτων, whereas Dr. Bigg recognizes no distinction of first and last. Moreover λ. εἰς κυλισμόν 'bathe into a wallowing' would be an extremely harsh construction; we should have expected βορβόρῳ or ἐν βορβόρῳ. It is true we find ἅλοντο εἰς τοῖς κοινοῖς λουστρώνας, 'he used to go to the common baths to bathe' (Ath. 438 e), but εἰς κυλισμὸν goes far more naturally with ἐπιστρέφασα. The ancient writers on farming, while they notice that the pig shares the likeness of other pachydermata for rolling in the mud, insist upon the importance of having water near their feeding-ground, see Varro R. R. ii. 4 in pastu locus huic pecori aptus uliginosus, quod defectatur non solum aqua sed etiam luto, Colum. vii. 10 non, ut capellam aut ovem, (suem) bis ad aquam duci praecipimus, sed, si fieri possit, juxta flumen detinere... nec ullæ re magis gaudent quam rivos atque caenosos lacu voluntari. A modern writer on stock-keeping defends the pig from the charge of uncleanness 'from the evident signs of enjoyment he manifests when scrubbed and washed: when pigs are served so once a week it helps very considerably to keep them in health.' 2 βορβόρῳ is found in biblical Greek only in Jer. 386 (LXX. 456) of the miry dungeon in which the prophet was confined. Both κυλισμὸν read by most editors, and κύλισμα, which is supported by most uncials, are extremely rare, the former occurring elsewhere only in Hippiastrica. 3 p. 204. 4, the latter in Hippiastr. p. 210. 8. For the meaning of the termination in -μοι see Lightfoot on Phil. p. 111. A commoner form is κυλιστρα, which is used by Xen. de Re Eq. v. 3 of a rolling place for horses.

Vorst (de Adag. N. T. c. 4) adds the following illustrations of the proverb, Lucr. vi. 975 foll. nobis caenum tetririma cum sit spurecités, eadem subus haec iucunda videtur, insatiatiliter toti ut volvantur ibidem, Clem. Al. Protr. p. 75 οί δὲ περὶ τέλματα καὶ βορβόρους, τὰ γῆνας ἐξαίματα, καλυμμένοις ἀναδένησις ἱκβάσκονται τροφάσις, ἵνα ἔχω ἄνθρωποι. ὃς γάρ, φησίν, ἤδοντας βορβόρφη μᾶλλον ἡ καθαρὸς ὀδιγ. Compare Bywater's note on Heracl. Pr. liv βορβόρῳ χαίρειν, Hor.

1 The use of the middle does not necessarily imply that there was no assistance in bathing, see Hom. Od. viii where the middle is used in 427 and 449 of the bathing of Odysseus; but in 454 we find the active used of the same bath, τον β' ἐνεὶ οὖν δυναίνα λουσάμαι καὶ χρίσαι θάλαμος, as to which cf. x. 360-365; and so in later times the use of the middle does not exclude the help of the βαλανάζων and +καθαρίζων in the public baths. The word here implies neither more nor less than 'after a bath of the ordinary kind,' i.e. in clean water.

2 Roland, p. 71.

3 This is an anonymous compilation of the tenth century containing quotations from earlier writers.
Epp. i. 2. 23 foll. Circas pocaia nosti, quae si cum sociis stultus cupi-dusque bibisset, vixisset canis immundus vel amica luto sus, Epict. Díass. iv. 11. 29 ἄπελθε καὶ χορφ ... κυλήτη ... μήτε ἐπες κυλίσας καὶ βορβόρων, μήτε κυόν γενναίος; III. 1. Here the writer turns away from the Libertines and their victims to the faithful members of the Church, as Jude does in v. 17, both marking the transition by the use of the word ἁγαστηρόν.

ταύτην ἡδὴ δεύτερον ὑμῖν γράφω ἄποστολήν.] ‘This is now the second letter that I write to you.’ For the idiomatic use of ἡδή with the numeral compare Joh. 21:14 τοῦτο ἡδή τρίτον ἐφανερώθη Ἰησοῦς, Hom. Od. ii. 89, Plato Prot. 309 d. For a discussion as to the earlier letter here alluded to, see Introduction.

in alis.] Constr. ad sensum ‘in both of which,’ cf. below v. 6 et 8, which some explain of ὑδάτως, Acts 15:38 κατὰ πάλιν πάσον ἐν αἷς κατηγο-γελαμεν τὸν λόγον, Winer p. 177, Jelf § 819 foll.

Σημειώμεν ὑμῖν ὑπομνήσει τὴν ἐλευρμήν διάνοιαν.] Repeated from 11. The word διάνοια received a technical sense from Plato (Rep. 511 d), corresponding to Coleridge’s ‘Understanding’ (German Verstand), as opposed to νοῦς, Coleridge’s ‘Reason’ (German Vernunft). With earlier writers it means simply ‘thought,’ ‘mind.’ 1 So in the LXX. Gen 17:17 Ἀβραὰμ ἐγέλασεν καὶ εἶπεν ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτοῦ ‘said in his heart,’ Deut. 6:2 ἁγαστήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν ἐκ δόλης τῆς διανοίας σου, Num. 15:50 oυ διαστραφήσετο ὑπίστω τῶν διανοιῶν ὑμῶν, and in N.T. Col. 2:1 ἄχρονς τῇ διανοίᾳ, 1 Pet. 1:18 ἀναζωομένοι τὰς ὀσφυὰς τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, where see Hort.

The etymology of ἐλευρμήν is uncertain. It is used first of unmixed substances, as of pure air; then logically of abstract ideas, as Xen. Mem. ii. 2. 3 ἐλευρμήν τοῖς ἐν εἴη ἀδικία ἢ ἄχαριστία ‘ingratitude would be the essence of injustice,’ Plat. Symp. 211 ε ἐν τῷ γένοιτό το καλὸν ἰδεῖν ἐλευρμές; and lastly of ethical purity, as in Phaedo 81 c, where the ψυχή ἐλευρμήν is contrasted with the ψυχῆς μεμισεμένη καὶ ἄκαθαρτος. This last is the sense in which it is used in the two passages of the N.T. where it occurs, viz. here and in Phil. 1:10 ἦν ἡ ἑλευρμείς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι, and the same is true of the substantive in 1 Cor. 5:8 ἄλλο ἐν ἄλοιπος ἐλευρμήνως καὶ ἀληθείας, 2 Cor. 11:2, 237. It is also found in Wisdom 7:25 (σοφία ἐστιν) ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης ἐλευρμήν. Perhaps it should be translated here ‘pure,’ uncontaminated by the poisonous principles of the libertines.

2. μην θητήνων τῶν προερημέων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν.] For the exegetical definitive following on διεγείρω ὑπομνήσει (not, as von Soden, on γράφω) cf. Winer 399 foll., Lk. 1:14 ἀνελαβέτο παῖδος αὐτοῦ μηθῆσαι ἔλεος, ib. v. 72. The governing phrase here has much the force of προφητῶ in Xen. Mem. i. 7. 1 δρεμὰς ἐπιμελεῖται προφῆτες. The only difficulty in the expression seems to be the slight pleonasm ‘I remind you to keep in mind the warning’ instead of ‘I remind you to be on your guard against.’ With the writer’s liking for the compact

1 This seems to be still its use in Phaedo 66 a αὕτη καθ᾽ ἀὑτήν ἐλευρμήν τῇ διανοίᾳ χρήσμον, as it is contrasted with the bodily senses, not with any other mental faculty.
articular construction, we might have expected τῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγ. προφ. προερμημάτων ῥημάτων. Probably his reason for preferring the looser construction here was the wish to avoid an uninterrupted succession of genitives. Cf. James 15 ἀπείρου παρὰ τοῦ δυοῦτος Θεοῦ πάνω ἀνάλοις with my n. As in 116, the writer again combines the evidence from prophecy with the witness of the apostles to the coming of Christ in glory. For the epithet ἄγος cf. Lk. 170.

καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἑντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος.] ‘Of the Lord’s command delivered by your apostles.’ It is a double possessive genitive, as if we were to say ‘Shakspere’s speech of Mark Antony,’ meaning ‘the speech put into Mark Antony’s mouth by Shakspere.’ For other instances of the ‘re duplicated genitive’ see Blass p. 99.1 For the use of the word ἑντολή to express the teaching of our Lord see above 221, Joh. 1226, and Comments on Jude p. 64. By ‘your apostles is meant, not necessarily ‘the Twelve,’ but the missionaries from whom they first received the knowledge of the Gospel, of whom the writer claims to have been one in 116. We find the same phrase used in Phil. 225 Ἐπαφρόδιτον τὸν ἄδελφον καὶ συνεργὸν καὶ συνστρατιώτην μου, ὑμῶν & ἀπόστολον, 2 Cor. 823 R.V. ‘whether any inquire about Titus, he is my partner and fellow-worker to you-ward; or our brethren, they are the messengers of the churches (ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν), the glory of Christ.’ In both passages the genitive is subjective referring to persons sent by the church. We have however an example of the objective genitive in Rom. 1118 ἐγὼ ἰδινῶν ἀπόστολος, and Clem. Rom. 44 αἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἠγνοοῦν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν . . . ὅτι ἐρᾶς ἂν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, which Lightfoot calls ‘an exact parallel’ to our text, and explains by a reference to § 5, where the phrase τῶν τιμίων ἀπόστολων is used of Peter and Paul. If our epistle was really addressed to the church in Rome (as to which see note on 315 ἐγκαθίστατο ὑμῖν), this would give a special force to the phrase τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν.

See the discussion in the Introduction.

3. τούτῳ πρῶτον γνώσκοντες.] This phrase was used above (120) in reference to the right appreciation of prophecy: here it is used of a certain portion of the message of the Apostles, which was now of special importance, viz. the warning against unbelieving mockers. The participle should have been in the accusative agreeing with the subject of μνησθῆναι. For a similar anacoluthon see 1 Pet. 211.12 ἄγαπητοι, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους ἀπέχονται τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμίων . . . τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἔχοντες καλῆν. In both cases there is an interval between the participle and the verb, and the writer continues his sentence as if he had begun with an imperative, instead of with a phrase equivalent to an imperative.

ἐν τούτῳ ἠλεήμονας τῶν ἡμῶν.] This idea is variously expressed in the N.T. John regularly uses τῇ ἠλεήμονας ἡμῶν, as in 639. 40. 44. 54. 737. 1124. 1243; ἐν τούτῳ ἠλεήμονας ἡμῶν is found in Acts 217, ἐν ἠλεήμονας ἡμῶν in 2 Tim. 31, James 53; ἐν καιρῷ ἠλεήμονας in 1 Pet. 15; ἐν ἠλεήμονας χρόνον (ἀν. τοῦ χρόνου) in Jude v. 18; ἐν ἠλεήμονας τῶν ἡμῶν τούτων in 1 Blass himself is inclined to insert ἐδ, after τῇ, as in the title of the Διακή, Δ. Κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἑθέσιν.
Heb. 1; ἐπὶ ἵσχατον τῶν χρόνων in 1 Pet. 1 (where ἵσχατον is substantival); ἐπὶ ἵσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν here (where ἵσχατον is a predicative adjective, used like summis mons ‘the top of the mountain’).

Blass (p. 156) quotes Barn. 16:5 λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή  ὃς ἐσται ἐπὶ ἵσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ παραδώσει Κύριος τὰ πρόβατα ἐκ καταφθοράς, and Herm. Sim. ix. 12. 3 ἐπὶ ἵσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς συντελείας. See Lightfoot’s translation of the same phrase in 2 Clem. Rom. xiv, ‘when the days were drawing to a close,’ where he refers to the following instances of its use in the LXX. Gen. 49, Deut. 430 (al. ἐπὶ ἵσχατον), Dan. 212 10, Hos. 3, Mic. 4, also Westcott on 1 Joh. 218 (p. 69).

This, temporal use of ἐπὶ is a further development of such phrases as we find in classical authors, ἐπὶ Κύριον, ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμῆς ἔος Herod. i. 38, ἐπὶ γῆς Arist. Eth. i. 9. 11, ἐπὶ τῶν ἄρχαίων χρόνων Arist. Pol. iv. 3, ἐπὶ τής τῶν ἡλικίας Isocr. p. 75 § 194, πάτερον ὕμιν ἐνδεχόμεθα δοκεῖ ἡ πάλι: εἰναι ἐπὶ τῶν τῶν καρπῶν ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων Aesch. Cles. p. 79 § 178. The existence of these scoffers is a proof of that which they deny. It is one of the appointed signs of the approach of the last day. Cf. 1 Joh. 219 where the activity of the antichrists denotes ἐπὶ ἵσχατε ὃ ἂν ἔστιν.

Διώκοντας... ἐπὶ ἱματισμῷ ἱματιζομένου.] Cf. Mt. 24:5 παλαιοὶ ἠλέσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ἴδαματί μου, λέγοντες 'Εγώ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός, and, for ἐπὶ, 1 Cor. 4:21 τί θαλέστε; ἐν δίδοι λαβὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς; 2 Cor. 2:1 ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἠλείως. The verb ἱματισμός is common both in classical and in biblical Greek, but the latter uses the unclassical formation in ἵματι (e.g. ἰδείταξαν Mk. 15:20), from which are derived the unclassical ἱματικός, found in Isa. 3 as well as in Jude v. 18; ἱματιγμὸς Heb. 11:6, Ezek. 22:4, 2 Macc. 77; ἱματικεῖμα Ps. 37:7, Isa. 66:4; ἱματικεῖμον which only occurs here. For the formation of the last see above n. on παραφρονία 216; and compare καλλιονή, κλαυθμονή, πεισμονή, πλησμονή, φλεγμονή. For the repetition of the cognate word see my n. on James 5:17 προσαρκονθέντες, Winer 281 foll.

4. τοῦ ἄγνωστον ἐπὶ τὰ παροιμίαν τούτου;) The Second Advent had formed the subject of the Apostles’ instructions to their converts (above 116) and the writer reverts to it again below, v. 12. Besides the more general intimations of the O. T. on such subjects as the future triumph of the Messiah, the glory and blessedness of His Kingdom, the renewed heaven and earth, of which we read in Isa. 60, 65, etc., the first recorded promise of this Advent in the N. T. is contained in Mt. 10:23 (the directions given to the Twelve before their first mission) οὐ μὴ τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις Ἰσραήλ, ἵως ἠλθῇ ὁ νόος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; the next is before the Transfiguration, Mt. 16:28 εἰς τινὲς τῶν ὧν ἐστιν κτισμάτων οἴκους οὕτως γεωργεῖται θανάτοις, ἵως ἐν ἑσάσθην τῶν νόον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχομεν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτῶν (cf. nn. on 116 above); the third shortly before the Betrayal, Mt. 24 (the request of the Apostles) τί το σημεῖον τῆς σής

1 Hilgenfeld has pointed out that the reference is to Enoch 89, 64, 67, though the words καὶ ἔστω—ἡμερῶν are wanting there.

2 Blass is, I think, mistaken in identifying the two constructions, by making ἵσχατον gen. of τὰ ἵσχατα.

3 Stephanus gives a reference to Cyr. Alex. v. 21, which I have not been able to find.
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παρουσίας καὶ συντελεῖας τοῦ αἰῶνος; Mt. 24:34 οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς, ἵνα πάντα πάντα γένηται, Mt. 24:45 γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὔκ οἴδατε ποῖα ἡμέρα ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται; and then the announcement of the angel after the Ascension, Acts 1:11 οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀναλαμβανόμενος ἀν' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν ὠσκεῖτε κ.τ.λ. The circumstances of this Coming are described more at length in Mt. 24:27-31, 1 Th. 4:16-17, 2 Th. 2:1-7. That the Coming was looked for shortly, appears from James 5:8, 9, Apoc. 20:25, 26, 31, and above all from St. Paul's expectation that he would himself live to see it, 1 Cor. 15:23, 1 Th. 4:15, 17. There are however signs of disappointment and impatience at the delay of the promised Coming, as in James 5:12, μακροθυμήσατε, ἀδελφοί, ἐως τὴν παρουσίαν... ἀπαρίθμητα τὰς καρδίας, Heb. 10:34, ὑπομονής ἔχετε χρείαν ὅν τὸ βήμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιήσαστε κομίτησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἐπὶ γὰρ μικρὸν ὄνομα ὅσον ὁ λόγος ὁ ἀρχόμενος ἐἐδείκτη καὶ οὐ χρονίζεται, cf. Lk. 12:24 χρονίζεται ὁ κύριος μοι ἔρχεσθαι: and stress was laid upon the fact that the day and hour were known only to the Father (Mt. 24:36), and that the Coming would be unexpected, like that of a thief in the night (below v. 10, Lk. 12:29), as former judgments were (Mt. 24:38-39). For the rhetorical use of ποῦ cf. Lk. 8:25 ποῦ ἡ πίστις, 1 Cor. 1:19 ποῦ σοφοί; ποῦ γραμματεύς; 1 Pet. 4:18, Ἰουδ. 6:18 ποῦ ἐστὶ πάντα τὰ βαθμία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔσονται ἡμῖν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν; Ps. 42:3 ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς σου; Isa. 63:15, Mal. 3:17 ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἤ; Eur. Herac. 510 ποῦ τοῦ ἥτις ἐν χρυσοὶ πρέπει; and the similar use of ποῦς in Arist. Nub. 367 ποῦς Ζεὺς;

ἀφ' ἢ γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκατέργασαν.] Cf. Lk. 7:45 ἀφ' ἢ ἐστόλθων οὐ διδασκαλεῖν, Acts 24:11 οὐ πλεῖστοι εἰσιν οἱ ἡμέραι δόξεω ἃφ' ἢ ἀνέβην εἰς Ἰερούσαλημ, Herm. Sim. viii. 6. 6 βλέπεις πολλοὺς μετανοηκότας ἀφ' ἢ ἠλάθησας, above 19 ἔως οὐ, Blass p. 140. The elliptical ἀφ' οὗ is used in the same sense Lk. 13:25, Apoc. 16:13, and in classical writers. οἱ πατέρες is understood of the first fathers of mankind by some, owing to the phrase which follows, ἀφ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως: the meaning then would be 'there has been no change since the creation, or the death of Adam.' This however is certainly not the prevailing sense in the N.T. It is used sometimes of Abraham and the patriarchs before the time of Moses, as in Lk. 1:55, Joh. 7:2; sometimes of Moses and his contemporaries, Joh. 6:49, Acts 7:2; sometimes of the times of the prophets, Lk. 6:26, Acts 7:22, Rom. 9:5, 11:18, 15:8, Heb. 11. In Judges quoted above, the fathers seem to belong to the preceding generation, and so in Jer. 31:20 (the fathers have eaten sour grapes), Acts 15:10 (neither our fathers nor we were able to bear), and in our text. None who claimed to belong to the Christian body, as these libertines did, could deny that the prophecies of the O. T. had to a certain extent received their fulfilment in the first advent of Christ. After the admission of the Gentiles and the rejection of the

1 Another way of explaining πατέρες would be to understand it of those who were held to be authorities in the early Church, see Westcott's n. on 1 Joh. 2:13 ὁ γράφω ὁδῷ, πατέρες, where he says that this term is applied to prophets, priests, and teachers in the O.T., and compares Mt. 23:9, Acts 7:1, 1 Cor. 4:15. This however seems to be hardly possible in a letter purporting to be written by an Apostle. Cf. Abbott Joh. Gram. p. 410.
Jews they could not say ‘All things continue as they were.’ Again, neither patriarchs nor prophets had asserted that the Messiah was to come in their own days; on the contrary they eagerly inquired as to the time signified by the Spirit within them (1 Pet. 1:11). What excited the hopes of the Thessalonians was not the vague prospect held out in the O.T., but the definite declarations of the Lord and His Apostles. The long-past deaths of patriarchs and prophets made not the slightest difference to them. What did make a difference was the time that had elapsed since the Lord had departed from earth. The natural and inevitable difficulty felt by a later generation of Christians was the apparent non-fulfilment of the promise that the Parousia would be accomplished during the life-time of the earlier generation. Compare the interesting quotation from an apocryphal writing in i. Clem. Rom. 23, in which the doubters say ταῦτα ἢκουόμασεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ ἴδον γεγράματα καὶ οὕτως ἡμῖν τούτων συμβεβήκεν, which is repeated in ii. Clem. R. 11 in slightly different words, ἡμῖν δὲ ἠμέραν εἶ ἠμέρας προσδεχόμενοι οὐδὲν τούτων ἰδεῖκαμεν. Lightfoot in his note says ‘it seems hardly possible that the two (2 Pet. and the quotation) can be wholly independent.’ Whichever was borrowed, we are justified, I think, in interpreting the obscure language of 2 Pet., by the quotation. The phrase ἀφ’ ἡς—ἐκοιμήθησαν seems to be a loose expression for ‘The fathers have fallen asleep, and things are still going on without alteration,’ perhaps mixed up in the mind of the speaker with another thought, ‘Now that they are gone, we can no longer hope for the Parousia, which was promised in their days.’ Spitta’s extraordinary explanation, by which, regardless of the intervening γάρ, he joins ἀφ’ ἡς (παρονοσίας) ἐκοιμήθησαν in the sense ‘die Väter sind entschlafen von der Parusie weg, ihr Tod hat sie entzogen,’ has received no support from later commentators. The sleep of death is a common expression in classical (cf. Soph. El. 509) as in biblical Greek (Mt. 27:52, Joh. 11:11, 1 Cor. 15:5).

πάντα οὕτως διαμάνεν ἀφ’ ἡρῴς κτίσεως.] ‘All things remain as we see them (in status quo).’ In the following verses this statement is shown to be erroneous: heaven and earth have undergone great changes within the memory of man. διαμάνεν, cf. Heb. 11:11. οὕτως ἀπολούμενοι, ἵν αἱ διαμένειν, Ps. 119:90. ἀφ’ ἡρῴς κτίσεως ‘From the beginning of the world,’ cf. Mt. 24:21, Mk. 10:6, Lk. 13:3. κτίσεως is used here not for the act of creation (a phrase which must at any rate exclude all but the first day’s work), but for the created universe, as in Rom. 1:26. It is not to be understood as a restatement of ἀφ’ ἡς κ.τ.λ., but as introducing a further difficulty: not only has the promise of the παρονοσία not been fulfilled before the disappearance of the first generation of Christians; but a change such as is involved in the παρονοσία is contrary to the whole experience of man.

5. λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοῖς τοῦτο θελοῦσα ἐτι] ‘For they shut their eyes to this fact that,’ cf. Acts 26:18, v. 8 below, Plato Parm. 128 ν πρῶτον μὲν σιτίος λανθάνει κτι. For θελοῦσα cf. Libanius Prog. 129 εἰκών ἄγνωστον ἄ τοις βασιλεύσον ὑφείλεται (quoted by Wetst.), Aesch. Cho. 19 γενοῦ δὲ σύμμαχος θῶλων ἵμαι, Soph. Phil. 1343 συγχωρεί θῶλων, and Col. 2:18
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**μὴ δὲς ὄρας κατὰ βραβεύετω θέλων, according to some interpreters. I see no ground for supposing (as Schott, Keil, Kühl, Spitta, and v. Soden) that τοὺς is to be taken as the object after θέλων.**

οὕρανοι ὅσαν—τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ.] It is a question how we are to take the construction of this sentence. It is evident that we must understand ὅσαν with γῇ from the preceding ὅσαν; but are we to understand the predicate of γῇ with οὕρανοι? That is, must we complete the first clause by supplying ἔξο̣ καὶ δ' ὡς συνεστῶτες ... λόγῳ? There can be no doubt that τῷ ... λόγῳ belongs to both clauses, and, if so, the construction would seem to require συνεστῶτες, which carries with it the connected words ἔξο̣ καὶ δ' ὡς. A further reason for supplying the entire predicate to both clauses, is that the heavens and earth make up the κόσμος (νν. 6, 7, 12, 13) and that the water by which ὁ τότε κόσμος was destroyed belonged alike to earth and heaven (Gen. 7:10, 8). Spitta, it is true, lays stress on ἐκπαλαι as used exclusively of heaven, on the ground that the rabbinical school of Shammasi, cited Gen. 1:1 ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανόν καὶ τὴν γῆν, as proving that the heaven existed before the six days' work began, but the same text might be used to prove the pre-existence of the earth. Similarly, we read in 4 Esdr. 6:8 Domine locutus es ... in primo die dicens, Fiat caelum et terra; et tuum verbum opus perfect. What may be argued is that the οὕρανοι is distinct from the στερέωμα, which the Jews believed to have been created as a mere appendage to the earth for the purpose of upholding the clouds, and to be itself supported by the mountains as by pillars (Job 26:12, 2 Sam. 22:). Below, however, a higher use is assigned to the στερεόμα, viz. to support the sun and moon and stars (Gen. 1:14-17), and in Ezek. 1:24-25 we read that the throne of God was over the firmament, which is also identified with οὕρανοι in Gen. 1:8. Compare the article on Cosmogony in Hastings' *D. of B.* For the plural οὕρανοι see Robinson's n. on Eph. 4:10, Charles' *Slavonic Enoch* pp. xxx-xlivii, and my notes on Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii. §§ 9, 10.

For the irregular construction (caused by the attraction of the nearer subject γῇ) οὕρανοι ὅσαν ... συνεστῶτα instead of συνεστῶτες, cf. Heb. 9:9 δωρᾶ τε καὶ θυσία προσφέρονται μὴ δυνάμεναι κ.τ.λ. The reading of Χ συνεστῶτα (W.H. marg.) was probably a correction, the neuter plural applying equally to the two preceding subjects. Lastly we have to investigate the word συνεστῶτα. The transitive tenses are often used in the N.T. in the sense 'to bring together,' 'introduce,' 'command,' 'put in a favourable light.' In Gal. 2:18 παραβατήν ἐμαυτὸν συνιστᾶνω means 'provoe myself a transgressor.' The intransitive uses are Lk. 9:2 δυὸ ἄνδρας συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ 'two men standing with him,' Col. 1:17 τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν which Lightfoot translates 'all things hold together in Him.' Sometimes it implies the composition of a whole from its elements, as in Philo i. p. 330 ἐκ γῆς καὶ ὕδατος καὶ ἄρτου καὶ πυρὸς συνέστη ὅσε ὁ κόσμος, Plat. *Tim.* 32 b: hence it is used more generally (as here) in the sense of being 'framed,' 'formed,' 'brought into being.'

οὕρανοι ὅσαν ἐκπαλαι καὶ γῇ.] 'There were heavens of old and an
earth.' It seems better to give an indefinite force to the statement. When a definite heaven and earth are spoken of just below, we have the article ὁ τότε κόσμος, οἱ νῦν ὄφρανοι. For ἐκτελάι see n. on 28.

ἐξ ὅσιος καὶ διὰ ὅσιος συνετέσσαρι τῷ τῷ Θεός λόγῳ.] 'Built up out of water and through water by the word of God.' This appears to refer (1) to the general evolution out of chaos, to which the names ἄβυσσος and ὑφέρ are applied in Gen. 1:1; (2) to the stages by which the heaven and earth were built up, the στερέωμα (here called ὄφρανοι) being made on the second day to divide the waters from the waters, and the land being separated from the water on the third day. The cause of these movements was the word of God, as it is written (Gen. 1:3) ἦτεν ὁ Θεός, Γεννήσῃ φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς, cf. Heb. 11:3, Ps. 33:6 ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου οἱ ὄρφανοι ἑτερεωθησαν. In i. Clem. R. 27. 4 ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλοσεῦνης αυτοῦ συνετέσσαρι τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν λόγῳ διώνεται αὐτὰ καταστρέφει, as in this passage, the word of God appears as the cause alike of creation and destruction. The meaning of ἐξ ὅσιος is plain, the only question being whether ἐξ has a local, or a material force, a distinction which was probably not in the mind of the writer; but διὰ ὅσιος has given rise to much discussion. In reference to the heaven it is explained above, as being equivalent to ἐν μέσῳ or μεταξύ, differing from its ordinary spatial use in that it here implies rest, not motion through or between. We find an analogy to this in the tropical use of ἐν to express a state, as διὰ θέρμας ἤσω, διὰ ἀνεξίων γίγανθαι, διὰ πένθους τὸ γῆρας διάγενος Xcn. Cyr. iv. 6. 6, τὸν διὰ περιπλήκτην παραβάτην Rom. 257, διὰ διασκόματος ἑσθῶν ἴδ. 1429, and also in certain adverbial phrases such as διὰ χειρῶν ἤσων, cf. Aesch. Suppl. 193 ἀγάματα ἦσσουσα διὰ χειρῶν εὐωνυμῶν ‘holding in their left hands,’ Soph. Ant. 916, Arist. Pol. v. 8. 8 διὰ χειρῶν μάλλον ἦσσουν τὴν πολιτείαν, also in the song. Plut. Vit. 63 (Numa 6) διὰ χειρῶν ἤσσου τὰς υμᾶς ‘holding tight in hand,’ Av. Vesp. 597, Luc. Demon. 56 διὰ στομάτος τὰς κατηγορίας ἤσσον ‘to have Aristotle’s categories between your lips,’ Persepol. 18 τοῦτο διὰ στομάτος ἤσσων, Theocr. 14. 27 χάμην τούτο διὰ ὅτις ἤκτα. If this is an allowable use of ἐν, we may explain it in regard to the earth from the Jewish belief that the earth rested upon water, cf. Ps. 24:5 ἐπὶ θαλασσῶν θεμελιώσεν αὐτήν, καὶ ἐπὶ ποταμῶν ἔταγμασεν αὐτήν, Ps. 136:6, Herm. Viss. i. 3. 4 τῷ ἀγωγῷ ὅματι πίθον τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ θεμελιώσες τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ υδάτων. If we suppose an allusion here to the Jewish belief as to the waters on which the earth is founded, the waters above the earth may be explained, as in the case of the στερέωμα, of the waters stored up above the firmament (Ps. 148:4).

There are many difficulties in the interpretation of this passage. The explanation of ἐν given above is that of Grotius, Beza, Hammond, and Mede, but recent commentators generally assign to ἐν its usual force

1 See also Apoc. 117 and 131, where the abyss from which τῷ θηρίῳ ascends is also called ἀβαν. 2 Dr. Bigg seems to have a leaning to the other view; and Weiss, Hofmann, and De Wette boldly adopt it, translating 'durch das Wasser hindurch, zwischen dem Wasser ... denn der Himmel ist nach Mosaischer Kosmogonie als feste Decke zwischen die irdischen und überirdischen Wasser hineingetreten.'
THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

by means of,' adducing in support Clem. Hom. xi. 24 τα πάντα το ὕδωρ τους, τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ὑπὸ τενέματος κυνηγεῖ τὴν γένεσιν λαμβάνει. How then are we to interpret it (1) of the heavens, (2) of the earth? How can the firmament be said to be created by means of water? I have not been able to find any satisfactory answer to the question in the commentators. Some, like Keil, put a comma after ἐκπαλαι, and are content with an explanation confined to the earth, alleging that it was made by means of water, because the transference of part of the water to the clouds and of another part to the sea gave rise to the dry land. Others refer to the erosive effect of water, or to the need of rain or mist (Gen. 26) in fashioning and preserving the earth.1

6. ὅτι δὲ τοῦ κόσμου θανατί καταυλισθεὶς ἀπέλευσε.] I have followed min. 31 in reading ὅτι for ὅτι of the great body of MSS.2 as ω and ω are frequently confused in MSS., and no satisfactory explanation of ὅτι has been given; whereas ὅτι refers to the immediately preceding λόγος and is taken up again in v. 7 by τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ. We might have had a dative of cause here, as in vv. 5 and 7 and in Heb. 11 κατηργείσα τοὺς αἰώνας ἐρηματὶ Θεοῦ, were it not that the dative was wanted for the instrument ἔσται. Sometimes indeed the λόγος itself is regarded as the instrument, as in Heb. 12 ὅτι τοις αἰώνας ἐποίησεν, Joh. 1 τὰ πάντα τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο; but διὰ with acc. is found in Ps. 119154 διὰ τῶν λόγων σου ἔστησαν με, Αρκ. 1211 ἐνέκρισαν αὐτὸν διὰ τῶν λόγων τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν, Ps. 16 διὰ τῶν λόγων τῶν χειλῶν σου ἔγινε ἐφύλαξα ὃδοις σκηνάς, Joh. 637 ὃ τρώμεν μὲ κάκινος ἔσει δὲ ἐμε. ‘It was owing to the divine word that the world of that date was destroyed by a deluge,’ cf. below v. 12 δι᾽ ἐν (παρουσίαν) οἴρων πυροῖσιν λυθῆσονται, Αρκ. 411 διὰ τὸ θελημα σου ἤσαν καὶ ἐκτυπώθησαν, Ηρακλ. xii. (Byw.) Σίβυλλα... χιλιών ἐτῶν ἐξεικνύει τῇ φωνῇ διὰ τῶν θεόν (paraphrased by Clem. Al. p. 358 σὺν Θεῷ, by Iambli. Myst. iii. 8 τῇ τοῦ κρατοῦτος ἐνεργείᾳ), Petr. Apoc. (p. 14. 2 Klost.) ἀνεπιδέης (ὁ Θεός) οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐπιδέηται καὶ δι᾽ ἐν ἐστιν... ἐποίητος δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐποίησεν λόγῳ δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.

The most usual explanation of δι᾽ ἐν regards εἰς ὀθάνως καὶ δι᾽ ἐν ὀθάνως as the antecedents; but this is really making two different substances out of the different uses of one substance, which is again repeated in the singular in the same verse. A better sense is made by referring to the remoter subjects οἴρων and γῆ, since both are spoken of as causing the deluge (Gen. 711, 83); but the fact of their remoteness makes this connexion very improbable. We should rather have expected such a phrase as ὅμως δὲ εἰς τοὺς. Moreover the heaven and the earth constitute the world which they are said to destroy. Wiesinger thinks the antecedents are ὀθάνως and τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, but then we have one of the antecedents introduced again as the instrument in ἔσται; and there is something awkward in making a compound antecedent out of two ideas which stand in different relations and in different cases in the preceding sentence.

1 Wetstein has three quotations from Artemidorus (ii. 13, 17, 34), in which a distinction is made between τοὺς εἰς ὀθάνως (fishermen) ἤ δι᾽ ὀθάνως (merchants) ἔχοντα τὴν ἐργασίαν.

2 I learn from Nestle (Textual Criticism of N.T. p. 326) that this change is also supported by Schmiedel in his new edition of Winer’s Gr.
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III 5–7]

ο τότε κόσμος. Cf. n. on 19 τῶν πάλαι ἀμαρτίων. By κόσμος is meant the material world made up of heaven and earth, which are here stated to have perished in the deluge, as we read below of the future destruction of the existing material world by fire.

ἀπέλευσα. The Mosaic account gives no support to this story of the absolute destruction of the earth, far less of the heaven by the deluge; but Spitta shows that the same language is used in Jewish legends, e.g. Enoch x. 22 πορείαν πρὸς τὸν Νῶε... καὶ δῆλωσον αὐτῷ τέλος ἐπηρεάσεων, ὥσπερ ἡ γῆ ἀπόλλυται πάσα, ἢδ. 838–5. 'I saw in a vision how the heaven collapsed and... fell to the earth. And when it fell to the earth, I saw how the earth was swallowed in a great abyss... and I said "The earth is destroyed, '" Joseph. Ant. i. 2. 3 προειρχότοι ἄφαντοι Ἀδάμου τῶν ἀλών ἐκεῖσθαι, τῶν μὲν κατ' έγχυσιν πυρός, τῶν ἔτερων δὲ κατὰ βίον καὶ πλῆθος ὑδάτος. So the term παλιγγενεσία is used of the reappearance of the earth after the flood, I Clem. Rom. 9 Νῶε πιστὸς εὐπρεπὴς διὰ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκφύραξεν, where see Lightfoot's note. It is evident from vv. 7, 10, 12 below that the writer looked forward to a fundamental metamorphosis of the existing universe through the final confabulation, and this naturally leads him to take an exaggerated view of the deluge, which he regards as a parallel destruction. Hence the present heavens and earth are distinguished from the antediluvian in the next verse.

7. οἱ δὲ τῶν ὑδάτων καὶ ἡ γῆ. A more correct expression would have been either καὶ ἡ γῆ or καὶ γῆ. In the latter case γῆ would have shared in the article οἱ.

τών αὐτῶν λόγῳ ταυτανωματικῶς εἰσὶν πυρί. 4. 'Have been treasured up for fire by the same divine word.' So Wiesinger, Schott, Hofmann, Spitta, Plummer, Bigg. The construction however is unusual, and it is not easy to catch the exact force of the metaphor in ὑγιαναρίζω, which I take to mean 'set apart for,' 'destined for,' cf. 4 Macc. 122 (of the judgment on the persecutor) ταμιεύεται σε ἥ θεια δίκη αἰώνιώ πυρί. Others take τῷ with the following τηροῦμεν, which is a more usual construction (e.g. Jos. Ant. i. 3. 7, where Noah on coming out of the ark prays that there may be no future deluge, κακοδαμονεστέρων γὰρ ἐκεῖσθαι εἰ τηρηθέων εἴρων κατακλυσμῷ), understanding τῷ θεῷ, absolutely, in the sense 'are kept in store' (Alf.), 'Himmel und Erde, wie ein

Cf. the Stoic definition of the κόσμος in Stob. Ecl. i. 21, pp. 444 f., σύνεπημ ὡς ὑδάτων καὶ γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς φύσεως, and the account of its alternate destruction and renovation by means of water and fire, πολλ' μὲν ἐκτροφέσθαι τῷ κόσμῳ, πάλιν δὲ εἰς τὸ πῦρ εὐκαρπεῖσθαι τάλων (Simplic. ap. Bywn. Herac. xx.), a doctrine attributed to the Babylonian Berosus by Seneca N. Q. iii. 29. In the ἐκτροφέσθαι we are told τὰ στοιχεῖα φθείρεσθαι (Diog. L. vii. 134), and that life retreads back into the fiery seed named Zeus, from whence it is gradually diffused again throughout the universe (Plut. Mor. 1077 D).

2 Spitta gives the wrong reference 'En. 84.'

3 Methodius in his De Resurrectione (p. 78 Jahn), quoted by Dr. Bigg, denies the annihilation of the present earth and heaven, οὐ μὴν εἰς ἀπάθειαν ἐλεύθερον παντελῆ... διὰ ἀνάγκης δὴ καὶ τὴν γῆν αἰθίς καὶ τῶν ὑδάτων μετὰ τὴν ἐκφύρασιν ἐκσταθῇ.

4 See Introduction on Text.
Schatz der unangegriffen bleibt... mit aller Sicherheit und Sorgfalt für zukünftigen Zeiten aufbewahrt sind' (Hundhausen). This seems to me very unnatural. We may speak of 'laying up treasures in heaven' or of 'treasuring up to ourselves wrath against the day of wrath' (where the datives ὑμῖν and σεανῷ leave no doubt as to what is intended), but to say that the existing universe is simply 'treasured up' is to me unmeaning. Heaven and earth are not stored away, but in constant use; and Hundhausen's interpretation of θησαυρίζω to 'keep safe' is, I think, inadmissible. R.V. has 'stored up for fire' in the text, and 'stored with fire' in the margin. I do not think θησαυρίζω capable of the latter meaning; otherwise it would suit the passage well: as the old world was stored with the water which eventually caused its destruction, so the new world with fire. Dr. Bigg illustrates this from a passage of Irenæus (i. 7. 1) in which he states the belief of the Valentinians in regard to the final conflagration τὸ ἐμφύλευμα τῷ κόσμῳ πῦρ ἐκλάμαν καὶ ἐξαφθῆ καὶ κατεργασάμενον πάνταν ὑλήν συναναλωθήσεται αὐτῇ.

It may be well here to sum up the different features of the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος (Mt. 1338, 243, 2820) as they are presented to us in this epistle, leaving the details for the notes on the different verses. This world, including the earth, the heavens, and the στοιχεῖα, will be destroyed by fire at the Coming of the Son of Man (vv. 4 and 12), otherwise called the 'day of the Lord' (v. 10 and v. 6), or the 'day of Judgment' (v. 5). The destruction by fire will then be as complete as that by water in the Deluge (v. 6). The overthrow and disappearance of the present world will be followed by the creation of new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness (v. 13).

The particular feature brought before us in this verse is the destruction of the existing world by fire. A similar belief prevailed among the Greeks, see Heracl. xxii. πυρὸς ἀνταμείβεται πάντα καὶ πῦρ ἀπάνω, with the passages quoted in Bywater's notes on xx.—xxv., Plato Tim. 22 B. τόλλαι... φθοραί γεγόνασιν ἀντρόπων καὶ ἔσοντα, πυρὶ μὲν καὶ νεανίσκαγμαμεν, to which Plato ascribes our ignorance of the past history of mankind. So Censorinus (xviii. 11) 'est praeterea annus quem Aristoteles (cf. Meteor. i. 14. 19 with Ideler's n.) maximum... appellat, quam solis et lunae vagarumque quinque stellarum orbes conficiunt, cum ad idem signum, ubi quondam simul fuerunt, una referuntur; cuius anni hiems summa est cataclysmos, quam nostri diluvianem vocant, aestas autem ecyprosis, quod est mundi incendium. Nam his alternis temporibus mundus tum ignescere, tum exaquecere videtur.' The chief upholders of this doctrine at the time of the Christian era were the Stoics, whose views are compared with those of the Christians by Justin M. (Apol. i. 20) καὶ Σίβυλλα δὲ καὶ Ὑστάστης γεγόσεθαι τῶν φθαρτῶν ἀνάλωσιν διὰ πυρὸς ἔφασαν. οἱ λεγόμενοι δὲ Στοιχεῖοι φιλόσοφοι καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν εἰς πῦρ ἀνάλυσθαι δοματίζοντον καὶ αὐτὸν κατὰ μεταβολῆν τῶν κόσμων γενέσθαι λέγοντες, also Apol. ii. 7. In like manner Tatian (ad Graecos 3 and 9) finds fault with the Stoics for their notions of the παλιγγενεσία, which followed the ἐκπύρωσις: they have no conception.
of a transfigured heaven and earth to last for ever, but merely of a repetition of the sins and sorrows of the preceding age. So Origen (Cels. iv. 11 f.) answering the charge of Celsus, that the Christian belief in the κατακλυσμός and ἐκπύρωσις was derived from the Greeks, remarks that, according to the latter, these catastrophes occur at fixed periods in necessary alternation, and that the last catastrophe having been that of water, the next must therefore be that of fire; whereas Christians impute both to the wise justice of God. When God is spoken of as a ‘consuming fire’ (Deut. 4:24 etc.), it is meant that it is His nature to destroy evil and to refine and perfect what is good. Seneca gives a fine description of the periodical conflagration in his Consol. ad Marc. 26. Cf. Cic. N. D. ii. 118 with my notes, and Numen. ap. Eus. Pr. Ev. xvi. 18 δρίκτην τοῦ Σταυροῦ τὴν ὁλὴν αὕτιν ἐις πῦρ μεταβάλλειν οἶκον εἰς σπέρμα. For other references see Zeller Phil. Gr. i. p. 1333. For the Sibyl, referred to by Justin above, compare Sib. iv. 172 πῦρ ἵσται κατὰ γαίαν . . . κόσμος ἀπας μῦκμα καὶ διβρόμων ἥχων ἀκούσει. φλέξεσται δὲ χόνον πᾶναν, ἀπας δὲ σῶσε γένος ἄνδρων καὶ πάσας τε πόλεις, ποταμοὺς ἀμα ἤδε θάλασσαν, ἐκκατοῖν δὲ τε πάντα, κόσμος δὲ ἢστει αἰθαλόβησα. As we have evidence in this epistle of familiarity with Stoic phrasology, such as θεία φύσις and ἀρετή, it is probable that the writer’s conception of the end of the world may have been influenced by Stoic teachers; and the Sibylline Oracles testify to opinions which were then common among Jews and Jewish Christians. Hippolytus (Refut. Haer. ix. 30) represents the Jews of his time as looking forward to the coming of a Messiah, who was to renew the glories of David, but would eventually fall by the sword, ἐπιτα μετ’ οὗ πολλὰ τὴν συντέλειαν καὶ ἐπτύσωσιν τοῦ παντὸς ἐπιστήναι; and we have seen the same belief expressed in the passage of Joseph. Ant. i. 2, 3 quoted above. On the other hand Philo argues for the eternity of the world in his treatise De Inc. Mundi, where he distinguishes between two senses of the word κόσμος, in one of which it is indestructible quæ material, in the other destructible quæ form and arrangement. What was there in the O.T. to suggest or encourage such beliefs?

The most striking resemblances are to be found in Joel 2:30, 31 δῶρω τέρατα ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ καὶ ἤλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἵμα πρὶν ἑλθεί τῇ ἡμέρᾳ Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανήν, id. 3:15, 16. Ps. 50 δ Ἑσὶς ἐμφανοῖς Ἰσραήλ . . . πῦρ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ καυθήται καὶ κύκλω αὐτοῦ καταγίζει σφόδρα, id. 18:13. Isa. 29:6, 30:30, 34:4, 51:6, 66:15, 16. Nahum 15, 6. Mal. 4:1. Dan. 7:10 ἐπὶ θανόν αὐτοῦ φλέξει πυρὸς, οἱ τροχοὶ αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον, ποταμοὶ πυρὸς ἔδεικνυσιν ἐμπυρωσθέν αὐτοῦ, and in the promise made to Noah (Gen. 9:11, 15) that the earth should not again be destroyed by water. For the N.T. see 2 Th. 1:7 ἐν τῇ ἀποκάλυψει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὸ οὐρανοῦ μετ’ ἄγγελον δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, ἐν πυρὶ φλόγος διδόντως ἐκδίκησιν τοῖς μη ἐδόθην Θεοῖς.

τηροῦμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπαλλαγῆς τῶν ἁμαρτῶν ἀνθρώπων.] So we read of angels reserved for judgment in 21, of unrighteous men reserved for judgment in 28, of the blackness of darkness reserved for
false teachers in 218; while here it is the heavens and earth which are reserved for the same office of vengeance.

8. ἐν δὲ τούτω μὴ λανθανώς ἡμᾶς.] See above on v. 5. The false teachers deliberately close their eyes to the revolutionary changes which the universe has already undergone. You, my beloved, will not forget these; but there is one thing in particular which I should wish you to bear in mind. For ἐν τούτω cf. v. 3, τούτῳ πρῶτον, Phil. 314 ἐν δὲ, Mk. 1011 ἐν σοι ὑστερεῖ.

ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρά Κυρίω ὡς χίλια ἡμέρα.] 'With the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.' The latter clause, of which the former is the corollary, is taken from Ps. 904 χίλια ἡμέρα ἐν ὑπαρξεὶς σου ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἔθης ἡ ἡμέρα διήλθη, καὶ φυλακὴ ἐν νυκτὶ. The general truth underlying both is that the measures of time are relative to man: to the Eternal, who is omnipresent in time as in space, all times are equally near. None but God knows the duration of His ἡμέρα χρίσεως, which scoffers say is now past and gone without injury to any one. Some interpreted this verse to mean that each day of the creation implied a thousand years of the earth's duration, so Barn. 154 συντελεσθεν ἐν ἡμέραις—τοῦτο λέγει οτι ἐν ἐκατομμυρισθεὶς ἑτερον συντελεσθεν Κυρίος τὰ σύμπαντα. ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ' αὐτῷ χίλια ἡμέρα ἐν. καὶ κατέπανεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ—τοῦτο λέγει ότι αἰῶνα ὁ θεός αὐτοῦ καταργήσει τὸν καιρὸν τὸν καιρὸν και κραυγὰς τῶν ἁσβείων και ἀλαξίας τῶν ρήματι καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τῶν αστέρων, τότε καλός καταπληκτεται εἰς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ, Slavonic Enoch xiii foll., Justin M. Dial. 81 τὸ εἰρημένον ὅτι ἡμέρα Κυρίον ὡς χίλια ἡμέρα κ.τ.λ., Iren. v. 28. 3 διὰς θεός ἡμέρας ἐγένετο ὁ κόσμος τοσοῦτος χωλοῦτας συντελεσθεν . . . ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα Κυρίον ὡς χίλια ἡμέρα ἐν. τὶ ν. v. 23. 2, where there is a similar allusion to this verse. Wetstein adduces parallels from rabbinical writers, who explained the apparent non-fulfilment of the warning against eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge (Gen. 217 ᾧ δὲ ἡμέρα φάγητε ἀν' αὐτοῦ, βανάτω ἀποθανατωθε) by reference to the difference between the human day and the divine day; so Just. M. Dial. 81, p. 308.

9. ὅπερ βραδύνη Κύριος τὰς ἐπαγγελίας.] The verb βρ. (here used intransitively, as in 1 Tim. 315) occurs also in Gen. 43, Isa. 4618 τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρ' ἐμοὶ ὁ βραδύνη. This is the only recorded instance of its being followed by a genitive, which may be compared with that after ὑστερεῖν, ὑστερεῖν, λειτούργειν (for which Winer quotes Diod. xiii. 110 ὑστερόν τῆς ὑστερείας); or it may be taken as the genitive of the sphere, for which cf. 214 πλεονεκίας.

ὅτε τινι βραδύνητα ἐγένονται.] 'According to some men's notion of dilatoriness.' Alford makes βραδύνητα predicate 'account (his conduct) tardiness'; but, if that meaning were intended, it would have been simpler to omit βραδύνητα, translating 'as some men hold': with βραδύνητα the meaning must be 'the Lord is not dilatory in any injurious sense, He is not powerless, or careless, or indifferent.' The word βραδύνης is classical, but not found elsewhere in biblical Greek. Wetstein appositely quotes Plut. De Sera Numinis Vindicta p. 549 β (the delay of punishment has this bad effect) τὴν πιστὶν ἡ βραδύνης.
άφαιρεται τῆς προνοίας, and App. B.C. iv. p. 1052 μηδὲ βραδυτήτα τις ἤγεισθω τὴν ἡμερίαν. For τινα see n. on Jude v. 4. I understand it of the ἐμπαί ητέαν of v. 3 above.

αλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ ἐς θῆνα.] See Introduction on the Text. Cf. below v. 15, Ps. 86:15, Isa. 30:13, Jonah 4:2, 1 Pet. 3:20 ἔξεδεψεν ἵν τὸ Θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμίραις Νόες, Rom. 2:4 τοῦ πλουτοῦ ... τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρόνεις, ἀγνοοῦν διὰ τὸ χρυσόν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιαν σὲ ἄγει; Wisdom 12:19, 20, Herm. Sim. viii. 11. 1 μακράθυμος ἵνα κύριος θηλεὶ τὴν κλόην τῆς γενομενήν διὰ τοῦ νεόν αὐτοῦ σφέτεσαι; Clem. Hom. xvi. 20 μακροθυμεῖ, εἰς μετάνοιαν καλεῖ. The construction with εἰς is only found here: πρός is used in 1 Th. 5:14; ἐπὶ in Mt. 18:26, 29, Lk. 18, James 5.

μὴ βουλομένως τινας ἄπολεθαι αλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χαρῆσαι.] Cf. 1 Tim. 2:4 (God our Saviour) πάντας αὐθόρως θηλεὶ σωθήσαι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἄλθεις, Rom. 11:29, Ezek. 18:32. Clem. R. i. 7, 5 ἐν γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ μετανοιας τότων ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσπότης τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐπιστραφθίην ἐπ' αὐτῶν, id. 8, 5, Justin M. Apol. i. 28 ἐν ἐμπροφυὶ τοῦ μνήμων τούτων πράξει τοῦ Θεοῦ (referring to the final judgment) διὰ τὸ αὐθόρως ἕνας γεγονότα προευνώκει γὰρ τινας εἰς μετανοιας σωθῆσεαι. Wetstein illustrates χαρῆσαι from Plut. de fum. 19 ὁλόγον δὲ σωφρονήσας, καὶ εἰς μετάνοιαν ἐπὶ τοῖς πραξθεῖσι χαρῆσαι, but I have not been able to find this: cf. Prov. 14:15 πανουργός ἔρχεται εἰς μετάνοιαν, Rom. 2:4 ἂγει εἰς μετάνοιαν. R. V. translates τινας by ‘any’ giving it the force of μιθον: if so, should we have had the plural? The Vulgate has aliqunos, and some of the commentators think there is an allusion to the preceding τινας. Perhaps we may give the force of the plural by translating ‘not desiring to make exceptions.’

1 For ἀπόλεθαι compare ἀπώλεια above 21, 3, 37, and below 31.

10. ἥμαρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτες.] Cf. 1 Th. 5:2 οἴδατε ὃτι ἥμερα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτες ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται, Mt. 24:43, Lk. 12:39, Apoc. 3, 16:15.

ἐν ὑμῖν σώφρων μοιζοῦντες παραλεῖσθωμ.] For the adverbial termination cf. κλαγγαθόν, κοναβδίαν, λυποῦτον, μυθοῦν, ρυμηδόν, and the cognate ροιζηδόν. The word is onomatopoetic, expressing the whizzing sound produced by rapid motion through the air, as the flight of a bird or an arrow, and is then used for the rushing movement itself or the accompanying crash or roar. Cf. Wisd. 5:11, Cantic. 4:15 φρέαρ ὑδατός ζώντος καὶ ροιζοῦντος ἀπὸ τοῦ λιβάδου, other exx. from Homer to ῾Λυχρον in Wetstein. It is used of thunder in Luc. Jup. Trag. 1 ὁ μεγαλομαράγγον στερεᾶς ροϊζημα, of the music of the spheres in Ἰαμβ. Vit. Pyth. c. 15. and Oecumenius says the word is especially used of the noise caused by a devouring flame. This explanation would suit the passage away of the heavens, of which we are told in

1 Abbott in his Joh. Gr. § 2586 d gives examples of the singular τις following οὗ or μη, where it is equivalent to μηδεὶς. I do not remember any other instance of the plural.

2 Keil prefers to understand it (with the Vulg. magnus impetus transcurrent) simply of a sudden disappearance, comparing Wisd. 2 ναρελεῖσθαι ὁ βοῖος ἡμῶν ἢ Ἰχνη νηφλῆς.
v. 7 that they are set apart for fire, and which the author seems to have regarded as forming a solid firmament according to the old Jewish conception. That the day of the Lord would be terror-striking to the ear as well as to the eye was a natural conclusion from the account of the giving of the law on Sinai (Heb. 12:18, cf. Enoch 14) as well as from Jer. 25:30, 31, Joel. 3:16, Isa. 42:13, 1 Th. 4:16. The adv. ῥωζήδων is found in Lycophon Casm. 66 (of Oenone hurling herself into the grave of Paris) πυρων ἀπ' ἄκρων πρὸς νεκροτήτων νεκρὸν ῥωζήδων ἐκβράσασα κύμβαλον δέμας, Nicander Theriacae 556, and the other form ῥοξῆδα in the Ἀλεξίφαρμας 182, 498.

στοιχεία δὲ κανονομαζον λαθήται.] For the absence of the article see Introduction on Grammar. The word στοιχεία 1 'elements' is used in Heb. 5:11 of the elementary principles of religion; it occurs twice both in the Ep. to the Galatians and in the Ep. to the Colossians (thrice with the addition τοῦ κόσμου), where its meaning is disputed. In Gal. 4:3 ὀπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡματα δεδουλωμένως, the patristic commentators generally understand it of the material elements, or of the heavenly bodies: for (1) cf. Philo i. 162 τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα ἦν δὲ συνεκαθῆ ὁ κόσμος, Wisd. 717, 1918, Hermas V. iii. 13 ὁ κόσμος διὰ τεσσάρων στοιχείων κρατᾶται; for (2) Theoph. ad Autol. ii. 35 ὁ θείος νόμος οὗ μόνον κωλύει τὸ εἰδώλου προσκυνεῖν, ἅλλα καὶ τοῖς στοιχείοις, ἡλιφε, σελήνη ἢ τοῖς λουσιοῖς ἀστροις, Justin M. Apol. ii. 4, ad Diogn. 7. Sometimes these are joined with the seasons defined by them, as in the Sibylline description of the final conflagration (ii. 206) καὶ τότε χρησάνται στοιχεῖα πρόσαντα τοῦ κόσμου, ἄη, γαῖα, βάλασσα, φαῖος, πόλος, ἡμέρα, νύκτες. Clem. Hom. x. 9 οὖδὲ τὰ ζῷα προσκυνοῦσι, οὐδὲ στοιχεῖα τὰ ὑπὸ Θεοῦ γεγενημένα κολακεύουσιν, λέγοι δὲ ἡλιον, σελήνην, ἀστρα, γῆν, βάλασσαν, κ.τ.λ. Spitta suggests a third interpretation, of the angelic powers who were supposed to preside over different departments of Nature; objecting to (1) on the ground that, if στοιχεῖα meant the material elements, it would not here be placed between οἰράναι and γῆ, but would have either preceded or followed them. He thinks that in Gal. 4 the following verses show that στοιχεῖα is used of objects of worship (vv. 8, 9) τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες Θείον ἐθουλώσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ σοφον θείοις... τοῖς ἐπιστρέφετε παλιν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀσθενεὶ καὶ στοχα στοιχεῖα; He shows from the book of Jubilees and from Enoch that

---

1 This word, originally used of the letters of the alphabet or the lines of the dial, is said to have been first used of the material elements by Plato (Fearonius ap. Diog. L. iii. 24), cf. Theodet. p. 201 οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐκεῖ οὐκ οὐκ ἡμᾶς τῆς συγκεκριμένης καὶ ἀλλα, λόγον οὐκ ἔχει. Later writers distinguished between the στοιχεία and first principles, cf. Suidas d. e. διάφοροι δ' ἀρχαί καὶ στοιχεῖα τῷ τά μὲν εἶναι ἀγγελικά καὶ ἀφθάρτας, τα δὲ στοιχεία κατὰ τὴν ἔκπυρον θεῷς, Hippol. Philosoph. ii. 22 (Diels Doxogr. p. 571) Ἔπειτο ῥαχαί μὲν τῶν διὰν ὑπέθεσα ἀτόμως καὶ κενῶν . . . δὲ τῶν ἀτόμων σωματικῶν γενέσθαι καὶ τὸν θεόν καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῶι πάσα. This distinction was not always observed; see (for Aristotle) Zeller vol. iii. p. 442, and for the Epicureans Lucr. ii. 392, 410, 463, 978, iv. 941, etc., where elementum = 'atom', also Hastings 'D. of B. under 'Element,' Diels' Doxographi Graeci (Index) and his excellent history of the word in the treatise entitled Elementum.
the Jews believed the various powers of nature to be under the control of spirits. Similarly Spitta explains Col. 2:28 κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ κατὰ Χριστόν, and 2:20 ἀπεθάνει σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου by a comparison of 2:15 μὴ οὖν τις κρίνῃ ἐν βρόχῳ ἢ ἐν πάσῃ ἢ ἐν μέρει ἑρτής ἢ νουμνίας. These things belong to the θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων with which St. Paul charges the Colossians (2:17); but such ἄρχαι καὶ ἐξουσίαι (2:15) are not to be compared with Him in whom κατοικεῖ πάν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος (2:8). In support of this view Spitta quotes the Κηρύγμα Πέτρου (ap. Clem. Al. St. vi. p. 760) μηδὲ κατὰ Ἰουνίους σβέσθε, καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι, μόνον οἰδομενοί τὸν Θεὸν γινώσκειν, οὐκ ἐπιτάσσοντες λατρεύοντες ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀρχαγγέλους, μην τε καὶ σελήνης καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σελήνης φανὴ σάββατον οὐκ ἄγουσιν κ.τ.λ., cf. Lightfoot's n. on Col. 2:19. The stars and the angels were closely associated in Jewish thought, see Job 38:7. Enoch 68:1-26, 41:4, 43:2 with Charles' note.

To the natural objection that we cannot conceive of spirits being burnt and dissolved (καυσούμενα λυθήσεται) Spitta replies by quoting Test. Levi 4 καὶ τοῦ πυρὸς καταπτήσοντος καὶ πάσης κτίσεως καυσούμενης (MSS. κλονουμένης) καὶ τῶν ὀφράων πνευμάτων τηκομένων, Enoch 68:2 'who can endure the rigorous judgment passed upon the angels, before which when they melt away.' Spitta discovers another argument in the reading λυθήσονται, found in AKL, etc., where he thinks the plural implies a living conscious subject.

This view is accepted by Kühl and v. Soden. On the whole however I prefer to understand οὐρανοὶ with Aug. Civ. Dei. xx. 24,3 Bede, Estius, and Hundhausen, of the firmament or lower heaven, distinguishing this from the starry heaven in which the στοιχεῖα are set. That the stars were involved in the destruction of the last day was a part of Jewish belief,4 as is evident from Isa. 34:4 καὶ τυχόντων πάσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ ἐληλύσεται οὐρανός ὡς βιβλίαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀστρα πεσεῖται ὡς φύλλα ἢ τοίχου, a passage which our

See especially En. 50:12f. where mention is made of the spirits of the moon and stars and lightning, the sea, the hoar-frost, the hail, the dew, the rain, etc., Δροσ. 16. The names of the angels who preside over the seasons are given in En. 82. In the apocryphal Test. Salom. (Fabr. p. 1047) Solomon questions certain spirits which are brought before him τίνος δέστος; oi δὲ ὁμοθυμάδων ἔφρασιν... ἡμεῖς ἐγὼν τα λεγόμενα στοιχεῖα, οἱ κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, Ep. ad Diogn. 7 God sent to save man, not an angel ἢ ἄρχοντα ἢ τιμα τῶν διεκτώτων τα ὑπερέχει εἶνα τῶν πεντετευμένων τὰς ἐν οὐρανοῖς διαλείπειες, but Him by whom He had made the world, οὐ τὰ μυσθηρία πιστῶς πάντα φυλάσσει τα στοιχεῖα (sun, moon, etc.), cf. Eus. H.E. iii. 31 with the notes in Heinichen's ed.

3 Compare with this Lightfoot's notes on Gal. 4:9 and Col. 2:8, where he argues in favour of the first interpretation given above of στοιχεῖα, viz. rudimentary instruction belonging to the sphere of material and external things.' I learn from Dr. Bigg's note on this passage that Ritschl and Everling (Paulinische Angelologie, 1888) share Spitta's view as against Lightfoot.

Possunt illi caeli intellegi perituri, quos dixit repositos igni reservandos.

4 Aug. L.c. takes the other view, that the stars remain intact, and that only those elements will be burnt 'quaœ in haco ima mundi partes subsistent proseolosa et turbulenta.' He does not define what these elements are, or how they are related to the two great categories, heaven and earth. In another passage quoted by Hundhausen (En. in Psalm. 101) he speaks more doubtfully.
author evidently had in mind, Joel 2\textsuperscript{30}, 31, Mt. 24\textsuperscript{39} ὃ ἡμιον ἐκπαυθήσεται καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ αστήρες πεσοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται. Ἄρσος. 612-14.

κανώμαμα. A word, employed by medical writers to express feverish heat, used (here only) of the burning of inanimate objects.\textsuperscript{1} It may perhaps be intended to denote a conflagration arising from internal heat, such as a volcano. I see no reason for questioning this use of the word. The writer is certainly not one who shares Caesar's prejudice against verba inusitata; and though καῦμος, from which it is derived, is generally used of fever, it also occurs in Proclus of ordinary heat.\textsuperscript{2} So καυματίζω in classical Greek seems to be confined to the medical sense, but in the N.T. (Mt. 13\textsuperscript{6}, Ἄρσος 16\textsuperscript{9}) it is used of the scorching effect of fire. Dr. Bigg suggests, after Veitch p. 309, that it may be an irregular future of καῦω; but there is nothing to justify the use of the future here.

λυθάρναι. Occurs also in ν. 11 and 12. It is used of breaking up a structure as in Joh. 24, as well as of dissolving a compound into its elements.

καὶ ἡ καὶ τα ἐν αὐτῇ ἐργα εἰρηθήσεται.] For readings see Introduction on the Text. I agree with Plumptre that ἐργα is to be understood here of all that man has wrought on the surface of the globe.\textsuperscript{3} The common-place amendment κατακαυθήσεται is accepted by ν. Soden, Hundhausen, Brückner. I do not think any one is quite satisfied with Horta's suggestion ῥυόταται or διαρνήσεται. The reading of Sah. (οἷς εἰρηθήσεται) makes excellent sense, as may be seen from Gen. 5\textsuperscript{24} (Enoch) οἷς εἰρώσκετο, Ἄρσος 16\textsuperscript{20} πᾶσα νήσος ἐφυγε καὶ ὤρη οἷς εἰρήθησαν together with the parallels quoted in the Introduction: if the negative were accidentally omitted in the archetype, the other readings would be easy to explain. Weiss and Plummer attempt to get the same sense by making εἰρηθήσεται interrogative, but this, as Spitta says, is extremely harsh: it should at least have had a τοῦ prefixed, as in 1 Pet. 4\textsuperscript{18}. Nor is there much more to be said for the rendering given by Steinfass and Dr. Gwynn the works of man shall be discovered and brought to judgement, for which the latter refers to Ezek. 28\textsuperscript{15} εἰρήθη τα ἄδικηματα ἐν σοῖ. This separates between the earth and the works in it; and would require αὐθεντήσεται, rather than εἰρηθήσεται. If we are not to accept οἷς εἰρηθήσεται, I am rather disposed to suggest ἀρνήσεται, cf. Mt. 24\textsuperscript{39} ἠλθεν ὁ καταικλυμνὸς καὶ ἤρεν ἀπαντάς, Joh. 15\textsuperscript{2}, 17\textsuperscript{15}, Acts 8\textsuperscript{8}, 22\textsuperscript{22}, Isa. 16\textsuperscript{10} ἀρνήσεται εὐφροσύνη, id. 57\textsuperscript{1} ἀνδρεὶς δίκαιοι ἡρόται καὶ οὐδές κατανεί.

\textsuperscript{1} Stephanus gives one example of its figurative use (Hesych. Antirrheto. p. 315) ποτε (εἰ νοῦ καὶ παλαιοῦ χρόνου καυσαθάντα τῇ ἀσφηλείᾳ.

\textsuperscript{2} Dr. Chase in Hastings' D. of B. s.v. 'Peter' states that καῦμος is used of burnt soil in Athenaeus and Hesychius, referring to Sophocles' Lex., but I have not been able to find the passages there cited.

\textsuperscript{3} Cf. Melito Ἄρσος, quoted by Dr. Biggs (p. 205). Ultimo tempore erit diluvium ignis et ardebit terra cum montibus suis et ardebunt homines cum simulacris quae fecerunt et cum operis sculptilibus quae adoraverunt.

\textsuperscript{4} Dr. Abbott suggests πυρεθήσεται, as in ν. 12, or πυρεθήσεται, as in Plat.
11. τούτων οὖν πάντων λυμένων.] For the reading see Introduction on Text. The pres. part. implies 'since these things are in process of dissolution.' The seeds of the destruction which will overtake them at the last day are already at work within them. For the tense cf. Joh. 21:22 οὐ μαθήτης ἐκαίνος οὐκ ἀποθνησκεί.

ποταπός δὲ ὑπάρχων ἐμῶς.] The classical ποταπός (formed like ἄλλο-

δαπός, παντοδαπός) is equivalent to Lat. suius, as is shown in Plato Apol. 20 B τίς καὶ ποταπός; Εὔπνοος, ἐφθ., Πάρμος. In later writers it is found, generally in the form ποταπός, in the sense of ποιος, as in Mt. 8:27 ποταπός ἐστιν αὐτὸς οὗτι καὶ οἱ ἀνέμοι ... ὑπακούσαν; Lk. 7:50 ἑώρασεν δὲ τίς καὶ ποταπὴ ἡ γυνὴ, 1 Joh. 3:1 ἔστε ποταπὴν ἀγάπην δεδωκεν ἡμῖν ὑπὸ πατήρ, Petri Ἀροτ. ἦν ἰδωμεν ποταπὸς εἰς τὴν μορφήν, see Lobbeck Phrynichus p. 56. Alford seems to me to give the precise contrary of the meaning of ὑπάρχων in his note ('what manner of men ought ye to be when the event comes?': ὑπ. seems to imply some fact supervening on the previously existing state'). I understand it to mean 'what ought ye to be now, beforehand, in readiness for the time when the Lord shall come as a thief in the night?', cf. 1 Pet. 4:7 and (for ὑπάρχων) Dem. Olynth. p. 32. 20 τούτω οὖν διὰ προσεύμα τα δὲ ἀλλὰ ὑπάρχον, 'this one thing, promptness of action, must be added: quickness of intelligence and all other requisites are your birth-right.'

ἐν ἀγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις.] For the abstract plural compare above 218 ἀσέλγειας, Jude v. 13, 1 Pet. 2:1, James 2:1, Blass p. 84.1 For ἀναστρόφη see above 27, 1 Pet. 1:15; for εὐσεβεία above 13:6:7. Alford is perhaps right in connecting these words with the following participles.

12. προσδοκάντας καὶ στενδοῦντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας.] For other examples of the transitive force of στενάω see Isa. 16:5 ἐκφεύ̂γων κρίμα καὶ στενάων δικαιούντων, Pind. Pyth. iii. 110 μὴ βλον ἀθάνατον στενάω, Eur. Suppl. 161 εὑρίσκαν γ' ἐκπεισαν ἀν' εἰβουλᾶς, where the sense is 'to desire,' 'to be eager for'; also Hom. Od. xix. 137 ολ' δὲ γόμον στενάσαν, Eur. Med. 150 τίς σοι ποτὲ ... ἔρος, δὲ ματαία, στενάσαν θανάτον τελευτάν; Esther 5:4 καταπευτάτε Αμάν, where the sense is 'to hasten,' 'to accelerate,' cf. Sir. 36:8 (or 33:8) στενάσων καθὼν καὶ μηδοῦθη δρκομένοι, i.e. 'hasten the time of the promised vengeance,' Deut. 32:37, Baruch 3:33 altitissimus accelerans accelerabit temporā suet adducens adducet horas suas. The latter is the sense preferred here by most editors. 'In Mt. 24:14 we are told that one condition of the Advent was that the Gospel should be first preached to all nations: it was also to be the subject of prayer 'Thy kingdom come'; and we find an even closer parallel to our text in Peter's speech in Acts 3:18 ἐπανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἑποτρέψατε εἰς τὸ ἐξαλείφθην ἡμῶν τὸς ... Legg. 843 ε. He observes that πωρόν is corrupt or corrupted in Prov. 10:9, Lam. 4:7, and other passages where it occurs in the LXX.

3 Bremi (exc. τινι in Isocr.) cites ἄθεται de Pace § 38, Evangel. § 5. c. 1, de Antid. § 170, § 260, § 267, and Nicoc. § 20; καταρριμα Evangel. § 42. c. 19; μεταφέρει Pasey. § 11.; προσφέρει Philipp. § 116. c. 49, de Antid. § 214; συνάφεις Arch. § 98; πλατευμάτως Philipp. § 116. c. 49, etc.

2 So too Spitta.
THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

ἀμαρτίας ὅπως δὲν ἀλθεύναι καυροὶ ἀναψιφίζω (R.V. "that so there may come seasons of refreshing") ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ἀποστελῇ . . . Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἵνα δεῖ σώματα μὲν δεξασθαι ἁχρὶ χρόνων ἀποκατα-
stάσεως πάντων" (from Plummer). Compare 4 Esdr. 4:30 usque quo sper-
sic et respondit archangelus et dixit Quando impletus erit numeros similium vobis . . . Et respondi et dixi . . . Ne forte propter nos non
impleantur justorum areas, propter peccata inhabitantium super
 terram. For προσθεκώντας cf. προσδεχόμενοι Jude v. 21, 1 Cor. 17
μὴ ὑπερείσθαι ἵνα μιθείναι, ἀπεκδεχόμενον τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ
κυρίου ἡμῶν 'Ι.Χ.

The word πυροσφαίρα in biblical Greek is elsewhere used only of a
person, not of a day. 'The Day of God' is an unusual expression for
the Day of the Lord (Joel 2:11, Mt. 4:5, v. 10 above): we find it however
in Jer. 46:10 'the Day of the Lord God of hosts,' and in Apoc. 16:14.

δὲ ὁ σῶμα πυροσφαίρα λαθήσονται.] In v. 10 the connexion was
only one of time (ἡ γῆ), here it is one of cause. The presence of the
Day of God is the cause of the destruction of heaven by fire.

πυρὸς is used of gold tried in the fire (Apoc. 1:15, 3:18), of fiery darts
(Eph. 6:16), of strong feeling (1 Cor. 7:9, 2 Cor. 11:20), of incendiary fire
(Herod. vii. 8).

καὶ στοιχεῖα καυρομένα τῆς τάφων.] Some editors have found a difficulty
in the repetitions of this verse. It appears to me to make a very
effective refrain, and to be quite in the writer's manner. Spitta
wonders why the clause καὶ γῆ . . . εἰρεθήσονται should be inserted in
v. 10 and omitted here; but a refrain is not a catalogue, and the
rhythm of the sentence would have suffered from the addition. For
τῆς τάφων, Hort suggests τῆς τάφων (which is used in a passive sense by
Hippocrates vi. 110).1 The same word is used of the mountains Isa.
64:1-3, of the heavens Isa. 34:10 ταχύσονται τάσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν σωρῶν,

13. καυροὶ δὲ σῶμα πυροσφαίρα . . . κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ προσθεκόμενοι.2] The
Hence we must understand αὐτοῦ of God, not, as Spitta, of Christ.
The figure chiasmus (καυροὶ σῶμα πυροσφαίρα—γῆ καυρία) is used for the sake
of variety, as in Mt. 5:18 ἦσαν ἐν ἒλθε κεφαλα. Here, as in v. 8 above
(μὴ ἡμέρα ὁς χλὸς ἔτη καὶ χλὸς ἔτη ὁς ἡμέρα μία), it has the further
effect of improving the rhythm, and giving additional emphasis to the
closing καυρία. On the other hand, in Isaiah and Apoc. 21:1 the
epithet is repeated in the same order σώμα πυροσφαίρα καυροὶ—γῆ καυρία: so

1 Alford explains the text as the 'present of destiny,' comparing λαθέσον
t above; but how then are we to account for the future λαθεύσονται?
2 Charles in his book on Eschatology (1899) points out that the opposite view,
of the permanence of heaven and earth, is that which prevails in earlier Jewish
writings as in Ps. 148:4, 104:4. He thinks that the doctrine of a new heaven and
earth was probably derived from the Persian religion, that its first Jewish
expression is in Enoch (45:4, 91:14 'The first heaven will depart and pass away
and a new heaven will appear') and that the passages quoted from Isaiah are
later interpolations and inconsistent with his general teaching. I cannot say
that I find his arguments convincing. The doctrine is much more vaguely given
in Enoch than in Isaiah, and we do not expect rigid consistency in prophetic
visions.
Joh. 10:16 γενήσεται μία ποίμνη, εἰς ποιμήν, Zech. 14:9, 2 Cor. 7:4 πολλή μοι παρρησία πρὸς ὑμᾶς, πολλὴ μοι καύχησις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.

ἐν εἰς δικαιοσύνη κατωτάτα.] Cf. Isa. 32:1 βασιλεῖν δίκαιος βασιλεύσει, ἵδ. v. 16 f. καὶ ἀναπαύονται ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνη ἐν τῷ Καρμήλῳ κατωτάτῳ, καὶ ἐστὶν τὰ ἄγαλη τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐφήμη, καὶ κρατήσει ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἀνάπαυον . . . καὶ κατωτάτῳ δ ὅ λεις αὐτοῦ ἐν πολλῇ ἐφήμῃ. Righteousness is said to have its home in the renewed heaven and earth, because (1) the people shall be all righteous (Isa. 60:21, Apoc. 21:17; cf. the picture of the natural effects of virtue in Butler’s *Analogy* Pt. I, ch. 3), and (2) because the Lord, the source of all righteousness, is the light and glory of the new Jerusalem (Jer. 23:4, Isa. 11:4, 5, 61:10, 11, 60:20, Apoc. 21:21, 22), in contradistinction to this present world, of which Satan is called ὁ ἄρχων Joh. 12:31.

ἐν ἐς, i.e. in the new earth and heaven. For the construction of the relative see above 31.

14. ἀδικητος, ταύτα προσδιοίκεται.] For διό see above 110, 12. It is only righteousness that can dwell in the new earth; therefore cleanse yourselves from all unrighteousness. As in Jude v. 20, ἀδικητος introduces the direct appeal to the true members of the Church.

στοικὸς καὶ ἀδικήτως αὐτῷ ἐφεβίοις.] Cf. above, notes on 213 στοικοι καὶ μῶμοι. For the complementary construction of ἐφεβίοις see Phil. 3:9 (τα) ἐφεβίῳ ἐν αὐτῷ μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τῷ εἰ σώματι, Gal. 2:17 ἐφεβίοις εἰμαρτωλοι, 2 Cor. 5:16 γεγυμνοὶ εὑρέθησθομεθα, 1 P. 1:7 with Hort’s note. For the dat. see Rom. 7:10 ἐφεβίῳ μοι ἡ ἐντολή ἐις ζωῆς αὐτῆς ἐς θάνατον, where it does not express the agent, but the person interested, “the command, which was for life, turned out in my case to be for death”: so in Apoc. 20:11 τὸν τῶν οὐκ ἐφεβίῳ αὐτοῦ. In Rom. 10:30, ἐφεβίᾳ τοῖς ἐμε μὴ ἔχῃ τούτων, it approaches more nearly to ὑπὸ with the gen. Here the dative is ethical, depending on the adjective rather than on the verb, “to be found without blemish in His sight,” when He appears to judge the world, as in Diod. xvii. 4 fin. βουλόμενος τῷ βασιλείῳ ἀμεμπτόν αὐτῶν διαφυλάττει.1 Blass compares Eph. 1:11 ἐκεῖ αἰώνιος κατεστάσεως αὐτῶν, Col. 1:22 παραστάσεται ὄμως ἀμώμως κατεστάσεως αὐτῶν (Gr. pp. 112 f., 185). So Jude v. 24 στήσαι κατεστάσεως τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν αἰώνιος.

ἐν ἐφεβίῳ.] Peace and righteousness are joined together in Ps. 85:10, Isa. 32:17, quoted at 13 above, and James 3:18, where see my note.

15. ἡ καὶ τοῦ κυρίου τῆς μακροθυμίας ψυχῆν ἔγινεθε.] A stronger expression of the statement in v. 9, where the readers are taught to look on ἡ διακοσμηθή αἰώνια. Here they are taught to look on μακροθυμία as ψυχή, i.e. as intended by God to lead to their salvation, if rightly used. Cf. 1 Pet. 3:20 ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νεός.

καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητός ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος—ὑγιαφίων ὑμῖν.] A similar phrase is used by Paul of Tychicus (Eph. 6:21, Col. 4:7), of Onesimus (Col. 4, Philem. v. 16). So Epaphras is called ὁ ἀγαπητός συνδέως (Col. 17), Philemon ἀγαπητός καὶ συνεργός (Phil. v. 1), Timothy τέκνος ἀγαπητός (1 Cor. 4:17, 2 Tim. 1), while the phrase ὁ ἀγαπητός μου is.

For this quotation I am indebted to Dr. Abbott.
used of Epaenetus, Ampliatus, Stachys, and Persis in Rom. 16. It would be a very natural phrase for St. Peter to use of St. Paul, especially in a letter written to those who were themselves acquainted with St. Paul and had probably read the severe strictures contained in Gal. 2:11-14. That the warm-hearted, generous Peter bore no grudge against his 'brother' for his animadversions, and was (at any rate in later life) in full sympathy with his teaching, is evident from the whole tone of the first Petrine letter. This does not of course prove the genuineness of the present letter; but it shows that there is nothing opposed to it in this kindly mention of St. Paul, joined, as it is, with the gentle caution which follows. For ἡμῶν compare Acts 15:25 σὺν τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν Βαρνάβα καὶ Παύλῳ. 1 Th. 3:2 Τιμόθεου τοῦ ἄδελφον ἡμῶν. 2 Cor. 1:28, Phil. v. 2 'Αρχίσαξεν τῷ συνανταγώνῃ ἡμῶν καὶ τῇ κατ' ὀδόν σου ἐκκλησίᾳ. It may be understood either of the Apostles, or, as I should prefer, of Christians generally.

Who are those to whom St. Paul is here said to have written? Can we identify them with the recipients of any of his extant epistles? It seems to me that the phrase καθὼς ἔγραψεν can only refer to the preceding injunction, the importance of which injunction is shown by the reiteration in vv. 9 and 13, to the effect that the long-suffering of God was to be regarded as an evidence of His goodwill to men. We find the equivalent to this in Rom. 2:4 καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς ἄγνοιαν ὅτι τὸ χρηστόν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν μετανοίᾳ σε ἀφεῖ; 3:22 ἐν ἑυδαιμονίᾳ τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ . . . ἐν τῇ ἄνωθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ; ἦδ. 9:22, 23 θέλων ὅ Θεος ἐνδείκνυσθαι . . . τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ ὑμείς ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκοπεῖς ὑγιής κατηργομένα εἰς ἀπέλευσιν, ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλούσιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκέφθη ἐλέους, 11:22, 23. Hence Oecumenius, Grotius, Dietlein, Ewald, Plummer argue, as I think, rightly that our epistle is addressed to the Romans, see Introduction on this subject. Others however assuming that those addressed are inhabitants of Asia Minor, as in 1 Pet., are driven to find a different reference in καθὼς ἔγραψεν. So Wiesinger, Schott, Hofmann, Keil, Kühl, v. Soden, Weiss think the epistle to the Ephesians intended, because that was certainly known to the author of 1 Pet., and because we find in it admonitions to a godly life, based upon the hope of the inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God (Eph. 4:30–5:2). It is unnecessary to point out the vague generality of such a reference; how little there is in it that is distinctive of one epistle rather than another. Hence Cajetan, Benson, and others have supposed an allusion to the epistles to the Galatians and Colossians along with that to the Ephesians. Corn. à Lapide and Jackmann prefer the first epistle to the Corinthians, the former because of the resemblance of 2 Pet. 3:18 κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὑτῷ σοφίαν to 1 Cor. 2:7, 12:8, but this point is too unimportant to justify the reference: the latter on the more plausible ground, that 1 Cor. iii and iv are illustrative of portions of our epistle; but, as these portions do not belong to the section in question, we cannot accept this as a natural explanation. Estius, Bengel, and others, prefer the epistle to the Hebrews, assuming that 2 Pet. was addressed to Jewish Christians, and that the author would have admitted the Hebrews as a writing of Paul. Bengel rests
this hypothesis on the fact that we have repeated references to the last time in Heb. 11, 22, 1025. 37. De Wette, with whom Plumptre and Alford agree, widens the reference so as to include the whole passage dealing with the Second Coming (35–313) and thinks that the writer must have had in mind 1 Thess. 418–511 and 2 Thess. 2112. Lastly Pott, Morus, Spitta, and Zahn (Einl. ii. 46) consider that the reference is to a lost epistle. Dr. Bigg is undecided.

κατὰ τὴν δοθείαν αὐτῇ σοφίαν.] Cf. Paul's own words κατὰ τὴν καθορισμόν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν δοθείαν μοι ἡ σοφίας ἀρχιστατοῦ δημιουργοῦ ἐκείνου (1 Cor. 300), γνώσει τὴν καθορισμόν τὴν δοθείαν μοι Ἡλλᾶς καὶ Κηφᾶς . . . δεξίας ἐδωκαν ἡμοί (Gal. 29), 1 Cor. 261, Col. 128, and Polycarp (ad Phil. iii. 2) ὁπότε γὰρ ἐγὼ ὑπὲρ ἀλλότριος ὑπόστασις κατακολούθησα τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδέξομαι Παύλου . . . ὅτε καὶ ἐποίη τῇ ἡμῖν ἐγραφεῖ ἐνστόλως.

16. ὡς καὶ ἐν τάσις ταῖς ἐνστολαῖς, λαλῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς περὶ τούτων.] See Introduction on the Text. We must understand γράφεις after ὃς. Of course 'all his letters' does not necessarily include all the epistles which have come down to us under the name of Paul; nor on the other hand is it necessarily limited to them: it means simply 'all the letters known to the writer.' We may assume that the early Christian teachers would naturally communicate their writings to each other, and that these would be read as containing the teaching of the Spirit for the Church at large. At the same time the phrase πάσαι ταῖς ἐνστολαῖς would be more naturally understood of a collection of letters made after St. Paul's death. If he were still living, we should rather have expected ταῖς ἀλλαὶς ἐνστολαῖς. In later Greek λαλῶ is used, much like λέγω, of serious speech (cf. above 123) and of writing (here and in Heb. 2, 2 Cor. 1117). We may translate the phrase 'where he touches on these subjects.' Some commentators seem to me to press too far the meaning of this sentence, using it to weaken the force of the preceding verse, as though the distinct reference to one epistle of St. Paul was destroyed by the addition, that 'the doctrine there taught was in harmony with his other writings,' and as though the καθορισμός of v. 15, following immediately on the reiterated statement of the great truth μακροθυμία σωτηρία, must be set aside because of the vague plural περὶ τούτων. The addition of the phrase λαλῶν περὶ τούτων is intended to show that the precise connexion before noted between the one doctrine and the one epistle is now widened into a connexion between a whole class of doctrines and the whole body of the known Pauline writings. What then is the more general teaching here referred to? It is the teaching as to the Coming of Christ, its meaning and its end, as contained for instance in 1 Cor. 15. It is the teaching of mercy in judgment, of which μακροθυμία σωτηρία, like the parable of the fig-tree, is one great example. Calvin in his note says truly that the reference to the teaching of St. Paul here is introduced to deprecate the idea put forward by some of the Jewish Christians of a personal rivalry between the former and St. Peter. A further and even more important reason was that the libertines claimed the authority of St. Paul on their side. I cannot see however why Calvin should add 'Et tamen dum omnia propius expendo, mihi fit
verisimilarius hanc epistolam ex Petri sensu ab ali'o compositam, quam ab eo scriptam esse. *Nonquum enim sic locutus fuisset Petrus.* I should have said just the opposite. There are many difficulties in the way of accepting the genuineness of this epistle; but the manner in which St. Paul is spoken of seems to me just what we should have expected from his brother Apostle.

*In alici locutionibus.] The reading *a* is probably owing to the copyist's taking *toινων* to be the antecedent. For *δυναμία* (not found elsewhere in biblical Greek) cf. Luc. *Alexandria.* 54 *χρησιμοις άνωτέρωκαι δυναμίασι* (Diog. L. ix. 13 (a supposititious letter of Darius to Heraclitus) καταβάλλοικαι στην γραπτήν περί φύσεως δυναμικών τοι και δυσεξήγματος.

*αι δυναμίαις και δύσεξήγματοι στρεβλάσισι.] Cf. Clem. Al. Str. p. 529 *ίνα.* οἱ διαστρέφοντες τὰς γραφὰς πρὸς ἴδιας ἴδιας, καὶ τινῶν προσφεύγων καὶ στιγμάτων μεταβίβας τά παραγγελθέντα σωφρόνως βιαζόμενοι πρὸς ἴδιαν ἱνα τὰς ἴδιας, ib. pp. 890, 891. I have not found any other example of *στρεβλῶν* in the sense of twisting or straining a phrase like the Fr. *torturer un mot,* but in Ps. 18:30 we have *μετὰ στρεβλοῦ διαστρέφεις* (Clement's word above), where 2 Sam. 22:7 has *μετὰ στρεβλοῦ στρεβλάθη.* I think the figurative sense flows from the notion of twisting or warping, rather than from that of torturing on the rack, cf. Arist. *Rapaeis* 878 (of *ανάκερτος γνωμοτύποι* οταν εἰς *ἐν* ἡμερινῶν ἱλαρωθείσης στρεβλος στολήσατε παλαιάμασιν ἀντίληψετε, Aristot. *Rhet.* i. 1. δ ου δει τὸν δικαστὴν διαστρέφων (we must not warp his judgment) . . . *δυσοικον γὰρ κῶν εἰ τις, φωλεῖ χρησθαι κανόνι, τοινοῖ ποσήμα στρεβλῶν* (with Cope's notes); so Plutarch (Mor. 2, p. 968 A) uses the term *στρεβλάθης* to express the windings of the ant's nest; and Sir. 36:28 has *καρδία στρεβλήσ σκολία.* It is strange that so common a word as *ἀμαθία* should not be found elsewhere in the N.T. or LXX., its place being taken by such words as *ίδωσιν* Acts 4:18, 1 Cor. 14:15, 23, or *ἀγράμματος* Acts 4:13, or δ ἄγνωστον Heb. 5:2. For *άστυρμοις* see above on 214.

What are the δυναμίαις *των* referred to? Probably St. Paul's doctrine of God's free grace (Rom. 3:24), with his apparent disapproval of the Law in Rom. 3:20, 28, 4:15, 5:20, 6:4, 7:11; his teaching with regard to the *πνευματικό* 1 Cor. 11; with regard to the strong, whom he seems to justify in their neglect of the rule made at the Apostolic Council as to *εἰσελθόντα* (Acts 15:29, Rom. 14, 1 Cor. 8, 10:25); as regards the resurrection in baptism (Rom. 6:9-11, Col. 3, 1 Cor. 15:12); perhaps as regards predestination (Rom. 9:11), and the Parousia (2 Th. 2).

*οὐ καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς.] In the N.T. *αἱ* γραφαί is regularly used of the O.T. Scriptures, especially in the Synoptic Gospels, but also once in the fourth Gospel (5:39), four times in the Acts, once in Rom. 15, twice in 1 Cor. 15:4 (κατά τὰς γραφάς). We find *γραφαί* without the article in Rom. 1:5 ἐπογγειλάτο διά τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἄγιας, ib. 16:23 (μνημείον) διὰ γραφῶν προφητικῶν . . . γνωρισθέντος. The singular is used in Mk. 12:10 οὗτος ἡ γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωσεν; Lk. 4:21 σήμερον πεπλήρωθα ἡ γραφή αὐτή, Joh. 2:22 ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ,
on which Westcott's note is 'the phrase occurs elsewhere ten times in St. John 7:28, 43, 10:52, 13:18, 17:12, 19:24, 25:26, 36, 37, 20:9 and in every case except 17:12 and 20:9 the reference is to a definite passage quoted in the context [similarly Joh. 19:37 ἐτέρα γραφὴ λέγει] ... In 17:12 the reference appears to be to the words quoted in 13:18 ... According to the Apostle's usage, then, we must suppose that a definite passage is present to his mind in 20:9 ... which can hardly be any other than Ps. 16:10.' The singular is similarly used of a definite reference in Acts 11:16, 8:2 ἢ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς ἐν ἀνειγίσθηκεν, 8:56; in Rom. 4:28, 9:17, 10:11, 11:2, Gal. 3:8, 3:22, 4:30, 1 Tim. 5:15, in all of which passages St. Paul seems to personify γραφή, using it without αὐτή. So James 2:23, 4:5. The article is omitted in Joh. 19:17, Rom. 1:2, 16:23 already quoted, and in 2 Tim. 3:16 πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόντος καὶ ὕψιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, 'every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching' (R.V.), 1 Pet. 2:26 περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ, where Hort thinks 'the translation "in Scripture" is barely possible without the article; nor again, in the absence of τῶν, is the sense "in a passage of Scripture" probable. The most natural rendering is simply "in writing" as Sir. 39:32 διενοθήκη καὶ ἐν γραφῇ ἄφηκα; 42:7 δώσει καὶ λήψει, πάντα ἐν γραφῇ, 44:5 δηγούμενον ἐσθή ἐν γραφῇ, 2 Chron. 21:1 ἔπει Χεριμ βασιλέως Τύρου ἐν γραφῇ, 21:12 ἔλθεν αὐτῷ ἐν γραφῇ παρὰ Ἡλίου τοῦ προφήτου, Ps. 86:6, Ezek. 13:9, 1 Chron. 28:19. Thus περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ is equivalent to "it stands written": compare St. John's formula of quotation ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον. That the quotation was authoritative was doubtless implied, in accordance with the familiar Jewish use of the words "said," "written." If we accept this interpretation, which is supported by Blass p. 182, n. 3 and by Zahn Einl. ii. p. 109,1 we should perhaps attach the same general meaning to γραφῇ in 2 Tim. 3:16, translating 'every inspired writing,' which gives a better reason for the otherwise otiose epithet. But then what are we to say of 2 Pet. 1:20 πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς δίδα ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται? Is this to be translated 'no prophecy of (or "in") writing,' Zahn 'schriftlich'? I confess I prefer the R.V. 'no prophecy of Scripture,' and so in 1 Pet. 2:6 'It is contained in Scripture.' A unique use naturally tends to dispense with the article, as in Θεός, Κύριος, βασιλεὺς, σωτήρ, Χριστός, πνεῦμα, νόμος, λόγος.2 When St. Paul can speak of ἡ γραφὴ λέγει, it is a very short step onwards to say γραφῆ λέγει, shorter still to say ἐν γραφῇ. I think then that here we must translate γραφῆς 'Scriptures' understanding by it the O.T., unless strong reason can be shown on the other side. Such strong reason is thought to be found in the epithet λοιπάς. Can it be supposed that the writer here puts the Pauline epistles on the same shelf as the old sacred books of the Jews?  

1 Sometimes γραφῇ stands for 'register' as in Nehem. 7:24 ὁ δόθηκεν γραφὴν αὐτῶν τῷ εὐνοίας, Ezek. 13:9 ἐν γραφῇ οἴκου Ἰσραήλ ὁ γραφοῦσα ἤτοι: sometimes for any particular writing, as in Dan. 5:1 ἐν ἀναγγή τῆς γραφῆς ταῦταν. Irenæus has 'haec scriptura' (αὕτη ἡ γραφή) of his own book (iii. 17. 4): so Clem. Al. Strom. vi. 32 περὶ μὲν τούτων προεόρισε τῆς γραφῆς διαλέξεως of his own treatise, followed shortly after by κατὰ τῆς γραφῆς used of scripture, and the same diversity is found ib. 181. Similarly Euseb. (H.E. ii. 11. 1) uses γραφῆ of Josephus. [Taken from Zahn, l.c.] 

2 See my Introduction to St. James, pp. clxxxvi, excii.
Some commentators escape from this argument by reference to the idiomatic use of ἀλλας and similar words, as in the passages cited by Dr. Bigg, Hom. Od. i. 132 ἐκτὸς ἄλλων μνηστήρων, where Odysseus is distinguished from the others, the suitors; Λκ. 2322 ἔτερος δυὸ κακοῖριον; . . . Deut. 28 (ἀνωλεία ἀπολείποντο) καθὰ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ θηνή δοα καὶ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπάλλην πρὸ προσώπων ὑμῶν, where the chosen people might seem, according to the usual force of λοιπῶς, to be included in the Gentiles who were destroyed before their face, see Winer, p. 664. The last passage is not of much weight, because Israel is strictly included among τὰ θηνη. Besides λοιπῶς certainly implies a closer connexion than ἄλλας. If we had ὅς τὰς ἄλλας γραφάς, it might mean ‘like the Scriptures also,’ but if the writer made any broad distinction between Paul’s epistles and Scripture, I think he must have said καθαρτε αὐτὰς τὰς γραφάς. We have a parallel use of λοιπῶς in Sir. proi. αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητείαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων. I incline to think that γραφαί is here used to denote any book read in the synagogue or congregation, including the letters of the Apostles (Col. 416, 1 Th. 527) as well as the lessons from the O.T.

Though γραφαὶ is generally used of the O.T. in the Apostolic writings, it is also used of the N.T. by the middle of the second century. Thus in 2 Clem. Rom. 2, after a quotation from Isa. 541, a quotation from Mk. 217 is introduced in the words καὶ ἐτέρι διὶ γραφῇ λέγετε δι’ ὅν ἔδωκεν καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτωλοὺς; (ib. 13) Λκ. 623, 26 is referred to as τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ. Even before the end of the first century, in 1 Clem. Rom. 23 ἡ γραφὴ λέγει introduces a quotation from a book not included in the canon of the O.T. which Lightfoot supposes to be Eldad and Modad. [Hermas alludes to this in Vis. ii. 3. 4 ὁς γεγραπται ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι καὶ Μωδαί, τοῖς προφητεύσαν ἐν Ἰρημ. τῷ λαῷ.] What is considered by some to be the still earlier epistle of Barnabas introduces the words πολλοὶ λεγοῦν, ἠλέγω δὲ ἐκλεκτοῖ (Mat. 2214) with ὅς γεγραπται. Can we then suppose that the books of the N.T. are to be understood here? If we give λοιπῶς its ordinary sense, this seems to me a more difficult explanation than that which would interpret it of the O.T., because it assumes that there was a collection of later writings known to the writer as Scripture, of which St. Paul’s epistles formed a part. But such an assumption can hardly be conceived as possible before the middle of the second century. That the word γραφῆ, Scripture, should be applied to the epistle to the Colossians by one who had heard it read in public worship seems to me perfectly natural; but that this epistle should have been bound up, not only with other epistles, but with a variety of Christian writings by different authors claiming a similar authority (and this is suggested by λοιπῶς), before the end of the first century seems to me incredible. Again this interpretation involves the statement that the new Christian Scriptures were, as a known fact, perverted and distorted in the interest of heretical partisans; but this would surely require a considerable interval of time after the first recognition of their authority.1

1 Zahn i.c. notices that, while ἵπτα γραμματα (from which γραμματεῖς is derived)
Supposing, then, that τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς is to be understood in the first instance of the O.T., what are the kind of perversions referred to? I think those which rise up first in our minds would be such as are noted by our Lord Himself in Mt. 5:21-44, 15:3, 19:10, Lk. 9:44-46, etc. If the O.T. was thus liable to perversion, no wonder that the writings of the new prophets should be liable to similar misuse.

πρὸς τὴν ἱδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπόλλαν.] The preposition denotes the end or result of the action ἀπεβλέπωσε, as in Heb. 9:13 ἀγέτας πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα, Joh. 11:14 αὐτὴ ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἦτο πρὸς τὸν θάνατον, 2 Cor. 4:2 ὁ θεὸς σώζει τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν, 2 Th. 3:5 ἐργαζόμενοι πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαι τινα, 1 Joh. 5:16 διότι δύναμις τῆς ἀμαρτίας μὴ πρὸς βάπτασιν. For the combination ἱδίαν αὐτῶν cf. Acts 24:28 μηδένα καλύπτει τῶν ἱδίων αὐτοῦ ἀπήρευτοι αὐτῷ, Tit. 1:11 εἰπὲν τις εξ αὐτῶν ἱδίος αὐτῶν προφήτης, Dem. 1244. 24 ἵνα οὐκ ἄν ἔλυσεν διὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἱδίον, Theog. 440 τὸν αὐτὸν ἱδίον νοῦν, cf. above v. 3. For ἀπόλλαν cf. above 21.

17. ἡμῖν σὺν, ἀγαπητῶ, προσγείωσκετε.] This resumes the exhortation of ver. 14 after the digression on St. Paul’s teaching, replacing the phrase ταῦτα προσδοκούντες by the stronger προσγείωσκετε, ‘being thus forewarned.’ The word is more often used in the N.T. of the divine foreknowledge. It is used, as here, in Wisdom 18:16 ἡκίήν ὑνὶ προσγείωσθη πατράνων ἡμῶν.

φιλάστερον ἵνα μὴ... ἐκκύθη.] ‘Be on your guard, in order that you may not fall away,’ cf. Plut. Mor. p. 231 c οὐ φιλάστερον συνευκοµία γελοιάζων, ὅπως μὴ γελοιοῦ γείνῃ; Xen. Mem. i. 2. 37 φιλάστοι ὅπως μὴ πλάκων τὰς βοῦς ποιήσῃς, Job 36:21 φιλάστερον μὴ πράξῃς ἄτοπα, Sir. 22:11 φιλάστερον ἵνα αὐτοὶ ἵνα μὴ κόπουν ἑχθῇς.

τῇ τῶν άθέσμων πλάνῃ συνασκόμενες.] For ἄθέσμων see n. on 27; for πλάνῃ note on 218, Jude v. 11; for συνασκόμενες Gal. 2:18 (of the weak compliance of Peter and Barnabas) and B. συνασκόμενη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει, Rom. 12:10 τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συνασκόμενοι (in a good sense).

ἐκπεπλήττερον τῶν ἱδίων σταυρίσω.] Cf. Gal. 5:4 τῶν χάριτος ἐκπεπλήττατε, see n. on James 1:11 where it has a different sense. σταυρίσω here only in N.T., found also in Isa. 3:4, Symm., in the sense of ‘support,’ and in Diod. i. 81, Plut. Mor. 76 ὁ of the apparent ‘stations’ of the planets. See n. on ἀστρωθείτω 214, 316, and σταυρίζω 112 above.

18. αὔξανε 51 ἐν χάριν.] In early Greek αὔξανε is only transitive, like αὔξω, and this use is found in 1 Cor. 3:6 Ἀπολλώνος ἐπότισεν, ἀλλὰ ὁ θεὸς γέγαζε, 2 Cor. 9:10 (God) αὔξησέ μα τὰ γεννήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν: the passive is also found in 2 Cor. 10:15 αὔξανομένης τῆς πίστεως, Col. 1:11 καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὔξανομενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 Pet. 2:5 ἐν αὐτῷ ἀὔξησθήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν, Mt. 13:28, Mk. 4:9. The more common use in the N.T. is the intransitive, of which we have exx. in Mt. 6:28, Lk. 1:30, 2:24, Joh. 3:30, Acts 6:7, 7:17, 12:24, 19:39, Eph. 4:15, and here, besides the form αὔξω in Eph. 3:7, Col. 2:10. So Aristotle combines the passive and the intransitive use in Anal. Post. i. 13. p. 78 b 5 et γὰρ τὸ is used of holy scripture in 2 Tim. 3:16, γραμμάτα by itself is often used of writings generally, as in Luke 16:7, Acts 28:2, and thinks that it is merely a matter of accident that we have not more examples of a like use of γραφή in the N.T.
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αὐξανόμενον ὁτι ςφαιρоειδές, αὐξάνει στελεχή κ.τ.λ. For the thought we may compare 1 Pet. 2:2 τὸ λογικόν ἀδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῇ εἰς σωτηρίαν and Eph. 4:15 αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα ὅσ ἦσεὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ. The writer here repeats the prayer of 1:2. It seems better to take χάριν absolutely, rather than to connect it with τοῦ Κυρίου, as in the latter case we should have the awkwardness of giving to the genitive a subjective force as regards χάριν, and an objective force as regards γνῶσις.

καὶ γνῶσιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] A repetition of 2:20 except that γνῶσιν here takes the place of ἐπιγνώσῃ there: cf. also 3:2. In the introductory verses of the Epistle we have seen reason to believe that, in spite of the absence of the article, Jesus our Lord is distinguished from God: here, as in 3:2, we naturally understand τοῦ Κυρίου of Jesus. For γνῶσις see above 1:8 and Appendix on ἐπιγνώσῃ.

αὐτῷ ἡ δύσα... αἰῶνος.] See 1 Pet. 5:11 and notes on Jude v. 25; also Joh. 6:51 ζήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 12:24 ὁ Χριστὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. The rare phrase ἡμέρα αἰῶνος is perhaps borrowed from Sir. 18:10 (where man’s life is compared with eternity) ὡς σταγνῶν οὗτος ἀπὸ βαλάσσης... οὐτως ὠλγα ἐτῇ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ αἰῶνος. It also agrees well with v. 8 above and with the expressions ἡμέρα κρίσεως and ἡμέρα Κυρίου in 3:7, 10; also with Heb. 1:5 σήμερον γεγένηται σε, where Alf. quotes Philo i. p. 554 σήμερον εἶστιν ὁ ἀπέραντος καὶ ἀδιεξίπτητος αἰῶν; see his whole note.
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ἐπίγνωσις.

Lightfoot commenting on Col. 19 (αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῇ τῇ ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος ἀνθρώπων ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέκουσι τυπομακρικῇ) says ‘the compound ἐπίγνωσις is an advance upon γνῶσις, denoting a larger and more thorough knowledge. So Chrysostom here, ἄγωνε, ἀλλὰ δεῖ τι καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν, cf. Justin M. Dial. 3, p. 221 λ ἡ παρέχουσα αὐτῶν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ τῶν θείων γνώσεως, ἂνειτα τῆς τούτων θείωτος καὶ δυσκολοτάτης ἐπίγνωσις. So too St. Paul himself contrasts γνώσεως, γνῶσις, with ἐπίγνωσεως, ἐπίγνωσις, as the partial with the complete in two passages, Rom. 121, 22 γνώτες τὸν Θεὸν οὗ ὁ λόγος ἐδόθης ... ἵνα ἐπιγνωσόμεθα τὸν Θεὸν ἐκείνον εἰς ἐπίγνωσις, 1 Cor. 1312 ... Hence also ἐπίγνωσις is used especially of the knowledge of God and of Christ, as being the perfection of knowledge.’ Again, on Philem. 6 ἢ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεως σου ἐνεργῆς γίνεται ἐπίγνωσις παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ. Lightfoot writes ‘ἐπίγνωσις, involving the complete appropriation of all truth and the unreserved acquiescence in God’s will, is the goal and crown of the believer’s course.’ ‘In all the epistles of the Roman captivity St. Paul’s prayer for his correspondents culminates in this word.’ [Possibly the word came into use to distinguish the living knowledge of the true believer from the spurious γνῶσις which had then begun to ravage the Church.]

Dr. Armitage Robinson has traced the history of the word ἐπίγνωσις with great care in his edition of the Ephesians (pp. 248–254). He shows that in classical writers ἐπιγνώσεως is chiefly used in the sense of ‘recognition’ and holds that ἐπὶ here expresses direction rather than addition. ‘There is no indication that it conveys the idea of a fuller and more perfect knowledge.’ It ‘directs attention to some particular point in regard to which knowledge is affirmed.’ In the LXX. ἐπιγνώσεως, except where it is used in the sense of recognize, seems not to differ from γνώσεως. The phrase ἐπιγνώσεως Θεοῦ occurs in Prov. 24, Hos. 41, 64, but γνώσεως Θεοῦ in Wisdom 213, 1422. In Hos. 46 ὁμομοίωσα (A.V. ‘are destroyed’) ὅ λαός μου ἵνα ἐχων γνῶσιν· ἐπὶ σὺ ἐπίγνωσιν ἐπιστεύει καί ἀναποθάνει σε. ‘In the Gospels and Acts it is found in the sense of “perceiving,” “discerning,” “recognizing” just as in classical authors’: where we have γνώσεως in Lk. 1022 (οὐδεὶς γνώσει
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τίς ἵπτων ὁ νῦς) we have ἀδειᾷ ἐπιγνώσκει τὼν νῦν in Mt. 11.27. He states the general result of his investigation in the words 'as a rule γνῶσις is used where knowledge in the abstract is spoken of, but ἐπί-

γνώσει where the special object of the knowledge is to be expressed.' I am disposed to accept this as a true distinction, but I think it leads on to the distinction made by Lightfoot, because the discernment of 'the special object,' the recognition of the general in the particular, implies a closer knowledge, or, if we like to call it so, a further step of knowledge, than the acceptance of an abstract principle.

We will now consider Dr. Robinson's explanation of the passages adduced in support of Bp. Lightfoot's view. Of Rom. 1.21, 22, 23, Dr. Robinson says 'the difference, if there be one, is that ἐπιγνώσις is more naturally used of knowledge of a particular point.' I must say, I think L's the more natural interpretation: γνώσις is used of the first vague knowledge of God possessed by the heathen, which is contrasted with that more developed knowledge, which might have been expected, if they had made right use of the initial knowledge, cf. (v. 28) σὺν δοκιμασίᾳ τῶν Θεοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιγνώσει, and (v. 32) τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιγνώσει, the latter implying a knowledge of the character and will of God, not merely of his existence and his power. So in 1 Cor. 13.12 ἀρτι γνώσεωι ἐκ μέρους, τότε δε ἐπιγνώσωμα καθὼς καὶ ἐπι-

gνώσθην: all that Dr. Robinson will allow is that ἐπιγνώσωμα is used as a 'full-sounding word to heighten the effect.' Dr. Robinson then examines the passage cited from Chrysostom and shows that the distinction alleged between γνῶσις and ἐπιγνώσις is scarcely borne out by the context.

I do not quite understand however why he attaches so little value to Dr. Hatch's quotation from Const. Apost. vii. 39 ο μελῶν κατηχεύθαι τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐκστρέψεως παῖδευσθοι πρὸ τοῦ βαπτίσαμετο τὴν περὶ τοῦ ἀγνίθου γνῶσις, τὴν περὶ νυοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐπίγνωσιν, τὴν περὶ τοῦ ἀγών πνεύματος πληροφορίαν. Even if we accept Dr. Robinson's description of the writer and of his reasons for choosing this particular form of expression ('The writer is in want of synonyms: he may even fancy that he is working up to a climax, and may have chosen ἐπιγνώσις as a word of fuller sound than γνώσις') I do not see that we are thereby driven to his conclusion that 'nothing is to be gained from verbiage of this kind for the strict definition of words.' The writing is at any rate intended for Greek readers, and whether the author is guilty of verbiage or not, he must have assumed that the words γνῶσις, ἐπιγνώσις, ἐπιγνώσωμα, and πληροφορία would be understood by his readers as forming a climax, which is really the sole point at issue. It does not, of course, follow that the climax would have been equally readily accepted in the time of the Apostles, nor is it conclusive as to the original force of ἐπί in the compound.

I should draw a similar conclusion from the fact that the phrase καὶ̃ ἐπιγνώσωμα is twice opposed to κατὰ περίφασιν in Clem. Alex. The word περίφασις is very rare, apparently occurring only in Polyb. x. 42. 8 where it is used of the commanding views to be obtained from a certain mountain in Thessaly (ἐσφυός κείμενον πρὸς τὰς τῶν προερημεύον̃̃)
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tόπων περιφάσεις), and in the Clementine passages referred to. We should infer that the phrase κατὰ περιφάσειν must mean ‘on a broad general view,’ and this seems to suit its use in Clem., though Dindorf reads κατὰ περιφάσειν in each case.1 The 1st passage is Str. i. p. 372, where speaking of Paul’s sermon at Athens Clement says διὰ τοῦ ἀγνώστου Θεοῦ τιμᾶται κατὰ περίφασιν πρός τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἐμμομογόνων Θεοὺς ἑξῆςτατο, κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν δὲ δεῖν δὲ νῦν παραλαβεῖν τε καὶ μαθεῖν. A little below, Clement, commenting on Acts 26:17–18 (‘to open their eyes, to turn them from darkness to light’), continues οὕτω σὺν οἷς ἀνοιγόμενοι τυφλῶν ὑφαλαμοὶ ἢ δὲ νῦν ἐπίγνωσις ἐστὶ τοῦ πατρός, ἢ τῆς περιφάσεως (MS. περιφάσεως) τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς κατάληψις, where the meaning seems to be ‘the opening eyes of the blind are the growing knowledge of the Father through the Son, the clear apprehension of that which was dimly and vaguely seen by the Greeks.’ The MS. reading περιφάσεως would be here unmeaning. The second passage is Str. vi. p. 759 δι’ αὐτὸν ἡμῶν σεβόμεθα µὴ κατὰ τοῦς Ἑλληνας, ὥς ἡλιονύτι τὸν αὐτοῦ ἡμῶν σεβόμενον Θεόν καὶ τῶν παρ’ Ἐλληνι δοκίμων, ἀλλ’ σὺ καὶ µὴ ἡµῖν ὁ σωστός τήν δὲ νῦν παράδοσιν μεμαθηκότων.

In considering the force of any compound, we may begin with the assumption that it must have originated in the wish to express some modification in the meaning of the simple word. But the first user of the compound, unless it is introduced as a definitely scientific term (and even that is not always a safeguard; it gets misused by scientific smatterers, and by the large class who like to give their words a scientific flavour), has very little control over its subsequent fortunes. If the prefix is a preposition, such as ἐπ’, it has itself a variety of shades of meaning, and the new compound is liable to have its meaning changed or coloured by the associations which the preposition carries with it in the mind of each speaker or hearer. We have an example of this in the word ἐπαγωγῆς (Jude 3) which is used to express ‘contend for,’ ‘lay stress upon,’ ‘contend further,’ and possibly ‘contend against.’ Then there is the constant tendency to wear down the special force of new words with a view to novelty of expression though there may be no novelty of thought. Thus, whatever may have been the original force of ἐπίγνωσις, it was likely in process of time to be simply regarded as a finer word for γνῶσις: and again, since the simple word contains latent in itself all that is brought out into distinctness in the compound, it is likely that even a careful speaker or writer will, for euphony or some other purpose, employ the simple word where the compound would have been more exact. Or again, the simple word may from changed circumstances gain a technical force which obscures or destroys the relation between it and the compound. This, I am inclined to think, was the case with the word γνῶσις in the latter half of the second century. It had gained so much in importance through its gnostic use, that Clement of Alexandria thought it more necessary

1 Klostermann in his edition of the Kerygma Petri keeps περιφάσειν.
to claim it as part of the Catholic heritage than to set up against it the special term ἐπίγνωσις.

And now to consider what uses of ἐπί may have contributed to the meaning of ἐπιγνώσις. The earliest meaning found in classical Greek is 'to recognize,' 'to discern.' Dr. Robinson says that there is here 'no indication of a fuller, more perfect, more advanced knowledge,' but that ἐπί 'seems to fix the verb on a definite object'; and further on he says that 'as a rule γνώσις is used where knowledge in the abstract is spoken of, but ἐπίγνωσις where the special object of knowledge is expressed' ; and he connects these compounds with others in which the preposition has the force of 'direction.' I agree that ἐπί has this defining force and that it frequently expresses direction, but I do not think that this is enough to explain either the classical or the Pauline use. To discern and to recognize imply a closeness and an intimacy of knowledge. I may be acquainted with a man, but I may fail to recognize him. I may know that I am approaching the harbour of Dover, but it is only gradually that I discern the different features of the scene. It seems to me that in many compounds ἐπί has this force of onward movement or pressure, as in ἐπακολουθεῖν, ἐπεξελθεῖν, ἐπιστρέφειν, ἐπιργασία 'encroachment upon,' ἐπιγάμια 'marrying into,' ἐπιλάσσειν 'to interchange,' 'to be closely associated'; and that we pass easily from this to the intensive force which we find in Menander's ἐπαβελτρώσας τὸν ποτ' ὄν' ἀβέλτερον 'to befool even more,' ἐπαγάλλω 'to grace still more,' ἐπανορθοῦ, ἐπανζών, ἐπενείνω, ἐπεξήγησις, ἐπιβεβαιώσεις. This intensive force seems also to derive support from another use of ἐπί where it connotes addition, repetition, something over and above, as in ἐπιδεινεῖω, ἐπίδορπος, ἐπαινέω, ἐπαινέτω, ἐπαινοωτάω, ἐπαροίημα, ἐπιμαθάων, ἐπιχορηγεῖ, ἐπισυγγράφω, ἐπιδιδάσκω (Eus. H.E. v. 16. 3), above all perhaps in ἐπιδίδωμι, which beginning with the notion of addition (giving a dowry in addition to a daughter) comes to mean liberality, and then simply growth or increase.

I think therefore that, while Dr. Robinson has rightly insisted on the specializing force of ἐπίγνωσις, Lightfoot is justified in claiming for it an intensive force.1

1 Dr. Abbott has supplied me with the following examples from Epictetus. Diss. i. 6. 42 πρὸς τὸν δότα ἀποτευτοιουμένω, μη' ἐπιγνώσκοτες τὸν ἐπερήμητα, i. 9. 11 ἐπιγνώστες τῇ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς συγγένεια, i. 29. 59 'Bring me Caesar without his trappings, and I am quite at my ease': ἦταν δὲ μετὰ τοῦτον ἔλθω ... τῇ ἄλλῃ ἐπιγήμνημα τὸν κύριον ἐστὶ δραμάτης; iv. 8. 20 τὰ κακά, ἐν ὑπὸ ἐποιῶν ἐπιγνώσκοσας τὸν φιλόσοφον, ἐν δὲ τοῖς συμβόλοις μή; In all these cases the meaning 'recognize' is suitable. In Fragm. Schw. 61 (Schenkl, p. 475) 'If you wish to be a just judge,' μηδενά τῶν δικαιομόνων καὶ δικαιολογοῦστων ἐπιγνώσκε ἄλλ' αὐτήν τὴν δίκην, the sense seems to be 'give heed to,' 'to note.'
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The characteristic mark of words belonging to the root φθι, of which these, along with φθιω and φθίω, are the most important, as distinguished from such words as κτείνω, καίνω, σφάττω, φονεύω, ἀλλυρι, θανατώ, etc., seems to be that the former group denote primarily not a sudden destruction owing to external violence, but a dissolution brought on by means of internal decay. This seems to be the only sense of φθινόθω and φθίσει, but φθίω is used also of violent death, as in Aesch. S. c. Theb. 970 πρὸς φίλον ἐπιθυμεῖ, καὶ φίλον ἐκτάνει, Od. iv. 741 μεμάζαν 'Οδυσσήδος φθίσαι γόνον, and so φθιμένωι and φθιτοῖ of the dead generally.

φθείρω is used of the wasting effect of a pestilence, as in Herod. viii. 116 and Thuc. iii. 12; but also of violent death as in Aesch. Pers. 283, Soph. Aj. 25; then of destruction or injury of any sort, as φθείρειν τὴν γῆν, τὸν σίτον, τὰ δένδρα; especially of moral injury, as in Xen. Mem. i. 5. 3 κακογυρισάτων ἐστι μὴ μόνον τὸν οἶκον ἄλλα καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν φθείρειν. Plato Legg. xii. 958 c πάλιν καὶ νόμον φθείρων ξηµιούσθαι; then of bribery, and seduction, of debasing the quality of anything, etc.

φθορά ‘rotteness’ has a similar range of meaning. Its original force is seen in Philo M. ii. p. 96 ἐπαπτίθηκε τὰ γενὶ τῶν ἔχθρων ἀπαντα, ἄν τῆς ἑαυτῆς δυνάμεως ἐὰς φθοροποιοῦν μεταβαλόντης, ὡς δυσφίδας τόντα ἀναπετλήθαι. Hence it is generally defined as ἡ πρὸς τὸ χρύον μεταβολή, and is frequently found in philosophic writings as the counterpart of γένεσις, it being assumed that all that has come into being is necessarily liable to pass out of being by dissolution. It is technically used for the deluges and conflagrations from which the world has suffered (Plato Tim. 22 c). It was especially used in later writers for the ‘crime of sense avenged by sense’ as combining both the moral and physical senses of the word. So φθορά of seduction, φθερεύω a seducer, ἄφθορος chaste. Some of the ascetic writers, e.g. Tatian, employ it generally of sexual union, see the quotation in Clem. Al. Str. iii. p. 547, συμφονία μὲν ὄν ἄρµαζε προσεχῆ, κοινωνία δὲ φθοράς λιτε τὴν ἐντενεῖν, on which Clement comments οὕτω γάρ, ὡς τινὲς ἐξηγησάντα, δεινὶ γνωσµὸν πρὸς ἄνδρα τὴν σαρκὸς πρὸς τὴν φθορὰν ἐπιπλοκὴν μηρούσθαι ὑποτυπώσῃν, τὴν γὰρ ἀντικροὺς διαβόλῳ προσαπτῶσα τὴν τοῦ γάμου εὐρέων ἀνθρώπων ἐπίνοιαν κατηγορεῖν καὶ κινδυνεύειν βλασφημεῖσθαι ὁ νομοθέτης.

In the LXX. φθείρω occurs in the sense ‘to kill’ in Wisd. 165-27 δῆγμαι δῆλων ἐφείροντο . . . καὶ πῦρ δῆλων ἐφείροντο: in the sense to ‘destroy’ or ‘devastate’ in Exod. 1015 (the swarm of locusts) ἐκάλυψε τὴν δῆμον τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐφθάρη ἡ γῆ, 2 Sam. 2020 Joab denies that he seeks to destroy a city, 1 Chron. 201 ἐφθείραν τὴν χώραν, Isa. 244 ἐφθάρη ἡ οἰκονύμη: to ‘injure,’ ‘march,’ ‘spoil’ in Lev. 1927 φθ. τὴν δῆμον τοῦ πόλεως ‘to mar the corners of the beard,’ Deut. 344 ‘natural force abducted,’ Jer. 139 φθ. τὴν ἱβρων Ἰουδα ‘mar the pride of Judah.’ In Gen. 611 ἐφθάρη ἡ γῆ is used in a moral sense of the corruption of the inhabitants of the earth.
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φθορά is used of destruction in Ps. 103:4 τὸν λυτρούμενον ἕκα ἀφόρας τὴν ζωήν σου, Micah 21:10 διενεμάτων φθορά, Isa. 24:1 φθορά φθαρόμεθα ή γῆ; of being worn out by toil. Exod. 18:18 φθορά καταφθάρησθῃ; of moral corruption in Wisdom 14:12 εύρεσιν εἰδώλων φθορά ζωῆς.

The strengthened forms διαφθορά and διαφθορά, which are more common in the LXX. than the simple words, appear to have the same variety of meaning.

In the N.T. φθείρω has usually a moral significance, as in the quotation from Menander in 1 Cor. 15:33 φθείρωμεν ήθη χρηστ' ὑμᾶς κακά, bad company is injurious to character. So 2 Cor. 11:9 φθείρομαι μὴ ποιεῖται, ὡς ὁ δίκαιος ἔγραψεν Εσώ ἐν τῇ πανορμίᾳ αὐτοῦ, φθαρή τὰ νοηματα ψυχῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλάτοις τῆς εἰς τῶν Χριστῶν λεστήσεσθαι your thoughts should be seduced from the simple faith in Christ, 2 Cor. 7:12 οὕτω οὐκ ἐνημερώσεσθαι, οὕτω ἐφθαδράσης, οὕτω ἐπιλειτυχήσεσθαι. In the last passage Alford understands it of outward injury ‘we ruined no man’; but if we compare Tit. 2:2 παρεχόμενον ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀφθορίαν and 1 Thess. 2:8, where the apostle protests that his teaching was not ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας or ἐν δόλῳ, not ἐν λόγῳ κολακίας οὕτω προφάσαι πλανεντείς, I think we shall prefer the rendering of A.V. and R.V., ‘we corrupted none,’ i.e. we did not seek to gain popularity by lowering the standard of the Gospel. In Eph. 4:25 τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν φθειρόμαν κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης, Dr. Armitage Robinson’s explanation is (p. 107) ‘you must strip off the old man, a miserable decaying thing, rotted with the old life of error: you must be made new in your spirit,’ and again (p. 109) ‘φθειρόμενον may simply mean is on the way to perish, as in 2 Cor. 4:10 εἷς καὶ οὐκ ἔχω ἡμῖν ἄνθρωπον διαφθείρεται αὐτῷ’ ἐκεῖνος ἡμῖν ἀνακαινισθῇ. But, again, it may refer to moral corruption as in 2 Cor. 11:2. This ‘second meaning is also in the Apostle’s mind, for he adds the words according to the lusts of deceit and he offers a second contrast in the new man which is created after God.’ ‘The original purity of newly created man was corrupted by means of a deceit which worked through the lusts.’ Cf. 2 Pet. 1:4 below. In Apoc. 19:1 κρίνων τὴν πόρνην τὴν μεγάλην ἦν εἰς ἐφθαρύνυ τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῇ, the phrase φθ. τ. γῆν is used of moral corruption, as in Gen. 6:11, cf. Apoc. 11:18. In 1 Cor. 3:16-o. ὡκ οἴδατε ὅτι γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν οὐκ; ἐὰς τῆς γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος ἐστιν, διαφθορά τὸν διαφθοράς θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγίου ἐστιν, the R.V. has ‘if any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy,’ but the sense of φθείρω is not the same in the two cases. The A.V. translates the former ‘defiles,’ and so Alford ‘mars.’ From a comparison with 1 Cor. 6:19 ὃ οἴδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν νόετ τὸν ἐν ὑμῖν ἄγιον πνεύματος ἐστὶν; we learn that the temple or shrine spoken of is the body, which is defiled but not destroyed by sin. It seems therefore to be another instance of playing upon the double meaning of the Greek word. Last comes the use of φθείρω in Jude v. 10 δὲ δὲ φυσικῶς ἐπιταται, ἐν τούτῳ φθείρωνται and the imitation in 2 Pet. 2:12 οὗτος δὲ ὡς ἄλογα Ἰάκω γεγεννημένα εἰς ἀλογίαν καὶ φθοράν, ἐν οἷς ἀγαθονοὺς βλασφημοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθορά ἀνῆκεν καὶ φθαροῦσαν. The former is translated in A.V. ‘in those they corrupt themselves,’ in R.V. ‘in those things are they destroyed’ (margin ‘corrupted’).
Here too I should be inclined to join the two meanings 'these things are their moral and physical ruin.' The latter is translated in A.V. 'made to be taken and destroyed;' 'shall utterly perish in their own corruption,' in R.V. 'born to be taken and destroyed;' 'shall in their destroying (mg. 'corruption') surely be destroyed.' As I have stated in the note, I think it means 'shall share the destruction of the brutes,' i.e. 'shall not attain to eternal life.'

φθορά is used of the physical corruption of the dead body in 1. Cor. 15 50, στείρεται εν φθορᾷ; cf. Col. 22 ἢ ἐστιν εἰς φθοράν 'meats are destined for decomposition'; Gal. 68 ὁ στείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἰατρόν ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν, ὁ δὲ στείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνων, where Lightfoot says 'the harvest is here made to depend on the nature of the ground into which it is cast. The field of the flesh yields, not full ears of corn, but only putrescent grains. The metaphor suggests that φθορά should be taken in its primary physical sense. At the same time, in its recognized secondary meaning as a moral term, it is directly opposed to life eternal.' Similarly in 2 Pet. 2 12 discussed above, φθορά is primarily physical.

There are two other instances of its use in 2 Pet. viz. 14 ἵνα γίνητε θείας κατωστείλει φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, which may be compared with Eph. 4 26 already discussed, τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρώπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης; and 2 Pet. 2 19 δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς, which reminds us of Rom. 8 21 καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κυρία ἐλευθερωθησάται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ. Here we find φθορά personified as a world-wide power to which both the material creation and man himself are subject. From Rom. 1 20 it appears that the creation was brought under the yoke of vanity, i.e. of instability and perishableness, not of its own choice, as man was, but owing to the will of another. In man, on the contrary, this bondage to corruption was brought about by his yielding himself up to the motions of his bodily appetites (2 Pet. 1 4, 215 19, Rom. 8 5 7 10 13), a bondage from which he can only escape by becoming partaker of the divine nature (2 Pet. 1 4, Rom. 813 2). It is called a bondage, because, unless we make strenuous resistance, we are carried away by a stream of tendency in the direction of evil. We naturally change for the worse, unless we set ourselves with all our might to change for the better. The choice before us is between regeneration and degeneration. We may compare Heb. 2 14 'that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death... and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.' This fear of death is included in the notion of φθορά, which might be described as our consciousness of the process of death already at work within us and around us. 'Passing away' is written upon all that we see.

Tears from the depth of some divine despair
Rise in the heart, and gather to the eyes,
In looking on the happy autumn-fields,
And thinking of the days that are no more.

N
We are conscious of decay in ourselves. The quick sensibilities and eager delights of youth are quickly over.

Summer ebbs: each day that follows
Is a reflux from on high,
Tending to the darksome hollows
Where the frosts of winter lie.

And the end is
My days are in the yellow leaf;
The flowers and fruits of love are gone;
The worm, the canker, and the grief
Are mine alone.

The lines of Tennyson and Wordsworth give a natural and beautiful expression to the *Weltorschmerz*, the sense of the *ματαιότης* of the surroundings of our earthly life. Byron combines with this the deeper, sadder sense of the intrusion of *φθορά* into his own inner life and his recognition of the ruin wrought thereby. Yet, as we learn from this very poem, it was out of this sad recognition of failure, that there sprang those few months of the glorious life of sacrifice, which he offered on the altar of Greek freedom.

Contrast now the utterance of one who had long escaped from *φθορά* and become partaker of the divine nature 'I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day.'

There are still some other offshoots of this family of words which have to be considered. *Διαφθείρω* and *διαφθορά* have in the N.T. much the same meaning as the corresponding simple words. Thus Lk. 12:35 ὅπου κλέπτης σῶκ ἦγγιζε οὕδε σῆς διαφθείρει 'corrupts,' 2 Cor. 4:16 εἰ καὶ ὁ ἐξω ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπου διαφθείρεται 'decays,' 'is being wasted away'; Apc. 8:10 τὸ τρίτον τῶν πλοίων διαφθάρσαν 'were destroyed'; Apc. 11:18 διαφθείρατο τοῖς διαφθειρότατος τῆς γῆς, where, I think, we must recognize a play on the double meaning of the word, 'to destroy them that corrupt the earth' (R.V. has 'destroy,' but cf. Apc. 19:2). The only case in which the word means simply moral corruption is 1 Tim. 6:9 ἀνθρώπων διαφθαρμένων τῶν τοιῶν. *Διαφθορά* occurs several times in Acts 13 in reference to the quotation *δείκνυς διαφθοράν*, denoting physical corruption.

Another derivative, *αἵθωρία* occurs in Tit. 2:7 παρεχόμενος ἐν τῇ δικαιοκρίνῃ αἵθωρίᾳ of moral incorruptness.

More important are the words *φθαρτός* and *ἀφθαρτός* which are often used in the N.T. to distinguish the perishable from the imperishable, e.g. Rom. 1:25 ἡλλαξαν τὴν δοξάν τοῦ ἀφθαρτοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ὄρυχωμα εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 1 Cor. 9:25 ἐκεῖνος μὲν οὖν ἐνα φθαρτόν στεφάνον λάβωσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀφθαρτον, ἰδ. 15:53. ἀδελφοί τῶν ἐνδείκνυται ἀφθαρσία, 1 Pet. 1:18 ὁ φθαρτός, ἀργυρός ἡ χρυσώ, ἀμαρτώθητε, ἰδ. 1:23 ἀναγεννημένοι οὖν ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς, ἀλλὰ ἀφθαρτόν. In Rom. 1:23 and 1 Th. 1:7 ἀφθαρτος is used of God, in 1 Pet. 1:4 of the κληρονομία. In 1 Pet. 3:4 the imperishable ornament of a meek and quiet spirit is opposed to the outward adorning of gold.

So ἀφθαρσία is used of the life to come in 1 Cor. 15:42 ἐγέρεται ἐν ἀφθαρ-
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σία, Rom. 27 [27] ἄφθαρσίαν ζητοῦν, 1 Cor. 1550 οὐδὲ ἡ φθορά τήν ἄφθαρσίαν κληρονομεῖ, 2 Tim. 110 καταργήσατος μὲν τὸν βάπτισαν, φωτίζατος δὲ ζωῆς κ. ἄφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. In Eph. 624 it is questioned how ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπώντων τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰ.Χ. ἐν ἄφθαρσίᾳ should be understood. See Robinson's n. He explains it to mean 'in that endless and unbroken life, in which love has triumphed over death and dissolution,' and shows that this is the only sense found in the Greek O.T. I agree however with the R.V. rendering 'uncorruptness.'

Dr. Robinson endeavours to show that the writers of the second century use these words exclusively in that which is certainly their ordinary meaning in biblical Greek. He allows however that Ignatius is fond of playing on the two meanings of φθείρω, as in Eph. 17 διὰ τοῦτο μύρον ἔλαβεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς δό κύριος, ἵνα πνεύμ ό ἡκκλησία ἄφθαρσίαν, where Lightfoot says the idea of incorruptibility must be prominent here, as the preceding φθορὰ requires, though the idea of immortality may not be absent. In § 16 we have the phrase οἱ οἰκοφθείρω γειτονίας Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν and ἠν πίστιν φθείρα, both alluding to 1 Cor. 316,17 οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστε... ἐς τῶν ναῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ φθείρει, φθείρει τοῦτον δὲ Θεός, combined with vi. 9, 10, 19.

Dr. Robinson himself allows (p. 219) that Origen's use of the word seems sometimes to combine the idea of the indissolubility of eternal life with the purity which Christians associated with that life.
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PARAPHRASE AND COMMENTS.

ADDRESS (v. 1).

Smyeon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, to those whose lot it has been to enjoy a faith not less privileged than our own, through the equal justice of our God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Συμεών Πέτρος.

The name Πέτρος is a translation of the Aramaic Kephás, as Christ of Messiah, Didymus of Thomas, Ζηλωτής of Ḥanáwán. The form Ζήλων is hellenized from Συμεών, like Paulus from Saulus; compare such forms as Díaścheli, Braham, Lias, etc. in the present day. The consistent Hellenic form of the double name, Simon Peter, is frequently found in the N.T.: the consistent Aramaic, Συμεών Κηφᾶς, is never found.1 I give below a table showing how often each name occurs.2

How are we to account for the unique use in our text? The writer of the epistle, whoever he may have been, was certainly not one who wrote without thinking. We may take it for granted, then, that the combination of the old Hebrew and the new Greek names was intentional; the intention being, as we may suppose, to remind his readers

---

1 It may be noted that Peter's brother bore the Greek name Ἄνδρας.
2 Κηφᾶς stands, with its interpretation, in John 14; it is also found alone four times in 1 Cor. and four times in 2 Cor. The only passage besides this in which Ζήλων is used by itself of Peter is St. James' speech in Acts 15. Ζήλων stands alone in Matt. once; in Mk. ch. i. four times (before the name Peter had been given), and once in 14+, where Jesus λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Ζήλων καθεύδεις; Luke has it ten times; John twice in ch. i., thrice in ch. xxii., where the penitent Apostle is thrice addressed as Ζήλων Ἰωάνου; in Acts we have four times 'Simon surnamed Peter.' Of Πέτρος standing alone we have twenty examples in Matt., eighteen in Mk., seventeen in Lk., sixteen in John, fifty-three in Acts, two in Gal., one in 1 Pet. Ζήλων Πέτρος is found three times in Matt. (twice with δὲ λέγουσαν); never in Mk., except where it is stated that Simon received the name Peter; seventeen times in John; never in Acts, except with the addition 'surnamed'; and nowhere else in the N.T. See Hort on 1 Pet. pp. 161 foll.
that, though Peter was known as 'the apostle of the circumcision,' still it had been granted to him to open the kingdom of heaven to Gentiles in the person of Cornelius, as well as to Jews on the day of Pentecost. From this we should infer that the epistle was addressed to a church made up of Jews and Gentiles, in which perhaps the Jews were inclined to exaggerate their interest in St. Peter, and to claim a superiority above the branches of the wild olive-tree, which were recipients of grace only through being grafted into the good olive-tree. Such an assumption seems to be rebuked in the words which follow. God has no favourites: He allotst to each their circumstances, and their opportunities of learning divine truth. This truth, however brought to them, carries with it equal privileges, if it is duly received in the heart.

τοῖς ίσοτύμων ἡμῖν λαχείῳν πίστιν.

You have been allotted by divine election (v. 10) a faith which carries with it privileges equal to our own. 'Not of yourselves, it is the gift of God' might be said of all who were born Christians, as opposed to those who belonged to heathen families; and it may (1 Cor. 7:1) be said also of the latter, in so far as they must have been brought by God's providence within the range of Christian influence. From v. 9 we gather that all here addressed had been baptized. Baptism had been granted to the Gentiles in the first instance, because their faith had been attested by the gift of the Holy Ghost: in St. Peter's words 'Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?' The view maintained by Spitta, that the Apostles themselves form the other member of the comparison, seems to be excluded by the story of Simon Magus (Acts 8:17).

Does the statement here made hold good in the present day? Have all Christians πίστιν ίσοτύμων? Was the faith of the doubting father ίσοτύμως with that of the Syro-Phænician woman? Is that of any ordinary Christian ίσοτύμως with the faith of an a Kempis, or a Luther, or a Baxter, or a Bishop Wilson? The word is no doubt intended as an encouragement; but perhaps also as a warning. The writer speaks to those of a like faith, not of a different faith. Where the faith is of the same quality, however different in quantity, it contains within it, like the grain of mustard seed, a promise of endless expansion.

ἐν δικαιωσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Choice does not mean favouritism. Israel was chosen to be a blessing to others, and at the same time to suffer more than any other people. God wills that all should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. This impartiality marked the determinate counsel of the Father no less than the redemptive work of the Son. Salvation is for all, not, as the degenerate Jews supposed, a peculiar privilege for a peculiar people.
Salutation (vv. 2-4).

Grace and peace be multiplied upon you through the knowledge of [God and of Jesus] our Lord, seeing that it is by means of the knowledge of Him who called us by His own glory and goodness, that His Divine power has granted us all that makes for life and godliness. Through this manifestation of the divine goodness there have been imparted to you [us] promises of highest blessing, in order that through them you may be made partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.

On a first reading this passage might seem to be a mere tangle of words. It is certainly very complicated both as regards persons and instruments, cause within cause, wheel within wheel, difference of names with identity of person and ideas. In the address we have already had the justice of God (ἐν δικαιοσύνη) named as the cause of the gift of faith to all the members of the Church in common, regardless of distinctions of Jew and Gentile. In v. 2 we have the knowledge of God and the Lord Jesus (ἐν ἐπιγνώσει) named as the means whereby grace and peace may be increased: a statement which is confirmed in v. 3 from the fact that it is through this knowledge (διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως) that we have received all that is needed for salvation. Not only are the divine names themselves, as it might seem, unnecessarily repeated, in vv. 1, 2, but we have also the periphrases τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, τοῦ καθότατος ἡμᾶς, θείας φύσεως in vv. 3, 4. The general idea of salvation appears as faith in v. 1, as grace and peace in v. 2, as life and godliness in v. 3, as participation in the divine nature in v. 4. The divine calling is said in v. 3 to have been effected by means of the attractive power of the glory and excellency of the Caller, Jesus Christ; and in v. 4 it is stated that this same glory and excellency hold out to the readers the highest hopes for the future, in order that by means of these hopes they may become participants of the divine nature.

Both these characteristics, complexity and the unnecessary repetition, or (as it may be more truly described) the affectionate dwelling upon the divine names, may be found in the salutations of other epistles, especially 1 Pet. 1:7, Ephes. 1:4, in both of which the name Jesus Christ occurs four times in the first three verses, and in Rom. 1:7.

1 See Introduction on the Text.
2 It certainly is so in the Vulgate: "Gratia vobis et pax adimpleatur in aequitate Dei et Christi Jesu, Domini nostri, quomodo omnia nobis divinae virtutis suae quae ad vitam et pietatem donata est per cognitionem eius qui vocavit nos propria gloria et virtute," where the gen. abs. seems to have been taken for a genitive of possession, and the verb has disappeared.
The knowledge of God is affirmed to be (1) that which makes possible their growth in grace and peace, (2) the means employed by the divine Power to bestow upon us all that is needed for life and godliness (v. 3).

How is it the ground of peace? To the primitive man there could be no peace. Experience compels every human being to believe in the existence of powers immensely superior to himself, which surround him on every side. No one who thinks can help feeling that both body and mind are liable to internal disease and to external violence of nature and of man. Life itself and all that makes life worth living hang on a thread. As to what may follow this life, nature speaks in vague, sometimes in menacing tones; but, that there is a survival of some sort is a matter of almost universal belief. If the power or powers above us are jealous, malevolent, tyrannical, like earthly rulers, only to be propitiated by bribes and flatteries and abject prostrations, as many nations have believed, what ground have men for hoping for any improvement after death? Even if there were in the nobler minds some dawning consciousness of ‘a stream of tendency which makes for righteousness,’ still this might of itself only intensify the gloom of the future. The higher our ideal, the more conscious we become of failure to attain to it. The more conscious we become of sin within us and around us, the more we feel that punishment awaits the sinner either here or hereafter. As civilization advances, the crude religious usages based upon such feelings gradually become incredible: some are felt to be horrible, some disgusting, some childish. Looking at the witch-doctors and inquisitors of every age, who can deny that there is justification for the verdict of the philosophic poet ‘tantum religio potuit suadere malorum’? But here idealistic breaks off from materialistic philosophy. The latter, while not objecting to religion as an aesthetic cult, altogether repudiates the belief in God as ruler and judge; the former looks upon God as the supreme ideal, the law and reason of the universe, the father of mankind, and bids men discard from their thought of Him and their worship of Him all that is unworthy of so great an Object, or injurious to the welfare of mankind. It is this latter view, raised to a far higher potency, which is given to us in the N.T., as the truth made manifest by Him who by His Incarnation and Resurrection abolished death and brought life and immortality to light. In Jesus, the perfect man, we believe that we have revealed to us the character and the nature of God. The powers of the universe are no longer a source of terror; they are ordained and controlled for our good by Him whom we have been taught to invoke as our Father. In Jesus, the perfect man, we believe that we behold also the pattern of what we and all men are to be hereafter. We believe that we are called upon even now to follow Him ourselves, and to behave to others as brothers capable of being renewed in His image, and undergoing in this life a training along

1 For the distinction between ἐνεργεῖα and ἐνεργεία see Appendix.
THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

with us for the higher life to come. Having this hope, we are never to despair of the world or of ourselves, but to fight manfully the good fight of faith against the evil passions which assault us all. We are not, with the Stoics, to deaden our sensibilities, to stunt and crush out our God-given faculties and feelings, but to raise and educate them for a fruition infinitely surpassing our present imaginations. No sympathy is wasted, no defeat is final. Knowing God's fatherly will towards us, we are at peace with Him and with His creation, animate and inanimate: knowing that He inhabits all time and all space, we are able to cast our care upon Him, not for this life only, but for the unknown possibilities of eternity.

Such were the hopes of St. Paul as made known to us in his writings and especially in his description of the ultimate destiny of mankind in the 15th chapter of the 1st epistle to the Corinthians. But can we speak as confidently now, now that nearly 2000 years have passed, and 'all things continue as they were'? Can we say that peace is now established upon earth, as a consequence of the revelation made in Christ? Can we speak of peace as a result of Christianity, in a century which, before it has run a twentieth part of its course, has seen Christians engaged in such wars as the South African and the Manchurian and in the even more terrible civil strife in Russia? a century in which a larger proportion of the wealth and manhood of Christendom are permanently employed for purposes of war than has ever been the case before? And these wars and rumours of wars, this threatening dissolution of mighty empires, are merely the outward symptoms of the internal discord, so powerfully described by St. James. Our wars and fightings arise from the lusts that war in our members, from the greediness with which each grasps at pleasure and riches for himself, regardless of duty and of the rights and interests of others. More devastating, more destructive than all the sacrifices of war, more utterly ruinous to character and honour and humanity, not to speak of religion and morality, is the mad thirst for pleasure and excitement, the reckless desire to make money by gambling 'trusts' and 'corners,' and the utter indifference to the ruin thereby caused to the bodies and souls of our fellow-men. 'Without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful'—in these words St. Paul sums up his terrible impeachment of the heathen world of his time: would that it could be said to be no longer applicable to the Christian world, especially to us, English and Americans, in this twentieth century!

There is of course another side to the picture of our time. Probably

1 Compare Hort, *The Way, the Truth, and the Life* (p. 96), of the heathen world before the birth of Christ, 'The depression or abnegation of life became the refuge of the wise and good. Life, they knew, made men vulnerable in proportion to its variety and intensity. Whether their desire was to ward off misery and maintain serenity, or to avoid wickedness and cherish virtue, in either case it was prudent not to feel overmuch, for so opportunity would be offered to the enemy. The individual soul and body together, or the individual soul fortified against its body as the nearest camp of the enemy, could maintain independence only by a lowering of life, a tempering of life with death.'
in no age of the world have there been so many, and such devoted efforts to resist evil. It is enough to recall the names of Mrs. Fry, Wilberforce, Shaftesbury, Maurice, Father Mathew, Dr. Barnardo, to mention but a few of our own countrymen, who have led the way in this noble crusade. Never before have Englishmen shown so much zeal for the conversion of the heathen at home and abroad. Never before in the history of the world has there been a more earnest effort both in England and abroad to understand and to apply the story of the life and teaching of our Lord. Unhappily even here disunion has sprung up. Community of aim in different bodies has not been found a strong enough bond to overcome the separating influences of diversity of order and method. The generous element of appreciative emulation has too often passed into a depreciative jealousy. Self-will on the part of individuals has too often failed in consideration for others, and hindered the common work of the Church, even where it has not led to actual schism.

Are we then to be satisfied with this? Was it this to which our Master looked forward when he said ‘Not peace but a sword’? Far different is His meaning. He spoke of the necessary effect of the new wine in old bottles, the introduction of an unexampled ideal of righteousness into a world peopled by men, good, bad, and indifferent. To some of each of these classes the new teaching would appeal at once as a true divine message, freed from the traditional form which had disguised its meaning and deadened its force before. To others, as to Saul the Pharisee, it seemed to be a denial or reversal of the old revelation, and roused their strongest opposition; the good being often for a while the enemy of the better. Others, who had contrived some sort of modus vivendi with the old religion, found the new intolerably exacting, and its preachers men not worthy to live. But the blood of the martyrs is seed: Saul the persecutor became Paul the apostle.

Our Lord’s words then are descriptive of a period of transition from a lower to a higher ideal. It would be a total misconception of their spirit, if we used them to make us contented with the world as we see it around us.

But how are we to explain the failure? Why is it that the knowledge of God has not been followed according to promise by universal peace? To this it may be answered in the first place, that the present is an era of transition, if ever there was one since the beginning of the world. Never was change more rapid and multifarious than during the last century. In science, in industry, in politics, in social life, in education, in religion, how different the end of the century from its beginning! One result has been that appeals to tradition and authority have far less effect than they used to have, and that classes or policies or views of life, which base their claims on these appeals, tend to fall into the background. The incredible so rapidly became credible, the impossible possible, the certain either uncertain or actually false, that men ceased to hold firmly to any belief, especially where it placed a restraint on their natural inclinations.

This fact however does not entirely remove the difficulty; for man,
being an imperfect creature on the way to become perfect, must, so far as he acts up to his vocation and destiny, be always in a state of transition, always rising from lower to higher. Thus in all ages the Christian is called upon to be a soldier, though the warfare is hotter at one time than another, and the struggle becomes more difficult and more complicated in proportion to the rapidity of the movement, and the consequent division in the ranks of the well-meaning and public-spirited. At such a time it behoves Christians to bear in mind the warning of Gamaliel ‘lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.’ May it not be that the present revolt against authority, in almost every sphere of thought and action, is a sign that we need an authority of a different and more penetrating kind; that the time is approaching of which Isaiah prophesied, when ‘thy children shall be all taught of God’; a time when the external law written on tables of stone should become a law written on the heart; when, in the words of Christ, men should no longer be called ‘father and rabbi, because one is your master and all ye are brethren’? May it not be a sign that ‘the good message’ consists in expansion rather than repression; that its true bearing is shown not so much in insisting on the restrictions of the past, as in fostering and guiding the aspirations of the future? To put it somewhat differently, should it not be equally our care to stimulate independence of thought and feeling, and to foster the spirit of reverence and humility? May we not hope to do this by the endeavour, on the part of each and all, to realize more our own immediate responsibility to God and to our fellow-men for the use we make both of our reason and our will? There is a danger, no doubt, in encouraging people to think and act for themselves, instead of simply following the traditions of preceding generations; but it is a danger which is inevitable at a certain point in the onward progress of humanity. There are many excellent men who are inclined to despair when they find the world turning with impatience from that which has been the breath of life to themselves. So Samuel was inclined to despair when the rule of the Judges was exchanged for that of the Davidic Kingdom; but ‘God fulfils Himself in many ways.’ After all it is He who is responsible for the conduct and guiding of the men He has made. After all He is the Great Teacher. If He sees that it is through what seems to us error and heresy, that man must rise to higher purpose and clearer light, who shall gainsay Him? Meanwhile our duty is to be true to the light He vouchsafes to us, and to trust Him absolutely for the future.

So far I have been speaking of Christianity as a theory of life, and have endeavoured to show that, as such, it has a natural tendency, far beyond all other theories, to bring about peace, internal and external. But our text speaks not of an abstract theory, but of intimate acquaintance with a Person (ἐν ἐπιγνώσει του Θεοῦ), an acquaintance closer even than that vouchsafed to Abraham and to Moses, to whom God is said to have spoken face to face, ‘as a man speaketh with a friend’; it speaks of the consciousness of a guiding and inspiring Presence ever ready to reveal itself in answer to believing prayer; and it connects
peace with grace, as the immediate consequence of that close communion with God. In his note on 1 Pet. 1:2 Hort has well explained the reason why grace should come first: 'standing at the head of the Christian form of blessing, it directs our thoughts to the heavenly source of blessing.' Before joy or peace or any other form of well-being, which formed the subject of ordinary good wishes, the Apostles first wished for their converts the smile and the merciful help of the Lord of heaven and earth.' Understood in its widest sense, 'grace' would thus mean the influence of the Holy Spirit in the heart. From this flows directly the peace of God which passes all understanding, that of which Isaiah said 'Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee,' that peace which is independent of outward troubles, and which underlies and rises victorious above all inward agitation.  

τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ ευσέβειαν (v. 3).

The divine power has granted to men all things necessary for life and godliness through the knowledge of Christ. If we met such words in a writing of the present day, we might be inclined to interpret them as follows: Human life manifests itself in feeling, thought, and action. Where these are not, life is arrested, if not extinguished. A full and healthy life shows itself in the health and vigour of these manifestations and in their harmonious action for the good of the individual and the community. We might think, What the writer here asserts is, that this energy of life is not inconsistent with piety, that is, with the constant reference to God as our ruler and guide; and further, that all that tends to develop life and piety is supplied by the knowledge of Christ. We might compare with this the words in 1 Tim. 4:8 ἡ εὐσέβεια πρὸς πάντα ὁφέλιμος ἐστιν, ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχουσα ζωῆς τῆς νόον καὶ τῆς μελλόντος, godliness is useful both for the life of earth and for the life of heaven. If however we look at the other passages in which ζωὴ occurs in the N.T., we shall find that, in the great majority of these, ζωὴ has a deeper and more mystical sense, particularly where it is mentioned in connexion with the sight or knowledge, or the teaching or word of Christ. Often this deeper sense is distinguished by the epithet αἰώνιος, as in Joh. 6:40 'This is the will of my Father, that every one that seeth the Son and believeth in him should have eternal life'; 6:53 'The words that I have spoken unto you, they are spirit and they are life'; 17:3 'This is life eternal that they should know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent'; Joh. 4:14, 7:53. Sometimes it is spoken of as 'the real life,' 1 Tim. 6:19 ἡ ἀμώμη ζωῆς; sometimes as the 'life of God,' Eph. 4:18 'being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them'; sometimes as the life of Christ, 2 Cor. 4:11 'that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal body,' Col. 3:8 'Our life is hid with Christ in God,' ib. v. 4 'Christ our life'; sometimes it is connected with the Spirit, Gal. 6:1 he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap

1 It may be noticed that grace and knowledge are again joined in 3:18.
eternal life,' Rom. 8: 'the mind of the Spirit is life and peace.' We do not possess this life by nature: we are said to enter into or inherit it, Mt. 108, 1917, 29; and again 'to pass from death into life,' 1 Joh. 3:14.

I know of no modern writer who has thrown such light upon the Christian mystery of Life, as Hort in his difficult, but profoundly interesting and instructive lectures on The Way, the Truth, and the Life. After speaking of life as seen in the heathen world, in the passage I have quoted above, he proceeds to speak of the higher life known to Israel.

'There is no life, worthy to be called life, entirely separate from joy and gladness. The lower life, when it exists in any strength, has in it at once a gladness of personal energy and a delight in the gladness of all living creatures, as it is displayed in their youth or comeliness. The higher life for Israel could never be wanting in this characteristic . . . 'With Thee,' says the Psalmist, 'is the fountain of life.' The perennial spring of water that leaps and flashes as though it were a living thing, breaking ceaselessly forth from a hidden source, is the best image of that higher life bestowed on him to whom God has unveiled his face. . . . The spontaneous uncultured joy of spring or of youth is short-lived. It dies out with the mere lapse of time . . . But he whose heart has learned to make answer to the Lord comes to find that the power of life and joy lives on with him, while outward things are taking their course of obstruction or decay. He has a life exempt from being dried up, for it flows not from himself or from any part of the perishable creation, but from an ever-living fountain in the heavens' (pp. 98, 99). 'Whatever life had anywhere been found and lost, whatever life had never been found, was given to man in Christ. It may be that this or that portion of the vast inheritance of life has never as yet been claimed, or has been but doubtfully claimed, because faith in Him has been too petty or wilful in its scope as well as too feeble in its energy. But in Christ life was given in its fulness nevertheless, and in that due subordination which alone secures that nothing be lost. This is the one character of the Gospel which takes precedence of all others: its many partial messages are unfoldings of its primary message of life. Salvation according to Scripture is nothing less than the preservation, restoration, or exaltation of life; while nothing that partakes or can partake of life is excluded from its scope; and as is the measure, grade, and perfection of life, such is the measure, grade, and perfection of salvation' (pp. 100, 101). 'The call to the disciples to receive Christ unreservedly as the Life, is a call which surely the Church of later days may well accept as addressed to itself . . . It is the glory of this life to include every life. We do not purify it but impoverish it by detracting from its fulness. It may be that all lower forms of life are rising and will rise yet more in rebellion against the life of Christ, as though it were only a cunningly devised death. Yet the Church will be false to herself and to the universality of the task committed to her, if she seeks to protect the life of Christ by striving to fence it round into a little province of peculiar emotion. There is indeed that in it which is known only to those who have most communed with the living Lord Himself, and been baptized by Him with a holy spirit and with fire. Yet it ceases to be His life when it ceases to go forth and save. It was ordained to purify and control every lower life; and therefore it must enter freely into them all. If we fear that it may lose itself in the vast and often lawless universe of life beneath, the danger is to be averted not by wilfully contracting it within a narrower field, but by seeking greater intensity of life in deeper and more submissive communion with the Head Himself in the heavens . . . If other lives will not be ruled by His life, they must presently seek to cast it out as an evil thing. Wherever they for a time prevail, they work perdition and destruction for a little hour, and then they perish, while yet proving that life cannot be slighted or repudiated with impunity. Wherever He prevails, He conquers that He may save . . . He destroyed nothing that had life: He lives, that all which once lived may live again in Him.
No ancient form of life can perish for ever, though it be long before mankind are fitted to receive it back at Christ's hands, renewed and transfigured by His resurrection... The Saviour Himself stands always nigh to transform by His presence the purifying water without into the wine of gladness within. So He manifests His glory to His disciples. So His disciples believe on Him and live' (pp. 146-149).

tou kaléstantos hýmas idia dézy kai ēreth (v. 3).

All that is needed for the life of which we have spoken, that life which is always united with submission to the divine will, is given to us in the knowledge of Christ, who is here described as the Caller of Men; and the mode of His calling is said to be the manifestation of His own character and nature. We may compare Joh. 1228 (also 31, 838), where the lifting up of Jesus, that is, the crucifixion, by which, more than by any other single act, He manifested His self-sacrificing love for man, is declared to be the magnet which should draw all men to Him—we love Him because He loved us—as well as the manifestation of His glory: see Joh. 1228 αληθινὴ ἡ ἡμέρα ἐν ἐνδοξάσθη ὁ νῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, and 1331, where the departure of Judas to complete the work of betrayal is followed by the saying νῦν ἐνδοξάσθη ὁ νῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐνδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ. The word 'glory' is often misunderstood. The glory of God is sometimes contrasted with the good of man. 'In majorem Dei gloriam' has served as a pretext for much cruelty and excused much superstition. Nothing can really be for the glory of God on earth which is not also for the good of man. The glory of God is the exhibition of His character by His own acts and works, and by the reflexion of His character in the life of His children. Where there is not this reflexion in the heart and life, lip-praise or ceremonial worship, whether gorgeous or slovenly, is of no avail; it is not the ὑβριστὰ καθαρά, 'the worship in spirit and in truth,' which God demands. The only acceptable praise is the outpouring of a heart which is filled with thankful delight in the presence of God and in the contemplation of His works.

di' δὲν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἐπαγγελματα δεδώρηται (v. 4).

As our trust in the kindness and goodwill of a friend extends far beyond any definite promise of assistance which he may have made; as it enables us to give the right interpretation of any reported message of his, and even to discriminate between true and false messages ascribed to him; so is it with our trust in God. It is not so much in consequence of this or that particular promise as it is through the manifestation of the Father's love in the person of His Son, that we are emboldened to hope for all future blessings. Therefore it is that in our prayers we encourage ourselves with the thought of what He has already done for man, no less than with the thought of His actual promises for the future. Such is the appeal in the words of the ancient hymn 'Qui Mariam absolvisti et latronem exaudisti, mihi quoque spem dedisti,' and in the suffrages of our Litany, 'By thy baptism, fasting, and temptation, by thine agony and bloody sweat, by
thy cross and passion, by thy glorious resurrection and ascension.' Hence too it was, that St. Paul in preaching to the Corinthians determined to know nothing among them but Jesus Christ and him crucified.' Deeds are more than words, and the life of glory and goodness has a wider scope, and penetrates more deeply even than the deeds regarded by themselves.

棰α διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνία φώσεως (v. 4).

The purpose and end of the divine action in our behalf is that we may become partakers of the divine nature by making full use of the promises imparted to us. We can see how even the spoken promises of Christ may lead to this result, if we reflect on such a text as Lk. 11:13: 'If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him.' For what else is it to have the Holy Spirit dwelling in us, but to be partakers in the divine nature, a participation promised in answer to prayer? So again, and still more strongly, in 1 Joh. 4:12-16: 'If we love one another, God abideth in us and His love is perfected in us. Herein we know that we abide in Him and He in us, because He has given us of His Spirit... Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him and He in God... God is love, and he that abideth in love abideth in God and God in him'; Joh. 17:22: 'The glory which thou gavest me I have given them that they may be one even as we are one; I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.' It may help us to the better understanding of these mysterious intimations, if we call to mind St. Paul's words in 2 Cor. 3:18: 'we all, reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit,' and Gal. 2:20: 'no longer I, but Christ liveth in me.'

We must carefully distinguish this idea of the possibility of our participation in the life and character of God, not only from presumptuous Stoic assertions as to man's equality with God, but also from the unguarded statements of Athanasius and other early Fathers, as to which see my note on Clem. Al. Str. vii. 53, P. 830.

ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς (v. 4).

Here we have the contrast between the state of nature and the state of grace. The opposite condition to the participation in the divine nature is said to be that from which the Christian has escaped, viz. the corruption which is in the world through lust. The word φθορᾶ means destruction, especially destruction proceeding from natural causes. Hence it comes to be used of moral corruption and decay, and sometimes seems to combine both meanings, see the Appendix on the word.

1 See Cic. N. D. ii. 153, where the life of the wise man is said to be par et similis deorum, nulla alia re nisi immortalitate, quae nihil ad bene vivendum pertinet, cedens caelestibus, and the passages quoted in my note.
Possibly our author may have shared the view of Theophilus, who speaks of immortality as the property of deity, in his treatise Ad Autol. ii. 27 'God made man neither mortal nor immortal allà δεκτικόν ἀμφοτέρων ἴνα, εἰ δέηται ητα τῆς ἀθανασίας τηρήσας τὴν ἐντολήν τού Θεοῦ, μισθὸν κομίσῃ τιν' αὐτοῦ τῆς ἀθανασίας καὶ γένηται θεὸς κ.τ.λ., and a little above οὕτω σοιν φύσει θητοῖς ἐγένετο οὕτω ἀθανασίος. εἰ γὰρ ἀθανάτον ἄπτ' ἀρχῆς πεποίηκε, θεὸν αὐτὸν πεποίηκε. This idea may have originated in the language used in 1 Tim. 6:16 ὁ μόνος ἐκὸν ἀθανασίαν, where immortality is spoken of as the peculiar property of God. So Theodoret Dial. iii. p. 145 (quoted by Suicer under ἀθανασία) has κυρίως ἀθανάτος ὁ Θεός. οὐκ οὐδὲ ἄθανατος, οὐ μετονομάζει... τοὺς δὲ ἀγγέλους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους αὐτὸς τῆς ἀθανασίας δεδώρηται. Compare the opposition in 1 Cor. 15:53 δει γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι φθαρσίαν, ἢ ν. 42 σπέρται ἐν φύσῃ, ἢ γείρεται ἐν φθαρσία. Wisdom ii. 23 f. ὁ Θεός έκτεινε τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν επ' ἀφθαρσία, καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἑδραίας ἑξόρευσε (ἕθεα κοινοὶ φόνεως) ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν φόνοι δὲ διαβόλου βάναυς εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἢ ν. 19 φθαρσία ἄγνης εἶναι τοιοῦ Θεοῦ. God Himself is called ἀφθαρσίος in Rom. 1:23, 1 Th. 1:7 and the Christian inheritance ἀφθαρσίς and ἀμαρτος in 1 Pet. 1:4.

This corruption which pervades the world is the result of ἐπιζυμία; compare Gal. 6:9 'he that soweth to his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption,' and 1 Joh. 2:17 'the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.' So St. Paul (Rom. 5:18) attributes 'the reign of death' in the world to the entrance of sin (i.e. as St. James says 115 of fully developed ἐπιζυμία) through one man, see Wisdom 2:23 quoted above; and, again, declares the same truth more generally in the phrase τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς βάναυς (Rom. 8:6).

EXHORTATION TO MAKE FULL USE OF THE GRACE IMPARTED (vv. 5-7).

Since the power of God has bestowed on us all that we need, you are especially bound to use every effort to add energy to your faith and knowledge to your energy. Energy and knowledge combined will enable you to practise self-denial and endurance. If with these are joined a pious submission to the divine Will, and warm affection to the brethren, it will gradually create within you that highest of all Christian graces, love to God manifesting itself in love to man and to the whole creation, animate and inanimate.

Does the writer mean this for a complete list of Christian virtues or graces? If so, why does he omit one of St. Paul's great trio, ἄξις, while he takes the remaining two, one for the foundation, and the other for the crown of his series? It is true he admits its effect ἐπιμονή as one link in the chain of graces, but this is far from covering all the
ground of the hope which is so prominent a feature in the first epistle of St. Peter, as well as in the epistles of St. Paul. Why does he leave out so many of the fruits of the Spirit named in Gal. 5:22, χαρά, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, χριστιανικός, ἀγαθωσύνη, πράσινη, as well as δικαιοσύνη and ἀλήθεια mentioned in Eph. 5:9? In 1 Pet. we find in addition to those mentioned in 2 Pet. viz. faith, and love, and ἐλπίς (1:22, 217, 38), δικαιοσύνη (2:20), a number of other graces, such as obedience (ὑπακοή 1:2, 214-22), joy (χαρὰ δικαιλητής καὶ διδασκαλίαν 1:23, 1:17, 5:8), holiness (ἁγίότης 1:1, 5, 9), fear (φόβος 1:7), meekness (πράσινη 3:1-12), compassion (εὐσπλαγχνία 38), humility (ταπεινώφορος 37), and especially ἀμείωσις, moderation (σωφροσύνη 47), hospitality (φιλοξενία 47); while on the other hand 1 Pet. omits four out of the list in 2 Pet., viz. ἀρετή, γνῶσις, ἐγκράτεια, εὐσέβεια. Again, we have seen evidence of an acquaintance with Greek philosophy in the latter writer: why does he omit three out of the four cardinal virtues, σωφροσύνη, ἀμείωσις, δικαιοσύνη? It may be said perhaps that ἀρετή and ἐνμομοσύνη cover the ground of ἀμείωσις, that ἐγκράτεια represents σωφροσύνη, however imperfectly, and that ἀρετή, since it fulfils the whole law, is more than δικαιοσύνη. Anyhow the list is peculiar, partly from its arbitrary selections and omissions, partly for the marked way in which the writer introduces his seven virtues, each apparently growing out of the preceding, and all rooted in faith. That seven was a mystical number with the Hebrews, we all know; and its influence in the mind of the writer of the fourth Gospel has been shown by Bishop Westcott in his Commentary (pp. 75 foll.) and by Dr. Abbott in his Johannine Grammar, pp. 301, 463, 464.

That the number eight, the 'Ogdoad' was also regarded as a mystical number by some of the early Christians, who liked to speak of the Lord's day as the eighth day, a day of holy activity, the beginning of a new world, surpassing the day of rest which followed on the creation of the old world, is shown by the following passages: Barn. 15. 8 oive ἐτὸς τὸν σαββάτῳ ἦμαι δεῦτε, ἄλλα δ' οὐσίας, εν δὲ καταπάτως τὰ πάντα, ἀφίξεπ ἡμέρας ὁγούς τοιώθο, δ' ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ κόσμου ἀφίξεπ. διά καὶ ἄμοιν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὕγιν ἐν ὑπομομοσύνῃ, ἐν γὰρ καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀδιάβροχος ἐν οὐρανοῦ, Justin M. Dial. 24, cf. Clem. Al. Str. v. pp. 712, 713, § 106, where he interprets of the Lord's day Plato's description of the vision of Er (Rep. x. p. 616), id. vi. p. 794, § 108 οἱ τοιοῦτοι καταπάτωσιν ἐν ὅρει ἀγίῳ θεοῦ ... οἱ μὲν κατακείμενες ἐν ἢβδομάδα ἀναπάτωσι, ἀναθερμαί δι' θείας ἐξομοιώσεις εἰς ὑγιασάσεις ἐνσώματα, ἀκορωστὸν τεωρίας εἰκονεῖ τῆς προσωπο- ἔχοντες, id. vi. pp. 811 f. § 140, Str. iv. p. 636, § 158 τῇ ἢβδομῇ ἡ ἀνάπτωσις ἐκκρείται, τῇ δὲ ὕγιν ὁμιγούν προσφέρει, id. § 159 εἰτε ἡ ἀπλανής χώρα ἔπληκτον τῷ νοητῷ κόσμῳ ὕγινα ἐγείρατο ... ἠμαρτάνει γενέσθαι τε καὶ ἀμαρτίας χρίναι λέγει τὸν γνωστικόν, id. p. 637, § 162 Βασιλείος δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἀμείωσις ὑπολαμβάνει ἐν ὕγινα βελέβην. That the writer of 2 Pet. regarded the ogdoad as a mystical number may perhaps be inferred from a comparison between 25, where he speaks of ὕγινον Νός, and Jude v. 14, where Enoch is described as the seventh from Adam.

1 Ezek. 44:26, 27.
PARAPHRASE AND COMMENTS

FURTHER REMARKS ON THE VALUE AND IMPORTANCE OF THESE VIRTUES (vv. 8–11).

If you have these virtues, and if they continue to flourish in you, you will be not idle or unfruitful as regards the knowledge of Christ. On the other hand their absence is necessarily attended by spiritual blindness or near-sightedness, and by forgetfulness of the grace received in baptism. Since there is this possibility of falling away, beware of losing the light; be more earnest to ensure and make good the calling and election of which your baptism was the sign. If you steadily practise the virtues I have named, you will walk in the light and be kept from stumbling here, and hereafter you will inherit the glory prepared for you in the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

It is remarkable how the writer recurs to his previous list of virtues with a thrice repeated ταῦτα in vv. 8, 9, 10 and οὕτως in v. 11. In 318 he exhorts his readers to grow (αὔξανετε) in grace (which may be regarded as summing up the list) and knowledge (γνῶσις equivalent to εἰμιγνώσκει here). Cf. Eph. 4:12, especially v. 15 ἀνθρεπόντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξάνετε εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὥστε ἐστίν ἡ κεφαλή, 1 Pet. 2:3 ὡς ἀρτιγενήτα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιστοθῆσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξησίης, 2 Th. 1:3 ὑπεραυξήσει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καὶ πλεονάζει ἡ ἀγάπη.

λήθην λαβῶν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ (v. 9).

So Moses warns the Israelites (Deut. 4:28) προσέχετε ὑμῖν, μὴ ἐπιλάβητε τὴν διαθήκην τοῦ Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐν διέθετο πρὸς ὑμᾶς: cf. 2 Kings 17:38.

βεβαιαίνει ὑμῶν τὴν κληρίναν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖται (v. 10).

So, in other epistles, the elect are urged to make their election sure: as in Eph. 4:1 παρακαλῶ σοῦ ὑμᾶς ἀξίως παραπανηγυσάσετε τῇ κληρίσει τῆς ἐκλήσεως, 1 Th. 6:12 ἀναλάβετε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἵνα δυνηθῆτε... ἄπαντα ἐργασάμενοι στῆναι, 1 Cor. 9:27 ὑποπιάζω μοι τὸ σῶμα... μήπως ἄλλοις κρίζας αὐτῶν ἀδόκιμοι γένωμαι, Col. 3:12 ἐνυήσασθε ὅπνε τού Θεοῦ σπλάγχνα οἰκτηρίων, 1 Th. 5:19 τὸν πνεῦμα μὴ σβήνωτε compared with 1 Pet. 5:17 ἐν φόβῳ τοῦ τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε compared with 1 Th 1:2 ἐκλεκτοῖς... κατὰ πρόγνωσιν, and 2 Pet. 3:17 φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἱδίου στηρειμονοῦ. The Vulgate adds 'per bona opera certam... faciatis,'

1 See above on ὑπηχοθείᾳ in v. 2, and below on αὔξανετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει, 3:18.
THE SECOND EPISODE OF ST. PETER

The Writer's Promise (vv. 12-15).

Therefore, that you may escape the dangers and inherit the blessings named, it will be my care1 continually to remind you of your duty in this respect (namely that you should make your calling sure in the manner I have pointed out), though I know well that you are familiar with the lesson, and are established in the truth which has been delivered to you [reading παραδοθέσῃ]. If we retain παρόση the sense will probably be 'in the truth, so far as it has been revealed to you,' but this seems hardly to suit such terms as εἰδότας καὶ ἐστηρυγμένος (v. 12) or the statement in v. 3 that 'the Divine power has bestowed on you all things needed for life'). I feel myself bound, so long as I am in this tent of the body, to stir you up by way of remembrance, since I know that I must shortly put it off, as our Lord Jesus Christ declared to me. And further I will do my best to enable you to make mention of these things, as you may find opportunity, after my departure.

In what respects does the promise in v. 15 differ from that in v. 13? The one refers to warnings uttered in the writer's life-time whether by word or by letter; the other to something which he would leave behind as a memorial for after time. We cannot, I think, suppose that the reference is merely to an epistle, whether the present or some other. It implies something more like a store-house of facts, on which they will be able to draw after his death, a store-house which would contain such narratives as that which follows immediately, being joined to what precedes by the particle γάρ. I am inclined to think therefore that the writer here alludes to the Gospel according to St. Mark.

The Grounds of our Belief (vv. 16-21).

When we preached to you the coming of the Lord in power, we relied upon no cunning fable, but on the witness of our own eyes, which had beheld His majesty. For He received from the Father honour and glory, when there came to Him from2 the excellent Glory such a voice as this: 'Behold My Son, My beloved, in Whom I am well pleased'; and it was this voice we heard proceeding from heaven, when we were with Him in the Holy Mount. We who witnessed the Transfiguration have had thereby confirmed to us the testimony of the prophets, to which you do well to give heed, as to a lamp shining in a dark place until the day break and the day-star arise in your hearts; recognizing this first of all, that no prophecy is a matter of

---

1 See Introduction on the Text.  
2 See Introduction on the Text.
private interpretation, for it was not by the will of man that prophecy came at any time, but men delivered the message of God under the influence of the Holy Spirit.

Dr. Chase takes the word παροιμία here of the First Coming; but it does not seem to bear this sense in any other passage of the N.T. I think therefore we must understand it here of the Second Coming, as in 3.17 below, unless there is strong reason on the other side. But it is the Second Coming that forms the pivot on which the whole epistle turns, the object of all its hopes and fears. It is this to which believers look forward as implied in the glorious promises of 14, and in the eternal kingdom of 11; this is the Day of God which scoffers deny (34), but which should continually be in the minds of all true disciples, urging them on to greater diligence in His service (31.12). The preaching of the coming of the Lord with power, referred to in 16, must surely be of the same nature as the preaching of St. Paul at Athens (Acts 1730f.), 'God now commandeth all men to repent, because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained, πίστιν παρακεύων τῶν, ἀναστήσας αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Christ's resurrection was the ordinary proof of His divine mission; it was the only one of which St. Paul himself could claim to be an eye-witness. But those who had seen the vision and heard the utterance on the Holy Mount could appeal to another experience, which had been to them personally a strong confirmation of the prophetic word, that told of the Coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven.

Some critics have found a difficulty in this allusion to the Transfiguration. We may perhaps doubt whether St. Peter would have mentioned it to the exclusion of the Resurrection, of which the Apostles were the appointed witnesses, and to which reference is so often made in 1 Pet. and in the speeches recorded in the Acts; but I see no reason why he should have hesitated to speak of it as making it easier to believe in the coming glory of Christ. The three evangelists who mention it all speak of it as affording to those who witnessed it a 'sight of the kingdom of God.' It was also an earnest of the glory which was to be hereafter revealed in the saints, just as the sealing of the Spirit is said by St. Paul to be the earnest of our inheritance. Doubtless the cross of Christ was the manifestation of an even higher spiritual glory, as it was felt to be by St. Paul and St. John; and the Resurrection was a fact of more universal importance; but we instinctively feel that perfection of beauty is the natural vesture of perfect goodness: things are not as they should be, till the inner and the outer glory are in complete accord. Of this great harmony the Transfiguration was truly felt by our author to be the foretaste and image. The appearance of the representatives of law and prophecy, to whom Jewish tradition ascribed an exemption from the common lot of mortality, by the side of the Central Figure, was a token of a resurrection glory to be imparted to all who believed on Him, of what the writer describes as 'new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.'
The prophets, like John the Baptist, were lamps shining in the darkness which preceded the coming of the Messiah. When the Sun of Righteousness arises, then their light wanes. But the dawning of the Gospel is not simultaneous over all the earth. One country, one soul, may be in darkness, though the light has come to others. The lamp of prophecy prepared the Jews to recognize the dawn of the Gospel. Hence the frequent reference to prophecy in the Gospels and the Acts. It was by means of prophecy that the Jews and proselytes were first introduced to the faith. Again the Old Testament served as a lamp to the early Church before the Gospels were in circulation. It was the text, to which the Apostles and first missionaries supplied the commentary.

Clement of Alexandria speaks of philosophy as being to the Greeks what the Law was to the Jews, the πασδαγωγός to bring them to Christ. More generally we may say that whatever there was of ennobling thought or higher aspiration in the art or poetry or religion of ancient Greece; whatever there was of reverence and stedfastness and trust and purity and patriotism in the family and national life of Rome; whatever there is still that makes for true manhood and womanhood in nations or individuals that have not the knowledge of God—all this is to be regarded as the divinely intended preparation for the full light of the Gospel, and for the appropriation of its message in the heart.

προφητεία ἰδίας ἐπιλύεις οὐ γίνεται (v. 20).

Prophecy is not restricted to the particular meaning assigned to it by a particular man or a particular generation. The special work of the prophet is to interpret the working of God to his own generation. But in doing this he is laying down the principles of God's action generally. Hence there may be many fulfilsments of one prophecy, or, to speak more exactly, many historical illustrations of some one principle of Providential Government. This is admirably illustrated in Dr. Arnold's Sermons on the Interpretation of Prophecy, from which the following quotations are taken:

'Prophecy is God's voice speaking to us respecting the issue in all time of that great struggle, which is the real interest of human life, the struggle between good and evil. Beset as we are by evil within us and without, it is the natural and earnest question of the human mind, what shall be the end thereof? And the answer is given by Prophecy, that it shall be well at last; that there shall be a time when good shall perfectly triumph. But the answer declares also that the struggle shall be long and hard; that there will be much to suffer before the victory is complete' (pp. 12, 13). 'As it is certain that no people on earth has ever either perfectly served the cause of good, or utterly opposed it, so it follows that no people can fully satisfy the mind of Prophecy.' (pp. 19, 20). 'Christ alone is the true and complete fulfilment of
Prophecy . . . but Christ's triumph is not for himself alone; we all may partake in it . . . If looking on the world as God looks on it, we feel keenly the struggle which is going on between good and evil, and fain would take our part in it to the death under Christ's banner; then along with all the anxieties and sufferings of the contest we have our portion besides in the hopes of the final issue' (pp. 26–28).

'History is especially Ιδας ἔρμος; that is to say, what the historian relates of Babylon is to be understood of Babylon only. But what Prophecy says of Babylon is κοινὴς ἐρμός; it does not relate exclusively, nor even principally, to the Babylon of History; but to certain spiritual evils of which Babylon was at one period the representative, and Rome at another, and of which other cities . . . may be the representatives now 1 . . . The Prophecies, as I believe, will go on continually meeting with a typical and imperfect fulfilment till the time of the end; when they will be fulfilled finally and completely in the destruction of the true prophetical Babylon, the World as opposed to the Church' (pp. 31, 32). '

'Most remarkable is it to see in the Prophecies and in the Psalms the confident anticipation of future triumph, which to the human writer individually was never verified. But by this very circumstance their incomplete and typical character is fully manifested: it is by this especially that they in a manner point to Christ; that they stretch out their hands to Him, imploring Him to fulfil what they could but faintly shadow, the whole condition of fallen and redeemed man: sufferings first, but afterwards glory, the serpent bruising man's heel, but man finally crushing the serpent's head' (pp. 40, 41).

'Every prophecy has, according to the very definition of the word, a double source: it has, if I may venture so to speak, two authors, the one human, the other divine.' 'And now we see why the language of the prophets, as applied to those nearer events which occupy the fore-front in their vision, is and must be hyperbolical. Beginning amidst all familiar objects and images, Israel, Jerusalem, the Law, the Temple, Babylon, Egypt, Edom, defeat and victory, captivity and deliverance, famine and plenty, desolation and prosperity, other and higher hopes possess their minds almost immediately, distinct in their greatness, undiscerned in their particular forms. Thus into the human framework there is infused a divine spirit, far too vast for that which contains it.' 'When St. Peter says that 'it was revealed to them that not unto themselves but unto us they did minister the things now reported unto us' he does not surely mean to deny that they ministered to their own generation also, although not exclusively nor in the highest degree. The prophets never cast themselves as it were into the midst of the ocean of futurity; their view reaches

---

1 Cf. Baxter's letter to the Lady Ann Lindsay in Silvester's Life, p. 225: 'An interpretation is called private, either as to the subject person, or as to the interpreter. You take the text to speak of the latter, when the context plainly sheweth you that it speaks of the former; the Apostle . . . giving this caution, that none of those scriptures that are spoken of Christ, the public Person, must be interpreted as spoken of David or other private Persons only . . . It is subjectively a private interpretation to restrain that scripture to David or other ordinary men, which the Holy Ghost intended of the Messiah.'
over the ocean, their hearts it may be are set on the shore beyond it, but their feet are on their own land, their eyes look upon the objects of their own land; there is the first occasion of their hopes, and there lie their duties. They are prophets in both senses of the term, preachers of righteousness to their own generation, as well as for-tellers of blessing for generations yet to come’ (pp. 63, 68, 69).\footnote{A valuable book on this subject is Riehm’s \textit{Messianic Prophecy} followed by a complete bibliography, of which an English translation was published in 1900 by Mesers. Clark.}

\textbf{ON FALSE TEACHERS (CH. II).}

\textbf{The False Teachers of the New Dispensation answer to the False Prophets of the Old (v. 1–3).}

\textit{Besides the true prophets spoken of above, there were also false prophets under the Old Dispensation; and their counterparts will be found in the false teachers of the New Dispensation. As the former denied the Lord who had redeemed them out of Egypt, giving them-selves up to the worship of strange gods, and bringing on themselves swift destruction; so will it be with the false teachers who deny their Redeemer. Their vicious life will be followed by many, who will thus bring discredit on the Way of Truth. A further characteristic of these false teachers is their covetousness, which will lead them to make profit of you by lying words. But the judgment declared by God’s dealings with their forerunners of old has long ago been passed upon them, and their doom is already impending.}

\textit{δι’ οὖς ἡ δόος τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημήσεται (v. 2).}

The immoral lives of some of the heretics and especially their misuse of the love-feasts cast suspicion on the practices and the worship of Christians generally. So in the present day the careless lives and the random talk of nominal Christians are still a great stumbling-block in the way of the spread of the Gospel both at home and abroad. Christianity not only sets up a higher standard than that of the world: it claims to enable men to live up to that standard. When those who profess Christianity fall below their profession, their failure is regarded as disproving the regenerative power of Christianity itself; just as, on the contrary, each man who truly follows in the steps of Christ, and does not neglect the gift that is in him, is a living witness of the truth of the Gospel.

The comparison of the course and manner of life to a road is common in Hebrew writers, as in Ps. \footnote{16 γνωσθεί Κύριος ὃδεν δικαίων, 119:271 ὃδὲν δικαιώματον σου συνετίων με... ὃδὲν δικαιός ἀπόστησεν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ...}
God spared not angels when they sinned, but hurled them down to Tartarus, where they were delivered to chains (or "pits") of darkness to be kept for the final judgment. Similarly He spared not the ancient world, but brought on its ungodly inhabitants the Flood, from which Noah only, the preacher of righteousness, and his family were saved. So the Cities of the Plain were overwhelmed with ashes and overturned by earthquake, as a sign of the divine displeasure and a warning of the fate reserved for the ungodly. On the other hand God saved righteous Lot, grieved and weared as he was with the profigate life of the rebellious. For day after day his righteous soul was vexed within him at their lawless deeds, as he dwelt among them keenly sensitive to the wickedness which met his ears and eyes at every turn. In this we have a proof that the Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of trial, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment, especially those who follow the polluting lusts of the flesh and make light of authority.

FURTHER DESCRIPTION OF THE LIBERTINES (vv. 10–16).

Presumptuous that they are, they shrink not from railing against the unseen powers; yet angels, though so far superior to the libertines in greatness and might, do not venture to bring against these powers a railing accusation. Vengeance however will come upon them in return for their insolent words in matters of which they have no

1 In the parallel passage of St. Jude the moral is rather Mercy does not exclude judgment: here it is Judgment does not exclude mercy.
knowledge: they will share the destruction of senseless animals, that are born creatures of instinct for capture and destruction. Thus they will receive wrong [as they deem it] in requital of their wrong-doing. Their idea of pleasure is to spend the day in wanton living. They are spots and blemishes in the Church [which should be without spot or wrinkle], reveling in their deceits when admitted to your love-feasts. Their eyes betray their adulterous thoughts, insatiates of sin, while they allure unstable souls, having a heart practised in contentiousness. Cursed ones! they have left the straight way and wandered from it, having followed the way of Balaam, who loved the wages of wrong-doing, and was rebuked for his own contumaciousness [breach of law, παρανόμα], when his ass [by a παρανόμα of another kind] spoke with human voice, resisting the infatuation of the prophet.

δόξας οὗ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες (v. 10).

See comments on Jude, pp. 74 foll.

Love-Feasts of the Early Christians.

The eminent French theologian, Prof. Batiffol, in a recent study, on the Agape (Études d'Histoire, vol. i. pp. 283–325), controverts what has hitherto been the prevalent opinion among Roman Catholic, no less than among Protestant writers on this subject. St. Jude has described the libertines of his time as ἐν ταῖς ἁγάταις ὑμῶν στυλάδες, σωματίων ἀφόβως ἀνειπότα πομάδοντες, on which à Lapide comments as follows: 'Primitus Christiani in symbolum caritatis, post Eucharistiam celebrabant convivia, communia tam pauperibus quam divitiis, sed frugalia et pia, ideoque eas vocabant Agapes, id est caritates, uti ostendi in 1 Cor. xi. 20. Sic gentiles sua habebant convivia, quae vocabant φάλαντα'; and Estius on 2 Pet. ii. 13: 'Vox ἁγάτη jam inde a tempore apostolorum usurpata fuit pro convivis Christianorum inter se; quod ad ea pauperes advocando caritatem in eos exercerent.' This explanation is supported by the Vulgate rendering of ἁγάτη both here (in conviviiis luxuriantiae) and in Jude (in epulis suis maeculae). Prof. Batiffol, on the contrary, affirms as his conclusion (p. 294), 'il n'est pas question d'agapes dans le Nouveau Testament.' The arguments adduced in favour of this startling conclusion are the following: St. Jude uses ἁγάτη twice, ἁγάτηροι twice, and ἡγάτημα once, in the ordinary sense. He uses the plurals δόξαι (v. 8) and ἀδικίναις (v. 13) for the singulares. We may therefore translate his words in v. 12 as follows: 'Ils sont des écumeurs dans votre amour... et ici le mot amour signifierait l'ensemble des fidèles, au milieu de qui ces impies sont des pierres de scandale.' In answer to this I may quote Blass (p. 84) on the use of abstract plurals:

1 Or 'of love,' if we read ἁγάτην for ὑμῶν.
They are used,’ he says, ‘to indicate the individual concrete manifestations of the abstract quality.’ What then are the ‘concrete manifestations’ of love, here implied by the context, ‘feasting with you in your ἀγάπη’? The ἀγάπη, it is evident, gives an opportunity of feasting, in a manner which causes scandal (εἰςλαβοντες). Who can help being reminded of the similar scene described in 1 Cor. xi. 18–34, where it is said that those who come together to partake of the Lord’s Supper destroy its character and call down judgment on themselves by drunkenness and greediness? The first Lord’s Supper united the Paschal meal with the participation in the sacramental Bread and Wine; and the allusions in 1 Cor. and in Jude lead us to conclude that the κλάσις ἄρτου in private houses, of which mention is made in the description of the life of the early Christians in Acts ii. 46, was a continuation of this custom, thus furnishing occasion for the possible growth of the abuses of which we read afterwards. Naturally the relative importance attached to either element, the sacrament or the common meal, would vary in different places.

Prof. Batiffol’s explanation of the κλάσις ἄρτου is as follows. He distinguishes the Pauline source in Acts 248, ἵσταν ὁ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαξῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ τῇ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς, from the Judaistic source in 249, καθ’ ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ὕμνῳ μισθισμένον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, κλωντες τε κατ’ οἶκον ἄρτον, μετελάμβανον τροφήν ἐν ἄγιλλιασει καὶ ἄμφιλησι καρδίας. The former ‘parle de la fraction du pain comme d’un acte purement religieux et la place sur le même rang que λαβηντία et la προσευχή,’ the latter ‘qui voit d’abord le culte du Temple, subordonne la fraction du pain, en la réduisant à une observance privée, en faisant une sorte de rappel intime du Christ, un acte journalier et domestique, qui ne se distingue plus de la fraction familier du pain à table que par l’acte de foi qui l’accompagne.’ Of the latter he asserts ‘l’intention judaïsante de son auteur se manifeste : mais l’agape s’évanouit.’ On the contrary, I should be much surprised if my readers fail to recognize the agape in both. His examination of the language of St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. seems to me equally inconclusive.

By the end of the second century the term agape was in regular use for the love-feasts; see quotations from Tertullian and Clemens Alexandrinus in Appendix C to my edition of Clem. Al. Strom. vii. For a more general account see Smith’s D. of Bible under ‘Lord’s Supper,’ Dict. of Christian Antiquities under ‘Agape,’ and the Encyclopaedias of Herzog and of Welzer and Welte.

ἐν ἀνθρώπων φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον (v. 16).

The writer takes literally the narrative in Num. 22 21–36, and emphasizes its miraculous character by thus paraphrasing the words in v. 28 ἠνοετον ὁ θεός τῷ στόμα τῆς ἀνων. Are we bound to accept his paraphrase? Our reasons for giving credit to the miraculous narratives of the N.T. are (1) because, speaking generally, we believe that we have in the N.T. a revelation of God and of His will towards
men, made through the medium of His Son, who in His perfect goodness, wisdom, and power, represents to men the perfection of His Father's glory. We see signs of His goodness and wisdom shining through all His words and works: we see the same goodness and wisdom, along with some traces of His supernatural power, manifested in what we call His miracles. Though to us now the evidence from miracles may seem of small importance, as compared with the living energy of Christ working in his disciples from the beginning up to the present day, yet we find no difficulty in a supernatural Person acting in what seems to us a supernatural way. As Bishop Butler has pointed out, we can see the value of such action in calling attention to the message of Christ, just as the forces of civilization now strike the chord of wonder in the minds of the uncivilized, and prepare them to receive religious teaching from the mouth of those whose superiority in knowledge has been so unmistakably attested. Moreover, without miracles could Christ have fully manifested what He was to the men of that generation? Above all, could He have brought immortality to light for the men of all time, unless He, the pattern Man, had risen from the dead?

(2) This a priori probability of miracles in the case of Jesus Christ is met by evidence of their actual occurrence proceeding from contemporary witnesses, who also record instances of miracles wrought by themselves or in their presence; and it is confirmed by the rapid growth of the Christian religion after the death of the Founder. With the miracles of the O.T. the case is very different. The reports are rarely contemporary. The chronicles in which they are imbedded are sometimes inconsistent and erroneous. Some accounts, such as that of the sun and moon standing still at Joshua's command, seem due to a misunderstanding of poetical hyperbole: others have little or no moral significance, as many of the miracles of Elisha, which are rather of the nature of Jewish Haggadoth than of sober history.'

That the story of which the text treats belongs to that class of O.T. miracles which are not to be taken literally appears, I think, from the narrative in the Book of Numbers itself.

Is it conceivable that, if a human voice had really proceeded from the mouth of the ass, Balaam could have shown no surprise, but just gone on talking with the ass, as though it had been one of his servants? The true interpretation is, I think, suggested by what we are told as to the idiosyncrasy of Balaam. He describes himself (24\textsuperscript{2}) as 'the man whose eye was closed, who hears the words of God, and sees the vision of the Almighty, falling down, and having his eyes open,' i.e. as one blind to outer things but capable of hearing and seeing things which cannot be seen or heard by others. When, therefore, we read that Balaam saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way with his sword drawn, we need not suppose the writer to mean that this was an objective appearance of an angel. Balaam himself did not see it at first. So it was with Saul on the way to Damascus. Those who were with him were conscious of a sudden light, but he alone heard the

\footnote{1 See Dr. J. H. Bernard's article on 'Miracles' in Hastings' \textit{D. of B.}.}
voice and saw the vision. Similarly we should naturally infer that the speech of the ass was only audible to the prophet's ears. It is evident that we are meant to conceive of Balaam as one who was wonderfully sensitive to spiritual influences. All nature was full of visions and voices to him. He was setting out on his journey with a conscience ill at ease, knowing that he was tempting God, but trying to quiet his scruples with the resolution that, in any case, he would only speak the words which God should put into his mouth. Nevertheless he is afraid that God may still interfere and prevent him from receiving the rewards on which his heart was set. It is this fear which makes him so irritable when the quiet beast, on which he had so long ridden, suddenly starts aside and leaves the road. It is his own conscience, as we should call it, i.e. it is the still small voice of God within, that speaks to him in the complaints of the ass. His passion answers at first in threats to kill it; but more and more he feels that it cannot be mere natural impulse which makes the animal turn away so obstinately. It is something more, something deeper: it is that awful power from which he is now seeking to escape, but which he was daring to make use of to serve his own avarice and ambition.

There is a strange depth of meaning in the appealing eye of an illtreated animal. It is an appeal, in the first place, to whatever remnant of pity and generosity may still survive in the heart of the man who illtreats it; but it is an appeal, in the second place, to the justice of the God who made them both, a cry of which we may be sure that it has entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. When animals are put to unnecessary suffering, either in the shambles or as beasts of burden, or in the interest of science or sport, or for any other reason, cases are sure to arise in which we may justly apply the words of our Epistle, and say of such poor tortured creatures that with their dying gaze, no less clearly than if they had spoken with man's voice, they forbade the madness of their torturers.

The belief in a kind of second sight in animals is widely spread, originating probably in their liability to sudden, unaccountable panics: compare Homer Od. xvi. 160 f., where Athené, invisible to Telemachus, is visible to Odysseus and the dogs, καὶ ἧδεν ὄνομα, κωνδηθμὸς ἡ ἀμώςδεις διὰ σταθμὸν φοβήσαν. Other examples are given in Tyler's Primitive Culture, vol. ii. p. 196. There are also famous stories of talking animals, as that of Xanthus, the horse of Achilles, who was made vocal by Hera, and predicted the coming fate of his master (Homer II. xix. 400 f.). See Wetstein's note on the text.

On the story of Balaam generally, see Dr. Lock's excellent sermon in Journal of Theological Studies for Jan. 1901, where he gives Maurice's view of Balaam's character in the words: 'He is the heathen seer to whom God really speaks, and who yet becomes a false prophet, because he has been ruined by the sense of his own strange power of insight, which he has tried to strengthen by charms and divinations, until the spiritual has become unreal to him, and material things have grown to be of the strongest attraction. So God strives to educate him by permitting him to feel the effects of his own self-will, by lifting him
out of himself by the sight of a righteous nation; yet he falls back, and his language is the utterance of a melancholy spirit, conscious that he is not true to himself. Dr. Lock points to Simon Magus as the New Testament counterpart of Balaam: 'He too is a soothsayer, he too one to whom they all gave heed from the least to the greatest, attracted by a higher religion, with a heart not right with God, but bent on avarice; if tradition may be trusted, falling back from the highest that he sees, and becoming a source of danger and corruption to true believers.' He notes that 'the venal character of the soothsayer and the rewards of divination offered to him find a parallel in the Greek μάρτυς, so often denounced in the Greek tragedians.' Speaking of the remonstrance of the ass, Dr. Lock says, 'With the exception of the speech of the serpent in Genesis, this is the only incident in the Bible in which an animal is made to speak, and this incident occurs when... we get a glimpse into Gentile religions. We are in the region of folk-lore that abounds in animal speech: we are in the region again of auguries and auspices, in which God was supposed to reveal His will through the cries or movements of animals, the animal being supposed to know what He tells to man... It is the prophet who is accustomed to go out to meet the bird-omens, εἰς συνάντησιν ρῶς οἰωνοίς (xxiv. 1.), to whom an ass speaks.'

Modern criticism distinguishes three main sources of the narrative: the Elohist, according to which Balaam is a selfish, grasping man, coveting the rewards of Balak, and only restrained from taking them by sordid fear of God, yet trying by every means to cajole God into changing his mind; the Jehovistic, in which Balaam acts up to his light with perfect consistency and is loyal to Jehovah; the Priestly, in which he is the Midianite soothsayer, the wicked counsellor who persuaded his people to seduce the Israelites by means of immoral rites: and some have been disposed to see in the existing narrative simply an amalgamation of the doings of three different persons. Whatever may have been the earlier forms of the story, its inspiration, that is its ethical and religious significance, is due to the writer who combined them together and gave them their present shape. The surpassing grandeur and interest of the story of Balaam consists just in its combination of these several elements, in its faithful picture of the downfall of the prophet or man of genius in its three stages, the first, that in which his only care is not to be disobedient to the heavenly vision, but simply to deliver the message entrusted to him; the second, that in which, as recognition and influence increase, he begins to think of himself as something apart from, and superior to, his message, and finally feels the message to be a hindrance in the way of his obtaining the position due to him; the third, that in which enthusiasm has passed into cynicism, the lost leader has come to hate the cause he once upheld, and is ready to use the vilest means to undermine and destroy it. The downfall is most

1 See Maurice, The Old Testament, Serm. XII.
2 See Lock, i.e. p. 163, and the article on 'Balaam' in Hastings' D. of B.; also J. A. Bewer on the 'Literary Problems of the Balaam Story' in the American Journal of Theology for 1905, pp. 238-262.
conspicuous in the case of the prophet, but the danger threatens all who are conscious of the dying away of youthful aspirations and enthusiasms under the pressure of the cares of this world; above all it is a warning to those—writers, speakers, politicians, philanthropists, whatever they may be—who claim to lead the way in promoting the onward progress of humanity.

**THE MISCHIEF CAUSED BY THE LIBERTINES (vv. 17–22).**

*Profession without performance, preaching without doing, are like wells with no water or mists dispersed by the wind. For such men the darkest future is reserved. With their empty boasts they allure through their lusts, by fleshly indulgences, those who were just escaping from the life of heathendom. Promising freedom to others, they are themselves slaves of corruption, since each man is enslaved to that by which he is overcome. For if, after having escaped from the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled in them and overcome by them, their last state has become worse than the first. It would have been better for them never to have been acquainted with the way of righteousness than, after having made acquaintance with it, to turn back from the holy command once delivered to them. In their case has been realized the truth of the proverb, 'A dog returns to its vomit, and a sow, after washing, to its wallowing in the mire.'*

**WARNINGS OF THE SPREAD OF UNBELIEF IN THE LAST DAYS, AND FINAL EXHORTATION (Ch. III).**

*PROPHETS AND APOSTLES HAVE WARNED US THAT THE DELAY IN THE LORD'S APPEARANCE WOULD LEAD MEN TO DENY HIS COMING ALTOGETHER (vv. 1–4).*

*This, my beloved, is my second letter to you. In this, as in the former, I call upon you honestly to reflect on the predictions of the holy prophets and on the command of the Lord and Saviour which was delivered to you by your missionaries, especially bearing in mind their warning that in the last days scoffers would come with their scoffing inquiries, following their own lusts, and saying 'Where is the promise of His coming? The fathers have fallen asleep, and all goes on as it was from the beginning of time.'*

*κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι (v. 3).*

*As in the days before the flood and before the destruction of Sodom, in spite of the warnings of Noah and Lot, Lk. 17:26–30.*
THE SECOND EPISODE OF ST. PETER

ποῦ δότω ἡ ἐπαγγέλλα τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; (v. 4).

The writer may have had in his mind such passages as Isa. 510 (Woe unto them that say) Let him make speed and hasten his work, that we may see it: and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come, that we may know it; Jer. 1715, Behold they say unto me Where is the word of the Lord? let it come now; Ezek. 1228, What is that proverb ye have in the land of Israel, saying, the days are prolonged, and every vision faieth? ib. 1227, Behold they of the house of Israel say The vision that he seeth is for many days to come, and he prophesieth of times that are far off. St. Jude ascribes the warning against scoffers not to prophets as here, but to the spoken words of the Apostles (v. 18 ἀληθῶν). What is the command of the Saviour here referred to? Perhaps such passages as Mt. 2442, Watch therefore, for ye know not on what day your Lord cometh, ib. 2518, which we find repeated in 1 Th. 52-10 by St. Paul, and in Apoc. 38.4.

THE SCOFFERS ANSWERED (vv. 5–10).

It is not true that the course of the world is unchanging. There was a time when heaven and earth were not. They were called into being by the Word of God: yet that very Word1 was the cause of their destruction by means of the water which had been used in forming them. As the old world was destroyed by water, so our present heaven and earth are by the same Word treasured up for fire, being reserved for that day when the ungodly shall be finally judged and punished. And there is one thing, my beloved, which I would especially ask you to remember, that measures of time have relation to man and not to God: one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. It is not from indifference that His coming is delayed, but from long-suffering patience, because He desires that all without exception should be brought to repent. Nevertheless, come it will, as a thief, that day of the Lord, in which the heavens shall pass away with a roaring sound and the stars shall be dissolved with glowing heat; and the earth and all the works thereof shall be burnt with fire [or 'nowhere found' or 'taken away'].

It is probably to this passage that the traditional idea of the Judgment Day is mainly due, 'that dreadful day,' as Scott describes it,

4 When shrivelling like a parched scroll
The flaming heavens together roll.'

The experience of partial destructions by means of flood or volcanic eruption naturally led men to look to these as the destined causes of a

1 Reading ἤ for ἤν.
universal destruction; and since the repetition of a flood was understood to be precluded by divine decree, it followed that the world must be doomed to perish by fire.

*Answer to the objection that no change is possible in the material universe.*

This objection is directed against the cosmical changes which were supposed to be the necessary accompaniments of the Day of the Lord. The scoffers, on the contrary, maintained the necessary stability of the earth, borne witness to in such scriptures as Ps. 119:90, 'Thou hast established the earth and it abideth'; Eccl. 1:4, 'One generation passeth away and another generation cometh, but the earth abideth for ever.' To this the writer replies that history affords a parallel case of the transformation of the earth in the Deluge. Few persons would now admit the fact of a universal deluge, but geology and astronomy afford much stronger proof of the transitory nature of the visible universe, which our Lord asserts in the words 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away,' and St. Paul in the words 'The things that we see are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal,' and again, in 1 Cor. 7:31, παράγει τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου; one great aim of Christianity being to enable us to resist the tyranny of the senses, and so to 'endure as seeing Him who is invisible,' looking back to the past and forward to the future.

The association therefore of great cosmical changes with the Coming of Christ is no reason for denying the latter. If He comes to establish on earth a reign of righteousness, peace, and happiness, as the writer seems to suggest, this involves, as St. Paul tells us, 'the deliverance of the Creation itself from the bondage of corruption into the glory of the liberty of the children of God.' We are not bound to take literally all the poetical imaginations with which this idea was embellished by prophets and seers of the Old and New Testaments, though they appear to be taken literally by our author. For instance, we are not bound to believe that the lion shall eat straw like the ox, that there shall be no more sun and no more sea, that the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the earth and all the works that are therein shall be burnt up. It is enough for us to know with St. John that 'though it is not yet manifested what we shall be, yet we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is,' and a fortiori to know that, while we are not informed as to the nature of our future environment, yet it must be such as to satisfy all the longings, and give scope for all the activities, of a perfected humanity. That the

1 As the authority of Scripture might thus be appealed to on either side of the question of the permanence of the present world-system, so was it with the authority of contemporary science. Philo (M. 2, p. 489) classifies opinions on this subject under three heads: (1) that of Aristotle who held that the universe was ἀγένητος καὶ ἀνάληθος; (2a) that of the Epicureans who held it to be γενητὸν καὶ φαινότων; (2b) that of the Stoics who held it to be φαινότων κατὰ διαδόχους, ἀπὸ δὲ as regards its essence; (3) that of Plato who held it to be γενητὸν καὶ φαινότων.
Kingdom of God is within us does not mean that it is not also to be increasingly without us: that the divine judgment is going on within and around us at every period in the world's history does not mean that there shall not be a greater and more penetrating judgment in which the thoughts of all hearts shall be revealed; but we may believe the latter without joining to it the belief in the great white throne and the literal opening of the books.

There are many things which suggest that the outlook on creation will be very different, when the natural is exchanged for the spiritual body. If we may argue from what we are told of our Lord after His resurrection, matter will no longer be an obstruction to our freedom of movement; and our intercourse with other rational beings will probably be more under our own control, less dominated by proximity in space than at present.¹ There seems also to be no reason why we should then be limited to the present channels of communication with the external world; why we may not have new senses which will give us an entirely new conception of material objects. Even now philosophers are telling us that what we call matter may have a constitution utterly unlike the prevalent conception of it, and that our knowledge of reality is so far illusory.² Thus a new outlook and new knowledge may bring us into connexion with what might fairly be called a new heaven and earth, looking at it merely from the material point of view.

The guesses of modern science present a curious contrast to those of the ancient naturalists. Pliny (N.H. ii. 107), after recounting the various sources of flame which surround us on every side, exclaims that 'it is the greatest of all wonders that the general conflagration is deferred for a single day.' The accepted theory of yesterday was, that cold, rather than heat, would be the cause of the destruction of life throughout the universe, since it is the tendency of all other forms of energy to change into the form called Heat, which itself gets lost by radiation into space. There being no known cause which could make up for this constant loss of heat from the sun, the radiating centre of our solar system, it was inferred that the life which depends upon heat must gradually disappear from our earth.³ To-day

¹ So Sir Oliver Lodge (Hibbert Journal for Jan. 1906, p. 322) says: 'Present human bodies bring us into contact with . . . people in whom per chance we take no interest. Hereafter our acquaintance may be limited to those with whom we are linked by ties of affinity or affection, the mode of communication being of a more sympathetic or telepathic character, and less physical, than now.'

² See Balfour's Address to the British Association, contained in Essays and Addresses, p. 406, ed. 3. 'The atom is now no more than the relatively vast theatre of operations in which minute monads perform their orderly evolutions; while the monads themselves are not regarded as units of matter, but as units of electricity, so that matter is not merely explained, but explained away.'

³ 'Follow out the theory to its obvious conclusion, and it becomes plain that the stars now visibly incandescent are those in mid-journey between the nebulae from which they sprang and the frozen darkness to which they are destined. At the temperature of interstellar space their constituent elements would be solid and inert; chemical and molecular movement would be alike impossible.'—Balfour, p. 396.
it seems likely that this hypothesis will have to be considerably modified in consequence of the recognition of the stores of energy in the chemical elements, and of the varieties of radiant energy to which attention has been prominently directed by the discovery of radium.

Moreover the history of scientific research supplies fresh evidence for the possible conflagration of our planet, in the incandescence and subsequent disappearance of what are known as temporary stars, such as the famous star observed by Tycho Brahe in 1572, whether these phenomena are caused by internal disturbance or by collision with other bodies travelling through space. And the possibility of such collision is confirmed by the fact that many of the stars are now known to be moving in different directions with enormous velocity, and that the earth is frequently visited by meteorites, which come from the unknown regions of space, and chance to cross its path.\(^1\)

It is remarkable that one of the supposed consequences of the Second Coming, which plays an important part in the Apocalypse and which had the greatest vogue in the first three centuries, viz. the Millennium, is not distinctly named by our author, though he quotes (or provides) the text on which the belief is founded by Barnabas, Justin, Irenæus, and other early writers.

**Answer to the objection that, as the promise of the Second Coming has not yet been fulfilled, there is no ground for expecting it in the future.**

The promise was made that ‘this generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled,’ or ‘till the Son of Man cometh in His Kingdom’; yet that first generation has passed away, and all is not fulfilled. Some have answered this objection by a reference to the secondary fulfilments of prophecy. Our Lord’s discourse, related in Matt. 24, was elicited by the double question, ‘When shall these things be’ (viz. the destruction of the temple, of which he had just spoken), ‘and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world.’ A portion, no doubt, of the prophecy was fulfilled in the siege and capture of Jerusalem by Titus, which was in a very true sense the συνέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος.

In Bishop Westcott’s words,\(^2\) ‘The Apostles looked for Christ, and Christ came most truly in the life-time of St. John. He founded His immovable kingdom. He gathered before Him, seated upon the throne of His glory, the nations of the earth, old and new, and passed sentence upon them. He judged in that shaking of earth and heaven most truly and most decisively the living and the dead. He established fresh foundations for society and a fresh standard of individual worth . . . The form of His Coming, His Coming to judgment, at that crisis, is a lesson for all time . . . We see in that Coming the type and promise

---

\(^1\) I have to thank Professors F. Fuller and G. D. Liveing for kindly revising the above paragraphs, in which I have ventured to touch on questions belonging to natural science.

\(^2\) *Historic Faith*, pp. 90 foll.
of other Comings through the long ages, till the earthly life of humanity is closed. We see in it the signs of a divine Presence which is laid open in the great crises of social movement. We see in it the assurance that the world is not left unvisited by Him Who died for it; and we take courage at the sight... The wider range of our vision enables us now to recognize these manifold Comings of Christ already accomplished, and we may be most thankful for such teachings of experience, but we do not rest in them... We believe that Christ has not yet revealed the fulness of His power or uttered the last voice of His judgment... This aspect of Christ's Coming, the trustful and reverent recognition of His manifestations in history and in society, is of the highest moment to us now... The reality and the meaning of these Comings are clear to faith, but like the Presence of Christ Himself they are hidden from the world. None but believers saw the Risen Christ during the forty days: none but believers see Christ in the great changes of human affairs. But beyond all these preliminary Comings there is a day when every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him. In that Coming, that Manifestation, that Presence, the first Coming on earth and the later Comings in history shall be shown in their full import. Then all things, our actions and ourselves, shall be seen as they are, seen by ourselves and seen by others. Then the whole course of life, the life of creation, of humanity, of men, will be laid open, and that vision will be a Judgment beyond controversy and beyond appeal.'

Our author takes a different line. Whether he wrote before, or after, the fall of Jerusalem, it is certain that this event was not marked by the literal fulfilment of Mt. 24, predicting that the sun and moon should withhold their light and that the stars should fall from heaven. In his view these are signs which prognosticate the Second Coming. Later interpreters have explained these words to mean 'danger to the fabric of human society'; 'the knowledge of God shall be obscured, the truth nigh put out, worldly wisdom darkened, the Church system abolished' (Alf.); but such allegorization was not to the taste of our author. He takes each feature of prophecy in its most literal sense; and for his answer to the objection of the scoffers, he has recourse to the declaration of the Psalmist that God is not bound by limitations of time, one day being with Him as a thousand years. It can hardly be said that this clears up the difficulty. The text was more appropriately used by the Jewish rabbis to explain the non-fulfilment of the threat 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die'; but even there it involved a playing upon words, a sort of paying in one coin of what was promised in another; whereas the essence of good faith is that a promise should be kept in the sense in which it was understood by both parties. There is however a distinction to be made between a threat of evil and a promise of good. To do more of good, or less of evil, than is promised, is no breach of the covenant, but the prerogative of a merciful and generous ruler; and so we continually find it to be in God's dealings declared to us in the O.T., as especially in the rebuke to the prophet Jonah for his peevish resentment when the threat to
Nineveh was not carried out. This is partly the ground taken up in what follows: it is for the good of man that the Day of Judgment has been deferred by the long-suffering of God, in order to extend to all the opportunity for repentance. It also provided a motive to stimulate the zeal of believers, whose part it was to hasten the day of God by spreading the Good News to all (v. 12). But this does not make the reference to the Divine timelessness inappropriate here. It is introduced as a corrective to the impatience and hastiness of men. When we complain, as we naturally do, of the slow pace of improvement, of the delay in the establishment of the reign of righteousness and peace, to which we are taught to look forward as the Kingdom of God, the time when His will shall be done, as in heaven, so in earth,—it may be well to call to mind the deliberateness of His work in bringing the material world to the state in which we now find it, and the long postponement of the discoveries which have so changed the aspect of our modern life. As these have been reserved for the present age in reward for the untiring work of preceding generations, so it may perhaps be with regard to moral and religious discoveries, which may reward the work of those who by diligent use of the talents committed to them, by patient doing of the Father’s will, so far as it has already been made known to them, above all by attentive listening to the whispers of the Spirit of Christ within them, may be enabled to hasten the coming of a new Day of God. To such men the Presence within is even now sufficient evidence of that Presence without, which they look forward to beholding ‘face to face’ when they have ‘crossed the bar.’ It is to the power of this Presence within that our author testifies, when he says that grace and peace are multiplied by the εἰώτης of the Lord, and of which Christ Himself affirms that ‘this is life eternal, to know thee and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.’

Another point which enters into the consideration of this question of the Second Coming is the fact that, in many respects, the day of death is, for each individual, equivalent to the day of God. It removes him out of the sphere of illusion into the sphere of reality. Judgment is passed upon the whole of the earthly life. The environment of the soul is altogether new. For the sensualist, the covetous, the overbearing, the selfish, the worldling, as well as for the believer, there is a new heaven and a new earth, perhaps the very opposite of what he had pictured to himself before. Thus each man is made to stand before the Judgment-seat of God, not because Christ has shown Himself in glory upon earth, but because we are one by one called to behold Him as our judge in the unseen world.

1 “How this last Coming of Christ to judgment shall be accomplished, which reveals the world to itself, we know not, and it is idle to speculate. But for each one of us death is its symbol. For each one of us that solemn coming, which seals our earthly work, is in a most real sense the vision of God, instantaneous and age-long, the vision, in His light, of ourselves.”—Westcott, p. 97.
Final Exhortation (vv. 11–18).

How Christians should be affected by the thought of the approaching Judgment (vv. 11–18).

Since, then, all that we see around us is thus in process of dissolution, what sort of persons should you show yourselves to be, as you look forward to and hasten the coming of the Day of God, in all holy and pious living—that great day which will bring about the dissolution of the heavens by fire, and the melting of the stars with glowing heat. But we, according to His promise, look forward to new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore, my beloved, as you look forward to these things, do your best that you may be found by Him spotless and unblemished in peace, and count that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation, as our beloved brother Paul also wrote to you, according to the wisdom given to him, as in all his epistles, where he touches on these matters. [I say this to you, for] I do not mean that his instructions are always suited to the unlearned and unstable, seeing that there are some things in them hard to be understood, which such men distort, as they do also the other scriptures, to their own destruction. Having been thus forewarned, do you, my beloved, stand on your guard, that you may not fall away from your own steadfastness through the evil example of the rebellious; but grow in grace and in knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To Him be glory both in this earthly life and in the day of eternity.

σπεύδωντας τὴν παροιμίαν (v. 12).

In the explanatory notes special mention was made of two ways of hastening the coming of the Day of God (1) by prayer, (2) by working for the fulfilment of one of its conditions, viz. the preaching of the Gospel through all the world. I think the last has sometimes been interpreted too narrowly by missionaries, who have been dispirited by apparent want of success and have endeavoured to console themselves with the thought that, independently of any practical result of their labours in the conversion of the heathen, the mere fact that the Gospel had been preached for the first time in a new country sufficed to bring nearer the fulfilment of prophecy. Ought we not however to understand the text in a wider and more spiritual sense? The coming of the Day of God in its fullest sense means the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven, first, like the leaven in the heart, and secondly, like the
mustard-seed in the world. Christians can hasten this coming by their holiness of life, by their growth in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, not as if these things were something apart from the Coming, but because they in themselves constitute the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Additional Note on κατὰ περίφασιν, pp. 172 f.

In his recent edition of Clement, Dr. Stählin follows Dindorf with some hesitation. He thinks περίφασις may mean ungenau Bezeichnung, ungenau Kennnisse. "Doch bin ich nicht sicher ob ich richtig entschieden habe. In meine Ausgabe (3. 59. 2) ist 'περίφασις L' Druckfehler statt 'περίφασιν L.' The word also occurs in Str. v. p. 730 (the heathen acknowledge a divine Creator and Governor) τὰ ἄκολουθα τοιαῦτα, εἰ μὴ κατηχήθειν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, οὐκ ἑπισταμένοι, ἄλλ' οὖν αὐτόν, δεικνύει τοπίου πέρον, τὸν θεόν, μόνον δὲ, ὡς ἡ θελλακτία εἰρήκαμεν, κατὰ περίφασιν (Eus. Pr. Ev. xiii. 691 A περίφασιν) ἑλπίζῃ. Here the phrase κατὰ περίφασιν ἑλπίζῃ, meaning 'a correct general view,' is opposed to δεικνύει τοπίου instead of to κατ' ἐνέργειαν, of which the former may be regarded as a synonym. Dr. Gifford in his note on the passage of Eusebius cites for the reading περίφασιν, Plut. Mor. 406 τὰ ἀνέπαιν τὴν Πολιεὶ τὸ θεὸν ποικιλὸν μὲν ἐνομίζων τοῖς αὐτῷ συνέταξεν, ἐνομίζων δὲ τοὺς ψαριάτας... ἐφεξῆς τὸν κριμαῖον ἦν καὶ γλώσσα καὶ περίφασις καὶ ἐλπίς, and again, id. 408 d, where the obscurities of the oracles are condemned, πλάττειν περίφασις καὶ γλώσσας ἐνέργειας. Here the word means simply a round-about, indirect way of speaking, such as βίς ἤρμασιν for Heracles. A better example is that from Origen (Sch. in Psalm. iv, Lomm. xi. 431) ἐὰν δὲ κατὰ περίφασιν λάβῃ τινὰ μνήμην ἀνθρώπου τού θεοῦ τού 'if one understands the phrase Son of Man simply as a circumlocution for man.' But surely this does not at all help us in the Clementine passages adduced above, which distinguish between different kinds, not of expression, but of knowledge. It is far more probable that the common phrase κατὰ περίφασιν took the place of the rare phrase κατὰ περίφασιν. If we are to change the latter, it would be better to read κατ' ἐνέργειαν 'on a surface view' as in Polybius xiv. 2. 9 ὡς Πύθαρξ κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἑκλοι τὸ παρακλήσιον (κο. ἀθήνης διήγησι), κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἄλλην ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα περὶ τὰς παρακλήσεις ἦν, xxxi. 5. 3 (Antiochus showed great courtesy to the Roman ambassadors) κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν καὶ περὶ οὐκ ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει τοιούτῳ.
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a. First example of its use.
b. Post-Aristotelian.
c. No other example in the N.T.
d. Not used in the LXX.
e. Special significance.

d. ἀγαλλιάσει: J. 24 ἄμωμοι ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει.

ἀγαπῶ: 2 P. 2. 15 μισθῶν ἀδίκια ἧγαπησαν, J. 1 τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἧγαπησάνως (al. ἧγαπησοῦν), pp. 17 foll.

e. ἀγάπη: 2 P. 1. 7 ἐν τῇ ϕιλαδελφίᾳ τῇ ἄγαπῇ ἐπιχορηγήσατε, 2. 18 ἄγαπην (MSS. ἰδιων) ἤγομεν μεν τῇ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, ἐπιρημάτων ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν (al. ἄγαπας), J. 2 ἄγαπη πληθυνθείη, ἵδι ἐαρτοῦ ἐν ἄγατῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε, ἵδι 12 ἐν ταῖς ἄγαπαις ἕμων σπιλαδεῖς, pp. x, cxxvi, 200.


ἀγάλενος: 2 P. 2. 4 ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάλενον ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφεύσατο, 2. 11 ἀγάλενοι οὐχ οὐκ ἔκαμεν μειζόνες ὅστε, J. 6 ἀγάλενοι τοῦ μὴ τηρήσασας τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἁρμὴν.

ἀγὼ ζω, στὸ ἄγασα.

ἄγιος: 2 P. 1. 18 ἐν τῇ ὁρᾷ τῷ ἄγιῳ, 1. 21 ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἄγιον φερόμενον ἤλλα ἄγιοι (al. ἀπὸ) Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, 2. 21 τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἄγιας ἐνταλήθη, 3. 2 ὑπὸ τῶν ἄγιων προφητῶν, 3. 11 ποταποὶ δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ἕμας ἐν ἄγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς, J. 14 ἐν ἄγιας μυρίσαν αὐτούς, 20 ἐν πνεύματι ἄγιοι προσέχομεν, ἵδι ἑπωκομομεντες ἑαυτοῖς τῇ ἀγαθότητι ἕμων πίστει, 8 (subst.) τῇ ἁπάξ παραδοθείσῃ τοὺς ἄγιοις πίστει.

ἀγωνιῶ: 2 P. 2. 12 ἐν ὅλης ἄγονοις ἑλπίσης ἡμῶν.

ἀγοραὶ: 2 P. 2. 1 τὸν ἄγορασαν αὐτοῖς διασπότον ἀρνοῦμεν.

ἀγρίος: J. 18 κύματα ἀγρία βαλάσουσα.

Ἁδὲ μὲν: J. 14 ἐξεβοσμον ἄπει Ἀδαμ Ἑλών.

δέλφος: 2 P. 1. 10 διὰ μᾶλλον, ἀδελφός, στουδάσατε, 3. 15 ὁ ἄγαπητὸς ἕμων ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος, J. 1 Ἰσοῦς ἀδελφός Ἰακώβου.

δικία: 2 P. 2. 13 δικοῦμενοι (al. κοιμοῦμενοι) μισθῶν ἀδίκιας, p. lxvi.

δικία: 2 P. 2. 13 and 15 μισθῶν ἀδίκιας.

δικός: 2 P. 2. 9 δικόνως εἰς ἑμᾶς κρίσεις κολαζομένους τηρεῖν.

διέ: 2 P. 1. 13 διε ἕμας ὑπομομυθένων.
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b. c. ἀθεομοσ: 2 P. 2. 7 τῆς τῶν ἀθέων ἀναστροφῆς, 3. 17 τῆς τῶν ἀθέων πλάνης.

b. δ' ἀθετω: J. 8 κυρίωτα ἀθετοῦσι.

A ἀγνώστως ἀγνώστως J. 5 λαῶν ἐκ γῆς Ἀλβίατου σώφρου.

ἀδίος: J. 6 δεσμοίς δίδοις ὑπὸ ὄζων τατηρηκέναι.

ἀρέσις: 2 P. 2. 1 παρεισάξων τοις ἀρεσίσ τις ἐπιθυμείας.

ἀλγχύνη: J. 13 κύματα ἀγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφράζων τὰς ἐναντίων αἰχμάς.


ἀλλωνιος: 2 P. 1. 11 τῆς αἰῶνοι βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου, J. 7 πυρὸς αἰῶνοι δίκην, 21 εἰς τοῦρ αἰῶνοι.

ἀκαρπος: 2 P. 1. 8 αὐτῶν καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν του κυρίου ἠμῶν . . . ἐπίγυσιν, J. 12 δέδοσα φθονοφρίαν ἀκαρπία.

b. c. e. ἄκατανυστος: 2 P. 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄκαταπάστος ἄμαρτια (ἄκαταπάστους), p. cexvii.

ἀκοφί: 2 P. 2. 8 βλέπωντα καὶ αἰθός δίκαιος.

ἀκοφιω: 2 P. 2. 18 ταύτην τὴν φύσιν ἡμεῖς ἱκουσάμενος.

ἀληθεία: 2 P. 2. 12 ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ ἐστηριγμένον, 2. 2 ἢ δὲν ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται.

ἀλήθειας: 2 P. 2. 22 τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας παρομαγία.

ἀλλά: 2 P. 1. 18 οὐ σκοτωμάνους μίνως ἀξιολογήσασται, ἐγνωρίσασμεν, ἀλλ' ἐπετάται γεγονόντες, οὐ δὲν ἔδοξαν αὐτοὺς ἐν ἐν κρίνος ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ του ἁγίου, 2. 4 οὖν ἐφεύσατο, ἀλλὰ παρέδωκαν, ἀρχαῖον κόσμον οὐκ ἐφεύσατο, ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἐφεύσατο, 3. 9 οὐ βραδύνει Κυρίως, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ, ἢ, μὴ βουλήμενος τινας ἀπολέσημα, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετανοεῖσθαι, Ἰ. 6 ἄγγελους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσησάντας . . . ἀλλὰ ἀποτάντας, 9 οὖν ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκώς βλασφημῆς ἅπας ἐπεν, pp. li, ci.


b. c. ἀλωσις: 2 P. 2. 13 γεγονημένα εἰς ἄλογον καὶ φθοράν.

c. d. ἀμβεθης: 2 P. 3. 18 οἱ ἀμοῖνος καὶ ἀμαρτητοὺς.

ἀμάρτημα: 2 P. 2. 4 ἄγγελον ἀμαρτησάτως οὐκ ἐφεύσατο.

ἀμάρτια: 2 P. 1. 9 λήμαν λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν (ἀμαρτητῆμάτων), 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀκαταπάστος ἀμαρτια.

ἀμαρτωλοι ἀσεβείας.

ἀμελέω: 2 P. 2. 13 οὐκ ἀμελήσω δει ἡμᾶς ἀπομίμησείκες (ἀμελήσω).

ἀμην: 2 P. 3. 18 εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, ἰμην (ομ. αἰῶνας) J. 25 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας [τῶν αἰῶνων], ἰμην.

c. d. ἀμηντος: 2 P. 3. 14 ἀσπελεοι καὶ ἀμαρτητοῦς.

c. ἀμωμοσ: 2 P. 24 ἀμωμοῦς ἐν ἀγαλλίασι.

ἀνάγκη: J. 3 ἀνάγκην ἀναγάλυνα.

ἀναστρέφω: 2 P. 2. 18 τοὺς ἐν πλάγῃ ἀναστρεφομένους.

ἀναστρεφόη: 2 P. 2. 7 τῆς τῶν ἀθέων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς, 3. 11 ποταποῦ δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ἡμᾶς ἐν ἄγιοις ἀναστροφαῖς.
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Δατέλω: 2 P. 1. 19 ἄως ὁ φωσφόρος ἀντελθὲ σὰς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.

Ἀνεμος: J. 12 νεφέλαια ὅποι ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι.

Ἄνθρωπος: 2 P. 2. 21 γὰρ θελήματε ἀνθρώπον ἡμέρα προφητεία, ἢδ.

Ἄγιοι (al. ἁγίοι). Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι. 2. 16 ὑποζύγιον ἄρως ἐν ἄνθρωπῳ

Φωνὴ βηδεξίμενον, 3. 7 εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἄνθρωπων, J. 14

Ταυτευθεῖνας τινες ἄνθρωποι.

Άνομος: 2 P. 2. 8 ψυχὴν δικαίων ἀνόμων ἄριστο γιαζάμενεν.

Ἄντιλογία: J. 11 τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀπόλυοντο.

Ἀνυδρος: 2 P. 2. 17 οὐτοὶ εἰςων πηγαὶ ἀνδροὶ, J. 12 νεφέλαι ἄνθρωποι.

Ἄπαξ: J. 3 τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθεῖται τοῖς ἄγιοι πιστεῖ, ἀ Kύριος ἄπαξ λαδόν

Σωτῆρας (readings appearing, see pp. cxxiii f.).

Ἄπαχ: 2 P. 2. 12 ἀντράφωτες εἰς ταῖς αὐτῶν (al. ἀγάπας, see pp. excvi f).

Ἄπερχομαι: J. 7 ἀπείροναι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας.

Ἄπος: 2 P. 1. 17 ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης (al. ὡς), I. 21 ἑλάθησαν ἀπὸ (al. ἃγιοι) Ἰεωποῦ ἀνθρώποι,

3. 4 ἂφ’ ἡ γὰρ ταῖς ἐκομισθῆσαν, ἢδ. ἄπ’ ἄρχης κτίσεως, p. lxv, J. 14 ἐξαίρομαι ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ, 23 τοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἀστειμέον ἐκτός.


c. d. άποδοθεις: 2 P. 1. 14 ταχύν ἄτων ἡ ἀποθεωσι τοῦ σκηνόματος

μου (only found elsewhere in Ὁ. T. in 1 P. 3. 21).

Ἦποθνῃς: J. 12 δένδρα δίς ἀποθεϊόντα.

Ἄποκαλύψεις: pp. lxiv f.

Ἄπολείπω: J. 6 ἀπολείποντας τὸν ἱδίον οἰκητηρίων.

Ἄπολλος: 2 P. 3. 6 ὁ κόσμος ὁ διακατέθεει ἀπώλετο, 3. 9 μὴ

βουλόμενος τίνας ἀπολείπονται, J. 5 τῶν μὴ πιστεύοντας ἀπώλεσαν, 11 τῇ

ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀπόλυοντο.

Ἄποστολος: 2 P. 1. 1 δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἡ. X., 3. 2 μηνύθηκαν τῆς

τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἵπτολης, J. 17 μηνύθητε τῶν ἰημάτων τῶν

προεκπεμένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου.

c. d. ἂποφυγόντω: p. gen. 2 P. 1. 4 ἀποφυγόντως τῆς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθοράς, c. acc.

2. 18 ἀποφυγόντως τῶν ἐλγίων ἀποφεύγετοντας τοὺς ἐν ἐπίθετον ἀναστρεφο-

μένον, 2. 20 ἀποφεύγοντας τὰ μάσσατα τοῦ κόσμου.

c. άπταις: J. 24 πυλαῖς ὑμᾶς ἀπαίτοντος.

ἄπωλεία: 2 P. 2. 1 ἀποτελοῦσα ἀπωλείας, ἢδ. ταχυν ἀπώλεσαν, 2. 8 ἡ

ἀπωλεία αὐτῶν οὔ νυστάτης, 3. 7 εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν

ἄρωπων, 3. 16 ἂπὸ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτῶν ἀπώλεσαν.

c. ἄργος: 2 P. 2. 2 οἶς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαι δοὺς ἄργει.

ἄργος: 2 P. 1. 8 οὐκ ἄργους οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθιστήσαν.

ἄρετή: 2 P. 1. 8 τοῦ καλέσαντος ἀρέτης ἢδια δόξη καὶ ἄρετή (al. ἀδιὰ δόξης

κ. ἀρετῆς), 1. 5 ἐπιυπηργήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐν ἐδὲ τῇ

ἀρετῇ τῆς γνώσεως.

ἄρνομαι: 2 P. 2. 1 τῶν ἀγορόναται αὐτῶν δεσπότην ἀρνοῦμεν, J. 14

τῶν μόνων δεσποτῆν ἀρνοῦμεν, p. 72.

ἄρπαξ: J. 28 οὐδὲ ἀπέφερε ἐν πυρὸς ἀρπάξαντες.

ἄρχαγγελος: J. 9 Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελον.

ἀρχαῖος: 2 P. 2. 5 ἀρχαῖον κόσμον οὐκ ἐφείσατο.

ἀρχή: 2 P. 3. 4 αὐτ’ ἄρχης κτίσεως, J. 6 ἄγγελοι τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαται τὴν

κεφαλὴν ἀρχήν.
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a σιβεία: J. 16 ἔλθεις περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν, 18 κατὰ τὰς ἀνωτέρως ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀσεβείων.

c. d σεβέω: 2 P. 2. 6 ὀπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβείων (al. ἀσεβείων) τεθυκόσι, J. 15 τῶν ἐφιάλου ἀσεβείων ὑπεύθυνοι.

d σεβής: 2 P. 2. 5 κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβείων ἐπάταξα, 2. 6 ἀσεβείων (al. ἀσεβείων), 3. 7 εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως τῶν ἀσεβείων ἀνθρώπων, J. 4 ταραττωμένης τινος ἀνθρώπως, ἀσεβείς, 15 ἔλεγξα τοὺς ἀσεβείς, ἰδ. ἀράμπηλοι ἀσεβείς.

d ἐλγεία: 2 P. 2. 2 τολοί ἰζακολουθήσοντων αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις,
2. 7 τῆς τῶν ἀθέσων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀνατροφής, 2. 18 δελαδεύουσιν ἀσελγείαις, J. 4 τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθεῖται εἰς ἀσελγείαν.

δ σπίλος: 2 P. 3. 14 ἄστυλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι.

δ στήρι: J. 18 ἀστερές πλανήται.

α. c. α στήρικτος: 2 P. 2. 14 δελαδεύουσιν ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, 3. 18 τοια ἀσικεῖς καὶ ἀστηρίκτους.

α διάδης: 2 P. 2. 10 τομηματι αὐθαίναι.

α δέαν: ἵππος, 2 P. 3. 18 ἀδιάνειτε ἐν χάριτι.

α νιός: (: id) 2 P. 1. 17, 18, 2. 3, 8, 8, 11, 12, 18, 19 ἀληθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελ-
λόμενοι, 21 δία, 22, 3. 8, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 18 δία; (emphatic) 18 αὐτοὶ ἡ δόξα; (unusual order) 2. 2 ἰζακολούθησον τοῖς τῶν ἀσελγείαις; J. 7, 11, 14, 18, 18 δία, 24. (: idem) 2 P. 1. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τούτο δὲ, 2. 19 αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες, ἀ νιός, 2. P. 3. 7, see p. cxix, τα ἀντών τῶν παπυρωτάτων, 1 P. 5. 9, p. xciv.

c. d. α νιάρχος: 2 P. 1. 19 λύχνως φαινόντα ἐν αὐχμορῳ τῶν, pp. cxiii f.

e. α ν ιάρχος: J. 12 συνενυχομενοις ἀφαβεῖς (others connect it with what follows ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ ποιμάνοντες).

δ φωνος: 2 P. 2. 16 ὑποκύπτων ἄφωνον.

Βαλλαμος: 2 P. 2. 15 ἰζακολούθησαν τῇ ὄδῷ του Βαλλαμ του Βοσορ, J. 11 τῇ πλαται του Βαλλαμ μυστου ἐξερχόμεναι.

βασνις: 2 P. 2. 8 ψυχὴν δικαιῶν ἀνώμων ἔργων ἐβασάνειν.

βασιλείας: 2 P. 1. 11 εἰς τῆς ἀνώνυμων βασιλείας του κυρίου.

βεβαιότερον τοὺς προφητικοὺς λόγους.

Βεβαιωρ: 2 P. 2. 16 (al. Βοσορ).

βεβαιωρ: 2 P. 2. 2 ἡ ὄδος τῆς ἀρετῆς βλασφημηθήσεται, 2. 10 δόξας οὗ τρέμουσιν βλασφημούντες, 2. 12 ἐν οἷς ἐγνώσιν βλασφη-
μοῦντες, J. 8 δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν, 10 δοκεῖ μὲν οἷς σώζον βλασφη-
μοῦσιν.

βεβαίωσα: 2 P. 2. 11 ἰον συνεδριάσαντος κρίσιν ἑπενεχείς βλασφημίας, p. 75.

βεβαισοφος: 2 P. 2. 11 οὗ φέροντα κατ᾽ αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν.

c. d. βέλεμμα: 2 P. 2. 8 βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοή δίκαιοι, p. lx.

c. d. βελορος: 2 P. 2. 12 ἐν λοιπομενὴν εἰς κυλιμαν βορβόρων.

Βοσορ: 2 P. 2. 15 (al. Βεβαίωσα, see p. cxviii).

βουλομαι: 2 P. 3. 9 μὴ βουλομένοις τινας ἀπολογοῦσι, J. 5 ὑπομνησαί
μᾶς βουλομαί.

βραδυνως: 2 P. 3. 9 οὗ βραδυνὰ Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.

c. d. βραδυνως: 2 P. 3. 9 οὗ τινας βραδυττὰ ἦγοντα.

γαρ: 2 P. 1. 8, 9, 10, 11, 11, 17, 21; 2. 4, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21; 3. 4. 5; J. 4.
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γενώνας</td>
<td>2 P. 2. 12 ος ἄλογα ζώα γεγενημένα φυσικά εἰς ἄλωσιν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γη</td>
<td>2 P. 3. 5 γη εξ ὅδατος καὶ δι' ὅδατος συνεστώσα, 3. 7 οὐ δὲ νῦν ὄφραν καὶ ἡ γη, 3. 10 καὶ γη καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἄγα, 3. 18 γην καυνην προσδοκώμεν, 5. 5 λαὸν ἐκ γης Ἀγωντος σώοσ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γίνομαι</td>
<td>2 P. 1. 4 ἵνα γένθηκε θεῖας κοινωνοι φύσεως, 1. 18 ἑσταῖται γενηθέντες τῆς ἑκείνου μεγαλεύσης, 1. 20 προφητεία γραφής ἰδίας ἐπιτίλους óυ γίνεται, 2. 1 ἑγώνυντο δὲ καὶ πεντάπροφτατα, 2. 20 γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἑστατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γινωσκε</td>
<td>2 P. 1. 20 and 3. 3 τούτο πρῶτον γινωσκότες.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γνωρίζω</td>
<td>2 P. 1. 15 ἐγνωρίσατο ὑμῖν τὴν δύναμαν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γνώσει</td>
<td>2 P. 1. 5, 6 ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ ἁρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν, ἐν δὲ τῇ γνῶσι τῆς ἐγκρατείας, 3. 15 αὐξάνετε ἐν γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. c. γογγυστεῖς</td>
<td>J. 18 γογγυταί μεμνήμοροι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γόμορρα</td>
<td>2 P. 2. 6 πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γόμορρας, 7 ὡς Σοδόμα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτῶν πόλεις.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γράφω</td>
<td>2 P. 1. 20 πᾶσα προφητεία γραφής, 3. 16 στρεβλώσων ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γράφεις</td>
<td>2 P. 1. 31 δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἑπιστολῆν, 3. 15 Παῦλος ἐργαίμην ὑμῖν. 5 πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιομένους γράφειν ὑμῖς, ἴδ. ἀνάγκην ἐσχον γράφατε ὑμῖν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γυμνάζω</td>
<td>2 P. 2. 14 καρδιὰν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεκίας.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δὲ</td>
<td>2 P. 1. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ, ὦδ. ἐν δὲ τῇ ἁρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν (ἐπιχορηγήσατε). 1. 6 δὲ, 1. 7 δίε στὸ καὶ 1. 15, 2. 1, δὲ 1. 18, 2. 1, 9, 10, 16, 20, 3. 7, 8, 10 δίπλω, 18, 18, 18; ὦδι τὸ 2. 12; ὡς φτοῦρας ὡδ. 10, 12, 16, 19, ὡδις ὡδὶ 17, 20, 21; δὲ καὶ 14 μὲν—δὲ: 8 σάρκα μὲν ἤκρυστα ὡδ. . . . δόξας δὲ, 10 ὡδα μὲν . . . ὡδα δὲ, 28 l. ὡδα μὲν . . . ὡδα δὲ . . . ὡδ. δὲ; δὲ 1, 6, 10, 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δείκνυς</td>
<td>2 P. 3. 11 ποταποῦ δὲ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. α. δείγμα</td>
<td>ὥς J. 7 πρόκειται δείγμα πυρὸς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δείκνυς</td>
<td>2 P. 2. 14 δειλαίζοντες ψυχᾶς ἀστηράκτους, 2. 18 δελεάζοντον ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκός.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δείν δροεν</td>
<td>J. 13 δόδρα φθονοπαρινά.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεσμοί</td>
<td>J. 6 δεσμοῖς διδίοις ὑπὸ τόφων τετηρήκεν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεσμεύεις</td>
<td>2 P. 2. 1 τόν ἀγοράσατο αὐτὸς δεσμευθήν ἀρνοῦμενων, 4 τῶν μόνων δεσμευθήν καὶ κυρίων ἡμῶν Ἰ.Χ. ἀρνοῦμενοι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεύτερος</td>
<td>2 P. 3. 1 ταύτην ἡδά δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἑπιστολήν, 5 τό δευτέραν τούς μὴ πιστεύοντας ἀπόλεσεν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δῆλον</td>
<td>2 P. 1. 14 ὃς κύριος ὄφρως ὑμοι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διά</td>
<td>c. γεν. 2 P. 1. 8 δία τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης (αλ. ἀδίκα δόξη). 1. 4 δὲ τῶν τίμων ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, 1. 4 ἵνα διὰ τῶν ταύτων γένθηκε θείας κοινωνοι φύσεως, 5 γη εξ ὅδατος καὶ δι’ ὅδατος συναντάτωσι, 1. 3 δὲ δὲν (δείκτη) ὁ τότε κόσμος ἀπόλετο, pp. lxxv, lxxxiπ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διάβολος</td>
<td>J. 9 τῷ διαβάλον διακρόμονος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διακρίνω</td>
<td>J. 9 τῷ διαβάλον διακρόμονος, 22ὅς μὲν ἠλέγχετε διακρόμονον (αλ. διακρινόμενοι).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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διαλέγομαι: J. 9 διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωσείου σώματος.

diāménο: 2 P. 3. 4 πάντα οὖν διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κύτους.

diāνοια: 2 P. 3. 1 τὴν εἰλικρινὴ διάνοιαν, 145.

b. c. d. δίανυσώ: 2 P. 1. 19 ἐν δὲ ἡμέρᾳ διανύσω.

δίδωμι: 2 P. 3. 15 κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν.

diégērō: 2 P. 1. 13 διεγείρεις ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 3. 1 διεγείρω ἡμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινὴ διάνοιαν.

dikaiος: 2 P. 1. 13 δίκαιον ἡγούμαι διεγείρεις ἡμᾶς, 2. 7 δίκαιον Λέων Ἰρύσατο, 2. 8 βλέπομαι καὶ ἀκοφ[δ] δίκαιος ἑγκατοκούν ἐν αὐτοῖς ὄνομα δικαίαν ἐβασάνιζε.

δικαίοσύνη: 2 P. 1. 1 ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τ. Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος 'Ι.Χ.
p. 1. 2. 6 ἄλλη δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα, 2. 21 τὴν ὄδον τῆς δικαιοσύνης, 3. 13 καυνοὺς σφαιροῖς ... ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατειχεί, 181.

δίκη: J. 7 πιέρας αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέγραψε.

diós: 2 P. 1. 10 διὸ μάλλον, ἄδελφοι, στουδάσατε, 1. 12 διὸ μελλόν ἂν ἡμᾶς ὑπομνήσκεις, 3. 14 διὸ, ἄγαπητο, στουδάσατε.

diós: J. 12 δέορα διὸ ἀποφεύγατα.

δέξα: 2 P. 1. 8 τοῦ καλάσατος ἡμᾶς ἀδική δέχῃ καὶ δρεθῇ, 1. 17 λαβὸν παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς δόξαν, ὥστε φωτὶς ἐνεχείθησι τοῖς ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλουχίας δόξας, 10 δόξας οὗ τρέμουσιν βλασφημούντες, 18 αὐτοὶ ἡ δόξα, 8 ἀδελφοὶ δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν, 21 κατευθύνων τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, 28 Θεοῦ δόξα μεγαλούχη κράτος καὶ ἀξιονοία.

δουλος: 2 P. 1. 1 δουλὸς καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, p. 17, 2. 19 δουλοὶ ὑπάρχοντες τὴν φόβος; J. 1 'Ιουδαῖς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δουλοὺς.

dουλόω: 2 P. 2. 19 φιλὶ τῆς ἀγαθοτητῆς τοῦ καὶ δεδούλωται.

dυναμεῖς: 2 P. 1. 8 πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ δεδωρημένης, 1. 16 ἐγγυόμενοι ἡμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν καὶ παροικιάν, 11 ἀγγέλου λαβοῦν καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες.

c. d. συνόρτος: 2 P. 3. 16 ἐν αἷς ἐστιν δυσνόητα τινα.

dωρέομαι: 2 P. 1. 8 πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως δεδωρημένης, 1. 8 τὰ τίμα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδωρήται.

δαυτοῦ: 2 P. 2. 1 ἑπανορθεῖται ἑαυτοῖς ταχοῖς ἐπάλειπε, J. 6 μὴ τηροῦμεν τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν, 12 ἀδόξα ἑαυτοῦ παμφαίνοντες, 13 ἐπαφροζίστηκα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας, 9 ἐν τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας, 19 οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες ἑαυτοὺς (αὐτ. 'ἐπανορθοῦσας ἑαυτοὺς), 20 ἑποκομοδούμενοτε ἑαυτοῖς, 21 ἑαυτοῖς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηροῦμεν.


c. d. ἐγκατοικεῖω (ἐγκατοικήω): 2 P. 2. 8 ἑγκατοικοῦν ἐν αὐτοῖς.

ἐγκέματε: 2 P. 1. 6 ἐπικράτηται ἐν τῇ γνώσει τῆς ἐγκέματε, ἐν δὲ τῆς ἐγκέματε τὴν ὑπομονὴν.


(Ημαῖς): 2 P. 1. 18 ταῦτα τὴν φωνὴν ἡμᾶς ἠκούσαμεν, (ἡμᾶς) 2 P. 1. 3 τοῦ καλάσατος ἡμᾶς, 9 μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ἡμᾶς (ἀπ. ἡμᾶς), (ἡμῶν), 2 P. 1. 1 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, 1. 2, 8, 11, 14, 15, 3. 15, 18 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, 20 (ἀπ. ἡμῶν), 3. 15 δ' ἀγαπητῶς ἡμῶν ἄδελφος, J. 2 τῆς κοινῆς
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ημῶν σωτηρίας, 4 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἱδ. κυρίων ἡμῶν, 17, 21, 25 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, ἱδ. σωτῆρα ἡμῶν, ἰδ. ημῶν, (ἡμῶν) 2 Ρ. 1. 1 τοῖς ἱεροτήμοις ἡμῶν λαχανίζων πίστιν, 1. 3 πάντα ἡμῶν (ἄλ. ἡμῶν, ἱδ. p. cxciii) τῆς θείας δυνάμεως δεινοφιλῶν, 1. 4 μέγιστα ἡμῶν δεινοφιλῶν.

εἶ: 2 Ρ. 2. 4 εἰ γὰρ δ’ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ ἀφεῖστο, 2. 20 εἰ γὰρ ἀποκαλύπτει τὰ μάρτυρα τοῦ κόσμου, τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἀποκάλυπτες ἡγεῖται.

εἶδόνα, ἱδ. οἶδα.

εἰλικρινὴς: 2 Ρ. 3. 1 τὴν εἰλικρινὴ διάνοιαν, 145.

εἰμὶ: 2 Ρ. 1. 18 ἐφ’ ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνοματί, 2 Ρ. 1. 9 τυφλὸς ἐστὶν μυκτάζων, 1. 14 ταχύν ἐστίν ἡ ἀπόφευκς, 1. 17 οὕτως ἐστίν ὁ νῦς μου, 3. 4 τοῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, 3. 10 ὁ ὦ ὁ ὦ ὁ ὦ ὁ ὦ ὁ ὀνοματικῶν, 2. 17 οὕτως εἶλαν πηγαὶ ἀνυδροί, 3. 7 πεθαναυρισμοῦνει εἰσὶν, 12 οὕτως καὶ εἰς ὁ συνειφυκοῦσαν, 10 οὕτως εἶλαν γογγυσται, 12 οὕτως εἶλαν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες—2 Ρ. 1. 18 σύν ἃ ἄφθατε ἐν τῷ ὅρει, 2. 11 ἀγγελοὶ δυνάμει μείζονας ὅτε ἐστὶ—2 Ρ. 2. 21 κρίτην ἧν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπηγειονύκται κ.τ.λ., 3. 5 οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἐκπαλαι—2 Ρ. 2. 1 ὦ ὄστιν ψευδοδιάσκαλοι, 12 ὄστιν ἦσαν μεταλειτα.

εἴπον: Ἰ. 2 ἀλλὰ εἰπεῖν ἐπιτιμῆσαι σοι Κύριος.

εἴρνη: 2 Ρ. 2. 3 χάρις ἡμῶν καὶ εἰράνθη πληθυνθείη, 3. 14 σπουδάσατε ἄμπελοι εὐθερθέναι ἐν εἰρήνη, Ἰ. 3 ἔλεος ἡμῶν καὶ εἰράνθη καὶ ἀγάπῃ πληθυνθείη.

εἶ: 2 Ρ. 1. 8 ἀκάρτων καθάρσεων εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἐπίγνωσιν, 1. 11 ἡ ἐκατάρτωσιν εἰς τὴν αἰωνίων βασιλείαν, 1. 17 ἡ εἰς ἑνώθιον ἑος ἐκκόψις, 2. 4 ἡ κρίσιν ἡμερῶν, 2. 9 εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως τηρεῖν, 2. 12 γεγονεῖσθαι ἡ λόγως, 2. 22 εἰς κυριακὸν δορυφορίαν, 3. 7 παρα τὸ τηρήματι εἰς ἑμέραν κρίσεως, 3. 9 μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἵδ. εἰς ἡμέτερον χαρῆσθαι, 3. 18 αὐτῆς ἡ δόξα εἰς ἡμέραν αἰωνίων, Ἰ. 4 προεγγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο, ἵδ. τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀστάλημα, 6 εἰς κρίσιν τετρήκην, 14 εἰς αἰῶνα τετρήκην, 21 προσδεχόμενοι τὸ θέλει τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ὁμήρην, 18 δόξα... εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.

εἶ: 2 Ρ. 3. 8 ὅτι δὴ τούτῳ μὴ λανθανέτω ὅμαι, ὅτι μῖα ἡμέρα παρά Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἐτη καὶ χίλια ἐτη ὡς ἡμέρα μιᾶ.

Ποσοῦ: 2 Ρ. 2. 11 ἡ ἐκάρτωσιν εἰς τὴν αἰωνίων βασιλείαν.

κ.: 2 Ρ. 1. 18 φωνὴν ἐν ὁμοραντίῳ ἐλευθερίαν, 2. 8 ἡμέραν ἐν ἡμέρας ἑλπίζων διασάσθαι, 2. 9 εἰς περαιμακὸν ἔρευθα, 2. 21 ὅπωστε ἐπεφεύγεται τῇ τῆς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς, 3. 5 γεὶς ἐν ἄδωτος καὶ ἐν ἄδωτος συνεστάσθα, Ἰ. 5 ἐν ἅγια Αλγάπον σωσασάς, 22 ἐν πυρὸς ἀρέτοις.

κ. ἄ.: εἰκάστωτε: 2 Ρ. 1. 15 σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ εἰκάστοτε ἠμῶν ἡμᾶς τοῖς τούτων μνήμην ποιώσθω.

κείνος: 2 Ρ. 1. 18 τῆς εἰκότως μεγαλειότητος.

κλογή: 2 Ρ. 1. 10 βεβαιαν ὅμως τὴν κλήσιν καὶ κλογὴν ποιώσθαι, pp. 19 f.

δ. σ. ἐκπολεμήσαι: 2 Ρ. 2. 3 τὸ κρίμα ἐκπολεμῆκαν οὐκ ἀργεὶ, 3. 5 οὕρανοι ἦσαν ἐκπολεμῆκαν, liii.

κρίτω: 2 Ρ. 3. 17 ἢ μὴ ἐκτίμησθε τοῦ ἑαυτὸς στηργοῦ.

δ. σ. ἐκεραυνοῦς: Τ. 7 πόλεις ἐκεραυνοῦσαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ἐπὶσώσεσθε ἐπισώσεσθε.

δ. κρίσις: Ἰ. 12 δένδρα δὲ εὐθυγράμμω στραφέντα.

κρέος: Ἰ. 11 τῇ πλαισίᾳ τοῦ Βαλαάμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν.

λαύνω: 2 Ρ. 2. 2 ὁμιλήσαι ὅπως λαυάτος ἔλαυνόμεναι.
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δ. έλεγξεν: 2 P. 2. 16 ἔλεγξεν ἵσχεν ἰδιὰς παρανομίας.

λέγχω: J. 16 ἔλεγχαι πάντας τοὺς ἀνεξέλπους περὶ πάντων, 28 οὗς μὲν ἔλεγχε (al. ἔλεγε) διακρινομένους.

λεος: J. 2 Πλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθεῖσι, 31 προσδεχόμενου τῷ Πλεος τοῦ κυρίου.

λευθερία: 2 P. 2. 19 ἕλθεραν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι.

μόσι: 2 P. 1. 15 μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον.

ομαίγονι: 2 P. 3. 3 ἔλεγοντοι ἐν ἐμπαγγελμένοι ἐμπαίσκεται.

ομπαίκτης: 2 P. 3. 3 ἔλεγοντοι ἐν ἐμπαίσκετοι τῶν ἕμερων ἐμπαίσκεται.

πλεονεξία: J. 18 ἐν τῇ ἀκόλουθος κράτους ἐστοιντ ἐμπαίσκεται.

πορεύομαι: 2 P. 2. 30 τούτοις ἐπὶ πᾶν ἐμπλακέστες.

πλαστοῖς: 2 P. 2. 3 ἐν πλεονεξία πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπερεύο-

στονται.

πάροικο: 2 P. 1. 4 τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ φθοράς, 1. 18 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι,

τὸ: 1. 18 ἐν τῷ ὅρε, 1. 19 ἐν ἀγαπήτῳ τόπῳ, ἕν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, 2. 1 ἐν τῷ

λαῷ, ἕν ἐν οἷς, 2. 8 ἐγκατασκοῦν ἐν αὐτοῖς, 3. 10 ἐν τῇ ἡγ. ἡρα, 1. 13 ἐν

οἷς διακοινοῦν κατοικεῖ, 3. 1, 3. 10 ἐν ἐποικολαί ηλαιῶν ὅσι; (time)

τα: 2. 13 τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν, ἐπιθυμώ, 3. 10; (cause or instrument) 1. 1 ἐντοίμων

λαχών πίστιν ἐν διακοινοῦν Θεοῦ, 1. 13 and 3. 1 διεγέρον οὐς ἐν

ὑπομνήματε, 2. 3 ἐν πλεονεξία ὑμᾶς ἐμπερεύονται, 2. 16 ἐν ἀνθρώπου

φυσικοῦ φθεγμένος, 2. 16 δεδομένων ἐν θεομπαίσκεται, 2. 30 ἀποφαίνε

τὰ μάρτυρα ἐν ἐπιγνώσει; (manner) 2. 7 ἐν ἐν αἰσχυλεῖ ἀναστροφής, 2.

τὸ: 2. 10 ἐπιθυμία πορεύομεν, 2. 10 τοῖς ἐν πλαίς ἀναστροφίομενοι, 2.

ἐν: 3 ἐν ἐμπαγγελμένο ἐμπαίσκεται, 3. 11 ἐν αὐς ἀναστροφές, 3. 14

ἀμόμητοι ἐν εἰρήνη; (sphere) 1. 12 ἐπιγνώσεως ἐν ἀλθείας, 3. 15

ἀνέκαντο ἐν χάριτι; (subject-matter) 2. 12 ἐν ἐν αἰσχυλεῖς ἐμπαίσκε

μοντεῖς, 2. 13 ἐντυπώετε ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις; (addition) 1. 5 ἐπιχορη

γήσατε ἐν πίστει ἡρετή διά, 1. 6 τεν, 1. 7 διά, (place) 12 ἐν ταῖς

ἀγάπαις σπολείας; (accompaniment) 14 ἐν αὐς μιμοῦσας ἤλθεν;

(cause or instrument) 10 ἐν τούτοις φθειρονται; (manner) 22 ἐν φοβῷ, 24 ἐν ἀγαλλιάσα, (used of God) 1 ἐν ἐν ἀγαλλίασα (I), p. clxxii,

πλαστοῖς: 21 ἐν τούτοις ἐπροεικόμενοι, 2. 30 ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν, (al.

ἀγάπαις).

ἐνποιήθη: 2 P. 2. 21 τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἀγάς ἐντολῆς, 3. 2 τῆς

ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου, p. 64.

δ. ἐντρυφά: 2 P. 2. 18 ἐπιστρεφόμενον ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν (al.

ἀγάπαις).

ἐννιάκομισι: J. 8 οὕτοι ἐννιακόμισι, p. 74.

Ἐνώχ: J. 14 ἐπορφάτουν ἐβοβοις ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ Ἐνώχ.

δ. ξακολούθῃ: 2 P. 1. 18 μύθοις ἔξακολοθήσατε, 2. 1 ἐξακολού

θήσατε αὐτοῦ ταῖς ἀγάπαις, 2. 15 ἐξακολούθήσατε τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ

Βαλαίμ.

δ. ἐξέραμα: 2 P. 2. 22 κύριο ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἱδὼν ἐξέραμα,

π. thir, lxii

ἐξοδός: 2 P. 1. 15 μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον.

ἐξουσία: J. 23 μόνος Θεοῦ κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία.

παγελία: 2 P. 3. 4 που ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ;

9 οὐ βραδύτεις Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.

παγελία: 2 P. 2. 19 ἔλεγχεραν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι.
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c. d. ἐπάγγελμα: 2 P. 1. 4 τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ἐπαγγέλματα, 3. 13 κατά τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ, pp. xxxiv, cxxii.

ἐπάγω: 2 P. 2. 1 ἐπαγόντες ἐαυτούς ταχύν ἀπόλειαν, 2. 5 κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσέβεων ἐπέξασι, p. xxvi.

b. c. d. ἐπαγωνιζόμαι: Ἰ. 3 ἐπαγωνιζόμεθα τῇ ἁπάξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει, pp. 22, 23, 70 f.

b. c. d. ἐπαφρίζω: Ἰ. 13 κύματα ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀλχίνας.

ἐπί: c. gen. 146 f., 2 P. 3. 3 ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἁμερῶν, Ἰ. 18 ἐπὶ ἐσχάτου χρόνου.

c. acc. 2 P. 1. 18 ἐφʼ ὄσον εἰμι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκήνωματι, 22 ἐπιστρέφασι ἐπὶ τὸ ἄδικον ἐξέγραμα. In compounds, pp. 22, 174.

ἐπειγανωσκεῖ: 2 P. 2. 21 κριτικὴν ἡν ἡ ἐπειγανωσκόν, τῆς ὁδὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἠ ἐπειγανωσκόν, ἐπιστρέφασι.

b. ἐπειγανωσκεῖ: 2 P. 1. 2 χρώμα καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείσῃ καὶ ἐπιγνώσῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1. 3 ἀνά τῆς ἐπειγανωσκότας τοῦ ἀνάστασις θμαῖ, 1. 8 ἐν τῇ τοῦ κυρίου ἐπέγνωση, 2. 20 ἄφθογοντες τὰ μάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐπειγανωσκόν τοῦ κυρίου.

ἐπιθυμία: 2 P. 1. 4 ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπιθυμία ἄβδομα, 2. 10 τῶν ὁπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μασχοῦ πορευόμενον, 2. 18 δειλαίων ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκός ἀσελγείας, 3. 5 κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν περιορισμού, Ἰ. 18 κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας περιορίσμοι, 18 κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας περιορίσμοι.

c. d. ἐπίλυσις: 2 P. 1. 20 πάσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἑαυτὸς ἐπιλύσεως σοῦ γινομεν, pp. iv. 196 f.

ἐπίσταμαι: Ἰ. 10 ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ἐπιστάνται.

ἐπιστολή: 2 P. 3. 1 δευτέραν ὅμων γράφω ἐπιστολὴν, 3. 18 ὡς ἐν πάσας ταῖς ἑπιστολαῖς.

ἐπιστρέφω: 2 P. 2. 22 κώσμος ἐπιστρέφασι ἐπὶ τὸ ἄδικον ἐξέγραμα.

ἐπιτιμάω: Ἰ. 9 ἐπιτιμᾶται καὶ Κυρίος.

ἐπιφάνεια: Ἰ. 9 ἐπιφάνεια σοι Κυρίος.

ἐπιχρήστε: 2 P. 1. 5 ἐπιχρηστεύσεται ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, 11 πλουσίων ἐπιχρηστεύθησαν ὑμῖν ἡ ἐσόδος.

ἐπικοινωνέω: Ἰ. 20 ἐπικοινωνοῦσα ἑαυτούς τῇ διαλογῇ ὑμῶν πίστει.

ἐπιστήμη: 2 P. 1. 16 ἐπιστήμην γενήθησαν τῆς ἑκείνου μεγαλειώτατος.

ἐργον: 2 P. 1. 10 διὰ τῶν καλῶν ὑμῶν ἐργῶν (om. al.) 2. 8 ψυχὴν δικαίων ἀνόμων ἐργῶν ἐβασάνισεν, 3. 10 γῆ καὶ τα ἐν αὐτῇ ἐργα, Ἰ. 16 περὶ πάντων τῶν ἐργῶν ἀσέβειας αὐτῶν.

ἐρχόμαι: 2 P. 3. 3 ἐξεύθενται ἐμπαίκτη, Ἰ. 14 ἡλθεν Κυρίος ἐν ἀγίαις μυρωνίας αὐτοῦ, σ. ὑπερ. p. xlv.

ἐρχόμαι: 2 P. 2. 20 γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐσχάτα χείραν τῶν πρῶτων, 3. 3 ἐν ἐσχάτων τῶν ἁμερῶν, pp. 146 f., Ἰ. 18 ἐν ἐσχάτου χρόνου, pp. 77 f.

ἐπηρεάζω: Ἰ. 7 ἐπηρεάζει τὰ ἑαυτοῦ σαρκὸς ἐπιστρεφάντα

ἐπιστρέφω: 2 P. 3. 8 μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίω ὡς χίλια ἐτη καὶ χίλια ἐτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία.

ἐφαγγέλλων, p. 65.

ἐυδοκέω: 2 P. 1. 17 ἐλεῖ ἐν ἐγώ εὐδοκείσα.

ἐθύσα: 2 P. 2. 15 καταλείποντες εἰδείαν ὁδόν.
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εὑρίσκω: 2 P. 3. 10 γῇ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἥγη εὑρεθήσεται (I see p. 88),
3. 14 ἀμφότεροι αὐτῷ εὑρεθήσεται ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

ἐς ἐος ἐβεία: 2 P. 1. 3 ἃ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν, 1. 6 ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ
tῆς εὐσέβειας, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσεβείᾳ τῆς φιλαδελφίας, 3. 11 ἐν ἀγίαις
dαυτοῦ τοὺς καὶ εὐσεβεῖας.

εὔνεος: 2 P. 2. 9 οὗτος Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς εἰς πεπραγμένον ἔστωσα.

ἐχώ (1): 2 P. 1. 19 ἔχομεν βαθμικὸν τοῦ προφητικοῦ λόγου, 2. 14 ὀφθαλ-

μῶς ἔχοντες μετοικοῦν μοχαλίδως, ἔδρα καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας

ἐχοντες, 2. 16 ἐλευθερόν ἐχον παρανομάσας, 3. 8 ἀνάγκην ἐχον γράφας,
19 πνεύμα μὴ ἔχοντες. (2) — rosastra. 2 P. 1. 18 σπουδᾶσαι ἐχεῖν ὑμᾶς

μνήμην ποιεῖται.

ἐως: 2 P. 1. 19 ὃ καλῶς ποιεῖται προσέχοντες ἦσος οὗ ἡμέρα διανύσῃ.

d. ἔφοιτο: 2 P. 2. 4 (ἄγγελος) σειρᾶς ἔφοιτο (al. σειρᾶς and ἔφοιτο)  
tαρταρόσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν, 2. 17 οἷς ὁ ἔφοιτο τοῦ σκότους τετῆρηται,
J. 6 (ἄγγελος) εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς δεόντως ὑπὸ ἔφοιτο

τετῆρηκεν, 18 οἷς ὁ ἔφοιτο τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰώνη τετῆρηται.

ξ σο: 2 P. 1. 3 ἃ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν, 3. 21 εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

ζων: 2 P. 2. 18 ὁς ἄλογον ζῶα γεγενημένα φυσικά εἰς ἄλογος, 3. 10 ὅσα

δὲ φυσικὸς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα ἐπιστανται ἐν τούτοις φθειροῦσαν.

η: 2 P. 2. 31 κραδίτων ήν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐκγεννήσεται ἡ ἐκγεννοῦν ὑποτρέψαται.

ηγέραι: 2 P. 1. 18 δικαιον δὲ ἢγουμαι διεγερτές ὑμᾶς, 2. 18 ἢγουν

ηγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῆν, 3. 9 ὡς τινες βραδυτίτα ἢγοῦνται, 3. 15
tὴν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγείσθη.

ηδῆ: 2 P. 3. 1 ταύτην ἡδη δευτέραν γράφω ἐπιστολῆς.

ηδονή: 2 P. 2. 13 ἡδονὴ (ἀγάπην ἢ) ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῆν, p. x.

μερός: 2 P. 1. 19 ἐστὶν ὡς ἡμέρα διανύσῃ, 2. 8 ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχήν

ἐβασάνεθαν, 2. 9 ὧν καὶ 3. 7 εἰς ἡμέρων κρίσεως, 2. 13 τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῆν,

3. 8 ἐπὶ ἀγαθῶν τῶν ἡμέρων, 3. 8 μὲ ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χλια ἔτη
cαι χλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μιὰ, 3. 10 ἢξει ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης, 3. 12
tῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, 3. 15 ἐς ἡμέραν αἰώνων, 4. 6 ἐς κρίσιν μεγάλης

ητάομα: 2 P. 2. 19 ὃ γὰρ τις ἤγγισεν τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωσε, 2. 20
tούτους δὲ πάλιν ἐμπληκέντες ἤττωνται.

θάλασσα: 1. 13 κύματα ἄγρυς θαλάσσης.

θαυμάζεται: 2 P. 1. 16 δαιμόνους προσώπῳ ὀφθαλίας χαρίν.

θείος: 2 P. 1. 3 τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, 1. 4 θείας κοινωνία φύσεως (else-

where in N.T. only in Ac 17. 29 τὸ θείον).

θέλω: 2 P. 3. 5 θελεῖ ἢ ἄρα τούτῳ θέλεται ἢ κ.τ.λ.

θεσπ. 2. P. 1. 1 ἐν ἑαυτούτης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
1. 3 ἐν ἑπταγωσίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, 1. 17 λαβὼν παρὰ

Θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμᾶν καὶ δοξάζω, 1. 21 ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμεναν ἀλληγοράτω

ἀπὸ (ἀλ. ἀγίου) Θεοῦ ἀνθρωπον, 2. 4 ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ

ἔφειτο, 3. 5 γη ἐν ἑδάθοις συνενώσω τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, 3. 12 τὴν

παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, 1. 10 τούς ἐν Θεοὶ πατρὶ ἡγαστήριον, 4
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τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, 21 έαντον ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε, 22 μόνης Θεοῦ σωτηρία ἡμῶν.

θῆσαν ζω' 2 P. 3. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὕραν καὶ η γη τῇ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσίν.

' ἱκά ω βος: J. 1 'Ισσας Άισσαν Χριστοῦ δύσλος, ἀδελφός δὲ Ἰακώβου.

δίοις: 2 P. 1. 3 τοῦ καλάστατος ἡμᾶς ἵδια δόξη (al. διὰ δόξης, p. exccii) καὶ ἀρχή, 1. 20 πάντα προφητεία γραφῆς ἤδια ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται, 2. 18 ἔλεγεν ἤδειν ἤδια παρανομίας, 2. 22 κῶν ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ διὸν ἐξέρχεται, 3. 3 κατὰ τὰς ἢδιας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, 3. 18 πρὸς τὴν ἢδιάν αὐτῶν ἀπόλειαι, 3. 17 ἦν καὶ ἐκπέμπει τοῦ ἢδιον στριγμόν, J. 6 (ἀγγέλους) ἀπολύσατο τὸ διὸν οἰκητήριον, pp. xxxii f., xlix.

ίδοι: J. 14 ιδοὺ ήλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἄγαιαις μυρίασιν αὐτοῦ.

' Ἱσσας: 2 P. 1. 1 ἀπόστολος Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ ἵδι. ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ, 1. 2 εν ἐπιγίνεται εἰς Θεοῦ καὶ Ισσαίου κυρίου ἡμῶν, 1. 8 τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν, 1. 11 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ, 1. 14 διὰ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ ἐδήλωσεν μοι, 1. 10 τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ δύναμιν, 2. 20 εν ἐπιγίνεται τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ, 3. 18 εν γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ, J. 1 Ἰσσας Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ δύσλος, ἵδιος τοὺς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαστήμενος καὶ Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ τετερημένους κλητούς, 4 τὸν μόνον δικαστήν καὶ κυρίον ἡμῶν Ἰσσαίον Χριστοῦ ἠρωμένοι, 5 Ἰσσαίου (al. Κύριος, see pp. cixxxi f.) λαῶν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας, 11 τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ, 21 τὸ Θεός τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ, 25 διὰ Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

ίνα: 2 P. 1. 4 εἴη γεγενήμετα διὰ διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φώτως, 3. 17 φιλάστατο εἰς μὴ ἐκπέμπητε.

Ἰουδάς: J. 1. 1.


ι: 2 P. 2. 11 ἄγγελοι ἵσσας καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὅτες.

δ. καθαρίσμος: 2 P. 1. 9 λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτῶν ἄμαρτιών.

καθαρίσμος: 2 P. 1. 16 ἀκάρπους καθύστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰσσαίου Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν.

καθός: 2 P. 1. 14 καθός καὶ δό κυρίος ἐδήλωσεν μοι, 3. 15 καθῷ καὶ ἀγαπητός ἡμῶν ἀδελφός Παῦλος ἐργαζόμεν ἡμῖν.

καὶ: 'both' 2 P. 3. 18 καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰώνας, J. 25 καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰώνας.

'also' 2 P. 1. 14 καθός καὶ δό κυρίος ἐδήλωσεν μοι, 2. 1 ἡμέρα ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐσονται, 2. 12 ἐν τῇ φορῇ αὐτῶν καὶ φασάρησονται (al. καταφθαρήσονται), 2. 19 καὶ τὰς ἄργηται τούτων καὶ (om. al.) διδοῦλας, 3. 15 καθὼς καὶ ἀγαπητός ἡμῶν ἀδελφός, 3. 16 ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς, ἵδι. ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς, J. 8 ἀμωμοῦς μέντοι καὶ οὕτω, 14 ἐπροφήτευσε δὲ καὶ τούτοις; 'even' 2 P. 2. 1 καὶ τῶν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς ἄρνομενοι, J. 23 μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἀπελπισμένον χυτώνα.

Καίν: J. 11 τῇ ὄψιν τοῦ Καίν ἐπορεύθησαν.
INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

καίνος: 2 P. 3. 13 καίνος οδρακοῦς καὶ γῆς καίν̣ος προσδοκῶμεν.
καίτερ: 2 P. 1. 12 καίτερ εἰδώτας.
καλέω: 2 P. 1. 5 τοῦ καλάσαντος ἡμᾶς ὑδὰς δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ.
καρδιά: 2 P. 1. 10 ἐς ός φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, 2. 14 καρδιὰς γεγυμνασμένην ἔχοντες.
κατά: c. gen. 2 P. 2. 11 οὐ γέροντων κατ' αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίνω, J. 15 ποιήσαι κρίνων κατά πάντων, 15 ἐλάλησα κατ' αὐτούς.
c. acc. 2 P. 3. 8 κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν περενόμενοι, 3. 13 γῆς κατὰ κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτῶν προσδοκῶμεν, 3. 15 κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν ἐγγραψεν, J. 16 κατὰ κατὰ ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν περενόμενοι, 18 κατὰ τὰς ἔκτις ἐπιθυμίας περενόμενοι.
κατακαίω: 2 P. 3. 10 γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα κατακαίγομαι (αὐτ. ἐφερθή-σεται).
c. κατακλύω: 2 P. 3. 6 δὸ τότε κόσμος ὧνατε κατακλυσθεῖς ἀπόλετο.
d. κατακλυσμός: 2 P. 2. 5 κατακλυσμῶν κόσμως ἀσέβεως ἐπάξας.
κατακρίνω: 2 P. 2. 8 πόλεως . . καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν, p. σχεν.
καταλείπω: 2 P. 2. 15 καταλείπουται (αὐτ. καταλείπουτες) εὐθείων ἀδικίων.
καταπονέω: 2 P. 2. 7 Δἀτ καταπονοῦμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀθεσίας ἀναστροφῆς.
κατάρα: 2 P. 2. 14 κατάρας τέκνα.
καταστροφή: 2 P. 2. 6 [καταστροφῇ] κατέκρινεν (ομ. WH.): see p. σχεν.
d. καταφθηρω: 2 P. 2. 12 ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καταφθαρῆσονται (αὐτ. καλ. φθαρ-).
καταφρονέω: 2 P. 2. 10 κυριόττως καταφρονοῦται.
d. κατενώπιω: J. 24 στῆσε κατενώπιόν της ἀδόξης αὐτούς.
κατοικίω: 2 P. 3. 18 ἐν ὅσι δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ.
d. c. d. e. καινός: 2 P. 3. 10 στοιχεῖα καινούμενα λιθήσεται, 3. 2 στοιχεῖα καινούμενα τήκεται, p. 1x.
κηρύξω: 2 P. 2. 6 Νῦν δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα.
κλείσις: 2 P. 3. 10 ἤζει ἡμέρα Κυρίου ως κλείσις.
κλήσις: 2 P. 1. 10 βεβαίως ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν ποιεῖσθαι.
kλητός: J. 10 τεταρτήμων κλήτος.
kοιμάω: 2 P. 3. 4 ἀφ’ ὑπὲρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμηθοῦσαν.
kοινός: J. 8 περὶ τῆς κοινῆς συνθήκης.
kοινώνοις: 2 P. 1. 4 δειας κοινωνικοὶ φύσεως.
kολάζω: 2 P. 2. 4, 9 κολάζωμεν τῆς ἐπιτείν (in 4 some read τηρομένου).
kομείωμα: 2 P. 2. 18 κομείωμα (αὐτ. ἐξ ἐκκομείωμα) μισθῶν ἀδικίας.
κορέ: J. 11 τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορέ ἀπώλειντο.
kόσμος: 2 P. 1. 4 τῆς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, 2. 5 ἀρχαίον κόσμων ὡς ἐφείσατο κατακλυσμῶν κόσμως ἀσέβεως ἐπάξας, 2. 20 ἀποφυγόμενα τὰ μάσσαμα τοῦ κόσμου, 3. 6 δὸ τότε κόσμος κατακλυσθεῖς ἀπόλετο.
κράτος: J. 26 θεῖο κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία.
κρείττων: 2 P. 2. 21 κρείττων ἦν αὐτῶς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὅδον ἢ ἐπιγνώσων κ.τ.λ.
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κρίμα: 2 P. 2. 8 οίς τὸ κρίμα ἔκταλαι ὄδκ ἀργεῖ, J. 4 προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τούτο τὸ κρίμα.
κρίσεις: 2 P. 2. 4 εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους, 2. 9 εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν, 2. 11 οὐ φέροντας κατ' αὐτῶν παρά Κυρίῳ βλασφημον κρίσιν, 3. 7 τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως, J. 6 εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας τετήρηκεν, 9 κρίσιν ἑπενεχεῖν βλασφημίας, 15 τούτοις κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων.
κτασις: 2 P. 3. 4 ἀπ' ἄρχης κτίσεως.
κυλίσμος: 2 P. 2. 22 εἰς κυλισμόν (ἀλ. κύλισμα) βορβόρου, p. lxiii.
κύμα: J. 18 κύματα ἀγωνια θαλάσσης.
κυριότης: 2 P. 2. 10 κυριότητος καταφρονούντας, J. 8 κυριότητα ἀδενοῦν, p. viii.
λάγχων: 2 P. 1. 9 τοῖς ἰσότιμοις ἡμῖν λανδοῦσιν πίστιν.
λαλεῖ: 2 P. 2. 17 ήμῖν ἐπὶ λαλήπας ἐλαυνόμεναι.
λαλεῖ: 2 P. 1. 21 ἑλάθηναι ἡ γῆ του (ἀλ. ἀπὸ) Θεοῦ ἀνθρωπος, 3. 16 λαλῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς περί τοῦτος, J. 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ἐν ἑλάθεσιν, 16 τοῖς μαθηταῖς υπέροχα.
λαμβάνω: 2 P. 1. 9 λάβῃς λαβῶν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν, 17 λαβῶν παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν.
λανθανει: 2 P. 3. 5 λανθανεῖ γὰρ αὐτοῦ ὅτι, 3. 8 τούτῳ μὴ λανθανέτω ὅμως ὅτι.
λανθάνει: 2 P. 2. 1 ἐγένοτο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροσῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, J. 5 λανθάνει ἐγὼ Ἀγγείου σώσας.
λέγω: 2 P. 3. 4 λέγοντες Ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία; J. 14 προεφήτευσεν Ἐνδοχ λέγων, 17 μηνόθθετε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προεφήτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑπὸ δελεοῦν.
λέγων: 2 P. 1. 4 λέγων: 2 P. 1. 10 τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων, 2. 3 πλαστῶν λόγως, 3. 5 τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, 3. 7 τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τιθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν.
λόγος: 2 P. 3. 3. 10 ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς.
λογαριασθείς: 2 P. 2. 22 ὡς λουσαμένη.
λυχνος: 2 P. 1. 19 ὡς λύχνω φαίνοντι.
λυσις: 2 P. 3. 10 στοιχεῖα κανονοῦμεν λυθῆσαι, 3. 11 τοῦτων πάντων λυομένων, 3. 12 στοιχεῖα τυρωμένοιν λυθομένουν.
τοῦ: 2 P. 2. 7 δίκαιον Δῶτ καταπονούμενον.
μακροθυμεῖ: 2 P. 3. 9 μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὅμαις.
μακροθυμεῖ: 2 P. 3. 15 τῆς τοῦ κυρίου μακροθυμάς σωτηριὰν ἐγείροις.
μάλιστα: 2 P. 2. 10 μάλιστα δὲ τούτος ὑπὸ σαρκὸς πορευομένους.
μάλλον: 2 P. 1. 10 διὰ μάλλου σπονδάσατε.
ματαιότης: 2 P. 2. 18 υπέροχα ματαιότητος φθεγγομένου.
μεγαλείτης: 2 P. 1. 10 ἐστι τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλείτητος.
μεγαλείτης: 2 P. 1. 17 ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλειτήτους δόξης.
μεγαλοπρεπεῖς: 2 P. 1. 17 ἐστὶ τῆς μεγαλειτήτους δόξης.
μέγες: J. 8 εἰς κρίσιν μεγαλής ἡμέρας.
μέγες: 2 P. 1. 4 δι' ὅν τὸ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ἡμῖν ἐπαγγελματα δεδόθηται (reading uncertain), p. xiii.
μέγες: 2 P. 2. 11 ἀγγελοὶ ἱσχοῦ καὶ δυνάμει μελζονες ἠντες.

q 2
μέλλων: 2 P. 1. 12 διὸ μελλήσαν (ὅ) διὰς δεῖ ὑπομομυθήσειν περὶ τοῦτων,
p. 1x, 2. 6 ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσβεστοῦ τεθείκη, p. exccv.
μέλως, see 2 P. 1 13 and p. excixii.
b. c. α. μεμορίσασθα: J. 18 γγυγονταὶ μεμφύμορος.
μέν: J. 8 σάρκα μέν μαίνοντα, κυριότητα δὲ ἀσθενουσα δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσίν,
10 δόξα μὲν οὖν οἰδασι βλασφημοῦσιν, δόξα δὲ φυσικὰς ἔπεταν ταῖς ἐν
tοῖς φησιν. 22, 23 οὖς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένοις, οὐς δὲ σώζετε ... ὁδὸς δὲ ἔλευτη (readings differ).
μέντοι: J. 8 δορίως μέντοι καὶ οὕτω σάρκα μαίνοντα.
μεστὸς: 2 P. 2. 14 ὄφθαλμοι ἔχοντες μεστοῦ μοιχαλῆς.
μετά: c. acc. 2 P. 1. 15 μετὰ τὴν ἧμιν ἔξοδον.
μετάνοια: 2 P. 3. βουλόμενος πάντας εἰς μετάναια χωρήσας.
μετατίθητι μου: J. 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάρητα μετατιθήτες εἰς ἀπελευνα.
μή: pp. 1c. 1 10 μὴ ἰμπέρατι. 2 P. 3. 8 τοῦτο μὴ λανδανώτι ψίς ὑμᾶς ὑπ᾿ ἐν
part. 2 P. 3. μακροθυμεῖ μὴ βουλόμενος τινα ἀπόλεσθαι, J. 19
tοῦτοι εἰσέχοντες τειχαμενοι τῆς ἐχοντες; μετὰ part. and g articles,
J. 5 τοὺς μὴ προτείνωντας ἀκάλεσαν, 6 τοὺς μὴ τρίτον τὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ ἰχνόν τετήρηκαν.
μῆν: 2 P. 2. 21 κριστὼν ἂν μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ἡμέραν ... ἦ.
μεθ. 1 P. 1. 9 ὃ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα τυφλὸς ἦτοιν.
οδὸς μή: 2 P. 1. 10 ὃδος τῇ πταίσθε ποτὲ.
μία: J. 8 σάρκα μέν μαίνοντα.
μίας μα: 2 P. 2. 20 ἀποφαγόντες τα μάσαμα τοῦ κόσμου.
μίας μοί: 2 P. 2. 10 οὕτως σάρκις εἰς ἐπιθυμίας μιαμοῦ πορευο-
μένους.
μίας κομαί: 2 P. 3. μηθηρᾶς τῶν προερημών ῥημάτων, J. 17
μηθηρᾶς τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προερημών.
μίας εἰς χαλκοὶ: 2 P. 2. 23 μισοῦντας καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιλαμβανόν χωδά.
μίας εἰς καὶ αἱ: 2 P. 2. 13 κομούμενος (αἱ. αὐθεεούμενοι) μυθοῦν αὐθεείας 2. 15
μυθοῦν αὐθεείας ἡμῖν πάντα τοῦ Βαλαίμα μυθοῦν εὐχεθήσατο.
μίας εἰς: 2 P. 1. 15 τοῦτοι μίημα ποιεῖται, pp. xxxii, ix.
μίας εἰς: 2 P. 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοῖς ἔχοντες μεστοῦ μοιχαλῶς.
μίας εἰς: J. 4 τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον 'Ι. Χρεόμενοι, 25 μόνε Θεός
σωτῆρι ἠμῶν.
μίας εἰς: 2 P. 1. 16 ἐσοφισμόμενοι μίθοις ἐξακολουηθήσατε.
μίας εἰς: J. 14 ἤθεν Κύριον ἐν αἰγίας μισθώμεν αὐτοῦ, p. xxi.
μίας εἰς: 2 P. 1. 9 τυφλὸς ἐστῶν μυστηρίων, p. lxi.
μίας εἰς: 2 P. 2. 13 σπλαχνοὶ καὶ μούμοι.
Μίας εἰς: J. 9 τῷ διαβάζει διακρινομένου διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωσείων
σώματος.

νεφελεῖα: 2 P. 2. 17 ὀρέχα λατρείας (αἱ. νεφελεῖας) ὑπὸ λαστικὸς θλανομένα,
p. 12 οὕτως εἰσίν ... νεφελεῖα ἀνυρίδοι ὑπὸ ἀνεμών παραφρεμέναι.
νυμ: 2 P. 3. 3 οἱ δὲ νῦν ὑπάρχοντας καὶ ἡ γῆ τεθυγρισμένον εἰσὶν πυρὶ, 3. 10
αὐτὸ δὲ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰώνας, J. 25 μόνε Θεός δόξα καὶ νῦν
καὶ εἰς τὰ πάντα τοὺς αἰώνας.
νυσταίς: 2 P. 2. 8 ἡ ἀπολεία αὐτῶν οὐ νυσταίς.
Νώς: 2 P. 2. 5 ὁδὸν Νώς δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα διήλαξεν.
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δυδος: 2 P. 2. 5 οδυν Νωε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα έφύλαξεν, pp. vii, 192

e. δυδος: 2 P. 2. 2 ὅδος τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθῆσεται, 2. 15 καταλείποντες (αλ. καταλείποντες) εὑρίσκαν ὁδὸν, ὑδ. ἐξακολουθήσατε τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ, 2. 21 εγεννοκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, Ι. 11 τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καίν ἐπορεύθησαν.

οἶδα: 2 P. 1. 12 καίπερ εἰδότας καὶ ἐστηργμένοις εν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ, 1. 14 εἰδος ὅτι ἐστὶν ἆπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος μου, 2. 9 οδιν Κλέρος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ μένυθα, Ι. 5 ὑπομνήσας ὡμᾶς βούλομαι εἰδότας ὡμᾶς πάντα, 10 ὡς μὲν οὐκ ὁδισσαν βλασφημοῦσιν.

οἴκητριον: J. 6 ἀπολεπίσατο τὸ ἱδιον οἰκητήριον.

σ. δ. δήλωσ: 2 P. 2. 18 δελαίζοντος τοῦ ὀλίγου ἀποφεύγοντας, p. cxviii.

δ. μ. ἰχλη: 2 P. 2. 17 ὑμιχάλα ὡς λαδαπος ἑλανόμεναι.

δ. μοίος: J. 7 τῶν ῥημών τρόπων τούτων ἐκτορεύεται.

μ. οίῳς: J. 8 ὡς μέντοι καὶ ὡς σάρκα μαίνοντος.

σ. δ. πις: 2 P. 2. 10 τῶν ὁπίσω σαρκὸς πορευομένους, 2. 21 εἰς τὰ ὁπίσω ὑποστρέφαται (αλ. ὁπις τὰ ὁπισω), J. 1 ἀπελθοῦντα ὁπίσω σαρκὸς ἐνεργεῖ.

δασοῦ: 2 P. 2. 11 ὅτου ἄγγελοι οὐ φέρωσιν κατ’ αὐτῶν βλασφημοῦν κρίσιν.

δεί: 2 P. 1. 18 εν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἀγώ (αλ. τῷ ἀγῷ ὄρει), iv, cxliv.

δ. σ. η.: 2 P. 1. 4 δι’ ὅτι τῶν μέγυτα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδομένα, 1. 9 ϕ γὰρ μὴ παρέστω ταῦτα τυφλὰς ὡστιν, 1. 17 ὡς εἰς ὅγον εὐδοκήσατο, 1. 19 τῶν λόγων ϕαλὼς ποιέστε προσέγγιστος, ἐως οὖν ἡμῖν διανοῶσιν, 2. 2 δι’ ὅτι ὅδος βλασφημηθῆσεται, 2. 3 αὐτὸ τῇ κρίσις οὐκ ἀργαί, 2. 12 ὡς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦσιν, 2. 15 δι’ ἡμᾶς ἀδικεὶ ἐγέρσιν, 2. 17 ὡς ὁ ζοφὸς τετηρηθῇ, 2. 19 ϕ τίς ἠκούεται τούτῳ καὶ δεδομένως, 3. 1 δευτέρα μὲν γράφει ἑπιστολῆς, ἐν αἷς δεικνύει, 3. 6 ὣς ὁ πατέρας ἐκοιμήθησαν, 3. 8 δι’ ὅτι ἴν (Ἰδίᾳ, σεε p. cxix) δ’ ὁ τότε κόσμος ἀπάλετο, 3. 10 ἐν ὧν οἱ ὄρανοι παρελευσόμεναι, 3. 12 δι’ ὃν ὁρανοὶ λυθήσονται, 3. 13 εἰς τὸν δικαιοσύνην κατοικεῖ, 3. 18 ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσνόητα τις, ὁ οἱ μαθηταὶ στρεβλοῦσιν, 3. 18 ὁ ζοφὸς τετηρηθῇ, 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αἰσθείας ἂν ἠχέβρασαν, καὶ περὶ πάντων σκληρῶν ἂν ἠλάθρασαν, 22, 23 οὐς μὲν ἔλλεγγετε, οὐς δὲ σωζέτε, οὐ δὲ ἔλεητε (readings differ).

δ. σ. ο: 2 P. 1. 13 ἐφ’ ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, Ι. 10 ὡς μὲν οὐκ ἀδισσαν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὡς δὲ φυσικῶς ἐπιστάνται εἰς τούτους φθείρονται.

δ. στις: 2 P. 2. 1 ψυχοδιδασκαλοὶ ὁτινες παρεισάξονε τοῖς εἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας.

δ. τε: J. 9 δι’ (αλ. ὅτε) Μιχαήλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε (αλ. τότε) τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρίσατον διηλεγότα.

δ. τι: (‘that’) 2 P. 1. 14 εἰδος ὅτε, 1. 20, 3. 3 γενώσκοντες ὅτε, 3. 5 λανθάνει ὅτε, 3. 8 λανθανότω ὅτε, Ι. 5 εἰδότας ὅτι, 18 μνησθῇ τῶν ῥημάτων... ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν [ὅτε] ... ἔστωντα.

(‘because’) J. 11 οἷοι αὕτοις ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καίν ἐπορεύθησαν.

οὐ, see μη, pp. 1 f.

οὐαί: J. 11 οἷοι αὗτοις ὅτε.

οὐοδί: 2 P. 1. 8 οὐκ ἀργούς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους.
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oǐn: 2 P. 3. 11 τούτων οὖν (al. οὔτως) πάντων λυσμένων, 3. 17 οἷμείς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, φιλάσσεσθε.
oubarɔs: 2 P. 1. 18 φωνὴν ἐξ οὖραν ἐνεχθέσαν, 3. 5 οὖραν ἤσαν ἐκκαλας, 3. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὖραν καὶ ἡ γῆ, 3. 10 οἱ οὖραν οὐκ ἤρθον παρελεύσονται (al. οὕτως), 3. 12 οὖραν πυρομένου λυθήσονται, 3. 13 καινοὶ δὲ οὖραν καὶ γῆν καίνων προσδοκοίμεθα, p. xxxiiii.
oútos: 2 P. 1. 17 οὗτος ἵνα οὗς μοι ὁ ἀγαπητός, 1. 18 ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἤμεις ἥκοσαμεν, 3. 1 ταύτην ἤθελεν ὡς γράφο ἐπιστολήν, 1. 6 καὶ αὐτὸ τούτῳ δὲ (al. καὶ αὐτῷ δὲ) στούδην πάσαν παρεισενέχοντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε, 1. 20, 3. 8 τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες, 3. 5 λατάνθαι γὰρ αὐτοῖς τούτῳ θέλωντας, 3. 8 ἐν δὲ τούτῳ μὴ λαβανθῇ ὡμᾶς, 1. 12 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, 2. 19 ψ' γὰρ τις ἤττηται τούτῳ διδοῦλωται, 2. 12 οὖτοι δὲ ὡς ἄλογα ἤδω, 2. 17 οὖτοι εἰσὶν πηγαί ἀνδροί, 1. 8 ταύτα ὡς ἕτοροντα, 1. 9 ψ' γὰρ μὴ πάρεστι ταύτα, 1. 10 ταύτα ποιοῦντες, 3. 14 ταύτα προσδοκοῖμεν, 1. 4 ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνίας φύσεως, 1. 12 ὑπομονηκέχοντες περὶ τούτων, 1. 15 τὴν τούτων μηχάνην τουεῖσθαι, 3. 11 τούτων οὖν πάντων λυσμένων, 3. 18 λαλῶν περὶ τούτων, 2. 20 τούτως δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακόντες, 3. 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τούτῳ τὸ κρίμα, 5 εἰδότας ὡς τούτο (al. πάντα), 3. 9 δοκεῖ καὶ οὖτοι ἐντυπωσάμονοι, 10 οὖτοι δὲ ὡς καὶ οὐκ ὁδόνθαν βλάσφημοισιν, 12. 10, 19 οὖτοί εἰσίν, 7 τὸν διὸν τρόπον τούτους, 10 ἐν τούτοις φθέρονται, 14 ἐπροφήτευσον δὲ καὶ τούτους. Prospective use p. xciii f., 25.
oútos: 2 P. 1. 11 οὗτος γὰρ πλούσιοι ἐπιχορηγήσασθε, 3. 4 πάντα οὖτως διαμάντει ἀπ' ἀρχὴς κτίσεως, 3. 11 τούτων οὖτως (al. οὖν) πάντων λυσμένων.

φθαλίοις: 2 P. 2. 14 φθαλίοις ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοχαλίδος.

πάλαι: 2 P. 1. 9 τῶν πάλαι αὐτῶν ἁμαρτών, 4. 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τούτῳ τὸ κρίμα.
πάλαι: 2 P. 2. 20 τούτως πάλαι ἐμπλακόντες.

παρά: (c. gen.) 2 P. 1. 17 λαβὼν παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός τιμήν.
παρά: (c. dat.) 2 P. 2. 11 οἱ φέροντες κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ Κυρίῳ (al. οὕτως), see p. excvii) βλάσφημον κρίσιν, 3. 8 μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη.

παραγελία: p. 64.
παράδειξις: p. 64.
παράθηκη: p. 62.
παρακάλεω: J. 3 παρακαλῶν ἑπαγωνίζοντας.
παρανομία: 2 P. 2. 16 ἔλεγχων δὲ ήσχεν ἡδίᾳ παρανομία.
παραφέρω: J. 12 νεφελάς ἄνδροι ὑπὸ ἄγαν παραφερόμεθα, p. 33.
παραφοβία: 2 P. 2. 16 τὴν τοῦ προφητῶν παραφοβία.
πάρειμι: 2 P. 1. 5 τάτα ὡς πάροντα (al. ἐπάρχοντα), 1. 9 ψ' γὰρ μὴ πάρεστιν ταύτα, 1. 12 ἐστηριγμένοιν ἐν τῇ παρονόμω ἄλθεια (παραδοθεία Sp.).

κατὰ: παρεισάγω: 2 P. 2. 1 παρεισάγοντι αἰρέσεις ἀπολείας.
κατὰ: παρεισδύσαντι τινὲς ἀνθρωποί.
INDEX OF GREEK WORDS 231

c. d. παρείσφερω: 2 P. 1. 15 σπουδήν πᾶσαν παρεισφερέντας, pp. lx, lxi.
παρεισφερω μαία: 2 P. 3. 10 οι σύμφωνοι θεοί διδόντως παρεισφέρουσαν.
παροιμία: 2 P. 2. 22 το τής θαλάτου παροιμίας.
παρουσία: 2 P. 1. 18 'I.X. δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, 3. 4 ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς
παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, 3. 12 τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, pp. lxxiv f., 193.
πάντα: 2 P. 1. 3 πάντα τὰ πρὸς ζωήν, 1. 5 σπουδήν πᾶσαν παρεισφερέντας, 1. 20 πᾶσα προφητεία γραφής, 3. 4 πάντα οὕτως διαμένει, 3. 9 πάντας εἰς
μετανόην χρὴματίζον, 3. 11 τούτων οὖν πάντων λοιμώνων, 3. 16 ἐν πάσιν
ἐπιστολαίς (al. ταῖς ἐπ.), 3. 8 πάναν σπουδὴν ποιούμενον, 5 εἴδοσιν ὡμᾶς πάντα (readings differ), 15 ποιήσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, καὶ ἐλέγξαι
πάντας τοὺς ἀσέβεις περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων . . . καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν
σκληρῶν, 25 μόνη Θεό δέσι πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς
πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.
παράθυρο: 2 P. 1. 17 παρὰ Θεοῦ παράθυρος, 3. 4 οἱ πατέρες ἱκκομηθήσαν, J. 1 τοῦ
 GetHashCode() Θεό πατρὶ ἡγατμένοις.
Παύλος: 2 P. 3. 16 ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παύλος.
pείρασμός: 2 P. 2. 9 εὐσέβεις ἐκ πιερασμοῦ ῥίζεσθαι.
pερί: (c. gen.) 2 P. 1. 15 ὑπομνημάκειν περὶ τούτων, 3. 18 λαλῶν περὶ
tούτων, J. 3 περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας γράφατι, 9 διέλεγεν περὶ
tοῦ Μονοθεῶς σώματος, 15 ἐλέγξαι περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων καὶ περὶ
πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν.
(p. acc.) J. 7 Σῶδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αὐτὰ πάντα πόλεις.
pεριέχει εἰς γραφή: 1 P. 2. 6, p. xeviii.
pερισσεύω: pp. 93 f.
pερίφασις: (ἐπίγνωσις) pp. 172 ff 213.
Pέτρος: 2 P. 1. 1 Συμεών Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Τ.X.
πηγή: 2 P. 2. 17 εὐθύς ἐξίσον πηγάλ ἀνέδροι.
pιστεύω: J. 5 τοὺς μὴ πιστεύουσαν ἀπώλεσαν.
πίστις: 2 P. 1. 1 τοῖς ἵδοιμοι ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν, 1. 5 ἐπικορηγήσατε
ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀφετῆν, J. 3 ἐπαγωγώσαθα τῇ ἀποκάλυψις τοῖς
ἀγίοις πιστεῖ, 20 εὐκοιτισμοhuntes ἑαυτοῦ τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει.
pλάνα: 2 P. 2. 15 ἐπιλείχατον ἕξακολουθήσατε τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ
Βαλαίμον.
pλάνη: 2 P. 2. 18 εἰ πλάνη ἀναστρεφόμενος, 3. 17 τῇ τῶν ἄθεσμων πλάνῃ
συπαχθέντος, J. 13 αστέρες πλαώται (al. πλανήτες).
p. c. πλάνη: J. 13 αστέρες πλαώται (al. πλανήτες).
πλαστοίς: 2 P. 2. 3 πλαστοῖς λογίως ὡμᾶς ἐμπορεύονται.
pλευκάζω: 2 P. 1. 8 παίνει πλευκάζων ἅπι ἄργους καθίστησιν.
pλεονεκρία: 2 P. 2. 8 εἰ πλεονεκρία ὡμᾶς ἐμπορεύονται, 2. 14 καρδίαν
γεγυμναμάθην πλεονεκρίας ἕξοντες.
pληθυσμός: 2 P. 1. 2 ἀστέρες ὡμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείση, J. 2 ἔλεος ὡμῶν καὶ
εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείση.
πλουσίως: 2 P. 1. 11 πλουσίως ἐπικορηγήσατο ὡμῖν ἡ ἐλεοθ. ἔλεος ἐς
τὴν αἰῶνον βασιλεύσει.
pνεύμα: 2 P. 1. 21 ἕντο πνεύματος ἁγίον φερόμενον ἐλάλησαν, J. 19
ψυχικός, πνεύμα μὴ ἤχοντες, 20 ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι,
p. xxiv.
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ποίεω: 2 P. 1. 10 βεβαιαν ἰμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογήν ποιεῖσθαι, ἵδ.
tαύτα γάρ ποιοῦντες, 1. 15 τούτων μεγίστην ποιεῖσθαι, 1. 19 ψ. καλῶς
ποιεῖσθαι προσέχοντες, J. 3 πάσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος, 15 ποιήσατε κρίσιν
κατὰ πάντων, ρ. xlii.

ποιμαίνω: J. 12 ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες.

πὸλεις: 2 P. 2. 6 πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας, J. 7 αἰ. αὕτης πόλεις.

πολύς: 2 P. 2. 3 πολλοῖς ἐξακολουθήσοντων αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσεβείαις.

παρέχω: 2 P. 2. 10 τούς ὁποῖοι σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μισσοῦ τορευο-
μένον, 3. 3 κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευομένων, 11 τῇ ἀδε
τοῦ Καιν ἐπορευότατον, 18 κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευομένων, 18 κατὰ
τὰς ἐναυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευομένων τῶν ἀσεβείων.

ποτέ: 2 P. 1. 10 οὐ μὴ πταίσητε ποτέ, 1. 21 οὖ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου

ποτήριον: 2 P. 3. 11 ποταμοῦ δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ἵμαρ.

ποτός: 2 P. 1. 10 οὐ μὴ πταίσητε ποτέ, 1. 21 οὖ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου

ποινικός: 2 P. 3. 11 ποταμοῦ δεῖ ὑπάρξειν ἤμαρ.

ποιεῖσθαι potē.

ποιμαίνω: J. 12 ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες.

πρὸ: 2 P. 3. 4 ποιεῖσθαι ἒπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; p. llii.

πρὸς: c. acc. 2 P. 1. 3 πάντα τῶν πρὀς τούτου ἰδίων.

προφητεύω: 2 P. 2. 10 πάσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἵδια ἐπιλύσεως οὐ
gίνεται, 1. 21 οὖ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπουν ἡρέθη προφητεία τοτέ.

προβαλλω: 2 P. 3. 12 προορισκομένας τῆς παρουσίας, 13 καὶ νῦν ἰδ

προσέχω: 2 P. 2. 1. 19 ψ. καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες.

πρόσωπον: 2 P. 2. 18 προσώπων πρόσωπων πρόσωπων.

προφητεύω: J. 14 ἐπιφωνεύσειν (ἀλ. προφητεύσειν) δὲ καὶ τούτως

προφήτης: 2 P. 2. 1. 19 ψ. καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες.

προφήτης: J. 14 ἐπιφωνεύσειν (ἀλ. προφητεύσειν) δὲ καὶ τούτως

προφήτης: 2 P. 2. 10 τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφροσύνης, 3. 2 καὶ

προφητικός: 2 P. 2. 10 τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφροσύνης, 3. 2 καὶ

προφήτευω: 2 P. 2. 20 γέγονεν αὕτου τὰ ἐκάστα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων, 1. 20,

προφήτης: 2 P. 2. 10 τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφροσύνης, 3. 2 καὶ

προφήτης: 2 P. 2. 10 τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφροσύνης, 3. 2 καὶ

προφήτης: J. 14 ἐπιφωνεύσειν (ἀλ. προφητεύσειν) δὲ καὶ τούτως

προφήτης: J. 14 ἐπιφωνεύσειν (ἀλ. προφητεύσειν) δὲ καὶ τούτως

προφήτης: 2 P. 2. 20 γέγονεν αὕτου τὰ ἐκάστα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων, 1. 20,

προφήτης: J. 14 ἐπιφωνεύσειν (ἀλ. προφητεύσειν) δὲ καὶ τούτως

προφήτης: J. 14 ἐπιφωνεύσειν (ἀλ. προφητεύσειν) δὲ καὶ τούτως

προφήτης: 2 P. 2. 10 τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφροσύνης, 3. 2 καὶ

προφήτης: J. 14 ἐπιφωνεύσειν (ἀλ. προφητεύσειν) δὲ καὶ τούτως

προφήτης: J. 14 ἐπιφωνεύσειν (ἀλ. προφητεύσειν) δὲ καὶ τούτως

προφήτης: 2 P. 2. 10 τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφροσύνης, 3. 2 καὶ
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b. c. d. ροι ζη δν: 2 P. 3. 10 οι οἰρανοὶ μοιζήδων παρελεύσονται.
ρύο μα: 2 P. 2. 7 δίκαιοι Δωτ ςρύσατο (ἀλ. ςρύσατο), 2. 9 οίδεν Κύριος εὐθεῖς εἰκ περασμοῦ μέσονα.

ε. σαρξ: 2 P. 2. 10 τοὺς ὅσιόν σαρκὸς ἐν ἐκτιθῆμα μασοῦ πορευομένον, 18 δειλαίως ἐν ἐκκεθήμασι σαρκὸς ἄσπελευσει τοὺς ὅλοις ἀποπεφυγόντας, Ἰ. 7 ἀπελθοῦσα διὰ σοφίας σαρκὸς ἐξέρχετο οὔτως, 8 ἐνεπικράτει σάρκα μὴν μαίνεται, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετείναι, 23 μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμέναν χιτώνα.
σὲρ ἄ, σὲρ εἰράσ ἐστιν εἰράσ (ἀλ. εἰράσ): 2 P. 2. 4 σερεθις (ἀλ. σερεθις) ζώους ταρατσάσας παρεδωκένς εἰς κράτος προμυγένους.

ε. σηκήωμα: 2 P. 1. 13 ἐφ' ὅσον εἶμι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, ἑκατὸν ἐπιάσας τοῦ σκηνώματος μου, ἐπὶ εὐκρηξία, εὐκρηξία.
σιλό: Ι. 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν (ἀλ. ἀδα. λόγων) ὑπὸ ἡλικιαν. σιλοτος: 2 P. 2. 17 and Ι. 18 ὅ τις ςφός τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τεθηρύθη. Σιλομα: 2 P. 2. 6 πόλεις Σιλομαίας καὶ Σιλομάας τεθηρύθης κατέκρυψε, Ἰ. 7 πόλει κἄτομα καὶ τῆς πόλεως πρόκειται δήγαμα.
σομία: 2 P. 3. 15 κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν.
σομία: 2 P. 1. 16 συσφιασμένοις μύσις ἐξακολουθήσασες. σοφία: Ι. 25 μοῖνος σοφὸς Θεός (ἀλ. ὑστ. σοφός).
σπειρά: 2 P. 3. 13 σπειρυότας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ζῷας.
σειράς: Ι. 12 οὐτοί εἰσών [ο] ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις υἱῶν σπειράδες συνενωμένους, π. ξι.
σίλοι: 2 P. 2. 18 σπειραί καὶ μῶιοι ἐντρυφώντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις (ἀλ. ἀγάπαις) αὐτῶν συνενωμένους μίων.
σίλος: 2 P. 3. 22 τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένοι χιτώνα.
σπειραί: 2 P. 1. 10 σπειραίατε βεβαιαί υἱῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν μισώδεις, 1. 15 σπειραίας δὲ καὶ ἑκάστου ἕχειν υἱῶν τὴν τούτων μωμῆν σπειραίας, 3. 14 σπειραίας ἀποπλούσαι καὶ μισωμένοι αὐτῶν εἰρεθήσει.
σπυρί: 2 P. 1. 5 σπυρίς πάσαν παρεισενέγκατες, Ἰ. 8 πάσαν σπυρίς ποιονεμόννοι γράφετε υἱῶν.
σπυρίς: 2 P. 3. 17 μισωμένοις ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αἰρεθείς.
σπυρί: 2 P. 3. 10 στοιχεῖα κανονοῦμενα λυθήσεται, 3. 12 στοιχεία κανονοῦμενα τίκτηται.
σπυρίς: 2 P. 1. 12 καθαρισμόν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αἰρεθείς.
σπυρίς: 2 P. 3. 10 στοιχεία κανονοῦμενα λυθήσεται, 3. 12 στοιχεία κανονοῦμενα τίκτηται.
σπυρίς: 2 P. 1. 12 καθαρισμόν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αἰρεθείς.
σπυρίς: 2 P. 3. 10 στοιχεία κανονοῦμενα λυθήσεται, 3. 12 στοιχεία κανονοῦμενα τίκτηται.
στεραθευμα: Ι. 16 τὰ στομά αὐτῶν ἀλλεὶς ὢντες.
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 Psi m, gra sportologh, J. 2 aleos imin plathunthei, 3 grafein imin, id. grafei: f. n. 12 imas upomimseis, 1. 13, 15, 2. 5, 3. 8, 9, 11, J. 24.

 B a i n o w: 2 P. 2. 22 stimerheken autous to tis archous paroxias.

 Zuph mew: 2 P. 1. 1 Symew (al. Ximew) Petros, pp. 180 f., ii.

 V in: 2 P. 1. 18 sin anfdoi ontes en to trei to aigm.

 V na p a g: 2 P. 3. 17 tois abtimoi plagn synapaxontai.


 V ni o s: 2 P. 3. 5 qhe idosato kai did odatos synestwa to th tove logia.

 S 0 x: J. 5 lodin ek ypsi Alxipouto swag, 23 ovs men elaitai diakrinoimones ovs de sou.

 S o ma: J. 9 peri tou Mawsewsw symatos.

 T e: 2 P. 1. 10 tou Theou imon kai swthros 'I. X., 1. 11 thn alwewn basileian tou kuriou kai swthros 'I. X. 2. 20 en epitouv tou Theou kai swthros 'I. X., 3. 2 tou kuriou kai swthros, 3. 13 afetanata en gnwseis tou kuriou kai swthros, J. 25 mon ypsi swthri imon di 'I. X. tou kuriou imon.

 D. a. t e f r: 2 P. 2. 5 polis Xeidipnos kai Gomopras tevrosas katekrinon, p. vii.

 D. c. d. suneuq kor: 2 P. 3. 12 stoukheia kauvoymena tiktetai.

 T e: 2 P. 2. 4 eis krious tevoumivos (al. kolazomwv tevoumivos), 2. 9 adikos eis hmeras krioumivos kolazomwv tevoumivos, 2. 17 ois zofos tou skouton tevthrotai, 3. 1 th noi en ono roi... tevthrotati eis thn tevoumivos eis hmeras kriovs, J. 1 tevthretai klyros, eis zofos tou pou tevthretai thn kai thn krious megalh hmeras tevthrotai, 13 ois zofos tou skouton eis aionw tevthrotai, 21 aionw eis hmera Theou tprastai.

 D. f. s. suneuq kor: 2 P. 2. 6 ypodeigma melleonton asabewon (al. asabewon) tevthrok.

 T e: 2 P. 1. 17 laiwn para Theou patrov timon kai dixen.

 Suneuq kor: 2 P. 1. 4 ta tima kai megaista imin epaggeimat (al. ta megaista kai tima imon epaggeimat).

 T e: 2 P. 2. 19 o yper tis tevthrotai touto kai deivlota (al. om. kal), 3. 9 ois teves bradunetai govnatai... me bovalmevnois teves apoletai, 3. 18 en als eisw pagenota tiva, J. 4 parapsidouna yper teves anbropov.

 The interrogative tis does not occur.

 C. d. to iso o: 2 P. 2. 17 fwnhs enegkleias autou toiaudai.

 T e: 2 P. 1. 9 en eisw bradunetai krious epaggeimat philagogias.

 D. d. to iso o: 2 P. 2. 10 toymata aubhdeis.
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ρός 2 P. 1. 19 ός λύχνα φαίνοντι ἐν αἰχμηρῷ τόπῳ.
τότε: 2 P. 3. 6 ο τότε κόσμος ἀπάλετο, Ἰ. 9 οτε Μιχαήλ . . . τότε διακρινό-
μενος διελέγετο (ἀλ. ὁ δὲ Μ. . . , οτε).
τρέμω 2 P. 2. 10 δοξας ου τρέμουσιν.
τρόπος 2 J. 7 των όμιοιον τρόπον τότους ἑκοτοναίσασθαι.
τρυφή: 2 P. 2. 18 ἡδονή ἠγούμενοι την ἐν ἡμέρα τρυφήν.
τυφλός 2 P. 1. 9 τυφλός ἔστιν μωσαϊκών.

δώρα 2 P. 3. 5 γα ἐξ ὅλατος καὶ δι’ ὅλατος συνεστώσα, 3. 6 ο τότε κόσμος
δεῖται κατακλυθείς ἀπάλετο.

νόστος 2 P. 1. 17 οὐτός ἐστιν ὁ νόστος μου ὁ ἀγαπητός (ἀλ. ὁ νόστος μου, ὁ
ἀγαπητός μου, οὐτός ἐστιν).

προχω: 2 P. 1. 8 ταῦτα ὧμων ὑπάρχοντα (ἀλ. παρόντα), 19 αὐτοὶ δούλων
ὑπάρχουσε, 3. 11 ποιητοὺς δει ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς.

προϊκός: 2 P. 2. 18 ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι, ρ. 

πρός 2 P. 1. 7 πρὸς αὐτοῦ δίκαι ὑπέχουσαν.

πρός: (c. gen.) 2 P. 1. 7 ὑφῆς ἐνεχθεῖσας αὐτῆς ὑπ’ (ἀπο, θεο p. excviiii) τῆς
μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης, 2. 11 ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἄγιον φερόμενοι, 2. 7 δίκαιοι
Λὸς κατατυπομένου ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἄθαντων ἐν ἀσέλγεια ἀναστροφῆς
ἐρύθησα, 2. 17 ὁμίλια ὑπὸ λαλάτως ἐλανόμεναι, 3. 1 μεταβοῦσιν τῶν
προερχομένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἄγιων προφητῶν, 12 κεφαλαὶ ἀνδρῶν
ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι, 17 μνήμης τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προερχομένων
ὑπὸ τῶν ἄντων.

πρός: (c. acc.) 2 J. 9 ἀγγέλους . . . ὑπὸ ἑοραν τετήρηκεν.

πρὸς: (c. gen.) 2 P. 2. 6 ὑπόθευγα μελλόντων ἀσεβείων τεθεικώς, p. excv.

πρὸς: (c. gen.) 2 P. 2. 16 ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπων φωνή φθεγγά-
μανον.

πρὸς: (c. gen.) 2 P. 1. 12. ἀς ὑμᾶς ὑπομονήσας περὶ τούτων, Ἰ. 5
ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι.

πρὸς: (c. gen.) 2 P. 1. 18 δειγματικῶς ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 3. 11 δειγματικῶς ὑμῶν
ἐν ὑπομνήσει τῆς εἰλικρινὸς διάνοιαν.

πρὸς: (c. gen.) 2 P. 1. 5 (ἐπιχορηγήσατε) ἐν τῇ ἐγκρατείᾳ τῆς ὑπομνήσου, ἐν δὲ
τῇ ὑπομνήσες τῆς εὐδοκείων.

πρὸς: (c. gen.) 2 P. 2. 21 ὑποστρέφαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείας αὐτοῦ ἀγιῶς
ἀπολέσῃς.

πρὸς: (c. gen.) 2 P. 2. 22 ὑπὸ λουσσάμενη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου.

φάινω: 2 P. 1. 19 προσέχοντες ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν ἀχμηρῷ τόπῳ.
φαίνω: 2 P. 2. 4 ἀγγελῶν ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, 2. 5 ἀρχαίου
κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο.

φέρω: 2 P. 1. 17 φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσας αὐτοῦ τοιαύτε, 1. 18 ταῦτα τῆς ἄγιῳ
ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθείσαν, 1. 21 οὐ γὰρ θελήματι
ἀνθρώπου ἠνέκαθε προφητεία ποτὲ, ἢ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἄγιον φερόμενοι, 2. 11
οὐ φέροντι κατ’ αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν.

φερω: 2 P. 2. 18 ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπων φωνή
φθεγγάμανον, 2. 18 ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι.

φερω: 2 P. 2. 12 ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται (ἀλ. καταφθ.),
Ἰ. 10 ἐν τούτωι φθείρονται.
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φθορά: 2 Ρ. 1. 4 ἀποφυγόντες τὴς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθοράς, 2. 12 γεγενημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἄλοιπον καὶ φθοράν, . . . ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρῆσονται, 2. 19 δούλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς, pp. 190, 176–9.

d. e. φιλάδελφεία: 2 Ρ. 1. 7 (ἐπιχορηγήσατε) ἐν τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ τῆς φιλαδελφείας, ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφείᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην.

φόβος: J. 22 οὐς δὲ ἔλειτε ἐν φόβῳ.

φυλάσσω: 2 Ρ. 2. 5 δύονοι Νοεὶ δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξαν, 3. 17 φυλάσσοντες ἵνα μὴ . . . ἐκπέμπετε τοῦ ἰδίου στηργμοῦ, J. 24 τῷ δυναμένω φυλάξαι ὡς ἀπαίτατος.

d. φυσικός: 2 Ρ. 2. 12 ζῶα γεγενημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἄλοιπον, p. viii.

c. d. φυσικός: J. 10 οὐ δὲ φυσικὸς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα ἐπίσταται.

φύσις: 2 Ρ. 1. 4 ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινοῖς φύσεως.

φωνή: 2 Ρ. 1. 17 φωνὴς ἐνεχείωσεν αὐτῷ τοιαύτῃ ὡς (ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης, 1. 18 ταύτην τὴν φωνήν ἡμεῖς ἡκούσαμεν, 2. 16 ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγγάζονος, p. lxi.

c. d. φωσφόρος: 2 Ρ. 1. 19 εἰς οὗ φωσφόρος ἀνατελή ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὠμῶν.


χάριν: J. 10 θαυμάζοντες πρόςωπα ὀφελέσαι χάριν.

χίλιοι: 2 Ρ. 3. 8 μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἡμέρα ἡ καὶ χίλια ἡ ἡμέρα μία.

χιτών: J. 28 μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκός ἐσπιλωμένον χιτώνα.

χρίστος: never alone, nor before Ἰησοῦς, follows Ἰησοῦς in 2 Ρ. 1. 1 bis, 1. 8, 1. 11, 1. 14, 1. 16, 2. 20, 3. 18, and in J. 1. 4, 17, 21, 25.

χρόνος: J. 18 ἐκ ἴσχατον χρόνου.

χωρέω: 2 Ρ. 3. 9 πάντας εἰς μετανοιαν χωρέσαι.

a. c. ψευδοδίασκαλος: 2 Ρ. 2. 1 ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσονται ψευδοδίασκαλοι.

b. ψευδοπροφήτης: 2 Ρ. 2. 1 ἐγένοτο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ.

ψυχή: 2 Ρ. 2. 8 ψυχήν δικαίων ἀνώμοις ἢργοι ἢβασάνων, 2. 11 διελεύθερος ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους.

d. e. ψυχικός: J. 19 οὔτος εἰσὶς ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἤχοτες, pp. xxiv, clxxvii f.

δόσιν: followed by substantive (α) 2 Ρ. 1. 19, 2. 12, 3. 8, 3. 10, 3. 16, J. 7, 10; followed by verb (β) 2 Ρ. 2. 1, 3. 9; followed by participle 2 Ρ. 1. 8, cf. pp. liii, cii.

δόφιλα: J. 16 ὀφελέσαι χάριν.
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<tr>
<td>Abraham, Assumption of</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives in J. and 2 P. xliii; in 1 P.</td>
<td>xcv</td>
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<tr>
<td>Advent, Second, 200 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs, li, ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agapé, 40, 133 f., 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alford, 27, 108, 112, 126, 161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliteration, lix, civ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacoluthon in Jude and 2 P., liv; in 1 P. ciili</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anathemases, 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo, fallen, clviii–clxvi, 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antecedent of relative, ambiguous, xli, xcv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist Ind. answering to English Perfect in J. and 2 P. xliii; in 1 P., xcv f.; Aor. Imper. of urgency, xliii f., xcv i; Aor. Inf. of a momentary act, xliii f.; Aor. Part. expresses antecedence either temporal or logical, xlv–xlvi; used for Perf. Part., xlvii f., xcvii f.; Pres. and Aor. combined γραφειν, γράφαται, 22; τιμάται and τιμήσατε, xcv i; Aor. and Perf. Part. combined xcvii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalypse of Peter, resemblance to 2 P., cxxx–cxxxiv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocryphal books used by early Christian writers, especially Jude, cliii fol. See under Enoch, Moses, Apocalypse of Peter, Testaments of the Patriarchs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark a symbol of the Church, vii, lxxxi–lxxxiil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, T., on the interpretation of prophecy, 196-198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article, use of, in J. and 2 P., xxxi–xxxv; in 1 P., lxxxix, xc; omission of the article in poetry and prophecy, xxxiv, xxxv; art. with two nouns, xxxv, 27; wrongly inserted in text J. v. 5 (clxxxiv); in J. v. 12 (clxxv); 2 P. 29 (cxcv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity, see Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon a name for Rome with the early Christians, cxxxix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balaam, 39, 136-8, 201-205; Balaamites, clxxvi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B’s ass speaking with man’s voice, x, 203 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balfour, A., on cosmical changes, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism illustrated by Noah’s deliverance, lxxxii–lxxxi; sin after, vi, xii, xx, 30, 96, 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batiffol on the Agape, 200 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bede, 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal, 33, 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigg, ix, xvii, xxii, xxiv, xcvii, xlv f., xcvii, ci, ovii, cxxvi, cxxvii, 25, 28, 35, 40, 95, 103 f., 119, 126, 129 f, 133, 144, 154, 159, 160, 168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cain and Korah highly esteemed by the Ophites, 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling of God, 20 f.; through the life of Christ, 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin, 165 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases in J. and 2 P., cxxxv–xxxv; in 1 P., xcvii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles, 25, 26, 36, 45, 99, 121, 162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase, iii, xxi, xxv, lx, cxxvii, cxxx, cxi f., 19, 25, 31, 33, 41, 54, 195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiasmus, 162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity, continual growth essential to its life, 65–69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climax, 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compounds with ψευδο-, 115; with ἐστι, see ἐκπαιδευζομαι, ἐκπαιδευσε; with ἁρπαστα, lx.; compound adverbs, 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflation, final, 154, 156, 158 foll., 207–209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion between ἤμεις and ὅμεις, cxxiii f., cxxvii, 87; between ἐς and ὑ, cxxviii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creed, its growth, 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deissman, 69; resemblances of his Carian decree to 2 P. cxxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delugo, why substituted by 2 P. for J.’s punishment of Israel, vi f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of a person, 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivations in -ονα from nouns in -ν, 137; in -ον from -ος, 147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine nature, 87; man’s participation in, 190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Döllinger, xxi f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Doxology, 62-54
Driver, Prof. clix, clxvi

Eight, a mystic number, 192, see "Ogdoad"
Elijah's spirit opposed to the Christian spirit, clxv
Ellipsis in J. and 2 P., lii; in 1 P., cli
Enoch, contrasted with Noah vii; book of, cliii f., clivi, clx, 24, 26, 28, 30 f., 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 76; Secrets of Enoch, clxi, 28, 40
Estius, 28
Evidence external for Jude, cxiv, cxv; for 2 P., cxvi-cxiii; internal for Jude, cxvi foll.; for 2 P. cxxiv-cxxvii
Ewald, 29, 35
Excommunication, 70 f.

Faith, right and wrong ways of defending it, 70, 71
Fetloe, 118
Field, cxiii, 36, 64, 99, 107

Gender in J. and P. xl., in 1 P. xciii
Gospel of St. Mark alluded to, 194
Gow, 55
Grammar of Jude and 2 P. Introd. ch. ii, xxvi-lv
Gwynn, clxxi foll. 1

Harnack, cxiv, 67
Hare, Julius, 50
Hatch, 172
Holl, harrowing of, lxxxiii f.
Hellenism in 2 P., iii
Hendiadys, liv
Heresies of the later part of the First
Cent., clxvii-clxxx
Hofmann, 25, 129, 132, 134
Horner, G., 1, clxxx, foll.
Hort, xxii, xxv, lxxiv, lxxxv, xxvii, cv, clxxiv, clxxvii; 20, 21, 25, 52, 139, 162, 167, 184, 187, 188
Hundhausen 88, 90, 94, 136, 140, 141, 159

Imperative, xliii f., xcvii
Infinite with art, xcvii, rare in N.T., xlv; other uses, xlv f., xcvii f.
Indexuses, unusual in J. and 2 P., xxvi; in 1 P., lxxxix

James, M., cxxvii foll., cv
Jerome on Epp. of Peter, lxxviii
Josephus, resemblances to 2 P., cxxvii foll.
Joshua, 29

Jude: Relation of his Epistle to 2 P., Introd., i-xxv; detailed comparison of contents i-xv; doctrinal differences and resemblances, xv-xxi; priority of Jude discussed, xxi-xxv; Grammar and style, xxvi-lxvii; life and character, clxvi-clxvii; use of apocryphal books, cliii-clxi; his account of the Libertines, clxvii foll.; fondness for triplets, lvi f.; written to Jews, 20, fragment contained in Fayoum papyrus, cxxvi; authenticity, cv f.; date cxxiv

Kenyon, F. G., cxxvii, coi
Knowledge of God, its effects, 183-7

Life, meaning of, 187-9
Lightfoot, Bp. 18, 24, 26, 34, 41, 52 n., 57 f., 85, 87, 117, 171 foll., 177, cxxvii, cxxxvii foll., clxxii
Luther, 61

Mark, his connexion with Peter, lxxviii
his Gospel alluded to in 2 P. 18, cxli foll.
MSS., 1; errors caused by love of uniformity, 82, ἡεις and ἡεις confused, 87
Michael contending for the body of Moses, 74; story generalized in 2 P., ix

Miracles, 202
Moods, xlii f., xcvii f.
Moral difficulties of the O.T., clxv
Moses, Assumption of, cliii foll., 36
Moulton, J. H., Gr. of N.T., xxvi, xxxv f., xlii f., xlv, xlvi f., li, lxxxix
 Munro on ἀνδρον c. abl. = καταστροφὴ καταστροφή, 124

Negative in J. and 2 P., 1 f.; in 1 P., c, ci
Nestle, 83, 127, 128, 152, cxcix
Number in J. and 2 P., lxxxix, xlv; in 1 P. xciii
Nicolaian heresy, 38, 39, clxxvi f., clxxx

Ogdoad, vii, lvii, cxxvi, 192
Old Testament, allusions in 1 P. and 2 P. lxxxv-lxxxix
Optative rare in N.T., xlv, xcvii

Participle sometimes used instead of finite verb, xviii, xcvii, see aorist
Paul, his letter cited in 2 P. 316, supposed by Zahn to be lost cxxvii, but probably our Ep. to the Romans, 164; his collected Epistles, cxxvii; Lightfoot's account of his stay in Rome, cxxvii foll.
INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Peace caused by the knowledge of God, 183-187
Periphrasis, liii; 'reverential,' xvii f.
St. Peter, names by which he is known, 180; Life and character as seen in the N.T. civ-cxiv; agree with 1 P. not with 2 P. cxi, cxiv f.; Chase and Zahn on his later life cxi f.; his crucifixion, clix

2 Peter, vagueness of, ix; love of iteration, lvii f.; criticisms on his style, lix-lxvii; reference to a former epistle, xiii; allusions to Gospels lxxviii; to O.T. lxxxviii; doctrine of, xvi-xxi; later than Jude, xxi-xxv; its relation to 1 P., lxix-cxiv; probable date, cxxvii; not addressed to the readers of 1 P., cxxxv; addressed to a Graeco-Jewish church, cxxxi

1 Peter, influenced by the writings of St. Paul, xxv, xxv; sense of rhythm, civ; full of reminiscences of Christ's life and teachings, lxxvi-lxxx; Grammar and Style, lxxxix-cv; allusions to O.T. lxxv; ambiguity in, cv
Peter, Gospel of, lxxiv
Philo, resemblances to 2 P. cxxix f.
Pleonasms, lxi, ciii
Plummer, xxii, 161 f.
Plumptre, 48
Plural of abstract nouns, 161
Prayer in the Holy Spirit, 78
Prepositions, excess of, in N.T., lv, xciii
Pronouns in J. and 2 P., xi-xl; in 1 P. xciii-cxv
Prophecy, 111-115; spoken of both in 1 P. and 2 P., lxxxvii f., cxli; Arnold on, 196-198; Baxter on, 197
Psudepigraphts not the same as forgeries, cxxv; condemned by the early Christians, not as fictitious, but as heretical, cxxiv f.

Rampf, 40
Ramsay, 39
Readings of cod. B tested, cci f.
Reiteration in 2 P., lviii; in 1 P., civ
Repentance not limited to this life, vii; possible after falling away, xx
Rhythm of J. and 2 P., lviii f., lxii f.; in 1 P., civ
Richards, H., xxxvii, 86
Robinson, A., 19, 26, 63, 74, 171 foll. 176, 179
Rome, church in, cxxvii foll.; Peter's connexion with, cxi f.
Ryle, clix, cxxvi.

Salutation, form of, 21; in 2 P. 182
Sandy, cxxii
Satn, cxi foll., 74-76
Seven, a mystic number, iii, 44, 192
Silvanus, cxxxiv; in Rome, cxxvii, cxli
Simon Magus, clxxxviii f.
v. Soden, 84
'Sons of God,' how explained, clviii foll.

Sorites or climax, 90 f.
Spirits in prison, lxxiii f.
Spitta, xxii f., cxxxiv, cxliii, cxv, 25, 42, 51, 64, 82, 83, 87, 95 f., 97, 100, 108, 113, 118, 123, 129 f., 131, 133 f., 158, 169
Style of 2 P., objections to, lix foll.
Subjunctive, clix, xcvi
Superlative joined with positive, 86, cxci

Taylor, C., 39
Tennant, clix f.
Tenses, xliii f., xciv f.
Testaments of the Patriarchs, clv, clxiii
Text, 4-15, Introduction on, clxxvii, xcici
Tischendorf, clxxxiii
Tradition as a fact, 61; contents of, 62; its use, 65; danger of its misuse, 67
Transfiguration, accounts compared, 106 f., 195
Tregelles, clxxxii
Trench, 57
Triplet a feature of J.'s style, livi; found also in James, livi

Vansittart, cxvii n.
Verb, inflexions, xxvi; moods and tenses, xlii foll., xciv f.
Version revised, faults in, 93; versions, Syriac and Egyptian, clxii
Virtue, Christian, list of, lvii, 90 f., 191; divine and human, 86
Vocabulary of 1 P. and 2 P. compared, lxix-lxxxvi; of 2 P. criticized, lx, foll.
Voices, rare uses of, xcvi f., xxvii f.

Way of truth, 198 f.
Weiss B., 14
Wernle, 67
Westcott, 38, 88, 167, 209, cxv-cxvii
Weymouth, 23
Wordsworth, Bp. Chr. Ixxii, 41

Zahn, xxii f., clxxxvii, clix f. clxxv, 20, 24, 25, 30, 39, 167, 168 f.
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