This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

B 449449

Digitized by Google

1817
ARTES SCIENTIA
VERITAS
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
TUEBOR
CIRCUMSPICE

Digitized by Google

BS
2
.19

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE

AND THE

SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Bible. N.T. Jude. Greek. 1907.

THE

EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE

AND THE

SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

GREEK TEXT

WITH

INTRODUCTION NOTES AND COMMENTS

BY

JOSEPH B. MAYOR, M.A. CAMB., LITT.D. DUBL.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON
HONORARY FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1907

All Rights Reserved

Digitized by Google

RICHARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED
BREAD STREET HILL, E.C., AND
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

Digitized by Google

07-10-40 J.A.

THOMAE · ARNOLDO

ΦΙΛΑΛΗΘΕΙ ΦΙΛΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΙ ΦΙΛΟΘΕΩΙ

CVIVS · ETIAMNVM · ADSVNT · MIHI

VOX · ILLA · AC · BENE · NOTVS · OLIM · VVLTVS

INTER · PAVCOS · SVPERSTES · DISCIPVLOS

HAEC · STVDIA · SENECTVTIS

QVAE · VTINAM · TANTO · NOMINE · DIGNIORA · ESSENT

GRATO · ANIMO · DEDICO

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Inst. of Arch. Research
Hyper
7-9-40
41095

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*

Digitized by Google

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 πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανεῖσα 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 exprimat. *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.* 1^{12}, *where Field proposes* μελήσω *for* μελλήσω *and Spitta suggests* παραδοθείσῃ *for* παρούσῃ; 3^{10}, *where Vansittart and Abbott suggest*

Digitized by Google

πυρωθήσεται for εὑρεθήσεται; besides 2^{13}, *where it is proposed to read ἀγάπην for ἡδονήν; and* 3^{6}, *where δι' ὅν is proposed for δι' ὧν.*

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 Adumbrationes *of Clement and the compilations of the Catenae, 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.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

P. 22.—On *ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι* add Clem. *Strom.* iii. p. 553 *ἐπαγωνιζόμενος τῇ ἀθέῳ δόξῃ*.

P. 23, l. 9 up.—*For* '1 Cor. 2' *read* '1 Cor. 1^{2}.'

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

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 *ζώουσιν ὑπ' αὐγὰς ἠελίοιο*.

P. 32.—After § 2 add Soph. *Ant.* 640 *γνώμης πατρῴας πάντ' ὄπισθεν ἑστάναι*. On *πρόκειται* add Jos. *B.J.* vi. 2. 1 *καλὸν ὑπόδειγμά σοι πρόκειται βασιλεὺς Ἰεχονίας*, Demosth. p. 1078 *νομίζετε τὸν παῖδα τοῦτον ἱκετηρίαν ὑμῖν προκεῖσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν τετελευτηκότων*.

P. 33, last l.—For repeated *δέ* compare 1 Cor. 1^{12}, $12^{8f.}$, 15^{39}.

P. 40, add to note.—Euphorion ap. Clem. Al. *Strom.* v. p. 673 *fin.* *ζὰψ* (=*θάλασσα*) *δὲ ποτὶ σπιλάδεσσι νεῶν ὀλέτειρα κακύνει*.

P. 46.—After § 1 add: See Hort on 1 P. 2^{11} 'Sometimes desires, as such, are implied to be evil, as in $4^{2,3}$ and 1^{14}. Sometimes they are implied to be evil in so far as they are individual and so separate and ultimately selfish, as in James 1^{14} *ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἐξελκόμενος*: cf. Jude 16 and 18, 2 Pet. 3^{3} *κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι*. Sometimes a desire is called evil (*κακή* Col. 3^{5}, *σαρκική* 1 Pet. 2^{11}, *κοσμική* Tit. 2^{12}).'

P. 46, l. 5 up.—Om. ref. to Hort's note. I had carelessly omitted to notice that he laid the stress on *καιρῷ* not on *ἐσχάτῳ*.

P. 48.—On *ἐποικοδοῦντες* add Clem. *Strom.* v. p. 644 *ἡ κοινὴ πίστις καθάπερ θεμέλιος ὑπόκειται*.

P. 51, l. 3.—*For* '*πρὸ*' *read* '*πρὸς*.'

P. 52.—On *ἄπταιστος* add Epict. *Fr.* 62 Schw. *ἥκιστα πταίσεις ἐν ταῖς κρίσεσιν ἐὰν αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ βίῳ ἄπταιστος διατελῇς*, Antoninus v. 9.

P. 80.—First l. of § 3 add after *δοῦλος* 'in 1^{1}, though we read of *Θεοῦ δοῦλος* in 2^{16}.'

P. 81.—Add after § 2 'Col. 1^{12} *τὴν μερίδα 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 ἐλευθερίας καὶ κυριωτάτης ἀγάπης*.

P. 88, l. 5.—After *δόξαν* add 4 Macc. 18^{3} *θείας μερίδος κατηξιώθησαν*.

P. 89.—Add to § 3 cf. Phil. $2^{12,13}$. l. 3 up, *for* 'Appendix' *read* 'p. cxxx.'

P. 90, ll. 14–16.—Transfer 'in the *δῆμος*' to l. 19 after *στρατόπεδον*. l. 17, *for* 'Polyb. iii. 78' *read* 'Polyb. iii. 68.' l. 1 up, after *κλῖμαξ* add, Cf. the Sorites in Wisdom $6^{15\,f.}$ *ἀρχὴ σοφίας ἡ ἀληθεστάτη παιδείας ἐπιθυμία, φροντὶς δὲ παιδείας ἀγάπη, ἀγάπη δὲ τήρησις νόμων αὐτῆς, προσοχὴ δὲ νόμων βεβαίωσις ἀφθαρσίας, ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ Θεοῦ· ἐπιθυμία ἄρα σοφίας ἀνάγει ἐπὶ βασιλείαν*.

Digitized by Google

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

P. 92, l. 24.—*For* '5^{25}' *read* '5^{23}.' l. 10 up.—On *εὐσέβεια* see Bonitz, *Index to Aristotle s.v.*, Diog. L. iii. 83, and my note on Cic. *N.D.* i. 116.

P. 95.—After § 4 add Cf. Wisdom 13^{1} *μάταιοι πάντες ἄνθρωποι φύσει οἷς παρῆν Θεοῦ ἀγνωσία*, Aesch. *Pers.* 391 *φόβος δὲ πᾶσι βαρβάροις παρῆν*, *Eum.* 385 *θαῦμα δ' ὄμμασιν παρῆν.*

P. 98, last l.—After 5^{10} add Dan. 7^{27} *ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ βασιλεία αἰώνιος*, Isa. 45^{17} *σωτηρία αἰώνιος*, 1 Macc. 2^{57} *θρόνον βασιλείας εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος*, Wisdom 10^{14} *δόξα αἰώνιος.*

P. 101, § 2.—Add on *διεγείρω* 'rare in classical Greek, used in Aristot. *Fr.* of stirring up the feelings, see Bonitz, *Index*, *s.v.* On *σκήνωμα* see quotations from Eus. *H.E.* in Introd. p. cxx, from *Apoc. Pauli* in p. cxxi. *σκῆνος* is used by ps. Plato, see Ast's *Lex.*

P. 104, § 4.—*μεγαλειότης* is found in Jer. 40^{9} (33^{9}) and 3 Esdr. 1^{4}.

P. 105, § 5.—*τοιόσδε* also occurs in Ezra 5^{3}. Other exx. of the use of *μεγαλοπρέπεια* occur in Ps. 20^{5}, $144^{5.\,12}$. The phrase *μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα* occurs in two of the early Greek liturgies (Swainson, pp. 129, 268).

P. 107, § 3.—The reading in Mt. 12^{18} is doubtful: WH. and Ti. omit *εἰς* and read *ὅν* with B ℵ; Treg. reads *ἐν ᾧ* with $C^{1}D$, vg. etc.: *εἰς ὅν* is supported by $C^{2}L$ etc., Clem. *Hom.* iii. 53, Eus. *Dem. Ev.* p. 452 C. § 5.—Dr. Chase states that the phrase *ἅγιον ὄρος* is always followed by a possessive genitive in the O.T. but there seem to be some exceptions, *e.g.* Ps. 87^{1} *οἱ θεμέλιοι αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις*, Isa. 27^{13}, Dan. 9^{20}, 1 Macc. 11^{37} (of a document) *τεθήτω ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ ἐν τόπῳ ἐπισήμῳ.* In Isa. 11^{9} it stands for the Messianic kingdom. § 6.—*ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον*, compare the exx. of *βέβαιον παρέχειν τὴν ὠνήν* 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. 2^{14} *λογομαχεῖν ... ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ τῶν ἀκουόντων*, Gen. 19^{29} *ἐξαπέστειλε τὸν Λὼτ ἐκ μέσου τῆς καταστροφῆς.*

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

P. 133, heading. Om. '12.'

P. 134, l 3 up.—Comma after *ἀκράτοις.*

P. 135, last line.—*Read δίδωμι.*

P. 138, § 4.—*φθεγγόμενοι*, cf. Acts 4^{18} *παρήγγειλαν μὴ φθέγγεσθαι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι.*

P. 141, last § but one *ἥττηται.*—This is the only place where the verb occurs in the N.T., but the cognate *ἡσσόω* is found in 2 Cor. 12^{13}, and *ἧττημα* in Rom. and 1 Cor. We meet with the active in Isa. 54^{17} *πάντας ἡττήσεις.*

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. 1^{12} we have a similar reference to missionaries in the plural, *διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς.*

P. 148, l. 19.—Read 'Pet. 4^{18}.'

P. 151, § 2.—Add R.V. 'compacted out of water and amidst water' and the explanation of Oecumenius *ἡ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος μὲν ὡς ἐξ ὑλικοῦ αἰτίου, δι' ὕδατος δὲ ὡς διὰ τελικοῦ· ὕδωρ γὰρ τὸ συνέχον τὴν γῆν, οἷον κόλλα τις ὑπάρχον αὐτῇ.*

P. 160, n. 3.—Read 'Dr. Bigg.'

Digitized by Google

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

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

2 Peter ch. I compared with Jude, p. i; ch. II, p. v; ch. III, p. xii. Summary of agreements and differences, p. xv; doctrines compared, p. xvi. Priority of Jude maintained against Spitta, Zahn, and Bigg, p. xxi.

CHAPTER II

GRAMMAR AND STYLE OF JUDE AND OF 2 PETER

Unusual Inflexions, p. xxvi. Uses of the Article, p. xxvi; with qualified nouns, p. xxvii; irregular omission of Article, p. xxx, especially in poetry or prophecy, p. xxxiv. Cases, Nom. p. xxxv, Acc. p. xxxvi, Gen. p. xxxvi, Dat. p. xxxviii; Number and Gender, p. xxxix; Pronouns, p. xl; Adjectives, p. xlii. Verbs, Moods and Tenses, p. xlii; Voices, p. xlviii. Compound Sentence, p. xlix. Negatives, p. l. Adverbs and Particles, p. l. Ellipsis, p. li; Pleonasm, p. lii; Periphrases, p. lii; Anacoluthon, p. liv.

CHAPTER III

FURTHER REMARKS ON THE STYLE OF THE TWO EPISTLES

Jude's fondness for triplets, p. lvi; Iteration in 2 P., p. lvii; Rhythmical effects in the two epistles, p. lviii. Criticisms on the style and vocabulary of 2 P. considered, p. lix; vagueness and obscurity of 2 P., p. lxiv.

CHAPTER IV

COMPARISON BETWEEN 1 PETER AND 2 PETER

Differences between them explained by Jerome as due to St. Peter's employing different interpreters, p. lxviii. Resemblances in the vocabulary, p. lxix; words used by 1 P. not by 2 P., p. lxx, used by 2 P. not by 1 P., p. lxxii; specimens of different terminology, p. lxxiv; significant differences, p. lxxvi; the language of 1 P. recalls scenes in our Lord's life or sayings of His, p. lxxvi. It shows also a warmth of feeling and depth of spirituality to which 2 P. affords no parallel, p. lxxviii; there is, however, some resemblance in the topics discussed, p. lxxx. 1 P. has many more allusions to the O.T. than 2 P. has, p. lxxxv.

Digitized by Google

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Comparison between the grammar and style of the two epistles, p. lxxxix. Similarity in their use of the article, p. lxxxix, and generally in their use of the cases, p. xci, especially in their accumulation of prepositions, p. xciii. There is no great difference in their use of the verb, except that 1 P. employs the articular infinitive, p. xcvii, and uses περιέχει and παρεδίδου in a curious way, p. xcviii. Compound sentences, p. xcix; negatives and other particles, p. c. Ellipsis, Anacoluthon, p. ciii. On the whole, 1 P. is a little smoother and easier and has more command of particles; but the difference in grammar and style is much less than that in vocabulary, and this again is less than that in matter, feeling, and personality, p. civ.

CHAPTER V

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE PETER OF THE TWO EPISTLES AND THE PETER OF THE REST OF THE N.T.

The character of St. Peter as it comes out in the Gospels, p. cvi, in the Acts, p. cx, in Galatians, p. cxii, agrees with 1 P. (not with 2 P.). 1 P. stands between the epistle of James and that to the Romans, as St. Peter himself stood between the Bishop of Jerusalem and the Apostle of the Gentiles, p. cxiv.

CHAPTER VI

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

External Evidence: Jude, p. cxv, 2 Peter, p. cxvi. *Internal Evidence:* 2 Peter, p. cxxiv. Feeling of the Early Church with regard to Pseudepigrapha, p. cxxv. The epistle shows marks of a post-apostolic date, p. cxxvi. Resemblances between 2 Peter and Josephus, p. cxxvii, between 2 Peter and Philo, p. cxxiv, between 2 Peter and the *Apocalypse of Peter*, p. cxxx, between 2 Peter and the *Acts of Peter and Simon*, p. cxxxiv.

CHAPTER VII

UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES WERE THE EPISTLE OF JUDE AND THE TWO EPISTLES OF PETER WRITTEN?

2 Peter not addressed to the same readers as 1 Peter, p. cxxxv. The letter from St. Paul to the readers, to which allusion is made in 2 Peter, seems to have been our Epistle to the Romans, p. cxxxvi. Lightfoot's account of the Church at Rome during the time of St. Paul's imprisonment, p. cxxxvii. 1 Peter written from Rome, p. cxxxix. Early tradition as to St. Peter's labours in Rome, p. cxl. Chase and Zahn on the later history of St. Peter, p. cxli. How to explain the absence of allusion to St. Paul in 1 Peter, and to St. Peter in the later letters of Paul, if they were working together in Rome, p. cxlii. Allusion to the Gospel of Mark in 2 Peter, p. cxliii. Other allusions which favour a late date, p. cxliv. Date of Jude, p. cxlv.

CHAPTER VIII

THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE OF JUDE

The name Jude, p. cxlvi. What we learn about St. Jude from the N.T. p. cxlvii, from Eusebius, p. cxlvii. Resemblances between this epistle and that of James, p. cxlix; differences between them, p. cl.

Digitized by Google

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER IX

USE OF APOCRYPHAL BOOKS BY JUDE

The Book of Enoch, p. cliii; the Assumption of Moses, p. cliv; Testaments of the Patriarchs, p. clv. Allusions to Apocryphal Books in other portions of the N.T., p. clvi.

CHAPTER X

STORY OF THE FALLEN ANGELS

Gradual development of this story out of the Hebrew legend referred to in Gen. ch. 6, p. clviii, until it took shape in the Book of Enoch and other similar writings, p. clx; generally accepted by Jewish and Christian writers till the end of the third century, p. clxiii, except by Philo and Origen, who (with doubts on the part of the latter) understood it metaphorically, p. clxiv. Another interpretation was that of Julius Africanus, who understood 'sons of God' of the children of Seth, p. clxiv. This interpretation, though certainly erroneous, prevailed generally after A.D. 400 p. clxv.

CHAPTER XI

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

The innovators as described in Jude, p. clxvii; in 2 Peter, p. clxviii; in Paul's speeches and writings, especially the Pastoral Epistles, p. clxix, and in John, p. clxxiii. The same features are found in all, p. clxxiv. They seem to point especially to the heretics known as Nicolaitans and Simonians, and to the later Ophites and Carpocratians, p. clxxvi.

CHAPTER XII

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF JUDE AND 2 PETER

Unsatisfactory condition of the text. Improved knowledge of the Syrian and Egyptian versions owing to the researches of Dr. Gwynn and the Rev. G. Horner, p. clxxxi. Jude *v.* 1, p. clxxxii, *vv.* 2, 4, 5, p. clxxxiii, *vv.* 6, 7, 12, p. clxxxv, *vv.* 17–20, pp. clxxxv–clxxxviii, *vv.* 22, 23, pp. clxxxviii–cxci. 2 P. 1^{1}, p. cxci, 1^{2-4}, p. cxcii, $1^{12, 17}$, p. cxciii, $1^{19, 21}$, 2^{4}, p. cxciv, $2^{6, 8}$, p. cxcv, $2^{11, 13}$, p. cxcvi, 2^{14}, p. cxcvii, $2^{15, 18}$, p. cxcviii, 3^{6-10}, p. cxcix f., $3^{11, 16}$, p. cc f. Readings of B tested, p. cci f.

TEXT OF JUDE AND 2 PETER, pp. 1—15

NOTES ON ST. JUDE, pp. 17—54

APPENDIX ON *φθινοπωρινός*, pp. 55—59

JUDE: PARAPHRASE AND COMMENTS

vv. 1, 2. Salutation, p. 60.

vv. 3, 4. Reasons for Writing, p. 60. *ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει*, pp. 61—71.

v. 4. Denial of a Person, p. 72.

vv. 5—13. Illustrations of Sin and Judgment, p. 72. Example of the Archangel, pp. 74—76.

Digitized by Google

vv. 14—16. Prophecy of Enoch, p. 76.
vv. 17—19. The Faithful are bidden to call to mind the Warnings of the Apostles, p. 77. *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου*, pp. 77 f.
vv. 20—23. Final Charge to the Faithful: *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι*, pp. 78 f.
vv. 24, 25. Benediction and Ascription, p. 79.

NOTES ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER, pp. 80—170

APPENDIX ON *ἐπίγνωσις*, pp. 171—174

APPENDIX ON *φθείρω* AND *φθορά*, pp. 175—179

2 PETER: PARAPHRASE AND COMMENTS

1^{1} Address. *Συμεὼν Πέτρος*, pp. 180 f. *τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν*, p. 181. *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ*, p. 181.
1^{2-4} Salutation. Complexity of the passage, p. 182. How Grace and Peace flow from the knowledge of God, pp. 183—187. *τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν*, pp. 187—189. *τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ*, p. 189. *δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται*, pp. 189 f. *θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*, p. 190. *τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*, pp. 190 f.
1^{5-7} Exhortation to make full use of the grace imparted, p. 191. The 'ogdoad,' or list of eight virtues, growing out of faith and completed in love, compared with other lists of virtues, pp. 191, 192.
1^{8-11} Remarks on the importance of these virtues, p. 193.
1^{12-15} The writer's promise, p. 194.
1^{16-21} The grounds of our belief, pp. 194 f. The Transfiguration an earnest of the future glory, p. 195. The light of prophecy. Dr. Arnold's explanation of *ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως*, pp. 196—198.
2^{1-3} The false teachers of the new dispensation answer to the false prophets of the old, p. 198.
2^{4-10} Examples of judgment joined with mercy, p. 199.
2^{10-16} Further description of the Libertines, pp. 199, 200. Prof. Batiffol on the Love-feasts, pp. 200 f. The ass speaking with man's voice, pp. 200—203. The story of Balaam, pp. 203—205.
2^{17-22} Mischief caused by the Libertines, p. 205.
3^{1-4} Warning of the spread of unbelief in the last days, p. 205.
3^{5-10} Scoffers answered, p. 206. Ideas as to the unchangeableness of the universe and as to its destruction by fire both found some support in the language of the Scriptures and of contemporary science. Modern science, which lately favoured the idea that our planet was destined to perish by cold, seems now to look to heat as the more likely agent of destruction, pp. 207—209. Peter's answer to the difficulty caused by the delay of the coming of the Lord to judgment, pp. 209—211.
3^{11-18} Final exhortation, p. 212. *σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν*, pp. 212, 213.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON *κατὰ περίφασιν*, p. 213.

INDEX

Index of Greek Words, p. 215.
Index of Subjects, p. 237.

Digitized by Google

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

Relation of the Second Epistle of Peter to the Epistle of Jude[1]

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 vocabulary 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*.[2]

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 occasioned 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 ἔλεος 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 λαχοῦσιν πίστιν) as characteristic of his readers. He adds two remarkable phrases, (1) that, through the justice[3] 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 πιστῷ κτίστῃ in 1 Pet. 4^{19}, Rom. 2^{5} (ἀποκάλυψις) δικαιοκρισίατοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, and 2^{11} οὐ γάρ ἐστιν προσωπος λημψία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ.

Digitized by Google

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),[1] 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,[2] 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 1^2 P. introduces a topic which is of great importance in his eyes, *ἐπίγνωσις*. '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*[3] *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 *ἰσότιμος* 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. 55), and his condemnation of the heretics who considered that the distinction between the elect and others existed *φύσει*, and stood in no need of the *ἐπιχορηγία* of which P. speaks in $1^{5\text{-}11}$.

[2] The word *κοινήν* here may have suggested to P. his phrase *ἰσότιμον πίστιν*.

[3] Cf. J. *v.* 1 *κλητοῖς*.

Digitized by Google

through lust.' *φθορά* here (cf. *φθείρονται* in J. 10) is opposed to *ζωή* in *v.* 3. It is not original evil, but *ἡ ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον μεταβολή*. Here we find the writer freely using expressions borrowed from Greek philosophy, such as *τῆς θείας δυνάμεως, θείας κοινωνοὶ 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 (1^5) 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-fold[1] 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 ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει . . . ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε*. The phrase *σπουδὴν πᾶσαν* of P. 1^5 occurs also in J. 3. The philosophic *ἀρετή* occurs twice in P. 1^5. It has been suggested by Dr. Chase that the association of *γνῶσις* with *ἐγκράτεια* in the next verse may be pointed at the antinomianism of some of the Gnostics. The mention of *εὐσέβεια* in P. $1^{3, 6, 7}$ may be due to the prevalence of *ἀσέβεια* so often deplored by J. The verses which follow (1^{8-11}) 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. 1^{11}. The *οὐ μὴ πταίσητε* and the *πλουσίως 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 lamps, 7 spirits, 7 stars, 7 horns, 7 eyes, 7 seals, 7 angels, 7 thunders, 7 vials, 7 plagues. So there are 7 deacons (Acts 21^8), and 7 pillars in the house of Wisdom (Prov. 9^1), cf. also the spirits in Isa. 11^2, and Clem. Al. p. 813.

Digitized by Google

'God our Saviour is able to *keep us without stumbling* and to set us *before his glory* without blemish *in exceeding joy*.'

P. continues (1^{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 1^{16-21} 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,[1] when the voice came to him from the excellent glory, proclaiming him to be the beloved Son, in whom the Father is well pleased.[2] 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 ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ 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^{25} 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.

[2] Cf. Westcott, *Historic Faith*, p. 264.

Digitized by Google

we read below (3^4), doubts were entertained of any Second Coming, some affirming, like Hymenaeus and Philetas, that the Resurrection was past already (2 Tim. $2^{17, 18}$)? 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 (3^{21}, 10^{43}) and 1 Pet. (1^{10-12}) 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. 2^{1-3}), 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. $2^{15, 16}$, and J. *v.* 11). Corresponding to this in the new dispensation will be the abuse of teaching (cf. James 3^{1-12}); 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 *ἀγοράσαντα* before *δεσπότην*. He foretells that many will follow the loose living of these teachers and that thus the way of truth (Ps. 119^{30}) will be evil spoken of (Isa. 52^5). He speaks of their covetousness, cf. J. *v.* 11 on Balaam [*ἐμπορεύσονται* in P. 2^3 perhaps contrasted with *ἀγοράσαντα* in 2^1], and of their glozing words. While J. speaks of *οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα* (where the reference in *τοῦτο* is obscure), P. has the fine phrase *οἷς τὸ κρίμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει.* On the other hand we lose J.'s *τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν*, for which perhaps *ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς* (P. 2^{19}) was intended as an

[1] Dr. Abbott compares Christ's warning against those who say, 'Lo here is the Christ, or there,' Mt. 24^{23}.

Digitized by Google

equivalent, cf. Gal. 5^{13} *ἐπ' 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^{4-9}, 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^{26-29}), 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.[1] 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 λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν* 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 Θεὸς 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 ἑτέρας*, as the men of Sodom did afterwards (*τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις* 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 *ταρταρώσας*,[2] 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 *ταρταρόω* occurs in Amphilochius (fl. 370 A.D.) *Patrol. Graeca* vol. xxxix, p. 41 A, *διὰ παρθενικοῦ τοκετοῦ τεταρτάρωται δαιμονίων ἀυράτων τὰ τοσαῦτα καὶ τηλικαῦτα συστήματα.* The substantive *τάρταρος* occurs in Clem. *Hom.* iii. 35 (on the immensity of creation) *μέχρι ποῦ τοῦ ἀπεράντου ταρτάρου τὸ ἄπειρον βάθος; ἐπὶ τίνι ἐπαιωρεῖται ὁ πάντα περιέχων οὐρανός;* *ib.* i. 4 *παραδοθήσομαι κατ' ἐνίων φιλοσόφων λόγους Πυριφλεγέθοντι καὶ Ταρτάρῳ . . . καὶ ἔσομαι ἐν ᾅδου τὸν αἰῶνα κολαζόμενος,* *ib.* xx. 9 *ὁ πονηρὸς σκότῳ χαίρειν κατὰ τὴν κρᾶσιν γεγονὼς μετὰ τῶν ὁμοδούλων ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ταρτάρου σκότος κατελθὼν ἥδεται,* *ib. Ep. ad Jac.* 14 *ταρτα-*

Digitized by Google

The Deluge is described in P. 2^5, where he uses the words φυλάσσω and ἀσεβής 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 (3^{5-7}) 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. 3^{20} (κιβωτοῦ) εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὀκτὼ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος.[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 (3^{19})?[2] In the account of Sodom (P. 2^6) 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 καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν),[3] while

ρείαν χάρυβδιν. The force of the verbal termination is the same as in οὐρανόω, πεντόω and καταπεντόω, καταθαλαττόω, χαρακόω, cf. Eustath. (*de Thessalon.* 403 C. ed. Tafel) τὸ ἐν ἐμοὶ χθόνιον οὐρανώσας, Nicol. Damasc. 445 ed. Val. τοὺς ἀνθρώπους οἷα ἀθέους ἐπόρτωσεν.

[1] Cf. Justin M. *Dial.* 138, Iren. i. 18. 3.

[2] Cf. Clement on this subject in *Str.* vi. § 44–§ 52, esp. § 47 *fin.* οὐ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα μόνον ἡ δύναμις ἡ ἐνεργητικὴ (τοῦ Θεοῦ) φθάνει, πάντη δέ ἐστι καὶ ἀεὶ ἐργάζεται.

[3] In my note on 2^6 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?

Digitized by Google

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 *πρόκεινται δεῖγμα 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 *οὗτοι δέ*) 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. (2^{10}) combines part of J.'s description of the men of Sodom, who went *ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας* (for which he substitutes *ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους*) 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' (2^{10}). In 2^{12} he goes on, as J. does in *v.* 10, with a *οὗτοι δέ*, 'these are like brute beasts.' Apparently he wants to bring out more fully the force of J.'s *ὅσα φυσικῶς ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται* by the periphrasis *γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν* and *ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν φθαρήσονται*. 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 φθείρονται* 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^{21-28}.

[2] It will be noticed that, while J. couples *κυριότητα* and *δόξας* as belonging to the same category, P. only names the abstract word *κυριότητα* here, and introduces *δόξας* later on as a concrete example.

Digitized by Google

We have now to consider the very curious verse interposed between J. 8 and 10, P. 2^{10} and 2^{12}. 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 2^4, 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 (*ἄγγελοι, αὐτῶν*). So too a vague *παρὰ Κυρίῳ* takes the place of *ἐπιτιμήσαι 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. $2^{13\text{-}17}$, but, in the latter, the

Digitized by Google

order is considerably altered and there are various additions and omissions. Balaam (who is also prominent in the Apocalypse 2^{14}) is the only one of the old haeresiarchs referred to, but his story is given at more length in $2^{15, 16}$ '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. clenches the comparison made before (2^{1}) 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 2^{3} and 2^{15}). 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. 1^{27}, Ps. 8^{2}), or in which men are called upon to learn a lesson from animals, as Isa. 1^{3}, Jer. 8^{7}, Prov. 6^{6}, Job 12^{7}. Possibly P. may be thinking of the scorn entertained for simple believers by those who called themselves Gnostics (see below 2^{18}).

J. *v.* 12 appears with some remarkable alterations in P. 2^{13}, *σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν*. Here *σπίλοι* and *ἀπάταις* are substituted for *σπιλάδες* and *ἀγάπαις* in J. Some editors read *ἀγάπαις* with B, but the addition of *αὐτῶν* suits much better with *ἀπάταις*. J. speaks of *ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν*. 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 *ἀγάπαις* 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 (*ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν*); 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. 13^{13}). I account for *ἡδονήν* by supposing that it was a marginal gloss on *τρυφήν*. The word

Digitized by Google

ἀπάτη is often joined with τρυφή, 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 σπίλοι. 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 σπίλος found in Eph. 5^{27}, of which the derivatives ἄσπιλος and σπιλόω 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 νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι into two, πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι and ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι, 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, οἷς ὁ ζόφος 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^{13}), ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας, which commences the loose series of participles ending in 2^{15}. If the participle is omitted, this phrase recalls J. 11 τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν and is repeated again in 2^{15}; but ἀδικούμενοι is difficult. Apparently P. intends his paradoxical phrase to correspond to J.'s οὐαί: 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, ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς

Digitized by Google

μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας, δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους (cf. γεγεννημένα εἰς ἄλωσιν, 2^{12}), καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, κατάρας τέκνα. Perhaps P. may intend this partly to take the place of J.'s fine figure κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας.

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 λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, and who flatter others for the sake of advantage.' To the same effect P. (2^{18}) speaks of them as uttering ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος, by which they seduce through the lusts of the flesh those who were just escaping from heathen error. In $2^{19\text{-}22}$ P. is mostly independent of J., but I have already noticed that ἐλευθερίαν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι may be an echo of J. 4 χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν. He continues εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, words which recall what he had said in 1^{4} ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, . . . διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως . . . τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, and goes on to give an impressive warning against the dangers of backsliding, in which he borrows from J. 3, ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς, 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 1^{9}, 2^{20}, to post-baptismal sin, and seems to have been applied to the torments of the unseen world in the *Apocalypse of Peter*, §§ 11 ὁ ἰχὼρ καὶ ἡ δυσωδία τῶν κολαζομένων κατέρρεε καὶ ὥσπερ λίμνη ἐγένετο ἐκεῖ· κἀκεῖ ἐκάθηντο γυναῖκες ἔχουσαι τὸν ἰχῶρα μέχρι τῶν τραχήλων, and §§ 8, 9, 16, quoted on p. cxxxi.

In the third chapter of P. we return again to J. The readers are addressed as ἀγαπητοί in P. 3^{1} as in J. *v.* 17. In both, they are bidden to remember the words of the Apostles, warning them

[1] Compare the description of the Church as a ship in *Clem. Hom.* (*Ep. Clem. ad Jac.* § 15) ναυτιῶντες . . . ἀπεμῶντες (*al.* ἀπερῶντες) τουτέστιν ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὥσπερ νοσοποιοὺς χολάς, τὰς ἐκ πικρίας ἁμαρτίας λέγω καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἐπιθυμιῶν ἀτάκτων σωρευθέντα κακά, ἅτινα τῷ ὁμολογῆσαι ὥσπερ ἀπεράσαντες (cf. ἐξέραμα in 2 P. 2^{22}) κουφίζεσθε τῆς νόσου.

Digitized by Google

against mockers who should come in the last days, walking after their own lusts. To this P. adds ($3^{1,2}$) '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^{16} 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^{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' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται 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 3^2 and 3^3 by inserting the phrase *τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες*, which he had previously used in 1^{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 3^2, bidding the readers pay heed to the words of the prophets and the apostles. If we turn now to 1 P. 1^{10-12} *περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν . . . προφῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες . . . οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς, ὑμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτά, ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* (cf. 1 P. 1^{16}), we shall find an exact correspondence to what is stated here. The words *τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων* (J. 17, P. 3^2) remind us of J. 4 *οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα* (though no doubt the immediate reference there is to the prophecy of Enoch) and of P. 2^3 *οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ*. In citing the prophecy, P. adds the emphatic *ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ*, which may be compared with *ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται* of 2^{12} and with the reiterated *ἀσεβεῖς* of J. 15 and *κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι* of J. 16 and 18.

In 3^4, P., omitting J.'s somewhat obscure *v.* 19 *οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες*, goes on to specify in what the mockery of the *ἐμπαῖκται* consisted. They said that

Digitized by Google

the promise of the coming of Christ (to which P. had borne witness in 1^{16}) 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' ἧς ἐκοιμήθησαν*, 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 3^{5-10}: (*a*) as the world was created out of water by the word of God, so owing to [1] 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. $2^{3,4,9}$); (*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 ($2^{5,7}$), in contrast with the severer tone of J. 5–7. In 3^{10} 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. 3^{14}, both commencing a new section with *ἀγαπητοί*. 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 1^{5-7}. His reference to the Spirit's help in prayer may be compared with P. 1^{20} on the inspiration of the prophets. His phrase in *v.* 21 *προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον* is taken up in the *προσδοκῶντας* of P. 3^{12} and *προσδοκῶμεν* of 3^{13}, and again in 3^{14}, while the goal *εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον* may be compared with *εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν* in P. 1^{11}. P. inserts *ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι* (cf. 1 P. 1^{19}) from J.'s *ἀμώμους* in *v.* 24, and in contrast to his own *σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι* in 2^{13}, and to J.'s *ἐσπιλωμένον* in *v.* 23. *ἐν εἰρήνῃ* looks back to J. *v.* 2 and P. 1^{2}. While in *vv.* 22, 23 we have J.'s stern rule for the treatment of backsliders, P. gives utterance again (3^{15}) to the more hopeful

[1] Reading *δι' ὅν*, for which see Chapter on the Text.

Digitized by Google

view of 3^9, 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 3^{15} 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. 1^{10}) and present them before His glory in exceeding joy' (cf. P. 1^{11}). P. bids his readers, 'knowing these things beforehand (see above 1^{12}, 3^2) to be on their guard, that they may not be led away by the *error* (J. 11, P. 2^{18}) of the wicked (P. 2^7, cf. J. 23 *ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ*), and so fall from their own stedfastness' (cf. P. 1^{12}, 2^{14}, 3^{16}). J.'s *ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει* soars higher than the lesson which P. here inculcates: it may be compared, as we have seen, with the *πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται* of 1^{11}. P. continues his exhortation in 3^{18} *αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει*, for which we may compare *χάρις πληθυνθείη* in 1^2 and *ταῦτα πλεονάζοντα* in 1^8, 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 σωτῆρι 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 αἰῶνος*, while J. has *πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας*, concluding with *ἀμήν*, 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. 1^1 *λαχοῦσιν πίστιν*), the foundation of the Christian life (J. 3, 20, P. $1^{1,5}$): both agree that its commencement lies in the divine call (J. 1, P. $1^{3,10}$). The call was sealed in baptism for the forgiveness of sin (J. 5 in connexion with 1 Cor. $10^{1,2}$, P. 1^9), but we have to make our calling sure through good works (P. 1^{10}), to build ourselves up on the foundation of the faith (J. 20, P. 1^{5-7}), 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.

Digitized by Google

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' 3^{14}, 'beware lest ye fall from your steadfastness, grow in grace' $3^{17, 18}$. So in 1^{5-8} 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. $1^{3, 4}$).

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 πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες (*v.* 19).

P. speaks of the Divine power, which has granted to us all that is

Digitized by Google

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^{17}). God is the source of the inspiration of the prophets (1^{21}). 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^{5-7}). In 2^1 it would seem, from the ordinary use of the word δεσπότης in early Christian writers, that we must understand τὸν ἀγοράσαντα δεσπότην as used, at any rate in the first instance, of God, who redeemed Israel out of Egypt (2 Sam. 7^{23}), though there is probably also some reference to the Christian use of ἀγοράζω. 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 ($1^{3, 4}$). The final doxology is addressed solely to Him.

The Holy Spirit. 'Men spake from God' ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι (1^{21}).

Many have drawn attention to the frequent use in 2 P. of what Dr. Bigg has called 'reverential periphrases,' ἡ θεία δύναμις, θεία φύσις, ἡ μεγαλοπρεπὴς 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. 2^9, Acts 17^{29}), with the 'Word' of St. John, and with such phrases as 'the Deity,' 'Providence,' 'Heaven,' 'the Author of Nature,' 'the

Digitized by Google

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' (1^4), from 'the pollutions of the world' (2^{20}), from 'those that live in error' (1^4), from 'the ignorance of the way of righteousness' (2^{21}). He refers to 'the old sins from which we are cleansed in baptism' (1^9).

(3) *Man under grace.* While still in this ignorant, degraded state, man is made conscious of a call (P. $1^{3,10}$) and of an answering faith, which is itself a gift from God (1^1). The call consists in the appeal made to us by the exhibition of Divine goodness in the life of Jesus Christ (1^3), which is the foundation and embodiment of all the promises of future good contained in the Gospel (1^4), promises which are summed up in our being made partakers of the Divine Nature (1^4). This call is sealed in baptism for the washing away of sin (1^{10}). The more we know of God and of Jesus Christ, the more we shall grow in grace and peace (1^2, 3^{18}). The Divine power has granted to us all that is needed for life and godliness (1^3). The goal which we have in view is 'the entrance into the eternal Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ' (1^{11}), otherwise described as the 'new heavens and new earth in which righteousness dwells' (3^{13}).

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 ($1^{1,3}$). 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

Digitized by Google

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. 2^{20}). To have thus turned away from the holy law once delivered to us is worse than never to have known the way of righteousness (2^{21}). 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-sightednesss (1^{9}). We fall from our own steadfastness, being carried away by the surrounding evil (3^{17}). We must make our calling and election sure or else we shall stumble (1^{10}). 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 (1^{5-7}). 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 ($1^{3,4}$). 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 (3^{11}). 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 ($2^{1,2}$). They seduce the ignorant and unwary by their confident words (2^{14}) promising them liberty, while they are themselves slaves to corruptness ($2^{18,19}$). 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 ($2^{3,10,12}$), they dishonour your love-feasts by their loose behaviour. They pervert the meaning of Scripture to their own ruin (3^{15}). They mock the Christian hope by the sneering question 'Where is the promise of His coming? All remains unchanged' ($3^{3,4}$).

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

Digitized by Google

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. 2^{3-9}). They are reserved under punishment for the day of judgment, which will be the day of their final destruction (2^{9}, 3^{7}). 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 ($2^{19,20}$). So he speaks of those who have forgotten the cleansing of baptism (1^{9}). 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 (3^{9}). Hence we are told that we are justified in regarding the long-suffering of God as a token of our own salvation (3^{15}). 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 (ἡ 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 (3^{4}). P. answers generally that God is not limited by measures

Digitized by Google

of time which are merely relative to man; but he had already given a more precise answer in 1^{16} 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 αἰῶνος*, 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 (3^{5-13}). On that great day the offending angels and ungodly men will meet their doom (2^{4}, 2^{9}). 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 1^{19-32}. 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 (1^{16-19}), and by the contemplation of his goodness as manifested in the record of his acts and words (1^{3}).

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*

Digitized by Google

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 *οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα . . . τὸν μόνον δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι* and in *vv.* 17, 18 *μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι,* the former verse being regarded as an allusion to P.'s 2^3 *ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι . . . τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι . . . οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ,* the latter to P. $3^{2,3}$ *μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος, τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι.*

(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.

Digitized by Google

or the present, cf. P. 2^1 *ἔσονται, παρεισάξουσιν,* 2^2 *ἐξακολουθήσουσιν, βλασφημηθήσεται,* 2^3 *ἐμπορεύσονται* with J. *v.* 4 *παρεισεδύησαν, v.* 8 *μιαίνουσιν, v.* 10 *βλασφημοῦσιν* 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 *ἀσεβεῖς* (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 3^2 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 2^{10} *τρέμουσιν,* 2^{17} *εἰσίν,* 2^{18} *δελεάζουσιν,* 3^5 *λανθάνει,* 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 at times 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 makes 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

Digitized by Google

for the mention of Paul in 2 P. is quite distinct from the acknowledgement 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*, *ἅγιος* (= 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 *κλῆσις* is found in 2 P. 1^{10} and *καλέω* of the Divine calling four times in 1 P. as well as in 2 P. 1^{3}. The synonymous *ἐκλεκτός* is found in 1 P., as *ἐκλογή* is found in 2 P. 1^{10}, both being thoroughly Pauline words. When it is said that *ἅγιος* 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 *ἔθνος ἅγιον* used in 1 P. 2^{9}. 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. 4^{6} *ζῶσιν κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι* and 3^{3} *ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος*, where *καρδία* and *πνεῦμα* are both preferred to *ψυχή*? So 3^{15} *Χριστὸν ἁγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν*. The 'indwelling spirit' is surely indicated in 1 P. 1^{11} *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 3^{15}, 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 *ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους* in 2 P. 2^{14}, and in 1 P. 3^{20} *ὀκτὼ ψυχαί* stands simply for 'eight persons' without

Digitized by Google

any allusion to the religious life, while on the other hand we find the phrase *οἶκος πνευματικός* and *πνευματικὰς θυσίας* in 1 P. 2^5. Dr. Hort commenting on 1 P. 2^{11} ('lusts 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 depreciatory sense ... We must not be tempted to force into St. Peter's language here St. Paul's meaning in Gal. v. 17 *ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος*.' *ψυχή*, as Hort says, 'answers very nearly to our modern word and conception "self."' See my note on 2 P. 2^8 *ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἐβασάνιζεν*. Other Pauline words which occur in Peter are *ἀγοράζω, αἵρεσις, ἄνομος, γνωρίζω, δικαιοσύνη, δουλόω, ἐγκράτεια, εἰλικρινής, ἐλευθερία, ἐπίγνωσις, παραδίδωμι*, to name a few from 2 P., and similarly we find *ἁγιασμός, αἷμα Ἰησοῦ, Χριστοῦ παθήματα, εὐλογέω, εὐλογητός, εὐλογία, κληρονομία, προγινώσκω, γάλα, συνείδησις, συνκληρονόμος, 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.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER II

Grammar and Style of Jude and of 2 Peter[1]

Unusual Inflexions.[2]

Jude *v.* 4 *παρεισεδύησαν* read by WH. after B for *παρεισέδυσαν* read by Ti. Treg. after ℵ A etc., see explanatory note. 2 Pet. 2^5 *ἐπάξας* for the usual *ἐπαγαγών*, cf. Blass p. 43. 2 Pet. 1^{16} *ἐγενήθην* for *ἐγενόμην*. On the other hand it might seem that hybrid aorist forms such as *ἔβαλαν*, *ἔπεσαν*, which are found in other books of the N.T., and the termination *-σαν* in impf. or 2nd aor. as *εἶχοσαν*, *παρελάβοσαν*, and *-αν* for *-ασι* in the pf. as *εἰσελήλυθαν*, 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 Μιχαήλ*, 11 *τοῦ Καίν, τοῦ Βαλαάμ, τοῦ Κορέ*, also in 2 Pet. 2^{15} *τοῦ Βαλαάμ*.

It is omitted in J. *v.* 14 *ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ, Ἐνώχ*, *v.* 1 *Ἰακώβου*, *v.* 5 *Αἰγύπτου, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ passim*.[3] So in 2 Pet. 2^5 *Νῶε*, 2^7 *Λώτ*.

[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 Messrs. 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.

Digitized by Google

(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. 1^{1} we find *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 1^{2} *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 3^{12} *τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας*, 1^{16} *τὴν 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 ἠγαπημένοις*, *v.* 21 *ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ*, *v.* 5 Κύριος *ἀπώλεσεν*, *v.* 9 *ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι* Κύριος. So 2 Pet. 1^{17} *παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός*, *ib. v.* 21 *ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ*, 2^{9} *οἶδεν* Κύριος *ἀσεβεῖς ῥύεσθαι*, 3^{9} *οὐ βραδύνει* Κύριος, 2^{9}, 3^{10} *ἡμέρα* Κυρίου, 2^{11}, 3^{8} *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. 7^{22} *ὁ γὰρ ἐν* Κυρίῳ *κληθεὶς δοῦλος ἀπελεύθερος* Κυρίου *ἐστίν*, 1 Cor. 10^{21} *ποτήριον* Κυρίου.

This use is widely extended in the N.T. owing to the growth of a special Christian terminology, *e.g.* *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* 2 Pet. 1^{21}: *σάρξ*, Jude *v.* 8 *σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν*, 2 Pet. 2^{10} *τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς πορευομένους*, 2^{18} *σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις*: *γραφή*, 2 Pet. 1^{20} *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. 3^{6}; (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 ζόφος τοῦ σκότους*, *ib.* 5 *ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν*. 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*, *ib.* *τῇ ἅπαξ παρα-*

[1] See below under *Irregular Omission of Article.*

Digitized by Google

δοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει, *v.* 4 *τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα*, *v.* 7 *αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις*, *v.* 9 *περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος*, *v.* 23 *τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα*, *v.* 12 [*οἱ*] *ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι*. (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 1^4 *τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*, 1^{16} *τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν*, 2^1 *τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην*, 2^7 *ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς*, 2^{10} *τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους*, 2^{13} *τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν*, 2^{16} *τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν*, 2^{21} *ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς*, 3^2 *τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς*, 3^{15} *κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν 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 *πίστιν* in 2 Pet. 1^1 *τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν*. Such a clause may be called 'semi-compact.' Other examples are Jude *v.* 4 *οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα*, *v.* 7 *τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις*, *v.* 18 *κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν*, 2 Pet. 3^2 *μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν*, *ib.* *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. 1^4 *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 ἀρχήν*, *v.* 11 *τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καίν*, *τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαάμ*, *τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορέ*, *v.* 17 *μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων*, *v.* 21 *τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*. 2 Pet. 1^3 *διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ* (where the desire of compactness would have resulted in the less simple *διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ ἡμᾶς καλέσαντος ἐπιγνώσεως*), 1^9 *τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν*, 1^{11} *ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*, 1^{14} *ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου*, 2^{15} *τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βόσορ*, 2^{18} *τοὺς*

Digitized by Google

ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους (where the compact form would have been less clear), 3[12] *τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας.*

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 . . . τὸν κυρίον ἡμῶν* (also *vv.* 17, 21, 25), *v.* 12 *ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν*, *v.* 16 *κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν, τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν*, *v.* 24 *τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.*

2 Pet. 1[1] *τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν*, 1[2] *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν* (also in *vv.* 8, 11, 14, 16, iii. 15, 18), 1[3] *τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ*, 1[5] *ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν*, 1[14] *τοῦ σκηνώματός μου*, 1[17] *ὁ υἱός μου, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου*, 1[19] *ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν*, 2[3] *ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν*, 2[12] *ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν*, 2[13] *ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν*, 3[2] *τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν*, 3[4] *τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ*, 3[13] *τὸ 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[3] quoted above; sometimes the adjective, as in Jude *v.* 3 *τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας*, *v.* 20 *τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει*, 2 Pet. 1[9] *τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν*, 3[15] *ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφός*, 3[16] *τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν.*

Where the possessive genitive follows immediately on the article, as in Jude *v.* 6 *τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν*, *v.* 13 *τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας*, *v.* 18 *τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας*, the effect is to give special emphasis. Since *ἑαυτοῦ* is in itself emphatic, it is usually found in this emphatic position, as in Mt. 8[22] *τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκρούς*, Lk. 2[3] *ἔκαστος εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν*, 9[60] *θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκρούς*, 11[21] *φυλάσσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐλήν*, 14[26] *καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν*, Rom. 4[19] *τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ἤδη νενεκρωμένον*, 8[3] *ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας*, 16[4] *τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν*, 1 Cor. 7[2] *ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω*, etc., but there are also cases in which it is found after its noun, as in Mt. 25[7] *ἐκόσμησαν τὰς λαμπάδας ἑαυτῶν*, Lk. 14[27] *ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ.* An examination of the passages quoted under *ἑαυτοῦ* in the concordance shows that in general the latter position is less emphatic than the former, and that, in many cases of the latter, *αὐτοῦ* and *αὐτῶν* occur as various readings. The more emphatic position is naturally assigned to *τούτων* in 2 Pet. 1[15] *τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι*, and to *ἐκείνου* in 2 Pet. 1[16] *τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος.* So Joh. 5[27] *τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμμασιν*, 2 Cor. 8[9] *τῇ ἐκείνου πτωχείᾳ*,

Digitized by Google

8^{18} *τὸ ἐκείνων περίσσευμα*, 8^{14} *τὸ ἐκείνων ὑστέρημα*, 2 Tim. 2^{26} *τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα*, Tit. 3^{7} *τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι*. In 2 Pet. 3^{7} some MSS. have *τῷ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ*, which resembles James 1^{18} *τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων*, 1 Pet. 1^{3} *τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος*, Tit. 3^{5} *τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος*, 1 Joh. 2^{27} *τὸ αὐτοῦ χρίσμα*, Rom. 3^{24} *τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι*, 3^{25} *τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*, 1 Thess. 2^{19} *ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ*, Heb. 2^{4} *κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν* (quoted by Abbott, *Joh. Gr.* p. 415); but there can be little doubt that in 2 Pet. 3^{7} *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. 1^{15} *μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον* contrasted with the preceding *ὑμᾶς*.

In two passages of 2 Pet. we find the possessive genitive preceding the articular phrase, 2^{2} *πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις*, and 3^{1} *διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ 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. 1^{27} *ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος* (corresponding to Lk. 3^{16} *λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ*), Joh. 4^{16} *φώνησόν 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. 13^{6} *σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας;* 13^{14} *εἰ οὖν ἐγὼ ἔνιψα ὑμῶν τοὺς πόδας . . . καὶ ὑμεῖς ὀφείλετε 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

Digitized by Google

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 ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως*, which occurs four times in Mt., *εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως* 2 Pet. 2^9, 3^7, *ἥξει ἡμέρα Κυρίου* 3^{10}, *εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος* 3^{18}, cf. *οὐκ ἀναστήσονται ἀσεβεῖς ἐν κρίσει* Ps. 1^5, *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. 3^{12}, *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως* 1 Joh. 4^{17}, *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ* (MS. *τῆς—λης*) *τῆς κρίσεως* Enoch p. 337. Jude *v.* 14 *ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ*: the parallel in Enoch has *σὺν τοῖς* (?) *μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ* (p. 327 Charles); but the article is omitted in Heb. 12^{22} *προσεληλύθατε . . . μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων*, Ps. 3^6 *οὐ φοβηθήσομαι ἀπὸ μυριάδων λαοῦ*, and in Deut. 33^2 *σὺν μυριάσι 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 ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν*, the Gizeh Greek (followed by ℵ and others) omits *ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν*, and Treg. brackets *ἀσεβείας*. The omission of the article is awkward but not more so than in Job. 31^{18} *δι' ἀσέβειαν δώρων ὧν ἐδέχοντο*, and other examples cited in my Introduction to St. James, p. cxciii. 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. 6^2 *(θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι) βαπτισμῶν διδαχήν, ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν, ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου*. Jude *v.* 21 *ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ* (R.V. 'keep yourselves in the love of God'). We find similar examples in 2 Pet.

2 Pet. 1^1 *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν* (R.V. 'in the righteousness of our God'), cf. Rom. 4^{13} *διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως* and even the nominative in Rom. 1^{17} *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται*: so 2 Pet. 1^2 *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ* and 2^{20}, but we meet the full form just below 1^8 *εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐπίγνωσιν* and 1^3 *διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς*, as in Rom. 2^{21} we have *τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης*. 2 Pet. 1^{21} *οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία* (R.V. 'by the will of man'), cf. Joh. 1^{13} *ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός*, 1 Pet. 4^2 *θελήματι Θεοῦ βιῶσαι*: so the phrase *διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ* occurs seven times in St. Paul. 2 Pet. 2^5 *κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας* (R.V. 'the world of the ungodly'): we might translate 'a world of ungodly men,' but

Digitized by Google

κόσμος is often anarthrous, not only in prepositional phrases such as *ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου, ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ*, but in such cases as Rom. 11[12] *τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτοῦ πλοῦτος κόσμου*, and even in the nominative, as Gal. 6[14] *δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ κόσμῳ*. 2 Pet. 2[6] *πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας κατέκρινεν* (R.V. 'the cities'), cf. Lk. 2[4] *ἀνέβη ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρέτ*. 2 Pet. 2[10] *τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους* (R.V. 'after the flesh in the lust of defilement'), cf. 2[18] *ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις* (R.V. 'in the lusts of the flesh,' but see explanatory note), Gal. 5[16] *ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε*, 1 Pet. 4[2] *ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις . . . βιῶσαι*. 2 Pet. 2[13, 15] *μισθὸν ἀδικίας* (R.V. 'the hire of wrong-doing'), cf. Acts 1[18] *ἐκτήσατο χωρίον ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας*. 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 ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, which is more usual than the full phrase, *τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον* in 1 Joh. 1[2], 2[25]. Jude *v.* 18 *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου* (R.V. 'in the last time'); cf. 2 Tit. 3[1], James 5[3] *ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*, 1 Pet. 1[5] *ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ*, 1 Joh. 2[18] *ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστιν*, 2 Pet. 3[3] *ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν*, where see note. Jude *v.* 25 *μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν δόξα* (R.V. 'to the only God our Saviour,' Rom. 16[27] *μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ*, 1 Tim. 1[17] *μόνῳ Θεῷ τιμή*; but in Joh. 5[44] *τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε*, *ib.* 17[3] *ἵνα γινώσκωσίν σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν*, Jude *v.* 4 *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην*. Cf. Thuc. iii. 57. 4 *ἡμεῖς τε, ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἡ μόνη ἐλπίς, δέδιμεν μὴ οὐ βέβαιοι ἦτε*, *Joh. Gr.* p. 10. 2 Pet. 2[5] *ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο* (R.V. 'spared not the ancient world'), cf. Ps. 78[8] *μὴ μνησθῇς ἡμῶν ἀνομιῶν ἀρχαίων*, Job 21[28] *ὑπὲρ τὴν φρόνησιν πάντων ἀρχαίων ἀνθρώπων*. 2 Pet. 2[15] *καταλείποντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδόν* (R.V. 'the right way'): elsewhere in this epistle *ὁδός* is joined with the article, as in 2[2], 2[21], and in Jude *v.* 11; but it is anarthrous in Mt. 21[32] *ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης*, Lk. 1[79] *εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης*, James 5[20] *ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ*, and in the following quotations from the LXX., Acts 2[28] *ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς*, Rom. 3[17] *ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν*, and constantly in the poetic books of the O.T. *e.g.* Ps. 1[6] *ὁδὸν δικαίων, ὁδὸς ἀσεβῶν*, Ps. 2[12] *ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαίας*, Prov. 2[16] *ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ εὐθείας*, 2[8] *ὁδὸν εὐλαβουμένων αὐτὸν διαφυλάξει*. 2 Pet. 2[16] *ἔλεγξιν ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας*, 1[3] *ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ*, cf. Acts 13[36] *ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ ὑπηρετήσας*, 1 Cor. 9[7]

Digitized by Google

τίς στρατεύεται ἰδίοις ὀψωνίοις; Gal. 6[9] καιρῷ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν, Tit. 2[9] δούλους ἰδίοις δεσπόταις ὑποτάσσεσθαι, *Evang. Petri* § 6 λαβὼν τὸν Κύριον εἰσήγαγεν εἰς ἴδιον τάφον. In 2 Pet. 1[20] προφητεία ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται is indefinite in scope, 'Prophecy is not a matter of private interpretation.' In 2[22] and 3[17] we have the article ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα, ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ, and in 3[3, 16] this is further strengthened by the addition of αὐτῶν. 2 Pet. 2[8] ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν (R.V. 'vexed his righteous soul with their lawless deeds'). If we had not seen so many examples of the writer's freedom in dispensing with the article, we might have given an indefinite force to the sentence 'vexed a righteous soul at unlawful deeds'; but cf. 2 Pet. 2[7] δίκαιον Λὼτ . . . ἐρύσατο, which must be translated 'saved just Lot,' not 'a just man named Lot,' and Ps. 111[6, 7] ἰσχὺν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ἀνήγγειλε . . . ἔργα χειρῶν αὐτοῦ ἀλήθεια καὶ κρίσις, Wisdom 3[1] ψυχαὶ δικαίων ἐν χειρὶ Θεοῦ. 2 Pet. 1[4] θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως (R.V. 'of the divine nature'): here too an indefinite rendering is possible, 'partakers of a divine nature.'

We will now consider some nouns apart from their construction. Οὐρανός[1] is anarthrous in 2 Pet. 1[18] φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν, 3[5] οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι, 3[12] οὐρανοὶ λυθήσονται, 3[13] καινοὺς οὐρανοὺς προσδοκῶμεν. Here 3[5] and 3[13] are indefinite, but 1[18] and 3[12] refer definitely to a known heaven. The article is rightly used in 3[7] οἱ νῦν οὐρανοί as contrasted with the former heavens, but in 3[10] there is no special occasion for it, as it is followed by the anarthrous στοιχεῖα and γῆ and also by οὐρανοί in 3[12]. The article is often omitted both with the singular and plural in other books of the N.T. where a preposition precedes: we also find δν δεῖ οὐρανὸν δέξασθαι Acts 3[21], οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς Κύριος Acts 17[24], and the nominative οὐρανὸς ὑψηλός, γῆ δὲ βαθεῖα (R.V. 'the heaven for height, and the earth for depth') Prov. 25[3]. 2 Pet. 1[19] ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ (R.V. 'the day,' 'the day-star'), cf. Job. 38[12] ἑωσφόρος ἐπεῖδε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τάξιν, Mal. 4[3] ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ἥλιος δικαιοσύνης, and the phrases ἡμέρα Κυρίου, ἡμέρα κρίσεως mentioned above. Ἄγγελος is used without the article in Jude *v.* 6 ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας 'angels, viz. those that kept not,' and 2 Pet. 2[4] ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο 'spared not angels when they sinned,'

[1] Cf. *Joh. Gr.* pp. 49 foll.

Digitized by Google

2 Pet. 2^{11} *ὅπου ἄγγελοι* 'whereas angels, though greater,' etc. So *εὐσεβεῖς* and *ἀδίκους* in 2 Pet. 2^{9} *οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ κολαζομένους τηρεῖν*, 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 ὀπίσω σαρκός*.

It is sometimes a little difficult to see why the article is used, as in 2 P. 1^{4} *δι' ὧν 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, *ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων*, the latter resembling the broken utterances of the Sibyl, *τοῦ δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν 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} *ἔτι τούτου λαλοῦντος ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἔρχεται λέγων τῷ Ἰώβ, Τῶν υἱῶν σου καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων σου ἐσθιόντων καὶ πινόντων παρὰ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτῶν τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ, ἐξαίφνης πνεῦμα μέγα ἐπῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς ἐρήμου καὶ ἥψατο τῶν τεσσάρων γωνιῶν τῆς οἰκίας, καὶ ἔπεσεν ἡ οἰκία ἐπὶ τὰ παιδία σου καὶ ἐτελεύτησαν*, while in the drama itself we meet such phrases as *συνέκλεισε πύλας γαστρὸς μητρός μου* 3^{10}, *ἰσχὺν ῥημάτων σου τίς ὑποίσει*; 4^{2}, *στόνος λέοντος, φωνὴ δὲ λεαίνης, γαυρίαμα δὲ δρακόντων ἐσβέσθη* 4^{10}, *ἄφρονα ἀναιρεῖ ὀργή, πεπλανημένον δὲ θανατοῖ ζῆλος* 5^{2}. There is a similar contrast between the style of the narrative portion of Judges, *e.g.* 4^{21} *συνεκάλυψεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ δέρρει αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔλαβεν . . . τὸν πάσσαλον τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ ἔθηκε τὴν σφῦραν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτῆς . . . καὶ ἐνέκρουσε τὸν πάσσαλον ἐν τῇ γνάθῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ διήλασεν ἐν τῇ γῇ*, and the song of Deborah 5^{5} *ὄρη ἐσαλεύ-*

Digitized by Google

θησαν ἀπὸ προσώπου Κυρίου, τοῦτο Σινᾶ ἀπὸ προσώπου Κυρίου, 5^{29} *σοφαὶ ἀρχουσῶν 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. 1^{11}, 2^{20}, 3^{2}, 3^{18} *τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος* (*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. 1^{1} *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος 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 *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*, where see note.[1] In 2 Pet. 1^{10} *βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι,* 1^{16} *τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν,* 3^{16} *οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι*, the single article is sufficient because the connected nouns belong to one category (see Winer, p. 154).

Cases.

Nominative.—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. 3^{1-3} *διεγείρω ὑμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν,*

[1] J. H. Moulton, p. 84, understands *τοῦ Θεοῦ* 2 P. 1^{1} of Christ.

Digitized by Google

μνησθῆναι τῶν ῥημάτων . . . γινώσκοντες, where the participle should have been in the acc. to agree with the understood subject of the infin. *μνησθῆναι*. See below under *Anacoluthon*, and Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 69; Blass, pp. 81, 242, 243, 284.

ACCUSATIVE.—Jude (1) *Adverbial*: *v.* 5 *τὸ δεύτερον μὴ πιστεύσαντας*, *v.* 7 *τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι*; (2) *with prepositions*[1]: *εἰς*, *v.* 4 *οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα*; *χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν*; *v.* 6 *εἰς κρίσιν τετήρηκεν*; *v.* 13 *εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται*; *v.* 25 *Θεῷ δόξα εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας*; *v.* 21 *προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. *περί c. acc. v.* 7 *αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις*. *ὑπό*, Jude *v.* 6 *ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν*, cf. Moulton p. 63.

2 Pet. (1) *Adverbial*: 1[5] *αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ*† . . . *ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἀρετήν*. *Acc. of duration of time*: 2[8] *ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας*† *ψυχὴν ἐβασάνιζεν*. *Cognate Acc. after passive verb*: 2 Pet. 2[13] *ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας*. (2) *with preposition*: *εἰς* eleven times, the more remarkable instances being 1[8] *ἀκάρπους εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν*, 1[17] *εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησα*,* 2[22] (*ἐπιστρέψας*) *εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου*, 3[9] *μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς*. *δια c. acc.* 2[2] *δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς βλασφημηθήσεται*, 3[6] *δι' ὃν* (*λόγον*) *ὁ κόσμος ἀπώλετο* (MSS. *δι' ὧν*), 3[12] *δι' ἣν* (*παρουσίαν*) *οὐρανοὶ λυθήσονται*, 3[9] *μακροθυμεῖ δι'* (*al. εἰς*) *ὑμᾶς*. *ἐπί c. acc.* 1[13] *ἐφ' ὅσον*, 2[22] *ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα*. *μετά c. acc.* 1[15] *μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον*. *κατά c. acc.* 3[3] *κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι*, 3[13] *κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα προσδοκῶμεν*, 3[15] *κατὰ τὴν σοφίαν ἔγραψεν*. *πρός c. acc.* 1[3] *τὰ πρὸς ζωήν*,† 3[15] *στρεβλοῦσιν πρὸς ἀπώλειαν*.

Complementary construction with factitive verb. 2 Pet. 2[6] *τὰς πόλεις ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς*, of which we have the passive in Jude *v.* 7 *αἱ πόλεις πρόκεινται δεῖγμα*; 2 Pet. 1[8] *ταῦτα οὐκ ἀργοὺς* (*ὑμᾶς*) *καθίστησιν*; Jude *v.* 24 *στῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἀμώμους*; 2 Pet. 2[13] *ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν*, 3[15] *τὴν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε*; Jude *v.* 24 *φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπταίστους*.

GENITIVE.—The most noteworthy examples in Jude are (*after substantive*) *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.

Digitized by Google

τῶν ἀσεβειῶν. Qualitative: *v.* 9 *κρίσιν βλασφημίας.** *Material*: *v.* 6 *πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην.** (*After verb*): *v.* 17 *μνήσθητε ῥημάτων. Gen. of Price*: Jude *v.* 11 *μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν. With prepositions*: *ἀπό* twice, *ἐκ* twice, *ἐπί* once, *v.* 18 *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου, περί* four times, *διά* once, *πρό* once, *v.* 25 *πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος, κατά* twice, esp. *v.* 15 *ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων,** *ὑπό* twice, esp. *v.* 12 *νεφέλαι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι, ὀπίσω** *v.* 7 *ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς, κατενώπιον** *v.* 24 *στῆσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης, χάριν v.* 16 *ὠφελίας χάριν.*

2 Pet. Noteworthy examples of the gen. are (*after substantive*) the *Possessive*, 1^{17} *ὁ υἱός μου, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου*, 3^{10} *ἡμέρα* Κυρίου, 3^{12} *ἡμέρα* Θεοῦ, 3^{18} *ἡμέρα αἰῶνος*, 2^{2}, 3^{7} *ἡμέρα κρίσεως*, 1^{20} *προφητεία γραφῆς*, 2^{2} *ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας. Objective*: 1^{3} *ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος*, 1^{13} *ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος*, 1^{15} *τὴν τούτων μνήμην*, 2^{16} *ἔλεγξιν παρανομίας. Reduplicated genitive**: 3^{2} *μνησθῆναι τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ* Κυρίου, where *ὑμῶν* depends on *ἀποστόλων, ἀποστόλων* on *τῆς ἐντολῆς τοῦ* Κυρίου, and this last on *μνησθῆναι. Gen. of Quality*: 2^{1} *αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας,** 2^{10} *ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ,** 2^{4} *σειροῖς ζόφου,** (reading *σειραῖς* it is easier to explain it as a *Gen. of Material*). *Gen. of Apposition*: 2^{6} †*πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας*, (cf. Hes. *Sc. Herc.* 469 *πόλιν* Τρηχῖνος, Aesch. *Ag.* 29 *Ἰλίου πόλις*, Thuc. iv. 130 *ἡ* Μένδη *πόλις*). *Hebraistic*: 2^{14} *κατάρας τέκνα.** *After neuter article*: 2^{22} †*τὸ τῆς παροιμίας. After neuter adjective*: 2^{18} *ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος.* So Heb. 3^{8} *ἅγια ἁγίων*, 1 Cor. 5^{8} *ἐν ἀζύμοις εἰλικρινίας.* This construction is common with the article, as in Rom. 1^{20} *τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ* Θεοῦ, Eph. 6^{12} *τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας*, 1 Cor. 4^{5} *τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους.* But here it is not a whole class that is spoken of, not the boastings of vanity in general, but occasional swelling words, as in Jude *v.* 16 *λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα* and in Dan. 11^{36}. So even in Soph. *Ant.* 1209 *τῷ δ' ἀθλίας ἄσημα περιβαίνει βοῆς* and 1265 *ὦμοι ἐμῶν ἄνολβα βουλευμάτων.*[1] Cf. such Tacitean phrases as *vana rumoris, inania honoris. With adjective*: of the sphere 2^{14} *ἀκατάπαυστος ἁμαρτίας, γεγυμνασμένος πλεονεξίας**; of possession or privation, 2^{14} *μεστὸς μοιχαλίδος ὀφθαλμός. With verb*: 2^{5} *κόσμου φείδεσθαι*, 3^{2} *μνησθῆναι ῥημάτων*, 3^{17} *ἐκπίπτειν*

[1] I am indebted to Mr. Herbert Richards for the following additional examples, Eur. *Phoen.* 1485 *προκαλυπτομένα βοτρυχώδεος ἀβρὰ παρηίδος, Hec.* 192 *πῶς φθέγγει ἀμέγαρτα κακῶν*; Hor. *C.* iv. 12. 19 amara curarum, iv. 4. 76 acuta belli, *Sat.* II. 2. 25 vana rerum, II. 8. 83 ficta rerum, *A. P.* 49 abdita rerum, Cic. *Verr.* I. 6. 15 inania nobilitatis, Tac. *Hist.* iv. 50 ambigua sonitus, iv. 41 tacita suspicionum.

Digitized by Google

στηριγμοῦ, 1[4] *ἀποφεύγω τῆς φθορᾶς** (but with acc. 2[20] *ἀπ. τὰ μιάσματα* and 2[18]); of the sphere 1[20] *προφητεία ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται*, 3[7] *βραδύνω ἐπαγγελίας*.* *Genitive absolute*[1]: 2 Pet. 1[3] *τῆς θείας δυνάμεως τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν δεδωρημένης*, 1[17] *φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης*, 3[11] *τούτων πάντων λυομένων*. *With prepositions*: *ἀπό* three (or four if we read *ἀπό* for *ὑπό* in 1[17]), esp. 1[21] *ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ*,* 3[4] *ἀφ' ἧς (ἡμέρας) ἐκοιμήθησαν*.† *ἐκ* five, esp. 2[8] *ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας*.† *ὑπό* five (or four if we read *ἀπό* in 1[17]), 1[21] *ὑπὸ πνεύματος φερόμενοι*, 2[7] *καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἀναστροφῆς* (where we should rather have expected *διά* or the dative, but see my Introd. to St. James, p. cc, and the note on James 3[4]), 2[17] *ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι*. *ὀπίσω** once, 2[16] *τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς πορευομένους*. *ἕως* once, 1[19] *ἕως οὗ (χρόνου) ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ*.† *διά* five times (six if we read *διὰ δόξης* in 1[3], four if we read *δι' ὅν* in 3[6]), esp. 3[5] *γῆ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα*,* where it seems to have the force of *μεταξύ*. *ἐπί* once, 3[8] *ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν*. *κατά* once, 2[11] *οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν*.* *παρά* once, 1[17] *λαβὼν παρὰ Θεοῦ τιμήν*. *περί* twice.

DATIVE.—Jude. *Of Indirect Object*: *v.* 3 *γράφειν ὑμῖν bis*, *v.* 13 *οἷς ὁ ζόφος τετήρηται*, *v.* 1 *Χριστῷ τετηρημένοι* (?), *v.* 3 *ἡ παραδοθεῖσα τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστις*. *Dativus commodi*: *v.* 2 *ἔλεος ὑμῖν*. *Of the Agent*: *v.* 1 *Θεῷ ἠγαπημένοι* (*al. ἐν Θεῷ*). *After εἰμί understood v.* 25 *μόνῳ Θεῷ δόξα*. *Following compound verbs*: *v.* 3 *ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ πίστει*, *v.* 20 *ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ πίστει*, *v.* 9 *ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι*. *Following adjective*: *v.* 7 *τρόπον ὅμοιον τούτοις*. *With exclamation*: *v.* 11 *οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς*, cf. Epict. iii. 19. 1 *οὐαί μοι*.

Of Instrument: *v.* 6 *εἰς κρίσιν δεσμοῖς τετήρηκεν*. *Of Cause*: *v.* 11 *τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο*. *Of Manner**: *v.* 11 *τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν*, *τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ ἐξεχύθησαν*.

With Preposition: *ἐν* eight times, three being unclassical, viz. the dat. of the *instrument* in *v.* 10 *ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται*, that of *association* in *v.* 14 *ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν ἦλθεν*, that of *divine influence v.* 20 *ἐν πνεύματι προσευχόμενοι*. See Index.

2 Pet. *Dat. of Indirect Object*: after *δωρέομαι* 1[3], 1[4], *ἐπιχορηγέω* 1[11], *παραδίδωμι* 2[4], 2[21], *δίδωμι* 3[15], *δηλόω* 1[14], *γνωρίζω* 1[16], *ἐπάγω* 2[1], 2[5], *ἐπαγγέλλομαι* 2[19], *δουλόω* 2[19], *γράφω* 3[1], cf. 1[1] *τοῖς ἰσότιμον λαχοῦσιν πίστιν*, where *χαίρειν 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.

Digitized by Google

correspondence (unless we prefer to say that *χαίρειν* is changed into *χάρις ὑμῖν* in *v.* 2, see note on James 1[1]), *προσέχοντες λύχνῳ* 1[19], *φέρω* 1[17], *τίθημι* 2[6] (*ὑπόδειγμα ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς*), 2[3] *οἷς τὸ κρίμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ. Dat. with εἰμί*, etc.: 1[8] *ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα*, 1[9] *ᾧ πάρεστιν ταῦτα*, 2[20] *γέγονεν αὐτοῖς*, 2[21] *κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς*, 2[22] *συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς*, 3[18] *αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα* (verb understood), 1[2] *χάρις ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη. After words implying agreement*: *ἐξακολουθέω* 1[16], 2[2], 2[15], *ἰσότιμος ἡμῖν* 1[1]. *After words implying destination*: 2[17] *οἷς τετήρηται*, 3[7] *πυρὶ τεθησαυρισμένοι. Ethical Dative*: 3[14] *ἄσπιλοι αὐτῷ εὑρεθῆναι.*

Dat. of Instrument: 1[8] *ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καλεῖν*, 2[3] *λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται*, 2[6] *καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν*,* 2[18] *ἀσελγείαις δελεάζω*, 2[19] *ᾧ ἥττηται*, 3[6] *κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθείς. Dat. of Cause*: 1[21] *θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη*, 2[8] *ψυχὴν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν*,* 3[5] *γῆ συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ*, 3[7] *οὐρανοὶ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρίσμενοι. Dat. of Respect*: 2[8] *βλέμματι δίκαιος*,* 2[11] *ἰσχύϊ μείζονες.*

With Prepositions:[1] *ἐν* forty instances, many being unclassical, *e.g.* the dat. of the *instrument*, 2[16] *ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον*, 2[3] *ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται*, 1[1] *λαχὼν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*, dat. of *manner*, 1[13] *διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει*, 3[3] *ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐλεύσονται. παρὰ Κυρίῳ bis. σύν* once. *With prep. in compound verb*: 2[13] *συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν*, 2[20] *τούτοις ἐμπλακέντες*, 3[17] *πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες.*

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. 1[8] *ταῦτα καθίστησιν*, 1[9] *πάρεστιν ταῦτα*, and 3[10] *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. 1[19] *ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ*, 3[10] *οὐρανοὶ παρελεύσονται στοιχεῖα δὲ λυθήσεται*, 3[12] *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. 1[2]) *ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χάρις πληθυνθείη.* A singular verb is also found where the compound subject is made up of a singular and a neuter

[1] See Index.

Digitized by Google

plural, as 3^{10} *γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται* (where some MSS. have the plural). Elsewhere, as a rule, (3) the compound subject is followed by a plural verb, as 3^{7} *οἱ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσίν*. In 3^{1} 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, *λαὸν σώσας* [*τοὺς*] *μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν*. 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 ἀσεβειῶν*, *v.* 8 *δόξας βλασφημοῦσιν* ('glories' for 'glorious beings'): so 2 Pet. 2^{10} *δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες*, 2^{2} *πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις*, 2^{18} *δελεάζουσιν σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις τοὺς ἀποφεύγοντας*, 3^{11} *ἐν ἁγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις*, where there may be an intentional reference to Jude *v.* 18; see explanatory note. Other examples are James 2^{1} *μὴ ἐν προσωπολημψίαις ἔχετε τὴν πίστιν*, Col. 3^{22} *ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλείαις*, 1 Pet. 2^{1} *ὑποκρίσεις, φθόνους*.

Gender.—Exceptional examples are 2 Pet. 3^{5} *οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος συνεστῶσα*, where I think we must supply *συνεστῶτες* with *οὐρανοί*, 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 3^{7} *οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσίν* the gender agrees with that of the more important, though more distant, noun. So in 3^{13} *οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν προσδοκῶμεν ἐν οἷς κ.τ.λ.* the gender of the relative agrees with *οὐρανούς*. In Jude *v.* 12 the reading of the best MSS., *οἱ . . . σπιλάδες εὐωχούμενοι*, 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 K 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.

Pronouns.

Demonstrative.

οὗτος (*a*) Substantival (masculine) used as in Demosthenes, of opponents, in Jude 8, *καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι*, 10 *οὗτοι δὲ*

Digitized by Google

βλασφημοῦσιν, 12 *οὗτοί εἰσιν σπιλάδες*, 16 *οὗτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταί*, 19 *οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες*, 14 *ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις*. 2 Pet. 2^{12} *οὗτοι δὲ ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα*, 2^{17} *οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι*. Used of others, Jude *v.* 7 *τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις* (the fallen angels). 2 Pet. 1^{18} *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου* (of Christ).

(*b*) Substantival (neuter) Jude 10 *ὅσα ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται*. 2 Pet. 1^{20}, 3^{3} *τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες*, 3^{5}, 3^{8} *τοῦτο λανθάνει*, 2^{19} *τούτῳ δεδούλωται*, $1^{8, 9, 10}$, 3^{14} *ταῦτα*, 1^{4} *διὰ τούτων*, 1^{12}, 3^{16} *περὶ τούτων*, 1^{15} *τὴν τούτων μνήμην*, 3^{11} *τούτων λυομένων*, 2^{20} *τούτοις ἐμπλακέντες*.

(*c*) Adjectival, Jude *v.* 4 (retrospective). 2 Pet. 1^{18}, 3^{1}, 1^{5}, 1^{13}.

ἔκεινος substantival, with emphatic reference to preceding subject. 2 Pet. 1^{16} *τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος*.

For *αὐτός* and *ἑαυτοῦ*, see Index under these and under *ἴδιος*, *ἑαυτούς* is used of the 2nd person in Jude 20 and 21.

τοιοῦτος is not found in either epistle, though common in other parts of the N.T. *τοιόσδε*, found in 2 Pet. 1^{17} alone in the N.T., retains its classical prospective use, as it does in Ezra 5^{8} *τοιάδε εἶπεν αὐτοῖς*, and in Josephus *Ant.* ii. 2. 1 *αἱ ὄψεις τοιαίδε ἦσαν*, xvii. 13. 3 *Ἀρχέλαος ὄναρ τοιόνδε ἐκδιηγεῖται*, repeated in § 4.

ὃς μέν . . . ὃς δέ used as demonstratives,† Jude 21, 22.

Relative.

ὅς. Attracted: Jude *v.* 15 *περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν* (=*ἅ*) *ἠσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν*. 2 Pet. 2^{12} *ἐν οἷς* (=*ἐν τούτοις ἅ*) *ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες*.

With ambiguous antecedent, 2 P. 1^{4} *δι' ὧν* referring to the immediately preceding *δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ* but misunderstood by many editors; 3^{6} *δι' ὧν ὁ τότε κόσμος ἀπώλετο*, where various antecedents have been suggested, but where I think we should read *δι' ὅν*, 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. $2^{11, 12}$ *φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν . . . ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν*, *ib.* 1^{3} *τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ*.

Replaced by demonstrative in second clause, 2 Pet. 2^{3} *οἷς τὸ κρίμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει*, cf. 1 Cor. 8^{6} *ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν*, Winer, p. 186, Jelf § 833.

Elliptical: 2 Pet. 1^{19} *ἕως οὗ* (*sc.* *χρόνου*) *ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ*, 3^{4} *ἀφ' ἧς* (*sc.* *ἡμέρας*) *οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν*.

Digitized by Google

For ὃς μέν . . . ὃς δέ see under Demonstratives.

ὅστις: 2 Pet, 2^{1} οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν,† 'men that will bring in heresies.'

ὅσος: Jude *v.* 10 ὅσα μὲν . . . ὅσα δέ . . . ἐν τούτοις. 2 Pet. 1^{13} ἐφ' ὅσον† (*sc.* χρόνον) εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι.

Interrogative: τίς, πόσος, ποῖος do not occur in these epistles. ποταπός, 2 Pet. 3^{11}.

Indefinite: emphatic Jude *v.* 4 τινες ἄνθρωποι. 2 Pet. 3^{9} ὥς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἡγοῦνται, *ib.* μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι.

Adjectives.

Neuter Plural as Object. Jude *v.* 15 σκληρὰ ἐλάλησαν, *v.* 16 and 2 Pet. 2^{18} λαλεῖ ὑπέρογχα.

Neut. Pl. followed by Gen. 2 Pet. 2^{18} ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος, 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^{4}, though it retains its proper superlative force in 1 Cor. 15^{9}. Possibly this may explain the combination of μέγιστα with τίμια in 2 Pet. 1^{4}. J. H. Moulton goes so far as to say that μέγιστος is 'practically obsolete in Hellenistic,' p. 78. It occurs however in Job 26^{3} τίνι ἐπακολουθήσεις; οὐχ ᾧ μεγίστη δύναμις; and 31^{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 μείζονες in 2 Pet. 2^{11}.

Special Uses of some Common Adjectives.

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

ἕτερος. Qualitative: Jude *v.* 7 ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας, cf. Acts 2^{4} λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις.

ἴδιος, 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 Ἐνὼχ λέγων Ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν Κύριος ποιῆσαι

Digitized by Google

κρίσιν. Varying use of fut. aor. and pres. in 2 Pet. 2^{1} *ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι*, 2^{10} *δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν*, 2^{12} *φθαρήσονται*, 2^{15} *ἐπλανήθησαν*, 2^{17} *οὗτοί εἰσιν*, 2^{18} *δελεάζουσιν*, 3^{3} *ἐλεύσονται ἐμπαῖκται*, 3^{5} *λανθάνει αὐτούς*, 3^{12} *οὐρανοὶ λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα τήκεται* (*al.* *τακήσεται* or *τήξεται*).[1]

Imperfect Indicative used without *ἄν* where condition has failed, 2 Pet. 2^{21} *κρεῖττον ἦν† αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι*, 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. 1^{12}, where most MSS. read *μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν*, 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 *παρεισδύησαν* 'there are certain men crept in privily,' R.V. J. *v.* 11 *τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ . . . ἐξεχύθησαν καὶ . . . ἀπώλοντο*. 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 interposed 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. 1^{17} *ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ 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. 3^{17}, 12^{18}, 17^{5}, Mk. 1^{11}, Lk. 3^{22}, 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 *ἐλέγξαι τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς περὶ τῶν ἔργων ὧν ἠσέβησαν καὶ . . . ἐλάλησαν* the aorists, as they refer to a time previous to that denoted by *ἐλέγξαι*, 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.

Digitized by Google

τῶν ῥημάτων, it is perhaps better to translate 'call to mind,' rather than 'remember' with the R.V. The present imperatives in *vv.* 21, 22 *ἐλέγχετε, σώζετε, ἐλεᾶτε* prescribe a course of conduct. So in 2 Pet. 1^5 *ἐπιχορηγήσατε*, 1^{10}, 3^{14} *σπουδάσατε* have the quality of urgency,[1] while the present imperatives in 3^8 *μὴ λανθανέτω*, 3^{15} *ἡγεῖσθε*, 3^{17} *φυλάσσεσθε*, 3^{18} *αὐξάνετε* have a continuous force.

Aor. Subjunctive is correctly used in 2 Pet. 1^4, 3^{17} after *ἵνα* (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 μή* 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 *ἕως οὗ* in 1^{19} *ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ* (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 *ἔλεος 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 πατρός*.

Aor. Inf. is contrasted with *Pres. Inf.* in Jude *v.* 3 *πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν . . . ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι*, the present implying continuous action, the aorist a momentary act, so in 3 Joh. 13 *πολλὰ εἶχον γράψαι σοι* 'I had much that I wanted to say,' *ἀλλ' οὐ θέλω διὰ μέλανος καὶ καλάμου σοι γράφειν* 'but I do not care to be writing to you by pen and ink,' *v.* 5 *ὑπομνῆσαι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι* 'I wish to give you a reminder,' *v.* 24 *τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς φυλάξαι ἀπταίστους καὶ στῆσαι ἀμώμους*: here *στῆσαι* 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. *στῆσαι*. In 2 Pet. the present infinitives *ποιεῖσθαι* 1^{10}, *ὑπομιμνήσκειν* 1^{12}, *διεγείρειν* 1^{13}, *ἑκάστοτε ἔχειν . . . ποιεῖσθαι* 1^{15} are all continuous. Similarly *ῥύεσθαι* and *τηρεῖν* in 2^4, and *ὑπάρχειν* in 3^{11}. On the other hand *ὑποστρέψαι* 2^{21}, *μνησθῆναι* 'call to mind' 3^2, *ἀπολέ-*

[1] Cf. J. H. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 172 f.

Digitized by Google

σθαι, χωρῆσαι ('to arrive at' not 'to keep going'), 3[9] *ἄσπιλοι εὑρεθῆναι* 3[14], all denote a single act.

Unusual constructions of Infinitive: After verbs of motion, as Jude *v.* 15 *ἦλθεν ποιῆσαι κρίσιν*; so Mt. 2[2] *ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι*, 11[3] *τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν;* Mk. 2[17] *οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους*, Lk. 3[12] *ἦλθον βαπτισθῆναι*, 2[3] *ἐπορεύοντο ἀπογράφεσθαι*, Gen. 25[32] *πορεύομαι τελευτᾶν*. For examples in late Greek see Jannaris, *Gr.* p. 575. It is occasionally found in classical writers, as Soph. *Oed. Col.* 12 *μανθάνειν γὰρ ἥκομεν*, Eur. *Medea* 1303 *ἐμῶν δὲ παίδων ἦλθον ἐκσῶσαι βίον*, where some read the more regular *ἐκσώσων*. After verbs of knowing, 2 Pet. 2[9] *οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ τηρεῖν*, cf. James 4[17] *εἰδὼς καλὸν ποιεῖν*, Mt. 7[11] *οἴδατε ἀγαθὰ διδόναι*, Mt. 16[3] *τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινώσκετε διακρίνειν* Phil. 4[12] *οἶδα περισσεύειν*, 1 Th. 4[4], 1 Tim. 3[5]; also found in classical writings. After *ἔχω* = *δύναμαι*, 2 Pet. 1[15] *σπουδάσω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι*. *Infinitive of Result* 2 Pet. 1[15] *σπουδάσω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς*, 2 Pet. 3[1, 2] *διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν διάνοιαν, μνησθῆναι τῶν ῥημάτων*, cf. Acts 5[3] *διὰ τί ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψεύσασθαί σε;* Apoc. 5[5] *ἐνίκησεν ὁ λέων . . . ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον*, Col. 4[6] *ὁ λόγος ἅλατι ἠρτυμένος, εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς πῶς δεῖ ἀποκρίνεσθαι*, also in classical writings, *e.g.* Thuc. vi. 69. 3 *μαχούμενοι ἐχώρουν περὶ τῆς ἀλλοτρίας, οἰκείαν σχεῖν*.

Infinitive as subject: 2[21] *κρεῖττον ἦν μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν 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. cciii. 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 *ἵνα* and *ὅτι*. The following exx. are found in 2 Pet. 1[15] *σπουδάσω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι*, 3[1, 2] *διεγείρω ὑμῶν τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν μνησθῆναι τῶν ῥημάτων*, 3[9] *μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι*, 3[11] *ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς*, 3[15] *τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν (εἶναι) ἡγεῖσθε*. It is not used at all by Jude.

Participle: Joined with a finite verb, the general force of the

Digitized by Google

Aor. Part., as contrasted with the Present or Perfect Participle, is to express priority of time, as in Jude *v.* 5 *ἅπαξ σώσας ἀπώλεσεν* 'after once saving destroyed,' 'once saved and then destroyed.' 2 Pet. 1[4] *ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς φθορᾶς* 'after escaping from,' 'that ye may escape from *φθορά* and thereby become partakers of a divine nature.' 1[5] *σπουδὴν παρεισενέγκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε* 'contribute all diligence and so add energy to faith.' 1[16] *οὐ μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες ἐγνωρίσαμεν τὴν παρουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἐπόπται γενηθέντες* 'it was not from any reliance on fables but from eye-witness that we were empowered to declare the second coming.' 1[17f.] *λαβὼν τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης τοιᾶσδε . . . ἠκούσαμεν κ.τ.λ.* (the last words standing here by anacoluthon for the logical apodosis *ἐβεβαίωσεν 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*. 2[4] *σειραῖς ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν* 'he cast them down to Tartarus and then delivered them to chains.' 2[5] *Νῶε ἐφύλαξεν κατακλυσμὸν ἐπάξας* 'when he brought a flood upon the earth, he saved Noah.' 2[6] *τεφρώσας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν*, first came the showers of ashes, then the earthquake which overthrew the cities, see explanatory note. 2[15] *καταλείποντες ὁδὸν 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.' 2[16] *φθεγξάμενον ἐκώλυσεν* 'it spoke and so hindered,' lit. 'by speaking it hindered.' 3[6] *ὁ κόσμος κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο* 'the world perished by the flood.' 3[17] *ἵνα μὴ τῇ πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε τοῦ στηριγμοῦ* '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 ἠκούσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν* 'we heard a voice that came from heaven.' 2[4] *ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ 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 σπόγγον, περιθεὶς καλάμῳ, ἐπότιζεν.*

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.

Digitized by Google

See Thuc. iv. 133 *ὁ νεὼς τῆς Ἥρας κατεκαύθη, Χρυσίδος τῆς ἱερείας λύχνον τινὰ θείσης ἡμμένον πρὸς τὰ στέμματα καὶ ἐπικαταδαρθούσης.* Chrysis did not fall asleep before she set the lamp near the garlands. Here there is no *καί* between *λαβών* and *ἐνεχθείσης*, 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 2^{15}, where he reads *καταλιπόντες*, 'the aorist part. and the aor. verb are contemporary,' and again on 2^{16} 'aor. part. contemporary with aor. verb.' It is the present part. which expresses contemporaneousness, as in Jude 3 *σπουδὴν ποιούμενος . . . ἔγραψα*, *v.* 4 *παρεισεδύησαν . . . μετατιθέντες . . . ἀρνούμενοι*, *v.* 8 *ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι μιαίνουσιν*, *v.* 9 *διακρινόμενος διέλεγετο*, *v.* 14 *ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγων*, *v.* 21 *ἑαυτοὺς τηρήσατε προσδεχόμενοι*. 2 Pet. 1^{21} *ὑπὸ πνεύματος φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν* 'spake under inspiration,' 'as inspiration came to them,' 2^{8} *δίκαιος ἐνκατοικῶν ψυχὴν ἐβασανίζεν*, $3^{15,16}$ *ἔγραψεν . . . λαλῶν περὶ τούτων* 'he wrote touching this matter,' 1^{10} *ταῦτα ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ πταίσητε* 'while you do this.' So too when the part. agrees with the object of the verb, as 2^{7} *Λὼτ καταπονούμενον ἐρύσατο* 'saved Lot under his sufferings.'[1]

The aorist participle is sometimes equivalent to a perfect, especially where the verb is in the present tense, as in Jude *v.* 7 *αἱ πόλεις ἐκπορνεύσασαι πρόκεινται δεῖγμα* '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. 22^{1}) *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν*, (Acts 10^{33}) *καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγενόμενος*. He adds that 'the latter puts into the past a formula constantly recurring in the papyri . . . *εὖ ποιήσεις δούς* 'you will oblige me by giving,' *si 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. 2^{7} *ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών* means 'He put on the form of a servant and thereby emptied himself.' *κενώσας ἔλαβεν* 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 *ἐπῆνεσα, ἀπέπτυσα, τί οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο;* (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 not he do so the moment he had a chance?' 'Why has he not answered already?' Cf. Thuc. iii. 38 *ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι τοῖς λέγουσιν μὴ ὕστεροι ἀκολουθῆσαι δοκεῖν τῇ γνώμῃ, ὀξέως δέ τι λέγοντος προεπαινέσαι.*

Digitized by Google

themselves over to fornication are set forth as an example,' R.V. *v.* 12 *οὗτοί εἰσιν . . . δένδρα . . . δὶς ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζωθέντα* '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. 1^{1} *τοῖς ἰσότιμον λαχοῦσιν πίστιν* (*subaud. γράφει*) 'to them that have obtained a like precious faith,' R.V. 2^{15} *ἐπλανήθησαν ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ*, 'having followed the way of Balaam,' R.V. 1^{9} *τυφλός ἐστιν, λήθην λαβών* 'is blind, having forgotten,' R.V. 2^{20} *εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου, τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττῶνται* '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 $2^{13, 14}$ *ἀδικούμενοι . . . ἡγούμενοι . . . ἐντρυφῶντες συνευωχούμενοι . . . ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος . . . δελεάζοντες 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. 7^{5} *οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι*, Rom. $12^{9 \text{ foll.}}$ *ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος, ἀποστυγοῦντες τὸ πονηρόν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ . . . προηγούμενοι . . . ζέοντες . . . δουλεύοντες κ.τ.λ.* See 1 Pet. 3^{1} *ὁμοίως γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι*, $3^{7, 9}$, Lightfoot on Col. 3^{16} *διδάσκοντες*, J. H. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, pp. 180–183, 222–225.

Participle used instead of Infinitive 2 P. 2^{10} *οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες*, where see note.

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

Voices.

Active for Middle 2 Pet. 1^{5} *σπουδὴν παρεισενέγκαντες* instead of the usual *σπουδὴν εἰσενεγκάμενοι.*[1] 2^{1} *ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς*

[1] The aor. mid. of *φέρω* does not seem to occur in biblical Greek.

Digitized by Google

ἀπώλειαν instead of *ἐπαγόμενοι*. 2 Pet. 1^{15} *σπουδάσω* for the classical *σπουδάσομαι*, cf. *ἀκούσω* Mt. 12^{19}, 13^{14}, *ἁμαρτήσω* 18^{21}, *ἀπαντήσω* Mk. 14^{13}, Blass, p. 42. So we find *μεταπέμπω* for *μεταπέμπομαι* in Thuc. i. 112. 3, iv. 30, vi. 52, etc., also *μεταχειρίζω*, *λῄζω* quoted in Poppo's n. on i. 13. See Blass, pp. 183 f.; Moulton, pp. 154–160.

ποιεῖν act. Jude *v.* 15 *ποιῆσαι κρίσιν* 'to execute judgment': 2 Pet. 1^{19} *καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες*. *ποιεῖσθαι* mid. with periphrastic force Jude *v.* 3 *σπουδὴν ποιούμενος* 'hasting;' 2 Pet. 1^{10} *βεβαίαν τὴν κλῆσιν ποιεῖσθαι* 'to confirm,' 1^{15} *μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι* 'to call to mind' or 'to mention.'

διακρίνεσθαι 'to contend.' Jude *v.* 9 *τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος*, *v.* 22 *ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους*. The latter might also be taken to imply 'hesitation.' I think both senses are derived from the passive. See my n. on James 1^{6} *μηδὲν διακρινόμενος*.

φθείρεσθαι pass. Jude *v.* 10 *ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται* 'in these things they are destroyed' or 'corrupted' ('they corrupt themselves' A.V.): 2 Pet. 2^{12} *ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται*, see Appendix, p. 177.

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

μνήσθητε pass. with middle force, Jude *v.* 17, 2 Pet. 3^{2}.

δεδώρηται deponent, perhaps used with passive force 2 Pet. 1^{4} though *δεδωρημένης* has an active force in 1^{4}, see quotations in n. and Winer, pp. 324, 325.

βασανίζω, active used with an equivalent to the reflexive pronoun instead of the passive, 2 Pet. 2^{8} *ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν*. Cf. J. H. Moulton *Prol.* p. 87 and J. A. Robinson there cited.

ἥττηται true passive followed by dat. 2 Pet. $2^{19, 20}$.

ἐκοιμήθησαν pass. with middle force 2 Pet. 3^{4}.

τήκεται (*al.* *τακήσεται* or *τήξεται*) pass. 2 Pet. 3^{12}.

λούομαι, 2 Pet. 2^{22} *ὗς 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 *εἶπεν Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος*, *v.* 14 *λέγων Ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν Κύριος*, *v.* 18 *ἔλεγον . . . ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται*. 2 Pet. 1^{17} *φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης τοιᾶσδε . . . Ὁ υἱός μου οὗτός ἐστιν*, 3^{4} *λέγοντες Ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία ;*

Digitized by Google

(*b*) *Indirect Statement* introduced by ὅτι, Jude *v.* 5 *ὑπομνῆσαι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι ὅτι Κύριος ἀπώλεσεν, vv.* 17, 18 *μνήσθητε ὅτι ἔλεγον.* 2 Pet. 1[14] *εἰδὼς ὅτι,* 1[20], 3[3] *γινώσκοντες ὅτι,* 3[5], 3[8] *λανθανέτω ὅτι.*

(2) *Adjectival Clauses* introduced by relative, Jude *v.* 10, *v.* 13, *v.* 15 *bis,* 2 Pet. 1[4], 1[9], 1[13], 1[17], 1[19], 2[12], 2[15], 2[17], 2[19], 3[1], 3[6], 3[10], 3[12], 3[13], 3[16] *bis.*

(3) *Adverbial Clauses.*

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

(*a*) Jude *v.* 9 *ὅτε διελέγετο.* 2 Pet. 1[19] *ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ,* 3[4] *ἀφ' ἧς ἐκοιμήθησαν,* 1[13] *ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμί.*

(*β*) 2 Pet. 2[11] *ὅπου ἄγγελοι οὐ φέρουσιν* (tropical force).

(*γ*) Jude *v.* 7 *ὡς αἱ πόλεις πρόκεινται.* 2 Pet. 1[14] *καθὼς ἐδήλωσεν,* 2[1] *ὡς ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται,* 3[9] *ὥς τινες ἡγοῦνται.*

(*b*) *Causal,* Jude *v.* 11 *οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς ὅτι ἐπορεύθησαν.*

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

(*d*) *Conditional,* 2 Pet. 2[4] *εἰ ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἐφείσατο . . . οἶδεν εὐσεβεῖς ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ τηρεῖν* (irregular apodosis), 2[20] *εἰ ἥττωνται . . . γέγονεν αὐτοῖς.*

No other form of the conditional clause occurs in either epistle. *ἐάν, ἄν, ὅταν* are not found either here or in 1 Pet., except *ἐάν* once in 1 Pet. 3[13].

NEGATIVES.

There is nothing unusual in the use of *οὐ* in either epistle, except that *πᾶς . . . οὐ = οὐδείς,* 2 P. 1[20], *οὐ . . . ποτέ = οὔποτε ib.* 1[21]. It occurs twice only in Jude *vv.* 9 and 10. It is found after *εἰ* in 2 P. 2[4,5] *εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ ἐφείσατο—καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο* in accordance with the predominant use in the N.T. See Blass, p. 254, and my note on James 1[23]. For *μή* see Index. It is used with the relative where *qui* would take subjunctive, as in 2 P. 1[9] *ᾧ μὴ πάρεστιν,* 1 Joh. 4[3] *πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ,* Tit. 1[11] *διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ.* More commonly the relative is followed by *οὐ* as in Joh. 4[22] *προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε,* Lk. 14[27] *ὅστις οὐ βαπτίζει.* As a rule *μή* is used with the participle, as in Jude *v.* 19 *πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες,* 2 P. 3[9] *μακροθυμεῖ μὴ βουλόμενός*

Digitized by Google

τινας ἀπολέσθαι. The exceptional cases in which οὐ is used with the participle are given in Winer, pp. 609 f. and J. H. Moulton, pp. 231 f.

The prohibitive use of οὐ 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. 1[10] οὐ μὴ πταίσητε and in classical Greek, with the aor. subj., but is also found with the future indicative, as in Mt. 26[35] οὐ μή σε ἀρνήσομαι, and in Aristoph. *Ranae* 508 οὐ μή σ' ἐγὼ περιόψομαι.

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[4,5] the opposition is varied: in the former verse ἀλλά contrasts the verbs, the object remaining the same εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειραῖς παρέδωκεν; in the latter it contrasts the objects as well as the verbs, καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, thus preparing the way for the general apodosis οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ κολαζομένους τηρεῖν. Here the strict logical sequence would have been εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειραῖς παρέδωκεν, καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ κατακλυσμὸν ἐπῆξεν, ὄγδοον Νῶε σώσας, with some such apodosis as πῶς τούτων φείσεται;

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

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

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

δέ occurs 21 times in 2 Pet. twice with καί, 1[15] σπουδάσω δὲ καί, 2[1] ἐγένοντο δὲ καί, which is also found in Jude *v.* 14. Rarer uses in 2 Pet. are καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ 1[5], and the repeated ἐν δέ in 1[5-7], where see notes.

ἤδη. The idiomatic use of ἤδη with the numeral is found in 2 Pet. 3[1] ταύτην ἤδη δευτέραν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, where see n.

καθώς.* 2 Pet. 1[14], 3[15], once in 1 Pet.

καί. See Index. τε not found in 2 Pet. or 1 Pet., once in Jude *v.* 6 τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν, ἀγγέλους τε τετήρηκεν.

καίπερ. 2 Pet. 1[12] καίπερ εἰδότας.†

Digitized by Google

καλῶς. The idiomatic *καλῶς ποιεῖτε* occurs in 2 Pet. 1^{19}; cf. Moulton, pp. 228 f.

μέντοι used with its proper force 'nevertheless' Jude *v.* 8.

οὕτως, idiomatic, 2 Pet. 3^{4} *πάντα οὕτως διαμένει* = *in statu quo*: cf. Joh. 4^{6} *ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως*, *ib.* 13^{25}, Abbott *Joh. Gr.* pp. 26 f.

πάλαι. Jude *v.* 4 *οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι*, 2 Pet. 1^{9} *τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν*.

ἔκπαλαι. Used in 2 Pet. 2^{3}, 3^{5} alone in biblical Greek. Lobeck (*Phryn.* p. 47) quotes Philo M. 1 p. 323 *ταῖς ὁμολογηθείσαις ἔκπαλαι παρθένοις ἐς ὁμιλίαν ἐρχόμενοι*, Plut. *V. Aristid.* p. 328 F *ἔκπαλαι πρὸς τὴν μάχην σπαργῶν*, *V. Them.* p. 127 A *παρεσκευακὼς ἔκπαλαί τινας ἀποκτενοῦντας*, Josephus *Ant.* xvi. 8. 4 *ἔκπαλαι μὲν συνεδρεύων αὐτῷ προσέκειτο*. See also Wetstein's n. on 2^{3}.

ποῦ. Rhetorical use.† 2 Pet. 3^{4} *ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας*; cf. Isa. 33^{18} *ποῦ εἰσὶν οἱ γραμματικοί*; Ps. $42^{3,10}$ *ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός σου*; Eur. *Heracl.* 369 *ποῦ ταῦτα καλῶς ἂν εἴη παρά γ' εὖ φρονοῦσιν*; where Paley quotes Elmsley 'Particula interrogativa *ποῦ* non sine indignatione negat, ut saepe apud tragicos,' cf. *Alc.* 1075, *Phoen.* 548 *ποῦ 'στιν ἡ δίκη*; Soph. *Aj.* 1100 *ποῦ σὺ στρατηγεῖς τοῦδε*; *Oed. T.* 390 *ποῦ σὺ μάντις εἶ σαφής*; Sibyl. viii. 75 *ποῦ τότε σοι τὸ κράτος*;

ὡς with gen. abs., 2 Pet. 1^{3} *ὡς πάντα τῆς θείας δυνάμεως δεδωρημένης*, following *χάρις ὑμῖν 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 *Ἰούδας τοῖς κλητοῖς sc. χαίρειν λέγει*, so 2 Pet. 1^{1} *Πέτρος τοῖς λαχοῦσιν*. Of the substantive verb in the Ascription, Jude *v.* 25 *Θεῷ δόξα sc. ἔστω*, so 2 Pet. 3^{18} *αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα*, and 3^{15} *τὴν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν (εἶναι) ἡγεῖσθε*. *Of Noun* in agreement with relative 2 Pet. 1^{19} *ἕως οὗ (χρόνου)*, 1^{12} *ἐφ' ὅσον (χρόνον)*, 3^{4} *ἀφ' ἧς (ἡμέρας)*; of Antecedent understood from relative 2 Pet. 1^{9} *ᾧ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα (οὗτος)*

Digitized by Google

τυφλός ἐστιν, 2[12] ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες by attraction for ἐν τούτοις ἃ ἀγνοοῦσιν. Noun or pronoun expressed with one verb and understood with another, 2 Pet. 1[8] ταῦτα ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα οὐκ ἀργοὺς (ὑμᾶς) καθίστησιν. 1 Pet. 2[8] προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες (τῷ λόγῳ). Verb of subordinate clause understood from the verb of the principal clause, 2 Pet. 3[16] (Παῦλος ἔγραψεν) ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς (γράφει). Participle understood in a later clause from a preceding clause, 2 Pet. 3[9] μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ (βουλόμενος) πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι, 2[22] κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα καὶ ὗς λουσαμένη (ἐπιστρέψασα) εἰς κυλισμόν. Also κύων is without a verb, which may be thus supplied, ὁ πάλιν ἐμπλακεὶς (*v.* 20) ἐστὶν ὡς κύων.

Pleonasm.

Jude *v.* 3 ὑμῖν repeated after γράψαι; *v.* 5 ὑμᾶς repeated emphatically after εἰδότας; *v.* 4 ἄνθρωποι after τινές, after ἀσεβεῖς 2 Pet. 3[7]; redundant pronoun after ἴδιος, 2 Pet. 3[3] κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, 3[16] πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν; in resumption of preceding noun 2 Pet. 3[16] 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. 27[33] ἐξέστη Ἰσαὰκ ἔκστασιν μεγάλην, Lk. 22[15] ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα, James 5[17] προσευχῇ προσηύξατο, where see my note, also Vorst *De Hebraismis* pp. 610–635. Two remarkable instances are found in 2 Pet. where ἐν is joined to the dative, viz. 2[12] ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται, where αὐτῶν appears to refer to the preceding ἄλογα ζῷα, and ἐν implies that their destruction will be shared by the libertines; and 3[3] ἐλεύσονται ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται, where ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ is equivalent to the participle, as in Lam. 1[2] κλαίουσα ἔκλαυσεν.

Periphrasis.

With ἔχειν, Jude *v.* 3 ἀνάγκην ἔσχον (=ἠναγκάσθην) γράψαι ὑμῖν, 2 Pet. 1[19] ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν λόγον = perfect of βεβαιόω, 2[16] ἔλεγξιν ἔσχεν παρανομίας = ἠλέγχθη περὶ π., 2[14] καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες = γεγυμνασμένοι πλεονεξίας.

Digitized by Google

ποιεῖσθαι,† 2 Pet. 1[10] *βεβαίαν τὴν κλῆσιν ποιεῖσθαι* = *βεβαιοῦν*, 1[15] *τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι* = *τούτων μνησθῆναι*, Jude *v.* 3 *σπουδὴν ποιούμενος* = *σπεύδων*. *λαμβάνειν*, 2 Pet. 1[9] *λήθην λαβών* = *ἐπιλαθόμενος*, 2 Pet. 1[17] *λαβὼν τιμήν* = *τιμηθείς*. 2 Pet. 1[13], 3[1] *διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει* = *ὑπομνῆσαι*.

Hendiadys. 2 Pet. 1[16] *τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν* = *τὴν ἐν δυνάμει παρουσίαν*, see Mt. 24[30] and Mk. 9[1] quoted in explanatory note.

ANACOLUTHON.

Jude *v.* 16 *οὗτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταί, κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα.* Here the construction would have been regular, if we had had *ὧν 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[1] below.

2 Pet. 1[17-19] *λαβὼν . . . δόξαν, φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης τοιᾶσδε . . . καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἠκούσαμεν . . . καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν λόγον.* Here *λαβών* prepares the way for such an apodosis as *ἐβεβαίωσεν τὸν λόγον*, but the interposed clause of *v.* 18, dwelling on the importance of the evidence referred to, causes the writer to lose his construction.

2 Pet. 2[4-9] *εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς . . . οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ παρέδωκεν . . . καὶ . . . οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ . . . ἐφύλαξεν, . . . καὶ πόλεις . . . κατέκρινεν, . . . καὶ δίκαιον . . . ἐρύσατο, . . . οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους 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 *v.* 8 to explain *καταπονούμενον*.

2. Pet. 3[1-3] *διεγείρω ὑμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν, μνησθῆναι τῶν ῥημάτων τοῦ κυρίου, γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐμπαῖκται.* Here we

Digitized by Google

should have expected *γινώσκοντας* to agree with the subject of the infinitive *μνησθῆναι*, but the writer ends his sentence, as if he had begun, as Jude does, with *μνήσθητε*. See explanatory note.

Asyndeton, confirmatory, where we might have expected a genitive absolute, 2 Pet. 2^{16} *ἔλεγξιν ἔσχεν παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν.*

Digitized by Google

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[1] καὶ εἰρήνη[2] καὶ ἀγάπη[3] πληθυνθείη. In *v.* 4 'the men who were designed for this judgment' are described as ἀσεβεῖς[1], τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες[2] εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, τὸν μόνον δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι[3]. 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 μιαίνουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. [In *vv.* 9, 10 we have two couplets οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν—ἀλλὰ εἶπεν: ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν—βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ—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 ποιῆσαι κρίσιν—ἐλέγξαι, περὶ πάντων ὧν ἠσέβησαν—ὧν ἐλάλησαν.] In *v.* 16 we return to the triplet πορευόμενοι—λαλοῦντες (disguised in the form καὶ τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα)—θαυμάζοντες. So in *v.* 17, the word—the Apostles—the Lord. *v.* 18 does not admit of subdivision. *v.* 19 has the triplet ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. *vv.* 20 and 21 have a double triplet ἐποικοδομοῦντες—προσευχόμενοι—προσδεχόμενοι and πνεῦμα ἅγιον—Θεός—Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. *v.* 22 has the marked triplet οὓς μὲν—οὓς δὲ—οὓς δέ. *v.* 24 has a couplet φυλάξαι—στῆσαι. *v.* 25 has a quartet δόξα, μεγαλωσύνη, κράτος, ἐξουσία, followed by the triplet πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ νῦν, καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας, 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 1^{14}

Digitized by Google

ἕκαστος πειράζεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας—εἶτα ἡ ἐπιθυμία τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία ἀποκύει θάνατον, v. 19 *ἔστω δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι, βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν*, 2^{23} *ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, καὶ φίλος Θεοῦ ἐκλήθη*, 3^{6} *ἡ γλῶσσα ἡ σπιλοῦσα, καὶ φλογίζουσα—καὶ φλογιζομένη*, 4^{8} *ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ—καθαρίσατε χεῖρας—ἁγνίσατε καρδίας*, so 4^{9}, $5^{17,18}$. Perhaps we may find a septet in the beautiful description of heavenly wisdom (3^{17}) *πρῶτον μὲν ἁγνή, ἔπειτα εἰρηνική, ἐπιεικής, εὐπειθής, μεστὴ ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀδιάκριτος, ἀνυπόκριτος*. But the distinctive mark of St. James' style is 'paronomasia' passing at times into such a climax as we find in $1^{14,15}$ quoted above and in $1^{3,4}$ *τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ ἔργον τέλειον ἐχέτω, ἵνα ἦτε τέλειοι*. See pp. ccxxii f. of my edition.

There is something analogous to this last in 2 Peter, as in 1^{5-7} 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 ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν, ἐν δὲ κ.τ.λ.*).[1] I have suggested (p. 192) that the writer may have had in his mind the mystical ogdoad, which includes and completes the sabbatical hebdomad, and that he may have intended to mark this by substituting Noah the eighth (2 P. 2^{5}) 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} *οὐρανοὶ παρελεύσονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται καὶ γῆ πυρωθήσεται*(?). *τούτων λυομένων ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς ... σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν ... δι' ἣν οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήξεται* (?). Not unlike is the intensive force of the reduplication of *ἐμπαίκτης* in 3^{3} *ἐλεύσονται ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται*, and of *φθορά* in 2^{12} *γεγεννημένα εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν, ... ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται*. The same idea is dwelt on 1^{4} *ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*, 2^{19} *δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες 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.

Digitized by Google

desire to give emphasis by the use of 'line upon line' or from both. Such repeated words are ἀπώλεια in 2^{1} παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας . . . ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν, 2^{3} ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει, 3^{16} πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν, and ἀπόλλυμι in 3^{6} ὁ κόσμος ἀπώλετο, 3^{9} μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι. So we have the word ἐπίγνωσις four times, γνῶσις twice, ἐπιγινώσκω twice,[1] ἐπιθυμία four times, κολαζομένους τηρεῖν twice, τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες twice, διεγείρειν ἐν ὑπομνήσει twice, ὑπομιμνήσκω once, μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι once, the tropical use of the rare ἐξακολουθέω thrice, the rare ἄθεσμος twice, σπουδάζω thrice, βέβαιος twice, ἐπαγγελία twice, ἐπάγγελμα twice, ἐπάγω twice, πάρειμι twice, κρίσις four times, βλασφημεῖν thrice, βλάσφημος once, ἔκπαλαι twice, προσδοκάω three times, ὁδός (tropical) four times, κόσμος four times, παρουσία thrice, ἐπιχορηγέω twice, σωτήρ four times (of Christ), στηρίζω 1^{12}, ἀστήρικτος 3^{16}, στηριγμός 3^{17}. It is worth noting how frequently the repetition occurs in the same sentence, as in $1^{3,4}$ ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως δεδωρημένης . . . δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται (where the verb seems to be used first as middle and then as passive), $1^{13,14}$ ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι . . . ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου, $1^{17,18}$ λαβὼν δόξαν, φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης . . . καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡκούσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν, $2^{7,8}$ δίκαιον Λὼτ ἐρύσατο, βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ δίκαιος ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἐβασάνιζεν, in the next verse comes ῥύεσθαι, 2^{13} ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις, 3^{9} οὐ βραδύνει ὥς τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται. There is the same impressive fourfold repetition of ἀσέβεια and its cognates in Jude *v.* 15. We also meet with pairs of synonyms, as 1^{7} ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην, 1^{10} κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογήν, 2^{13} σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι, 3^{14} ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι. The only triplets I have noticed in 2 Peter are the three examples of judgment in 2^{4-8}, and the constituents of the Cosmos (οὐρανοί, στοιχεῖα, γῆ) in 3^{10}.

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. ccxxvi foll.). As examples of fine rhythm I would cite 2 P. $1^{16,17}$ οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες |

[1] See the quotations in the Index.

Digitized by Google

ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ˌ δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν || ἀλλ' ἐπόπται γενηθέντες ˌ τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος ||[1] λαβὼν γὰρ ˌ παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ˌ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν | φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης τοιᾶσδε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης || Ὁ υἱός μου ˌ ὁ ἀγαπητός μου | οὗτός 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 τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον | ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες | ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ | ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ | καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ˌ 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[4-9] and 3[13]; also Jude *vv.* 20, 21 ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπητοί | ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει | ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι | ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε | προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ˌ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ | εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ||, where there is a marked alliteration in *p*, as also in *v.* 3. Another peculiarity in Jude is the rhyme in *v.* 8 σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν, and in *vv.* 10 and 11: ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν, βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ . . . ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται· οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς ὅτι . . . ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ . . . ἐξεχύθησαν. We may compare the occasional iambic fragments to be found in 2 P. as 1[19] τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ, 2[4] εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους, 2[8] ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας, ψυχὴν δικαίαν, 2[22] κύλισμα βορβόρου, as to which see a note by Canon E. L. Hicks in *C.R.* 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 καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες 1[19], καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ 1[5], ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας 2[8], τὰ πρὸς ζωήν 1[3], τὸ τῆς παροιμίας 2[22], ἕως οὗ διαυγάσῃ 1[19], ἀφ' ἧς ἐκοιμήθησαν 3[4], ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμί 1[13], and

[1] I use the half stroke, the stroke, and the double stoke to mark an ascending scale of the rhythmical pause.

Digitized by Google

the subjunctive after *ἵνα* 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, καυσοῦσθαι, μελλήσω, μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, παρεισφέρω, φωνή*. Taking these in order, we must allow that, if we retain the old reading, and the old translation of 2^8, *βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ ὁ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς . . . ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν* ('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 auditu 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. 13^6, Mk. 4^6, Apoc. $16^{8,9}$) of external heat, as in Epict. i. 6. 26 *ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ δ' οὐ καυματίζεσθε; οὐ στενοχωρεῖσθε;* A similar explanation may be given of *μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι* in 1^{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 *μελλήσω* (1^{12}), 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 παρεισενέγκαντες* (1) that the verb regularly used in periphrasis with *σπουδήν* is the middle *εἰσφέρεσθαι*, and (2) that, in the compound *παρεισφέρω*, *παρά* must mean 'secretly,' as in *παρεισεδύησαν* Jude *v.* 4 and *παρεισάξουσιν* 2 P. 2^1. As to the second objection, *παρά* in composition is not limited to the meaning 'secretly;' cf. Rom. 5^{20} *νόμος παρεισῆλθεν* 'the law came in beside,' and see Schweighäuser *Lex. Polyb.* under *παρεισάγω*. Compare also the compounds *παρεισβάλλω, παρεισδέχομαι, παρεισφρέω, παρεισχέω* and other compounds quoted in my note on

Digitized by Google

2 P. 1[5]. As to the voice, in Hellenistic Greek the force of the middle was very much forgotten, as we may see from the forms *σπουδάσω* 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[18] 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 *ὣς ἄρα φώνησεν*, and even for the thought apart from the utterance, as in Plato *Protag.* 341 B *τὴν Σιμωνίδου φωνήν* 'the saying of Simonides,' Epict. iv. 1. 32 (after a quotation from Diogenes) *τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐλευθέρου ἀνδρὸς φωνή*, Plut. *Mor.* 106 B *ἐνταῦθα ἄν τις ἐλκύσειε τὴν τοῦ Σωκράτους φωνήν, εἰ συνεισενέγκαιμεν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τὰς ἀτυχίας ὥστε διελέσθαι τὸ ἴσον ἕκαστον, ἀσμένους ἂν τοὺς πλείους τὰς ἑαυτῶν λαβόντας ἀπελθεῖν.* So Acts 13[27] *ἀγνοήσαντες τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας*, Gen. 45[16] *διεβοήθη ἡ φωνὴ* (R.V. 'the fame thereof) *εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φαραώ, λέγοντες ὅτι Ἦκασιν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Ἰωσήφ.*

Another word which has caused offence is *μυωπάζων*. 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[9] *τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων*, the last word defines or limits the first: he who is without the virtues mentioned in 1[5-7] is blind, or, to put it more exactly, is short-sighted; he cannot see the things of heaven, though he may be quick enough

Digitized by Google

in regard to worldly matters. Cf. what is said of the libertines in 2^{12}. The same characteristic is noted in Plato *Rep.* vi. 508 C *ἀμβλυώττουσι καὶ ἐγγὺς φαίνονται τυφλῶν*, but *μυωπάζων* 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, *ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος* (2^{14}). In the note I have compared the saying of Timaeus *οὐκ ἔφη κόρας ἐν τοῖς ὄμμασιν ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ πόρνας*, which gives the origin of *μοιχαλίδος* in 2 P.; and the quotation from Arcesilaus, 'oculos inlecebrae voluptatisque plenos,' which supplies the remaining words *ὀφθαλμοὺς μεστούς* in the phrase of 2 P. Other words of extreme rarity are *παραφρονία, ἐξέραμα, ταρταρόω, κυλισμός* on which see explanatory notes. The first is an irregular derivative from *παράφρων* instead of the ordinary *παραφρόνησις*. It was probably used in 2 P. 2^{16} for the sake of the assonance with *παρανομία* (*ἔλεγξιν ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον . . . ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν*). The second takes the place of *ἔμετον* in the quotation from Prov. 26^{11}. The verb *ἐξεράω* is used by Aquila in translating the same word, and the cognates *ἀπεράω, ἐξεράω* are comparatively common.[1] The simple verb *ταρταρόω* occurs elsewhere only in Amphilochius (A.D. 370), the compound *καταταρταρόω* 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. 2^{18}.

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 *ἐξέραμα* gives a better rhythm than *ἔμετον*, and *κυλισμόν* than *κύλισιν* in 2^{22}, *Κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα, καί Ὑς λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου*. So too the word *ταρταρώσας* contributes greatly to the fine rhythmical effect of 2^{4-8}. 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. 2^{22} is an inexact quotation of two iambic lines

εἰς ἴδιον ἐξέραμ' ἐπιστρέψας κύων,
λελουμένη θ' ὗς εἰς κύλισμα βορβόρου,

this would account for two out of these rare words.

Digitized by Google

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 *ἅλωσις*, *ἀμαθής*, *ἀποφεύγω*, *ἀργέω*, *βόρβορος*, *βραδυτής*, *ἑκάστοτε*, *ἐπάγγελμα*, *ἐπόπτης*, *κατακλύζω*, *λήθη*, *μεγαλοπρεπής*, *μέγιστος*, *μίασμα*, *μνήμη*, *ὁμίχλη*, *παρανομία*, *πλαστός*, *σειρά*, *τοιόσδε*, *ὗς*, *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 *ἐνκατοικέω*, *τολμητής*. Others are fairly common in post-Aristotelian Greek, as *ἄθεσμος* (Diod. Plut. Macc.), *ἀκατάπαυστος* (Polyb. Plut.), *διαυγάζω*, *ἔκπαλαι*, *ἐντρυφάω*, *ἐξακολουθέω*, *ἐπίλυσις*, *ἰσότιμος*, *παρεισάγω*, *σπίλος*, *ταχινός*, *τεφρόω*. Some bear an unusual sense, as *αὐχμηρός*, usually 'dry' and 'squalid,' used (not in 2 P. only) for 'dark'; *μῶμος* 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; *στρεβλόω* an old word meaning to 'twist' or 'wrench,' used here metaphorically of wilful misinterpretation; *στηριγμός* 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 *ἀστήρικτος*, 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; *δυσνόητος* Luc. and Diog. L.; *ἔλεγξις* LXX. and Philostr.; *ἐμπαιγμονή* *ἅπ.λεγ.*; *μιασμός* found elsewhere only in Wisdom and 1 Macc., *Test. Levi* 17, *Test. Benj.* 8; *ὀλίγως* occurs only thrice elsewhere; *ῥοιζηδόν* twice, see notes; *ψευδοδιδάσκαλος* apparently first used in 2 P.,

Digitized by Google

found in later writers. If we read *μελήσω* with Dr. Field in 2 P. 1^{12}, 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 1^4, though it is joined to the ordinary accusative in 2^{18} and 2^{20}; *βραδύνω* followed by *ἐπαγγελίας* (3^9) and *ἀκατάπαυστος* followed by *ἁμαρτίας* (2^{14}), both being classified above under the 'genitive of the sphere.' The combination of positive and superlative in 1^4 *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*, *ἔλεγξις*, *μοιχαλίς*, *στηριγμός*, *ψευδοδιδάσκαλος*; some to be unnecessary, such as the Hebraic *ἐμπαιγμονή* and perhaps *καυσοῦσθαι*, which however does not read to me like an invention, but rather like a colloquialism or provincialism. *ῥοιζηδόν* is a poetical word, which may be compared with the phrase *ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος* (2^{18}) and was perhaps borrowed from Lycophron, 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 *ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος*, *ἀνάχυσις*, *ἀνεκλάλητος*, *ἀπροσωπολήμπτως*, *δεδοξασμένη*, *ἐγκομβόομαι*, *ἐμπλοκή*, *ἐπερώτημα*, *περίθεσις*, *συνπρεσβύτερος*. 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.* *ὡς* in 1^8, which in my opinion refers to what precedes; but there is something to be said for putting a full stop at the end of

Digitized by Google

the preceding verse, and a comma at the end of the 4th verse. So in the use of prepositions, we have *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει* in (1^2, 2^{20}), *διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως* (1^3), *εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν* (1^8) where it may be puzzling to catch the precise shade of meaning. If we read with WH. *διὰ δόξης* in 1^3, we have a succession of four phrases introduced by *διά—διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς, δι' ὧν τὰ μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ 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 ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*, the first *ἐν* has a local, the second a causative sense. Again, the sense varies in 1^{13} *δίκαιον ἡγοῦμαι, ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει*, 2^{12} *ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν φθαρήσονται*, 2^{18} *δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους*, 3^1 (*ἐπιστολὰς*) *ἐν αἷς διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν διάνοιαν*. The force of the repeated *ἐν δέ* in 1^{5-7} is not clear. So the meaning of *διά* in $3^{5,6}$ *οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ· δι' ὧν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο* is not easy to make out. I think that in the former verse it is equivalent to *μεταξύ*, in the latter the plural *ὧν* is so ambiguous that it seems necessary to read *ὅν*, referring to the preceding *λόγῳ*. In 1^{17} *φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης* we should probably read *ἀπό*. In 3^2 Blass thinks it necessary to insert *διά* after *τῆς*, 'the Lord's command given through the apostles.' In 3^4 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 $3^{10,12}$, of *ἀρετή* in 1^3 and 1^5, and as to the force of *ταχινή* in 1^{14} and 2^1, whether it should be translated 'sudden' or 'speedy,' also as to the allusion contained in the words *καθὼς ὁ κύριος ἐδήλωσέν μοι*. In 1^4 are we to take *δεδώρηται* as passive or middle? The latter is in accordance with *δεδωρημένης* in 1^3, the former makes better sense. In 1^3 is *ὁ καλέσας* to be understood of God or of Christ? How are we to understand *τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς* (3^{16})? In 1^{12}, *ἐν τῇ*

Digitized by Google

παρουσῃ ἀληθείᾳ should we read παραδοθείσῃ with Spitta? In 2^{18} how is τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους related to the words which follow (2^{20}), ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου?

I must refer to my notes for the questions which have been raised as to the interpretation of 1^{1} τοῖς ἰσότιμον λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, 2^{1} τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, 2^{10} δόξας βλασφημοῦντες, 1^{19} ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, 1^{19} ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ, 3^{18} εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος.

Sometimes the difficulty lies in determining the construction, as in 2^{18}, δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις: does σαρκός depend on the preceding or on the following word? In 3^{5} λανθάνει αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας is τοῦτο subject to λανθάνει or object to θέλοντας? In 3^{7} τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως, on which of the participles does πυρί depend? The difficulties culminate in $2^{10\text{-}13}$, 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 2^{15}, 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 2^{12}, 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 $2^{14,18}$). 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 συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκυεῖ θάνατον. The meaning of the words ἀδικία, ἀδικέω 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 γραφῆς

Digitized by Google

ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται· οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ. 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 $1^{3,4}$, 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.

Digitized by Google

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: 'Scripsit Petrus duas epistolas 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 discrepant 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 ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσε ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα· οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. So Irenaeus iii. 1 (after the death of Peter and Paul in Rome) Μάρκος, ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγραφῶς ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. To the same effect Clement of Alexandria in the Sixth Book of the *Hypotyposes* (*ap.* Eus. *H.E.* ii. 15) says τοσοῦτο δ' ἐπέλαμψεν ταῖς τῶν ἀκροατῶν τοῦ Πέτρου διανοίαις εὐσεβείας φέγγος, ὡς μὴ τῇ εἰσάπαξ ἱκανῶς ἔχειν ἀρκεῖσθαι ἀκοῇ μηδὲ τῇ ἀγράφῳ τοῦ θείου κηρύγματος διδασκαλίᾳ, παρακλήσεσι δὲ παντοίαις Μάρκον, οὗ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκόλουθον ὄντα Πέτρου λιπαρῆσαι ὡς ἂν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς καταλείψοι (? καταλείψαι) διδασκαλίας, μὴ πρότερόν τε ἀνεῖναι ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ ταύτῃ αἰτίους γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς (cf. 2 Pet. 1[15]). And Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 5): 'Marcus quod edidit Evangelium Petri affirmatur, cuius interpres Marcus.' We read of another interpreter of Peter named

Digitized by Google

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 1^2 *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη*, is found also in 1 P 1^2. 2 P 1^3 *τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδιᾷ δόξῃ* may be compared with 1 P 1^{15} *κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ἡμᾶς ἅγιον*, *ib.* 2^9 *τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς*, *ib.* 2^{21}, 3^9 *εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε*, *ib.* 5^{10} *ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν*. 2 P 1^{10} *βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι*, cf. 1 P 1^1 *ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις*, 2^4 *παρὰ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτός*, 2^9 *γένος ἐκλεκτόν*. 2 P 1^{21} *οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ . . . ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι*, cf. 1 P 2^{15} *οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 3^{17} *εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 4^2 *θελήματι Θεοῦ τὸν ἐπίλοιπον βιῶσαι χρόνον*, 4^{19} *κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ*. 2 P 2^{18} *δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις*, *ib.* 2^2 *πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις*, cf. 1 P 4^3 *πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις*. 2 P 1^{16} *ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος*, cf. 1 P 2^{12} *ἵνα ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσι τὸν Θεόν*, 3^2 *ἐποπτεύοντες τὴν ἁγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν*. 2 P 3^{14} *ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι*, 1 P 1^{19} *ἄμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος*. 2 P 2^{14} *ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας*, cf. 1 P 4^1 *πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας*.

Other resemblances may be more summarily given.

ἀγαπάω 2 P (1), 1 P (4). *ἀγάπη* 2 P (1), 1 P (3). *ἀγαπητός* 2 P (6), 1 P (2). *ἅγιος* 2 P (5), 1 P (8). *ἀδελφός* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *ἄδικος* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ἀεί* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *αἰών* 2 P (1), 1 P (3). *αἰώνιος* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ἀλήθεια* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *ἀληθής* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ἁμαρτία* 2 P (1), 1 P (6). *ἁμαρτάνω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ἀναστρέφομαι* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ἀναστροφή* 2 P (2), 1 P (6), only five times besides in the whole N.T. *ἄνθρωπος* 2 P (4), 1 P (5). *ἀπόθεσις* 2 P (1), 1 P (1), nowhere else in N.T. *ἀπόλλυμι* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *ἀρετή* 2 P (3), 1 P (1) pl., only once besides in N.T. *ἀσεβής* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *ἀσέλγεια* 2 P (3), 1 P (1). *ἄσπιλος* 2 P (1), 1 P (1), only twice besides in N.T. *αὐξάνω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *βλασφημέω* 2 P (3), 1 P (1). *γνῶσις*

Digitized by Google

2 P (3), 1 P (1). *γραφή* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *γράφω* 2 P (2), 1 P (2). *δεσπότης* 2 P (1) of God, 1 P (1) of man. *δηλόω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *διάνοια* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *δίκαιος* 2 P (4), 1 P (3). *δικαιοσύνη* 2 P (4), 1 P (2). *διό* 2 P (3), 1 P (1). *δόξα* 2 P (5), 1 P (10). *δοῦλος* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *δύναμις* 2 P (3), 1 P (2). *εἰρήνη* 2 P (2), 1 P (3). *ἐκπίπτω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ἐλευθερία* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ἐπιθυμία* 2 P (4), 1 P (4). *ἐπιστρέφω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ἔργον* 2 P (2), 1 P (2). *ἔσχατος* 2 P (2), 1 P (2). *εὑρίσκομαι* 2 P (2 ?), 1 P (2). *ζωή* 2 P (1), 1 P (2). *ἡμέρα* 2 P (11), 1 P (3). *θέλημα* 2 P (1), 1 P (4). *θέλω* 2 P (1), 1 P (2). *ἴδιος* 2 P (7), 1 P (2). *ἰσχύς* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *καθώς* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *καλέω* 2 P (1), 1 P (6). *καρδία* 2 P (2), 1 P (3). *κλέπτης* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *κοινωνός* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *κομίζομαι* 2 P (1 ?), 1 P (2). *κόσμος* 2 P (5), 1 P (3). *κρεῖττον* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *κρίμα* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *κτίσις* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *λαλέω* 2 P (2), 1 P (2). *λαμβάνω* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *λαός* 2 P (1), 1 P (2). *λόγος* 2 P (4), 1 P (7). *μακροθυμία* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *οἶδα* 2 P (3), 1 P (2). *ὅστις* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *οὐδέ* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *οὐρανός s.* 2 P (1), 1 P (2), *pl.* 2 P (5), 1 P (1). *οὕτως* 2 P (2), 1 P (2). *ὀφθαλμός* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *παραδίδωμι* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *παρέρχομαι* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *πειρασμός* 2 P (1), 1 P (2). *πίστις* 2 P (2), 1 P (5). *πλανάομαι* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *πληθύνω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *πνεῦμα* 2 P (1), 1 P (8). *πορεύομαι* 2 P (2), 1 P (3). *ποτέ* 2 P (2), 1 P (3). *ποῦ* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *προγινώσκω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *προφήτης* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *πρῶτον* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *πῦρ* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ῥῆμα* 2 P (1), 1 P (2). *σάρξ* 2 P (2), 1 P (7). *σκότος* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *στηρίζω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *συμβαίνω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *σωτηρία* 2 P (1), 1 P (4). *τέκνα* 2 P (1), 1 P (2). *τιμή* 2 P (1), 1 P (3). *τίμιος* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ὕδωρ* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *υἱός* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *φαίνω act.* 2 P (1), *m.* 1 P (1). *φέρομαι* 2 P (4), 1 P (1). *φιλαδελφία* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *χάρις* 2 P (2), 1 P (10). Total 100.

Words used in 1 P *not in* 2 P.[1]

ἀγαθός (7), *ἀγαθοποιέω* (4), **ἀγαθοποιία* (1), **ἀγαθοποιός* (1), *ἀγαλλιάω* (3), *ἁγιάζω* (1), *ἁγιασμός* (1), *ἁγνίζω* (1), *ἁγνός* (1), *ἄγνοια* (1), *ἀγνωσία* (1), **ἀδελφότης* (2), *ἀδίκως* (1), **ἄδολος* (1), *ἀθέμιτος* (1), *αἷμα* (2), **αἰσχροκερδῶς* (1), *αἰσχύνομαι* (1), *αἰτέω* (1), *ἀκρογωνιαῖος* (1), *ἀλλήλων* (4), **ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος*

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

Digitized by Google

(1), *ἀμαράντινος (1), *ἀμάραντος (1), ἀμαρτωλός (1), ἀμίαντος (1), ἀμνός (1), ἄμωμος (1), ἀναγγέλλω (1), *ἀναγεννάω (2), *ἀναγκαστῶς (1), *ἀναζώννυμι (1), *ἀναπαύομαι (1), ἀνάστασις (2), ἀναφέρω (2), *ἀνάχυσις (1), *ἀνεκλάλητος (1), ἄνευ (2), ἀνήρ (3), ἀνθίστημι (1), ἄνθος (2), ἀνθρώπινος (1), ἀντί (1), ἀντίδικος (1), *ἀντιλοιδορέω (1), ἀντιτάσσομαι (1), ἀντίτυπος (1), ἀνυπόκριτος (1), ἅπαξ (1), ἀπειθέω (4), ἀπειλέω (1), ἀπεκδέχομαι (1), ἀπέχω m. (1), ἀπιστέω (1), *ἀπογίνομαι (1), ἀποδίδωμι (2), ἀποδοκιμάζω (2), ἀποθνήσκω (1), ἀποκαλύπτω (3), ἀποκάλυψις (3), ἀπολογία (1), *ἀπονέμω (1), ἀποστέλλω (1), ἀποτίθεμαι (1), *ἀπροσωπολήμπτως (1), ἀργύριον (1), ἀρκετός (1), ἄρτι (2), *ἀρτιγέννητος (1), *ἀρχιποίμην (1), ἄρχομαι (1), ἀσθενής (1), ἀσπάζομαι (2), ἀσωτία (1), ἄφρων (1), ἄφθαρτος (3), βάπτισμα (1), βασιλεύς (2), βασίλειος (1), *βίοω (1), βούλημα (1), βρέφος (1), γάλα (1), γένος (1), γεύομαι (1), γλῶσσα (1), γογγυσμός (1), γρηγορέω (1), γυνή (3), *γυναικεῖος (1), γωνία (1), δέησις (1), δέον (1), δεξιά (1), διάβολος (1), διακονέω (3), διασπορά (1), διασῴζω (1), δικαίως (1), διότι (3), διώκω (1), δοκιμάζω (1), δοκίμιον (1), δόλος (3), δοξάζω (4), ἐγγίζω (1), ἐγείρω (1), *ἐγκομβόομαι (1), ἔθνος (3), εἰδωλολατρία (1), εἴτε (2), ἕκαστος (2), ἐκδίκησις (1), ἐκζητέω (1), ἐκκλίνω (1), ἐκλεκτός (4), ἐκουσίως (1), *ἐκτενής (1), ἐκτενῶς (1), ἐλεέω (2), ἔλεος (1), ἐλεύθερος (1), ἐλπίζω (2), ἐλπίς (3), *ἐμπλοκή (1), *ἔνδυσις (1), ἐγκόπτω (1), ἔννοια (1), ἔντιμος (2), ἐνώπιον (1), *ἐξαγγέλλω (1), *ἐξεραυνάω (1), ἐξουσία (1), ἔξωθεν (1), ἔπαινος (2), ἐπακολουθέω (1), *ἐπερώτημα (1), ἐπηρεάζω (1), ἐπιεικής (1), ἐπιθυμέω (1), ἐπικαλέω (1), *ἐπικάλυμμα (1), *ἐπίλοιπος (1), *ἐπιμαρτυρέω (1), ἐπιποθέω (1), ἐπιρίπτω (1), ἐπισκοπέω (1), ἐπισκοπή (1), ἐπίσκοπος (1), ἐπιτελέω (1), ἐποικοδομέω (1), *ἐποπτεύω (2), ἐραυνάω (1), ἕτοιμος (2), ἑτοίμως (1), εὐαγγελίζομαι (3), εὐαγγέλιον (1), εὐλογέω (1), εὐλογητός (1), εὐλογία (1), εὐπρόσδεκτος (1), εὔσπλαγχνος (1), ζάω (7), ζηλωτής (1), ζητέω (2), ζῳοποιέω (1), ἡγεμών (1), ἡσύχιος (1), θανατόω (1), θαυμαστός (1), θεμελιόω (1), θρίξ (1), θυσία (1), ἰάομαι (1), *ἱεράτευμα (2), ἱμάτιον (1), ἵστημι (1), ἶχνος (1), καθό (1), καιρός (4), κακία (2), κακοποιέω (1), κακοποιός (3), κακός (4), κακόω (1), καλός (3), καλύπτω (1), καταβολή (1), καταισχύνω (1), κατακυριεύω (1), καταλαλέω (2), καταλαλία (1), καταπίνω (1), καταρτίζω (1), κατασκευάζω (1), κατεργάζομαι (1), κερδαίνω (1), κεφαλή (1), κηρύσσω (1), κιβωτός (1), *κλέος (1), κληρονομέω (1), κληρονομία (1), κλῆρος (1), κοινωνέω (1), κολαφίζω (1), κοσμέω (1), *κραταιός (1),

Digitized by Google

κράτος (2), κρίνω (4), κρυπτός (1), *κτίστης (1), κῶμος (1), λέων (1), λίθος (5), λογίζομαι (1), λογικός (1), λόγιον (1), λοιδορέω (1), λοιδορία (1), λυπέω (1), λύπη (1), λυτρόομαι (1), μακάριος (2), μάρτυς (1), μάταιος (1), μέλει (1), μένω (2), μέριμνα (1), μηδέ (3), μηδείς (1), μηκέτι (1), μόλις (1), μόνον (1), *μώλωψ (1), νεκρός (4), νέος (1), νήφω (3), ξενίζω (2), ξένος (1), ξηραίνω (1), ξύλον (1), οἰκέτης (1), οἰκοδομέω (2), οἰκόνομος (1), οἶκος (2), *οἰνοφλυγία (1), ὀκτώ (1), ὀλίγος (4), ὁμοίως (3), *ὁμόφρων (1), ὀνειδίζω (1), ὄνομα (2), *ὁπλίζομαι (1), ὅπως (1), ὁράω (1), ὀσφύς (1), οὖς (1), πάθημα (4), παρακαλέω (3), παρακύπτω (1), παρατίθημι (1), παρεπίδημος (2), παροικία (1), πάροικος (1), πάσχω (12), *πατροπαράδοτος (1), παύω (2), πέμπω (1), περιέχω (1), *περίθεσις (1), περιπατέω (1), περιποίησις (1), πέτρα (1), πιστεύω (3), πιστός (3), πλῆθος (1), πνευματικός (2), ποικίλος (2), ποιμαίνω (1), ποιμήν (1), ποίμνιον (2), ποῖος (2), πολυτελής (1), πολύτιμος (1), *πότος (1), πραΰς (1), πραΰτης (1), πρεσβύτερος (2), πρόβατον (1), πρόγνωσις (1), *προθύμως (1), *προμαρτύρομαι (1), προσάγω (1), προσέρχομαι (1), πρόσκομμα (1), προσκόπτω (1), πρόσωπον (1), πρότερον (1), προφητεύω (1), *πτόησις (1), πύρωσις (1), ῥαντισμός (1), *ῥύπος (1), σαρκικός (1), *σθενόω (1), σκάνδαλον (1), σκεῦος (1), σκολιός (1), *σπορά (1), στερεός (1), στέφανος (1), στόμα (1), στρατεύομαι, (1), *συμπαθής (1), συνείδησις (3), *συνεκλεκτός (1), συνκληρονόμος (1), *συνοικέω (1), *συνπρεσβύτερος (1), συνσχηματίζομαι (1), συντρέχω (1), σῴζω (2), σῶμα (1), σωφρονέω (1), ταπεινός (1), ταπεινοφροσύνη (1), *ταπεινόφρων (1), ταπεινόω (1), ταράσσω (1), *τελείως (1), τέλος (4), τιμάω (2), τοὐναντίον (1), τύπος (1), ὑπακοή (3), ὑπακούω (1), ὑπερέχω (1), ὑπερήφανος (1), *ὑπογραμμός (1), ὑπόκρισις (1), *ὑπολιμπάνω (1), ὑπομένω (2), ὑποτάσσω (6), ὑποφέρω (1), ὑψόω (1), φανερόω (2), φθαρτός (2), φθόνος (1), *φιλάδελφος (1), φοβέομαι (3), φόβος (5), φονεύς (1), φρουρέω (1), φυλακή (1), φῶς (1), χαίρω (1), χαρά (1), χάρισμα (1), χεῖλος (1), χείρ (1), χορηγέω (1), χόρτος (3), χρηστός (1), Χριστιανός (1), χρόνος (4), χρυσίον (3), *ὠρύομαι (1), ὥστε (2). Total 369, of which 59 occur only in 1 P. among the writings of the N. T.

Words used in 2 P *not in* 1 P.

ἀγνοέω (1), ἀγοράζω (1), ἀδικέω (1), ἀδικία (2), *ἄθεσμος (2), αἵρεσις (1), ἄκαρπος (1), *ἀκατάπαυστος (1), ἀκοή (1), ἀκούω (1), ἄλογος (1), *ἄλωσις (1), *ἀμαθής (1), ἁμάρτημα (1), *ἀμώμητος (1),

Digitized by Google

ἀνατέλλω (1), ἄνομος (1), ἄνυδρος (1), ἀπάτη (1), *ἀποφεύγω (3), ἀπώλεια (5), *ἀργέω (1), ἀργός (1), ἀρνέομαι (1), ἀρχαῖος (1), ἀρχή (1), *ἀστήρικτος (2), αὐθάδης (1), *αὐχμηρός (1), ἄφωνος (1), βασανίζω (1), βασιλεία (1), βέβαιος (2), βλάσφημος (1), *βλέμμα (1), *βόρβορος (1), βούλομαι (1), βραδύνω (1), *βραδυτής (1), γεννάω (1), γῆ (4), γινώσκω (2), γνωρίζω (1), γυμνάζω (1), δεῖ (1), δεύτερος (1), διαμένω (1), *διαυγάζω (1), διεγείρω (2), δουλόω (1), *δυσνόητος (1), δωρέομαι (2), εἰλικρινής (1), εἷς (3), εἴσοδος (1), *ἑκάστοτε (1), ἐκλογή (1), *ἔκπαλαι (2), ἐλαύνω (1), *ἔλεγξις (1), ἐμός (1), *ἐμπαιγμονή (1), ἐμπαίκτης (1), ἐμπλέκω (1), *ἐνκατοικέω (1), ἐντολή (2), *ἐντρυφάω (1), *ἐξακολουθέω (3), *ἐξέραμα (1), ἔξοδος (1), ἐπαγγελία (2), ἐπαγγέλλομαι (1), *ἐπάγγελμα (2), ἐπάγω (1), ἐπιγινώσκω (2), ἐπίγνωσις (4), *ἐπίλυσις (1), ἐπιστολή (2), ἐπιχορηγέω (2), *ἐπόπτης (1), ἔρχομαι (1), ἔτος (2), εὐδοκέω (1), εὐθύς adj. (1), εὐσέβεια (4), εὐσεβής (1), ἕως prep. (1), ζόφος (2), ζῷον (1), ἡγέομαι (4), ἤδη (1), ἡδονή (1), ἥκω (1), ἡττάομαι (2), θεῖος (2), θησαυρίζω (1), *ἰσότιμος (1), καθαρισμός (1), καθίστημι (1), καινός (2), καίπερ (1), καλῶς (1), *κατακλύζω (1), κατακλυσμός (1), κατακρίνω (1), καταλείπω (1), καταπονέω (1), κατάρα (1), καταστροφή (1), καταφρονέω (1), κατοικέω (1), *καυσόομαι (2), κῆρυξ (1), κλῆσις (1), κοιμάομαι (1), κολάζω (1), κρίσις (4), *κυλισμός (1), κύων (1), κωλύω (1), λαγχάνω (1), λανθάνω (2), λέγω (1), *λήθη (1), λοιπός (1), λούω (2), λύχνος (1), λύω (3), μακροθυμέω (1), μάλιστα (1), μᾶλλον (1), ματαιότης (1), μεγαλειότης (1), *μεγαλοπρεπής (1), *μέγιστος (1), μείζων (1), μεστός (1), μετάνοια (1), *μίασμα (1), *μιασμός (1), μιμνήσκομαι (1), μισθός (2), *μνήμη (1), μοιχαλίς (1), μῦθος (1), *μυωπάζω (1), *μῶμος (1), νυστάζω (1), ὄγδοος (1), ὁδός (4), *ὀλίγως (1), *ὁμίχλη (1), ὀπίσω (1), ὅπου (1), ὅρος (1), ὅσος (1), πάλαι (1), πάλιν (1), *παρανομία (1), *παραφρονία (1), πάρειμι (2) *παρεισάγω (1), *παρεισφέρω (1), παροιμία (1), παρουσία (3), πηγή (1), πλάνη (2), *πλαστός (1), πλεονάζω (1), πλεονεξία (2), πλουσίως (1), πόλις (1), ποταπός (1), προειρημένος (1), προσδοκάω (3), προσέχω (1), προφητεία (2), προφητικός (1), πρῶτος (1), πταίω (1), πυρόω (1), *ῥοιζηδόν (1), ῥύομαι (2), *σειρά (*al.* σειρός) (1), σκήνωμα (2), σοφία (1), σοφίζω (1), σπεύδω (1), σπίλος (1), σπουδάζω (3), σπουδή (1), *στηριγμός (1), στοιχεῖον (2), *στρεβλόω (1), συναπάγω (1), συνευωχέομαι (1), συνίστημι (1), σωτήρ (5), *ταρταρόω (1), ταχινός (2), *τεφρόω (1), *τήκομαι (1), *τοιόσδε (1), *τολμητής (1), τόπος (1), τότε (1), τρέμω (1), τρυφή (1), τυφλός (1), ὑπάρχω (3), ὑπόδειγμα (1),

Digitized by Google

ὑποζύγιον (1), *ὑπομιμνήσκω* (1), *ὑπόμνησις* (2), *ὑπομονή* (2), *ὑποστρέφω* (1), *ὗς (1), *φείδομαι* (2), *φθέγγομαι* (2), *φθείρω* (1), *φθορά* (4), *φυλάσσω* (2), *φυσικός* (1), *φύσις* (1), *φωνή* (3), *φωσφόρος (1), *χείρων* (1), *χωρέω* (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 1^{16}, *ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, i.e.* it formed the subject of the Apostles' teaching; in 3^{4} it is said that in the last days scoffers shall appear who will make a mock of the promised Advent, asking *ποῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ ;* and in 3^{12} 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 $5^{7,8}$, in 1 Joh. 2^{28}, and by Paul in 1 Cor. 15^{23}, 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 1^{7} that the trial of your faith may be found for praise and honour and glory *ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; in 4^{13}, where it is said that the joy of sharing in the sufferings of Christ leads on to the joy *ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*; in 1^{13} *ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει 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 progressing unveiling of Jesus Christ.' Cf. 1^{5}, 'kept through the power of God' *εἰς σωτηρίαν ἑτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ*, 5^{1} *ὁ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός*. Hort adds that the phrase goes back to our Lord's words in Lk. 17^{30} 'In the day when the Son of Man is revealed.' It is used by St. Paul in the same sense 1 Cor. 1^{7}, 2 Th. 1^{7}. There can be no doubt

Digitized by Google

that, of the two, *ἀποκάλυψις* is the finer and richer phrase, implying, in Hort's words (on 1 P 1^{5}), 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 *ἀποκαλύπτω* is *φανερόω* in 1 P 5^{4} *φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος κομιεῖσθε τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον.* It is also used of the First Advent in 1 P 1^{20}.

It is perhaps worth noting that while *ἀγαθός, ἀγαθοποιός, ἀγαθοποιέω, ἀγαθοποιία,* and *κακός, κακία, κακόω, κακοποιός, κακοποιέω* 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 *ἅγιος, δίκαιος δικαιοσύνη, ἐλευθερία, μακροθυμία, γνῶσις.* Found in 2 P only are *εὐσεβής, εὐσέβεια, ἐγκράτεια, ἐπίγνωσις, μετάνοια, σοφία, στηριγμός.* Found only in 1 P are *ἁγνός, ἀνυπόκριτος, ἀγαλλιάομαι, ἐπιεικής, εὔσπλαγχνος, εὐλογέω, ἡσύχιος, καλός, νήφω, ὁμόφρων, πιστός, πιστεύω, πνευματικός, πραΰς, πραΰτης, προθύμως, στερεὸς τῇ πίστει, συμπαθής, σωφρονέω, συνείδησις ἀγαθή, ταπεινός, ταπεινόφρων, ταπεινοφροσύνη, ὑπακοή, ὑποτάσσομαι, φόβος, χαίρω, χαρά, χάρισμα, χρηστός,* Χριστιανός. Words denoting bad qualities found in both are *ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτία, ἄδικος, ἀσεβής, ἀσέλγεια, βλασφημέω, ἐπιθυμία, σάρξ.* Found in 2 P only are *ἀγνοέω, ἀδικία, ἀδικέω, ἄθεσμος, αἵρεσις, ἀμαθής, ἁμάρτημα, ἄνομος, ἀπάτη, ἀπώλεια, ἀργός, -έω, ἀστήρικτος, αὐθάδης, βλάσφημος, ἐμπαιγμόνη, ἐμπαίκτης, μυωπάζων, παρανομία, παραφρονία, πλεονεξία, τολμητής, τρυφή, ἐντρυφάω, τυφλός, φθορά.* Found in 1 P only are *ἄγνοια, ἀθέμιτος, ἀπειθέω, ἀπιστέω, ἀγνωσία, ἄφρων, ἁμαρτωλός, ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος, αἰσχροκερδῶς, ἀσωτία, γογγυσμός, εἰδωλατρία, ἐπηρεάζω, καταλαλέω, -λαλία, κερδαίνω, κῶμος, λοιδορέω, -ρία, λυπέω, οἰνοφλυγία, πότος, πρόσκομμα, προσκόπτω, πτόησις, ῥύπος, σαρκικός, σκάνδαλον, σκολιός, ταράσσω, ὑπερήφανος, ὑπόκρισις, 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, συνκληρονόμος, συνοικέω, συνσχηματίζομαι, συν-*

Digitized by Google

πρεσβύτερος, *συντρέχω*, while 2 P has only *συναπάγω*, *συνευωχέομαι* and *συνίστημι*, of which the last has lost its proper power.

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 *ἄθεσμος* 2 P for *ἀθέμιτος* 1 P; *ἐξακολουθέω* 2 P for *ἐπακολουθέω* 1 P; *ἐπιχορηγέω* 2 P for *χορηγέω* 1 P; *ἡγέομαι* 2 P for *λογίζομαι* 1 P; *ἡμέρα* 2 P for *ἡμέρα*, *καιρός*, and *χρόνος* 1 P; *ἀγοράζω* 2 P for *λυτρόομαι* 1 P; *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως* 2 P with Mk. for *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου* 1 P with Paul; *ἐπόπτης* 2 P for *μάρτυς* 1 P; *ὑπόδειγμα* 2 P for *ὑπόγραμμος* 1 P; *αἱ πάλαι ἁμαρτίαι* 2 P for *αἱ πρότερον ἐπιθυμίαι* 1 P; *ποταπός* 2 P for *ποῖος* 1 P; *παίω* 2 P for *προσκόπτω* 1 P. Words significative of a difference of mind and feeling are *ἐλπίς* 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 *ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος* 1 P 1^2, *τίμιον αἷμα ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου* 1^{19}, *ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* 1 P 2^{21}, *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν*, *δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων* 3^{18}, *παθήματα* (cf. especially $1^{18f.}$, $2^{21\text{-}25}$, 3^{18}, $4^{1,\ 13}$, 5^1), *ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν* 1^3, cf. 1^{21} *ὁ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δούς*, 3^{21} *δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 3^{22} *ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν, ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν.*

Sometimes we have particular scenes in our Lord's life, or sayings of His called up before us. Thus the phrase *ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας* (1^{13}) reminds us of Lk. 12^{35} *ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ ὀσφύες περιεζωσμέναι*, while that most picturesque and remarkable phrase *ἐγκομβώσασθε ταπεινοφροσύνην* (5^5) reminds us of Christ's girding himself before washing the feet of His disciples (Joh. 13^5) and of His injunction to them to follow His example (13^{14}). The word *ἀρχιποίμην*, with its accompaniments, *ποιμαίνω*, *ποιμήν*, *ποίμνιον*, *πρόβατα*, reminds us of the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Good Shepherd, and of the charge to Peter *ποίμαινε τὰ προβάτιά μου*. Perhaps *αὐτὸς στηρίξει* in 1 P 5^{10}, and the cognate words in 2 P may have a reference to another charge in Lk. 22^{32}, *στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς*. And the phrase *ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι*

Digitized by Google

μὴ ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶτε (1 P 1[8]) naturally recalls the words addressed to Thomas, *ὅτι ἑώρακάς με πεπίστευκας; μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες.* When we read *ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν Κύριον . . . ὡς Θεοῦ δοῦλοι* (1 P 2[13-16]), our thoughts naturally go back to the rule laid down by the Master in Mt. 17 [24 f.] as to the payment of the half-shekel, and the words in Mt. 22[21], '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 5[8] *νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε, ὅτι ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος περιπατεῖ, ζητῶν τινα καταπιεῖν,* we naturally think of our Lord's warnings in Lk. 22[31] and in Mt. 26[41], *γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν.* The words *κλῆρος, κληρονομέω, κληρονομία* (1 P 1[4]), *συνκληρονόμος* bring to our minds Mt. 19[29] *ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει,* along with 5[5] and 25[34]. So *ἀναγεννήσας* 1 P 1[3], *ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς, ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου* 1 P 1[23], and *ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε* 1 P 2[2], suggest a reminiscence of the words recorded in Joh. 1[13] *οἳ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν,* and 3[3] *ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ* foll., taken with 1 Joh. 3[9] *πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει,* and Lk. 18[17] *ὃς ἂν μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν.* 1 P 4[14] *εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι* reminds us of Mt. 5[11] *μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς . . . ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ* (cf. 10[22], 19[29]); 1 P 1[6] *ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε ὀλίγον λυπηθέντες κ.τ.λ.* of Mt. 5[12] *χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.* 4[19] *οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ πιστῷ κτίστῃ παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχάς,* recalls Lk. 23[46] *Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου.* So 3[14] *μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε* recalls Joh. 14[1, 27]. 4[10] *ἕκαστος ὡς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα, ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι* recalls Lk. 12[42] *τίς ἐστιν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος 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' (2[20]), 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. 14[65]? Again 5[3] *μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων* recalls Mt. 20[25] *οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν . . . οὐχ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν.* So 2[12] *ἵνα ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσι τὸν Θεόν* seems

Digitized by Google

to be a reminiscence of Mt. 5^{16} *οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*: 1^{22} *ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε*, of Joh. 13^{34}, 15^{12}: 1^{10} *περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν προφῆται*, of Mt. 13^{17}.

The quotation from Ps. 118^{22} in 1 P 2^{4-6} was also used by our Lord (Mt. 21^{42}), 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^{6}, 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^{3} in 1 P 2^{12} *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς* compared with Lk. 19^{44}; that from Ps. 110^{5} in 1 P. 3^{22} compared with Mt. 22^{44}, 26^{64} and Acts 2^{34}.

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 (1^{16-18}) and the use of the words *ἔξοδος* and *σκήνωμα* in the preceding verses ($1^{13,15}$) reminding us of words then spoken; the warning as to his own approaching death (1^{14}); the stealthy intrusion of false prophets (2^{1}, cf. Mt. 7^{15}, 24^{11}), denying their Lord (2^{1}, cf. Mt. 10^{33}); the parable of the Return of the Evil Spirit (2^{20}, cf. Mt. 12^{45}); *ἥξει ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης* (3^{10}, cf. Mt. $24^{43,44}$). 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* 1^{16}), His judgment of sinners ($2^{1,3,12,17}$), the terrors of His second coming ($3^{7,10-12}$), 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 ($3^{9,15}$), and of His care for the righteous (2^{9}). 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 1^{8} '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' (*χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ*

Digitized by Google

καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ); 1^{18} '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;' 1^{22} 'Love one another from the heart fervently'; $2^{2,3}$ '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^{9} '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.' 1^{11} 'Beloved, I beseech you as sojourners and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul.' 2^{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.' $4^{12f.}$ '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.' $5^{1f.}$ '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

Digitized by Google

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*, *εὐθεῖα ὁδός*, the Gospel is spoken of as the *ἐντολὴ τοῦ κυρίου*, *ἡ παραδοθεῖσα ἁγία ἐντολή*; *ἀπώλεια* occurs five times, *ἀπόλλυμι* twice; the warning against forgetfulness is often repeated, as in $1^{9, 12, 13, 15}$ 3^{1} (the last of which, *διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν*, may be contrasted with 1 P 1^{13}, *ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, νήφοντες τελείως ἐλπίσατε*), also in 2 P $3^{5, 8}$. 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*, *ἐπιγινώσκω* 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. 5^{22-24} 6^{5-8}, Rom. 13^{1-8}, 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^{9}, 3^{7}) when heaven and earth shall be destroyed by fire,

Digitized by Google

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 (1^{11}, 3^{13}). To this day of God they are urged to be continually looking forward (3^{12}). 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* ($1^{4,5}$); their tried faith will eventually redound to praise and honour and glory in the revelation of Jesus Christ (1^{7}); at the revelation of the glory of Jesus Christ they will rejoice with exceeding joy (4^{13}); when the chief shepherd appears, they will receive the crown of glory which fadeth not away (5^{4}); the God of grace has called them to his eternal glory in Christ (5^{10}). The wicked shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead ($4^{5,18}$). The thought of this Coming should cheer believers in their trials, and at the same time make them sober and watchful, given to prayer (4^{7}); remembering that the end of all things is at hand (4^{7}). 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 ($3^{4,8}$).

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 (3^{5-7}); and in 2^{5} 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 3^{19-21}, 4^{6} 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 (*ὃ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει*), 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

Digitized by Google

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 $3^{9,15}$. 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 3^{20}, and Noah the 8th in 2 P 2^{5}. 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. 24^{37-39} *ὥσπερ γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ Νῶε, οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. See also the comparison of the cloud and the sea to baptism in 1 Cor. $10^{1,2}$ *οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἦσαν καὶ πάντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διῆλθον 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 *διά*, 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 ὀκτὼ ψυχαὶ διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος*, 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' ὕδατος* 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. $7^{4,5,10f.}$ 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 *διά* in the sense *μεταξύ*, which it seems to bear in 2 P 3^{5}, *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα*. In my note there I have explained it of the position assigned to the earth by Jewish tradition, between the waters of

Digitized by Google

the deep and of the firmament. Similarly in 1 Cor. 10^{1} *διά* 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 *δι' ὕδατος* 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 (3^{20}) but also to the dead generally (4^{6})? 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 $2^{27,31}$, 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^{20}. 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 ἀοράτων πνευμάτων τηκομένων*—we read *τοῦ ᾅδου σκυλευομένου ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει τοῦ ὑψίστου*; perhaps Mt. $27^{52f.}$ *πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἠγέρθησαν, καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς*[1]; certainly Ignat. *Magn.* ix. *οὗ* (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) *οἱ προφῆται μαθηταὶ ὄντες τῷ πνεύματι ὡς διδάσκαλον αὐτὸν προσεδόκων. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ὃν δικαίως ἀνέμενον, παρὼν ἤγειρεν 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. 64 *ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν ἐν ᾅδου ψυχῶν παρῆν, ἐκ μακροῦ αἰῶνος τὴν ἔφιξιν αὐτοῦ περιμενουσῶν, καὶ κατῆγε γε θύρας χαλκᾶς συντρίψων . . . καὶ τοὺς πρὶν δεσμίους ᾅδου ἐλευθέρους ἀνήσων. ὃ καὶ γέγονεν, ὅτε πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἀναστάντα συνεισῆλθον αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν ἀληθῶς ἁγίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ πόλιν.*

Digitized by Google

72 (p. 298) quotes a passage from Jeremiah, *ἐμνήσθη δὲ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ* (*al.* *ὁ ἅγιος*) *Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χώματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς 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) *φωνῆς ἤκουον ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λεγούσης Ἐκήρυξας τοῖς κοιμωμένοις; καὶ ὑπακοὴ ἠκούετο ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὅτι Ναί.*

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 (1^{11}); in 2 P 1^{21} 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

Digitized by Google

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 $3^{18,21}$ '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 $26^{22,23}$ '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^{2} *ἵνα 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 ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι*, and in 3^{22} *ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων*, may be compared with those in 2 P 2^{4} *ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο*, 2^{11} *ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ 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:

1 P 1^{16} *ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος*, taken from Lev. 11^{44}, 19^{2}, 20^{7}. 1^{17} *εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε* from Jer. 3^{19} *πατέρα καλέσετέ με*. 1^{18} *οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ ἐλυτρώθητε*, from Isa. 52^{3} *οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε*. 1^{23} *διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος*, from Dan. 6^{26} *αὐτός ἐστι Θεὸς ζῶν καὶ μένων εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*. 1^{24} *πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς χόρτος καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου· ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν· τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα Κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*

Digitized by Google

where the words spaced are quoted exactly from Isa. 40^{6-8}. 2^{3} *εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κύριος*, from Ps. 34^{8} *γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι* κ.τ.λ. $2^{4,6,7}$ *λίθον ζῶντα ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον, παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν . . . ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν λίθον ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἔντιμον, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ. ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, ἀπιστοῦσιν δὲ λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας*, from Ps. 118^{22} *λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας*, and Isa. 28^{16} *ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιὼν λίθον πολυτελῆ ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἔντιμον, εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ.* 2^{7} *καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου*, from Isa. 8^{14} *κἂν ἐπ' αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾖς, ἔσται σοι ὡς ἁγίασμα καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι.* 2^{9} *ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε*, from Isa. $43^{20,21}$ *ποτίσαι τὸ γένος μου τὸ ἐκλεκτόν, λαόν μου ὃν περιεποιησάμην τὰς ἀρετάς μου διηγεῖσθαι*, Exod. $19^{5,6}$ *ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος . . . βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον*, *ib.* 23^{22}, Deut. 7^{6}. 2^{10} *οἵ ποτε οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες* from Hos. $1^{6,9}$ *κάλεσον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Οὐκ ἠλεημένη . . . κάλεσον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, Οὐ λαός μου*, *ib.* 2^{1} *εἴπατε τῷ ἀδελφῷ ὑμῶν Λαός μου, καὶ τῇ ἀδελφῇ ὑμῶν Ἠλεημένη*, *ib. v.* 28. 2^{11} *παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους*, from Ps. 39^{12} *πάροικος ἐγώ εἰμι ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ παρεπίδημος καθὼς πάντες οἱ πατέρες μου.* 2^{12} *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς*, from Isa. 10^{3}. 2^{17} *τὸν Θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε*, from Prov. 24^{21} *φοβοῦ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ βασιλέα.* 2^{22} *ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ*, quoted exactly from Isa. 53^{9}. 2^{24} *ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν . . . οὗ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε*, from Isa. 53^{12} *αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν*, *ib. v.* 5 *τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν.* 2^{25} *ἦτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι*, from Isa. 53^{6} *πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν.* 3^{6} *Σάρρα ὑπήκουεν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα*, from Gen. 18^{12}. 3^{6} *μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν*, from Prov. 3^{25} *οὐ φοβηθήσῃ πτόησιν ἐπελθοῦσαν.* 3^{10-12} *ὁ γὰρ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν καὶ ἰδεῖν*

Digitized by Google

ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χείλη τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλον, ἐκκλινάτω δὲ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιησάτω ἀγαθόν, ζητησάτω εἰρήνην καὶ διωξάτω αὐτήν. ὅτι ὀφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ὦτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν, πρόσωπον δὲ Κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακά, from Ps. 34[12-16] τίς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θέλων ζωήν, ἀγαπῶν ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν ἀγαθάς (where the reading ἀγαπῶν 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. 3[14,15] τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε, Κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἁγιάσατε, from Isa. 8[12, 13] τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ φοβηθῆτε οὐδὲ μὴ ταραχθῆτε. Κύριον αὐτὸν ἁγιάσατε καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου φόβος. 3[22] ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ, from Ps. 110[1] εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου. 4[8] ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν from Prov. 10[12] 'Love covereth all transgressions' (R.V.), where LXX. has τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας καλύπτει φιλία. 4[14] εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ... μακάριοι, ὅτι ... τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται. Hort reckons this as a quotation from Ps. 89[50f.], 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 πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4[17] καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ, from Ezek. 9[6, 7] ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μου ἄρξασθε ... καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Μιάνατε τὸν οἶκον. 4[18] εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται; quoted exactly from Prov. 11[31]. 5[5] Θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν, from Prov. 3[34] with the change of Κύριος into Θεός. 5[7] τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρρίψαντες ἐπ' αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν, from Ps. 55[22] ἐπίρριψον ἐπὶ Κύριον τὴν μέριμνάν σου, καὶ αὐτός σε διαθρέψει.

Perhaps we may add to these, as probably in the mind of the writer, 1[2] εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, from Dan. 4[1] (3[31]) and 6[25]. 1[4] ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον: 'These three words are all absent from the LXX. and are all found in Wisdom (12[1], 18[4], 3[13], 4[2], 8[20], 6[12])' Hort. 1[7] ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου εὑρεθῇ εἰς ἔπαινον, from Zech. 13[9] πυρώσω αὐτοὺς ὡς πυροῦται τὸ ἀργύριον, καὶ δοκιμῶ

Digitized by Google

αὐτοὺς ὡς δοκιμάζεται τὸ χρυσίον. $1^{10\text{-}12}$ *περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν . . . προφῆται . . . ἐραυνῶντες εἰς τίνα . . . καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρόμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας, . . . εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι,* from Dan. $8^{13\text{-}15}$, $9^{24\text{-}26}$, $12^{6\text{-}9}$, Isa. 52^{13}–53^{12}, 1^{17} *κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἔργον,* from Ps. 62^{12} *σὺ ἀποδώσεις ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.* 1^{18} see above, and add Ps. 49^{8}. 1^{19} *ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου,* from Lev. 22^{21} *ἄμωμον ἔσται εἰσδεκτόν, πᾶς μῶμος οὐκ ἔσται ἐν αὐτῷ.* $3^{19, 20}$, from Gen. chapters 6 and 7. 4^{17} see above, and add Jer. 25 (32)^{29} *ἐν πόλει ἐν ᾗ ὠνομάσθη τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐγὼ ἄρχομαι κακῶσαι.* 4^{19} *πιστῷ κτίστῃ παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχάς,* from Ps. 31^{5} *εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου· ἐλυτρώσω με Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας.* 5^{8} *ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος . . . περιπατεῖ ζητῶν καταπιεῖν,* from Job. 1^{7} *ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ διάβολος εἶπε, Περιελθὼν τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσας τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν πάρειμι, ib.* 2^{2}.

In 2 P Hort reckons the following as quotations: 2^{2} *δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται,* from Isa. 52^{5} *δι' ὑμᾶς . . . τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι.* 2^{22} *κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα,* from Prov. 26^{11} *ὥσπερ κύων ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἔμετον καὶ μισητὸς γένηται, οὕτως ἄφρων τῇ ἑαυτοῦ κακίᾳ ἀναστρέψας ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἁμαρτίαν.* 3^{8} *μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη, καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία,* from Ps. 90^{4} *χίλια ἔτη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἐχθὲς ἥτις διῆλθε.* 3^{12} *οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται,* from Isa. 34^{4} *καὶ τακήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ἑλιγήσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα πεσεῖται.* 3^{13} *καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν προσδοκῶμεν,* from Isa. 65^{17} *ἔσται γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς καινὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καινή, ib.* 66^{22}. Perhaps we may add the following: 1^{2} *τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων,* compared with Isa. 59^{10} *ὡς οὐχ ὑπαρχόντων ὀφθαλμῶν ψηλαφήσουσι.* 1^{19} *τῷ λόγῳ προσέχοντες ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ,* cf. Ps. 119^{105} *λύχνος τοῖς ποσί μου ὁ νόμος σου,* 2 Esdras 12^{42} tu nobis superasti ex omnibus prophetis . . . sicut lucerna in loco obscuro. 2^{2} *ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας,* cf. Ps. 119^{30}. 2^{4} *σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους,* cf. Wisdom 17^{16} *μίᾳ ἀλύσει σκότους πάντες ἐδέθησαν.* 2^{5} saving of Noah, cf. Gen. chapters 6 and 7. 2^{6} *πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν, ὑπό-*

Digitized by Google

δειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς, cf. Gen. 19[24f.] Κύριος ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα θεῖον 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. 2[7-9] saving of Lot, cf. Gen. ch. 18, Wisdom 10[6, 7]. 2[15, 16] Balaam, cf. Numb. 22[21-28]. 3[9] οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὥς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ, cf. Sir. 35[18] καὶ ὁ Κύριος οὐ μὴ βραδύνῃ οὐδὲ μὴ μακροθυμήσῃ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. 3[9] μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι, cf. Ezek. 18[23], Wisdom 11[24] ἐλεεῖς δὲ πάντας, ὅτι πάντα δύνασαι, καὶ παροράς ἁμαρτήματα 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. βιῶσαι (4[2]), found also in Aristotle and Plutarch, instead of the classical βιῶναι. The fut. pass. κερδηθήσονται is found only in 1 P 3[1]. 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 κερδανῶ (WH.) or κερδάνω (Blass) occurs after ἵνα in 1 Cor. 9[21]. 1 P has three examples of the form ἐγενήθην (1[15], 2[7], 3[6]). It keeps the classical προσαγάγῃ in 3[18] as contrasted with ἐπάξας in 2 P 2[5]. In 2[15] WH. (Introduction § 410, App. p. 166), read φιμοῖν with ℵ comparing κατασκηνοῖν 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 φιμοῦν 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

Digitized by Google

noun.[1] Of the former we have examples in 1 P 1[5] *τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους*, 1[10] *οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες*, 1[14] *ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις*, 3[2] *τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἁγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν*, 3[3] *ὁ ἔξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος*, 3[16] *τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφήν*, 4[2] *εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιῶσαι χρόνον*, 5[1] *ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός*, 5[4] *τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον*, 5[9] *τῇ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητι*. Of the latter in 1[2] *ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος, εἰς ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος*, 1[3] *δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν*, 1[5] *ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ, ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ*, 1[7] *ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ*, 1[12] *(εὐαγγελισάμενοι) ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ*, 1[20] *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, 1[23] *διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος*, 3[21] *οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα*, 2[6] *περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ* (cf. 2 P 1[20] *πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς*), 4[1] *Χριστοῦ παθόντος σαρκί*, 4[2] *εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ βιῶσαι*, 4[10] *οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος Θεοῦ*, 4[14] *ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ*, 5[8] *ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος περιπατεῖ*, 5[12] *ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 3[12] *πρόσωπον Κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακά*. We find also in 1 P examples of the looser constructions which we have seen in 2 P, *e.g.* 1 P 1[13] *τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας*, 1[21] *τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*, 1[22] *τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας*, 2[15] *τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 4[3] *τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν*, 4[13] *ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης*, 4[17] *ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ*: of the 'appositional' form in 1[25] *τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθέν*, 1[10] *προφῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες*: of the 'semi-compact' in 1[5] *τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἑτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ*, 1[17] *τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἔργον*, 1[13] *τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 1[18] *τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου*, 4[12] *τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένῃ*. 4[14] *τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα* 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 5[1] *ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς*.

[1] See for 2 P above, p. xxvi foll.

Digitized by Google

Cases.

Accusative. We find the Adverbial Accusative in 1 P 3^{8} *τὸ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες*, 3^{9} *τοὐναντίον*, 1^{6} *ὀλίγον*; the Acc. of Duration of Time in 1^{17} *ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας χρόνον ἀναστράφητε*, 4^{2} *τὸν ἐπίλοιπον βιῶσαι χρόνον*; Cognate Acc. in 3^{6} *φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν*, 3^{14} *τὸν φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε*, 4^{1} *ὁπλίσασθε ἔννοιαν* (some take these as Accusative of the Object). Double Acc. in 3^{15} *αἰτεῖ ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ ἐλπίδος*. Of Prepositions which take the Acc. *εἰς* is the commonest in 1 P as in 2 P, the former having 42 examples as compared with the 11 of the latter: *διά* 1 P (4), 2 P (4); *ἐπί* 1 P (5), 2 P (2); *κατά* 1 P (9), 2 P (3); *μετά* 1 P (1), 2 P (1); *πρός* 1 P (3), 2 P (2). Especially noticeable are the following: 1 P 3^{20} *εἰς ἣν (κιβωτὸν), διεσώθησαν*, 1^{21} *πιστὸς εἰς Θεόν, ib. τὴν πίστιν εἶναι εἰς Θεόν*, 5^{12} *εἰς ἣν στῆτε*; 1^{11} *τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα*; 1^{15} *κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἅγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι γενήθητε*, and 4^{6} *ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους, ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ Θεόν*, which are unlike anything in 2 P with the exception of *εἰς* in 2 P 1^{17} *εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα*. So 1^{13} *ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ τὴν χάριν*, is copied from the Hebrew use: see Hort's n.

Genitive *Possessive*. 1 P 1^{1} *ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ, παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου*; 3^{4} *ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος* (not Gen. of Apposition, as Alf.). *Subjective* 1^{2} *πρόγνωσιν Θεοῦ, ἁγιασμὸς πνεύματος*, 1^{22} *τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας* (see Hort's n.), 3^{21} *συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα*. *Objective* 1^{2} *ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος*, 1^{7} *δοκίμιον τῆς πίστεως*, 2^{14} *ἐκδίκησις κακοποιῶν*, 3^{3} *ἔνδυσις ἱματίων, ἐμπλοκὴ τριχῶν*, 3^{21} *ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου*, 4^{4} *ἀσωτίας ἀνάχυσις*. *After Comparative* 1^{7} *πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου*. *Hebraistic* 1^{14} *τέκνα ὑπακοῆς*, 2^{8} *λίθος προσκόμματος, πέτρα σκανδάλου*, 2^{12} *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς*. *Gen. of Material* 'consisting in' 3^{3} *ὁ ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν κόσμος*, 3^{7} *χάρις ζωῆς*, 5^{4} *τὸν τῆς δόξης στέφανον*. *Gen. of Quality* 5^{10} *ὁ Θεὸς πάσης χάριτος*. *With Verb* 4^{1} *πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας* (*al. ἁμαρτίαις*) cf. 2 P 2^{14} *ἀκατάπαυστος ἁμαρτίας*, 2^{11} *ἀπέχεσθαι ἐπιθυμιῶν*, 2^{12} *καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν*, 5^{3} *κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων*. *Gen. of Purpose* (*Infinitive*) 3^{10} *παυσάτω χείλη τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλον*. *Gen. Absolute* 3^{20} *κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ*, 3^{22} *ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων*, 4^{1} *Χριστοῦ παθόντος*, 4^{4} *μὴ συντρεχόντων ὑμῶν*, 5^{4} *φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος*, 4^{12} *ὡς ξένου συμβαίνοντος*. Of prepositions which take the genitive, *ἀντί* occurs twice in

Digitized by Google

1 P, never in 2 P; *ἄνευ* 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 1^{17}); *ἐκ* 1 P (8), 2 P (5); *διά* 1 P (15), the most remarkable being 5^{12} *δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα*, and 3^{20} *διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος*, 2 P (5), or 6, if we read *διὰ δόξης* in 1^{3}, the most remarkable being *δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα*. *ἐπί* 1 P (1), 2 P (1); *ἐνώπιον* 1 P (1), 2 P (0); *ἕως* 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); *ὀπίσω* 1 P (0), 2 P (1); *περί* 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 1^{17}).

DATIVE. *Indirect Object* 1 P 1^{1} *ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις* (*λέγει χαίρειν*), cf. 2 P 1^{1}, 1^{2} *χάρις ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη*, 1 P 1^{12} *οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι ὑμῖν διηκόνουν αὐτὰ ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν*, 1^{13} *τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν*, 1^{21}, 5^{5} after *δίδωμι*, $2^{13, 18}$, $3^{1, 5, 22}$, 5^{5} after *ὑποτάσσομαι*, 2^{21} *ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπόγραμμον*, 2^{21} *ἐπακολουθεῖν τοῖς ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ*, 2^{23} *παρεδίδου τῷ κρίνοντι*, 3^{1}, 4^{17} *ἀπειθεῖν τῷ λόγῳ*, 3^{6} *ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ*, 3^{7} *τῷ γυναικείῳ* (*σκεύει*) *ἀπονέμοντες τιμήν*, 3^{19} *τοῖς πνεύμασιν ἐκήρυξεν*, 4^{5} *ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ κρίνοντι*, 4^{6} *νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη*, 4^{19} *πιστῷ κτίστῃ παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχάς*, 5^{5} *ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε*, 5^{5} *ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται*, 5^{9} *ᾧ ἀντίστητε*, *τὰ αὐτὰ τῇ ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελεῖται*, 3^{18} *ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ*, 2^{5} *εὐπρόσδεκτος Θεῷ*, 3^{15} *πρὸς ἀπολογίαν τῷ αἰτοῦντι*; with *εἰμί*, etc., 4^{11} *ᾧ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα*, 4^{12} *πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένῃ . . . ξένου ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος*, 2^{7} *ὑμῖν* (*ἐστὶν*) *ἡ τιμή*, 5^{11} *αὐτῷ τὸ κράτος* (*ἔστω*), 5^{7} *αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ἡμῶν*. *Dat. of Reference* 2^{24} *ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν*, 4^{1} *πέπαυται ἁμαρτίαις* (*al. ἁμαρτίας*); with compound verb 2^{8} *προσκόπτειν τῷ λόγῳ*, 1^{14} *συνσχηματιζόμενοι ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις*. *Dat. of Instrument* 1^{12} *εὐαγγελισάμενοι πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*, 1^{19} *τιμίῳ αἵματι ἐλυτρώθητε*, 2^{24} *οὗ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε*; *Dat. of Cause* 4^{12} *μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ πυρώσει*; *Dat. of Respect* 4^{1} *παθὼν σαρκί*, 4^{6} *ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν σαρκί, ζῶσι δὲ πνεύματι*, 3^{18} *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι*, 4^{13} *κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς παθήμασιν*, 5^{9} *στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει*; *Dat. of Manner* 1^{8} *ἀγαλλιᾶτε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ*, 4^{2} *μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ βιῶσαι*. *With Prepositions ἐν* 1 P (49), 2 P (44), *ἐπί* 1 P (1), 2 P (0), *παρά* 1 P (2), 2 P (2), *σύν* 1 P (0), 2 P (1). The most noteworthy examples in 1 P are *ἐν Χριστῷ* (3), 4^{14} *ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ*, 4^{16} *δοξαζέτω τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ*, 5^{14} *ἀσπάσασθε ἐν φιλήματι*.

Digitized by Google

The accumulation of prepositions is even more noticeable in 1 P than in 2 P, hardly less than in Romans, *e.g.* 1^2 *ἀπόστολος* κατὰ *πρόγνωσιν* ἐν *ἁγιασμῷ* εἰς *ὑπακοήν*, 1^3 *ὁ* κατὰ *τὸ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς* εἰς *ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν* δι' *ἀναστάσεως* ἐκ *νεκρῶν* εἰς *κληρονομίαν τετηρημένην* ἐν *οὐρανοῖς* εἰς *ἡμᾶς τοὺς* ἐν *δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους* διὰ *πίστεως* εἰς *σωτηρίαν ἑτοίμην* ἐν *καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ*. Cf. 2 P $1^{2ff.}$ *χάρις ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη* ἐν *ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ* πρὸς *ζωὴν δεδωρημένης* διὰ *τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς* διὰ *δόξης* (*al. ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ*) *καὶ ἀρετῆς*, δι' *ὧν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, ἵνα* διὰ *τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς* ἐν *τῷ κόσμῳ* ἐν *ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*. and Rom. $1^{1f.}$ *Παῦλος ἀφωρισμένος* εἰς *εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, ὃ προεπηγγείλατο* διὰ *τῶν προφητῶν* ἐν *γραφαῖς ἁγίαις* περὶ *τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ γενομένου* ἐκ *σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ* κατὰ *σάρκα, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ* ἐν *δυνάμει* κατὰ *πνεῦμα* ἐξ *ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν*, δι' *οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν* εἰς *ὑπακοὴν πίστεως* ἐν *πᾶσιν* ὑπὲρ *τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ*, ἐν *οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς, πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν* ἐν *Ῥώμῃ χάρις* ἀπὸ *Θεοῦ*.

Number and Gender.

We find an irregularity where nouns, differing in gender, are joined to the same adjective, as in 2^1 *ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑπόκρισιν καὶ φθόνους καὶ πάσας καταλαλίας*. Here it would have been easy to make the construction regular by putting *πάντα δόλον* after *ὑπόκρισιν*. WH. give *ὑποκρίσεις* in the margin, which seems to me the better reading, and this is supported by ℵC etc. The plural would be easily assimilated to the preceding singulars. In 4^{10} (*ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα*) *εἰς ἑαυτοὺς διακονοῦντες* 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 *διακονοῦντες*. 2^1 also affords examples of the Plural Abstract in *φθόνους* and *καταλαλίας*. So we find *δόξαι* 1^{11}, *ἀσέλγειαι* 4^3.

Pronouns.

Demonstrative. As 1 P is not controversial, it has no example of the denunciatory use of *οὗτος* which is so common in 2 P. The most characteristic use here is the prospective, where it serves as

Digitized by Google

a pivot for a following explanation, as in 2^{19} *τοῦτο χάρις εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν ὑποφέρει τις λύπας*, 3^{9} *εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε, ἵνα κληρονομήσητε*, 4^{6} *εἰς τοῦτο εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσιν*; and so with *οὕτως* in 2^{15} *οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, followed by the appositional infinitive *ἀγαθοποιοῦντας φιμοῦν*. The pronoun is retrospective in $2^{20, 21}$ *τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ Θεῷ, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε*, 2^{7} *λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν . . οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας*. And so *οὕτως* in 3^{5} *οὕτως γὰρ αἱ ἅγιαι γυναῖκες ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτάς*.

Neither *ὅδε* nor *ἐκεῖνος* occurs in 1 P.

ἑαυτούς is used in 4^{8} *τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες*, and in 4^{10} for *ἀλλήλους*, as in Col. 3^{13} *χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς*, and elsewhere both in the N.T. and in classical writers. It is curious that it is coupled with *ἀλλήλους* in 4^{9} *φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους*, as in Col. 3^{13} *ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων*. It keeps its usual reflexive sense in 1^{12}, 3^{5}.

There is a remarkable use of *τὰ αὐτά* followed by a genitive in 5^{9} *εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων τῇ ἐν κόσμῳ ὑμῶν 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 ἀναισχυντίας ἔφθασεν τῷ Θερσίτῃ*, or *τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν θλίψεων ἀντλήσαντες*? I do not mean that the last is exactly equivalent to *τὰς αὐτὰς 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 1^{6} *ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε*, where some find it in *καιρῷ*, some in *Θεῷ*, some in the general sense of the preceding clause; 4^{4} *ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται*, where it sums up the preceding clause; 2^{8} *εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν*, where the antecedent is suggested by the preceding

Digitized by Google

προσκόπτουσιν. Replaced by demonstrative in second clause, 2^{22} *ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ. ὅστις* occurs once, 2^{11} *ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες 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 $2^{22f.}$ (*Χριστὸς*) *ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν . . . ὃς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει . . . ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν . . . οὗ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε*: 1^{8} *ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε*: 1^{12} *οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς ὑμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτά, ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν . . . εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι*: $3^{19\text{-}21}$ *ἐν ᾧ πνεύμασι ἐκήρυξεν . . . κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ, εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος, ὃ καὶ ἡμᾶς σώζει. Attraction,* 2^{12} *ἵνα ἐν ᾧ* (*= ἐν τούτῳ ὅ*) *καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν . . . δοξάσωσι τὸν Θεόν,* 3^{16} *ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν . . . καταισχυνθῶσιν. ὅσος* does not occur in 1 P.

Interrogative. τίς and *ποῖος,* 3^{13} *τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς ;* 4^{17} *τί τὸ τέλος ;* 1^{11} *ἐραυνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον χρόνον ἐδήλου. ποταπός,* found in 2 P, does not occur in 1 P.

Adjectives.[1]

Neuter used as a substantive (1) with article 3^{4} *τὸ ἄφθαρτον τοῦ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος,* (2) without article 1^{20} *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων,* 3^{11} *ἐκκλινάτω ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιησάτω ἀγαθόν. ἴδιος* is preceded by the article without *αὐτῶν* in the two places where it occurs ($3^{1,5}$). The distributive *πᾶς* is found with the article in the singular, 3^{15} *παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι.*

Verbs.

Tenses. *Future Indicative* after *ἵνα,* 3^{1} *ἵνα εἴ τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν . . κερδηθήσονται,* cf. Blass, pp. 211 f.

Aorist Indicative answering to English Perfect. 1^{12} *ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη* 'these things which have now been announced unto you' (R.V.), 2^{25} *ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα* 'are now returned' (R.V.), 2^{3} *εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κύριος* 'if ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious' (R.V.), 2^{25} *ἦτε ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενα ἀλλ' ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα* 'ye were going astray . . . but are now returned' (R.V.), 3^{6} *ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι*

[1] See below under 'Participles.'

Digitized by Google

'whose children ye now are if ye do well' (R.V.). We have two examples of what is called the Gnomic aorist in 1^{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^{17} we have them combined, *πάντας τιμήσατε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπᾶτε, τὸν Θεὸν 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^{9} *εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε ἵνα κληρονομήσητε,* 3^{18} *Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ.* After *οὐ μή* 2^{6}.

Optative. The true optative occurs in 1 P. 1^{2} *εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη,* as in 2 P. 1^{2}. Its use to express a pure hypothesis is rare in the N.T., but is found in 1 P. 3^{14} *εἰ πάσχοιτε . . . μακάριοί (ἐστε),* 3^{17} *κρεῖττον (ἐστὶν) ἀγαθοποιοῦντας, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιοῦντας.* The latter parenthetical use may be compared with 1 Cor. 14^{10} *τοσαῦτα, εἰ τύχοι, γένη φωνῶν εἰσίν,* 15^{37} *σπείρεις . . . γυμνὸν κόκκον, εἰ τύχοι.* Luke is more free in the use of the optative than the other writers of the N.T.; cf. Acts 24^{19} *οὓς ἔδει . . . κατηγορεῖν εἴ τι ἔχοιεν πρὸς ἐμέ, ib.* 17^{27}, 20^{16}, 27^{12}, etc.

Infinitive after verb: 1^{12} *ἐπιθυμοῦσιν παρακύψαι,* 2^{11} *παρακαλῶ ἀπέχεσθαι,* 5^{1} *μέλλουσα ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι,* 5^{8} *ζητῶν καταπιεῖν.* Accusative with infinitive 5^{9} *εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι* 'knowing that the same things are accomplished.' As the more usual construction of *οἶδα* in this sense is that which we find in 1^{18} *εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς ἐλυτρώθητε,* some understand *οἶδα* in the

Digitized by Google

sense in which it is used in 2 P. 2^{9} *οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ῥύεσθαι*, but Blass (p. 231) prefers the usual translation which he illustrates from Luke 4^{41} *ᾔδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι*. Another example of acc. with inf. is 1 P. 5^{12} *ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Infinitive after adjective: 1^{5} *ἕτοιμος ἀποκαλυφθῆναι*, 4^{3} *ἀρκετὸς ὁ χρόνος κατειργάσθαι*.

Epexegetic Infinitive. 2^{5} *οἰκοδομεῖσθε . . . εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον ἀνενέγκαι θυσίας*, 2^{15} *οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀγαθοποιοῦντας φιμοῦν*. After *ὥστε* 1^{21}.

Infinitive with Article: 4^{17} *ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι*, 3^{7} *εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν*, 4^{2} *εἰς τὸ μηκέτι βιῶσαι*, 3^{10} *παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χείλη τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλον*, where the genitive implies purpose, as in Mt. 13^{3} *ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν*, see Blass, pp. 284 f.

Infinitive as subject without article: 3^{17} *κρεῖττον ἀγαθοποιοῦντας πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιοῦντας*.

Participle used for Imperative 2^{18} (following imperative *τιμᾶτε* in *v.* 17) *οἱ οἰκέται ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς δεσπόταις*, 3^{1} *ὁμοίως γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν* (no imperative in the preceding eight verses); 3^{7} (following imperative *ἔστω* in *v.* 3) *οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως συνοικοῦντες κατὰ γνῶσιν*, 3^{9} *μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακόν*, 4^{8} (after *νήψατε* in *v.* 7) *πρὸ πάντων δὲ τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες*.

The adjective is sometimes used for a participle, as in 3^{15} *τὸν Χριστὸν ἁγιάσατε ἕτοιμοι* (*ὄντες*) *πρὸς ἀπολογίαν*, $4^{7\text{-}9}$ *νήψατε . . . τὴν ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες . . . φιλόξενοι* (*ὄντες*) *εἰς ἀλλήλους*, and thus gains an imperative force in $3^{8,9}$ *τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, εὔσπλαγχνοι, ταπεινόφρονες, μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακόν*.

We have a remarkable instance of the combination of the aorist and perfect participle in 2^{10} *οἵ ποτε οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες*, where it might seem, on a first glance, that the perfect, that is, the completed present, should have gone with *νῦν*; only that *νῦν* is joined with the aorist in two other passages of 1 P., viz. 1^{12}, 2^{25}. 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. 11^{30}, *ὥσπερ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ποτὲ ἠπειθήσατε τῷ Θεῷ, νῦν δὲ ἠλεήθητε*. For

Digitized by Google

other instances of the perfect participle used with pluperfect force, see Joh. 2^9 *οἱ διάκονοι ᾔδεισαν οἱ ἠντληκότες*, Acts 18^2 *εὑρὼν Ἰουδαῖον . . . προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας*, Heb. 2^9 *τὸν δὲ βραχὺ παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλλαττωμένον 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. 1^6, 4^{13}. In 1^8 however WH. read *ἀγαλλιᾶτε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ*, and this form occurs also in Lk. 1^{47}, Apoc. 19^7. Perhaps the distinction which I have drawn between *αἰτεῖν* and *αἰτεῖσθαι* in James 4^3 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 *ἐπικαλεῖν* is used in the N.T. in the sense of 'to call by name,' as in Mt. 10^{25} *εἰ τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐπεκάλεσαν*, the middle in the sense 'invoke,' as in 1 P. 1^{17} *εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα* 'if ye invoke as Father,' or, as Dr. Bigg prefers, 'invoke the Father,' *πατήρ* being frequently anarthrous; cf. 3^{15} *Κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἁγιάσατε*. The active *λυτρόω* is not found in the N.T., the middle being used in the sense 'to ransom,' Lk. 24^{21}, Tit. 2^{14}. The passive *ἐλυτρώθητε* is used in 1 P. 1^{18} 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. 1^{12} *οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ὑμᾶς*, and the passive is used of the word preached in 1 P. 1^{25}, 4^6. Another passive of a deponent verb is *ἰάθητε* 1 P. 2^{24}. The verb *ἐπιστρέφω* bears the same sense 'to turn' or 'to be converted' in the active (2 P. 2^{22}), middle, and passive (1 P. 2^{25}). The passive forms *ὑποτάγητε* and *ταπεινώθητε* have a middle force in $5^{5,6}$.

Two curious uses of the active voice are found in 1 P., one where *περιέχω* might be thought to have a passive force (2^6) *περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ*. The original phrase is *περιέχει ἡ γραφή τοῦτο* '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 2^{23} we find the unique *παρεδίδου τῷ κρίνοντι*,

Digitized by Google

where we should have expected *παρεδίδου ἑαυτόν*. We may compare the use of *παρέχω* in Plato *Gorg.* 456 B *οὐχὶ ἐθέλοντα ἢ τεμεῖν ἢ καῦσαι παρασχεῖν τῷ ἰατρῷ*, 475 D *γενναίως τῷ λόγῳ ὥσπερ ἰατρῷ παρέχων ἀποκρίνου*, 480 C, *Protag.* 348 A, *Theaet.* 191 A, and the full construction in *Apol.* 33 B *ὁμοίως καὶ πλουσίῳ καὶ πένητι παρέχω ἐμαυτὸν ἐρωτᾶν*.

Compound Sentences.

(1) *Substantival Clauses.*

(*a*) *Direct Statement*, subordinated to verb of saying. 1^{16} *γέγραπται* [*ὅτι*] *Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος*, 2^{6} *περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ Ἰδοὺ τίθημι λίθον*.

(*b*) *Indirect Statement.* 1^{12} *ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς διηκόνουν αὐτά*, 1^{18} *εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς ἐλυτρώθητε*, 2^{3} *ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κύριος*.

(*c*) *Indirect Question.* 1^{11} *ἐραυνῶντες εἰς τίνα καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ πνεῦμα*.

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

(3) *Adverbial Clauses.*

(*a*) *Causal Clause*, introduced by *διότι* $1^{16, 24}$, 2^{6}, by *ὅτι* $2^{15, 21}$, $3^{9, 12, 18}$, $4^{1, 8, 17}$, $5^{5, 7}$.

(*b*) *Temporal* (*α*), *Local* (*β*), *Modal* (*γ*).

(*a*) 3^{20} *ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο*, (*β*) does not occur, (*γ*) 4^{13} *καθὼς κοινωνεῖτε χαίρετε*, 5^{12} *πιστός, ὡς λογίζομαι*.

(*c*) *Final Clause.* After *ὅπως*, 2^{2} *ὑμεῖς λαὸς εἰς περιποίησίν* (*ἐστε*), *ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε*; after *ἵνα*, 1^{7} *λυπηθέντες . . . ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον . . . εὑρεθῇ*, 2^{2} *γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα . . . αὐξηθῆτε*, 2^{12} *ἀναστροφὴν ἔχοντες καλήν, ἵνα δοξάσωσι*, 2^{21} *Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν . . . ἵνα ἐπακολουθήσητε*, 2^{24} *τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀνήνεγκεν . . . ἵνα ζήσωμεν*, 3^{9} *εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε, ἵνα κληρονομήσητε*, 3^{16} (*ἁγιάσατε*) *. . . ἵνα καταισχυνθῶσιν*, 3^{18} *ἀπέθανεν . . . ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ*, 4^{6} *εἰς τοῦτο εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσιν*, 4^{11} (*διακονείτω*) *ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ Θεός, ἵνα δοξάζηται ὁ Θεός*, 4^{13} *παθήμασιν χαίρετε, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει χαρῆτε*, 5^{6} *ταπεινώθητε . . . ἵνα ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ*. It will be noticed that in all these cases *ἵνα* is followed by the subjunctive, even though the principal verb may

Digitized by Google

be in the past, the final optative never occurring in the N.T. In 3^{1} *ἵνα* is followed by the future indicative *κερδηθήσονται*, as in Apoc. 3^{9} *ποιήσω ἵνα ἥξουσιν*, and even in Gal. 2^{4} *οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον . . . ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν.* and Acts 21^{24} *δαπάνησον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἵνα ξυρήσονται τὴν κεφαλήν.*

(*d*) *Conditional Clause.* *εἰ with present ind. both in protasis and apodosis*: 2^{19} *τοῦτο χάρις (ἐστίν), εἰ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας,* 4^{14} *εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε μακάριοί (ἐστε)*; *with pres. ind. in protasis and fut. ind. in apodosis,* 4^{17} *εἰ πρῶτον (ἄρχεται) ἀφ' ὑμῶν τί τὸ τέλος (ἔσται)*; 4^{18} *εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἀσεβὴς ποῦ φανεῖται*; *pres. ind. in protasis and imperative in apodosis* 1^{17} *εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε . . . ἐν φόβῳ ἀναστράφητε,* 4^{16} *εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανὸς (πάσχει), μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω*; *fut. ind. both in protasis and in apodosis,* 2^{20} *ποῖον κλέος (ἔσται), εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες ὑπομενεῖτε*; *aor. ind. in protasis, imperative in apodosis,* 2^{3} *εἰ ἐγεύσασθε, ἐπιποθήσατε. With pres. opt. in protasis, pres. ind.* (understood) *in apodosis,* 3^{14} *εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε μακάριοί (ἐστε),* and where the apodosis is dependent on the principal verb as in 3^{17} *κρεῖττόν (ἐστιν) ἀγαθοποιοῦντας, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιοῦντας.* Here if we liberate the dependent clause, we should have, in the classical construction, *εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα, πάσχοιμεν ἄν,* which subordinated to *κρεῖττόν ἐστιν,* becomes *πασχεῖν.* A similar case of dependence is 1^{6} *ὀλίγον ἄρτι εἰ δέον λυπηθέντες,* where the conditional sentence, if freed from its surroundings, would be *εἰ δέον ἐστί, λυπηθήσεσθε,* but the apodosis is subordinated as a participle to the principal verb *ἀγαλλιᾶσθε.*

ἐάν with subjunctive in protasis and fut. ind. in apodosis, 3^{13} *τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς (ἔσται), ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γένησθε*;

Negatives.

μή is used with the imperative in 3^{14} *μὴ φοβήθητε,* cf. $4^{12, 15, 16}$; with participle or adverb in imperatival sentence, as 3^{9} *μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακόν,* following *τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες (ἔστωσαν),* 1^{14} *(ἐλπίσατε) ὡς μὴ συνσχηματιζόμενοι,* 2^{16} *ὡς ἐλεύθεροι καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες . . . ἀλλ' ὡς δοῦλοι Θεοῦ πάντας τιμήσατε,* 5^{2} *ποιμάνατε ἐπισκοποῦντες μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς . . . μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς . . . μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κληρῶν*; also with participles where there is no imperative, as in 1^{8} *ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν μὴ ὁρῶντες, πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε,* 'whom, not having

Digitized by Google

seen, ye love; on whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing ye rejoice' (R.V.), where *οὐ* denotes a fact, *μή* a concession; 4^4 *ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται μὴ συντρεχόντων ὑμῶν*, where *μή* denotes the cause; 3^6 *ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα . . . μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν* 'if ye are not put in fear' [for the double negative compare Mk. 11^{14} *μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι*]; with infinitive 3^7 *εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι*, 4^2 *εἰς τὸ μηκέτι βιῶσαι*.

Sometimes we find *οὐ* where the principal verb is in the imperative as in $1^{22, 23}$ *ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου*, 2^{18} *οἱ οἰκέται ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς δεσπόταις, οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς σκολιοῖς*, 3^3 *ὧν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἔξωθεν κόσμος . . . ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτὸς ἄνθρωπος*. 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 ἠλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες*, and so with the article or relative, when it simply negatives a fact, as in 2^{10} *οἵ ποτε οὐ λαός*, and 2^{22} *ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν*.

οὐ μή is used with the subjunctive in 2^6 *ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ* with the negative sense as in 2 P. 1^{10}.

Other Adverbs and Particles.

ἀλλά is generally used to contrast a positive with a negative conception as in 1^{15} *μὴ συνσχηματιζόμενοι . . . ἀλλά*, 1^{19} *οὐ φθαρτοῖς . . . ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι*, 1^{23} *οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου*, 2^{16} *μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀλλ' ὡς Θεοῦ δοῦλοι*, 2^{18} *οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καί*, 3^4 *οὐχ ὁ ἔξωθεν κόσμος, ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτός*, 3^{21} *οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις . . . ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἐπερώτημα*, 4^2 *μηκέτι ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ βιῶσαι*, $4^{12, 13}$ *μὴ ξενίζεσθε . . · ἀλλὰ χαίρετε*, $5^{2, 3}$ *μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς, ἀλλὰ ἑκουσίως, ib. μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς, ἀλλὰ προθύμως, μηδὲ ὡς κατακυριεύοντες . . , ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι*. The negative side is less prominent in 2^{20} *ποῖον κλέος εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε ; ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιοῦντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις*, which is equivalent to 'suffering when guilty is not praiseworthy, but suffering when innocent is praiseworthy.' In $3^{13, 14}$ *τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς, ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γένησθε ; ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοί* (*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 (*τίς ὁ κακώσων*), but positive blessedness (*μακάριοι*). With the contradictory

Digitized by Google

οὐκ—ἀλλά may be compared the contrasting μέν—δέ, 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., 1^{20} (ἐλυτρώθητε αἵματι Χριστοῦ) προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων, 2^{4} λίθον ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον, παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτόν, 2^{10} οἵ ποτε οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες, 3^{18} θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύμασι, 4^{6} ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκί, ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι. Sometimes μέν is omitted, as in 1^{7} χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου, 2^{14} (πεμπομένοις) εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν, ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν, cf. Jelf § 767. In 1 P. we, not unfrequently, find δέ opposed, as a weakened ἀλλά, to a preceding negative as in 1^{8} εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες, πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶτε, 1^{12} οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς, ὑμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν, 2^{23} οὐκ ἠπείλει, παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι, 3^{9} μὴ ἀποδίδοντες λοιδορίαν, τοὐναντίον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες, $3^{14,15}$ τὸν φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε, Κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἁγιάσατε, 4^{16} μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω, δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν Θεόν. Occasional examples may also be found in the Acts 12^{9} οὐκ ᾔδει . . . ἐδόκει δέ, 12^{14} οὐκ ἤνοιξε . . . εἰσδραμοῦσα δέ, and in some of the Epistles, as Eph. 4^{28}, 5^{11} μὴ . . . μᾶλλον δέ, but not in 2 Pet. or Jude. δὲ καί is not found in 1 P.

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

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

ποῦ occurs once in 1 P. 4^{18} ὁ ἀσεβὴς ποῦ φανεῖται; where it has the same rhetorical force as in 2 P. 3^{4}.

Dr. Bigg has called attention (p. 4) to the 'refined accuracy' of the use of ὡς in 1 P. 1^{19} ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ, 2^{11} παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους ἀπέχεσθαι (ὑμᾶς) τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, 3^{7} συνοικοῦντες ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει τῷ γυναίκειῳ (σκεύει), 2^{16} μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, in all of which the comparison precedes the thing which is compared to it. He illustrates this from Heb. 12^{7} ὡς υἱοῖς ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ Θεός and Plato *Legg.* x. 905 B ὡς ἐν κατόπτροις ταῖς πράξεσιν, where Stallbaum quotes *Rep.* iii. 414 E ὡς περὶ μητρὸς τῆς χώρας ἐν ᾗ εἰσὶ βουλεύεσθαι and other examples. The more usual order of words is found in 1 P. 2^{12} καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν. In 4^{12} ὡς is used with the gen. abs.

Digitized by Google

εἴτε—εἴτε is not found in N.T. except in the Epistles of Paul and in 1 P. $2^{13.\ 14}$ *ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει, εἴτε βασιλεῖ . . . εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν.* The phrase is properly used with a finite verb, as in 2 Cor. 1^{6} *εἴτε θλιβόμεθα . . . εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα,* but the verb is more frequently omitted, both in the N.T. (as in 1 Cor. $3^{21f.}$ *πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστίν, εἴτε* Παῦλος *εἴτε* Ἀπολλώς), and in classical Greek.

ὥστε followed by infinitive 1 P. 1^{21}, by imperative 4^{19} *ὥστε οἱ πάσχοντες . . . παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχάς.*

Ellipsis.

Of verb. *εἰμί*: 2^{20} *ποῖον κλέος (ἐστίν), εἰ ὑπομενεῖτε ;* 3^{13} *τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς (ἐστίν) ;* 3^{14} *εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε μακάριοί (ἐστε),* 4^{17} *καιρός (ἐστι) τοῦ ἄρξασθαι,* 4^{14} *εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε μακάριοί (ἐστε),* 3^{12} *ὀφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους (εἰσίν),* 1^{3} *εὐλογητός (ἐστιν) ὁ Θεός,* 2^{9} *ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν (ἐστε).*

Of other verbs. 1^{1} *Πέτρος ἐκλεκτοῖς (χαίρειν λέγει),* 4^{11} *εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια (λαλείτω), εἴ τις διακονεῖ, ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ Θεὸς (διακονείτω),* $4^{15,\ 16}$ *μὴ γάρ τις πασχέτω ὡς φονεύς . . . εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανὸς (πάσχει), μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω,* 4^{17} *ὁ καιρός (ἐστιν) τοῦ ἄρξασθαι . . . εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀφ' ἡμῶν (ἄρχεται) τί τὸ τέλος (ἔσται) ;*

Of noun (subject of infinitive). 2^{11} *παρακαλῶ (ὑμᾶς) ἀπέχεσθαι,* (of object) 2^{23} *παρεδίδου (ἑαυτὸν) τῷ κρίνοντι,* 3^{7} *ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ (σκεύει) ἀπονέμοντες τιμήν.*

Pleonasm.

3^{17} *εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ,* cf. James 3^{4} *ὅπου ἡ ὁρμὴ τοῦ εὐθύνοντος βούλεται,* 4^{11} *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων,* cf. Jude *v.* 25.

Anacoluthon.

1 P. $2^{11,\ 12}$ *ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους . . . ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν . . . τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἔχοντες καλήν.* 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. 3^{1-3} the periphrastic *διεγείρω ὑμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν μνησθῆναι* suggests the simple *μνήσθητε* and is followed by the nominative *γινώσκοντες.*

Digitized by Google

Asyndeton, confirmatory, 1 P. 5^{8} *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 $1^{5,7,12,13}$, *ἡ ἀποκάλυψις τῆς δόξης* in 4^{13}, cf. 5^{1}; *δοκίμιον* and *δοκιμαζομένου* in 1^{7}; *δόξα* in $1^{7,11}$, *δεδοξασμένη* in 1^{8}; *σωτηρία* in $1^{5,9,10}$; *ἐξεραυνάω* in 1^{10}, *ἐραυνάω* in 1^{11}; *ἅγιος* four times in $1^{15,16}$, also in $2^{5,9}$; *ἀναστροφή* in $1^{15,18}$, 2^{12}, $3^{1,2,16}$; *ἐλπίς* (3), *ἐλπίζω* (2); *ἀναγεννάω* (2); *ἁμαρτία* (6); *λόγος* (7); *χάρις* (10); *ἀγαθός* (7); *ἄφθαρτος* (3); *ἐποπτεύω* (2); *εὐαγγελίζομαι* (3); *ἱεράτευμα* (2); *κακοποιός* (3); *κρίνω* (4); *λίθος* (5); *νήφω* (3); *νεκρός* (4); *ὀλίγος* (4); *πάσχω* (12); *συνείδησις* (3); *τέλος* (4); *ὑπακοή* (3); *ὑποτάσσω* (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 $1^{6\text{-}9}$ *ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε | ὀλίγον ἄρτι ˌ εἰ δέον ˌ λυπηθέντες ˌ ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς | ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως ˌ πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου ˌ διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου ˌ εὑρεθῇ ˌ εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ˌ ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ || ὃν ˌ οὐκ ἰδόντες ˌ ἀγαπᾶτε | εἰς ὃν ˌ ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες ˌ πιστεύοντες δὲ ˌ ἀγαλλιᾶτε ˌ χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ | κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ˌ σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν||*. The reader will notice here the repetition of *l* (14), *p* (12), *d* (8), and of the syllables in *ἀπολλυμένου, δοκιμαζομένου, ὃν, εἰς ὃν, ἰδόντες, ὁρῶντες, πιστεύοντες, ἀγαπᾶτε, ἀγαλλιᾶτε*.

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 the article, they resemble one another more than they resemble any other book of the N.T. Both use the genitive absolute

[1] See pp. lvii f. [2] For notation, see note on p. lix.

Digitized by Google

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 *ἵνα*, 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 2^{7}.

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 2^{2} *τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα*, 3^{6} *μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν*, $3^{20,21}$ *διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος· ὃ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεόν*. In the last I am disposed to agree with Hort that we should read *ᾧ* (or else *οὗ*) for the MS. *ὅ*. 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 ἀληθῆ 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 υἱός 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.

Digitized by Google

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

Digitized by Google

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

Digitized by Google

advantage of knowing two languages.[1] 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^{8}), his walking on the water (Mt. $14^{28\,f.}$), his refusal to allow his Master to wash his feet (Joh. 13^{8}), 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 hastiest word was always the outcome of a noble and generous nature?[2]

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^{67}), 'Who say ye that I am?' (Mt. 16^{16}), 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

[1] See my Introduction to St. James, p. xlii.
[2] See my edition of St. James, p. 201.

Digitized by Google

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. 1^{41}) 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^{6}, '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 $10^{13\text{f.}}$, 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

Digitized by Google

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 $2^{23, 36}$, 3^{18}), 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^{5}) 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

Digitized by Google

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. 5^{1}, Acts $1^{8, 22}$, 2^{32}, 3^{15}, 10^{39-41}). 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 κατηξιώθησαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀτιμασθῆναι* 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 ῥύπου* and the *ἐπερώτημα συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς* in baptism (1 P. 3^{21}). I have

Digitized by Google

already referred to the story of Cornelius in Acts 10. Particularly deserving of notice are *v.* 28 *ἀθέμιτόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ κολλᾶσθαι ἀλλοφύλῳ*, compared with 1 P. 4^3, 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. 2^{17} 'Honour all men.' Again Acts 10^{34} *ἐπ' ἀληθείας καταλαμβάνομαι ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήμπτης ὁ Θεός* may be compared with 1 P. 1^{17} *εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἔργον*; and 10^{42} 'This is he which is ordained of God to be judge of quick and dead' with 1 P. 4^5 *ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ ἑτοίμως ἔχοντι κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς*. The phrase *ἰσότιμον πίστιν* in 2 P. 1^1 may be illustrated by Acts 10^{47} 'Who can forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?' also with $11^{12, 17}$, 15^9. 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. 2^{11} 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

Digitized by Google

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 ($2^{21\text{-}24}$); 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^{13}); 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 ($5^{1\text{-}3}$). 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 ($1^{5\text{-}8}$). 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

Digitized by Google

3^7, 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^{10-13}. 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 (1^3); 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 (1^8); his earnest warning to his readers to be sober and watch unto prayer, because the end of all things is at hand (4^7), 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 ($3^{10, 12}$). It is only when we pass away from the earthquake and the fire to the still small voice in 3^{13}, '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' (5^1). 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 unhesitating 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.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VI

Authenticity of the Epistle of Jude and of the Second Epistle of Peter considered[1]

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 ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολήν, ὀλιγόστιχον 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, εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰουδᾶ πρόσοιτό

[1] For further details compare Dr. Chase's excellent articles on Peter and Jude in Hastings' *D. of B.*

Digitized by Google

τις 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 (*Paed.* iii. 44, 45) with commendation, διδασκαλικώτατα ἐκτίθεται 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, ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν. (Of the angels some) ἔμειναν ἐφ' οἷς αὐτοὺς ἐποίησεν 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 ἔλεος 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 οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, περὶ δὲ ὧν προσεύξῃ, οὓς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις, 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

Digitized by Google

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 μία ἡ λεγομένη αὐτοῦ προτέρα ἀνωμολόγηται· ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ οἱ πάλαι πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλέκτῳ ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακέχρηνται συγγράμμασι. τὴν δὲ φερομένην αὐτοῦ δευτέραν οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκον μὲν εἶναι παρειλήφαμεν, ὅμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανεῖσα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν. τό γε μὴν τῶν ἐπικεκλημένων αὐτοῦ Πράξεων καὶ τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν ὠνομασμένον Εὐαγγέλιον, τό τε λεγόμενον Κήρυγμα καὶ τὴν καλουμένην Ἀποκάλυψιν οὐδ' ὅλως ἐν καθολικοῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδομένα, ὅτι μήτε ἀρχαίων μήτε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς ταῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίαις . . , ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ὀνομαζόμενα Πέτρου, ὧν μίαν μόνην γνησίαν ἔγνων ἐπιστολὴν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πάλαι πρεσβυτέροις ὁμολογουμένην, 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 (*Dial. de Trin.* i. 164) quotes (1^3) ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ as from the Catholic Epistles; and (1^4) θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως in

[1] In his note Westcott gives examples (*a*) of 'Differences from the general renderings' of the Vulgate: κοινωνός †*consors* (1^4); ἐγκράτεια †*abstinentia* (1^6); ἀρχαῖος ††*originalis* 2^5. (*β*) 'Differences from renderings in 1 Peter: πληθύνεσθαι *adimpleri* (1^2), *multiplicari* (1 P. 1^2); ἐπιθυμία *concupiscentia* (1^4, 2^{10}, 3^3), *desiderium* (1 P. 1^{14}, 2^{11}, $4^{2,3}$) and in 2 P. 2^{18}; τηρεῖν *reservare* ($2^{4,9,17}$, 3^7), *conservare* (1 P. 4^3). (*γ*) Differences from the translation of Jude, ἄλογος ††*irrationabilis* (2^{12}), *mutus* (J. 10); φθείρεσθαι *perire* (2^{12}), *corrumpi* (J. 10); συνευωχεῖσθαι *luxuriare vobiscum* (2^{13}), *convivari* (J. 12); δόξαι *sectae* (2^{10}), *majestates* (J. 8); ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους *caligo tenebrarum* (2^{17}), *procella 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.

Digitized by Google

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 (= *νοθεύεται*), 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. 3^{10c}, 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.

Adamantius the friend of Origen in his *Dialogue*, contained in Lommatzch's ed. of Origen, vol. xvi, p. 309, quotes 2 P. 3^{15} by name, and in p. 291 refers to 2 P. 2^{19}.

Methodius, a bishop of Lycia at the end of the third century quotes from 2 P. 3^{8} in a fragment of his *de Resurrectione* cited by Dr. Chase (Hastings' *D. of B.* p. 804) *χίλια δὲ ἔτη τῆς βασιλείας ὠνόμασεν, τὸν ἀπέραντον αἰῶνα διὰ τῆς χιλιάδος δηλῶν· γέγραφεν γὰρ ὁ ἀπόστολος* Πέτρος *ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ* Κυρίῳ *ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς 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 haereticos exsecrati 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' ᾧ οἰκοδομεῖται ἡ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία ... μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην καταλέλοιπεν· ἔστω 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.*

Digitized by Google

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 quatuordecim 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 τῆς ἀληθείας* as taken from 2 P. 2^2; *Str.* i. p. 374 *σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις* (cf. *ib.* iv. 636 *τέλειος καθαρισμὸς . . . ἡ δι' ὑπακοῆς πάσης ἁγνεία σὺν καὶ τῇ ἀποθέσει τῶν κοσμικῶν εἰς τὴν . . . εὐχάριστον τοῦ σκήνους ἀπόδοσιν*) as taken from 2 P. 1^{14} *ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου*; *Paed.* iii. p. 280 *ἑνὸς δε ὑποδείγματος μνησθήσομαι . . . τὸ Σοδομιτῶν πάθος κρίσις μὲν ἀδικήσασιν, παιδαγωγία δὲ ἀκούσασιν.* As Clement quotes Jude by name in the following §§, it might be supposed that the reference here was to Jude *v.* 7, *Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα . . . πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου,* but there is a much closer resemblance to 2 P. 2^6 *πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας . . . κατέκρινεν, ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς, καὶ δίκαιον Λὼτ καταπονούμενον ἐρύσατο κ.τ.λ. Ecl. Proph.* 20 *ἀγοράζει δὲ ἡμᾶς Κύριος τιμίῳ αἵματι, δεσποτῶν πάλαι τῶν πικρῶν ἀπαλλάσσων ἁμαρτιῶν* is like 2 P. 2^1 *τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι* and 1 P. 1^{19} *ἐλυτρώθητε . . . τιμίῳ αἵματι*; *Str.* ii. p. 458 *βασανίζων δὲ ἐφ' οἷς ἥμαρτεν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἀγαθοεργεῖ* like 2 P. 2^8 *ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν,* though the verb seems to me to have a different force in the two passages. In my notes on 2 P. $1^{3,4}$ 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 *πεπίστευκεν διά τε τῆς προφητείας διά τε τῆς παρουσίας τῷ μὴ ψευδομένῳ Θεῷ . . . καὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας βεβαίως κατείληφεν· ὁ δὲ τὴν ἐν οἷς ἐστι κατάστασιν βεβαίαν κατάληψιν εἰδὼς δι' ἀγάπης προαπαντᾷ τῷ*

Digitized by Google

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[16-19] ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν... καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, κ.τ.λ. There seems to be an allusion to the same passage in *Str.* v. 663, ἡ μὲν Ἑλληνικὴ φιλοσοφία τῇ ἐκ τῆς θρυαλλίδος ἔοικεν λαμπηδόνι, ἣν ἀνάπτουσιν ἄνθρωποι παρὰ ἡλίου κλέπτοντες ἐντέχνως τὸ φῶς· κηρυχθέντος δὲ τοῦ λόγου πᾶν 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, ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, is illustrated in my note by three quotations from Clement, of which I will only repeat the last here, *Prot.* p. 89, λαμψάτω οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀποκεκρυμμένῳ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, τὸ φῶς. The words ἑωσφόρος 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[4] ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, which is often referred to by Didymus.

There appears to be a reminiscence of 2 P. 1[13] in Eus. *H.E.* iii. 31 Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου ... τῆς μετὰ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν τοῦ βιοῦ τῶν σκηνωμάτων ἀποθέσεως ὁ χῶρος δεδήλωται, and *H.E.* ii. 25, speaking of the site where τῶν εἰρημένων ἀποστόλων τὰ ἱερὰ σκηνώματα κατατεθεῖται. In the same writer's *c. Hieroclem.* c. 4 there seems to be an allusion to 2 P. 1[3] τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ in the words τῇ ἰδίᾳ θεότητί τε καὶ ἀρετῇ πᾶσαν ἔσωσε τὴν οἰκουμένην; and the same treatise abounds in such phrases as θεία δύναμις, φύσις, ἀρετή (see my note on 2 P. 1[3, 4]).

Hippolytus (d. 235) *Haeres.* ix. 7 (We resisted Zephyrinus and Callistus, confuting them and compelling them to confess the truth) οἳ πρὸς μὲν ὥραν αἰδούμενοι καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας συναγόμενοι (? συνεχόμενοι) ὡμολόγουν, μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν βόρβορον ἀνεκυλίοντο, cf. 2 P. 2[22] and Clem. Al. *Prot.* p. 75 οἱ δὲ περὶ τέλματα καὶ βορβόρους, τὰ ἡδονῆς ῥεύματα, καλινδούμενοι ἀνονήτους ἐκβόσκονται τροφάς, ὑώδεις τινὲς ἄνθρωποι. ὗες γάρ, φησίν, ἥδονται βορβόρῳ μᾶλλον ἢ καθαρῷ ὕδατι. Hippol. x. 34 μὴ προσέχοντες σοφίσμασιν ἐντέχνων λόγων μηδὲ ματαίοις ἐπαγγελίαις κλεψιλόγων

Digitized by Google

αἱρέσεων, ἀλλ' ἀληθείας ἀκόμπου ἁπλότητι σεμνῇ, δι' ἧς ἐπιγνώσεως ἐκφεύξεσθε ἐπερχομένην πυρὸς κρίσεως ἀπειλὴν καὶ ταρτάρου ζοφεροῦ ὄμμα ἀφώτιστον, cf. 2 P. 1^{16}, $2^{4.17}$. *In Dan.* iii. 22, *ᾧ γὰρ ἄν τις ὑποταγῇ, τούτῳ δεδούλωται*, cf. 2 P. 2^{19}. *De Antichristo* 2 *οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως ἐφθέγγοντο, οὐδὲ ἅπερ αὐτοὶ ἐβούλοντο ταῦτα ἐκήρυττον, ἀλλὰ . . . ἔλεγον ταῦτα ἅπερ αὐτοῖς ἦν μόνοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένα*, cf. 2 P. $1^{20.21}$.

Clementine Literature. *Recognitiones* v. 12 unusquisque illius fit servus cui se ipse subiecerit, cf. 2 P. 2^{19}. *Homiliae, Epist. Clem.* 2 *ἐπεί, ὡς ἐδιδάχθην ἀπὸ τοῦ με ἀποστείλαντος κυρίου τε καὶ διδασκάλου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, αἱ τοῦ θανάτου μου ἠγγίκασιν ἡμέραι Κλήμεντα τοῦτον ἐπίσκοπον ὑμῖν χειροτονῶ*, cf. 2 P. 1^{14}. So, in *Ep. Petri ad Jac.* 2, St. Peter complains that his own writings were misinterpreted, and in § 2 prays *ἵνα τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα παραδῶσιν, ἑρμηνεύοντες τὰ πάντα πρὸς τὴν παράδοσιν ἡμῶν καὶ μὴ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ ἀμαθίας κατασπώμενοι ἄλλους εἰς τὸν ὅμοιον τῆς ἀπωλείας ἐνέγκωσι βόθυνον*, cf. 2 P. 3^{16} *ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς στρεβλοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν ἀπώλειαν.*

Apocalypsis Pauli 13 *τὰς τῶν δικαίων καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐξόδους*; 15 *θεώρησον τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς πῶς ἐξέρχεται ἐκ τοῦ σκηνώματος αὐτῆς*, cf. 2 P. $1^{14.15}$; 18 *παραδοθήτω ἡ ψυχὴ αὕτη ταρταρούχῳ ἀγγέλῳ καὶ φυλαττέσθω ἕως τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τῆς κρίσεως*, cf. 2 P. 2^{9}, 3^{7}, 2^{4}; 4 *ἡ μακροθυμία μου πάντων τούτων ἀνέχεται ὅπως μετανοήσουσιν*, cf. 2 P. 3^{9}.

Irenaeus (*fl.* 180) iii. 1. 1, *μετὰ τὴν τούτων* (*i.e.* Peter and Paul) *ἔξοδον Μάρκος τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγραφῶς ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε*, cf. 2 P. 1^{15} : iv. 36 Noe juste *diluvium inducens*, cf. 2 P. 2^{4} *κατακλυσμὸν ἐπάξας*. Irenaeus has the same adaptation of Ps. 90^{4} *χίλια ἔτη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἐχθές*, as we find in 2 P. 3^{8} *μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη*, 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 ὅτι Ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη*, which has, with him, the same double application as with Irenaeus. So Barnabas (xv. 4) commenting on

Digitized by Google

Gen. 2^2 *συνετέλεσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*, explains it as meaning that *ἐν ἑξακισχιλίοις ἔτεσιν συντελέσει Κύριος τὰ σύμπαντα. Ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ' αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη· αὐτὸς δέ μοι μαρτυρεῖ λέγων· Ἰδοὺ σήμερον ἡμέρα ἔσται ὡς χίλια ἔτη.* 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. 90^4; 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. 3^8 and Dr. Chase in Hastings' *D. of B.* iii. p. 80.

I go back now to Theophilus of Antioch (*fl.* 170). In the treatise *ad Autol.* ii. 13 there appears to be a reminiscence of 2 P. 1^{19} in the words *ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ φαίνων ὥσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι συνεχομένῳ ἐφώτισεν τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν*; while ii. 9 *οἱ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, πνευματόφοροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφῆται γενόμενοι, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες ἐγένοντο θεοδίδακτοι*, and ii. 33 *ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου διδασκόμεθα τοῦ λαλήσαντος ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις προφήταις* remind us of 2 P. 1^{21}.

Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 51) *ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ* ('in the interval before His Second Coming') *γενήσεσθαι αἱρέσεις* (MS. *ἱερεῖς*) *καὶ ψευδοπροφήτας ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ προεμήνυσε*, (*ib.* 82) *ὅνπερ δὲ τρόπον καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐπὶ τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν γενομένων ἁγίων προφητῶν ἦσαν, καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν νῦν πολλοί εἰσι καὶ ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι* remind us of 2 P. 2^1 *ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι.*

Heracleon (*c.* 130) *ap. Orig. in Joh.* tom. 13, *τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας τοῦ ἄνωθεν ἐπιχορηγουμένου πλουσίως καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκβλύσαι εἰς τὴν ἑτέρων αἰώνιον ζωὴν τὸ ἐπιχορηγούμενον αὐτοῖς*, cf. 2 P. 1^{11} *οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος.*

Digitized by Google

Aristides (*c.* 130) *Apol.* xvi. ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας ἥτις τοὺς ὁδεύοντας αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ βασιλείαν, cf. 2 P 1,[11] 2[2].

Epistle of the Gallic Churches (A.D. 177), *ap.* Eus. *H.E.* v. 1, p. 24, Hein. ὁ διὰ μέσου καιρὸς οὐκ ἀργὸς οὐδὲ ἄκαρπος ἐγίνετο, cf. 2 P. 1[8].

Polycarp *Ep. ad Phil.* 3 κατακολουθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου, cf. 2 P. 3[16].

2 Clem. Rom. (*c.* 150) 11 (a quotation from a προφητικὸς λόγος) ταῦτα πάντα ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας προσδεχόμενοι οὐδὲν τούτων ἑωράκαμεν, cf. 2 P. 1 [19], 2,[8] 3 [4]; *ib.* 16 ἔρχεται ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως ὡς κλίβανος καιόμενος, καὶ τακήσονται αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ὡς μόλυβδος τηκόμενος, καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ κρύφια καὶ φανερὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Cf. 2 P. 3[7, 10, 12].

Hermas (*c.* 140) *Vis.* iii. 8 ἐκ τῆς πίστεως γεννᾶται ἐγκράτεια, ἐκ τῆς ἐγκρατείας ἁπλότης, ἐκ τῆς . . . ἐπιστήμης ἀγάπη; 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 δοκῶν πνεῦμα ἔχειν ὑψοῖ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀναιδὴς ἐστιν καὶ ἐν τρυφαῖς πολλαῖς ἀναστρεφόμενος καὶ ἐν ἑτέραις πολλαῖς ἀπάταις, καὶ μισθοὺς λαμβάνει τῆς προφητείας αὐτοῦ, cf. 2 P. 2[13].

Clement of Rome 9 τελείως λειτουργήσαντας τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ, cf. 2 P. 1[17]. *Ib.* 35 ἀγωνισώμεθα εὑρεθῆναι ἐν τῷ ἀριθμῷ τῶν ὑπομενόντων αὐτόν, ὅπως μεταλάβωμεν τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων δωρεῶν. πῶς δὲ ἔσται τοῦτο, ἀγαπητοί; ἐὰν ἐστηριγμένη ᾖ ἡ διάνοια ὑμῶν διὰ πίστεως πρὸς τὸν Θεόν . . . ἐὰν ἐπιτελέσωμεν τὰ ἀνήκοντα τῇ ἀμώμῳ βουλήσει αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθήσωμεν τῇ ὁδῷ τῆς ἀληθείας, cf. 2 P. 3'[14] 1[4, 12] 2[2]. *Ib.* 27 ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δύναται αὐτὰ καταστρέψαι, cf. 2 P. 3[5-7]. *Ib.* 23 πόρρω γενέσθω ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ὅπου λέγει Ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν . . . οἱ λέγοντες, Ταῦτα ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ ἰδοὺ γεγηράκαμεν καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συμβέβηκεν, cf. 2 P. 3[4] and 2 Clem. Rom. 11 quoted above.

Digitized by Google

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 πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανεῖσα 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.).[1] 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 pseudepigrapha 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.

Digitized by Google

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 3[4] 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 Tranfiguration. 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 δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφός μου λαβόντες τὰ λίνα ἀπήλθομεν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν*, and the author of the Apocalypse of Peter giving his version of a Transfiguration, says *ἡμεῖς οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταὶ ἐδεήθημεν ὅπως δείξῃ ἡμῖν ἕνα τῶν ἀδελφῶν . . τῶν ἐξελθόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου, ἵνα ἴδωμεν ποταποί εἰσι 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* xcv.) In like manner the vehement warning against apocryphal writings in the Apostolic Constitutions (vi. 16) is not directed against them simply *qua* 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 Ecclesiastici*—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 Abgarus, 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.

Digitized by Google

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 1^{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 2^{5} 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 Νῶε ἔσωσά σε*, he goes on to explain that *τὸ μυστήριον τῶν σωζομένων ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ γέγονεν* . . . those that were saved being eight in number *σύμβολον εἶχον τῆς ἀριθμῷ μὲν ὀγδόης ἡμέρας ἐν ᾗ ἐφάνη ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἀναστάς . . . δι' ὕδατος καὶ πίστεως καὶ ξύλου οἱ μετανοοῦντες ἐφ' οἷς ἥμαρτον ἐκφεύξονται τὴν μέλλουσαν κρίσιν.* And so Irenaeus (i. 18. 3) in his account of the heresy of Marcus says *τὴν τῆς κιβωτοῦ οἰκονομίαν ἐν τῷ κατακλυσμῷ ἐν ᾗ ὀκτὼ ἄνθρωποι διεσώθησαν φανερώτατά φασι τὴν σωτήριον ὀγδοάδα 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 2^{6} I have suggested that the author may have been indebted to Pliny for his description of the overthrow of Sodom, *τεφρώσας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν.* If so, it must have been written after 80 A.D. In my note on 3^{2} I have assumed that the writer is included in *τῶν ἀποστόλων 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. 3^{8} 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 3^{16} I have argued that the phrase *τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς* must mean 'the remaining scriptures,' which assumes the

Digitized by Google

existence of a body of writings called *γραφαί*, 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

Digitized by Google

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 Θεοῦ φύσιν[1] κατανοῆσαι.' From this point it will be more convenient to quote the Greek, *καὶ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἐκείνου θεατὴν τῷ νῷ γενόμενον οὕτως παράδειγμα τὸ πάντων ἄριστον μιμεῖσθαι .... οὔτε γὰρ αὐτῷ ποτ' ἂν γενέσθαι νοῦν ἀγαθὸν τῷ νομοθέτῃ ταύτης ἀπολειπομένῳ τῆς θέας, οὔτε τῶν γραφησομένων εἰς ἀρετῆς*[2] *λόγον οὐδὲν ἀποβήσεσθαι τοῖς λαβοῦσιν, εἰ μὴ πρὸ παντὸς ἄλλου διδάχθειεν, ὅτι πάντων πατήρ τε καὶ δεσπότης ὁ Θεὸς ὢν καὶ πάντα ἐπιβλέπων τοῖς μὲν ἑπομένοις αὐτῷ δίδωσιν εὐδαίμονα βίον, τοὺς ἔξω δὲ βαίνοντας ἀρετῆς μεγάλαις περιβάλλει συμφοραῖς. τοῦτο δῆ παιδεῦσαι βουληθεὶς Μωυσῆς τὸ παίδευμα τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ πολίτας, τῆς τῶν νόμων θέσεως οὐκ ἀπὸ συμβολαίων καὶ τῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαίων ἤρξατο τοῖς ἄλλοις παραπλησίως, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου κατασκευὴν τὰς γνώμας αὐτῶν ἀναγαγὼν καὶ πείσας, ὅτι τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἔργων τοῦ Θεοῦ κάλλιστον ἔσμεν ἄνθρωποι, ὅτε πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν*[3] *ἔσχεν ὑπακούοντας, ῥᾳδίως ἤδη περὶ πάντων ἔπειθεν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι νομοθέται τοῖς μύθοις*[4] *ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἁμαρτημάτων εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τῷ λόγῳ τὴν αἰσχύνην μετέθεσαν καὶ πολλὴν ὑποτίμησιν τοῖς πονηροῖς ἔδωκαν· ὁ δ' ἡμέτερος νομοθέτης ἀκραιφνῆ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἔχοντα τὸν Θεὸν*[5] *ἀποφήνας ᾠήθη δεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκείνης πειρᾶσθαι μεταλαμβάνειν, καὶ τοὺς μὴ ταῦτα φρονοῦντας μηδὲ μὴν πιστεύοντας ἀπαραιτήτως ἐκόλασε.*[6] *πρὸς ταύτην οὖν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξέτασιν τοὺς ἀναγνωσομένους παρακαλῶ· φανεῖται γὰρ σκοπουμένοις οὕτως οὐδὲν οὔτ' ἄλογον αὐτοῖς οὔτε πρὸς τὴν μεγαλειότητα τοῦ Θεοῦ*[7] *καὶ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν ἀνάρμοστον.*

The connexion between this passage of Josephus[8] 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. 1[4]. [2] 2 P. 1[3]. [3] 2 P. 1[6]. [4] 2 P. 1[16]. [5] 2 P. 1[3].
[6] 2 P. 2[9]. [7] 2 P. 1[16].
[8] Notice also the repetition of the words *σπουδή* (twice) and *σπουδάζω* (thrice) in the preceding sections of Josephus, together with the words *δεσπότης*, *εὐσέβεια*, and *ψευδῆ πλάσματα*.

Digitized by Google

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. Ant.* iv. 8. 2 (Last words of Moses) *λέγει τοιάδε*[1] *ἄνδρες . . . τῆς μακρᾶς κοινωνοὶ*[2] *ταλαιπωρίας, ἐπεὶ . . . χρόνον ἐτῶν εἴκοσι καὶ ἑκατὸν ἠνυσμένον δεῖ με τοῦ ζῆν ἀπελθεῖν,*[3] *καὶ . . . οὐ μέλλω*[4] *βοηθὸς ὑμῖν ἔσεσθαι . . . δίκαιον*[5] *ἡγησάμην μηδὲ νῦν ἐγκαταλιπεῖν τοὐμὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμετέρας εὐδαιμονίας. πρόθυμον, ἀλλ' ἀΐδιον πραγματεύσασθαι . . . μνήμην*[6] *ἐμαυτῷ . . . μήτε νομίμων τῶν παρόντων*[7] *ἄλλην προτιμήσητε διάταξιν μήτ' εὐσεβείας,*[8] *ἧς νῦν περὶ τὸν θεὸν ἔχετε* (*al.* ἔχοντες), *καταφρονήσαντες*[9] *εἰς ἄλλον μεταστήσησθε τρόπον. ταῦτα δὲ πράττοντες ἔσεσθε . . . μηδενὶ τῶν ἐχθρῶν εὐάλωτοι*[10] *. . . ὧν* (*sc.* Eleazar and Joshua) *ἀκροάσθε μὴ χαλεπῶς, γινώσκοντες ὅτι πάντες οἱ ἄρχεσθαι καλῶς εἰδότες*[11] *καὶ ἄρχειν εἴσονται· . . . τήν τ' ἐλευθερίαν*[12] *ἡγεῖσθε*[13] *μὴ τὸ προσαγανακτεῖν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἡγεμόνες πράττειν ἀξιῶσι . . . ταῦτα δ' οὐκ ὀνειδίζειν ὑμᾶς προεθέμην, οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἔξοδον*[14] *τοῦ ζῆν δυσχεραίνοντας καταλιπεῖν ἠξίουν εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησιν*[15] *φέρων· . . . βεβαία*[16] *γὰρ ἂν οὕτως ὑμῖν ὑπάρξειεν ἡ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀσφάλεια· ἵνα δὲ μὴ δι' ἀμαθίαν*[17] *ἡ φύσις ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον ἀπονεύσῃ, συνέθηκα ὑμῖν καὶ νόμους, ὑπαγορεύσαντός μοι τοῦ θεοῦ.*[18] In the same treatise xi. 6. 12 we find the phrase *οἷς καλῶς ποιήσετε μὴ προσέχοντες*, closely resembling 2 Pet. 1[14] *ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες.*

Similar resemblances might be quoted from Philo (M. 1. 70) on 2 P. 1[1] *ἰσότιμον αὐτὸ ἡγούμενος ψυχῇ*, *ib.* M. 1. 165 *τὸν σοφὸν ἰσότιμον κόσμῳ*, so *ἰσοτιμία* in M. 1. 160, 2. 86; on *ἀρετὴ Θεοῦ*

[1] 2 P. 1[17]. [2] 2 P. 1[4]. [3] 2 P. 1[14]. [4] 2 P. 1[12]. [5] 2 P. 1[13].
[6] 2 P. 1[15]. [7] 2 P. 1[12]. [8] 2 P. 1[6], 3[11]. [9] 2 P. 2[10]. [10] 2 Pet. 2[12].
[11] 2 P. 2[9]. [12] 2 P. 2[19]. [13] 2 P. 3[15]. [14] 2 P. 1[15]. [15] 2 P. 1[12].
[16] 2 P. 1[10]. [17] 2 P. 3[16]. [18] 2 P. 1[15].

Digitized by Google

(2 P. 1[3]), M. 1. 75, 222, 488, 489, 635; on *θεία φύσις* (2 P. 1[4]), M. 1. 51, 647, 2, 22, 143, 329, 343; on *πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται* (2 P. 1[11]), M. 2. 476; on *τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον* (2 P. 1[19]), M. 1. 95, 347.

Deissman (*Bible Studies*, pp. 360 f.) compares with 2 Pet. a decree of Stratonicea in Caria in honour of Zeus Panhemerios and Hecate, which begins by stating that *τὴν πόλιν ἄνωθεν τῇ τῶν προεστώτων αὐτῆς μεγίστων*[1] *θεῶν* [*προνοίᾳ, Διὸς Π*]*ανημε*[*ρίου καὶ Ἑ*]*κάτης, ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων καὶ συνεχῶν κινδύνων σεσῶσθαι, ὧν καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἄσυλα καὶ ἱκέται καὶ ἡ ἱερὰ σύνκλητος, δόγματι Σε*[*βαστοῦ Καίσαρος ἐπὶ*][2] *τῆς τῶν κυρίων Ῥωμαίων αἰωνίου*[3] *ἀρχῆς, ἐποιήσαντο προφανεῖς ἐναργείας· καλῶς δὲ ἔχει πᾶσαν σπουδὴν εἰσφέρεσθαι*[4] *εἰς τὴν πρὸς* [*αὐτοὺς εὐσέβ*]*ειαν καὶ μηδένα καιρὸν παραλιπεῖν τοῦ εὐσεβεῖν καὶ λιτανεύειν αὐτοὺς· καθίδρυται δὲ ἀγάλματα ἐν τῷ σεβαστῷ βουλευτηρίῳ τῶν προειρημένω*[*ν θεῶν ἐπιφαν*]*εστάτας παρέχοντα τῆς θείας*[5] *δυνάμεως ἀρετάς· δι'*[6] *ἃς καὶ τὸ σύνπαν πλῆθος θύει τε καὶ ἐπιθυμιᾷ* ('offers incense') *καὶ εὔχεται καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ ἀ*[*εὶ τοῖσ*]*δε τοῖς οὕτως ἐπιφανεστάτοις θεοῖς κἀκ τῆς δι' ὑμνωδίας προσόδου καὶ θρησκείας εὐσεβεῖν*[7] *αὐτοὺς* [*εἴθισται*]*· ἔδοξε 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 commonplaces 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. 1[4].
[2] The words in brackets are Dr. Deissman's conjectural fillings-up of gaps in the inscription.
[3] 2 P. 1[11]. [4] 2 P. 1[7]. [5] 2 P. 1[3]. [6] 2 P. 1[4]. [7] 2 P. 1[6], 3[11].

Digitized by Google

are taken chiefly from Dr. Montague James' *Lecture on the Revelation of Peter*, p. 52.

Apoc. § 1. πολλοὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔσονται ψευδοπροφῆται (2 Pet. 2^{1}), *ib.* δόγματα ποικίλα τῆς ἀπωλείας διδάξουσιν (2 P. 2^{1}), *ib.* κρινεῖ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀνομίας (2 P. 2^{14} κατάρας τέκνα), *ib.* τὰς ψυχὰς ἑαυτῶν δοκιμάζοντας (2 P. 2^{8}). *Apoc.* § 2. The twelve Apostles having gone up with the Lord εἰς τὸ ὄρος (2 P. 1^{18}) desire to see one of the departed saints in his glorified body, ἐδεήθημεν ὅπως δείξῃ ἡμῖν ἕνα τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν τῶν δικαίων [τῶν] ἐξελθόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου (2 P. 1^{15}), ἵνα ἴδωμεν ποταποί (2 P. 3^{11}) εἰσι τὴν μορφήν, καὶ θαρσήσαντες παραθαρσύνωμεν καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἡμῶν. § 3 καὶ εὐχομένων ἡμῶν ἄ[φνω φαίν]ονται δύο ἄνδρες ἑστῶτες ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς ἔ[ω οἷς] οὐκ ἐδυνήθημεν ἀντιβλέψαι· ἐξήρχετο γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς [δ]ψεως αὐτῶν ἀκτὶν ὡς ἡλίου, καὶ φωτινὸν ἦν αὐ[τῶν ὅλον τὸ] ἔνδυμα. 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. 1^{16} ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν, 1^{19} ἔχομεν 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. 27^{53} than of the Transfiguration of the Lord. Further resemblances are *Apoc.* § 6 εἶδον καὶ ἕτερον τόπον αὐχμηρὸν (2 P. 1^{19}) πάνυ, καὶ ἦν τόπος κολάσεως· καὶ οἱ κολαζόμενοι ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ κολάζοντες ἄγγελοι σκοτινὸν εἶχον αὐτῶν τὸ ἔνδυμα κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα τοῦ τόπου (2 P. 2^{9}), *ib.* (and § 13) οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, cf. 20 οἱ ἀφέντες τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ (2 P. $2^{2.\,15.\,21}$). *Apoc.* § 8 λίμνη πεπληρωμένη βορβόρου (also in § 9, *bis*, § 16), *ib.* § 15 ἐκυλίοντο κολαζόμενοι (2 P. 2^{22} and *Acta Thomae* 52 εἶδον βόρβορον . . . καὶ ψυχὰς ἐκεῖ κυλιομένας). *Apoc.* § 9 τὸ μίασμα τῆς μοιχείας and § 17 μιάναντες τὰ σώματα ἑαυτῶν ὡς γυναῖκες ἀναστρεφόμενοι (2 P. 2^{20}, 2^{10}). *Apoc.* § 13 (and § 15) πεπυρωμένος (2 P. 3^{12}). *Apoc.* § 15 ἀμελήσαντες τῆς ἐντολῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ (2 P. 2^{21}, 3^{2}). *Fragm.* 1 ἡ γῆ παραστήσει

Digitized by Google

πάντας τῷ Θεῷ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως καὶ αὐτὴ μέλλουσα κρίνεσθαι σὺν καὶ τῷ περιέχοντι οὐρανῷ. Fr. 2 *καὶ τακήσεται πᾶσα δύναμις οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἑλιχθήσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα πεσεῖται* (2 P. 3^{10-12}). *Fr.* 5 *παρὰ τὸν θεσμὸν* (*ἄθεσμος* 2 P. 2^{7}, 3^{17}) *τῆς μακαρίας ἐκείνης φύσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ* (2 P. 1^{4}). *Ib. καταφρονήσαντες τῆς ἐντολῆς* (2 P. 2^{10}, 2^{21}). *Fr.* 6 *διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἐπράθη ὁ λαός* (2 P. 2^{19} *ᾧ τις ἥττηται, τούτῳ δεδούλωται*). The punishment of sins against nature *Apoc.* § 17, 2 P. $2^{6, 10, 13}$.

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 Ἀποκαλύψει* and refers to it as *ἡ γραφή*. Methodius (*Conviv. 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

Digitized by Google

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 ῥόδου, συνεκέκρατο δὲ τὸ ἐρυθρὸν αὐτῶν τῷ λευκῷ, καὶ ἁπλῶς οὐ δύναμαι ἐξηγήσασθαι τὸ κάλλος αὐτῶν· ἥ τε γὰρ κόμη αὐτῶν οὔλη ἦν καὶ ἀνθηρὰ καὶ ἐπιπρέπουσα (ἐπιτρέχουσα ?) αὐτῶν τῷ τε προσώπῳ καὶ τοῖς ὤμοις, ὡσπερεὶ στέφανος ἐκ ναρδοστάχυος πεπλεγμένος καὶ ποικίλων ἀνθῶν, ἢ ὥσπερ ἶρις ἐν ἀέρι, τοιαύτη ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ εὐπρέπεια.* 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 δικαιοσύνην*). Comparing this list with that in the Apocalypse of St. John (21^9) we notice the absence of 'the fearful, the unbelieving, sorcerers, and all liars.' Comparing it with St. Paul's 'works of the flesh,' we miss witchcraft, hatred, emulations, seditions, heresies, envyings, drunkenness, etc. (Gal. $5^{19\,f.}$). If the author of 2 Pet. had made out such a list, must he not have mentioned the *αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας* and *ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι* of 2^1, the *ἀργία* and *ἀκαρπία* of 1^8, the *πλεονεξία* and falsehood of 2^3, the proud, the presumptuous, and rebellious of 2^{10}, the boastful of 2^{18}, the backsliders of 2^{20}, the mockers of 3^3? 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

Digitized by Google

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 *κυλισμὸς βορβόρου* (2 P. 2^{22}, Ps. 40^{2}), along with the undying worm (Isa. 66^{24}), the darkness (2 P. 2^{4}), 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 *ἐκυλίοντο ἐπὶ χαλίκων πεπυρωμένων*, § 10 (murderers) *πλησσομένους ὑπὸ ἑρπετῶν πονηρῶν καὶ στρεφομένους ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ κολάσει ταύτῃ*, § 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 *οὗτοι ἦσαν οἱ διώξαντες τοὺς δικαίους*, and the use of the word *τηγανιζόμενοι*, 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 Sibylline 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, cecidi tamquam mortuus et oculos meos conclusi, etc.

Digitized by Google

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 ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν 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 Cæsarea 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. 1^{12}, 4^{15}, Gal. 2, 3.

Digitized by Google

Acts, were made up of Jews and Gentiles, and the latter are plainly alluded to in 1 P. 1^{18}, *ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου*. The vague language of 2 P. 1^{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 antinomianism which professed to rest itself on the authority of Paul (2 P. 3^{16}). The phrase *ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου* in 2^{20} seems also more appropriate to Gentile than to Jewish converts.

It has been argued from 1^{16}, *ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν*, 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^{2}. It would seem also from 1^{16}, *ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος*, 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^{4} *ταῦτα γράφομεν*, Heb. 6^{3} *ποιήσομεν*, 6^{9} *λαλοῦμεν*, etc.), and to suppose the writer to refer simply to his own personal experience, though we may still hold, in accordance with 3^{2}, 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^{1} 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^{16} *ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν*) and whom he felt bound to be continually reminding of the teaching they had received from the holy prophets, and

Digitized by Google

of the law of Jesus Christ in which they had been instructed by their Apostles (1^{12-18}, $3^{1.2}$), 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. 3^{1} 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. 3^{15} *καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν Παῦλος ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν*. I have suggested in my note that the Epistle referred to is that to the Romans, on the ground that *καθώς* must be explained by the immediately preceding admonition *τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε*, which is more distinctly stated in Rom. 2^{4}, $3^{25.26}$, 9^{22} than elsewhere, though we find an echo of it in other Epistles, such as 1 Cor. 15, 2 Cor. 4^{1}, 6^{1}, Eph. 2^{4-8}, 2 Th. 2^{16}. 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 necesary 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

Digitized by Google

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—conci iatory 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 Appius, 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. 1^{15-18}. [2] Col. $4^{10, 11}$.

Digitized by Google

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^{10}); (4) the reference to Mark in 1 P. 5^{13} *ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός 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 Ῥώμης βασιλεὺς μέγας . . .
ὅστις παμμούσῳ φθόγγῳ μελιηδέας ὕμνους
θεατροκοπῶν ἀπολεῖ πολλοὺς σὺν μητρὶ ταλαίνῃ.
φεύξεται ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος ἄναξ φοβερὸς καὶ ἀναιδὴς,

and v. 158,

φλέξει αὐτὴν Βαβυλῶνα
Ἰταλίης γαῖάν θ', ἧς εἵνεκα πολλοὶ ὄλοντο
Ἑβραίων ἅγιοι πιστοὶ καὶ ναὸς ἀληθής.

That Rome was the scene of the joint labours of the two Apostles[1] and of their martyrdom under Nero is established by very early

[1] See Eus. *H.E.* ii. 15, and Chase, Art. on Babylon in Hastings' *D. of B.* i. p. 213.

Digitized by Google

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 (*μαρτυρήσαντα*) 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. Irenaeus (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 fidem Romae primus Nero cruentavit. 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 (1^{11} f., 15^{23} f.). 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. 1^{15} f.), and that in Rome he grasped, as even he had never done before, the greatness of the issues involved (Eph. 2^{11}–4^{16}). 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.

Digitized by Google

he had been summoned to Jerusalem in connexion with the appointment of a successor to St. James.[1] 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.[2] 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.[3] In Rome ('Babylon' 1 P. 5^{13}) 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} *ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι τὴν ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ· εἰς ἣν στῆτε*). St. Paul's absence in Spain explains why there is no allusion to him.[4] Zahn thinks that within a year, in the spring of 64, St. Peter was crucified[5] 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 *ἄνωθεν* in the phrase which we find in the *Acta Pauli* cited by Orig. *Tom. xx in Joh.* *ἄνωθεν μέλλω σταυροῦσθαι*, itself borrowed from Heb. 6^{6} *ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ*. See Zahn *Einl.* ii. 25, *G.K.* ii. 846.

Digitized by Google

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. *ἐγνωρίσαμεν* 1^{16}, and *τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν* 3^{2}). 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. 1^{15} 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 (*Einl.* 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 (1^{3}) to Christ, as having called them

Digitized by Google

ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ: surely nothing could be more appropriate, more helpful to a godly life, than that he should leave behind the picture of this *δόξα καὶ ἀρετή* drawn up from his own recollection by his favourite disciple. And the following words *οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες, ἀλλ' ἐπόπται γενηθέντες* 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*), *παρακλήσεσι δὲ παντοίαις Μάρκον, οὗ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκόλουθον ὄντα Πέτρου λιπαρῆσαι, ὡς ἂν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς καταλείψοι διδασκαλίας, μὴ πρότερόν τε ἀνεῖναι ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ ταύτῃ αἰτίους γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς. γνόντα δὲ τὸ πραχθὲν φασὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον, ἀποκαλύψαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἡσθῆναι τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν προθυμίᾳ κυρῶσαί τε τὴν γραφὴν εἰς ἔντευξιν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Κλήμης ἐν ἕκτῳ τῶν Ὑποτυπώσεων παρατέθειται τὴν ἱστορίαν, συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Ἱεραπολίτης ἐπίσκοπος ὀνόματι Παπίας.* Much the same account is given in Eus. *H.E.* vi. 14, according to the traditions *τῶν ἀνέκαθεν 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 μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς 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 ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα. οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ Κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δέ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων· ὥστε οὐδὲν ἥμαρτεν Μάρκος, οὕτως*

Digitized by Google

ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. ἑνὸς γὰρ ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν ἢ ψεύσασθαί τι ἐν αὐτοῖς.' 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 1^{15} was written by St. Peter, we naturally suppose the allusion to be to the words of Christ recorded in Joh. 21^{18}, 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 ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς, 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 $20^{22.25}$ and 2 Tim. 4^{6}, so it seemed natural that a similar intimation should be made to St. Peter.

The phrase τὸ ἅγιον ὄρος (2 P. 1^{18}) seems to imply a later date than the simple εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν (Mk. 9^{2}, Mt. 17^{1}) or εἰς τὸ ὄρος (Lk. 9^{28}), 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 τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην (2 P. 2^{1}) is to be under-

Digitized by Google

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 3^2 the writer reminds his readers of the command of the Lord, which they had received through their apostles, *i.e.* through those who had preached the Gospel to them. It is evident from 1^{16} that Peter himself is to be counted as one of these, and from 3^{15} 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) *ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται*, 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, *παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει*, as contrasted with such passages as Lk. 4^{21} *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 *πίστις*.

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.

Digitized by Google

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 (Ἰούδας) 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 Λεββαῖος). 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, ἀδελφὸς δέ 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[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.

Digitized by Google

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. 13^{55} *οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωσῆς καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας*, and last but one in Mk. 6^{3} *ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆ 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. 9^{5}), 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. 2^{9}, Mt. 10^{23}, 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 not 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 ὄντος ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ καὶ Χριστιανοῦ. καὶ οὕτως μαρτυρεῖ ἐτῶν ὢν ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν ἐπὶ Τραϊανοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ ὑπατικοῦ Ἀττικοῦ*).

Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 19) quotes again from Hegesippus an interesting story of the grandsons of Judas: *τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ Δομετιανοῦ τοὺς ἀπὸ γένους Δαβὶδ ἀναιρεῖσθαι προστάξαντος, παλαιὸς κατέχει λόγος τῶν αἱρετικῶν τινας*[1] *κατηγορῆσαι τῶν ἀπογόνων Ἰουδᾶ (τοῦτον δὲ εἶναι ἀδελφὸν κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ σωτῆρος) ὡς ἀπὸ γένους τυγχανόντων Δαβὶδ καὶ ὡς αὐτοῦ συγγένειαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ φερόντων. ταῦτα δὲ δηλοῖ κατὰ λέξιν ὧδέ πως λέγων ὁ Ἡγήσιππος.* (20) *ἔτι δὲ περιῆσαν οἱ ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ Κυρίου υἱωνοὶ Ἰουδᾶ, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, οὓς ἐδηλατόρευσαν*[2] *ὡς ἐκ γένους ὄντας Δαβίδ, τούτους δ' ὁ Ἰουδάτος*[3] *ἤγαγε πρὸς Δομετιανὸν Καίσαρα. ἐφοβεῖτο γὰρ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς καὶ Ἡρώδης. καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς εἰ ἐκ Δαβίδ εἰσι· καὶ ὡμολόγησαν. τότε ἠρώτησεν αὐτοὺς πόσας*

[1] Perhaps provoked by this epistle of their grandfather.
[2] From *delator*. [3] *Evocatus*.

Digitized by Google

κτήσεις ἔχουσιν ἢ πόσων χρημάτων κυριεύουσιν. οἱ δὲ εἶπον ἀμφότεροι ἐννεακισχίλια δηνάρια ὑπάρχειν αὐτοῖς μόνα, ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν ἀνήκοντος τοῦ ἡμίσεως. καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐν ἀργυρίοις ἔφασκον ἔχειν, ἀλλ' ἐν διατιμήσει γῆς πλέθρων τριάκοντα ἐννέα μόνων, ἐξ ὧν καὶ τοὺς φόρους ἀναφέρειν καὶ αὐτοὺς αὐτουργοῦντας διατρέφεσθαι· εἶτα δὲ καὶ τὰς χεῖρας τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιδεικνύναι μαρτύριον τῆς αὐτουργίας, τὴν τοῦ σώματος σκληρίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς συνεχοῦς ἐργασίας ἐναποτυπωθέντας ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων χειρῶν τύλους παριστάντας. ἐρωτηθέντας δὲ περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ, ὁποία τις εἴη καὶ πότε καὶ ποῖ φανησομένη, λόγον δοῦναι ὡς οὐ κοσμικὴ μὲν οὐδ' ἐπίγειος, ἐπουράνιος δὲ καὶ ἀγγελικὴ τυγχάνει, ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος γενησομένη, ὁπηνίκα ἐλθὼν ἐν δόξῃ κρινεῖ ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς καὶ ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτοῦ. ἐφ' οἷς μηδὲν αὐτῶν κατεγνωκότα τὸν Δομετιανὸν ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς εὐτελῶν καταφρονήσαντα ἐλευθέρους μὲν αὐτοὺς ἀνεῖναι, καταπαῦσαι δὲ διὰ προστάγματος τὸν κατὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διωγμόν. τοὺς δὲ ἀπολυθέντας ἡγήσασθαι (became bishops) *τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ὡς ἂν δὴ μάρτυρας ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γένους ὄντας τοῦ Κυρίου, γενομένης τε εἰρήνης μέχρι Τραϊανοῦ παραμεῖναι αὐτοὺς τῷ βίῳ.*

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. cxlv) 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

Digitized by Google

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^{1}, $5^{8, 9, 14}$); 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 $^{1, 4, 21, 25}$). They are sharers of a common salvation (Jude ^{3}), 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-

Digitized by Google

bouring 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^{19}, 3^{15}, 4^{1}–5^{6}. For noble and weighty expression we may compare *vv.* 20, 21, *ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι, ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ 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. ccxxviii. 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 $2^{1\text{-}9}$ and in Jude ^{16}: that against a murmuring discontented spirit in James 1^{13}, 4^{1}, 5^{9}, in Jude $^{15, 16}$; that against the misuse of the tongue in James $3^{1\text{-}10}$, 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, *ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται.* 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):

Digitized by Google

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 *ἅγιοι* (*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 misgrowth 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.[2] of my Introduction to his Epistle; but my notes on 1^{8} (*δίψυχος*) and $4^{8,9}$ *ἁγνίσατε καρδίας δίψυχοι· ταλαιπωρήσατε*, suggest a connexion with an apocryphal writing quoted in Clem. Rom. i. 23 *ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη, ὅπου λέγει Ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι*[1] and identified by Lightfoot and Spitta with *Eldad and Modad* (on which see Herm. *Vis.* ii. 3), by Hilgenfeld with the *Assumption of Moses*. The phrase in 4^{14}, *ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστε πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη*, has been traced by some to another apocryphal quotation found in Clem. i. 17 *ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι ἀτμὶς ἀπὸ κύθρας*, which Hilgenfeld also supposes to be taken from the *Assumption of Moses*. The phrase *κόσμος ἀδικίας* in James 3^{6} is found in Enoch 48^{7}. The *Testaments of the Patriarchs*, which also contain quotations from Enoch (such as *Sim.* 5 *ἑώρακα ἐν χαρακτῆρι γραφῆς Ἐνώχ*, *Levi* 10 *βίβλος Ἐνὼχ τοῦ δικαίου*, *ib.* 14, *ἔγνων ἀπὸ γραφῆς Ἐνὼχ ὅτι ἐπὶ τέλει ἀσεβήσετε*, *ib.* 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 3^{16}.

Digitized by Google

Benj. 9, *Zab.* 3, *Nepht.* 4, *ἐν γραφῇ ἁγίᾳ Ἐνὼχ ὅτι . . . ποιήσετε κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀνομίαν Σοδόμων*), furnish several parallels quoted in my note on James 4^7 *ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν.* The words which immediately precede (*ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐγγίσει ὑμῖν*) are not unlike another quotation which occurs in Herm. *Vis.* ii. 3 *ἐγγὺς Θεὸς τοῖς ἐπιστρεφομένοις, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἐλδὰτ καὶ Μωδὰτ 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 *ἰοῦ θανατηφόρου* which occurs in 3^8 and also in Sib. *Prooem*, 71

> *εἰσὶ θεοὶ μερόπων δηλήτορες*[1] *<οὗτοι> ἀβούλων,*
> *τῶν δὴ κἀκ στόματος χεῖται θανατηφόρος ἰός.*

But if there is borrowing, it is just as likely to be on the other side. The strange expression *τροχὸς γενέσεως* in 3^6 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 (*vv.* 1, 2 and 20–25). This is no doubt to be explained by what is stated of the purport of the letter in *v.* 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 (*v.* 3), and which would probably have been more in the tone and spirit of *vv.* 20 f.

[1] MS. *δολοητορες*. Geffcken reads *δόλῳ ἠγητῆρες*.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IX

Use of Apocryphal Books by Jude

Clement of Alexandria in his *Adumbrationes* (Dind. vol. iii. p. 483), after quoting Jude *v.* 9, 'Quando Michael archangelus 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.

Digitized by Google

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 judicii Dei, quoniam angeli quidam deciderunt in terram in judicium' (En. 14^7). 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 *Ecl. 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 θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνὼχ βιβλία*, and *In Johannem* vi. 25, *ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐνὼχ γέγραπται, εἴ τῳ φίλον παραδέχεσθαι ὡς ἅγιον τὸ βιβλίον*, also *In Num. Hom.* xxviii. 2, *De Princ.* i. 3. 3. Hilary (*Comm. in Psalm.* cxxxii. 3) writes: 'Fertur id, de quo etiam nescio cuius liber extat, quod angeli concupiscentes filias hominum cum de caelo descenderent 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 *φθοροποιὰ 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.

Digitized by Google

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[1] is derived from the *Assumption*, Jude *v.* 16 from the *Testament* (p. lxii). On the latter Charles compares *οὗτοί εἰσι γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελίας 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. acceptiones munerum). He identifies the *ἐμπαῖκται* of Jude *v.* 18 with the *homines pestilentiosi* of *Ass. M.* vii. 3, and calls attention to the frequent recurrence of the word *ἀσεβεῖς* in the former (*vv.* 4, 15, 18) and *impii* in the latter: see vi. 1 facient facientes impietatem, vii. 3 pestilentiosi et impii, *ib.* 7, ix. 3, xi. 17.

Again there appears to be a reminiscence of the *Testaments of the Patriarchs*, where the sin of the Watchers is connected with that of Sodom: cf. *Test. Nepht.* 3, *ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη καὶ ἀστέρες οὐκ ἀλλοιοῦσι τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν . . . ἔθνη πλανηθέντα καὶ ἀφέντα κύριον ἠλλοίωσαν τάξιν αὐτῶν . . . ἐξακολουθήσαντες πνεύμασι πλάνης. Ὑμεῖς μὴ οὕτως . . . ἵνα μὴ γένησθε ὡς Σόδομα, ἥτις ἐνήλλαξεν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῆς. Ὁμοίως καὶ Ἐγρήγορες ἐνήλλαξαν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν, οὓς κατηράσατο Κύριος ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ, Test. Aser.* 7 *μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς Σόδομα ἥτις ἠγνόησε τοὺς ἀγγέλους κυρίου καὶ ἀπώλετο ἕως αἰῶνος.* There seems to be more than a casual coincidence between these passages and Jude 6, 7, and 13, *ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν . . . ὡς Σόδομα . . .*

[1] See n. on this, and add to the illustrative passages there quoted a scholium printed for the first time in James' *Test. of Abraham*, p. 18: *ὁ διάβολος ἀντεῖχεν θέλων ἁπατῆσαι, λέγων ὅτι Ἐμόν ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα, ὡς τῆς ὕλης δεσπόζων· καὶ ἤκουσεν τὸ Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος, τούτεστιν ὁ Κύριος ὁ πάντων τῶν πνευμάτων δεσπόζων· ἄλλοι δέ, ὅτι βουλόμενος ὁ Θεὸς δεῖξαι ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἔνθενδε ἀπαλλαγήν, ταῖς ἡμετέραις ψυχαῖς ἀνθιστάμενοι <ἦσαν> δαίμονες πορευομέναις τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνω πορείαν, τοῦτο οὖν συνεχώρησεν ὁρᾶσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς Μωσέως ταφῆς· ἐβλασφήμει γὰρ καὶ ὁ διάβολος κατὰ Μωσέως, φονέα τοῦτον καλῶν διὰ τὸ πατάξαι τὸν Αἰγύπτιον· ὁ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, μὴ ἐνεγκὼν τὴν αὐτοῦ βλασφημίαν, εἴρηκεν αὐτῷ ὅτι Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος ὁ Θεός, διάβολε. ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐψεύσατο ὁ Θεὸς εἰσαγαγὼν τὸν Μωσῆν ἔνθα ὤμοσεν αὐτὸν μὴ εἰσελθεῖν.*

Digitized by Google

τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου . . . ἀστέρες πλανῆται.

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): 'Scripsisse 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 *προγεγραμμένοι*, 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. 10^4), gives the names of the magicians who withstood Moses before Pharaoh (2 Tim. 3^8), recognizes the instrumentality of angels in the giving of the Law (Gal. 3^{19}, cf.

Digitized by Google

Heb. 2^{2}, Acts 7^{53}). So, too, Stephen speaks of Moses as learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (Acts 7^{22}), the author of the ep. to the Hebrews (11^{37}) alludes to the tradition as to the death of Isaiah (see Charles' *Ascension of Isaiah*, pp. xlv foll.), and James (5^{17}) limits the drought predicted by Elijah to $3\frac{1}{2}$ years.

Digitized by Google

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^{4-9}, 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 ἡνίκα*

Digitized by Google

ἤρξαντο οἱ ἄνθρωποι πολλοὶ γίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ θυγατέρες ἐγεννήθησαν αὐτοῖς, ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὅτι καλαὶ εἰσὶν ἔλαβον ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας ἀπὸ πασῶν ὧν ἐξελέξαντο . . . οἱ δὲ γίγαντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, καὶ μετ' ἐκεῖνο, ὡς ἂν εἰσεπορεύοντο οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐγέννωσαν ἑαυτοῖς, ἐκεῖνοι ἦσαν οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἀπ' αἰῶνος, οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί (LXX.). That 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' ἐκεῖνο 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 γίγαντες 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 ἐξιλάσατο περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων γιγάντων οἳ ἀπέστησαν (? ἐπίστευσαν) τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτῶν, Wisdom, 14^{6} ἀπολλυμένων ὑπερηφάνων γιγάντων, ἡ ἐλπὶς τοῦ κόσμου ἐπὶ σχεδίας καταφυγοῦσα ἀπέλιπεν αἰῶνι σπέρμα γενέσεως τῇ σῇ κυβερνηθεῖσα χειρί, 3. Macc. 2^{4} σὺ τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν ἀδικίαν ποιήσαντας, ἐν οἷς καὶ γίγαντες ἦσαν ῥώμῃ καὶ θράσει πεποιθότες, διέφθειρας, ἐπαγαγὼν αὐτοῖς ἀμέτρητον ὕδωρ, Baruch

Digitized by Google

$3^{26\text{-}28}$, Josephus *Ant.* 1. 3. 1, *πολλοὶ γὰρ ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ γυναιξὶ συνιόντες ὑβριστὰς ἐγέννησαν παῖδας καὶ παντὸς ὑπερόπτας καλοῦ διὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ δυνάμει πεποίθησιν. ὅμοια τοῖς ὑπὸ γιγάντων τετολμῆσθαι λεγομένοις ὑφ' Ἑλλήνων καὶ οὗτοι δρᾶσαι παραδίδονται.* Philo (*Vit. Cont.* p. 472) ridicules the idea of angels being open to such temptation, *ἦν τολμῶσιν οὐκ εὐαγῶς προσάπτειν ταῖς μακαρίαις καὶ θείαις δυνάμεσιν, εἰ γυναιξὶ θνηταῖς ἐπιμανέντες ὡμίλησαν οἱ παντὸς πάθους ἀμέτοχοι.* A knowledge of the sin of the angels seems to be implied in Job 4^{18}, '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 6^{14} etc.). Tertullian (*De Virg. Vel.* 7) explains St. Paul's injunction (1 Cor. 11^{10}) by reference to the same history 'propter angelos, scilicet quos legimus a Deo et caelo excidisse ob concupiscentiam 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, Ἐγρήγοροι as they are called in the Greek versions of Dan. 5^{13} by Aquila and Symmachus, conspired together under the leadership 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 γίγαντες ἐτέκνωσαν Ναφηλείμ . . . μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἤρξαντο οἱ γίγαντες κατεσθίειν 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 (10^{9}): 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

Digitized by Google

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. 12[9] *καὶ ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην—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 Evam seduxisse describitur, de quo in *Asc. Mosis*, cujus libelli meminit apostolus Judas, Michael Archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Mosis ait a diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam exstitisse praevaricationis 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.

Digitized by Google

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 2^{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. 18^{8} *οὐδὲ ἐλυμήνατό μου τὰ ἁγνὰ τῆς παρθενίας λυμεὼν ἀπάτης ὄφις.* 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. 14^{13}). 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.'[2]

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. $24^{21f.}$), '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^{2}.

Digitized by Google

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 1^{6} and Zech. $3^{1,2}$, and in the N.T., as in James 4^{7}, 1 P. 5^{8}, Eph. ^{6,11,12} (we have to stand against the wiles of the devil, . . . our warfare is not against flesh and blood, but) *πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*, see Lightfoot on Col. 2^{15}. In 2 Cor. 4^{4} Satan is spoken of as the god, in John 12^{31} and 16^{11} 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. 4^{3}).

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. Nepht.* iii. *οἱ Ἐγρήγορες ἐνήλλαξαν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν, οὓς κατηράσατο Κύριος ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ*, and with a rationalistic explanation in *Test. Rub.* v. where the watchers are said to have been seduced by women, *οὕτω γὰρ ἔθελξαν τοὺς Ἐγρηγόρους πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ· κἀκεῖνοι συνεχῶς ὁρῶντες αὐτὰς ἐγένοντο ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἀλλήλων καὶ συνέλαβον τῇ διανοίᾳ τὴν πρᾶξιν καὶ μετεσχηματίζοντο εἰς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἐν τῇ συνουσίᾳ τῶν ἀνδρῶν αὐτῶν συνεφαίνοντο αὐταῖς, κἀκεῖναι ἐπιθυμοῦσαι τῇ διανοίᾳ τῆς φαντασίας αὐτῶν ἔτεκον γίγαντας*. So Justin M. *Apol.* i. 5, *τὸ παλαιὸν δαίμονες φαῦλοι ἐπιφανείας ποιησάμενοι καὶ γυναῖκας ἐμοίχευσαν καὶ παῖδας διέφθειραν καὶ φόβητρα ἀνθρώποις ἔδειξαν, ὡς καταπλαγῆναι τοὺς οἵ, . . . μὴ ἐπιστάμενοι δαίμονας εἶναι φαύλους, θεοὺς προσωνόμαζον*, *Apol.* ii. 5, *οἱ δ' ἄγγελοι, παραβάντες τήνδε τὴν τάξιν, γυναικῶν μίξεσιν ἡττήθησαν καὶ παῖδας ἐτέκνωσαν, οἵ εἰσιν οἱ λεγόμενοι δαίμονες*, Heracleon ap. Orig. (*in Joh.* tom. 13, Lomm. vol. ii. p. 125) *ζητεῖσθαί φησι περί τινων ἀγγέλων, εἰ σωθήσονται, τῶν κατελθόντων ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων θυγατέρας*, Tert. *Apol.* 22, *De Virg. Vel.* 7, *De Cultu Fem.* 2 (where he defends the authenticity of our Epistle), *ib.* 10, Iren. iv. 36. 4, Clem. Al. *Paed.* iii. p. 260, *δεῖγμά σοι τούτων οἱ ἄγγελοι, τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ κάλλος ἀπολελοιπότες διὰ κάλλος μαραινόμενον, καὶ τοσοῦτον ἐξ οὐρανῶν ἀποπεσόντες χαμαί*, *ib.* p. 280, *Strom.* iii. p. 538, *Str.* v. 650, *οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐκεῖνοι οἳ τὸν ἄνω κλῆρον εἰληχότες κατολισθήσαντες εἰς ἡδονάς, ἐξεῖπον τὰ ἀπόρρητα ταῖς γυναιξὶν κ.τ.λ.* Celsus having made use of the story in his attack on the Christians,

Digitized by Google

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. 6[25] he seems to accept the ordinary view in the words *οὐ μόνον δὲ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τελείου ἐπὶ τὸ ἀτελές, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων 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.'[1] See the quotation in Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* ii. p. 241, where he also gives the alternative explanation *εἰ δὲ ἐπ' ἀγγέλων νοοῖτο τοῦτο, τοὺς περὶ μαγείας καὶ γοητείας . . . ἐσχολακότας συνιέναι χρὴ τῶν μετεώρων ταῖς γυναιξὶ τὴν γνῶσιν 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 dederat potestatem, vel corrumperet 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 paullatim ad vitia pellexit et mulierum congressibus inquinavit . . . 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 suae originisque degeneres . . . matrimoniis 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 interpresation 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.

Digitized by Google

resurrection men shall be like angels, neither marrying nor given in marriage.' Augustine (*Civ. Dei*, xv. 23) 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 children 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 Dispensation.[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. 3^{22}, and in $11^{6.7}$, 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 development.

[1] Cf. Mt. 5^{21-48}, 19^{8}, Lk. 9^{54-56}. In the last passage the reading supported by the best MSS. is *Κύριε θέλεις εἴπωμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλῶσαι αὐτούς; στραφεὶς δὲ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς*, leaving out all that gives point to the fuller narrative preserved in other MSS. and versions, which insert the words *ὡς καὶ Ἠλίας ἐποίησεν* at the end of the Apostles' question, and the words *καὶ εἶπεν· οὐκ οἴδατε οἵου πνεύματός ἐστε ὑμεῖς. ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ἀπολέσαι ἀλλὰ σῶσαι*, 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.

Digitized by Google

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 Ἐγρήγορος, Hasting's *D. of B.*, under 'Angel,' 'Demon,' 'Fall,' 'Flood'; *Encycl. of B. Lit.*, under 'Angel,' 'Demon,' 'Deluge,' 'Nephilim,' 'Satan'; Maitland's *Eruvin* (Essays iv.–vi.), where the literal interpretation is defended; Hagenbach, *Hist. Doctr.* § 52 and § 132.

Digitized by Google

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.[1] 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.

Digitized by Google

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 *ψευδοπροφῆται* and *ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι*. 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

Digitized by Google

themselves be utterly destroyed, 'defrauded of the hire of fraud.' They count it pleasure[1] 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 ἀγάπην should be read for ἡδονήν.

Digitized by Google

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. $3^{18 f.}$, *πολλοὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦσιν, οὓς πολλάκις ἔλεγον ὑμῖν, νῦν δὲ καὶ κλαίων λέγω, τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια, ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία, καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν, οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες*, and those referred to in J. *vv.* 4, 10–13, 2 P. $2^{1, 2, 3}$.

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^{4}, of *ψευδαπόστολοι* in 2 Cor. 11^{13}, of a mystery of iniquity already at work in 2 Th. 2^{7}, 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. 1^{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. 6^{12}, 10^{23}), who defy their teachers and even the Apostle himself (1 Cor. 4^{8-13}, 5^{2}, 8^{1-13}, 9^{1-12}, 10^{14-33}), innovators in doctrine, serving their own belly, indulging in carnal lusts (Rom. $16^{17, 18}$, 1 Cor. 6^{9-20}), deceiving the simple through their plausible speeches (Eph. 4^{14}, *περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ κυβίᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδίαν τῆς πλάνης*, *ib.* 5^{6} *μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοῖς 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.'[1] 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.

Digitized by Google

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* (1[28]). 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' (2[4]). 'This false wisdom is . . . speculative, vague and dreamy' (2[4, 8, 18]). [We may compare the phrase ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι 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. 2[10f.]) and the Apocalypse'; or ascetic, as among the Colossians (2[16, 21, 23]) and 1 Tim. 4[2]. 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. 1[6, 7] some have turned aside into *ματαιολογίαν, θέλοντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι, μὴ νοοῦντες μήτε ἃ λέγουσιν μήτε περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιοῦνται*; (*v.* 19) Some *have made shipwreck* concerning the faith, of whom are Hymenaeus and Alexander; (3[6]) *μὴ νεόφυτον, ἵνα μὴ τυφωθεὶς εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου*; (4[1]) *τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει ὅτι ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἀποστήσονταί τινες τῆς πίστεως προσέχοντες πνεύμασι πλάνοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων, κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν,*

Digitized by Google

κωλυόντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων; (*ver.* 7) τοὺς βεβήλους καὶ γραώδεις μύθους παραιτοῦ; (6[3]) εἴ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαίνουσιν λόγοις,... τετύφωται... νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας, ἐξ οὗ γίνεται... διαπαρατριβαὶ διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν ... νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν; (*ver.* 20) τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως. 2 Tim. 1[13] *Hold the pattern of sound words, etc.*; (2[14]) 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. (2[25]) *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. ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ χαλεποί. ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι φίλαυτοι, φιλάργυροι, ἀλαζόνες, ὑπερήφανοι, βλάσφημοι, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἀχάριστοι, ἀνόσιοι, ἄστοργοι, ἄσπονδοι, διάβολοι, ἀκρατεῖς, ἀνήμεροι, ἀφιλάγαθοι, προδόται, προπετεῖς, τετυφωμένοι, φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι, ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἀρνούμενοι. καὶ τούτους ἀποτρέπου. ἐκ τούτων γάρ εἰσιν οἱ ἐνδύνοντες εἰς τὰς οἰκίας καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντες γυναικάρια σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίαις ἀγόμενα ἐπιθυμίαις ποικίλαις... ὃν τρόπον Ἰωαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς ἀντέστησαν Μωυσεῖ, οὕτως καὶ οὗτοι ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἄνθρωποι κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν, ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν... (*v.* 13) πονηροὶ δὲ ἄνθρωποι καὶ γόητες προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον, πλανῶντες καὶ πλανώμενοι. σὺ δὲ μένε ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες... (4[3]) ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς ὅτε τῆς ὑγιαινούσης διδασκαλίας οὐκ ἀνέξονται, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισωρεύσουσιν διδασκάλους, κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν.

Titus 1[10] εἰσὶν πολλοὶ ἀνυπότακτοι, ματαιόλογοι καὶ φρεναπάται μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν, οἵτινες ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν; (*v.* 16) Θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται, βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν

Digitized by Google

ἀδόκιμοι; (3[9]) μωρὰς ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καὶ μάχας νομικὰς περιίστασο... αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ ... νουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἐξέστραπται ὁ τοιοῦτος καὶ ἁμαρτάνει, ὢν αὐτοκατάκριτος.

Apocalypse.

2[2] (Ephesus) ἐπείρασας τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους εἶναι καὶ οὐκ εἰσίν, καὶ εὗρες αὐτοὺς ψευδεῖς; (*ver.* 6) μισεῖς τὰ ἔργα τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν ἃ ἐγὼ 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 διδαχὴν Βαλαάμ, ὃς ἐδίδασκεν τῷ Βαλὰκ βαλεῖν σκάνδαλον ἐνώπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα καὶ πορνεῦσαι; (*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[4] Sardis) 'they have not *defiled their garments*'; (3[8] Philadelphia) 'thou didst keep my word and didst not *deny my name*.'

Epistles of John.

1 Joh. 2[18] ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν, καὶ καθὼς ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν, ὅθεν γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν. ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθαν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν... (v. 22) τίς ἐστιν ὁ ψεύστης εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀρνούμενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός; οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀντίχριστος ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν. πᾶς ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν υἱὸν οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει... (*v.* 26) ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν περὶ τῶν πλανώντων ὑμᾶς; (4[1]) πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐξεληλύθασιν εἰς τὸν κοσμον. (2 Joh. [7]) πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἐξῆλθαν εἰς τὸν κόσμον οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί. (3 Joh. [9]) ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων Διοτρεφὴς οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς. διὰ τοῦτο, ἐὰν ἔλθω, ὑπομνήσω αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιεῖ λόγοις πονηροῖς φλυαρῶν 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

Digitized by Google

Christ. This falling away is to take place in the last times (Jude [18], 2 P. 2^{1}, 3^{3}, 1 Tim. 4^{1}, 2 Tim. 3^{1}, 4^{3}, 1 Joh. $2^{18, 19}$, 2 Th. 2^{3-12}, Matt. 24^{11-13}), but it has already begun, as is shown by the use of the past or present tenses in Jude [4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 19], 2 P. $2^{10, 15, 17-22}$, 3^{4}, 1 Tim. $1^{6, 7, 19}$, 6^{3}, 2 Tim. 3^{6-9}, Tit. 1^{10-16}, Apoc. $2^{2, 6, 14}$, 1 Joh. $2^{18, 19, 22}$, $4^{1, 3}$, 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. 2^{19}, 3^{16}, cf. Rom. 3^{5-8}). 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. $2^{1, 20, 21}$). They join in the love-feasts (Jude [12], 2 P. 2^{13}, 1 Cor. 11^{18}), are greedy of gain (Jude [11, 16], 2 P. $2^{12, 15, 16}$), are disputatious (Jude [22], 2 P. $3^{4, 16}$), plausible (Jude [12], 2 P. 2^{2}), boastful, disobedient, irreverent (Jude [8, 11, 16], 2 P. $2^{10, 11, 18}$), speaking evil of things and persons beyond their knowledge (Jude [10], 2 P. 2^{12}), seducing the simple by their confident and scornful assertions (Jude [13, 16, 18, 19], 2 P. $2^{2, 14, 18}$), 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. 2^{1}). It is true that in 2 P. the mischief-makers are distinctly called 'false-teachers' and charged with introducing *αἱρέσεις* (2^{1}), 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

Digitized by Google

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. [16]), and seeking for popularity by all means fair or foul (cf. Tit. 1^{11}, 1 Tim. 6^{5}).
6. This state of things had been prophesied long before.

Digitized by Google

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 *εἰδωλόθυτα* 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 *ἀνὴρ ἀποστολικός*, 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 παραχρῆσθαι τῇ σαρκί. ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν γενναῖος κολούειν δεῖν ἐδήλου τάς τε ἡδονὰς τάς τε ἐπιθυμίας . . . οἱ δὲ εἰς ἡδονὴν τράγων δίκην ἐκχυθέντες οἷον 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.

Digitized by Google

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 Peratae). Hippolytus says of the Naassenes or Ophites, that they called themselves Gnostics, *φάσκοντες μόνοι τὰ βάθη γινώσκειν* (*Ref. Haer.* v. 6), which reminds us of the words addressed to the Church in Thyatira (Apoc. 2^{18-25}), 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 βάθεα τοῦ Σατανᾶ*, where the addition *τοῦ Σατανᾶ* pronounces judgment upon the heretics. Of these Nicolaitans Irenaeus 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 (*ἀπόσπασμα*) eius quae falso cognominatur scientia, ut suaderet quoniam unus Deus qui omnia fecit per verbum suum; et non, quemadmodum illi dicunt, alterum quidem fabricatorem, alium autem Patrem Domini; et alium quidem fabricatoris filium, alterum vero de superioribus Christum, quem et impassibilem perseverasse, descendentem in Jesum . . 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 *ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι*, holding that the context shows it to be spoken *περὶ τῆς μυθώδους αὐτῶν τραγῳδίας καὶ ληρολογίας, ὡς διὰ ὕπνου λεγομένης καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ ἐρρωμένης διανοίας.*

Digitized by Google

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, Irenaeus, 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 εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν*; that the Samaritans of all classes believed his professions and agreed in holding that *οὗτός 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 ἀργύριόν σου σὺν σοὶ εἴη εἰς ἀπώλειαν*. The story ends with Simon's entreaty that the Apostles would pray for him *ὅπως μηδὲν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ὧν εἰρήκατε*.

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 *fin.*) *ὃν θεὸν ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως εἶναι λέγουσιν*. He adds that Simon was accompanied by a woman named Helena, whom he declared to be *ἡ πρώτη ἔννοια* 'the first Idea or Conception.'[1]

Irenaeus (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.

Digitized by Google

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.[1] 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 κρατεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐπί 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 γάρ ἐστι φύσει κακὸν ἀλλὰ 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 υἱὸν Θεοῦ Σιμωνιανοί, ἀλλὰ 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 *ἀλογίστως φάσκοντες δεῖν μίγνυσθαι..., ἀλλὰ καὶ μακαρίζουσιν ἑαυτοὺς 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 (i. 6. 2) *αὐτοὺς μὴ διὰ πράξεως, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ φύσει πνευματικοὺς εἶναι, παντῇ τε καὶ πάντως σωθήσεσθαι δογματίζουσιν.*

[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.*

Digitized by Google

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 'contemnere mundi fabricatores archontas.' A *βλασφημία* of a more atrocious kind is attributed to the Cainites by the same writer (i. 31. 2), 'nec aliter servari nisi per omnia eant' (so they interpreted Math. 5[26]). What follows is more clearly given in the Greek of Epiphanius, *Haer.* 38. 2, *ἕκαστος ἄρρητα ποιῶν καὶ αἰσχρουργίας ἐπιτελῶν ἐπικαλεῖται ἑκάστου ἀγγέλου ὄνομα καὶ ἑκάστῳ τούτων προσάπτει τι ἔργον ἀθέμιτον . . . ὁ δεῖνα ἄγγελε καταχρῶμαί σου τὸ ἔργον· ἡ δεῖνα ἐξουσία πράττω σου τὴν πρᾶξιν.* 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. 401–422, 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).

Digitized by Google

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 *p*, and the Harkleian which is a revision of the Philoxenian made by Thomas of Harkel in 616 A.D., by the initial *h*. Unfortunately the ordinary notation of these is rather misleading, *p* being distinguished as Syr. bodl. 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 *h* has been even

Digitized by Google

worse, as it is cited by Tischendorf as Syr^{p}. though Tregelles cites it correctly as Hcl.[1] 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 ἠγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς.

Here ἠγαπημένοις is supported by ABℵ, several cursives and versions, Orig. iii. 607, Lucif. Cassiod. *al.*, while ἡγιασμένοις 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 θεῷ . . . καὶ ἐν Ἰ. Χ.' For the reading ἐν Ἰ. Χ. they cite Vulg. Spec. Syr^{p}. Sah. Aeth. Orig. (*Mt.*) Lucif. Cassiod.; but I learn from Dr. Gwynn that the true readings of the Syriac versions are as follows:—

'*p* is *prima facie* a rendering of the Greek τοῖς ἔθνεσι [τοῖς] κλητοῖς, τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις καὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις. But, as there are no case-endings in Syr., the translator was obliged to insert a preposition (and he had few to choose from) just as the English translator must. Hence the presence in *p* of the preposition = ἐν proves nothing. Nor do I think *p* had before him a text with τοῖς κλητοῖς, or with κλητοῖς placed *not* at end of sentence. *h* omits καὶ ἐν Ἰ. Χ. τετηρημένοις, and places κλητοῖς at end.'

Similarly Mr. Horner holds that though Sah. translates 'kept in J. C.,' we need not suppose that the preposition means anything more than the Greek dative. He translates Boh. 'To those who were loved by (*or* in) God the Father, and were kept by J. C., to those who are called'; and Sah. 'To the beloved who are in God the Father, to those who are called, who are kept by (*or* in) J. C.'

The objection to the text rests on internal grounds. There appears to be no parallel either for ἐν Θεῷ Πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοι, or for Χριστῷ 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 ἠγαπημένοι '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.'

Digitized by Google

as in Nehemiah 13^{26}, *ἀγαπώμενος 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 believers are kept *by* and *in* Christ, as in 2 Thes. 2^{3}, 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 ἀγάπῃ* and *καὶ ἀγάπῃ*, the one which is best of all reading *καί*. 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. *h* has *καὶ ἀγάπῃ*.

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

v. 5. *ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι εἰδότας ἅπαξ πάντα, ὅτι Κύριος λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας 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.

εἰδότας '*add. ὑμᾶς* ς ℵ 31 KL. syrr., *om.* ABC² 13 Vulg. Boh. Sah. Arm.,' and so Tisch.

In point of fact however B reads *εἰδότας ὑμᾶς*, as any one may convince himself by looking at Cozza-Luzi's photographic reproduction. Also Dr. Gwynn reports that *h* 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 *ὑμᾶς* 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 *ὑμῖν* of *v.* 3.

ἅπαξ ante πάντα ABC. 13. 31. L. *vn. Ante ὅτι* K. *Ante λαὸν* ℵ. (Syrr.) Arm. *Ante ἐκ γῆς* Aἰγ. Clem. 280 (and 997, Did. Cassiod.). *ὅτι κύριος σώσας τὸν λαὸν ἐκ γῆς* Aἰγ. *ἅπαξ* Sah., *ὅτι ἅπαξ κύριος σώσας λαὸν αὐτοῦ* Boh. *Om. ἅπαξ* Lucif. 28. [*ἅπαξ* is so placed in Syrr. as to be connected with *σώσας* 'when he had once saved them,' G.]

πάντα ABCℵ 13 Vulg. Syr^{h}. Boh. Arm. Aeth. Lucif. [In the *App.*

Digitized by Google

to WH (*Sel. Readings*, p. 106) it is suggested that this may be a primitive error for *πάντας* (cf. 1 John 2^{20}) found in Syr^{p}.[1] *τοῦτο*] ς. 31. KL. Sah.

ὅτι] *add.* ὁ ς.C.^{2} 31. KL. Arm. Clem. 280. *Om.* ABℵ 13.

κύριος] ℵCKL. Syr^{h}. Θεὸς C^{2} Tol. Syr^{p}. Arm. Clem. Lucif. Ἰησοῦς AB. 13 Vulg. Boh. Sah. Aeth. [In *App.* to WH. (*Sel. Readings*, p. 106) it is suggested that there may have been some primitive error, 'apparently οτικο̄ (*ὅτι* Κύριος), and οτιῑο̄ (*ὅτι* Ἰησοῦς) for οτιο (*ὅτι* ὁ).']

γῆς om. Syr^{p}.

It appears to me that the true reading of the passage is *ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ὑμᾶς πάντα, ὅτι* Κύριος *ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς* Αἰγύπτου *σώσας τὸ δεύτερον* [*τοὺς*] *μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν.* I see no difficulty in *πάντα*, which gives a reason for the use of the word *ὑπομνῆσαι*, '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 *ἅπαξ* 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, *ἅπαξ* 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 *ὅτι ὁ* (*λαὸν σώσας*), I think the fact of the variants is better explained by Spitta, who considers that the abbreviations $\overline{\text{IC}}$, $\overline{\text{KC}}$, $\overline{\Theta\text{C}}$ 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 $\overline{\text{IC}}$, a supposition which is confirmed by Cramer's *Catena*, p. 158, *εἴρηται γὰρ πρὸ τούτων περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὡς εἴη ἀληθινὸς θεὸς οὗτος ὁ μόνος δεσπότης ὁ κύριος* Ἰ.Χ., *ὁ ἀναγαγὼν τὸν λαὸν ἐξ* Αἰγύπτου *διὰ* Μωσέως. Spitta himself however holds that $\overline{\Theta\text{C}}$ is the true reading, as it agrees with the corresponding passage in 2 Peter 2^{4}, *ὁ* Θεὸς

[1] 'This is an error: the two best MSS. of *p* represent *πάντα*.' G.

Digitized by Google

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. $10^{4,9}$, in reference to the wandering in the wilderness. But in the second and later centuries this distinction was less carefully observed. Thus Justin M. (*Dial.* 120), speaking of the prophecy in Genesis 49^{10}, says that it does not refer to Judah, but to Jesus, *τὸν καὶ τοῦς 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, *Dial.* 75; Clem. Al. 133; Didymus, *De Trin.* 1. 19, *Ἰούδας καθολικῶς γράφει, ἅπαξ γὰρ κύριος Ἰησοῦς 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 praesentiens jussit eum Jesum vocari'). In the explanatory note I have stated my reasons for considering that the article before *μή* did not belong to the original text.

v. 6. *ἀγγέλους τε*] *ἀγγ. δέ* A boh.[1], *καὶ ἀγγ.* sah. boh.[2].

[*v.* 7. *p* and *h* punctuate *πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου, δίκην ὑπέχουσαι*, *h* interpolates *τέφρα* bef. *πρόκεινται*: so Lucifer (*de non conv. c. haereticis*) reads 'cinis propositae sunt exemplum.' G.]

v. 12. *οὗτοί εἰσιν* [*οἱ*] *ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι ἀφόβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες*. The article here is omitted by ℵK 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, *ἀφόβως* should be attached to *συνευωχ.* as by Ti. In syrr. it is joined with *ποιμαίνοντες*.

συνευωχούμενοι] C sah. boh. *add ὑμῖν*.

[*v.* 18. Syrr. *p* and *h* agree with KLP in prefixing *ὅτι* to *ἐν ἐσχάτῳ* or *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου 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

Digitized by Google

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, ὅτιπερ εἶπον ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐμπαῖκται ἐλεύσονται πορευόμενοι κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἀσεβείας· οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, μὴ ἔχοντες πνεῦμα. Ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, ἔστε οἰκοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐν πίστει ὑμῶν [ἁγίᾳ τὸ ἔλεος] προσευχόμενοι ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*, which agrees exactly with sah. except that, for the bracketed words, the latter has *ἁγιωτάτῃ* omitting *τὸ ἔλεος*.

v. 19. *οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.*

ἀποδιορίζοντες add. ἑαυτούς C vulg. syrr. *Om.* ℵABKL 13, etc.

This rare word is used of logical distinctions in Arist. *Pol.* iv. 48, *ὥσπερ οὖν εἰ ζῴου προηρούμεθα λαβεῖν εἶδη, πρῶτον ἂν ἀποδιωρίζομεν ὅπερ ἀναγκαῖον πᾶν 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 (*παρεισεδύησαν*, *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 *ἀποδιορίζω* could bear this sense. *ἀφορίζω* is used in Luke 6^{22} 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 *ψυχικοί* in inverted commas, as the utterance of the innovators (and should we not then have expected the contrast *ψυχικοί, πνευματικοί*?), still we cannot

Digitized by Google

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* :—

ψυχικοὺς ὑμᾶς (or *τοὺς πιστοὺς*) *λέγοντες, ὄντες 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 fidelibus secundum propriam 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 ἁγίων μεταδιδόναι τοῖς κυσὶν 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 ἑαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα.* But perhaps we should read *sanctos* and transpose the clauses as follows :—

Isti segregantes : fideles a fidelibus et iterum sanctos a carnalibus discernentes secundum propriam incredulitatem, redarguti, *animales spiritum non habentes*, the Greek being something of this sort: *οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες. πιστοὺς τῶν πιστῶν, ἁγίους δὲ αὖ τῶν ψυχικῶν διακρίνοντες κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀπιστίαν, ἐλέγχονται ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.*

The opposition of *ψυχικοί* to *πνευματικοί* 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.* LP.
[2] *Redarguti* 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').

Digitized by Google

the Church. These were also technical terms with the Naassenes and Heracleon (see my notes on James 3^{15}), and were probably borrowed by the early heretics from St. Paul, who uses them to distinguish the natural from the heavenly body (1 Cor. 15^{44}), and also to express the presence or absence of spiritual insight (1 Cor. $2^{14f.}$) *ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστιν . . . ὁ δὲ πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνει 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 ἀσέλγειαν*), professing a knowledge of the *βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ* (1 Cor. 2^{10}), though it was really a knowledge only of *τὰ βάθεα τοῦ Σατανᾶ* (Apoc. 2^{24}), and claiming to be the true *δυνατοί* and *πνευματικοί*, 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 οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.* (Text of WH. and B. Weiss) *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.* In *App.* to WH. it is added, 'Some primitive error probable: perhaps the first *ἐλεᾶτε* an interpolation' (*Sel. Readings*, p. 107).

22 *ἐλέγχετε* AC* 13. Vulg Boh. Arm. Aeth. (Eph. Theophyl. Oec. *Comm.* Cassiod.). *ἐλεᾶτε* BC^{2} · Syr^{h}. *ἐλεείτε* KLP (Theophyl. Oec. *txt.*), *ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζετε* (hic) Syr^{p}. Clem. 773.

διακρινομένους ABC$\aleph$. 13. Vulg. Syrr. Boh. Arm. Clem. 773, *διακρινόμενοι* KLP+.

23. *οὓς δὲ* (1st) A$\aleph$C 13 KLP Vulg. Syr^{h}. Boh. Arm., *Om.* B., *δὲ* Syr^{p}. Clem. *σώζετε* $\aleph$ABC 13 Vulg. Boh. Arm. Aeth., *ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε* KLP+, *ἐλεείτε* Clem. 773 (quoted below), *ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ* Syr^{p}. *ἐκ πυρὸς* ABCKLP$\aleph$ 13 Arm., *ἐκ τοῦ π.* Boh. *Om. σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες* Syr^{p}.

ἁρπάζοντες οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ AB$\aleph$ 13. Vulg., Arm., *om. ἁρπάζοντες* Boh., *ἁρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ* C. Syr^{h}., *ἁρπάζοντες* KLP+

Tischendorf makes the matter clearer by giving the consecutive text of versions and quotations as follows: Vulg. *Et hos quidem arguite judicatos, illos vero salvate de igne rapientes, aliis autem miseremini in timore.* Ar^{c}. *Et quosdam corripite super peccatis eorum, et quorundam miseremini cum fuerint victi, et quosdam salvate ex igne et liberate eos.* Ar^{p}. *Et signate quos-*

Digitized by Google

dam cum dubitaverint orbos (?) *et salvate quosdam territione, abripite eos ex igne.* Aeth. *quoniam est quem redarguent per verbum quod dictum est* (Aeth$^{p.p.}$. *propter 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 salvate rapiendo ex igne, et quorundam miseremini timore judicando* (? *indicando*). Cassiodor.[142] *Ita ut quosdam dijudicatos arguant, quosdam de adustione aeterni ignis eripiant, nonnullis miscreantur errantibus et conscientias maculatas emundent, sic tamen ut peccata eorum digna execrationere fugiant.* Mr. Horner states that *vv.* 22, 23 are omitted in Sah. He translates Boh. as follows: *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ τοῦ πυρός* (*al. om. τοῦ*), *οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε* (*al. φέρετε*) *ἐν φόβῳ.* Commentaries of Theophylact and Oecumenius, *κἀκείνους δέ, εἰ μὲν ἀποδίδονται ὑμῶν—τοῦτο γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ διακρίνεσθαι—ἐλέγχετε, τουτέστι φανεροῦτε τοῖς πᾶσι τὴν ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν· εἶτε δὲ πρὸς ἴασιν ἀφορῶσι, μὴ ἀπωθεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ τῷ τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν ἐλέῳ προσλαμβάνεσθε, σώζοντες ἐκ τοῦ ἠπειλημένου αὐτοῖς πυρός· προσλαμβάνεσθε δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἐλεεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ μετὰ φόβου.*

In all these it will be observed that three classes are distinguished, as in the text of Tregelles and Tischendorf, and in A, *οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ*, and ℵ, *οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ.* We should draw the same conclusion from the seeming quotation in *Can. Apost.* vi. 4 (*οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ*) *οὓς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις, περὶ ὧν δὲ προσεύξῃ* (*οὓς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχήν σου*), which occurs also, with the omission of the cause *οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις* in the Didache ii. 7.

Two classes only are distinguished in the following: Syr^{p}. *Et quosdam de illis quidem ex igne rapite; cum autem resipuerint, miseremini super eis in timore,* representing *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ.* Syr^{h}. *et hos quidem miseremini resipiscentes, hos autem servate de igne rapientes in timore,* representing *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ.* Clem. *Adumbr. quosdam autem salvate de igne rapientes, quibusdam vero miseremini in timore,*[1] representing *οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ*

[1] The paraphrase continues, *id est ut eos qui in ignem cadunt doceatis ut semet ipsos liberent.* (It would seem that this clause has got misplaced and should be

Digitized by Google

ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ. Clem. *Strom.* vi. 773, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεεῖτε, 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 οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, of C, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ, and of KLP, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε διακρινόμενοι, οὓς δὲ ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες.

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 ℵ 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 οὓς μέν to be taken as the relative, introducing the subordinate verb ἐλεᾶτε, depending on the principal verb σώζετε; while οὓς δέ, on the other hand, must be taken as demonstrative. WH suggest that ἐλεᾶτε 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 ἐλεᾶτε was written in error for ἐλέγχετε, and οὓς omitted in error after διακρινομένους. The latter phenomenon is exemplified in the readings of Syr^{p}. 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 ἐλεᾶτε in *a* and *c* (as in ℵ) caused the omission of the second ἐλεᾶτε, and therefore of the second οὓς δέ. The reading διακρινόμενοι in KLP was a natural assimilation to the following nominative ἁρπάζοντες, 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 tunica macula* (read *maculata*) *est spiritus concupiscentiis pollutus carnalibus.*

Digitized by Google

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 *ἐλέγχειν* 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: *ἐάν τις ἐν ὑμῖν πλανηθῇ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ἐπιστρέψῃ τις αὐτόν, γινώσκετε ὅτι ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου.* The first class with which the believers are called upon to deal is that of doubters, *διακρινόμενοι*, men still halting between two opinions (cf. James 1^6), or perhaps we should understand it of disputers, as in Jude 9. These they are to reprove and convince (cf. John $16^{8,9}$, *ἐλέγξει περὶ ἁμαρτίας ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν 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. 5^5), and the story told about Cerinthus and St. John.

2 P. i. 1. *Συμεών* ℵAKLP syrr '*al. longe plu.*' Ti Treg WH.^{m}, Spitta, Weiss, Kühl, von Soden, Zahn, *Σιμων* B vg sah boh WH. It is far more easy to suppose that *Σίμων* was a correction of *Συμεών*

Digitized by Google

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., *Om. τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ* P. vulg. Minusc. 69, 137, 163, Spitta, Zahn, Nestle. There is much to be said for the omission: see n. on the passage.

[i. 3. syr^{p} represents *ὡς πάντα τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ δεδωρημένου* 'in as much as He has given all things of divine power,' syr^{h} *ὃς . . . δεδωρημένος*; both connect *vv.* 3, 4 closely with *v.* 2, not with *v.* 5. G.]

ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ ℵ ACP 13 vg sah boh syrr Ti Treg WH.^{m}, v. Soden, Weiss, Spitta, Kühl, Keil+, *διὰ δόξης* BKL 31 '*al. longe plu.*' WH. The recurrence of *διὰ* in the sentence *πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν . . . δεδωρημένης διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς· δι' ὧν τὰ μέγιστα . . . ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*, makes it more likely that *διά* should have been written by mistake for *ἰδίᾳ* than the reverse; *δόξῃ* would then be corrected to *δόξης*. Again *διὰ δόξης* is too vague to convey a meaning; while *ἴδιος* is a favourite word with 2 Peter and *ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ* 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' ὧν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν* B syr^{h} spec (*bis*) WH. Weiss, *δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια ἡμῖν καὶ μέγιστα* ℵ KL+Ti, *δι' ὧν τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ἡμῖν* ACP 13. 31. 68 syr^{p} Treg (*sed* A 68 syr^{p} *ὑμῖν pro ἡμῖν*[1]). As regards the order of the epithets, ℵBKL 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 προθύμων*, where the two characteristics do not necessarily vary together. The position of the dative in B seems to be the true one; that in ℵ is explained by the desire to bring it under the influence of *τίμια*. The order in A seems to have originated in

[1] Syr^{h} has *ἡμῖν* but, as usual, gives the reading of syr^{p} in marg.

Digitized by Google

the accidental or intentional omission of *τίμια καί* and its wrong insertion from the margin. A appears to be right in reading *ὑμῖν*, 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 *τίμια ἡμῖν*, inserts *ὑμῖν* after *ἐπαγγέλματα*.

i. 12. *μελλήσω* ℵ ABCP vg Ti Treg WH, *οὐκ ἀμελήσω* KL syrr, *οὐ μελλήσω* tol Cass, *μελήσω* Field (*Otium Norv.* 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. 24[6] *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 12[6], 1 P. 5[7], Mt. 22[16], where many MSS. have the incorrect *μέλλω*. Field quotes Suidas *μελήσω· σπούδασω, φροντίσω*. Hesychius and Photius wrongly ascribe this force to *μελλήσω*, perhaps from a recollection of the received reading of this passage. Schleusner's note on Photius is (*Cur. Nov.* p. 227) 'pro *μελλήσω* necessario reponendum est *μελήσω*.' Other instances of the personal construction, *μέλω* for *μέλει μοι*,[1] are found in Eur. *Herc. F.* 772 *θεοὶ τῶν ἀδίκων μέλουσι καὶ τῶν ὁσίων ἐπαΐειν*, Plut. *Vit.* 395.

ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ. For the difficult *παρούσῃ*, read by all the authorities, Spitta suggests *παραδοθείσῃ*, as in ii. 21 *ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς*, and Jude 3 *τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ πίστει*.

i. 17. *φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιᾶσδε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης*. So all the authorities, except syrr, which give *ἀπό*, and vg which has *delapsa a* (in Sabatier's Old Latin *del. de*). It is difficult however to see the force of *ὑπό*, 'a voice brought *by* the excellent glory.' We have an example of the proper use of *φέρομαι ὑπό* just below in *v.* 21, *ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν*. Surely the excellent glory is the *source*, not the *vehicle* of the voice I think we should read *ἀπό* with syrr. In like manner *ὑπό* has been substituted for *ἀπό* in most MSS. of Lk. 8[29] and Acts 15[4].

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

[1] Suidas explains *μέλω* by *ἐν ἐπιμελείᾳ εἰμί*.

Digitized by Google

in the *ἀκαταπάστους* of B in ii. 14, on which see note. Perhaps it originated in faulty pronunciation.

i. 21. *ἀπὸ θεοῦ* BP syr^{h}+WH Ti, *ἀπὸ θελήματος θεοῦ* boh, *ἅγιοι θεοῦ* ℵ KL syr^{p}+Treg, *ἅγιοι τοῦ θεοῦ* A, *ἅγιοι* sah, *ἅγιοι ἀπὸ θεοῦ al.* Evidently *ἅγιοι* is a correction, which had the advantage of giving greater prominence to the idea of holiness.

ii. 4. *σιροῖς* ℵ Ti (*σειροῖς* 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 *ἀβύσσῳ ἐν ἀπείροις* (*cf.* J. 6 *ἀϊδίοις*) *ζόφοις ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν κολαζομένους τηρεῖν.* If *σειραῖς* were the reading of the archetype, we can hardly conceive its being changed to *σιροῖς*, 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 *σιροῖς*. 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.

ζόφου BCKLPℵ Ti Treg WH Weiss, *ζόφοις* ℵA Spitta, Kühl. The latter reading may have arisen from a marginal *-οις* intended to correct *σειραῖς*, but wrongly applied to *ζόφου*. Spitta would read *ζοφοῖς* contracted from *ζοφέοις*, but the word itself is very rare, and there is no proof that it was ever contracted.

τηρουμένους BCKLP syr^{h}+Ti Treg WH, *κολαζομένους τηρεῖν* ℵ A latt syr^{p} 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.* *διεγείρειν ἐν ὑπομνήσει* in i. 13 and iii. 1; *τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες* in i. 20, iii. 3; *ἐξακολουθέω* in i. 16, ii. 2, 15; *φθορά*, ii. 12 *bis*; *μισθὸν ἀδικίας*, ii. 13, 15; *δελεάζω*, ii. 14, 18; *οὐρανοί . . . παρελεύσονται στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται* in iii. 10, and *οὐρανοί . . . λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται* in iii. 12. Moreover, the reading of ℵ A is more in harmony with the description in Enoch x. 4, 12, lxxviii. 2, where final punishment is preceded by preparatory punishment.

ii. 6. *καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν* ℵ AC^{2}KL vg syrr (*ἐν κατ.*

Digitized by Google

where *ἐν* merely marks the dative)+Treg Ti Spitta Weiss v. Soden, *κατέκρινεν* BC WH, *κατέστρεψεν* P. It seems more likely that *καταστροφῇ* 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, *κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ*, Matthew xx. 18 (where B omits *θανάτῳ*), *Martyr. Andr. prius* 13 *ἄνδρα μηδὲν ἀδικήσαντα κατέκρινεν σταυρῷ*, Diod. xiv. 4 *τοὺς πονηροτάτους κατεδίκαζον θανάτῳ*, Ael. *V.H.* xii. 49 *κατεγνώσθη θανάτῳ*.

ἀσεβέσιν BP syr^{h} (exemplum eorum quae impiis futura sunt ponens) syr^{p} (exemplum impiis futurorum ponens, *al.* exemplum impiis futuris ponens) WH, *τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν* sah boh, *ἀσεβεῖν* ℵ ACKL vg Treg Ti. The infinitive *ἀσεβεῖν* is naturally suggested by *μελλόντων*, but does not give so good a sense as the dat. *ἀσεβέσιν*. As a rule, *ὑπόδειγμα* takes a genitive of the thing and dat. of the person, as in Sir. 44. 16 *Ἐνὼχ ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς*; 2 Macc. vi. 31 *τοῖς νέοις ὑπόδειγμα γενναιότητος καταλιπών*; 3 Macc. ii. 5 *παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγνομένοις κατεστήσας*. 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 εὐλόγησεν*, and *v.l.* in Heb. ix. 11 *τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*, Col. 2^{17} *ἅ ἐστιν σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων*, *Petri Apoc.* (*ap.* Clem. Al. *Str.* vi. § 48) *ἀποστόλους δηλοῦντας τὰ μέλλοντα*] 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* ℵ ACKLP syrr 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 *ψυχὴν δικαίαν 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. Norv.* 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.'

Digitized by Google

ii. 11. *οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίῳ βλάσφημον κρίσιν* ℵ BCKLP syrr Ti, *om. παρὰ κυρίῳ* A vg+, *παρὰ κυρίου minusc. et. verss. al.* Spitta, [*παρὰ κυρίῳ*] Treg WH. Here *αὐτῶν* refers to *δόξας* (=*τῷ διαβόλῳ*), and *παρὰ κυρίῳ* refers to *ἀλλὰ εἶπεν ἐπιτιμήσαι 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 A, 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* ℵ BP syr^{p} arm+WH, *κομιούμενοι* ℵ^{c} ACKL vg sah boh syr^{h} (ementes)+Ti Treg. The future *κομιούμενοι* is out of place here, where we want a present (or even a past) participle synchronizing with the verb *φθαρήσονται*, 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.

ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι all MSS. and edd. I have endeavoured to explain this reading in the note. But I am inclined to think that *ἡδονήν*, which may have been a marginal gloss on *τρυφήν*, has taken the place of a half-obliterated *ἀγάπην*. Cf. Clem. Al. *Str.* iii. 10 *οὐ γὰρ ἀγάπην εἴποιμ' ἂν τὴν συνέλευσιν αὐτῶν*, and just below *μεθ' ἡμέραν ἤδη* (= 2 P. *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ*) *παρ' ὧν ἂν ἐθελήσωσι γυναικῶν ἀπαιτεῖν τὴν τοῦ Καρποκρατείου νόμου ὑπακοήν*. So *Paed.* ii. 4 (p. 165) *τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν ἡγιασμένην . . . καθυβρίζοντες*, *ib. τὰς τοιαύτας ἑστιάσεις ὁ κύριος ἀγάπας οὐ κέκληκεν*, *ib.* § 7 *ἀγάπη μὲν οὖν δεῖπνον οὐκ ἔστιν, ἡ δὲ ἑστίασις ἀγάπης ἠρτήσθω*, 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 ℵ A^{1}C^{1}KLP syr^{h}+WH, for *ἀπάταις* A^{2}BC^{2} vg syr^{p} (and mg of syr^{h}) Treg Zahn Nestle Lightfoot (on *Ign. Smyrn.*), WH mg. read *ἀγάπαις*. The gen. *αὐτῶν* is in favour

Digitized by Google

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. *ἀκαταπαύστους* ℵCKLP 13 31 Ti Treg, *ἀκατα-πάστους* AB WH. The latter form is unknown in Greek. It is supposed to be derived from a Laconian form *πάζω*, see under *ἀμπάζονται* in Herwerden, *Lex. Gr. Suppletorium*, where, after quoting from Hesych. *ἀμπ.* = *ἀναπαύονται*, he continues: 'fuit ergo verbum Laconicum *πάζεν* = *παύειν*.' 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 *ἀχμηρῷ*, the reading may have originated in a faulty pronunciation on the part of the reader, or the *υ* 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 *-στους*. So in *v.* 21 below, B has lost the last syllable of *ἔσχατα* at the end of a line. Blass, *Gr. T. Gr.*, p. 44, gives examples of forms in which the *υ* has been lost, such as *ἐπάην*, Herm. *Vis*, i. 33, *ἐπαναπαήσεται* Luke x. 6, and *ἐκάην* from *καίω*. Cf. *New Sayings of Jesus*, 1 *βασιλεύσας ἀναπαήσεται*. Schaefer in the Index to Bast's *Comment. Palaeogr.* (*s. αυ et α confusa*) refers to the reading *πίφασκον* for *πίφαυσκον* in Hom. *Od.* 12. 165 with Porson's note, and Dr. F. G. Kenyon writes to me that *ἑατοῦ* and *τἀτό* are not unfrequently found in papyri and inscriptions for *ἑαυτοῦ* and *ταὐτό*. He also mentions that *Ἀγουστος* often stands for *Αὔγουστος* in papyri, that two examples of *πάω* for *παύω* occur in the *C.I.G.*, viz., 5984 A 3 *ἀναπαόμενος* and 6595, 4 *ἀναπάεται*, and refers to a paragraph on the subject in Crönert's *Memoria Herculanensis*, p. 126.[1] Hort in his *Notes on Orthography* (*Appendix*, p. 170) mentions the form *ἀναπαμός* = *ἀνάπαυσις* 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 A) *οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πληρωθῆναι τιθέασι τὸ πάσασθαι . . .* *Ἀκατάπαστος* is exactly similar to *ἄπαστος*, *ἀπαστία*, *ἀπαστί*.' There is no evidence however that

[1] See J. H. Moulton *Gr. of N.T. Greek, Prolegomena*, p. 47.

Digitized by Google

these words bear the suggested sense. In all the recorded examples ἄπαστος and its cognates have the sense of 'fasting.'

ii. 15. καταλείποντες ℵ AB Ti WH, καταλιπόντες B^3CKLP syrr + Treg WH^m. If we assume that the reference is to a fact anterior to the action of the verb ἐπλανήθησαν, 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 ει and ι see my note on ἴδε James iii. 3 and Hort's Introduction, p. 306: 'B shows a remarkable inclination to change ι into ει,' of which we have the following instances in this epistle, i. 1 ισοτειμον, 17 τειμην, 20 and iii. 3 γεινωσκοντες, 21 γεινεται, iii. 1 ειλικρεινη, 8 χειλια *bis*.

Βόσορ $ℵ^c$ACKLP boh syr^h Ti Treg, Βεωρ B syr^p sah WH Weiss, Βεωρσορ ℵ (arising from a confusion between Βόσορ and the marginal correction εωρ). Prof. Swete informs me, on the authority of Mr. Norman McLean, 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 cursives 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 Βέωρ than the reverse.

ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν ACKLP $ℵ^c$ syrr WH Ti Treg, μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησαν B arm $Treg^m$ WH^m. The objection to the latter reading is that in the next clause (ἔλεγξιν ἔσχεν) we have to revert to the subject Balaam. Possibly an accidental omission of ὅς may account for B's reading.

ii. 18. ὀλίγως AB $ℵ^c$ vg syrr ('propemodum' White, 'paululum' Poc., Gwynn is doubtful), sah boh render 'slightly' Treg Ti WH, ὄντως ℵ CKLP, ὀλίγον *minusc. al.* The reading ὄντως (translated 'who were clean escaped' in A.V.) seems to involve a self-contradiction after δελεάζουσιν. In the MSS. it is hardly distinguishable from the rare adverb ὀλίγως. Like ὄντως, the reading ὀλίγον,

Digitized by Google

'for a short time,' would seem to require the aor. *ἀποφυγόντας* read by KLP.

iii. 6. *δι' ὧν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο.* Commentators explain *δι' ὧν* as referring to the *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος* 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 *ὕδατι* 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' ὅν* with minusc. 31,[1] 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* ℵ CKL syrr 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'* ℵ A 5. 13. 69 + vg Aug. spec. sah syrr aeth, *εἰς* BCKLP arm boh Oecum., *ἡμᾶς* KL boh Theoph. Oec., *ὑμᾶς* ℵ ABCP sah syrr arm aeth vg spec +. *δι' ὑμᾶς* Treg^{m}, *εἰς ὑμᾶς* Treg WH Weiss, *εἰς ἡμᾶς* KL. 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 *v.* 11 below I am inclined to think that *ἡμᾶς* (read by ℵ) 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.* ℵAKLP Weiss. The phrase *ἡμέρα κυρίου* is found without the article in

[1] I learn from Nestle's *Introduction 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$^{20 f.}$ *φανερωθέντος ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς, τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς Θεόν*, which Hort explains of the Gentiles generally.

Digitized by Google

1 Thess. v. 2. Where *ἡ ἡμέρα* occurs, as in 2 Th. ii. 2, *κυρίου* also generally takes the article; cf. below *v.* 12.

iii. 10. *οἱ οὐρανοί* ABC Treg WH Weiss, *οὐρανοί* ℵ KL Ti, *add. μέν* ℵ13. 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*.

εὑρεθήσεται ℵ BKP syr^{p}, *οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται* sah, *κατακαήσεται* AL boh syr^{h} Ti, *καυθήσεται vel κατακαυθήσονται al.*, *ἀφανισθήσονται* C, *om. καὶ γῆ—εὑρεθήσεται* vg, *om. εὑρεθήσεται* spec, Weiss reads *εὑρεθήσεται* with a question, *ex ῥυήσεται corr. putat* H (*S.R.* p. 103). The phrase *οὐχ εὑρίσκεται* is used to denote disappearance in Ps. xxxvii. 36 *οὐχ εὑρέθη ὁ τόπος αὐτοῦ*, Job xx. 8 *ὥσπερ ἐνύπνιον ἐκπετασθὲν οὐ μὴ εὑρεθῇ*, Dan. xi, 19 *πεσεῖται καὶ οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται*, Heb. xi. 5, Apoc. 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 *εὑρεθήσεται*: so probably in the case of *κατακαήσεται* and the other readings. The required sense would be given by *καταρυήσεται* or *διαρυήσεται*, but not, I think, by the simple *ῥυήσεται*. Buttman's suggestion, *ἃ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται*, does not seem to me very felicitous. Dr. Chase thinks that *διαρυήσεται* receives some support from Enoch i. 6, and also that it is nearer to *εὑρεθήσεται* than *καταρυήσεται*. He suggests however that possibly *ἰαθήσεται* or *ἐξιαθήσεται* may be the true reading, in accordance with the words addressed to Gabriel in Enoch x. 7, *ἴασον τὴν γῆν ἣν ἠφάνισαν οἱ ἐγρήγοροι*, and in anticipation of *καινὴν γῆν* in ver. 13 below (the three clauses in *vv.* 12*b*, 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 *ἀρθήσεται*? There is much to be said for *πυρωθήσεται* 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*]*θήσεται*, and that the letters *υρ* had also disappeared before the second scribe conjectured [*αφανισ*]*θήσεται*, while *θ* also had disappeared when the third scribe conjectured [*κατακα*]*ήσεται*.

iii. 11. *τούτων οὖν* ℵAKL syr^{p} Ti Treg, *τούτων οὕτως* B

Digitized by Google

syr^{h} (*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 ō in the London medical papyrus, as ŏ in the Berlin Didymus papyrus, while *οὖν* = *ó* in the Aristotle papyrus, and in the Berlin Didymus.

iii. 16 *πάσαις ταῖς* ℵKLP Ti, *om. ταῖς* ABC Treg WH Weiss. 'In all letters' seems to me too indefinite: *ταῖς* would be easily lost after *πάσαις*.

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*) *παρεισεδύησαν*. 5 (*β*) *ὑμᾶς ἅπαξ πάντα* (instead of *ὑμᾶς πάντα*). 9 (*β*) *ὅτε* Μιχαήλ . . . *τότε*. 13 (*β*) *πλάνητες οἷς ζόφος σκότους*. 14 (*α*) *ἐπροφήτευσεν*. 23 (*β*) *om.* 1st *οὓς δέ*.

2 PETER.

i. 1 (*β*) *Σίμων*. i. 4 (*α*) *τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν*. i. 17 (?) *ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν*. ii. 8 (*α*) *ἀκοῇ δίκαιος*. ii. 15 (*β*) *Βέωρ μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησαν*. ii. 16 (*β*) *ἀνθρώποις*. ii. 18 (*β*) *ματαιότης* B′, *ματαιοτητης* B^{3}. ii. 20 (*β*) *ἐσχα*. iii. 5 (*β*) *συνεστώσης*. iii. 11 (*β*) *τούτων οὕτως*, *ib. om. ὑμᾶς*. Possibly the pronoun was omitted in the archetype and differently supplied by ℵ 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 ἁγίῳ ὄρει* BC. i. 21 (*α*) *ἀπὸ θεοῦ* BP. ii. 6 (*β*) *om. καταστροφῇ* BC. ii. 13 (*β*) *ἀγάπαις* BA^{2}. ii. 14 (*β*) *ἀκαταπά-*

Digitized by Google

στους BA. ii. 15 (β) *om.* ὅς B𝔎. ii. 19 (?) τούτῳ B𝔎 (omitting καί). ii. 20 (?) κυρίου (omitting ἡμῶν) BK. ii. 22 (?) κυλισμόν BC. iii. 10 (α) ἡμέρα (omitting ἡ) BC.

Readings of B supported by two other uncial MSS.:

2 PETER.

i. 3 (β) διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς BKL. ii. 4 (?) σειροῖς BAC. ii. 12 (α) ἀδικούμενοι BP𝔎. ii. 15 (?) καταλείποντες BA𝔎. ii. 21 (α) ὑποστρέψαι BCP. ii. 22 (α) συμβέβηκεν (omitting δέ) BA𝔎. iii. 7 (α) τῷ αὐτῷ BAP. iii. 9 (β) εἰς ὑμᾶς BCP. iii. 10 (β) οἱ οὐρανοί BAC. (?) εὑρεθήσεται BKP. iii. 16 (β) πάσαις (omitting ταῖς) BAC.

Digitized by Google

EPISTLE OF JUDE

AND

SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

EPISTLE OF JUDE

AND

SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

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 ℵ, 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 uncials ℵABCKLP. They are omitted in the Peshitto, but included in the later Syriac versions, the Philoxenian and Harkleian, here distinguished as *syr*^{p} and *syr*^{h}. 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 τοῖς Θεῷ . . . καὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ, 2 Pet. 1^{2} *om.* τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ, 1^{3} *om.* αὐτοῦ, 1^{4} ὑμῖν, 1^{9} ἁμαρτημάτων, 1^{12} μελήσω, 1^{17} ἀπό, 2^{4} σειραῖς, *ib.* κολαζομένους τηρεῖν, 3^{6} δι' ὅν, 3^{9} ἡμᾶς, 3^{12} τήξεται.

Digitized by Google

ΙΟΥΔΑ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ

2 P. 1. 1 1 Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ
2 P. 1. 17 Ἰακώβου, τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ
2 P. 1. 3, 10 Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς· 2 ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ
2 P. 1. 2, 7 εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.

1. τοις θεφ...και εν Ιησου conj. H (*Sel. Read.* p. 106). ηγαπημενοις AB ℵ, ηγιασμενοις KLP.

Digitized by Google

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ Β

1 Συμεὼν Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ J. 2
Χριστοῦ τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν J. 3, 20
δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ J. 25
Χριστοῦ· 2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη J. 4, J. 2
ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν,
3 ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ
πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν δεδωρημένης διὰ τῆς ἐπι- J. 21
γνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ, J. 1, J. 24
4 δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα
δεδώρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ
φύσεως, ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ J. 16, 18
φθορᾶς. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ σπουδὴν πᾶσαν J. 10, J.
παρεισενέγκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει J. 3, 20
ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν, 6 ἐν
δὲ τῇ γνώσει τὴν ἐγκράτειαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐγκρατείᾳ
τὴν ὑπομονήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ τὴν εὐσέβειαν,
7 ἐν δὲ τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν φιλαδελφίαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ
φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην. 8 ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμῖν ὑπάρ- J. 2, 21
χοντα καὶ πλεονάζοντα οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους J. 12
καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

1. Συμεων ℵ AKLl^{p} syrr. +Treg. Ti. WH.^{m}, Σιμων B vulg. sah. boh. +WH. εις δικαιοσυνην ℵ. του θεου] τ. κυριου ℵ.
2. ημων, WH., ημων. Treg. Ti.
3. παντα BCKLP+Treg.WH., τα παντα ℵ A+Ti. ιδια δοξη και αρετη ℵ ACP 13 vul^{t}. spec. syrr. sah. boh. Ti. Treg. WH.^{m}, δια δοξης και αρετης BKL 31 WH.
4. τιμια και μεγιστα ημιν B syr^{h}. spec. WH., τιμια ημιν και μεγιστα ℵ KL Ti. WH.^{m}, μεγιστα και τιμια ημιν ACP syr^{p}. (sed A syr^{p}. υμιν) 13, 31 + Treg. της εν τω κοσμω εν επιθυμια] την εν τω κοσμω επιθυμιαν ℵ. φθορας. syrr. WH. Ti. Treg., φθορας, Weiss.
5. και αυτο τουτο δε BCKLP, και αυτοι δε A vulg. +, και αυτο δε τουτο ℵ C^{2} syrr., κατ' (pro και) conj. Blass.
8. υπαρχοντα] παροντα A +.

Digitized by Google

2 P. 3. 1, 8, 14, 17 2 P. 1. 5, 10 2 P. 3. 1, 15 2 P. 2. 21 2 P. 3. 2, 2 P. 1. 1, 5

3 Ἀγαπητοι, πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ὑμῖν παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.

3. κοινης ημων] κ. υμων boh., om. ημων KLP+, σωτηριας] add. και ζωης ℵ. γραψαι] γραφειν ℵ.

Digitized by Google

ἐπίγνωσιν. 9 ᾧ γὰρ μὴ πάρεστιν ταυτα, τυφλός ἐστιν
μυωπάζων, λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι J. 4
αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν. 10 διὸ μᾶλλον, ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε
βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι· J. 1, J. 3
ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε· J. 24
11 οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ
εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν J. 7, 21
καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. J. 25
12 Διὸ μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ J. 5
τούτων, καίπερ εἰδότας καὶ ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ J. 5
παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ. 13 δίκαιον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι, ἐφ' ὅσον
εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπο- J. 5
μνήσει, 14 εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ
σκηνώματός μου, καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς
Χριστὸς ἐδήλωσέν μοι. 15 σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἑκάσ-
τοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον τὴν τούτων
μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι. 16 οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις J. 8
ἐξακολουθήσαντες ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου
ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, ἀλλ'
ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος. 17 λαβὼν
γὰρ παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, φωνῆς J. 1, J. 24
ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιᾶσδε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης
Ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν, εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ
εὐδόκησα,—18 καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν
ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντες ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει·
19 καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, ᾧ J. 14
καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν
αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος

9. *αμαρτιων* BCLP+WH., *αμαρτηματων* ℵ AK Ti. Treg. WH^{m}.

10. *σπουδασατε*] *add. ινα δια των καλων υμων εργων* ℵ A syrr. sah. boh. (*sed om. υμων* ℵ)+. *ποιεισθαι*] *ποιεισθε* A, *ποιησθε* syrr. vulg. *cf.* WH. (*App.* p. 103).

12. *μελλησω* ℵ ABCP vulg. sah. boh. +, *ου μελλησω* tol. Cassiod., *ουκ αμελησω* KL syrr. +, *μελησω* Field. *αει υμας* BCKL+, *υμας αει* A vulg., *αει περι τουτων υπομιμνησκειν υμας* ℵ.

12, 13 *om. καιπερ—διεγειρειν υμας* ℵ.

13. *υπομνησει*] *τη υπ.* A ℵ.

14. *καθως και ο κυριος ημων om.* ℵ.

15. *σπουδασω*] *σπουδαζω* ℵ syr^{p}., *σπουδασατε* syr^{h}.

17. *υπο*] *απο* syrr. *ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος μου ουτος εστιν* B WH., *ουτος εστιν ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος* ACKL ℵ sah. (adding *μου* after *αγ.*) Treg. Ti.

18. *τω αγιω ορει* BC+WH. Treg., *τω ορει τω αγιω* ACKLP ℵ+Ti.

Digitized by Google

2 P. 2. 1, 3. 7 4 παρεισεδύησαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι, οἱ
2 P. 1. 9, 2. 3 πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀσε-
2 P. 3. 7, 2 P. 1. 2, 3. 18 βεῖς, τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς
2 P. 2. 2, 7 ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον
2 P. 2. 1 ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι. 5 Ὑπο-
2 P. 1. 12 μνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ὑμᾶς πάντα, ὅτι
2 P. 2. 1 Κύριος ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον
2 P. 2. 1, 3. 2 P. 2. 4 [τοὺς] μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν, 6 ἀγγέλους
2 P. 1. 3, 2. 16, 22, 3. 8 τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολι-
2 P. 2. 4, 9, 3. 7, 10, 12 πόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης
2 P. 2. 6 ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετή-
ρηκεν· 7 ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ
περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις, τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκ-
2 P. 2. 10 πορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέ-
2 P. 2. 6, 1. 11 ρας, πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην
ὑπέχουσαι. 8 Ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι
2 P. 2. 10, 20 σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθε-
τοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. 9 Ὁ δὲ
2 P. 2. 11 Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρι-
νόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος, οὐκ
2 P. 2, 10, 11 ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφη-

4. *παρεισεδυησαν* B WH., *παρεισεδυσαν* ℵACKLP+Ti. Treg. *δεσποτην*] *add.* *θεον* KLP syrr. +.

5. *υμας παντα* ℵ KL 31 syrr. Clem. Theoph. Oecon. +, *υμας απαξ παντα* B, *απαξ παντα* AC² 13 vulg. + Ti. Treg. WH., *απαξ παντας* H. (*Sel. Read.* p. 106). *ὁτι* ℵ AB syr^{h}., *add.* *ὁ* C²KL syr^{p}. *κυριος* ℵ CKL syr^{h}., *Ιησους* AB +, *θεος* C² syr^{p}. Clem. *απαξ λαον* ℵ 68 tol. syrr. boh. (*οτι απαξ Ιησ. λαον*) sah. arm. Did. Cassiod., *λαον απαξ* Clem., *λαον* ABCL Ti. Treg. WH.

6. *ζοφον*] *add.* *αγιων αγγελων* speculum, Luc. cf. H. (*S.R.* p. 106), *αγριων αγγ.* Clem. p. 280. *add.* 'in Tartaro constrictos' Orig.

8. *κυριοτητα*]—*τητας* ℵ Orig.

9. *ο δε Μιχαηλ...οτε* ACKL ℵ, *οτε Μιχ....τοτε* B. *κυριος*] *ὁ θεος* ℵ.

Digitized by Google

ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδιαις ὑμῶν· 20 τοῦτο πρῶτον
γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπι-
λύσεως οὐ γίνεται· 21 οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου
ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεύματος J. 20
ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι.

II

1 Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς J. 5
καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισ- J. 4
άξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας, καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα
αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς J. 4
ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν· 2 καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν J. 5
αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις, δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς J. 4, J. 11
ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται· 3 καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ J. 8,
πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται· οἷς τὸ κρίμα J. 4
ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ J. 4, J 5
νυστάζει. 4 εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτη- J. 6
σάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειροῖς ζόφου ταρ- J. 6
ταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους, J. 6
5 καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ ὄγδοον Νῶε
δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ J. 24
ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας· 6 καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ J. 4, 15, J. 7
Γομόρρας τεφρώσας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν, ὑπό-
δειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς, 7 καὶ δίκαιον J. 7 J. 4
Λὼτ καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ J. 4
ἀναστροφῆς ἐρύσατο,—8 βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ
δίκαιος ἐνκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν
δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν,—9 οἶδεν Κύριος J. 15

20. προφητεια γραφης] γραφη προφητειας syrh. επιλυσεως] επιλυσις syrr.
21. προφητεια ποτε BCKP + WH. Treg., ποτε προφ. ℵ AL Ti. απο θεου BP syrh. boh. WH. Ti., αγιοι θεου ℵ KL syrp. + Treg., αγιοι sah., αγιοι του θ. A, αγιοι απο θ. C.

II 1. εν τω λαω] om. sah.
2. οδος] δοξα A ℵc.
4. σειροις ABC WH. Treg., σιροις ℵ Ti., σειραις KLP vulg. syrr. boh. +. ζοφου] ζοφοις A ℵ. τηρουμενους] κολαζομενους τηρειν A ℵ vulg. syrp. boh. (ex. v. 9 ?).
6. καταστροφη κατεκρινεν] ℵ AC²KL vulg. syrr. + Treg. Ti., κατεκρινεν BC boh. WH., κατεστρεψεν P. ασεβεσιν BP syrr. WH., ασεβειν ℵ ACKL + Treg. Ti.
7. ερυσατο B WH., ερρυσατο ℵ ACKLP Treg. Ti.
8. δικαιος B vg. WH. ὁ δικ. ℵ ACKLP syrr. boh. Treg. Ti.

Digitized by Google

μίας, ἀλλὰ εἶπεν Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος.
2 P. 2. 12 10 Οὗτοι δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφη-
μοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα
ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται. 11 οὐαὶ
2 P. 2. 15 αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν, καὶ τῇ
2 P. 2. 18, 3. 17 πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν, καὶ
2 P. 3. 6, 9 τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο. 12 οὗτοί εἰσιν
2 P. 2. 13 [οἱ] ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευω-
2 P. 2. 17 χούμενοι ἀφόβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες, νεφέλαι
ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι, δέν-
2 P. 1. 8 δρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα δὶς ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζω-
θέντα, 13 κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς
2 P. 2. 17 ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας, ἀστέρες πλανῆται οἷς ὁ ζόφος
2 P. 3. 18 τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται. 14 Ἐπρο-
2 P 1. 19, 3. 2 φήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνὼχ
λέγων Ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ,
2 P. 2. 4, 16 2 P. 3. 7 15 ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλέγξαι πάντας
2 P. 2. 8 τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας
αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν
ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.
2 P. 2. 10; 3. 3 16 Οὗτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι, κατὰ τὰς
ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, καὶ τὸ
2 P. 2. 18 στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες
πρόσωπα ὠφελίας χάριν.

12. *ουτοι εισιν*] *add.* (*ex v.* 16) *γογγυσται—πορευομενοι* ℵ C². *οι εν ταις*] *om. οι* ℵ K vulg. Luc. Theophl. Oecon. + Chase. *αγαπαις* ℵ BKL syrr. sah. boh. +, *απαταις* AC. *υμων*] *αυτων* A vulg. syrᵖ. +. *συνευωχουμενοι, αφοβως* syrr. Treg. WH, *συνευωχ. αφοβως*, Ti. *παραφερομενοι* B.

13. *πλανητες οις ζοφος σκοτους* B.

14. *επροφητευσεν* B¹, *επροεφ.* B², *προεπροφ.* ℵ, *προεφ.* ACKL *al.* *αγιαις μυριασιν*] *μυριασιν αγιων αγγελων* ℵ syrᵖ. sah. arm. +.

15. *παντας τους ασεβεις*] *add. αυτων* KL Ti. (*incuria* ?), *πασαν ψυχην* ℵ syrᵖ. sah. *ασεβειας αυτων*] *om.* ℵ sah. +, [*ασεβειας*] *αυτων* Treg. *σκληρων*] *add. λογων* ℵ C Ti.

Digitized by Google

εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέ- J. 6
ραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν, 10 μάλιστα
δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ J. 7, 8, 16, 18
πορευομένους καὶ κυριότητος καταφρο-
νοῦντας. τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις, δόξας οὐ τρέμου- J. 8
σιν βλασφημοῦντες· 11 ὅπου ἄγγελοι J. 9
ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν
κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ Κυρίῳ βλάσφημον κρίσιν.
12 οὗτοι δέ, ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα γεγεννημένα φυ- J. 10
σικὰ εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν, ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦ-
σιν βλασφημοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν
καὶ φθαρήσονται, 13 ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν
ἀδικίας· ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν,
σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις J. 12
αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν, 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς
ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρ-
τίας, δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, καρδίαν γεγυμ-
νασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, κατάρας τέκνα· 15 κατα- J. 11
λείποντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν,
ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βόσορ
ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν, 16 ἔλεγξιν δὲ J. 15, 22
ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώ-
που φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου
παραφρονίαν. 17 οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι καὶ J. 12
ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι, οἷς

9. πειρασμου] -σμων ℵ + Ti.
10. επιθυμιᾳ] -αις ℵ, -αις CP syrʰ. +. τολμηται αυθαδεις Ti. Weiss, τολμηται, αυθαδεις Treg. WH.
11. παρα κυριῳ ℵ BCKLP syrr. + Ti., om. A +, παρα κυριου minusc. ei versiones plur. Spitta, [παρα κυριῳ] WH. Treg.
12. γεγεννημενα ABCP + WH. Treg., γεγεννημενα ℵ A² KL + Ti. γεγ. φυσ. ℵ ABCP, φυσ. γεγ. KL. και φθαρησονται] καταφθαρ- KL +.
13. αδικουμενοι ℵ BP syrᵖ. + WH., κομιουμενοι ACKL ℵᶜ. boh. spec. syrʰ. + Ti. Treg. απαταις ℵ ACKLP syrʰ. (mg. αγαπαις), WH. Ti., αγαπαις A²B sah. syrᵖ. + Treg. WHᵐ.
14. μοιχαλιδος BCKLP +, μοιχαλιας A ℵ vulg. sah. boh., ακαταπαυστους ℵ CKLP syrr. + Ti. Treg., -παστους AB WH. -παυστου Vulg. +. αμαρτιας] αμαρτιαις ℵ spec.
15. καταλειποντες ℵ AB WH. Ti., καταλιποντες B³CKLP + Treg. WHᵐ. Βοσορ ACKLP ℵᶜ. vulg. boh. syrʰ. seth., Ti. Treg. WHᵐ., Βεωρ B syrᵖ. + WH., Βεωορσορ ℵ. ος ACKLP ℵᶜ syrr. WH., om. B ℵ WHᵐ. ηγαπησεν] ηγαπησαν B WHᵐ.
16. ανθρωπου] ανθρωποις B.
17. και ομιχλαι] νεφελαι (ex Jud. 12) L +, om. και—τετηρηται K. σκοτους add. εις αιωνα (ex Jud. 13) ACLP.

Digitized by Google

2 P. 3. 1; 1. 12
2 P. 3. 2
2 P. 3. 3
2 P. 2. 10

17 Ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· 18 ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν. 19 Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

18. επ' εσχατου ℵ B, οτι επ' εσχ. AC, [οτι] επ' εσχ. Treg., ὁτι εν εσχατῳ KL mg. P sah. χρονου BC, του χρονου ℵ A, χρονῳ KL τῳ χρονῳ P sah., των χρονων boh. *al.* εσονται ℵ BCKLP, ελευσονται ℵ² AC² sah. boh. των ασεβειων] οπισω ασεβειων syrʰ., οπισω ασεβειας syrᵖ.

19. αποδιοριζοντες] *add.* εαυτους C vulg.

Digitized by Google

ὁ ζόφος τοὺ σκότους τετήρηται. 18 ὑπέρ- J. 13
ογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι δελεάζουσιν J. 16
ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις τοὺς ὀλί- J. 7
γως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους, J. 11
19 ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι
ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς· ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται, τούτῳ
δεδούλωται. 20 εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα J. 8
τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος J. 25
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττῶνται,
γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων.
21 κρεῖττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν
τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς
παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς· J. 8
22 συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας, Κύων
ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα, καί Ὗς λουσαμένη J. 6
εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου.

III

1 Ταύτην ἤδη, ἀγαπητοί, δευτέραν ὑμῖν J. 3, 17, 20
γράφω ἐπιστολήν, ἐν αἷς διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπο- J. 3
μνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν, 2 μνησθῆναι J. 5
τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων
προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐν- J. 14, J. 17
τολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος, 3 τοῦτο J. 25
πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχά- J. 18
των τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται
κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευό-

18. ματαιοτητος] ματαιοτης B′, -οτητης B^{3}, μαθηταιοτητος ℵ*. ασελγειαις] ασελγειας P vulg. syrr. boh. +. ολιγως AB ℵ^{c} syrr. vulg. sah. boh., οντως ℵ CKLP+. αποφευγοντας ℵ ABC, αποφυγοντας KLP +.

19. τουτῳ ℵ B sah. boh. + WH. Ti, τουτῳ και ACKLP ℵ^{c}. +, τουτῳ [και] Treg.

20. κυριου BK + WH. Treg., add. ημων ℵ ACLP+Ti. εσχατα] εσχα B *in fine versus.*

21. επιγνουσιν] *add.* εις τα οπισω A ℵ +. υποστρεψαι BCP′+, επιστρεψαι KL+, ανακαμψαι A ℵ. εκ BCKLP, απο A ℵ.

22. συμβεβηκεν ℵ AB, *add.* δε CKLP ℵ^{c}. κυλισμον BC, κυλισμα ℵ AKLP.

III 2. υμων ℵ ABCKLP, ημων *minusc. al.*

3. εσχατων ℵ ABC^{2}, εσχατου KLP+, εσχατῳ C. εν εμπαιγμονῃ ℵ ABCP, (*om.* εν CP), *om.* KL.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

μενοι 4 καὶ λέγοντες Ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; ἀφ' ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. 5 λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας ὅτι οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ· 6 δι' ὧν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο· 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ J. 11
λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς J. 6, J. 7
ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν J. 6, J. 4
ἀνθρώπων. 8 Ἓν δὲ τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς,
ἀγαπητοί, ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια J. 8, 17, 20
ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία. 9 οὐ βραδύνει
Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὥς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἡγοῦνται,
ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπο-
λέσθαι ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι. 10 Ἥξει J. 11
δὲ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης, ἐν ᾗ οἱ οὐρανοὶ J. 6
ῥοιζηδὸν παρελεύσονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθή-
σεται, καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται.
11 Τούτων οὖν πάντων λυομένων ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρ-
χειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ἁγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις
12 προσδοκῶντας καὶ σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς J. 21
τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, δι' ἣν οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι J. 6
λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται. 13 καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα
αὐτοῦ προσδοκῶμεν, ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ. J. 21

5. *συνεστωσα* ACLP ℵ^{c}, *συνεστωσης* B, *-στωσαι* K, *-στωτα* ℵ WH^{m}.
6. *δι' ὧν*] *δι' ὃν* 31.
7. *τῳ αυτῳ* ABP vulg. sah. boh. WH. Ti., *τῳ αυτου* ℵ CKL syrr. Treg.
8. *και χιλια ετη*] *om.* ℵ.
9. *εις υμας* BCP boh. WH. Treg., *δι υμας* ℵ A vulg. sah. syrr. +Ti., *εις ημας* KL.
10. *ημερα* BC Ti. Treg. WH., *η ημερα* ℵ AKLP. *κλεπτης* ℵ ABP+, *κλ. εν νυκτι* CKL (*ex* 1 Th. v. 2). *οι ουρανοι* ABC WH. Treg., *om. οι* ℵ KL. Ti., *add. μεν* ℵ 13. *ροιζηδον* BCLP, *ρυζηδον* ℵ AK, *ρυζιδον vel ρυζιδον vel ριζηδον al.* *λυθησεται* ℵ BCP, *λυθησονται* AKL. *ευρεθησεται* ℵ BKP syr^{p}. (Sah. 'non invenientur'), *κατακαησεται* AL syr^{h}. Ti., *καυθησεται vel κατακαυθησονται al.*, *αφανισθησονται* C, *om. και γη—ευρεθησεται* vulg., *om. ευρεθησεται* spec., *ex ρυησεται corr. prius* H. (*S.R.* p. 103).
11. *τουτων ουν* ℵ AKL syr^{p}. vulg. boh. Ti. Treg., *τουτων ουτως* B+WH., *τουτων δε ουτως* CP. *υμας* ACKL ℵ^{c} syrr. Ti. Treg., *ημας* ℵ, *om.* B, [*υμας*] WH.
12. *τηκεται* ℵ ABKL, *τακησεται* C, *τακησονται* P, *corr. ex τηξεται prius* H. (*S.R.* p. 103).
13. *γην καινην* BCKLP WH. Treg., *κ. γ.* ℵ ATi. *κατα*] *και* A sah. +. *το επαγγελμα* BCKLP syr^{p}. WH. Treg., *τα επαγγελματα* ℵ A sah. boh. syr^{h}. +Ti.

Digitized by Google

2 P. 3. 17 20 Ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς
2 P. 2. 21; 1. 1, 5 τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσ-
2 P. 1. 7 ευχόμενοι, 21 ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε
2. P. 3. 12, 13, 14 προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
2 P. 1. 3, 11 Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 22 Καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγ-
2 P. 2. 16 χετε διακρινομένους, 23 οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς
2 P. 3. 7 ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ
2 P. 2. 13, 3. 14 τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.

2 P. 3. 17, 2. 5 2 P. 1. 10 24 Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπταίστους
2 P. 1. 17 καὶ στῆσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώ-
2 P. 3. 14; 1. 1 μους ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει, 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν
2 P. 3. 18 διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δόξα μεγα-
2 P. 3. 18 λωσύνη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος
καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.

21. *τηρησατε*] *τηρησωμεν* BC.

22. *ελεγχετε* AC vulg. boh. arm. +, *ελεατε* ℵ BC^3, *ελεειτε* KLP +. *διακρινομενους* ℵ ABC, *διακρινομενοι* KLP.

23. *ους δε* (1) ℵ ACKLP, *om.* B. *σωζετε* ℵ ABC, *εν φοβῳ σωζετε* KLP. *ους δε* (2) *ελεατε εν φοβῳ* ℵ AB., *om.* KLP., *εν φοβῳ* C.

24. *υμας* ℵ BCL vulg. syrr. boh., *ημας* A syrp*., *αυτους* KP. *απταιστους*] *add. και ασπιλους* C. *αμωμους*] *αμεμπτους* A.

25. *μονῳ*] *add. σοφῳ* KLP +. *δια* I.X. *του κυριου ημων*] *om.* KP. *εις παντας*] *εις* ℵ.

Digitized by Google

14 Διό, ἀγαπητοί, ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες σπουδά- J. 17, J. 21
σατε ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ εὑρεθῆναι ἐν J. 23, J. 24
εἰρήνῃ, 15 καὶ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σω- J. 2, J. 3, 25
τηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε, καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς
Παῦλος κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν ἔγραψεν
ὑμῖν, 16 ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς λαλῶν ἐν
αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων, ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσνόητά τινα, ἃ
οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι στρεβλοῦσιν ὡς καὶ τὰς
λοιπὰς γραφὰς πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν. J. 3

17 Ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, προγινώσκοντες φυ- J. 20
λάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συν- J. 24, J. 11
απαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ, 18 αὐξά- J. 4
νετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ
σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν J. 24, J. 25
καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος. J. 25

14. αμωμητοι] αμωμοι A.
16. πασαις ABC WH. Treg., *add.* ταις ℵ KLP Ti. αυταις] αυτοις A. αις ℵ AB, οις CKLP.
18. αυξανετε] αυξανεσθε CP. *fin.* αμην ℵ ACKLP, *om.* B WH. Ti, [αμην] Treg.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

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* 'I. X., 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. 4^5). There is no opposition between *δουλεία* and *ἐλευθερία* 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.

ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου.] Cf. Tit. 1^1 *δοῦλος Θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος δὲ* 'I. X. See Introduction on the Author.

τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς.] On the readings see Introduction on the Text. For the phrase *Θεὸς πατήρ* see Hort's note on 1 P. 1^2. The easier reading of some MSS., *ἡγιασμένοις* for *ἠγαπημένοις*, is probably derived from 1 Cor. 1^2 *ἡγιασμένοις ἐν* X. 'I. There is no precise parallel either for *ἐν Θεῷ ἠγ.* 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* X. 'I. Rom. 8^1, *τοὺς ὄντας ἐν Κυρίῳ ib.* 16^{11}, *ἄνθρωπος ἐν Χριστῷ* 2 Cor. 12^2, *εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθημεν* Gal. 3^{27}, *τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν* X. 'I. Phil. 1^1, *δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ* Gal. 2^{17}, *ἀγάπης τῆς ἐν* X. 'I. 1 Tim. 1^{14}, *σωτηρίας τῆς ἐν* X. 'I. 2 Tim. 2^{10}. 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. 1^1 *Παῦλος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ κ. Κυρίῳ* 'I. X., cf. 1 Joh. 4^{16} *ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μένων ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ μένει καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ*, Joh. 17^{21} *ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν, καθὼς σύ, Πατήρ, ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὦσιν*, below ver. 25 *μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ* 'I. X. There would therefore have been no difficulty in the expression *ἐν Θ. Π. καὶ* 'I. X. *τετηρημένοις*, cf. Joh. 17^{11} *πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι...Ὅτε ἤμην*

Digitized by Google

μετ' αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ., also ver. 15. But it is different with ἠγαπημένοις. Lightfoot, commenting on Col. 3^{12} ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι, 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 ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν, and 2 Th. 2^{13}, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Κυρίου. Cf. 2 Cor. 13^{13}, Rom. 5^5, 1 Joh. $4^{9.\,10.\,19}$, 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.' Ἠγαπημένοι is used of the objects of *man's* love in Clem. *Hom.* ix. 5 τῶν αὐτοῖς ἠγαπημένων τοὺς τάφους ναοῖς τιμῶσιν, and the cognate ἀγαπητοί 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 Θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις). If, therefore, we are to retain the reading, I am disposed to interpret it as equivalent to ἀδελφοί, 'beloved by us in the Father,' *i.e.* 'beloved with φιλαδελφία as children of God,' but I think that Hort is right in considering that ἐν has shifted its place in the text. See below.

The verb τηρέω, 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 ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε, the latter in ver. 6 εἰς κρίσιν δεσμοῖς τετήρηκεν. 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. 11^9 ἐμαυτὸν ὑμῖν ἐτήρησα, Athanas I. 393 A τὴν ἀκρόασιν 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 δέ ἐστιν ὁ κύριος, ὃς στηρίξει ὑμᾶς καὶ φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου. Below (ver. 24) it is said of the Father that He is able φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπταίστους and so in Rom. 16^{25} we read (μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ) τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς 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^{26} ἀγαπώμενος τῷ Θεῷ ἦν, and my note on James 3^7 δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ. Others suppose the dat. to be governed by the ἐν which precedes Θεῷ, but the interposed ἠγαπημένοις 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 ἐν should be omitted before Θεῷ and inserted before Ἰησοῦ, 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. 1^5 τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν.

Digitized by Google

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^{37}, 10^{15}, 23^{5}, 2 Chron. 2^{11}, 9^{8}, Is. 43^{4}, Hos. 2^{23} (LXX. ; cf. Rom. 9^{25}), Mal. 1^{2}; comp. Pss. Sol. 9^{16}.

Hence [δ] ἠγαπημένος becomes a title—or of the nature of a title—for the people : Deut. 32^{15}, $33^{3\ 12\ 26}$, 2 Chron. 20^{7}, Ps. 28^{6}(?), Is. 5^{1}, 44^{2}, Bar. 3^{37}.

Further, it is used in the singular of certain typical Israelites, Abraham (Dan. 3^{35}, Th. and LXX.), Moses (Ecclus. 45^{1}), Samuel (Ecclus. 46^{13}), Solomon (Neh. 13^{26}) ; 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^{11}) it is in *the plural* used of a body of Israelites as opposed to heathen—μὴ τοῖς ματαίοις οἱ ματαιόφρονες εὐλογησάτωσαν ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ἠγαπημένων σου ἀπωλείᾳ. Hence like such words as ἅγιος, ἐκλεκτός, which also are specially applied to the Messiah, it has a particular application to Israel and may be said to 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 ἠγαπημένοι is used I think confirm this view of the word. (*a*) In 1 Thess. 1^{4} (εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγ. ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν) it is brought into close relation to the divine ἐκλογή, the latter word being pre-eminently one used to express Israel's relation to Jehovah (see Hort on 1 Pet. 1^{1}, 2^{4} [Messianic use]^{9}). (*b*) 2 Thess. 2^{13} (ἀδ. ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Κυρίου, ὅτι εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κ.τ.λ.), where WH give the words as a quotation from Deut. 33^{12}. Here also we have the O.T. idea of God's choice—for the word εἵλατο in reference to Israel, see Deut. 26^{18}. (*c*) Col. 3^{12} (ἐνδύσασθε οὖν ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι). St. Paul had just said οὐκ ἔνι Ἕλλην καὶ Ἰουδαῖος : then he uses of the gentile Colossians three words specially connected with Israel—ἐκλεκτοί (the same idea as in 1 and 2 Thess.), ἅγιοι, ἠγαπημένοι. The use of ἠγαπημένος (and -οι) 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. Lect., p. 7.

I cannot help thinking that, following on these words, the words τοῖς...Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις naturally express the thought—'who have been kept for Jesus Christ,' the reference being to these Gentiles having been reserved as a λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν. Note especially the *perfect* participle, and compare the whole phrase κληρονομίαν...τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς (1 Pet. 1^{4} f. 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^{1} (to the Theocracy), 1 Pet. 1^{1} (to Gentiles).

Such a reference I find in the following verse περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας—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 that, 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.* 3*b*.

For the phrase ἐν [τῷ] Θεῷ compare Ps. 43^{8} ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ἐπαινεσθησόμεθα, 59^{14} ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ποιήσομεν δύναμιν. 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 ἐκκλησίᾳ ἠγαπημένῃ καὶ πεφωτισμένῃ ἐν θελήματι τοῦ θελήσαντος τὰ πάντα ἃ ἔστιν—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.'

Digitized by Google

I quite agree with all that is here said on the application of ἠγαπημένοις 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 ἠγαπημένοις 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 πεφωτισμένῃ after ἠγαπημένῃ, and the use of ἐν θελήματι 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. 2^{7-9}, 1 Cor. 9^{5}), 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 outworn, was at least of less pressing importance at the time.

κλητοῖς is here the substantive of which ἠγαπημένοις and τετηρημένοις are predicated. We find the same use in Apoc. 17^{14} (νικήσουσιν) οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ κλητοὶ κ. ἐκλεκτοὶ κ. πιστοί, in St. Paul's epistles, as in Rom. 1^{6} ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς, κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. 1^{24} κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον . . . αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς . . Χριστὸν Θεοῦ δύναμιν. The calling is sometimes specially defined, as in Rom. $1.^{1}$ Παῦλος κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, *ib.* 1^{7} κλητοῖς ἁγίοις. At other times its nature is further explained, as in Rom. 8^{28} τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν, 1 Cor. 1^{26} βλέπετε τὴν κλῆσιν ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα . . . ἀλλὰ τὰ μωρὰ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεός, Eph. 1^{18} εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, 2 Tim. 1^{9} Θεοῦ τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγίᾳ, Heb. 3^{1} κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι. In Matt. 22^{14} a distinction is made between calling and election (πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί) but Lightfoot (Col. 3^{12}) 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. 4^{21}, Mk. 1^{20}) 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. 1^{1} Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοῖς: '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 ἐκλεκτός never stands at the beginning of St. Paul's Epistles, as it does here: . . . his corresponding word is

Digitized by Google

κλητός and he often uses καλέω 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^{37}) 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}, $43^{1.\ 7}$. 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^{7} *τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*, and 1 Pet. 2^{9} *ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα . . . λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν*. 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 *χαίρειν* James 1^{1}, and Hort's excellent note on 1 P. 1^{2} *χάρις . . . πληθυνθείη*. We find *ἔλεος* and *εἰρήνη* joined in Gal. 6^{16}, and with the addition of *χάρις* in 1 Tim. 1^{2}, 2 Tim. 1^{2}, 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 *πληθυνθείη* occurs in the Salutation both of 1 Pet. and 2 Pet. and in Dan. 6^{25} (in the letter of Darius) *εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη*, cf. 1 Thess. 3^{12} *ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ κύριος πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς ἀλλήλους*. *Ἀγάπη* (= the love of God) occurs also in the final salutation of 2 Cor. *ἡ χάρις τ. κυρίου Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and in Eph. *εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰ. Χ.* Cf. 1 Joh. 3^{1} *ἴδετε ποταπὴν ἀγάπην δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ἵνα τέκνα Θεοῦ κληθῶμεν*, 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. 13^{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 Smyrnaeans (*c.* 156 A.D.) giving an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, *ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. πληθυνθείη*. The thought of *ἔλεος* and *ἀγάπη* recurs again in ver. 21.

3. **ἀγαπητοί** occurs in vv. 17 and 20, also in 2 P. $3^{1.\ 8.\ 14.\ 17}$, 1 Pet. 2^{11}, 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 *ἀδελφοί*, especially in James. The *ἀγάπη* of ver. 2 leads on to the *ἀγαπητοί* here. They are themselves *ἀγαπητοί* because the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts.

πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος.] For *πᾶσαν* see my n. on James 1^{2}, and cf. 2 Pet. 1^{5} *σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες*, 1^{15} *σπουδάσω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς*

Digitized by Google

μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, also Isocr. *Orat.* v. p. 91 b *πᾶσαν τὴν σπουδὴν περὶ τούτου ποιεῖσθαι*, Plato, *Euthyd.* 304 E *περὶ οὐδενὸς ἀξίων ἀναξίαν 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 θέλων γράφειν . . . γράφειν ἐσπούδασα.*

κοινῆς σωτηρίας.] Cf. n. on 2 P. 1^1 *ἰσότιμον*, Tit. 1^4 *κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν*, Ign. *Eph.* 1 *ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ ἐλπίδος* with Lightfoot's n., Jos. *Ant.* 10. 1. 3 (Hezekiah besought Isaiah to offer sacrifice) *ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας*. Bede explains as follows: 'omnium 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 ἔσχον γράψαι.] Cf. Luke 14^{18} *ἔχω ἀνάγκην ἰδεῖν αὐτόν*, Heb. 7^{27}, *al.*, also Plut. *Cato Mi.* 24 *ἀνάγκην ἔσχεν ἐκβαλεῖν ἀσχημονοῦσαν τὴν γυναῖκα*. There is a similar combination of *γράφειν* and *γράψαι* in 3 Joh. 13. The aor. *γράψαι*, contrasted with the preceding pres. *γράφειν*, 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. $3^{17\text{-}19}$, $33^{6\text{-}9}$).

ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.] 'to contend *for* the faith,' almost equivalent to the *ἀγώνισαι περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας* in Sir. 4^{28}, see 1 Tim. 6^{12} *ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως*, and *εἰς ὃ κοπιῶ ἀγωνιζόμενος* Col. 1^{29}. We may compare *ἐπαμύνειν*, *ἐπαναπαύειν νόμῳ* Rom. 2^{17}. Bengel connects this with the parallel phrase *ἐποικοδομοῦντες 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 *ἐπαγ.* is rare in this sense (1): it is found in Plut. *Mor.* 1075 D *ἐπαγωνιζόμενος ὁ Κλεάνθης τῇ ἐκπυρώσει*. Stephanus quotes Maximus *Schol. in Dion. Areop.* p. 54 *ταύτῃ τῇ δόξῃ ἐπαγωνιεῖται*. Philo (M. 2. 495) uses it in the same sense with the dative understood, *ἐπαγωνίζομενος* (*τῷ ἀΐδιον εἶναι τὸν κόσμον*) *ὁ Κριτόλαος ἐχρῆτο καὶ τοιούτῳ λόγῳ*, *ib.* p. 228 *fin.* (2) Closely connected with this sense is that which we find in Plut. *V.* 65 C. *ἑτέροις ἐπαγωνίζονται τεκμηρίοις* 'lay stress upon other proofs.' Aristid. *τέχνη ῥητορική* p. 658 (D. vol. ii. p. 756) *κατὰ λέξιν γίνεται βραχύτης, ὅταν τις . . . μὴ ἐπαγωνίζηται τῇ λέξει . . . ὅταν τις μὴ φιλοτιμῆται πρὸς τὴν λέξιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὰ*

Digitized by Google

πράγματα ἀποβλέπῃ. (3) Libanius (*Arg. in Androt.* p. 587 δεύτερος ὁ Διόδωρος ἐπαγωνίζεται 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 ἔδωκε τῷ Πτολέμωνι ὁ Ἡρώδης καὶ τὸ μὴ παρελθεῖν ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰς λόγου ἐπίδειξιν μηδ' ἐπαγωνίσασθαι οἱ (ut post eum ad declamandum non veniret, nec post eum dicere auderet), Sext. Emp. *Math.* iii. 327 ἤρκει μὲν ἴσως ἐν τούτοις περατοῦν τ. ἀντίρρησιν, ὅμως δὲ ἐπαγωνιζόμενοι (ulterius decernentes) πειρασόμεθα διδάσκειν, Dion. Hal. *Ars Rhet.* vii. 6 'urge those who have taken few prizes' ὅτι δεῖ μὴ τούτοις ἀρκεῖσθαι ἀλλὰ . . . ἐπαγωνίσασθαι καὶ προσλαβεῖν ἑτέρους. (4) 'Fighting against,' so translated in Plut. *V.* 187 Φάβιος, ὥσπερ ἀθλητὴς ἀγαθὸς ἐπαγωνιζόμενος τῷ Ἀννίβᾳ, *ib.* 486 Κίμων ὥσπερ ἀθλητὴς δεινὸς δύο καθῃρηκὼς ἀγωνίσματα . . . ἐπηγωνίσατο ταῖς νίκαις by L. and S. but probably to be understood as (3) 'followed up.'

τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.] The word πίστις here 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} ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτε νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἣν ποτε ἐπόρθει, also Gal. 3^{23}, Phil. 1^{27} συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, where see Lightfoot, Acts 6^{7}. In the same way ἐλπίς is used in a concrete sense for the object of hope (as in Col. 1^{5} τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν, 1 Tim. 1^{1} Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, Tit. 2^{13} προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα), and φόβος for the object of fear, Rom. 13^{3}, 1 P. 3^{14}.

ἅπαξ.] Used here in its classical sense 'once for all,' as below v. 5, and in Heb. 6^{4} τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, *ib.* $9^{26, 27}$, 10^{2}, 1 P. 3^{18}. This excludes the novelties of the libertines, cf. Gal. 1^{9}. The later sense 'on one occasion' is found in 2 Cor. 11^{25} ἅπαξ ἐλιθάσθην, 1 Th. 2^{18} καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δὶς ἠθελήσαμεν ἐλθεῖν.

παραδοθείσῃ.] Cf. Philo M. 1. 387 πιστεύει τοῖς ἅπαξ παραδοθεῖσι, 2 P. 2^{21}. The Christian tradition is constantly referred to by the Fathers, as by Clem. Al. *Str.* vii. where we read of ἡ ἀληθὴς 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} κάθως παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε, 2 Th. 2^{15}, 1 Tim. 6^{20} τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον. 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.

τοῖς ἁγίοις.] Used generally of Christians who were consecrated and called to be holy, as in 1 Cor. 2, Phil. 1^{1}, where see Lightfoot. The word contains an appeal to the brethren to stand fast against the teaching and practice of the libertines.

4. **παρεισεδύησαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι.**] For the form, which is found in B and adopted by WH, Veitch cites διεκδυῆναι in Hippocr. i. 601, and compares ἐφύην, ἐρρύην. The aor. is here used with the perfect force, as in v. 11 ἐπορεύθησαν, *etc.*, cf. Blass *Gr.* p. 199, my ed. of St. James. p. ccii, and Dr. Weymouth there cited. The contrary view is maintained by Winer, but corrected in Moulton's n. p. 345. The verb

Digitized by Google

occurs in Demades 178 ἄδικος παρεισδύνων λόγος εἰς τὰς τῶν δικαστῶν γνώμας οὐκ ἐᾷ συνορᾶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, Clem. Al. p. 659 ὅπως εἰς τὴν τῶν αἰνιγμάτων ἔννοιαν ἡ ζήτησις παρεισδύουσα ἐπὶ τὴν εὕρεσιν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀναδράμῃ, D. Laert. ii. 142 λαθραίως παρεισδὺς εἰς τὴν πατρίδα, Plut. *M.* p. 216 B τὰ ἀρχαῖα νόμιμα ἐκλυόμενα ἐώρα, ἄλλα δὲ παρεισδυόμενα μοχθηρά, other exx. in Wetst. The noun παρείσδυσις occurs in Barn. 2^{10}, 4^{9} ἀντιστῶμεν ἵνα μὴ σχῇ παρείσδυσιν ὁ μέλας, Clem. Al. p. 189 ἀκροσφαλὴς ἡ τοῦ οἴνου παρείσδυσις. Similar compounds are παρεισφέρω in 2 P. 1^{5}, παρεισάγω in 2 P. 2^{1}, παρείσακτος in Gal. 2^{4} διὰ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ὑμῶν, Rom. 5^{20}, 2 Macc. 8^{1} παρεισπορευόμενοι λεληθότως εἰς τὰς κώμας, so παρεισέρπω, παρεισπέμπω, παρεισπίπτω. The earliest prophecy of such seducers comes from the lips of Jesus Himself Mt. 7^{15} προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασι προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δέ εἰσι λύκοι ἅρπαγες, cf. Acts $20^{29, 30}$ and Introduction on the Early Heresies.

τινες ἄνθρωποι.] For the position of the indefinite τις see Acts 3^{2} καί τις ἀνὴρ χωλὸς...ἐβαστάζετο, 14^{8}, 15^{1}, $17^{6, 34}$, 1 Tim. 5^{24} τινῶν ἀνθρώπων αἱ ἁμαρτίαι πρόδηλοί εἰσιν: and for pleonastic ἄνθρωπος Lk. 15^{4} τίς ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πρόβατα κ.τ.λ. Mt. 7^{9}, 18^{12}, Jn. 5^{5}. [For τινες, hinting at a party who are yet well known, compare 2 Cor. 10^{12}, Gal. 1^{7}. C. Compare also Gal. 2^{12} πρὸ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, 2 P. 3^{9} ὥς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἡγοῦνται.] It has often a contemptuous signification.

οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα.] Cf. 2 P. 2^{3} οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ. Clem. Al. *Adumbr. in ep. Judae* translates 'homines impii qui olim...praedestinati erant in judicium...non ut fiant impii; sed exsistentes 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 οἱ προγ. is in apposition to τινες ἄνθρωποι, cf. Gal. 1^{7} with Lightfoot's n., Lk. 18^{9} εἶπεν δὲ πρός τινας τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς. For προγ. cf. Rom. 15^{4} ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη. Bp. Lightfoot in his note on Gal. 3^{1} οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰ. Χ. προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος seems to give to the word here the same sense 'placard' which it bears there, quoting in support Demosth. 1151 τοὺς πρυτάνεις προγράφειν αὐτῷ τὴν κρίσιν ἐπὶ δύο ἡμέρας 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. 32^{32}, Isa. 4^{3} οἱ γραφέντες εἰς ζωήν, Dan. 12^{1}, 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 'lately'; 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 ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ in ver. 14.

Digitized by Google

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 *εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν*. By 'this' Spitta understands 'that judgment which I am now about to declare,' *i.e.*, the condemnation contained in the word *ἀσεβεῖς* used by some ancient writer. Zahn however remarks that *οὗτος* usually refers to what precedes, and he would take *τοῦτο* here (with Hofmann) as referring to *παρεισεδύησαν*. I agree that the classical distinction between the prospective use of *ὅδε* and *τοιόσδε*, and the retrospective use of *οὗτος* and *τοιοῦτος* prevails also in the N.T., as in the *τάδε λέγει* of Apoc. $2^{1.\ 8.\ 12.\ 18}$. $3^{1.\ 7.\ 14}$ contrasted with the *μετὰ ταῦτα* of Apoc. 4^1, $7^{1.\ 9}$, 15^5, 18^1, 19^1, and the solitary instance of *τοιόσδε* in 2 P. 1^{17} (where *φωνῆς τοιᾶσδε* is explained by the following *ὁ υἱός μου οὗτός ἐστιν*), as contrasted with the common retrospective use of *τοιοῦτος*. Οὗτος 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. 6^3 *οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε ὃ ἐποίησεν Δαυείδ*; Phil. 2^5 *τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ*, or by a conjunction such as *ἵνα* (Lk. 1^{43}) or *ὅτι* (Lk. 10^{11}), or *εἰ* (1 P. 2^{19} *τοῦτο χάρις εἰ*), or *μή* (2 Cor. 8^{20} *στελλόμενοι τοῦτο μή τις*), or what approaches more nearly to the use here, by a verb or noun in apposition as Lk. 3^{20} *προσέθηκεν καὶ τοῦτο, κατέκλεισεν*, *ib.* 12^{18} *τοῦτο ποιήσω, καθελῶ*, 1 Th. 4^3 *τοῦτό ἐστιν θέλημα Θεοῦ ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ὑμῶν*, Lk. 2^{12} *τοῦτο ὑμῖν σημεῖον, εὑρήσετε βρέφος*, Rom. 14^{18} *τοῦτο κρίνατε, τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα*, 2 Cor. 2^1 *ἔκρινα τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ ἐλθεῖν*. None of these is quite like our text, where every reader naturally looks *back* for an explanation of *τοῦτο*. I think however *παρεισεδύησαν* 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 *παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι* 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. 2^3, 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 οὐρανῶν ὅτι ἀπειθοῦντες ἀπειθήσετε αὐτῷ* (the Messiah) *καὶ ἀσεβοῦντες ἀσεβήσετε εἰς αὐτόν*, *ib. Levi* 14 *ἔγνων ἀπὸ γραφῆς Ἐνὼχ ὅτι ἐπὶ τέλος ἀσεβήσετε, ἐπὶ Κύριον χεῖρας ἐπιβάλλοντες ἐν πάσῃ κακίᾳ*, *Apoc. Baruch.* 24^1 'aperientur libri in quibus scripta sunt peccata omnium qui

Digitized by Google

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.'

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

τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν.] With this we may compare 1 P. 2^{16} *μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν*, 2 P. 2^{19}, *ἐλευθερίαν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι*, 3^{16} *δυσνόητά τινα, ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς στρεβλοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν*, Rom. $3^{1.2.5-8}$. (If man is justified by free grace and not by works, then works are unnecessary) *ib.* $6^{1.15}$, 8^{21}, 1 Cor. 6^{12}, 10^{23} foll., Joh. 8^{32-36}, Gal. 5^{13} *ὑμεῖς ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε· μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί.* For *μετατιθέντες* see Gal. 1^{6}, for *ἀσέλγειαν* 2 P. 2^{2} *πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις*, *ib.* $2^{7.18}$, 1 P. 4^{3}, and Lightfoot on Gal. 5^{19} 'A man may be *ἀκάθαρτος* and hide his sin: he does not become *ἀσελγής* until he shocks public decency. In classical Greek the word *ἀσέλγεια* generally signifies insolence or violence towards another...In the later language the prominent idea is sensuality...cp. Polyb. 37. 2 *πολλὴ δέ τις ἀσέλγεια καὶ περὶ τὰς σωματικὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῷ συνεξηκολούθει.* Thus it has much the same range of meaning as *ὕβρις*.' 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 κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.] So 2 P. 2^{1} *τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι.* On the denial of God and Christ see Mt. 10^{33} *ὅστις ἂν ἀρνήσηταί με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι κἀγὼ αὐτὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου*, *ib.* 26^{70} (Peter's denial), 1 Joh. 2^{22} *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν*, Tit. 1^{16} *Θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται, βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι*, 1 Tim. 5^{8} *τὴν πίστιν ἤρνηται.* 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^{2}, 45^{2}, 46^{7}, 48^{10} '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 δεσπότην* to be understood of the Son, (2) what is the force of *ἀρνεῖσθαι*? The objection to understanding *δεσπότης* of our Lord is that in every other passage in the N.T., where *δεσπότης* 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 δεσπότην*.[1] It seems to me a forced explanation to say that the phrase *μόνος δεσπότης* 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 *δεσπόσυνοι*, to denote the kinsfolk of Jesus, by Julius Africanus (lived at Emmaus about 200 A.D.) *ap.* Euseb. *H.E.* i. 7, proves that the word *δεσπότης* 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.

Digitized by Google

of the one Master in heaven. Again *μόνος* is elsewhere used of the Father only, as in Joh. 5[44] *τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε*, 17[3] *ἵνα γινώσκωσίν σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν*, Rom. 16[27] *μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 1 Tim. 1[17] *τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων . . . μόνῳ Θεῷ τιμὴ κ. δόξα*, *ib.* 6[15, 16] *ὁ μακάριος κ. μόνος δυνάστης, ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν*, and by Jude himself, below 25 *μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰ. Χ., τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δόξα*. Wetst. quotes several passages in which Josephus speaks of God as *ὁ 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. 2[13] *προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χ. Ἰ. ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἵνα λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς*, where also I should take *τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ* to refer to the Father. Other examples of the same kind are Eph. 5[5] *οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ* (where Alf. notes 'We cannot safely say here that the same Person is intended by Χ. 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) *Θεός* is so frequently anarthrous that it is not safe to ground any such inference on its use here'), 2 Th. 1[12] *ὅπως ἐνδοξασθῇ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; 1 Tim. 5[21] (cf. 2 Tim. 4[1]) *διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων*, which Chrysostom explains *μάρτυρα καλῶ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ*; 2 P. 1[1] *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ 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 τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ Κύριον ἀρνουμένου*. 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. 1[16]; but it is more naturally taken as explicit, as in 1 Joh. 2[22], where Westcott notes that a common gnostic theory was that '"the Aeon 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 *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην* might also refer to the heresy attributed to Cerinthus by Hippolytus (*Haer.* vii. 33, x. 21) *οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου θεοῦ τὸν κόσμον γεγονέναι ἠθέλησεν ἀλλ' ὑπὸ δυνάμεώς τινος ἀγγελικῆς*, and Irenaeus (*Haer.* i. 26). See Introduction on Early Heresies.

5. *ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ὑμᾶς πάντα.*][1] Cf. 2 P. 1[12] *διὸ*

[1] On the readings see Introduction.

Digitized by Google

μελλήσω ὑμᾶς ἀεὶ ὑπομιμνήσκειν καίπερ εἰδότας, *ib.* 1[13] διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, *ib.* 3[1] διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν, Rom. 15[14] πέπεισμαι δὲ ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοί ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πεπληρωμένοι πάσης τῆς γνώσεως . . . τολμηροτέρως δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἀπὸ μέρους ὡς ἐπαναμιμνήσκων ὑμᾶς. The word εἰδότας justifies ὑπομνῆσαι: 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 οὗτοι (the Libertines) forbids such an interpretation. If we read ἅπαξ πάντα with some MSS., it suggests something of anxiety and upbraiding, which may be compared with the tone of St. Paul in writing to the Galatians. See, however, the following note for the position of ἅπαξ. Instead of πάντα some MSS. have τοῦτο. The former finds some support in Enoch 1[2] 'I heard every thing from the angels,' 25[2] 'I should like to know about every thing,' *Secrets of En.* 40[1, 2] 'I know all things from the lips of the Lord...I know all things and have written all things in the books,' 61[2] (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 commonere.'[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 ἅπαξ with σώσας, 'ita clamantes ad se de afflictione Aegyptiae primo salvavit humiles, ut secundo murmurantes contra se in eremo prosterneret superbos . . . Meminerimus illum sic per aquas baptismi salvare credentes, ut etiam post baptismum humilem in nobis requirat vitam.'

ὅτι Κύριος, ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας, τὸ δεύτερον [τοὺς] μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν.] For text see Introduction on Readings. Clement in his *Adumbrationes* gives the paraphrase 'Quoniam Dominus Deus semel populum de terra Aegypti liberans deinceps eos qui non crediderunt perdidit' 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. 49[10], says that it does not refer to Judah, but to Jesus τὸν καὶ τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγαγόντα, 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[4, 9], Heb. 11[26]. Clem. Al. p. 133 says (of Exod. 23[20]) ὁ μυστικὸς ἐκεῖνος 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 to prepare for the Coming Kingdom which precede 2 P. 1[12], 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.

Digitized by Google

Ἰησοῦς is recognized by Jerome (*Jovin.* 1. 12) but explained by him of Joshua. With this we may compare Sir. 46[1] foll. *κραταιὸς ἐν πολέμῳ Ἰησοῦς Ναυῆ...ὃς ἐγένετο κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μέγας ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ ἐκλεκτῶν 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 εἰσήγαγε τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν; ἤδη ποτὲ νοήσατε ὅτι ὁ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ ἐπονομασθεὶς Ἰησοῦς, πρότερον Αὐσῆς καλούμενος* (see Numb. 13[16]), *ib.* 106, 132, Clem. Al. 134, Lactant. *Inst.* 4. 17 Christi figuram gerebat ille Jesus; qui cum primum Auses vocaretur, Moyses futura praesentiens jussit eum Jesum vocari; other reff. 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[11. 12], Pss. 78, 95, 106, Sir. 16[7-10], Heb. 3[16-19], and 1 Cor. 10[1-10].

τὸ δεύτερον has given rise to much discussion. If we place *ἅπαξ* before *λαόν* with Sin., or before *ἐκ γῆς* with Clem. Al. p. 280 (*ὁ Θεὸς ἅπαξ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου λαὸν σώσας, τὸ δεύτερον...ἀπώλεσεν*), we might then regard it as contrasting the preceding *saving* with the following *destruction*. I think Ewald is right in connecting *ἅπαξ* with this later clause rather than with *εἰδότας*, as it agrees better with the *ἅπαξ* 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[27-37]). 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 *ἅπαξ* with *εἰδότας*: *ἤδη* would have been more suitable. For the opposition to *τὸ δεύτερον* cf. Heb. 9[28] *ὁ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας ἐκ δευτέρου χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας ὀφθήσεται*, Theoph. *Autol.* ii. 26 *ἵνα τὸ μὲν ἅπαξ ᾖ πεπληρωμένον ὅτε ἐτέθη, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον μέλλῃ πληροῦσθαι μετὰ τὴν... κρίσιν*, Liban. *ap.* Wetst. *ἐμοὶ δὲ ἅπαξ ἀρκεῖ γέλωτα ὀφλεῖν, δεύτερον δὲ οὐκέτι.*

I am inclined to think that the article before *μή* is an intrusion, as it seems to be before *ἐν* in ver. 12. Omitting it, we can take *δεύτερον* with *μὴ πιστεύσαντας*, getting the sense: 'In the 1st case of unbelief (in Egypt)[1] 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 *λαόν*. We may compare the solemn utterance in Heb. 10[26] *ἑκουσίως*

[1] Cf. Exod. 2[14], 4[1], 5[21], 6[9], 14[11. 12].

Digitized by Google

ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία, and the belief, apparently based upon it, in the early Church as to sin after baptism, cf. Herm. *Mand.* iv. 3, *Vis.* ii. 1, Clem. Al. *Str.* ii. p. 459 τὸν οὖν εἰληφότα τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν οὐκ ἔτι ἁμαρτάνειν χρή. ἐπὶ γὰρ τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ μόνῃ μετανοίᾳ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὕτη ἂν εἴη...ἔδωκεν οὖν ἄλλην ἔτι τοῖς κἂν τῇ πίστει περιπεπτωκόσι τινὶ πλημμελήματι, πολυέλεος ὤν, μετάνοιαν δευτέραν. Hence sprang the custom of postponing baptism till the approach of death. For the emphatic δεύτερον compare δὶς ἀποθανόντα in ver. 12, also 2 P. 1^{9}, $2^{20\text{-}22}$, Heb. $6^{4\text{-}8}$, Tit. 3^{10} αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ.

Others join τὸ δεύτερον with σώσας, some supposing a reference to the saving from famine in the wilderness, others to the Salvation wrought by Christ. This last seems to be the view taken by Zahn, who understands σώσας λαόν metaphorically of the new Israel and reads Ἰησοῦς, 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 bethought himself of the warning derived from the story of the Watchers in Enoch? Some again imagine allusion to be made 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 ὕστερον, as is done by many interpreters. In Nonnus *Dionys.* 46. 189 καὶ τότε μὶν λίπε λύσσα νοοσφαλέος Διονύσου, καὶ προτέρας φρένας ἔσχε τὸ δεύτερον it is nearly 'again.' For the combination σώσας—ἀπώλεσεν B. Weiss compares James 4^{12} εἷς ἐστιν—ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι.

6. ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν...εἰς κρίσιν...τετήρηκεν.] Cf. Clem. Al. *Adumbr.* 'Angelos qui non servaverunt proprium principatum, scilicet quem acceperunt secundum profectum.' 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 parcet superbientibus, 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. 2^{4}, and in Enoch, chapters 6–10.

ἀρχήν.] Used of office and dignity, as in Gen. 40^{21} 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 ἄνω κλῆρον in Clem. Al. 650 P. The term ἀρχή is used of the evil angels themselves in Eph. 6^{12}. Cf. Enoch 12^{4}, of the Watchers (angels) who have *abandoned the high heaven and the holy eternal place* and defiled themselves with women, *ib.* 15^{3}. Philo says of the fallen angels (M. 1, p. 268) καλὸν μὴ λιποτακτῆσαι μὲν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ τάξεως, ἐν ᾗ τοὺς τεταγμένους πάντας ἀριστεύειν ἀνάγκη, αὐτομολῆσαι

Digitized by Google

δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἄνανδρον ἡδονήν. So Just. M. *Apol.* ii. 5 οἱ δ' ἄγγελοι παραβάντες τήνδε τὴν τάξιν γυναικῶν μίξεσιν ἡττήθησαν with Otto's n.

ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον.] Cf. 2 Cor. 5^2 τὸ οἰκ. τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, and the quotation from Enoch in the last n. [For οἰκητήριον cf. Enoch 15^7 (the message of Enoch to the Watchers) 'the spiritual have their dwelling in heaven'...ἡ κατοίκησις αὐτῶν ἔσται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. C.]

εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν.] Cf. 2 P. 2^4 σειροῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας, *ib.* 2^9 ἀδίκους εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν, *ib.* 3^7 τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως...τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων, Joel 2^{31} ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος...πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ, Apoc. 6^{17} ἦλθεν ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ, *ib.* 16^{14} συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος. Enoch 10^5 ἐπικάλυψον αὐτῷ (Azazel) σκότος, καὶ οἰκησάτω ἐκεῖ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 10^{12} δῆσον αὐτοὺς...μέχρι ἡμέρας κρίσεως αὐτῶν, *ib.* 22^{11} (Gr. in Charles' *App.* C) μέχρι τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τῆς κρίσεως, *ib.* 54^6, note on xlv. 1. So ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου 1 Cor. 1^8, 2 P. 3^{10} *al.*, ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα 2 Th. 1^{10}. On δεσμοῖς see En. $54^{3\text{-}5}$ '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. δέσμιοι σκότους (Wisd. 17^2) of the plague of darkness.

For the use of the acc. after ὑπό to express 'rest under,' instead of the earlier dat. or gen. cf. Joh. 1^{49} ὄντα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν, Jannaris *Gr.* § 1698^b, Schmid *Attic.* iv. p. 467 f.

ἀϊδίοις.] 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 7^{26} ἀπαύγασμά ἐστι φωτὸς ἀϊδίου, and Rom. 1^{20} ἡ ἀΐδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης. After ζόφον Clem. Al. p. 280 adds ἀγρίων ἀγγέλων, a variant of which is found also in Lucif. 28 sanctorum angelorum, *Speculum*, p. 50 (Belsheim, 1899). Cf. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 363 n.

7. **ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις.**] 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 connexion ἀγγέλους τε...ὡς Σόδομα. Cf. 2 P. 2^6 πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν. The destruction was not limited to these two cities, but extended to all the neighbouring country (Gen. 19^{25}, called Πεντάπολις in Wisd. 10^6), including the towns of Admah and Zeboim (Deut. 29^{23}, Hos. 11^8). Zoar was spared at the request of Lot.

τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι.] For the adverbial acc., which repeats the preceding ὡς = *sicut* (Clem. *Adumbr.*), cf. Mt. 23^{37} ὃν τρόπον ἐπισυνάγει ὄρνις τὰ νοσσία, 2 Macc. 15^{39} ὃν τρόπον οἶνος...ἀποτελεῖ, οὕτω καί, Luc. *Catapl.* 6 τεθνᾶσι τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον. 'Like them,' *i.e.* the fallen angels. The two judgments are similarly joined in *Test. Nepht.* 3 μὴ γένησθε ὡς Σόδομα, ἥτις ἐνήλλαξε τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῆς. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἐγρήγορες ἐνήλλαξαν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν, οὓς κατηράσατο Κύριος, 3 Macc. $2^{4\text{-}5}$. Others understand τούτοις of the libertines who are subsequently referred to as οὗτοι (vv. 8, 10, 12, 16, 19); but the beginning

Digitized by Google

of ver. 8 (*μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι*) seems to distinguish between them and the preceding. The verb *ἐκπ.* occurs in Gen. 38[24] of Tamar, Exod. 34[15. 16] (*μή ποτε*) *ἐκπορνεύσωσιν ὀπίσω τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν*, Lev. 17[7], Hos. 4[12], Ezek. 16[26. 28. 33].

ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας.] 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 *ἀνόμους καὶ ἐκθέσμους μίξεις* (*de Gig.* M 1, p. 267), cf. Exod. 30[9] *οὐκ ἀνοίσεις θυμίαμα ἕτερον*. For the post-classical phrase cf. 2 P. 2[10] *τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους*, Deut. 4[3] *ἐπορεύθη ὀπίσω Βεελφεγώρ*, Jer. 2[2. 3].

πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι.] Cf. Enoch 67[12] 'this judgment wherewith the angels are judged is a testimony for the kings and the mighty,' 2 P. 2[6] *ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς*, 1 Cor. 10[6. 11] *τύποι ἐγένοντο*, Heb. 4[11] *ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδείγματι πέσῃ τῆς ἀπειθείας*, 3 Macc. 2[5] *σὺ τοὺς ὑπερηφανίαν ἐργαζομένους Σοδομίτας... πυρὶ θείῳ κατέφλεξας, παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις καταστήσας*, Clem. Al. p. 260 *δεῖγμά σοι τούτων οἱ ἄγγελοι, τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ κάλλος ἀπολελοιπότες διὰ κάλλος μαραινόμενον*, Ael. *V.H.* vi. 12 *fin.* *ἦν δεῖγμα οὐ τὸ τυχὸν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς σωφροσύνην ἡ τοῦ Διονυσίου ἐκ τῶν τηλικούτων εἰς οὕτω ταπεινὰ μεταβολή*. The present aspect of the Lacus Asphaltites 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 *πυρός* is governed by *δεῖγμα* or *δίκην*. If by *δίκην*, then 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] (*πῦρ Πενταπόλεως*) *ἧς ἔτι μαρτύριον τῆς πονηρίας καπνιζομένη καθέστηκε χέρσος*, Philo (*De Abr.* M. 2. 21) *μέχρι νῦν καίεται. τὸ γὰρ κεραύνιον πῦρ ἥκιστα σβεννύμενον ἢ νέμεται ἢ ἐντύφεται. πίστις δὲ σαφεστάτη τὰ δρώμενα, τοῦ γὰρ συμβεβηκότος πάθους σημεῖόν ἐστιν ὅ τε ἀναδιδόμενος ἀεὶ καπνὸς καὶ ὃ μεταλλεύουσι θεῖον*, *ib. V. Moys.* 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[12] (the words of the martyr contrasting the fires of present torture with the eternal flames awaiting the persecutor) *ταμιεύεταί σε ἡ θεία δίκη πυκνοτέρῳ καὶ αἰωνίῳ πυρί, καὶ βάσανοι εἰς ὅλον τὸν αἰῶνα οὐκ ἀνήσουσί 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[1-12] (a prophecy of the removal of the curse of the Dead Sea and its borders), Enoch. 10[5] and [12], where the *εἰς αἰῶνα* of the former verse is equivalent to 70 generations in the latter, also ver. 10 where *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* is reckoned at 500 years. As the meaning of *δεῖγμα* is made clear by the following participial clause, it seems unnecessary to take it with *πυρός* in the sense of 'an example or type of eternal fire,' which would escape the difficulty connected with *αἰωνίου*, but leaves *δίκην ὑπέχουσαι* (for which cf. Xen. *Mem.* 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-

Digitized by Google

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. **ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι.**] Notwithstanding these warnings the libertines go on in similar courses.

ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μιαίνουσιν.] Clement's paraphrase in his *Adumbrationes* is 'qui somniant imaginatione sua libidines... bonum esse putantes non illud quod vere bonum est.' He also explains the word in *Str.* iii. 11, *οὐ* (so Hort, in the margin of his copy, corrects *ὃ* of MS.) *γὰρ ὕπαρ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἐπιβάλλουσιν.* Cf. parallel in 2 P. $2^{10\text{-}13}$, 1 Th. 5^{6}, Rom. $13^{11.\ 12}$, Ps. 73^{20}, 126^{1}. Can there be any reference to the blindness with which the men of Sodom were smitten? The verb is used in Acts 2^{17} (a quotation from Joel 2^{28}) *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνιασθήσονται* 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 *ψευδοπροφῆται* and *ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι* of 2 P. 2^{1}. 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 56^{10} in connexion with the words *οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, οὐκ εἰδότες* (see ver. 10 below), *ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι κοίτην φιλοῦντες νυστάξαι*, which Delitsch 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. *ib.* 29^{10}, Jer. $23^{25\text{-}32}$ where lying dreams are contrasted with the word of the Lord, *ib.* 27^{9} (LXX. 34^{9}) *μὴ ἀκούετε τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν ὑμῶν... καὶ τῶν ἐνυπνιαζομένων ὑμῖν* ('nor to your dreamers') *καὶ τῶν οἰωνισμάτων ὑμῶν*, Deut. $13^{1.\ 3.\ 5}$ *προφήτης ἢ ἐνυπνιαζόμενος.* Compare Gen. 28^{12}, 41^{5}.

Bengel's explanation 'Hominum mere naturalium indoles graphice 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. 2^{18} *ἀέρα 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 ἀεὶ τοῖς καθεύδουσιν ἐνυπνιάζειν, ἀλλ' οὐ μνημονεύουσιν; Probl.* 30. 14. 2 *οἱ ἐν τῷ καθεύδειν ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι ἱσταμένης τῆς διανοίας, καὶ καθ' ὅσον ἠρεμεῖ, ὀνειρώττουσιν*, cf. Artem. *Oneir.* 1. 1. Some interpret of polluting dreams (cf. Lev. 15); but the word *ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι* is evidently intended to have a larger scope, covering not merely *μιαίνουσιν* but *ἀθετοῦσιν* and *βλασφημοῦσιν.* We must also interpret *μιαίνω* here by the *ἀσέλγειαν* of v. 4, the *ἐκπορνεύσασαι* and *σαρκὸς ἑτέρας* of v. 7. This wide sense appears in Tit. 1^{15} *τοῖς μεμιασμένοις οὐδὲν καθαρόν, ἀλλὰ μεμίανται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις.* The heretics condemned by St. Paul for forbidding marriage (1 Tim. 4^{3}) regarded it as *μιασμὸς σαρκός.*

κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν.] On first reading one is

Digitized by Google

inclined to take the words κυριότης and δόξαι 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 ἄγρια θαλάσσης, 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 ὅσα φυσικῶς ἐπίστανται and the phrase κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν by ὅσα οὐκ οἴδασιν 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. 2^{10}, Eph. 1^{21} (having raised him from the dead and set him on his right hand) ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος, Col. 1^{16} ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι, 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 earthly 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) ὡς κύριον, ὅθεν γὰρ ἡ κυριότης λαλεῖται, ἐκεῖ κύριός ἐστιν, Herm. *Sim.* v. 6. 1 εἰς δούλου τρόπον οὐ κεῖται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' εἰς ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην κεῖται καὶ κυριότητα. Hase, on Leo Diaconus v. 3, p. 449, has the note 'κυριότης vocatur dignitas Servatoris, qua 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 ὁμότιμον τὸ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα,' Greg. Nyss. *c. Eunom.* vi. p. 180 c ἡ κυριότης οὐχὶ οὐσίας ὄνομα ἀλλ' ἐξουσίας ἐστί. It was also used as a complimentary address, ἡ σὴ κυριότης 'your lordship.' The verb ἀθετέω has God or Christ for its object in Lk. 10^{16}, Joh. 12^{48}, 1 Th. 4^{8}, etc. We have then to consider how it can be said that the libertines (οὗτοι) 'despise authority' in like manner to the above mentioned offenders. For the former we may refer to ver. 4 κύριον ἡμῶν ἀρνούμενοι, 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 irreverence towards God's representatives, the angels (Gen. 19^{5}). Cf. Joseph. *Ant.* i. 11. 2 εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἦσαν

Digitized by Google

ὑβρισταὶ καὶ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἀσεβεῖς, and *Test. Aser* 7, where the sin of Sodom is expressly stated to have been their behaviour towards the angels, μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς Σόδομα ἥτις ἠγνόησε τοὺς ἀγγέλους Κυρίου καὶ ἀπώλετο ἕως αἰῶνος.

δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν.] Cf. 2 P. 2^{10} τολμηταὶ αὐθαδεῖς δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες. The only other passage in the N.T. in which the pl. occurs is 1 P. 1^{11}, where the sense is different. Dr. Bigg compares Exod. 15^{11} τίς ὅμοιός σοι ἐν θεοῖς, Κύριε; τίς ὅμοιός σοι; δεδοξασμένος ἐν ἁγίοις, θαυμαστὸς ἐν δόξαις. 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 angelos.' The word δόξα in the singular is used for the Shekinah, see my n. on James 2^{1}. 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 σὴν εἶναι νομίζω τάς σε δορυφορούσας δυνάμεις. See *Test. Jud.* 25 Κύριος εὐλόγησε τὸν Λευί, ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ προσώπου ἐμέ, αἱ δυνάμεις τῆς δόξης τὸν Συμεών, also Luke 9^{26}, 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. Isr.* 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. 13^{20}). There may also be some allusion to the teaching or practice of the libertines. If we compare the mysterious reference in 1 Cor. 11^{10} διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, which is explained by Tertullian (*De Virg. Vel.* 7) as spoken of the fallen angels mentioned by Jude, 'propter angelos, scilicet quos legimus a Deo et caelo excidisse ob concupiscentiam 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 κοινωνοὶ 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 δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος.**] The term ἀρχ. occurs in the N.T. only here and in 1 Th. 4^{16}. The names of seven archangels are given in Enoch. The story here narrated is taken from the apocryphal *Assumptio Mosis*, 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.

Digitized by Google

an apocryphal book. In Cramer's *Catena* on this passage (p. 163) we read *τελευτήσαντος ἐν τῷ ὄρει Μωυσέως, ὁ Μιχαὴλ ἀποστέλλεται μεταθήσων τὸ σῶμα, εἶτα τοῦ διαβόλου κατὰ τοῦ Μωυσέως βλασφημοῦντος καὶ φονέα ἀναγορεύοντος διὰ τὸ πατάξαι τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, οὐκ ἐνεγκὼν τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ βλασφημίαν ὁ ἄγγελος, Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς τὸν διάβολον 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[6] (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. 2[16. 17]). Further details in Josephus (*Ant.* iv. 8. 48) *νέφους αἰφνίδιον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ στάντος ἀφανίζεται κατά τινος φάραγγος. γέγραφε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις τεθνεῶτα, δείσας μὴ δι' ὑπερβολὴν τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν ἀρετῆς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον αὐτὸν ἀναχωρῆσαι τολμήσωσιν εἰπεῖν,* 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.

διακρινόμενος.] Here used in the sense of 'disputing,' as in Jer. 15[10] *ἄνδρα διακρινόμενον πάσῃ τῇ γῇ*, Joel 3[2], Acts 11[2]. See my note on James 1[6] and below ver. 22.

διελέγετο.] Cf. Mk. 9[34] *πρὸς ἀλλήλους διελέχθησαν, τίς μείζων.*

οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας.] Cf. Plat. *Legg.* ix. 856 *προδόσεως αἰτίαν ἐπιφέρων, ib.* 943 *τιμωρίαν ἐπιφ.* The word occurs elsewhere in N. T. only in Rom. 3[5]. Field (*On Translation of N.T.* p. 244) compares Acts 25[18] *οἱ κατήγοροι οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔφερον ὧν ἐγὼ ὑπενόουν*, Diod. 16. 29 *δίκην ἐπήνεγκαν κατὰ τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν, ib.* 20. 10 *κρίσεις ἀδίκους ἐπιφέροντες*, 20. 62 *φοβηθεὶς τὰς ἐπιφερομένας κρίσεις*, tom. x. p. 171 ed. Bip. *ἐπήνεγκαν κρίσιν περὶ ὕβρεως*, 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 *βλασφημίας* to be *gen. qualitatis*, expressed by the adj. *βλάσφημον* in 2 P.: see below on ver. 18, James 1[25] *ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς*, 2[4] *κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν*, 3[6] *ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας*, also 2 P. 2[1] *αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας*, 2[10] *ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ.*

κρίσις, like *κρίνω*, has the two meanings of judgment and of accusation, cf. Lycurg. 31 where *οἱ συκοφαντοῦντες* are distinguished from *τῶν δικαίως τὰς κρίσεις ἐνισταμένων.*

ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος.] These words occur in the vision of Zechariah (3[1-10]) where the angel of the Lord replies to the charges of Satan against the high priest Joshua with the words *ἐπιτιμήσαι Κύριος ἐν σοὶ,*

Digitized by Google

διάβολε, καὶ ἐπιτιμήσοι Κύριος ἐν σοί, ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὴν Ἰερουσαλήμ. They were no doubt inserted as appropriate by the author of the *Asc. Mos.* in his account of the controversy at the grave of Moses. We may compare Mt. 17[18] *ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.*

10. **οὗτοι δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν.**] 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 *βλασφ.* shows that the δόξαι of ver. 8 are identical with *ὅσα οὐκ οἴδασιν* here. For the blindness of the carnal mind to all higher wisdom cf. 1 Cor. 2[7-16], a passage linked with our epistle by the distinction between the *ψυχικοί* and *πνευματικοί* and by the words *λαλοῦμεν Θεοῦ σοφίαν, ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἔγνωκεν· εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν οὐκ ἂν τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν.* See too Joh. 8[19], 1 Tim. 6[4] *τετύφωται μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος.* For the form *οἴδασιν* see my ed. of St. James p. clxxxiii.

ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἐπίστανται.] This stands for *σάρκα* in ver. 8 and is explained by *ἀσέλγειαν* in ver. 4, *ἐκπορνεύσασαι* in ver. 7, *μιαίνουσιν* in ver. 8, *κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι* in ver. 16.

φυσικῶς 'by instinct,' so Diog. L. x. 137 *φυσικῶς καὶ χωρὶς λόγου.* Alford cites Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 3. 9 *μάχην ὁρῶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους φύσει ἐπισταμένους, ὥσπερ γε καὶ τἄλλα ζῷα ἐπίσταταί τινα μάχην ἕκαστα οὐδὲ παρ' ἑνὸς ἄλλου μαθόντα ἢ παρὰ τῆς φύσεως.*

ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται.] 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 *ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια, ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν*, Eph. 4[22] *ἀποθέσθαι . . . τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας.*

11. **οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν.**] For the use of the aorist see n. on ver. 4 *παρεισεδύησαν*: for the phrase cf. Blass *Gr.* p. 119, and 2 P. 2[15] *ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ.* The phrase *οὐαί*, 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. 1 p. 206) *πᾶς φίλαυτος ἐπίκλησιν Καὶν εὕρηκεν* (quoted by Schneckenb. p. 221); he is named as a type of jealous hate in 1 John 3[11, 12] *ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους· οὐ καθὼς Καὶν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν καὶ ἔσφαξεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ· καὶ χάριν τίνος ἔσφαξεν αὐτόν; ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἦν, τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ δίκαια*, of unbelief in Heb. 11[4] *πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν Ἄβελ παρὰ Καὶν προσήνεγκεν 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. 4[7] cited by Schneckenburger, in which Cain is represented as saying 'non est judicium, nec judex, nec est aliud saeculum, 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[23]. Euthym Zig. gives an allegorical explanation, *καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀδελφοκτόνοι*

Digitized by Google

εἰσί, δι' ὧν διδάσκουσι τὰς τῶν ἀπατωμένων ψυχὰς 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 (Epiphan. *Pan.* i. 3. 37. 1 οἱ Ὀφῖται τὰς προφάσεις εἰλήφασιν ἀπὸ τῆς Νικολάου καὶ Γνωστικῶν καὶ τῶν πρὸ τούτων αἱρέσεων). They held that the Creator was evil, that the Serpent represented the divine Wisdom, that Cain and his successors were champions of right (Epiphan. *ib.* 38. 1, οἱ Καιανοί φασι τὸν Καὶν ἐκ τῆς ἰσχυροτέρας Δυνάμεως ὑπάρχειν καὶ τῆς ἄνωθεν αὐθεντίας, and boast themselves to be of kin to Cain, καὶ τῶν Σοδομιτῶν καὶ Ἡσαῦ καὶ Κορέ, see too Iren. i. 31, Clem. *Str.* vii. § 108).

τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν.] Westcott on 1 Joh. 1[8] 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[27]]. Such going astray is essentially ruinous. The cognate terms are used of the false Christs and prophets (Mt. 24[4] ff., Apoc. 2[20], 13[14], 19[20], 1 Joh. 4[6], 2 Joh. 7), of Satan (Apoc. 12[9], 20[3] ff.), of Babylon (Apoc. 18[23]), of Balaam in Jude 11.' See also his n. on 4[6] ἐκ τούτου γινώσκομεν τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης.

Every word in this clause is open to question. The passive of ἐκχέω 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. 37[29] μὴ ἐκχυθῇς ἐπ' ἐδεσμάτων, *Test. Reub.* 1 πορνεία ἐν ᾗ ἐξεχύθην, Clem. Al. *Str.* ii. p. 491 εἰς ἡδονήν, τράγων δίκην, ἐκχυθέντες καθηδυπαθοῦσιν, Plut. *V. Ant.* 21 εἰς τὸν ἡδυπαθῆ καὶ ἀκόλαστον βίον ἐκκεχυμένος. Such an interpretation seems not quite consistent with μισθοῦ, which implies cool self-interest. That covetousness, αἰσχροκέρδεια, 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 πλάνῃ, and what is the reference in the word? Should we take πλάνῃ as equivalent to εἰς πλάνην (Winer p. 268)? This is the interpretation given by Lucifer p. 219 'vae illis quoniam in seductionem B. mercede effusi sunt,' but it is a rare use of the dative, and it seems more natural to explain πλάνῃ by the preceding ὁδῷ (dat. of the means or manner), which is used in the same collocation in 2 P. 2[15]. What then are we to understand by

[1] I do not think the marginal reading in the R.V. 'cast themselves away' is tenable.

Digitized by Google

'they were hurried along on the line of Balaam's error'? What was his error? From Numb. 22, 25[1-3], and 31[16], Nehem. 13[2] Μωαβῖται ἐμισθώσαντο ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸν Βαλαὰμ καταράσασθαι, 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[6]) 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. 2[14] we read of some in Pergamum that held the teaching of Balaam, ὃς ἐδίδασκεν τῷ Βαλὰκ βαλεῖν σκάνδαλον ἐνώπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα καὶ πορνεῦσαι. 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[3 f.] where Paul asserts of his own ministry that it was οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ . . . οὔτε γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας ἐγενήθημεν, οὔτε ἐν προφάσει πλεονεξίας, οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν, 1 Tim. 3[8, 9] διακόνους μὴ διλόγους, μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ προσέχοντας, μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς, ἔχοντας τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει, Tit. 1[7, 11] διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ κέρδους χάριν, 1 Pet. 5[2]. For the gen. μισθοῦ cf. Winer, p. 258, Plat. *Rep.* ix. 575 B μισθοῦ ἐπικουροῦσιν, 1 Cor. 7[23] τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε.

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 prophetical gifts for purposes of self-aggrandisement and endeavour to make their services attractive by excluding from religion all that is strenuous and difficult, and opening the door to every kind of indulgence.

τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο.] 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], εἰσὶ πολλοὶ ἀνυπότακτοι . . οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν, *ib.* 1[16]; *ib.* 3[10, 11], 1 Tim. 1[20] (among those who have made shipwreck of the faith mention is made of Hymenaeus and Alexander) οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν μὴ βλασφημεῖν, *ib.* 6[3-6], 2 Tim.

[1] Zahn understands πλάνη in an active, not a passive sense, as the ruling principle of the πλάνος Balaam, not as the error into which others fell through his seductions. I do not think Jude discriminated between these meanings: πλάνη covers both.

Digitized by Google

$2^{16\text{-}18.\ 25}$ ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν ὡς γάγγραινα νομὴν ἕξει, ὧν ἐστιν Ὑμέναιος καὶ Φίλητος, οἵτινες περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠστόχησαν, 4^{14} where the opposition of Alexander the coppersmith is noted; but especially $3^{1\text{-}9}$, 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. 12^{3} ἀναλογίσασθε τὸν τοιαύτην ὑπομεμενηκότα ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀντιλογίαν. It is used as a translation of Meribah in Numb. 20^{13} *al.* and (in relation to Korah) in *Protev. Jac.* 9 μνήσθητι ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς Δαθάν, Κωρέ, καὶ Ἀβειράμ, πῶς ἐδιχάσθη ἡ γῆ καὶ κατέπιεν αὐτοὺς διὰ τὴν ἀντιλογίαν αὐτῶν.

Rampf draws attention to the climax contained in these examples. The sin of Cain is marked by the words ἐπορεύθησαν ὁδῷ, that of Balaam the gentile prophet by ἐξεχύθησαν πλάνῃ, that of the Levite Korah by ἀπώλοντο ἀντιλογίᾳ.

12. οὗτοί εἰσιν [οἱ] ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι.] Dr. Chase quotes Zech. $1^{10\,f.}$, Apoc. 7^{14}, Enoch 46^{3}, *Secrets of Enoch*, 7^{3}, 18^{3}, 19^{3}, *etc.* for the phrase οὗτοί εἰσιν, 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 ἀπάταις for ἀγάπαις and σπῖλοι for σπιλάδες. 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, ὕφαλος πέτρα, see Thomas Mag. σπιλάς, Ἀττικῶς· ὕφαλος πέτρα, Ἕλληνες, Etymol. M. σπιλάδες...αἱ ὑπὸ θάλασσαν κεκρυμμέναι πέτραι, ὅθεν καὶ ὕφαλος ἄνθρωπος λέγεται ὁ κεκρυμμένος καὶ πανοῦργος, *ib.* κατασπιλάζοντες, κατακρύπτοντες, ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ὑφάλων πετρῶν, αἵτινες ὑπὸ ὕδατος καλυπτόμεναι τοῖς ἀπροὐπτως προσπελάζουσι κίνδυνον ἐπιφέρουσι (both cited by Wetst.). The same explanation is given by the scholiast on Hom. *Od.* 5. 401–405 καὶ δὴ δοῦπον ἄκουσε ποτὶ σπιλάδεσσι θαλάσσης...ἀλλ' ἀκταὶ προβλῆτες ἔσαν σπιλάδες τε πάγοι τε. See Plut. Mor. 101 B εὐδία σπιλάδος which Wytt. translates 'tranquillitas maris caecam rupem tegentis,' *ib.* 476 A, Oecumenius on this passage αἱ σπιλάδες τοῖς πλέουσιν ὀλέθριοι ἀπροσδοκήτως ἐπιγενόμεναι (? -νοις), and ἐξαίφνης, ὥσπερ σπιλάδες, ἐπάγοντες αὐτοῖς τὸν ὄλεθρον τῶν ψυχῶν. Wetst. also quotes Heliod. v. 31 θαλάσσῃ προσείκασας ἂν τοὺς ἄνδρας αἰφνιδίῳ σπιλάδι κατασεισθέντας. The compound κατασπιλάζω joined with the parallel case of ὕφαλος justifies, I think, this sense of σπιλάς, which is rejected by most of the later commentators.[1] Cf. also the use of ναναγέω in 1 Tim. 1^{19}, and the description of drunkenness

[1] Dr. Bigg denies this meaning on the strength mainly of two quotations, Hom. *Od.* 3. 298 ἀτὰρ νῆάς γε ποτὶ σπιλάδεσσιν ἔαξαν κύματα, where, he says, the σπιλάδες are identical with λισσὴ αἰπεῖά τε εἰς ἅλα πέτρη of 293; and Anthol. xi. 390 φασὶ δὲ καὶ νήεσσιν ἀλιπλανέεσσι χερείους τὰς ὑφάλους πέτρας τῶν φανερῶν σπιλάδων. 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 ὄρος δὲ ταύτῃ παράκειται κατὰ μὲν τὴν κορυφὴν πέτρας ἀποτομάδας ἔχον καὶ τοῖς ὕψεσι κατακληκτικάς, ὑπὸ δὲ τὰς ῥίζας σπιλάδας ὀξείας καὶ πυκνὰς ἐνθαλάττους.

Digitized by Google

(perhaps suggested by the text) in Clem. Al. *Paed.* 183 *fin.* ὁρᾶτε τοῦ ναναγίου τὸν κίνδυνον...ὁ νοῦς περιφέρεται τῷ κλύδωνι...ἐνθαλαττεύων εἰλιγγιᾷ τῷ ζόφῳ τῆς καταιγίδος, τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀστοχήσας λιμένος, ἕως ἀντιπεριπεσὼν ὑφάλοις πέτραις αὐτὸς αὑτὸν ἐξοκείλας εἰς ἡδονὰς διαφθείρῃ. *Scopulus* is used in a similar metaphoric sense, see Cic. *in Pis.* 41 where Piso and Gabinius are called 'geminae voragines scopulique reipublicae.' On the other hand σπιλάς is sometimes used loosely of a rock of any kind, as we find it joined with ὑψηλός in Soph. *Laoc. fr.*; sometimes of gravel, as in *Trach.* 678 (= χθονί in 698) where however the reading and the interpretation are doubtful; sometimes of a cave, Callim. *Del.* 242, where the seals are said to bring forth their young ἐνὶ σπιλάδεσσιν, see also Suidas and Apollon. *lexx.* Others take σπιλάδες in the very rare sense of 'spots,' or 'stains' like σπίλοι in 2 P. The only example of this sense seems to be in Orph. *Lith.* 614, but Hesych. gives the interpretation σπιλάς, μεμιασμένοι. Lightfoot, on the *Revision 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 *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.

How are we to account for the gender in οἱ ..σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι? Are we to suppose the gender of σπιλάς 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 *constructio ad sensum*, the feminine being changed to masculine because it is metaphorically used of men (Winer pp. 176, 648, 660, 672), cf. Apoc. 11[4] οὗτοί εἰσιν αἱ δύο λυχνίαι αἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου ἑστῶτες and B's reading παραφερόμενοι below? Or may we take σπιλάδες as expressing a complementary notion in apposition to συνευωχούμενοι? 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' *D. of B.* ii. p. 799*b*, translating: 'these are sunken rocks in your love-feasts while they feast with you.' Spitta considers that there is a reference to the same prophetic warning as in ver. 4.

συνευωχούμενοι.] Is used in the parallel passage of 2 P. with a dat. as in Luc. *Philops* 4, Jos. *Ant.* iv. 8. 7.

ἀφόβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες.] If we take σπιλάδες as complementary to συνευωχούμενοι, it is better to take ἀφόβως with ποιμ.: if we omit the article and take σπιλάδες to be the predicate, συνευωχούμενοι will be an epexegetic participle, which will require strengthening by ἀφόβως. Generally ἀφ. is used in a good sense, but we find it used, as here, of the want of a right fear in Prov. 19[23] φόβος Κυρίου εἰς ζωὴν ἀνδρί, ὁ δὲ ἄφοβος κ.τ.λ. *ib.* 15[16] κρεῖσσον μικρὰ μερὶς μετὰ φόβου Κυρίου ἢ θησαυροὶ μεγάλοι μετὰ ἀφοβίας, Sir. 5[5] περὶ ἐξιλασμοῦ μὴ ἄφοβος γίνου, προσθεῖναι ἁμαρτίαν ἐφ' ἁμαρτίαις. The phrase ἑαυτοὺς ποιμ. recalls Ezek. 34[8] ἐβόσκησαν οἱ ποιμένες ἑαυτούς, τὰ δὲ πρόβατά μου οὐκ ἐβόσκησαν,

Digitized by Google

but there does not seem to be any reference to spiritual pastors in Jude; and ποιμαίνω has probably here the sense 'to fatten, indulge,' as in Prov. 28[7] ὃς δὲ ποιμαίνει ἀσωτίαν, ἀτιμάζει πατέρα, *ib.* 29[3] ὃς δὲ ποιμαίνει πόρνας, ἀπολεῖ πλοῦτον, Plut. *Mor.* 792 B Ἄτταλον ὑπ' ἀργίας μακρᾶς ἐκλυθέντα κομιδῇ Φιλοποίμην ἐποίμαινεν ἀτεχνῶς πιαινόμενον. We may compare 1 Cor. 11[27 foll.], James 5[5], 1 Tim. 5[6].

νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι.] The character of the innovators is illustrated by figures drawn from the four elements, air, earth, sea, heaven (*αἰθήρ*). 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 πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ) with your impure mouths against his greatness.' For the metaphor cf. Eph. 4[14]. Clement's paraphrase in the *Adumbr.* is 'Nubes sine aqua, hoc est qui verbum divinum et fecundum 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, πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι, ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι. 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 δὶς ἀποθανόντα, ἐκριζωθέντα. We find the same comparison in Prov. 25[14] '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 ὑπό with ἀνέμων see my n. on James 3[4].

δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα.] Clement's paraphrase is '*Arbores autumnales infructuosae* [et] infideles videlicet, qui nullum fructum fidelitatis apportant.' See below App. on φθινοπωρινός.

δὶς ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζωθέντα.] Clement's paraphrase is '*Bis mortuae*, semel scilicet quando delinquendo peccarunt; secundo vero quando suppliciis contradentur secundum praedestinata Dei judicia: mors quippe reputanda est etiam quando quisque 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. 2[13]), he who has apostatized is twice dead,' cf. Apoc. 21[8], Heb. 6[4-8], 2 P. 2[20-22], and the n. on τὸ δεύτερον above, ver. 5. This

Digitized by Google

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. 1^3, Mt. 3^{10}, 7^{19}, 15^{13} *πᾶσα φυτεία ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατήρ μου . . ἐκριζωθήσεται*, Joh. $15^{2.\ 6}$.

13. **κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας.**] Cf. Cic. *Ad Herenn.* iv. 55 spumans ex ore scelus. The two former illustrations, the reefs and the clouds, refer to the specious 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 abominabilis est finis.' The comparison reminds us of Isa. 57^{20} 'the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt.' See my n. on James 1^6. The phrase *ἄγρια 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. 17^4), the *ῥυπαρία 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 πλανῆται.] Clement's paraphrase is 'Errantes et apostatas significat: ex hujusmodi stellis sunt qui angelorum cecidere de 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^{24} '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 $18^{14\ f.}$ (where the Greek has been preserved, see Charles, p. 354) *δεσμωτήριον τοῦτο ἐγένετο τοῖς ἄστροις καὶ ταῖς δυνάμεσιν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες οἱ κυλιόμενοι ἐν τῷ πυρὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν, οἱ παραβάντες πρόσταγμα Κυρίου ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἀνατολῆς αὐτῶν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐξῆλθον ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὠργίσθη αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτοὺς μέχρι καιροῦ τελειώσεως ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν ἐνιαυτῶν μυρίων*, *ib.* $21^{2\ f.}$ *ἐώρακα . . . τόπον ἀκατασκεύαστον καὶ φοβερόν . . . καὶ ἐκεῖ τεθέαμαι ἑπτὰ ἀστέρας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ δεδεμένους . . . οὗτοί εἰσιν τῶν ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἱ παραβάντες τὴν ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἐδέθησαν ὧδε μέχρι τοῦ πληρῶσαι μυρία ἔτη*.

It would seem from these passages, which Jude certainly had before him, that *πλανῆται* cannot here have its usual application, the propriety of which was repudiated by all the ancient astronomers from Plato

Digitized by Google

downwards. Cf. Cic. *N.D.* ii. 51 'maxime sunt admirabiles motus earum quinque stellarum quae falso 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 πλανῆται here bears its usual sense (*ad Autol.* ii. 15) ἡ δὲ τῶν ἄστρων θέσις οἰκονομίαν καὶ τάξιν ἔχει τῶν δικαίων καὶ εὐσεβῶν καὶ τηρούντων τὸν νόμον...οἱ δ' αὖ μεταβαίνοντες καὶ φεύγοντες τόπον ἐκ τόπου, οἱ καὶ πλάνητες καλούμενοι, καὶ αὐτοὶ τύπος τυγχάνουσιν τῶν ἀφισταμένων 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 διάττοντες (Arist. *Meteor.* i. 4. 7) which seem to rush from their sphere into darkness; compare Hermes Trism. quoted in Stob. *Ecl.* i. 478, κάτωθεν τῆς σελήνης εἰσὶν ἕτεροι ἀστέρες φθαρτοὶ ἀργοὶ . . . . οὓς καὶ ἡμεῖς ὁρῶμεν διαλυομένους, τὴν φύσιν ὁμοίαν ἔχοντες τοῖς ἀχρήστοις τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ζώων, ἐπὶ ἕτερον δὲ οὐδὲν γίγνεται ἢ ἵνα μόνον φθαρῇ. For the close relationship supposed by the Jews to exist between the stars and the angels see my n. on James 1^{17} φώτων. 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 φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ Phil. 2^{15}), 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. Apoc. 6^{13}, $8^{10.12}$, 9^{1}, 12^{4}.

οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται.] See the parallel in 2 P. 2^{17}, and above ver. 6.

14. ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ 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. 5^{21} and the allusions in Sir. 44^{16}, 49^{14}, Heb. 11^{5}, Charles *Introduction to Book of Enoch.* The prophecy is contained in En. 1^{9} (Greek in Charles *App. C.* p. 327) ὅτι ἔρχεται σὺν τοῖς (ἁγίαις) μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἐλέγξει πᾶσαν σάρκα περὶ πάντων <τῶν> ἔργων ἀυτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς. The phrase ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ is also found in En. 60^{8} 'My grandfather was taken up, the seventh from Adam,' *ib.* 93^{3} '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. $5^{4\text{-}20}$, is (1) Adam, (2) Seth, (3) Enos, (4) Cainan, (5) Mahalaleel, (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 ἐπροφήτευσεν, see L. and S. *s.v.*, Winer p. 84, Blass p. 39.

Digitized by Google

ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ.] 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 *μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων* 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 ἐστιν ἐν δέκα χιλιάσιν ἀπαντῆσαι τῷ μετὰ εἴκοσι χιλιάδων ἐρχομένῳ ἐπ' αὐτόν*. The aorist here is the preterite of prophetic vision, as when Micaiah says, 'I saw all Israel scattered,' cf. Apoc. 10^{7}, 14^{8}. Ewald notices that this quotation as to the Coming of the Lord and the subsequent reference in ver. 24 imply the existence of the same doubt as is expressed in 2 P. 3^{4}.

15. **ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων.**] Follows exactly the Greek translation of Enoch given above, cf. Ael. *V.H.* ii. 6 *Κρίτων ἔπειθεν αὐτὸν ἀποδρᾶναι καὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ κρίσιν διαφθεῖραι*. On the distinction between the active *ποιεῖν κρίσιν* 'to execute judgment' (as in Joh. 5^{27}) and the periphrastic middle = *κρίνειν* (as in Isocr. 48 D) see my nn. on *αἰτεῖν* and *αἰτεῖσθαι*, *ἴδε* and *ἰδού* (James 4^{3}, *ib.* 3^{3}).

ἐλέγξαι πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν.] Shortened from the Greek Enoch quoted above.

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

περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν.] This is taken from Enoch 27^{2}. Charles p. 366 (To Gehenna shall come) *πάντες οἵτινες ἐροῦσιν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν κατὰ Κυρίου φωνὴν ἀπρεπῆ καὶ περὶ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ σκληρὰ λαλήσουσιν*, cf. *ib.* 5^{4} '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.* 101^{3}, *al.*, Gen. 42^{7} *ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς σκληρά*, 1 Kings 12^{13} *ἀπεκρίθη πρὸς τὸν λαὸν σκληρά*, Mal. $3^{13\text{-}15}$.

16. **οὗτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι.**] Charles thinks that we have here another case of borrowing from the *Assumption of Moses*, see Introd. on Apocryphal Quotations. The word *γογγυστής* is used in the LXX., Exod. 16^{8}, Num. $11^{1, 14\text{-}27, 29}$. The verb *γογγύζω* is found in Joh. 7^{32} 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 murmurings 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. $6^{41\text{-}43}$ 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. *γογγυσμός* is used in 1 P. 4^{9}. See further in Phrynichus p. 358 Lob. For the word *μεμψίμοιρος* see Lucian *Cynic.* 17 *ὑμεῖς δὲ διὰ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν οὐδενὶ τῶν γιγνομένων ἀρέσκεσθε, καὶ παντὶ μέμφεσθε, καὶ τὰ μὲν παρόντα φέρειν οὐκ ἐθέλετε, τῶν δὲ ἀπόντων ἐφίεσθε, χειμῶνος μὲν θέρος εὐχόμενοι, θέρους δὲ χειμῶνα . . . καθάπερ οἱ νοσοῦντες, δυσάρεστοι καὶ μεμψίμοιροι ὄντες*, and Theophr. *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 1^{13}.

Digitized by Google

κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι.] Cf. 2 P. 3^3 and 2^{10}, below ver. 18, and see my notes on James $4^{1.2}$. 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. $2^{1\text{-}20}$.'

τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα.] See Enoch 5^4 quoted on ver. 15, also Enoch 101^3 'ye have spoken insolent words against His righteousness,' Ps. 12^4, Ps. 73^8, Dan. 7^8 *στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα* and ver. 20 of the little horn; compare above vv. 4, 8, 11, and James 3^5 foll. In classical writers *ὑπέρογκα* 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^{18} and Plut. *Mor.* 1119 B (Socrates) *τὴν ἐμβροντησίαν ἐκ τοῦ βίου καὶ τὸν τῦφον ἐξήλαυνε καὶ τὰς ἐπαχθεῖς καὶ ὑπερόγκους κατοιήσεις καὶ μεγαλαυχίας, ib.* 7A, where *ἡ θεατρικὴ καὶ παρατράγῳδος λέξις* is styled *ὑπέρογκος* in contrast with *ἰσχνὴ λέξις*, Plut. *Vitae* 505B *τοῦ βασιλέως τὸ φρόνημα τραγικὸν καὶ ὑπέρογκον ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις εὐτυχίαις ἐγεγόνει.* It is found in 2 P. 2^{18} and in Dan. 11^{36} *ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑψωθήσεται καὶ μεγαλυνθήσεται ἐπὶ πάντα θεόν, καὶ λαλήσει ὑπέρογκα.*

θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελίας χάριν.] The phrase occurs with the same force in Lev. 19^{15} *οὐ μὴ θαυμάσῃς πρόσωπον*, Job 13^{10}, see my n. on James 2^1 *μὴ ἐν προσωπολημψίαις ἔχετε τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν* I. X., and cf. 1 Tim. 3^8 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. 2^2 *ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν συμβιβασθέντες ἐν εἰρήνῃ* where a similar periphrasis (*αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν = ὑμεῖς*) is followed by a *constructio 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^{10} *τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν ἐλάλησεν ὑπερηφανίαν*, or Ps. $144^{8.11}$ where a similar phrase occurs.

17. **ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ 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. 3^2, 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 **ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν**, which follow, imply that the warning was spoken, not written, and that it was often repeated. See Introduction on the Early Heresies.

18. **ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται.**] The parallel in 2 P. 3^3 is *ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται*, where see n. on the use of the article with *ἔσχατος, etc.* Hort in his note on 1 P. 1^5 translates *ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ* '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. 3^1 *ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ*

Digitized by Google

χαλεποί, which would thus become merely tautological. There can be no doubt that in 2 P. 2^{20} τὰ ἔσχατα compared with τῶν πρώτων means 'latest in time,' and so in Apoc. 1^{17}, $2^{8.\,19}$, 22^{13}, Mt. 12^{45}, 19^{30}, 20^{8}, *etc.* So Joh. $6^{39\,f.}$ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, 7^{37} ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς, 11^{24} ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, 1 Cor. $15^{8.\,20.\,45.\,52}$, Heb. 1^{1} ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ. So I should take Acts 2^{17}, 1 P. 1^{20}, 1 Joh. 2^{18} where see Westcott, and Isa. 2^{2}. For ἐπί cf. Arist. *Pol.* iv. 3 ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων χρόνων.

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 2^{13} ἕτεροι χλευάζοντες ἔλεγον ὅτι γλεύκους μεμεστωμένοι εἰσί. In the O. T. we have such exx. as 2 Chron. 36^{16} (the summing up of the attitude of the Jews towards the prophets) ἦσαν μυκτηρίζοντες τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξουθενοῦντες τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμπαίζοντες ἐν τοῖς προφήταις αὐτοῦ, Jer. 20^{8} ἐγενήθη λόγος Κυρίου εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ εἰς χλευασμὸν πᾶσαν ἡμέραν. Cf. also the mockery at the crucifixion, and the declaration in Mt. $10^{25\,f.}$ εἰ τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην Βεεζεβοὺλ ἐπεκάλεσαν πόσῳ 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 ἐμπαίκτης and its cognates see n. on 2 P.

τῶν ἀσεβειῶν.] (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^{1} μὴ ἐν προσωπολημψίαις ἔχετε 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 ἀσεβειῶν here as a subjective gen. 'lusts belonging to or arising from their impieties,' cf. Rom. 1^{28} καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν.

19. **οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες.**] 'These are they that make invidious distinctions.' See Introduction on the Text. The rare word ἀποδιορίζοντες is used of logical distinctions in Aristotle *Pol.* iv. 43, ὥσπερ οὖν εἰ ζῴου προηρούμεθα λαβεῖν εἶδη, πρῶτον ἂν ἀποδιωρίζομεν ὅπερ ἀναγκαῖον πᾶν 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: see Maximus Confessor, ii. p. 103 D τὸ μὲν φυσικὸν ὥρισεν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ γνωμικὸν ἀποδιώρισε translated 'naturali in eo (Christo) constituta voluntate, arbitrariam dispunxit,' *ib.* p. 131 C ὡς ὁ λόγος ἦν αὐτοῦ μόνον τὸ ἐμπαθές, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ φυσικὸν ἀποδιορίσασθαι θέλημα 'quod

Digitized by Google

dixerat hoc solum spectare ut libidinosam, non ut naturalem voluntatem a Salvatore eliminaret,' Severus *de Clyst.* 32. 25 *ὅταν ταῦτα τὰ συμπτώματα ὄψῃ παρόντα, ἀποδιόριζε τὴν ὀργανικὴν νόσον ἐκ τῆς ὁμοιομεροῦς.* 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 *ἀποδιορισμός* to Hermias *in Plat. Phaedr.* p. 166 is valueless, as the true reading there is *ἀπομερισμός* (so stated in Couvreur's ed. 1901). The simple *διορίζω* is found in Lev. 20^{24} *διώρισα ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν* 'I separated you from the nations,' Job 35^{11}: so *ἀφορίζω* Mt. 25^{32} *ἀφορίζει τὰ πρόβατα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίφων*, Acts 19^{9} (Paul left the synagogue) *καὶ ἀφώρισεν τοὺς μαθητάς*, 2 Cor. 6^{17} *ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν καὶ ἀφορίσθητε*, Lk. 6^{22} (of excommunication) *ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς*, Gal. 2^{12} (of Peter's withdrawal from the Gentiles) *ὑπέστελλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν.*

ψυχικοί.] Used of worldly wisdom in James 3^{15}, where see note, distinguished from *πνευματικός* in 1 Cor. $2^{13\text{-}15}$. 15^{44}, cf. the teaching of the Naassenes (*ap.* Hippol. p. 164) *εἰς τὸν οἶκον θεοῦ οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται ἀκάθαρτος οὐδείς, οὐ ψυχικός, οὐ σαρκικός, ἀλλὰ τηρεῖται πνευματικοῖς.*

πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.] 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 *μή* is much more widely extended in late than in classical Greek, cf. such phrases as *ἐπεὶ μή, ὅτι μή.* It is simplest to understand *πνεῦμα* here of the Holy Spirit, cf. Rom. 8^{9} *ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν*, 1 Cor. 2^{13}, 7^{40}, 1 Joh. 3^{24}, 4^{13}, and the contrast in ver. 20 *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ 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. $4^{3.\,4}$, *σπουδάζοντες τηρεῖν τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος . . . ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα*, and 1 Cor. 3^{3} *ὅπου γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν ζῆλος . . . καὶ διχοστασίαι, οὐχὶ σαρκικοί ἐστε;*

20. **ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί.**] Contrasted with the libertines, as in ver. 17.

ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει.] These words, descriptive of earnest effort to build up the one spiritual temple, are contrasted with the *ἐμπαίκται* of ver. 18, and *οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες* in ver. 19. For the construction of verbs compounded with *ἐπί* see Winer pp. 535, 536. For the spiritual temple, cf. 1 Pet. $2^{3\text{-}5}$, Col. 1^{23}, Eph. $2^{20\text{-}22}$ *ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ κ.τ.λ.*, 1 Cor. $3^{9\text{-}17}$, 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, *δυνηθήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν 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 (*ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ πίστει*). Otherwise it might be explained of that faculty by which we are brought into relation

Digitized by Google

with the spiritual realities (Heb. 11[1] *πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων*), that which is the introduction to all the other Christian graces, see n. on 2 P. 1[5], and which leads to eternal life (1 P. 1[5], and [9] *κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν*). 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[4. 5]). Cf. 1 Pet. 5[9] *ᾧ ἀντίστητε στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει.*

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

ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι.] These words, contrasted with *πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες* in ver. 19, show how they are to build themselves up upon their faith. I understand them as equivalent to James 5[16] *δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη*, where see n. Compare also Eph. 6[18] *διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς προσευχόμενοι ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἐν πνεύματι*, Rom. 8[26. 27].

21. **ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε.**] In ver. 1 the passive is used: those who are addressed are described as kept and beloved (cf. ver. 24 *τῷ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι*): 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] *ἄσπιλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν*, Phil. 2[12] *τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε· Θεὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν*. Again in ver. 2 the writer invokes the divine love and mercy on those to whom he writes: here they are bidden to take steps to secure these. Compare Rom. 5[5] *ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν*, *ib.* 8[38. 39] *πέπεισμαι ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωὴ . . οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Joh. 15[9] *καθὼς ἠγάπησέν με ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ὑμᾶς ἠγάπησα, μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ. ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσητε, μενεῖτε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου.* The aor. imper. is expressive of urgency, see n. on *ἠγήσασθε* James 1[2].

προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος.] Cf. Tit. 2[13] *προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν* I. X., and 2 P. 3[12. 13. 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. 2[25. 38].

εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.] Some connect this closely with the imperative *τηρήσατε*, but it seems to me to follow more naturally on the nearer phrase *πρ. τὸ ἔλεος*: cf. 1 P. 1[3-7] *εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς . . . ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον . . . τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς . . . φρουρουμένους . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν ἑτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ.*

22. **οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους.**] On the reading see the Introduction. For the form *ὃς μέν* instead of *ὁ μέν*, cf. Mt. 13[8], 22[5], Lk. 23[33], Acts 27[44], Rom. 14[5], 1 Cor. 7[7], 11[21], 2 Cor. 2[16], 2 Tim. 2[20], not used in Heb., 1 and 2 P., James or John. The doubled *ὃς δέ* is found in Mt. 21[35] *ὃν μὲν ἔδειραν, ὃν δὲ ἀπέκτειναν, ὃν δὲ ἐλιθοβόλησαν*, *ib.* 25[15] *ᾧ μὲν ἔδωκεν πέντε τάλαντα, ᾧ δὲ δύο, ᾧ δὲ ἕν.* The use is condemned as a solecism by Thomas Magister and by Lucian *Soloec.* 1, but is common in late Greek from the time of Aristotle, cf. Sturz *Dial. Maced.* pp. 105 foll. On the word *ἐλέγχω* (here wrongly translated 'strafen,' in the sense of excommunication, by Rampf), see *Const. Apost.* vii. 5. 3 *ἐλεγμῷ*

Digitized by Google

ἐλέγξεις 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 'ἐλέγχειν 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 ἔλεγχος, there arises a feeling of sin, which is always painful: thus every ἔλεγχος 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 οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπων ἀλλ' οὓς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις, περὶ ὧν δὲ προσεύξῃ, οὓς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχήν σου, which is also found in the Didache ii. 7 with the omission of οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις. Cf. Joh. 16[8] ἐκεῖνος ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας 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] ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν ἐν τῇ πίστει, *ib.* 1[9] τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν, 2 Tim. 4[2] (the charge to Timothy) ἔλεγξον, παρακάλεσον ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ, Apoc. 3[19] ὅσους ἐὰν φιλῶ ἐλέγχω καὶ παιδεύω, Eph. 5[13] τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐλεγχόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεροῦται. There is a tone of greater severity in the ποιῆσαι κρίσιν καὶ ἐλέγξαι 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.

διακρινομένους.] We should have expected a nominative here to correspond with ἁρπάζοντες and μισοῦντες in the following clauses, and so the *text. rec.* has διακρινόμενοι, 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 D ἐμὲ ἐλέγξας ληροῦντα, Xen. *Mem.* 1. 7. 2 ἐλεγχθήσεται γελοῖος ὤν, 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[6], 2[4]? 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] ἕτοιμοι ἀεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον . . . ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραΰτητος καὶ φόβου (cf. ἐν φόβῳ below). So taken, this first clause would refer to intellectual difficulties to be met by quiet reasoning; the force of διακρινόμενος being the same as that in ver. 9 τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρ., and in Socr. *E.H.* v. 5 ὁ λαὸς εἶχεν ὁμόνοιαν καὶ οὐκέτι πρὸς ἀλλήλους διεκρίνοντο.

23. σῴζετε.] 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 τηρήσατε, ἐλέγχετε above, especially James 5[20] ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου.

Digitized by Google

ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες.] The expression is borrowed from Amos 4^{11} *κατέστρεψα ὑμᾶς καθὼς κατέστρεψεν ὁ Θεὸς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα, καὶ ἐγένεσθε ὡς δαλὸς ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός, καὶ οὐδ' ὡς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸ μέ, λέγει* Κύριος, and Zech. 3^{3} *οὐκ ἰδοὺ οὗτος δαλὸς 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} *ἐξεκαύθη πῦρ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν καὶ φλὸξ κατέφλεξεν ἁμαρτωλούς.* 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. $3^{13\text{-}15}$ *ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον ὁποῖόν ἐστιν τὸ πῦρ αὐτὸ δοκιμάσει . . . εἴ τινος τὸ ἔργον κατακαήσεται, ζημιωθήσεται, αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς 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.

ἐλεᾶτε 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 *ἔλεος* in the N.T. which expresses no mere passive impression, but active benevolence, cf. James $2^{13\text{-}16}$. 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 thy 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 ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ*, Phil. 2^{12}, 1 P. 1^{17}, 3^{15}. For the confusion of the contracted verbs in *-έω* and *-άω* in late Greek see Jannaris § 850, § 854 foll., Winer p. 104. The best MSS. read *ἐλεᾷ* in Prov. 21^{26}, and *ἐλεῶντος* Rom. 9^{16}, but *ἐλεεῖ* in Rom. 9^{18}.

μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.] 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^{22}, Lev. 15^{17}, perhaps too from Zech. 3^{4} *Ἰησοῦς ἦν ἐνδεδυμένος ἱμάτια ῥυπαρά.* Cf. Apoc. 3^{4} *οὐκ ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν*, and *Apocal. Pauli* quoted by Spitta *ὁ χιτών μου οὐκ ἐρυπώθη.* The derivatives of *σπίλος* are peculiar to late Greek: the only other examples of *σπιλόω* in Biblical Greek are James 3^{6} *ἡ γλῶσσα . . . ἡ σπιλοῦσα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα* and Wisd. 15^{4} *εἶδος σπιλωθὲν χρώμασι διηλλαγμένοις.* Compare for the treatment of the erring 2 Tim. $2^{25,26}$ *ἐν πραΰτητι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους μήποτε δώῃ αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας, καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος.*

Digitized by Google

24. **τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπταίστους.**] Apparently a reminiscence[1] of Rom. 16[25] α τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι . . . μονῷ σοφῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Similarly the noble doxology in Eph. 3[20] commences τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ. The reading ὑμᾶς is confirmed by the evidence of ℵ and B, which were unknown to Alford when he endeavoured to defend the reading αὐτούς, found in KP and some inferior MSS.

ἀπταίστους.] Occurs in 3 Macc. 6[39] μεγαλοδόξως ἐπιφάνας τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ὁ τῶν ὅλων δυνάστης ἀπταίστους αὐτοὺς ἐρρύσατο: used here only in the N T. The verb πταίω has the same figurative sense in James 2[10], 3[2] εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει, οὗτος τέλειος ἀνήρ, 2 P. 1[10] ταῦτα ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε.

στῆσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει.] Cf. Mt. 25[31-33] ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ . . . στήσει τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, Acts 6[6] οὓς ἔστησαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων, Col. 1[22] παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον 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[17], 4[2], 7[12], 12[19]. In the present passage the addition of the words τῆς δόξης shows that the final judgment, the goal of φυλάξαι, is spoken of. Lightfoot remarks that ἄμωμους is 'without blemish' rather than 'without blame,' being a sacrificial word like τέλειος and ὁλόκληρος. Hort gives a fuller account of the word in his interesting note on 1 P. 1[19] τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ, where he traces the way in which the words μῶμος 'blame,' and ἄμωμος 'blameless,' 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[4], 5[27], Heb. 9[14]. In 2 P. 3[14] ἀμώμητος seems to be used in the same sense. The word κατενώπιον is apparently confined to the Bible, where it occurs in Jos. 1[5], 21[42], Lev. 4[17], Eph. 1[4], ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ: κατένωπα is found in Hom. *Il.* xv. 320. For ἀγαλλίασις see Hort's n. on 1 P. 1[6] ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε '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 quot.) Heb. . . . It apparently denotes a proud exulting joy, being probably connected closely with ἀγάλλομαι, properly "to be proud of," but often combined with ἥδομαι and such words . . . Clem *Str.* vi. p. 789 says τὴν δὲ ἀγαλλίασιν εὐφροσύνην εἶναί φαμεν, ἐπιλογισμὸν οὖσαν τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀρετῆς διά τινος ἑστιάσεως καὶ διαχύσεως ψυχικῆς . . . See also *Str.* vi. p. 815 εὐφρανθῶμεν καὶ ἀγαλλιαθῶμεν ἐν αὐτῇ, τουτέστι . . . τὴν θείαν ἑστίασιν εὐωχηθῶμεν.' Dr. Chase notes that it occurs in Enoch 5[9] τὰ ἔτη τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτῶν πληθυνθήσεται ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει.

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.

Digitized by Google

25. **μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν.**] See above on ver. 4 *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην*. God is called *σωτήρ* in Is. 45[15] *σὺ γὰρ εἶ Θεός,...ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ σωτήρ*, *ib.* ver. 21, Sir. 51[1] *αἰνέσω σε Θεὸν τὸν σωτῆρά μου*, Philo *Confus. Ling.* § 20, i. p. 418 *fin. τίς δ' οὐκ ἂν...πρὸς τὸν μόνον σωτῆρα Θεὸν ἐκβοήσῃ* (? *-σαι*); cf. Lk. 1[47] *ἠγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου*, elsewhere in N. T. only in Tit. 1[3], 2[10], 3[4] *ὅτε ἡ χρηστότης...ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ...κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ...πνεύματος ἁγίου οὗ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως διὰ Ἰ. Χ. τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, 1 Tim. 1[1] *Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Ἰ. Χ. κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χ. Ἰ. ib.* 2[3], 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.

διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] It seems best to take *διά* with *δόξα* and the following words. The glory of God is manifested through the Word, cf. 1 Pet. 4[11] *ἵνα ἐν πᾶσιν δοξάζηται ὁ Θεὸς διὰ Ἰ. Χ. ᾧ ἐστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*.

δόξα.] The verb is often omitted in these ascriptions, cf. 2 P. *αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα*, Rom. 11[36], 16[27], Gal. 1[5], Lk. 2[16] *δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ*. In 1 P. 4[11] it is inserted, *ᾧ ἐστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος*, and, as we find no case in which *ἔστω* is inserted, and the indicative is more subject to ellipse 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 ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρός*, where we must supply *ἔστω* or *γένοιτο*. 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 θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς*. The omission of the verb allows of either or 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] *ἄξιος εἶ, ὁ κύριος...λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν*, 5[13] *τῷ καθημένῳ 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 ἰσχὺς 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]) *σοὶ Κύριε ἡ μεγαλωσύνη καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ τὸ καύχημα καὶ ἡ νίκη καὶ ἡ ἰσχύς, ὅτι σὺ πάντων τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς δεσπόζεις*. For a similar expression in regard to the future blessedness of man

Digitized by Google

see Rom. 2^{10} δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν.[1] An unusual form of ascription occurs in Clem. Rom. 65 ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν καὶ μετὰ πάντων πανταχῆ τῶν κεκλημένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ· δι' οὗ αὐτῷ δόξα, τιμή, κράτος καὶ μεγαλωσύνη, θρόνος αἰώνιος ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

μεγαλωσύνη.] Only found elsewhere in N. T. in Heb. 1^3 ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, repeated in 8^1. Dr. Chase notes that occurs in Enoch 5^4 κατελαλήσατε μεγάλους καὶ σκληροὺς λόγους ἐν στόματι ἀκαθαρσίας ὑμῶν κατὰ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης αὐτοῦ, 12^3 τῷ κυρίῳ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης, 14^{16} (a house excelling) 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, 28^{18} ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.

πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος.] Cf. 1 Cor. 2^7 (τὴν σοφίαν) ἣν προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν, Prov. 8^{23} πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέ με (*i.e.* σοφίαν), ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι. An equivalent expression is πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου found in Joh. 17^{24} ἠγάπησάς με π. κ. κ. also Eph. 1^4 ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ π. κ. κ. and 1 Pet. 1^{20} (Χριστοῦ) προεγνωσμένου μὲν π. κ. κ., φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου 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. 2^7), and St. John of only one age in the future.

εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.] This precise phrase is unique in the Bible, but εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας is common enough, as in Lk. 1^{33}. Rom. 1^{25}, 5^5, 11^{36}, 16^{27}, 2 Cor. 11^{31}, etc., so in LXX. Dan. 2^{44}, 6^{26}. The stronger phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων occurs in Gal. 1^5, Phil. 4^{20}, 1 Tim. 1^{17}, 2 Tim. 4^{18}, Heb. 13^{21}, 1 P. 4^{11}, 5^{11}, Apoc. 1^6, etc. John uses only εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα apparently with the same meaning. Other variations are found in Eph. 3^{21} αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χ. Ἰ. εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων, 2 P. 3^{18} αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος.

[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 (σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας 'appears to be a conflation of two distinct forms,' and 'was added to the Prayer in the "Syrian" text of St. Matthew's Gospel.'

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX TO ST. JUDE

φθινοπωρινός.[1]

THE force of this word seems to me to have been generally misunderstood by the commentators on Jude [12], δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα δὶς ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζωθέντα, 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 'frugiperdae,' 'fruchtverderbenden.' It is not denied that this is an entirely unexampled use of the word, but it is thought to be justified by the etymology, as illustrated by the parallel δρῦς φθινόκαρπος (Pindar, *P.* iv. 471) used of a tree which sheds its fruits before they ripen, and φθινοπωρὶς ἀνέμων χειμερίοι καταπνοά (Pindar, *P.* v. 161), 'the fruit-withering blast of stormy winds,' also by ἰτέαι ὠλεσίκαρποι (*Od.* x. 510). There can be no doubt however that φθινοπωρινός is an adjective[2] derived from τὸ φθινόπωρον, which is itself, I think, best explained as a compound of φθίνουσα ὀπώρα (cf. φθίνοντος μηνός), meaning the concluding portion of the ὀπώρα. This latter word is, according to Curtius, compounded of ὀπ-, connected with ὀπίσω, ὄπισθεν, and ὥρα = 'the later prime.' We find ὥρα used by itself both for the spring with its flowers and, more rarely, for the summer with its fruits, as in Thuc. ii. 52, ὥρα ἔτους. Perhaps from this double use of the word may have come the ambiguity in the application of ὀπώρα, 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 ἀστὴρ ὀπωρινός *Il.* 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. klass. 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 *-ινός* (so accented) is almost confined to adjectives of time, as ἐαρινός, θερινός, χειμερινός, δειλινός, περυσινός. The two apparent exceptions (πεδινός, ἀληθινός) are perhaps of different formation, cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss der Vergl. Gramm.* ii. pp. 135, 147.

Digitized by Google

recognized only three seasons—winter, spring, summer; and that the last was indifferently named *θέρος* or *ὀπώρα*: compare Arist. *Aves* 709, *πρῶτα μὲν ὥρας φαίνομεν ἡμεῖς ἦρος, χειμῶνος, ὀπώρας*, with Aesch. *Prom.* 453, *ἦν δ' οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς οὔτε χείματος τέκμαρ οὔτ' ἀνθεμώδους ἦρος οὔτε καρπίμου θέρους βέβαιον*. 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 οἶνόν τε νέον καὶ ὀπωρινὸν ὄμβρον καὶ χειμῶν' ἐπιόντα*: and *ὀπώρα* appears as a definite season by the side of the others in a line of Euripides, quoted by Plutarch (*Mor.* 1028 F), from which it appears that he assigned four months each to summer and winter, and two to spring and *ὀπώρα*[1]:—

φίλης τ' ὀπώρας διπτύχους ἦρος τ' ἴσους

(where the epithet *φίλης* deserves 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 (*φθινόπωρον* or *μετόπωρον*[2]) for the new season, the word *ὀπώρα* being reserved for the late summer, according to the definition of Eustath. on *Il.* v. 5, *ὀπώρα ὥρα μεταξὺ κειμένη θέρους καὶ τοῦ μετ' αὐτὴν μετοπώρου*. And so we find it used by Aristotle (*Meteor.* ii. 5) *αἱ χάλαζαι γίνονται ἔαρος μὲν καὶ μετοπώρου μάλιστα, εἶτα καὶ τῆς ὀπώρας, χειμῶνος δὲ ὀλιγάκις*, and by Theophrastus (*περὶ Σημείων*, 44) *ἐὰν τὸ ἔαρ καὶ τὸ θέρος ψυχρὰ γίνηται, ἡ ὀπώρα γίνεται καὶ τὸ μετόπωρον πνιγηρόν*.[3]

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 re-appearance 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. Sext.* (Aug. 11), winter *a.d. iv. id. Nov.* (Nov. 10).[4]

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

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

[2] The word *μετοπωρινός* is found in our present text of Hesiod (*Op.* 415), *μετοπωρινὸν ὀμβρήσαντος Ζηνός*.

[3] Ptolemy, *Appar.* (quoted by Schmidt) gives the limits of the *ὀπώρα* as follows: 21 July, *ὀπώρας ἀρχή*; 15 September, *μετοπώρου ἀρχή*.

[4] See Varro, *R.R.* i. 28 (where Keil quotes *Geoponica*, i. 1. 3, *μετόπωρον ἄρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸ ἕξ εἰδῶν Αὐγούστων, ἡλίου ὄντος ἐν λέοντι*); Columella, *R.R.* xi. 2. 57, 84; Plin. *N.H.* xviii. 68. 7; Ov. *Fasti*, ed. Peter, pp. 20–22.

Digitized by Google

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 Ἀρκτούρου (*i.e.* his morning rising about Sept. 15) μέχρι Πλειάδων δύσεως (the morning setting about Nov. 9), giving less than two months to this season. As the same treatise (Bk. iii. *init.*) says τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἐς τέσσαρα μέρεα διαιροῦσιν, ἅπερ μάλιστα γινώσκουσιν οἱ πολλοί . . . ἔαρ δὲ ἀπὸ ἰσημερινῆς (March 21) μέχρι Πλειάδων ἐπιτολῆς (May 10), his summer must have extended over more than four months. Another reckoning was that from the autumnal equinox, φθινοπωρινὴ ἰσημερία (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* (*s.v.* 'Autumnus') is Ulp. *Dig.* 43. 20. 1, § 32, 'aestatem incipere sic peritiores (? the astronomers) ab aequinoctio verno, et finiri aequinoctio autumnali, et ita senis mensibus aestas 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 Rost and Palm under φθινόπωρος, has the following blundering account of its duration, ἀπὸ τῆς πεντεκαιδεκάτης Αὐγούστου μηνὸς ἕως τῆς πεντεκαιδεκάτης Δεκεμβρίου, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς εἰκοστῆς δευτέρας Αὐγούστου ἕως πάλιν εἰκοστῆς 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 Αὐγούστου to Σεπτεμβρίου. [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 representing their view in his *Authorised Version*, p. 186, ed. 2, where he says, 'The φθινόπωρον is the late autumn . . . which succeeds the ὀπώρα (or the autumn contemplated as the time of the ripened fruits of the earth) and which has its name παρὰ τὸ φθίνεσθαι τὴν ὀπώραν, 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

Digitized by Google

versions all rendered *φθινοπωρινά* correctly.[1] 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 *φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα* as "mutually completing one another, *without leaves, without fruit.*" Tyndale was followed by Coverdale and the Great Bible. Similarly Wycliffe has "hervest trees without fruyt," and the Rheims version "trees of autumne unfruiteful." The earliest offender is the Geneva Testament, which gives "corrupt trees and without frute." . . The Bishops' Bible strangely combines both renderings, "trees withered (*φθίνειν*) at fruite gathering (*ὀπώρα*) and without fruite," which is explained in the margin, "Trees withered in autumne 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 *φθινοπωρινά* were equivalent to *χειμερινά*, denoting the season when the trees are necessarily bare both of leaves and fruit, how could a tree be blamed for being *ἄκαρπον*? 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 *φθινόπωρον* has already spent its force in the change from the dog-days (*ὀπώρα*) to the autumn, and cannot act again (as Trench supposes) to change autumn into late-autumn, it follows that *φθινοπωρινά* would have been a most unsuitable word to express the bareness of winter. How unsuitable it would have been, how little corresponding to the *Spätherbst* 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 *ἔτι τῆς ὥρας οὔσης καυματώδους*, in i. 28 of the ripening of the grapes, *μετοπώρου δ' ἀκμάζοντος καὶ τοῦ βότρυος*. 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, *ἦρος ῥόδα, κρίνα . . . θέρους μήκωνες καὶ μῆλα πάντα· νῦν ἄμπελοι καὶ συκαῖ καὶ ῥοιαὶ 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 '*arbores autumnales infructuosae.*'

Digitized by Google

ἡ ὥρα καὶ ὡς ἐκδεδώκασιν ἱλαροὶ οἱ βότρυς, τὰ δένδρα θ' ὡς διάκειται πάντα καὶ ὡς ἀμβροσία ἡ ὀσμὴ τοῦ χωρίου. We may compare the saying attributed to Euripides (Ael. *V.H.* xiii. 4), οὐ μόνον τὸ ἔαρ 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.

Digitized by Google

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[1] *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*

[1] For this see the Introduction on Early Heresies.

Digitized by Google

free grace into an excuse for licentiousness, and deny the only Master and our Lord Jesus Christ.

πάσαν σπουδὴν 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 (παράδοσις, παραδόσεις) in the Apostolic age, appears from 2 Th. 2^{15} κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν, *ib.* 3^{6} κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἣν παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν, 1 Cor. 11^{2} καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε. In contrast with this there was a Jewish παράδοσις of which we read (Mt. 15^{6}) ἠκυρώσατε τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν, Mk. 7^{8} ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Gal. 1^{14} ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων, and also such oral traditions as those to which the Christianized Essenes of Colossae made their appeal, see Col. 2^{8} κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων with Lightfoot's note. The cognate verb was similarly used, as in 1 Cor. 11^{2} quoted above, *ib. v.* 23 παρέλαβον ἀπὸ Κυρίου ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν (viz. the institution of the Eucharist), *ib.* 15^{3} παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον (viz. the Resurrection of Christ), Lk. 1^{2} καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, 2 P. 2^{21} ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς.[1]

It is noticeable that, in all the cases in which St. Paul speaks of a Christian tradition, he speaks of it as received by his converts from himself, either by speech or writing (2 Th. 2^{15}). Sometimes he says that he received a tradition from the Lord, as in 1 Cor. 11^{23} (as to the meaning of which see *Class. Rev.* viii. 149 foll., 267 foll.), with which we may compare Gal. $1^{11, 12}$ γνωρίζω ὑμῖν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτό, οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Some understand in the same way 1 Cor. 15^{3}, but the details that follow (καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾷ, εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα, etc.) make it more probable that the reference here is to information received from older disciples.

[1] A remarkable instance of the passive used of a person is given under (1 *b*).

Digitized by Google

The converse term to *παραδίδωμι* is *παραλαμβάνω*, of which some examples have already been given (2 Th. 3^6, 1 Cor. 11^{23}, 15^3, Gal. 1^{12}); others are Mk. 7^4 (of Jewish tradition) *ἄλλα πολλά ἐστιν ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν*, 1 Cor. 15^1 *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε, . . . δι' οὗ καὶ σώζεσθε*, Gal. 1^9 *εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*, Phil. 4^9 *ἃ καὶ ἐμάθετε καὶ παρελάβετε καὶ ἠκούσατε καὶ εἴδετε ἐν ἐμοί, ταῦτα πράσσετε*, Col. 2^6 *ὡς παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστόν, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε*, 1 Th. 2^{13} *παραλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλά, καθὼς ἀληθῶς ἐστίν, λόγον Θεοῦ*, *ib.* 4^1 *παρακαλοῦμεν ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα καθὼς παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν . . . ἵνα περισσεύητε μᾶλλον.*

(1 *b*) It is a definite type of teaching, cf. Rom. 6^{17} *ὑπηκούσατε ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς*, Rom. 16^{17} *παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς σκοπεῖν τοὺς τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διδαχήν, ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε, ποιοῦντας*, 1 Cor. 11^{16} *ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν, οὐδὲ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Gal. 1^8 'though we or an angel from heaven should preach to you any other Gospel, let him be anathema', 2 Cor. 11^4, 2 Tim. 1^{13} *ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαινόντων λόγων ὧν παρ' ἐμοῦ ἤκουσας ἐν πίστει*, 1 Tim. 1^3 *ἵνα παραγγείλῃς τισὶν μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*, 1 Tim. 4^6 *ἐντρεφόμενος τοῖς λόγοις τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας ᾗ παρηκολούθηκας*, 2 Tim. 3^{14} *σὺ δὲ μένε ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ ἐπιστώθης, εἰδὼς παρὰ τίνων ἔμαθες*, Tit. 1^3 (*τὸ κήρυγμα*) *ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγὼ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ.*

(1 *c*) Sometimes it is spoken of as a deposit (*παραθήκη, παρατίθεμαι*), cf. 1 Tim. 6^{20} *ὦ Τιμόθεε, τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον, ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας*, 2 Tim. 1^{14} *τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου*, 1 Tim. 1^{18} *ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν παρατίθεμαί σοι*, 2 Tim. 2^2 *ἃ ἤκούσας παρ' ἐμοῦ ... ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις οἵτινες ἱκανοὶ ἔσονται καὶ ἑτέρους διδάξαι.*

(1 *d*) In the pastoral epistles we also meet such phrases as *ὑγιής, ὑγιαίνων, πιστὸς λόγος* or *διδασκαλία*, cf. 1 Tim. $1^{10, 11}$ *εἴ τι τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀντίκειται κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον . . . ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ*, *ib.* $6^{3,4}$ *εἴ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαίνουσιν λόγοις τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῇ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ, τετύφωται*, 2 Tim. 4^3 *τῆς ὑγιαινούσης διδασκαλίας οὐκ ἀνέξονται ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισωρεύσουσιν διδασκάλους*, Tit. 1^9 *ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου, ἵνα δυνατὸς ᾖ καὶ παρακαλεῖν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ*, *ib.* 2^1 *σὺ δὲ λάλει ἃ πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ*, *ib.* 2^8 *λόγον ὑγιῆ ἀκατάγνωστον.* The phrase *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος* is used with more freedom, sometimes with reference to salvation through Christ, as 1 Tim. 1^{15}, sometimes of a proverb or maxim, as apparently in 1 Tim. 3^1 *εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ.*

(2) A comparison with the parallel passage in 2 P. 2^{21} suggests that this tradition had two sides: Jude speaks of it as *πίστις*, teaching what we should believe, Peter as *ἐντολή*, teaching what we should do. We have the same two sides brought out in the Baptismal Service and Church Catechism.

(2 *a*) St. Paul gives briefly the contents of the tradition in 1 Cor. $1^{23f.}$

Digitized by Google

ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον, ἔθνεσιν δὲ μωρίαν, αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς . . . Χριστὸν Θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ Θεοῦ σοφίαν. Elsewhere he speaks of it as 'the ministry of reconciliation (τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς) that God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself,' 2 Cor. $5^{18f.}$. So in 1 Tim. 1^{15} πιστὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος, ὅτι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι, and still more briefly in Rom. $10^{8f.}$ τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὃ κηρύσσομεν· ὅτι, ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς τὸ ῥῆμα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ, 1 Cor. 12^{3} οὐδεὶς δύναται εἰπεῖν Κύριος Ἰησοῦς εἰ μὴ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Much to the same effect St. John says (1 Jo. 4^{2}) πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰ.Χ. ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστίν, of which the converse is given in 2 Jo.^{7}, πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἐξῆλθαν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰ.Χ. 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 16^{31} πίστευσον ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου . . .). 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 (ἐπερώτημα) 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 (σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος). ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέν σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς· κἀγὼ δέ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (Mt. $16^{16f.}$). Compare 1 Cor. 3^{11} θεμέλιον ἄλλον οὐδεὶς δύναται θεῖναι παρὰ τὸν κείμενον, ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.

(2 *b*) But the tradition also included rules of action. Thus in 2 Th. 3^{6} St. Paul warns his converts στέλλεσθαι ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἣν παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν. His own conduct was to be a τύπος to them (*ib.* ver. 9). See also Rom. 6^{17} χάρις τῷ Θεῷ ὅτι ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς, ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε 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 ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγγελία ἣν ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, 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^{34}) ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, to which the Apostle refers in 1 Jo. 2^{8}.

Sometimes the word παράδοσις is used of less fundamental matters,

Digitized by Google

as in 1 Cor. 11[1] *ἐπαινῶ 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[5]) 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[16]), the latter by appeal to a *Κυρίου ἐντολή* (14[37]).

It may be worth while here to consider some of the terms which are used to express the contents of the *παράδοσις*, 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: *ib.* 12[49. 50], My Father has given Me an *ἐντολὴν τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω· καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιός ἐστιν*: also of a command of our Lord, *ib.* 13[34] *ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους*, 1 Joh. 4[21]. The widest significance of the term is found in 1 Joh. 3[23] *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα πιστεύσωμεν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ 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] *τηρῆσαί σε τὴν ἐντολὴν ἄσπιλον 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 2[21] already quoted under *παραδίδωμι*, and 3[2] *μνησθῆναι τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος*, 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 *Κυρίου 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 ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, Tit. 1[14] *μὴ προσέχοντες Ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν*).

A similar word is *παραγγελία* found in 1 Th. 4[2] *οἴδατε τίνας παραγγελίας ἐδώκαμεν ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* (warnings against impurity as appears from the context), 1 Tim. 1[5] *τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη*, *ib.* 1[18] *ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν παρατίθεμαί σοι . . . ἵνα στρατεύῃ τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν*, and so *παραγγέλλω*.

A more important word is *εὐαγγέλιον*, the good news of the kingdom, as it is called in Mt. 4[23], etc., the good news of Jesus Christ (Mk. 1[1]), of God (Mk. 1[14]); men are called to believe in it (Mk. 1[15]), to sacrifice home and life for it (Mk. 10[29], 8[35]); 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 *my* or *our* Gospel, Rom. 2[16], where it is said to

Digitized by Google

include the coming of Christ to judge the world, *ib.* 16[25] *τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ στηρίξαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα* 'I.X. *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου . . . εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος*, 2 Cor. 4[4-5] *τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας συνιστάντες ἑαυτοὺς πρὸς πᾶσαν συνείδησιν ἀνθρώπων ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον, ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν Θεοῦ. οὐ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς κηρύσσομεν ἀλλὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν Κύριον*, 1 Th. 1[5] *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγένετο εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν λόγῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ*, 2 Th. 2[13] *εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας εἰς ὃ ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἡμῶν*, 2 Tim. 2[8] *μνημόνευε Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐγηγερμένον ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυείδ, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου.* Its nature is further shown by Rom. 10[9] *τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὃ κηρύσσομεν. ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματί σου Κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πιστεύῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ 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 *πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς* (Gal. 2[7]). It would take too long to go through other terms which are employed to express the new message of salvation, such as *ἀλήθεια, κήρυγμα, τὸ ῥῆμα, τὰ ῥήματα, ζωή, ἐλπίς, λόγος, πίστις.*

(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. Growth 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

Digitized by Google

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 remember that 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 ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Eph. $4^{12,13}$). So too our Lord looking forward to the future says ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω ὑμῖν λέγειν, ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι· ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν (Joh. $16^{12,13}$), and in his final charge ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. We must beware therefore of laying too great a stress on the ἅπαξ of Jude, as though it forbad 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 ἰδέα 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.

Digitized by Google

(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 ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται.*) 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 immobilis et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in Deum omnipotentem' (then follows a creed ending with the Resurrection of Christ) 'Hac lege fidei manente, cetera . . . admittunt 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 efferbuit in juventutem; nunc per Paracletum componitur in maturitatem.'[1] 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, *ὅσα ἐστιν ἀληθῆ, ὅσα σεμνά, ὅσα δίκαια, ὅσα ἁγνά, ὅσα προσφιλῆ, ὅσα εὔφημα· εἴ τις ἀρετή, καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος, ταῦτα λογίζεσθε,* 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.'

Digitized by Google

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

Digitized by Google

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]

[1] I have given expression above—I fear rather confusedly—to some of the thoughts which arise as one meditates on the words ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ πίστει. 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) ὁπόσα ῥέζουσι κακοὶ σφετέρῃσιν ἀνοίαις. 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.

Digitized by Google

ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι.

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 οὐαί 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}) ἕτοιμοι ἀεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραΰτητος καὶ φόβου, συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθήν. 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^{9}), 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

Digitized by Google

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. 3^{10} 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. 6^{22}, Joh. 9^{22}) and sanctioned by our Lord (Mt. 18^{17}). St. Paul uses this as a regular instrument of Church discipline in a case of immorality in 1 Cor. 5^{3-5} *ἐγὼ μὲν ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι, παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, ἤδη κέκρικα ὡς παρὼν τὸν οὕτως τοῦτο κατεργασάμενον, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ Σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου*, and in a case of misbelief in 1 Tim. 1^{20}, where he says (speaking of Hymenaeus and Alexander) *οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ, ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν μὴ βλασφημεῖν*. 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

Digitized by Google

misuse of the Gospel of God's free grace, and in the denial of God and Christ.

Denial of a Person.

The use of ἀρνέομαι (*denego*) followed by an accusative of the person is unclassical and seems to be confined to Christian literature. In general ἀρνέομαι is opposed to ὁμολογέω. The N.T. use is illustrated in the Homily 139, on the Adoration of the Cross, wrongly ascribed to Chrysostom: ὁ ἀρνούμενος ἕτερον οἷον ἢ ἀδελφὸν ἢ φίλον . . . κἂν μαστιζόμενον ἴδῃ τοῦτον . . . κἂν ὁτιοῦν πάσχοντα, οὐ προίσταται, οὐ βοηθεῖ . . . ἅπαξ γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἠλλοτρίωται, *i.e.* it is equivalent to repudiation. So Peter repudiated our Lord. The sin and its punishment are spoken of in Mt. 10[33] ὅστις ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· ὅστις δὲ ἀρνήσεταί με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι κἀγὼ αὐτὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου. In Mk. 8[38] and Lk. 9[26] the phrase ὅστις ἀρνήσεταί με is replaced by ὃς ἂν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους. In the martyrologies 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 Καῖσαρ, and offer incense to Caesar or swear by his name. In Apoc. 2[13] it is said of the church at Pergamum οὐκ ἠρνήσω τὴν πίστιν μου, in contrast to the followers of Balaam, 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. *H.E.* 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 θεὸν παρευρίσκουσιν καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν οὐχ ὡς αἱ προφητεῖαι παραδιδόασιν ἐκδέχονται, and the Introduction on the Early Heresies. Confession being a main element in baptism (cf. Rom. 10[10] καρδίᾳ 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,

Digitized by Google

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 teaching of Lot, they had been lately rescued from captivity by Abraham, yet they) followed the sinful example of the angels, and their land is still a prey to the fire, bearing witness to the eternal punishment of sin. In spite of these warnings the heretics, who are now finding their way into the Church, persist in their wild hallucinations, 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 however rail at that which is beyond their knowledge, while they surrender 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 infi[r]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 ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους

Digitized by Google

(Lk. 22^{53}, Col. 1^{13}), and of the ruler τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος (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.

ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι.

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} τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας . . . καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πέμπει αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς ἐνέργειαν πλάνης εἰς τὸ πιστεῦσαι αὐτοὺς 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,'[1] yet there was a certain amount of βλασφημία, not

[1] In agreement with this, Bengel in his note says 'Angeli qui peccarunt, tamen ut creaturae Dei habent bonitatem . . . et in sua natura praestantissima, quam a Creatore acceperunt, characterem retinent indebilem majestatis.'

Digitized by Google

merely in the language addressed to him by Zephon 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 *χλευάζω* or *λοιδορέω* or *ἐπισκώπτω*? I think the following quotations tend to show that it may: Clem. Al. *Paed.* p. 297 *πολλοὺς βλασφημοῦντες εἰς γέλωτα οὐ παύονται*, Herodian iv. 12. 1 *εἰς τοῦτον πολλάκις ἀπέσκωψε καὶ μέχρι αἰσχρᾶς βλασφημίας*. 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

Digitized by Google

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 δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς στῆναι πρὸς τὰς μεθοδίας τοῦ διαβόλου· ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν 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 ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.* So too our Lord (Lk. $12^{4.5}$) *μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἐχόντων περισσότερόν τι ποιῆσαι. ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθῆτε· φοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν,* 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 *τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου.* Similar warnings are suggested by Lk. $22^{3.31}$, Joh. $13^{2.27}$, 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, slaves 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) *ἑώρα τὴν ὅρασιν τοῦ ἁγίου . . . ἣν ἔδειξάν μοι ἄγγελοι καὶ ἤκουσα παρ' αὐτῶν πάντα καὶ ἔγνων αὐτὸ θεωρῶν. καὶ ουκ εις την νυν γενεαν αλλ' επι πορρω ουσαν γενεάν* (cf. J. 14 *καὶ τούτοις*) *. . . καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ὁ ἅγιος ὁ μέγας ἐκ τῆς κατοικήσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐπὶ γῆν πατήσει ἐπὶ τὸ Σινὰ ὄρος . . . καὶ φανήσεται ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ φοβηθήσονται 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. *ἔλεος*, cf. J. 2), will be upon them,

Digitized by Google

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 Joh. 2^{18}. 'The successive partial dawnings 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^{3}; 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' ἐσχάτων 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' ἐσχάτου 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' ἐσχάτῳ 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^{29}) the phrase ἔσχατον 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 ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις '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^{47}) and of Elam (49^{39}), and twice over of the repentance of Israel, ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν νοήσουσιν αὐτό (23^{20}, 30^{24}). It is used by Ezekiel of the

Digitized by Google

invasion of Gog and Magog ($38^{8.16}$), by Daniel in explaining the vision of the four kingdoms (2^{28}), 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 (9^{25}, 12^{12}). 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 (3^{5}).

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 ἁγίῳ 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

Digitized by Google

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.

Digitized by Google

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 **Σίμων 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 **Σίμων** 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 appellative 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 *ἰσότιμον* 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 *ἰσότιμον* below.

τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν.] Field seems to be right in holding that *ἰσότιμος* and ὁμότιμος 'invariably borrow their meaning from *τιμή honour*,' and not from *τιμή* in the sense of *price*.[1] He quotes Jos. *Ant.* xii. 3. 1 *ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ μητροπόλει Ἀντιοχείᾳ πολιτείας αὐτοὺς ἠξίωσε καὶ τοῖς ἐνοικισθεῖσιν ἰσοτίμους ἀπέδειξε Μακεδόσι*. The same holds good in the great majority of compounds of *τιμή*. So here F. translates '*equally*

[1] I see however that it bears this sense in Philo M. i. p. 165 *τὸν σοφὸν ἰσότιμον κόσμῳ ὁ Θεὸς ἡγεῖται* quoted in Salmon's *Introd. to N.T.* p. 502.

Digitized by Google

privileged,' a faith which carries equal privileges, so putting them on an equality with us, whether *us* the Apostles, or, if addressed to Gentiles, *us* 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, $21^{20\text{-}28}$, Rom. 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, Ephes. $2^{14\text{-}22}$, esp. ver. 14 *αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἕν, καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ*, 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 *ἰσότιμον* and *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*. It is true that those here addressed are warned against the *τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις* who speak evil of dignities (2^{10}) and that they are bidden to remember the teaching of the Apostles (3^{2}); 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 appropriate 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 (*ἡμῖν = τῷ ἡμῶν*) see Winer pp. 777 f.

The use of the word *λαγχάνω* here is to emphasize the fact that faith itself is the gift of God; so *Wisd.* 8^{19} *ψυχῆς ἔλαχον ἀγαθῆς*, Plato *Phileb.* 55 B *ἀνδρίαν ἢ σωφροσύνην...ἤ τι τῶν ἄλλων ὅσ' ἀγαθὰ εἴληχε ψυχή*, *Polit.* 269 C *φρόνησιν εἰληχός*, cf. Eph. $2^{8,9}$.

ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.] Does this form one phrase with *πίστιν*? Does it mean 'faith in the righteousness of Christ as our justification'? Cf. Eph. 1^{15} *τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ*, 1 Tim. 3^{13}. 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 *δίκαιος* cf. Heb. 6^{10} *οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν*, 1 Joh. 1^{9} *ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστός ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιος ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας*, and Clem. Al. p. 116 *ὅτι γε μία καθολικὴ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος σωτηρία ἡ πίστις, ἰσότης δὲ καὶ κοινωνία τοῦ δικαίου καὶ φιλανθρώπου Θεοῦ ἡ αὐτὴ πρὸς πάντας, ὁ ἀπόστολος σαφέστατα ἐξηγήσατο*, shortly after which follows the quotation from Gal. $3^{26\text{-}29}$.

τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] See n. on Jude *v.* 4 *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην*. If we take *Θεοῦ* of Christ with Spitta, we may compare 2^{1} below *τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην*, Joh. 20^{28} (the words of Thomas) *ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου*, Tit. 2^{13}, 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

Digitized by Google

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, 1^{11}, 2^{20}, 3^{2}, 3^{18}, but does not occur at all in 1 Pet. Apart from its use as predicate, it occurs without the article in 1 Tim. 1^{1} *Παῦλος ἀπόστολος . . . κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν*, and in Jude *v.* 25 *μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν*, Ps. 24^{5}, Isa. 45^{15}.

2. **χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.**] See n. on Jude 2. The same formula is found in 1 P. 1^{2} and (without *πληθυνθείη*) in Rom. 1^{7}, 1 Cor. 1^{3}, 2 Cor. 1^{2}, Gal. 1^{3}, Eph. 1^{2}, Phil. 1^{2}, Col. 1^{2}, 1 Th. 1^{1}, 2 Th. 1^{2}, Philem. 3 *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰ. Χ.* In 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit. we have the same salutation with *ἔλεος* added. The salutation in Apoc. 1^{4} is *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν*; the final salutation in Heb. 13^{25} is simply *ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν*, as in Eph. 6^{24}, Col. 4^{18}, 1 Tim. 6^{21}, 2 Tim. 4^{22}, Tit. 3^{15}, to which the words *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. μεθ' ὑμῶν* are added in Rom. 16^{20}, 1 Th. 5^{28}, 2 Th. 3^{18}. In Gal. 6^{18} and Phil. 4^{23}, we have the fuller form *ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν*. In 2 Cor. 13^{13} the names of all three Persons are invoked *ἡ χάρις τ. κυρίου Ἰ. Χ. καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν*. On *χάρις* see Hort's n. on 1 Pet. 1^{2}.

ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ.] The word *ἐπίγνωσις* occurs four times in this epistle (here and 1^{3}, 1^{8}, 2^{20}), once in Heb. 10^{26}, 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. 2^{5} *ἐπίγνωσιν Θεοῦ εὑρήσεις*, Hos. 4^{1} *οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια . . . οὐδὲ ἐπίγνωσις Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, *ib.* 6^{7}. 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. 17^{3} *αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας* Ἰ. Χ., 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 ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*, read by P and some of the Lat. verss., to the longer form *ἐν ἐπ. τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου*[1] read by BCK, and by ℵ AL+ with the addition of *Χριστοῦ* after *Ἰησοῦ*. He compares 1 Th. 1^{1}, where the editors agree in a short form against the preponderating weight of MS. authority in favour of a longer form, and Col. 1^{2} *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. 4^{24} and 1 Cor. 9^{1}, though the converse order *ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς* is frequent in the epp. to the Thessalonians.

Digitized by Google

The use of the sing. *αὐτοῦ* in the 3rd verse is perhaps in favour of the short form here.

3. **ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ . . . δεδωρημένης.**] 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 ὡς, 2 Cor. 5^{20} *ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ πρεσβεύομεν ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν*, Acts 27^{30} *τῶν ναυτῶν χαλασάντων τὴν σκάφην . . . προφάσει ὡς ἐκ πρῴρας ἀγκύρας μελλόντων ἐκτείνειν*, 1 Cor. 4^{18} *ὡς μὴ ἐρχομένου μου ἐφυσιώθησάν τινες*, 1 Pet. 4^{12} *μὴ ξενίζεσθε ὡς ξένου ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος*. In all these cases ὡς 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. Ἰησοῦ*.

On the other hand, if we connect this verse with what follows, as is done by Kühl, Keil, Weiss, Hundhausen, the subjective force of ὡς 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 δέ*, on which see n. below.

Spitta, Weiss, and Nestle read *τὰ πάντα* with ℵ 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 dittographia of the 1st syllable of *πα-ντα*. Spitta further carries out his idea of the opposition between the Apostles and the community by insisting on the contrast between *ὑμῖν* in *v.* 2 and *ἡμῖν* 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) *ὁ μὲν διὰ τὴν θείαν ἐνέργειαν ἄφωνος ἔρριπτο*, Job 27^{3} (and elsewhere) *πνεῦμα θεῖον*.

[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.

Digitized by Google

Besides this verse the adj. only occurs in the N.T. in *v.* 4 (where see n.) and in Acts 17[29] *οὐκ ὀφείλομεν νομίζειν χρυσῷ τὸ θεῖον εἶναι ὅμοιον*. The phrase *θεία δύναμις* appears in the Carian inscription quoted in the Appendix, *ἀγάλματα ἐπιφανεστάτας παρέχοντα τῆς θείας δυνάμεως ἀρετάς*, and is common in philosophic writings, *e.g.* Plato *Ion* 534 c (the poets speak) *θείᾳ δυνάμει*, *Legg.* iii. 691 E, Arist. *Pol.* vii. 4 *θείας τοῦτο δυνάμεως ἔργον, ἥτις καὶ τόδε συνέχει τὸ πᾶν*, Justin *Apol.* 1. 32, Clem. Al. *Str.* i. p. 376 *χωρίζεται ἡ Ἑλληνικὴ ἀλήθεια τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ μεγέθει γνώσεως καὶ ἀποδείξει κυριωτέρᾳ καὶ θείᾳ δυνάμει*, *ib.* vii. p. 853. 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. Hierocl.* 4 *Ἰησοῦς πλείους ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς θείας διδασκαλίας λόγον προυτρέψατο*, *ib. μύρια πλήθη ἐπὶ τὴν θείαν ἑαυτοῦ διδασκαλίαν ἐπαγόμενος*, *ib. θείᾳ καὶ ἀρρήτῳ δυνάμει τοὺς μὲν ἐπανισταμένους αὐτοῦ τῇ θείᾳ διδασκαλίᾳ ῥαδίως μετιών, τὸν δὲ παγέντα καὶ παραδοθέντα θεῖον λόγον κρατύνων, οὐδ' ὡς εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν τῆς ἐνθέου δυνάμεως τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπιδείκνυται 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 καλέσαντος*, see n. below.

τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν.] 'All that tends to, or is needed for, life and godliness,' cf. Jud. 17[10] 'I will give thee thy victuals' (*τὰ πρὸς ζωήν σου*), Acts 28[10] *τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν*, Lk. 19[42] *τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην σου*, Jos. *Ant. prooem.* 6 *παιδευθέντες τὰ πρὸς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἄσκησιν ἀρετῆς*. Weiss explains 'es handelt sich um alles was dazu gehört um in uns das durch die Wiedergeburt erzeugte wahre geistliche Leben, dessen Hauptcharakterzug die *εὐσέβεια* ist, zu erzeugen.' *εὐσεβής* 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[16] Christ, the Incarnate, Risen Lord, is spoken of as *τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον*, 'the secret of piety.'

δεδωρημένης.] See n. on *δώρημα* James 1[17]. The only other passage, besides this and the following verse, in which the word is found in the N.T. is Mk. 15[45]. It occurs also in Gen. 30[20] *δεδώρηται ὁ Θεός μοι δῶρον καλόν*, Prov. 4[2] *δῶρον ἀγαθὸν δωροῦμαι ὑμῖν*.

διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς.] There is a considerable resemblance between this passage and Col. 1[9-11] *αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ . . . ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ καρποφοροῦντες* (see below *v.* 8 *οὐκ ἀκάρπους*) *καὶ αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*, where we have *ἐπίγνωσις* repeated as here, and the words underlined correspond to words in our text. For *καλέσαντος* see below *v.* 10 *σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν ποιεῖσθαι*, and cf. 2 Tim. 1[9] (*Θεοῦ*) *τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγίᾳ οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ κατ' ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν*, 1 Pet. 1[15] *κατὰ τὸν*

Digitized by Google

καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἅγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι . . γενήθητε, *ib.* 2[9] ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς. 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 ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, 2 Clem. Rom. 9 εἰ Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος . . . ἐγένετο σὰρξ καὶ οὕτως ἡμᾶς ἐκάλεσεν. In other passages of this epistle Christ is mentioned as the object of ἐπίγνωσις (1[8], 2[20]). Cf also Herm. *Sim.* 14. 5 εἰ οὖν πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ βαστάζεται, τί δοκεῖς 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 κλητοῖς J. 2.

ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ.] 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[5] ἀπῆλθον ὃς μὲν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν, ὃς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ, below 2[22] ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα compared with Prov. 26[11] ἐπὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἔμετον, Barn. v. 9 τοὺς ἰδίους ἀποστόλους ἐξελέξατο. It is found also in LXX. Job 2[11] παρεγένοντο ἕκαστος ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας χώρας, Prov. 27[8], Herm. *Vis.* i. 3. 4 ὁ Θεὸς . . . τῇ ἰδίᾳ σοφίᾳ καὶ προνοίᾳ κτίσας τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Plut. *Mor.* 237 D τοὺς νέους τοὺς ἰδίους αἰδεῖσθαι πατέρας, Chariton Aphr. iv. 6 ἰδίῳ δεσπότῃ χαίρειν with D'Orville's n. Cf. Phrynichus p. 441 Lob. 'τὰ ἴδια πράττω' οἱ πολλοὶ λέγουσιν, δέον 'τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ πράττω' λέγειν. The article is frequently omitted, as in Acts 13[36] Δαυεὶδ ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ ὑπηρετήσας, Gal. 6[9] καιρῷ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν (so καιροῖς ἰδίοις 1 Tim. 2[6], 6[15], Tit. 1[3], as compared with Polyb. i. 30. 10 χρώμενοι τοῖς ἰδίοις καιροῖς), 2 Tim. 1[9] οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν, Tit. 2[9] δούλους ἰδίοις δεσπόταις ὑποτάσσεσθαι and below 2[16] ἔλεγξιν ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας. By **δόξα** 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. 1[14] ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο . . . καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, which is explained immediately afterwards by saying that He was πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. **ἀρετή** 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] ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος,[1] 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] ὅσα εὔφημα, εἴ τις ἀρετὴ καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος, ταῦτα λογίζεσθε, where Lightfoot comments 'some treat ἀρετή and ἔπαινος 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.

Digitized by Google

conception of virtue, whatever consideration is due to the praise of men.' The fact that philosophical terms like *θεία φύσις* are used in 2 Pet. leads one to suppose that *ἀρετή* has its usual Greek meaning, as in Wisdom 8^7, 4 Macc. $1^{2-4.\ 8.\ 13-18}$, where the cardinal virtues are recounted, cf. Justin M. *Apol.* ii. 2 *τὸ διδασκάλιον τῆς θείας ἀρετῆς*, Clem. Al. p. 438 *παράδειγμα θείας ἀρετῆς*, Eus. *c. Hierocl.* 4 *τῇ ἰδίᾳ θεότητι καὶ ἀρετῇ πᾶσαν ἔσωσε τὴν οἰκουμένην*. 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 *ἐνεπαροίνει τῇ ἀρετῇ τοῦ θείου* 'abused the goodness of Providence,' *ib. Procem.* 4. 11 *οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι νομοθέται τοῖς μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἁμαρτημάτων εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τῷ λόγῳ τὴν αἰσχύνην μετέθεσαν . . . ὁ δὲ ἡμέτερος νομοθέτης, ἀκραιφνῆ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἔχοντα τὸν Θεὸν ἀποφήνας, ᾠήθη δεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκείνης πειρᾶσθαι μεταλαβεῖν*, *ib.* i. 3. 8 (the words of God to Noah after the Flood) *οἷς ἐξύβριζον εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν εὐσέβειαν καὶ ἀρετήν, τούτοις ἐξεβιάσαντό με ταύτην αὐτοῖς ἐπιθεῖναι τὴν δίκην*. Philo *Leg. Alleg.* ii. 14 (M. 1. p. 75) speaks of *τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ σοφίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ* as *τὴν μητέρα τῶν συμπάντων*, *Q. det. pot.* § 44 (M. 1. p. 222) *τῶν ἀρετῶν, ἡ μὲν Θεοῦ πρὸς ἀλήθειάν ἐστι . . . ἡ δὲ Μωυσέως σκηνή, συμβολικῶς οὖσα ἀνθρώπου ἀρετὴ . . . μίμημα καὶ ἀπεικόνισμα τῆς θείας ἐκείνης*, *ib.* 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.* 535 (*De Vit. Pudore*) *πῶς οὐ παρίσταται δεινὸν εἶναι τὸ τῆς ἰδίας δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς ἀφειδεῖν;*

4. **δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται.**] The verb may be taken here in the middle sense, as before, with Θεός (understood from *τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ*) for the subject; but the perf. of deponent verbs frequently bears a passive sense, as in Clem. Al. *Protr.* p. 73 *οὗ μεῖζον οὐδὲν ἐκ Θεοῦ δεδώρηται*, *Paed.* i. p. 133 *καινῷ λαῷ καινὴ διαθήκη δεδώρηται*, *Str.* iii. 1. 4 *οἷς τοῦτο δεδώρηται ὑπὸ Θεοῦ*, and the article suits the subject. For the combination of positive and superlative epithets, see Plato *Rep.* 450 E *περὶ τῶν μεγίστων τε καὶ φίλων*, where H. Richards proposes to read *φιλτάτων* (*C.R.* vii. 349). He has supplied me with the following exx. taken from Rehdantz's n. on Lycurgus 29, *δοκεῖ δικαιότατον καὶ δημοτικὸν εἶναι*, Thuc. i. 1 *ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων*, i. 84 *ἐλευθέραν καὶ εὐδοξοτάτην πόλιν νεμόμεθα*, Xen. *Hell.* v. 3. 17 *εὐτάκτους καὶ εὐοπλοτάτους*, Eur. *Cycl.* 315 *κομψὸς γενήσει καὶ λαλίστατος*, Plato *Legg.* 808 D *ἐπίβουλον καὶ δριμὺ καὶ ὑβριστότατον θηρίων*, Plato *Symp.* 205 D *ὁ μέγιστος καὶ δολερὸς ἔρως παντί*, Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 4. 29 *δυνατωτάτων καὶ προθύμων*, Aesch. ii. 11 *ὅθεν δ' ἡγοῦμαι σαφεστάτους μοι τοὺς λόγους ἔσεσθαι καὶ γνωρίμους 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 *τίμια* and *μέγιστα*, 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

Digitized by Google

μέγιστα καὶ τιμιώτατα which might suggest reading τιμιώτατα here. The forms ἐπάγγελμα and ἐπαγγελία are both classical; the latter alone is found in biblical Gr., excepting this verse and 3^{13} below.

Three explanations of δι' ὧν have been given. Spitta would understand them of ἡμῖν in *vv.* 1 and 3 (*i.e.* the Apostles, according to his view): he then reads τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα <ὑμῖν> δεδώρηται, 'through whom He has granted *to you* the promised blessings which are so great and precious *to us*.' The 2nd view is that δι' ὧν refers to πάντα τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν: so Keil, Schott, and Hofmann, 'Wie die Erkenntnis Gottes das Mittel ist, durch welches uns alles zum Leben u. zur Gottseligkeit Dienende geschenkt ist, so ist letzteres das Mittel, wodurch uns köstliche u. grosse Verheissungen geschenkt 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 ζωήν, but are *included in* them. The 3rd view (held by Kühl, Dietlein, Wiesinger, Brückner) is far the simplest, connecting the relative δι' ὧν with the immediately preceding ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ, '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. $3^{2.3}$. For the contents of the ἐπαγγέλματα see below 3^{13}. I should prefer however to read ὑμῖν with א 68 syr^{p}., instead of ἡμῖν, on account of the following γένησθε. 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 ἡμῖν as being much more expressive. In such cases the MSS. are of no great authority.' So here the preceding ἡμᾶς would easily lead to ἡμῖν being written for ὑμῖν.

ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως.] The reference in διὰ τούτων is to ἐπαγγέλματα (as Dietlein, Wiesinger, Schott, Keil, Kühl, Weiss), not to τὰ πρὸς ζωήν (as de Wette, Hofmann, Spitta), nor to δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ (as Bengel). Our nature is changed to divine by the moral power of hope and faith kindled in us by the promises. The phrase θεία φύσις is Platonic, see *Critias* 120 D–121 A μέχρι περ ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ φύσις αὐτοῖς ἐξήρκει . . . φύσεως θείας παραμενούσης πάντ' αὐτοῖς ἠξήθη, *Rep.* 366 C θείᾳ φύσει δυσχεραίνων τὸ ἀδικεῖν, *Legg.* iii. 691 φύσις τις ἀνθρωπίνη μεμιγμένη θείᾳ τινὶ δυνάμει, *Phaedr.* 230 A θείας καὶ ἀτύφου μοίρας φύσει μετέχον, 253 A ἐφαπτόμενοι θεοῦ τῇ μνήμῃ ἐξ ἐκείνου λαμβάνουσι τὰ ἤθη καθ' ὅσον δυνατὸν θεοῦ ἀνθρώπῳ μετασχεῖν, *Rep.* vi. 500C, *Protag.* 322 A ὁ ἄνθρωπος θείας μετέσχε μοίρας. It is found also in Xen. *Hell.* vii. 1. 2 δοκεῖ ταῦτα οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνῃ μᾶλλον ἢ θείᾳ φύσει καὶ τύχῃ διωρίσθαι, 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 ἐξ ἀνθρώπου ἐπιθυμοῦντα γενέσθαι καὶ . . . περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Δία κοινωνίας βουλευόμενον. 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 ἐφ' ὅσον ἐνδέχεται ἀθανατίζειν). The same idea occurs in slightly altered form in Heb. 3^{14} μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν, 6^{4} μετόχους γενηθέντας

Digitized by Google

πνεύματος ἁγίου, 1 2[10] εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ, 1 Joh. 1[3], ἡ κοινωνία ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰ.Χ., 1 P. 5[1] ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός, 2 Cor. 3[18] τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν. The phrase or its equivalent also occurs in *Apoc. Petri ap.* Method. *Symp.* ii. 6 ἡ μακαρία ἐκείνη φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ, Jos. *c. Ap.* 26 Ἀμενώφει θείας δοκοῦντι μετεσχηκέναι φύσεως, Philo M. 2. p. 329 ἡ ἀμετάβλητος καὶ μακάριος καὶ τρισευδαίμων θεία φύσις, *ib.* p. 343 ἡ μακαρία Θεοῦ φύσις, *ib.* M. 1. p. 51 οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐπετόλμησε τοσοῦτον ἀναδραμεῖν ὁ ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς ὡς ἀντιλαβέσθαι Θεοῦ φύσεως εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἀνέσπασεν αὐτὸν πρὸς ἑαυτόν, *ib.* 647 ὅσοι λογικῆς κεκοινήκασι φύσεως, and in many of the Fathers, *e.g.* Iren. iv. 20[5] μετοχὴ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν τὸ γινώσκειν Θεὸν καὶ ἀπολαύειν τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ, Clem. Al. p. 471 ἡ δὲ ἡμετέρα φύσις ἐμπαθὴς οὖσα ἐγκρατείας δεῖται, δι' ἧς συνεγγίζειν πειρᾶται τῇ θείᾳ φύσει, Euseb. *c. Hierocl.* 6 θείαν μὲν φύσιν, εὐεργέτιν οὖσαν καὶ σώτειραν καὶ προνοητικὴν τῶν ὄντων, ἀνθρώποις ποτὲ ἐς ὁμιλίαν ἐλθεῖν οὐδεὶς ἂν ἀπείργοι λόγος, *ib.* 7 ἦ γὰρ οὐκ ἀτοπώτατον . . . θείαν φύσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐπιλάμψασαν (*i.e.* on Apollonius) σκότιόν που καὶ μιννθάδιον ἀποτελεῖν, οὐχὶ δὲ ἐς αἰῶνα τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπιδείκνυσθαι; Quotations will be found from Origen, Hilary, Athanasius, Jerome, and others in Hundhausen's n. on this verse. The phrase is profusely used by Greg. Nyss., cf. *Anim. et Resurr.* 224 A ἐπειδὰν ἡ ψυχὴ πάντα τὰ ποικίλα τῆς φύσεως ἀποσκενασαμένη κινήματα θεοειδὴς γένηται . . . τὴν ὑπερέχουσαν μιμεῖται ζωήν, τοῖς ἰδιώμασι τῆς θείας φύσεως ἐμμορφωθεῖσα, 228 D ἡ θεία φύσις ἡ πηγὴ πάσης ἐστὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς, *Catech.* 46 D, 48 B, 51 B, 52 A, 54 D, etc. The same idea receives a stronger and more startling expression in the θεοποίησις of Athanasius and other Fathers, see Westcott on the epistles of St. John p. 319 and my note on Clem. Al. *Str.* vii. § 3 ἐσομένῳ θεῷ.

ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς.] The negative preparation for the positive glorification, as in James 1[21] ἀποθέμενοι ῥυπαρίαν δέξασθε τὸν λόγον, cf. Plat. *Theaet.* 176A φυγὴ (ἐνθένδε ἐκεῖσε) ὁμοίωσις θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν. The acc. is commonly used after ἀποφεύγω, as below 2[18. 20]. In fact this is the only recorded instance of the gen. with this verb. Winer (p. 532) mentions other compounds of ἀπό, ἀπαλλοτριοῦν (Eph. 2[12]. 4[18]), ἀφίστασθαι (1 Tim. 4[1]), which have the same construction. To these may be added ἀποδιδράσκω Philo *Alleg.* p. 90, ἀποκρύπτεσθαι *ib.* p. 88, ἀποτέμνειν, ἀποβαίνειν, ἀπολύειν. The gen. whether with or without a preposition serves to intensify the danger which has been escaped, cf. Mt. 3[7] φυγεῖν ἀπ' ὀργῆς, 1 Cor. 10[14]. Sometimes the simple φεύγω takes the gen., as in Soph. *Phil.* 1034 τῆς νόσου πεφευγέναι like πεφυγάδευται τοῦ θείου χοροῦ 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 4[4] with the notes in my ed. pp. 218 f. Also compare Rom. 8[21] αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ, Gal. 6[8] ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα . . . θερίσει φθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα . . . ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Digitized by Google

The author is fond of these compact articular phrases, see 2^{7} below.

5. **καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ.**] See for *καὶ δέ* 2 Tim. 3^{12} *καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ θέλοντες ζῆν*, 1 Tim. 3^{10} *καὶ οὗτοι δὲ δοκιμαζέσθωσαν*, Rom. 11^{23} *κἀκεῖνοι δὲ . . . ἐγκεντρισθήσονται*, Mt. 10^{18}, 16^{18}, Joh. 6^{51}, $8^{16.\ 17}$, Acts 3^{24}, 22^{29}, Heb. 9^{21}, 1 Joh. 1^{3} *καὶ ἡ κοινωνία δέ* with Wescott's n., and Madvig *Gr. Gr.* § 185. 2, 'By annexing a *δέ* to *καί* the new member acquires prominence as a special corroboration and enlargement of the preceding (*and too, and also*).' For classical examples cf. *Prom.* 972 *χλιδῶντας ὧδε τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἐγὼ ἐχθροὺς ἴδοιμι· καὶ σὲ δ' ἐν τούτοις λέγω*, Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 1. 2 *ἄρχοντες μέν εἰσι καὶ οἱ βουκόλοι τῶν βοῶν . . . καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ καλούμενοι νομεῖς*. In all these cases *δέ* has its ordinary connective use: here (if we suppose the construction continued after *φθορᾶς*) it would be used *in apodosi*, as in 1 Cor. $1^{22.\ 23}$, *ἐπειδὴ Ἰουδαῖοι σημεῖα αἰτοῦσιν . . . ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν*, 1 Cor. $2^{9.\ 10}$ *ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν . . . ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ Θεός* according to Alford's interpretation, and B in 1 Pet. 4^{18} *εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ δὲ ἀσεβὴς 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' αὐτό* with Blass (*N. T. Gr.* p. 171 n.) for *καὶ αὐτό*.

For the adverbial use of *αὐτὸ τοῦτο* see Kühner's *Gr. Gr.* vol. ii. p. 267, Plato *Protag.* 310 E *αὐτὰ ταῦτα καὶ νῦν ἥκω παρά σε*, Xen. *Anab.* i. 9. 21 *αὐτὸ τοῦτο οὗπερ ἕνεκα φίλων ᾤετο δεῖσθαι, ὡς συνεργοὺς ἕξοι, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπειρᾶτο συνεργὸς τοῖς φίλοις εἶναι* *ob id ipsum propter quod opus sibi esse existimabat amicis ut adiutores haberet, ipse amicis adiumento esse conabatur*, Euseb. *c. Hierocl.* 5 *fin.* *αὐτό τε τοῦτο γόης ἀντὶ φιλοσόφου φωραθήσεται*. What then is 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'.

σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε.] The *παρά* and *ἐπί* serve to show the subordinate nature of human effort (along with and in addition to the grace of God) in giving effect to the *δώρημα* twice mentioned above. The word *παρεισφέρειν* is used by Demosthenes (*Lept.* 88, 89, 99, 137) of moving an amendment to an existing law. It is also used of smuggling, importing through by-ways, also of heretics introducing unmeaning phrases *κενοφωνίας ὀνόματα* Epiphan. *Haer.* xxvi. 1, and 16, also *Index* 11 *μυθολογίας παρεισφέροντες*. Cf. *παρεισάγω* below 2^{1}.

The phrase *εἰσφέρομαι σπουδήν* is very common in later Greek, see Polyb. xxii. 12. 12, Diod. i. 83 *οἱ δ' ὄχλοι πᾶσαν εἰσεφέροντο σπουδήν*, *ib.* 84, xviii. 34, xvi. 3 *φιλοτιμίαν εἰσφερόμενοι*, Jos. *Ant.* xx. 9. 2 *πᾶσαν εἰσηνέγκατο σπουδὴν καὶ πρόνοιαν*, and the Inscription quoted in the Appendix. The prefixing of *παρά* alters the sense as in *πάρεργον*, *παράνυμφος*, *παραίτιος*, *παραπράσσω*, *παραβλάπτω*, *παραφθέγγομαι*, *παραψάλλω*, *παραδράω*, *παραδυναστεύω*, etc. The meaning is well

Digitized by Google

expressed by Aug. *De Pecc. Meritis*, ii. 5, quoted by Hundhausen 'nec ideo tantum solis de hac re votis agendum est, ut non *subinferatur* adnitendo etiam nostrae efficacia voluntatis.'

ἐπιχορηγήσατε.] ('supply,' 'provide'). Used twice in 2 P., viz. here and in 1^{11} *πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ἡ εἴσοδος*, and thrice by St. Paul in 2 Cor. 9^{10} *ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν σπέρμα τῷ σπείροντι καὶ ἄρτον εἰς βρῶσιν χορηγήσει*, Gal. 3^5 *ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα*, Col. 2^{19} *πᾶν τὸ σῶμα 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 *ὁσάκις Ἀντισθένης κεχορήγηκε, πᾶσι τοῖς χοροῖς νενίκηκε*, Plut. *Mor.* 13 E *ἐφείσω ποτέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ χορήγησον* ('spend'), Antiph. p. 117 *λαμπρῶς χορηγῶν*; in the passive Xen. *Resp. Ath.* i. 13 *χορηγοῦσι μὲν οἱ πλούσιοι, χορηγεῖται δ' ὁ δῆμος*: sometimes it has for direct object the person benefited as in Polyb. iii. 78. 8 (the Celtic population) *δαψιλῶς ἐχορήγει τὸ στρατόπεδον τοῖς ἐπιτηδείοις, ib.* 49. 11 *σίτῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπιτηδείοις ἀφθόνως ἐχορήγησε τὸ στρατόπεδον*; sometimes the assistance given, as in Diod. ii. 35 *χορηγοῦσα τὰς τροφὰς ἀφθόνως*, and similarly in 2 Cor. 9^{10} just quoted, and in 1 P. 4^{11} *ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ Θεός*. The compound is found once in the LXX. (Sir. 25^{21}) *γυνὴ ἐὰν ἐπιχορηγῇ* (if she supports) *τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς* (is a cause of shame); the simple verb is more common, *e.g.* in 1 K. 4^7 *χορηγεῖν τῷ βασιλεῖ*, 1 Macc. 14^{10} *ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐχορήγησε βρώματα*. It is frequently used by classical writers in the same wide sense, *e.g.* in Aristotle's definition of the *εὐδαίμων* (*Eth.* i. 10. 13) *τοῖς ἐκτὸς ἀγαθοῖς ἱκανῶς κεχορηγημένος*, Dio. Chr. vol. i. p. 52 (Teubner) *ἥλιος χορηγεῖ τὸ κάλλιστον ὁραμάτων, φῶς*. The rarer compound occurs in Dionys. Hal. (*Ep. ad Pomp.* 1) *τὰς συντάξεις ἐπιχορηγοῦντός σοι Ζήνωνος*, Strabo xi. 14. 16 *ἐξ εὐπόρων οἴκων ἐπιχορηγούμεναι*, Diog. L. v. 67 *πλεῖστα ἐπεχορήγουν αὐτῷ*, Aristid. D. ii. p. 194. 9, i. Clem. R. 38 *ὁ πλούσιος ἐπιχορηγείτω τῷ πτωχῷ, ib.* *ἕτερός ἐστιν ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐγκράτειαν*, Theoph. *Autol.* 73 B, where *ἐπί* seems to have an accumulative force, 'to add further supplies,' 'to provide more than was expected or could be demanded.'

ἐν τῇ πίστει τὴν ἀρετήν.] Faith is the foundation of a series of seven virtues, each of which is apparently described as rooted in the preceding. We have similar lists in Rom. $5^{3\,f.}$ *ἡ θλῖψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμήν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα, ἡ δὲ ἐλπὶς οὐ καταισχύνει*, which is itself an expansion of James $1^{3\,f.}$ *τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν· ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ ἔργον τέλειον ἐχέτω ἵνα ἦτε τέλειοι*. Blass (*N. 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. $8^{29\,f.}$ *οὓς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν . . . οὓς δὲ προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν· καὶ οὓς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν, ib.* 10^{14}, Herm. *Mand.* v. 2. 4 *ἐκ τῆς ἀφροσύνης γίνεται πικρία, ἐκ δὲ τῆς πικρίας θυμός, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ θυμοῦ ὀργή, ἐκ δὲ τῆς ὀργῆς μῆνις*. Cicero uses *gradatio* to express the Gr. *κλῖμαξ*. Examples are given in the *Ad Herenn.*

Digitized by Google

iv. 25 *e.g.* 'Africano industria virtutem, virtus gloriam, gloria aemulos 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 χάριτι ἐστε σεσωσμένοι 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 δέ (perhaps derived from the repeated ἐν δέ 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. $5^{22\,f.}$ ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἀγάπη, χαρά, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις, πραΰτης, ἐγκράτεια, 2 Cor. $6^{4\,f.}$ (where S. Paul appeals to his sufferings and the spirit in which they were borne) ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ . . . ἐν ἀγνότητι, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν χρηστότητι, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀνυποκρίτῳ κ.τ.λ., 1 Tim. 6^{11} δίωκε δικαιοσύνην, εὐσέβειαν, πίστιν, ἀγάπην, ὑπομονήν, πραϋπαθίαν, Apoc. 2^{19} οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα, καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην, καὶ τὴν πίστιν, καὶ τὴν διακονίαν, 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. $1^{3.4}$, where ὑπομονὴ 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.* iii. 8 (explaining the vision of the Seven Virgins) κρατοῦνται δὲ ὑπ' ἀλλήλων αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτῶν καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν ἀλλήλαις, καθὼς καὶ γεγεννημέναι εἰσίν. ἐκ τῆς Πίστεως γεννᾶται Ἐγκράτεια, ἐκ τῆς Ἐγκρατείας Ἁπλότης, ἐκ τῆς Ἁπλότητος Ἀκακία, ἐκ τῆς Ἀκακίας Σεμνότης, ἐκ τῆς Σεμνότητος Ἐπιστήμη, ἐκ τῆς Ἐπιστήμης Ἀγάπη, which is perhaps modelled on this passage; Barn. ii. τῆς οὖν πίστεως ἡμῶν εἰσὶν βοηθοὶ φόβος καὶ ὑπομονή, τὰ δὲ συμμαχοῦντα ἡμῖν μακροθυμία καὶ ἐγκράτεια· τούτων μενόντων τὰ πρὸς Κύριον ἀγνῶς, συνευφραίνονται αὐτοῖς σοφία, σύνεσις, ἐπιστήμη, γνῶσις. In i. Clem. R. 1 πίστις, εὐσέβεια, γνῶσις are found together, and in 62 we have περὶ γὰρ πίστεως καὶ μετανοίας καὶ γνησίας ἀγάπης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ὑπομονῆς πάντα τύπον ἐψηλαφήσαμεν.

ἀρετήν.] 'Moral energy.' *Strenuus animae tonus et vigor* Bengel, equivalent to 1 Pet. 1^{13} ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν. It is found in this sense in 2 Macc. 6^{31} τὸν ἑαυτοῦ θάνατον ὑπόδειγμα γενναιότητος καὶ μνημόσυνον ἀρετῆς κατέλιπεν, 4 Mc. 9^{18}, 12^{14}, 17^{12}, Plut. *Mor.*

Digitized by Google

169 c ἀρετῆς ἐλπὶς ὁ Θεός ἐστιν, 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^{12}, 3 Macc. 6^{1}, Wisd. 4^{1}, in which case it would answer to the ἔργα of James 2^{26} πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἐστι, cf. 1 Joh. $5^{4.5}$.

ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν.] This agrees with Joh. 7^{17} ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς, only that the object of γνῶσις is not here limited to doctrine. It agrees also with the relation between moral and intellectual virtues in the systems of Plato and Aristotle.

6. **ἐν δὲ τῇ γνώσει τὴν ἐγκράτειαν.**] 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 ἀκολασία, where reason is entirely subject to passion. Between these come ἐγκράτεια 'self-control' or 'continence' where reason wins the day against resisting passion, and ἀκρασία '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 ἡ τοιαύτη ἐγκράτεια (Clem. Al. *Str.* vii. p. 874), and again θεμέλιος ἀρετῆς ἡ ἐγκράτεια (*ib. Str.* ii. p. 484); cf. also *Str.* iii. p. 538. It closes the list of the fruits of the Spirit in Gal. 5^{25}, cf. 1 Cor. 9^{25} πᾶς ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται, *ib.* 7^{9} εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐγκρατεύονται, γαμησάτωσαν, Gen 43^{31} (of Joseph restraining his tears) ἐξελθὼν ἐνεκρατεύσατο. It was one of the topics of Paul's address before Felix.

ἐν τῇ ἐγκρατείᾳ τὴν ὑπομονήν.] For ὑπομονή see my note on James 1^{3}. It corresponds to the Aristotelian καρτερία, which is distinguished from ἐγκράτεια in *Magn. Mor.* ii. 6. 34 ἡ μὲν ἐγκράτειά ἐστι περὶ ἡδονὰς καὶ ὁ ἐγκρατὴς ὁ κρατῶν τῶν ἡδονῶν, ἡ δὲ καρτερία περὶ λύπας· ὁ γὰρ καρτερῶν καὶ ὑπομένων τὰς λύπας, οὗτος καρτερικός ἐστιν. The cognate verb is used of Moses (Heb. 11^{27}) τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν ἐκαρτέρησεν.

ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ τὴν εὐσέβειαν.] The martyr in 4 Macc. $5^{23.33}$ combines ὑπομονή, εὐσέβεια, and φίλη ἐγκράτεια. No doubt εὐσέβεια here, as in *v.* 3, is in tacit opposition to the ἀσεβεῖς 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 δὲ τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν φιλαδελφίαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην.**] Cf. 1 Joh. 4^{20} ἐάν τις εἴπῃ ὅτι Ἀγαπῶ τὸν Θεόν, καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ μισῇ, ψεύστης ἐστίν and Westcott's n. on 1 Joh. 2^{9} 'Brethren are those who are united together in Christ to God as their Father' (Joh. 20^{17}, 21^{23}, Matt. 12^{50}). φιλαδελφία (1 Th. 4^{9}, Rom. 12^{10}, Heb. 13^{1}, 1 Pet. 1^{22}, where see Hort, 3^{8}) leads up to ἀγάπη. Cf. 1 Th. 3^{12} ὑμᾶς ὁ κύριος πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς ἀλλήλους 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.

Digitized by Google

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) ὁ φιλάδελφος οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πολλὰ προσευχόμενος περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ. The noun φιλαδελφία occurs twice in Clem. R. 47 ἡ περιβόητος φ. and 48 ἡ σεμνὴ τῆς φ. ἡμῶν ἀγνὴ ἀγωγή. 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 ὥσπερ ἀρχὴ καὶ στοιχεῖον τῆς πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους εὐνοίας· . . . ἔπεται τῷ φιλαδέλφῳ μὲν ὁ φιλοίκειος, τῷ φιλοικείῳ δὲ ὁ φιλόπατρις, τῷ φιλοπάτριδι δὲ ὁ φιλάνθρωπος. We may compare Plato's famous description of the development of ἔρως (*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[1]; (5) right feeling and behaviour towards God, (6) towards the brethren, (7) towards all.

8. **ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα καὶ πλεονάζοντα.**] '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] ὁ τὸ πολὺ (συλλέξας) οὐκ ἐπλεόνασεν, καὶ ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον οὐκ ἠλαττόνησεν, which is a quotation from Exod. 16[18]) it is eulogistic, implying increase or abundance of what is good, as in 2 Cor. 4[15] ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσασα διὰ τῶν πλειόνων τὴν 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] ἐπιζητῶ τὸν καρπὸν τὸν πλεονάζοντα εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν 'I long for the fruit that increaseth to your credit,' 2 Th. 1[3] ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καὶ πλεονάζει ἡ ἀγάπη ἑνὸς ἑκάστου πάντων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους 'your faith groweth exceedingly and the love of each one of you all toward one another aboundeth,' Rom. 5[20] νόμος παρεισῆλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα, οὗ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ 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 ὁ κύριος πλεονάσαι ('make you to increase') καὶ περισσεύσαι 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 γνῶσις.

Digitized by Google

between them both in their uses and in their history. The prevailing classical use reminds one of the *μηδὲν ἄγαν*, the Aristotelian *μέσον*, the Greek hatred of the *ἄπειρον*, a trace of which may be found in *Eccles.* 7^{16} '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. 5^{20} quoted above. So in 2 Cor. 7^{4} he cries *ὑπερπερισσεύομαι τῇ χαρᾷ*, in 1 Tim. 1^{14} *ὑπερεπλεόνασεν ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*, in Eph. 3^{20} *τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν*, cf. 1 Th. 3^{10}, 5^{13}. The very word *ὑπερβολή* chosen by Aristotle to express the vice of excess (*Eth. N.* ii. 8. 1 *δύο οὐσῶν κακιῶν τῆς μὲν καθ' ὑπερβολήν, τῆς δὲ κατ' ἔλλειψιν*) is employed to express surpassing goodness, as in 1 Cor. 12^{31} *ἔτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν δείκνυμι*, 2 Cor. 4^{17} *τὸ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν*, Eph. 3^{19} *γνῶναι τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *ib.* 2^{7}, 2 Cor. 3^{10}, *ib.* 9^{14}.

οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν.] 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 *καθίστησιν* 'show.' So Schott 'lässt euch nicht träg noch früchteleer erscheinen in Beziehung auf die Erkenntniss 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 fruchtlos 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 Tugenden ist, so ist sie andererseits auch in gewissem Sinne Ziel derselben, insofern die Seele durch die Uebung und das Wachsthum 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 3^{18} *αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*. Just in the same way St. Paul (Col. 1^{6} foll.) after speaking of the growth of the Colossians in faith and love from the day that *ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ* . . . goes on to tell them of his prayer *ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ* . . . *ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ*: cf. Phil. 1^{9} *προσεύχομαι ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν ἔτι μᾶλλον περισσεύῃ ἐν ἐπιγνώσει καὶ πάσῃ αἰσθήσει*. So we read in Heb. 12^{2} *ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτήν*. Above all, see Joh. 17^{3} compared with 1 Cor. 13^{12} *ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους*. It is surely a mistake to suppose

Digitized by Google

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. *γηράσκω δ' αἰεὶ πολλὰ διδασκόμενος* is an experience which the Christian has no need to learn from others.

καθίστησιν.] 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] *ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, κ.τ.λ.*

We have still to ascertain the exact force of *εἰς* after *ἀργούς* and *ἀκάρπους*. '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 *ἀκάρπους* is perhaps borrowed from the *ἄκαρπα* of Jude *v.* 12.

9. **ᾧ γὰρ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα, τυφλός ἐστιν.**] 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.

μυωπάζων.] 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 *μυωπαζούσῃ καὶ ἀποστρεφομένῃ* (blinking and turning away).' Suidas gives the following interpretations, *μυωπάζω = τυφλώττω* (corrected from MS. *τὸ φυλάττω*): *μυωπιζόμενος = μυωπάζων, παρακαμμύων* (half-closing the eyes), *ἄκροις τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς προσέχων* (observing, as it were, with the edge of his eyes). The same explanation is given under the form *ἐμυωπίασεν*.[1] Spitta thinks that

[1] Dr. Bigg (p. 259) is of opinion that the correct form of the verb is either *μυωπιάζειν* (cf. *ὑπωπιάζειν*) or *μυωπεῖν* (cf. *ὀξυωπεῖν*). But *ὀξυωπεῖν* is not formed from *ὀξύωψ*, which does not exist, but from the Aristotelian *ὀξυωπός*. So *ὑπωπιάζειν* comes from *ὑπώπιον*, like *ἀντιάζω* from *ἀντίος*, *σχετλιάζω* from *σχέτλιος*, *ἰδιάζω* from *ἴδιος*. Nouns ending in *-ωψ* or *-οψ* usually give rise to verbs in *-ίζω*, as *Αἰθίοψ αἰθιοπίζω*, *μώλωψ μωλωπίζω*, *σκόλοψ σκολοπίζω*, and so *μύωψ*, 'gadfly' or 'goad,' *μυωπίζω*. When it was desired to find a verb for the other sense, *μυωπάζω* was chosen (like *σαρκάζω* from *σάρξ*, *ἐπηλυγάζω* from *ἠλυξ*), though *μυωπίαζω* would have been perhaps an easier formation, as we find *μυωπία, μυωπίας, μυωπίασις*. The form *-ενω* is also found in derivatives from words ending in *-ωψ*, as *θωπεύω, κλωπεύω*; see Lobeck's careful investigation of the whole subject in his 'Ρηματικόν

Digitized by Google

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 *μύωψ*; 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 τί οἱ μύωπες συνάγοντες τὰ βλέφαρα ὁρῶσιν; . . . ἵνα ἀθροωτέρα ἡ ὄψις ἐξίῃ δι' ἐλάττονος ἐξιοῦσα, καὶ μὴ εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀναπεπταμένου ἐξιοῦσα διασπασθῇ.* 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 sputtering of the lamp, when water is poured upon it': *ἄμφω γὰρ συνάγεται* 'because both are contracted.' The relation between *μυωπ.* 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. 2^{12}). Cf. Anton. iv. 29 *ὁ καταμύων τῷ νοερῷ ὄμματι*, Greg. Naz. *Anim. et Res.* 186 A *οἱ πρὸς τὸν κόσμον ὁρῶντες πρὸς τὸν διὰ τούτου δηλούμενον ἀμβλυωποῦσιν*, Clem. Rom. i. 3 *ἐν τῇ πίστει ἀμβλυωπῆσαι*, Clem Al. p. 116 *ἀμβλυωποῦντες περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν*. Hippol. *Ref.* v. 16 where Isaac's blessing of Jacob is called *ἀμβλυωπὸς εὐλογία*, Plato *Rep.* vi. 508 C *ἀμβλυώττουσί τε καὶ ἐγγὺς φαίνονται τυφλῶν*. The vulg. and boh. translate 'manu tentans.'

λήθην λαβών.] The phrase occurs in Timocles *Dionysiazusae* (B.C. 340) *ὁ γὰρ νοῦς τῶν ἰδίων λήθην λαβών*, Jos. *Ant.* ii. 6. 9 *ὑμᾶς βούλομαι καὶ αὐτοὺς λήθην ἐκείνων λαβόντας ἥδεσθαι*, *ib.* iv. 8. 44, Ael. *V.H.* iii. 18, *Hist. An.* iv. 35, cf. Job 7^{21} *ἐποιήσω τῆς ἀνομίας μου λήθην*, Deut. 8^{19}, Wisd. 16^{11}: other exx. in Wetstein. Such phrases as *λήθην ἔχειν, ποιεῖσθαι, ἐμποιεῖν* are common in the best authors. For a similar use of *λαμβάνω* see 2 Tim. 1^{5} *ὑπόμνησιν λαμβάνων τῆς πίστεως*, Heb. 11^{29} *πεῖραν 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. $1^{13.\,14}$.

τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν.][1] Cf. Heb. 1^{3} *δι' ἑαυτοῦ καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*, Joh. 3^{25} *ἐγένετο ζήτησις . . . 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. 3^{21} *ὃ* (*ᾧ*?) *καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σῴζει βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεόν*, 1 Cor. 6^{11} *καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε· ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε*, Eph. $5^{25\,f.}$ *ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς· ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι*, Tit. 3^{5} *ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου*, Rom. 6^{3}, the words of Peter in Acts 2^{38} *μετανοήσατε καὶ βαπτισθήτω*

pp. 216-233, and *Pathologiae Serm. Gr. Prolegomena*, pp. 439–483, where many examples of the double form *-αζω* and *-ιαζω* are given.

[1] Hundhausen, following Ti. and Treg., prefers the reading of ℵAK *ἁμαρτημάτων* on account of its comparative rarity and because it might naturally be altered to suit Heb. 1^{3}.

Digitized by Google

ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ λήμψεσθε τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, and of the Baptist in Lk. 3^3, also Job 7^{21} διατί οὐκ ἐποιήσω τῆς ἀνομίας μου λήθην καὶ καθαρισμὸν τῆς ἁμαρτίας μου; Barn. 11^{11} καταβαίνομεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ γέμοντες ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ῥύπου, καὶ ἀναβαίνομεν καρποφοροῦντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, Herm. *Mand.* 4. 3 ἑτέρα μετάνοια οὐκ ἔστιν εἰ μὴ ἐκείνη ὅτε εἰς ὕδωρ κατέβημεν καὶ ἐλάβομεν ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν τῶν προτέρων . . . ἔδει γὰρ τὸν εἰληφότα ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν μηκέτι ἁμαρτάνειν, *Sim.* 9. 16. Spitta denies the reference to baptism, and would explain it by what follows in $2^{20\text{-}22}$, 1 Joh. 3^3 '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, it 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 καθαρισμοῦ here and of φωτισθέντας in Heb. $6^{4\text{-}6}$ 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. 4^3, and see note on τὸ δεύτερον Jude 5. To the passages quoted there on the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin, add Hippol. *Ref.* vi. 41, (The Marcosians) μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἕτερον ἐπαγγέλλονται, ὃ καλοῦσιν ἀπολύτρωσιν, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἀναστρέφοντες κακῶς τοὺς αὐτοῖς παραμένοντας ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως, ὡς δυναμένους μετὰ τὸ ἅπαξ βαπτισθέντας (? βαπτισθῆναι) πάλιν τυχεῖν ἀφέσεως κ.τ.λ. Second baptism was practised by the Elkesaites, as we learn from Hippol. *Ref.* ix. 15 (whoever has committed any enormous sin and seeks forgiveness) βαπτισάσθω ἐκ δευτέρου ἐν ὀνόματι ὑψίστου θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ 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 3^6 ὁ τότε κόσμος, 3^7 οἱ νῦν οὐρανοί, 1 Pet. 2^{10} οἱ ποτὲ οὐ λαός, Gal. 4^{26} ἡ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ, Joh. 8^{23} ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῶν κάτω ἐστέ, Phil. 3^{14} ἡ ἄνω κλῆσις, James 4^{14} τὸ τῆς αὔριον, Xen. *Mem.* i. 6. 14 τῶν πάλαι σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν.

10. **διὸ μᾶλλον, ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε.**] We have διὸ σπουδάσατε again in 3^{14}, and διό in *v.* 12 below and in 1 P. 1^{13}. 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 σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαι in *v.* 5 and now appeals to them more earnestly under the name ἀδελφοί, 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 ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι.[1]] The only other passages in the N.T. in which ἐκλογή occurs are Acts 9^{15} (where Saul is described as σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς), 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 βέβαιος occurs several times in the Epistle to the Hebrews, cf. especially 3^6

[1] Ewald and Hundhausen prefer the reading of ℵA syrr. sah. boh. (σπουδάσατε ἵνα διὰ τῶν καλῶν ὑμῶν ἔργων βεβαίαν . . . ποιῆσθε), which is also thought possible by Hort.

Digitized by Google

ἐὰν τὴν παρρησίαν . . . τῆς ἐλπίδος μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν, ib. v. 14 *ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν. βεβ. ποιεῖσθαι = βεβαιοῦν* 'to certify,' 'confirm,' 'attest,' the ordinary periphrastic use of the middle of *ποιέω*, like *σπουδὴν ποιούμενος* Jude 3. The word *βεβ.* occurs again in *v.* 19 below. For *κλῆσις* cf. n. on *καλέσαντος* above 1^3, Eph. $4^{1,2}$ *παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης κ.τ.λ.*, Phil. $3^{8\text{-}14}$ esp. *τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενος διώκω εἰς τὸ βραβεῖον τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως.*

ταῦτα ποιοῦντες] Repeating the *ταῦτα* of *vv.* 8, 9 with reference to the preceding list of virtues.

οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε.] 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. *πταίω* is found in James 2^{10}, 3^2, and Rom. 11^{11}. See n. on *ἄπταιστος*, Jude 24.

11. **οὕτως γάρ**] = *ταῦτα ποιοῦντες*, cf. 1 P. 3^5.

πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν.] 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 *πλουσίως* compare Col. 3^{16} *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικείτω ἐν ὑμῖν πλουσίως ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ*, Philo *Vit. Cont.* M. 2. p. 476 *σοφία πλουσίως καὶ ἀφθόνως τὰ δόγματα χορηγεῖ*, Heracleon *ap.* Orig. *in Joh. tom.* 13, § 10 *τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας τοῦ ἄνωθεν ἐπιχορηγουμένου πλουσίως καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκβλύσαι εἰς τὴν ἑτέρων αἰώνιον ζωὴν τὰ ἐπικεχορηγημένα αὐτοῖς. πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης* and similar phrases are found in St. Paul's epistles, see Lightfoot's n. on Col 1^{27} *γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου . . . ὅ ἐστιν Χριστὸς ἐν ἡμῖν, ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς δόξης.* For the thought compare Lk. 6^{38} *δίδοτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· μέτρον καλὸν πεπιεσμένον σεσαλευμένον ὑπερεκχυννομένον δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν.* The use of *ἐπιχορηγέω* here suggests the ordering of a triumphal procession, cf. Plut. *Vit.* 994 *ὁ δῆμος ἐθεᾶτο τὰς θέας ἀφειδῶς πάνυ χορηγουμένας.*

ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον 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^{34} *δεῦτε οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός μου κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, Joh. 14^2 *πορεύομαι ἑτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν.* In the N.T. *εἴσοδος* is used not of a place but of an action, cf. Heb. 10^{19} *ἔχοντες παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων* 'boldness to enter into the holy place,' 1 Th. 1^9, 2^1, Acts 13^{24}. It is curious that the phrase *αἰώνιος βασιλεία* does not occur elsewhere either in the N.T. or in the Apostolic Fathers.[1] The earliest other examples appear to be Aristides *Apol.* xvi (quoted on 2^2 below) and Clem. *Hom.* x. 25 *αἰωνίας βασιλείας κληρονόμοι.* From the Index published by the Lightfoot Trustees I learn that *ἀΐδιος β.* occurs in the same viii. 23, xiii. 20, *Ep. Clem.* 11. In the LXX. we find *ἡ βασιλεία σου βασιλεία πάντων τῶν αἰώνων* (Ps. 144^{13}), *Κύριος βασιλεύων τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπ' αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι* (Exod. 15^{18}), *ἐξουσία αἰώνιος* (Dan. 4^{31} 7^{14}), cf. Ps. 10^{16}, Lk. 1^{33}, *αἰώνιος κληρονομία* Heb. 9^{15}, *δόξα αἰώνιος* 1 Pet. 5^{10}. The usual biblical equivalent is *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* often found

[1] In *Mart. Polyc.* 20, where codd. b p have *αἰώνιον β.*, Lightfoot reads *ἐπουράνιον βασιλείαν* with cod. m.

Digitized by Google

with κληρονόμος, 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. 1[4]. St. John prefers ἔχειν ζωήν which occurs in his Gospel 3[15. 16. 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[21], 6[22], 2 Cor. 4[17. 18], Gal. 6[8], 1 Tim. 1[16], 2 Tim. 4[8], Tit. 1[2]; perhaps as present in 1 Tim. 6[12] ἐπιλαβοῦ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, cf. Col. 1[13], Eph. 2[6]: 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] ἀπεθάνετε γὰρ (in your baptism) καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ· ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῇ, ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν, τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς φανερώσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ, and in 1 Joh. 3[2] νῦν τέκνα Θεοῦ ἐσμεν, καὶ οὔπω ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα· οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι, ἐὰν φανερωθῇ, ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα, ὅτι ὀψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθώς 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] ῥύσεταί με ὁ κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ καὶ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουρανίαν) 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 ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ, so Mt. 28[18], 1 Cor. 15[24], Joh. 18[36], Eph. 5[5] κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ, Apoc. 11[15], Lk. 22[29. 30], 23[42], and Messianic prophecies in the O.T. as Ps. 2[6].

12. **διὸ μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων.**] It seems best to explain διό 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).

μελλήσω.] 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 μελλήσετε δὲ ἀκούειν πολέμους, which some take (like the present μέλλω in Mt. 2[13] μέλλει ζητεῖν) as a periphrasis for the future. But μελλήσω 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 μελήσω '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 3[1]. ἀεί implies a prospect of frequent communication between him and them.

καίπερ εἰδότας.] Cf. for construction Heb. 5[8], 7[5], 12[17]. In Heb. 4[3] we find the unclassical καίτοι τῶν ἔργων γενηθέντων. The connexion with ὑπομιμνήσκειν 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.

Digitized by Google

know what he is about to say: here the writer seems to apologize for venturing to remind them of what they already know.

ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ.] When Jesus warned St. Peter of his approaching fall, he added the word of comfort *καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου*. The same word is used in 1 P. 5^{10} *ὁ Θεὸς πάσης χάριτος ..αὐτὸς καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, σθενώσει*, and the cognate noun in 2 P. 3^{17} *φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ*. Cf. Rom. $1^{11, 12}$ *ἐπιποθῶ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς...εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν συνπαρακληθῆναι ἐν ὑμῖν διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως, ib.* 16^{25} *τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι*, Jude v. 24, Rom. 14^{4}. This metaphorical sense occurs in Sir. 5^{10} *ἴσθι ἐστηριγμένος ἐν συνέσει σου, ib.* 6^{36}, *αὐτὸς στηριεῖ τὴν καρδίαν σου*, and 22^{16} *καρδία ἐστηριγμένη ἐπὶ διανοήματος βουλῆς ἐν καιρῷ οὐ δειλιάσει*, Ps. 51^{12} *πνεύματι ἡγεμονικῷ στήριξόν με, ib.* 112^{8}, Clem. R. 35 *ἐστηριγμένη ἡ διάνοια ἡμῶν διὰ πίστεως πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*; but is not found in classical authors. It is difficult to see the force of *παρούσῃ*. Editors refer back to *πάρεστιν v.* 9, but this would add nothing to what is already expressed in the sentence. If we take *παρούσῃ* in a strict temporal sense, it might suggest, like Phil. 3^{16}, and *κράτει ὃ ἔχεις* in Apoc. 3^{11}, 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 *v.* 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 εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς*, translated by Lightfoot 'which reached you.' So the meaning here might be 'stablished in the truth which has come to you,' but it is not a natural expression, and the close resemblance to Jude *vv.* 3 and 5, together with the parallels in Jude 3 *τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει* and 2 P. 2^{21} seem to me to favour Spitta's emendation *παραδοθείσῃ* for *παρούσῃ*, 'stablished in the truth handed down to you.' Such repetitions are not infrequent in 2 P.[1]

13. **δίκαιον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι.**] His first reason for reminding them was the gain to his readers, his second his duty as an Apostle, cf. Phil. 3^{1} *τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν ὑμῖν, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐκ ὀκνηρόν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀσφαλές, ib.* 1^{7}, Eph. 6^{1}. 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. 2 *ἐπεὶ χρόνον ἐτῶν εἴκοσι καὶ ἑκατὸν ἡνυσμένον δεῖ με τοῦ ζῆν ἀπελθεῖν . . . δίκαιον ἡγησάμην . . . ἀίδιόν τε ὑμῖν πραγματεύσασθαι τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπόλαυσιν, καὶ μνήμην ἐμαυτῷ . . . μήτε νομίμων τῶν παρόντων ἄλλην προτιμήσητε διάταξιν, μήτ' εὐσεβείας . . καταφρονήσαντες εἰς ἄλλον μεταστήσησθε τρόπον*. A little below we read *ταῦτα δ' οὐκ ὀνειδίζειν ὑμᾶς προεθέμην, οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἐξόδου τοῦ ζῆν δυσχεραίνοντας καταλιπεῖν ἠξίουν, εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησιν φέρων*, and at the end *ἵνα δὲ μὴ δι' ἀμαθίαν τοῦ κρείττονος ἡ φύσις ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον ἀπονεύσῃ, συνέθηκα ὑμῖν καὶ νόμους*.

[1] Compare however the *Traditions f Matthias* quoted in Clem. Al. *Str.* ii. p. 453 *init. θαύμασον τὰ παρόντα, βαθμὸν τοῦτον πρῶτον τῆς ἐπέκεινα γνώσεως ὑποτιθέμενος.*

Digitized by Google

ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι.] Cf. Mt. 9[15] *ἐφ' ὅσον μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ὁ νυμφίος*, Rom. 11[13] *ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος*. 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[18]. *σκῆνος* is similarly used in 2 Cor. 5[1] *ἐὰν ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους καταλυθῇ, οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἔχομεν, οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, where *σκῆνος* seems to be so far identified with *σῶμα*, that the original figure of the tent or hut has to be recalled by the use of the synonym *οἰκία*, *ib.* v. 4, Wisd. 9[15] *βρίθει τὸ γεῶδες σκῆνος νοῦν πολυφροντίδα*, also in profane Greek, *e.g.* Plato *Ax.* 365, *Tim. Locr.* 103. We may compare Job. 4[19] *τοὺς κατοικοῦντας οἰκίας πηλίνας*, 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 *ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν θνητῷ σκηνώματι κατοικεῖ*, Eus. *H.E.* iii. 31 *Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου . . . τῆς μετὰ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν τοῦ βίου τῶν σκηνωμάτων ἀποθέσεως ὁ χῶρος δεδήλωται*, with Heinichen's n. Weiss thinks the metaphor has reference to the pilgrim life of the Christian, comparing 1 Pet. 2[11].

διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει.] The same phrase is repeated in 3[1]. Elsewhere in the N.T. *διεγείρω* 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 Macc. 15[9, 10] *προσυπομνήσας αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας οὓς ἦσαν ἐκτετελεκότες, προθυμοτέρους αὐτοὺς κατέστησε· καὶ τοῖς θυμοῖς διεγείρας κ.τ.λ.*, *ib.* 7[21]; Test. Dan. 4 *διεγείρει ἐν θυμῷ μεγάλῳ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ*. For the use of *ἐν* see Blass *G. T. Gr.* § 38. 1, § 41.

14. **εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου.**] *ἀποτίθεμαι* 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 *ἀποδυτήριον* in the bath. Its combination with *σκήνωμα* here reminds us of 2 Cor. 5[2-4] where *ἐνδύσασθαι* and *ἐκδύσασθαι* are used with reference to the earthly and the heavenly *οἰκητήριον*. 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 . . . εὐχάριστον τοῦ σκήνους ἀπόδοσιν*, *ib.* iv. p. 636. *ταχινός* has the sense of 'speedy' in Isa. 59[7], where it is used of *πόδες*, Sir. 11[20] *ἐν ὥρᾳ ταχινῇ*, also in Theocritus and other post-Aristotelian writers. Some interpret it here 'sudden,' in accordance with the use of *ταχύς* in Plato *Rep.* 553 D *οὐκ ἔστ' ἄλλη μεταβολὴ οὕτω ταχεῖά τε καὶ ἰσχυρά*, 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[28-32], and his final charge to Timothy (2 Tim. 4[1] foll.) *διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ . . . κήρυξον τὸν λόγον· ἐπίστηθι εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως . . . ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἀναλύσεώς μου ἐφέστηκεν.*

καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐδήλωσέν μοι.] One's first thought here is of the prophecy of Peter's death, contained in Joh. 21[18, 19] *ὅτε ἦς νεώτερος, ἐζώννυες σεαυτὸν καὶ περιεπάτεις ὅπου ἤθελες· ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς, ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς σου καὶ ἄλλος ζώσει σε καὶ οἴσει ὅπου οὐ θέλεις. τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν Θεόν*: but a

Digitized by Google

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 Jacob.* ἐπεί, ὡς ἐδιδάχθην ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ, αἱ τοῦ θάνατου μου ἠγγίκασιν ἡμέραι. Compare similar intimations in the life of St. Paul (Acts 16^9, 18^9, 21^{11}, 23^{11}, 27^{23}).

15. **σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἑκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς.**] 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 *σπουδάσομαι*. There seems to be only one other recorded example of the *acc. c. inf.* after *σπουδάζω*, Plato *Alc. sec.* 141 *σπουδάσαντες τοῦτ' αὐτοῖς παραγενέσθαι*, but it is not uncommon with the cognate *σπεύδω*, which shares most of its uses. Thus Blass (*Gr.* p. 223) compares Herm. *Sim.* ix. 3. 2 *ἔλεγον τοῖς ἀνδράσι σπεύδειν τὸν πύργον οἰκοδομεῖσθαι*, so Herod. i. 74 *ἔσπευσαν εἰρήνην ἑωυτοῖσι γενέσθαι*, Plato *Crit.* 45 c *τοιαῦτα σπεύδεις περὶ σαυτὸν γενέσθαι*, Arist. *Pax* 672 *ἔσπευδεν εἶναι μὴ μάχας*. The infinitive however and even the passive infinitive is not uncommon after *σπουδάζω*, see Plato *Euthyd.* 293 A *σπουδ. ἐπιδεῖξαι*, Eur. *Hec.* 337 *σπ. μὴ στερηθῆναι βίου*. For *ἔχω* with infin. cf. Mt. 18^{25} *μὴ ἔχοντος αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι*, Eph. 4^{28} *ἵνα ἔχῃ μεταδιδόναι τῷ χρείαν ἔχοντι*, Heb. 6^{13}. **ἑκάστοτε** 'on each occasion,' whenever there is need: used here only in N. T. and LXX.

μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν 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 Ἰερουσαλήμ*, Wisd. 3^2 *ἐλογίσθη κάκωσις ἡ ἔξοδος αὐτῶν*, *ib.* 7^6 *μία πάντων εἴσοδος εἰς τὸν βίον ἔξοδός τε ἴση*, Jos. *Ant.* iv. 8. 2 *ἐπ' ἐξόδου τοῦ ζῆν*, Iren. iii. 1. 1 (*ap.* Eus. *H.E.* v. 8.) *μετὰ τὴν τούτων* (*i.e.* Peter and Paul) *ἔξοδον Μάρκος, ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγραφῶς ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε.*[1] Did Irenaeus 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 ποιεῖσθαι.] The words *μνήμη* and *μνεία* 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. 1^{12}, Eccl. 1^{11}, 2^{16}. The phrase *μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι* is found in Ps. 111^4, Rom. 1^9, Eph. 1^{16}, Philem. 4, etc. in the sense 'to make mention,' see Robinson on the Epistle to the Ephesians pp. 279 f.; *μνείαν 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*.

Digitized by Google

classical Gr.; see Aeschin. 23. 5 *οὐδαμοῦ μνείαν περὶ συνθηκῶν πεποίηται*· Plato *Protag.* 317 A *περὶ ὧν μνείαν ἐποίου πρὸς ἐμέ* (for *μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι*); Plat. *Legg.* 798 B (for *μνείαν ἔχειν*). Similarly we find *μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι* 'to mention' in Herod. i. 15, Polyb. 2. 7. 12, *ib.* 2. 71. 1 *τίνος χάριν ἐποιησάμεθα τὴν ἐπὶ πλεῖον ὑπὲρ τοῦ προειρημένου πολέμου μνήμην*; while *μνήμην ἔχειν* 'to remember' occurs in Plato *Theaet.* 163 D, *Polit.* 306 D *ἢ καὶ μνήμην ἔχεις ὄντινα τρόπον αὐτὸ δρῶσιν*. The distinction however is less rigidly observed in the case of *μνήμη*. Thus we find *τοῦ καὶ ὀλίγον τι πρότερον μνήμην εἶχον φάμενος κ.τ.λ.*, Herod. iv. 81, *ib.* 79, in the sense of 'mention,' and *μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι* in the sense of 'remember' in Thuc. ii. 54 (as to whether *λιμός* or *λοιμός* was the right reading in the prophecy) *πρὸς ἃ ἔπασχον τὴν μνήμην ἐποιοῦντο* 'accommodated their memory to their experience.' Even *μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι* seems to be used in this sense in Job 14^{13} *τάξῃ μοι χρόνον ἐν ᾧ μνείαν μου ποιήσῃ*, cf. *λήθην ποιεῖσθαι*, 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. **σεσοφισμένοις . μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες.**] In the N.T. *ἐξακολουθέω* occurs only here and below, 2^{2}, 2^{15}. It is found in Amos 2^{4} *τὰ μάταια ...οἷς ἐξηκολούθησαν οἱ πατέρες*, Isa. 56^{11} *ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν ἐξηκολούθησαν*. The phrase *μύθοις ἐξακ.* occurs, as Wetstein has pointed out, in Jos. *Ant. prooem.* 3 *οἱ ἄλλοι νομοθέται τοῖς μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἁμαρτημάτων εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τὴν αἰσχύνην μετέθεσαν*, which is itself borrowed from Philo M. 1. 1 *μύθους πλασάμενος*. The act, *σοφίζω* is used in the original sense 'to make wise' in 2 Tim. 3^{15}, Ps. 18^{7}, etc.; and the middle in the sense of 'to be wise,' 'to behave wisely,' in 1 K. 4^{31}, Eccl. 2^{19}. Sometimes the latter is used to express quibbling, as in Sir. 37^{20} *ἔστι σοφιζόμενος ἐν λόγοις μισητός*. Both uses are found in classical writers, as well as the transitive use which we have here, cf. *ὅσα προφάσεως χάριν σοφίζονται πρὸς τὸν δῆμον* Arist. *Pol.* iv. 13. For the passive L. and S. quote Greg. Nyss. i. 171 D *σεσοφισμένη μήτηρ* 'supposititious.' The phrase here is not unlike Pind. *Ol.* i. 46 f. *δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι*. Apparently the mockers of 3^{3} 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 *μῦθοι*, which is often used in the Pastoral Epistles of the fanciful gnostic genealogies: 'our belief is not founded on fables as theirs is.'[1]

[1] Dr. Bigg thinks that *μῦθος* 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 retort the charge: 'it is you who are guilty, and not we, of using cunningly devised fables to support your beliefs or assertions.' But

Digitized by Google

ἐγνωρίσαμεν.] We, who were witnesses on the Holy Mount. *γνωρίζω* in the N.T. is generally used of the preaching of the Gospel.

δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν.] The word *παρουσία* is used of the Second Advent below 3^4 and 3^{12}, 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 *ἕως 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. 2^8, 1 Tim. 6^{14}, 2 Tim. $4^{1.8}$, Tit. 2^{13}; also the verb *φανερόω* in Col. 3^4, 1 Joh. 3^2. More commonly the verb *ἔρχομαι* is used, or *ἡμέρα Κυρίου* or *Χριστοῦ*: *εἴσοδος* is used in Mal. 3^2. **δύναμις** has been already referred to in *v.* 3. Its connexion with the *παρουσία* is shown in Mt. 24^{30} *ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς*, and in the Transfiguration, which was to the Three a foretaste of the *παρουσία*, and of which it was said *οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει* (Mk. 9^1).

ἐπόπται γενηθέντες] = *ἐποπτεύσαντες* in 1 P. 3^2, see also 1 P. 2^{12}, and Aesch. *Prom.* 299 f. *καὶ σὺ δὴ πόνων ἐμῶν ἥκεις ἐπόπτης;* 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 14^{23}, Philo i. p. 146 *fin.*) and Christians, see Ch. 3 of my Introduction to Clem. Al. *Str.* vii. pp. l. to lx. ('Clement and the Mysteries').

τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος.] The word occurs elsewhere in N.T. only in the account of the healing of the demoniac (Lk. 9^{43}) *ἐξεπλήσσοντο πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ μεγαλειότητι τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and of the goddess Artemis in Acts 19^{27}, see Lightfoot on Ign. *Rom. inscr.* p. 189, Jos. *Ant. prooem.* 4 *τὴν μεγαλειότητα τοῦ Θεοῦ*. The phrase *τὰ μεγαλεῖα 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. 24^{29-31} 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 *μῦθοι* followed by the heretics themselves? Dr. Bigg says they were allegorical misinterpretations of the Gospel miracles. But can *μῦθοι* mean this? It is true that we are told of some who declared the resurrection to be already past (2 Tim. $2^{17.18}$), probably misinterpreting the teaching of St. Paul in such passages as Col. 2^{12}. But this is not the allegorization of a miracle but the one-sided spiritualization of a doctrine. The meaning of *μῦθος* 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 (These false teachers) 'differ from the False Teachers alluded to in the Pastorals, 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 Pastorals *μῦθος* 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. 1^4 *μηδὲ προσέχειν μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις*, *ib.* 4^7 *τοὺς δὲ βεβήλους καὶ γραώδεις μύθους παραιτοῦ*: in Tit. 1^{14} the *μῦθοι* are defined as *Ἰουδαϊκοί* and joined with *ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν*: in the remaining passage there is nothing to mark the character of the *μῦθοι* 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.

Digitized by Google

in Acts 2^{11}. For the emphatic *ἐκείνου* cf. 2 Tim. 2^{26}. The ordinary pronoun would have been *αὐτοῦ* following *μεγ.* Bengel says of *ἐκείνου* 'remotum quiddam et admirabile et magnum notat.'

17. **λαβὼν—λόγον** *v.* 19]. The construction is broken off after *εὐδόκησα.* I agree with Dietlein, Schott, and Ewald that the writer intended to go on *ἐβεβαίωσεν τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον,* for which he substitutes *καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον,* after the parenthetic 18th verse. See Blass pp. 283 foll., Winer p. 442 on varieties of Anacoluthon.

Θεοῦ πατρός.] See n. on Jude 1.

τιμὴν 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, *τιμή* being rather extrinsic, *δόξα* intrinsic. We find them combined in 1 P. 1^{7}, Rom. $2^{7.\ 10}$, 1 Tim. 1^{17}, Heb. $2^{7.\ 9}$, and six times in the Apocalypse. Cf. Heb. 1^{3} *ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης.*

φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιᾶσδε.] The only instance of *τοιόσδε* in biblical Greek. It is used here prospectively as in classical Greek, 'to the following effect.' Compare for the use of *φέρω* 1 Pet. 1^{13} *τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν* and vv. 18 and 21 below.

ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης.] In the Introduction on the Text I have stated why I think *ἀπό* should be read here for *ὑπό.* This is the only example of *μεγαλοπρεπής* in the N.T. It occurs in Deut. 33^{26} *ὁ μεγαλοπρεπὴς τοῦ στερεώματος* ('who rides in his excellency upon the sky,' A.V.), also in 2 Macc. 15^{13} *μεγαλοπρεπεστάτην εἶναι τὴν περὶ αὐτὸν ὑπεροχήν, ib.* 8^{15} *ἡ ἐπίκλησις τοῦ σεμνοῦ καὶ μεγαλοπρεποῦς ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ.* So *ἡ μεγαλοπρέπειά σου* is used of God in Ps. 8^{1}. The above phrase is found in Clem. Rom. i. 9 *τελείως λειτουργήσαντας τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ,* with whom the adjective is common, and in Clem. Al. p. 793 *τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι οἱ κατὰ τὴν τελείαν γνῶσιν . . . καὶ τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτῃ δόξῃ τετιμημένοι*; there is a reference to the Transfiguration *ib.* p. 812. Dr. Bigg calls attention to our author's fondness for these 'reverential paraphrases,' instancing *θεία δύναμις v.* 3, *θεία φύσις v.* 4 and gives the following examples, taken from Spitta, of a like fondness in Jewish Apocryphal writers: *Test. Levi ἐν τῷ ἀνωτέρῳ (οὐρανῷ) πάντων καταλύει ἡ μεγάλη δόξα, Ascens. Is.* xi. 32 et vidi quod sedit a dextera illius magnae gloriae (ed. Charles p. 146 *ταῦτα ἤκουον τῆς δόξης τῆς μεγάλης λεγούσης τῷ κυρίῳ μου καὶ Χριστῷ*), Enoch xiv. 20 *ἡ δόξα ἡ μεγάλη ἐκάθητο ἐπ' αὐτῷ* (the throne): *τὸ περιβόλαιον αὐτοῦ ἡλίου λαμπρότερον* (Charles p. 347), also c. 11. 3. So Heb. 8^{1} *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξίᾳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.*

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 mountain[1] (Luke adds 'to pray, and while he was praying')

[1] Probably not Tabor, but one of the lower slopes of Hermon; see Edersheim *Messiah*, vol. ii. p. 92 foll.

Digitized by Google

καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν, οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι Mk. 9^{2} foll.; καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς Mt. 17^{2} foll.; (ἐγένετο) τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου ἕτερον καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ λευκὸς ἐξαστράπτων Lk. 9^{28} foll.

(2) *The appearance of Moses and Elijah.*

καὶ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς Ἠλείας σὺν Μωϋσεῖ καὶ ἦσαν συνλαλοῦντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ Mk. and Mt.; καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο συνελάλουν αὐτῷ, οἵτινες ἦσαν Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἠλείας, οἳ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ ἣν ἤμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ Lk.

(3) *The words of Peter.*

καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ Ῥαββεί καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι, καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μίαν καὶ Ἠλείᾳ μίαν. οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ, ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο Mk. and Mt. (except that Mt. has Κύριε for Ῥαββεί and omits the last sentence). ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι ὕπνῳ, διαγρηγορήσαντες δὲ εἶδαν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας τοὺς συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, Ἐπιστάτα κ.τ.λ., μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει Lk.

(4) *The overshadowing cloud.*

καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης Mk.; ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ νεφέλη φωτινὴ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα Mt.; ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἐγένετο νεφέλη καὶ ἐπεσκίαζεν αὐτούς· ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν νεφέλην. καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα Lk.

(5) *The voice from Heaven.*

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ Mk.; οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ Mt.; οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε Lk. (Compare Mt. 12^{18}.)

(6) *The end of the vision.*

καὶ ἐξάπινα περιβλεψάμενοι οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον Mk.; καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα. καὶ προσῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἁψάμενος αὐτῶν εἶπεν Ἐγέρθητε καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε. ἐπάραντες δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον Mt.; καὶ ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν φωνὴν εὑρέθη Ἰησοῦς μόνος Lk.[1]

The chief points of resemblance between the Gospel narratives and our epistle are δόξαν in v. 17 and Lk. 9^{32} εἶδαν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; ἔξοδον in v. 15 and Lk. 9^{31} ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ; φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης in v. 17 and Mt. 17^{5} νεφέλη φωτεινὴ (the Shechinah) ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης; εὐδόκησα in v. 17 and

[1] Compare the account in *Apoc. Petri* quoted in Appendix.

Digitized by Google

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 precedes the voice: here the aor. part. ἐνεχθείσης seems to show that the voice preceded, and occasioned the receiving of the glory (*λαβὼν τιμὴν 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.

ὁ υἱός μου, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, οὗτός ἐστιν.] Cf. the loose quotation from Isa. 42[1] in Mt. 12[18] *ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ᾑρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου*. See note on '*The Beloved*,' *as a Messianic Title* in Dr. Armitage Robinson's edition of the Ephesians, pp. 229–233.

εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα.] The construction of εὐδ. with εἰς 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, εὐδ. in reference to a person is followed by ἐν. The word belongs to late Greek, not being used by any profane writer before Polybius.

18. **ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν.**] Heaven here corresponds to the bright cloud of the synoptics. The repetition of ἐνεχθεῖσαν from *v.* 17 is characteristic of the writer.

ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει.] 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[15]), of Jerusalem the holy city (Isa. 52[1], 63[18], Mt. 4[5], 27[53]), and so of the new Jerusalem (Apoc. 21[2]). Zahn (*Einl. 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. **ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον.**] We should rather have expected ἔσχομεν, to suit the preceding *ἠκούσαμεν*; 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 *βεβαίαν τὴν κλῆσιν ποιεῖσθαι*. Field illustrates from Isoc. *ad Dem.* p. 10 *τὴν παρ' ἐκείνων εὔνοιαν βεβαιοτέραν ἔχειν*, Chaeremon *ap.* Stob. *Flor.* 79, 31 (Mein. vol. iii. p. 83) *βεβαιοτέραν ἔχε τὴν φιλίαν*. Charit. iii. 9 *βεβαιότερον ἔσχον τὸ θαρρεῖν*. Cf. for ἔχω 1 Pet. 2[12] *τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ἔχοντες καλήν*, *ib.* 4[8] *τὴν ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες*. The word *προφητικός* is not found elsewhere in biblical Greek except in Rom. 16[26] *μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν, διά τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν . . . εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως . . . γνωρισθέντος*. It occurs in Philo *de Plantat.* M. i. p. 347 *τὸν τέσσαρα ἀριθμὸν . . . ἀποσεμνύειν ἔοικεν ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος*, *Leg. All.* M. i. p. 95 *Μωϋσῆς δὲ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος φησίν* κ.τ.λ. and is not uncommon in Justin, *e.g. Apol.* i. 54 (after quotations from Deut.) *τούτων τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων ἀκούσαντες οἱ δαίμονες Διόνυσον ἔφασαν γεγονέναι υἱὸν τοῦ Διός*, *Dial.* 39 *τοὺς σοφοὺς*

Digitized by Google

. . . ἀπὸ τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων ἀποδείκνυμεν ἀνοήτους, 56 (p. 276) Θεὸν αὐτὸν ὄντα ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος σημαίνει, 77 (p. 302) πρὶν ἢ γνῶναι τὸ παιδίον καλεῖν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος ἔφη, 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^{2}, Isa. 60^{1}, 40^{5}, esp. v. 9 ἐπ' ὄρος ὑψηλὸν ἀνάβηθι ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος Σιών . . . εἰπὸν ταῖς πόλεσιν Ἰούδα Ἰδοὺ ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν. Compare St. Peter's remarks on messianic prophecy in Acts 2^{17-36}, 3^{18-24}, and *Praedic. Petri ap.* Str. vi. p. 804 ἀναπτύξαντες τὰς βίβλους ἃς εἴχομεν τῶν προφητῶν, ἃ μὲν διὰ παραβολῶν, ἃ δὲ δι' αἰνιγμάτων, ἃ δὲ αὐθεντικῶς καὶ αὐτολεξεὶ τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ὀνομαζόντων, εὕρομεν καὶ τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς κολάσεις πάσας ὅσας ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν . . . ταῦτα οὖν ἐπιγνόντες ἐπιστεύσαμεν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τῶν γεγραμμένων εἰς αὐτόν. 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 βεβαιότερος, '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. Zig. ἡμεῖς αὐτοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐθεασάμεθα μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄντες ἐν τῷ ὄρει . . . διὰ τῆς ὄψεως βεβαιότερος τῶν προφητῶν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος ἐγένετο· ἃ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι εἶπον, ταῦτα παρὼν ὁ Χριστὸς ἐπιστώσατο, and most commentators, Orig. *Princ.* iv. 6 ἡ Ἰησοῦ ἐπιδημία δυναμένους ὑποπτεύεσθαι τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας, ὡς οὐ θεῖα, εἰς τοὔμφανὲς ἤγαγεν, ὡς οὐρανίῳ χάριτι ἀναγεγραμμένα, Clem. Al. p. 778 πεπίστευκεν διά τε τῆς προφητείας διά τε τῆς παρουσίας τῷ μὴ ψευδομένῳ Θεῷ, καὶ ὃ πεπίστευκεν ἔχει καὶ κρατεῖ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας . . . καὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας βεβαίως κατείληφεν· ὁ δὲ τὴν ἐν οἷς ἐστὶ κατάστασιν βεβαίαν τῶν μελλόντων κατάληψιν εἰδὼς δι' ἀγάπης προαπαντᾷ τῷ μέλλοντι.

ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες.] On the phrase καλῶς ποιεῖτε cf. James 2^{8} with my n.; on προσέχειν Heb. 2^{1} περισσοτέρως προσέχειν τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσι, Acts 8^{6} προσεῖχον τοῖς λεγομένοις. For both cf. Jos. *Ant.* xi. 6. 12 οἷς (γράμμασιν) ποιήσετε καλῶς μὴ προσέχοντες. The importance of prophecy is also dwelt upon in 1 Pet. 1^{10-12}, which should be compared with this passage. See too Lk. 16^{31}, $24^{25\,f.}$ Joh. 1^{45}, Acts 10^{43}.

ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ.] So John, the last and greatest of the prophets, is described by our Lord as ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων (Joh. 5^{35}). Spitta cites Ps. 119^{105} λύχνος τοῖς ποσί μου ὁ νόμος σου, and 4 Esdr. 12^{42} 'tu superasti ex omnibus prophetis, sicut lucerna in loco obscuro,' cf. also Theoph. *ad Aut.* ii. 13 ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Θεοῦ) φαίνων ὥσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι συνεχομένῳ ἐφώτισεν τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν, *Mart. Ignat.* 1 λύχνου δίκην θεϊκοῦ τὴν ἑκάστου φωτίζων διάνοιαν διὰ τῆς τῶν γραφῶν ἐξηγήσεως ἐπετύγχανεν τῶν κατ' εὐχήν. Cf. Clem. Al. *Str.* v. p. 663 *init.* ἡ μὲν Ἑλληνικὴ φιλοσοφία τῇ ἐκ τῆς

Digitized by Google

θρυαλλίδος ἔοικεν λαμπηδόνι, ἣν ἀνάπτουσιν ἄνθρωποι παρὰ ἡλίου κλέπτοντες ἐντέχνως τὸ φῶς· κηρυχθέντος δὲ τοῦ λόγου πᾶν ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἅγιον ἐξέλαμψεν φῶς. αὐχμηρός is properly 'dry and parched,' then 'squalid and rough,' found here only in biblical Greek: αὐχμώδης is the form used in the LXX. as in 1 Sam. 23[15]. The apocryphal *Apocalypse of Peter* § 21 has εἶδον καὶ ἕτερον τόπον καταντικρὺς ἐκείνου αὐχμηρότατον. καὶ ἦν τόπος κολάσεως, καὶ οἱ κολαζόμενοι . . . σκοτεινὸν εἶχον <τὸ ἔνδυμα> αὐτῶν, ἐνδεδυμένοι κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα τοῦ τόπου. Suidas explains it as στυγνὸν ἢ σκοτεινόν, Hesychius as σκοτῶδες, and the Vg. has 'caliginosus' (Itala 'obscurus') which is the meaning suggested both in our text and in *Apoc. Petri*. In Arist. *de Color.* 3 τὸ λαμπρὸν ἢ στίλβον is opposed to τὸ αὐχμηρὸν καὶ ἀλαμπές. It does not seem to imply absolute darkness, but dingy and dusky obscurity as contrasted with 'the brightness of Messiah's rising' Isa. 60[3], Rom. 13[12]. The τόπος αὐχμηρός may be illustrated by Clem. Al. *Protr.* p. 87 εἰ μὴ τὸν λόγον ἔγνωμεν καὶ τούτῳ κατηυγάσθημεν, οὐδὲν ἂν τῶν σιτευομένων ὀρνίθων ἐλειπόμεθα, ἐν σκότει πιαινόμενοι καὶ θανάτῳ τρεφόμενοι.

ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ.] For construction cf. Lk. 15[8] ζητεῖ ἕως οὗ εὕρῃ, *ib.* 22[18] οὐ μὴ πίω . . . ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.[1] It seems better to connect ἕως οὗ with φαίνοντι than with the more remote προσέχοντες. The rare διαυγάζω is used of the first streaks of dawn breaking through the darkness, cf. Polyb. iii. 104. 5 ἅμα τῷ διαυγάζειν *primo diluculo*; of a flash of lightning, Plut. *Mor.* 893 τῇ πληγῇ καὶ τῷ σχισμῷ διαυγάζει. The form διαυγέω is found in Plut. *V. Arati* c. 22 ἡμέρας ἤδη διαυγούσης.

καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.] The word φωσφόρος is not found elsewhere in biblical Greek, but the synonymous ἑωσφόρος occurs in Isa. 14. 12 πῶς ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὁ Ἑωσφόρος ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων; 1 Sam. 30[17] ἀπὸ ἑωσφόρου ἕως δείλης, Job 3[9] μὴ ἴδοι ἑωσφόρον ἀνατέλλοντα, and in the difficult Ps. 110[3] ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε, explained by Jennings and Lowe of the birth of the Messiah who comes like a rising sun from the womb of the dawn. The coming of the Messiah is also compared to the dawn in Malachi 4[2] καὶ ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸ ὄνομά μου ἥλιος δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἴασις ἐν ταῖς πτέρυξιν αὐτοῦ, Lk. 1[76-79] προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ . . . ἑτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ, τοῦ δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας . . . διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἐν οἷς ἐπισκέψεται ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους, ἐπιφᾶναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκίᾳ θανάτου καθημένοις, Apoc. 22[16] ἐγώ εἰμι . . . ὁ ἀστὴρ ὁ λαμπρός, ὁ πρωινός, cf. *ib.* 2[28], 2 Cor. 4[4-6] ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ὁ εἰπών Ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψει, ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ, 1 Joh. 2[8] ἡ σκοτία παράγεται καὶ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἤδη 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 'ἕως *conj.*' Of course οὗ (χρόνου) is the relative governed by ἕως *prep.*

Digitized by Google

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. Il.* 23. 226 *ἦμος δ' ἐωσφόρος εἶσι φόως ἐρέων ἐπὶ γαῖαν, ὄντε μέτα κροκόπεπλος ὑπείρ ἅλα κίδναται ἠώς, τῆμος κ.τ.λ.*, Ov. *Trist.* iii. 5. 55 hunc utinam nitidi solis praenuntius ortum adferat admisso Lucifer albus equo, *Heroid.* 18. 112 praevius 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 ἑωσφόρου* in Ps. 110[3], which is apparently referred to in connexion with our passage by Hippolytus *Ref.* x. 33 *τὰ δὲ πάντα διοικεῖ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ πρωτόγονος πατρὸς παῖς, ἡ πρὸ ἑωσφόρου φωσφόρος φωνή.*[1] There may also be a reference to our text in Clem. Al. *Protr.* p. 70 (*ὁ κύριος*) *ἀφυπνίζει καὶ τοῦ σκότους τοὺς πεπλανημένους διανίστησιν· ἔγειρε, φησίν, ὁ καθεύδων, . . . καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός, ὁ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἥλιος, ὁ πρὸ ἑωσφόρου γεννώμενος, ὁ ζωὴν χαρισάμενος ἀκτῖσιν ἰδίαις*, p. 87 *πῶς γὰρ οὐ ποθεινὸς ὁ τὸν ἐν σκότει κατορωρυγμένον νοῦν ἐναργῆ ποιησάμενος καὶ τὰ φωσφόρα τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποξύνας ὄμματα*; and p. 89 *λαμψάτω οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀποκεκρυμμένῳ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τὸ φῶς, καὶ τῆς γνώσεως αἱ ἀκτῖνες ἀνατειλάτωσαν τὸν ἐγκεκρυμμένον ἔνδον ἐκφαίνουσαι καὶ ἀποστίλβουσαι ἄνθρωπον.* Wetstein compares Philo *de Decal.* ii. p. 188 *ἠκρίβωται καὶ βεβασάνισται τὰ Θεοῦ λόγια καθάπερ χρυσὸς πυρί . . . οἱ μὲν τοῖς χρησμοῖς ἀξιοῦντες εἶναι καταπειθεῖς ὡς ἐν ἀσκίῳ φωτὶ τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον βιώσονται, τοὺς νόμους αὐτοὺς ἀστέρας ἔχοντες 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 (*ἴδιον*, 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 (*λογισμός*) is to the mind what the sun is to the universe, for both reason and the sun *φωσφορεῖ*. When the divine light shines, the light of human reason sets; when the former sets, this rises, *ἡ δύσις τοῦ λογισμοῦ καὶ τὸ περὶ αὐτὸν σκότος ἔκστασιν καὶ θεοφόρητον μανίαν ἐγέννησε.*' Dr. Abbott thinks that the use of *φωσφορεῖ* above implies that the substantive *φωσφόρος* (often applied to Helios, Apollo, etc.) may stand for the sun; but *φωσφορέω* simply means 'I give light.' It is true that Wetstein quotes Suidas as interpreting *φωσφόρος* 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 *οὐ λόγον ὡς φωνήν, ἀλλ' ἐνδιάθετον . . . ἅμα γὰρ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ γεννήσαντος προελθεῖν, πρωτότοκος τούτου γενόμενος φωνή, ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰς ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ προεννοηθείσας ἰδέας.* Thus *φωσφόρος φωνή* is the light-giving utterance of the Word, which was *ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον.*

Digitized by Google

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 3^4. The phrase *ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν* implies an inward coming (Lk. 17^{21}) as we see in Rom. 2^{15} 5^5, 8^{27}, 2 Cor. 1^{21} *ὁ δὲ βεβαιῶν ἡμᾶς σὺν ὑμῖν εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ χρίσας ἡμᾶς Θεός, ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν*, 4^6, Eph. 1^{18}, 3^{15}, Col. 3^{15}. 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^{16}) 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 ἀγνοίᾳ φωταγωγεῖ ἕως καθαρὸν ὑμῖν τὸ φῶς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαφανῇ καὶ ὁ νοητὸς ἑωσφόρος, τουτέστι Χριστός, ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν ἀνατείλῃ.*

20. **τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες.**] Occurs again below (3^3) 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. *γινώσκοντες*, continuing the construction of *καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες*, defines the spirit and feeling with which the Scriptures should be read, 'recognizing this truth first of all.'

πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς.] Here we have the Hebraic *πᾶσα—οὐ* for *οὐδεμία*, as in 1 Joh. 2^{21} *πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστιν*. The converse *οὐ—πᾶς* is also common as Mt. 24^{22} *οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ*, see Blass tr. p. 178. For *προφ. γρ.* cf. Apoc. 22^7 *τὰς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου*, and Acts 8^{32} *ἡ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς ἣν ἀνεγίνωσκεν*, 2 Tim. 3^{16} *πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν*. 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 *ψευδοπροφῆται* mentioned below.

ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται.] Aquila has *ἐννυπνίων ἐπίλυσις* in Gen. 40^8, where the LXX. has *διασάφησις*. Cf. Mk. 4^{34} *κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπέλυεν πάντα*, Herm. *Sim.* ix. 13 *ἔχεις τὴν ἐπίλυσιν τῶν ἀποβεβλημένων*, *ib.* v. 5. 1. *αὐθάδης εἶ ἐπερωτῶν τὰς ἐπιλύσεις τῶν παραβολῶν. ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὕτω παράμονος εἶ, ἐπιλύσω σοι τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ ἀγροῦ*, *ib.* v. 6. 8, 3. 1, 4. 2, 3,

Digitized by Google

viii. 11. 1 *τὰς ἐπιλύσεις πασῶν τῶν ῥάβδων*, Iren. ii. 28. 3 *τῶν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς ζητουμένων, ὅλων τῶν γραφῶν πνευματικῶν οὐσῶν, ἕνια μὲν ἐπιλύομεν* (=absolvimus) *κατὰ χάριν Θεοῦ, ἕνια δὲ ἀνακείσεται Θεῷ*, *ib.* 27. 3 parabolae possunt multas recipere absolutiones (=*ἐπιλύσεις*), Philo *Vit. Cont.* M. 2. p. 483 *ζητεῖ τίς τι τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν, ἢ καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλου προσταθέν τι ἐπιλύεται*, Heliod. i. 18 *ὀνειράτων ἐπίλυσις*, *ib.* iv. 9 *πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀγνοουμένων εὕρεσιν καὶ τῶν χρησθέντων τὴν ἐπίλυσιν*, Clem. Al. *Paed.* ii. p. 172 *ἔχοι δ' ἂν καὶ ἄλλας ἐπιλύσεις ὁ στατήρ*. For the gen. cf. Heb. 12[11] *πᾶσα παιδεία οὐ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι ἀλλὰ λύπης*, Acts 20[3] *ἐγένετο γνώμης τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν*, Plato *Apol.* p. 28 *ὡς μὲν ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀδικῶ, οὐ πολλῆς μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι ἀπολογίας*. Alford and others urge that *γίνομαι* 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 *Vita Mosis* M. ii. p. 125, where Balaam is represented as saying *λέγω γὰρ οὐδὲν ἴδιον, ἀλλ' ἅττ' ἂν ὑπηχήσῃ τὸ θεῖον*, and again *ὁ δὲ μονωθεὶς ἐξαίφνης θεοφορεῖται καὶ μηδὲν συνιείς, ὥσπερ μετανισταμένου τοῦ λογισμοῦ, τὰ ὑποβαλλόμενα ἐξελάλει*, p. 126 *ἀπολογίᾳ χρώμενος ἀληθεῖ, ὡς οὐδὲν ἴδιον λέγοι, κατεχόμενος δὲ καὶ ἐνθουσιῶν διερμηνεύοι τὰ ἑτέρου*. It was the mark of a false prophet to speak *τὸ ἴδιον* or *ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ*. Compare Jer. 23[16] *ματαιοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς ὅρασιν· ἀπὸ καρδίας ἑαυτῶν λαλοῦσιν καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ στόματος Κυρίου*, Ezek. 13[3] *οὐαὶ τοῖς προφητεύουσιν ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ καθόλου μὴ βλέπουσιν*. Of the true prophet we read (Hippol. *Antichr.* 2) *οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως ἐφθέγγοντο, οὐδὲ ἅπερ αὐτοὶ ἐβούλοντο ταῦτα ἐκήρυττον, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐσοφίζοντο ὀρθῶς, ἔπειτα δι' ὁραμάτων προεδιδάσκοντο τὰ μέλλοντα καλῶς· εἶθ' οὕτω πεπεισμένοι ἔλεγον ταῦτα ἅπερ αὐτοῖς ἦν μόνοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένα*. This is the view taken in a scholium from Oecumenius quoted by Wetstein *λαμβάνουσι μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ οἱ προφῆται τὴν προφητείαν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐκεῖνοι βούλονται, ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ κινοῦν αὐτοὺς θεῖον ἐνεργεῖ πνεῦμα*. Such an interpretation is applicable to the next verse, but is not in harmony with the ordinary force of *ἐπίλυσις* here. Accordingly Grotius altered the reading to *ἐπηλύσεως*, Heinsius to *ἐπιλεύσεως*, with the sense '*προφητεία* non est res proprii impetus,' while Alford, following Hüther and Bengel, seems to understand *ἐπίλυσις*, 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 continuatiom of Wetstein's scholium seems to give the more correct view of *ἐπίλυσις*—the prophets knew that the word which came to them was prophetic—*οὐ μέντοι καὶ τὴν ἐπίλυσιν αὐτοῦ ἐποιοῦντο*. So even the holy prophets had very vague ideas as to the meaning and scope of their prophecies, cf. Dan. 12[8. 9] *καὶ ἐγὼ ἤκουσα καὶ οὐ συνῆκα, καὶ εἶπα, Κύριε, τί τὰ ἔσχατα τούτων; καὶ εἶπε, Δεῦρο Δανιήλ, ὅτι ἐμπεφραγμένοι καὶ ἐσφραγισμένοι οἱ λόγοι ἕως καιροῦ πέρας*, Zech. 4[5], 1 Pet. 1[10. 11]. This agrees very well with v. 21 but not so well with what precedes. Why should it be so important,

Digitized by Google

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) *ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ Θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν*, Acts 10^{43} *τούτῳ πάντες οἱ προφῆται μαρτυροῦσιν ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν*, Rom. 15^{8} *λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας Θεοῦ εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων*, Iren. iv. 6. 1 *Χριστὸς διὰ τύπων καὶ παραβολῶν ἐσημαίνετο μὴ δυναμένων νοηθῆναι πρὸ τοῦ τὴν ἔκβασιν τῶν προφητευμένων ἐλθεῖν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

The different interpretations of this difficult phrase may be classified as follows. Those who agree that *ἐπίλυσις* (*ἐπιλύειν*) 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 (Heliod. 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 meaniug of the word *γίνομαι*, 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 populis dogmata vitae praedicavit, sed quae a Domino didicerant, haec suis auditoribus agenda commendabant.' So Bengel '*ἐπίλυσις* dicitur interpretatio qua ipsi prophetae res antea plane clausas aperuere mortalibus,' Cajetan, Alford, Keil, Kühl, Hundhausen. Spitta proposes an entirely new sense of the word *ἐπίλυσις*, translating 'no prophecy is of such a nature that it can be dissolved,' for which he compares Joh. 10^{35} *οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή*. Mt. 5^{17} *οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι*, but confesses that he can make nothing of *ἰδίας*, for which he proposes to read *ἁγίας*.

There is similar diversity of opinion as to *ἰδίας*. (1) à Lapide, Estius, and the Roman Catholics in general take it as equivalent to *ἰδιωτικῆς*,

Digitized by Google

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 innixus, in rebus fidei et morum ad aedificationem doctrinae Christianae pertinentium, Sacram Scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens contra eum sensum quem tenuit et tenet Sancta Mater Ecclesia, cuius est iudicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum Sanctarum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum, ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari audeat. (2) Œcumenius interprets it of the prophet himself in accordance with 1 Pet. $1^{10 f.}$, cf. 4 Esdras 12^{11} 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, Bisping refer ἰδίας to προφητεία itself, in the sense 'no prophecy is self-interpreting'; it receives its interpretation from the event which fulfils 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. **οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ.**] Cf. Joh. 1^{13} οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ 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. 7^{9} ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ, 1 Cor. 9^{7} τίς στρατεύεται ἰδίοις ὀψωνίοις ποτέ; so Eph. 2^{3}, Col. 3^{7}, Heb. 1^{13}. With ἠνέχθη we should probably supply in thought ἐξ οὐρανοῦ or its equivalent as in *vv.* 17, 18.

ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι.] Compare the compounds θεοφόρος Aesch. *Ag.* 1150, θεοφόρητος *ib.* 1140, θεοφορία Strabo, θεοφόρησις Plut., θεοφορεῖσθαι Menander, πνευματόφορος and πνευματοφορούμενος Eccl., and Philo i. 510 quoted above under φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ, also p. 482, ἔκστηθι σεαυτῆς, καθάπερ οἱ κορυβαντιῶντες καὶ κατεχόμενοι, βακχευθεῖσα καὶ θεοφορηθεῖσα κατά τινα προφητικὸν ἐπιθειασμόν, *Mut. Nom.* M. i. p. 609 (of Balaam) σοφιστείᾳ μαντικῇ τὴν θεοφόρητον προφητείαν παρεχάραξε, *de Somn.* p. 689 ὅταν ἐξ ἔρωτος θείου κατασχεθεὶς ὁ νοῦς, συντείνας ἑαυτὸν ἄχρι τῶν ἀδύτων, ὁρμῇ καὶ σπουδῇ πάσῃ χρώμενος προέρχηται, θεοφορούμενος ἐπιλέλησται τῶν ἄλλων, Justin *Apol.* I. § 33 οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ θεοφοροῦνται οἱ προφητεύοντες εἰ μὴ θείῳ λόγῳ, *ib.* § 35 Ἡσαΐας θεοφοροῦμενος τῷ πνεύματι τῷ προφητικῷ, Theoph. *Autol.* ii. 9 οἱ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, πνεύματοφοροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφῆται γενόμενοι, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες . . . ἐγένοντο θεοδίδακτοι, iii. 12 τοὺς πάντας πνευματοφόρους ἐνὶ πνεύματι Θεοῦ λελαληκέναι. For the simple φερόμενος cf. Jos. *B.J.* vi. 5. 2 φερόμενοι τοῖς θυμοῖς οἱ στρατιῶται τὴν στοὰν ὑφάπτουσι, Plut. *Mor.* 205A φερόμενος ταῖς ὁρμαῖς, Acts 2^{2} of the descent of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost ὥσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας, and such phrases as Mk. 1^{12} τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, Acts 8^{39} πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἥρπασεν τὸν Φίλιππον, 2 Cor. 12^{2} ἁρπαγέντα ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ.

Digitized by Google

ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι.] Cf. Acts 3[21] (Times of Restoration of which) *ἐλάλησεν ὁ Θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν*, Jus in *Apol.* i. 36 *ὅταν δὲ τὰς λέξεις τῶν προφητῶν λεγομένας . . . ἀκούητε, μὴ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐμπεπνευσμένων λέγεσθαι νομίσητε, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ κινοῦντος αὐτοὺς θείου λόγου, ib.* 37 *τὰ διδασκόμενα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ib. ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐλέχθησαν διὰ Ἡσαΐου οἵδε οἱ λόγοι, ib.* 38 *ὅταν δὲ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγῃ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, οὕτως φθέγγεται.* The reading *ἀπό* makes a better contrast to *θελήματι ἀνθρώπου* than the *ἅγιοι* of some MSS. The position of *ἄνθρωποι* at the end of the sentence next to *Θεοῦ* is emphatic. Though the prophets were men, yet their prophecies came not from mere human impulse, but proceeded from God.

II. 1. **ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ.**]

[Compare throughout this chapter the notes on the parallels in Jude]

Besides the true prophets spoken of in the previous verses there were also false prophets among the Israelites. The word *ψευδοπροφήτης* is used of O.T. prophets in Jer. 27[8] (LXX. 34[9]) *μὴ ἀκούετε τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν ὑμῶν, ib.* 26[7] (LXX. 33[7]) and in Lk. 6[26]. We often meet references to these, as in Deut. 13[1 f.], 18[20], Jer. 5[31], Ezek. 13 esp. *v.* 3 *οὐαὶ τοῖς προφητεύουσιν ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτῶν* (= *θελήματι ἀνθρώπου* in 1[21] above). Examples of such are Zedekiah (1 Kings 22), Hananiah (Jer. 28). Words compounded with *ψευδο-* may either mean, falsely named, a 'sham' or 'counterfeit,' as *ψευδόχριστος* Mt. 24[24], *ψευδαπόστολος* 2 Cor. 11[13], *ψευδάδελφος* Gal. 2[4], *ψευδονέρων* 'a sham Nero' (Lucian), *ψευδοκύων* 'a sham Cynic' (Plut.); or they may mean falsely doing the work implied in the second part of the compound, as in *ψευδοστομέω* 'to speak falsely' (Soph.), *ψευδουργός* 'one who practises deceitful arts' (Plato), *ψευδορκία* 'perjury' (Philo), *ψευδομάρτυρ* 'a false witness' Mt. 26[60], *ψευδολόγος* 'speaking falsely' 1 Tim. 4[2]. 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 prophets 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[21-23], 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

Digitized by Google

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 ψευδοπροφῆται in the Christian Church, cf. Mt. 24^{11}, 1 Tim. 4^{1}.

λαός is used of Israel generally in the O.T. esp. in Ex. 19^{5} and Deut. 8^{6} ἔσεσθε μοι λαὸς περιούσιος, from which is taken the phrase in 1 P. 2^{9} λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν. Compare also Lk. 2^{32} φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ, and Acts $26^{17,23}$, where we find the same distinction between the λαός and the ἔθνη.

οἵτινες καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι.] The mention of the false prophets of old leads on naturally to the thought of the false teachers who were even then making their way into the Church. Διδάσκαλος corresponds to Rabbi (Joh. 1^{39}). In the early Church teachers are joined with prophets (Acts 13^{1}, 1 Cor. 12^{28} πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους, Eph. 4^{11} ἔδωκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους). We learn from James 3^{1} that the office was much sought after, see my note there. The word ψευδοδ. is rare, ψευδοδιδασκαλία is found in Polyc. *ad Phil.* 7. For further information see Introduction *On the False Teachers*.

οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας.] 'Men who will introduce destructive heresies into the Church.' ὅστις seems to have its usual indefinite force, cf. Mt. 7^{15} προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες . . . εἰσιν λύκοι ἅρπαγες. 'There are some places in the N.T. in which ὅστις cannot be distinguished from ὅς; ultimately the distinction quite broke down,' Hort on 1 Pet. p. 133. For παρεισάγω, which is found only here in N.T., see nn. on Jude 4 παρεισεδύησαν and 2 Pet. 1^{5} παρεισφέρω, also Lightfoot's n. on παρεισάκτους Gal. 2^{4}, and Clem. Al. *Str.* vii. p. 854 ὑπεμνήσθην τῶν περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν εὔχεσθαι πρός τινων ἑτεροδόξων παρεισαγομένων δογμάτων. It is frequently used in the Apology of Aristides without any notion of secrecy, which however easily attaches to παρά, as in παρείσακτος.

αἱρέσεις.] Athanasius quoted by Suicer defines the word ἀπὸ τοῦ αἱρεῖσθαί τι ἴδιον καὶ τούτῳ ἑξακολουθεῖν. 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 δοκιμωτάτοις τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι φιλοσόφων πάμπολλαι γεγόνασιν αἱρέσεις . . . καὶ οἱ ἰατροί, ἐναντίας δόξας κεκτημένοι κατὰ τὰς οἰκείας αἱρέσεις, ἐπ' ἴσης ἔργῳ θεραπεύουσιν. Apparently the first instance of its use in this sense is in Cicero's amusing letter to Cassius (*Fam.* xv. 16. 3). So in Acts 5^{17} αἵρεσις Σαδδουκαίων, *ib.* 15^{5} αἵρ. Φαρισαίων, 24^{5} πρωτοστάτην τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων αἱρέσεως. In our text it is used in a dyslogistic sense, as in 1 Cor. 11^{19} δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἱρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, ἵνα οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται, Gal. 5^{20}, where διχοστασίαι and αἱρέσεις are joined with adultery and idolatry as works of the flesh, Tit. 3^{10} αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον παραιτοῦ. 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

Digitized by Google

as millennarianism. 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 ἀγεννὲς καὶ γυναικῶδες τῆς αἱρέσεως αὐτοῦ*, xviii. 20. 4 *οὐδέποτε ταύτην ἐσχηκέναι τὴν αἵρεσιν, ὅτι δεῖ πολεμεῖν ἀδιαλύτως*. 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. 5^{20} and 1 Cor. 11^{18} 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 *οἱ ἐν οἰήσει οἱ κατὰ τὰς αἱρέσεις*. 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,' *ib. Eph.* 6 *ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδεμία αἵρεσις κατοικεῖ* where it seems to be equivalent to *κακὴ διδαχή* in 9. I am disposed to assign the same force to *αἵρεσις* in our text, as more suitable to the word *παρεισάξουσιν* and receiving a natural explanation in *ἀρνούμενοι*. 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.

ἀπωλείας.] 'Dangerous heresies,' the *gen. qualitatis*, as below in *v.* 4 *σειροῖς ζόφου*, *v.* 10 *ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ*, see Sir. 16^{7} *ἔθνος ἀπωλείας* and my n. on Jas. 1^{25} *ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς* and p. ccxiv. The word occurs five times in this ep., once in Acts, where Peter rebukes Simon, and is found in *Apoc. Petri* 1 *ὁδοὺς καὶ δόγματα ποικίλα τῆς ἀπωλείας διδάξουσιν*. It appears as the opposite of *σωτηρία* in Phil. 1^{28}.

καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι.] 'Denying even the Lord that bought them.' Alford and others have got into unnecessary trouble about the construction by refusing to recognize that *καί* is used in the sense of 'even' in the N.T. as in other Greek. See his n. on Mt. 10^{30} *ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες . . . ἠριθμημέναι εἰσίν*, where he translates 'and yet.' For other instances of this use of *καί* cf. Mk. 1^{27}, 4^{25}, 1 Cor. 2^{10}. For *ἀγοράσαντα* see Hort on 1 Pet. $1^{18.19}$ (pp. 78–80) *οὐ φθαρτοῖς ἐλυτρώθητε . . . ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι, ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου, Χριστοῦ*: '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 τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν* . . . The nearest

Digitized by Google

repetition of these words is in 1 Tim. ii. 6 *ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*. For *λυτροῦμαι* St. Paul uses *ἀγοράζω* 1 Cor. vi. 20 *ἠγόρασθε γὰρ τιμῆς*, vii. 23, Gal. iii. 13 *Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα*. So Apoc. v. 9 (of the Lamb) *ἠγόρασας τῷ Θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου*. . . . In the LXX. *λυτροῦμαι* is connected with the Exodus . . . in Acts vii. 35 St. Stephen boldly says that God sent Moses as *ἄρχοντα 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 *ἑαυτοῦ*) and viii. 32.' Spitta takes the latter view in our text, comparing such 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 4^{24} *δέσποτα, σὺ ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν*, Lk. 2^{29}, Apoc. 6^{10}. 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 *ἀρνούμενοι* of the various idolatries, and *ἐπάγοντες* of the consequent punishments of Israel; but this is rather an awkward construction. Otherwise *ἀρν.* describes the nature of the threatening heresy, *ἐπ.* its effect 'so bringing on t emselves 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.) *βαβαὶ τῆς ἀνεξικακίας τοῦ δεσπότου, τοῦ καὶ φιλήσαντος τὸν προδότην*, and in p. 242 we have the phrase *τὸ δεσποτικὸν σῶμα* used of the Lord's body. For *ἀρνούμενοι* see n. on Jude, and Peter's words in Acts $3^{13.\ 14}$.

ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν.] The middle is used by classical writers in cases of self-caused evil, *e.g.* Dem. p. 424. 10 *αὐθαίρετον αὑτοῖς ἐπάγονται δουλείαν* Lys. p. 102. 19 *κινδυνεύω πολὺ μείζω συμφορὰν ἐμαυτῷ ἐπαγαγέσθαι*. see Blass pp. 183 f., Jannaris *Gr.* §§ 1472, 1478. Another instance of the unclassical active is found in Sir. 1^{27} *μὴ ἐξύψου σεαυτὸν ἵνα μὴ . . . ἐπαγάγῃς τῇ ψυχῇ σου ἀτιμίαν*. The active is properly used in *v.* 5 below. For **ταχινήν** see n. on 1^{14}. Spitta finds a difficulty in the doubled participle, on which see Winer p. 433 and Blass p. 250.

2. **πολλοὶ ἐξακολούθησουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις.**] **αὐτῶν** refers to the *ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι*, whose bad example will be largely followed. This verse is parenthetic 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, $3^{3.\ 17}$. For pl. *ἀσελγείαις* cf. below *v.* 15 and *εὐσεβείαις* 3^{11}, also James 2^{1} with my note.

δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται.] Cf. Rom. $2^{23.\ 24}$ (a quotation from Isa. 52^{5}) *ὃς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν Θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις; τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ib.* 3^{8}, Tit. 2^{5}, James 2^{7} (where see my note), *Apoc. Petri.* 7 *οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης*. For *ὁδός* see also *vv.* 15 and

Digitized by Google

21 below, and Mt. 21[32], Lk. 1[79], Rom. 3[17] (ὁδὸν εἰρήνης), Acts 16[17] (ὁδὸν σωτηρίας), Barn. i. 4, v. 4 ὁδ. δικαιοσύνης.[1] The phrase ὁδὸς ἀληθείας comes from Ps. 119[30]: it is opposed to the 'way of lying' in *v.* 29.

3. ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται.] 'Through covetousness 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[5. 6] οὔτε γάρ ποτε ἐν λόγῳ κολακίας ἐγενήθημεν . . οὔτε προφάσει πλεονεξίας . . οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν. For causal ἐν cf. 1[1], 2[13], 2[18], 2[20], 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. Themist. 298 ἐμπ. τὴν φιλοσοφίαν, Philo M. ii. p. 536 ἐνεπορεύετο τὴν λήθην τῶν δικαστῶν 'purchased the forgetfulness of the jurors,' Jos. *B.J.* i. 26. 1 οὐδὲν ἡγεῖτο τὴν καθαρὰν δόσιν εἰ μὴ δι' αἵματος ἐμπορεύσεται τὴν βασιλείαν, Chion *Epist.* xi. ἀρετὴν ἐμπορευόμεθα, οὐδενὸς ἄλλου πλὴν φύσεως καὶ φιλοπονίας ὤνιον, Prov. 3[14] κρεῖσσον σοφίαν ἐμπορεύεσθαι ἢ χρυσίου θησαυρούς, Jos. *Ant.* iv. 6. 8 (of the Midianitish women) οὐδ' ἐμπορευσόμεναι τὴν ὥραν τοῦ σώματος προσηκάμεθα τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀξίωσιν 'we have not lent an ear to your request with a design of making traffic out of our beauty.' Suicer quotes Greg. Nyss. *de Bapt.* μὴ ἐμπορεύου τὴν χάριν ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσῃς τῆς δωρεᾶς, Theodoret τὰς τῶν πενήτων συμφορὰς ἐμπορεύεσθαι. The idea is the same as that in 2 Cor. 2[17], 1 Tim. 6[5] 'thinking that godliness is a trade' (πορισμόν 'a means of gain'). The compound χριστέμπορος occurs in the longer recension of Ignatius *ad Magn.* ix. οἱ χριστέμποροι τὸν λόγον καπηλεύοντες καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πωλοῦντες and *ad Trall.* vi. where see Lightfoot's note.

πλαστοῖς.] 'Made up,' 'fictitious,' not found elsewhere in biblical Greek, cf. Herod. i. 68 ἐκ λόγου πλαστοῦ ἐπενείκαντες αἰτίαν ἐδίωξαν 'banished him, having having brought a charge against him on a false pretext.' Cf. Jos. *Vita* 65 πράττουσι μὲν ὅμοιόν τι τοῖς περὶ συμβολαίων πλαστὰ γράμματα συντεθεικόσι 'they act like those who have forged false documents in a case of contract,' Philo M. i. p. 1 μυθικοῖς πλάσμασι τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπικρύψαντες. I do not think there is any reference to the σεσοφισμένοι μῦθοι of 1[16].

οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ.] 'Over whom the judgment (pronounced against false prophets in the O.T.) has long been impending.' The combination of ἀργεῖ and νυστάζει reminds one of ἀργός and μυωπάζων in 1[8. 9]. The judgment is not idle, but already active in the punishment of other offenders, and gathering up for these false teachers. ἔκπαλαι only here and in 3[15] in biblical Greek, is found in Philo, Josephus, Plutarch, etc The use of compound adverbs, which is comparatively rare in classical Greek (*e.g.* ἀπαρτί, ἔμπροσθεν, καθάπαξ, ἐξοπίσω, παραυτίκα), received a great extension in post-Aristotelian writers, see Lobeck's *Phryn.* p. 45 f. Thus we find the unclassical ὑπεράνω, ὑπερλίαν, ἐφάπαξ, κατέναντι, κατενώπιον in the N.T.

[1] Dr. Bigg quotes Aristid. *Apol.* xvi αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, ἥτις τοὺς ὁδεύοντας αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ βασιλείαν, which, as he says, appears to be directly taken from this verse combined with 1[11].

Digitized by Google

ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει.] The repetition of *ἀπώλεια* (here personified) for the third time in these three verses is characteristic of the writer. *νυστάζω* 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] *οὐ νυστάξει οὐδὲ ὑπνώσει ὁ φυλάσσων τὸν Ἰσραήλ*, Isa. 5[27] (of the avengers) *οὐδὲ κοπιάσουσιν οὐδὲ νυστάξουσιν*, Prov. 24[33], Nah. 3[18]. Compare the scene of the sleeping Eumenides awakened by the shade of Clytemnestra.

4. **εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο.**] The natural apodosis would have been *ὑμῶν οὐ φείσεται*, but (as above 1[17-19]) the sequence of thought is weakened by the length of the sentence, and the actual apodosis in *v.* 9 (*οἶδεν 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, οὐδέ σου φείσεται*, Mt. 6[30].

σειροῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν.] For *σειροῖς* see Introduction on the text. *σειρός* or *σιρός* is properly a pit for the storage of grain as in Demosth. p. 100 *ad fin.* *ἐν τοῖς Θρᾳκίοις σιροῖς*, where the scholiast explains *τοὺς θησαυροὺς καὶ τὰ ὀρύγματα ἐν οἷς κατέθεντο τὰ σπέρματα* (different kinds of grain) *σιροὺς ἐκάλουν οἱ Θρᾷκες καὶ οἱ Λίβυες*. 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 *σειρούς*. In Anaxandridas *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 Antigenes was thrown and burnt alive (Diod. xix. 44, though *σορόν* is read there instead of *σειρόν* 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) *ἔμβαλε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος καὶ ἄνοιξον τὴν ἔρημον τὴν οὖσαν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῃ Δουδαήλ*,[1] *καὶ ἐκεῖ πορευθεὶς βάλε αὐτόν· καὶ ὑπόθες αὐτῷ λίθους ὀξεῖς καὶ λίθους τραχεῖς καὶ ἐπικάλυψον αὐτῷ σκότος, καὶ οἰκησάτω ἐκεῖ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα . . . καὶ φῶς μὴ θεωρείτω, ib.* 12 (of Shemjaza and his companions) *δῆσον αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ ἑβδομήκοντα γενεὰς εἰς τὰς νάπας τῆς γῆς . . . ἕως συντελεσθῇ κρίμα τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων*, 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 *τῷ Δ.* omitting *τῇ ἐρήμῃ* (Charles p. 337).

Digitized by Google

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 δεσμωτήριον*) and shall be shut up in the prison (*εἰς ὀχύρωμα*), 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 *σιρός*, which does not seem to suggest anything awful or terrible. Supposing, as I think we must,[1] 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 *σειραῖς*, which as the substitution of a more elegant word for the common-place *δεσμός*, would be in accordance with our author's procedure elsewhere. The scholiast to Demosthenes, quoted above, states that the word *σιρός* was in use in Egypt. Supposing it to have been better known than the word *σειρά* to the scribes of ℵ and B, it might easily happen that the former was unconsciously written in the place of the latter. We also find *σειραῖς* attested by Didymus, Cyril, Ephrem Syr., Procopius, Damascenus, Œcumenius, and Theophylact, as well as by most cursives and versions. The word occurs in the LXX. in the sense of fetters, Prov. 5^{22} *παρανομίαι ἄνδρα ἀγρεύουσι, σειραῖς δὲ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν ἕκαστος σφίγγεται.* **ζόφον** occurs below *v.* 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^{34} *παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν τοῖς βασανισταῖς*, and an accusative preceded by *εἰς* of the thing, as Acts 8^{3} *παρεδίδου εἰς φυλακήν*, 2 Cor. 4^{11} *εἰς θάνατον.* We find *παρέδωκαν ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ* Eph. 4^{19}, *παρ. λήθῃ 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 Apoc. 20^{1-3} *εἶδον ἄγγελον καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἔχοντα τὴν κλεῖν τῆς ἀβύσσου καὶ ἅλυσιν μεγάλην . . . καὶ ἐκράτησεν τὸν Δράκοντα . . . καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν χίλια ἔτη καὶ ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον.* Alford illustrates *σειραῖς ζόφου* by Wisdom 17^{16} (of the Egyptian plague of darkness) *μιᾷ ἁλύσει σκότους πάντες ἐδέθησαν*: the darkness constituted the chain which prevented them from moving: so in *v.* 2 of the same chapter we have *δέσμιοι σκότους καὶ μακρᾶς πεδῆται νυκτός* and in *v.* 15 *ἐφρουρεῖτο εἰς τὴν ἀσίδηρον εἱρκτὴν κατακλεισθείς.*

ταρταρώσας.] *ἅπ. λεγ.* See for the compound *καταταρταρόω* Sext. *P.H.* iii. 24. 210 *ὁ Ζεὺς τὸν Κρόνον κατεταρτάρωσεν* with the note of Fabricius. In Enoch 20^{2} 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' ὄρος ἀκρότομον, ἐποίησε χαρμονὴν τετράποσιν 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.

Digitized by Google

he eateth grass as an ox,' and in 41[23] *τὸν δὲ τάρταρον τῆς ἀβύσσου ὥσπερ αἰχμάλωτον* (*ἤγηται*), which is again entirely unlike the Hebrew; also in Philo M. 2 p. 433 (the wicked) *ὑποσυρήσεται κατωτάτω, πρὸς αὐτὸν τάρταρον καὶ βαθὺ σκότος ἐνεχθείς*, Jos. *c. Ap.* ii. 33 (of the Greek mythology) *τοὺς πρεσβυτάτους αὐτῶν* (*sc. τῶν θεῶν*) *ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ δεδεμένους*, cf. Hippol. *Refut.* p. 544, l. 28 foll. *δι' ἧς ἐπιγνώσεως ἐκφέυξεσθε ἐπερχομένην πυρὸς κρίσεως ἀπειλὴν καὶ ταρτάρου ζοφεροῦ ὄμμα ἀφώτιστον . . . καὶ ταρταρούχων ἀγγέλων κολαστῶν ὄμμα ἀεὶ μένον ἐν ἀπειλῇ*, *Acta Thomae* 32, where the serpent who tempted Eve says *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ τὴν ἄβυσσον τοῦ ταρτάρου οἰκῶν*, *Acta Philippi* 110. For the reasons stated in the Introduction on the Text, I am inclined to prefer the longer reading *κολαζομένους τηρεῖν* (on which see below *v.* 9) to the shorter *τηρουμένους*. The infinitive would be epexegetic after *παρέδωκεν*.

5. **ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο.**] 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 3[6] in contrast to the present world which is doomed to be destroyed by fire. Compare Sir. 16[7] *οὐκ ἐξιλάσατο περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων γιγάντων*. The omission of the article is common in 2 Pet. See *κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν*, *πόλεις Σοδόμων*, just below and Introduction on Grammar.

ἀλλὰ ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν.] The negative statement *οὐκ ἐφείσατο* is contrasted with the positive (brought a flood on the world of the ungodly at the time when he saved Noah) by *ἀλλά*, just as the *οὐκ ἐφείσατο* of the preceding verse is contrasted with *σειροῖς παρέδωκεν*; 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 *ὄγδοον* cf. 1 Pet. 3[20] *ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ, εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὀκτὼ ψυχαὶ ἐσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος*, Clem. Al. p. 812 *init.* (on the Transfiguration) *ὁ κύριος, τέταρτος ἀναβὰς εἰς τὸ ὄρος, ἕκτος γίνεται, καὶ φωτὶ περιλάμπεται πνευματικῷ, τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ παραγυμνώσας εἰς ὅσον οἱόν τε ἦν ἰδεῖν τοῖς ὁρᾶν ἐκλεγεῖσι, δι' ἑβδόμης ἀνακηρυσσόμενος τῆς φωνῆς υἱὸς εἶναι Θεοῦ*. The Greeks usually add *αὐτός* with this peculiar use of the ordinal, but Winer quotes as examples of the omission of the pronoun, Plato *Legg.* iii. 695 c *λαβὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἕβδομος*, Plut. *Pelop.* 13 *εἰς οἰκίαν δωδέκατος κατελθών*. Others compare *ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ* 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 *ἦν δ' αὐτὸς ἀπὸ Ἀδάμου δέκατος*) not 8th. Hundhausen refers to J. Lightfoot, Heinsius, and others, as maintaining that Noah might be described as the 8th preacher, because Enos, the son of Seth, is said to have been the first to call upon God (Gen. 4[26]). But he rightly replies that we have no knowledge of such a series of preachers, and that Noah is

Digitized by Google

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 Νῶχος δὲ τοῖς *πραττομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν δυσχεραίνων . . . ἔπειθεν ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰς πράξεις μεταφέρειν*, *Sib. Orac.* i. 128 Νῶε *δέμας θάρσυνον ἐὸν λαοῖσί τε πᾶσι κήρυξον μετάνοιαν, ὅπως σωθῶσιν ἅπαντες*, where also his sermon is given extending from l. 150 to 200. So Clem. Rom. i. 7 Νῶε *ἐκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν καὶ οἱ ὑπακούσαντες ἐσώθησαν*, *ib.* 9 Νῶε *πιστὸς εὑρεθεὶς . . . παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξεν*, *Pauli Apocalypsis* (Tisch. p. 68) *ἐγὼ εἰμὶ* Νῶε . . . *καὶ οὐκ ἐπαυσάμην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κηρύσσειν*, Μετανοεῖτε, *ἰδοὺ γὰρ κατακλυσμὸς ἔρχεται*, 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 *ὄγδοον*. 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.

δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα.] The noun *κήρυξ* occurs in the N.T. in this sense only here and in 1 Tim. 2^7, and 2 Tim. 1^{11} *εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κήρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος*, but the verb *κηρύσσω* is common. Clement of Rome (v.) speaks of St. Paul as *κήρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει*, and so Epict. *Diss.* iii. 21. 13 (quoted by Lightfoot *in loco*) calls his ideal philosopher *κήρυξ τῶν θεῶν*. In the Book of Enoch 12^4, 15^1, Enoch is addressed as 'Thou scribe of righteousness.' Here δικ. κ. is contrasted with *κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν*. Noah is called *ἄνθρωπος δίκαιος* in Gen 6^9, like Lot below *v.* 9.

κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας.] See below 3^6 *ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο* and Mt. $24^{38.\,39}$ Lk. 17^{27}, Gen. 6^{17}, where the same noun is used. For *ἐπάξας* cf. n. on *ἐπάγοντες v.* 1, and for the form of the aor. Lk. 13^{34}, Acts 14^{27}, Winer p. 99, Veitch *s.v.* *ἄγω*, 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 *ἐφύλαξεν*: Noah was kept safe in the flood which came on the world of the ungodly.

6. **καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας.**] Winer (pp. 666–668) and Blass (p. 98) take this as a *gen. appositionis*, like Rom. 4^{11} *σημεῖον ἔλαβε περιτομῆς*, and the Latin *urbs Romae*, *virtus continentiae*. On the contrary A. Buttman (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, Σόδομα *καὶ* Γόμορρα *καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις*. I prefer the former explanation, as the latter strictly taken refers only to *αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις*, omitting the principal cities. Probably our author introduced the pleonastic *πόλεις* here from his recollection of Jude. The very rare *τεφρόω*, meaning either to cover with, or to convert into, ashes (cf. *αἰθαλόω*), is found in the description of an eruption of Vesuvius (Dio Cass. lxvi. p. 1094) *τῶν ἐν μέσῳ κραυρουμένων* (being parched) *καὶ*

Digitized by Google

τεφρουμένων (overwhelmed with ashes), Lyc. *Cass.* 227 τεφρώσας γυῖα Λημναίῳ πυρί. ἐκτεφρόω 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, ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ αἱ μὲν εὐανδροῦσαι πόλεις τάφος τῶν οἰκητόρων ἐγεγένηντο, αἱ δὲ ἐκ λίθων καὶ ξύλων κατασκευαὶ τέφρα καὶ λεπτὴ κόνις.

καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν.] 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. 8^3 κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν σαρκί, and 1 Cor. 11^{32} κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου παιδευόμεθα, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν. Another possible and, I think, a better interpretation is that the dat. καταστροφῇ 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. 19^{24} we have Κύριος ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα θεῖον καὶ πῦρ παρὰ Κυρίου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, after which follows in *v.* 25 καὶ κατέστρεψε τὰς πόλεις ταύτας, 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 ὑπὸ σεισμῶν καὶ ἀναφυσημάτων πυρὸς καὶ θερμῶν ὑδάτων ἀσφαλτωδῶν τε καὶ θειωδῶν ἡ λίμνη προπέσοι . . . αἵ τε πόλεις καταποθεῖεν, 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, *ib.* 11 iam navibus cinis incidebat calidior et densior, *ib.* 14 area . . . ita iam cinere mixtisque pumicibus oppleta surrexerat, ut si longior in cubiculo mora, exitus negaretur, *Ep.* vi. 20. 16 tenebrae rursus, cinis rursus multus et gravis. Hunc identidem adsurgentes excutiebamus; operti alioqui atque etiam oblisi pondere essemus . . . mox verus dies . . . occursabant trepidantibus adhuc oculis mutata omnia altoque cinere tanquam nive obducta.' This shows that τεφρόω 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 ita invaluit, ut non moveri omnia, sed verti crederentur . . . iam quassatis circumiacentibus tectis . . . 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.

ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς.] For the reading and construction see Introd. on Text. Compare *Clem. Al.* 280 ἑνὸς δὲ ὑποδείγματος μνησθήσο-

Digitized by Google

μαι . . . τὸ Σοδομιτῶν πάθος, κρίσις μὲν ἀδικήσασι, παιδαγωγία δὲ ἀκούσασιν. Phryn. (p. 42 Lob.) condemns ὑποδ. as un-Attic.

7. **καὶ δίκαιον Λὼτ . . . ἐρύσατο.**] Cf. Abraham's pleading in Gen. 18[23] *μὴ συναπολέσῃς δίκαιον μετὰ ἀσεβοῦς*, and Wisdom 10[6] *αὕτη (σοφία) δίκαιον ἐξαπολλυμένων ἀσεβῶν ἐρρύσατο, φυγόντα καταβάσιον πῦρ Πενταπόλεως.* The verb occurs again in *v.* 9; the form *ἐρύσατο* is supported by B, see Lightfoot on Col. 1[13].

καταπονούμενον.] Cf. Acts 7[24] *ἰδών τινα ἀδικούμενον ἠμύνατο καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν τῷ καταπονουμένῳ*, 3 Macc. 2[2] *Κύριε . . . πρόσχες ἡμῖν καταπονουμένοις ὑπὸ ἀνοσίου καὶ βεβήλου*, Theophr. *Char.* 8 *τοὺς ἀκούοντας καταπονοῦντες ταῖς ψευδολογίαις.*

ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς.] 'By the licentious behaviour of the wicked.' For other exx. of a compact articular phrase see Introd. on Grammar and 1[4] *τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*, where, as here, an *ἐν*-clause is incorporated: cf. 1 Pet. 3[2] *τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἁγνὴν ἀναστροφήν*, *ib. v.* 16 *τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφήν.* For the gen. see n. on James 3[4] *ὑπὸ ἀνέμων ἐλαυνόμενα*, Philo i. p. 609 *κατακεντούμενος ὑπὸ φρενοβλαβείας.* **ἄθεσμος** occurs again in 3[17], alone in N.T., also in 3 Macc. 5[12] *τῆς ἀθέσμου προθέσεως διεσφαλμένος*, *ib.* 6[26]. Not used by classical writers. The cognate *ἀθέμιτος* is used in 1 Pet. 4[3]. Philo has *ἐκθεσμος* in the same sense, cf. *Abrah.* 369 *ὀχείας ἐκθέσμους μεταδιώκοντες*, *ib. ἐκφύλους καὶ ἐκθέσμους συνόδους* (of Sodom), *Gigant.* 288 *τὰς ἐκνόμους καὶ ἐκθέσμους ὁμιλίας τε καὶ μίξεις* (of the Watchers). It is a stronger word than *ἄνομος*, because *θεσμός* is used especially of a divine ordinance, a fundamental law.

8. **βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ δίκαιος ἐνκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς.**] For the reading see Introd. on Text. The rare *ἐνκ.* is found in Herod. iv. 204 *βασιλεὺς δέ σφι ἔδωκε κώμην ἐγκατοικῆσαι*, Eur. *Antiope fr.* 198 *ἐξ ὧν κενοῖσιν ἐγκατοικήσεις δόμοις.* Alford with most commentators takes *βλέμματι* 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 Wetstein. I quote one from Philo *Conf. Ling.* i. p. 406 *καὶ γὰρ ἐκτετμημένοι γλῶσσαν νεύμασι καὶ βλέμμασι καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις τοῦ σώματος σχέσεσι καὶ κινήσεσιν, οὐχ ἧττον τῆς διὰ λόγων προφορᾶς, ἃ ἂν θέλωσιν ὑποσημαίνουσιν.* Wetstein would interpret it of the look and report of the Sodomites by which Lot was vexed, but the interval between *βλέμματι* and *ἐβασάνιζεν* 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.'[1] Cf. Field *Notes on N.T.* p. 241, Chase on 2 Pet. in Hastings' *D. of B.* iii. 867.

ἡμεράν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν.] Cf. Ps. 96[2]

[1] Perhaps Clem. Al. *Q. Div. Serv.* p. 950 *εἰ βλέποιεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον ἀτενεῖ τῷ βλέμματι, καθάπερ εἰς ἀγαθοῦ κυβερνήτου νεῦμα δεδορκότες, τί βούλεται, τί προστάσσει, τί σημαίνει, τί δίδωσι τοῖς αὐτοῦ ναύταις τὸ σύνθημα* combines the two meanings. It describes a fixed gaze intent on the actions of the pilot.

Digitized by Google

εὐαγγελίζεσθε ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ, Jer. 52[34] a portion was given to him from the king ἐξ ἡμέρας εἰς ἡμέραν, Gen. 39[10], Numb. 30[15], 2 Clem. R. 11, in a quotation from what is called a προφητικὸς λόγος, which corresponds closely with 2 P. 3[4] ταῦτα πάντα ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας προσδεχόμενοι οὐδὲν τούτων ἑωράκαμεν. The same passage is quoted with slight variations in 1 Clem. R. 23, where it is introduced as ἡ γραφὴ 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 (*Rhesus* 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 ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ of 2 Cor. 4[16], and ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν of Ps. 68[19].

βασανίζω.] Used of testing, questioning, especially by the use of torture; then for bodily pain in general, as Mk. 5[7] μή με βασανίσῃς, Wisdom 11[9] μετ' ὀργῆς κρινόμενοι ἀσεβεῖς ἐβασανίζοντο; of disease, Mt. 8[6] δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος, 1 Sam. 5[3] ἐβαρύνθη χεὶρ Κυρίου ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἀζωτίους καὶ ἐβασάνισεν αὐτούς; then of fatigue, Mk 6[48] βασανιζομένους ἐν τῷ ἐλαύνειν; lastly of mental suffering, as in Plut. *Vit.* 896c, where Antigonus says to a messenger who had been tardy in bringing good news, οὕτως ἡμᾶς βασανίσας δίκην ὑφέξεις 'you shall pay for keeping me so long on tenterhooks,' Ign. *Eph.* 8 ὅταν μηδεμία ἐπιθυμία ἐρήρεισται ἐν ὑμῖν ἡ δυναμένη ὑμᾶς βασανίσαι, ἄρα κατὰ Θεὸν ζῆτε, Clem. Al. *Str.* ii. 55, p. 458 μετανοῶν ἐφ' οἷς ἔδρασεν οὐκέτι ποιεῖ ἢ λέγει, βασανίζων δὲ ἐφ' οἷς ἥμαρτεν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἀγαθοεργεῖ, which is perhaps a reminiscence of our text. There is a peculiarity in the expression here: we should rather have expected βασανισθείς, just as in Joh. 11[33] ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν might seem to be equivalent to Joh. 13[21] ἐταράχθη 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 Ἑαυτὸν τιμωρούμενος. Alford on our text compares our use of the phrase 'distress yourself' (so 'vex yourself,' 'trouble yourself,' 'worry yourself,' 'put yourself out'). For ἑαυτόν the writer substitutes ψυχὴν δικαίαν, repeating the idea of justice already embodied in δίκαιος. In an ordinary writer we should have expected τὴν δικαίαν αὐτοῦ ψυχήν, 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 epithet. I cannot agree with Dr. Bigg's interpretation 'By sight and hearing that righteous man, as he dwelt 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 φιλοσοφήσειν μέλλων ἑαυτὸν βασανίσας ἐπιχειρεῖ, but could it be followed by such a dative?

ἀνόμοις ἔργοις.] The adjective is used (*a*) of persons who are not subject to law, Gentiles, as in Acts 2[23], 1 Cor. 9[21]; (*b*) of persons who break the law, malefactors, Lk. 22[37]; (*c*) of lawless deeds, as here and in Prov. 1[19] οἱ συντελοῦντες τὰ ἄνομα Job. 34[17] ἴδε σὺ τὸν μισοῦντα ἄνομα.

9. οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι.] Here we have the apo-

Digitized by Google

dosis to *εἰ γὰρ—οὐκ ἐφείσατο* in *v.* 4, modified to suit the second member of the protasis contained in *vv.* 5 and 7 *ἀλλὰ ὄγδοον Νῶε ἐφύλαξεν . . . καὶ δίκαιον Λὼτ ἐρύσατο.* Notice the repetition of *ῥύεσθαι* from *v.* 7. Compare for the general meaning of the passage Ps. 1^{6} *γινώσκει Κύριος ὁδὸν δικαίων, καὶ ὁδὸς ἀσεβῶν ἀπολεῖται*; for infin. with *οἶδα* 1 Tim. 3^{5}, James 4^{17}, Mt. 7^{11}; for the meaning of *πειρασμός* James 1^{2} with my note and comments, Apoc. 3^{10} *κἀγώ σε τηρήσω ἐκ τῆς ὥρας τοῦ πειρασμοῦ*. Noah and Lot were exposed to trial, as standing alone amid mockers and unbelievers.

ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν.] For *ἡμ. κρίσ.* see 3^{7} and note on Jude *v.* 6. The phrase **κολ. τηρ.** agrees with the account given in 1 Pet. 3^{19} of *τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν* who had been disobedient in the days of Noah, to whom Christ preached, *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι*, and also with the account of the fallen angels in the Book of Enoch (see n. on *v.* 4 above).

10. **μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ 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 *ἀσέλγεια* in *vv.* 2 and 7. For the compact articular phrase see above on *v.* 5. On *ὀπίσω σαρκός* see Jude *v.* 7. The word *ὀπίσω* is often used of following a teacher or leader, as in Mt. 4^{19} *δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου*; so of following Satan in 1 Tim. 5^{15}, 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} *τοῖς πορευομένοις ὁδῷ οὐ καλῇ, ἀλλ' ὀπίσω τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν 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 *ἑτέρας* is here omitted, unless we suppose it to be represented by *μιασμοῦ*. Alford translates *ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ* '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 2^{1} on *αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας*. For *πορευόμενοι* see on Jude *v.* 16 and cf. 1 Pet. 4^{3}. **μιασμός** found here only in N.T., occurs in Wisdom 14^{26} *ψυχῶν μιασμός*, 1 Macc. 4^{43} 'who cleansed the sanctuary and bare out the defiled stones (*τοὺς λίθους τοῦ μιασμοῦ*) into an unclean place,' *Test. Levi.* 17. *μίασμα* occurs below *v.* 20, *μιαίνω* in Jude *v.* 8.

κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας.] 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 2^{1} above).

τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις.] WH. and Treg. separate the words by a comma. I have followed Nestle's punctuation, taking *αὐθ.* as an epithet of *τολμ.* with Bengel, Spitta, and others. In a somewhat similar phrase in Jude 16 *οὗτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι*, I have retained the dividing comma, as it seemed to me that the weighty word *μεμψίμοιροι* was

Digitized by Google

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 τολ., 'headstrong dare-devils' would be too flattering: perhaps 'shameless and headstrong.' The meaning of τολμητής is suggested by Jude 9 οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν and Jos. *Ant.* i. 11. 4, where speaking of the behaviour of the men of Sodom, he says ὁ Θεὸς ἀγανακτήσας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς τολμήμασι τοὺς μὲν ἠμαύρωσεν. So we find τόλμη joined with ἀναισχυντία in Arist. *Thesmoph.* 702, Isaeus 60 *fin.*, Antipho 123, Plat. *Apol.* 38 D, ἀναιδὴς καὶ τολμηρός in Antipho 122. τολμητής is found in Thuc. i. 70 οἱ μὲν καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν τολμηταὶ καὶ παρὰ γνώμην κινδυνευταί, Plut. *V.* 988 F τολμητὰς ὄντας ἀγαθούς, Jos. *B.J.* iii. 10. 2 Ἰουδαῖοι μέν, εἰ καὶ σφόδρα τολμηταὶ καὶ θανάτου καταφρονοῦντες, ἀλλὰ πολέμων ἄπειροι. The only other place in the N.T. in which αὐθάδης is found is 1 Tit. 1[7] 'the ἐπίσκοπος is to be μὴ αὐθάδης.'

δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες.] See on Jude 8. For the complementary participle in place of the infinitive (as in Soph. *Oed. Col.* 128 ἃς τρέμομεν λέγειν) see Winer p. 434 foll., and cf. Lycurg. p. 150. 6 οὔτε τὴν ἀκρόπολιν . . . προδιδοὺς ἐφοβήθη. This is Nestle's view of the construction, in which I am inclined to concur: if so, we should omit the comma placed after τρέμουσιν by WH. According to the other construction δόξας is governed by τρέμουσιν, for which compare Isa. 66[2] τρέμοντα τοὺς λόγους μου.

11. **ὅπου.**] 'Whereas,' 'seeing that,' lit. 'in a case in which,' as in 1 Cor. 3[3] ὅπου γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν ζῆλος καὶ ἔρις, οὐχὶ σαρκικοί ἐστε; 4 Macc. 2[14] (ὁ νόμος καὶ τῆς φίλων συνηθείας δεσπόζει·) καὶ μὴ νομίσητε παράδοξον εἶναι, ὅπου γε καὶ ἔχθρας ἐπικρατεῖν ὁ λογισμὸς δύναται διὰ τὸν νόμον, *ib.* 6[34] δίκαιόν ἐστιν ὁμολογεῖν ἡμᾶς τὸ κράτος εἶναι τοῦ λογισμοῦ, ὅπου γε καὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν ἀλγηδόνων ἐπικρατεῖ. Common in classical writers, as Antipho p. 112 ὅπου δὲ μὴ ἠθέλησεν ἔλεγχον ποιήσασθαι τῶν πεπραγμένων, πῶς περί γ' ὧν οὐκ ἠθέλησε πυθέσθαι, ἐγχωρεῖ αὐτῷ περὶ τούτων εἰδέναι; Andocides p. 12 ὅπου τοίνυν ὑμῖν τοῖς τριάκοντα ὤμνυτε μὴ μνησικακήσειν, τοῖς μεγίστων κακῶν αἰτίοις . . . ἢ που σχολῇ τῶν γε ἄλλων πολιτῶν τινι ἡξιοῦτε μνησικακεῖν, Isocrat. p. 164 ὅπου γὰρ Ἀθηνόδωρος καὶ Καλλίστρατος, ὁ μὲν ἰδιώτης ὤν, ὁ δὲ φυγάς, οἰκίσαι πόλεις οἵοί τε γεγόνασι, ἢ που βουληθέντες ἡμεῖς πολλοὺς ἂν τόπους τοιούτους κατασχεῖν δυνηθεῖμεν, Thuc. viii. 96, Dem. Herod. etc.

ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες.] 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 οὔτε ποσίν εἰμι ταχὺς οὔτε χερσὶν ἰσχυρός in contrast with the πόδας ὠκύς of Homer, cf. Plato *Rep.* v. 473 B ὀλίγιστοι τὸν ἀριθμόν, σμικρότατοι τὴν δύναμιν, *Symp.* 190 B ἦν οὖν ταῦτα τὰ γένη ἰσχὺν δεινά. See above *v.* 8 βλέμματι δίκαιοι and Blass pp. 117, 118. We find ἰσχύς and δύναμις combined in the ascription in Apoc. 7[12], Deut. 3[24], Cant. 2[7]. The latter is the more general word. Our author gives an indefinite reference both to angels and to δόξαι, instead of the very

Digitized by Google

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 μείζονες? Dr. Bigg (with Hofmann, Spitta, and Weiss) understands evil angels implied in the word δόξαι. 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 βλάσφημος κρίσις, as the ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι indulge in towards δόξαι. 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).

οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ Κυρίῳ βλάσφημον κρίσιν.] Who are meant by αὐτῶν? When did the angels abstain from bringing a railing accusation against them? What is the force of παρὰ Κυρίῳ? To answer the first question we must go back to the railing of the false teachers. This was certainly directed against the δόξαι 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 δόξαι. 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 Κυρίου, 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 10^4), and then delegated by them[1] to Enoch (12^4), and by him announced to Azazel (13^1). 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 unfallen Watchers) are here said to summon Enoch and enjoin him to visit the fallen Watchers and announce to them the sentence of judgment.

Digitized by Google

regards as a periphrasis for ἀρχάγγελοι), decline to carry an announcement of degradation (*βλάσφημον κρίσιν*) from the Lord'; and he illustrates this from *Test. Levi* 15 *καὶ λήψεσθε ὀνειδισμὸν καὶ αἰσχύνην αἰώνιον παρὰ τῆς δικαιοκρισίας 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 Κυρίῳ* to represent the words of Jude *ἀλλὰ εἶπεν Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος*. The consciousness of the Divine presence keeps the angels from any injurious word.

For the phrase *φέρουσιν κρίσιν* cf. *κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν* in Jude, and John 18[29] *τίνα κατηγορίαν φέρετε κατὰ*[1] *τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου;* Acts 25[18] *οἱ κατήγοροι οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔφερον ὧν ἐγὼ ὑπενόουν*, Acts 25[7] *πολλὰ καὶ βαρέα αἰτιώματα καταφέροντες*, Aristotle *Rhet. Al.* xxx. 12 *διαβολὴν καταφέρειν*.

12. **οὗτοι δέ, ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα . . . φθαρήσονται.**] The expression in Jude *v.* 10 is far simpler and more natural.

γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν.] 'Born creatures of instinct for capture and destruction.' Cf. Joh. 18[37] *ἐγὼ εἰς τοῦτο γεγέννημαι . . . ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ*, Juv. i. 141 'animal propter convivia natum,' and a rabbinical quotation in Wetstein's n. 'quidam vitulus cum ad mactandum adduceretur, R. Judam accessit caputque in ejus gremium reponens flevit. Sed ille, Abi, inquit, in hunc finem creatus es.' For *φυσικά* 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 ἄλογον καὶ φυσικὸν ἀποτελευτῶσαι τῆς ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ τοῦ κρίνοντος ἁπτόμεναι καὶ τοῦ φρονοῦντος*). One would rather have expected *σφαγήν* 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, *ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν φθαρήσονται*. We must therefore compare *ἅλωσιν* with such passages as 1 Tim. 3[7] *ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν ἐμπέσῃ καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου*, 2 Tim. 2[26] *καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς διαβόλου παγίδος ἐζωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα*, 2 Tim. 3[6] *αἰχμαλωτίζοντες γυναικάρια σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίαις*, Eccles. 10[12], Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 4. *οὐκοῦν ὁ οὕτω πεπαιδευμένος ἧττον ἂν δοκεῖ σοι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιπάλων ἢ τὰ λοιπὰ ζῷα ἁλίσκεσθαι; . . . γαστρὶ δελεαζόμενα . . . τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τοῦ φαγεῖν ἀγόμενα πρὸς τὸ δέλεαρ ἁλίσκεται*, κ.τ.λ., and *v.* 18 below.

ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες.] 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 τούτοις ἅ*, the frequent confusion between *εἰς* and *ἐν* in late

[1] B and WH. om. *κατά*.

Digitized by Google

Greek may account for the use of *ἐν* here, compare 1 Esdr. 1^{49} *ἐξεμυκτήρισαν ἐν τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ*. 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 οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν*, for which they compare the totally dissimilar Sir. 5^{15} *ἐν μεγάλῳ καὶ ἐν μικρῷ μὴ ἀγνόει*. The point of the phrase is explained by *Test. Aser* 7 *μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς Σόδομα, ἥτις ἠγνόησε τοὺς ἀγγέλους Κυρίου καὶ ἀπώλετο ἕως αἰῶνος*.

ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται.] A very rhetorical phrase to express Jude's *ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται*. We may compare it with *ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαΐκται* 3^{3} below, and Philo i. p. 693 *βούλεται διοικίσας ἡμᾶς τῶν σωματικῶν, ἅπερ ἐν ῥύσει καὶ φθορᾷ φθειρομένῃ καὶ φθειρούσῃ θεωρεῖται, κλῆρον ψυχῆς λαβεῖν μετὰ τῶν ἀφθάρτων καὶ ἀφθαρσίας ἀξίων ἀρετῶν*. What is the reference in *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 οἴδασιν* corresponding to *ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν* here), who in both epistles are said to rail at the objects of this knowledge (*δόξαι*): the other kind of knowledge 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 knowledge; 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 *sua* (*αὐτῶν*) plane corrumpentur,' reading *καταφθαρήσονται* for *καὶ φθαρ.*, meaning, I suppose, 'their own corrupt hearts will bring about their destruction' But would not this require *αὑτῶν* or at any rate a more emphatic position for *αὐτων*? Spitta understands *αὐτῶν* of the *δόξαι*, who are referred to as *κατ' αὐτῶν* in *v.* 11, and explains *ἐν οἷς* as *ἐν τούτοις οὓς* (because *δόξαι* = *ἄγγελοι*); this *ἐν τούτοις* is then replaced by *ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν*, depending on *καταφθαρήσονται*; 'der Untergang der *δόξαι* wird auch der der Libertiner sein (*vv.* 4, 11, 12).' He further explains the reference to the *ἄλωσις* of the brutes by the use of *σιροί* 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 confusion between good and bad angels.

The general meaning seems to be the same as that of Rom. $8^{5,6}$ *οἱ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος· τὸ δὲ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη*, and 1 Cor. 2^{14} *ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστίν, καὶ οὐ δύναται γνῶναι, ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται*. See further in the Comment.

Digitized by Google

13. **ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας.**] For the reading see Introduction on the Text. The reading *κομιούμενοι* resembles Col. 3[25] *ὁ γὰρ ἀδικῶν κομίσεται ὃ ἠδίκησεν*, Barn. iv. 12 *ὁ κύριος κρινεῖ τὸν κόσμον· ἕκαστος, καθὼς ἐποίησεν, κομιεῖται . . ἐὰν ᾖ πονηρός, ὁ μισθὸς τῆς πονηρίας ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ*. But there seems no reason for a future here. The principal verb *φθαρήσονται* is followed by seven present participles before we reach *καταλείποντες*, which forms part of the escort of the next principal verb *ἐπλανήθησαν*. This series of participles is broken, like *v.* 10, by exclamatory substantives in apposition, *σπίλοι 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 *καταφθαρήσονται*, thinks that the participles stand for finite verbs as in Hebrew. Cf. Blass *G.T.* § 79. 10, Jannaris § 2168. If *ἀδικούμενοι* 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 *ἀδικία*' (cf. *ἀδίκους* in *v.* 9), a thought which may have recalled to his mind Rom. 6[23] *τὰ γὰρ ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος*, and perhaps Mt. 6[2] *ἀπέχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν*. The corresponding verse in Jude speaks of *μισθός* in connexion with Balaam, and our author uses the phrase *μισθὸς ἀδικίας* 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 wage by death? So Tischendorf appears to take it translating 'decepti circa *μισθὸν ἀδικίας*.' The construction *ἀδικεῖν τινά τι* '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 *ἀδίκημα*: *μισθὸν ἀποστερούμενος* would rather have been used for the sense 'defrauded,' which is here supposed. See however Plut. *Cato Mi.* 17 (p. 766) *εὑρὼν χρέα παλαιὰ τῷ δημοσίῳ πολλοὺς ὀφείλοντας καὶ πολλοῖς τὸ δημόσιον, ἅμα τὴν πόλιν ἔπαυσεν ἀδικουμένην καὶ ἀδικοῦσαν*. The R.V. has 'suffering wrong as the hire of wrong-doing,' which is much the way in which it is taken by Dr. Abbott, who would understand *ἀδικίαν* after *ἀδικούμενοι*, translating 'they receive from God what they call injustice as the requital of their injustice,' and by Hofmann 'Schlimmes erfahrend als einen Lohn für Schlimmes,' which may be compared with Ps. 18[26] 'With the froward thou wilt show thyself froward.' The difficulty of this is that *μισθὸν ἀδικίας* is used below of the literal reward offered to Balaam. But this playing on the double use of *μισθός* is not unlike the play on *φθορά*, above, and *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος* in 3[5].

ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν.] Here again we have a very ambiguous sentence. Both *ἡδονή* and *τρυφή* may be taken either in a

Digitized by Google

good or a bad sense, while ἐν ἡμέρᾳ has been variously interpreted. The word τρυφή occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in Lk. 7[25] where οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδόξῳ καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρχοντες are contrasted with the Baptist, the reference being to a luxurious life with no special blame attached. In James 5[5] ἐτρυφήσατε is joined with ἐσπαταλήσατε in a bad sense, like ἐντρυφάω here. Exx. of τρυφή in the bad sense are found in Herm. *Mand.* vi. 5 (of the works of the Evil Angel) πολυτέλεια μεθυσμάτων καὶ ποικίλων τρυφῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμία γυναικῶν, *ib.* viii. 3, xi. 12 ὁ δοκῶν πνεῦμα ἔχειν ὑψοῖ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀναιδής ἐστιν καὶ ἐν τρυφαῖς πολλαῖς ἀναστρεφόμενος καὶ ἐν ἑτέραις πολλαῖς ἀπάταις, καὶ μισθοὺς λαμβάνει τῆς προφητείας αὐτοῦ, *ib.* xii. 2 πᾶσα τρυφὴ μωρά ἐστι καὶ κενὴ τοῖς δούλοις τοῦ Θεοῦ, Sim. vi. 2 οὗτος ἄγγελος τρυφῆς καὶ ἀπάτης ἐστίν, *ib.* 2 πορεύονται ἀπάταις καὶ τρυφαῖς ματαίαις, *ib.* iv. 4 τῆς τρυφῆς καὶ ἀπάτης ὥρα ἐστὶ μία, τῆς δὲ βασάνου ἡ ὥρα λ' ἡμερῶν δύναμιν ἔχει, and so *passim*. On the other hand τρυφή is used of the gifts of wisdom in Prov. 4[9] ἵνα δῷ τῇ σῇ κεφάλῃ στέφανον χαρίτων, στεφάνῳ δὲ τρυφῆς ὑπερασπίσῃ σου, and of the divine blessing in Ps. 36[8]. 'Thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures' (τὸν χειμάρρουν τῆς τρυφῆς σου ποτιεῖς αὐτούς), moreover the garden of Eden is called ὁ παράδεισος τῆς τρυφῆς (Gen. 2[15], 3[13. 24], Ezek. 31[9]). In the N.T. ἡδονή is used only in a bad sense, see Lk. 8[14], Tit. 3[3], James 4[1. 3]. In one place in the LXX. (Prov. 17[1]) it has a good sense, κρείσσων ψωμὸς μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἐν εἰρήνῃ, ἢ οἶκος πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν μετὰ μάχης. I doubt whether we can find ἡδονή in an entirely good sense outside the Epicurean school, but Philo's definition would suit here, see M. 2. p. 164 τοῦ παρόντος καὶ νομισθέντος ἀγαθοῦ φαντασία διεγείρει τὴν ψυχήν . . . καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ πάθος ἡδονή, M. 1. p. 39 σπεύδει πᾶν ζῷον ὡς ἐπὶ ἀναγκαιότατον καὶ συνεκτικώτατον τέλος, ἡδονήν, καὶ μάλιστα ἄνθρωπος, or Aristotle's (*Eth. N.* x. 4) πᾶσαν ἐνέργειαν τελειοῖ ἡ ἡδονή. I think this justifies the reading of the R.V., 'Men that count it pleasure to revel in the daytime,' agreeing with *Assumpt. Moys.* iv. 4 'omni 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 bestimt ist, mit Schwelgen hinzubringen für Vergnügen achten sie.' For the phrase ἐν ἡμέρᾳ cf. 3 Macc. 5[11] ἐν νυκτὶ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ, Rom. 13[13] ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν, μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις, μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις. 1 Th. 5[8] ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέρας ὄντες νήφωμεν, also Joh. 9[4] ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν. Joh. 11[9] ἐάν τις περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, οὐ προσκόπτει. The more usual expression in classical Greek would be ἡμέρας or μεθ' ἡμέραν. 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 τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν is very far-fetched, and it is by no means certain that the Agape was then a daylight meal.[1] Spitta reads τροφή for τρυφή, translating

[1] See my Appendix C to Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii.

Digitized by Google

'Als Lustbarkeit betrachten die Libertiner die tägliche Mahlzeit, die doch nur den Zweck hat den Menschen für die Arbeit des Lebens die nöthige Kraft zu geben.' The objections to this are (1) that *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ* is not equivalent to *καθ' ἡμέραν*, cf. Mt. 26[55], 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 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν* 'luxury which according to its nature can only last as long as it is day, *i.e.* during our earthly life.'

σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι.] *σπίλος* is late Greek for the classical *κηλίς* (Phryn. p. 28 Lob.), used of moral defect in Eph. 5[27] *ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἔνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μὴ ἔχουσαν σπίλον ἢ ῥυτίδα ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων, ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ ἄμωμος*; 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 δυσεκκαθάρτους σπίλους ἀποβλέποντες οἱ πολλοὶ δυσχεραίνουσι*. The adjective *ἄσπιλος* is used below 3[14], also in 1 Pet. 1[19] *τιμίῳ αἵματι, ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου, Χριστοῦ*, as well as in 1 Tim. 6[14], James 1[27]; and the verb *σπιλόω* in Jude 23, James 3[6]. As the word *σπιλάς* in the parallel passage of St. Jude is also found in the sense of *σπίλος* in one solitary passage, so the *σπίλος* of 2 P. is also found, though rarely, in the sense of *σπιλάς*, 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 *μῶμος* see note on Jude *v.* 24, and Lev. 21[21] *πᾶς ᾧ ἐστιν ἐν αὐτῷ μῶμος . . . οὐκ ἐγγιεῖ τοῦ προσενεγκεῖν τὰς θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ σου, ὅτι μῶμος ἐν αὐτῷ*, where it refers to ritual blemish: in Sir. 11[31] *πρόσεχε ἀπὸ κακούργου . . . μήποτε μῶμον εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα δῷ σοι, ib.* 18[14] *ἐν ἀγαθοῖς μὴ δῷς μῶμον, ib.* 20[23] *μῶμος πονηρὸς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ ψεῦδος* it is used as in profane Greek, in the sense of 'blame,' 'reproach,' 'disgrace.' With the exclamatory *σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι* may be compared *τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις* in *v.* 10, *κατάρας τέκνα* in *v.* 14, and the denunciatory terms introduced by *οὗτοί εἰσιν* in *v.* 17 and Jude *vv.* 12, 16.

ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν.] For readings see Introduction on the Text. Cf. Isa. 55[2] *ἐντρυφήσει ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν* (good sense), 'Let your soul delight itself in fatness' R.V., 57[4] *ἐν τίνι ἐνετρυφήσατε*; (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 *δελεάζοντες ψυχάς* in the next verse. Ewald takes it literally, supposing that *ἀπάτη* is a sort of pun on the *ἀγάπη* of Jude, 'Diebesmahle' for 'Liebesmahle.' It might also be taken absolutely, as in Xen. *Hell.* iv. 1. 30 *ὑποτιθέντων δὲ αὐτῷ τῶν θεραπόντων ῥαπτά, ἐφ' ὧν καθίζουσιν οἱ Πέρσαι μαλακῶς, ᾐσχύνθη ἐντρυφῆσαι*, and Philo M. 1 p. 232 *ἐνευφραίνεται καὶ ἐντρυφᾷ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων, ἀμιγέσι καὶ ἀκράτοις ἔτι δὲ ἀρτίοις καὶ πλήρεσι κεχρημένος ἀγαθοῖς*; in which case *ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις* might be joined with *συνευωχούμενοι* to explain how it happened that the libertines were

Digitized by Google

admitted to the feasts of believers. On the whole however I prefer Hofmann's rendering.

συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν.] The participle denotes the circumstances of the preceding action. The phrase *ἡ ἐπουράνιος εὐωχία* is used in respect to the eucharist by Clem. Al. *Paed.* ii. p. 166.

14. **ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς 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^{28} *πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς, ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ*, Plut. *Mor.* 528 E *ὁ μὲν ῥήτωρ τὸν ἀναίσχυντον οὐκ ἔφη κόρας ἐν τοῖς ὄμμασιν ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ πόρνας* (a saying attributed to Timaeus by Longin. 4, 5), Gell. iii. 5 (Arcesilaus) cum oculos ludibundos atque inlecebrae voluptatisque plenos videret: 'nihil interest,' inquit, 'quibus membris cinaedi sitis, posterioribus an prioribus' (cited by Wetstein). For the metaphorical use of *μεστός* see Mt. 23^{28} *ἔσωθεν μεστοί ἐστε ὑποκρίσεως*, Rom. 1^{29} *μεστοὺς φθόνου*, Prov. 6^{34}, Xen. *Symp.* i. 13. **μοιχαλίς** found in Rom. 7^{3}, James 4^{4}, Mt. 12^{39}, and late Greek writers (see Phryn. p. 452 Lob.) instead of the classical *μοιχεύτρια*. The reading *μοιχαλίας* found in ℵ A and some versions is a *vox nihili*.

ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας.] For readings see Introd. on Text. For the construction cf. 1 Pet. 4^{1} *πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας*, and *γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας* below: see my note on James 1^{13} *ἀπείραστος κακῶν*. The late word ἀκ. is only found here in biblical Greek. It is used by Polyb. 4. 17. 4, Plut. *Mor.* 114 E *ἀκαταπαύστῳ συμφορᾷ συνεσόμεθα*, *ib.* 924 B, *Vitae* p. 734 C *ἡ μοναρχία τὸ ἀκατάπαυστον προσλαβοῦσα*, *ib.* 1039 C *ἀκατάπαυστος ἀρχή*. The classical equivalent is *ἄπαυστος*, used with gen. by Eur. *Suppl.* 82 *ἄπαυστος γόων*.

δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους.] For the rare late Greek *ἀστήρικτος* see below (3^{16}), and n. on *στηρίζω* (1^{12}): it is used by Longinus ii. 2 (great wits) *δίχα ἐπιστήμης ἀστήρικτα καὶ ἀνερμάτιστα*. For δελ. see below *v.* 18, Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 4 quoted above on *v.* 12, and my n. on James 1^{14}.

καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες.] Cf. Heb. 5^{14} *τῶν διὰ τὴν ἕξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν*. Wetstein illustrates the construction from Philostratus *Heroic.* iii. p. 688 *θαλάττης οὔπω γεγυμνασμένοι*, *ib.* iv. p. 696 *πολέμων πολλῶν γεγυμνασμένος*, *ib.* xi. p. 708 *σοφίας ἤδη γεγυμνασμένος*, Alford adds Clem. *Hom.* iv. 7 *πάσης Ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας ἐξησκημένος*, Hes. *Op.* 649 *ναυτιλίης σεσοφισμένος*. Exx. of this 'genitive of the sphere' are also to be found in Lat. *e.g.* 'vetus militiae,' 'prodigiorum peritus.' For *πλεονεξία* see above *v.* 3.

κατάρας τέκνα.] For this Hebraism = *κατάρατοι*, cf. *τέκνα ὑπακοῆς* I Pet. 1^{14}, *τέκνα ὀργῆς* Eph. 2^{3}, *τέκνα φωτός* *ib.* 5^{8}, *τέκνα ἀπωλείας* Isa. 57^{4}, *τέκνα ἀδικίας* Hos. 10^{9}, and *οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθίας* Eph. 2^{2}, 5^{6}, *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας* 2 Th. 2^{3}, Joh. 17^{12}, Winer p. 298 f. Spitta quotes Ps. 95^{10} *ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδούς μου· ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται*. For **κατάρας** cf. Deut. 11^{26} *ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δίδωμί*

Digitized by Google

ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν σήμερον τὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τὴν κατάραν, Ps. 109[18] ἐνεδύσατο κατάραν ὡς ἱμάτιον, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν ὡσεὶ ὕδωρ εἰς τὰ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ. It seems better to connect this phrase with what follows rather than with what precedes.

15. **καταλείποντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν.**] For the readings see Introd. on Text. For the metaphorical ὁδός see above on *v.* 2, 1 Sam. 12[23] δείξω ὑμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἀγαθὴν καὶ τὴν εὐθεῖαν, Ezra 8[21] ζητῆσαι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁδὸν εὐθεῖαν ἡμῖν, Ps. 107[7], Isa. 30[21], Hos. 14[9] εὐθεῖαι αἱ ὁδοὶ τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ δίκαιοι πορεύσονται ἐν αὐταῖς, Acts 13[10] (of Simon Magus) διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς Κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας. For the absence of the article see Introd. on Grammar. For πλανάομαι cf. Jas. 5[19. 20], 1 Pet. 2[25].

ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βόσορ.] See Introd. on Text. For ἐξακ. cf. above 1[16], 2[2]. For Balaam see n. on Jude *v.* 11. Alford compares Num. 22[32] οὐκ ἀστεία ἡ ὁδός σου ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ.

ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν.] See Introd. on Text. For a similar use of ἀγαπάω cf. Lk. 11[43]. Balak'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 Balak 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 ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία (3[4]) and πᾶσα ἀδικία ἁμαρτία ἐστίν (5[17]) 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 ἀδικία.

16. **ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας.**] The only other recorded instances of ἔλεγξις in biblical Greek are in Job 21[4] μὴ ἀνθρώπου μου ἡ ἔλεγξις; 'is my complaint of man?', *ib.* 23[2] ἐκ χειρός μου ἡ ἔλεγξίς ἐστι, where R.V. has 'even to-day is my complaint rebellion.' Cf. Philostratus *Vit. Ap.* ii. p. 74 οὐ πικρὸς πρὸς τὰς ἐλέγξεις ἦν. Here ἔχω is used with the noun as a sort of periphrastic passive of the cognate verb, as in αἰτίαν ἔχω. For ἴδιος see above on 1[3] ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ., 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[5] οἱ δὲ ἀμελήσαντες ἀπῆλθον, ὃς μὲν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν, ὃς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ. There can be no doubt however that in the great majority of instances in the N.T. ἴδιος retains its emphatic force, and so the R.V. has 'own' both here and in Mt. 22. Weiss translates it 'eine Zurechtweisung der ihm characteristischen παρανομίας,' Dietlein 'die ihm als Urbilde der Lügenpropheten eigene παρανομία,' Wiesinger 'er der andern ein Prophet war, musste durch eine Eselin sich die eigene παρανομ. vorhalten lassen,' Keil 'ἰδίας 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 Frevelthat von einer Eselin musste zurecht weisen lassen.'

Digitized by Google

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.' **παρανομία** 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} *παρανομίαι ἄνδρα ἀγρεύουσιν*, *ib.* 10^{26} *ὥσπερ καπνὸς ὄμμασιν, οὕτως παρανομία τοῖς χρωμένοις αὐτῇ*.

ὑποζύγιον . . . ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν.] An example of confirmatory asyndeton, which would have been more usually expressed by the gen. abs. *ὑποζυγίου κωλύσαντος*. The indefinite *ὑποζύγιον* is sometimes used for the more common *ὄνος* in biblical Greek, as the ass was the familiar beast of burden among the Israelites, see Mt. 21^5, Exod. 4^{20}, 20^{17}, $23^{4.5}$, Josh. 6^{21}, Jud. 1^{14}, Job 24^3. Among the Greeks and Romans the term *ὑποζύγιον* 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 E we find *ὑποζύγιον* distinguished from the horse.

ἄφωνον.] As *φωνή* is used of the sound uttered by any living thing (Arist. *de Anim.* ii. 8. 9), the epithet *ἄφωνος* 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} *ἄφωνος* is used of the gift of tongues in the sense 'without signification.'

ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον.] For exx. of the use of *ἐν* to express the instrument, see the Index. *φθέγγομαι* 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 *ἐκώλυσεν* 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 *νηστεύσαντες καὶ προσευξάμενοι . . . ἀπέλυσαν* and Introd. on Grammar.

ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν.] '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 *φρήν* is *-οσυνη*, as *παραφροσύνη* in Plat. *Soph.* 228 D, from *παράφρων* 'delirious' (another form is *παραφρόνησις* LXX. Zach. 12^4); sometimes *-ονη* as in *εὐφρόνη*, *ἀφρόνη*, *δυσφρόνη*. Lobeck gives a long list of nouns in *-οσυνη* 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*, *γειτονία* (rarely *γειτοσύνη*) from *γείτων*, *εὐδαιμονία* and *κακοδαιμονία* (very rarely *εὐ-* and *κακο-δαιμοσύνη*) from *δαίμων*, *ἀπημονία* as well as *ἀπημοσύνη* from *ἀπήμων*. Probably the author was led to select the form *παραφρονία* from the assonance to

Digitized by Google

the preceding *παρανομία*. Philo i. p. 609 speaks of Balaam as *κατακεντούμενος ὑπὸ φρενοβλαβείας τῆς ἑαυτοῦ*.

17. **οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι καὶ ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι.**] For *οὗτοί 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 6^{15}, Jer. 14^{3} foll., for the latter Job 7^{9}, 30^{15}, Hos. 6^{4}, 13^{3}. *λαῖλαψ* is used of the storm on the Lake of Galilee in Mk. 4^{37}, Lk. 8^{23}. It seems an unnecessarily strong expression here. Compare however Wisdom 5^{14} *ἐλπὶς ἀσεβοῦς ὡς φερόμενος χνοῦς ὑπὸ ἀνέμου, καὶ ὡς πάχνη ὑπὸ λαίλαπος διωχθεῖσα λεπτή*. Philo i. p. 611 uses it metaphorically *λαίλαπι κενῆς δόξης μὴ ἀναρπασθῆναι*. We should hardly think of a mist as promising rain, indeed Aristotle (*Meteor* i. 9. 4) asserts the contrary, *ὁμίχλη σημεῖον μᾶλλόν ἐστιν εὐδίας ἢ ὑδάτων· οἷον γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ὁμίχλη νεφέλη ἄγονος*, and so in the *De Mundo* i. p. 394*a*; Plato however defines *ὁμίχλη* as *τὸ ἐξ ἀέρος εἰς ὕδωρ ἰόν*, and is on this account condemned by Theophrastus (*De Sensu et Sensili* §§ 90), who makes a mist a sign of fine weather, *ὅταν ὁμίχλη γένηται, ὕδωρ οὐ γίνεται, ἢ ἔλαττον* (*De Signis* c. 4).[1] Possibly the author may have had in his mind Gen. 2^{6}, where a mist is said to have supplied the place of rain in the garden of Eden. For *ἐλαυν.* see n. on James 3^{4}.

οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται.] 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 *οἷς* is used because the false teachers are typified by these figures, cf. Winer pp. 176 f. Spitta quotes Micah 3^{6} (*ἐπὶ τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς πλανῶντας τὸν λαόν μου*) *διὰ τοῦτο νὺξ ὑμῖν ἔσται ἐξ ὁράσεως καὶ σκοτία ἔσται ὑμῖν ἐκ μαντείας καὶ δύσεται ὁ ἥλιος ἐπὶ τοὺς προφήτας κ.τ.λ.* contrasting it with Dan. 12^{3}.

18. **ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι.**] For *ὑπέρογκα* see note on Jude *ver.* 16. The verb *φθέγγομαι* 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. 4^{2} *ἱνατί ἀγαπᾶτε ματαιότητα;* Ps. 39^{6} *τὰ σύμπαντα ματαιότης*, Eccles. 1^{2} *ματ. ματαιοτήτων*, Rom. 8^{20} *τῇ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη*, where it is used of what is empty, passing, and transient. In Ps. 26^{4} *οὐκ ἐκάθισα μετὰ συνεδρίου ματαιότητος*, Ps. 119^{37} *ἀπόστρεψον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν ματαιότητα*, Ps. 144^{8} *ὧν τὸ στόμα ἐλάλησε ματαιότητα*, Eph. 4^{17} *μηκέτι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ 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. 4^{10} *φύγωμεν ἀπὸ πάσης ματαιότητος*, Polyc. *ad Philipp.* 7 *διὸ ἀπολιπόντες τὴν ματαιότητα τῶν πολλῶν*, cf. *ib.* 2 *ἀπολιπόντες τὴν κενὴν ματαιολογίαν*. For the genitive see Introd. on Grammar.

[1] Quoted in Ideler's note to the *Meteorologica*.

Digitized by Google

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.

δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις.] For δελ. see *v.* 14 above. It is a question whether σαρκός 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 licentiousnesses of the flesh'; but the usage is in favour of the phrase ἐπιθυμίαι σαρκός, as in Eph. 2^3, 1 Pet. 2^{11} ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, where Hort says 'this is the only place in the Epistle where St. Peter uses σάρξ or σαρκικός 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} τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας, Gal. 5^{16} πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε, *ib.* *v.* 24 οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, 1 Joh. 2^{16}, above *v.* 10 τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους. It might seem also that since ἐπιθυμία, though commonly used in a bad sense, is a neutral word to start with, while ἀσέλγεια is always bad, it was more appropriate to define the former by adding σαρκός. There are however two kinds of misconduct denoted by ἀσελγής and the cognate words, (1) petulance, insolence, and (2) lasciviousness. Of (1) we have exx. in Plato *Legg.* ix. 879 D where ἀσελγαίνειν is used of one who wantonly strikes another, Isocr. p. 174 *e* τίς ἂν ὑπέμεινε τὴν ἀσέλγειαν τῶν πατέρων τῶν ἡμετέρων, where it refers to tyrannical treatment of the allies, *ib.* 398 *b*, where it refers to striking, *ib.* 240 *b* ἀσελγῶς κατηγορεῖν τῆς 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), ἀσέλγεια περὶ τὰς σωματικὰς ἐπιθυμίας, to which σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις here corresponds. For the plural of abstract words see on ἀσελγείαις *v.* 2 above and Blass p. 84. The meaning would then be 'They ensnare in lusts through fleshly indulgences,' ἐν denoting the sphere ('Anknüpfungspunkt', Kühl) in which the bait is applied, ἀσέλγεια 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 ἀσελγείαις as the precise means employed to attain this result.[1] Cf. 1 Pet. 4^3 τὸ βούλευμα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατειργάσθαι πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, κ.τ.λ.

τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους.] 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.

Digitized by Google

present (with most authorities) or the aorist participle (with K L P 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 *v.* 20 ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου and in 1[4] ἀποφυγόντες 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 τις ὅλως ἁπαλὸς τοῦ γείτονος οὐκ ὀλίγως ('in no slight degree') με κνίζει, Isa. 10[7] ἐξολοθρεῦσαι ἔθνη οὐκ ὀλίγα (Aquila ὀλίγως). 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 λεπτυνόμενα σώματα νωθρῶς ἐπανατρέφειν δεῖ, 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 to ὀλίγως the sense of ὀλίγου, and read ἀποφυγόντας, 'those who had all but escaped.'[1] The other reading ὄντως ἀποφυγόντας is illustrated by Arist. *Vespae* 997 ὄντως ἀπέφυγεν.[2]

The clause τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους 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 δελεάζουσιν, and that the clause would then be a rather futile periphrasis for ἑαυτούς. Spitta answers this by referring to 1[3] where τοῦ καλέσαντος refers, if not to the preceding αὐτοῦ, yet to Ἰησοῦ in *v.* 2. In the similar passages 3[17] τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες, 2[7] τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς, and 2[14] δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, 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 ἀποφυγόντες *v.* 20 below.

[2] In Plato, *Alcib. sec.* 149 A, where the MSS. have τἄλλα πάντα οὐκ ὀλίγως ἐνδεέστερως τιμῶσιν ἢπερ ἡμεῖς, Buttmann, reading ὀλίγῳ, says in his note, 'Voci ὀλίγως, cuius parcissimus est veteribus usus, nullus omnino hic locus est.' He refers to Hippocr. *l.c.* where he translates ὀλίγως *brevi* and νωθρῶς *lente*.

Digitized by Google

Weiss, who understands the verse of recent converts 'die sich noch lange nicht ganz von der Gemeinschaft heidnischen Lebens losgesagt haben'; Hundhausen '*οἱ ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφόμενοι* 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 *ἐν πλάνῃ* führen. Dem Wandel der Heiden noch nicht ganz entronnen, lassen die Christen sich durch die Schwelgereien der Verführer 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 *ἀποφυγόντας*, 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 *ἀποφυγόντας τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου*.[1] The word *πλάνη* would suit either interpretation. It is used of heretics below 3^{17} and Jude *v.* 11; of heathens in Rom. 1^{27}, Barn. 14^{5} *Ἰησοῦς τὰς παραδεδομένας τῇ τῆς πλάνης ἀνομίᾳ ψυχὰς ἡμῶν λυτρωσάμενος ἐκ τοῦ σκότους*, and generally.

19. **ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι.**] The participle gives a further explanation of the phrase *δελεάζουσιν ἀσελγείαις*, see quotations in n. on Jude *v.* 4.

αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς.] The participles *ἐπαγγ.* and *ὑπ.* are contrasted by asyndeton instead of by *μέν* and *δέ*. For *φθορά* see Rom. 8^{21} and Appendix below.

ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται, τούτῳ δεδούλωται.] The act. *ἡττάω* is found in Polyb. and later writers: the pass. is used with the dat. (not of the personal agent, which is expressed by *ὑπό* with gen. as in 2 Macc. 10^{24}, but of an overmastering feeling) in Ael. *N.A.* xiii. 22 *ἐλέφαντες ἄγρυπνοι καὶ ὕπνῳ μὴ ἡττώμενοι πιστότατοι φυλάκων*, Plut. *Vit.* 766 *ἡττώμενος τοῖς δικαίοις* 'defeated on the merits of the case,' even by Thuc. iii. 38 *ἀκοῆς ἡδονῇ ἡσσώμενοι*, and vii. 25. 9. *δουλόω* is followed, like *δουλεύω*, by the dat. of the remoter object, cf. Mt. 6^{24} *οὐδεὶς δύναται δυσὶν κυρίοις δουλεύειν*, 1 Cor. 9^{19} *πᾶσιν ἐμαυτὸν ἐδούλωσα*, Rom 6^{18} *ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ*, Tit. 2^{3} *οἴνῳ πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας*, 1 Sam. 17^{9} (the challenge of Goliath) *ἐὰν ἐγὼ πατάξω αὐτόν, ἔσεσθε ἡμῖν εἰς δούλους*, Joh. 8^{34} *πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν δοῦλός ἐστιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, Rom. 6^{16}, Tit. 3^{3}, Plato *Phaedr.* 238 E, Xen. *Mem.* i. 6. 8, Julian *Orat.* vi. p. 198 *βίον αἰδοίοις καὶ γαστρὶ δουλεύοντα*. Estius remarks 'ex jure belli victor victum et captum sibi faciebat mancipium.'

20. **εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα 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.

Digitized by Google

the subject to be continued from ἐπαγγελλόμενοι and δελεάζουσιν, 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 τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας of *v.* 18. It would seem however that the persons here spoken of have got beyond the stage of progress implied in ὀλίγ. ἀποφ. 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 ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐπιγνοῦσιν), see above $1^{2.3}$. The force of γάρ is seen in the apodosis, 'their last state is worse than the first,' which confirms the preceding statement that they are δοῦλοι τῆς φθορᾶς. No doubt is implied by the hypothetical form (εἰ γὰρ ἡττῶνται . . . γέγονεν αὐτοῖς): it simply expresses a general principle. For μίασμα which occurs here only in N.T. see n. on μιασμός in *v.* 10 above. Both are found in the LXX. Compare for the sense 1^{4} ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς and 1 Pet. 4^{3}.

ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] See on 1^{3} and 3^{18}.

τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττῶνται.] The participles ἐμπλακέντες and ἀποφυγόντες are opposed to one another by δέ: the emphatic τούτοις is used instead of αὐτοῖς because of the intervening clause. It is governed by ἐμπλακέντες and must be understood with ἡττῶνται. For ἐμπλ. see 2 Tim. 2^{4}, the only other passage in which it occurs in N.T., οὐδεὶς στρατευόμενος ἐμπλέκεται ταῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματίαις. It is found once in LXX. ὁ σκολιαῖς ὁδοῖς πορευόμενος ἐμπλακήσεται Prov. 28^{18}. So Eur. *Hipp.* 1236 ἡνίαισιν ἐμπλακείς.

γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων.] This is the moral of the parable of the Return of the Evil Spirit (Mt. 12^{45}, Lk. 11^{26}). Cf. Heb. 6^{4-8}, 10^{26}, n. on Jude *v.* 5, Herm. *Sim.* ix. 17. 5 τινὲς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐμίαναν ἑαυτοὺς . . . καὶ πάλιν ἐγένοντο οἷοι πρότερον ἦσαν, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ χείρονες, *ib.* 18^{2}.

21. κρεῖττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν 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} ὠφείλετε ἄρα ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελθεῖν 'then must ye needs go out of the world,' Heb. 9^{26} ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν 'else must he often have suffered,' Rom. 7^{7} τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ᾔδειν ('I had not known sin'), εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, Xen. *Anab.* vii. 7. 4 αἰσχρὸν ἦν. More frequently κρεῖττον is used with the present, or the verb is omitted, as in 1 Cor. 7^{9} κρεῖττόν ἐστιν γαμεῖν ἢ πυροῦσθαι, 1 Pet. 3^{17} κρεῖττον ἀγαθοποιοῦντας πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιοῦντας, Exod. 14^{12}, Prov. 25^{24}, Xen. *Oecon.* 20. 9 προκαταλαμβάνειν τὰ ἐπίκαιρα κρεῖττον ἢ μή. For the phrase cf. above 2^{2} ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, *v.* 15 καταλείποντες τὴν εὐθεῖαν ὁδόν, Mt. 21^{32} ἦλθεν Ἰωάννης πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, Prov. 21^{16}, Job. 24^{13}.

ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ὑποστρέψαι.] For the dative instead of the acc. with inf. see Acts 15^{25} ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν . . . ἐκλεξαμένοις (*al.* -μένους) ἄνδρας πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, *ib.* 27^{3} ἐπέτρεψεν (τῷ Παύλῳ) πρὸς τοὺς φίλους πορευθέντι (*al.*

Digitized by Google

-θέντα) ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν, Blass pp. 241 f. For ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ see Acts 12[25].

ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς.] Cf. note and comment on Jude *v.* 3 ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει, and the use of ἐντολή below in 3[2] 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. **συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας.**] 'They exemplify the truth of the proverb,' more literally 'the (warning) of the true proverb has happened to them,' cf. Mt. 21[21] τὸ τῆς συκῆς 'the case of the fig-tree,' James 4[14] τὸ τῆς αὔριον, Xen. *Oecon.* 16. 7 ἀνεμνήσθην τὸ τῶν ἁλιέων ὅτι θαλαττουργοὶ ὄντες ὅμως . . . τὴν μὲν κακὴν γῆν ψέγουσι, τὴν δ' ἀγαθὴν ἐπαινοῦσι, Plato *Phaedr.* 230 c πάντων δὲ κομψότατον τὸ τῆς πόας ὅτι ἱκανὴ πέφυκε κ.τ λ. Wetstein quotes Lucian *Dial. Mort.* viii. 1 τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο τὸ τῆς παροιμίας, ὁ νεβρὸς τὸν λέοντα. For συμβ. cf. 1 Cor. 10[11] ταῦτα δὲ τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν ἐκείνοις.

κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα.] This proverb is found in Prov. 26[11] ὥσπερ κύων ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἔμετον καὶ μισητὸς γένηται, οὕτως ἄφρων τῇ ἑαυτοῦ κακίᾳ ἀναστρέψας ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἁμαρτίαν. It is the nature of proverbs, as being familiar to everybody, to suffer abbreviations, like ὄνος πρὸς λύραν, 'a stitch in time,' etc.: so here we must supply such a thought as 'the renegade is ὡς κύων.' For ἐπιστρέψας cf. Gal. 4[9] πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα; The only other recorded exx. of ἐξέραμα are Diosc. vi. 19, Eustath. *Opusc.* 248. 91, but the verb ἐξεράω is not unfrequently used in a general or figurative sense, as well as in the literal sense of a vomit or purge, cf. Demosth. 963, 993 ἐξέρα τὸ ὕδωρ of emptying the clepsydra, Plut. *Mor.* 904 ἀέρα θύραζε ἐξερᾷ of expelling the air from the lungs, Arist. *Vesp.* 993 φέρ' ἐξεράσω τὰς ψήφους 'let me pour out the voting pebbles from the urn,' *ib. Ach.* 341. So κατεξεράω Epict. iii. 13. 23 μὴ κατεξέρα αὐτῶν τὸ σαυτοῦ φλέγμα, *ib.* iii. 21. 6 ἀκούσατέ μου σχόλια λέγοντος. ὕπαγε, ζήτει τίνων κατεξεράσεις, cf. μετεράω, διεράω. Warfield notes that ἐξεράω 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 of Nicolaus οὐ μὴν εἰς τέλος ἤνεγκε κρατεῖν τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκρασίας, ἀλλὰ βουληθεὶς ὡς κύων ἐπὶ τὸν ἴδιον ἔμετον ἐπιστρέφειν, προφάσεις τινὰς ἐπενόει, which seems to be taken from this passage with the change of ἐξέραμα into the more common word.

ὑς λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου.] 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. 440[88] Duncker), speaking of Zephyrinus and Callistus πρὸς μὲν ὥραν αἰδούμενοι καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας συναγόμενοι (? συνεχόμενοι) ὡμολόγουν, μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν βόρβορον ἀνεκυλίοντο. Dr. Bigg however, following Spitta, takes the sense to be 'not

Digitized by Google

that the creature has washed itself clean in water (as the R.V.), still less that it has been washed clean (as A.V.)[1] 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 τὰς δ' ὗας καὶ τὸ λούεσθαι ἐν πηλῷ (πιαίνει). Other passages are quoted by Wetstein to the same effect, as Ael. *H.A.* v. 45, Varro *R.R.* ii. 4 (volutari in luto) est illorum requies, ut lavatio hominis. The objection to this explanation is that the proverb is quoted in illustration of the saying τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα 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 ἐλούετο εἰς τοὺς κοινοὺς λουτρῶνας, 'he used to go to the common baths to bathe' (Ath. 438 E), but εἰς κυλισμόν goes far more naturally with ἐπιστρέψασα. The ancient writers on farming, while they notice that the pig shares the liking 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 delectatur 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 detineri . . . nec ulla re magis gaudet quam rivis atque caenoso lacu volutari. A modern writer on stock-keeping defends the pig from the charge of uncleanliness '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] βόρβορος is found in biblical Greek only in Jer. 38[6] (LXX. 45[6]) of the miry dungeon in which the prophet was confined. Both κυλισμόν read by most editors, and κύλισμα, which is supported by most uncials, are extremely rare, the former occurring elsewhere only in Hippiatrica[3] p. 204. 4, the latter in Hippiatr. p. 210.8. For the meaning of the termination in -μος see Lightfoot on *Phil.* p. 111. A commoner form is κυλίστρα, 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 cacnum teterrima cum sit spurcities, eadem subus haec iucunda videtur, insatiabiliter toti ut volvantur ibidem, Clem. Al. *Protr.* p. 75 οἱ δὲ περὶ τέλματα καὶ βορβόρους, τὰ ἡδονῆς ῥεύματα, καλινδούμενοι ἀνονήτους ἐκβόσκονται τροφάς, ὑώδεις τινὲς ἄνθρωποι. ὗες γάρ, φησίν, ἥδονται βορβόρῳ μᾶλλον ἢ καθαρῷ ὕδατι. Compare Bywater's note on Heracl. *Fr.* 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 bathe, τὸν δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δμωαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ, as to which cf. x. 360–365; and so in later times the use of the middle does not exclude the help of the βαλανεύς and ἀλείπτης in the public baths. The word here implies neither more nor less than 'after a bathe 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.

Digitized by Google

Epp. i. 2. 23 foll. Circae pocula nosti, quae si cum sociis stultus cupidusque bibisset, vixisset canis immundus vel amica luto sus, Epict. *Diss.* iv. 11. 29 *ἄπελθε καὶ χοίρῳ διαλέγου ἵν' ἐν βορβόρῳ μὴ κυλίηται . . . μήτι ἵππος κυλίεται ἐν βορβόρῳ, μήτι κύων γενναῖος;*

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 *ἀγαπητοί*.

ταύτην ἤδη δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν.] 'This is now the second letter that I write to you.' For the idiomatic use of *ἤδη* with the numeral compare Joh. 21[14] *τοῦτο ἤδη τρίτον ἐφανερώθη Ἰησοῦς*, Hom. *Od.* ii. 89, Plato *Prot.* 309 D. For a discussion as to the earlier letter here alluded to, see Introduction.

ἐν αἷς.] *Constr. ad sensum* 'in both of which,' cf. below *v.* 6 *δι' ὧν*, which some explain of *ὕδατος*, Acts 15[36] *κατὰ πόλιν πᾶσαν ἐν αἷς κατηγγείλαμεν τὸν λόγον*, Winer p. 177, Jelf § 819 foll.

διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν.] Repeated from 1[13]. 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' (Germ. *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[5] *ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου*, Num. 15[39] *οὐ διαστραφήσεσθε ὀπίσω τῶν διανοιῶν ὑμῶν*, and in N.T. Col. 1[21] *ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ*, 1 Pet. 1[13] *ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν*, where see Hort.

The etymology of **εἰλικρινής** is uncertain. It is used first of unmixed substances, as of pure air; then logically of abstract ideas, as Xen. *Mem.* ii. 2. 3 *εἰλικρινής τις ἂν εἴη ἀδικία ἡ ἀχαριστία* 'ingratitude would be the essence of injustice,' Plat. *Symp.* 211 E *εἴ τῳ γένοιτο τὸ καλὸν ἰδεῖν εἰλικρινές*; and lastly of ethical purity, as in *Phaedo* 81 C, where the *ψυχὴ εἰλικρινής* is contrasted with the *ψυχὴ μεμιασμένη καὶ ἀκάθαρτος*. 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] *ἵνα ἦτε εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι*, and the same is true of the substantive in 1 Cor. 5[8] *ἀλλ' ἐν ἀζύμοις εἰλικρινίας καὶ ἀληθείας*, 2 Cor. 1[12], 2[27]. It is also found in Wisdom 7[25] (*σοφία ἐστὶν*) *ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰλικρινής*. Perhaps it should be translated here 'pure,' uncontaminated by the poisonous principles of the libertines.

2. **μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν.**] For the epexegetic infinitive following on *διεγείρω ἐν ὑπομνήσει* (not, as von Soden, on *γράφω*) cf. Winer 399 foll., Lk. 1[54] *ἀντελάβετο παιδὸς αὐτοῦ μνησθῆναι ἐλέους*, *ib. v.* 72. The governing phrase here has much the force of *προτρέπω* in Xen. *Mem.* i. 7. 1 *ἀρετῆς ἐπιμελεῖσθαι προέτρεπεν*. 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 *αὐτῇ καθ' αὑτὴν εἰλικρινεῖ τῇ διανοίᾳ χρώμενος*, as it is contrasted with the bodily senses, not with any other mental faculty.

Digitized by Google

articular construction, we might have expected *τῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγ. προφ. προειρημένων ῥημάτων*. Probably his reason for preferring the looser construction here was the wish to avoid an uninterrupted succession of genitives. Cf. James 1^{5} *αἰτείτω παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος Θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς* with my n. As in $1^{13\text{-}21}$, the writer again combines the evidence from prophecy with the witness of the apostles to the coming of Christ in glory. For the epithet *ἅγιος* cf. Lk. 1^{70}.

καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος.] '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 'reduplicated genitive' see Blass p. 99.[1] For the use of the word *ἐντολή* to express the teaching of our Lord see above 2^{21}, Joh. 12^{50}, 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 1^{16}. We find the same phrase used in Phil. 2^{25} *Ἐπαφρόδιτον τὸν ἀδελφὸν καὶ συνεργὸν καὶ συστρατιώτην μου, ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον*, 2 Cor. 8^{23} 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. 11^{13} *ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος*, and Clem. Rom. 44 *οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν . . . ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς*, which Lightfoot calls 'an exact parallel' to our text, and explains by a reference to § 5, where the phrase *τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀποστόλους* is used of Peter and Paul. If our epistle was really addressed to the church in Rome (as to which see note on 3^{15} *ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν*), this would give a special force to the phrase *τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν*. See the discussion in the Introduction.

3. **τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες.**] This phrase was used above (1^{20}) 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. $2^{11.\,12}$ *ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν . . . τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἔχοντες καλήν*. 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.

ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν.] This idea is variously expressed in the N.T. John regularly uses *τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*, as in $6^{39.\,40.\,44.\,54}$, 7^{37}, 11^{24}, 12^{48}; *ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις* is found in Acts 2^{17}, *ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις* in 2 Tim. 3^{1}, James 5^{3}; *ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ* in 1 Pet. 1^{5}; *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου* (*al. τοῦ χρόνου*) in Jude *v.* 18; *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων* in

[1] Blass himself is inclined to insert *διά* after *τῆς*, as in the title of the *Διδαχή*, *Δ. Κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*.

Digitized by Google

Heb. 1[1]; *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων* in 1 Pet. 1[20] (where *ἐσχάτου* is substantival); *ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν* here (where *ἐσχάτων* is a predicative adjective, used like *summus mons* 'the top of the mountain'). Blass (p. 156) quotes Barn. 16[5] *λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ*[1] *Καὶ ἔσται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ παραδώσει Κύριος τὰ πρόβατα εἰς καταφθοράν*, and Herm. *Sim.* ix. 12. 3 *ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς συντελείας*.[2] 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[1], Deut. 4[30] (*al.* *ἐπ' ἐσχάτῳ*), Dan. 2[28] 10[14], Hos. 3[5], Mic. 4[1], also Westcott on 1 Joh. 2[18] (p. 69). This, temporal use of *ἐπί* is a further development of such phrases as we find in classical authors, *ἐπὶ Κύρου, ἐπὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ζόης* Herod. i. 38, *ἐπὶ γήρως* Arist. *Eth.* i. 9. 11, *ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων χρόνων* Arist. *Pol.* iv. 3, *ἐπὶ τῆς νῦν ἡλικίας* Isocr. p. 75 § 194, *πότερον ὑμῖν ἐνδοξοτέρα δοκεῖ ἡ πόλις εἶναι ἐπὶ τῶν νῦν καιρῶν ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων* Aesch. *Ctes.* 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. 2[18] where the activity of the antichrists denotes *ὅτι ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν*.

ἥξουσιν . . . ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται.] Cf. Mt. 24[5] *πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, λέγοντες Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός*, and, for *ἐν*, 1 Cor. 4[21] *τί θέλετε; ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς;* 2 Cor. 2[1] *ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν*. The verb *ἐμπαίζω* is common both in classical and in biblical Greek, but the latter uses the unclassical formation in *ξ* (*e.g.* *ἐνέπαιξαν* Mk. 15[20]), from which are derived the unclassical *ἐμπαίκτης*, found in Isa. 3[4] as well as in Jude *v.* 18; *ἐμπαιγμός* Heb. 11[36], Ezek. 22[4], 2 Macc. 7[7]; *ἔμπαιγμα* Ps. 37[7], Isa. 66[4]; *ἐμπαιγμόνη* which only occurs here.[3] For the formation of the last see above n. on *παραφρονία* 2[16]; and compare *καλλονή, κλαυθμονή, πεισμονή, πλησμονή, φλεγμονή*. For the repetition of the cognate word see my n. on James 5[17] *προσευχῇ προσηύξατο*, Winer 281 foll.

4. **ποῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ;**] The Second Advent had formed the subject of the Apostles' instructions to their converts (above 1[16]) 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 Ἰσραὴλ, ἕως ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*; the next is before the Transfiguration, Mt. 16[28] *εἰσί τινες τῶν ὧδε ἑστηκότων οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου, ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ* (cf. nn. on 1[16] above); the third shortly before the Betrayal, Mt. 24[3] (the request of the Apostles) *τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς*

[1] Hilgenfeld has pointed out that the reference is to Enoch 89[56, 66, 67], though the words *καὶ ἔσται—ἡμερῶν* are wanting there.

[2] Blass is, I think, mistaken in identifying the two constructions, by making *ἐσχάτων* gen. of *τὰ ἔσχατα*.

[3] Stephanus gives a reference to Cyr. Alex. v. 21, which I have not been able to find.

Digitized by Google

παρουσίας καὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος; Mt. 24[34] οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, ἕως πάντα ταῦτα γένηται, Mt. 24[42] γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε ποίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται; then the announcement of the angel after the Ascension, Acts 1[11] οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀναλαμβανόμενος ἀφ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οὕτως ἐλεύσεται 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. 1[7-9]. That the Coming was looked for shortly, appears from James 5[8. 9], Apoc. 2[5 25], 3[11], and above all from St. Paul's expectation that he would himself live to see it, 1 Cor. 15[52], 1 Th. 4[15. 17]. There are however signs of disappointment and impatience at the delay of the promised Coming, as in James 5[7 f.] μακροθυμήσατε, ἀδελφοί, ἕως τῆς παρουσίας . . . στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας, Heb. 10[36 f.] ὑπομονῆς ἔχετε χρείαν ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιήσαντες κομίσησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν· ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον, ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ χρονίσει, cf. Lk. 12[45] χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου 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[39]), as former judgments were (Mt. 24[37-39]). For the rhetorical use of ποῦ cf. Lk. 8[25] ποῦ ἡ πίστις, 1 Cor. 1[20] ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεύς; 1 Pet. 4[13], Judg. 6[13] ποῦ ἐστι πάντα τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ ἃ διηγήσαντο ἡμῖν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν; Ps. 42[3] ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός σου; Isa. 63[15], Mal. 2[17] ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης; Eur. *Herac.* 510 ποῦ τάδ' ἐν χρηστοῖς πρέπει; and the similar use of ποῖος in Arist. *Nub.* 367 ποῖος Ζεύς;

ἀφ' ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν.] Cf. Lk. 7[45] ἀφ' ἧς εἰσῆλθον οὐ διέλιπεν καταφιλοῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας, Acts 24[11] οὐ πλείους εἰσίν μοι ἡμέραι δώδεκα ἀφ' ἧς ἀνέβην εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, Herm. *Sim.* viii. 6. 6 βλέπεις πολλοὺς μετανενοηκότας ἀφ' ἧς ἐλάλησας, above 1[19] ἕως οὗ, Blass p. 140. The elliptical ἀφ' οὗ is used in the same sense Lk. 13[25], Apoc. 16[18], and in classical writers. **οἱ πατέρες** is understood of the first fathers of mankind by some, owing to the phrase which follows, ἀπ' 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[22]; sometimes of Moses and his contemporaries, Joh. 6[49], Acts 7[38]; sometimes of the times of the prophets, Lk. 6[23], Acts 7[52], Rom. 9[5], 11[28], 15[8], Heb. 1[1]. In Judges quoted above, the fathers seem to belong to the preceding generation, and so in Jer. 31[29] (the fathers have eaten sour grapes), Acts 15[10] (neither our fathers nor we were able to bear), and in our text.[1] 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] γράφω ὑμῖν, 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[2], 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.

Digitized by Google

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^{10}). 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 ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ γεγηράκαμεν καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συμβέβηκεν*, which is repeated in ii. Clem. R. 11 in slightly different words, *ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας προσδεχόμενοι οὐδὲν τούτων ἑωράκαμεν*. 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 obscurer language of 2 Pet., by the quotation. The phrase *ἀφ' ἧς—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' ἧς* (*παρουσίας*) *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^{6}).

πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως.] 'All things remain as we see them (*in statu quo*).' In the following verses this statement is shown to be erroneous: heaven and earth have undergone great changes within the memory of man. **διαμένει**, cf. Heb. $1^{11\,f.}$ *αὐτοὶ ἀπολοῦνται, σὺ δὲ διαμένεις*, Ps. 119^{90}. **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως** 'From the beginning of the world,' cf. Mt. 24^{21}, Mk. 10^{6}, *ib.* 13^{9}. **κτίσις** 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^{25}. It is not to be understood as a restatement of *ἀφ' ἧς κ.τ.λ.*, but as introducing a further difficulty: not only has the promise of the *παρουσία* not been fulfilled before the disappearance of the first generation of Christians; but a change such as is involved in the *παρουσία* is contrary to the whole experience of man.

5. **λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας ὅτι**] 'For they shut their eyes to this fact that', cf. Acts 26^{26}, *v.* 8 below, Plato *Parm.* 128 C *πρῶτον μὲν σὲ τοῦτο λανθάνει ὅτι*. For **θέλοντας** cf. Libanius *Prog.* 129 C *ἑκὼν ἀγνοῶν ἃ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ὀφείλεται* (quoted by Wetst.), Aesch. *Cho.* 19 *γενοῦ δὲ σύμμαχος θέλων ἐμοί*, Soph. *Phil.* 1343 *συγχώρει θέλων*, and Col. 2^{18}

Digitized by Google

μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβευετω θέλων, according to some interpreters. I see no ground for supposing (as Schott, Keil, Kühl, Spitta, and v. Soden) that τοῦτο is to be taken as the object after θέλοντας.

οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν—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 ἦν with γῆ from the preceding ἦσαν; but are we to understand the predicate of γῆ with οὐρανοί? That is, must we complete the first clause by supplying ἐξ ὕδ. καὶ δι' ὕδ. 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 ἐξ ὕδ, καὶ δι' ὕδ. A further reason for supplying the entire predicate to both clauses, is that the heavens and earth make up the κόσμος (*vv.* 6, 7, 12, 13) and that the water by which ὁ τότε κόσμος was destroyed belonged alike to earth and heaven (Gen. 7^{11}, 8^{2}). Spitta, it is true, lays stress on ἔκπαλαι as used exclusively of heaven, on the ground that the rabbinical school of Shammai, cited Gen. 1^{1} ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν 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^{38} Domine locutus es . . . in primo die dicens, Fiat caelum et terra; et tuum verbum opus perfecit. What *may* be argued is that the οὐρανός 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^{11}, 2 Sam. 22^{8}). Below, however, a higher use is assigned to the στερέωμα, viz. to support the sun and moon and stars (Gen. $1^{14\text{-}17}$), and in Ezek. $1^{23\text{-}25}$ we read that the throne of God was over the firmament, which is also identified with οὐρανός in Gen. 1^{8}. Compare the article on Cosmogony in Hastings' *D. of B.* For the plural οὐρανοί see Robinson's n. on Eph. 4^{10}, Charles' *Slavonic Enoch* pp. xxx–xlvii, and my notes on Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii. §§ 9, 10.

For the irregular construction (caused by the attraction of the nearer subject γῆ) οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν . . . συνεστῶσα instead of συνεστῶτες, cf. Heb. 9^{9} δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται μὴ δυνάμεναι κ.τ.λ. The reading of ℵ συνεστῶτα (WH. marg.) was probably a correction, the neuter plural applying equally to the two preceding subjects. Lastly we have to investigate the word συνεστῶσα. The transitive tenses are often used in the N.T. in the sense 'to bring together,' 'introduce,' 'commend,' 'put in a favourable light.' In Gal. 2^{18} παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω means '*prove* myself a transgressor.' The intransitive uses are Lk. 9^{32} 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 ἀέρος καὶ πυρὸς συνέστη ὅδε ὁ κόσμος, Plat. *Tim.* 32 B: hence it is used more generally (as here) in the sense of being 'framed,' 'formed,' 'brought into being.'

οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι καὶ γῆ.] 'There were heavens of old and an

Digitized by Google

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 οὐρανοί. For ἔκπαλαι see n. on 2[3].

ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ 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 ὕδωρ are applied in Gen. 1[2];[1] (2) to the stages by which the heaven and earth were built up, the στερέωμα (here called οὐρανοί) 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]) εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, Γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς, cf. Heb. 11[3], Ps. 33[6] τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν. In i. Clem. R. 27. 4 ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δύναται αὐτὰ καταστρέψαι, as in this passage, the word of God appears as the cause alike of creation and destruction. The meaning of ἐξ ὕδατος 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 δι' ὕδατος has given rise to much discussion. In reference to the heaven it is explained above, as being equivalent to ἀνὰ μέσον 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 διά to express a state, as δι' ἡσυχίας εἶναι, διὰ ἀπεχθείας γίγνεσθαι, διὰ πένθους τὸ γῆρας διάγειν Xen. *Cyr.* iv. 6. 6, τὸν διὰ περιτομῆς παραβάτην Rom. 2[27], ὁ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίων *ib.* 14[20], and also in certain adverbial phrases such as διὰ χειρῶν ἔχειν, cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 193 ἀγάλματα ἔχουσαι διὰ χερῶν εὐωνύμων 'holding in their left hands,' Soph. *Ant.* 916, Arist. *Pol.* v. 8. 8 διὰ χειρῶν μᾶλλον ἔχουσι τὴν πολιτείαν, also in the sing. Plut. *Vit.* 63 (*Numa* 6) διὰ χειρὸς ἔχοντα τὰς ἡνίας 'holding tight in hand,' Av. *Vesp.* 597, Luc. *Demon.* 56 διὰ στόματος τὰς κατηγορίας ἔχειν 'to have Aristotle's categories between your lips,' *Peregrin.* 18 τοῦτο διὰ στόματος ἦν ἅπασιν, Theocr. 14. 27 χἀμὶν τοῦτο δι' ὠτὸς ἔγεντο. If this is an allowable use of διά, we may explain it in regard to the earth from the Jewish belief that the earth rested upon water, cf. Ps. 24[2] αὐτὸς ἐπὶ θαλασσῶν ἐθεμελίωσεν αὐτήν, καὶ ἐπὶ ποταμῶν ἡτοίμασεν αὐτήν, Ps. 136[6], Herm. *Vis.* i. 3. 4 τῷ ἰσχυρῷ ῥήματι πήξας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ θεμελιώσας τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ ὑδάτων. 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 διά given above is that of Grotius, Beza, Hammond, and Mede, but recent commentators[2] generally assign to διά its usual force

[1] See also Apoc. 11[7] and 13[1], where the abyss from which τὸ θηρίον ascends is also called θάλασσα.

[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.'

Digitized by Google

'by means of,' adducing in support Clem. Hom. xi. 24 *τὰ πάντα τὸ ὕδωρ ποιεῖ, τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ὑπὸ πνεύματος κινήσεως 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 *ἔκπαλαι*, 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. 2^6) in fashioning and preserving the earth.[1]

6. **δι' ὃν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο.**] I have followed min. 31 in reading *ὅν* for *ὧν* of the great body of MSS.,[2] as *o* and *ω* are frequently confused in MSS., and no satisfactory explanation of *δι' ὧν* has been given; whereas *ὅν* refers to the immediately preceding *λόγῳ* 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. 11^3 *κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι Θεοῦ*, were it not that the dative was wanted for the instrument *ὕδατι*. Sometimes indeed the *λόγος* itself is regarded as the instrument, as in Heb. 1^2 *δι' οὗ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν*, Joh. 1^3 *πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο*; but *διά* with acc. is found in Ps. 119^{154} *διὰ τὸν λόγον σου ζῆσόν με*, Apoc. 12^{11} *ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν*, Ps. 16^4 *διὰ τοὺς λόγους τῶν χειλέων σου ἐγὼ ἐφύλαξα ὁδοὺς σκληράς*, Joh. 6^{57} *ὁ τρώγων με κἀκεῖνος ζήσει δι' ἐμέ*. 'It was owing to the divine word that the world of that date was destroyed by a deluge,' cf. below *v.* 12 *δι' ἣν (παρουσίαν) οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται*, Apoc. 4^{11} *διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου ἦσαν καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν*, Heraclit. xii. (Byw.) *Σίβυλλα . . . χιλίων ἐτέων ἐξικνέεται τῇ φωνῇ διὰ τὸν θεόν* (paraphrased by Clem. Al. p. 358 *σὺν Θεῷ*, by Iambl. *Myst.* iii. 8 *τῇ τοῦ κρατοῦντος ἐνεργείᾳ*), *Petr. Apoc.* (p. 14. 2 Klost.) *ἀνεπιδεὴς (ὁ Θεὸς) οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐπιδέεται καὶ δι' ὃν ἔστιν . . . ἀποιήτος ὃς τὰ πάντα ἐποίησεν λόγῳ δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.*

The most usual explanation of *δι' ὧν* regards *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος* 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 *οὐρανοί* and *γῆ*, since both are spoken of as causing the deluge (Gen. 7^{11}, 8^2); but the fact of their remoteness makes this connexion very improbable. We should rather have expected such a phrase as *ὅμως δὲ ἐκ τούτων*. Moreover the heaven and the earth constitute the world which they are said to destroy. Wiesinger thinks the antecedents are *ὕδατος* and *τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ*, but then we have one of the antecedents introduced again as the instrument in *ὕδατι*; 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 ἐξ ὕδατος* (fishermen) *ἢ δι' ὕδατος* (merchants) *ἔχοντας 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.*

Digitized by Google

ὁ τότε κόσμος.] Cf. n. on 1^9 *τῶν πάλαι ἁμαρτιῶν*. 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.[1]

ἀπόλετο.] 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. 2^2 *πορεύου πρὸς τὸν Νῶε . . . καὶ δήλωσον αὐτῷ τέλος ἐπερχόμενον, ὅτι ἡ γῆ ἀπόλλυται πᾶσα, ib.* 83^{3-5}. '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 *προειρηκότος ἀφανισμὸν Ἀδάμου τῶν ὅλων ἔσεσθαι, τὸν μὲν κατ' ἰσχὺν πυρός, τὸν ἕτερον δὲ κατὰ βίαν καὶ πλῆθος ὕδατος.* So the term *παλιγγενεσία* is used of the reappearance of the earth after the flood, 1 Clem. Rom. 9 *Νῶε πιστὸς εὑρεθεὶς διὰ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξεν*, 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 conflagration, 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.[3]

7. **οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ.**] A more correct expression would have been either *καὶ ἡ νῦν γῆ* or *καὶ γῆ*. In the latter case *γῆ* would have shared in the article *οἱ*.

τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι 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 *θησαυρίζω*, which I take to mean 'set apart for,' 'destined for,' cf. 4 Macc. 12^{12} (of the judgment on the persecutor) *ταμιεύεταί σε ἡ θεία δίκη αἰωνίῳ πυρί*. Others take *πυρί* with the following *τηρούμενοι*, 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, *κακοδαιμονεστέρους γὰρ ἔσεσθαι εἰ τηρηθεῖεν ἑτέρῳ κατακλυσμῷ*), understanding *τεθησ.* 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., *σύστημα ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν τούτοις φύσεων*, and the account of its alternate destruction and renovation by means of water and fire, *ποτὲ μὲν ἐκπυροῦσθαι τὸν κόσμον, ποτὲ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς συνίστασθαι πάλιν* (Simplic. *ap.* Byw. Heracl. xx.), a doctrine attributed to the Babylonian Berosus by Seneca *N.Q.* iii. 29. In the *ἐκπύρωσις* we are told *τὰ στοιχεῖα φθείρεσθαι* (Diog. L. vii. 134), and that life retreats 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 ἀπώλειαν ἐλεύσεται παντελῆ . . . διὸ ἀνάγκη δὴ καὶ τὴν γῆν αὖθις καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐκφλόγωσιν ἔσεσθαι.*

[4] See Introduction on Text.

Digitized by Google

Schatz der unangegriffen bleibt . . . mit aller Sicherheit und Sorgfalt für zukunftigen 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 σεαυτῷ 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 Irenaeus (i. 7. 1) in which he states the belief of the Valentinians in regard to the final conflagration τὸ ἐμφωλεῦον τῷ κόσμῳ πῦρ ἐκλάμψαν καὶ ἐξαφθὲν καὶ κατεργασάμενον πᾶσαν ὕλην συναναλωθήσεσθαι αὐτῇ.

It may be well here to sum up the different features of the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος (Mt. 13^{39}, 24^{3}, 28^{20}) 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 ἁπάντων, with the passages quoted in Bywater's notes on xx.—xxv., Plato *Tim.* 22 B. πολλαὶ . . . φθοραὶ γεγόνασιν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἔσονται, πυρὶ μὲν καὶ ὕδατι μέγισται, 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, quem solis et lunae vagarumque quinque stellarum orbes conficiunt, cum ad idem signum, ubi quondam simul fuerunt, una referuntur; cuius anni hiemps summa est cataclysmos, quam nostri diluvionem vocant, aestas autem ecpyrosis, quod est mundi incendium. Nam his alternis temporibus mundus tum ignescere, tum exaquescere 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 Ὑστάσπης γενήσεσθαι τῶν φθαρτῶν ἀνάλωσιν διὰ πυρὸς ἔφασαν. οἱ λεγόμενοι δὲ Στωικοὶ φιλόσοφοι καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν εἰς πῦρ ἀναλύεσθαι δογματίζουσιν καὶ αὖ πάλιν κατὰ μεταβολὴν τὸν κόσμον γενέσθαι λέγουσιν, 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

Digitized by Google

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.* xv. 18 *ἀρέσκει τοῖς Στωικοῖς τὴν ὅλην οὐσίαν εἰς πῦρ μεταβάλλειν οἷον εἰς σπέρμα.* For other references see Zeller *Phil. Gr.* iv. p. 133[3]. For the Sibyl, referred to by Justin above, compare *Sib.* iv. 172 *πῦρ ἔσται κατὰ γαῖαν . . . κόσμος ἅπας μύκημα καὶ ὄμβριμον ἦχον ἀκούσει. φλέξει δὲ χθόνα πᾶσαν, ἅπαν δ' ὀλέσει γένος ἀνδρῶν καὶ πάσας τε πόλεις, ποταμοὺς ἅμα ἠδὲ θάλασσαν, ἐκκαύσει δέ τε πάντα, κόνις δ' ἔσετ' αἰθαλόεσσα.* As we have evidence in this epistle of familiarity with Stoic phraseology, 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, *ἔπειτα μετ' οὐ πολὺ τὴν συντέλειαν καὶ ἐκπύρωσιν τοῦ παντὸς ἐπιστῆναι*; 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 *qua* material, in the other destructible *qua* 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 $2^{30, 31}$ *δώσω τέρατα ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ· ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ*, *ib.* $3^{15, 16}$, Ps. 50^{3} *ὁ Θεὸς ἐμφανῶς ἥξει . . . πῦρ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ καυθήσεται καὶ κύκλῳ αὐτοῦ καταιγὶς σφόδρα*, *ib.* 18^{8-13}, Isa. 29^{6}, 30^{30}, 34^{4}, 51^{6}, $66^{15, 16}$, Nahum $1^{5, 6}$, Mal. 4^{1}, Dan. $7^{9, 10}$ *ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ φλὸξ πυρός, οἱ τροχοὶ αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον, ποταμὸς πυρὸς εἵλκεν ἔμπροσθεν 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. $1^{7, 8}$ *ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς διδόντος ἐκδίκησιν τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσιν Θεόν.*

τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων.] So we read of angels reserved for judgment in 2^{4}, of unrighteous men reserved for judgment in 2^{9}, of the blackness of darkness reserved for

Digitized by Google

false teachers in 2^{18}; while here it is the heavens and earth which are reserved for the same office of vengeance.

8. **ἓν δὲ τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς.**] 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 **ἓν τοῦτο** cf. *v.* 3, *τοῦτο πρῶτον*, Phil. 3^{14} **ἕν δέ**, Mk. 10^{21} *ἓν σοι ὑστερεῖ*.

ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη.] '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. 90^{4} *χίλια ἔτη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἐχθὲς ἥτις διῆλθε, καὶ φυλακὴ ἐν νυκτί*. 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 κρίσεως*, 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. 15^{4} *συνετέλεσεν ἐν ἓξ ἡμέραις—τοῦτο λέγει ὅτι ἐν ἑξακισχιλίοις ἔτεσιν συντελέσει Κύριος τὰ σύμπαντα. ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ' αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη. καὶ κατέπαυσεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ—τοῦτο λέγει ὅταν ἐλθὼν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καταργήσει τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον καὶ κρινεῖ τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἀλλάξει τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας, τότε καλῶς κατα-παύσεται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ*, Slavonic Enoch xxxii foll., Justin M. *Dial.* 81 *τὸ εἰρημένον ὅτι ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη κ.τ.λ.*, Iren. v. 28. 3 *ὅσαις ἡμέραις ἐγένετο ὁ κόσμος τοσαύταις χιλιοντάσι συντελεῖται . . . ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη, ib.* 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. 2^{17} *ᾗ δ' ἂν ἡμέρᾳ φάγητε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε*) by reference to the difference between the human day and the divine day; so Just. M. *Dial.* 81, p. 308.

9. **οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.**] The verb *βρ.* (here used intransitively, as in 1 Tim. 3^{15}) occurs also in Gen. 43^{10}, Isa. 46^{13} *τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρ' ἐμοῦ οὐ βραδυνῶ*. This is the only recorded instance of its being followed by a genitive, which may be compared with that after *ὑστερεῖν, ὑστερίζειν, λείπεσθαι* (for which Winer quotes Diod. xiii. 110 *ὑστέρουν τῆς βοηθείας*); or it may be taken as the genitive of the sphere, for which cf. 2^{14} *πλεονεξίας*.

ὡς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἡγοῦνται.] 'According to some men's notion of dilatoriness.' Alford makes *βραδυτῆτα* predicate 'account (his conduct) tardiness'; but, if that meaning were intended, it would have been simpler to omit *βραδυτῆτα*, translating 'as some men hold': with *βραδυτῆτα* the meaning must be 'the Lord is not dilatory in any injurious sense, He is not powerless, or careless, or indifferent.' The word *βραδυτής* is classical, but not found elsewhere in biblical Greek. Wetstein appositely quotes Plut. *De Sera Numinis Vindicta* p. 549 B (the delay of punishment has this bad effect) *τὴν πίστιν ἡ βραδυτὴς*

Digitized by Google

ἀφαιρεῖται τῆς προνοίας, and App. *B.C.* iv. p. 1052 μηδὲ βραδυτῆτά τις ἡγείσθω τὴν ἐμπειρίαν. For τινες see n. on Jude *v.* 4. I understand it of the ἐμπαίκται of *v.* 3 above.

ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς.] See Introduction on the Text. Cf. below *v.* 15, Ps. 86[15], Isa. 30[18], Jonah 4[2], 1 Pet. 3[20] ἐξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε, Rom. 2[4] τοῦ πλούτου . . . τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; Wisdom 12[19. 20], Herm. *Sim.* viii. 11. 1 μακρόθυμος ὢν ὁ κύριος θέλει τὴν κλῆσιν τὴν γενομένην διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ σῴζεσθαι; Clem. *Hom.* xvi. 20 μακροθυμεῖ, εἰς μετάνοιαν καλεῖ. The construction with εἰς is only found here: πρός is used in 1 Th. 5[14]; ἐπί in Mt. 18[26. 29], Lk. 18[7], James 5[7].

μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι.] Cf. 1 Tim. 2[4] (God our Saviour) πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν, Rom. 11[32], Ezek. 18[23]. Clem. R. i. 7. 5 ἐν γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ μετανοίας τόπον ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσπότης τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐπιστραφῆναι ἐπ' αὐτόν, *ib.* 8. 5, Justin M. *Apol.* i. 28 ἡ ἐπιμονὴ τοῦ μηδέπω ταῦτα πρᾶξαι τὸν Θεὸν (referring to the final judgment) διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος γεγένηται· προγινώσκει γάρ τινας ἐκ μετανοίας σωθήσεσθαι. Wetstein illustrates χωρῆσαι from Plut. *de flum.* 19 ὀλίγον δὲ σωφρονήσας, καὶ εἰς μετάνοιαν ἐπὶ τοῖς πραχθεῖσι χωρήσας, but I have not been able to find this: cf. Prov. 14[15] πανοῦργος ἔρχεται εἰς μετάνοιαν, Rom. 2[4] ἄγειν εἰς μετάνοιαν. R. V. translates τινας by 'any' giving it the force of μηδένα: if so, should we have had the plural? The Vulgate has *aliquos*, and some of the commentators think there is an allusion to the preceding τινες. Perhaps we may give the force of the plural by translating 'not desiring to make exceptions.[1] For ἀπολέσθαι compare ἀπώλεια above 2[1. 3], 3[7], and below 3[16].

10. **ἥξει δὲ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης.**] Cf. 1 Th. 5[2] οἴδατε ὅτι ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται, Mt. 24[43], Lk. 12[39], Apoc. 3[3], 16[15].

ἐν ᾗ οἱ οὐρανοὶ ῥοιζηδὸν παρελεύσονται.] For the adverbial termination cf. κλαγγηδόν, κοναβηδόν, λυσσηδόν, μολπηδόν, ῥυμηδόν, and the cognate ῥοιβδηδόν. The word is onomatopoeic, 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 ὕδατος ζῶντος καὶ ῥοιζοῦντος ἀπὸ τοῦ Λιβάνου, other exx. from Homer to Lycophron in Wetstein. It is used of thunder in Luc. *Jup. Trag.* 1 ὦ μεγαλοσμαράγου στεροπᾶς ῥοίζημα, of the music of the spheres in Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* c. 15. and Oecumenius says the word is especially used of the noise caused by a devouring flame.[2] This explanation would suit the passing 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 οὐ or μή, where it is equivalent to μηδείς. I do not remember any other instance of the plural.

[2] Keil prefers to understand it (with the Vulg. *magno impetu transcurrent*) simply of a sudden disappearance, comparing Wisd. 2[4] παρελεύσεται ὁ βίος ἡμῶν ὡς ἴχνη νεφέλης.

Digitized by Google

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 1^{4}) as well as from Jer. $25^{30.31}$, Joel. 3^{16}, Isa. 42^{13}, 1 Th. 4^{16}. The adv. ῥοιζηδόν is found in Lycophron *Cass.* 66 (of Oenone hurling herself into the grave of Paris) πύργων ἀπ' ἄκρων πρὸς νεόδμητον νέκυν ῥοιζηδὸν ἐκβράσασα κύμβαχον δέμας, Nicander *Theriaca* 556, and the other form ῥοιζηδά in the *Alexipharmaca* 182, 498.

στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται.] For the absence of the article see Introduction on Grammar. The word στοιχεῖα [1] 'elements' is used in Heb. 5^{12} 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} ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἤμεθα δεδουλωμένοι, the patristic commentators generally understand it of the material elements, or of the heavenly bodies: for (1) cf. Philo i. 162 τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα ἐξ ὧν συνεκράθη ὁ κόσμος, Wisd. 7^{17}, 19^{18}, Hermas *Vis.* iii. 13 ὁ κόσμος διὰ τεσσάρων στοιχείων κρατεῖται; for (2) Theoph. *ad Autol.* ii. 35 ὁ θεῖος νόμος οὐ μόνον κωλύει τὸ εἰδώλοις προσκυνεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχείοις, ἡλίῳ, σελήνῃ ἢ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἄστροις, 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 χηρεύσει στοιχεῖα πρόπαντα τὰ κόσμου, ἀήρ, γαῖα, θάλασσα, φάος, πόλος, ἤματα, νύκτες. Clem. *Hom.* x. 9 οὐδὲ τὰ ζῷα προσκυνοῦσιν, οὐδὲ στοιχεῖα τὰ ὑπὸ Θεοῦ γεγενημένα κολακεύουσιν, λέγω δὲ ἥλιον, σελήνην, ἄστρα, γῆν, θάλασσαν, 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 οὐρανοί 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 Θεὸν ἐδουλώσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς . . . νῦν δέ . . . πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ 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 (Favorinus *ap.* Diog. L. iii. 24), cf. *Theaet.* p. 201 E ἐδόκουν ἀκούειν τινῶν ὅτι τὰ μὲν πρῶτα οἱονπερεὶ στοιχεῖα, ἐξ ὧν ἡμεῖς τε συγκείμεθα καὶ τἄλλα, λόγον οὐκ ἔχοι. Later writers distinguished between the στοιχεῖα and first principles, cf. Suidas *s.v.* διαφέρουσι δ' ἀρχαὶ καὶ στοιχεῖα τῷ τὰς μὲν εἶναι ἀγεννήτους καὶ ἀφθάρτους, τὰ δὲ στοιχεῖα κατὰ τὴν ἐκπύρωσιν φθείρεσθαι, Hippol. *Philosoph.* i. 22 (Diels *Doxogr.* p. 571) Ἐπίκουρος ἀρχὰς μὲν τῶν ὅλων ὑπέθετο ἀτόμους καὶ κενόν . . . ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἀτόμων συνελθουσῶν γενέσθαι καὶ τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα. This distinction was not always observed; see (for Aristotle) Zeller vol. iii. p. 442^{3}, and for the Epicureans Lucr. ii. 392, 410, 463, 979, 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*.

Digitized by Google

the Jews believed the various powers of nature to be under the control of spirits.[1] Similarly Spitta explains Col. 2^{8} *κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν*, and 2^{20} *ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου* by a comparison of 2^{16} *μὴ οὖν τις κρινέτω ἐν βρώσει ἢ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νουμηνίας*. These things belong to the *θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων* with which St. Paul charges the Colossians (2^{18}); but such *ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι* (2^{15}) are not to be compared with Him in whom *κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος* (2^{9}).[2] In support of this view Spitta quotes the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου (*ap.* Clem. Al. *Str.* vi. p. 760) *μηδὲ κατὰ Ἰουδαίους σέβεσθε, καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι, μόνοι οἰόμενοι τὸν Θεὸν γινώσκειν, οὐκ ἐπίστανται λατρεύοντες ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀρχαγγέλοις, μηνί τε καὶ σελήνῃ. καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σελήνη φανῇ σάββατον οὐκ ἄγουσιν κ.τ.λ.*, cf. Lightfoot's n. on Col. 2^{18}. The stars and the angels were closely associated in Jewish thought, see Job 38^{7}, Enoch $69^{21\text{-}26}$, $41^{5\text{-}9}$, 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 καταπτήσσοντος καὶ πάσης κτίσεως καυσουμένης* (MSS. *κλονουμένης*) *καὶ τῶν ἀοράτων πνευμάτων τηκομένων*, Enoch 68^{2} 'who can endure the rigorous judgment passed upon the angels, before which 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 *οὐρανοί* 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 τακήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ ἑλιγήσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα πεσεῖται ὡς φύλλα ἐξ ἀμπέλου*, a passage which our

See especially En. $50^{1\text{-}2}$ 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., Apoc. 16^{5}. 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 *τίνες ἔστε; οἱ δὲ ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἔφησαν . . . ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν τὰ λεγόμενα στοιχεῖα, οἱ κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, Ep. ad Diogn. 7 God sent to save man, not an angel *ἢ ἄρχοντα ἢ τινα τῶν διεπόντων τὰ ἐπίγεια ἢ τινα τῶν πεπιστευμένων τὰς ἐν οὐρανοῖς διοικήσεις*, but Him by whom He had made the world, *οὗ τὰ μυστήρια πιστῶς πάντα φυλάσσει τὰ στοιχεῖα* (sun, moon, etc.), cf. Eus. *H.E.* iii. 31 with the notes in Heinichen's ed.

[2] Compare with this Lightfoot's notes on Gal. 4^{3} 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.

[3] 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 'quae in hac ima mundi parte subsistunt procellosa 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.

Digitized by Google

author evidently had in mind, Joel $2^{30.31}$, 3^{15}, Mt. 24^{29} *ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται*, Apoc. 6^{12-14}.

καυσόομαι.] A word, employed by medical writers to express feverish heat, used (here only) of the burning of inanimate objects.[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 *καῦσος*, from which it is derived, is generally used of fever, it also occurs in Proclus of ordinary heat.[2] So *καυματίζω* in classical Greek seems to be confined to the medical sense, but in the N.T. (Mt. 13^{6}, Apoc. 16^{8}) it is used of the scorching effect of fire. Dr. Bigg suggests, after Veitch p. 309, that it may be an irregular future of *καίω*; but there is nothing to justify the use of the future here.

λυθήσεται.] Occurs also in *vv.* 11 and 12. It is used of breaking up a structure as in Joh. 2^{44}, as well as of dissolving a compound into its elements.

καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται.] For readings see Introduction on the Text. I agree with Plumptre that *ἔργα* is to be understood here of all that man has wrought on the surface of the globe.[3] The common-place amendment *κατακαήσεται* is accepted by v. Soden, Hundhausen, Brückner. I do not think any one is quite satisfied with Hort's suggestion *ῥυήσεται* or *διαρυήσεται*. The reading of Sah. (*οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται*) makes excellent sense, as may be seen from Gen. 5^{24} (Enoch) *οὐχ εὑρίσκετο*, Apoc. 16^{20} *πᾶσα νῆσος ἔφυγε καὶ ὄρη οὐχ εὑρέθησαν* 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 *εὑρεθήσεται* interrogative, but this, as Spitta says, is extremely harsh: it should at least have had a *ποῦ* prefixed, as in 1 Pet. 4^{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^{15} *εὑρέθη τὰ ἀδικήματα ἐν σοί*. This separates between the earth and the works in it; and would require *φανερωθήσεται*, rather than *εὑρεθήσεται*. If we are not to accept *οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται*, I am rather disposed to suggest *ἀρθήσεται*, cf. Mt. 24^{39} *ἦλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμὸς καὶ ἦρεν ἅπαντας*, Joh. 15^{2}, 17^{15}, Acts 8^{33}, 22^{22}, Isa. 16^{10} *ἀρθήσεται εὐφροσύνη*, *ib.* 57^{1} *ἄνδρες δίκαιοι αἴρονται καὶ οὐδεὶς κατανοεῖ*.[4]

[1] Stephanus gives one example of its figurative use (Hesych. *Antirrhet.* p. 315) *ποτίζει νοῦν ἐκ πολλοῦ χρόνου καυσωθέντα τῇ ἀσεβείᾳ*.

[2] Dr. Chase in Hastings' *D. of B. s.v.* 'Peter' states that *καῦσος* 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.

[3] Cf. Melito *Apol.*, 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.

[4] Dr. Abbott suggests *πυρωθήσεται*, as in *v.* 12, or *πυρευθήσεται*, as in Plat.

Digitized by Google

11. **τούτων οὖν πάντων λυομένων.**] 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^{23} *ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει.*

ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς.] The classical *ποδαπός* (formed like *ἀλλοδαπός, παντοδαπός*) is equivalent to Lat. *cuias*, as is shown in Plato *Apol.* 20 B *τίς καὶ ποδαπός;* Εὔηνος, *ἔφη*, Πάριος. In later writers it is found, generally in the form *ποταπός*, in the sense of *ποῖος*, as in Mt. 8^{27} *ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι . . . ὑπακούουσιν;* Lk. 7^{39} *ἐγίνωσκεν ἂν τίς καὶ ποταπὴ ἡ γυνή*, 1 Joh. 3^{1} *ἴδετε ποταπὴν ἀγάπην δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ πατήρ, Petri Apoc. ἵνα ἴδωμεν ποταποί εἰσι τὴν μορφήν*, see Lobeck *Phrynichus* p. 56. Alford seems to me to give the precise contrary of the meaning of **ὑπάρχειν** 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 *ὑπάρχειν*) Dem. *Olynth.* p. 32. 20 *τοῦτ' οὖν δεῖ προσεῖναι· τὰ δ' ἄλλα ὑπάρχει*, 'this one thing, promptness of action, must be added: quickness of intelligence and all other requisites are your birth-right.'

ἐν ἁγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις.] For the abstract plural compare above 2^{18} *ἀσελγείαις*, Jude *v.* 13, 1 Pet. 2^{1}, James 2^{1}, Blass p. 84.[1] For *ἀναστροφή* see above 2^{7}, 1 Pet. 1^{15}; for *εὐσέβεια* above $1^{3.6.7}$. Alford[2] is perhaps right in connecting these words with the following participles.

12. **προσδοκῶντας καὶ σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας.**] For other examples of the transitive force of *σπεύδω* see Isa. 16^{5} *ἐκζητῶν κρίμα καὶ σπεύδων δικαιοσύνην*, Pind. *Pyth.* iii. 110 *μὴ βίον ἀθάνατον σπεῦδε*, Eur. *Suppl.* 161 *εὐψυχίαν γ' ἔσπευσας ἀντ' εὐβουλίας*, where the sense is 'to desire,' 'to be eager for'; also Hom. *Od.* xix. 137 *οἱ δὲ γάμον σπεύδουσιν*, Eur. *Med.* 150 *τίς σοί ποτε . . . ἔρος, ὦ ματαία, σπεύσει θανάτου τελευτάν;* Esther 5^{5} *κατασπεύσατε Ἀμάν*, where the sense is 'to hasten,' 'to accelerate', cf. Sir. 36^{8} (or 33^{8}) *σπεῦσον καιρὸν καὶ μνήσθητι ὁρκισμοῦ, i.e.* 'hasten the time of the promised vengeance,' Deut. 32^{35}, Baruchi Apoc. 83^{1} altissimus accelerans accelerabit tempora sua et 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 $3^{19f.}$ *μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε εἰς τὸ ἐξαλειφθῆναι ὑμῶν τὰς*

Legg. 843 E. He observes that *πυρόω* is corrupt or corrupted in Prov. 10^{20}, Lam. 4^{7}, and other passages where it occurs in the LXX.

[1] Bremi (*exc. vii in Isocr.*) cites *ἀληθειαι de Pace* § 38, *Evag.* § 5. c. 1, *de Antid.* § 170, § 260, § 283, *ad Nicocl.* § 20; *καρτερίαι Evag.* § 42. c. 19; *μετριότητες Paneg.* § 11; *πραότητες Philipp.* § 116. c. 49, *de Antid.* § 214; *σεμνότητες Archil.* § 98; *φιλανθρωπίαι Philipp.* § 116 c. 49, etc.

[2] So too Spitta.

Digitized by Google

ἁμαρτίας ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσιν καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως (R.V. "that so there may come seasons of refreshing") ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ἀποστείλῃ . . . Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων' (from Plummer). Compare 4 Esdr. 4[35] usque quo spero sic? et respondit archangelus et dixit Quando impletus erit numerus similium vobis . . . Et respondi et dixi . . . Ne forte propter nos non impleantur justorum areae, propter peccata inhabitantium super terram. For προσδοκῶντας cf. προσδεχόμενοι Jude *v.* 21, 1 Cor. 1[7] μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι, ἀπεκδεχομένους τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 'I.X.

The word παρουσία 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].

δι' ἣν οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται.] In *v.* 10 the connexion was only one of time (ἐν ᾗ), here it is one of cause. The presence of the Day of God is the cause of the destruction of heaven by fire.

πυρόω 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[29]), of incendiary fire (Herod. vii. 8).

καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται.] 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 . . . εὑρεθήσεται 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 τήκεται, Hort suggests τήξεται (which is used in a passive sense by Hippocrates vi. 110).[1] The same word is used of the mountains Isa. 64[1. 2], of the heavens Isa. 34[4] τακήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν, Micah 1[4], Nahum 1[5. 6].

13. καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανοὺς . . . κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ προσδοκῶμεν.[2]] The reference is to Isa. 65[17–19] and 66[22]. See also Apoc. 21[1], Isa. 51[6]. Hence we must understand αὐτοῦ of God, not, as Spitta, of Christ. The figure chiasmus (καινοὺς οὐρανοὺς—γῆν καινήν) is used for the sake of variety, as in Mt. 5[18] ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία. Here, as in *v.* 8 above (μία ἡμέρα ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία), it has the further effect of improving the rhythm, and giving additional emphasis to the closing καινήν. On the other hand, in Isaiah and Apoc. 21[1] the epithet is repeated in the same order οὐρανὸν καινὸν—γῆν καινήν: so

[1] Alford explains the text as the 'present of destiny,' comparing λυομένων above; but how then are we to account for the future λυθήσονται?

[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[4-6], 104[5]. 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. 5], 91[16] '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.

Digitized by Google

Joh. 10[16] *γενήσεται μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμήν*, Zech. 14[9], 2 Cor. 7[4] *πολλή μοι παρρησία πρὸς ὑμᾶς, πολλή μοι καύχησις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.*

ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ.] Cf. Isa. 32[1] *βασιλεὺς δίκαιος βασιλεύσει, ib. v.* 16 f. *καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνη ἐν τῷ* Καρμήλῳ *κατοικήσει. καὶ ἔσται τὰ ἔργα τῆς δικαιοσύνης εἰρήνη, καὶ κρατήσει ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἀνάπαυσιν . . . καὶ κατοικήσει ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἐν πόλει εἰρήνης.* 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[27], 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[6], Isa. 11[4. 5], 61[10. 11], 60[19. 20], Apoc. 21[22. 23]), in contradistinction to this present world, of which Satan is called *ὁ ἄρχων* Joh. 12[31].

ἐν οἷς, *i.e.* in the new earth and heaven. For the construction of the relative see above 3[1].

14. **διό, ἀγαπητοί, ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες.**] For *διό* see above 1[10. 12]. It is only righteousness that can dwell in the new earth; therefore cleanse yourselves from all unrighteousness. As in Jude *v.* 20, *ἀγαπητοί* introduces the direct appeal to the true members of the Church.

σπουδάσατε ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ εὑρεθῆναι.] Cf. above, notes on 2[13] *σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι.* For the complementary construction of *εὑρεθῆναι* see Phil. 3[9] (*ἵνα*) *εὑρεθῶ ἐν αὐτῷ μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου*, Gal. 2[17] *εὑρέθημεν ἁμαρτωλοί*, 2 Cor. 5[3] *οὐ γυμνοὶ εὑρεθησόμεθα*, 1 P. 1[7] with Hort's note. For the dat. see Rom. 7[10] *εὑρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωὴν αὕτη εἰς 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] *τόπος οὐχ εὑρέθη αὐτοῖς.* In Rom. 10[20], *εὑρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν*, it approaches more nearly to *ὑπό* 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 βασιλεῖ ἄμεμπτον αὐτὸν διαφυλάττειν.*[1] Blass compares Eph. 1[4] *εἶναι ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ*, Col. 1[22] *παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ* (*Gr.* pp. 112 f., 185). So Jude *v.* 24 *στῆσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους.*

ἐν εἰρήνῃ.] Peace and righteousness are joined together in Ps. 85[10], Isa. 32[17], quoted on *v.* 13 above, and James 3[18], where see my note.

15. **τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε.**] A stronger expression of the statement in *v.* 9, where the readers are taught to look on *βραδυτής* as *μακροθυμία*. Here they are taught to look on *μακροθυμία* as *σωτηρία*, *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 Νῶε.*

καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος—ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν.] A similar phrase is used by Paul of Tychicus (Eph. 6[21], Col. 4[7]), of Onesimus (Col. 4[9], Philem. *v.* 16). So Epaphras is called *ὁ ἀγαπητὸς σύνδουλος* (Col. 1[7]), Philemon *ἀγαπητὸς καὶ συνεργός* (Philem. *v.* 1), Timothy *τέκνον ἀγαπητόν* (1 Cor. 4[17], 2 Tim. 1[2]), while the phrase *ὁ ἀγαπητός μου* is

[1] For this quotation I am indebted to Dr. Abbott.

Digitized by Google

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 Βαρνάβᾳ καὶ Παύλῳ, 1 Th. 3^{2} Τιμόθεον τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν, 2 Cor. 1^{22}, Philem. *v.* 2 Ἀρχίππῳ τῷ συνστρατιώτῃ ἡμῶν καὶ τῇ κατ' οἶκόν 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 15, 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 ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; $3^{25,26}$ εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ . . . ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ; *ib.* $9^{22,23}$ θέλων ὁ Θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι . . . τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη 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^{5}). 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^{15} κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν to 1 Cor. 2^{1}, 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

Digitized by Google

this hypothesis on the fact that we have repeated references to the last time in Heb. 1^1, 9^{26}, $10^{25.\ 37}$. De Wette, with whom Plumptre and Alford agree, widens the reference so as to include the whole passage dealing with the Second Coming (3^5–3^{13}) and thinks that the writer must have had in mind 1 Thess. 4^{13}–5^{11} and 2 Thess. $2^{1\text{-}12}$. Lastly Pott, Morus, Spitta, and Zahn (*Einl.* ii. 46) consider that the reference is to a lost epistle. Dr. Bigg is undecided.

κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν.] Cf. Paul's own words *κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκα* (1 Cor. 3^{10}), *γνόντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς . . . δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοί* (Gal. 2^9), 1 Cor. $2^{6\ f.}$, Col. 1^{28}, and Polycarp (*ad Phil.* iii. 2) *οὔτε γὰρ ἐγὼ οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου . . . ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς.*

16. **ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων.**] See Introduction on the Text. We must understand *γράφει* after *ὡς*. 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 *πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς* 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 ἄλλαις ἐπιστολαῖς*. In later Greek *λαλῶ* is used, much like *λέγω*, of serious speech (cf. above 1^{23}) and of writing (here and in Heb. 2^5, 2 Cor. 11^{17}). 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 *καθώς* 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

Digitized by Google

verisimilius hanc epistolam ex Petri sensu ab alio compositam, quam ab eo scriptam esse. *Nunquam 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.

ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσνόητά τινα.] The reading *οἷς* is probably owing to the copyist's taking *τούτων* to be the antecedent. For *δυσνόητα* (not found elsewhere in biblical Greek) cf. Luc. *Alexand.* 54 *χρησμοὺς ἀνοήτους καὶ δυσνοήτους*, Diog. L. ix. 13 (a supposititious letter of Darius to Heraclitus) *καταβέβλησαι λόγον γραπτὸν περὶ φύσεως δυσνόητόν τε καὶ δυσεξήγητον.*

ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι στρεβλοῦσιν.] Cf. Clem. Al. *Str.* p. 529 *init.* *οἱ διαστρέφοντες τὰς γραφὰς πρὸς ἰδίας ἡδονάς, καὶ τινῶν προσῳδιῶν καὶ στιγμάτων μεταθέσει τὰ παραγγελθέντα σωφρόνως βιαζόμενοι πρὸς ἡδυπαθείας τὰς ἑαυτῶν*, *ib.* pp. 890, 891. I have not found any other example of *στρεβλόω* in the sense of twisting or straining a phrase like the Fr. 'torturer un mot,' but in Ps. 18[26] we have *μετὰ στρεβλοῦ διαστρέψεις* (Clement's word above), where 2 Sam. 22[27] has *μετὰ στρεβλοῦ στρεβλωθήσῃ*. I think the figurative sense flows from the notion of twisting or warping, rather than from that of torturing on the rack, cf. Arist. *Ranae* 878 (of *ἄνδρες γνωμοτύποι*) *ὅταν εἰς ἔριν ὀξυμερίμνοις ἔλθωσι στρεβλοῖσι παλαίσμασιν ἀντιλέγοντες*, Aristot. *Rhet.* i. 1. 5 *οὐ δεῖ τὸν δικαστὴν διαστρέφειν* (we must not warp his judgment) . . . *ὅμοιον γὰρ κἂν εἴ τις, ᾧ μέλλει χρῆσθαι κανόνι, τοῦτον ποιήσειε στρεβλόν* (with Cope's notes); so Plutarch (*Mor.* 2, p. 968 A) uses the term *στρεβλότης* to express the windings of the ant's nest; and Sir. 36[25] has *καρδία στρεβλὴ = κ. σκολιά*. It is strange that so common a word as *ἀμαθής* should not be found elsewhere in the N.T. or LXX., its place being taken by such words as *ἰδιώτης* Acts 4[13], 1 Cor. 14[16. 23], or *ἀγράμματος* Acts 4[13], or *ὁ ἀγνοῶν* Heb. 5[2]. For *ἀστήρικτος* see above on 2[14].

What are the *δυσνόητά τινα* referred to? Probably St. Paul's doctrine of God's free grace (Rom. 3[5-8]), with his apparent disparagement of the Law in Rom. 3[20. 28], 4[15], 5[20], 6[4], 7[4-11]; his teaching with regard to the *πνευματικοί* 1 Cor. 1[15]; with regard to the strong, whom he seems to justify in their neglect of the rule made at the Apostolic Council as to *εἰδωλόθυτα* (Acts 15[29], Rom. 14, 1 Cor. 8, 10[25]); as regards the resurrection in baptism (Rom. 6[3-11], Col. 3[1], 1 Cor. 15[12]); perhaps as regards predestination (Rom. 9[11-21]), and the Parousia (2 Th. 2).

ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς.] 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[4], twice in 1 Cor. 15[3. 4] (*κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*). We find *γραφαί* without the article in Rom. 1[2] *ὃ προηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις*, *ib.* 16[26] (*μυστηρίου*) *διὰ γραφῶν προφητικῶν . . . γνωρισθέντος*. The singular is used in Mk. 12[10] *οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε*; Lk. 4[21] *σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη*, Joh. 2[22] *ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ*,

Digitized by Google

on which Westcott's note is 'the phrase occurs elsewhere ten times in St. John $7^{38.42}$, 10^{35}, 13^{18}, 17^{12}, $19^{24.28.36.37}$, 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} *ἑτέρα 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 1^{16}, 8^{32} *ἡ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς ἣν ἀνεγίνωσκεν*, 8^{35}; in Rom. 4^{3}, 9^{17}, 10^{11}, 11^{2}, Gal. 3^{8}, 3^{22}, 4^{30}, 1 Tim. 5^{18}, in all of which passages St. Paul seems to personify *γραφή*, using it without *αὕτη*. So James $2^{8.23}$, 4^{5}. The article is omitted in Joh. 19^{7}, Rom. 1^{2}, 16^{26} already quoted, and in 2 Tim. 3^{16} *πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν*, 'every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching' (R.V.), 1 Pet. 2^{6} *περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ*, where Hort thinks 'the translation "in Scripture" is barely possible without the article; nor again, in the absence of *τινί*, is the sense "in a passage of Scripture" probable. The most natural rendering is simply "in writing" as Sir. 39^{32} *διενοήθην καὶ ἐν γραφῇ ἀφῆκα*; 42^{7} *δόσις καὶ λῆψις, πάντα ἐν γραφῇ*, 44^{5} *διηγούμενοι ἔπη ἐν γραφῇ*, 2 Chron. 2^{11} *εἶπε Χιρὰμ βασιλεὺς Τύρου ἐν γραφῇ*, 21^{12} *ἦλθεν αὐτῷ ἐν γραφῇ παρὰ Ἠλιοὺ 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 *ἔστιν 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 *γραφή* 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 ἰδίας 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, βασιλεύς, σωτήρ, Χριστός, πνεῦμα, νόμος, λόγος*.[2] When St. Paul can speak of *ἡ γραφὴ λέγει*, it is a very short step onwards to say *γραφὴ λέγει*, shorter still to say *ἐν γραφῇ*. I think then that here we must translate *γραφάς* '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 *γραφή* stands for 'register' as in Nehem. 7^{64} *οὗτοι ἐζήτησαν γραφὴν αὐτῶν τῆς συνοδίας*, Ezek. 13^{9} *ἐν γραφῇ οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ οὐ γραφήσονται*; sometimes for any particular writing, as in Dan. 5^{7} *ὃς ἂν ἀναγνῷ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην*. Irenaeus has 'haec scriptura' (*αὕτη ἡ γραφή*) of his own book (iii. 17. 4): so Clem. Al. *Str.* vi. 32 *περὶ μὲν τούτων προιούσης τῆς γραφῆς διαλεξόμεθα* of his own treatise, followed shortly after by *κατὰ τὴν γραφήν* used of scripture, and the same diversity is found *ib.* 131. Similarly Euseb. (*H.E.* ii. 11. 1) uses *γραφή* of Josephus. [Taken from Zahn, *l.c.*]

[2] See my Introduction to St. James, pp. clxxxvi, cxcii.

Digitized by Google

Some commentators escape from this argument by reference to the idiomatic use of ἄλλος and similar words, as in the passages cited by Dr. Bigg, Hom. *Od.* i. 132 ἔκτοθεν ἄλλων μνηστήρων, where Odysseus is distinguished from the others, the suitors; Lk. 23[32] ἕτεροι δύο κακοῦργοι; . . . Deut. 8[20] (ἀπωλεία ἀπολεῖσθε) καθὰ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη ὅσα καὶ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπολλύει πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν, where the chosen people might seem, according to the usual force of λοιπός, 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 ἔθνη. Besides λοιπάς certainly implies a closer connexion than ἄλλας. If we had ὡς 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 καθάπερ αὐτὰς τὰς γραφάς. We have a parallel use of λοιπός in Sir. *prol.* αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι 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. 4[16], 1 Th. 5[27]) as well as the lessons from the O.T.

Though γραφαί 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. 54[1], a quotation from Mk. 2[17] is introduced in the words καὶ ἑτέρα δὲ γραφὴ λέγει ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς; (*ib.* 13) Lk. 6[32. 35] 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 ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἐλδὰδ καὶ Μωδάτ, τοῖς προφητεύσασιν ἐν ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ.] What is considered by some to be the still earlier epistle of Barnabas introduces the words πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί (Mat. 22[14]) with ὡς γέγραπται. Can we then suppose that the books of the N.T. are to be understood here? If we give λοιπάς 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 γραφή, 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 λοιπάς), 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 *l.c.* notices that, while ἱερὰ γράμματα (from which γραμματεύς is derived)

Digitized by Google

Supposing, then, that τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς 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^{3-6}, 19^{3-10}, Lk. 9^{54-56}, 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 ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν.] The preposition denotes the end or result of the action στρεβλοῦσιν, as in Heb. 9^{13} ἁγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα, Joh. 11^{4} αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἔστι πρὸς θάνατον, 2 Cor. 4^{6} ὁ Θεὸς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμόν, 2 Th. 3^{8} ἐργαζόμενοι πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα, 1 Joh. 5^{16} δώσει ζωὴν τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον. For the combination ἰδίαν αὐτῶν cf. Acts 24^{23} μηδένα κωλύειν τῶν ἰδίων αὐτοῦ ὑπηρετεῖν αὐτῷ, Tit. 1^{12} εἶπέν τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης, Dem. 1244. 24 ἴσως οὐκ ἂν ἠδίκησε διὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἴδιον, Theog. 440 τὸν αὐτοῦ ἴδιον νοῦν, cf. above *v.* 3. For ἀπώλειαν cf. above 2^{1}.

17. **ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, προγινώσκοντες.**] This resumes the exhortation of ver. 14 after the digression on St. Paul's teaching, replacing the phrase ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες by the stronger προγινώσκοντες '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^{6} ἐκείνη ἡ νὺξ προεγνώσθη πατράσιν ἡμῶν.

φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ . . . ἐκπέσητε.] 'Be on your guard, in order that you may not fall away,' cf. Plut. *Mor.* p. 231 C οὐ φυλάξῃ συνεχῶς γελοιάζων, ὅπως μὴ γελοῖος γένῃ; Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 37 φυλάττου ὅπως μὴ ἐλάττους τὰς βοῦς ποιήσῃς, Job 36^{21} φύλαξαι μὴ πράξῃς ἄτοπα, Sir. 22^{11} φύλαξαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἵνα μὴ κόπον ἔχῃς.

τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες.] For ἀθέσμων see n. on 2^{7}; for πλάνῃ note on 2^{18}, Jude *v.* 11; for συναπαχθέντες Gal. 2^{13} (of the weak compliance of Peter and Barnabas) καὶ Β. συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει, Rom. 12^{16} τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι (in a good sense).

ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ.] Cf. Gal. 5^{4} τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε, see n. on James 1^{11} where it has a different sense. στηριγμός here only in N.T., found also in Isa. 3^{1}, Symm., in the sense of 'support,' and in Diod. i. 81, Plut. *Mor.* 76 D of the apparent 'stations' of the planets. See n. on ἀστήρικτοι 2^{14}, 3^{16}, and στηρίζω 1^{12} above.

18. **αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι.**] In early Greek αὐξάνω is only transitive, like *augeo*, and this use is found in 1 Cor. 3^{6} Ἀπολλὼς ἐπότισεν, ἀλλὰ ὁ Θεὸς ηὔξανεν, 2 Cor. 9^{10} (God) αὐξήσει τὰ γεννήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν: the passive is also found in 2 Cor. 10^{15} αὐξανομένης τῆς πίστεως, Col. 1^{10} καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1 Pet. 2^{2} ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν, Mt. 13^{32}, Mk. 4^{8}. The more common use in the N.T. is the intransitive, of which we have exx. in Mt. 6^{28}, Lk. 1^{80}, 2^{40}, Joh. 3^{30}, Acts 6^{7}, 7^{17}, 12^{24}, 19^{20}, Eph. 4^{15}, and here, besides the form αὔξω in Eph. 2^{21}, Col. 2^{19}. So Aristotle combines the passive and the intransitive use in *Anal. Post.* i. 13. p. 78 *b* 5 εἰ γὰρ τὸ

is used of holy scripture in 2 Tim. 3^{15}, γράμματα by itself is often used of writings generally, as in Luke $16^{6,7}$, Acts 28^{21}, 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.

Digitized by Google

αὐξανόμενον οὕτω σφαιροειδές, αὐξάνει δ' ἡ σελήνη κ.τ.λ. For the thought we may compare 1 Pet. 2^2 τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν and Eph. 4^{15} αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή. The writer here repeats the prayer of 1^2. It seems better to take χάριτι 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 χάριτι, and an objective force as regards γνῶσις.

καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] A repetition of 2^{20} except that γνώσει here takes the place of ἐπιγνώσει 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 1^6 and Appendix on ἐπίγνωσις.

αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα . . . αἰῶνος.] See 1 Pet. 5^{11} and notes on Jude *v.* 25; also Joh. 6^{51} ζήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 12^{34} 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 σταγὼν ὕδατος ἀπὸ θαλάσσης . . . οὕτως ὀλίγα ἔτη 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 γεγέννηκά σε, where Alf. quotes Philo i. p. 554 σήμερόν ἐστιν ὁ ἀπέραντος καὶ ἀδιεξίτητος αἰών; see his whole note.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX

TO

SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

ἐπίγνωσις.

Lightfoot commenting on Col. 1^9 (*αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ*) says 'the compound *ἐπίγνωσις* is an advance upon *γνῶσις*, denoting a larger and more thorough knowledge. So Chrysostom here, *ἔγνωτε, ἀλλὰ δεῖ τι καὶ ἐπιγνῶναι, cf.* Justin M. *Dial.* 3, p. 221 A *ἡ παρέχουσα αὐτῶν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ τῶν θείων γνῶσιν, ἔπειτα τῆς τούτων θειότητος καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἐπίγνωσιν.* So too St. Paul himself contrasts *γινώσκειν, γνῶσις*, with *ἐπιγινώσκειν, ἐπίγνωσις*, as the partial with the complete in two passages, Rom. $1^{21.28}$ *γόντες τὸν Θεὸν οὐχ ὡς Θεὸν ἐδόξασαν . . . οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει*, 1 Cor. 13^{12} . . . Hence also *ἐπίγνωσις* is used especially of the knowledge of God and of Christ, as being the perfection of knowledge.' Again, on Philem. 6 *ὅπως ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου ἐνεργὴς γένηται ἐν ἐπιγνώσει 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 *ἐπιγινώσκειν* is chiefly used in the sense of 'recognition' and holds that *ἐπί* 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. *ἐπιγινώσκω*, except where it is used in the sense of recognize, seems not to differ from *γινώσκω*. The phrase *ἐπίγνωσις Θεοῦ* occurs in Prov. 2^5, Hos. 4^1, 6^6, but *γνῶσις Θεοῦ* in Wisdom 2^{13}, 14^{22}. In Hos. 4^6 *ὡμοιώθη* (A.V. 'are destroyed') *ὁ λαός μου ὡς οὐκ ἔχων γνῶσιν· ὅτι σὺ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀπώσω κἀγὼ ἀπώσομαί σε.* 'In the Gospels and Acts it is found in the sense of "perceiving," "discerning," "recognizing" just as in classical authors': where we have *γινώσκει* in Lk. 10^{22} (*οὐδεὶς γινώσκει*

Digitized by Google

τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱός) we have οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱόν 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 ἐπίγνωσις 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. 28. 32], Dr. Robinson says 'the difference, if there be one, is that ἐπίγνωσις is more naturally used of knowledge of a particular point.' I must say, I think L.'s the more natural interpretation: γνόντες 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) οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, and (*v.* 32) τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες, 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] ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην: all that Dr. Robinson will allow is that ἐπιγνώσομαι 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 ἐπίγνωσις 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 ὁ μελλων κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν λόγον τῆς εὐσεβείας παιδενέσθω πρὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὴν περὶ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου γνῶσιν, τὴν περὶ υἱοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐπίγνωσιν, τὴν περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου 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 ἐπίγνωσις as a word of fuller sound than γνῶσις') 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, ἐπίγνωσις, 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 κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν 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 (εὐφυῶς κείμενον πρὸς τὰς τῶν προειρημένων

Digitized by Google

τόπων περιφάσεις), and in the Clementine passages referred to. We should infer that the phrase κατὰ περίφασιν must mean 'on a broad general view,' and this seems to suit its use in Clem., though Dindorf reads κατὰ περίφρασιν 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 τιμᾶσθαι κατὰ περίφασιν πρὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὸν δημιουργὸν Θεὸν ᾐνίξατο, κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν δὲ δεῖν δι' υἱοῦ 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 οὗτοι οὖν οἱ ἀνοιγόμενοι τυφλῶν ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡ δι' υἱοῦ ἐπίγνωσίς ἐστι τοῦ πατρός, ἡ τῆς περιφάσεως (MS. περιφράσεως) 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 περιφράσεως would be here unmeaning. The second passage is *Str.* vi. p. 759 ὅτι δὲ οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν ἴσασι τὸν Θεόν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ περίφασιν Ἑλλήνων οἱ δοκιμώτατοι, Πέτρος ἐν τῷ Κηρύγματι λέγει . . . τοῦτον τὸν Θεὸν σέβεσθε μὴ κατὰ τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ὡς δηλονότι τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν σεβόντων Θεὸν καὶ τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι δοκίμων, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν παντελῆ τὴν δι' υἱοῦ 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 ἐπί, 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 ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι (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 περίφασιν.

Digitized by Google

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 ἐπιγινώσκειν, 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 γνῶσις 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, ἐπιποθεῖν, ἐπεργασία 'encroachment upon,' ἐπιγαμία 'marrying into,' ἐπαλλάσσω 'to interchange,' 'to be closely associated'; and that we pass easily from this to the intensive force which we find in Menander's ἐπαβελτερώσας τόν ποτ' ὄντ' ἀβέλτερον 'to befool even more,' ἐπαγλαΐζω 'to grace still more,' ἐπανορθόω, ἐπαυξάνω, ἐπεντείνω, ἐπεξήγησις, ἐπιβεβαίωσις. This intensive force seems also to derive support from another use of ἐπί where it connotes addition, repetition, something over and above, as in ἐπιδειπνέω, ἐπιδόρπιος, ἐπαιτέω, ἐπαμπέχω, ἐπανερωτάω, ἐπαπορέω, ἐπιμανθάνω, ἐπιχορηγέω, ἐπισυγγράφω, ἐπιδιατάσσω (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 δόντα ἀποτετυφλωμένοι, μηδ' ἐπιγινώσκοντες τὸν εὐεργέτην, i. 9. 11 ἐπιγνόντες τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς συγγένειαν, i. 29. 59 'Bring me Caesar without his trappings, and I am quite at my ease': ὅταν δὲ μετὰ τούτων ἔλθῃ . . . τί ἄλλο ἢ ἐπέγνωκα τὸν κύριον ὡς ὁ δραπέτης; iv. 8. 20 τί κακόν, ἐν οἷς ἐποίουν ἐπιγινώσκεσθαι 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,' μηδένα τῶν δικαζομένων καὶ δικαιολογούντων ἐπιγίνωσκε ἀλλ' αὐτὴν τὴν δίκην, the sense seems to be 'give heed to,' 'to note.'

Digitized by Google

φθείρω and φθορά.

The characteristic mark of words belonging to the root φθι, of which these, along with φθίω and φθίνω, are the most important, as distinguished from such words as κτείνω, καίνω, σφάττω, φονεύω, ὄλλυμι, θανατόω, 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 φθινύθω and φθίσις, but φθίνω is used also of violent death, as in Aesch. *S. c. Theb.* 970 πρὸς φίλου ἔφθισο, καὶ φίλον ἔκτανες, *Od.* iv. 741 μεμάασιν Ὀδυσσῆος φθῖσαι γόνον, and so φθίμενοι and φθιτοί 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 σῖτον, τὰ δένδρα; especially of moral injury, as in Xen. *Mem.* i. 5. 3 κακουργότατόν ἐστι μὴ μόνον τὸν οἶκον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν φθείρειν, Plato *Legg.* xii. 958 c πόλιν καὶ νόμους φθείρων ζημιούσθω; then of bribery, and seduction, of debasing the quality of anything, etc.

φθορά 'rottenness' has a similar range of meaning. Its original force is seen in Philo M. ii. p. 96 ἐναπέθηγσκε τὰ γένη τῶν ἰχθύων ἅπαντα, ἅτε τῆς ζωτικῆς δυνάμεως εἰς φθοροποιὸν μεταβαλούσης, ὡς δυσωδίας πάντα ἀναπεπλῆσθαι. Hence it is generally defined as ἡ πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον 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, φθορεύς 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, συμφωνία μὲν οὖν ἁρμόζει προσευχῇ, κοινωνία δὲ φθορᾶς λύει τὴν ἔντευξιν, on which Clement comments οὐ γάρ, ὥς τινες ἐξηγήσαντο, δέσιν γυναικὸς πρὸς ἄνδρα τὴν σαρκὸς πρὸς τὴν φθορὰν ἐπιπλοκὴν μηνύεσθαι ὑποτοπητέον, τῶν γὰρ ἄντικρυς διαβόλῳ προσαπτόντων τὴν τοῦ γάμου εὕρεσιν ἀθέων ἀνθρώπων ἐπίνοιαν κατηγορεῖ· καὶ κινδυνεύει βλασφημεῖσθαι ὁ νομοθέτης.

In the LXX. φθείρω occurs in the sense 'to kill' in Wisd. 16[5. 27] δήγμασι ὄφεων ἐφθείροντο . . . ὑπὸ πυρὸς φθειρόμενον: in the sense to 'destroy' or 'devastate' in Exod. 10[15] (the swarm of locusts) ἐκάλυψε τὴν ὄψιν τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐφθάρη ἡ γῆ, 2 Sam. 20[20] Joab denies that he seeks to destroy a city, 1 Chron. 20[1] ἔφθειραν τὴν χώραν, Isa. 24[4] ἐφθάρη ἡ οἰκουμένη: to 'injure,' 'mar,' 'spoil' in Lev. 19[27] φθ. τὴν ὄψιν τοῦ πώγωνος 'to *mar* the corners of the beard,' Deut. 34[7] 'natural force *abated*,' Jer. 13[9] φθ. τὴν ὕβριν Ἰούδα 'mar the pride of Judah.' In Gen. 6[11] ἐφθάρη ἡ γῆ is used in a moral sense of the corruption of the inhabitants of the earth.

Digitized by Google

φθορά is used of destruction in Ps. 103[4] *τὸν λυτρούμενον ἐκ φθορᾶς τὴν ζωήν σου*, Micah 2[10] *διεφθάρητε φθορᾷ*, Isa. 24[3] *φθορᾷ φθαρήσεται ἡ γῆ*; of being worn out by toil Exod. 18[18] *φθορᾷ καταφθαρήσῃ*; of moral corruption in Wisdom 14[12] *εὕρεσις εἰδώλων φθορὰ ζωῆς*.

The strengthened forms *διαφθείρω* 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] *φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρῆσθ' ὁμιλίαι κακαί*, bad company is injurious to character. So 2 Cor. 11[3] *φοβοῦμαι μή πως, ὡς ὁ ὄφις ἐξηπάτησεν Εὔαν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἁπλότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν* lest your thoughts should be seduced from the simple faith in Christ, 2 Cor. 7[2] *οὐδένα ἠδικήσαμεν, οὐδένα ἐφθείραμεν, οὐδένα ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν*. In the last passage Alford understands it of outward injury 'we ruined no man'; but if we compare Tit. 2[7] *παρεχόμενος ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀφθορίαν* and 1 Thess. 2[3-8], where the apostle protests that his teaching was not *ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας* or *ἐν δόλῳ*, not *ἐν λόγῳ κολακίας οὔτε προφάσει πλεονεξίας*, 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[22] *τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν φθειρόμενον 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[16] *εἰ καὶ ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται ἀλλ' ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν ἀνακαινοῦται*. But, again, it may refer to moral corruption as in 2 Cor. 11[3].' 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[2] *ἔκρινεν τὴν πόρνην τὴν μεγάλην ἥτις ἔφθειρεν τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῆς*, the phrase *φθ. τ. γῆν* is used of moral corruption, as in Gen. 6[11], cf. Apoc. 11[18]. In 1 Cor. 3[16-17] *οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν οἰκεῖ; εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ Θεός· ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς*, 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] *ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός ἐστιν;* 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 *ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται* and the imitation in 2 Pet. 2[12] *οὗτοι δὲ, ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα γεγεννημένα εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν, ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται*. The former is translated in A.V. 'in those they corrupt themselves,' in R.V. 'in those things are they destroyed' (margin 'corrupted').

Digitized by Google

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. $15^{42.\ 50}$, *σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ*; cf. Col. 2^{22} *ἅ ἐστιν εἰς φθοράν* 'meats are destined for decomposition'; Gal. 6^{8} *ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, 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. 1^{4} *ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*, which may be compared with Eph. 4^{22} already discussed, *τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον 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 κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται 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}, $2^{18.\ 19}$. Rom. $8^{6.\ 7.\ 10.\ 13}$), a bondage from which he can only escape by becoming partaker of the divine nature (2 Pet. 1^{4}, Rom. $8^{13\ f.}$). 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. $2^{14\ f.}$ '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.

Digitized by Google

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 *Weltschmerz*, 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^{33} *ὅπου κλέπτης οὐκ ἐγγίζει οὐδὲ σὴς διαφθείρει* 'corrupts,' 2 Cor. 4^{16} *εἰ καὶ ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται* 'decays,' 'is being wasted away'; Apoc. 8^{9} *τὸ τρίτον τῶν πλοίων διεφθάρησαν* 'were destroyed'; Apoc. 11^{18} *διαφθεῖραι τοὺς διαφθείροντας τὴν γῆν*, 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. Apoc. 19^{2}). The only case in which the word means simply moral corruption is 1 Tim. 6^{5} *ἀνθρώπων διεφθαρμένων τὸν νοῦν*. *Διαφθορά* occurs several times in Acts 13 in reference to the quotation *ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν*, denoting physical corruption.

Another derivative, *ἀφθορία* occurs in Tit. 2^{7} *παρεχόμενος ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀφθορίαν* of moral incorruptness.

More important are the words *φθαρτός* and *ἄφθαρτος* which are often used in the N.T. to distinguish the perishable from the imperishable, *e.g.* Rom. 1^{23} *ἤλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, 1 Cor. 9^{25} *ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν ἵνα φθαρτὸν στέφανον λάβωσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἄφθαρτον*, *ib.* $15^{53, 54}$ *δεῖ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν*, 1 Pet. 1^{18} *οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε*, *ib.* 1^{23} *ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς, ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου*. In Rom. 1^{23} and 1 Th. 1^{17} *ἄφθαρτος* 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 *ἀφθαρσια* is used of the life to come in 1 Cor. 15^{42} *ἐγείρεται ἐν ἀφθαρ-*

Digitized by Google

σίᾳ, Rom. 2^{7} *ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσιν*, 1 Cor. 15^{50} *οὐδὲ ἡ φθορὰ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν κληρονομεῖ*, 2 Tim. 1^{10} *καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον, φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν κ. ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*. In Eph. 6^{24} it is questioned how *ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπώντων τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν* 'I.X. *ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ* 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 ὁ κύριος, ἵνα πνέῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀφθαρσίαν*, where Lightfoot says the idea of *incorruptibility* must be prominent here, as the preceding *φθείρῃ* requires, though the idea of *immortality* may not be absent. In § 16 we have the phrase *οἱ οἰκοφθόροι βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν* and *ἐὰν πίστιν φθείρῃ*, both alluding to 1 Cor. $3^{16.17}$ *οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστε... εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ 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.

Digitized by Google

SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

PARAPHRASE AND COMMENTS.

Address (*v.* 1).

Symeon 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.

Συμεὼν Πέτρος.

The name Πέτρος is a translation of the Aramaic Kephas, as Christ of Messiah, Didymus of Thomas, Ζηλωτὴς of Καναναῖος. The form Σίμων is hellenized from Συμεών, like Paulus from Saulus; compare such forms as Disraeli, 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, Συμεὼν 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 Ἀνδρέας.

[2] Κηφᾶς stands, with its interpretation, in John 1[42]; it is also found alone four times in 1 Cor. and four times in 2 Cor. The only passage besides this in which Συμεών is used by itself of Peter is St. James' speech in Acts 15[14]. Σίμων stands alone in Matt. once; in Mk. ch. i. four times (before the name Peter had been given), and once in 14[37], where Jesus λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Σίμων καθεύδεις; Luke has it ten times; John twice in ch. i., thrice in ch. xxi., where the penitent Apostle is thrice addressed as Σίμων 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. Σίμων Πέτρος is found three times in Matt. (twice with ὁ λεγόμενος); 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. 151 foll.

Digitized by Google

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 engrafted into the good olive-tree. Such an assumption seems to be rebuked in the words which follow. God has no favourites: He allots 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 ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν 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^{14}) 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 $8^{14\,f.}$).

Does the statement here made hold good in the present day? Have all Christians *πίστιν ἰσότιμον*? Was the faith of the doubting father *ἰσότιμος* with that of the Syro-phœnician woman? Is that of any ordinary Christian *ἰσότιμος* with the faith of an à 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 δικαιοσύνῃ 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.

Digitized by Google

SALUTATION (*vv.* 2–4).

Grace and peace be multiplied upon you through the knowledge of [God and of Jesus][1] 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.[2] 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 δικαιοσύνῃ) 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 καλέσαντος 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. $1^{1\text{-}7}$, Ephes. $1^{1\text{-}6}$, in both of which the name Jesus Christ occurs four times in the first three verses, and in Rom. $1^{1\text{-}7}$.

[1] See Introduction on the Text.

[2] It certainly is so in the Vulgate: 'Gratia vobis et pax adimpleatur in agnitione 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.

Digitized by Google

χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ.[1]

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 *γνῶσις* and *ἐπίγνωσις* see Appendix.

Digitized by Google

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,[1] 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.'

Digitized by Google

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,

Digitized by Google

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 τοῦ 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

Digitized by Google

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.[1]

τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν (*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 ὠφέλιμός ἐστιν, ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχουσα ζωῆς τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης*, 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 *ζωή* occurs in the N.T., we shall find that, in the great majority of these, *ζωή* 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^{63} '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^{38}. Sometimes it is spoken of as 'the real life,' 1 Tim. 6^{19} *ἡ ὄντως ζωή*; 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. 3^3 'Our life is hid with Christ in God,' *ib.* *v.* 4 'Christ our life'; sometimes it is connected with the Spirit, Gal. 6^8 '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}.

Digitized by Google

eternal life,' Rom. 8^6 '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. 18^8, $19^{17, 29}$; 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.

Digitized by Google

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).

τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ (*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. 12[32] (also 3[14], 8[28]), 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. 12[23] ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, and 13[31], where the departure of Judas to complete the work of betrayal is followed by the saying νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη 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 θρησκεία 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.

δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα 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

Digitized by Google

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.

ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως (*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. $4^{12\text{-}16}$ '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,[1] 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 φθορά 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.

Digitized by Google

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 ἀλλὰ δεκτικὸν ἀμφοτέρων ἵνα, εἰ ῥέψῃ ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς ἀθανασίας τηρήσας τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, μισθὸν κομίσηται παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀθανασίαν καὶ γένηται θεός κ.τ.λ., and a little above οὔτε οὖν φύσει θνητὸς ἐγένετο οὔτε ἀθάνατος. εἰ γὰρ ἀθάνατον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πεποιήκει, θεὸν αὐτὸν πεποιήκει. This idea may have originated in the language used in 1 Tim. 6^{16} ὁ μόνος ἔχων 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 ἀθάνατος ὁ Θεός· οὐσίᾳ γὰρ ἀθάνατος, οὐ μετουσίᾳ . . . τοῖς δὲ ἀγγέλοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις αὐτὸς τὴν ἀθανασίαν δεδώρηται. Compare the opposition in 1 Cor. 15^{53} δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, *ib.* v. 42 σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, ἐγείρεται ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ, Wisdom ii. 23 f. ὁ Θεὸς ἔκτισε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ, καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ἰδιότητος (= θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως) ἐποίησεν αὐτόν· φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, *ib.* vi. 19 ἀφθαρσία ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ Θεοῦ. God Himself is called ἄφθαρτος in Rom. 1^{23}, 1 Th. 1^{17} and the Christian inheritance ἄφθαρτος καὶ ἀμίαντος in 1 Pet. 1^{4}.

This corruption which pervades the world is the result of ἐπιθυμία; compare Gal. 6^{8} '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^{12}) attributes 'the reign of death' in the world to the entrance of sin (*i.e.* as St. James says 1^{15} of fully developed ἐπιθυμία) through one man, see Wisdom 2^{23} quoted above; and, again, declares the same truth more generally in the phrase τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος (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, ἐλπίς, 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 ὑπομονή as one link in the chain of graces, but this is far from covering all the

Digitized by Google

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. $5^{22 f.}$ *χαρά, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη, πραΰτης*, 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 *φιλαδελφία* (1^{22}, 2^{17}, 3^{8}), and *ὑπομονή* (2^{20}), a number of other graces, such as obedience (*ὑπακοή* 1^{2}, $2^{14.22}$), joy (*χαρὰ ἀνεκλάλητος καὶ δεδοξασμένη* 1^{8}), sobriety (*νήφειν* 1^{13}, 4^{17}, 5^{8}), holiness (*ἁγιότης* 1^{14}, $2^{5.9}$), fear (*φόβος* 1^{17}), meekness (*πραΰτης* $3^{4.15}$), compassion (*εὐσπλαγχνία* 3^{8}), humility (*ταπεινόφρονες* 3^{8}, and especially $5^{5.6}$), moderation (*σωφροσύνη* 4^{7}), hospitality (*φιλόξενοι* 4^{9}); 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, ἀνδρεία, δικαιοσύνη*? It may be said perhaps that *ἀρετή* and *ὑπομονή* cover the ground of *ἀνδρεία*, that *ἐγκράτεια* represents *σωφροσύνη*, however imperfectly, and that *ἀγάπη*, 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 *οὐ τὰ νῦν σάββατα ἐμοὶ δεκτά, ἀλλὰ ὃ πεποίηκα, ἐν ᾧ, καταπαύσας τὰ πάντα, ἀρχὴν ἡμέρας ὀγδόης ποιήσω, ὅ ἐστιν, ἄλλου κόσμου ἀρχήν. διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανούς*, 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), *ib.* vi. p. 794, § 108 *οἱ τοιοῦτοι καταπαύσουσιν ἐν ὄρει ἁγίῳ θεοῦ . . . οἱ μὴ καταμείναντες ἐν ἑβδομάδι ἀναπαύσεως, ἀγαθοεργίᾳ δὲ θείας ἐξομοιώσεως εἰς ὀγδοαδικῆς εὐεργεσίας κληρονομίαν ὑπερκύψαντες, ἀκορέστου θεωρίας εἰλικρινεῖ ἐποπτείᾳ προσανέχοντες*, *ib.* vi. pp. 811 f. § 140, *Str.* iv. p. 636, § 158 *τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἡ ἀνάπαυσις θρησκεύεται, τῇ δὲ ὀγδόῃ ἵλασμὸν προσφέρει*,[1] *ib.* § 159 *εἴτε ἡ ἀπλανὴς χώρα ἡ πλησιάζουσα τῷ νοητῷ κόσμῳ ὀγδοὰς λέγοιτο . . . ἐξαναδῦναι γενέσεώς τε καὶ ἁμαρτίας χρῆναι λέγει τὸν γνωστικόν*, *ib.* p. 637, § 162 *Βασιλείδης δικαιοσύνην τε καὶ εἰρήνην ὑπολαμβάνει ἐν ὀγδοάδι μένειν*. That the writer of 2 Pet. regarded the ogdoad as a mystic number may perhaps be inferred from a comparison between 2^{5}, where he speaks of *ὄγδοον Νῶε*, and Jude *v.* 14, where Enoch is described as the seventh from Adam.

[1] Ezek. $44^{26.27}$.

Digitized by Google

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,[1] *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 3^{18} he exhorts his readers to grow (αὐξάνετε) in grace (which may be regarded as summing up the list) and knowledge (γνώσει equivalent to ἐπιγνώσει here). Cf. Eph. $4^{12f.}$, especially *v.* 15 ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξησώμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, 1 Pet. 2^{2} ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξήσητε, 2 Th. 1^{3} ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καὶ πλεονάζει ἡ ἀγάπη.

λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ (*v.* 9).

So Moses warns the Israelites (Deut. 4^{23}) προσέχετε ὑμῖν, μὴ ἐπιλάθησθε τὴν διαθήκην Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἣν διέθετο πρὸς ὑμᾶς: cf. 2 Kings 17^{38}.

βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι (*v.* 10).

So, in other epistles, the elect are urged to make their election sure: as in Eph. 4^{1} παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε, *ib.* 6^{18} ἀναλάβετε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἵνα δυνηθῆτε . . . ἅπαντα ἐργασάμενοι στῆναι, 1 Cor. 9^{27} ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα . . . μήπως ἄλλοις κηρύξας αὐτὸς ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι, Col. 3^{12} ἐνδύσασθε οὖν ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμῶν, 1 Th. 5^{19} τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε compared with 1^{4} εἰδότες τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν, 1 Pet. 1^{17} ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε compared with $1^{1,2}$ ἐκλεκτοῖς . . . κατὰ πρόγνωσιν, and 2 Pet. 3^{17} φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ. The Vulgate adds 'per bona opera certam . . . faciatis.'

[1] See above on πληθυνθείη in *v.* 2, and below on αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει, 3^{18}.

Digitized by Google

THE WRITER'S PROMISE (*vv.* 12–15).

Therefore, that you may escape the dangers and inherit the blessings named, it will be my care[1] *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 παραδοθείσῃ. If we retain παρούσῃ 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 ἐστηριγμένους (*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 from[2] *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.

Digitized by Google

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 παρουσία 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 $3^{4.17}$ 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 1^{4}, and in the eternal kingdom of 1^{11}: this is the Day of God which scoffers deny ($3^{4f.}$), but which should continually be in the minds of all true disciples, urging them on to greater diligence in His service ($3^{11.12}$). The preaching of the coming of the Lord with power, referred to in 1^{16}, must surely be of the same nature as the preaching of St. Paul at Athens (Acts $17^{30f.}$), '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 παρασχὼν πᾶσιν, ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν 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.'

Digitized by Google

ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ (*v.* 19).

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 παιδαγωγός 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 ἐπιλύσεως 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 fulfilments 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

Digitized by Google

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 ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως; that is to say, what the historian relates of Babylon is to be understood of Babylon only. But what Prophecy says of Babylon is κοινῆς ἐπιλύσεως; 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 Prophets 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 Lindsey 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.'

Digitized by Google

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 foretellers of blessing for generations yet to come' (pp. 63, 68, 69).[1]

ON FALSE TEACHERS (CH. II).

THE FALSE TEACHERS OF THE NEW DISPENSATION ANSWER TO THE FALSE PROPHETS OF THE OLD (*vv.* 1–3).

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 themselves 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.

δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται (*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. 1[6] γινώσκει Κύριος ὁδὸν δικαίων, 119[27L] ὁδὸν δικαιωμάτων σου συνέτισόν με . . . ὁδὸν ἀδικίας ἀπόστησον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ . . .

[1] A valuable book on this subject is Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy* followed by a complete bibliography, of which an English translation was published in 1900 by Messrs. Clark.

Digitized by Google

ὁδὸν ἀληθείας ἠρετισάμην, Isa. 26[7. 8] ὁδὸς εὐσεβῶν εὐθεῖα . . . ὁδὸς Κυρίου κρίσις, 35[8], Jer. 6[16], 10[23] οἶδα, Κύριε, ὅτι οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἡ ὁδὸς αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ ἀνὴρ πορεύσεται καὶ κατορθώσει πορείαν αὐτοῦ, especially 21[8] ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δέδωκα πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θανάτου, from which are derived the teaching as to the broad and narrow way of Mt. 7[13. 14], and the two ways of the Didache 1–5 : cf. Barn. 18–24, *Constit. Apost.* vii. 1–18. In the Acts we read of the 'way of salvation' (16[17]), the 'way of God' (18[26]), and 'the way' simply, meaning the Christian life (9[2], 19[9. 23]). Above all, Jesus speaks of Himself as the Way in Joh. 14[6] ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή· οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δι' ἐμοῦ, on which see Hort's commentary in the first of his lectures on *The Way, the Truth, the Life*, and compare Heb. 10[19. 20]. In like manner the verbs πορεύομαι (Exod. 16[4], Lev. 26[3], Deut. 5[33], Ps. 86[11], Isa. 2[3], Acts 9[31]), περιπατῶ (Rom. 13[12], 1. Cor. 7[17], 2. Cor. 5[7], 12[18], Gal. 5[16], Eph. 5[2], 1 Joh. 2[6]) are used of the Christian life.

Examples of Judgment joined with Mercy[1] (*vv.* 4–10).

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 overthrown 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 wearied as he was with the profligate 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.

Digitized by Google

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[1] *is to spend the day in wanton living. They are spots and blemishes in the Church [which should be without spot or wrinkle], revelling in their deceits when admitted to your love-feasts. Their eyes betray their adulterous thoughts, insatiate of sin, while they allure unstable souls, having a heart practised in covetousness. 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, παρανομία], when his ass [by a παρανομία of another kind] spoke with human voice, resisting the infatuation of the prophet.*

δόξας οὐ 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 ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες, συνευωχούμενοι ἀφόβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες, on which à Lapide comments as follows: 'Primitus Christiani in symbolum caritatis, post Eucharistiam celebrabant convivia, communia tam pauperibus quam divitibus, 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 φιλίτια'; and Estius on 2 Pet. ii. 13: 'Vox ἀγάπη jam inde a tempore apostolorun usurpata fuit pro conviviis Christianorum inter se; quod ad ea pauperes advocando caritatem in eos exercerent.' This explanation is supported by the Vulgate rendering of ἀγάπη both here (in conviviis luxuriantes) and in Jude (in epulis suis maculae). 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 ἀγάπη twice, ἀγαπητοί twice, and ἠγαπημένοι once, in the ordinary sense. He uses the plurals δόξαι (*v.* 8) and αἰσχύνας (*v.* 13) for the singulars. We may therefore translate his words in *v.* 12 as follows: 'Ils sont des écueils 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 ἀγάπην for ἡδονήν.

Digitized by Google

'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 *ἀγάπαι*'? The *ἀγάπη*, it is evident, gives an opportunity of feasting, in a manner which causes scandal (*σπιλάδες*). 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 2^{42}, *ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς*, from the Judaistic source in 2^{46}, *καθ' ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, κλῶντές τε κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον, μετελάμβανον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ ἀφελότητι καρδίας*. The former 'parle de la fraction du pain comme d'un acte purement religieux et la place sur le même rang que la *διδαχή* 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 Ç 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 ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον (*v.* 16).

The writer takes literally the narrative in Num. $22^{21\text{-}35}$, and emphasizes its miraculous character by thus paraphrasing the words in *v.* 28 *ἤνοιξεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ στόμα τῆς ὄνου*. 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

Digitized by Google

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.'[1] 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 ($24^{3f.}$) 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

[1] See Dr. J. H. Bernard's article on 'Miracles' in Hastings' *D. of B.*

Digitized by Google

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 Athene, invisible to Telemachus, is visible to Odysseus and the dogs, *καί ῥ' οὐκ ὐλάοντο, κνυζηθμῷ δ' ἐτέρωσε διὰ σταθμοῖο φόβηθεν.* 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 *Il.* 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

Digitized by Google

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.'[1] 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 *μάντις*, 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 τοῖς οἰωνοῖς* (xxiv. i.), to whom an ass speaks.'

Modern criticism distinguishes three main sources of the narrative: the Elohistic, 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:[2] 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, *l.c.* 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.

Digitized by Google

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 ἰδίας 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. $17^{26\text{-}30}$.

Digitized by Google

ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; (*v.* 4).

The writer may have had in his mind such passages as Isa. 5[19] (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. 17[15], Behold they say unto me Where is the word of the Lord? let it come now; Ezek. 12[22], What is that proverb ye have in the land of Israel, saying, the days are prolonged, and every vision faileth? *ib.* 12[27], 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 ἔλεγον). What is the command of the Saviour here referred to? Perhaps such passages as Mt. 24[42], Watch therefore, for ye know not on what day your Lord cometh, *ib.* 25[13], which we find repeated in 1 Th. 5[2-10] by St. Paul, and in Apoc. 3[3. 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 Word[1] *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,

> '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 δι' ὃν for δι' ὃν.

Digitized by Google

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*;[1] 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 *ἀγένητον καὶ ἀνώλεθρον*; (2*a*) that of the Epicureans who held it to be *γενητὸν καὶ φθαρτόν*; (2*b*) that of the Stoics who held it to be *φθαρτὸς κατὰ διακόσμησιν, ἀΐδιος δέ* as regards its essence; (3) that of Plato who held it to be *γενητὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτον*.

Digitized by Google

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 perchance we take no interest. Hereafter our acquaintanceship 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 predestined. 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.

Digitized by Google

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, Irenaeus, 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 *συντέλεια 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.

Digitized by Google

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[29], 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

Digitized by Google

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 ἐπίγνωσις 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.[1] 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.

Digitized by Google

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.*

σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν (*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

Digitized by Google

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 *περίφρασις* may mean *ungenaue Bezeichnung, ungenaue Kenntniss*. "Doch bin ich nicht sicher ob ich richtig entschieden habe. In meine Ausgabung (3. 59. 2) ist '*περιφρασιν* L' Druckfehler statt '*περιφασιν* L'." The word also occurs in *Str.* v. p. 730 (the heathen acknowledge a divine Creator and Governour) *τὰ ἀκόλουθα τούτοις, εἰ μὴ κατηχηθεῖεν πρὸς ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἐπιστάμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐδ' αὐτόν, ὅπως νοεῖσθαι πέφυκεν, τὸν θεόν, μόνον δέ, ὡς ἤδη πολλάκις εἰρήκαμεν, κατὰ περίφασιν* (Eus. *Pr. Ev.* xiii. 691 A *περίφρασιν*) *ἀληθῆ*. Here the phrase *κατὰ περίφασιν ἀληθῆ*, meaning 'a correct general view,' is opposed to *ὡς νοεῖσθαι πέφυκεν* instead of to *κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν*, of which the former may be regarded as a synonym. Dr. Gifford in his note on the passage of Eusebius cites for the reading *περίφρασιν*, Plut. *Mor.* 406 F *ἀπέπαυσε τὴν Πυθίαν ὁ θεὸς πυρικάους μὲν ὀνομάζουσαν τοὺς αὐτῆς πολίτας, ὀφιοβόρους δὲ τοὺς Σπαρτιάτας . . . ἀφελὼν τῶν χρησμῶν ἔπη καὶ γλώσσας καὶ περιφράσεις καὶ ἀσάφειαν*, and again, *ib.* 408 D, where the obscurities of the oracles are condemned, *πλάττειν περιφράσεις καὶ γλώσσας ἐπάγειν*. Here the word means simply a round-about, indirect way of speaking, such as *βίη Ἡρακληείη* for Heracles. A better example is that from Origen (*Sch. in Psalm.* iv, Lomm. xi. 431) *ἐὰν δὲ κατὰ περίφρασιν λάβῃ τις τὸν υἱὸν ἀνθρώπων ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* '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 περίφρασιν* took the place of the rare phrase *κατὰ περίφασιν*. If we are to change the latter, it would be better to read *κατ' ἐπίφασιν* 'on a surface view' as in Polybius xiv. 2. 9 *ὁ δὲ Πόπλιος κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἐπίφασιν ἐποίει τὸ παρακλήσιον* (*sc.* *ῥᾳθύμως διῆγε*), *κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα περὶ τὰς παρασκευὰς ἦν*, xxxi. 5. 3 (Antiochus showed great courtesy to the Roman ambassadors) *κατὰ τὴν ἐπίφασιν καίπερ οὐκ ὢν τῇ προαιρέσει τοιοῦτος*.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

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 signification.

b. ἀγαλλιασις: J. 24 ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει.
ἀγαπάω: 2 P. 2. 15 μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν, J. 1 τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις (*al.* ἡγιασμένοις), pp. 17 foll.
e. ἀγάπη: 2 P. 1. 7 ἐν τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην ἐπιχορηγήσατε, 2. 13 ἀγάπην (MSS. ἡδονὴν) ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν (*al.* ἀγάπαις), J. 2 ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη, *ib.* 21 ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε, *ib.* 12 ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες, pp. x, cxcvi, 200.
ἀγαπητός: 2 P. 1. 17 ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, 3. 15 ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφός, (voc.) ἀγαπητοί 2. P. 3. 1, 8, 14, 17, J. 3, 17, 20.
ἄγγελος: 2 P. 2. 4 ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, 2. 11 ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες, J. 6 ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν.
ἁγιάζω, see ἁγαπάω.
ἅγιος: 2 P. 1. 18 ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ, 1. 21 ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἅγιοι (*al.* ἀπὸ) Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, 2. 21 τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς, 3. 2 ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, 3. 11 ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ἁγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς, J. 14 ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ, 20 ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι, *ib.* ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, 3 (subst.) τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.
ἀγνοέω: 2 P. 2. 12 ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες.
ἀγοράζω: 2 P. 2. 1 τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι.
ἄγριος: J. 13 κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης.
Ἀδάμ: J. 14 ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνώχ.
ἀδελφός: 2 P. 1. 10 διὰ μᾶλλον, ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε, 3. 15 ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος, J. 1 Ἰούδας ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου.
ἀδικέω: 2 P. 2. 13 ἀδικούμενοι (*al.* κομούμενοι) μισθὸν ἀδικίας, p. lxvi.
ἀδικία: 2 P. 2. 13 and 15 μισθὸν ἀδικίας.
ἄδικος: 2 P. 2. 9 ἀδίκους εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν.
ἀεί: 2 P. 1. 12 ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν.

Digitized by Google

b. c. ἄθεσμος: 2 P. 2. 7 τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἀναστροφῆς, 3. 17 τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ.
b. e. ἀθετέω: J. 8 κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσι.
Αἴγυπτος: J. 5 λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας.
ἀΐδιος: J. 6 δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν.
αἵρεσις: 2 P. 2. 1 παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας.
αἰσχύνη: J. 13 κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας.
αἰών: 2 P. 2. 17 οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους [εἰς αἰῶνα] τετήρηται, 3. 18 εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, J. 13 οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται, 25 πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας (*al. add.* τῶν αἰώνων).
αἰώνιος: 2 P. 1. 11 τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου, J. 7 πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην, 21 εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
ἄκαρπος: 2 P. 1. 8 οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν . . . ἐπίγνωσιν, J. 12 δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα.
b. c. e. ἀκατάπαυστος: 2 P. 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας (*al.* ἀκαταπάστους), p. cxcvii.
ἀκοή: 2 P. 2. 8 βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ δίκαιος.
ἀκούω: 2 P. 1. 18 ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν.
ἀλήθεια: 2 P. 1. 12 ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ ἐστηριγμένους, 2. 2 ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται.
ἀληθής: 2 P. 2. 22 τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας.
ἀλλά: 2 P. 1. 16 οὐ σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες, ἐγνωρίσαμεν, ἀλλ' ἐπόπται γενηθέντες, 21 οὐ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου, 2. 4 οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ παρέδωκεν, 5 ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ Νῶε ἐφύλαξεν, 3. 9 οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ, *ib.* μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι, J. 6 ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας . . ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας, 9 οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας ἀλλὰ εἶπεν, pp. li, ci.
ἄλογος: 2 P. 2. 12 ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἅλωσιν, J. 10 ὅσα φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἐπίστανται.
b. c. ἅλωσις: 2 P. 2. 12 γεγεννημένα εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν.
c. d. ἀμαθής: 2 P. 3. 16 οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι.
ἁμαρτάνω: 2 P. 2. 4 ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο.
ἁμαρτία: 2 P. 1. 9 λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν (*al.* ἁμαρτημάτων), 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας.
ἁμαρτωλός: J. 15 ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.
ἀμελέω: 2 P. 1. 12 οὐκ ἀμελήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν (*al.* μελλήσω).
ἀμήν: 2 P. 3. 18 εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, ἀμήν (*om. al.*), J. 25 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας [τῶν αἰώνων], ἀμήν.
c. d. e. ἀμώμητος: 2 P. 3. 14 ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι.
c. e. ἄμωμος: J. 24 ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει.
ἀνάγκη: J. 3 ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι.
ἀναστρέφω: 2 P. 2. 18 τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους.
ἀναστροφή: 2 P. 2. 7 τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς, 3. 11 ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ἁγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς.

Digitized by Google

ἀνατέλλω: 2 P. 1. 19 ἕως οὗ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.
ἄνεμος: J. 12 νεφέλαι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι.
ἄνθρωπος: 2 P. 1. 21 οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία, *ib.* ἅγιοι (*al.* ἀπό) Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, 2. 16 ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον, 3. 7 εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων, J. 4 παρεισεδύησάν τινες ἄνθρωποι.
ἄνομος: 2 P. 2. 8 ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν.
ἀντιλογία: J. 11 τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο.
ἄνυδρος: 2 P. 2. 17 οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι, J. 12 νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι.
ἅπαξ: J. 3 τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει, 5 Κύριος ἅπαξ λαὸν σώσας (readings differ, see pp. clxxxiii f.).
ἀπάτη: 2 P. 2. 13 ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν (*al.* ἀγάπαις, see pp. cxcvi f.).
ἀπέρχομαι: J. 7 ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας.
ἀπό: 2 P. 1 17 ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης (*al.* ὑπὸ), 1 21 ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ (*al.* ἅγιοι) Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, 3. 4 ἀφ' ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, *ib.* ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, p. lxv, J. 14 ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ, 23 τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.
c. d. ἀποδιορίζω: J. 19 οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, p. clxxxvi.
c. d. e. ἀπόθεσις: 2 P. 1. 14 ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου (only found elsewhere in N.T. in 1 P. 3. 21).
ἀποθνήσκω: J. 12 δένδρα δὶς ἀποθανόντα.
ἀποκάλυψις, pp. lxxiv f.
ἀπολείπω: J. 6 ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον.
ἀπόλλυμι: 2 P. 3. 6 ὁ κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο, 3. 9 μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι, J. 5 τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν, 11 τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο.
ἀπόστολος: 2 P. 1. 1 δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰ.Χ., 3. 2 μνησθῆναι τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς, J. 17 μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου.
c. ἀποφεύγω: *c. gen.* 2 P. 1. 4 ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, *c. acc.* 2. 18 δελεάζουσιν τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους, 2. 20 ἀποφευγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου.
c. ἄπταιστος: J. 24 φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπταίστους.
ἀπώλεια: 2 P. 2. 1 αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας, *ib.* ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν, 2. 3 ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει, 3. 7 εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων, 3. 16 πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν.
c. ἀργέω: 2 P. 2. 3 οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ.
ἀργός: 2 P. 1. 8 οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν.
ἀρετή: 2 P. 1. 3 τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ (*al.* διὰ δόξης κ. ἀρετῆς), 1. 5 ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν.
ἀρνέομαι: 2 P. 2. 1 τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, J. 4 τὸν μόνον δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, p. 72.
ἁρπάζω: J. 23 οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες.
ἀρχάγγελος: J. 9 Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος.
ἀρχαῖος: 2 P. 2. 5 ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο.
ἀρχή: 2 P. 3. 4 ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, J. 6 ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν.

Digitized by Google

ἀσέβεια: J. 15 ἐλέγξαι περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν, 18 κατὰ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀσεβειῶν.
c. ἀσεβέω: 2 P. 2. 6 ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν (*al.* ἀσεβέσιν) τεθεικώς, J. 15 τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας ὧν ἠσέβησαν.
ἀσεβής: 2 P. 2. 5 κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας, 2. 6 ἀσεβέσιν (*al.* ἀσεβεῖν), 3. 7 εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων, J. 4 παρεισεδύησάν τινες ἄνθρωποι, ἀσεβεῖς, 15 ἐλέγξαι τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς, *ib.* ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.
ἀσέλγεια: 2 P. 2. 2 πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις, 2. 7 τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς, 2. 18 δελεάζουσιν ἀσελγείαις, J. 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν.
ἄσπιλος: 2 P. 3. 14 ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι.
ἀστήρ: J. 13 ἀστέρες πλανῆται.
a. c. ἀστήρικτος: 2 P. 2. 14 δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, 3. 16 οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι.
αὐθάδης: 2 P. 2. 10 τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις.
αὐξάνω: *intrans.* 2 P. 3. 18 αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι.
αὐτός: (=*is*) 2 P. 1. 17, 18, 2. 3, 8, 11, 12, 18, 19 ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, 21 *bis*, 22, 3. 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16 *bis*; (emphatic) 18 αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα; (unusual order) 2. 2 ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις; J. 7, 11, 14, 15 *bis*, 16 *bis*, 24. (=*ipse*) 2 P. 1. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ, 2. 19 αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες. ὁ αὐτός, 2. P. 3. 7, see p. cxcix, τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων, 1 P. 5. 9, p. xciv.
c. d. αὐχμηρός: 2 P. 1. 19 λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, pp. cxciii f.
e. ἀφόβως: J. 12 συνευωχούμενοι ἀφόβως (others connect it with what follows ἀφ. ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες).
ἄφωνος: 2 P. 2. 16 ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον.

Βαλαάμ: 2 P. 2. 15 ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βοσόρ, J. 11 τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν.
βασανίζω: 2 P. 2. 8 ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν.
βασιλεία: 2 P. 1. 11 εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου.
βέβαιος: 2 P. 1. 10 βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν ποιεῖσθαι, 1. 19 ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον.
Βεώρ: 2 P. 2. 15 (*al.* Βοσόρ).
βλασφημέω: 2 P. 2. 2 ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται, 2. 10 δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες, 2. 12 ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες, J. 8 δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν, 10 ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν.
βλασφημία: J. 9 οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας, p. 75.
βλάσφημος: 2 P. 2. 11 οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν.
c. d. βλέμμα: 2 P. 2. 8 βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ δίκαιος, p. lx.
c. βόρβορος: 2 P. 2. 22 ὗς λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου.
Βοσόρ: 2 P. 2. 15 (*al.* Βεώρ, see p. cxcviii).
βούλομαι: 2 P. 3. 9 μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι, J. 5 ὑπομνῆσαι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι.
βραδύνω: 2 P. 3. 9 οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.
c. d. βραδυτής: 2 P. 3. 9 ὥς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἡγοῦνται.

γάρ: 2 P. 1. 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 21; 2. 4, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21; 3. 4. 5; J. 4.

Digitized by Google

γεννάω: 2 P. 2. 12 ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἅλωσιν.
γῆ: 2 P. 3. 5 γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα, 3. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ, 3. 10 καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα, 3. 13 γῆν καινὴν προσδοκῶμεν, J. 5 λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας.
γίνομαι: 2 P. 1. 4 ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, 1. 16 ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος, 1. 20 προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται, 2. 1 ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται, 2. 20 γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων.
γινώσκω: 2 P. 1. 20 and 3. 3 τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες.
γνωρίζω: 2 P. 1. 16 ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν δύναμιν.
γνῶσις: 2 P. 1. 5, 6 ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν, ἐν δὲ τῇ γνώσει τὴν ἐγκράτειαν, 3. 18 αὐξάνετε ἐν γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.
b. c. γογγυστής: J. 16 γογγυσταὶ μεμψίμοιροι.
Γόμορρα: 2 P. 2. 6 πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας, J. 7 ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις.
γραφή: 2 P. 1. 20 πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς, 3. 16 στρεβλοῦσιν ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς.
γράφω: 2 P. 3. 1 δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, 3. 15 Παῦλος ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν, J. 3 πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν, *ib.* ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ὑμῖν.
γυμνάζω: 2 P. 2. 14 καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας.

δέ: 2 P. 1. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ, *ib.* ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν (ἐπιχορηγήσατε), 1. 6 *ter*, 1. 7 *bis*; δὲ καί 1. 15, 2. 1; δέ 1. 13, 2. 9, 10, 16, 20, 3. 7, 8, 10 *bis*, 13, 18; οὗτοι δέ 2. 12; J. οὗτοι δέ 10, 12, 16, 19; ὑμεῖς δέ 17, 20, 21; δὲ καί 14; μὲν—δέ: 8 σάρκα μὲν . . . κυριότητα δὲ . . . δόξας δέ, 10 ὅσα μὲν . . . ὅσα δέ, 22 f. οὓς μὲν . . . οὓς δὲ . . . οὓς δέ; δέ 1, 5, 10, 24.
δεῖ: 2 P. 3. 11 ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς.
c. d. δεῖγμα: J. 7 πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρός.
δελεάζω: 2 P. 2. 14 δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, 2. 18 δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκός.
δένδρον: J. 12 δένδρα φθινοπωρινά.
δεσμός: J. 6 δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν.
δεσπότης: 2 P. 2. 1 τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, J. 4 τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰ.Χ. ἀρνούμενοι.
δεύτερος: 2 P. 3. 1 ταύτην ἤδη δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, J. 5 τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν.
δηλόω: 2 P. 1. 14 ὁ κύριος ἐδήλωσέν μοι.
διά: *c. gen.* 2 P. 1. 3 διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης (*al.* ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ), 1. 4 δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, *ib.* 4 ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, 3. 5 γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα, 3. 6 δι' ὧν (ὃν?) ὁ τότε κόσμος ἀπώλετο, pp. lxv, lxxxii, J. 25 διὰ Ἰ.Χ. τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.
c. acc. 2 P. 2. 2 δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται, 3. 9 μακροθυμεῖ δι' ὑμᾶς (*al.* εἰς ὑμᾶς), 3. 12 δι' ἣν οὐρανοὶ λυθήσονται.
e. διάβολος: J. 9 τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος.
διακρίνω: J. 9 τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος, 22 οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους (*al.* διακρινόμενοι).

Digitized by Google

διαλέγομαι: J. 9 διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος.
διαμένω: 2 P. 3. 4 πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως.
διάνοια: 2 P. 3. 1 τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν, 145.
b. c. d. διαυγάζω: 2 P. 1. 19 ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ.
δίδωμι: 2 P. 3. 15 κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν.
διεγείρω: 2 P. 1. 13 διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 3. 1 διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν.
δίκαιος: 2 P. 1. 13 δίκαιον ἡγοῦμαι διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς, 2. 7 δίκαιον Λὼτ ἐρύσατο, 2. 8 βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ [ὁ] δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἐβασάνιζεν.
δικαιοσύνη: 2 P. 1. 1 ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τ. Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰ.Χ. p. i, 2. 5 Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα, 2. 21 τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, 3. 13 καινοὺς οὐρανοὺς . . . ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ, 181.
δίκη: J. 7 πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι.
διό: 2 P. 1. 10 διὸ μᾶλλον, ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε, 1. 12 διὸ μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν, 3. 14 διό, ἀγαπητοί, σπουδάσατε.
δίς: J. 12 δένδρα δὶς ἀποθανόντα.
δόξα: 2 P. 1. 3 τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ, 1. 17 λαβὼν παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς δόξαν, *ib.* φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης τοιᾶσδε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης, 2. 10 δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες, 3. 18 αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα, J. 8 δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν, 24 κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, 25 Θεῷ δόξα μεγαλωσύνη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία.
δοῦλος: 2 P. 1. 1 δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, p. 17, 2. 19 δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆν φθορᾶς; J. 1 Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος.
δουλόω: 2 P. 2. 19 ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται τούτῳ [καὶ] δεδούλωται.
δύναμαι: J. 24 τῷ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς.
δύναμις: 2 P. 1. 3 πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ δεδωρημένης, 1. 16 ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, 2. 11 ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες.
b. c. d. δυσνόητος: 2 P. 3. 16 ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσνόητά τινα.
δωρέομαι: 2 P. 1. 3 πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως δεδωρημένης, 1. 4 τὰ τίμια ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται.

ἑαυτοῦ: 2 P. 2. 1 ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν, J. 6 μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν, 12 ἀφόβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες, 13 ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας, 18 κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας, 19 οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες ἑαυτούς (*al. om.* ἑαυτούς), 20 ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτούς, 21 ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε.
ἕβδομος: J. 14 ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνώχ, p. vii.
c. d. ἐγκατοικέω: (*al.* ἐνκατοικέω) 2 P. 2. 8 ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς.
ἐγκράτεια: 2 P. 1. 6 (ἐπιχορηγήσατε) ἐν τῇ γνώσει τὴν ἐγκράτειαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐγκρατείᾳ τὴν ὑπομονήν.
ἐγώ: 2 P. 1. 17 εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα, (μοῦ) 2 P. 1. 14 ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου, 1. 17 ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, (μοί) 2 P. 1. 14 Χριστὸς ἐδήλωσέν μοι.
(ἡμεῖς): 2 P. 1. 18 ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν, (ἡμᾶς) 2 P. 1. 3 τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς, 3. 9 μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ἡμᾶς (*al.* ὑμᾶς), (ἡμῶν) 2 P. 1. 1 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, 1. 2, 8, 11, 14, 16, 3. 15, 18 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, 2. 20 (*al. om.* ἡμῶν), 3. 15 ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφός, J. 3 τῆς κοινῆς

Digitized by Google

ἡμῶν σωτηρίας, 4 *τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν*, *ib. κυρίου ἡμῶν*, 17, 21, 25 *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*, *ib. σωτῆρι ἡμῶν*, (*ἡμῖν*) 2 P. 1. 1 *τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν*, 1. 3 *πάντα ἡμῖν* (*al. ὑμῖν*, see p. cxciii) *τῆς θείας δυνάμεως δεδωρημένης*, 1. 4 *μέγιστα ἡμῖν δεδώρηται*.

εἰ: 2 P. 2. 4 *εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ ἐφείσατο*, 2. 20 *εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου, τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττῶνται*.

εἰδέναι, see *οἶδα*.

εἰλικρινής: 2 P. 3. 1 *τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν*, 145.

εἰμί: 2 P. 1. 13 *ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι*, 2 P. 1. 9 *τυφλός ἐστι μυωπάζων*, 1. 14 *ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις*, 1. 17 *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου*, 3. 4 *ποῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία*; 3. 16 *ἐν οἷς ἐστιν δυσνόητά τινα*, 2 P. 2. 17 *οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι*, 3. 7 *τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσίν*, J. 12 *οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ συνευωχούμενοι*, 16 *οὗτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταί*, 19 *οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες*—2 P. 1. 18 *σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντες ἐν τῷ ὄρει*, 2. 11 *ἄγγελοι δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες*—2 P. 2. 21 *κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι κ.τ.λ.*, 3. 5 *οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι*—2 P. 2. 1 *ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι*, J. 18 *ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται*.

εἶπον: J. 9 *ἀλλὰ εἶπεν Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος*.

εἰρήνη: 2 P. 1. 2 *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη*, 3. 14 *σπουδάσατε ἄσπιλοι εὑρεθῆναι ἐν εἰρήνῃ*, J. 2 *ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη*.

εἰς: 2 P. 1. 8 *ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἐπίγνωσιν*, 1. 11 *ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν*, 1. 17 *εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα*, 2. 4 *εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους*, 2. 9 *εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως τηρεῖν*, 2. 12 *γεγεννημένα εἰς ἅλωσιν*, 2. 22 *εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου*, 3. 7 *πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως*, 3. 9 *μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς*, *ib. εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι*, 3. 18 *αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος*, J. 4 *προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο*, *ib. τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν*, 6 *εἰς κρίσιν τετήρηκεν*, 13 *εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται*, 21 *προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ζωήν*, 25 *δόξα . . εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας*.

εἷς: 2 P. 3. 8 *ἓν δὲ τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς, ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία*.

ἔἰσοδος: 2 P. 1. 11 *ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν*.

ἐκ: 2 P. 1. 18 *φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν*, 2. 8 *ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν ἐβασάνιζεν*, 2. 9 *ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι*, 2. 21 *ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς*, 3. 5 *γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα*, J. 5 *λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας*, 23 *ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες*.

c. d. ἑκάστοτε: 2 P. 1. 15 *σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἑκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι*.

ἐκεῖνος: 2 P. 1. 16 *τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος*.

ἐκλογή: 2 P. 1. 10 *βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι*, pp. 19 f.

b. c. ἔκπαλαι: 2 P. 2. 3 *τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ*, 3. 5 *οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι*, p. lii.

ἐκπίπτω: 2 P. 3. 17 *ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ*.

b. c. ἐκπορνεύω: J. 7 *πόλεις ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας*.

b. ἐκριζόω: J. 12 *δένδρα δὶς ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζωθέντα*.

ἐκχέω: J. 11 *τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν*.

ἐλαύνω: 2 P. 2. 17 *ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι*.

Digitized by Google

b. c. ἔλεγξις: 2 P. 2. 16 ἔλεγξιν ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας.
ἐλέγχω: J. 15 ἐλέγξαι πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς περὶ πάντων, 22 οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε (*al.* ἐλεᾶτε or ἐλεεῖτε) διακρινομένους.
ἔλεος: J. 2 ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, 21 προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου.
ἐλευθερία: 2 P. 2. 19 ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι.
ἐμός: 2 P. 1. 15 μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον.
a. c. d. ἐμπαιγμονή: 2 P. 3. 3 ἐλεύσονται ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται.
b. c. ἐμπαίκτης: 2 P. 3. 3 ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐμπαῖκται, J. 18 ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται.
ἐμπλέκω: 2 P. 2. 20 τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες.
ἐμπορεύομαι: 2 P. 2. 3 ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται.
ἐν: (place) 2 P. 1. 4 τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ φθορᾶς, 1. 13 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, 1. 18 ἐν τῷ ὄρει, 1. 19 ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, *ib.* ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, 2. 1 ἐν τῷ λαῷ, *ib.* ἐν ὑμῖν, 2. 8 ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς, 3. 10 τὰ ἐν γῇ ἔργα, 3. 13 ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ, 3. 1, 3. 16 ἐν ἐπιστολαῖς λαλῶν *bis*; (time) 2. 13 τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, 3. 10; (cause or instrument) 1. 1 ἰσότιμον λαχὼν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ Θεοῦ, 1. 13 and 3. 1 διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 2. 3 ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται, 2. 16 ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον, 2. 18 δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις, 2. 20 ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα ἐν ἐπιγνώσει; (manner) 2. 7 τῆς ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς, 2. 10 ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ πορευόμενοι, 2. 18 τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους, 3. 3 ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται, 3. 11 ἐν ἁγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς, 3. 14 ἀμώμητοι ἐν εἰρήνῃ; (sphere) 1. 12 ἐστηριγμένους ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, 3. 18 αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι; (subject-matter) 2. 12 ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες; 2. 13 ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις; (addition) 1. 5 ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν πίστει ἀρετήν *bis*, 1. 6 *ter*, 1. 7 *bis*. J. (place) 12 ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις σπιλάδες; (accompaniment) 14 ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν ἦλθεν; (cause or instrument) 10 ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται; (manner) 23 ἐν φόβῳ, 24 ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει; (used of God) 1 ἐν Θεῷ ἠγαπημένοις (?), p. clxxxii, 20 ἐν πνεύματι προσευχόμενοι, 21 ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε, p. lxv.
ἐντολή: 2 P. 2. 21 τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς, 3. 2 τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου, p. 64.
b. c. ἐντρυφάω: 2 P. 2. 13 ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν (*al.* ἀγάπαις).
ἐννυπνιάζομαι: J. 8 οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι, p. 74.
Ἐνώχ: J. 14 ἐπροφήτευσεν ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνώχ.
b. c. ἐξακολουθέω: 2 P. 1. 16 μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες, 2. 2 ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις, 2. 15 ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ.
a. b. c. d. ἐξέραμα: 2 P. 2. 22 κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα, p. xii, lxii.
e. ἔξοδος: 2 P. 1. 15 μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον.
ἐξουσία: J. 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία.
ἐπαγγελία: 2 P. 3. 4 ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; 3. 9 οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.
ἐπαγγέλλομαι: 2 P. 2. 19 ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι.

Digitized by Google

c. d. ἐπάγγελμα: 2 P. 1. 4 *τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ἐπαγγέλματα*, 3. 13 *κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ*, pp. xxxiv, cxcii.
ἐπάγω: 2 P. 2. 1 *ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν*, 2. 5 *κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας*, p. xxvi.
b. c. d. ἐπαγωνίζομαι: J. 3 *ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει*, pp. 22, 23, 70 f.
b. c. d. ἐπαφρίζω: J. 13 *κύματα ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας.*
ἐπί: *c. gen.* 146 f., 2 P. 3. 3 *ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν*, J. 18 *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου.*
c. acc. 2 P. 1. 13 *ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι*, 2. 22 *ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα.* In compounds, pp. 22, 174.
ἐπιγινώσκω: 2 P. 2. 21 *κρεῖττον ἦν μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ὑποστρέψαι.*
b. ἐπίγνωσις: 2 P. 1. 2 *χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 1. 3 *διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς*, 1. 8 *εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἐπίγνωσιν*, 2. 20 *ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου.*
ἐπιθυμία: 2 P. 1. 4 *ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*, 2. 10 *τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους*, 2. 18 *δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις*, 3. 3 *κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι*, J. 16 *κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι*, 18 *κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι.*
c. d. ἐπίλυσις: 2 P. 1. 20 *πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται*, pp. iv. 196 f.
ἐπίσταμαι: J. 10 *ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ἐπίστανται.*
ἐπιστολή: 2 P. 3. 1 *δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν*, 3. 16 *ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς.*
ἐπιστρέφω: 2 P. 2. 22 *κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα.*
ἐπιτιμάω: J. 9 *ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος.*
ἐπιφέρω: J. 9 *κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας.*
b. ἐπιχορηγέω: 2 P. 1. 5 *ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν*, 1. 11 *πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἴσοδος.*
a. ἐποικοδομέω: J. 20 *ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει.*
c. ἔπόπτης: 2 P. 1. 16 *ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος.*
ἔργον: 2 P. 1. 10 *διὰ τῶν καλῶν ὑμῶν ἔργων* (*om. al.*) 2. 8 *ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν*, 3. 10 *γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα*, J. 15 *περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν.*
ἔρχομαι: 2 P. 3. 3 *ἐλεύσονται ἐμπαῖκται*, J. 14 *ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ*, *c. infin.* p. xlv.
ἔσχατος: 2 P. 2. 20 *γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων*, 3. 3 *ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν*, pp. 146 f., J. 18 *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου*, pp. 77 f.
ἕτερος: J. 7 *ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας.*
ἔτος: 2 P. 3. 8 *μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία.*
εὐαγγέλιον, p. 65.
b. εὐδοκέω: 2 P. 1. 17 *εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα.*
εὐθύς: 2 P. 2. 15 *καταλείποντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδόν.*

Digitized by Google

εὑρίσκω: 2 P. 3. 10 γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται (? see p. cc), 3. 14 ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ εὑρεθῆναι ἐν εἰρήνῃ.
εὐσέβεια: 2 P. 1. 3 τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν, 1. 6 ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ τὴν εὐσέβειαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν φιλαδελφίαν, 3. 11 ἐν ἁγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις.
εὐσεβής: 2 P. 2. 9 οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι.
ἔχω (1): 2 P. 1. 19 ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος, *ib.* καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, 2. 16 ἔλεγξιν ἔσχεν παρανομίας, J. 3 ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι, 19 πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. (2) = *possum*. 2 P. 1. 15 σπουδάσω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι.
ἕως: 2 P. 1. 19 ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ.

d. ζόφος: 2 P. 2. 4 (ἀγγέλους) σειροῖς ζόφου (*al.* σειραῖς and ζόφοις) ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν, 2. 17 οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται, J. 6 (ἀγγέλους) εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν, 13 οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται.
ζωή: 2 P. 1. 3 τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν, J. 21 εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
ζῷον: 2 P. 2. 12 ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἅλωσιν, J. 10 ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἐπίστανται ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται.

ἤ: 2 P. 2. 21 κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ὑποστρέψαι.
ἡγέομαι: 2 P. 1. 13 δίκαιον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς, 2. 13 ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, 3. 9 ὥς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἡγοῦνται, 3. 15 τὴν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε.
ἤδη: 2 P. 3. 1 ταύτην ἤδη δευτέραν γράφω ἐπιστολήν.
ἡδονή: 2 P. 2. 13 ἡδονὴν (ἀγάπην ?) ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, p. x.
ἡμέρα: 2 P. 1. 19 ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ, 2. 8 ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν ἐβασάνιζεν, 2. 9 and 3. 7 εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως, 2. 13 τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, 3. 3 ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, 3. 8 μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία, 3. 10 ἥξει ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης, 3. 12 τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, 3. 18 εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, J. 6 εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας.
ἡττάομαι: 2 P. 2. 19 ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται, 2. 20 τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττῶνται.

θάλασσα: J. 13 κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης.
θαυμάζω: J. 16 θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελίας χάριν.
θεῖος: 2 P. 1. 3 τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, 1. 4 θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως (elsewhere in N.T. only in Acts 17. 29 τὸ θεῖον).
b. θέλημα: 2 P. 1. 21 οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ.
θέλω: 2 P. 3. 5 λάνθανει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας ὅτι κ.τ.λ.
Θεός: 2. P. 1. 1 ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1. 2 ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, 1. 17 λαβὼν παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, 1. 21 ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ (*al.* ἅγιοι) Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, 2. 4 ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, 3. 5 γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, 3. 12 τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, J. 1 τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις, 4

Digitized by Google

τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, 21 *ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε*, 25 *μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν.*

θησαυρίζω: 2 P. 3. 7 *οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσίν.*

'Ιάκωβος: J. 1 'Ιούδας 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ 'Ιακώβου.

ἴδιος: 2 P. 1. 3 *τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ* (*al.* διὰ δόξης, p. cxcii) *καὶ ἀρετῇ*, 1. 20 *πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται*, 2. 16 *ἔλεγξιν ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας*, 2. 22 *κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα*, 3. 3 *κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι*, 3. 16 *πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν*, 3. 17 *ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ*, J. 6 (ἀγγέλους) *ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον*, pp. xxxii f., xlii.

ἰδού: J. 14 *ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ.*

'Ιησοῦς: 2 P. 1. 1 *ἀπόστολος 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *ib.* *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 1. 2 *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τ. Θεοῦ καὶ 'Ιησοῦ τ. κυρίου ἡμῶν*, 1. 8 *τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν*, 1. 11 *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 1. 14 *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν 'Ιησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐδήλωσέν μοι*, 1. 16 *τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν*, 2. 20 *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 3. 18 *ἐν γνώσει τ. κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, J. 1 'Ιούδας 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, *ib.* *τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις καὶ 'Ιησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς*, 4 *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν 'Ιησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι*, 5 *'Ιησοῦς* (*al.* Κύριος, see pp. clxxxiv f.) *λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας*, 17 *τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 21 *τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 25 *διὰ 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.*

ἵνα: 2 P. 1. 4 *ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*, 3. 17 *φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσητε.*

Ιούδας: J. 1. 1.

c. d. *ἰσότιμος*: 2 P. 1. 1 *τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν*, pp. ii, 181.

ἵστημι: J. 24 *τῷ δυναμένῳ στῆσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους.*

ἰσχύς: 2 P. 2. 11 *ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες.*

b. *καθαρισμός*: 2 P. 1. 9 *λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν.*

καθίστημι: 2 P. 1. 8 *ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν.*

καθώς: 2 P. 1. 14 *καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐδήλωσέν μοι*, 3. 15 *καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν.*

καί: 'both' 2 P. 3. 18 *καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος*, J. 25 *καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

'also' 2 P. 1. 14 *καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐδήλωσέν μοι*, 2. 1 *ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ ὡς καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἔσονται*, 2. 12 *ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται* (*al.* καταφθαρήσονται), 2. 19 *ᾧ τις ἥττηται τούτῳ καὶ* (*om. al.*) *δεδούλωται*, 3. 15 *καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφός*, 3. 16 *ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς*, *ib.* *ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς*, J. 8 *ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι*, 14 *ἐπροφήτευσε δὲ καὶ τούτοις*; 'even' 2 P. 2. 1 *καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς ἀρνούμενοι*, J. 23 *μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.*

Καίν: J. 11 *τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν.*

Digitized by Google

καινός: 2 P. 3. 13 καινοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν προσδοκῶμεν.
καίπερ: 2 P. 1. 12 καίπερ εἰδότας.
καλέω: 2 P. 1. 3 τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ.
καλός: 2 P. 1. 10 διὰ τῶν καλῶν ὑμῶν ἔργων (*om. al.*).
καλῶς: 2 P. 1. 19 ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες.
καρδία: 2 P. 1. 19 ἕως οὗ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, 2. 14 καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην ἔχοντες.
κατά: *c. gen.* 2 P. 2. 11 οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν, J. 15 ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, 15 ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ.
c. acc. 2 P. 3. 3 κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, 3. 13 γῆν καινὴν κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ προσδοκῶμεν, 3. 15 κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν ἔγραψεν, J. 16 κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, 18 κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι.
κατακαίω: 2 P. 3. 10 γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα κατακαήσεται (*al.* εὑρεθήσεται).
c. κατακλύζω: 2 P. 3. 6 ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο.
b. κατακλυσμός: 2 P. 2. 5 κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας.
κατακρίνω: 2 P. 2. 6 πόλεις . . καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν, p. cxcv.
καταλείπω: 2 P. 2. 15 καταλείποντες (*al.* καταλιπόντες) εὐθεῖαν ὁδόν.
καταπονέω: 2 P. 2. 7 Λὼτ καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς.
κατάρα: 2 P. 2. 14 κατάρας τέκνα.
καταστροφή: 2 P. 2. 6 [καταστροφῇ] κατέκρινεν (*om.* WH.): see p. cxcv.
b. καταφθείρω: 2 P. 2 12 ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καταφθαρήσονται (*al.* καὶ φθαρ-).
καταφρονέω: 2 P. 2. 10 κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας.
b. κατενώπιον: J. 24 στῆσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.
κατοικέω: 2 P. 3. 13 ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ.
b. c. d. e. καυσόω: 2 P. 3. 10 στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα λυθήσεται, 3. 2 στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται, p. lx.
κήρυξ: 2 P. 2. 5 Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα.
κλέπτης: 2 P. 3. 10 ἥξει ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης.
κλῆσις: 2 P. 1. 10 βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν ποιεῖσθαι.
κλητός: J. 1 τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς.
κοιμάω: 2 P. 3. 4 ἀφ' ἧς οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν.
κοινός: J. 3 περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας.
κοινωνός: 2 P. 1. 4 θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως.
κολάζω: 2 P. 2. 4, 9 κολαζομένους τηρεῖν (in 4 some read τηρουμένους).
κομίζω: 2 P. 2. 13 κομιούμενοι (*al.* ἀδικούμενοι) μισθὸν ἀδικίας.
Κορέ: J. 11 τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο.
κόσμος: 2 P. 1. 4 τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, 2. 5 ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας, 2. 20 ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου, 3. 6 ὁ τότε κόσμος κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο.
κράτος: J. 25 Θεῷ κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία.
κρείττων: 2 P. 2. 21 κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν κ.τ.λ.

Digitized by Google

κρίμα: 2 P. 2. 3 οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, J. 4 προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα.
κρίσις: 2 P. 2. 4 εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους, 2. 9 εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν, 2. 11 οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ Κυρίῳ βλάσφημον κρίσιν, 3. 7 τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως, J. 6 εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας τετήρηκεν, 9 κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας, 15 ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων.
κτίσις: 2 P. 3. 4 ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως.
a. c. d. κυλισμός: 2 P. 2. 22 εἰς κυλισμὸν (al. κύλισμα) βορβόρου, p. lxii.
κῦμα: J. 13 κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης.
b. d. κυριότης: 2 P. 2. 10 κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας, J. 8 κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσιν, p. viii.

λαγχάνω: 2 P. 1. 1 τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν.
λαῖλαψ: 2 P. 2. 17 ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι.
λαλέω: 2 P. 1. 21 ἐλάλησαν ἅγιοι τοῦ (al. ἀπὸ) Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, 3. 16 λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων, J. 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν, 16 τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα.
λαμβάνω: 2 P. 1. 9 λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν, 1. 17 λαβὼν παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν.
λανθάνω: 2 P. 3. 5 λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς ὅτι, 3. 8 τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς ὅτι.
λαός: 2 P. 2. 1 ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, J. 5 λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας.
λέγω: 2 P. 3. 4 λέγοντες Ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία; J. 14 προεφήτευσεν Ἐνὼχ λέγων, 17 μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὅτι ἔλεγον.
c. λήθη: 2 P. 1. 9 λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ.
λόγος: 2 P. 1. 19 τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, 2. 3 πλαστοῖς λόγοις, 3. 5 τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, 3. 7 τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσίν.
λοιπός: 2. P. 3. 16 ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς.
λούω: 2 P. 2. 22 ὗς λουσαμένη.
λύχνος: 2 P. 1. 19 ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι.
λύω: 2 P. 3. 10 στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα λυθήσεται, 3. 11 τούτων πάντων λυομένων, 3. 12 οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται.
ὡστε: 2 P. 2. 7 δίκαιον Λὼτ καταπονούμενον.

b. μακροθυμέω: 2 P. 3. 9 μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς.
b. μακροθυμία: 2 P. 3. 15 τὴν τοῦ κυρίου μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε.
μάλιστα: 2 P. 2. 10 μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς πορευομένους.
μᾶλλον: 2 P. 1. 10 διὸ μᾶλλον σπουδάσατε.
b. ματαιότης: 2 P. 2. 18 ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι.
b. μεγαλειότης: 2 P. 1. 16 ἐπόπται τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος.
c. μεγαλοπρεπής: 2 P. 1. 17 ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης.
b. μεγαλωσύνη: J. 25 Θεῷ . . . δόξα μεγαλωσύνη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία.
μέγας: J. 6 εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας.
c. μέγιστος: 2 P. 1. 4 δι' ὧν τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται (reading uncertain), p. xlii.
μείζων: 2 P. 2. 11 ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες.

Digitized by Google

μέλλω: 2 P. 1. 12 διὸ μελλήσω (?) ὑμᾶς ἀεὶ ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων, p. lx, 2. 6 ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς, p. cxcv.
μέλω, see 2 P. 1 12 and p. cxciii.
b. c. d. μεμψίμοιρος: J. 16 γογγυσταὶ μεμψίμοιροι.
μέν: J. 8 σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν, 10 ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ἐπίστανται . . . ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται, 22, 23 οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε . . . οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε (readings differ).
μέντοι: J. 8 ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι σάρκα μιαίνουσιν.
μεστός: 2 P. 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος.
μετά: c. acc. 2 P. 1. 15 μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον.
μετάνοια: 2 P. 3. 9 βουλόμενος πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι.
μετατίθημι: J. 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν.
μή: pp. l, c *with imperat.* 2 P. 3. 8 τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς ὅτι; *with part.* 2 P. 3. 9 μακροθυμεῖ μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι, J. 19 οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες; *with part. and article*, J. 5 τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν, 6 τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν.
c. *infin.* 2 P. 2. 21 κρεῖττον ἦν μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν . . . ἤ.
c. *rel.* 2 P. 1. 9 ᾧ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα τυφλός ἐστιν.
οὐ μή: 2 P. 1. 10 οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε.
μιαίνω: J. 8 σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν.
c. μίασμα: 2 P. 2. 20 ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου.
b. c. μιασμός: 2 P. 2. 10 τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους.
μιμνήσκομαι: 2 P. 3. 2 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων, J. 17 μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων.
μισέω: J. 23 μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.
μισθός: 2 P. 2. 13 κομιούμενοι (*al.* ἀδικούμενοι) μισθὸν ἀδικίας 2. 15 μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν, J. 11 τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν.
c. μνήμη: 2 P. 1. 15 τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, pp. xxxiv, lx.
b. μοιχαλίς: 2 P. 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος.
μόνος: J. 4 τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον Ἰ. Χ. ἀρνούμενοι, 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν.
μῦθος: 2 P. 1. 16 σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες.
μυριάς: J. 14 ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ, p. xxxi.
c. d. μυωπάζω: 2 P. 1. 9 τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων, p. lxi.
c. μῶμος: 2 P. 2. 13 σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι.
Μωυσῆς: J. 9 τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος.

νεφέλη: 2 P. 2. 17 ὁμίχλαι (*al.* νεφέλαι) ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι, J. 12 οὗτοί εἰσιν . . . νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι.
νῦν: 2 P. 3. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρί, 3. 18 αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, J. 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.
νυστάζω: 2 P. 2. 3 ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει.
Νῶε: 2 P. 2. 5 ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν.

Digitized by Google

ὄγδοος: 2 P. 2. 5 ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, pp. vii, 192

e. ὁδός: 2 P. 2. 2 ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται, 2. 15 καταλιπόντες (*al.* καταλείποντες) εὐθεῖαν ὁδόν, *ib.* ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ, 2. 21 ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, J. 11 τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν.

οἶδα: 2 P. 1. 12 καίπερ εἰδότας καὶ ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ, 1. 14 εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου, 2. 9 οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι, J. 5 ὑπομνῆσαι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι εἰδότας ὑμᾶς πάντα, 10 ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν.

οἰκητήριον: J. 6 ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον.

c. d. ὀλίγως: 2 P. 2. 18 δελεάζουσιν τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας, p. cxcviii.

c. ὁμίχλη: 2 P. 2. 17 ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι.

ὅμοιος: J. 7 τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι.

ὁμοίως: J. 8 ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι σάρκα μιαίνουσιν.

e. ὀπίσω: 2 P. 2. 10 τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς πορευομένους, 2. 21 εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ὑποστρέψαι (*al. om.* εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω), J. 7 ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας.

ὅπου: 2 P. 2. 11 ὅπου ἄγγελοι οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν.

ὀπώρα, pp. 55 f.

ὄρος: 2 P. 1. 18 ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ (*al.* τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει), iv, cxliv.

ὅς, ἥ, ὅ: 2 P. 1. 4 δι' ὧν τὰ μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, 1. 9 ᾧ γὰρ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα τυφλός ἐστιν, 1. 17 ὁ υἱός εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα, 1. 19 τὸν λόγον ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες, ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ, 2. 2 δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς βλασφημηθήσεται, 2. 3 οἷς τὸ κρίμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ, 2. 12 ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες, 2. 15 ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν, 2. 17 οἷς ὁ ζόφος τετήρηται, 2. 19 ᾧ τις ἥττηται τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται, 3. 1 δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, ἐν αἷς διεγείρω, 3. 4 ἀφ' ἧς οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, 3. 6 δι' ὧν (? ὅν, see p. cxcix) ὁ τότε κόσμος ἀπώλετο, 3. 10 ἐν ᾗ οἱ οὐρανοὶ παρελεύσονται, 3. 12 δι' ἣν οὐρανοὶ λυθήσονται, 3. 13 ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ, *ib.* 16 ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσνόητά τινα, ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς στρεβλοῦσιν, J. 13 οἷς ὁ ζόφος τετήρηται, 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας ὧν ἠσέβησαν, καὶ περὶ πάντων σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν, 22, 23 οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε, οὓς δὲ σώζετε, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε (readings differ).

ὅσος: 2 P. 1. 13 ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, J. 10 ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ἐπίστανται ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται.

ὅστις: 2 P. 2. 1 ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας.

ὅτε: J. 9 ὁ δὲ (*al.* ὅτε) Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε (*al.* τότε) τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο.

ὅτι: ('that') 2 P. 1. 14 εἰδὼς ὅτι, 1. 20, 3. 3 γινώσκοντες ὅτι, 3. 5 λανθάνει ὅτι, 3. 8 λανθανέτω ὅτι, J. 5 εἰδότας ὅτι, 18 μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων . . . ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν [ὅτι] . . . ἔσονται.

('because') J. 11 οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν.

οὐ, see μή, pp. l f.

οὐαί: J. 11 οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς ὅτι.

οὐδέ: 2 P. 1. 8 οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους.

Digitized by Google

οὖν: 2 P. 3. 11 τούτων οὖν (*al.* οὕτως) πάντων λυομένων, 3. 17 ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, φυλάσσεσθε.

οὐρανός: 2 P. 1. 18 φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν, 3. 5 οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι, 3. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ, 3. 10 οἱ οὐρανοὶ ῥοιζηδὸν παρελεύσονται (*al. om.* οἱ), 3. 12 οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται, 3. 13 καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν προσδοκῶμεν, p. xxxiii.

οὗτος: 2 P. 1. 17 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, 1. 18 ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν, 3. 1 ταύτην ἤδη δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, 1. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ (*al.* καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ) σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε, 1. 20, 3. 3 τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες, 3. 5 λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας, 3. 8 ἓν δὲ τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς, 1. 13 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, 2. 19 ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται τούτῳ δεδούλωται, 2. 12 οὗτοι δὲ ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα, 2. 17 οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι, 1. 8 ταῦτα ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα, 1. 9 ᾧ γὰρ μὴ πάρεστι ταῦτα, 1. 10 ταῦτα ποιοῦντες, 3. 14 ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες, 1. 4 ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, 1. 12 ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων, 1. 15 τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, 3. 11 τούτων οὖν πάντων λυομένων, 3. 16 λαλῶν περὶ τούτων, 2. 20 τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες, J. 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, 5 εἰδότας ὑμᾶς τοῦτο (*al.* πάντα), 8 ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι, 10 οὗτοι δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, 12, 16, 19 οὗτοί εἰσιν, 7 τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις, 10 ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται, 14 ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις. Prospective use p. xciii f, 25.

οὕτως: 2 P. 1. 11 οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται, 3. 4 πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, 3. 11 τούτων οὕτως (*al.* οὖν) πάντων λυομένων.

ὀφθαλμός: 2 P. 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος.

πάλαι: 2 P. 1. 9 τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν, J. 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα.

πάλιν: 2 P. 2. 20 τούτοις πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες.

παρά: (*c. gen.*) 2 P. 1. 17 λαβὼν παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμήν.
(*c. dat.*) 2 P. 2. 11 οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ Κυρίῳ (*al. om.* π. K., see p. cxcvi) βλάσφημον κρίσιν, 3. 8 μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη.

παραγγελία: p. 64.

παραδίδωμι: 2 P. 2. 4 παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους, 2. 21 ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς, J. 3 τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει, pp. 61 f. 1 P. 2 23 παρεδίδου τῷ κρίνοντι, pp. xcviii f.

παράδοσις: pp. 61 f.

παραθήκη: p. 62.

παρακαλέω: J. 3 παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι.

c. παρανομία: 2 P. 2. 16 ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας.

παραφέρω: J. 12 νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι.

a. παραφρονία: 2 P. 2. 16 τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν.

πάρειμι: 2 P. 1. 8 ταῦτα ὑμῖν πάροντα (*al.* ὑπάρχοντα), 1. 9 ᾧ γὰρ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα, 1. 12 ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ (παραδοθείσῃ Sp.).

c. d. παρεισάγω: 2 P. 2. 1 παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας.

c. d. παρεισδύω: J. 4 παρεισεδύησάν τινες ἄνθρωποι.

Digitized by Google

c. d. **παρεισφέρω**: 2 P. 1. 15 *σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες*, pp. lx, lxi.
παρέρχομαι: 2 P. 3. 10 *οἱ οὐρανοὶ ῥοιζηδὸν παρελεύσονται.*
παροιμία: 2 P. 2. 22 *τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας.*
παρουσία: 2 P. 1. 16 'I.X. *δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν*, 3. 4 *ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ*, 3. 12 *τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας*, pp. lxxiv f., 195.
πᾶς: 2 P. 1. 3 *πάντα τὰ πρὸς ζωήν*, 1. 5 *σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες*, 1. 20 *πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς*, 3. 4 *πάντα οὕτως διαμένει*, 3. 9 *πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι*, 3. 11 *τούτων οὖν πάντων λυομένων*, 3. 16 *ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς* (*al.* ταῖς ἐπ.), J. 3 *πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος*, 5 *εἰδότας ὑμᾶς πάντα* (readings differ), 15 *ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων*, *καὶ ἐλέγξαι πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων . . . καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν*, 25 *μόνῳ Θεῷ δόξα πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.*
πατήρ: 2 P. 1. 17 *παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός*, 3. 4 *οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν*, J. 1 *τοῖς [ἐν] Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις.*
Παῦλος: 2 P. 3. 15 *ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος.*
πειρασμός: 2 P. 2. 9 *εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι.*
περί: (*c. gen.*) 2 P. 1. 12 *ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων*, 3. 16 *λαλῶν περὶ τούτων*, J. 3 *περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας γράψαι*, 9 *διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος*, 15 *ἐλέγξαι περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν.*
(*c. acc.*) J. 7 *Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις.*
περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ: 1 P. 2. 6, p. xcviii.
περισσεύω: pp. 93 f.
περίφασις)(**ἐπίγνωσις**: pp. 172 f, 213.
Πέτρος: 2 P. 1. 1 *Συμεὼν Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος* 'I.X.
πηγή: 2 P. 2. 17 *οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι.*
πιστεύω: J. 5 *τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν.*
πίστις: 2 P. 1. 1 *τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν*, 1. 5 *ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν*, J. 3 *ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει*, 20 *ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει.*
πλανάω: 2 P. 2. 15 *ἐπλανήθησαν ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ.*
πλάνη: 2 P. 2. 18 *ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους*, 3. 17 *τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες*, J. 11 *τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ ἐξεχύθησαν.*
c. e. **πλανήτης**: J. 13 *ἀστέρες πλανῆται* (*al.* πλάνητες).
c. d. **πλαστός**: 2 P. 2. 3 *πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται.*
πλεονάζω: 2 P. 1. 8 *ταῦτα πλεονάζοντα οὐκ ἀργοὺς καθίστησιν.*
πλεονεξία: 2 P. 2. 3 *ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται*, 2. 14 *καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες.*
πληθύνω: 2 P. 1. 2 *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη*, J. 2 *ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.*
d. **πλουσίως**: 2 P. 1. 11 *πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν.*
πνεῦμα: 2 P. 1. 21 *ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν*, J. 19 *ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες*, 20 *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι*, p. xxiv.

Digitized by Google

πο ί ε ω: 2 P. 1. 10 *βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι, ib. ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες*, 1. 15 *τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι*, 1. 19 *ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες*, J. 3 *πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος*, 15 *ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων*, p. xlix.

πο ι μ α ί ν ω: J. 12 *ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες.*

π ό λ ι ς: 2 P. 2. 6 *πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας*, J. 7 *αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις.*

π ο λ ύ ς: 2 P. 2. 2 *πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις.*

e. π ο ρ ε ύ ο μ α ι: 2 P. 2. 10 *τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους*, 3. 3 *κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι*, J. 11 *τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν*, 16 *κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι*, 18 *κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν.*

b. d. π ο τ α π ό ς: 2 P. 3 11 *ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς.*

π ο τ έ: 2 P. 1. 10 *οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε*, 1. 21 *οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ.*

π ο ῦ: 2 P. 3. 4 *ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ*; p. lii.

π ρ ό: J. 25 *μόνῳ Θεῷ ἐξουσία πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος.*

π ρ ο γ ι ν ώ σ κ ω: 2 P. 3. 17 *προγινώσκοντες φυλάσσεσθε.*

π ρ ο γ ρ ά φ ω: J. 4 *οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα.*

π ρ ο ε ί ρ η κ α: 2 P. 3. 2 *μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν*, J. 17 *μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων.*

π ρ ό κ ε ι μ α ι: J. 7 *αἱ πόλεις πρόκεινται δεῖγμα.*

π ρ ό ς: *c. acc.* 2 P. 1. 3 *πάντα τὰ πρὸς ζωήν*, 3. 16 *στρεβλοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν.*

π ρ ο σ δ έ χ ο μ α ι: J. 21 *προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.*

π ρ ο σ δ ο κ ά ω: 2 P. 3. 12 *προσδοκῶντας τὴν παρουσίαν*, 3. 13 *καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανοὺς προσδοκῶμεν*, 3. 14 *ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες.*

π ρ ο σ ε ύ χ ο μ α ι: J. 20 *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι.*

π ρ ο σ έ χ ω: 2 P. 1. 19 *ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες.*

π ρ ό σ ω π ο ν: J. 16 *θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα.*

π ρ ο φ η τ ε ί α: 2 P. 1. 20 *πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται*, 1. 21 *οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ.*

π ρ ο φ η τ ε υ ώ: J. 14 *ἐπροφήτευσεν* (*al.* προεφήτευσεν) *δὲ καὶ τούτοις Ἐνώχ.*

π ρ ο φ ή τ η ς: 2 P. 2. 16 *τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν*, 3. 2 *μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν.*

b. d. π ρ ο φ η τ ι κ ό ς: 2 P. 1. 19 *καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον.*

π ρ ῶ τ ο ς: 2 P. 2. 20 *γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων*, 1. 20, 3. 3 *τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες.*

π τ α ί ω: 2 P. 1. 10 *οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε.*

π ῦ ρ: 2 P. 3. 7 *τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρί*, J. 7 *πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι*, 23 *σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες.*

π υ ρ ό ω: 2 P. 3. 12 *οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται*, 3. 10 *γῆ πυρωθήσεται*, see p. cc.

ῥ ῆ μ α: 2 P. 3. 2 *μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν*, J. 17 *μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων.*

Digitized by Google

b. c. d. ῥοιζηδόν: 2 P. 3. 10 οἱ οὐρανοὶ ῥοιζηδὸν παρελεύσονται.
ῥύομαι: 2 P. 2. 7 δίκαιον Λὼτ ἐρύσατο (*al.* ἐρρύσατο), 2. 9 οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι.

e. σάρξ: 2 P. 2 10 τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους, 2. 18 δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας, J. 7 ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας, 8 ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, 23 μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.
σειρά, see σειρός and p. cxciv.
c. d. σειρός (*al.* σιρός): 2 P. 2. 4 σειροῖς (*al.* σειραῖς) ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους.
e. σκήνωμα: 2 P. 1. 13 ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, 14 ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου, pp. cxx, cxxi.
σκληρός: J. 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν (*al. add.* λόγων) ὧν ἐλάλησαν.
σκότος: 2 P. 2. 17 and J. 13 οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται.
Σόδομα: 2 P. 2. 6 πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας κατέκρινεν, J. 7 Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις πρόκεινται δεῖγμα.
σοφία: 2 P. 3. 15 κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν.
σοφίζω: 2 P. 1. 16 σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες.
σοφός: J. 25 μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ (*al. om.* σοφῷ).
σπεύδω: 2 P. 3. 12 σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας.
c. d. σπιλάς: J. 12 οὗτοί εἰσιν [οἱ] ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι, p. xi.
b. d. σπίλος: 2 P. 2. 13 σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις (*al.* ἀγάπαις) αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν.
b. σπιλόω: J. 23 τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.
σπουδάζω: 2 P. 1. 10 σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι, 1. 15 σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἑκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, 3. 14 σπουδάσατε ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ εὑρεθῆναι.
σπουδή: 2 P. 1. 5 σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες, J. 3 πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν.
b. c. d. στηριγμός: 2 P. 3. 17 φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ.
στηρίζω: 2 P. 1. 12 ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ.
στοιχεῖον: 2 P. 3. 10 στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα λυθήσεται, 3. 12 στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται.
στόμα: J. 16 τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα.
c. e. στρεβλόω: 2 P. 3. 16 δυσνόητά τινα ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς στρεβλοῦσιν.
σύ: J. 9 ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος; (ὑμεῖς) 2 P. 3. 17 ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, φυλάσσεσθε, J. 17 ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων, 20 ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε, 2 P. 1. 5 ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, 1. 10 σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν ποιεῖσθαι, 1. 19 ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, 3. 1 διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν, 3. 2 τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς, J. 12 οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες, 20 τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, 2 P. 1. 2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη, 1. 8 ταῦτα ὑμῖν παρόντα, 1. 11 ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἴσοδος, 1. 16 ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν, 2. 1 ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, 2. 13 συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν, 3. 1 δευτέραν

Digitized by Google

ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, J. 2 *ἔλεος ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη*, 3 *γράφειν ὑμῖν*, *ib. γράψαι ὑμῖν*; 2 P. 1. 12 *ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν*, 1. 13, 15, 2. 3, 3. 8, 9, 11, J. 24.

συμβαίνω: 2 P. 2. 22 *συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας*.

Συμεών: 2 P. 1. 1 *Συμεὼν* (*al.* *Σίμων*) *Πέτρος*, pp. 180 f, ii.

σύν: 2 P. 1. 18 *σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντες ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ*.

συναπάγω: 2 P. 3. 17 *τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες*.

c. d. συνευωχέομαι: 2 P. 2. 13 *ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν*, J. 12 *οὗτοί εἰσιν* [*οἱ*] *ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι*.

συνίστημι: 2 P. 3. 5 *γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ*.

σώζω: J. 5 *λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας*, 23 *οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους οὓς δὲ σώζετε*.

σῶμα: J. 9 *περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος*.

σωτήρ: 2 P. 1. 1 *τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰ.Χ.*, 1. 11 *τὴν αἰωνίον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰ.Χ.* 2. 20 *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰ.Χ.*, 3. 2 *τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος*, 3. 18 *αὐξάνετε ἐν γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος*, J. 25 *μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰ.Χ. τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*.

σωτηρία: 2 P. 3. 15 *τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε*, J. 3 *πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας*.

a. ταρταρόω: 2 P. 2. 4 *σειροῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν*, pp. vi, lxii.

b. c ταχινός: 2 P. 1. 14 *ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου*, 2. 1 *ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν*.

τε: J. 6 *ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν . . . τετήρηκεν*.

τέκνον: 2 P. 2. 14 *κατάρας τέκνα*.

b. c. d. τεφρόω: 2 P. 2. 6 *πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας κατέκρινεν*, p. vii.

c. τήκω: 2 P. 3. 12 *στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται*.

τηρέω: 2 P. 2. 4 *εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους* (*al.* *κολαζομένους τηρεῖν*), 2. 9 *ἀδίκους εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν*, 2. 17 *οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται*, 3. 7 *οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ . . . τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως*, J. 1 *τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς*, 6 *ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας τετήρηκεν*, 13 *οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται*, 21 *ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε*.

τίθημι: 2 P. 2. 6 *ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν* (*al.* *ἀσεβεῖν*) *τεθεικώς*.

τιμή: 2 P. 1. 17 *λαβὼν παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν*.

τίμιος: 2 P. 1. 4 *τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ὑμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα* (*al.* *τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ἡμῖν ἐπαγγ.*).

τις: 2 P. 2. 19 *ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται* (*al.* *om. καί*), 3. 9 *ὡς τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται . . . μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι*, 3. 16 *ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσνόητά τινα*, J. 4 *παρεισεδύησαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι*. The interrogative *τίς* does not occur.

c. d. τοιόσδε: 2 P. 1. 17 *φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιᾶσδε*.

τολμάω: J. 9 *οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας*.

c. d. τολμητής: 2 P. 2. 10 *τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις*.

Digitized by Google

τόπος. 2 P. 1. 19 ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ.
τότε: 2 P. 3. 6 ὁ τότε κόσμος ἀπώλετο, J. 9 ὅτε Μιχαὴλ . . . τότε διακρινόμενος διελέγετο (*al.* ὁ δὲ Μ..., ὅτε).
τρέμω: 2 P. 2. 10 δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν.
τρόπος: J. 7 τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι.
τρυφή: 2 P. 2. 13 ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν.
τυφλός: 2 P. 1. 9 τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων.

ὕδωρ: 2 P. 3. 5 γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα, 3. 6 ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο.
υἱός: 2 P. 1. 17 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός (*al.* ὁ υἱός μου, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, οὗτός ἐστιν).
ὑπάρχω: 2 P. 1. 8 ταῦτα ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα (*al.* παρόντα), 2. 19 αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες, 3. 11 ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς.
c. g. ὑπέρογκος: 2 P. 2. 18 ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι, p. xxxvii, J. 16 τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα.
c. ὑπέχω: J. 7 πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι.
ὑπό: (*c. gen.*) 2 P. 1. 17 φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ ὑπὸ (ἀπὸ ?, see p. cxciii) τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης, 1. 21 ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι, 2. 7 δίκαιον Λὼτ καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς ἐρύσατο, 2. 17 ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι, 3. 2 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, J. 12 νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι, 17 μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων.
(*c. acc.*) J. 6 ἀγγέλους . . . ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν.
ὑπόδειγμα: 2 P. 2. 6 ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν τεθεικώς, p. cxcv.
ὑποζύγιον: 2 P. 2. 16 ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον.
ὑπομιμνήσκω: 2 P. 1. 12. ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων, J. 5 ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι.
ὑπόμνησις: 2 P. 1. 13 διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 3. 1 διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν.
ὑπομονή: 2 P. 1. 5 (ἐπιχορηγήσατε) ἐν τῇ ἐγκρατείᾳ τὴν ὑπομονήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ τὴν εὐσέβειαν.
ὑποστρέφω: 2 P. 2. 21 ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς.
c. ὗς: 2 P. 2. 22 ὗς λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου.

φαίνω: 2 P. 1. 19 προσέχοντες ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ.
φείδομαι: 2 P. 2. 4 ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, 2. 5 ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο.
φέρω: 2 P. 1. 17 φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιᾶσδε, 1. 18 ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν, 1. 21 οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, *ib.* ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι, 2. 11 οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν.
φθέγγομαι: 2 P. 2. 16 ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον, 2. 18 ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι.
φθείρω: 2 P. 2. 12 ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται (*al.* καταφθ.), J. 10 ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται.

Digitized by Google

c. d. **φθινοπωρινός**: J. 12 οὗτοί εἰσιν δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα, pp. 55–59.
φθορά: 2 P. 1. 4 ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, 2. 12 γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν, . . . ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται, 2. 19 δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς, pp. 190, 176–9.
d. e. **φιλαδελφία**: 2 P. 1. 7 (ἐπιχορηγήσατε) ἐν τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν φιλαδελφίαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην.
φόβος: J. 23 οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ.
φυλάσσω: 2 P. 2. 5 ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, 3. 17 φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ . . . ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ, J. 24 τῷ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπταίστους.
d. **φυσικός**: 2 P. 2. 12 ζῷα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἅλωσιν, p. viii.
c. d. **φυσικῶς**: J. 10 ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἐπίστανται.
φύσις: 2 P. 1. 4 ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως.
φωνή: 2 P. 1. 17 φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιᾶσδε ὑπὸ (ἀπὸ?) τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης, 1. 18 ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν, 2. 16 ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον, p. lxi.
c. d. **φωσφόρος**: 2 P. 1. 19 ἕως οὗ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.

χάρις: 2 P. 1. 2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, 3. 18 αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, J. 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, p. 26.
χάριν: J. 16 θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελίας χάριν.
χίλιοι: 2 P. 3. 8 μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία.
χιτών: J. 23 μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.
Χριστός: never alone, nor before Ἰησοῦς, follows Ἰησοῦς in 2. P. 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 ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου.
χωρέω: 2 P. 3. 9 πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι.

a. c. **ψευδοδιδάσκαλος**: 2 P. 2. 1 ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι.
b. **ψευδοπροφήτης**: 2 P. 2. 1 ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ.
ψυχή: 2 P. 2. 8 ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν, 2. 14 δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους.
d. e. **ψυχικός**: J. 19 οὗτοί εἰσιν ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες, pp. xxiv, clxxxvii f.

ὡς: followed by substantive (*a*) 2 P. 1. 19, 2. 12, 3. 8, 3. 10, 3. 16, J. 7, 10; followed by verb (*β*) 2 P. 2. 1, 3. 9; followed by participle 2 P. 1. 8, cf. pp. lii, cii.
ὠφελία: J. 16 ὠφελίας χάριν.

Digitized by Google

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Abbott, E. A., vi, xxvi, xxx, xliii, cxxvii, cxxix, cc, 97, 110, 132, 157, 160, 174
Abraham, Assumption of, 36
Adjectives in J. and 2 P. xlii; in 1 P., xcv
Advent, Second, 209 f.
Adverbs, li, ci
Agapè, 40, 133 f., 200
Alford, 27, 108, 112, 126, 161
Alliteration, lix, civ
Anacoluthon in Jude and 2 P., liv; in 1 P. ciii
Anathemas, 70
Angels, fallen, clviii–clxvi, 73
Antecedent of relative, ambiguous, xli, xciv
Aorist Ind. answering to English Perfect in J. and 2 P. xliii; in 1 P., xcv f.; Aor. Imper. of urgency, xliii f., xcvi; Aor. Inf. of a momentary act, xliii f.; Aor. Part. expresses antecedence either temporal or logical, xlv–xlvii, used for Perf. Part., xlvii f., xcvii f.; Pres. and Aor. combined γράφειν, γράψαι, 22; τιμᾶτε and τιμήσατε, xcvi; Aor. and Perf. Part. combined xcvii
Apocalypse of Peter, resemblance to 2 P., cxxx–cxxxiv
Apocryphal books used by early Christian writers, especially Jude, cliii foll. See under Enoch, Moses, Apocalypse of Peter, Testaments of the Patriarchs
Ark a symbol of the Church, vii, lxxxi–lxxxiii
Arnold, T., on the interpretation of prophecy, 196–198
Article, use of, in J. and 2 P., xxvi–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 (clxxxv); 2 P. 2^8 (cxcv)
Authenticity, see Evidence

Babylon a name for Rome with the early Christians, cxxxix
Balaam, 39, 136–8, 201–205; Balaamites, clxxvi
B.'s ass speaking with man's voice, x, 203 f.
Balfour, A., on cosmical changes, 208
Baptism illustrated by Noah's deliverance, lxxxi–lxxxiii; sin after, vi, xii, xx, 30, 96, 97
Batiffol on the Agape, 200 f.
Bede, 28
Bengel, 33, 131
Bigg, ix, xvii, xxii, xxiv, xxviii, xlvi f., xciv, cii, cvii, cxxvi, cxxxiv, 25, 28, 35, 40, 95, 103 f., 119, 126, 129 f, 133, 144, 154, 159, 160, 168

Cain and Korah highly esteemed by the Ophites, 38
Calling of God, 20 f.; through the life of Christ, 189
Calvin, 165 f.
Cases in J. and 2 P., xxxv–xxxix; in 1 P., xci–xciii
Charles, 25, 26, 36, 45, 99, 121, 162
Chase, iii, xxi, xxv, lx, cxvii, cxxx, cxl f., 19, 25, 31, 33, 41, 54, 195
Chiasmus, 162
Christianity, continual growth essential to its life, 65–69
Climax, 90
Compounds with ψευδο-, 115; with ἐπί, see ἐπαγωνίζομαι, ἐπίγνωσις; with παρά, lx; compound adverbs, 119
Conflagration, final, 154, 155, 158 foll., 207–209
Confusion between ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς, cxcii f. cxcix, 87; between ι and ει, cxcviii
Creed, its growth, 23

Deissman, 69; resemblances of his Carian decree to 2 P. cxxx
Deluge, why substituted by 2 P. for J.'s punishment of Israel, vi f.
Denial of a person, 72
Derivations in -ονια from nouns in -ων, 137; in -ονη from -ος, 147
Divine nature, 87; man's participation in, 190
Döllinger, xxi f.

Digitized by Google

Doxology, 52–54
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., ciii
Enoch, contrasted with Noah vii; book of, cliii f., clvi, 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–cxxiii; internal for Jude, cxlvi foll.; for 2 P. cxxiv–cxxvii
Ewald, 29, 35
Excommunication, 70 f.

Faith, right and wrong ways of defending it, 70, 71
Feltoe, 118
Field, cxciii, 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, clxxx foll. 1

Harnack, cxiv, 67
Hare, Julius, 50
Hatch, 172
Hell, 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, xcvii, cv, clxxxiv, cxcvii; 20, 21, 25, 52, 139, 162, 167, 184, 187, 188
Hundhausen 88, 90, 94, 136, 140, 141, 159

Imperative, xliii f., xcvi
Infinitive with art, xcvii, rare in N.T., xlv; other uses, xliv f., xcvi f.
Inflexions, unusual in J. and 2 P., xxvi; in 1 P., lxxxix

James, M., cxxxi foll., clv
Jerome on Epp. of Peter, lxviii
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, cxlvi–cliii; use of apocryphal books, cliii–clvii; his account of the Libertines, clxvii foll.; fondness for triplets, lvi f.; written to Jews, 20, fragment contained in Fayoum papyrus, clxxxvi; authenticity, cxv f.; date cxlv

Kenyon, F. G., cxcvii, cci
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., clxxxii
Luther, 51

Mark, his connexion with Peter, lxviii; his Gospel alluded to in 2 P. 1^{15}, cxlii foll.
MSS., 1; errors caused by love of uniformity, 82, ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς confounded, 87
Michael contending for the body of Moses, 74; story generalized in 2 P., ix
Miracles, 202
Moods, xliii f., xcvi 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., xliv, xlvii f., li, lxxxix
Munro on *damno c. abl.* = καταστροφῇ κατακρίνω, 124

Negative in J. and 2 P., l f.; in 1 P., c, ci
Nestle, 83. 127, 128, 152, cxcix
Number in J. and 2 P., xxxix, xl; in 1 P. xciii
Nicolaitan 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., xliv, xcvi

Participle sometimes used instead of finite verb, xlviii, xcvii, see aorist
Paul, his letter cited in 2 P. 3^{15}, supposed by Zahn to be lost cxxxvii, but probably our Ep. to the Romans, 164; his collected Epistles, cxxvii; Lightfoot's account of his stay in Rome, cxxxvii foll.

Digitized by Google

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. cvi–cxiv; agree with 1 P. not with 2 P. cxi, cxiv f.; Chase and Zahn on his later life cxl foll.; his crucifixion, clxi
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–cxv; probable date, cxxvii; not addressed to the readers of 1 P., cxxxv; addressed to a Graeco-Jewish church, cxxxvi
1 Peter, influenced by the writings of St. Paul, xxiv, 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. lxxxv; ambiguity in, cv
Peter, Gospel of, lxxxiv
Philo, resemblances to 2 P. cxxix f.
Pleonasm, lii, ciii
Plummer, xxii, 161 f.
Plumptre, 48
Plural of abstract nouns, 161
Prayer in the Holy Spirit, 78
Prepositions, excess of, in N.T., lxv, xciii
Pronouns in J. and 2 P., xl–xlii; in 1 P. xciii–xcv
Prophecy, 111–115; spoken of both in 1 P. and 2 P., lxxxvii f., cxlii; Arnold on, 196–198; Baxter on, 197
Pseudepigrapha not the same as forgeries, cxxv; condemned by the early Christians, not as fictions, 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, cxxxvii foll.; Peter's connexion with, cxl f.
Ryle, clix, clxvi.

Salutation, form of, 21; in 2 P. 182
Sanday, cxxxii
Satan, clxi foll., 74–76
Seven, a mystic number, iii, 44, 192
Silvanus, cxxxiv; in Rome, cxxxvii, cxli
Simon Magus, clxxviii f.
v. Soden, 94
'Sons of God,' how explained, clviii foll.
Sorites or climax, 90 f.
Spirits in prison, lxxxiii f.
Spitta, xxii f., clxxxiv, cxciii, cxciv, 25, 42, 51, 64, 82, 83, 87, 95 f., 97, 100, 108, 113, 118, 123, 129 f., 131, 133 f., 158, 159
Style of 2 P., objections to, lix foll.
Subjunctive, xliv, xcvi
Superlative joined with positive, 86, cxcii

Taylor, C., 39
Tennant, clxi f.
Tenses, xliii f., xcv f.
Testaments of the Patriarchs, clv, clxiii
Text, 4–15, Introduction on, clxxxi–ccii
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, clxxxiii
Trench, 57
Triplet a feature of J.'s style, lvi; found also in James, lvii

Vansittart, cxvii n.
Verb, inflexions, xxvi; moods and tenses, xliii foll., xcv f.
Version revised, faults in, 93; versions, Syriac and Egyptian, clxxxi
Virtues, Christian, list of, lvii, 90f., 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, xlviii f., xcviii f.

Way of truth, 198 f.
Weiss B., 18
Wernle, 67
Westcott, 38, 88, 167, 209, cxv–cxvii
Weymouth, 23
Wordsworth, Bp. Chr. lxii, 41

Zahn, xxii f., clxxxvii, cxli f. clxxv, 20, 24, 25, 30, 39, 167, 168 f.

Digitized by Google

RICHARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED,
BREAD STREET HILL, E.C., AND
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
3 9015 04989 1958

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google